



Slinfold Parish Council

Slinfold Football Club, Hayes Lane, RH13 0SQ

Telephone 07894 858048 email: clerk@slinfold-pc.gov.uk

Minutes of the Slinfold Parish Council Meeting on 24th September 2026

1. Attendance and Apologies for Absence

In attendance: Councillors Blake, Casdagli, Illingworth, Skeates (Vice Chair), Slipper, Snow, Walker and Waples.

Apologies: Councillors Roberts (Chair) and Sherwin-Smith which it was **RESOLVED** to accept.

Also in attendance: Mike Simpson, Clerk, and one member of the public.

2. Declarations of Interest, Notification of Changes to Members' Interests and to consider any dispensations

To receive any declarations of interests from Members in respect to items on the agenda.

There were none.

3. Public Session (Members of the Public may speak for up to five minutes at the discretion of the Chair)

To note any comments.

A member of the public spoke about application DC/25/2006, for 38 dwellings on land east of Hayes Lane, and the risk of flooding that such a number of houses would pose. He referred to the Parish Council's initial response, which objected to 38 houses and supported the initial number of 15 in the neighbourhood plan. Councillor Skeates advised that the Parish Council had changed its position to support 38 houses subject to various conditions. It had done this as it was very likely HDC would approve 38 houses as they had requested that the site was developed to full capacity. The resident said he was happy to speak to HDC about the risk of flooding, due to his expertise, but wanted clarification on several issues from the Parish Council before he could do so. These included the use of underground tanks, flooding, discharge of sewerage and biodiversity deficit. Councillor Skeates responded that the developer had confirmed funds for a drainage survey and other issues were beyond the remit of a Parish Council. Therefore, the resident withdrew his offer to speak to Horsham District Council or Lead Local Flooding Authority on the Council's behalf.

4. Minutes from the previous meeting on 30th July 2026

To review and approve.

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes as a true and accurate record.

5. Councillor Reports

To receive reports from the District and County Councillors.

Councillor Minto sent his apologies. Councillor Dye sent a written report (see appendices).

6. Planning Applications

(a) To consider any applications received since the publication of the agenda

DC/26/1271: Waterside Five Oaks Road Slinfold West Sussex: Formation of hardstanding on a date four years previous (Lawful Development Certificate).

It was **RESOLVED** to object on the grounds of overdevelopment, inaccurate plans, and loss of amenity. The plans submitted did not accurately reflect the extensive amount of hardstanding that had already been implemented on site. The actual tarmaced area was significantly greater than what was described in the application. This unauthorised increase in hardstanding had resulted in a severe loss of visual and rural amenity, leading to the overdevelopment of the countryside.

DC/26/1325: Southview Hayes Lane Slinfold West Sussex: Conversion of an existing detached garage into habitable space involving the removal of the existing door, window and garage door and the installation of a rear window and bi-fold doors and rooflight to the side elevation.
It was **RESOLVED** to remain neutral on this application.

DC/26/1359: Pinkhurst Pinkhurst Lane Slinfold West Sussex: Erection of a mixed-use building for stabling and storage and the creation of a sand school.
It was **RESOLVED** to remain neutral on this application.

DC/26/1263: Lower Broadbridge Farm Billingshurst Road Broadbridge Heath West Sussex: Erection of grass bund (Retrospective).
It was **RESOLVED** to remain neutral on this application.

DC/26/1377 Lackhams, Lyons Road Slinfold West Sussex Installation of 40 solar panels.
It was **RESOLVED** to remain neutral on this application.

(b) To consider any applications received since the publication of the agenda.

CA/26/0112 Birchwood The Street Slinfold West Sussex: Fell 1 Oak
It was agreed to defer this application to the tree wardens.

(c) To receive an update on application DC/25/2006 for 38 dwellings on land east of Hayes Lane.

There was no further update.

7. Finances and Administration

(a) To review the schedule of payments and bank reconciliation since 30th July 2026.

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the schedule and bank reconciliation (see appendices).

(b) To review the latest variance report.

Councillors reviewed and noted the report (see appendices).

(c) To consider adopting an investment policy.

It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the draft policy (see the Council's website).

(d) To receive an update on Horsham District Council's Community Governance Review.

It was agreed that Councillor Skeates would attend the Horsham District Council Committee meeting on 28th September to raise several concerns (see appendices) about the Community Governance Review process.

(e) To renew the Council's insurance premium.

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the expenditure of £2,576.16 with Clear Councils for 2027-2028.

(f) To review the external audit report and conclude the audit for 2025-26.

Councillors **RESOLVED** to approve the external audit report and conclude the audit for 2025-26.

(g) To review Committee membership.

It was **RESOLVED** to appoint Councillor Illingworth to the Planning Committee and Councillor Blake to Finance and Establishment.

8. Highways and Byways

(a) To receive an update on Community Speedwatch and consider the purchase of a body camera.

The Community Speedwatch (CSW) had been busy and needed more volunteers to help. There had been 30 cars in one hour caught speeding near Lyons Close; 20 near Mitchell Gardens and 40 down Lyons Road. The police had joined Speedwatch (CSW) on a couple of occasions and benefited from using their body camera. The Clerk advised that CSW could apply for a grant to cover the cost of a new camera.

(b) To discuss parking in laybys.

The layby opposite Cobblers was clear again of vans parking there. However, the issue persisted around Six Acres/Hayes Lane, so it was agreed that the Clerk would write to the owner of the cars.

(c) To discuss any other issues.

There were none.

9. Grounds and Buildings Maintenance

(a) To receive an update on Slinfold Stores.

The scaffolding had been erected, and works would hopefully start the following week. Councillor Skeates had spoken to the shop manager who wanted to carry on with the lease, despite thinking it had expired.

(b) To consider quotes to replace the barrier at Cherrytree.

The Finance and Establishment Committee had discussed replacing the barrier on 10th September and recommended the Council pay for it from CIL reserves. Since then, the Clerk had obtained three quotes from Oakland Security (£4,576), Frontier Pitts (£4,619) and Horsham Electrics (£5,031). Oakland Security and Frontier Pitts had quoted for the same product and Horsham Electrics a different model. Councillors **RESOLVED** to

approve the quote from Oakland Security, from CIL reserves, as they were based in Slinfold, which would make maintenance more efficient, and for which they would provide free for the first year.

(d) **To receive an update on the football club.**

The football club had recently contacted the Clerk to advise that the roof of the club house needed repair and could the Council arrange it. The Clerk responded advising that it would be for the football club to repair under the terms of their lease. The club then asked if a claim could be made on the Council's insurance. However, under the lease, only 'insured risks' were covered such as damage from a storm. Councillors agreed with this position.

10. Recreation, Youth and Environment

(a) **To receive an update on KGV and Six Acres playground.**

It was **RESOLVED** to approve £420 to deadwood an oak tree (720 from tree survey) at KGV.

(b) **To consider quotes to repair the MUGA and footpath at King George V playground.**

The Clerk needed to get more quotes as the amount was circa £7,000.

11. Committees and those on Outside Bodies

To receive any updates

The Clerk had circulated the draft minutes from the recent committee meetings.

12. Communications and events

(a) **To discuss any articles for the parish magazine.**

The Council had asked for residents to be reminded of their responsibilities to maintain hedges over pavements and footpaths.

(b) **To discuss the Winter Newsletter.**

The Clerk requested content.

13. Items for the next agenda

There were none.

14. Next meeting dates

Council: 29th October 2026.

Representation to Horsham District Council Community Governance Review Committee Meeting 28th September 2026:

The Parish Council has serious concerns regarding both the process and conduct of this Community Governance Review.

The original proposal was progressed following phase 1 consultation despite only six respondents expressing support. Yet, during phase 2, 289 Slinfold residents responded to object. The District Council has described that level of response as “reasonable” and typical for a Community Governance Review. That position is difficult to reconcile with its earlier decision to progress a significant boundary proposal based on only six supportive responses.

If 289 responses are considered a reasonable and typical level of public engagement, the authority must explain why six supportive responses were considered sufficient evidence of community support at phase 1. The contrast is stark and raises a legitimate concern that the proposal was progressed without an adequate evidential basis. In light of the scale and clarity of local objection, the Parish Council considers that the proposal should not have progressed and should now be withdrawn.

Both District Ward Councillors representing the affected area oppose the proposal and have expressed reservations regarding the process and the decision to continue the review despite substantial local opposition. Their views are relevant evidence of the lack of local support and should be addressed expressly in the decision-making report.

The officer report also fails to engage properly with Slinfold Parish Council’s detailed phase 2 response. That response set out, criterion by criterion, why the proposed change is unnecessary and fails to meet the statutory tests relating to community identity, effective and convenient local government, community representation, cohesion, and the size and boundaries of the local community. A report that does not fairly summarise or respond to those substantive representations cannot provide a sound basis for a decision.

By contrast, the report refers on several occasions to support from West Sussex County Council. It is unclear what weight can properly be attached to that view. The County Council is not directly affected by the parish boundary alteration, and its support does not answer the statutory questions of whether the proposal reflects the identities and interests of the affected communities or provides more effective and convenient parish-level local government.

Again, the Parish Council raises serious concerns about the appearance of impartiality. The Chair of the Committee overseeing the review is ward councillor for the parish that would benefit from the proposed transfer. While this may not amount to a disclosable pecuniary interest, the gaining parish would acquire a 133-dwelling development site, with future precept-base and CIL implications. In those circumstances, the Chair’s role gives rise to a clear appearance of conflict and undermines public confidence that the review has been conducted impartially.

The Parish Council recognises that CIL and precept are not formal statutory criteria for a Community Governance Review. However, their consequences are relevant context when assessing whether the stated case for change is genuinely based on community identity and effective governance. There is little evidence of either. Instead, the proposal would move a strategically valuable development site into the gaining parish, despite minimal phase 1 support and substantial, organised objection from the affected community.

The Parish Council is therefore entitled to conclude that the proposal appears to be an attempt by Broadbridge Heath Parish Council to secure Slinfold's future CIL-related benefit and precept base through the mechanism of a Community Governance Review, rather than a proposal demonstrably required by the statutory criteria. That perception is deeply damaging to confidence in the process.

The Parish Council requests that the proposal be withdrawn and that the existing boundary be retained. If the authority nevertheless proceeds, the Parish Council requests a full written explanation of:

1. Why six phase 1 responses were sufficient to progress the proposal.
2. Why 289 objections do not justify discontinuing it.
3. How each statutory criterion is said to be met.
4. Why the Parish Council's detailed phase 2 submission was not substantively addressed.
5. What weight was given to the views of the two affected ward councillors.
6. What declarations, advice, and safeguards were used in relation to the Committee Chair's role.
7. Why the support of an authority not directly affected by the change has been given prominence.

If these concerns are not addressed and the proposal proceeds without a lawful, fair, and evidence-based justification, the Parish Council will consider referring the matter to the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman.

Cllr Ross Dye HDC Report to SPC – 24/09/26

My report for this evening's meeting is as follows:

1. Community Governance Review. HDC's Community Governance Review 2nd Consultation closed on 7th September. The committee meets on the 28th September to consider the results of this consultation and recommend changes to parish governance to go before HDC's Full Council on the 7th October. As SPC are already aware, HDC's recommendation going before the committee is to move the boundary so the land at Lower Broadbridge Farm becomes part of Broadbridge Heath Parish. This is despite a majority of responses opposing this move.
2. Local Government Reorganisation. No doubt IPC are already aware that Central government have placed LGR under review which is adding further uncertainty and delay to the process. HDC Cllrs were given a briefing last week but there was nothing substantive announced beyond what is already in the public domain. The expectation is that HDC elections will go ahead next May but there is still time for Central Government to change this. The announcement confirming Surrey's reorganisation was made in February with the subsequent elections held in May earlier this year.
3. Local Plan. HDC's consultation on the main modifications is now closed and we await the results of this consultation. The hearing sessions for the examination of the Horsham Local Plan 2023-2040 will resume on Tuesday 13th October for up to 8 days of hearings.
4. Next Local Plan. As previously advised HDC have been tasked with starting the next local plan running until 2045 and a call for sites consultation has now closed and we await news of what has come forward.
5. Scheme of Delegation. National regulations are changing with effect from 31st October which will reduce numbers of planning applications determined by HDC Councillors. It's expected the planning committee will determine 50% fewer applications from this date. I believe HDC's Head of Planning has sent a summary of these changes to all parish councils.
6. NPPF guidance. New NPPF guidance was issued in August. We are awaiting a briefing and update from HDC officers as to the impact of these changes.
7. Capitol Theatre Refurbishment. Work is progressing and we believe this is still on schedule to re-open as expected in time for this year's panto which is Dick Whittington.
8. Swan Walk Closure. Most of Swan Walk is now open with the exception of a few shops closest to the old Wilkinson store site which are due to open soon.
9. Summary of meetings attended. Since the last SPC meeting, I've attended 2 HDC planning committee meetings, an Audit Committee meeting and training session, a planning briefing on the new scheme of delegation, A Scrutiny Committee meeting which included a briefing from Southern Water, an LGR briefing and parish meetings.

List of Payments made between 31/07/2026 and 30/09/2026

<u>Date Paid</u>	<u>Payee Name</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Amount Paid</u>	<u>Authorized Ref</u>	<u>Transaction Detail</u>
31/07/2026	Tony Burroughs	BACS	179.40		Salary July
31/07/2026	John Pilkington	BACS	241.20		Salary July
31/07/2026	Mike Simpson	BACS	2,163.71		Salary July
31/07/2026	LGPS	BACS	620.02		July 2026
31/07/2026	Carl Osborne	BACS	370.00		Invoice 596
17/08/2026	John Pilkington	BACS	241.20		Salary August
18/08/2026	Horsham District Council	DD	30.60		Cherrytree Bin
21/08/2026	SSE	DD	126.60		SSE
28/08/2026	Tony Burroughs	BACS	179.40		Salary August
28/08/2026	LGPS	BACS	620.02		August 2026
28/08/2026	Mike Simpson	BACS	2,163.71		Salary August
08/09/2026	Slinfold Village Hall	BACS	190.50		2409&2410
08/09/2026	Carl Osborne	BACS	1,420.00		Invoice 604
14/09/2026	George Potbury Forestry Ltd	BACS	1,416.00		George Potbury Forestry Ltd
16/09/2026	Horsham District Council	DD	30.60		CT bin collection
24/09/2026	4 The Youth	BACS	2,307.57		2289 Sep-Dec 2026
24/09/2026	Playsafety Limited	BACS	256.80		99160 Playground inspections
24/09/2026	Carl Osborne	BACS	1,415.00		Invoice 610
30/09/2026	Mike Simpson	BACS	2,545.80		Salary September
30/09/2026	LGPS	BACS	743.01		September 2026
30/09/2026	Tony Burroughs	BACS	179.40		Salary August
30/09/2026	John Pilkington	BACS	241.20		Salary September 2026
Total Payments			17,681.74		

View Mini Statement

Transactions list:

Transaction date	Bank reference	Customer reference	Type of payment	Credit amount (GBP)	Debit amount (GBP)	Balance (GBP)
28/08/2026		Michael Simpson	Standing Order		£ -2,163.71	£ 35,350.97
28/08/2026						
28/08/2026						
21/08/2026						

**Bank Reconciliation Statement as at 31/08/2026
for Cashbook 1 - CO-OP**

<u>Bank Statement Account Name (s)</u>	<u>Statement Date</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Balances</u>
CO-OP	28/08/2026		35,350.97
			<u>35,350.97</u>
<u>Unpresented Payments (Minus)</u>		<u>Amount</u>	
		0.00	
			<u>0.00</u>
			35,350.97
<u>Unpresented Receipts (Plus)</u>			
		0.00	
			<u>0.00</u>
			35,350.97
		Balance per Cash Book is :-	35,350.97
		Difference is :-	0.00

Signatory 1:

Name Signed Date

Signatory 2:

Name Signed Date

Detailed Receipts & Payments by Budget Heading 30/09/2026

Cost Centre Report

	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
<u>100 Income</u>							
118 Horsham Lottery	78	0	(78)			0.0%	63
1076 Precept	39,165	78,330	39,165			50.0%	
1080 Bank Interest	0	4,000	4,000			0.0%	
1100 Grants Received	2,700	2,800	100			96.4%	2,700
1120 Environment Cleansing	1,969	1,800	(169)			109.4%	1,969
Income :- Receipts	43,912	86,930	43,018			50.5%	4,732
Net Receipts	43,912	86,930	43,018				
6001 less Transfer to EMR	4,732						
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	39,180						
<u>200 Administration</u>							
4000 Clerk & Environment Officers	26,796	55,500	28,704		28,704	48.3%	
4025 EO Expenses	0	250	250		250	0.0%	
4055 Training	0	150	150		150	0.0%	
4060 Audit	319	650	331		331	49.0%	
4080 Subscriptions	747	753	6		6	99.2%	
4091 Chair's Allowance	0	400	400		400	0.0%	
4100 Insurance	0	2,389	2,389		2,389	0.0%	
4130 Hall Hire	117	850	734		734	13.7%	
4135 FC Office Hire	0	300	300		300	0.0%	
4140 Website and email	442	570	128		128	77.5%	
4150 Software	210	320	110		110	65.6%	
Administration :- Indirect Payments	28,631	62,132	33,501	0	33,501	46.1%	0
Net Payments	(28,631)	(62,132)	(33,501)				
<u>250 Football Club</u>							
1200 Rental Income	0	150	150			0.0%	
1205 Insurance Reclaimed	0	400	400			0.0%	
1210 Grounds Maintenance Reclaim	650	400	(250)			162.5%	
Football Club :- Receipts	650	950	300			68.4%	0
Net Receipts	650	950	300				
<u>255 Tennis Club</u>							
1200 Rental Income	0	150	150			0.0%	
1205 Insurance Reclaimed	0	360	360			0.0%	
1210 Grounds Maintenance Reclaim	0	900	900			0.0%	
Tennis Club :- Receipts	0	1,410	1,410			0.0%	0
Net Receipts	0	1,410	1,410				

Detailed Receipts & Payments by Budget Heading 30/09/2026

Cost Centre Report

		Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
<u>260</u>	<u>Community Shed</u>							
1205	Insurance Reclaimed	0	92	92			0.0%	
	Community Shed :- Receipts	<u>0</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>92</u>			<u>0.0%</u>	<u>0</u>
	Net Receipts	<u>0</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>92</u>				
<u>270</u>	<u>Slinfold Stores</u>							
1200	Rental Income	250	1,000	750			25.0%	
1205	Insurance Reclaimed	0	300	300			0.0%	
	Slinfold Stores :- Receipts	<u>250</u>	<u>1,300</u>	<u>1,050</u>			<u>19.2%</u>	<u>0</u>
	Net Receipts	<u>250</u>	<u>1,300</u>	<u>1,050</u>				
<u>275</u>	<u>Cherrytree</u>							
4406	CT Bin Collection	91	0	(91)		(91)	0.0%	
	Cherrytree :- Indirect Payments	<u>91</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(91)</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(91)</u>		<u>0</u>
	Net Payments	<u>(91)</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>91</u>				
<u>300</u>	<u>Community Services</u>							
4310	Community Events	197	2,800	2,603		2,603	7.0%	
4320	Youth Services	5,123	8,000	2,877		2,877	64.0%	
4321	Youth Services Other	235	0	(235)		(235)	0.0%	217
4370	Newsletters/Promotions	1,427	3,000	1,573		1,573	47.6%	
4390	Grants Made	0	2,500	2,500		2,500	0.0%	
4395	Cosy Café	970	2,800	1,830		1,830	34.6%	970
	Community Services :- Indirect Payments	<u>7,951</u>	<u>19,100</u>	<u>11,149</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>11,149</u>	<u>41.6%</u>	<u>1,187</u>
	Net Payments	<u>(7,951)</u>	<u>(19,100)</u>	<u>(11,149)</u>				
6000	plus Transfer from EMR	1,187						
	Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	<u>(6,765)</u>						
<u>350</u>	<u>Recreation</u>							
4400	Bin collection	461	750	289		289	61.4%	
4405	Dog bins	354	1,050	696		696	33.7%	
4412	Grounds Maintenance Extra Cuts	1,175	850	(325)		(325)	138.2%	
4420	King George V	2,020	1,260	(760)		(760)	160.3%	
4421	KGV playground inspection	0	270	270		270	0.0%	
4425	Six Acres	3,615	2,875	(740)		(740)	125.7%	3,615
4426	Six Acres playgroundinspection	0	125	125		125	0.0%	

Detailed Receipts & Payments by Budget Heading 30/09/2026

Cost Centre Report

	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
4435 Grounds Maintenance Cherrytree	1,360	1,300	(60)		(60)	104.6%	
4436 GM Football Club	345	400	55		55	86.3%	
4437 GM Tennis Club	255	900	645		645	28.3%	
Recreation :- Indirect Payments	9,584	9,780	196	0	196	98.0%	3,615
Net Payments	(9,584)	(9,780)	(196)				
6000 plus Transfer from EMR	3,615						
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	(5,969)						
<u>400 Highways & Byways</u>							
4200 Repairs & Improvements	150	0	(150)		(150)	0.0%	
4510 Streetlights & Maintenance	1,682	2,100	418		418	80.1%	
Highways & Byways :- Indirect Payments	1,832	2,100	268	0	268	87.2%	0
Net Payments	(1,832)	(2,100)	(268)				
<u>999 VAT Data</u>							
115 VAT on Receipts	1,106	0	(1,106)			0.0%	
VAT Data :- Receipts	1,106	0	(1,106)				0
515 VAT on Payments	822	0	(822)		(822)	0.0%	
VAT Data :- Indirect Payments	822	0	(822)	0	(822)		0
Net Receipts over Payments	284	0	(284)				
Grand Totals:- Receipts	45,918	90,682	44,764			50.6%	
Payments	48,911	93,112	44,201	0	44,201	52.5%	
Net Receipts over Payments	(2,993)	(2,430)	563				
plus Transfer from EMR	4,802						
less Transfer to EMR	4,732						
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	(2,923)						