



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 30th July 2026

1. Attendance and Apologies for Absence

In attendance: Councillors Casdagli, Sherwin-Smith, Skeates (Vice Chair), Smith, Snow, Walker and Waples.

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

Also in attendance: Mike Simpson (Clerk), County Councillor Colin Minto, District Councillor Ross Dye and three members of the public.

2. Councillor Co-option

To receive written applications for the office of Parish Councillor and to Co-opt candidates to fill the existing vacancies

Councillors considered two applications from Terry Blake and Sam Illingworth whereupon it was **RESOLVED** co-opt both candidates onto the Council. Sam Illingworth signed the declaration of acceptance of office and joined the meeting as a Councillor.

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

There were none.

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

There were no comments.

5. Minutes from the previous meeting on 25th June 2026

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

6. Councillor Reports

To receive reports from the District and County Councillors.

Councillor Dye provided a written report (see appendices). Councillor Minto said there was a full council meeting two weeks ago at which lots of questions were raised about highways. A question was raised about why some potholes were left when one next to it was being repaired. The answer was because WSCC had 4,000 miles of road to manage and potholes were prioritised by size. Contractors would then load the required amount of material so there was none left over to repair any others. He also raised issues of speeding and recommended installing more speed indicator signs with the data being sent automatically to the police. However, it was unsure whether the police would want this information, but the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner was looking into areas for average speed cameras.

7. Planning Applications

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

DC/26/1066: Land Known As Pinkhurst Stud Pinkhurst Lane Slinfold West Sussex RH13 0QR: Siting of a static caravan as a temporary rural workers dwelling (Retrospective).

It was **RESOLVED** to object to this application as it had not been demonstrated that there was a functional need to site a worker on agricultural land. Furthermore, the revised financial information was still incomplete. Therefore, the objection made to application DC/25/2089 by the Parish Council and Horsham District Council still applied.

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

Councillor Skeates, Slipper and the Clerk had met the developer since the last meeting to discuss various areas that needed addressing before support could be considered for the application. These included provision of a scout hut (not just the land), ensuring affordable housing was not commuted, providing funding for a drainage survey and ensuring good quality design. The developer said he would take the points raised and discuss them

with colleagues and come back to the Council. However, this never happened and the Council received a notification of a revised application a day before the meeting (29th July). The revised plans did not address the Council's concerns, so it was **RESOLVED** to object to the application and send a letter to the case officer (see appendices).

(c) To discuss the detail of a Section 106 agreement regarding application DC/25/2006

This was discussed under item 7(b).

8. Finances and Administration

(a) To review the schedule of payments and bank reconciliation since 25th June 2026.

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the payment and bank reconciliation since 25th June 2026 (see appendices).

(b) To review the latest variance report.

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the variance report.

(c) To discuss the Slinfold United Reform Church

The church might be for sale soon, so Councillors discussed the Council purchasing the building if it did happen. Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** to register it as an asset of community value so the community had a chance to bid if it came on the market.

(d) To discuss a members' allowance scheme

Councillors **RESOLVED** to not adopt a scheme.

(e) To discuss the transfer of the Scout Hut

Councillor Skeates was in discussion with HDC about the scout hut but, unless the clawback and community use provisions were negotiated, there was not much value in transferring the asset into the Council's name.

(f) To discuss Horsham District Council's Community Governance Review

The proposal from Broadbridge Heath Parish Council to alter the boundary with Slinfold to transfer the Lower Broadbridge Farm site (133 houses) to its parish had progressed to stage 2. Only six people had responded to the proposal but none were from Slinfold and Councillors agreed it should never have progressed based on the response. The Council's response to the initial consultation had been disregarded by the Horsham District Council as it did not fit the review criteria. Therefore, the Clerk had drafted a response which addressed each criterion whereupon it was **RESOLVED** to approve it with the addition of the Council's initial response (see appendices) as it highlighted material reasons which would have a detrimental impact on Slinfold and should not be ignored.

9. Highways and Byways

(a) To receive an update on Community Speedwatch

Five sessions had taken place which had caught 40 cars going over 24mph through the village. Hayes Lane would also be checked soon.

(b) To discuss parking in laybys

Cars had stopped parking in the layby outside the Cobblers thanks to Saxon Weald providing additional spaces for trades vehicles. However, the same cars were still parking in the Hayes Lane laybys despite the Council placing letters on the cars. Some of the cars had not moved for a long time so it was agreed that the Council should write directly to the owners asking them to refrain from parking in the laybys.

(c) To discuss any other issues

The broken pavement on The Street from the Village Hall to the shop had been repaired. The pavements on Lyons Road and Hayes Lane were also in a bad condition.

10. Grounds and Buildings Maintenance

(a) To receive an update on Slinfold Stores

There was no further update.

(b) To discuss any other issues

There were none.

11. Recreation, Youth and Environment

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

The Clerk provided an update on an insurance claim from a neighbouring property at King George V playground for subsidence on an extension. The report alleged that the oak tree at the playground was exacerbating moisture extraction and causing the subsidence, and the recommendation was to fell it. The Clerk had initially raised two main concerns about the report. Firstly, the report said it was clay moisture shrinkage exacerbated by the oak tree and not the primary reason. Secondly, root analysis showed there were oak roots but there were multiple oak trees in the area so it could not be proved it was solely this tree. Furthermore, the response from the insurance company when the Clerk raised these points was to send a corrected arborist report to state the oak tree was the primary cause of extraction which is different to the initial one. The Clerk did advise that the proof threshold for liability had changed in recent years from showing definitively to probable that the tree was the reason for subsidence. However, Councillors agreed that there was not enough evidence to show the oak tree

was the reason for subsidence and **RESOLVED** not to fell it. However, the Council's parish wide tree survey did recommend the tree in question had a crown reduction, so it was **RESOLVED** to carry out these works.

(b) **To receive an update on Cherrytree**

There was no update.

12. Committees and those on Outside Bodies

To receive any updates.

There were none.

13. Communications and events

To discuss any articles for the parish magazine.

There were none.

14. Items for the next agenda

Affordable Housing re Hayes Lane development.

15. Next meeting dates

Committee Meetings: 10th September 2026

Council: 24th September 2026

Private and Confidential Session

The Council will move to exclude the public and press from the meeting during the consideration of agenda item 16 due to the confidential nature of the business to be transacted, in accordance with Section 1(2) of the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960

16. Affordable Housing at Land East of Hayes Lane

To discuss options for management of any affordable housing associated with DC/25/2006

The Council received an update and, due to the confidential nature of the discussion, took a separate set of minutes.

Cllr Ross Dye HDC Report to SPC – 30/07/26

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

1. Community Governance Review. HDC's Governance Committee met on the 22nd July where it was agreed to include the proposed move of the Lower Broadbridge Farm area from Slinfold parish to Broadbridge Heath parish in the next stage of consultation. This consultation started on the 24th July and runs to the 7th September.

The link to the HDC consultation page is here: <https://www.horsham.gov.uk/council-democracy-and-elections/consultations>

2. Local Government Reorganisation. HDC previously issued a press release indicating they expected a decision from Central Government on their plan for Sussex by the Parliamentary recess on the 16th July. However, when the announcement came, whilst several outstanding decisions were resolved, the decision for West Sussex was deferred again, possibly until October.
3. Local Plan. HDC Cabinet met on the 6th July to propose a modified local plan for which the consultation has now started and runs until 24th August. Consultation papers are available on HDC website available (see above link)
4. Next Local Plan. As previously advised, despite not yet completing the previous plan and in the midst of LGR, Central Government are requiring HDC start preparation of the next "new style" local plan taking the district up to 2045. The scoping consultation has now closed but the call for sites consultation remains open until the 25th August.
5. Horsham District Community Road Safety Survey is open until 31st July (closes tomorrow). Responses help shape the Partnership's Road Safety Action Plan. Again, please use the above link to access this consultation.
6. Scout hut site. Ed raised this with me and I've reached out to Paul Anderson at HDC for a briefing but I'm awaiting Paul's response.
7. Affordable Housing, East of Hayes Lane site. Also raised with me by Ed and I've contacted the relevant housing officer. Awaiting his response but he's currently on Annual Leave.
8. Capitol Theatre Refurbishment. Work is progressing and we receive regular updates. I believe it's on schedule to re-open as expected in time for this year's panto which is Dick Whittington
9. Swan Walk Closure. A partial reopen starts Saturday which includes Next TG Jones and Toy Barnhaus

List of Payments made between 29/06/2026 and 31/07/2026

<u>Date Paid</u>	<u>Payee Name</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Amount Paid</u>	<u>Authorized Ref</u>	<u>Transaction Detail</u>
29/06/2026	Treetop Design	BACS	67.20		34730 Nature trail
01/07/2026	Horsham District Council	BACS	353.60		Dog and Litter Bins
13/07/2026	Treetop Design	BACS	377.00		Newsletter print 34545
13/07/2026	The Farm Studio	BACS	750.00		Newsletter design summer
13/07/2026	SSE	BACS	118.75		Streetlights
16/07/2026	Horsham District Council	DD	30.60		CT bin collection 23774088
23/07/2026	Ansell Arboriculture Ltd	BACS	2,100.00		Six Acres Ash trees (0022)
23/07/2026	HMRC	DD	3,217.87		PAYE First Quarter
30/07/2026	West Sussex County Council	BACS	1,502.54		Streetlight maintenance
30/07/2026	Slinfold Village Hall	BACS	313.00		23912379
30/07/2026	Jane Slipper	BACS	225.78		Village Day and Cosy Cafe
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
Total Payments			<u>12,260.67</u>		

View Mini Statement

Account: 0892996534736800

Balance Details

Available balance: **£ 46,418.15**Current balance: **£ 46,418.15**Overdraft limit: **£ 0.00**Remaining overdraft: **£ 0.00**Your balance as of: **23/07/2026**

Transactions list:

Transaction date	Bank reference	Customer reference	Type of payment	Credit amount (GBP)	Debit amount (GBP)	Balance (GBP)
23/07/2026	HMRC SDDS	0000538159	Direct Debit		£ -3,217.87	£ 46,418.15
16/07/2026	010000100352000001	HORSHAM DISTRICT C	Direct Debit		£ -30.60	£ 49,636.02
13/07/2026	8701321036	SSE Energy Supply	Standing Order		£ -118.75	£ 49,666.62
13/07/2026	20088	Laura Brown	Standing Order		£ -750.00	£ 49,785.37
13/07/2026	34545	Treetop Printing a	Standing Order		£ -377.00	£ 50,535.37
10/07/2026	HorshamLottery	CLIENTS DEPOSIT	Faster Payment	£ 15.00		£ 50,912.37
01/07/2026	010000100352000001	HORSHAM DISTRICT C	Direct Debit		£ -353.60	£ 50,897.37
29/06/2026		Michael Simpson	Standing Order		£ -2,163.71	£ 51,250.97
29/06/2026	582	OSBORNE CD	Standing Order		£ -835.00	£ 53,414.68
29/06/2026	NR0503	WSCC Pension Fund	Standing Order		£ -620.02	£ 54,249.68
29/06/2026	2371-2364-2360	Slinfold Village H	Standing Order		£ -371.00	£ 54,869.70
29/06/2026	Slinfold PC	John Pilkington	Standing Order		£ -241.20	£ 55,240.70
29/06/2026		Tony Burroughs	Standing Order		£ -179.40	£ 55,481.90
29/06/2026	Slinfold PC	Mrs J Slipper	Standing Order		£ -104.52	£ 55,661.30

29/06/2026	005	Amelia Savage	Standing Order	£ -100.00	£ 55,765.82
29/06/2026	34730	Treetop Printing a	Standing Order	£ -67.20	£ 55,865.82
24/06/2026	RENT	GRAYCON CONSULTING	Faster Payment	£ 250.00	£ 55,933.02

<u>Bank Statement Account Name (s)</u>	<u>Statement Date</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Balances</u>
CO-OP	29/06/2026		51,250.97
			<u>51,250.97</u>
<u>Unpresented Payments (Minus)</u>		<u>Amount</u>	
		0.00	
			<u>0.00</u>
			51,250.97
<u>Unpresented Receipts (Plus)</u>			
		0.00	
			<u>0.00</u>
			51,250.97
		Balance per Cash Book is :-	51,250.97
		Difference is :-	0.00

Signatory 1:

Name Signed Date

Signatory 2:

Name Signed Date

11:20

Detailed Receipts & Payments by Budget Heading 31/07/2026

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	53	0	(53)			0.0%	38
1076 Precept	39,165	78,330	39,165			50.0%	
1080 Bank Interest	0	4,000	4,000			0.0%	
1100 Grants Received	5,400	2,800	(2,600)			192.9%	5,400
1120 Environment Cleansing	1,969	1,800	(169)			109.4%	1,969
Income :- Receipts	46,587	86,930	40,343			53.6%	7,407
Net Receipts	46,587	86,930	40,343				
6001 less Transfer to EMR	7,407						
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	39,180						
<u>200 Administration</u>							
4000 Clerk & Environment Officers	19,883	55,500	35,617		35,617	35.8%	
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	94	850	756		756	11.1%	
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	21,695	62,132	40,437	0	40,437	34.9%	0
Net Payments	(21,695)	(62,132)	(40,437)				
<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 31/07/2026

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	60	0	(60)		(60)	0.0%	
	Cherrytree :- Indirect Payments	<u>60</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(60)</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(60)</u>		<u>0</u>
	Net Payments	<u>(60)</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>60</u>				
<u>300</u>	<u>Community Services</u>							
4310	Community Events	197	2,800	2,603		2,603	7.0%	
4320	Youth Services	2,815	8,000	5,185		5,185	35.2%	
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	802	2,800	1,998		1,998	28.6%	802
	Community Services :- Indirect Payments	<u>5,476</u>	<u>19,100</u>	<u>13,624</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>13,624</u>	<u>28.7%</u>	<u>1,019</u>
	Net Payments	<u>(5,476)</u>	<u>(19,100)</u>	<u>(13,624)</u>				
6000	plus Transfer from EMR	1,019						
	Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	<u>(4,457)</u>						
<u>350</u>	<u>Recreation</u>							
4400	Bin collection	430	750	320		320	57.3%	
4405	Dog bins	354	1,050	696		696	33.7%	
4412	Grounds Maintenance Extra Cuts	830	850	21		21	97.6%	
4420	King George V	630	1,260	630		630	50.0%	
4421	KGV playground inspection	0	270	270		270	0.0%	
4425	Six Acres	3,075	2,875	(200)		(200)	107.0%	3,075
4426	Six Acres playgroundinspection	0	125	125		125	0.0%	

Detailed Receipts & Payments by Budget Heading 31/07/2026

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	820	1,300	480		480	63.1%	
4436 GM Football Club	215	400	185		185	53.8%	
4437 GM Tennis Club	230	900	670		670	25.6%	
Recreation :- Indirect Payments	6,583	9,780	3,197	0	3,197	67.3%	3,075
Net Payments	(6,583)	(9,780)	(3,197)				
6000 plus Transfer from EMR	3,075						
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	(3,508)						
<u>400 Highways & Byways</u>							
4200 Repairs & Improvements	150	0	(150)		(150)	0.0%	
4510 Streetlights & Maintenance	1,579	2,100	521		521	75.2%	
Highways & Byways :- Indirect Payments	1,729	2,100	371	0	371	82.3%	0
Net Payments	(1,729)	(2,100)	(371)				
<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	562	0	(562)		(562)	0.0%	
VAT Data :- Indirect Payments	562	0	(562)	0	(562)		0
Net Receipts over Payments	543	0	(543)				
Grand Totals:- Receipts	48,593	90,682	42,089			53.6%	
Payments	36,105	93,112	57,007	0	57,007	38.8%	
Net Receipts over Payments	12,488	(2,430)	(14,918)				
plus Transfer from EMR	4,094						
less Transfer to EMR	7,407						
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	9,174						

Objection letter to case office for application DC/25/2006 for 38 dwellings on land east of Hayes Lane

Dear Sam

On the 9th of July we had another discussion with the developer for East of Hayes Lane and raised the following points which set out our position. We proposed that if we can reach agreement on all of these points then Parish Council is minded to change its position of Objection to Support for the outline application. We were awaiting a response from the developer. We note a bundle of revised information has been submitted by the developer on the 22nd of July. We were not made aware of this or its contents and unfortunately on examination they do not address our concerns and therefore remain completely unacceptable.

Scout Hut - The latest plan amended 30/6/26 shows the scout hut in a more central position on the green open space. This actually represents a reduction in the open space provision and is a loss to the Parish and is a 'gift' at no cost to the developer. The space has not been allocated from within the Neighbourhood Plan development area PDS8. Notwithstanding the size of the site which hasn't been considered at this stage, the PC accepts this location subject to funding.

Funding and construction of the Scout Hut by the developer is a prerequisite as neither the Scouts nor the Parish Council has funding or is prepared to take procurement risk on something which is within the developers means and skills. The developer has been told this on multiple occasions including the fact that the present site (owned by yourselves not WSCC) will not contribute to fund any works as it is highly compromised by a water easement. We are happy to liaise with the developer to agree plans and specification but they must fund and procure this project as did A2 Dominion for the tennis club on Brick Lane and the developer and landowner for the cricket club.

Drainage - This is a major concern of the Parish Council. Hayes Lane has history of flooding both upstream and downstream of the development and we have CCTV surveys showing some serious damage to the drain along Hayes Lane caused by tree roots and utilities. We appreciate the developer cannot take responsibility for issues outside the impact of the development however it equally cannot rely on a system which is not capable of serving it. This needs to be fixed regardless of who, WSCC, Southern Water or developer undertakes this. Simply discharging into a broken system is not acceptable. We have requested, and the developer has provisionally agreed, a contribution of £15k to fund an engineer to act on behalf of the PC to ensure this matter is resolved. This should be safeguarded in any s106.

Affordable Housing - It is essential that all affordable provision is provided on site and not commuted to sums. We understand the difficulties of securing providers at this smallish scale but we want to stress that HDC and the developer must come to an onsite solution to provide much needed affordable homes for the parish. We have potential solutions and are having discussions with a number of parties to try and secure this, including your housing colleagues, and we would welcome your assistance in pressing the developer to work with us.

Quality Design - We have stressed the importance of high quality design to the developer beginning with siting and access (for this outline application) and as the design develops we want to be fully involved. The developer has given us reassurance that this is their objective too. In the first instance we want to explore options for a better access and egress to the site as the current location close to the Downlink does raise safety concerns. The developer has agreed to explore this with us including potential for a secondary access to spread the load along Hayes Lane (which may mean sacrificing some trees in the boundary - albeit sensitive, road systems outlive trees and we want the best solution).

In due course as detail design progresses we will be looking at good quality landscape buffering along the Downlink and along the footpath.

Pedestrian Safety- Hayes Lane is already a busy road and 38 additional dwellings would result in a significant increase in daily traffic. Therefore, a transport impact assessment should be carried out,

paying special attention to the Downs Link crossing, investigating options for mitigation such as a zebra or courtesy crossings to ensure pedestrian safety.

Number of units - The Parish Council has objected to 38 units which is significantly in excess of the aspirations of the early Neighbourhood Plan. However, if the development can secure all of the above requirements the Parish Council would be minded to consider supporting the scheme at 38 units. This has been a highly controversial site with many refusals over the years - we urge the developer to work with us on this application so we can come behind it and see it deliver a strong scheme for Slinfold with public support.

Response to stage 2 Community Governance Review Consultation

Slinfold Parish Council argues that the proposal to alter the boundary between Broadbridge Heath and Slinfold does not satisfy the relevant criteria for community governance arrangements. Furthermore, there is insufficient public support to progress these proposals. The HDC Committee report stated 6 responses had been received which is not enough to progress the plans which would have such a detrimental impact on Slinfold Parish.

1. Reflecting the identities and interests of the community

The area affected by the proposal forms part of a settled and established community that identifies with Slinfold. Residents in the affected area have longstanding social, practical and historic links with that parish. They use its facilities, participate in its community life, and are connected to its local institutions and networks.

There is insufficient evidence that the affected residents identify instead with Broadbridge Heath or that the proposed transfer would better reflect their interests. On the contrary, the proposal risks separating residents from the parish with which they have the closest and most meaningful connection.

2. Effective and convenient local government

The existing arrangements already provide clear, effective and convenient local government. The proposal has not demonstrated any material deficiency in the current boundary that would justify change.

Altering the boundary would introduce avoidable disruption and may create confusion for residents regarding representation, responsibility and parish affiliation. In the absence of a clear and evidenced governance benefit, the proposed amendment appears unnecessary.

3. Existing arrangements for community representation and engagement

The present arrangements already sit alongside established forms of local representation and engagement, including community groups, school networks, faith groups and other bodies.

These arrangements reflect the existing community structure and help support participation and representation. The proposed boundary change would cut across these established patterns rather than reinforce them. No convincing case has been made that the proposal would improve community engagement or align more closely with existing non-parish arrangements.

4. Community cohesion

The proposal risks harming community cohesion by dividing or reassigning an area that is already part of a coherent local community. Community cohesion is supported by continuity, shared identity, and clear local association. The proposed change would weaken those links rather than strengthen them.

Where there is local opposition to the proposal, this itself is an indication that the change may generate division rather than promote unity.

5. Size, population and boundaries

The existing parish boundary already reflects a coherent area in terms of community identity, settlement pattern and practical geography. The proposed revised boundary does not appear to create a clearer or more logical parish area.

The proposed change would destroy established neighbourhood patterns and upset a balanced parish structure. It would also disrupt population balance, electoral arrangements and the overall coherence of both parishes.

Conclusion

For these reasons, the proposed boundary change should not be supported. The existing arrangements better reflect the identities and interests of the community, provide effective and convenient local government, align with established community engagement arrangements, support community cohesion, and maintain a coherent parish structure in terms of size, population and boundaries.

Whilst the Parish Council has addressed the criteria for the review above, it is not acceptable for HDC to ignore the points raised in its initial consultation response which are material reasons highlighting the detrimental impact on Slinfold. No response has been provided about the clear conflict of interest from Councillor Brookes and the Council's request for an independent Councillor to oversee the process. Therefore, we kindly request that the below points are strongly considered and that HDC rejects the proposed parish boundary alteration and retains the existing one.

SPC Initial Consultation Response

- The site at Lower Broadbridge Farm is currently within the Slinfold Parish and Ecclesiastic boundary of the Parish and has been for many years.
- The location forms a critical element of the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan in Aim 1 Preventing Coalescence between Slinfold and Broadbridge Heath. Removing the area would undermine our ability to protect this Aim which has already been significantly impacted by the Appeal application which HDC itself objected to.
- There are three significant implications if the boundary is moved:
 - Slinfold Parish will miss out on a significant CIL contribution. As the site is now consented and Slinfold has a made Plan it is eligible for 25% of CIL receipts. Forgoing this contribution will deprive our Parish of substantial and budgeted community infrastructure projects. Broadbridge Heath does not have a Neighbourhood Plan.
 - The new development will contribute a significant Council precept which will be lost from the residents of the Parish if the boundary is moved yet Slinfold will still have to deal with the implications of many more residents enjoying the Parish facilities.
 - Housing numbers for the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan, present and future rely on the contribution of the 133 new units from Lower Broadbridge Farm. Without these numbers the burden to provide additional units in the Parish to make up the shortfall will have a material and detrimental impact on the vitality and rural character of the Parish. These are fundamental Objectives of our made Neighbourhood Plan.

- To maintain an objective viewpoint, we would request an independent Councillor acts on this matter as Councillor Brookes has a clear conflict of interests.