

Summary of Support for the Appeal Proposal

Number	Name	Comment
1	Laura Markwick (application)	My friends have had a terrible wait for a recent funeral nearly a month and my friends lives close to Turners Hill. The Site is a cemetery with no environmental impact as confirmed we must stop localism and support new locations for this sad time at the end of our family and friends' lives. It is an existing cemetery
2	Dr Layton (appeal)	Mid Sussex have refused a much-needed community asset and prevented development that should clearly be permitted. In addition, MSDC have provided no substantive evidence on why there is no need. The reports seem to show clear need one report which is transport analyst appointed by MSDC confirms that extra capacity is needed and this is in addition confirmed by the only crematorium expert report in relation to this application provided by a Peter Mitchell and has not been taken into account by the planning officer. Some of my clients have been distressed with time taken to arrange funerals because of the lack of capacity and choice, covid has made this worse. The whole matter has been appalling handled and no technical evidence has been presented to the contrary. Lastly it's got planning for a cemetery with an enormous chapel building. As a local health professional MSDC seemed to have acted unreasonably.
3	Mr and Mrs Wigley (application)	As an NHS nurse post covid this beautifully designed community facility would be an asset to the area to allow for contemplation following this traumatic time many have experienced and this natural burial easy access to the local and wider midsussex community
4	Mr Oliver Mifsud (application)	I'm excited to see this application for a natural burial site, will be a great community asset which we should be supporting in today's world. The architecture has been very well considered for the surrounding low impact and highly positive
5	Miss Nicola Morris (application)	I am a teacher locally and see the clear need for these facilities locally. My dad had to wait after his sad passing in Forest Row for weeks for a space and it's an existing burial ground and this is just an extension of community facilities with no environmental impact. Extending existing community facilities makes sense.
6	Mr Anthony Williams (application)	This site as an existing burial ground is the logical place for a crematorium. The need is clear and reflected in the need statement. There is no impact as confirmed in the LVIA report and there is no environmental impact assessment required as confirmed by planning officer. It also complies with the planning policy relating to extending existing community facilities which I believe is DP25
7	Sue Marwick (application)	As a resident of Mid Sussex I have just seen this application and wish to write in support. The current wait times for funerals and cremation are excessive and provision of a new crematorium will assist this
8	Miss Charlotte Rusling (application)	We are in start of a recession possibly a depression we need to support new community enterprises hospitals schools and crematoriums they bring economic benefits and create jobs in sussex. The world has changed because of Covid and we must face reality we need many more facilities if a family member dies it takes weeks of delay to arrange a funeral or Cremation in Sussex
9	Mrs Tammy O Grady (application)	We need more provision for burial in Mid Sussex. So I support this application
10	Mrs Elizabeth Allan (application)	I support this new facility we should all support new facilities and employment opportunities
11	Mr D Patel (application)	I tried to open this Natural Burial site but gave up since I received no cooperation from planning so I am pleased to see this application and fully support the extension of the approved burial ground. It is clear there is a need and there are no reasonable planning grounds for refusal and I note that no Environmental impact assessment is required this means that the location is clearly suitable and the application has the support of Highways

12	Mr Guy Morris (application)	It's a perfect location and as confirmed by planning Officer no need for an Environmental impact assessment and already a cemetery which has been implemented I note the scale of building s especially height is greatly reduced from the enormous Chapel approved by the inspectorate . We need new community facilities and I think this fits in perfectly with policy DP 25 which I think allows for extension of existing community facilities and the fall back position is a cemetery and there no environmental issues at all in this location Also I note the need statement is very comprehensive and robust
13	Mrs E Tier (application)	I am an EYFS teacher in Sussex and can see the need for such a facility in the area. I therefore support this application they are usually extremely well landscaped and discreet businesses which normally have beautiful grounds
14	Mr Michael Da Rocha (application)	I undertake basic maintenance at this site and welcome the economic advantages it brings to an existing community asset
15	Mr David Hill (application)	Sussex has a shortage of crematorium facilities and therefore I support this application. The need report confirms this. I can see the application HAS THE SUPPORT OF HIGHWAYS. and there is no Environmental concerns as confirmed by the planning department The existing site is a cemetery so it's only an extension of an existing function as a cemetery which hopefully the planning Officer will explain in his report No credible reason for refusal and the planning department must be positive and proactive .The site also has economic benefits
16	Mr Mark Steward (application)	I have seen this application and can confirm that from a commercial and agents view point there is strong support for crematoriums and more needed in Sussex
17	Mr Chris Frost (application)	There are no reasonable grounds for the refusal of this application - the fall-back position confirms this
18	Miss Georgina McLeod (application)	As an architect I can see no reasonable reason why this community extension of existing facilities should not be approved
19	Ms Joanna Saady (application)	I write to strongly support this application, so relevant to these times. This is an excellent application, very well prepared with a strong LVIA which proves and confirms that the site does not need an Environmental impact assessment. The site has the support from highways already so this fall back position as a cemetery, with many buildings already approved by the inspectorate so clearly in legal and planning terms, is a brilliant idea. I urge the council to support this application as an extension of a community asset. I would finally just like to add the need report is the most comprehensive and through report I have ever seen as an architect. Its contents prove that the need for this facility is unarguable
20	Mr Simon Crabb (application)	Seems like a good idea to me, good to get local facilities in this respect
21	Mrs Michelle Hill (application)	We need more facilities in Sussex I support the application
22	Mr Martin Carter (application)	We need more facilities in Sussex I support the application and originally carried out the ground works for the site. There have been countless delays due to getting conditions satisfied so it will be a relief to continue works and it's an economic benefit to my company and employee s The implemented site is a perfect location for these facilities and no environmental impact . I note that highways fully support the project subject to a 278 agreement which can and be easily complied with
23	Penge Islamic Centre (application)	We at penge Islamic centre support this application as all faiths should be given a choice of burial or cremation. If you have burial chapel then cremation should be given as a choice
24	Dr Jennifer Layton (application)	No objection, I support

25	Miss Victoria Pearce (application)	I have just noticed this application my family have had delays waiting for funerals so support this application there seems no reason to refuse
26	Ms Bethan Carver (application)	I fully support this application, These facility's are currently already stretched and with the impact from Covid this is only exacerbated. Lovely location
27	Mr Ifraan Gaffar (application)	I have further spoken to members of my community including those in mid Sussex and their is widespread support from our faith group we ask the planning officer to emphasise this in his report ALSO THERE SEEMS NO VALID OR REASONABLE REASON FOR REFUSAL APART FROM LOCALISM I Note there is considerable support from residents of Sussex but this is apparently ignored by localism
28	Mr D Patel (application)	As a Hindu who has previously tried to open the site, I can confirm that my community is in support of this new facility and we believe that Dignity are basically running a monopoly and trying to restrict competition. They are going against advice from government that new facilities such as this are required. Dignity don't make any special arrangements for our community or represent them. Having looked through responses, it is clear that 40 percent of replies actively supported the need and only 15 percent reject the need but they do not substantiate why, Nearly half the comments want this community asset and having read the comments you can see there is multi faith need for facility.
29	N Wigley (appeal)	<p>This application should have been fully supported not obstructed. I supported the application and I work as an In Reach Practitioner, Sussex Community Foundation Trust in the NHS, living near Hayward's Heath. It's very clear from my experience that this facility was needed before COVID to provide choice and to reduce waiting times. However, with the current situation it is vital to have more facilities.</p> <p>I understand the need for such community facilities are assessed by a quantitative and qualitative approach but am I correct that the planning department has done neither of these but still say there is no need surely the inspectorate must not accept the planning officers say so based on no evidence.</p> <p>If you approach anyone in the health industry they will confirm the need for more facilities for the bereaved in Sussex. It seems to me as an NHS professional for 21 years that the planning department is being uncomprehending of the need aspect of providing this facility on an existing burial site without even carrying out a professional need survey. The site has planning already and is not very special in landscape terms so a beautiful landscaped crematorium would be an improvement.</p>
30	Mark P Steward (appeal)	<p>Clarke Gammon Wellers have an interest in cemeteries and burial grounds and we did submit a letter of support for the planning application. Having reviewed all the documentation, we would like to ask the inspector to drill into the figures below.</p> <p>"Over 122,000 people would live closer to a crematorium at Turners Hill than any other. For clarity Peter Mitchell Associates (PMA) states that 122,916 people would live closer to a crematorium at Turners Hill than any other, Beacon Dodsworth (BD) says this figure is 122,234. The difference in this calculated need between the two models is less than 1% and is therefore not statistically significant. BD describes this as 'good agreement'. The difference is primarily the result of a difference between ONS data and the use of Output Areas (BD) as opposed to Lower super output areas (PMA)." This clearly represents a substantial benefit to these people.</p> <p>If the transport analyst for Mid Sussex District Council and the crematorium expert Peter Mitchell Associates agree which they do, why are these figures not presented to committee? How come if this is common ground the case is even at appeal? We would welcome the input from the inspector to clarify and confirm both parties agree the figures, which clearly confirms the need. The landscape argument is nebulous because of the fall back position</p>

31	Ecotecture (Appeal)	<p>As architects we wish to submit comments as below.</p> <p>This site is clearly part brownfield or PDL and the application should not have been refused. The reason for refusal on need is completely groundless and does not even mention or explain the qualitative reasons for new crematoriums, therefore the refusal could be completely defective in the limited reasoning behind it. We would be grateful to the inspector if it can be clarified that NPPF84 applies to this site. If the figures of 120.000 + people benefiting from this as a new community asset are not disputed which seems the case thus providing much needed capacity and another option or choice to people bereaved how could this community asset not have been recommended for approval.</p> <p>Lastly as architects and residents of Mid Sussex how come the fall-back situation has been ignored, it is very significant and frankly negates the very weak and confused landscape objection. We are also perplexed as to the common ground on landscape and version six of the landscape report by the MSDC landscape consultant being apparently contradictory and why are there an unprecedented six contradictory versions. Frankly, there should be no reason for this application to have been refused</p>
----	--------------------------------	---