



**MID SUSSEX**  
**DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**Agenda Update Sheet**

**Planning Committee A**

**Date: 24<sup>th</sup> May 2018**

## Part I Recommended for Approval

### ITEM 1 - DM/17/4575 (1 Cyprus Road)

#### P.10 WSCC S106 Contributions

Updated contributions required to:

Education- Primary: £12,554  
Education – Secondary: £13,500  
Education – 6<sup>th</sup> Form: £3,163

#### P.23 Infrastructure Contributions

Update education contributions to:

Education Primary: £12,554 (to be used towards additional equipment at Manor Field Primary School)

Education Secondary: £13:500 (to be used towards additional equipment at Burgess Hill Academy)

Education Sixth Form: £3,163 (to be used towards additional equipment at St Pauls Catholic College sixth-form department).

#### P.32 Summary of Contributions Table

	Previous figure	Amended figure	Amount increase
Primary education	£10,966	<b>£12,554</b>	<b>£1,588</b>
Secondary education	£11,802	<b>£13,500</b>	<b>£1,698</b>
6 <sup>th</sup> Form education	£2,765	<b>£3,163</b>	<b>£398</b>

### ITEM 2 - DM/18/0302 (5 Lucastes Road)

### ITEM 3 - DM/18/0677 (Turners Hill Road)

#### P.65 SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Additional petition signed by 45 residents: "We undersigned residents of Turners Hill & area object to yet another application by Hartmires to wreck countryside around the village. All previous objections still apply to the one above, but there is another: As this is a new application, the old one must lapse. Also the new one must be rejected on the grounds of intrusion into the countryside; it's against the already approved village plan; entrance to and from oit on a fast road is far too dangerous; the scheme would create an overbearing impact and loss of outlook from the roof and nearby footpath, pollute the water table and badly effect a local shoot valuable to the village economy. How long would this building be a 'chapel' before application to make it a block of flats? Why do they need a huge basement if not for flats underground parking? Hartmires applied for housing in the same field and were turned down. Is this not just a 'back door' approach? We call on you please to reject it once and for all."

1 additional letter of objection: Same grounds as reported previously or above.

## **P.66 PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS (Updated comments)**

We object to this application.

The agents acting for Hartmires obviously feel that they are correct in asserting that the chapel size has not been increased or that this addition requires any explanation beyond stating that it might be used for a vehicle, possibly a hearse, and for general storage of items for maintenance. The overall size will actually double and the basement will be visible when viewed from the East (drawing number 461/54B). The addition of a basement will therefore have an impact on the character and appearance of the area.

The refusal to provide relevant measurements for the basement does not assist in judging the overall impact of this large building in the proposed new position.

Whilst drawing 48/57 showing the line of the existing terrain and the level of excavation is of some help there are still no measurements shown. The lack of a Visual Perspective, as required by our Neighbourhood Plan Policy THP12, does not help us to assess the building, parking and road impact.

The lack of any honest dialogue on the need for this latest application and a general lack of supportive information on the reasons for it make it impossible to support. A more open and co-operative approach might help reduce the number of objections.

The residents of Turners Hill are not trying to “bully” MSDC but are exerting their democratic right to voice their objections to an application which affects them and their village. We are sorry that Ms Saady (Ecotecture) feels that a “few vociferous people” are doing so.

In the Inspectors Appeal Decision he stated:

“Given the planning permission for the site as natural burial ground, the provision of a commensurate chapel building is not unreasonable. The siting of the building close to and parallel with the consented reception building is appropriate and would concentrate activity close to the car park.”

This would no longer be the case if this application is granted.

The Inspector also stated:

“The appellant has not objected to the conditions suggested by the Council and I concur on their necessity. I see no reason to vary from the default three year period for commencement of works. A condition to list the plan numbers is appropriate in the interests of certainty and to enable the submission of minor material amendments. Conditions in relation to the approval of materials for the building and hard surface areas and to control lighting are necessary to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.”

This is not an application for minor material amendment.

We object to the use of external lighting which causes light pollution in a countryside area. The Natural Burial Ground is unlikely to be open between the hours of darkness and therefore lighting of any type is completely unnecessary.

Condition 5 of the appeal document requires that MSDC is provided with details of landscape work before commencement and it therefore difficult to understand Ecotecture stating that a request from MSDC for further information on tree planting is considered not to be a planning issue.

The original Operation Statement for the Natural Burial Ground dated January 2015, stated:

Item 6. Burials may take place Monday to Friday, normally up to one each morning and each afternoon. This would give a capacity of around ten burials per week, however, it is envisaged that there would be roughly one burial per week in the first six months of operation, rising to around three burials per week after a year.

Item 8. Funeral corteges would arrive via Turners Hill Road and the site would have parking for a hearse and 22 cars, including 2 wheelchair accessible spaces. The reception building comprises a small reception area with WC, office and equipment store, with an external covered area of some 40sqm, where mourners can gather before moving to the grave.

Item 9. The burial plots will initially be located within the new woodland area. There will be no formal pathways, so that visitors can experience the woodland as a natural environment.

Planning statement 2015:

The proposed use of the site as a natural burial ground is considered to be acceptable in principle, being an appropriate, low intensity countryside use, in a sustainable location that will make significant enhancements to the rural character of the area and to natural habitats for protected species.

In our opinion the planning granted on appeal is more than adequate in light of the above statements.

We are still concerned by: the constant referral to a Burial Ground – permission granted under reference DM/15/1035 was for a NATURAL burial ground; The referral to the land as being brownfield or semi brownfield – it is not.

Highway matters are still of great concern to the Parish Council and it appears to be of concern to WSCC Highway Authority from the comments they previously submitted and which have not been acted on by the applicants. (WSCC comments dated 19.4.17.) The applicant still refers to a footpath link to a path outside of St. Leonards Church. There is no such path and in our view no space for such a path. The land within the Church boundary is private and not available for use.

We ask that this application is refused due the impact it will have on this rural location and all matters raised above.

**ITEM 4 - DM/18/1003 (Beech Hurst Gardens)**