

Dear Ian Dungavell,

could you please clarify something for me?

How many grave owners on the mound were actually contacted during the planning process and informed about your plans before the request for planning permission was submitted? I ask because not a single grave owner I have been in touch with had any idea before your letter sent at the end of March.

A joint meeting would allow grave owners access to opinions other than the ones you are presenting to them. As you are already aware, it is the opinion of others that the design for the gardener's building is based on a number of incorrect assumptions and that the visual representation paints a distorted picture of the actual situation that will ensue.

Grave owners who do not wish to participate in a joint meeting could continue to treat this as a private matter but at least they would have been introduced to dissenting opinion via an invitation explaining the reasons for a joint meeting. Such a meeting should have in my opinion been convened before you submitted the application.

I very much appreciate the urgent need to address the challenges facing the cemetery. However, there is never just one feasible solution to an issue and attempts to find one more palatable to those most intimately impacted by the proposals would seem advisable.

My objection is to the gardeners's building in front of the mound only. I personally find the sense of enclosure the proposal is creating more akin to being consigned to the backyard and excluded from the cemetery as such. I know a large number of grave owners feel the same. Hiding the graves of the recently deceased behind a two storey building does not seem in line with retaining the cemetery as a functioning burial ground.

Best Wishes
Anna Seifert-Speck