

Meeting Note

Attendance: Virtual Attendance Zoom Meeting
Turners Hill PC members that were visible
Chair (Bruce Forbes)
Adam Palin
Ian Gibson
Sue Mugridge
Sue Hughesden
Clerk Chris Marsh
Lisa Jackson (LJ)

Topic Turners Hill Parish Council
consider application DM/20/2877
Proposed Crematorium and
Natural Burial Site, Turners Hill
Road

Date: 1st September 2020

Circulation Mark Brassey
Aidan Beckford
Anthony Williams

Parish Meeting Turners Hill Parish Council (Zoom Meeting)

1. This note records part of the relevant parish council meeting held on the 1st of September 2020 by Zoom.
2. As a public speaker LJ was invited to join the meeting at 7 pm then I was let into the meeting by the same connection at 7 pm. It was clear that most of the other PC attendees were already in the meeting when I joined. Before the meeting formally started the Parish clerk was questioning various attendees who had joined the meeting remotely.
3. In line with the protocol LJ requested electronically to record the meeting. However, the meeting was not recorded as the red light shown on the left-hand corner of the screen was not lit.
4. The Chairman opened the meeting and asked if there were any public speakers. LJ responded that she had been informed that she would be able to speak to application DM/20/2877 regarding the proposal for a crematorium and natural burial site at Turner's Hill Road.
5. LJ presented a pre-prepared speech for about 15 minutes (copy attached).
6. Following the presentation the Chairman invited questions from the Councillors.
7. First question related to the business case for a crematorium following approval for a natural burial site. LJ explained that the business case was not a material planning consideration but the need case was as had been set out in her presentation. She explained that the planning authority only need to consider whether there was a proven need and the business case was not material.
8. The second question related to the potential scattering of ashes. LJ explained that the scattering of ashes was common at crematoria and it was anticipated that the area for the scattering of ashes would be secured through the reserved matters application.
9. The third question related to the presentation that the site would result in a net biodiversity gain and how this was calculated. LJ explained that the ecological study was supported by a DEFRA calculation that measured areas of various habitat types and calculated using the spreadsheet to determine whether a net gain of area was achieved.

10. There was a little debate on the item as the Council members had been circulated with a report in advance of the meeting. This was referred to by Councillor Ian Gibson who described as matters being covered in the report. **NB** no report was shared with LJ or other members of the public.
11. Councillor Ian Gibson disagreed with the statement by LJ that policy DP 12 was out of date and disagreed that the neighbourhood plan was also out of date in relation to adopted policy in the Local Plan 2018.
12. Councillor Gibson also disagreed with the decision of mid Sussex district Council that no environmental impact assessment was required, as he stated that it was necessary to consider the environmental impact.
13. Councillor Gibson also asked what the failure rate of an abated cremator was and he confirmed that it would surely fail and therefore the position of the flu had been designed for failure.
14. Councillor Gibson disagreed with the assessment on highways and stated that all junctions are overloaded and massively over capacity and that there had been a serious accident in the vicinity that made the roads unsafe in the area and there was no justification at all for additional traffic of any scale.
15. The Chairman agreed with Councillor Gibson and confirmed that the figures on the planning application for vehicle movements were all wrong and the West Sussex county council based data of 2013 was out of date.
16. Councillor Adam Palin questioned the siting of the crematorium at this location given village cricket matches and the Oktoberfest at Tulleys farm. He criticised the site has not been chosen for design but for convenience.
17. The chairman agreed with the content of the presentation regarding the number of the representations and dismiss those from London and further afield in Sussex.
18. The chairman moved to the recommendation in the report. He did not state whether this was to approve or object. There was a sort of vote where there were some agreement to the recommendation, however it was not clear who was in favour who was against and who abstained. LJ interjected at this point as it was not clear what the recommendation was, the chairman confirmed that the planning committee report was for an objection. LJ questioned this and asked when the planning committee had considered the application and whether she had missed the opportunity to present at the planning committee meeting. The chairman responded that the planning committee had not met.
19. The Parish Council agreed with the conclusion of the planning committee.
20. LJ requested a copy of the report circulated at the meeting and was assured by the chairman that a copy would be made available to her by the Clerk.

LJ left the meeting at 20.05 hours, but stayed connected to the zoom call until the Clerk disconnected the call when the Council went on to consider confidential matters.