

# Old Hill Farm Mausoleum Update

---

A Planning Application has been re-submitted by Bill Heasman following the dismissal of his appeal. Only changes are: -

- An increase in parking spaces from 25-37
- Proposed re-surfacing of local woodland footpaths!
- Provision of a minibus service

**IT IS IMPORTANT THAT AS MANY RESIDENTS AS POSSIBLE SUBMIT  
THEIR MAUSOLEUM OBJECTION LETTERS TO THE BROMLEY  
PLANNING OFFICER BY 5<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2015**

**Ref: DC/15/00981/FULL3**

You can send an e-mail to [planning@bromley.gov.uk](mailto:planning@bromley.gov.uk)

Or via the Bromley Planning Web Site: [www.bromley.gov.uk/planningaccess](http://www.bromley.gov.uk/planningaccess)

Or by post to David Bord, Bromley Town Planning, Civic Centre, Stockwell Close, Bromley BR1 3UH

(In all cases please ensure you quote reference **15/00981/FULL3**)

**Some of the key points you may wish to consider:**

- This new application 15/00981/FULL3 dated 9<sup>th</sup> March 2015 (just 6 days after the dismissal) is very similar to the previous application, with the only difference being an increase in parking for 37 cars, and proposed resurfacing of local footpaths, and provision of a minibus service.
- The site has no practical access for pedestrians, particularly in smart clothes and footwear. Visitors can only access by car, or by walking on Old Hill road, putting their own safety at risk. There are no bus services available into Old Hill.
- The Inspector stated in his statement for dismissing the previous appeal, that *'whilst the site may have the physical capacity to provide for additional parking... there would come a point where the extent of parking would be harmful and the openness of the site undermined'*. The new proposed development fails to address this issue.
- Inspector adds that *'the possible scale of vehicle generation is uncertain and would not be significantly offset by the attractions of public transport or of walking. I find, in all these circumstances, that the scheme would be harmful to the free and safe movement of pedestrians in that area'*. Re-surfacing of the footpaths, the provision on a minibus and increased parking space to 37 vehicles will NOT overcome the Inspector's objections.
- Road access to the site is relatively concealed in its approach by hedgerows and is positioned close to the top of narrow and winding hill. The immediate vicinity has no facilities for additional parking if the space allocation for 37 cars is exceeded. This provides possible implications for highway safety and congestion. Facility for vehicle overspill has not been shown in the proposed development.

- A slow moving cortege would create a long blockage of vehicles at the bottom of Old Hill. If there are any vehicles coming down Old Hill there would be nowhere for the cortege to pull into, and likely to cause a congestion of traffic back to the roundabout.
- Traffic impact on Old Hill has substantially been underestimated. Old Hill is 6m wide across its width, and the road is two-way from the entry point off Cudham Lane North and up to two thirds of the way up Old Hill, thereafter is one-way. At the lower end of Old Hill residents' parked cars restrict the width of the road to less than 3m. This means that two-way traffic cannot pass each other.
- The speed of traffic up the top of Old Hill has been understated and presents a danger to pedestrians and residents. Many vehicles speed and treat the whole road as one-way, and have no regards for the traffic coming down the hill
- Parking at the proposed mausoleum shows spaces for up to 37 cars, some of which will be taken up by local workers and officials. This clearly is insufficient for an average attendance at an interment. The only alternative is to park up along Old Hill (all of which is narrow, is a conservation site and includes young children as residents), or in Cudham Lane North, where there is also limited space. Often vehicles are parked on both corners of the junction between Old Hill and Cudham Lane North, and along the road leading up to the children's park
- The lower third of the proposed site and both sides of Old Hill are in a Site of Metropolitan Importance for nature conservation ("SMI"), designated by the Greater London Authority. Poor visibility to the left of the exit was one of the reasons for the Inspector's refusal, and the fact that both sides of Old Hill are in a conservation area (not just green belt land) is relevant when the visibility splay (51 metres to the left, by 2.4 metres into the exit, on an elongated triangle), would involve clear felling and a break-up of the tree lined canopy.
- I/We ask that Bromley Council declines to determine this application, under s. 70A(1). Town and Country Planning Act 1990, because the Secretary of State has dismissed an appeal regarding a similar application (s.70A(3) and there has been no significant change in the relevant considerations since the relevant event" (s. 70A(1)(b)) - namely, the appeal dismissal on 3rd March 2015 (paras. 15 to 24 considered, in particular).
- The Inspector concluded in his report that the *proposed development would create potentially unsafe conditions on the adjacent highway. Accordingly, the scheme would be contrary to Policy T18 of the UDP which seeks to have regard to the potential impact of a development upon road safety, and to ensure that road safety is not adversely affected.* Nothing in the revised development proposals deals with this issue
- This business proposal which does not appear to have a medium to long term income stream, but which has long term liabilities of maintenance and security for more than 100 years. If the business is unsustainable, it will almost certainly be the responsibility of the Bromley Council to maintain the mausoleum out of public funds, particularly given the sensitivity of removing (exhuming) the bodies from the site