

Committee	PTTC
Date	12/8/25
Item	6i, 8, 9 & 10

REPORT	Page
6.i. Reports on any significant planning decisions or issues DM/25/1560 Co-operative Food, 35-37 High Street – Installation of a digital display screen positioned inside the store.	1
8. Budget Report	2
9. Outstanding Action Points	3
10. Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025	5

Report:	6.i. Reports on any significant planning decisions or issues
---------	--

**Summary:**

For noting - MSDC have approved the Co-operative store's application for a digital display screen, to which LPC objected.

**Background:**

PTTC 1/7/25 considered the Co-op's application DM/25/1560 for the installation of a digital display screen positioned inside the store and submitted the following response:-

Lindfield Parish Council objects to this application; considering that this bright, moving image screen is totally inappropriate given its high-profile location within the Village's Conservation Area and its potential distraction to drivers negotiating the hazardous Lewes Road / High Street junction. Further, that the display will appear even more unsuitable during the longer hours of darkness in the winter months, both in terms of its distraction and likely light pollution.

If it is to be allowed, its operation should be restricted to daylight hours, the display change intervals should be extended to greater than two minutes at a time, and its light output set at an appropriately subdued level.

**Current Position**

MSDC have approved the application and the Planning Officer's Delegated Report (see [MSDC's Online Public Register](#) for full comments) includes the following comments in the context of the Parish Council's comments about public safety:

*"The digital display will be located within the shop which is set back from the public road. The brightness will be up to 700cd/m2 which meets the WSCC Highways standing advice for illuminated signage which for a display of this size in an E3 zone advises for up to 800 cd/m2. Additionally as the display will be set back from the public road and not within the main line of sight of a driver, therefore it is not considered to represent a hazard to public safety. Therefore, the proposal complies DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan."*

And concludes:

*"The proposed digital display is considered to be acceptable in terms of design and location, would preserve the character and appearance of the Lindfield Conservation Area and not create a hazard to public safety. The proposal therefore is considered to comply with Policies DP26 and DP35 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF."*

**Way Forward/Recommended Action**

No further action recommended.

**David Parsons**  
Deputy Parish Clerk

6<sup>th</sup> August 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	12/8/25
Item	6i, 8, 9 & 10

Report:	<b>8. Budget Report</b>
---------	-------------------------

**Summary**

No expenditure to date.

With the District Plan currently under (critical) scrutiny, the government's plans for increased housebuilding, and devolution proposals, it would appear more likely that the Planning Reserve may be required in the foreseeable future.

**Current Position**

Description	Cost Centre / Reserve	Budget 2025-26	Expenditure	Balance
Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) <sup>1</sup>	4973	£400	£0	£400
<b>sub-total Budget</b>		<b>£400</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£400</b>
<b>Earmarked Reserve</b>				
Planning Reserve <sup>2</sup>	4995/335	£4,000		£4,000
SID Replacement <sup>3</sup>	4936/336	£3,500		£3,500
<b>sub-total Reserves</b>		<b>£7,500</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£7,500</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>£7,900</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£7,900</b>

**Notes**

1. To meet RTPI annual maintenance charge
2. Planning Reserve – in anticipation of external costs which may be incurred (e.g. reviewing the Neighbourhood Plan, addressing unforeseen planning issues, pursuing sustainable transport initiatives)
3. To meet the anticipated cost of repairing/replacing one of the ageing early SIDs, which are now over 5 years old and outside of the manufacturers guarantee period.

**Recommended Action**

For noting.

**David Parsons**  
Deputy Parish Clerk

6<sup>th</sup> August 2025

# Lindfield Parish Council

Committee	PTTC
Date	12/8/25
Item	6i, 8, 9 & 10

Report:	<b>9. Outstanding Action Points</b>
---------	-------------------------------------

Minute	Meeting date	Subject	Action Agreed	Responsibility	Due Date	Status	Date Completed	Comments
285.1	29/10/24	TRO	whether WSCC would be seeking to update Satnav systems to reflect the newly erected 'unsuitable for HGV signs'	Deputy Parish Clerk	29/12/24	Overdue		See also 273.1 above Email sent to WSCC 12/11/24, Chased 17/12/24, 14/1/25, 4/3/25. Meeting WSCC 3/4/25 - Adam Denby / Andy Tuck undertook to find out
352 363.1	18/03/25 8/4/25	Joint Neighbourhood Plan	Cllr Webster advised that Lindfield Rural Parish Council were unlikely to comment further in the foreseeable future and LPC would therefore need to consider its approach accordingly	tba	tba	Not Started		363.1 Committee agreed that this should remain as an outstanding item for future consideration
425.3	22/7/25	20mph Speed Limit	(1) appropriate communications must be put in place to advise residents of the current position and way forward	Deputy Parish Clerk	22/8/25	In course		Communication drafted and circulated to WG members 5/8/25 Lindfield Life copy deadline 12/8/25
425.3	22/7/25	20mph Speed Limit	(2) a letter should be written to WSCC, setting out LPC's concerns	Deputy Parish Clerk	22/8/25	In course		Letter drafted and circulated to WG members 5/8/25

**Lindfield Parish Council**

Committee	PTTC
Date	12/8/25
Item	6i, 8, 9 & 10

Minute	Meeting date	Subject	Action Agreed	Responsibility	Due Date	Status	Date Completed	Comments
425.3	22/7/25	20mph Speed Limit	(3) a project plan be put in place to support the working group in applying to WSCC for a village wide 20mph scheme in advance of the (anticipated) 31st July 2026 deadline	Deputy Parish Clerk / ANO	22/8/25	Not Started		Working Group meeting tba

**Recommended Action**

1. To note the currently outstanding action points and consider any further action required.

**David Parsons**  
**Deputy Parish Clerk**

6<sup>th</sup> August 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	12/8/25
Item	6i, 8, 9 & 10

Report:	<b>10. Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025</b>
---------	---

**Summary:**

For Noting – both the letter and communication to residents required by PTTC 22/7/24 Draft Minutes Item 425 have been drafted (see Appendix One and Two) and are currently being reviewed by Working Group members. A working group meeting is to be arranged to plan out deadlines, responsibilities, and activities to allow a Communities Highways Scheme application in advance of the anticipated WSCC 31/7/26 Deadline.

**Background:**

During Q2 2025 several discussions were held with WSCC Highways to consider the best approach to implementing a 20mph speed limit in the village. Alongside this, Chris Lee of Fairer World Lindfield had set up a petition on change.org which has gathered over a 1000 signatures in support of a 20mph limit. Separately, LPC wrote to Lindfield organisations and businesses, seeing in excess of 50% response rate, with 96% of respondents in favour of such a scheme.

**Current Position**

PTTC 22/7/25 reluctantly agreed that it was not appropriate to submit a limited scope Community Highways Scheme (CHS) application to WSCC for the 31/7/25 annual deadline, as it would not have been fully researched and could well fail to proceed further as a result. It would also have had the potential to stymy any future applications under WSCC's current CHS rules. For similar reasons, a Traffic Restriction Order (TRO) application was also not considered to be appropriate.

PTTC agreed that its Working Group should build up a comprehensive 20mph speed limit application for the (anticipated) WSCC 31/7/26 deadline. In the meantime, to communicate the current situation to residents and write to WSCC expressing concerns that the two processes they currently operate, CHS and TROs, do not fit well with 20mph speed limits

**Financial Implications**

At the present time CHS/TRO schemes are predominantly funded by WSCC. It is understood that funding from Parish or Town Councils does not materially impact the assessment of schemes but that may of course change as budgets and policy evolve.

**Policy Context**

LPC has indicated that it is fully supportive of a 20mph scheme and WSCC has adopted Vision Zero, under which reduced speed limits play a significant part.

**Sustainability Implications**

20mph speed limits are increasingly recognised as contributing to increased levels of cycling and walking, as well as likely improved drivers' behaviour, contributing to a better village environment for all.

**Risk Management Implications**

All the available evidence is that 20mph reduces risks for road users and there would appear to be no negative implications from a LPC perspective.

**Legal Implications**

None for LPC – WSCC manage such from a Highway's perspective.

Committee	PTTC
Date	12/8/25
Item	6i, 8, 9 & 10

**Way Forward**

A draft communication to village residents and a letter to WSCC has been drafted and shared with working group members for approval, noting the Lindfield Life copy deadline of 12/8/25

**Recommended Action**

The working group have been asked to review the draft papers, ideally allowing the communication to meet the Lindfield Life deadline and be 'signed off' under the Scheme of Delegation. The letter has also been shared with 20sPlenty given their experience and recent dialogue with WSCC.

Subject to any comments from PTTC, the letter will hopefully be sent to WSCC during the next week or so.

The Deputy Parish Clerk will seek to agree a meeting date with working group members to allow the project to be properly planned out, to meet or exceed next years anticipated 31/7/26 CHS deadline.

**David Parsons**  
**Deputy Parish Clerk**

7<sup>th</sup> August 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	12/8/25
Item	6i, 8, 9 & 10

## Appendix One – Draft Communication:

### Lindfield and 20mph speed limit – application delayed

Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) is very disappointed to announce that it has not proved possible to apply to West Sussex County Council (WSCC) for a 20mph speed limit by its 31 July 2025 deadline. This decision was reluctantly taken in the light of changing advice from WSCC and that in the light of the latest advice received, the required level of consultation could not be completed within the available time. Serious consideration was given to submitting a partial or limited scope application but there was a danger that doing so might then preclude a subsequent fuller proposal. LPC concluded that it was best to apply for the most appropriate scheme, with the required level of consultation, rather than rush into a substandard proposal simply to meet WSCC's 31<sup>st</sup> July deadline.

At this time, LPC would like to thank Chris Lee and Fairer World Lindfield for the petition that she organised in support of a 20mph speed limit, all the residents who supported the petition, and the organisations and business who responded to LPC's subsequent email seeking their views.

LPC is putting a plan in place to allow a full application to be submitted to WSCC which will seek to address the level of consultation that WSCC's Officers have advised is required to give the application the best chance to succeed. However, there is no guarantee of success, as WSCC receive around 60 applications a year under their Community Highways Scheme and generally only 10-12 of these are successful. It is understood that priority is given to schemes which are the most cost effective and are required to address significant issues, including evidence of inappropriate speeds and collisions.

LPC will continue to actively engage with WSCC and 20's Plenty for Us.org to provide the strongest case for a 20mph speed limit across the village. LPC considers that a 20mph scheme is entirely appropriate for the village, especially recognising the summary of evidence detailed in the graphic below:



WSCC has adopted the widely used VisionZero strategy, which is intended to achieve a world of zero road deaths and serious injuries. A further benefit of such an approach is its impact in supporting sustainable travel and healthy living. LPC strongly believes that WSCC should promote the wide adoption of 20mph speed limits in all areas where pedestrians and vehicle traffic are in close proximity, rather than await a level of collisions or speeding which

Committee	PTTC
Date	12/8/25
Item	6i, 8, 9 & 10

**Appendix One (.../cont) – Draft Communication**

forces it to act after the event. Over the coming months all households in the village will be asked for their views and these will be used to assess the issues that such a scheme may create and how best to address concerns raised.

---



Committee	PTTC
Date	12/8/25
Item	6i, 8, 9 & 10

## **Appendix Two – Draft Letter:**

### **Vision Zero, Lindfield Village and 20mph speed limits**

Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) has asked me to write to you in the light of its experience to date in considering a 20mph speed limit for the village within the current processes operated by WSCC Highways; namely, a Traffic Restriction Order (TRO) or a Community Highways Scheme Application (CHS). As detailed below, the process appears to be significantly restricted by Sussex Police's approach to repeater signs and the reactive approach currently operated by WSCC.

The council is pleased to see that WSCC supports Vision Zero and the Safe System philosophy<sup>1</sup>, intrinsic parts of which include safe speeds. 20mph speed limits are widely seen as major contributors to these approaches, recognised by organisations including the International Health Organisation, United Nations and International Transport Forum but it doesn't currently appear that some of WSCC's policies and processes are able to support this.

At the present time, TRO applications to WSCC are individually restricted to £5k cost and CHS applications are heavily weighted towards the traditional, wholly reactive approach to crash history, and controlling speeding<sup>1,2</sup>. Neither the TRO nor CHS approaches appear suited to enabling village wide 20mph speed limit schemes and WSCC Highway's Officers have advised the council that any village wide 20mph scheme sought by the village is therefore likely to fail to meet the current criteria employed by the CHS.

The position is exacerbated by WSCC Highways approach to signage within 20mph speed limits, which the council is led to believe is driven by Sussex Police's requirements. The government changed the signage requirements for 20mph repeater signs in 2017 to being optional and reduced the terminal signage requirements<sup>3</sup>, however, the council understands that Sussex Police continue to require repeater signs within in 20mph speed limits.

In the case of Lindfield Village, which has seventy-five roads and five entry/exit points, following the current government requirement for signage of an estimated six terminal signs (double sided 20/30mph signs) would be likely to fall within the TRO £5k allowance<sup>4</sup>. However, the apparent requirement of Sussex Police, and therefore WSCC Highways, for repeater signs (understood to be every 200 yards) would be likely to require greater than seventy-five repeater signs in addition, increasing likely total signage costs to >£34k. This has added difficulties for Lindfield's Conservation Area, where additional signage or street clutter would be even more unwelcome.

If the modified, reduced signage (and therefore cost) requirements were to apply across other towns and villages in West Sussex, it would appear that 20mph schemes could be installed across up to six locations, for the same cost as one scheme under the current Sussex Police / WSCC Highways approach.

LPC would very much appreciate your consideration of these issues to enable villages and towns to realistically be able to consider 20mph schemes where pedestrians and vehicles are in close proximity, thereby assisting the direction of travel towards Vision Zero. Clearly, this will require Sussex Police to review its stance towards signage and WSCC Highways to ensure that its current TRO/CHS processes can be adjusted to effectively accommodate and encourage applications for 20 mph speed limits. This may also need to include options for villages and towns to contribute financially to schemes in the future, as the current process for both TROs and CHS are understood not to take meaningful account of such financial contributions in the approval process.

---

<sup>1</sup> West Sussex Transport Plan 2022 to 2036

<sup>2</sup> WSCC West Sussex Road Safety Strategy Ref HT 01 (24/25)

<sup>3</sup> 20's Plenty for Us

<sup>4</sup> WSCC Officer advice

Committee	PTTC
Date	12/8/25
Item	6i, 8, 9 & 10

**Appendix Two (.../cont) – Draft Letter**

I look forward to hearing from you and, hopefully, finding a way forward to enable Lindfield Village to apply for and implement a 20mph speed limit in the foreseeable future.