



Tel: (01444) 247726
Fax: (01444) 233707
Email: council@burgesshill.gov.uk
Website: www.burgesshill.gov.uk

24th September 2025

A MEETING of the Council will be held in the Council Chamber on Monday 29th September 2025 at 19.00 hours.

Mrs J Holden
Chief Executive Officer

The use of social media is permitted but members of the public are requested to switch their mobile devices to silent for the duration of the meeting. Filming is permitted in accordance with the Councils filming policy which is displayed in the Council Chamber.

A full copy of the agenda and appendices are available on the Council Website, a hard copy is available for perusal at the Help Point. Personal copies of the agenda are charged for at 2p per double side or 7p per double side colour and can be obtained from the Help Point during business hours.

A G E N D A

- 1. Open Forum**
- 2. Apologies for Absence**
- 3. Declarations of Interest**
- 4. Chairman's Announcements**
- 5. Council Minutes**
- 6. Planning Committee Minutes**
- 7. Community Engagement Key Area Notes of Meeting**
- 8. Staff and Member Development Key Area Group Notes of Meeting**
- 9. Strategic Development Key Area Group Notes of Meetings**
- 10. St Johns Park Working Group**
- 11. Delegated Decisions**
- 12. Council Position on Proportional Representation**
- 13. Allotments Tenancy Agreements**
- 14. Staff Cost of Living Rise**
- 15. Diary Dates**

1. **OPEN FORUM**
Each member of the public is permitted to speak once in respect of business itemised on the Agenda (during the Open Forum). They can also speak during the meeting (on topics relating to the published agenda) as the agenda debate is progressed. Speakers are encouraged not to speak for more than three minutes, at the discretion of the Chairman or nominee (including the Chair of any other meeting of the Council). Questions or comments will be endeavoured to be answered but will not cause debate. If it appears that the number of speakers is likely to unreasonably delay the disposal of business items on the agenda the Chairman may direct that a member of the public submits a question or comment in writing which shall be answered in due course.
2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
In respect of any matter on the agenda.
4. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**
To hear Chairman's announcements, for noting items only, if any.
5. **COUNCIL MINUTES**
To consider the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on Monday 7th July 2025 (previously circulated)
6. **PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES**
To consider the Minutes and decisions of the meetings of the Planning Committee held on; 4th August, 26th August, 15th September (minutes previously circulated). For the detail behind the resolutions Councillors are requested to review the original reports contained with the originating agenda and subsequent minutes.

Minute 386 04.08.25 (Request to support a community Traffic Regulation Order application)

RESOLVED: Committee supported the application for parking restriction on Ferndale Road to provide a safer flow of traffic movement.

Minute 396 26.08.25 –(MSDC Draft Street Naming Policy)

RESOLVED: A delegated decision can be made, based on the views of Committee members, to formulate a response before the closing date on 9th September

Minute 404 15.09.25 - (License Applications Ref: LI/25/1279 Yaprak 25 - 27 Station Road Burgess Hill, RH15 9DE)

RESOLVED: In noting the circumstances of the previous licence, the Committee required more evidence to ensure the Crime and Disorder component of the licencing would be adhered to.

7 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT KEY AREA GROUP - NOTES OF MEETING 15TH JULY 2025

To agree the notes and the decisions therein, the resolutions are included here, the full notes have already been circulated. For the detail behind the resolutions Councillors are requested to review the original reports contained with the originating agenda and subsequent minutes.

Note 59 Festive Market:

RESOLVED that: the Key Area Group approved all the recommendations as follows:

- a) the Festive Market would be delivered in 2025 operational over 4 days.
- b) Agreed the focus to secure sponsorship and agreed that any overspend on the entertainment would be met through the Bridge the Gap funds, sufficient to meet any shortfall and had been allocated by the Council for use for events such as this to encourage footfall into the town during the redevelopment of the town centre.
- c) Agreed that an additional contractor would be part of the project for 5 hours per week for 6 weeks to complete the sales and sponsorship work to come from the Bridge the Gap budget.

Note 60 Victory Over Japan Day

RESOLVED that: The Key Area Group approved the plans.

Note 61. Update On Community Facilitation by the Community Engagement Team

Note 62 Reports on Events Completed by the Community Engagement Team

Note 63 Report on VE DAY 80

Note 64 Report on Summer Fayre

All reports were noted.

Note 65 Update on Forthcoming Activities 2025

RESOLVED that: The contents of the report were noted. It was agreed that the Officer team would have further discussion with the Weald Classic Car club to share their reasoning as to why the 14 June was the only available date for the Summer Fayre to proceed. Should both

events be held on the same day, the Key Area Group requested they work to complement each other and ensure the town became a destination location on that day.

8. STAFF AND MEMBER DEVELOPMENT KEY AREA GROUP - NOTES OF MEETING 21st JULY 2025

To agree the notes and the decisions therein, the resolutions are included here, the full notes have already been circulated. For the detail behind the resolutions Councillors are requested to review the original reports contained with the originating agenda and subsequent minutes.

Note 29 (Staffing)

RESOLVED :

- 1) Move the RFO responsibility to the Chief Executive. The Chief Executives salary bar to be lifted to allow progression to the top of scale.
- 2) To start the recruitment of a new Head of Corporate Services/ Deputy Clerk at PO2/3 to replace the current Head of Corporate Service / RFO.
- 3) Recommend to Finance KAG for allocation in the 2026/27 budget for the recruitment of a new post for the Community Engagement Team to increase capacity for existing and new events and to allow for the movement of duties to include Emergency Planning, Mayors Secretary, Community Safety (including pubwatch and shopwatch). This post should be advertised at a scale 5. Scale 5 Salary is currently £28,163-£30,559 (pay award pending) with oncosts (NI, pension, training etc) this would be an increase in the budget overall for this post of £35,000-38,000. This recruitment starting no later than January 2026.
- 4) It was confirmed that the recruitment of the role for the Head of Corporate Services, due to expediency, needs to start immediately.
- 5) The Key Area Group noted with concern, that a lack of time to explore and invest in new innovations exists. These explorations which could result in greater efficiency and improved working arrangements. There was also concern that the current work levels may lead to staff burn out. A report is requested to come back to the KAG at a later time to consider these issues.

9 STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT KEY AREA GROUP – NOTES OF MEETINGS 28th JULY & 18th SEPTEMBER

To agree the notes and the decisions therein, the resolutions are included here, the full notes have already been circulated.

July 28th Meeting:

Note 65 (Local Government Reorganisation)

RESOLVED:

The KAG would express an opinion of preference, the CEO would draft the response in discussion with Chair and Vice Chair and circulate via email for all Councillors to view and comment before the submission date of 13th August.

The KAG then considered the options in the survey
RESOLVED: the KAG preference was for 2 unitary authorities, they would support B1 or B2 regarding the placement of Adur District, as the data evolves.

Note 66 (Neighbourhood Planning)

RESOLVED: 1) To review the existing Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and identify what is redundant.

2) Establish from the Planning Authority what would be relevant as non-strategic policies for a NP

Note 67(Beehive)

RESOLVED: 1) Chief Executive to convene a meeting of the CLBDG to consider the revised plan and costings and receive stakeholder feedback.

2) The list of stakeholders invited will be included with the papers for the CLBDG

September 18th Meeting:

Note 75 (Community Land and Buildings Development Group)

RESOLVED: To recommend to Council;

- (a) To obtain Pre Planning Advice from the Planning Authority on the RIBA Stage 2 design for The Beehive.
- (b) To meet with the Urban Design team at Mid Sussex District Council to obtain feedback on the design and its compliance with the Design Guide.
- (c) To prepare an indicative funding plan for The Beehive to be presented to the next meeting of the Strategic KAG.
- (d) To prepares an indicative business plan for The Beehive to be presented to the next meeting of the Strategic KAG
- (e) To allocate any further savings arising from additional design work or specifications as (a) additions to the existing £212k buffer for inflation and (b) design upgrades (e.g. Glulam beams).
- (f) To Consider commissioning the suggested Mechanical Engineering Report at the KAG's next meeting which shall be scheduled for a date in November 2025.

Note 76 Brookleigh (Community Building)

RESOLVED: To thank Mid Sussex District Council for considering the Town Council, however this Council would not be able to take the management of the building on the current outlined terms.

10 ST JOHNS PARK WORKING GROUP

The notes from the two working groups over the summer follow. The group has worked with MSDC to encourage greater involvement with the public for consultation responses. To that extent flyers were handed out in the park and during Wowzer Wednesdays and move it Mondays advertising the summer events but also encouraging signing up for the consultation information at the MSDC website. The cost of the flyers was negligible at around £15 and paid for from the promotions budget.

Notes from the St Johns Park Working Group 03.07.25 12 noon

Present: Janice Henwood (Chair), Bob Foster, Andy Stowe, Peter Williams and Adam White.

Officer: Julie Holden

- 1- Cllr Henwood shared the emails that she had received from the District Council inviting the Town Council to reply to their stakeholder engagement, confirming the budget allocation and current brief timetable for consultation.*
- 2- Cllr Henwood suggested that the stakeholders may need widening, the police should be included along with representatives of the youth groups, schools and nurseries. It was also important to ensure that the views of the young people so far gathered (youth council) were taken seriously. Julie will get contacts for the youth groups so that we can pass these to MSDC to request that they include them.*
- 3- It was noted that the feedback form was somewhat inadequate, however whether we could do our own publicity and or consultation would need approval from MSDC if we want it to be fed in officially so this will need careful handing as to the approach to MSDC.*
- 4- There was consideration as to how we could publicise over the summer at the wowzer Wednesdays and move it Mondays and other events in the park and town centre where users of the park would be. It was suggested if MSDC were to put a notice in the park with a link to the consultation when this starts this could be very useful. It was also noted that the public consultation was not scheduled to take place until later in the year. The Working Group felt this was a missed opportunity as the main use of the park was summertime when the weather was at its best.*
- 5- Cllr Henwood asked the group to focus on the phase 1 which included the play area, skatepark and MUGA. Suggestions included:*
 - a. More lighting*
 - b. More seating (especially shaded) wooden or living roof over benches*
 - c. Youth hang out space to include WIFI and phone charging*

- d. *Skate park needs splitting in to two areas, younger children and a more challenging area for the older children. There is a skateboarding facility in Bridge Road HH, Julie will ask HHTC if they have a contact to pass along to MSDC.*
 - e. *MUGA area, keep it simple. It needs fencing and properly lined up for basketball (not just a basket) . The existing gym equipment in this space should be re-sited to the area by the tennis courts/ cricket pavilion for “warm up”*
 - f. *Water fountain (for drinking and refilling bottles) should be in the play area where benches are.*
 - g. *It was unclear as to whether The play park equipment was to be fully reprovisioned or added to. Either way the group would like to see :*
 - i. *Sensory equipment*
 - ii. *Disabled access play equipment (see saw)*
 - iii. *Monkey bars*
 - iv. *Net swiing*
 - v. *Overall it should be “distinctive play equipment”*
 - h. *Not in the play park but additionally a Zip wire was favoured*
 - 6- *The group agreed that when the Council submit their wishes, they will include the surveys from the Youth Council to underline their wishes.*
 - 7- *The group felt that additional publicity of the consultation, even at this early stage would be useful and Cllr Henwood would write to MSDC to ask if we could assist them by promoting the consultation, maybe designing our own feedback sheet and by encouraging the District to have a presence to show the masterplan and gauge feedback before detail plans were drawn up.*
 - 8- *The group felt MSDC should showcase the masterplan and the later consultation, this could be done via static displays in the help point, library or in the park itself*
- The meeting concluded at 1.05pm*

Notes from the St Johns park Working Party - 26th August 2025 12 noon

Present: Cllr J Henwood (chair), Cllr B Foster, Cllr A Stowe, Cllr A White

Apologies: Cllr P Williams

Notetaker : J Holden

The group went through the notes from the previous meeting and updated the action points. Chair also advised that Nicole Batten-Evatt the landscape architect from MSDC has offered to meet with the Chair and CEO in the first instance around the aspirations for the park and the ongoing consultation.

The group were asked to consider the responses to create our formal reply on the stakeholders questionnaire, but also to think specifically about phase 1 (playpark skatepark and MUGA).

From the previous notes it was agreed that our priorities would be:

- *More lighting generally*
- *Feeder pillars for electricity*
- *Solar powered lighting columns*
- *In the play park and skate park*
- *Along paths*
- *Benches and street furniture to have solar panel for USB charging*
- *Would support MUGA on masterplan map at point "5".*
- *Would want to see skate park improvements*
- *Would like existing outdoor gym equipment to move to the east of the tennis courts (between points 1&2)*
- *Water fountain*
- *Dog bins at each entrance to the park*
- *Covered bike park (in line with CCTV and needs to be secure) south of the car park*
- *Play equipment to include inclusive apparatus.*
- *Desired new play facilities to include Zip wire and a large slide*

The Group were undecided as to whether WIFI should be installed, the park is for recreation and should be an emphasis on physical recreation not scrolling on phones. Other members felt it was necessary to encourage youngsters out of their homes to the park. If WIFI was coming to the whole town, who should pay for this? The group would not want to see WIFI installation taking a lion share of the budget, but it was also noted that the budget is set for each phase and is not currently including wifi. Questions to ask MSDC, What is the current view on WIFI being installed across the town in open areas? How would this be funded? and is it even part of this project?

The meeting concluded at 1.12pm

The draft questionnaire response can be found at Appendix A

RECOMMENDATION: Council are asked to approve the Working Party's response for submission to Mid Sussex DC (Appendix A) and also to advise whether WIFI should be included in the request.

11 DELEGATED DECISIONS

Following the Strategic Development KAG of 28th July, the Chief Executive compiled and submitted the Council response to the Local Government Reorganisation, having first circulated it amongst members for comment.

The response is here:

Local Government Reorganisation Survey - Sussex

Burgess Hill Town Council would like to take the opportunity to respond to the consultation survey as to the proposals for Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) in West Sussex. We believe our response is better targeted via email, than a completion of the survey which is mostly geared at individuals rather than organisations, however we trust that you will find this response useful and will include it with the official number of responses.

Burgess Hill Town Council based in the heart of our town centre acts as a help point and conduit for council services across the County, where the public can report highways defects and other problems for us to pass along. As a result, we see a large number of residents on a daily basis. We are mindful how important local connections are for residents and access to services. We have a concern that LGR will result in a more remote Unitary Council. Our District Council is only 4 miles away in Haywards Heath but the County Council in Chichester seems a very long way for many. We would hope to see the retention of local offices, or the establishment of Local Neighbourhood Committees and where this is not either ideal or economically possible continued co-operation with the use of Town and Parish partners to help share information.

We are mindful that a more cost-effective option would be option A (a single unitary) however we have concerns as to this due to the caseloads that would be assigned to an individual Councillor and the much-reduced representation that our area would have. We appreciate the reduction in representation for two Unitaries will also be significant, but not as so as a single. Additionally, we have concerns that if our representatives are to be truly representative of the community the workload should not be a factor in encouraging or discouraging candidates to stand to serve.

Our preferred option for LGR, therefore is a two Unitary Council model, options B in the survey. We feel that this is the best fit for our community based on a larger middle of Sussex authority coalescing around the Gatwick hub. At this time the Town Council has no particular preference as to where the current Adur District would sit, this should very much be determined by the residents of Adur district depending on where they feel best aligned. We deduce from the options that the inclusion of this district in either model is not driven by population numbers and they could therefore go to either. We are content to wait for further data to help make the decision as to where the best fit for Adur is, in the model.

The Council feel strongly that every effort must be taken to ensure that this new model is transitioned to, as seamlessly as possible for residents and that residents understand where they can access information and see that efficiencies are produced from the exercise. We understand the concept behind the restructure and welcome elements which will remove confusion from residents as to who deals with which service. There are concerns that the process of reorganization will be expensive and not realise overall savings, the Council wish to be assured that the process to create unification will be as efficient as possible and savings will be seen early in to the new operating model.

Finally, the Council are keen that as much information be shared with the public as possible as this process continues. We would urge advice and updates be given through spaces such as existing Council buildings, the local libraries, leisure centres and town & parish councils. Places where people are going for other services, to heighten awareness of the proposals and changes.

We trust this response will be useful in your deliberations.

RECOMMENDATION: This was submitted before the deadline in August and Council are asked to note the submission.

12 COUNCIL POSITION ON PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION (PR)

Purpose of Report: To determine whether Council wish to adopt a position policy regarding Proportional Representation.

The matter of proportional representation was discussed as part of the local government reorganisation, however as this is a Political matter it would need to be a policy that this Council have adopted, to be included in any formal recommendation that was sent from the Council. As this Council have not as yet made a policy concerning PR this is brought forward for discussion and potentially an adoption of such a policy.

Current system:

At this present time: The House of Commons, mayoral elections in England, Police and Crime Commissioner elections and local councils in England and Wales use the **first-past-the-post** system. Voters select their preferred candidate. The candidate with the most votes wins.

Alternative Vote is used to elect:

- chairs of most committees in the House of Commons
 - the Lord Speaker and by-elections for hereditary peers.
- Voters rank candidates in order of preference by marking 1, 2, 3 and so on. A voter can rank as many or as few candidates as they like or vote for one candidate.

First preference votes are counted first. If a candidate receives more than 50 per cent of the first preference votes then they are elected. If no candidate reaches 50 per cent, the candidate with the fewest first preference votes is eliminated. Their second preference votes are reallocated to the remaining candidates. If one candidate has more votes than the other remaining candidates put together, that candidate is elected.

If not, the process is repeated until one candidate has more votes than the other remaining candidates put together. This candidate wins the election.

Single Transferable Vote (STV) is used for:

- Elections for Deputy Speakers in the House of Commons
- Northern Ireland Assembly elections
- Local elections in Scotland and Northern Ireland

STV was also used in Northern Ireland to elect Members of the European Parliament from 1979 to 2019.

Constituencies which elect more than one representative use STV. Voters rank candidates in order of preference by marking 1, 2, 3 and so on. A voter can rank as many or as few candidates as they like or vote for only one candidate.

Each candidate needs to reach a quota. This is the minimum number of votes calculated according to the number of seats and votes cast. The first preference votes for each candidate are added up. Candidates who achieve this quota are elected. Surplus votes from candidates who hit the quota go to second preference candidates. The candidate with the fewest first preference votes who do not achieve the quota are eliminated. Voters who voted for an eliminated candidate then have their votes transferred to their second preference. The process of transferring surpluses and second (or third, fourth, and so on) preferences continues until all vacant seats have been filled.

Additional Member System (AMS) is used by:

- the Scottish Parliament
- the Welsh Parliament
- the London Assembly

Voters are given two votes on separate ballot papers. One vote is for a constituency member and one vote is for a party list. In Scotland and Wales list members are elected by region. In London there is a single London-wide list.

Constituency votes are counted first and the members for each constituency are elected using **First-Past-The-Post**.

Additional members are then elected by counting the party list votes in each region. The number of members elected from the list is based on the percentage of the votes cast but also takes into account the number of constituency members already elected in the region. This is designed to make the result more proportional to the number of votes cast.

In contrast to these **Proportional Representation** is an electoral system in which the distribution of seats corresponds closely with the proportion of the total votes cast for each party. For example, if a party gained 40% of the total votes, a perfectly proportional system would allow them to gain 40% of the seats.

All definitions taken from the parliament UK website

(<https://www.parliament.uk/about/how/elections-and-voting/voting-systems/>)

Proportional Representations aim is that all votes cast contribute to the result so that each representative in an assembly is mandated by a roughly equal number of voters, and therefore all votes have equal weight. Under other election systems, a slight majority in a district – or even simply a plurality – is all that is needed to elect a member or group of members. PR systems provide balanced representation to different factions, usually defined by parties, reflecting how votes were cast. Where only a choice of parties is allowed, the seats are allocated to parties in proportion to the vote tally or *vote share* each party receives.

Some PR systems do not necessitate the use of parties. The most widely used families of PR electoral systems are party-list PR, used in 85 countries; mixed-member PR (MMP), used in 7 countries; and the

single transferable vote (STV), used in 4 countries including Ireland. Proportional representation systems are used at all levels of government.

Council Position:

While this Council cannot change the electoral mechanism used to elect the Burgess Hill Town Council and must obey the law of the land, if the Council wishes to state as a policy matter that it would favour a different system of election should the matter be put to consultation, it may adopt a policy. This will inform officers should an opportunity come about to comment on such a matter from Central or Local Government.

Recommendation: Council to consider whether they wish to adopt a policy to state that *Burgess Hill Town Council would support electoral reform to introduce proportional representation at all levels of Government.*

13 ALLOTMENT TENANCIES

Purpose of the Report: Due to the timing of sending out new tenancy agreements, the following changes have not been able to progress through the Customer Service KAG but have been brought straight to Council. The agreements go out in October, following the recent Allotment working party some amendments have been suggested in order to encourage good order in leaving a plot, or being able to reclaim the cost of making a plot good if it is not left in a re-lettable condition.

The below changes to the tenancy agreement are therefore proposed, text in red is new text and text in blue is amended text.

Clause 1. Rent and Agreement –

- g. Within the first three months the tenant is within a probationary period. If the tenant chooses to return the allotment to the Council during this period, the tenant will have to return the plot in a condition suitable for reletting.

If the tenant undertakes no significant work (no less than 40% cultivation) to a plot within the first three months of receiving the plot, then the tenancy will be terminated, and the plot returned to the Council for re-letting. In such instances of termination, there will be no return of the rental and a charge will be made for the plot to be cleared ready for re-letting. (Please see clause 9 j).

Clause 6. Nuisance, Bonfires and other Restrictions

- g. Tenants should ensure that their composting does not encourage vermin. If pest control is required to deal with vermin due to food waste the Tenant may be charged.

Tenants should ensure that their composting does not encourage vermin. [If pest control is required to deal with vermin, this will be the responsibility of the Tenant to arrange and settle costs. The Council will need to be informed prior to any pest control being used on site.](#)

Clause 9. Notice and Termination

- a. A Tenant may voluntarily relinquish their plot at any time, or have their tenancy terminated for breach of the tenancy agreement before the rental year end but no rebate will be payable unless the plot is surrendered within the initial 3-month period. [\(Please see clause 1 g\).](#)
- j. Upon termination the Tenant must give up possession and use of the allotment at the end of the tenancy in a state suitable for immediate re-letting. Should any works be required to return the allotment plot to a workable condition, the existing Tenant will be charged to bring the plot to an acceptable standard. Any personal property, structure, produce or other items remaining on the plot or site, seven days after the termination of the tenancy will be assigned to any new Tenant or removed and the cost of removal recharged to the Tenant.

Upon termination the Tenant must give up possession and use of the allotment at the end of the tenancy in a state suitable for immediate re-letting. [If a plot is left in an unlettable state, then the outgoing Tenant will be charged for the clearance which is currently estimated at £500 to £1000. Notice of this charge will be given within 8 weeks of the end of tenancy.](#) Any personal property, structure, produce or other items remaining on the plot or site, seven days after the termination of the tenancy will be assigned to any new Tenant. [A plot will be deemed as unlettable if three prospective tenants refuse the plot due to its condition.](#)

Clause 13. Tenants of Gatehouse Lane Allotments only

The Tenant must sign that they have been issued with, read and understood the 'avoiding danger from overhead power lines' booklet and understands that the Council accepts no responsibility for accidents occurring from the electricity pylon overhead cables.

[By signing the Tenancy Agreement the Tenant confirms that they are in receipt of UK Power Networks 'Look up Look out' information guide and have read, understood and will comply. The Council accepts no responsibility for accidents occurring from the electricity pylon overhead cables.](#)

- a. The lease on this allotment site will terminate on 31 December 2026. **A new lease ending 31 December 2030, is currently awaiting signatures.**

RECOMMENDATION : To approve the changes to the tenancy agreements to allow them to be issued.

14 COST OF LIVING RISE FOR STAFF MEMBERS

Purpose of the Report: For Council to note the cost-of-living payrise for staff salaries from 1st April 2025 was agreed.

The cost-of-living rise was agreed between the Government and unions on 24th July this year. The rise was 3.2% and backdated to the 1st April 2025. The Unions also gave notice that they would start negotiations in the autumn to hopefully agree the 2026/27 rise before the start of the new year.

RECOMMENDATION: This is for the Council to note.

15 DIARY DATES

To note the dates of forthcoming meetings and notable dates

OCTOBER		
Planning Committee	Monday 6 October	19.00 hours
Planning Committee	Monday 27 October	19.00 hours
Customer Service Key Area Group	Tuesday 28 th October	19.00 hours
NOVEMBER		
Finance Key Area Group	Monday 10 November	18.30 hours
Planning Committee	Monday 17 November	19.00 hours
Council	Monday 24 November	19.00 hours

Christmas Lights Switch On - Saturday 22 November

Christmas Market - Thursday 11 - Sunday 14 December

Agenda item 9 - St Johns Working Party - Questionnaire

Mid Sussex District Council – Stakeholder site knowledge feedback

Proposed Landscape Improvements at St Johns Park, Burgess Hill

Completed By	<i>St Johns Park Working Group - Burgess Hill Town Council</i>
Date	28.08.25

Your views of the park/play area

1. Have you had any dealings with this park or the surrounding area in the last 5 years?

YES	NO
------------	----

If yes, please provide details:

The Town Council arranges events throughout the year eg: national celebrations/ beacon lightings/ Summer Fayre / Move it Mondays (tennis) / skateboarding

2. Are you aware of any other organisations that may have an interest in this park?

There are many, Cricket Club, Volleyballers, tennis coaching/ MSDC better young live Glendale (Council contractor for maintenance) and their community volunteer groups who assist with planting and care of flower beds.
--

Current use

3. Are there any issues in or around the park you think we need to be aware of?

There is a lack of litter / dog bins at the entry points to the park. There is insufficient lighting making the park less desirable during winter afternoons There is a lack of seating near the playpark for parents The length of time for repairs to equipment at play and skate park is not acceptable. The length of time to remove graffiti from play equipment gives a feeling of lack of care.
--

Suggestions for improvement

4. Are you aware of any planned works, events or changes at this park that we should be aware of?

The Cricket Club has aspirations for the development of the Cricket pavilion
--

Town Council events are programmed annually, when works are to be planned please can we have as much notice of disruption or removal of access to allow venues to be changed.

5. Do you have any thoughts about how this park works well or how we could improve it?

We think the existing pathways are good, we don't favour more tarmac to provide more.

The northwest area of the park (marked 8,9 and 15 on masterplan) does not need more trees. This is the area primarily used for events and trees may be damaged while young and later cause obstructions. Welcome trees to give shade to seating areas rather than in this area.

Improvements for phase 1 of the plan :

Play area - a good mix of equipment which is distinctive and inclusive including a big slide and a zip wire (as supported by the Youth Council).

MUGA- the proposed site is good, we are supportive of this facility. We would suggest the green gym equipment is relocated to the area east of the tennis courts between areas 1&2 on the masterplan.

Skatepark: We would like to see wider appeal for the skatepark to encourage beginners through to more advanced users, to cater for all ages and abilities.

General improvements looking at the masterplan:

Looking at the various projects as part of the masterplan we have the following comments that we would like considering:

Park entrances: we think the pathways are good connections through the park and we would not wish to see a large increase of tarmac. We would welcome more dog bins and litter bins

We support the need for drainage improvements

We support the need for the new MUGA

We support the enhancement of the skatepark

We Support the need for enhancing the public toilet provision, disabled toilets are needed

We support the need to enhance the community plaza public realm

We support the need for new picnic areas in the park but are not sure that the park would benefit from BBQ provision.

More specific requests for the overall project:

- More lighting generally;
 - Solar powered lighting columns
 - In the play park and skate park
 - Along paths
- Feeder pillars for electricity for events
- Benches and street furniture to have solar panel for USB charging
- Water fountain
- Covered bike park (in line with CCTV and needs to be secure) south of the car park

The working party have previously provided the views of the youth council regarding their thoughts regarding upgrading the park. We enclose them again with the Town Council response for your interest.