
23 May 2019

Dear Councillor,

A meeting of **CABINET** will be held in the **COUNCIL CHAMBER** at these offices on **MONDAY, 3RD JUNE, 2019 at 4.00 pm** when your attendance is requested.

Yours sincerely,
KATHRYN HALL
Chief Executive

A G E N D A

	Pages
1. To receive Declarations of Interest from Members in respect of any matter on the Agenda.	
2. To receive apologies for absence.	
3. To confirm Minutes of the previous meeting.	3 - 8
4. To consider any items that the Leader agrees to take as urgent business.	
5. Acceptance of the recommendations contained in the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan.	9 - 70
6. Local Development Scheme 2019.	71 - 86
7. Financial Outturn 2018/19.	87 - 114
8. Questions pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 10 due notice of which has been given.	

To: **Members of Cabinet:** Councillors J Ash-Edwards (Chair), J Llewellyn-Burke (Vice-Chair), J Belsey, R de Mierre, S Hillier, A MacNaughton and N Webster

**Minutes of a meeting of Cabinet
held on Monday, 29th April, 2019
from 4.00 pm - 4.36 pm**

Present: G Wall (Chairman)
J Ash-Edwards (Vice-Chair)

J Llewellyn-Burke
A MacNaughton

G Marsh
M Thomas-Atkin

N Webster

Also Present: Councillor Rod Clarke
Kathryn Hall Chief Executive, Judy Holmes Assistant Chief Executive, Tom Clark Head of Regulatory Services, Simon Hughes Head of Digital and Customer Services, Kate Wilson Business Unit Leader Community Services, Policy & Performance, Terry Stanley Business Unit Leader Democratic Services Officer & Alison Hammond Democratic Services Officer

1. TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM MEMBERS IN RESPECT OF ANY MATTER ON THE AGENDA.

None.

2. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

None.

3. TO CONFIRM MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 MARCH 2019.

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 March 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Deputy Leader.

4. TO CONSIDER ANY ITEMS THAT THE LEADER AGREES TO TAKE AS URGENT BUSINESS.

None.

5. QUARTER 3 PERFORMANCE REPORT

Kate Wilson, Business Unit Leader Community Services, Policy & Performance introduced the performance report. She highlighted the positive performance with 90% of the indicators at green meaning that they are on or above target compared to 76% in the previous year. It was also noted that there were no indicators at red for the second consecutive quarter. It was noted that in the four instances where

performance was slightly under target, that reasons for this and action being taken was set out in the report. The progress on flagship activities were detailed in appendix b and the officer confirmed that monitoring reports will be received by the Scrutiny Committee on the new set of flagship activities at its' meeting on 12 June 2019. The changes to the indicators for 2019/20 were listed in paragraph 68 and Kate Wilson confirmed that a Members working party including chairs of all three Scrutiny committees had been set up to review and agree all changes to indicators. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Performance commented that whilst the collection of Council Tax was below the target, the actual amounts collected had increased. There had been a publicity campaign on the Single Person Discount (SPD) to ensure all eligible residents make a claim and that all existing claims were valid.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Economic Growth noted the good report with no red targets which demonstrated the hard work of the Council for the current administration.

The Cabinet Member for Community highlighted the positive feedback from the public on the health and wellbeing interventions. These had led to improvements in their health, and improved quality of life and led to reduced costs in other services including the NHS. He noted that he was pleased the report differentiated between the homeless and rough sleepers.

The Cabinet Member for Service Delivery highlighted the improvements to The Triangle Leisure Centre and that an additional 36,000 people had visited the centre following the recent joint investment with Places Leisure. He noted that further investment is due at other leisure centres.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning noted the difficulty in predicting affordable housing delivery. Overall the council had achieved 30% affordable housing from eligible developments.

The Cabinet Member for Customer Service confirmed that the Council was responding to the needs of the residents and working with other partners to assist rough sleepers.

The Leader noted the exceptional report and confirmed that the examination of the report by the Scrutiny Committee had been thorough and relevant. The flagship activities demonstrated the ambition and focus of the Council and congratulated the team effort of the officers and councillors.

The Leader noted that no more Members wished to speak so took them to the recommendations contained in the report, which were agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED

Cabinet resolved to:

- i) Note the Council's performance and progress with flagship activities in the third quarter of the year and identify any areas where further reporting or information is required; and
- ii) Note the changes to the bundle of performance indicators to be monitored in 2019/20.

6. INSTALLING ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING POINTS (EVCPs)

Simon Hughes, the Head of Digital and Customer Services introduced the report and highlighted the tabled revised appendix detailing 13 sites. The sites had been checked for viability for government funding and deliverability in the short term. The installation of more EVCPs supports a reduction of the carbon footprint and the demand for more charging points was a high priority in a recent survey. It was noted that Mid Sussex has more EVCPs than any other council in West Sussex.

The Cabinet Member for Service Delivery welcomed the report and confirmed that some of the additional EVCPs would be installed in rural locations.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Economic Growth commented that the Council was responding to requests for increased availability of charging points and the increased awareness of electric vehicles.

The Leader noted that no more Members wished to speak so took them to the recommendations contained in the report, which were agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED

Cabinet resolved to:

- i) Invite tenders for the charging points at sites identified through feasibility, including the Triangle leisure centre.
- ii) The use of section 106 funding (£38,114) pending a successful Onstreet funding application.

7. DOLPHIN LEISURE CENTRE IMPROVEMENT PROPOSALS

Judy Holmes, Assistant Chief Executive introduced the report. She noted that this positive report extends the investment programme to enable further joint investment with Places Leisure at The Dolphin Leisure Centre which would start in May and be completed by November 2019.

The Cabinet Member for Customer Delivery confirmed that the investment had been identified as improvements were needed to the entrance of the leisure centre and the investment programme highlighted the good working partnership with Places Leisure.

In response to a question from the Cabinet Member for Customer Service, the Assistant Chief Executive confirmed that the work would be carefully planned to minimise disruption for the users of the centre during the school holidays and work that would benefit the public most would be prioritised.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Performance supported the use of funds from Council Reserves to improve the Council's assets.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Economic Growth commented that since the start of the contract with Places Leisure, £6 million has been invested in leisure centres across the district and it was noted that the Council was able to contribute financially towards the improvements because of good financial management.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning confirmed the Council's good working relationship with Places Leisure and confidence in the services Places Leisure provide the residents of Mid Sussex.

The Cabinet Member for Service Delivery noted that this investment did not include funds already allocated to improve car parking facilities at The Dolphin leisure centre.

The Leader stated that the process to let the leisure contract was complex and this report demonstrated the high quality work by the Contract Services team. He commented that the leisure centres provide good access to sports and improves the wellbeing of the residents of Mid Sussex.

The Leader noted that no more Members wished to speak so took them to the recommendation contained in the report, which was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED

Cabinet recommended that Council:

- i) Approves the proposed works to the Dolphin Leisure Centre, which will be jointly funded by Places Leisure and the Council; and
- ii) Agrees a variation to the 2019/20 capital programme, allocating £198k towards this project from General Reserve.

8. TO CONSIDER WHETHER TO EXCLUDE THE PRESS AND PUBLIC FROM THE MEETING DURING CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 100A OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 ON THE GROUNDS THAT IT INVOLVES THE LIKELY DISCLOSURE OF EXEMPT INFORMATION AS DEFINED IN PARAGRAPH 3 OF PART 1 OF SCHEDULE 12A OF THE SAID ACT.

The Leader proposed that the Press and Public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the exempt items on the agenda and this was seconded by the Cabinet Member for Service Delivery. This was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED

That the public and press be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item in accordance with Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the said Act.

The Leader brought the meeting back into open session on the completion of the exempt business.

9. TO CONFIRM EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 MARCH 2019.

10. QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10 DUE NOTICE OF WHICH HAS BEEN GIVEN.

None.

The meeting finished at 4.36 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

ACCEPTANCE OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE SLAUGHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN EXAMINATION REPORT

REPORT OF:	Divisional Leader for Planning and Economy
Contact Officer:	Alma Howell Email: Alma.Howell@midsussex.gov.uk Tel: 01444 477063
Wards Affected:	Slaugham
Key Decision:	Yes
Report to:	Cabinet 3 rd June 2019

Purpose of Report

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet acceptance of the recommended modifications to the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan following its Examination in respect of the Basic Conditions for Neighbourhood Plans.

Summary

2. Slaugham Parish Council submitted a revised Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan to Mid Sussex District Council for Examination in November 2018. An Independent Examiner was appointed to examine the Plan; this took place between January to May 2019. The Examiner considered the representations received and determined that no public hearing was required.
3. The Examiner has now issued his final report and concludes, that subject to a number of modifications, the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan can proceed to Referendum. It is recommended that the proposed modifications of the Examiner are accepted by the District Council.
4. Mid Sussex District Council as the Local Planning Authority (LPA) must publish a 'Decision Statement' setting out how the Neighbourhood Plan will be modified in response to the Examiner's Report.

Recommendations

5. **It is recommended that Cabinet:**
 - a) **formally accepts the Examiner's recommended modifications to the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan to enable the Plan to proceed to Referendum;**
 - b) **agrees to publish the 'Decision Statement' as set out at Appendix 2 of the report;**

Background

6. The Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan covers the plan period 2014 to 2031 and has been prepared for a designated neighbourhood area which follows the Slaugham Parish boundary.
7. The Parish Council first prepared their Pre-submission (Regulation 14) Neighbourhood Plan at the end of 2012. The Submission (Regulation 16) Plan underwent public consultation in May 2013 and was the subject of Examination. Ann

Skippers was appointed as Examiner and her report (dated 17 January 2014) concluded that the Plan should not proceed to a Referendum for three reasons: that the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) did not meet the legislative requirements', there had been insufficient consultation on the Pre-submission (Regulation 14) Plan, and the assessment of housing need needed to be more robust.

Revised Slaugham Neighbourhood Development Plan

8. Slaugham Parish Council resolved to prepare a revised Neighbourhood Plan in August 2014 and carried out Pre-submission (Regulation 14) consultation from 13 November 2017 to 22 January 2018. The Slaugham Submission (Regulation 16) Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to the District Council on 7th November 2018.
9. The Plan sets out a vision for the Parish and, in line with paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, it contains a series of policies to protect the environment and heritage, community facilities, the local economy, improve sustainability as well as proposing to allocate two sites for housing development. The NPPF explains that one of the conditions that needs to be met in order for Neighbourhood Plans to be immune from speculative development when a Local Planning Authority does not have a five year land supply, is that the Neighbourhood Plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement. Two housing sites have been identified:
 - Policy 11 - St Martin Close (east) for 30 residential units;
 - Policy 12 – St Martin Close (west) for 35 residential units as a Reserve Site.
10. The Neighbourhood Plan was published by the District Council for public consultation from 19th November 2018 until 14th January 2019. 50 representations were received during the consultation period. A summary of the representations can be found at: <https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/3846/slaugham-neighbourhood-plan-summary-representations.pdf>
11. In agreement with Slaugham Parish Council, Mid Sussex District Council appointed Mr Andrew Ashcroft as Independent Examiner to review whether the Neighbourhood Plan met the Basic Conditions, as required by legislation and to recommend whether it should proceed to Referendum. The Examiner's report was published on 6th May 2019 and is included as Appendix 1 to this report.

Examiner's Recommended Modifications to the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan

12. Officers have reviewed the Examiner's report in consultation with Slaugham Parish Council. The Examiner has recommended:
 - The deletion of Policy 2 – Protection of the Landscape as this policy is not in general conformity with District Plan Policies DP12 (Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside), DP14 (Sustainable Rural Development) and DP15 (New Homes);
 - The deletion of Policy 3 - Protection of the Open Countryside as this is inconsistent with District Plan policy DP12 and fails to add any local value or distinctiveness;

- Although supporting Policy 11, which allocates St Martin Close (east) as a housing site, as the development involves the loss of informal open space, he recommends that the development of the site should make provision for high quality open space to approved District Council standards;
 - Modifications to the policy and supporting text to Policy 12 - St Martin Close (west) housing site so that it properly operates as a reserve site and has recommended a series of triggers points at which the potential release of the reserve site would apply. These include: the review of the Neighbourhood Plan; the adoption of the emerging Mid Sussex Site Allocations DPD, the Review of the District Plan; and a material delay in the delivery of the strategic site at Pease Pottage. He has also recommended that the Policy includes a criterion relating to open space provision;
 - The inclusion of a section on monitoring the effectiveness of the implementation of the Neighbourhood Plan on an annual basis is recommended for inclusion;
13. Details of each modification recommended by the Examiner are set out in the Decision Statement at Appendix 2.
14. It is recommended that Cabinet formally accept the Examiner's modifications as they are considered to be necessary in order for the Neighbourhood Plan to meet the Basic Conditions tests.

Decision Statement

15. The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 state that a Local Planning Authority (LPA) must publish what actions will be taken in response to the recommendations of the Examiner. This is known as the 'Decision Statement'.
16. The Neighbourhood Plan Regulations impose no obligations for the Examiner or the LPA to have to consult on the changes to the Plan which they are minded to accept. Those that do not endorse the plan have the chance to vote to reject it at Referendum.
17. As the LPA, Mid Sussex District Council is recommending that all the modifications are accepted, therefore there is no requirement to carry out any further consultation.

Next Steps

18. Following the publication of the Decision Statement, the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan can proceed to Referendum. It is provisionally agreed that the Referendum will be held on Thursday 25th July 2019. If over 50% of those voting are in favour of the Neighbourhood Plan, then the Plan can be 'made' (adopted) by the District Council and will form part of the statutory Development Plan for Slaugham Parish and used in the assessment and determination of planning proposals.

Policy Context

19. The National Planning Policy Framework and the Localism Act 2011 support Neighbourhood Plans. The Mid Sussex District Plan was adopted in March 2018 and the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans is part of its overall development strategy.

Neighbourhood Plans will sit alongside the District Plan and set out how local communities wish their neighbourhoods to evolve.

Other Options Considered

20. Cabinet has the option not to accept the recommendations of the Independent Examiner on all of the elements, one of the elements, or some of the elements contained within the Examiner's Report. However, this is not considered appropriate as the modifications are considered necessary in order for the Neighbourhood Plan to meet the Basic Conditions.

Financial Implications

21. The cost of the Examination is £9,000 and the Referendum will cost £3,000. These costs can be met from Government grant once the Plan achieves a successful Referendum.

Risk Management Implications

22. The Examiner has recommended modifications to ensure the Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions. If these modifications are not implemented the Plan would be at risk of legal challenge on the basis it does not meet the legal requirements for Neighbourhood Development Plans.

Equality and Customer Service Implications

23. An Equality Impact Assessment was carried out at the Submission (Regulation 16) Stage of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council also prepared a Consultation Statement demonstrating how they have consulted the local community and statutory consultees. The Examiner was satisfied that the consultation and publicity undertaken meets regulatory requirements.

Other Material Implications

24. There are no other material considerations.

Appendices

1. The Independent Examination Report into the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan.
2. Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement.

Background Papers

- The Slaugham Submission (Regulation 16) Neighbourhood Plan - <https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/3751/slaugham-neighbourhood-plan-submission-plan.pdf>

Slaugham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2014-2031

**A report to Mid Sussex District Council on the
Slaugham Neighbourhood Development Plan**

**Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
BA (Hons) M.A. DMS M.R.T.P.I.**

Director – Andrew Ashcroft Planning Limited

Executive Summary

- 1 I was appointed by Mid Sussex District Council in November 2018 to carry out the independent examination of the Slaugham Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- 2 The examination was undertaken by written representations. I visited the neighbourhood plan area on 17 January 2019.
- 3 The Plan includes a range of policies and seeks to bring forward positive and sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. There is a very clear focus on safeguarding local character and community facilities. It identifies allocations for new residential development.
- 4 The Plan has been underpinned by community support and engagement. It is clear that all sections of the community have been actively engaged in its preparation.
- 5 Subject to a series of recommended modifications set out in this report I have concluded that the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan meets all the necessary legal requirements and should proceed to referendum.
- 6 I recommend that the referendum should be held within the neighbourhood area.

Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
7 May 2019

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report sets out the findings of the independent examination of the Slaugham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2014-2031 (the 'Plan').
- 1.2 The Plan has been submitted to Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) by Slaugham Parish Council in its capacity as the qualifying body responsible for preparing the neighbourhood plan.
- 1.3 Neighbourhood plans were introduced into the planning process by the Localism Act 2011. They aim to allow local communities to take responsibility for guiding development in their area. This approach was subsequently embedded in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2012 and 2018 and in the latest revision in February 2019. The NPPF continues to be the principal element of national planning policy.
- 1.4 The role of an independent examiner is clearly defined in the legislation. I have been appointed to examine whether or not the submitted Plan meets the basic conditions and Convention Rights and other statutory requirements. It is not within my remit to examine or to propose an alternative plan, or a potentially more sustainable plan except where this arises as a result of my recommended modifications to ensure that the plan meets the basic conditions and the other relevant requirements.
- 1.5 A neighbourhood plan can be narrow or broad in scope. Any plan can include whatever range of policies it sees as appropriate to its designated neighbourhood area. The submitted plan has been designed to be distinctive in general terms, and to be complementary to the development plan in particular. It addresses a range of environmental and community issues and proposes the allocation of two residential developments.
- 1.6 Within the context set out above this report assesses whether the Plan is legally compliant and meets the basic conditions that apply to neighbourhood plans. It also considers the content of the Plan and, where necessary, recommends changes to its policies and supporting text.
- 1.7 This report also provides a recommendation as to whether the Plan should proceed to referendum. If this is the case and that referendum results in a positive outcome the Plan would then be used to determine planning applications within the plan area and will sit as part of the wider development plan.

2 The Role of the Independent Examiner

- 2.1 The examiner's role is to ensure that any submitted neighbourhood plan meets the relevant legislative and procedural requirements.
- 2.2 I was appointed by MSDC, with the consent of the Parish Council, to conduct the examination of the Plan and to prepare this report. I am independent of both MSDC and the Parish Council. I do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan.
- 2.3 I possess the appropriate qualifications and experience to undertake this role. I am a Director of Andrew Ashcroft Planning Limited. In previous roles, I have over 35 years' experience in various local authorities at either Head of Planning or Service Director level. I am a chartered town planner and have significant experience of undertaking other neighbourhood plan examinations and health checks. I am a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute and the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service.

Examination Outcomes

- 2.4 In my role as the independent examiner of the Plan I am required to recommend one of the following outcomes of the examination:
- (a) that the Plan is submitted to a referendum; or
 - (b) that the Plan should proceed to referendum as modified (based on my recommendations); or
 - (c) that the Plan does not proceed to referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.

The Basic Conditions

- 2.5 As part of this process I must consider whether the submitted Plan meets the Basic Conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. To comply with the basic conditions, the Plan must:
- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State; and
 - contribute to the achievement of sustainable development; and
 - be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in the area;
 - be compatible with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations; and
 - not be likely to have a significant effect on a European site or a European offshore marine site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

I have examined the submitted Plan against each of these basic conditions, and my conclusions are set out in Sections 6 and 7 of this report. I have made specific comments on the fourth and fifth bullet points above in paragraphs 2.6 to 2.12 of this report.

- 2.6 The Neighbourhood Plan General Regulations 2015 require a qualifying body either to submit an environmental report prepared in accordance with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 or a statement of reasons why an environmental report is not required.
- 2.7 In order to comply with this requirement, the Parish Council commissioned the preparation of a Sustainability Appraisal incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). The report is thorough and well-constructed. It appraises the policy options against the sustainability framework.
- 2.8 The Appraisal has two detailed appendices. Appendix 1 appraises different policy options. Appendix 2 is a Housing Sites Options Appraisal. Where appropriate I comment on the technical details in the Sustainability Appraisal in the policy specific section of this report (Section 7).
- 2.9 MSDC also prepared its own Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Plan in November 2018. It assessed the policies in the Plan against the Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC. It concludes that the Plan is not likely to have significant environmental effects on this important European nature conservation site or undermine their conservation objectives alone or in combination taking account of the precautionary principle. As such Appropriate Assessment is not required.
- 2.10 Having reviewed the information provided to me as part of the examination, including the most recent HRA assessment, I am satisfied that a proportionate process has been undertaken in accordance with the various regulations. None of the statutory consultees have raised any concerns with regard to either neighbourhood plan or to European obligations. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I am entirely satisfied that the submitted Plan is compatible with this aspect of European obligations.
- 2.11 In a similar fashion I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and that it complies with the Human Rights Act. There is no evidence that has been submitted to me to suggest otherwise. There has been full and adequate opportunity for all interested parties to take part in the preparation of the Plan and to make their comments known. On this basis, I conclude that the submitted Plan does not breach, nor is in any way incompatible with the ECHR.

Other examination matters

- 2.12 In examining the Plan I am also required to check whether:
- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood plan area; and
 - the Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the Plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one neighbourhood area); and

- the Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under Section 61G of the Localism Act and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.

2.13 Having addressed the matters identified in paragraph 2.12 of this report I am satisfied that all of the points have been met subject to the contents of this report.

3 Procedural Matters

- 3.1 In undertaking this examination I have considered the following documents:
- the submitted Plan;
 - the Basic Conditions Statement;
 - the Consultation Statement;
 - the Sustainability Appraisal and the associated Non-Technical Summary;
 - the MSDC HRA report;
 - the Parish Council's responses to my Clarification Note;
 - the District Council's responses to my Clarification Note
 - the representations made to the Plan;
 - the adopted Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031;
 - the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012, July 2018 and February 2019);
 - Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014 and subsequent updates); and
 - relevant Ministerial Statements.
- 3.2 I carried out an unaccompanied visit to the Plan area on 17 January 2019. I looked at its overall character and appearance and at those areas affected by policies in the Plan in particular. My site inspection is covered in more detail in paragraphs 5.9 to 5.16 of this report.
- 3.3 It is a general rule that neighbourhood plan examinations should be held by written representations only. Having considered all the information before me, including the representations made to the submitted plan, I was satisfied that the Plan could be examined without the need for a public hearing. I advised MSDC of this decision early in the examination process.
- 3.4 On 24 July 2018 a revised version of the NPPF was published. Paragraph 214 of the 2018 NPPF identifies transitional arrangement to address these circumstances. It comments that plans submitted before 24 January 2019 will be examined on the basis of the 2012 version of the NPPF. The further updates to the NPPF in 2019 did not affect these transitional arrangements. I have proceeded with the examination on this basis. All references to paragraph numbers within the NPPF in this report are to those in the 2012 version.

4 Consultation

Consultation Process

- 4.1 Policies in made neighbourhood plans become the basis for local planning and development control decisions. As such the regulations require neighbourhood plans to be supported and underpinned by public consultation.
- 4.2 In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 the Parish Council has commissioned the preparation of a Consultation Statement. This Statement is proportionate to the Plan and its policies. It includes an assessment of the consultation undertaken during the various stages of Plan production. It also provides specific details about the consultation process that took place on the pre-submission version of the Plan (November 2017 to January 2018).
- 4.3 The Statement sets out details of the range of consultation events that were carried out in relation to the initial stages of the Plan. It provides details about:
- the organisation of dedicated meetings and discussions with key statutory local organisations, local residents and organised groups;
 - the distribution of leaflets and updates;
 - the use of banners and adverts to publicise key events; and
 - the public event on the proposed site allocations in April 2017.
- 4.4 The Statement itself is very comprehensive. It is supported by a series of technical appendices. Some of the appendices reproduce the consultation material used. This gives a degree of depth and interest to the Statement.
- 4.5 The Statement also provides specific details on the comments received as part of the consultation process that took place on the pre-submission version of the Plan (Table 1). It identifies the principal changes that worked their way through into the submission version (Table 2). They help to describe the evolution of the Plan.
- 4.6 It is clear that consultation has been an important element of the Plan's production. Advice on the neighbourhood planning process has been made available to the community in a positive and direct way by those responsible for the Plan's preparation. I note that several of the local residents who have made representations to the Plan consider that their earlier views have not been taken into account. I address the specific issues around the proposed housing sites later in this report. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this part of the report I am satisfied that proper engagement has been undertaken.
- 4.7 From all the evidence provided to me as part of the examination, I can see that the Plan has promoted an inclusive approach to seeking the opinions of all concerned throughout the process.

Representations Received

4.8 Consultation on the submitted plan was undertaken by the District Council for a six-week period that ended on 14 January 2019. This exercise generated comments from a range of organisations as follows:

- Thames Water
- Sport England
- Trustees of Ashfold Estate
- Environment Agency
- Thakenham Homes
- Welbeck Land
- Millwood Designer Homes
- West Sussex County Council
- Historic England
- Gladman Developments Limited
- High Weald AONB
- Highways England
- A2 Dominion
- Natural England
- Hallam Land
- Wates Homes
- Freechase and Lyndhurst Estates

4.9 In addition 33 representations were made to the Plan by local residents. The overwhelming majority of these comments expressed overlapping objections to the housing allocation and the reserve site proposed in the Plan.

4.10 In examining the Plan I have taken account of all the representations made. Where appropriate I make specific reference to the representation concerned on a policy-by-policy basis.

5 The Neighbourhood Area and the Development Plan Context

The Neighbourhood Area

- 5.1 The neighbourhood area consists of the parish of Slaugham. Its population in 2011 was 2769 persons living in 1131 houses. It was designated as a neighbourhood area in July 2012. It is of an irregular shape bisected by the A23 as it runs in a north-south direction from Crawley to Brighton. It has four principal settlements – Pease Pottage in the north, Handcross and Slaugham and Warninglid to the south. The majority of the neighbourhood area falls within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- 5.2 The villages of Handcross and Pease Pottage are the two major concentrations of residential and business activity in the neighbourhood area. Handcross is located at the junction of the B2110 and the B2114. It has a vibrant village centre. The National Trust property of Nymans Gardens is located to the immediate south of the village. Pease Pottage is located to the immediate west of the A23 and to the south of Crawley. A service centre is located to the immediate east of the A23.
- 5.3 The majority of the neighbourhood area falls within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The High Weald is a historic countryside of rolling hills with small irregular fields, woodlands and hedges. Its attractiveness is immediately apparent. In many cases the settlements in the neighbourhood area have taken account of their natural landscape setting. Slaugham itself is particularly attractive and is located on a ridge (Park Road) between two watercourses. Warninglid has a similarly attractive setting and makes good use of vernacular materials. The villages of Warninglid, Slaugham and Handcross each contain a designated conservation area.

Development Plan Context

- 5.4 The development plan covering the neighbourhood plan area is the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031. It was adopted in March 2018. The Plan sets out a vision, objectives, a spatial strategy and overarching planning policies that guide new development in the Plan period. It is this development plan context against which I am required to examine the submitted Neighbourhood Plan
- 5.5 Policy DP1 Sustainable Economic Development, DP4 Housing and DP6 Settlement Hierarchy of the District Plan provide key elements of the strategic approach of the District Plan. New growth is largely based around the settlement hierarchy. In District terms Burgess Hill, East Grinstead and Haywards Heath are category 1 settlements. Within the neighbourhood area Handcross and Pease Pottage are identified as category 3 settlements (medium size villages), and Slaugham and Warninglid are identified as category 4 settlements (small villages).

- 5.6 The principal new development proposed within the neighbourhood area is that of a strategic allocation to the east of Pease Pottage (Policy DP10). It incorporates 600 new dwellings and a range of associated community facilities.
- 5.7 In addition to this strategic approach the following policies in the District Plan are particularly relevant to the Slaughtam Neighbourhood Plan:

DP12 Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside
 DP13 Preventing Coalescence
 DP14 Sustainable Rural Development and the Rural Economy
 DP15 New Homes in the Countryside
 DP16 High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
 DP25 Community Facilities and Local Services
 DP31 Affordable Housing
 DP35 Conservation Areas

In this context the Basic Conditions Statement usefully highlights key policies in the development plan and how they relate to policies in the submitted Plan. This is good practice. It provides confidence to all concerned that the submitted Plan sits within its local planning policy context.

- 5.8 The submitted Plan has been prepared within its wider adopted development plan context. In doing so it has relied on up-to-date information and research that has underpinned existing planning policy documents in the District. This is good practice and reflects key elements in Planning Practice Guidance on this matter. It is clear that the submitted Plan seeks to add value to the District Plan and to give a local dimension to the delivery of its policies. This is captured in the Basic Conditions Statement.

Unaccompanied Visit

- 5.9 I carried out an unaccompanied visit to the neighbourhood area on 17 January 2019. The day was cold but sunny. It showed off the neighbourhood area at its Winter best.
- 5.10 I drove into the area from the M23/A23 to the north. I stopped initially at the Pease Pottage service station. This gave me an initial impression of the setting and the character of the neighbourhood area and its relationship with the A23. I saw the emerging development of the strategic housing allocation in Pease Pottage as identified in the District Plan.
- 5.11 I looked at the settlement of Pease Pottage to the west of the A23. I saw the new houses off Horsham Road and off Old Brighton Road (Haynes Way). I also looked at the two housing sites promoted by representors.
- 5.12 I then drove to Handcross. I saw the School to the north of the village. I then walked around the village centre. I saw its range of shop and commercial uses and its wider importance to the sustainability of the neighbourhood area. I saw some of the parking and congestion issues that are addressed in the Aims of the Plan. In most cases they

related to delivery vehicles. Plainly things have moved on since their predecessors filled up with petrol at the iconic Esso petrol pump outside The Old Garage.

- 5.13 I then looked at the two proposed housing sites in St Martin Close. I looked particularly at the way in which they would occupy land currently used as open grassland and as woodland. I saw that they were located at the end of a series of roads which created a long cul-de-sac. Whilst I was in Handcross I also took the opportunity to look at the three proposed housing sites promoted by developers in their representations to the Plan.
- 5.14 I took the opportunity to view the access and parking arrangements associated with Nymans Gardens (National Trust) to the immediate south of the village centre. This helped me to understand better the relationship between the village and the Gardens and one of the Aims in the Plan relating to car parking.
- 5.15 I drove to Slaugham via Staplefield. In Slaugham I saw the idyllic relationship between the church to the south of Staplefield Road and the main village to the north in Park Road. I saw several very fine vernacular houses and the pathway up to Slaugham Park. I also saw its iconic white telephone box.
- 5.16 I then drove to Warninglid. I saw the many pleasant cottages off The Street. I drove back to Handcross along Coos lane. In doing so I saw Furnace Pond.

6 The Neighbourhood Plan as a whole

- 6.1 This section of the report deals with the submitted neighbourhood plan as a whole and the extent to which it meets the basic conditions. The submitted Basic Conditions Statement has helped considerably in the preparation of this section of the report. It is an informative and professional document.
- 6.2 The Plan needs to meet all the basic conditions to proceed to referendum. This section provides an overview of the extent to which the Plan meets three of the five basic conditions. Paragraphs 2.6 to 2.11 of this report have already addressed the issue of conformity with European Union legislation.

National Planning Policies and Guidance

- 6.3 For the purposes of this examination the key elements of national policy relating to planning matters are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued in March 2012. Paragraph 3.4 of this report has addressed the transitional arrangements which the government has put in place as part of the publication of the 2018 version of the NPPF.
- 6.4 The NPPF sets out a range of core land-use planning principles to underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. The following are of particular relevance to the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan:
- a plan led system– in this case the relationship between the neighbourhood plan, the adopted Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031;
 - recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving local communities;
 - taking account of the different roles and characters of different areas;
 - always seeking to secure high quality design and good standards of amenity for all future occupants of land and buildings; and
 - conserving heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.
- 6.5 Neighbourhood plans sit within this wider context both generally, and within the more specific presumption in favour of sustainable development, which is identified as a golden thread running through the planning system. Paragraph 16 of the NPPF indicates that neighbourhoods should both develop plans that support the strategic needs set out in local plans and plan positively to support local development that is outside the strategic elements of the development plan.
- 6.6 In addition to the NPPF I have also taken account of other elements of national planning policy including Planning Practice Guidance and ministerial statements.

- 6.7 Having considered all the evidence and representations available as part of the examination I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to national planning policies and guidance in general terms. It sets out a positive vision for the future of the plan area within the context of its position in the settlement hierarchy. In particular it positively allocates a site for residential development and proposes another as a reserve site. It includes a series of policies that seek to safeguard the quality and nature of its natural environment and the High Weald AONB in particular. The Basic Conditions Statement maps the policies in the Plan against the appropriate sections of the NPPF.
- 6.8 At a more practical level the NPPF indicates that plans should provide a clear framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made and that they should give a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to a development proposal (paragraphs 17 and 154). This was reinforced with the publication of Planning Practice Guidance in March 2014. Its paragraph 41 (41-041-20140306) indicates that policies in neighbourhood plans should be drafted with sufficient clarity so that a decision-maker can apply them consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. Policies should also be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.
- 6.9 As submitted the Plan does not fully accord with this range of practical issues. The majority of my recommended modifications in Section 7 relate to matters of clarity and precision. They are designed to ensure that the Plan fully accords with national policy.

Contributing to sustainable development

- 6.10 There are clear overlaps between national policy and the contribution that the submitted Plan makes to achieving sustainable development. Sustainable development has three principal dimensions – economic, social and environmental. It is clear that the submitted Plan has set out to achieve sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. In the economic dimension the Plan includes policies for housing and employment development (Policies 11/12 and 14-16 respectively). In the social role, it includes policies on open space (Policy 7), community facilities (Policy 8), and on utility infrastructure (Policy 10). In the environmental dimension the Plan positively seeks to protect its natural, built and historic environment. It has specific policies on the AONB (Policy 1) and on conservation areas (Policy 6). The Parish Council has undertaken its own assessment of this matter in the submitted Basic Conditions Statement.

General conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan

- 6.11 I have already commented in detail on the development plan context in the wider District in paragraphs 5.4 to 5.8 of this report.
- 6.12 I consider that the submitted Plan delivers a local dimension to this strategic context. The Basic Conditions Statement helpfully relates the Plan's policies to policies in the development plan. Subject to the recommended modification in this report I am satisfied that the submitted Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies in

the development plan. Indeed, it positively seeks to deliver the ambitions of the District Plan in the neighbourhood area.

7 The Neighbourhood Plan policies

- 7.1 This section of the report comments on the policies in the Plan. In particular, it makes a series of recommended modifications to ensure that the various policies have the necessary precision to meet the basic conditions.
- 7.2 My recommendations focus on the policies themselves given that the basic conditions relate primarily to this aspect of neighbourhood plans. In some cases, I have also recommended changes to the associated supporting text.
- 7.3 I am satisfied that the content and the form of the Plan is fit for purpose. It is distinctive and proportionate to the Plan area. The wider community and the Parish Council have spent time and energy in identifying the issues and objectives that they wish to be included in their Plan. This sits at the heart of the localism agenda.
- 7.4 The Plan has been designed to reflect Planning Practice Guidance (41-004-20170728) which indicates that neighbourhood plans must address the development and use of land. It includes a series of Aims which the Plan recognises cannot be delivered directly through the planning process. These Aims are identified in a different colour to the land use policies. They sit within the appropriate topic-based parts of the Plan.
- 7.5 I have addressed the policies in the order that they appear in the submitted plan. Where necessary I have identified the inter-relationships between the policies. The Aims are addressed after the policies.
- 7.6 For clarity this section of the report comments on all the policies and the Aims whether or not I have recommended modifications in order to ensure that the Plan meets the basic conditions.
- 7.7 Where modifications are recommended to policies they are highlighted in bold print. Any associated or free-standing changes to the text of the Plan are set out in italic print.

The initial sections of the Plan (Sections 1-3)

- 7.8 These introductory sections of the Plan set the scene for the range of policies. They do so in a concise and proportionate way. The Plan is presented in a professional way. It is colourful and makes a very effective use of tables and maps. A very clear distinction is made between its policies and the supporting text. It also draws a very clear connection between the Plan's objectives and its resultant policies.
- 7.9 The initial elements of the Plan set the scene for the policies. They are commendable to the extent that they are proportionate to the Plan area and the subsequent policies.

- 7.10 Section 1 provides a very clear context to the neighbourhood area and when it was designated. It identifies how the Plan was prepared, how it will fit into the wider planning system in the event that it is 'made' and what the Plan sets out to achieve.
- 7.11 It also sets out how the community was engaged in the plan-making process. Whilst this overlaps with the Consultation Statement it provides a useful context to this matter in the main body of the Plan.
- 7.12 Section 2 provides commentary on the neighbourhood area. It sets out useful information on the social and economic context of the neighbourhood area. This information feeds into some of the policies in the Plan.
- 7.13 Section 3 provides a Vision for the neighbourhood area together with a series of Strategic Objectives. The objectives are both thorough and comprehensive.
- 7.14 The remaining parts of the Plan incorporate policies on a topic basis. They include related supporting text and background information. The remainder of this section of the report addresses each policy in turn in the context set out in paragraphs 7.5 to 7.7 of this report.

Policy 1: Protecting the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

- 7.15 The majority of the neighbourhood area falls within the High Weald AONB. This policy provides a context within which development proposals can be assessed and determined. I sought clarity from the Parish Council on the actual extent of the AONB and whether it should be included on a map base within the Plan. The Parish Council has provided the relevant information. I recommend accordingly.
- 7.16 The form and structure of the policy is very similar to that of Policy DP16 of the MSDP. National policy is clear that there is no need for a neighbourhood plan to repeat policies that are already contained within a local plan. However, in circumstances where the AONB extends largely throughout the neighbourhood area and has had a significant influence on other elements on the plan-making process, I am satisfied that the policy should remain in the Plan. I recommend two modifications to ensure that the policy has the clarity required by the NPPF. The first signposts the extent of the AONB within the neighbourhood area within the policy itself. The second inserts the relevant details from MSDP Policy DP16 into the first part of the policy. As submitted Policy 1 has excluded important parts of the corresponding MSDP policy. I also recommend a modification to the third part of the policy to correct a grammatical error.

At the beginning of the policy add:

'The extent of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is shown on [insert details]'

In the first part of the policy insert 'only' between 'will' and 'be'.

At the end of the first part of the policy add:

‘in particular;

- **the identified landscape features or components of landscape beauty and to their setting;**
- **the traditional interaction of people with nature and appropriate landscape management;**
- **character and local distinctiveness, settlement pattern, sense of place and setting of the AONB; and**
- **the conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage.’**

In the third part of the policy replace ‘it’s’ with ‘its’.

Policy 2: Protection of the Landscape

- 7.17 This policy refers specifically to the part of the neighbourhood area which is outside the AONB. In specific terms it is the built-up area of Pease Pottage and two adjoining modern developments.
- 7.18 The policy indicates that development which has an unacceptable detrimental effect on the landscape in this area will not be supported other than in exceptional circumstances where the use relates to essential infrastructure. The policy has attracted several representations.
- 7.19 I have considered the purpose of this policy very carefully. I can see that the Parish Council wishes to apply a policy approach to the landscape in that part of the neighbourhood area outside the AONB. However, the evidence for the policy is not well-developed. Paragraph 4.6 comments that its principal purpose is to protect this part of the neighbourhood area from unacceptable development based on public feedback about its local importance. Plainly this is an important part of the neighbourhood planning process. However, in this case the resultant policy is not dissimilar to Policy 1 which addresses the AONB. In particular Policy 2 would only support development in ‘exceptional circumstances’. Such an approach is reserved only for designated landscapes in paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF. Plainly in the case of the AONB that part of the neighbourhood area is such a designated landscape.
- 7.20 In addition the matter of fact approach taken in the policy is not in general conformity with Policies DP12 (Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside), DP14 (Sustainable Rural Development) and DP15 (New Homes in the Countryside) of the adopted District Plan. In their different ways these policies offer a degree of flexibility for appropriate development to come forward. On this basis I recommend the deletion of this policy from the Plan. It does not have regard to national policy and is not in general conformity with strategic policies of the development plan.

Delete the policy.

Delete paragraph 4.6

Policy 3: Protection of the Open Countryside

- 7.21 This policy raises similar issues to those addressed above in respect of Policy 2. In this case there is a specific issue of the consistency between the submitted policy and Policy DP12 (Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside) in the adopted District Plan.
- 7.22 The submitted policy takes a negative approach to development proposals in the countryside except for the purposes of agriculture or other uses which have to be located in the countryside. In contrast Policy DP12 of the District Plan takes a positive approach to new development in the countryside. The policy initially comments that the countryside will be protected in recognition of its intrinsic character and beauty. It then continues to comment that development will be permitted where it maintains or possibly enhances the quality of the rural and landscape character of the District.
- 7.23 Considering all of the issues I conclude that the submitted policy is not in general conformity with Policy DP12 of the District Plan. Indeed, in many respects the two policies run in different directions. In any event the submitted policy fails to add any local value or distinctiveness to the strategic context for development in the District. In these circumstances I recommend the deletion of the policy and the supporting text. I am satisfied that the general policy objective that is sought by the policy will be satisfactorily achieved by the implementation of District Plan Policy DP12 through the development management process.

Delete the policy.

Delete paragraph 4.12

Policy 4: Sustainable Development Measures

- 7.24 The policy supports sustainable development measures and associated proposals. It specifically highlights photovoltaic panels, solar thermal insulation and biomass and heat pumps.
- 7.25 The policy meets the basic conditions.

Policy 5: Green Infrastructure

- 7.26 The policy addresses green infrastructure. It has three related parts. The first supports proposals which would conserve, maintain and enhance existing green infrastructure. The second part supports proposals that would improve access for pedestrians and cyclists into the parcels of green infrastructure in the neighbourhood area. The third resists proposals that would involve the loss of green infrastructure unless mitigation or compensation measures are associated with the proposal.

- 7.27 The supporting text provides a context to the existing green infrastructure in the neighbourhood area (paragraph 4.17). It also identifies the social and community benefits of well-managed green infrastructure (paragraph 4.16).
- 7.28 I recommend a series of detailed modifications to the wording of the policy as follows:
- in the first part of the policy replace ‘and’ with ‘or’. As submitted the policy would require proposals to ‘conserve, maintain and enhance the existing green infrastructure network’. In some case this may well be possible. In most cases to achieve all three ambitions in the policy would be unrealistic or impracticable;
 - in the second part of the policy insert the missing words at the end; and
 - in the third part of the policy replace ‘be resisted’ with ‘not be supported’
- 7.29 Otherwise the policy meets the basic conditions.

In the first part of the policy replace ‘and’ with ‘or’

In the second part of the policy add at the end ‘will be particularly supported’

In the third part of the policy replace ‘be resisted’ with ‘not be supported’

Policy 6: Conservation Areas

- 7.30 This policy celebrates the rich historic built environment of the neighbourhood area. It contains three conservation areas – Slaugham, Warninglid and Handcross.
- 7.31 I recommend that the supporting text and map information shows the extent of the conservation areas. This would be best achieved by including an A4 plan for each of the three conservation areas in an appendix of the Plan. In the absence of this information the reader of the Plan has to go elsewhere to find the relevant information.
- 7.32 The policy itself has two related parts. The first provides general policy guidance on the need for new development to conserve or enhance the three conservation areas. The second part of the policy identifies five specific locations within the three conservation areas. I sought clarity from the Parish Council on the role and purpose of this part of the policy. I was advised that the intention of this part of the policy was to identify particularly sensitive locations within the conservation areas. The Parish Council also considers that they are of local significance and should be conserved in an appropriate fashion. I recommend modifications to this part of the policy, and to the supporting text, to bring clarity to the policy and to achieve the ambitions which the Parish Council had in mind in formulating its approach in the Plan.
- 7.33 The initial part of the policy is more general in its approach. The corresponding policy in the adopted District Plan is Policy DP35. Plainly its coverage is District-wide. Nevertheless, it is commendably detailed in the way in which it requires development in conservation areas to conserve or enhance the character or appearance of the District’s conservation areas. In comparison Policy 6 in the submitted Plan does not include the same level of general detail and guidance. As such it is not in general

conformity with the District Plan policy. In addition, it does not provide any refined or granular details which would apply to the three conservation areas in the neighbourhood area.

- 7.34 In these circumstances I recommend that the policy is modified so that it consolidates and reinforces the strategic District Plan policy in a more local context. In recommending this modification I have also considered the need for the retention or otherwise of the supporting text associated with the policy (paragraphs 4.18-4.23). Given the importance of the conservation areas within the neighbourhood area and the quality and robustness of the supporting text I am satisfied that it should remain in the Plan. I recommend modifications to the existing text so that it makes a direct reference to District Plan Policy DP35 and its role in determining development proposals in the three conservation areas.

Replace the opening part of the policy with the following:

‘Development proposals within the Handcross, Slaugham and Warninglid conservation areas will be supported where they conserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area concerned and comply with the requirements in Policy DP35 (Conservation Areas) of the District Local Plan.

In the second part of the policy add the following after ‘will be supported’:

‘where such proposals would conserve or enhance the specific part of the conservation area and its immediate setting’

At the end of paragraph 4.18 add:

‘The three conservation areas are shown on [insert details]’

At the end of paragraph 4.22 add:

‘Development proposals within the three conservation areas will be assessed and determined against national policy and Policy DP35 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2013. Policy 6 of this Plan has been designed to be complementary to this national and local policy context and to provide specific detail relevant to the neighbourhood area.’

At the end of paragraph 4.23 add:

‘Policy 6 has two related parts. The first has a general effect. It makes a reference to the key principles contained in Policy DP35 of the adopted District Plan. The second makes a specific reference to five identified locations within the three conservation areas. They are particularly sensitive locations which have been identified as part of the plan-making process. The Parish Council also considers that they are of local significance and should be conserved in an appropriate fashion.’

Policy 7: Open Space

- 7.35 The policy seeks to recognise the importance of good well-planned open spaces in the neighbourhood area. It has four related parts. The first offers support to

development proposals which provide a mix of formal and informal open space. The second requires open spaces to be high quality and to serve a local need. The third resists proposals that would result in the loss of open spaces. The fourth part supports proposals for the replacement of open space where two criteria are met.

- 7.36 I recommend that the first and second parts of the policy are combined. This will bring the clarity required by the NPPF. I also recommend that the initial part of the policy should be realigned so that it requires the provision of open space to standards set out in the Mid Sussex Development Infrastructure and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document in developments promoted within the neighbourhood area in either the neighbourhood plan or the District Plan. Whilst policies in a neighbourhood plan need to be considered in the round the language used in the first part of the policy could be interpreted as offering support to a proposed development which conflicted with the wider development plan but which provided open space to meet local need.
- 7.37 Otherwise the policy meets the basic conditions. Its implementation through the development management process will make a significant contribution towards the achievement of the social and the environmental dimensions of sustainable development in the neighbourhood area.

Replace the first and second parts of the policy with:

‘Development proposals which are otherwise in accordance with the development plan should provide a mix of formal and informal open space to standards set out in the Mid Sussex Development Infrastructure and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document to meet local need as appropriate to the site concerned. The resulting open space should be designed and arranged within the site in a high-quality fashion’

Policy 8: Community Facilities

- 7.38 This policy celebrates the extensive range of community facilities to be found in the neighbourhood area. They are primarily focused in the four main settlements. Paragraph 5.6 provides an indication of their scope. During my visit to the neighbourhood area I saw their importance to the local community.
- 7.39 The policy has two related parts. The first resists proposals that would result in the net loss of community facilities. The second offers support for the alteration and/or replacement of community facilities where a series of factors are met.
- 7.40 The policy has attracted two representations. One suggests that the policy would be improved if it provided a context for the provision of new community facilities. The other suggests that the policy has not fully explored the scenario where alternative sites would unlock the potential to provide new facilities to meet the immediate needs of residents of Handcross. Plainly both of these potential dimensions to a policy of this nature would improve its role and applicability. However, my role is to examine the policy against the basic conditions. It is not within my remit to improve a policy.

As such I am satisfied that the policy has regard to national policy and is in general conformity with strategic policies in the development plan. It meets the basic conditions.

Policy 9: Superfast Broadband

- 7.41 The policy has a sharp focus on supporting proposals that would improve access to high speed broadband services. It has regard to national policy in the NPPF.
- 7.42 The policy has two related elements. The first offers support to proposals which would provide access to super-fast broadband. The second offers support to schemes which sympathetically locate and design the associated above-ground network installations. I recommend modifications to both elements of the policy. They will bring clarity and simplicity to the intentions of the policy. They will also ensure that the two parts of the policy follow a similar format to other policies in the submitted Plan.

Replace the first part of the policy with:

‘Proposals which would provide access to a super-fast broadband network will be supported’.

Replace the second part of the policy with:

‘Proposals for above ground network installations which would provide access to a super-fast broadband network will be supported where their location is sympathetically chosen and designed to reflect the character of the local area’.

Policy 10: Utility Infrastructure

- 7.43 The policy offers support to new and/or improved community infrastructures where it meets the identified needs of the community.
- 7.44 The principle of the approach taken meets the basic conditions. Nonetheless I recommend the deletion of ‘encouraged’ in the policy wording. It is both unclear and unnecessary. I also recommend other detailed modifications to the wording of the policy so that it has the clarity required by the NPPF.

Delete ‘encouraged and’.

Replace ‘in order to meet’ with ‘where it meets’.

Housing Allocations

- 7.45 Policies 11 and 12 are at the very heart of the Plan. They propose a housing allocation and a reserve housing allocation respectively. They are located on adjacent parcels of land off St Martin Close in Handcross. I comment on each in turn later in this report. However, in the interests of consistency and to avoid repetition I

address a series of general issues at this point. Whilst they overlap one with another the following points have a particular bearing on the two housing sites:

- the strategic need or otherwise for the two proposed housing sites (paragraphs 7.46 to 7.54);
- the location of the two proposed sites with the High Weald AONB (paragraphs 7.55 to 7.69);
- the concentration of the proposed new housing development in the Plan in Handcross (paragraphs 7.70 to 7.71); and
- the site-selection process (paragraphs 7.72 to 7.82).

The strategic need or otherwise for the two proposed housing sites

- 7.46 The supporting text in Section 6 of the Plan provides a context against which it has proposed the two housing allocations. It outlines the strategic housing targets contained in the MSDP and the way in which they step from 876 dwellings per annum up to 2023/24 to 1090 dwellings from 2024/25. It also explains the context within which MSDC has commenced work on its own Site Allocations Development Plan Document.
- 7.47 The most significant residential development in the neighbourhood area during the Plan period will be that of the strategic site to the east of Pease Pottage. It is allocated in Policy DP10 of the MSDP. I saw that development had already commenced on this important site started when I visited the neighbourhood area.
- 7.48 Policy DP6 Settlement Hierarchy of the MSDP identifies the extent of the unidentified additional housing provision that remains to be provided within the District. It emphasises the role that will be played by neighbourhood plans as part of this process. The table at the end of the policy identifies the minimum residual housing delivery figure from 2017 onwards for the various settlements in the District. Footnote 6 to the table is particularly informative for the Slaugham Plan. It identifies that ‘the required minimum provision at Pease Pottage (Slaugham Parish) is significantly greater than other settlements within Category 3 due to the allocation and subsequent permission granted for 600 homes within this settlement. Due to this, the other settlements within Slaugham Parish (Handcross, Slaugham and Warninglid) will not be required to identify further growth through the Plan process on top of windfall growth although may wish to do so to boost supply’.
- 7.49 The Parish Council undertook a Housing Needs Consideration in late 2016 as the MSDP was in preparation. The results of that study indicate that the housing need in the neighbourhood area over the Plan period could be accommodated by the completions and commitments and that the housing need would be met without the need for allocations in the emerging neighbourhood plan.
- 7.50 Nevertheless the Parish Council resolved to consider whether further modest growth should be facilitated through the preparation of the emerging neighbourhood plan. As paragraphs 6.12 and 6.13 of the Plan comment this decision took account of the pro-

growth national growth agenda, the pressure for new dwellings in the District and MSDC's decision to proceed with work on a Site Allocations DPD.

- 7.51 The decision of the Parish Council to promote additional residential development in the submitted Plan beyond that already committed at Pease Pottage strategic allocation features in many of the local residents' representations made to the Plan (see paragraph 4.8 of this report). The representations contend that the proposed new housing in St Martin Close Handcross is simply not required.
- 7.52 Such comments from local residents are understandable. Indeed, they take account of footnote 6 of Policy DP6 of the MSDP. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that the principle of the approach taken by the Parish Council is both appropriate and meets the basic conditions. I have come to this conclusion for the following reasons:
- footnote 6 to Policy DP6 of the MSDP is clear that through the neighbourhood plan process the Parish Council may wish to identify further growth to boost supply;
 - it recognises the emerging work being carried out by MSDC on the preparation of a Sites Allocations DPD;
 - paragraph 47 of the NPPF highlights the importance and the role of the plan-making process in boosting significantly the supply of housing;
 - PPG (41-044-20160519) advises that neighbourhood plans can allocate additional sites to those in a Local Plan where this is supported by evidence to demonstrate need above that identified in the Local Plan; and
 - in any event the purpose of neighbourhood planning is to give communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of the local area (PPG 41-001-20140306).
- 7.53 Whilst local residents have contended that the two sites in St Martin Close are not needed the development industry has made a different set of representations on the Plan. Some suggest that the level of development should be higher both in general terms and to future-proof the Plan. Others promote potential development sites either in addition to or as alternatives to the St Martin Close package. Clearly different proposals would bring forward different levels of additional housing. In some case they would include community benefits. However, based on the evidence available to me I am satisfied that the proposals in the plan for a modest allocated site and a modest reserve site are appropriate to the circumstances that exist in the neighbourhood area on strategic housing allocation and delivery.
- 7.54 I address the site selection process shortly. Nevertheless, at this point in the report I highlight a later recommended modification which refers to the potential need for a review of any made neighbourhood plan based on the monitoring of the delivery of new housing development within the Plan period. The current situation may change within the Plan period.

The location of the two proposed sites within the High Weald AONB

- 7.55 Both of the proposed sites fall within the High Weald AONB. On this basis their proposed allocations have attracted objections from the High Weald AONB Unit and Slaughterham Neighbourhood Plan – Examiner's Report

Natural England. The comments from the AONB Unit draw my attention to paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF. The former indicates that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The latter indicates that planning permission should be refused for major development in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that they are in the public interest. Three factors are identified for the consideration of any such applications.

- 7.56 Plainly the issue of the appropriate location of additional housing allocations is heavily influenced by the extensive nature of the AONB within the neighbourhood area. This matter was addressed in detail within the examination and the eventual adoption of the MSDP. In paragraph 49 of his report on the MSDP the Planning Inspector comments:

'Meeting the housing needs of an area is a core planning principle in the NPPF, and in Mid Sussex this will entail development on greenfield land. Mid Sussex District is endowed with sites and areas of natural and historic interest; it has part of the South Downs National Park, the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and various heritage designations. Moreover, many of the undesignated rural areas of the District are attractive countryside. Together, these assets are a central part of the character of the District.'

- 7.57 It is within this context that the two housing sites in the submitted Plan have been promoted. They are a proposed housing allocation and a proposed reserve site in an emerging neighbourhood plan which has had to grapple with the inherent tensions of promoting new housing growth on the one hand and safeguarding a high-quality landscape on the other hand. The Planning Inspector's report on the Local Plan anticipates the challenges which the Parish Council has addressed. Paragraph 53 of his report comments that:

'Further allocations are likely to be needed in the future Site Allocations DPD to meet the housing requirement. There are locations within the District of lesser landscape value, in relatively sustainable locations near to settlements and close to main transport routes. Some settlements lie within the AONB and may be appropriate for modest housing schemes, but there is no evidence that meeting the housing requirement will necessitate major development in the AONB other than that already permitted by the Council at Pease Pottage, or that it would harm the National Park.'

- 7.58 I sought comments from both MSDC and the Parish Council on this important matter as part of the clarification note process. I summarise the responses below.

- 7.59 MSDC helpfully commented on the process which it is following with regards to its work on the emerging Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). The site selection criteria are based around three key factors: planning constraints, development considerations and sustainability/access to services. The work is drawing on the distribution requirements identified in Policy DP6 of the adopted District Plan.

- 7.60 I was also advised that approximately half of the wider District is within the High Weald AONB. On this basis the High Weald AONB Unit is providing an assessment of the potential impact of the development of sites within the AONB. Plainly this is good practice. As an outcome of this process sites with a medium or low impact will be taken forward for further assessment taking into account any necessary mitigation. Sites with a high impact are not being considered further.
- 7.61 The site assessment process was ongoing at the time that the responses to the clarification note were received. The package of sites in St Martin Close is one of eight sites in the wider parish, and one of four in Handcross that are being considered as part of this process
- 7.62 The Parish Council raises similar and overlapping commentary in its response to this issue to those raised by MSDC. In a local context it advises that 99% of the neighbourhood areas lies within the AONB. It goes on to comment that in this context there is little practical alternative to identifying land for new residential development in sustainable locations outside the built-up areas that would not be within the AONB. It then comments that not all land within the neighbourhood area is of equal landscape character, quality or sensitivity and that its site selection process has taken these matters and inevitable variations into account.
- 7.63 The Parish Council concludes that its detailed assessment of the various site options (as set out in the SA) indicates that the two sites promoted in the Plan are of a lesser landscape importance and sensitivity to other sites considered both in both absolute and relative terms. It also comments that the two sites are visually well-contained and relate well to the existing built up area of Handcross.
- 7.64 I have considered the extent to which the development of either the proposed allocated site or the combination of the allocated site and the reserve site would constitute major development in the AONB. In doing so I have considered national policy in paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF.
- 7.65 Within its general approach paragraph 116 of the NPPF specifically advises that any applications for major development in an AONB should include an assessment of three factors as follows:
- the need for the development;
 - the cost of and scope for developing elsewhere outside the designated area or meeting the need in some other way; and
 - any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities and the extent to which that could be moderated
- 7.66 In this context the High Weald AONB Unit has raised an objection to the identification of the allocated and the reserve site in the Plan. In particular the Unit comments that the proposals represent unwarranted major development in the AONB and that insufficient information has been included in the submitted documents to support such development.

- 7.67 I have also considered the allocation of the two sites that are located within the AONB very carefully. Plainly the submitted Plan needs to have regard to national policy to meet the basic conditions. Having considered all the evidence and information I am satisfied that the Plan has regards to national policy on AONBs. Firstly, the language used in paragraph 116 of the NPPF has a clear focus on how local planning authorities should consider planning applications for major development in AONBs. Plainly this may well arise in the event that the Plan is made. However, the neighbourhood plan is being promoted as part of the development plan process. In addition, the two sites, in their different ways are being promoted by a qualifying body for inclusion within a development plan document. In this capacity the process involved is very different from that which would properly arise if, in this case, MSDC was to receive an application for major development in the AONB.
- 7.68 Secondly the Plan itself, and the responses to the clarification note, comment on the way in which the identification of an allocated site and a reserve site would address a similar set of issues to the three criteria identified in paragraph 116 of the NPPF. In particular the Parish Council has come to a reasonable judgement that it wishes to promote additional housing development over and above the strategic development site at Pease Pottage and that there is no realistic prospect of accommodating that need in a sustainable location outside the AONB.
- 7.69 Thirdly I am satisfied that the development of either the proposed allocated site or the allocated site and the reserve site would not constitute major development in the AONB. Given that the NPPF does not define major development any assessment of this matter is inevitably subjective in nature. However, I have concluded that the development of the allocated site would be modest in scale and well-related to the existing built up area of the village. I have also separately recommended modifications to the proposed reserve site so that the policy reflects this approach and that clear release mechanisms are identified in the Plan. Nevertheless, if it came forward, I am also satisfied that the in-combination effect would not represent major development given the proximity of the two sites and the similarities of their effects on the natural beauty of the overall AONB.

The concentration of the proposed new housing development in the Plan in Handcross

- 7.70 The Plan provides commentary about the neighbourhood area and the relative sustainability of its various settlements. On the basis of this information and my own observations when I visited the neighbourhood area, it is unsurprising that several of the sites assessed for future development are around the edges of Handcross village. It is the most sustainable settlement within the neighbourhood area. In particular it has a critical mass of community services and an attractive and vibrant village centre.
- 7.71 As such I am satisfied that the Plan has sought to concentrate additional housing development in Handcross. Whilst some developers have argued that their sites are in more sustainable locations within or on the edge of the village than those included in the Plan off St Martin Close there is general agreement that Handcross is an appropriate location for new residential development in principle.

The site-selection process

- 7.72 The site-selection process has generated a considerable degree of commentary both from the development industry and from local residents. This reflects the importance of the relationship between the delivery of new housing and safeguarding the environment in the District in general and within the neighbourhood area in particular.
- 7.73 The site selection process is addressed both within the submitted Plan (paragraphs 6.2 to 6.15) and within the submitted Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The former sets out the way in which the process considered wider housing needs and has sought to take into account that a Site Allocations DPD is being prepared. The latter assesses a range of potential housing sites considered against a series of environmental and other factors. In combination these parallel sets of information inform the site-selection process captured in the Plan.
- 7.74 The Parish Council commissioned the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal. The resulting document is both thorough and detailed. The Appraisal has been prepared in accordance with the CLG Plan Making Manual and the SEA guidance from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister 'A Practical Guidance to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive' 2005.
- 7.75 The Appraisal identifies a range of sustainability issues and options to be considered in formulating the proposals for the emerging Plan. It has ensured that a range of potential social, economic and environmental effects have been properly considered. Its ambition has been to enable the most sustainable policy options to be identified for inclusion with the submitted Plan.
- 7.76 The SA assesses seventeen sites for their ability to provide additional housing within the neighbourhood area. Three of the sites had received planning permission at the time that the plan was submitted (SL04/05/14). SL05 is the strategic site at Pease Pottage as allocated in the MSDP. All of the other fourteen sites are within the AONB. In addition, the five sites promoted as alternative/additional sites through the representation process were also within the AONB. There are overlaps between the two sets of sites.
- 7.77 The details of the sites assessed are captured in Appendix 2 of the SA. Each site was assessed against a common set of criteria. They include the effect of the sites on rural character, highways safety, the delivery of affordable housing and their ability to maintain or enhance community infrastructure. The assessment highlighted that all sites will positively contribute to the delivery of housing. The majority would be likely to include some provision of affordable housing. The assessment process also highlighted that sites which are close to existing services and facilities score more favourably against the objectives which seek to enhance non-car modes of travel. The assessment also indicates that the majority of sites would have a negative impact on the environmental objectives of the Plan. Plainly the extent of the impact is dependent on the location of the site, and in particular with reference to the High Weald AONB. The results confirm that the neighbourhood area is relatively constrained in environmental terms.

7.78 The SA draws the following conclusions on this important matter:

'In order to seek to facilitate the delivery of housing need in the parish, it is considered inevitable there will be some harm, particularly against environmental objectives. Undertaking the requisite balancing exercise, it is considered sites off St. Martins Close score more favourably and the potential to limit and mitigate the adverse impacts are greater.

Having assessed all reasonable alternative sites, the Parish Council elected to allocate St. Martins Close (east), and St. Martins Close (west) which the Assessment has demonstrated will overall, and on balance, positively meet the Sustainability Objectives of the Plan. It is considered the proposed allocation of the identified sites presents the most sustainable option for the Parish as the sites with the least environmental effects have been allocated.'

7.79 Several representations have been made by the development industry on both the SA process followed and its conclusions. In most cases the developer concerned suggests either an alternative site to the St Martin Close package or its own site in addition to those proposed in the submitted Plan. In summary they raise the following matters:

- the Plan does not go far enough in contributing towards national and local housing needs;
- it fails to future-proof the Plan; and
- the comparison between the various sites assessed is insufficiently-detailed.

7.80 In several cases the various representations raise the following concerns about the appropriateness of the selection of the sites in St Martin Close and/or their sustainability as follows:

- the sites are rural and tranquil;
- they have relatively poor access to local services;
- their development would impact negatively on the informal recreational use of the open area in St Martin Close;
- the access to the sites and the capacity of the highways network; and
- the impact on the AONB from their development.

7.81 Plainly there will be a range of views about the scale of new development that should be delivered within the Plan and the best sites that would achieve the required amount. However, my role is to examine the Plan as submitted rather than a potential alternative to the submitted Plan. In this capacity I am satisfied that the site-selection has been robust and that it has been carried out to an appropriate standard. The SA takes a professional approach to the matter which is proportionate to the task concerned. In particular its conclusion is understandable and derived from its evidence base. In addition, the site selection has been undertaken within the wider context of the SA process which has addressed a series of environmental objectives and their relationship to the policies within the Plan itself.

- 7.82 I address site specific considerations for the St Martin Close sites in my commentary on the two sites concerned (Policies 11 and 12). However, in a broader sense I am satisfied that their development can be satisfactorily accommodated within the landscape/AONB context. I am also satisfied that the sites can be satisfactorily accommodated within the local highway network. In reaching this view I have taken account of the lack of any representation on this issue either from West Sussex County Council (in its capacity as the highways authority) or from MSDC (in its capacity as the local planning authority).

Summary of the section on housing allocations

- 7.83 I have given very careful consideration to these various matters and the overlaps between them. I have concluded that the Parish Council has taken a responsible and a thorough approach to this important aspect of the plan-making process. In particular it has addressed the matter of future housing development in a positive fashion and has responded to the opportunity provided by the Local Plan Inspector to consider further residential development in the Parish beyond the strategic allocation at Pease Pottage. In doing so it has sought to dovetail the preparation of the neighbourhood plan into the emerging Site Allocations DPD work.
- 7.84 I am also satisfied that the identification of a housing allocation and a reserve site in the AONB is both distinctive to the neighbourhood area and meets the basic conditions. In simple terms there is no practical option other than to allocate sites for any new residential development within the AONB. However, within this context I am satisfied that the Parish Council have chosen the correct package of sites and that it has done so on the basis of an appropriate evidence base within the SA. In my judgement either the separate development of the allocated site or the development of both sites would have a limited impact on the wider integrity and attractiveness of the High Weald AONB. In particular the sites concerned would be seen within the wider landscape as a logical and natural rounding off the existing village. This approach is in contrast with some of the other sites considered both within the neighbourhood area and around Handcross where the impact would be much greater.
- 7.85 The following sections of this report comment in detail on the two St Martin Close sites. Where necessary I recommended specific modifications to the policies.

Policy 11: St Martin Close (East)

- 7.86 This policy proposes the allocation of land adjacent to St Martin Close Handcross for residential development. The policy and the supporting text indicate that the site would yield 30 houses in the early part of the Plan period (2017-2022). As the Plan comments the character of the site is influenced by the adjacent modern residential development in St Martin Close which lies to the north of the site.
- 7.87 The proposed housing allocation is located at the southern end of West Park Road. In effect Covert Mead and West Park Road have been developed over the years to the south and have created a discrete group of houses to the south of Handcross. There are two separate vehicular access points into the wider area. The first via

Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan – Examiner’s Report

Covert Mead is off Horsham Road. The second via West Park Road is off Coos Lane. I looked at the traffic conditions and the capacity of the network when I visited the neighbourhood area. I saw several cars parked on street in the area in general, and on Covert Mead in particular. This restricted vehicular speeds. Both of the junctions with Coos Lane and Horsham Road were functioning safely and effectively. Plainly the development of additional dwellings at the southern end of St Martin Close will add further traffic onto the local network. Nevertheless, there is no evidence to the effect that the additional traffic and vehicle movements will impact on highway safety. In this respect I note that West Sussex County Council has raised no objection to the potential development of the site in its representation.

- 7.88 The Plan comments that the site is a greenfield site. My observations when I visited the neighbourhood area were that the site was a combination of informal open space (to the immediate west of St Martin Close) and a wooded area (to the south of the western part of West Park Road). I sought clarity from MSDC on this matter. I was advised that the planning history indicates that the planning application that granted consent for the construction of 20 low cost dwellings at St Martin Close, identified land at St Martin Close East as open space associated with the development (planning application SV/038/96). The land was transferred to the Parish Council via a Section 106 Agreement. Clause 5 of that agreement refers to the open space. I was also advised that the open space has neither been formally identified as open space on the Policies Map in the adopted District Plan nor on the Council's mapping system. In addition, it is not included in any of the published District Council open space surveys.
- 7.89 The Parish Council has also advised that the S106 agreement comments that the open space shall not be used for any purpose other than as public open space and no buildings or other structures or erections shall be constructed or placed thereon without the Council's prior written approval.
- 7.90 The Parish Council has advised further about how it has sought to address this restriction. It has engaged with the transferor, whose retained land benefits from this covenant, to keep them abreast of the preparation of the Plan and the Parish Council's aspiration to develop the site for residential uses. The transferor has been invited to attend public consultation events and to make representations at the pre-submission consultation stage. I was also advised about an informal understanding between the Parish Council and the transferor, that where the site is allocated for residential development as part of the emerging Plan, the transferor will agree to have the covenant removed from the land.
- 7.91 Since the grant of planning permission, the land has been left as grassland/scrubland. As a gesture of good will, for the benefit of existing residents, the Parish Council currently informally manage the area immediately fronting St. Martin Close (East).
- 7.92 Plainly the circumstances around the future development of the site are not straightforward. Nevertheless, this scenario is not unusual. On the basis of the information available to me I am satisfied that the site is capable of being developed

within the Plan period in general terms, and within its earlier part as anticipated in the Plan in particular. Plainly it cannot be guaranteed. It is for this and other reasons that I have separately recommended that the Plan is monitored, and, if necessary, reviewed.

- 7.93 The issue of the potential development of the 'open space' within the existing Martin Close development raises several related issues. The issues overlap with the representations made by several local residents. The first is its status. The planning history indicates that it was transferred to the Parish Council as part of the Section 106 agreement. Evidence from the Parish Council identifies that the land has been left as grassland/scrubland and that the area is informally managed.
- 7.94 The second is the use of the area. Its informal management and layout arrangements are unlikely to generate any formal use of the space. Evidence submitted by the development industry indicates that there are informal but established footpaths within the 'open space'. I saw these footpaths when I visited the neighbourhood area. Local residents have also advised about their use of the 'open space'.
- 7.95 The third is the opportunity for local residents, including children, to secure safe and convenient outdoor recreation in the event that the St Martin Close East site is developed for housing. The Parish Council draws my attention to the existing open recreational area at the western end of West Park Road. It is located approximately 75 metres away from the existing houses in St Martin Close.
- 7.96 In its response to the clarification note the Parish Council has also addressed the general issue of the provision of open space in the wider locality of St Martin Close/West Park Road in the event that the development of the proposed allocation proceeds. It considers that the proposed allocation can positively accommodate open space which would benefit future users of the site. It is envisaged that new open space could be provided which connects with existing open space(s) in the surrounding area. It is considered such connected provision could provide health and recreation benefits for existing and future users of the site. In addition, the Parish Council considers open space could provide community-focused and social benefits. It considers that the provision of such high-quality open space would be an important element in achieving sustainable development. In this context the wider issue of the provision of open space on new housing developments in the District is addressed in the Mid Sussex Development Infrastructure and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It was adopted in July 2018. It operates within the context of the adopted District Plan. Paragraph 3.53 of the SPD comments that the District Council requires that the leisure and recreation needs generated by residential development are provided for by the developer as an integral part of the development. These needs will include outdoor playing space, a contribution towards sporting infrastructure, and, in the case of larger developments may include indoor facilities. If this is not feasible, the District Council will require developers to make financial contributions which will be used to provide appropriate facilities in the District. In terms of the details of doing so paragraph A2.9 of the SPD comments that it is not always practicable or appropriate to provide all the categories of outdoor playing space, sport and recreation within every development. In particular it

comments that it is only appropriate on larger developments to provide playing pitches on site and that the provision of children's playing space on site for developments of 50 homes or more.

- 7.97 I have considered these various matters very carefully. On the one hand the proposed development of the site will involve the loss of the existing informal open space off St Martin Close. Plainly the existing space adds to the openness of this part of Handcross in general terms, and the West Park Road/St Martin Close part of the village in particular. On the other hand, the existing 'open space' appears to be used only on an informal basis. At the same time the development of the site offers an opportunity to incorporate a re-worked open space.
- 7.99 Taking all the various factors into account I am satisfied that the approach which has been taken in the plan-making process takes account of the evidence on this matter. Nevertheless, I recommend that the development of St Martin Close East provides for its own open space which would be provided and maintained to the standards set out in the Mid Sussex Development Infrastructure and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document. Given the circumstances of the site as described in paragraph 7.88 to 7.91 of this report I recommend that the open space is provided as an integral part of its development. I also recommend modifications both to the policy and to the supporting text on this matter.
- 7.100 Finally the policy requires access into the site from St Martin Close. It also requires that the development of this site provides access into the proposed site to the west – St Martin Close (west) and as detailed in Policy 12. I am satisfied that these matters are appropriate to the policy and the circumstances of the proposed development of the site. I comment on Policy 12 (St Martin Close West) in the next part of this report. I have already commented on the wider capacity of the highways network earlier in this report (paragraph 7.82).

Insert an additional criterion in the policy (between 3 and 4) to read: 'the development provides open space at least to the standards set out in the Mid Sussex Development Infrastructure and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document'

In paragraph 6.16 replace 'a greenfield site bound' with 'informal open space associated with the original development of St Martin Close and is bounded'

At the end of paragraph 6.16 add: 'Criterion 4 of Policy 11 requires the provision of open space as part of the development of the site. This should be to the standards in the Mid Sussex Development Infrastructure and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document as a minimum. The development of the site brings an opportunity to provide community and social benefits through the provision of revised open spaces facilities in this part of Handcross. The provision of high-quality well-designed open space would be an important element in securing the sustainable development of the site.'

Policy 12: St Martin Close (West)

- 7.101 The policy refers to a parcel of land which is located to the immediate west of the St Martin Close (east) site as addressed in Policy 11. My observations when I visited the neighbourhood area were that the site was open grassland and shrubland.
- 7.102 The policy comments that the site could deliver 35 houses. It also comments that access should be achieved through the development of the adjacent allocated site (as set out in Policy 11).
- 7.103 Paragraph 6.24 comments that the site is allocated as a reserve site. This reflects advice in national policy to the extent that such allocations can help to ensure that emerging evidence of housing need is addressed in the plan-making process. This is summarised in paragraph 6.22 of the Plan. However, the concept of a reserve site is not translated into the policy itself. It simply comments that development of the St Martin Close West site will be supported following the commencement of the St Martin Close East site. In these circumstances the reserve mechanism (effectively holding the development of such a site until a strategic need was identified) would not apply. Instead the development of the site would simply be linked to that of St Martin Close East. In its response to the clarification note the Parish Council acknowledges this inconsistency and confirms its view that the site should function as a reserve site. In this respect the commentary in paragraph 6.24 that the site could come forward in the second part of the plan period...if required to ensure the longer-term housing need of the Parish is fully met.
- 7.104 The site has developer interest (Millwood Designer Homes). In its representation to the Plan Millwood Designer Homes suggests that the site is immediately available and could come forward in the earlier part of the Plan. It also comments about the restrictions on its development in relation to the development of the St Martin Close east site. Finally, it draws my attention to the point above about the tension between the supporting text and the policy on when and in what circumstances its potential development could proceed.
- 7.105 I have considered the tension between the policy and the supporting text. In doing so I have taken careful consideration of the representation made by Millwood Designer Homes and by the Parish Council in its response to my clarification note. I am satisfied that the St Martin Close West site should be considered as a reserve site. There is no compelling evidence to suggest that there is a strategic need at this stage for the development of both the St Martin Close East and West sites. Nevertheless, the potential for this site to be developed in conjunction with that of St Martin Close East is appropriate in general terms in the event that the evidence justifies the need for its release for housing purposes.
- 7.106 The concept of a reserve site within a neighbourhood plan has regard to national policy (PPG 41-009-20160211). It also takes account of the potential uncertainty about future housing delivery needs within the neighbourhood area during the Plan period. Given the inconsistency between the policy and the supporting text on this site in the Plan I recommend modifications to the policy so that properly achieves the ambitions as captured in the text. In doing so I have considered the following matters:

- the likely commencement of development on the St Martin Close East site;
- the likely build out of that site;
- the timetable for the eventual adoption of the emerging Mid Sussex Site Allocations DPD;
- the recommended modification in this report that the neighbourhood plan is monitored and reviewed as appropriate in the event that it is 'made';
- the need for a stepped trajectory in the delivery of housing in the District as a whole (from 876 dwellings per annum from 2015/15-2023/24 to 1090 per annum from 2024/5); and
- the planned trajectory for the Pease Pottage strategic site.

7.107 Taking account of these matters I recommend that the supporting text identifies a series of key trigger points at which the potential release of the reserve site would be considered by the Parish Council. In the circumstances I recommend that this consideration involves MSDC given its broader access to information on the delivery of housing in the wider District. At this stage it is impractical to identify the way in which various process will unfold over the next few years. As such I recommend that the trigger point for the consideration of the release of the site should be whichever of the following four events occurs first:

- The review of neighbourhood plan itself – this review process is already recommended elsewhere in this report;
- The adoption of the emerging Mid Sussex Allocations DPD – this process will determine whether or not the site is required to meet the residual District housing requirement;
- The adoption of any review of the District Plan – this process would have a similar effect to that of the adoption of the DPD;
- A material delay in delivery of the Pease Pottage strategic delivery site in the adopted District Plan – the allocation of this site and its development trajectory has been an important factor in underpinning the development of the adopted District Plan and the emerging neighbourhood plan.

7.108 As submitted both the policy and the supporting text are based on the principle that the development of the St Martin Close West site follows the development of the St Martin Close East site. Within the context of the former site operating as a reserve site I am satisfied that it would be appropriate for it to be developed following the development of the St Martin Close East site. In particular this takes account of the access arrangements proposed in both policies.

7.109 In the event that the development of the St Martins Close East site does not proceed for whatever reason and evidence supports the need to release the development of the St Martin Close West site the issue could be addressed in a review of the neighbourhood plan at that time.

7.110 I have commented in paragraph 7.99 of this report about the need for an appropriate amount of open space to be provided as part of the residential development of the St Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan – Examiner's Report

Martin Close East site. The same principles should also apply to the development of this reserve site. I recommend accordingly. I also recommend consequential additional supporting text. In particular the additional text highlights the opportunity that would exist for the open spaces on the St Martin Close East and West sites to be provided on adjacent sites and to a complementary design and layout in the event that they were provided either in full or in part on the site concerned. This would enhance the usability of the spaces and may assist with maintenance costs and liabilities.

Replace the first part of the policy with:

‘Land at St Martin Close West Handcross is identified as a housing reserve site. Where the need for its release is identified at the relevant trigger point in paragraph 6.27 of this Plan development proposals for up to 35 houses will be supported subject to the following criteria:’

Insert an additional criterion in the policy (between 2 and 3) to read: ‘the development provides open space at least to the standards set out in the Mid Sussex Development Infrastructure and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document’

In paragraph 6.24 replace ‘in the second part of’ with ‘later within’

Replace paragraph 6.27 with:

‘The potential trigger point at which the need or otherwise for the release of this reserve site will be considered will be an important matter for the Parish Council. At this stage it is impractical to identify the way in which various process will unfold over the next few years. These include progress on the Mid Sussex Allocations DPD, the development of the St Martin Close East site and wider housing delivery in both the District and the neighbourhood area. As such the trigger point for the consideration of the release of the site should be whichever of the following events occurs first -the review of neighbourhood plan itself; the adoption of the emerging Mid Sussex Allocations DPD; the adoption of any review of the District Plan and a material delay in delivery of the Pease Pottage strategic delivery site in the adopted District Plan. The Parish Council will involve the District Council in this exercise given the overlaps with strategic housing delivery.’

At the end of paragraph 6.28 add:

‘Criterion 3 of Policy 12 requires the provision of open space as part of the development of the site. This should be to the standards in the Mid Sussex Development Infrastructure and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document as a minimum. The development of the site brings an opportunity to provide community and social benefits through the provision of enhanced open spaces facilities in this part of Handcross. The provision of high-quality well-designed open space would be an important element in securing the sustainable development of the site. In the event that both St Martin Close East and West sites are developed for housing purposes and that some or all of that open space is provided on site there would be an opportunity for the open spaces on the two sites to be provided on adjacent

parcels of land and to a complementary design and layout. There may also be the opportunity to consolidate the provision of open space on St Martin Close West with the existing open space off West Park Road. These options would enhance the usability of the spaces and may assist with maintenance costs and liabilities.'

Policy 13: Residential Development within and adjoining the settlement boundaries

- 7.111 This policy offers support for residential development within the built-up areas of Handcross, Pease Pottage and Warninglid subject to the proposals concerned meeting five environmental and design criteria. Its second part identifies the circumstances in which proposals for residential development outside the defined built up areas will be supported.
- 7.112 The policy takes on a similar format to that in Policy DP6 of the District Plan. In addition, the Parish Council advised me through the clarification note process that the definition of the built-up areas has adopted the boundaries as included in the Policies Maps of the District Plan.
- 7.113 On the one hand the submitted policy seeks to add local value to the District Plan policy by defining five specific environmental and design matters that are distinctive to the neighbourhood area. The policy in the District Plan is more general in its reference to its Policy DP26. This matter would in general terms add weight to the ability of the policy to meet the basic conditions and its retention of the policy in the Plan.
- 7.114 On the other hand the submitted policy either repeats key elements of District Plan Policy DP6, or in other places omits key elements of that policy. In particular the final part of Policy DP6 is excluded.
- 7.115 In all the circumstances I am not satisfied that the policy meets the basic conditions. In the first instance it does not have regard to national policy to the extent that it largely repeats a local plan policy without adding any local value. In the second instance the submitted policy is not in general conformity with Policy DP6 of the District Plan. In the event that I was to recommend modifications to ensure that it was in general conformity the policy would then replicate Policy DP6.
- 7.116 In recommending this modification I have also considered the need for the retention or otherwise of the supporting text associated with the policy (paragraphs 6.29-6.32). Given the importance of the built-up areas within the neighbourhood area and the quality and robustness of the supporting text I am satisfied that it should remain in the Plan. In any event the supporting text comments that the Parish has had a strong record of windfall development. There is no reason to suppose that this will not continue throughout the Plan period. I recommend modifications to the existing text so that it makes a direct reference to the role of District Plan Policy DP6 in determining residential development proposals in the three built up areas and their definition in the District Plan policies maps.

Delete the policy.

At the end of paragraph 6.31 add:

'The three built up areas are shown on the Mid Sussex District Plan Policies Map Pease Pottage (18a), Handcross (18b) and Warninglid (18d)'

At the end of paragraph 6.32 add:

'Development proposals within the three built-up areas will be assessed and determined against national policy and Policy DP6 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031'

Policy 14: Local Employment

- 7.117 This policy is the first of two policies which addresses economy and employment matters. Its focus is on restricting the loss of land in business or other employment use unless the business use is no longer viable.
- 7.118 The policy refers to the need for the marketing of the premises for business purposes for a period of six months and the levels of interest shown. Plainly this is an important factor. However, it is a process matter rather than a policy requirement. I recommend accordingly. The issue can be satisfactorily captured in the supporting text.

Delete 'and the site.....being shown'

At the end of paragraph 7.5 add:

'Policy 14 provides an opportunity for land owners to demonstrate that the site or premises concerned is no longer viable for business purposes. In these circumstances any resulting planning application should demonstrate that the site has been professionally marketed for business use at a realistic market price for at least six months and with no interest being shown.'

Policy 15: Economic Development

- 7.119 This is the second policy on the matter of economic development in the neighbourhood area. It offers support to proposals which would enable the development of business uses subject to four locational and environmental issues.
- 7.120 I sought advice from the Parish Council on its definition of 'a sustainable location' as set out in the first of the four criteria. I was advised that as part of its consideration of this matter it had concluded that a sustainable location would be either one within Handcross or Pease Pottage or within 800 metres of the settlement boundaries of those settlements and/or readily accessible to non-car forms of transport. It also commented that it recognised that other locations may have the ability to meet this test.
- 7.121 These comments are both helpful and highlight the inherent tension in attempting to define a matter which may vary from site to site. Nonetheless I consider that on

balance the retention of this matter within the policy meets the basic conditions and serves a useful purpose within the wider context of the policy. I recommend a modification to the supporting text to clarify this matter for the decision-maker. Otherwise the policy meets the basic conditions.

At the end of paragraph 7.6 add:

'Policy 15 provides a supporting context within which such proposals would be considered in the development management process. Plainly the definition of a sustainable location will be a matter of local judgement. However, the Parish Council considers that a sustainable location would be either one within Handcross or Pease Pottage or within 800 metres of the settlement boundaries of those settlements and/or readily accessible to non-car forms of transport.'

Policy 16: Protection of Handcross High Street

- 7.122 The policy seeks to protect the vitality of Handcross High Street. The approach taken has been underpinned by community consultation feedback. I saw its various retail and commercial facilities first-hand when I visited the neighbourhood area. It sits at the heart of the neighbourhood area and contributes significantly to its sustainability.
- 7.123 The focus of the policy is safeguarding A1(shops) and A4 (drinking establishments) uses. Proposals for the change of use of existing A1/A4 uses to other uses will not be supported. Within this context however the policy recognises the potential implications of permitted development rights and commercial viability issues.
- 7.124 The thrust of the policy meets the basic conditions. However, I recommend a series of modifications to ensure that it has the clarity required by the NPPF. In particular I recommend modifications to transfer text currently included in the policy into the supporting text and to clarify the wording of the principal element of the policy itself. The first paragraph of the policy is more of a statement of intent rather than a policy and is already addressed in the supporting text

Delete the first and third paragraphs

In the second paragraph of the policy replace 'Where planning permission is required for' with 'Insofar as planning permission is required'

At the end of paragraph 7.10 add:

In these circumstances [then include the deleted third paragraph]

Plan Aims

Aim 1: Preventing Coalescence: Pease Pottage Gap

- 7.125 This Aim indicates that development will not be supported within the Pease Pottage Gap unless the proposal concerned meets three criteria. They are primarily focused

on agricultural development or where they would otherwise make a valuable contribution to the landscape and amenity of the Gap.

- 7.126 Like other neighbourhood plans the submitted Plan has sought to include a suite of non-land use aims which do not meet the tests to be included as a land-use policy. The submitted Plan has properly followed this approach in the majority of the Aims in the submitted Plan.
- 7.127 However this approach does not extend to this specific Aim. By simple definition it is worded as a land use policy. In addition, the Gap is clearly defined on the Proposals Map. I sought clarity from the Parish Council on this point. The response is very thorough. It identifies the way in which the approach in the submitted Plan evolved during the Plan-making process. In summary the Aim was originally a planning policy in the pre-submission version of the Plan. The need for such an approach has now been overtaken by the adoption of the District Plan. Unlike the previous Local Plan, the District Local Plan does not include a Gap policy. Following detailed discussions with MSDC the Parish Council decided to proceed with an Aim in the submitted Plan recognising that it was not supported by a background paper as suggested by MSDC.
- 7.128 Plainly this matter has presented several challenges for the Parish Council. Whatever the background to this matter the Aim is worded as a planning policy. This is inherently contrary to the expected approach for a non-land use policy. I recommend modifications to the Aim so that it adopts an appropriate approach. In this case I recommend that the Aim indicates that the Parish Council will work with affected landowners to safeguard the existing gap between Crawley and Pease Pottage.
- 7.129 The Aim in the submitted Plan defines the Gap on the Proposals Map. Whilst I understand the intended clarity of that approach, I recommend that the Gap is removed from the Proposals Map. By definition an Aim in a neighbourhood plan is not a land use policy and cannot be shown on the Proposals Map.
- 7.130 Within this context I also recommend consequential modifications to the supporting text.

Replace the Aim with:

'The Parish Council considers the area to the north of Pease Pottage should be kept free from development. In this context it will work with landowners and other agencies to secure appropriate management regimes to safeguard the openness of the parcels of land between Pease Pottage and Crawley.'

Remove the Pease Pottage Gap from the Proposals Map

Replace paragraphs 4.7-4.9 as follows:

4.7

'This Aim refers to the existing open land between Pease Pottage and Crawley. The southern part of this wider area falls within the neighbourhood area.'

4.8

'The adopted District Plan includes a policy to prevent coalescence between settlements (DP13). This approach replaces the inclusion of specific Strategic Gaps in the former Local Plan.'

4.9

Retain the first sentence in the submitted Plan.

Replace the second sentence with:

'Aim 1 sets out the Plan's approach to this matter. It identifies the way in which the Parish Council will work with landowners and other agencies to secure appropriate management regimes to safeguard the openness of the parcels of land between Pease Pottage and Crawley.'

Aim 2: Preserving Settlement Identity

- 7.131 This Aim raises similar issues to those raised with regard to Aim 1. In this case it effectively produces a planning policy which would not support development proposals which would individually or cumulatively result in the loss of the separate identity of the four villages in the neighbourhood area.
- 7.132 The Aim largely repeats the approach taken in Policy DP13 of the adopted District Plan. Indeed, the supporting text in paragraph 4.10 largely repeats the first part of Policy DP13. The approach in that policy is to ensure that new development does not result in the coalescence of existing settlements.
- 7.133 I have considered all the information available to me on this element of the Plan, including the Parish Council's response to my clarification note. I recommend that the Aim is deleted. I have come to this view for two principal reasons. The first is that it adds no distinctive local value to Policy DP13 of the District Plan. The second is that the geography of the neighbourhood area is such that the coalescence of any two of the four villages would be a remote possibility given the distances between them and their location within the AONB.

Delete the Aim

Delete the supporting text (paragraph 4.10 and 4.11)

Aim 3: Pease Pottage Community Facilities

- 7.134 The Aim has two related parts. The first supports development that would bring community benefits in Pease Pottage. The second supports the creation of new community facilities in Pease Pottage.
- 7.135 I am satisfied that it is both appropriate and distinctive to the neighbourhood area.

Aim 4: Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

- 7.136 The Aim sets out the Parish Council's priorities for the local use of CIL funding.

- 7.137 MSDC has yet to decide to operate a CIL charging levy. Nonetheless the Aim seeks to establish priorities if this work is adopted. In this context I am satisfied that it is both appropriate and distinctive to the neighbourhood area.

Aim 5: Handcross Village Centre

- 7.138 The Aim reflects the importance of Handcross village centre in the neighbourhood area. In effect the Aim identifies the Parish Council's approach towards co-ordinating the retail approach and marketing of the existing operators.

- 7.139 I am satisfied that it is both appropriate and distinctive to the neighbourhood area. I saw the vibrancy of the village centre first-hand. The Aim has the ability to contribute significantly to the delivery of the economic dimension of sustainable development in the neighbourhood area.

Aim 6: Quiet Lanes and Public Rights of Way

- 7.140 The Aim reflects the importance of the use and the recreational opportunities offered by quiet lanes and footpaths. The Aim supports three related matters - the Quiet Lane initiative in the wider county, the upgrading of existing rights of way and supporting proposals for new footpaths. Six are specifically highlighted.

- 7.141 I am satisfied that the Aim is both appropriate and distinctive to the neighbourhood area. In particular I can see that the package of measures set out to develop a footpath between Warninglid and the primary school. I saw the isolated nature of the school when I visited the neighbourhood area.

Aim 7: Handcross Parking and Improvements to the Pedestrian Environment

- 7.142 The Aim reflects the importance of the use and vitality of the village centre of Handcross and the pressures placed on its parking facilities by visitors to the adjacent Nymans Gardens National Trust facility. The Aim supports three related matters - the identification of a site for off-street parking; the facilitation of additional parking for visitors to Nymans and the High Street and the improvement of the wider pedestrian environment.

- 7.143 I am satisfied that the Aim is both appropriate and distinctive to the neighbourhood area. In particular I can see that the package of measures set out to address a particular area of concentrated activity in the neighbourhood area.

Aim 8: Traffic Management and Access

- 7.144 This Aim supports proposals for traffic management and proposals that would improve access to community facilities. Plainly the two may overlap.

7.145 I am satisfied that it is both appropriate and distinctive to the neighbourhood area.

Aim 9: Parking

7.146 This Aim supports development which provides parking facilities at or beyond County Council parking standards

7.147 I am satisfied that it is both appropriate and distinctive to the neighbourhood area.

Other Matters – Monitoring the Plan

7.148 In paragraph 7.54 I recommended that measures be taken to monitor the effectiveness of the Plan and, as appropriate, to undertake a review of certain elements of the Plan. This is important both in its right and to take account of any potential implications which may arise from the adoption of the emerging Allocations Plan DPD or the review of the adopted District Plan.

7.149 In this context I recommend the inclusion of an additional section within the Plan on this important matter.

Include the following at the end of the Plan.

'Section 9

Monitoring and Review

9.1. The preparation of this Plan has taken place within the strategic context provided by the Mid Sussex District Plan which was adopted in March 2018. It has also sought to take account of the emerging Mid Sussex Allocations Plan DPD.

9.2. The Parish Council recognises that the plan-making process is dynamic and that development does not always proceed at the pace that was originally intended. In other cases, development may come forward which was not predicted at the time that development plans were adopted or made as appropriate. In this context the Parish Council will monitor the effectiveness or otherwise of the implementation of the policies in the neighbourhood plan on an annual basis.

9.3. Where monitoring of the Plan indicates that development is not proceeding as anticipated the Parish Council will consider undertaking a review of the wider neighbourhood plan or specific parts of the plan as appropriate.

9.4. Within the context of the monitoring and review process the Parish Council will specifically take account of the potential implications of the adoption of the Mid Sussex Allocations Plan DPD. At the end of the year in which the DPD is adopted the Parish Council will assess the need or otherwise for a review of the neighbourhood plan with regard to the delivery of new housing in the neighbourhood area.

9.5. The Parish Council will monitor the delivery of the allocated housing site at St Martin Close East (Policy 11). It will also monitor the strategic circumstances with regard to the delivery of housing in the neighbourhood area so that it can work collaboratively with the District Council to reach a decision on the extent to which the trigger mechanisms have been met in order to release the reserve site identified in the Plan (Policy 12 St Martin's Close West).'

Other Matters - General

- 7.150 This report has recommended a series of modifications both to the policies and to the supporting text in the submitted Plan. Where consequential changes to the text are required directly as a result of my recommended modification to the policy concerned, I have highlighted them in this report. However other changes to the general text may be required elsewhere in the Plan as a result of the recommended modifications to the policies. It will be appropriate for MSDC and the Parish Council to have the flexibility to make any necessary consequential changes to the general text. I recommend accordingly.

Modification of general text (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies.

Other Matters – Factual Errors

- 7.151 Paragraph 1.2 of the Plan comments that the neighbourhood area was designated in September 2012. However, the designation took place in July 2012. I recommend that the supporting text is modified accordingly.

In paragraph 1.2 replace ‘September’ with ‘July’

8 Summary and Conclusions

Summary

- 8.1 The Plan sets out a range of policies to guide and direct development proposals in the period up to 2031. It is distinctive in addressing a specific set of issues that have been identified and refined by the wider community.
- 8.2 Following my independent examination of the Plan I have concluded that the Slaugham Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the basic conditions for the preparation of a neighbourhood plan subject to a series of recommended modifications.

Conclusion

- 8.3 On the basis of the findings in this report I recommend to Mid Sussex District Council that subject to the incorporation of the modifications set out in this report that the Slaugham Neighbourhood Development Plan should proceed to referendum.

Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan – Examiner’s Report

Referendum Area

- 8.4 I am required to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Plan area. In my view, the neighbourhood area is entirely appropriate for this purpose and no evidence has been submitted to suggest that this is not the case. I therefore recommend that the Plan should proceed to referendum based on the neighbourhood area as approved by the District Council in July 2012.
- 8.5 I am grateful to everyone who has helped in any way to ensure that this examination has run in a smooth and efficient manner. The responses to my Clarification Note were very thorough. They helped significantly in the preparation of this report.

Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
7 May 2019

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 2

Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement - June 2019

1. Introduction

1.1 Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), Mid Sussex District Council has a statutory duty to assist communities in the preparation of neighbourhood development plans and orders and to take plans through a process of examination and referendum. The Localism Act 2011 (Part 6 chapter 3) sets out the Local Planning Authority's responsibilities under Neighbourhood Planning.

1.2 This statement confirms that the modifications proposed by the Examiner's report have been accepted, the draft Slaugham Neighbourhood Development Plan will be altered as a result of it; and that this plan can proceed to referendum.

2. Background

2.1 The Slaugham Neighbourhood Development Plan relates to the area that was designated by Mid Sussex District Council as a neighbourhood area July 2012. This area corresponds with the Slaugham Parish boundary that lies within Mid Sussex District Local Planning Authority Area.

2.2 Following the submission of the Slaugham Neighbourhood Development Plan to the District Council, the plan was publicised and representations were invited. The publicity period ended on Monday 14th January 2019.

2.3 Mr Andrew Ashcroft BA (Hons) MA, DMS, MRTPI was appointed by Mid Sussex District Council with the consent of Slaugham Parish Council, to undertake the examination of the Slaugham Neighbourhood Development Plan and to prepare a report of the independent examination.

2.4 The examiner's report concludes that subject to making the modifications recommended by the examiner, the Plan meets the basic conditions set out in the legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning referendum.

3. Decision

3.1 The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires the local planning authority to outline what action to take in response to the recommendations of an examiner made in a report under paragraph 10 of Schedule 4A to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of the 2004 Act) in relation to a neighbourhood development plan.

3.2 Having considered each of the recommendations made by the examiner’s report, and the reasons for them, Mid Sussex District Council in consultation with Slaugham Parish Council has decided to accept the modifications to the draft plan. Table 1 below outlines the alterations made to the draft plan under paragraph 12(6) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of 2004 Act) in response to each of the Examiner’s recommendations. The reasons set out have in some cases been paraphrased from the Examiners report for conciseness. This statement should be read alongside the Examiner’s Report.

3.3 If the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that, subject to the modifications being made, the Neighbourhood Plan meets the legal requirements and basic conditions then it can proceed to referendum.

Table 1

Examiner’s Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 1: Protecting the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty		
<p>At the beginning of the policy add: ‘The extent of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is shown on [insert details]’</p> <p>In the first part of the policy insert ‘only’ between ‘will’ and ‘be’.</p> <p>At the end of the first part of the policy add ‘in particular;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the identified landscape features or components of landscape beauty and to their setting; • the traditional interaction of people with nature and appropriate landscape management; • character and local distinctiveness, settlement pattern, sense of place and setting of the AONB; and • the conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage.’ <p>In the third part of the policy replace ‘it’s’ with ‘its’.</p>	<p>To ensure that the policy has the clarity required by the NPPF. The first modification signposts the extent of the AONB within the neighbourhood area within the policy itself. The second inserts the relevant details from MSDP Policy DP16 into the first part of the policy. As submitted Policy 1 has excluded important parts of the corresponding MSDP policy. The modification to the third part of the policy is to correct a grammatical error.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 2: Protection of the Landscape		
Delete the policy; Delete paragraph 4.6 in supporting text	The evidence for the policy is not well-developed. The policy is not dissimilar to Policy 1 which addresses the AONB. In particular, Policy 2 would only support development in 'exceptional circumstances'. Such an approach is reserved only for designated landscapes in paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF. In addition the policy is not in general conformity with Policies DP12 (Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside), DP14 (Sustainable Rural Development) and DP15 (New Homes in the Countryside) of the adopted District Plan.	Accept modification
Policy 3: Protection of the Open Countryside		
Delete the policy; Delete paragraph 4.12 in supporting text	The submitted policy is not in general conformity with Policy DP12 of the District Plan. In many respects the two policies run in different directions. In addition, the submitted policy fails to add any local value or distinctiveness to the strategic context for development in the District. The general policy objective that is sought by the policy will be satisfactorily achieved by District Plan Policy DP12.	Accept modification
Policy 5: Green Infrastructure		
In the first part of the policy replace 'and' with 'or'; In the second part of the policy add at the end 'will be particularly supported'; In the third part of the policy replace 'be resisted' with 'not be supported'	As submitted the policy would require proposals to 'conserve, maintain and enhance the existing green infrastructure network'. In some case this may well be possible. In most cases to achieve all three ambitions in the policy would be unrealistic or impracticable. There are missing words at the end of the second part of the policy and the third change is in the interest of consistency of policy wording.	Accept modification

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>Policy 6: Conservation Areas</p> <p>Inclusion of an A4 plan for each of the three conservation areas in an appendix of the Plan; Replace the opening part of the policy with the following: 'Development proposals within the Handcross, Slaugham and Warninglid conservation areas will be supported where they conserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area concerned and comply with the requirements in Policy DP35 (Conservation Areas) of the District Plan.</p> <p>In the second part of the policy add the following after 'will be supported': 'where such proposals would conserve or enhance the specific part of the conservation area and its immediate setting'</p> <p>At the end of paragraph 4.18 add: 'The three conservation areas are shown on [insert details]'</p> <p>At the end of paragraph 4.22 add: 'Development proposals within the three conservation areas will be assessed and determined against national policy and Policy DP35 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2013. Policy 6 of this Plan has been designed to be complementary to this national and local policy context and to provide specific detail relevant to the neighbourhood area.'</p> <p>At the end of paragraph 4.23 add: 'Policy 6 has two related parts. The first has a general effect. It makes a reference to the key principles contained in Policy DP35 of the adopted District Plan. The second makes a specific reference to five identified locations within the three conservation areas. They are particularly sensitive locations which have been identified as part of the plan-making process. The Parish Council also considers that they are of local significance and should be conserved in an appropriate fashion.'</p>	<p>To bring clarity to the policy and to achieve the ambitions which the Parish Council had in mind in formulating its approach in the Plan. The policy as currently worded does not provide any refined or granular details which would apply to the three conservation areas in the neighbourhood area. The proposed modifications will also consolidate and reinforce the strategic District Plan policy in a more local context.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 7: Open Space		
<p>Replace the first and second parts of the policy with:</p> <p>'Development proposals which are otherwise in accordance with the development plan should provide a mix of formal and informal open space to standards as set out in the Mid Sussex Development Infrastructure and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document to meet local need as appropriate to the site concerned. The resulting open space should be designed and arranged within the site in a high-quality fashion.'</p>	<p>This is to bring the clarity required by the NPPF. The initial part of the policy needs to be realigned so that it requires the provision of open space to approved District Council Standards within developments promoted within the neighbourhood area in either the neighbourhood plan or the District Plan. In addition, the language used in the first part of the policy could be interpreted as offering to support a proposed development which conflicted with the wider development plan but which provided open space to meet local need.</p>	Accept modification
Policy 9: Superfast Broadband		
<p>Replace the first part of the policy with: 'Proposals which would provide access to a super-fast broadband network will be supported'.</p> <p>Replace the second part of the policy with: 'Proposals for above ground network installations which would provide access to a super-fast broadband network will be supported where their location is sympathetically chosen and designed to reflect the character of the local area'.</p>	<p>To provide clarity and simplicity to the intentions of the policy and to ensure that the two parts of the policy follow a similar format to other policies in the submitted Plan.</p>	Accept modification
Policy 10: Utility Infrastructure		
<p>Delete 'encouraged and'; Replace 'in order to meet' with 'where it meets'</p>	<p>The word encouraged is considered both unclear and unnecessary. The other modifications to the wording of the policy are proposed to provide the clarity required by the NPPF.</p>	Accept modification

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 11: St Martin Close (East)		
<p>Insert an additional criterion in the policy (between 3 and 4) to read: 'the development provides open space at least to the standards set out in the Mid Sussex Development Infrastructure and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document;</p> <p>In paragraph 6.16 replace 'a greenfield site bound' with 'informal open space associated with the original development of St Martin Close and is bounded'</p> <p>At the end of paragraph 6.16 add: 'Criterion 4 of Policy 11 requires the provision of open space as part of the development of the site. This should be to the standards in the Mid Sussex Development Infrastructure and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document as a minimum. The development of the site brings an opportunity to provide community and social benefits through the provision of revised open spaces facilities in this part of Handcross. The provision of high-quality well-designed open space would be an important element in securing the sustainable development of the site.'</p>	<p>The proposed development of the site will involve the loss of the existing informal open space off St Martin Close. This existing space adds to the openness of this part of Handcross in general terms, and the West Park Road/St Martin Close part of the village in particular. However, the existing 'open space' appears to be used only on an informal basis. At the same time the development of the site offers an opportunity to incorporate a re-worked open space.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>
Policy 12: St Martin Close (West)		
<p>Replace the first part of the policy with: 'Land at St Martin Close West Handcross is identified as a housing reserve site. Where the need for its release is identified at the relevant trigger points in paragraph 6.27 of this Plan development proposals for up to 35 houses will be supported subject to the following criteria:'</p> <p>Insert an additional criterion in the policy (between 2 and 3) to read: 'the development provides open space at least to the standards as set out in the Mid Sussex Development Infrastructure and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document.'</p> <p>In paragraph 6.24 replace 'in the second part of' with 'later within'</p>	<p>The concept of a reserve site within a neighbourhood plan has regard to national policy (PPG 41-009-20160211). It also takes account of the potential uncertainty about future housing delivery needs within the neighbourhood area during the Plan period. However there is inconsistency between the policy and the supporting text therefore modifications are required so that the policy properly operates as a reserve site. As such a series of trigger points for the consideration of the release of the site are proposed. In addition, the development of the site should make provision for open space and there is the opportunity</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

<p>Replace paragraph 6.27 with: 'The potential trigger point at which the need or otherwise for the release of this reserve site will be considered will be an important matter for the Parish Council. At this stage it is impractical to identify the way in which various process will unfold over the next few years. These include progress on the Mid Sussex Allocations DPD, the development of the St Martin Close East site and wider housing delivery in both the District and the neighbourhood area. As such the trigger point for the consideration of the release of the site should be whichever of the following four events occurs first - the review of neighbourhood plan itself; the adoption of the emerging Mid Sussex Allocations DPD; the adoption of any review of the District Plan and a material delay in delivery of the Pease Pottage strategic delivery site in the adopted District Plan. The Parish Council will involve the District Council in this exercise given the overlaps with strategic housing delivery.'</p> <p>At the end of paragraph 6.28 add: 'Criterion 3 of Policy 12 requires the provision of open space as part of the development of the site. This should be to the standards in the Mid Sussex Development Infrastructure and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as a minimum. The development of the site brings an opportunity to provide community and social benefits through the provision of enhanced open spaces facilities in this part of Handcross. The provision of high-quality well-designed open space would be an important element in securing the sustainable development of the site. In the event that both St Martin Close East and West sites are developed for housing purposes and that some or all of that open space is provide on site there would be an opportunity for the open spaces on the two sites to be provided on adjacent parcels of land and to a complementary design and layout. There may also be the opportunity to consolidate the provision of open space on St martin Close West with the existing open spaces off West Park Road. These options would enhance the usability of the spaces and may assist with maintenance costs and liabilities.'</p>	<p>if both sites are developed for housing for the open spaces on the two sites to be provided on adjacent parcels of land and to a complementary design and layout.</p>	
--	--	--

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>Policy 13: Residential Development within and adjoining the settlement boundaries</p>		
<p>Delete the policy. At the end of paragraph 6.31 add: 'The three built up areas are shown on the Mid Sussex District Plan Policies Map Pease Pottage (18a), Handcross (18b) and Warninglid (18d)';</p> <p>At the end of paragraph 6.32 add: 'Development proposals within the three built-up areas will be assessed and determined against national policy and Policy DP6 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031'</p>	<p>The policy does not have regard to national policy to the extent that it largely repeats a local plan policy without adding any local value. In the second instance the submitted policy is not in general conformity with Policy DP6 of the District Plan. The supporting text associated with this policy is proposed to be retained due the importance of the built-up areas within the neighbourhood area and the comments regarding the Parish having a strong record of windfall development. Some modifications are proposed so that text makes a direct reference to the role of District Plan Policy DP6 in determining residential development proposals in the three built up areas and their definition in the District Plan policies maps.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>
<p>Policy 14: Local Employment</p>		
<p>Delete the wording in the policy 'and the site.....being shown'</p> <p>At the end of paragraph 7.5 add: 'Policy 14 provides an opportunity for land owners to demonstrate that the site or premises concerned is no longer viable for business purposes. In these circumstances any resulting planning application should demonstrate that the site has been professionally marketed for business use at a realistic market price for at least six months and with no interest being shown.'</p>	<p>The need for the marketing of the premises for business purposes for a period of six months and the levels of interest shown is considered to be a process matter rather than a policy requirement. The issue can be satisfactorily captured in the supporting text.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 15: Economic Development		
<p>At the end of paragraph 7.6 add: 'Policy 15 provides a supporting context within which such proposals would be considered in the development management process. Plainly the definition of a sustainable location will be a matter of local judgement. However, the Parish Council considers that a sustainable location would be either one within Handcross or Pease Pottage or within 800 metres of the settlement boundaries of those settlements and/or readily accessible to non-car forms of transport.'</p>	<p>For clarity regarding the definition of 'a sustainable location'</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>
Policy 16: Protection of Handcross High Street		
<p>Delete the first and third paragraphs of the policy.</p> <p>In the second paragraph of the policy replace 'Where planning permission is required for' with 'Insofar as planning permission is required'</p> <p>At the end of paragraph 7.10 add: In these circumstances [then include the deleted third paragraph]</p>	<p>To ensure that the policy has the clarity required by the NPPF. The first paragraph of the policy is more of a statement of intent rather than a policy and is already addressed in the supporting text</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Aim 1: Preventing Coalescence: Pease Pottage Gap		
<p>Replace the Aim with: 'The Parish Council considers the area to the north of Pease Pottage should be kept free from development. In this context it will work with landowners and other agencies to secure appropriate management regimes to safeguard the openness of the parcels of land between Pease Pottage and Crawley.'</p> <p>Remove the Pease Pottage Gap from the Proposals Map</p> <p>Replace paragraphs 4.7-4.9 as follows: 4.7 - 'This Aim refers to the existing open land between Pease Pottage and Crawley. The southern part of this wider area falls within the neighbourhood area.' 4.8 - 'The adopted District Plan includes a policy to prevent coalescence between settlements (DP13). This approach replaces the inclusion of specific Strategic Gaps in the former Local Plan.' 4.9 - Retain the first sentence in the submitted Plan. Replace the second sentence with: 'Aim 1 sets out the Plan's approach to this matter. It identifies the way in which the Parish Council will work with landowners and other agencies to secure appropriate management regimes to safeguard the openness of the parcels of land between Pease Pottage and Crawley.'</p>	<p>The Aim is worded as a planning policy. This is inherently contrary to the expected approach for a non-land use policy. Modifications are proposed so that the aim adopts an appropriate approach. The Aim in the submitted Plan also defines the Gap on the Proposals Map. By definition an Aim in a neighbourhood plan is not a land use policy and cannot be shown on the Proposals Map.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>
Aim 2: Preserving Settlement Identity		
<p>Delete the Aim; Delete the supporting text (paragraph 4.10 and 4.11)</p>	<p>The policy adds no distinctive local value to Policy DP13 of the District Plan. Furthermore, the geography of the neighbourhood area is such that the coalescence of any two of the four villages would be a remote possibility given the distances between them and their location within the AONB.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>Monitoring and review of the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Include the following 'Section 9 - Monitoring and Review</p> <p>9.1. The preparation of this Plan has taken place within the strategic context provided by the Mid Sussex District Plan which was adopted in April 2018. It has also sought to take account of the emerging Mid Sussex Allocations Plan DPD.</p> <p>9.2. The Parish Council recognises that the plan-making process is dynamic and that development does not always proceed at the pace that was originally intended. In other cases, development may come forward which was not predicted at the time that development plans were adopted or made as appropriate. In this context the Parish Council will monitor the effectiveness or otherwise of the implementation of the policies in the neighbourhood plan on an annual basis.</p> <p>9.3. Where monitoring of the Plan indicates that development is not proceeding as anticipated the Parish Council will consider undertaking a review of the wider neighbourhood plan or specific parts of the plan as appropriate.</p> <p>9.4. Within the context of the monitoring and review process the Parish Council will specifically take account of the potential implications of the adoption of the Mid Sussex Allocations Plan DPD. At the end of the year in which the DPD is adopted the Parish Council will assess the need or otherwise for a review of the neighbourhood plan with regard to the delivery of new housing in the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>9.5. The Parish Council will monitor the delivery of the allocated housing site at St Martin Close East (Policy 11). It will also monitor the strategic circumstances with regard to the delivery of housing in the neighbourhood area so that it can work collaboratively with the District Council to reach a decision on the extent to which the trigger mechanisms have been met in order to release the reserve site identified in the Plan (Policy 12 St Martin's Close West)'. </p>	<p>Measures should be taken to monitor the effectiveness of the Plan and, as appropriate, to undertake a review of certain elements of the Plan. This is important both in its right and to take account of any potential implications which may arise from the adoption of the emerging Allocations Plan DPD or the review of the adopted District Plan.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Other Matters - General		
Modification of general text (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies.	This is a general caveat as other changes to the general text may be required elsewhere in the Plan as a result of the recommended modifications to the policies. It is considered appropriate for MSDC and the Parish Council to have the flexibility to make any necessary consequential changes to the general text.	Accept modification
Other Matters – Factual Errors		
In paragraph 1.2 replace 'September' with 'July'	Paragraph 1.2 of the Plan comments that the neighbourhood area was designated in September 2012. However, the designation took place in July 2012.	Accept modification

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

REPORT OF: DIVISIONAL LEADER FOR PLANNING AND ECONOMY
Contact Officer: Andrew Maxted
Business Unit Leader – Planning Policy and Economy
Email: Andrew.Maxted@midsussex.gov.uk Tel: 01444 477063
Wards Affected: All
Key Decision Yes
Report To: Cabinet Meeting 3 June 2019

Purpose of Report

1. This Report proposes an update to the Council's Local Development Scheme for publication.

Summary

2. The Council has a legislative requirement to prepare a Local Development Scheme setting out its timetable for the production of Development Plan Documents. This Report proposes an update to the Council's Local Development Scheme to ensure it is up-to-date, and in particular, reflects the Council's timetable for preparing the Site Allocations Development Plan Document.

Recommendations

3. **It is recommended that Cabinet approve the Council's updated Local Development Scheme (Appendix 1) for publication on the 13 June 2019**
-

Background: Development Plan Documents

4. The Council's current Local Development Scheme (LDS) was published in October 2017. This LDS set out a timetable for preparing the Council's Development Plan Documents (DPD), such as the District Plan, and any other documents that make up the Council's 'Development Plan' including Neighbourhood Plans. The 'Development Plan' taken as a whole is used to inform planning decisions within the District.
5. The LDS ensures that community, businesses, developers, service and infrastructure providers and other interested organisations and individuals know which DPD's are to be prepared by the Council and when they will be able to participate in the plan making process¹.
6. The documents listed within the 2017 LDS included plans prepared by West Sussex County Council relating to Minerals and Waste planning, plans prepared by the South Downs National Park for the park area, and Neighbourhood Plans prepared by Town and Parish Councils.

¹ Public consultation will continue to be advertised and stakeholders notified when important documents are published for public consultation, in accordance with our Statement of Community Involvement which is available here: <https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/planning-building/consultation-monitoring/>

7. The October 2017 LDS referred to two Development Plan Documents to be prepared by Mid Sussex District Council. These were the District Plan 2014 – 2031 and the Site Allocations Development Plan Document. The District Plan was adopted in March 2018.
8. The focus of the updated LDS (June 2019) is the Site Allocations DPD. The Site Allocations DPD is a commitment set out in the District Plan and is necessary to support the District. This document will allocate non-strategic and strategic sites to meet the residual housing requirement for the rest of the plan period, to ensure the Council meets its identified housing need, maintains a five year land supply and to allocate additional employment sites.
9. A list of DPD's included in the October 2017 and updated LDS (June 2019) is set out in **Appendix 2**.
10. It is necessary to update the timetable for the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD to reflect the current position. The District Plan adoption date was March 2018, this clearly meant the Sites Allocation work could not commence as planned in late 2017. It is anticipated that Site Allocations DPD will be submitted in 2020, with intended adoption in 2021.
11. A timetable for the Site Allocations DPD is set out in **Appendix 3**. Although the publication of a draft plan has been delayed, submission to the Secretary of State will be before the end of the 2020.
12. The Mid Sussex District Plan 2014 – 2031 includes a commitment (Development Policy 5: Planning to Meet Future Housing Need) to undertake a review of the District Plan, with submission to the Secretary of State by 2023.
13. The timetable for the District Plan review will be included in a future update to the Local Development Scheme. The updated timetable for the Site Allocations DPD will not impact the preparation of the District Plan review.
14. The Council is committed to ensure the needs for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople are planned for appropriately in accordance with Development Policy 33: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. A Traveller Sites Allocations DPD may be required to support the identified needs during the plan period and the need for this DPD will be reviewed in due course, in line with the District Plan review
15. Work has commenced to review the Council's position regarding Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule in the context of changes to Government legislation and guidance. The timetable for this work will be set out in a future update of the LDS.

Background: Supporting Documents

16. Whilst not a legislative requirement, the LDS also provides a summary of any supporting documents the Council intends to prepare. These include Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) that complement or expand upon local plan policies, for example describing more detailed design guidance for how allocated sites should be developed.

17. A list of supporting documents included in the October 2017 and updated LDS (June 2019) is set out by **Appendix 4**.

Policy Context

18. The Corporate Plan and Budget for 2019/2020 states that a key objective for the Planning Policy and Economic Development business unit is to develop the Site Allocations DPD during the 2019/2020 period.

Other Options Considered

19. The Council is required to publish a Local Development Scheme to meet legislative requirements in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011). The Council is therefore required to publish an updated LDS to progress ongoing Development Plan Documents, including the Site Allocations DPD.

Financial Implications

20. There are no direct financial implications relating to the LDS per se, although failure to progress Development Plan Documents would have financial implications.

Risk Management Implications

21. The decision to publish the Local Development Scheme poses minimal, if any risk, as it is a legislative requirement on the Council. However, failure to publish an up-to-date LDS could hinder preparation of the Council's Development Plan Documents.
22. There are some risks associated with identifying a timetable for the preparation of DPD's as external factors, outside the control of the Council, may lead to the timetable being altered in the future. It should be noted that following submission to the Secretary of State the timetable is in the hands of the Planning Inspectorate and not the District Council.

Equality and customer service implications

23. Any Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents prepared by the Council are subject to separate Equality Impact Assessments (EQIA's) that are published as part of the material consulted by the Council, alongside the documents themselves. Consultation is undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement that was updated and published in March 2019. On this basis, there are no direct impacts of the Local Development Scheme.

Other Material Implications

24. There are no other considerations.

Background Papers

Appendix 1: Mid Sussex District Council – DRAFT Local Development Scheme May 2019.

Appendix 2: List of DPD's set out in October 2017 and June 2019 Local Development Schemes

Appendix 3: Production timetable for Mid Sussex District Site Allocations DPD

Appendix 4: List of supporting documents set out in October 2017 and June 2019 Local Development Schemes

**Appendix 1: Mid Sussex District Council – DRAFT Local Development Scheme
June 2019.**

Refer to Separate Document

Appendix 2: List of DPD's set out in October 2017 and June 2019 Local Development Schemes

On publication of this LDS in **October 2017**, the Development Plan for Mid Sussex District Council comprises:

- Saved policies from the West Sussex Minerals Local Plan (2003);
- West Sussex Waste Local Plan (2014)
- Saved policies of the Mid Sussex Local Plan (May 2004);
- Mid Sussex Small Scale Housing Allocations DPD (April 2008);
- Mid Sussex Local Plan (2004) Proposals Maps;
- 'Made' Neighbourhood Plans;
 - Albourne Neighbourhood Plan
 - Ansty and Staplefield Neighbourhood Plan
 - Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan
 - Ashurst Wood Neighbourhood Plan
 - Balcombe Neighbourhood Plan
 - Bolney Neighbourhood Plan
 - Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan
 - Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan
 - Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan
 - East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan
 - Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan
 - Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan
 - Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan
 - Turners Hill Neighbourhood Plan
 - Twineham Neighbourhood Plan
 - West Hoathly Neighbourhood Plan

On publication of this LDS in **June 2019**, the Development Plan for Mid Sussex District Council will comprise of the following documents:

- Mid Sussex District Plan 2014 – 2031 (March 2018)
- Saved policies of the Mid Sussex Local Plan (May 2004)²
- Mid Sussex Small Scale Housing Allocations DPD (April 2008)
- West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (2018)
- West Sussex Waste Local Plan (2014)
- In addition, there are 16 'made' (adopted) Neighbourhood Plans:
 - Albourne Neighbourhood Plan
 - Ansty and Staplefield Neighbourhood Plan
 - Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan
 - Ashurst Wood Neighbourhood Plan
 - Balcombe Neighbourhood Plan
 - Bolney Neighbourhood Plan
 - Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan
 - Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan
 - Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan
 - East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan
 - Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan
 - Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan
 - Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan
 - Turners Hill Neighbourhood Plan
 - Twineham Neighbourhood Plan
 - West Hoathly Neighbourhood Plan
 - Worth – Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan

² The saved Mid Sussex Local Plan 2004 policies are listed in Appendix C in the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014 – 2031 adopted March 2018.

Appendix 4: List of supporting documents set out in October 2017 and June 2019 Local Development Schemes

The following supporting documents have been adopted as at **October 2017**:

- Statement of Community Involvement – adopted October 2011
- Hassocks Station Goods Yard – Development Brief (SPD) adopted November 2011
- Hassocks Village Design Statement (SPD) - adopted March 2008
- Lindfield Village Design Statement (SPD) – adopted October 2011
- Turners Hill Village Design Statement (SPD) – adopted October 2011
- Haywards Heath Town Centre Master Plan – adopted June 2007
- Burgess Hill Town Centre Master Plan – adopted November 2006
- East Grinstead Town Centre Master Plan – adopted July 2006
- Sustainable Construction Supplementary Planning Document – adopted July 2006
- Development and Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document – adopted February 2006
- Shopfront Design Guide – adopted April 2005.

The following supporting documents have been adopted as at **June 2019**:

- Statement of Community Involvement – adopted March 2019
- Development Infrastructure and Contributions SPD – adopted July 2018
- Development Viability SPD – adopted July 2018
- Affordable Housing SPD – adopted July 2018
- Hassocks Station Goods Yard – Development Brief (SPD) adopted November 2011
- Shopfront Design Guide – adopted April 2005.

Mid Sussex District Council

DRAFT Local Development Scheme June 2019

Status of this Document

The Scheme will be brought into effect on 3rd June by a Cabinet resolution on 3rd June 2019.

1.0 Introduction – What is the Local Development Scheme?

- 1.1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) requires local planning authorities to prepare, maintain and publish a Local Development Scheme (LDS).
- 1.2 The LDS sets out the timetable for the production of Development Plan Documents (DPDs), including key production and public consultation stages. This enables the community, businesses, developers, service and infrastructure providers and other interested organisations and individuals to know which DPDs are to be prepared for the area and when they will be able to participate in the plan making process¹.
- 1.3 This LDS covers the period from 2019 to 2021, and updates the previous LDS, which was published in October 2017 by Mid Sussex District Council. It provides information about the Mid Sussex District Council's Site Allocations DPD, and related documents.
- 1.4 Whilst not a formal requirement, for ease of reference, our LDS also includes information about the main supporting and procedural documents that do or will accompany the Council's main DPD's.
- 1.5 Copies are available at the Council's Offices in Haywards Heath and on request. The Local Development Scheme is also available on the Council's website (www.midsussex.gov.uk/lds).

2.0 Development Plan Documents

2.1 Development Plan Documents (DPDs) are planning strategies that contain policies for the use, protection and/ or development of land, usually including the allocation of land for development. DPD's must be in general conformity with government guidance, in particular the National Planning Policy Framework.

- Local Plans – these are compulsory and the preparation of a local plan is a statutory requirement. They usually cover a single council area, but can be for more than once council area where joint plans are prepared.

A Local Plan may be a single document or a suite of documents, which can cover specific policy matters or specific geographical areas. In areas that have County and District Councils, the County Council has the responsibility for producing Minerals and Waste Local Plans.

- Neighbourhood Plans – these are not compulsory. However, when duly prepared they are a statutory document that forms part of the development plan. In parished areas such as ours, these are prepared by a town or

¹ Public consultation will continue to be advertised and stakeholders notified when important documents are published for public consultation, in accordance with our published Statement of Community Involvement which is available here: <https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/planning-building/consultation-monitoring/>

parish council or councils. They must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the local plan and are prepared in a timescale that is set by the parish councils, not Mid Sussex District Council.

3.0 The Mid Sussex District Statutory Development Plan

3.1 The statutory Development Plan forms the basis for determining planning applications by Mid Sussex District Council.

3.2 On publication of this LDS in June 2019, the Development Plan for Mid Sussex District Council will comprise of the following documents:

- Mid Sussex District Plan 2014 – 2031 (March 2018)
- Saved policies of the Mid Sussex Local Plan (May 2004)²
- Mid Sussex Small Scale Housing Allocations DPD (April 2008)
- West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (2018)
- West Sussex Waste Local Plan (2014)
- In addition, there are 16 ‘made’ (adopted) Neighbourhood Plans:
 - Albourne Neighbourhood Plan
 - Ansty and Staplefield Neighbourhood Plan
 - Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan
 - Ashurst Wood Neighbourhood Plan
 - Balcombe Neighbourhood Plan
 - Bolney Neighbourhood Plan
 - Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan
 - Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan
 - Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan
 - East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan
 - Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan
 - Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan
 - Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan
 - Turners Hill Neighbourhood Plan
 - Twineham Neighbourhood Plan
 - West Hoathly Neighbourhood Plan
 - Worth – Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan
- And any other subsequently ‘made’ (adopted) Neighbourhood Plans.

3.3 A number of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD’s) and other documents also support the Development Plan, and are material considerations in the determination of planning applications.

3.4 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) complement or expand upon local plan policies, for example describing in more detail how an allocated site should be developed. An SPD cannot allocate new sites for development nor

² The saved Mid Sussex Local Plan 2004 policies are listed in Appendix C in the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014 – 2031 adopted March 2018.

contain new policies for the use of development of land, and they must not conflict with the adopted Development Plan.

3.5 The following supporting documents have been adopted:

- Statement of Community Involvement – adopted March 2019
- Development Infrastructure and Contributions SPD – adopted July 2018
- Development Viability SPD – adopted July 2018
- Affordable Housing SPD – adopted July 2018
- Hassocks Station Goods Yard – Development Brief (SPD) adopted November 2011
- Shopfront Design Guide – adopted April 2005.

3.6 The emerging Site Allocations DPD is informed by a range of technical evidence base studies available to download from our website (<https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/planning-building/development-plan-documents/>). Two key parts of the evidence are:

- the **Infrastructure Delivery Plan** prepared alongside the Site Allocations DPD to identify essential supporting infrastructure and services, how they will be delivered and by whom, and
- the **Sustainability Appraisal Report** prepared alongside the Site Allocations DPD to show how the sustainability assessment assessed options to inform the development of the Site Allocations DPD policies and site allocations. This is to ensure the plan reflects a balance of sustainable development objectives (social, environmental and economic factors).

4.0 Timetable for the Mid Sussex Site Allocations DPD

4.1 The Mid Sussex District Plan 2014 – 2031 was adopted in March 2018. This document will be complemented by a Site Allocations DPD, which will allocate sites for residential or other uses, to meet the housing and employment needs identified in the District Plan and to plan for social and community infrastructure.

4.2 Table 1 sets out the content, coverage and timetable for the key stages of preparing the Site Allocations DPD. Table 2 sets out a more comprehensive timetable for the preparation of the DPD.

Table 1: Site Allocations DPD content, coverage and key stages

Mid Sussex Site Allocations Development Plan Document	
Role and Subject – To allocate non-strategic and strategic sites of any size over 5 dwellings (with no upper limit) to meet the residual housing requirement over the rest of the plan period to meet the full plan requirement (inclusive of the uplift to 1,090 dpa from 2024/25 onwards) to allocate additional employment sites and to maintain a five year land supply	
Coverage – District Wide (excluding area of district within South Downs National Park)	
Conformity – National Planning Policy Framework/ District Plan 2014 – 2031	
Replaces – Mid Sussex Small Scale Housing Allocations DPD (April 2008)	
Timetable – Key Stages	
Public Consultation on Preferred Approach (Regulation 18)	Autumn 2019
Statutory Public Consultation prior to Submission (Regulation 19)	Spring 2020
Submission to Secretary of State	Summer 2020
Examination	Winter 2020
Estimated date for Adoption for final publication	Summer 2021

Table 2: Production timetable for Mid Sussex Site Allocations DPD

	2018							2019							2020							2021																													
	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J														
Site Allocations DPD (June 2019 LDS)																																																			

Key	
Preparation, analysis and/ or plan development	
Cabinet, Cabinet Member or Full Council review and decision	C
Public Consultation on 'Preferred Options' draft plan (Regulation 18)	P
Public Consultation prior to plan submission for examination (Regulation 19)	P
Submit plan and supporting documents to the Secretary of State for independent examination (Regulation 22)	S
Examination of the plan by an independent Planning Inspector	E
Receipt of Inspector's Report	R
Formal Adoption and publication of the Plan	A

5.0 Future Development Plan Documents

- 5.1 The Mid Sussex District Plan 2014 – 2031 also includes a commitment (Development Policy 5: Planning to Meet Future Housing Need) to undertake a review of the District Plan commencing in 2021, with submission to the Secretary of State in 2023. This is to ensure future-housing need across the wider sub-region is planned for appropriately, prioritising the Northern West Sussex Housing Market Area as this is established as the primary Housing Market Area for this district.
- 5.2 The timetable for the District Plan review that will commence in 2021 will be included in a future update to the Local Development Scheme.
- 5.3 The Council is giving consideration to progressing work on a Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule, which would set out the charging rates for new developments in Mid Sussex District. The timetable for the Council's approach to CIL will be set out in a future update of the LDS.
- 5.4 The Council is committed to ensure the needs for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople are planned for appropriately in accordance with Development Policy 33: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. A Traveller Sites Allocations DPD may be required to support the identified needs during the plan period. The need for this DPD will be reviewed in due course.
- 5.5 South Downs National Park Authority are progressing a Local Plan for the whole of the National Park that is anticipated to be adopted later in 2019. Once adopted, the policies will apply to the area within Mid Sussex District that falls within the park area. Until the South Downs Local Plan is adopted, the policies in the Mid Sussex Local Plan 2004 will continue to apply to development proposals in the part of Mid Sussex District that is within the South Down National Park.
- 5.6 In addition, there are four neighbourhood plans in preparation for the following parishes: Hassocks, Horsted Keynes, Slaugham, Worth (Cophorne). These neighbourhood plans will become part of the Development Plan for Mid Sussex once successfully 'made' (adopted). The Council will work with these Parish Councils to progress the preparation and examination of these Plans.

6.0 Future Supporting Documents

- 6.1 The Council will also prepare a number of documents that will support the Development Plan.
- 6.2 The Council has an adopted Shopfront Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)(2005), which will be updated and refreshed in 2019.
- 6.3 The Council is preparing a Design Guide to provide practical, clear and coherent design guidance based on best practice urban design values and urban design principles for the district. The guide will help to ensure that we

attain high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces. It is anticipated that the Design Guide will be adopted as SPD by the end of 2019.

- 6.4 The Town and Country Planning (Brownfield Land Register) Regulations 2017 and the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017 require local authorities to prepare and maintain registers of brownfield land that is suitable for residential development. The Council's Brownfield Land Register is available to view on the Council's website:
<https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/planning-building/evidence-supporting-documents/>.
- 6.5 There are 36 designated Conservation Areas in Mid Sussex District. Five Conservation Area Appraisals have been prepared. The Council has a programme to review the remaining Conservation Area Appraisals on an ongoing basis and the District Council will continue to work with Parish Councils to oversee preparation of the Conservation Area Appraisals. East Grinstead and Lindfield Conservation Area Appraisals have been identified as the first to be updated and these are expected to be published for consultation later in 2019.
- 6.6 Historic England has produced guidance for local planning authorities on preparing a Local Heritage List. National Planning Policy requires that the significance of development proposals on non-designated heritage assets (i.e. those which are not formally listed) should be taken into account in determining planning applications. The Council will work with relevant stakeholders to prepare a local list of heritage buildings.
- 6.7 The Council intends to produce town centre masterplans to guide development in Haywards Heath and East Grinstead, working with the respective Town Councils. It is anticipated that the Haywards Heath Masterplan will be adopted as a SPD by the end of 2019/20.
- 6.8 The District Plan identifies that a Science and Technology Park will be developed to the west of Burgess Hill. The Council will prepare a masterplan for the Science and Technology Park to support and inform the delivery of the site.
- 6.9 The District Council, along with the 14 other local authorities, is working in partnership with the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Joint Advisory Committee to prepare a High Weald Design Guide for new housing development. Consultation on the draft Design Guide is anticipated in the summer 2019 and a revised version will be presented to the Joint Advisory Committee later in 2019. It is intended that the Design Guide will be adopted by the local authorities as a SPD or a material consideration to be used in the determination of planning applications within the High Weald AONB.

FINANCIAL OUTTURN 2018/19

REPORT OF: Head of Corporate Resources
Contact Officer: Cathy Craigen, Chief Accountant
Email: Cathy.craigen@midsussex.gov.uk Tel: 01444 477384
Wards Affected: All
Key Decision: No
Report to: Cabinet
3rd June 2019

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose of Report

1. To inform Cabinet of the outturn position for the 2018/19 revenue and capital budgets.

Summary

2. Following closedown, the year-end position for 2018/19 now shows a net underspend of £799,000 before allowing for transfers to Reserves outlined within this report and those previously actioned of £340,000.
3. The majority of this relates to over performance on income. In the last quarter of the year, most of this extra income relates to increased rents for Corporate Estates as well as additional income for Revenues Enforcement, Car Park Charges, Licencing, Recycling Credits, Legal, Land Charges and Outdoor Facilities. Savings on some expenditure budgets (£118,000) across the Council, in particular, staff salaries, consultants and pension payments gives us a further opportunity to earmark the 2018/19 underspend as detailed in paragraph 26 below. If approved, this fully utilises the net underspend for the year.
4. Interest income during the year, totalling £367,472, was £102,472 greater than the original estimate of £265,000. This is mainly due to the higher interest rates that have been achieved on short term investments together with an increase in the number of short term investments, following a reduction in the funds required for proposed capital spending during the year. Of the total interest received for the year, £7,345 has been utilised (refer to paragraph 27) leaving a balance of £360,127 to transfer to General Reserve.
5. Dividend income from investments in the Local Authorities Property Fund generated £257,369 in year, which exceeded the 2018/19 projection by £17,369. This overachievement of dividend income received will be transferred to General Reserve.
6. The capital outturn position shows a £8,004,000 increase in approved spending against the revised budget but this includes projects that came forward during the year totalling £8,972,000 which were unbudgeted at the time. An analysis of this is shown in Table 2. The total net expenditure on the Specific Items financed from Specific Reserve and the General Reserve for 2018/19 is set out in Appendix C of this report.

Recommendations

7. Cabinet is asked to note the contents of this report, and to recommend to Council:
- (i) that grant income as set out in paragraph 13 to 18 and 20 to 25 of this report be transferred to Specific Reserves;
 - (ii) that grant income as set out in paragraph 19 of this report be transferred to General Reserve;
 - (iii) that balance of interest totalling £360,127 as set out in paragraph 27 is transferred to the General Reserve;
 - (iv) that Dividend income totalling £17,369 as set out in paragraph 30 is transferred to the General Reserve;
 - (v) that the 2019/20 capital programme be increased by £966,000 as a result of slippage of some 2018/19 capital projects as detailed in Table 2;
 - (vi) that £14,823 be transferred to the Car Parking Strategy Specific Reserve as detailed in Appendix C note 32;
 - (vii) that £3,177 be transferred to Burgess Hill Growth Specific Reserve as detailed in Appendix C note 17;
 - (viii) that the revenue underspending in 2018/19, totalling £459,000, be transferred to Specific Reserves as set out in Table 1.
-

Background

8. During 2018/19, Cabinet received four Budget Management reports on 9 July 2018, 24 September 2018, 12 November 2019, and 11 February 2019. The last Budget Management report in February highlighted a potential underspend of £56,000, after allowing for the transfer of £340,000 to Specific Reserve approved at Council on 27 February 2019.
9. Over the year, income has exceeded targets in a number of areas. However, the budget has continued to be carefully managed to ensure financial targets are met without compromising service performance.
10. Service budget outturns have been discussed with the appropriate Cabinet Members and Officers. Members should note that this budget outturn links with the service performance outturn. Full details of service performance outturn for 2018/19 will be reported to the first meeting of Scrutiny Committee for the Leader, Finances and Performance on 12 June 2019 in the usual way, and will then be considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 8 July 2019.

Revenue Spending 2018/19

11. The outturn for 2018/19, is an underspend of £799,000, reduced to £459,000 after allowing for the transfer of £340,000 to Specific Reserve approved at Council on 27 February 2019. This is £403,000 more than the latest forecast underspend position of £56,000, reported to Cabinet on the 11 February 2019. The outturn position is further detailed in Appendix A. Members should note that the underspend will be fully utilised, after taking account of the proposed transfers to Reserves detailed in Table 1 below.
12. The main variances were the result of increased income in a number of areas together with careful management of expenditure.

Requests to Reserves

13. On 21 March 19 the Council received a non-ring fenced grant totalling £23,284 from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) in respect of Local Authority Parks Improvement Funding. Members are now requested to approve that this sum be transferred to specific reserves to supplement the existing Parks Improvement reserve.
14. On 6 March 19 we received a non-ring fenced grant totalling £30,000 from MHCLG in respect of Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Grant. Members are now requested to approve that this sum be earmarked in Specific Reserve for the development work to be undertaken by Housing Services in relation to this.
15. In March, grant totalling £17,484 was received from MHCLG in respect of funding Local Authority EU Exit preparation. Members are requested to approve the transfer of this sum to Specific reserves to meet the cost of any EU exit costs arising.
16. On 20 March 19 we received a non-ring fenced grant totalling £26,005 from the MHCLG in respect of National Community Clean up Grant. Members are now requested to approve that this sum be earmarked in Specific Reserve for projects working with community groups to undertake community led street cleans.
17. In April, we received a grant payment of £34,051 from the Department for Work and Pensions to meet the costs of new burdens relating to Verify Earnings & Pensions grant, which was reported to Members in the Budget Management Report to Cabinet 9 July 18. We have recently received a second payment totalling £8,518. Members are requested to approve the transfer of £8,518 to this specific reserve.
18. Recently we have received a grant payment of £13,595 from MHCLG in respect of the final allocation for the 2018/19 Family Annex Council Tax Discount grant. Members are requested to approve the transfer of this sum to specific reserves to meet this additional cost.
19. Since the last Budget Management report to Cabinet in February, the Council have received a number of small grants totalling £13,019 from the MHCLG in respect of New Burdens Transparency code (£8,103), Brownfield Register (£3,687), Lettings Agents Transparency and Redress schemes grant (£761) and Rogue Landlord measures (£468) grant. These grants are not ring-fenced and Members are requested to approve these transfers to General Reserve.
20. In January we received £71 from Department for Work and Pensions, relating to Universal Credits – Universal Support Grant Quarter 2. Members are requested to approve the transfer of this sum to the Universal Credits specific reserves to meet this additional cost.
21. On 28 March 2019 we received grant totalling £5,078 from Department for Work and Pensions, in respect of New Burdens relating to Mixed Aged Couples (£2,382) and from Single Persons Discount and Pension credit Child addition changes (£2,696). Members are requested to approve the transfer of this sum to specific reserves to meet this additional cost.
22. In May, we received £221,981 from the MHCLG in respect of Flexible Homelessness Support Grant. A second payment for £48,260 has now been received. Members are requested to approve the transfer of this sum to specific reserves to support delivery of the homelessness service.

23. On 29 March 19 we received a non-ring fenced grant totalling £32,339 from the MHCLG in respect of Levy Account Surplus Grant. Members are requested to approve the transfer of this sum to specific reserves to the Rate Retention Scheme Equalisation reserve.
24. On 16 January 2019, the Council received £125,000 from New River Retail plc as a 2nd Instalment towards the cost of helping users of the Martlets Hall to relocate. Members are requested to approve the transfer of this sum to the Specific Reserve to meet these costs as they arise.
25. A £70,000 grant was recently received from WSCC Business Rates Pool funding to Support WSCC Walking and Cycling Strategy. Members are requested to approve the transfer of this sum to specific reserves for various cycle schemes and events.

Proposed Use of Revenue Underspend

26. As mentioned at the start of this report, due to the year-end variance, Members may wish to consider earmarking the Revenue underspend for the items detailed in Table 1 below:

	£	<i>Notes</i>
Economic and Community Development Fund	100,000	1
Asset Management Reserve	100,000	2
Job Evaluation/Voluntary Redundancy Reserve	200,000	3
Tree works	59,000	4
Total	459,000	

Notes:

- 1 Additional funding required in order to replenish this reserve by which grant aids many voluntary organisations and community groups.
- 2 Additional funding required in order to replenish this reserve to £100,000. This will cover work on bringing sites forward for disposal.
- 3 It is proposed that the JE/VR reserve will be topped up by £200,000 to help meet the cost in 2019/20 of staff restructures
- 4 Survey work has established that a number of trees, for which the Council are responsible, require maintenance. It is proposed to earmark monies in a Reserve to start to finance this work over the coming year.

Total Interest (Treasury Management, Personal Loans and Mortgage)

27. Interest receipts for the year are £367,472, £102,472 more than the original estimate. Of the total, £6,805 is required to meet the cost of interest paid on temporary borrowing in the year and £540 has been transferred to the Specific Reserve in accordance with existing practice to part pay professional subscriptions. The remaining balance of £360,127 can then be transferred to General Reserve.

Treasury Management Interest

28. This report details the Treasury Management interest earnings for the year to be £365,938 at an average interest rate of 0.971%. This compares with a budgeted figure of £263,000 at 0.95%, which is £102,938 more than the original estimate. This is an improvement on the last reported position, which was £91,000 over target. The main reason for the variance was the higher interest rates that have been achieved on short term investments together with an increase in the size of short term investments, following a reduction in the funds required for proposed capital spending during the year. Further detail will be set out in a separate report to Audit Committee on 23 July 2019.

Local Authority Property Fund Dividends

29. Members will recall that £6m is invested in the Local Authorities' Property Fund administered by the CCLA. Dividends on these investments are paid to the Council on a quarterly basis.
30. Dividends received for 2018/19 totalled £257,369 against a budget of £240,000 which is required to finance the 2018/19 Revenue Budget. This additional Dividend income of £17,369 will be transferred to General Reserve.

General Reserve 2018/19

31. Reserves and cash balances are amounts held for future revenue or capital expenditure and are also held to ensure the Council has sufficient cash resources for any unforeseen demands. The actual end of year cash position and the contributions and use of reserves are shown in Appendix C. Members will remember the change in strategy adopted in 2009/10 to protect reserves, when the projections were that the Council's position would be below the minimum holding of £1.5m at March 2011. Since that time we have worked hard to rebuild the Council's Reserves and the year-end position reflects the success of that work and is a significant improvement in financial standing.

Specific items

32. Specific Items are sums which are the responsibility of individual Heads of Service and identified for specific purposes. Whilst they do not directly influence Council Tax levels, their proposed utilisation is included in the Corporate Plan. The balance on the reserve for each Business Unit at the beginning of the year, together with the increases during the year (i.e. Contributions), how amounts have been applied (i.e. utilised) and explanations for the changes in year are shown in Appendix C. The total of Specific Items financed from the Specific Reserve and the General Reserve was £19,634,000.

Capital Spending

33. Actual capital spending for the year was £21,537,000. This was £8,004,000 more than the updated 2018/19 programme totalling £13,533,000, and is due to service specific and other projects which were not budgeted at the start of the year but were approved within the year and now require financing. Details of spending for each service area are shown in Appendix D, together with reasons for variations over £10,000. A summary of the reasons for these differences is also shown in Table 2 below.
34. The variances within the programme include £966,000 not spent in 2018/19. This includes £557,000 relating to Corporate Estates and Facilities projects including Major Capital Renewals schemes, £343,000 relating to Disabled Facilities Grants and £65,000 for ICT Projects. Further detail can be found in Appendix D of this report.

35.

<i>Category</i>	<i>£'000</i>	<i>£'000</i>
2018/19 Revised Budget		13,533
A Slippage to 2019/20	(966)	
B Projects completed and underspent	(137)	
C Projects overspent	135	
D Projects brought forward in the year	8,972	
Total difference		8,004
2018/19 Outturn		21,537

Category:

- A. Some projects, in whole or in part, have not been able to be progressed as originally intended. Unspent monies have therefore been rolled forward in order to ensure the completion of the projects.
- B. The final cost of projects was less than the revised budget.
- C. The final cost of projects was more than the revised budget.
- D. Projects that did not form part of the planned Capital Programme but which were agreed in-year, authorised under delegated authority and/or financed from S106s.

POLICY CONTEXT

36. The outturn for 2018/19 shows actual financial performance against the original budget, which was approved within the context of the Financial Strategy. The 2018/19 budget was compiled in line with the Council's priorities. This policy context was explained in sections 1 and 2 of the Corporate Plan and Budget 2018/19 that was approved by Council on 28 February 2018. The Financial Procedure Rules require Heads of Service to assume operational responsibility for the Budget, and to make recommendations so that corrective action is taken, whilst ensuring changes from the original budget are reported in a way that makes sure any variations are both clear and transparent.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

37. This report is concerned in its entirety with the outturn financial position for each service area for 2018/19.

RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

38. This report has no specific implications for risk management. The recommendations are concerned primarily with the movement of reserves and slippage in the capital programme; neither of which change the risk profile of the authority.

EQUALITY AND CUSTOMER SERVICE IMPLICATIONS

39. There are none.

OTHER MATERIAL IMPLICATIONS

40. There are no legal implications as a direct consequence of this report.

Background Papers

Revenue Budget 2018/19

Final Accounts Working Papers for 2018/19.

Summary Of Revenue Spending Outturn for 2018/19					
Business Unit	Original budget 2018/19 £'000	Revised Budget* 2018/19 £'000	Outturn 2018/19 £'000	Outturn	Notes in Appendix
				Variation from Revised Budget £'000	
Housing	1,242	1,246	1,229	(17)	1
Planning Policy & Economic Development	831	837	796	(41)	2
Development Management	663	672	441	(231)	3
Cleansing Services	2,738	2,736	2,745	9	4
Parking Services	(1,176)	(1,174)	(1,357)	(183)	5
Landscapes and Leisure	947	965	1,056	91	6
Community Services Policy and Performance	1,197	1,202	1,139	(63)	7
Corporate Estates and Facilities	(2,012)	(2,009)	(2,152)	(143)	8
Finance Accountancy	0	5	(1)	(6)	9
Finance Corporate	1,507	1,507	1,412	(95)	10
Revenues & Benefits	2,426	2,440	2,435	(5)	11
Customer Services and Communications	0	3	7	4	12
ICT	12	19	26	7	13
Human Resources & Payroll	0	3	29	26	14
Legal Services	0	4	(28)	(32)	15
Democratic Services	951	954	941	(13)	16
Land Charges	152	154	106	(48)	17
Planning & Building Control Support	0	2	(2)	(4)	18
Environmental Health	1,079	1,087	1,017	(70)	19
Building Control	250	254	305	51	20
Strategic Core	1,131	1,140	1,131	(9)	21
Benefits	(119)	(119)	(119)	0	22
Drainage Levies	1	1	1	0	
Balance Unallocated	27	27	0	(27)	23
Council Net Expenditure	11,847	11,956	11,157	(799)	**
Total Revenue Spending (before approved reserve transfers)	11,847	11,956	11,157	(799)	
Contribution to reserves - Employees	109	0	0	0	
Contribution to the Rate Relief Equalisation reserve	817	817	817	0	
Contribution to ICT reserve	400	400	400	0	
Contribution to Burgess Hill Growth reserve	304	304	304	0	
Contribution to Orchards reserve	425	425	425	0	
Transfer to Specific Reserves (previously reported)	0	0	340	340	
Total Revenue Spending	13,902	13,902	13,443	(459)	***
Proposed utilisation of the Revenue Underspend as set out in Table 1 of this report			459	459	
Total	13,902	13,902	13,902	0	

* includes approved variations including any utilisation of Balance Unallocated

** Before transfers to Specific Reserves approved during 18/19 (£340k).

*** After transfers to Specific Reserves approved during 18/19 (£340k).

Forecast Budget Variations for 2018/19

	<i>Changes since last report in 2018/19</i>	<i>Notes</i>
	<i>£'000</i>	
Apr to Dec net savings Cabinet	(396)	
Approved Transfers to Specific Reserve (Council 27 Feb 19)	340	
	<hr style="width: 100%; border: 0.5px solid black;"/>	
	(56)	
<i>Final Quarter Variations:</i>		
Housing minor variations	10	1
Planning Policy staffing	(20)	2
Planning Policy minor variations	3	2
Development Management minor variations	3	3
Planning Fee Income	12	3
Planning Consultants	(26)	3
Refuse Contract	(6)	4
Cleansing staffing	(8)	4
Cleansing minor variations	(13)	4
Recycling credit income	(33)	4
Parking Pay and Display Income	(39)	5
Parking Maintenance contracts	(17)	5
Parking minor variations	(14)	5
Landscapes Grounds Maintenance	86	6
Landscapes Playground Inspections	(41)	6
Tree maintenance Contract	15	6
Outdoor facilities Income	(25)	6
Landscapes minor variations	10	6
Community Services, Policy & Performance - salaries	(2)	7
Community Services, Policy & Performance – minor variations	(36)	7
Corporate Estates and Facilities – Rental Income	(53)	8
Corporate Estates and Facilities – utilities	(14)	8
Corporate Estates and Facilities – borrowing costs	(58)	8
Corporate Estates and Facilities - salaries	26	8
Finance Accountancy minor variations	(6)	9
Finance Corporate – pre 1974 pensions – overpayment	(65)	10
Finance Corporate - pensions	(10)	10
Finance Corporate – insurance recovery	(10)	10
Finance Corporate – minor variations	(10)	10
Revenues and Benefits Contract costs	102	11
Revenues Enforcement Income	(96)	11
Revenues and Benefits minor variations	(11)	11
Customer Services and Communications	4	12
ICT – telephones and printers	(9)	13
ICT - maintenance	16	13
Human Resources and Payroll minor variations	5	14
Legal Service - Income	(13)	15
Legal Services - Salaries	(9)	15
Democratic Services – Canvassing printing and postage	14	16
Land Charges – Income	(16)	17
Land Charges minor variations	(7)	17
Planning & Building Support – salary savings	(4)	18
Environmental Health minor variations	(3)	19
Licencing Income	(39)	19
Building Control minor variations	(3)	20
Strategic Core minor variations	7	21
	<hr style="width: 100%; border: 0.5px solid black;"/>	
	(459)	

Summary and explanation of Key Variances set out in Table above

The Summary of Revenue Outturn Table above shows the full year variance for each Business Unit. Explanation of variances identified for the first three quarters of the year have been reported to Cabinet in previous budget management reports received by Cabinet during 2018/19. Members should note that some of these variances have also been addressed as part of the Budget Process for 2019/20, and where budgets have been adjusted, the 2018/19 underspends are not expected to reoccur. However, now that the final accounts procedure has been completed a number of final variations have arisen. Explanations for these variances are detailed in the paragraphs below.

Housing

1. The service previously reported a £27K saving. In the last quarter a pressure of £10K has been identified due to a number of minor variations below £10K, resulting in a final outturn saving of £17K.

Planning Policy & Economic Development

2. A £24K saving was previously identified for the service. There has since been an additional saving of £17K, mainly due to staff vacancy savings in the last quarter of (£20K), offset by a £3K pressure due to a number of minor variations, resulting in a final outturn saving of £41K.

Development Management

3. The last forecast position identified £220K net saving for the service. Since then there has been a further saving of £11K. This is partly due to an underspend of (£26K) in the last quarter in respect of Planning Consultants due to fewer public enquiries, offset by a shortfall in Planning Fee income of £12K in the last Quarter. The saving is also partly offset by minor variations totalling £3K, resulting in a total final outturn saving of £231K.

Cleansing Services

4. The last reported year-end forecast was a £69K pressure. An additional saving of £60K has been identified in the last quarter, resulting in a final outturn pressure of £9K. The recent variations are the result of: (£33K) additional performance-related Recycling Credit income from West Sussex County Council in the last quarter to reflect a share of additional income from recyclates; (£8K) Staff saving due to vacancies over the year; (£6K) Refuse contract saving resulting from lower than budgeted bank holiday collection costs; and (£13K) saving resulting from a number of minor variations below £10K.

Parking Services

5. The service was previously forecasting a saving of £113K. Since then a further net saving of £70K has occurred due to the following: (£17K) saving due to the replacement of Parking Machines which came with a year's warranty and the subsequent refund of annual maintenance costs in respect of the old machines; (£39K) additional Pay and Display income received in last quarter of the year and (£14K) saving due to number of minor variations, resulting in a final outturn saving of £183K.

Landscapes & Leisure

6. The last forecast position identified a £46K net pressure. Since then there has been a further pressure of £45K, resulting in a final outturn pressure of £91K. The variation in the last quarter is due to the following:
 - £86K additional Sports grounds works to address historic issues with the quality of pre-season pitch preparations;
 - £15K Additional Tree Maintenance costs arising from emergency tree safety works following the tree failure at Syresham Gardens, Haywards Heath;

Appendix A

- (£25K) Additional fourth quarter income in respect of Playgroups and Pavilions due to a reduction in sports cancellations due to the improved condition of the pitches and a resultant increase in pavilion hires, and as a result of more nursery utilisation due to the late Easter break;
- (£41K) saving in cost of Playground Inspections. This funding will be used in 2019/20 to support a variation in the contract to enhance playground inspections. ,
- £10K pressure due to a number of minor variations.

Community Services, Policy and Performance

7. The last forecast position identified a salary saving of £25K. This figure has increased by a further £2K, largely due to two staff vacancies within the Business Unit. An additional £36K underspend has been accrued through minor variations across a number of budget areas. The Business Unit restructure was completed at the end of the year giving clarity to roles and responsibilities, future work programmes and required budget for community focused activity. Responsibility for tourism has recently moved to the Economic Development team.

Corporate Estates and Facilities

8. The last reported forecast position was a saving of £44K. The final quarter is showing an increase in this saving by £99K of which £53K is additional rental income for operational properties recently purchased. There is an additional saving of £58K for lower than budgeted borrowing costs for The Orchards and a saving of £14K for utilities. These savings are partly offset by pressures of £26K for salaries as a result of vacancies within the business unit requiring the employment of agency staff.

Finance Accountancy

9. Since the last reported position there has been a saving of £6K as a result of minor variations.

Finance Corporate

10. Since the last reported position there has been a saving of £95K of which £65K relates to a refund from East Sussex for pre-1974 pensions following an overpayment in a previous year and £10K on the West Sussex pension service. There has also been a saving of £10K for insurance recovery and a saving of £10K for minor variations.

Revenues & Benefits

11. Outturn is showing a final net underspend of £5K. The variations shown in Appendix A are mainly the result of variances in the detailed budgets for 2018/19 prior to dissolving the CenSus Revenues and Benefits Partnership. The budgets were estimated based on assumptions of achieving proportional reductions in all previous CenSus Budgets, in the absence of more relevant forecasts at the time. Since the post Census reorganisation, the need for significant review of detailed budgets has been identified, to more accurately reflect the actual demands of the new service. Service budgets were managed overall in 2018/19, partly through the use of the CenSus Disaggregation reserve, which has funded any costs relating to delays in achieving the post Census contract savings and also through additional Income achieved in 2018/19 through increased Revenues Enforcement activity.

Customer Services and Communications

12. Since the last reported position there has been a pressure of £4K as a result of minor variations

ICT

13. Since the last reported position there has been a pressure of £7K of which £9K is due to a saving on telephones and printers. This is offset by a pressure of £16K for software maintenance.

Human Resources & Payroll

14. The last reported year-end forecast was a £21K pressure. Since then there has been a further pressure of £5K as a result of minor variations.

Legal Services

15. The last forecast position identified a salary saving of £10K. There has been a further salary saving of £9K due to vacant posts within the Business Unit remaining unfilled and another £13K relating to additional fee income generated by the team charging commercial third parties for property and planning work. This results in a final outturn saving of £32K.

Democratic Services

16. Since the last reported position there has been further expenditure to finalise electoral registration meaning that the reported underspend of £27k has not been achieved. The outturn saving is £13K.

Land Charges

17. Since the last reported position there has been a saving of £23K. This relates to £16K additional income due to an increase in the volume of Official Searches following a successful marketing campaign carried out by the Local Land Charges Team highlighting the speed and quality of the service. There is also a further saving of £7K due to minor variations, resulting in a final outturn saving of £48K.

Planning & Building Control Support

18. Since the last reported position there has been a saving of £4K due to a salary underspend.

Environmental Health

19. The last reported year-end forecast was a £28K saving. Since then a further saving of £42K has occurred, resulting in a final outturn saving of £70K. The additional saving is mainly due to the introduction of new licences for Houses in Multiple Occupation, generating an additional £21K income, as well as additional Taxi licencing (£9K) and Animal Welfare licencing income (£9K) due to increased demand. A further £3K saving was achieved resulting from a number of minor variations below £10K.

Building Control

20. The service previously reported a £54K pressure. Since then a saving of £3K has been achieved due to a number of minor variations, reducing the outturn pressure to £51K.

Strategic Core

21. The last reported position was a saving of £16K. Since then there has been a pressure of £7K due to minor variations.

Benefits

22. No variation. (Refer Appendix B of this report).

Balance Unallocated

23. The budget remaining for balance unallocated of £27K was previously reported as a saving, leaving no further variation to report.

Benefits Outturn 2018/19			
(using Academy subsidy claim figures)			
	2018/19	2018/19	Variation
	Original	Outturn	from
	Budget		Budget
Non HRA rent rebates			
	£	£	£
<i>gross expenditure</i>	163,000	477,631	314,631
net expenditure at standard subsidy	0	0	0
effect of reduced subsidy	17,000	46,607	29,607
effect of overpayments	(15,000)	(41,790)	(26,790)
Total Rent Rebates	2,000	4,817	2,817
Rent Allowances			
	£	£	£
<i>gross expenditure</i>	32,947,000	30,381,186	(2,565,814)
net expenditure at standard subsidy	0	0	0
effect of reduced subsidy	945,000	738,314	(206,686)
effect of overpayments	(1,109,000)	(948,566)	160,434
Total Rent Allowances	(164,000)	(210,252)	(46,252)
			1
Discretionary Local Scheme			
Council Tax Benefit	0	0	0
Rent Allowances	27,000	17,027	(9,973)
Subsidy 75%	(20,000)	(12,770)	7,230
Total Discretionary scheme	7,000	4,257	(2,743)
Total Support	(155,000)	(201,178)	(46,178)
Less: LA Error Subsidy	(83,000)	(82,648)	352
Add : Adjustment to 17/18	0	(6,758)	(6,758)
DHP Subsidy - effect of Overpayments		12,966	12,966
Less: Funding to / (from) Benefits			
Equalisation Reserve	119,000	158,618	39,618
Cost to MSDC	(119,000)	(119,000)	0
			2

Reasons for variation:				
<p>(1) The budgeted effect of Rent Allowances allows for the collection of overpayments from benefits recipients as well as being able to claim a percentage in subsidy from Central Government. The budget was based on historic activity with an allowance for an anticipated decrease in collection rates, resulting from the gradual transition to Local Housing Allowance, whereby the Housing benefit recipient changed from Landlord to Tenant. However, to date there has been no evidence of collection rates decreasing and there is therefore a surplus to budget relating to the collection of Rent Allowance overpayments.</p>				
<p>(2) The benefits equalisation reserve is made up from prior year's surplus' and was set up to reduce the variances on the revenue budget caused by fluctuations in Benefits subsidy volumes. An adjustment is made to/(from) the reserve to bring the outturn position back to the required budget. An amount of £158,618 has been paid to the equalisation reserve, compared to the £119,000 budgeted contribution from the reserve, a favourable variation of £36,618. This is the result of favourable Rent Allowance overpayment collection rates.</p>				

Use of Specific Reserve in 2018/19					
Description	Balance at 01/04/2018 £'000	Contributions In Year £'000	Utilised In Year £'000	Balance at 31/03/2019 £'000	Notes
Housing					
Recyclable loan fund	(37)	0	16	(21)	1
Housing Needs Survey	(0)	(19)	0	(19)	2
Repossession and Eviction Prevention fund	(19)	0	19	0	3
Gypsy and Traveller feasibility Studies	(16)	0	3	(13)	4
County court desk	(37)	0	23	(14)	5
CPO Fund for Empty Homes	(50)	0	0	(50)	6
Self Build and Custom House building	(51)	(30)	0	(81)	7
Flexible Homelessness Support SR	(155)	(270)	98	(328)	8
Preventing Homelessness Grant	(14)	(27)	30	(11)	9
Overhauling Statutory Homelessness data	(9)	0	0	(9)	10
Rough Sleepers Partnership Outreach	(21)	0	21	(0)	11
Temporary Accommodation reserve	(4,000)	0	2,183	(1,817)	12
Planning Policy & Economic Development					
SANG Project	(38)	0	38	0	13
Specialist Advice studies - Gatwick	(25)	0	0	(25)	14
Neighbourhood Planning Non Frontrunners	(129)	0	13	(116)	15
Development Plan Reserve (Studies and EIP costs)	(189)	(472)	305	(356)	16
Economic Development	(3)	0	3	0	17
SAMM Fees	(1,290)	(344)	0	(1,634)	18
Burgess Hill Growth	(502)	(397)	44	(854)	19
Martlets Relocation	(125)	(125)	85	(165)	20
Planning Performance Agreement	(14)	0	0	(14)	21
Business digitalisation	0	(16)	0	(16)	22
Independence Retail Programme	0	(39)	16	(23)	23
Development Management					
Development Management Temporary Staff	(1)	0	0	(1)	24
Brownfield Register	(20)	0	0	(20)	25
Cleansing Services					
Recycling Quality Project	(15)	0	15	0	26
Waste TEEP Assessment	(34)	0	0	(34)	27
Communal Recycling Quality	(36)	0	19	(18)	28
Waste and Recycling Projects	(83)	0	0	(83)	29
A23 Highway Cleansing	(21)	0	6	(15)	30
Community Street Clean	0	(26)	0	(26)	31
Parking Services					
Road Space Audit East Grinstead	(30)	0	30	0	32
CPE Investment Fund	(24)	(14)	8	(29)	33
Car Park Strategy	0	(85)	0	(85)	34
Landscapes and Leisure					
Invest to Save -Pavilions	(5)	0	0	(5)	35
Parks Improvement	0	(143)	0	(143)	36
Outstanding Insurance Claims	(2)	0	0	(2)	37
Leisure Reserve	(550)	0	464	(86)	38
Illegal Incursions Preventative Works	0	(172)	40	(131)	39
Tree Works*	0	(59)	0	(59)	40
Community Services, Policy & Performance					
CCTV Fund	(70)	0	31	(39)	41
Community Safety - Funding for All	(100)	0	0	(100)	42
Performance and Partnerships staffing	(22)	0	0	(22)	43
Capital Grants	(17)	0	0	(17)	44
Economic & Community Development Fund*	(201)	(100)	132	(168)	45
Community Services Policy	0	(69)	38	(30)	46
WSCC Pool Business Rates Bicycle Funding	0	(70)	0	(70)	47

Use of Specific Reserve in 2018/19					
Description	Balance at 01/04/2018 £'000	Contributions In Year £'000	Utilised In Year £'000	Balance at 31/03/2019 £'000	Notes
Corporate Estates and Facilities					
Asset management*	(100)	(100)	100	(100)	48
Planned Asset maintenance Specific Reserve	(101)	0	51	(50)	49
Asset Maintenance and Landscapes	(8)	0	0	(8)	50
WSCC Watercourse delegated function	(17)	0	0	(17)	51
Property Consultants	(14)	0	0	(14)	52
Orchards Repairs and Renewals	(70)	(425)	340	(155)	53
Orchards Improvement Reserve	(5,000)	0	0	(5,000)	54
Finance Accountancy					
FMS to move server costs	(2)	0	0	(2)	55
Icon Upgrade costs	(4)	(5)	0	(9)	56
Finance Corporate					
Insurance Reserve	(61)	0	0	(61)	57
JE and VR Reserve*	(125)	(377)	192	(311)	58
Audit Costs	(16)	0	0	(16)	59
Land and Property Reserve	(4,372)	0	4,356	(16)	60
Revenues & Benefits					
Localising Council Tax support admin	(129)	0	0	(129)	61
NDR pre95 Credits	(70)	0	70	0	62
Admin subsidy	(23)	0	23	0	63
CenSus Consultancy	(25)	0	25	0	64
Revenues and Benefits New Burdens	0	(102)	87	(15)	65
Universal credits	0	(33)	33	0	66
Census Partnership Disaggregation	0	(117)	70	(47)	67
ICT					
Inspire hosted software solution	(7)	0	0	(7)	68
Census ICT	(76)	0	76	0	69
ICT PSN related work	(7)	0	0	(7)	70
ICT reserve	(209)	(476)	627	(58)	71
ICT - Replacement GIS Software	(4)	0	0	(4)	72
Business Digitalisation	(29)	0	29	0	73
Burgess Hill Fibre Exchange	0	(150)	27	(123)	74
Human Resources & Payroll					
Employee Benefits	(2)	(7)	8	(0)	75
Corporate Training	(1)	0	0	(1)	76
Democratic Services					
District Elections	(145)	(44)	39	(150)	77
Civic Events	(2)	0	0	(2)	78
Individual Electoral Registration Grant	(29)	(26)	0	(55)	79
Land Charges					
Temporary staff for land searches	(2)	0	0	(2)	80
Planning & Building Control Support					
Validation Officer Temporary staff	(25)	0	0	(25)	81
Corporate Funds					
Benefits Equalisation	(975)	(159)	0	(1,134)	82
Rate Retention Scheme Equalisation	(1,007)	(2,512)	1,065	(2,454)	83
Benefits & Council tax support scheme equalisation	(100)	0	0	(100)	84
LA EU Exit Preparation	0	(17)	0	(17)	85
Total Specific Reserves	(20,714)	(7,026)	10,899	(16,840)	

Figures in this table are subject to roundings to nearest £'000

*Subject to approval by Council as set out in recommendations of this report

Appendix C

1. This reserve was created to augment the existing Housing Rent in Advance scheme, and be used in the form of a recyclable loan fund for eligible households. In 2018/19, £15,795 has been utilised leaving a balance of £21,242.
2. Housing Needs Survey. In 2018/19 £18,873 was transferred from the Repossession and Eviction Prevention fund as reported in Budget Management Cabinet 11 February 19 as it was no longer needed in the R&EP fund so reallocated to top up the Housing Needs Survey Specific Reserve. The year-end balance stands at £19,314.
3. This reserve was created from additional funding from the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) towards a Repossessions Prevention Fund to provide small interest free loans to families or other measures to prevent homelessness as agreed in a Budget management report to Cabinet on the 6th July 2009. As reported in Budget Management Cabinet 11 February 19, £18,873 was transferred to the Housing Needs Survey Specific Reserve as the R&EP was no longer required.
4. £20,000 approved at Cabinet 11th April 2011 for Empty homes works in default. £4,170 was utilised in 2013/14 leaving a balance of £15,830 to be spent in future years. As reported in the Budget Management Report to Cabinet 11 February 19, these funds are no longer required for this purpose and have been reallocated for consultancy work on feasibility studies to meet housing needs including Gypsy and Traveller needs. This reserve has been renamed accordingly, and £2,741 was utilised in year leaving a balance of £13,089.
5. Approved at Cabinet 6th June 11 in Outturn Report 2011/12, to fund additional resources to prevent homelessness in the future through defending court proceedings. £23,110 was utilised in year to support in-year costs for choice based lettings as well as the cost of the Nominations agreement redraft and advice, leaving a balance of £13,990.
6. This CPO Fund for Empty Homes was approved by Council 27th February 2013 to be funded from New Homes Bonus monies. To date this reserve has not been utilised.
7. This reserve was created to hold grants received from MHCLG in respect of Self build and custom house building. A further £30,000 was received on 6 March 19 and approved at Outturn 2018/19 (refer para. 14 of main report). These monies will be used for custom build development work to be undertaken by Housing Services. There was no call on this reserve in 2018/19.
8. Reserve created in 2017/18, in respect of Flexible Homelessness Support Grant received from MHCLG. The grant allocation replaced the £60 Temporary Accommodation Management Fee from 1st April 2017, and was expected to compensate local authorities for this loss as well as support homelessness services. In 2018/19, £221,981 was received as detailed in Budget Management report to Cabinet 9 July 18. A further £48,260 was received on March 19 and approved at Outturn 2018/19 (refer para. 22 of main report). £98,075 was utilised in year on Flexible Homelessness Support costs leaving a balance of £327,539.
9. Reserve created to hold Preventing Homelessness New Burdens grants received from MHCLG. In 2017/18 it was confirmed that grant totalling £82,706 would be received over a three year period. In 2018/19, £26,591 was received as reported in Budget Management 9 July 18 and 24 September 18. £29,902 was utilised in year on preventing homelessness costs leaving a balance of £10,898.
10. Reserve created in 2017/18, to hold £9,202 received from MHCLG for new burdens in respect of Overhauling Statutory Homelessness Data Grant Determination. This grant will be used to meet the costs of IT equipment to enable mobile working within the team. To date this reserve has not been utilised.
11. Reserve created at Outturn 2017/18 from a contribution received from West Sussex County Council. This has been used for Rough sleeper Outreach work to be undertaken by Housing Services leaving a balance of £98 at year end.
12. £4,000,000 Reserve created at Outturn 2017/18 to acquire and manage our own properties to improve the quality of services for homeless families and reduce revenue expenditure on the service by being our own landlord. £18,803 was utilised in year on revenue costs and £2,163,895 has been utilised as part of Capital Financing, leaving a balance of £1,817,301.
13. Reserve created in 2013/14 to meet the cost of creating and enhancing a Suitable Alternative Natural Green space (SANG). The Reserve was fully utilised in 2018/19 on SANG implementation costs.
14. Reserve created in 2013/14 to commission specialist advice studies in respect of noise and other environmental impacts to allow MSDC to provide an informed contribution to any consultation relating to the possible expansion of Gatwick airport. There has been no call on this reserve in 2018/19.
15. The reserve shows the remaining balance of a grant received for Neighbourhood Planning. £12,574 has been utilised in-year on Examination in Public Inspection Fees and grants to Parish Councils in relation to Neighbourhood plans, leaving a balance of £116,038.

Appendix C

16. The reserve shows the remaining balance of £189,151 at the start of the year. This Reserve is to help meet the costs of the District Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy Examinations. In 2018/19, the Reserve was topped up by £472,000 to meet a number of significant costs in the Planning Policy and Economy Service on technical work to support the District Plan, work to deliver the planning related elements of the Economic Development Strategy, an updated masterplan for Haywards Heath Town Centre as detailed in the Budget Management Report to Cabinet 24 September 2018, and the Site Allocations work. In 2018/19 £305,369 was utilised mainly on consultant and contractor fees as well as Examination in Public Inspector fees. A balance of £355,782 remains at 31 March 2019.
17. This reserve is available for economic development initiatives. There has been no call on this reserve in 2018/19 because a revenue budget has been created to support this work. This reserve is no longer needed and is recommended to be transferred to the Burgess Hill Growth Reserve.(refer note 19).
18. This represents contributions collected from developers in respect of the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring tariff (SAMM) which is required to fund migration projects to be delivered by the Conservators of Ashdown Forest. This reserve totalled £1,289,610 at the start of 2018/19. In year, the Reserve has increased by a further £344,029. The balance on this reserve is due to be transferred to Wealden District Council, as part of the Joint SAMM Strategy and the pooled funding of the shared service w.e.f 1st April 2018.
19. This Reserve was created to help meet the costs of planning /legal consultants as part of the Burgess Hill growth work. A contribution of £304,000 was approved in the Corporate Plan and Budget 2018/19 to Council 28 February 2018. An additional contribution of £90,000 was received from Homes England to support the Northern Arc planning application as reported in Budget Management to Cabinet 11 February 19. In addition, a balance of £3,177 has been transferred from the Economic Development as no longer required in this reserve (refer note 17). £44,444 was utilised in 2018/19 on consultant costs leaving a balance of £854,492 at year-end.
20. In July 2017, we received the sum of £125,000 from New River Retail Ltd as a contribution to any associated costs relating to the closure of Martlets Hall to support the town revitalisation project. This is the first of two amounts due of a total £250,000 contribution. The Martlets Relocation Specific Reserve was created to hold these sums, as reported in the Budget Management Report to Cabinet 5th September 2017. A further £125,000 has been received and approved at Outturn 2018/19 (refer para. 24 of main report). Of this total £85,489 has been utilised in 2018/19.
21. In December 2017, the Council received a fee of £14,176 in relation to a Planning Performance Agreement with a developer to facilitate delivery of a strategic housing site. Planning Performance Agreements are supported by the Government to promote an improved and more efficient service, and is considered to be good practice in supporting delivery of housing. The Planning Performance Agreement Specific Reserve was created to hold the sum, as reported in the Budget Management Report to Cabinet 19th February 2018. To date this reserve has not been utilised but will be used in 2019/20 to back fill Development Management posts..
22. Business Digitalisation Balance of £15,707 re-categorised under Economic Development from ICT as relates to Economic Development activities.(refer note 73).
23. This Reserve was created, as reported in the Budget Management Report to Cabinet 24 September 2018, when the Council received £39,200 via Chichester District Council from the West Sussex Business Rate pool in respect of the Independent Retail Programme, to be spent on a training programme for independent retailers on managing their shopfronts and to provide them with small bursaries to enable improvements to be made. £16,200 has been used in 2018/19, leaving a balance of £23,000 at 31 March 19.
24. This reserve was created at Outturn 2014/15 is to cover the cost of temporary staff for a two year period which is required to meet the rising number of planning applications. The balance in this Reserve at the start of the year was £790. There was no call on the reserve during 2018/19.
25. This Reserve was created at Outturn 2016/17 to hold grant received from MHCLG in respect of New Burdens funding for the Brownfield Land Register and Permission In Principle (PIP) LA. A further £5,485 was approved at Outturn 2017/18. This is to be used towards the cost of producing the register. To date this reserve has not been utilised.
26. The Recycling Quality Project Specific Reserve balance at the start of 2018/19 was £15,466, which has been fully utilised in year.
27. Reserve created in 2016/17 to meet the full cost of the TEEP assessment of £50,000. The balance in this Reserve at the start of the year was £34,025. There was no call on the reserve during 2018/19.
28. This Reserve is to fund a project to improve communal recycling quality and to fund a pilot project with the British Heart Foundation to increase recycling of textiles and small goods as set out in the Budget Management Report to Cabinet 19th February 18. £18,529 has been utilised in 2018/19 leaving a balance at year-end of £17,405.
29. The Waste and Recycling Projects Specific Reserve of £83,403 is to fund future projects identified in the 2018/19 Service Plan as set out in the Budget Management Report to Cabinet 19th February 18. There was no call on the reserve during 2018/19.

Appendix C

30. The A23 Highway Cleansing Reserve was created to cover the requirement for a deep cleanse (litter-picking) of the A23. In 2017/18 £19,147 was utilised leaving a balance of £20,853, and in 2018/19, a further £5,640 was used leaving a balance of £15,213.
31. Community Street Clean Specific Reserve created and approved at Outturn 2018/19 (refer para. 16 of main report), following receipt of £26,005 from MHCLG in respect of National Community Clean up Grant. This will be used for projects working with community groups to undertake community-led street cleans
32. This Reserve was created at Outturn 2016/17 to cover the cost of the Road Space Audits delayed until 2017/18. In 2018/19 £15,177 was utilised on a road space audit, East Grinstead leaving a balance of £14,823 at year-end. This reserve is no longer needed and the funds are recommended to be transferred to the Car Park Strategy reserve. (refer note 34).
33. This Reserve was created at Outturn 2016/17 as 30% of the Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) Surplus can now be retained by MSDC on the condition that it is re-invested in the Service. In 2018/19 £13,892 was received relating to the current year's surplus and £8,046 was utilised leaving a balance of £29,358.
34. This Reserve was created to support the Car Park Strategy that requires refreshing in 2020/21. Therefore, funding totalling £70,000 was earmarked from the forecast Revenue Underspend as detailed in Budget Management Report to Cabinet 11 February 19. An additional £14,823 has been transferred to this Reserve at Outturn being the balance held in the Road Space Audit Reserve now no longer required. (refer note 32).
35. This reserve was originally set up for the improvement works to pavilions as set out in the Proposal for in-year investment projects report to Cabinet 16th October 12. There was no call on the reserve during 2018/19.
36. £120,000 was earmarked from the forecast Revenue Underspend to set up a Parks Improvements Reserve, as detailed in Budget Management Report to Cabinet 11 February 2019. This is to cover the costs of the Parks Asset Management Plan, Recycling Bins in key parks as well as master planning costs on a number of sites, prior to bringing forwards Capital projects on these sites in 2020/21. A further £23,284 was approved at Outturn 2018/19 (refer para. 13 of main report), following receipt of a non-ring fenced grant from MHCLG in respect of Local Authority Parks Improvement Funding.
37. This reserve was created following the contract award for the management of the Leisure centres to Freedom/GLL to cover a few outstanding insurance claims which have not yet been settled by our insurers. There was no call on the reserve during 2018/19.
38. The Leisure Reserve was created to enable investment in the Council's Leisure Centres. At the start of the year the balance on this Reserve was £550,000. During the year, £450,000 has been utilised as a contribution towards further leisure improvements at the Triangle Leisure Centre, and £14,347 was used to finance the Dolphin car park capital works. Further details are contained in the Leisure Centre Investment Report to Council 31/01/18. The remaining balance is £85,653.
39. Illegal Incursions Preventative Works Reserve totalling £171,600 was set up, as detailed in Budget Management Report to Cabinet 24 September 2019, to accelerate the programme of outstanding works across the District's most vulnerable sites. During the year £40,292 has been utilised for this purpose.
40. At Outturn 2018/19, a request to create this Reserve is detailed in Table 1 note 4 of main report.
41. Reserve created to part-fund the upgrade of the existing CCTV system with additional contributions to be sought from partners. During the year £30,953 has been utilised for this purpose, leaving a balance of £39,047.
42. The Community Safety - Funding for All Reserve was created at Outturn 2016/17 to meet any future reductions in Mid Sussex Partnership funding. There was no call on the reserve during 2018/19.
43. This Reserve was created due to a Revenue Underspend at Outturn 2016/17 to be used for temporary staffing and equipment in Policy and Performance Business Unit. However, to date there has been no call on the reserve.
44. This reserve represents the Capital grant which was approved by the Cabinet Grants Panel on 11th February 2009 for Ansty Village Hall, but not yet paid over. There was no call on the reserve during 2018/19.
45. The Reserve was set up to help meet the cost of Economic and Community Development related activities. The balance in this Reserve at the start of the year was £220,662. £132,401 has been utilised in 2018/19 on Community and Economic grants in year. A request to add a further £100,000 to this reserve is detailed in Table 1 note 1 of this report..
46. Community Services Policy Reserve was set up, as detailed in Budget Management Report to Cabinet 24 September 2019, to cover the cost of consultancy services on the Playing Pitch Strategy (£15,750), the Play & Amenity Green Space Strategy (£33,000) and the Community Building Strategy (£19,949). £38,257 was utilised in year for this purpose.

Appendix C

47. £70,000 contribution relates to grant received from WSCC Business rate pool in March 2019 to support WSCC Walking and Cycling Strategy. The WSCC Pool Business Rates Bicycle Funding Specific Reserve was approved at Outturn 2018/19 (refer para. 25 of main report).
48. This reserve is to cover the cost of work needed to enable the Council to make best use of its assets. During 2018/19 this reserve has been fully utilised towards the cost of a number of asset disposals including, assets located at Courtmead Road and Paddockhall Road, Bolnore Road and Imberhorne Lane Car Park. A request to add a further £100,000 to this reserve is detailed in Table 1 note 2 of this report.
49. Reserve created to fund planned asset maintenance works that were not able to be completed during the year it was created. During 2018/19 £51,217 has been utilised leaving a balance in this Reserve at year end of £49,889.
50. Reserve created to fund the cost of purchasing and implementing the new property, asset maintenance and landscapes system. There was no call on the reserve during 2018/19.
51. This represents balance of monies received from WSCC for the watercourse delegated function which was earmarked for trash screens at Cophthorne Golf Course. There has been no utilisation of this Reserve in 2018/19.
52. Approved to help meet the future cost of Property Consultants. There has been no call on this reserve during 2018/19.
53. In 2017/18, this reserve was created to meet expenses that remain the landlord's responsibility and for future investment in the centre. During 2018/19, a budgeted contribution totalling £425,000 has been added to the Reserve. £340,000 has been utilised to financing the Orchards Roof works capital project. This leaves a balance of £155,000.
54. Reserve created at Outturn 2017/18 to fund future Orchards improvements. There was no call on the reserve during 2018/19.
55. Reserve created to fund the consultancy costs of moving FMS over to the new server. In 2014/15, £3,984 has been utilised leaving a balance of £2,016. There has been no call on this reserve in 2018/19.
56. Reserve created to fund the bi-annual Icon upgrade costs of approximately £9,000. In 2018/19, £5,000 represented the annual budgeted contribution. There was no call on this Reserve this year.
57. The insurance reserve is to be held for non- planned MSDC liability settlements. There has been no call on this reserve in 2018/19.
58. Reserve created to offset planned redundancy and job evaluation costs. In 2018/19, £177,169 was added to the Reserve to cover the cost of redundancies resulting from the Census Revenue and Benefits partnership disaggregation, as detailed in Budget Management Report to Cabinet 24 September 18. A request to add a further £200,000 to this reserve is detailed in Table 1 note 3 of this report. £152,804 has been utilised to finance our 50% share of Revenues and Benefits termination benefits in 2018/19.
59. Reserve created to offset unbudgeted costs which may arise due to the uncertainty of the total cost of External Audit services. There has been no call on this reserve in 2018/19.
60. The Land and Property Reserve was created in 2016/17 to enable land and property investments to generate a revenue stream. The balance on this Reserve at the start of the year was £4,372,348. In 2018/19, £4,356,200 was utilised in total. Of this total, £4,000,000 was used for the purchase of the freehold at 255-269 London Road (Wickes), Burgess Hill, and £356,200 relates to acquisition of the tenant's leasehold interests in investment property: Flat 10 St. Josephs Way (£180,200) and Flat 7 St. Josephs Way (£176,000) as reported as reported in Budget Management 11 February 19. The balance on this Reserve at the end of 2018/19 is £16,148.
61. This reserve was set up to meet the additional administration costs in the transition to a Council Tax Support Scheme as reported to Cabinet on 9th July 2013. During 2018/19, there has been no call on this reserve, leaving a balance of £129,199 to be spent in future years.
62. Earmarked amount of NNDR credits transferred from General Reserve to Specific Reserve as a contingency sum to cover possible future repayments. This Reserve was no longer required and moved to Census Partnership Disaggregation Reserve as detailed in Budget Management Report to Cabinet 12 November 18.
63. This reserve was created from additional Administration Subsidy grant received in 2009/10 for future caseload pressures occurring the next year. This Reserve was no longer required and moved to Census Partnership Disaggregation Reserve as detailed in Budget Management Report to Cabinet 12 November 18.
64. Reserve created to help fund the specialist advice needed on the departure of Adur District Council from the Revenues and Benefits part of the CenSUS Partnership, as well as advice needed to deal with future economic, social and technological change. This Reserve was no longer required and moved to Census Partnership Disaggregation Reserve as detailed in Budget Management Report to Cabinet 12 November 18.

Appendix C

65. Reserve created in 2018/19 from grant received from the Department for Work and Pensions towards the cost of New Burdens relating to the Local Authority Data sharing programme (£3,791); the Single Fraud Investigation Service (£970); Verifying Earnings & pensions (£34,051) and implementing Welfare Reform (£19,353). This was detailed in the Budget Management Report to Cabinet 9 July 18. Further grant payments received totalling £16,864 as detailed in the Budget Management Report to Cabinet 11 February 19. Additional grants totalling £27,191 were approved at Outturn 2018/19 (refer para. 17, 18, and 21 of main report). In 2018/19 £86,872 was utilised, leaving £15,348 remaining at year-end.
66. Reserve created in 2018/19 from grant received from the Department for Work and Pensions towards the cost of New Burdens relating to the Transition to Universal Credits, as detailed in Budget Management Report to Cabinet 12 November 18. Further grant payments received totalling £2,786 as detailed in the Budget Management Report to Cabinet 11 February 19. Additional grant received was approved at Outturn 2018/19 (refer para. 20 of main report). This Reserve, totalling £32,500, has been fully utilised in year on additional staff costs and Universal credit consultant costs.
67. This reserve was created from reserves reallocated as detailed in notes 62, 63 and 64 above, as detailed in Budget Management Report to Cabinet 12 November 18, to fund additional costs emerging associated with the Census partnership disaggregation. In 2018/19, £69,948 has been utilised for this purpose including £24,650 used to finance the Info @ work EDRMS system Migration to MSDC server Capital project.
68. Reserve created in 2013/14 from grant received from DEFRA for local authorities to comply with a European directive to make spatial (GIS) data available. The reserve will meet the costs of purchasing a hosted software solution to fulfil our obligations. There has been no call on this reserve in 2018/19.
69. The Census ICT Reserve was intended to provide funding for the Mid Sussex element of Census projects relating to IDOX or Revenues and Benefits. Since the dissolution of the Census partnership these costs are now the responsibility of MSDC. As reported in Budget Management Report to Cabinet 24 September 18, this reserve has been moved to the MSDC ICT Reserve to reflect this change in responsibility.
70. Reserve created to fund the on-going Public Service Network (PSN) costs which are an essential requirement for creating the statutory secure government computer network. There was no call on the reserve during 2018/19.
71. Reserve created to enable future development in ICT and related customer service software and the balance at the start of the year was £209,226. A contribution of £400,000 was approved in the Corporate Plan and Budget 2018/19 to Council 28 February 2018. In addition, £76,004 was transferred to the Reserve from the Census ICT Reserve (Refer note 69 above). During the year £627,275 was utilised. £214,692 on installation of a new FMS system revenue project, £255,052 was used to finance the Capital Programme and £157,530 was used on revenue projects. A balance of £57,955 remains at year end.
72. This Reserve was set up to fund a fully hosted web-based service. In 2018/19, there has been no call on this reserve.
73. This Reserve is to help support small businesses to use digital technologies. £13,763 has been utilised on Open for Business, and the balance of £15,707 has been re-designated to a new Business Digitalisation reserve under Economic Development (refer note 22 above).
74. This Reserve was created for the Burgess Hill Fibre Exchange to procure legal, procurement and commercial advice. Therefore, funding totalling £150,000 was earmarked from the forecast Revenue Underspend as detailed in Budget Management Report to Cabinet 11 February 19. During 2018/19 £26,884 has been utilised leaving a balance of £123,116.
75. The utilisation in 2018/19 totalling £7,671 is to fund professional qualification subscriptions. Contributions made to this reserve in year represent the annual budgeted sum of £6,000, and an additional amount of £540 which represents the difference between the average interest rates and the interest rate charged on personal loans being transferred to this reserve as a result of the 2018/19 final accounts exercise.
76. This reserve is to meet necessary training requirements over and above the Corporate Training budget. There was no call on the reserve during 2018/19.
77. This reserve represents the annual contribution made from revenue to meet the future costs of District Elections. During the year the Reserve was topped up by the annual budgeted sum of £44,165. £39,478 has been utilised during 2018/19 leaving a balance of £149,549.
78. This reserve is earmarked to offset additional costs for the Chairman's civic events. There was no call on the reserve during 2018/19.
79. This reserve holds the non-ring fenced grants received from the Cabinet Office to cover the cost of the move to Individual Electoral Registration (IER). In 2018/19, £26,039 was received from the Cabinet Office to cover costs associated with the ongoing transition to IER as reported in Budget Management Cabinet 24th September 18. There was no call on the reserve during 2018/19.

Appendix C

80. This reserve was created to cover the increased cost of a temporary Local Land Charges Assistant required due to increased volume of searches. There was no call on the reserve during 2018/19.
81. This reserve is to cover the cost of a temporary Validation Officer required to cover the increased workload in the Planning and Building Control Support Team. There was no call on the reserve during 2018/19.
82. This reserve is available to smooth out any variations year on year, in the Benefits outturn position, reducing the impact on the Council of any possible adverse effects after the final Benefits claim for the year is audited. This reserve increased by £158,618 in 2018/19 being £36,618 greater than the budgeted contribution of £119,000, as a result of favourable Rent Allowance overpayment collection rates (refer Appendix B of this report for more detail).
83. This reserve is available to smooth out any variations year on year as a result of the actual RRS being less than the budgeted figure for 2018/19. In 2018/19 contributions totalled £2,511,755. Of the total contributions, £816,565 relates to the budgeted 2018/19 Corporate Plan contribution. £1,413,088 relates to MHCLG grants such as the NNDR1 Section 31 Payment on Account, Small Business Rate Relief, and Empty Property Relief. £32,339 is for the Levy Account Surplus Grant, £21,111 is the NNDR3 S31 grant accrual adjustment for 2017/18 and £228,653 is for this years NNDR3 S31 grants accrual. £1,064,869 has been utilised in 2018/19. £216,588 represents the budgeted figure in the financing of the Corporate Plan 2018/19, £167,133 is the levy accrual adjustment for 2017/18, and £618,149 is the 18/19 levy accrual. This leaves a balance of £2,453,694 in this reserve at year end.
84. This reserve is available to smooth out any variations year on year as a result of the actual Council Tax Support scheme income being less than the budgeted figure for 2018/19. In 2018/19 there has been no call on this reserve.
85. Reserve created from grant totalling £17,484 received from MHCLG in respect of funding Local Authority EU Exit preparation, as approved at Outturn 2018/19 (refer para. 15 of main report).

Use of General Reserve in 2018/19					
Description	Balance at 01/04/2018 £'000	Contributions In Year £'000 y635	Utilised In Year £'000 y636	Balance at 31/03/2019 £'000	Notes
Unallocated Balance:	(4,073)				
Local Authority Property Fund (LAPF) dividends **	0	(17)	0		1
MHCLG –Other grants received in year**	0	(17)	0		2
Transfers (from) /to Specific Reserves**		0	889		3
Interest received / paid in 2018/19**	0	(367)	7		4
New Homes Bonus	0	(3,657)			5
Annual contribution to General Reserve for MCR	0	(430)	0		6
Capital Financing	0	0	7,837		7
Insurance Claim	0	(257)	0		8
Total Unallocated Balance	(4,073)	(4,745)	8,734	(85)	
Historic Building Loans	(24)	0	0	(24)	9
Commuted Sums – Cemetery Maint.	(1)	0	0	(1)	
Commuted Sums – Open Spaces Maint.	(2,196)	0	0	(2,196)	
Commuted Sums – Culverts Maint	(101)	0	0	(101)	
SANG in perpetuity	(458)	(233)	0	(691)	10
Total General Reserve	(6,854)	(4,979)	8,734	(3,098)	

*Figures are subject to roundings to nearest £'000

**Subject to approval by Council as set out in recommendations of this report

Notes:

1. Refer paragraph 30 of the main report.

Appendix C

2. Contribution to General Reserve for small variance relating to Housing Benefit Admin grant which was slightly more than budgeted for financing purposes (£3,881). Refer paragraph 19 of the main report for contributions totalling £13,019 requested to go to General Reserve.
3. £889,468 has been moved to Specific Reserve as detailed in Specific Reserve notes 16, 39, 46, & 58 of this report, and as reported in Budget Management on 24 September 2018 and approved at Council on 26 September 2018. This included a £472,000 transfer to the Development Plan Specific Reserve, a £171,600 contribution from General Reserve to an Illegal Incursions Preventative Works Specific Reserve, a £68,699 transfer to the Community Services Policy Specific Reserve and £177,169 which was transferred to the JE/VR Specific Reserve.
4. Total interest received in 2018/19 of £367,472. Of this total £6,805 is required to meet the cost of interest paid on temporary borrowing in the year, and £540 was transferred to the Employee Benefits Specific Reserve (refer Specific Reserves note 75 above).
5. £3,656,665 New Homes Bonus monies have been received in 2018/19. This forms part of General Revenue Reserves.
6. This is the annual contribution budgeted to be paid to General Reserve for Major Capital Renewals (MCR).
7. Being the amount utilised to finance the capital programme.
8. £257,015 represents the Insurance Claim monies for Court Bushes Pavilion. This has been used to finance the Refurbishment Works at Court Bushes Pavilion which is part of the 2018/19 Capital Programme.
9. Relates to transfer to/from General reserve relating to part repayment of Historic building loans.
10. Earmarked reserve to help meet costs of SANG. In 2018/19, £233,164 has been added to this reserve.

Capital Programme Outturn 2018/19						
Scheme Description	2018/19 Original Budget £'000	2018/19 Revised Budget £'000	2018/19 Outturn £'000	Variance on Revised Budget £'000	Category	Notes
Housing						
TA Project - Mocatta Way	0	284	291	7	C	
TA Project - Rushy Grove	0	300	317	17	C	1
TA Project - Bowden Way	0	322	326	4	C	
TA Project - Woodvale Lane	0	295	311	16	C	2
TA Project - Chelwood Court	0	0	182	182	D	3
TA Project - Buckhurst Way	0	0	195	195	D	4
TA Project - Hoblands	0	0	293	293	D	5
TA Project - Gower Road	0	0	15	15	D	6
TA Project - Berry Close	0	0	234	234	D	7
Affordable Housing Unallocated Funding	0	0	180	180	D	8
Total Housing	0	1,201	2,344	1,143		
Commercial services and Contracts - Cleansing Services						
Expansion of Green waste service	20	23	23	0		
Total Commercial services and Contracts - Cleansing Services	20	23	23	0		
Commercial services and Contracts - Parking Services						
Extension to Heath Road Car Park Haywards Heath	0	1	0	(1)	A	
Dolphin Car Park works	0	0	14	14	D	9
Padel Tennis Court, The Triangle Leisure Centre	0	0	7	7	C	
Upgrade pay and display machines	179	169	169	0		
Total Commercial services and Contracts -Parking Services	179	170	190	20		
Commercial services and Contracts -Landscapes and Leisure						
Triangle Leisure Pool Improvements	0	0	450	450	D	10
Total Commercial services and Contracts -Landscapes and Leisure	0	0	450	450		
Corporate Estates & Facillites						
Improvement works to Open Space at Spring Copse EG	14	14	0	(14)	B	11
Finches Field Community Building Pavilion & Car Park	0	759	694	(65)	A	12
Upgrading Play Equipment at St. John's Playground Bhill	30	0	0	0		
Drainage capital works	50	129	85	(44)	A	13
Roof Light Replacements, Oaklands	0	78	80	2	C	
Council Chamber Modernisation	270	0	0	0		
Upgrade Council Chamber toilets & Reception area, Oaklands	81	0	0	0		
Resurfacing of Victoria Park Tennis Courts	0	38	38	0		
Mount Noddy Pavilion- Extension/Alterations	0	357	370	13	C	14
Oaklands replacement heating	190	190	50	(140)	A	15
Windows replacement (North Wing) Oaklands	100	100	101	1	C	
Replace Intruder Alarms, Oaklands	20	0	0	0		
Clair Hall -Replace fire & intruder alarm system	15	0	0	0		
Resurface Queensway car park, East Grinstead	41	0	0	0		
Resurface St Wilfrid's Way top car park	14	14	2	(12)	B	16
Upgrading play equipment at Ansty playground	13	13	13	0		
Upgrading Play Equipment at Priory Way Playground HH	19	19	18	(1)	B	
Upgrading Play Equipment at Kitty Lane Playground, Bolnore HH	11	11	11	0		
Christopher Road Car Park EG	18	18	20	2	C	
Fairfield Rec Car Park HPP	11	11	10	(1)	B	
Upgrade of St. John's skate Park	0	15	13	(2)	B	
Beech Hurst Gardens path & landscapes	0	0	30	30	D	17
Beech Hurst Cottages Car Park resurfacing	0	0	7	7	D	
Beech Hurst Bowls Green water irrigation	0	0	10	10	D	18
Fairfield Rec Gmd Hurstpierpoint vertical drainage	0	24	24	0		
Resurfacing of Dale Avenue Car Park, Hassocks	0	26	26	0		

Appendix D

Capital Programme Outturn 2018/19						
Scheme Description	2018/19 Original Budget £'000	2018/19 Revised Budget £'000	2018/19 Outturn £'000	Variance on Revised Budget £'000	Category	Notes
Bedelands Farm - improvement to paths	0	72	68	(4)	A	
Worlds End Recreation Ground Play Improvements	0	199	116	(83)	A	19
Worlds End Rec- changing places toilet	0	81	84	3	C	
Worlds End Rec- football pitches	0	15	13	(2)	B	
Worlds End Rec - BHTC - streetscene	0	16	1	(15)	A	20
Resurface St Wilfrid's service road	37	37	28	(9)	B	
Refurbishment of Poynings Pavilion	20	35	37	2	C	
Hurst Farm Development costs	0	75	54	(21)	A	21
Flat 10 St Josephs Way Service Rd HH	0	180	180	0		
The Orchards - roof works	0	340	340	0		
Replacement of CCTV system at Oaklands, Haywards Heath	0	20	15	(5)	A	
255-269 London Rd B Hill (Wickes acquisition)	0	6,605	6,622	17	C	22
Flat 7 St Josephs Way Acquisition	0	170	176	6	C	
Refurbishment works and alteration works on Court Bushes Pavilion	0	410	439	29	C	23
Martlet's Hall demolition and car park creation	0	180	0	(180)	A	24
208-216 London Road, (Halfords) Bhill			5,271	5,271	D	25
Woodside Pavilion Bolnore Village	0	0	1	1	C	
Upgrading Play Equipment at Dolphin Centre Playground HH	21	0	0	0		
Resurfacing of Lindfield Common Car Park	0	14	14	0		
Scaynes Hill Millennium Hall Car Park Ext	0	25	25	0		
Total Corporate Estates and Facilities	975	10,290	15,086	4,796		
Revenues and Benefits						
Information at work EDRMS system migration to MSDC servers	0	25	25	0		
Total Revenues and Benefits	0	25	25	0		
Digital and Customer Service						
PC replacement programme	25	25	25	0		
Switch Replacements	0	60	67	7	C	
New Remote Access	0	6	4	(2)	B	
Relocation of IDOX Uniform software to Oaklands	68	68	62	(6)	A	
Edge Switch	50	50	51	1	C	
Windows 10 update	208	130	71	(59)	A	26
Total Digital and Customer Services	351	339	280	(59)		
Land Charges						
Modernisation of corporate records	88	97	55	(42)	B	27
Total Land Charges	88	97	55	(42)		
Environmental Health						
Disabled Facility Grants	700	1,388	993	(395)	A/B	28
Total Environmental Health	700	1,388	993	(395)		
Planning Services						
Goddards Green Sewage Treatment Works	0		1,415	1,415	D	29
Total Planning Services	0	0	1,415	1,415		
Total Programme	2,313	13,533	20,861	7,328		

Appendix D

Capital Programme Outturn 2018/19						
Scheme Description	2018/19	2018/19	2018/19	Variance on	Category	Notes
	Original	Revised	Outturn	Revised		
	Budget	Budget		Budget		
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000		
Projects brought forward in the year						
Cuckfield PC - Heritage Street Lights	0	0	1	1	D	30
WSSC TADWorth Way West St West St EG	0	0	198	198	D	31
Hurstpierpoint Cricket Club Art Wicket	0	0	12	12	D	32
Copthorne Sports & Comm Ass - Pitch Drain	0	0	8	8	D	33
Chequer Mead Community Centre building improvements	0	0	37	37	D	34
Oathall Rd roundabout WSSC	0	0	53	53	D	35
Historic cultural heritage sign HHTC	0	0	2	2	D	36
HH War memorial imp's HHTC	0	0	17	17	D	37
Northlands Wood Medical Centre	0	0	55	55	D	38
Lindfield Medical centre consulting room	0	0	62	62	D	39
Crawley Down Comm Centre Assoc Haven	0	0	33	33	D	40
Scaynes Hill Cricket Club artificial pitch	0	0	9	9	D	41
East Grinstead Sports Club fac imp & cricket pitch	0	0	34	34	D	42
Burgess Hill Rugby club - Clubhouse improvements	0	0	10	10	D	43
Ardingly Traffic Management Scheme	0	0	33	33	D	44
St Andrews PCC Community Building	0	0	28	28	D	45
Lindfield Rural PC speed indicating device	0	0	2	2	D	46
H Heath Baptist Church lift	0	0	24	24	D	47
Ardingly PC Speed Indicator brackets	0	0	1	1	D	48
Haywards Heath Town Council Tree Planters	0	0	5	5	D	49
East Court Public Toilet - EGTC	0	0	49	49	D	50
Cuckfield PC - Commemorative Sculpturals	0	0	3	3	D	51
Total Projects brought forward in the year	0	0	676	676		
Grand Total	2,313	13,533	21,537	8,004		

Notes:

1. TA Project - Rushy Grove: Housing purchase funded from the Temporary Accommodation Reserve created at Outturn 2017/18. Variance relates mainly to Stamp Duty Land Tax (£14,000) and minor works to bring property up to agreed standard.
2. TA Project - Woodvale Lane: Housing purchase funded from the Temporary Accommodation Reserve created at Outturn 2017/18. Variance relates mainly to Stamp Duty Land Tax (£13,600) and minor works to bring property up to agreed standard.
3. TA Project - Chelwood Court: Housing purchase funded from the Temporary Accommodation Reserve created at Outturn 2017/18. Variance relates to purchase of property (£172,000), Stamp Duty Land Tax (£6,100) and minor works to bring property up to agreed standard.
4. TA Project - Buckhurst Way: Housing purchase funded from the Temporary Accommodation Reserve created at Outturn 2017/18. Variance relates to purchase of property (£180,000), Stamp Duty Land Tax (£6,500) and minor works to bring property up to agreed standard.
5. TA Project – Hoblands: Housing purchase funded from the Temporary Accommodation Reserve created at Outturn 2017/18. Variance relates to purchase of property (£272,500), Stamp Duty Land Tax (£11,800) and minor works to bring property up to agreed standard.
6. TA Project – Gower Road: Temporary Accommodation funded from the Temporary Accommodation Reserve created at Outturn 2017/18. Variance relates minor works to bring property up to agreed standard.
7. TA Project – Berry Close: Housing purchase funded from the Temporary Accommodation Reserve created at Outturn 2017/18. Variance relates to purchase of property (£225,000) and Stamp Duty Land Tax (£8,750).
8. Payment of Affordable Housing Grant to Raven Housing Trust in respect of 1-3 Kilnwood Apartments, Rocky Lane, Haywards Heath.

Appendix D

9. Dolphin Car Park works: Creation of additional car parking spaces at Dolphin Leisure Centre financed from the Leisure Improvements Fund Specific Reserve approved in a report to Council on 31 January 2018.
10. Triangle Leisure Pool Improvements: New facilities at the Triangle Leisure Centre, financed from the Leisure Improvements Fund Specific reserve, approved in a report to Council on 31 January 2018.
11. Improvement works to Open Space at Spring Copse EG: Budget no longer required - works completed to agreed scope, resulting in a saving of £14,000.
12. Finches Field Community Building Pavilion & Car Park: Works are in progress with completion in 2019/20. Balance of scheme to be slipped to next year.–
13. Drainage capital works: There are a number of schemes which are funded from this budget and which are at various stages of progress. A lack of resources within the business unit has resulted in less work being carried out this year. This has been addressed and a plan of works is being compiled for 2019/20. The remaining budget is to slip to 2019/20.
14. Mount Noddy Pavilion- Extension/Alterations: A combination of value engineering and additional funding have enabled this project to proceed. The final account has resulted in a £13,000 overspend which is due to additional drainage works, the relocation of the nursery during the works and the renewal of electrical wiring to the nursery.
15. Oaklands replacement heating distribution system: First phase of works complete - further phases to follow on from more in-depth feasibility and design work. Remaining budget to slip to 2019/20.
16. Resurface St Wilfrid's Way top car park: £11,791 underspend as a result of economies of scale in the contract. By tendering and awarding 3 projects as a single contract the prelims and site setup (for the two St. Wilfrids Way projects) were reduced resulting in lower costs.
17. Beech Hurst Gardens path & landscapes: Works underway and funded from Beech Hurst surplus as agreed by Charity Trustees in June/July.
18. Beech Hurst Bowls Green water irrigation: : Works complete and funded from Beech Hurst surplus as agreed by Charity Trustees in June/July.
19. Worlds End Recreation Ground Play Improvements: Works started in March 19 and due to complete in 19/20. Remaining budget to slip to 2019/20
20. Worlds End Rec - BHTC – Streetscene: Expected start date was March 2019. Due to complete in 19/20. Remaining budget to slip to 2019/20.
21. Hurst Farm Development costs: Preparation costs for outline planning application now approved and awaiting decision notice so the remainder of the budget will need to be slipped to 2019/20.
22. 255-269 London Rd B Hill (Wickes acquisition): The variance of £17,000 is due to legal fees in respect of the purchase of this property.
23. Refurbishment works and alteration works on Court Bushes Pavilion. Project completed. This project was mostly funded from an insurance claim. Value engineering was undertaken to reduce the total costs but the Loss Adjusters reduced the amount of the claim resulting in an overspend of £29,000.
24. Martlets Hall demolition and car park creation. Works due to commence in April 2019. Budget to be slipped to 19/20.
25. 208-216 London Road, (Halfords) Burgess Hill. Acquisition of property, funded from General Reserve, as detailed in Property Investment Opportunity report to Cabinet 11 February 2019, approved by Council 27 February 2019.
26. Windows 10 update. Initial work has started and consultation for device and software complete. Infrastructure work due to be completed by the end of May 2019. Deployment of Windows 10 devices due June to December 2019. Remaining budget to be slipped to 2019/20.
27. Modernisation of corporate records. Underspend due to fluctuations in staffing levels over the preceding 12 months and slight modifications made to end of project costs.
28. Disabled Facility Grants: Any unspent funds will be slipped to 2019/20 to meet the cost of renovation works approved in 2018/19 for which the works will not be completed until 2019/20. However, of the £395,824 unspent funds variance shown in the table above, £52,858 has been utilised on DFG Revenue projects in 2018/19 leaving a balance of £342,967 to slip to the 2019/20 Capital Programme.
29. Goddards Green Sewage Treatment Works. Mid Sussex acts as Accountable body for a Grant from the Local Enterprise Partnership . Any works completed in 2018/19 are to be funded from a grant claim.
30. Payment of Local Community Infrastructure contributions (P35/688 £703 & P35/708 £129) S106 monies to Cuckfield Parish Council for Heritage Street Lights, as agreed under delegated authority by the Cabinet Member for Planning on 24th February 2015 (refer MIS 08 25th February 2015).

Appendix D

31. Payment of Sustainable Transport (TAD) contributions (PL12-000170 £35,271, PL12-000620 £3,579, P35/369 £62.78, P35/382 £77, P35/781 £2,613, P35/258 £179.07, P35/519 £12,015, P35/620a £6,480, P35/624 £13,065, P35/632b £2991, P35/743 £1,260, PL13-000019 £4872, PL13-000271 £3688, PL13-000617 £3900 & P35/779 £108,155) S106 monies to West Sussex County Council for schemes at Worth Way Crawley Down, West Street Burgess Hill, West Street East Grinstead and Imberhorne Lane East Grinstead, as agreed under delegated authority by the Cabinet Member for Planning on 12th April 2017 (refer MIS 16 19th April 2017).
32. Payment of Formal Sport contributions (P35/544 £11,790) S106 monies to Hurstpierpoint Cricket Club towards an artificial cricket wicket, as agreed by the Cabinet Grants Panel on 5th June 2017 (refer MIS 23 5th June 2017).
33. Payment of Formal Sport contribution (P35/728 £8,070) S106 monies to Copthorne Sports Association towards playing pitch drainage, as agreed by the Cabinet Grants Panel on 12th October 2016 (refer MIS 42 14th October 2016).
34. Payment of Community Building contributions (P35/694 £11,488, P35/705 £4,858, P35/667 £8,704 & P35/680 £12,326) S106 monies to Chequer Mead Community Arts Centre towards building improvement work, as agreed under delegated authority by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Economic Growth on 30th June 2017 (refer MIS 27 5th July 2017).
35. Payment of Sustainable Transport TAD contribution (P35/754 £13,095, PL12-000709 £12,859, P35/542 £22,547, P35/611b £756 & P35/656 £3,885) S106 monies to West Sussex County Council for the Oathall Road roundabout, as agreed under delegated authority by the Cabinet Member for Planning on 18th January 2018 (refer MIS 4 24th January 2018).
36. Payment of Public Art contributions (P35/611b £1,480 & P35/648b £680) S106 monies to Haywards Heath Town Council to install a reproduction historical cultural heritage sign on Heath Road, as agreed under delegated authority by the Cabinet Member for Planning in October 2017 (Refer MIS 44 1st November 2017).
37. Payment of Local Community Infrastructure contributions (PL13-001412 £15,970 & P35/641 £696) S106 monies to Haywards Heath Town Council towards improvements at Muster Green War Memorial, as agreed under delegated authority by the Cabinet Member for Planning in April 2018 & 17th July 2018 (refer MIS 14 4th April 2018 & MIS 29 18th July 2018).
38. Payment of Health contribution (PL3-000199 £52,807) and Local Community Infrastructure contribution (P35/641 £2,106) S106 monies to Northlands Wood Medical Centre to create an additional Consulting Room, as agreed by the Cabinet Grants Panel on the 30th October 2017 (refer MIS 44 1st November 2017).
39. Payment of Health contribution (PL3-000199 £52,807) and Local Community Infrastructure contribution (P35/662 £8,803) S106 monies to Lindfield Medical Centre to create an additional Consulting Room, as agreed by the Cabinet Grants Panel on the 30th October 2017 (refer MIS 44 1st November 2017).
40. Payment of Community Building contributions (PL12-000367 £12,442, P35/654 £241, P35/759 £14,039 & P35/679 £5,853) S106 monies to Crawley Down Community Centre Association towards improvements to the The Haven Centre, as agreed by the Cabinet Grants Panel on 30th October 2017 & 19th June 2018 (refer MIS 44 1st November 2017 & MIS 25 20th June 2018).
41. Payment of Formal Sport contribution (P35/594 £8,581) S106 monies to Scaynes Hill Cricket Club towards the cost of an artificial cricket pitch, as agreed by the Cabinet Grants Panel on 30th October 2017 (refer MIS 44 1st November 2017).
42. Payment of Local Community Infrastructure contribution (P35/694 £1,135) and Formal Sport contributions (P35/779 £19,116, PL13-000680 £12,067 & PL13-000617 £1,702) S106 monies to East Grinstead Sports Club towards facility improvements and cricket pitch drainage, as agreed by the Cabinet Grants Panel on 14th March 2018 (refer MIS 11 14th March 2018).
43. Payment of Formal Sport contribution (P35/625 £10,000) S106 monies to Burgess Hill Rugby Club towards Clubhouse improvements, as agreed by the Cabinet Grants Panel on 5th June 2017 (refer MIS 23 5th June 2017).
44. Payment of Sustainable Transport TAD contribution (PL12-000981 £32,839) S106 monies to WSCC for the Ardingly Traffic Management Scheme, as agreed under delegated authority on 18th September 2018 (refer MIS 38 19th September 2018).
45. Payment of Community Building contribution (P35/716 £28,500) S106 monies to St Andrews PCC to fund external improvements and toilet refurbishments, as agreed by the Cabinet Grants Panel on 2nd June 2015 (refer MIS 23 10th June 2015).
46. Payment of Local Community Infrastructure contribution (PL3-000199 £2,339) S106 monies to Lindfield Rural Parish Council for Speed Indicating Devices, as agreed under delegated authority by the Cabinet Member for Planning on 9th August 2018 (refer MIS 33 15th August 2018).

Appendix D

47. Payment of Community Building contributions (P35/489c £1,094, P35/763 £5,510, PL12-000511 £8,902, PL12-000709 £4,512 & P35/757 £3,985) S106 monies to Haywards Heath Baptist Church for installation of a lift, as agreed by the Cabinet Grants Panel on 30th October 2017 (refer MIS 44 1st November 2017).
48. Payment of Sustainable Transport TAD contributions (PL12-000981 £500) S106 monies to Ardingly Parish Council towards Speed Indicator brackets, as agreed under delegated authority by the Cabinet Member for Planning on 12th November 2018 (refer MIS 46 14th November 2018).
49. Payment of Local Community Infrastructure contribution (P35/489b £5,000) S106 monies to Haywards Heath Town Council towards tree planters in South Road, as agreed by the Cabinet Grants Panel on 14th March 2018 (refer MIS 11 14th March 2018).
50. Payment of Community Building contributions (PL12-001864 £46,963 & P35/620a £2,256) S106 monies to East Grinstead Town Council towards the upgrade of East Court Public Toilets, as agreed under delegated authority by the Cabinet Member for Planning on 25th September 2018 (refer MIS 39 26th September 2018).
51. Payment of Public Art contributions (P35/708 £2,927 & P35/688 £73) S106 monies to Cuckfield Parish Council towards a Commemorative sculptured bench in Cuckfield Cemetery, as agreed by the Cabinet Grants Panel on 14th March 2018 (refer MIS 11 14th March 2018).