

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5407/P	Ron Cook	7 Wrentham Avenue London NW10 3HT	13/05/2025 20:33:07	INT	The gardeners building is far too big, and will intrude on the graves nearby. A very close friend of mine is buried right next to the proposed building. And this is causing great concern and distress to his family. It will also block any sense of openness in the cemetery.
2024/5407/P	Eli Watson	38 Estelle Road London NW3 2JY	13/05/2025 21:05:20	OBJ	<p>I am writing in objection to the proposed Gardeners' Building on the East Side.</p> <p>1. Emotional Objections</p> <p>The Mound is a sacred and reflective space. In my view, the Gardeners' building would be in violation of the spiritual sanctity of this place. Furthermore, many grave owners, including my father, were not consulted before the application was made, which overlooks key stakeholders as part of the plans. This feels very disappointing and hurtful. It also feels as if commercialisation is being prioritised over maintaining the calm and respectful atmosphere of this area of the cemetery.</p> <p>2. Visual and Heritage Impact</p> <p>The proposed Gardeners' Building will be an eye sore. The design will be incongruous with the historic and tranquil setting of this Grade I listed cemetery. The building would obstruct views from the Mound and would overshadow graves.</p> <p>3. Concerns about logistics</p> <p>The construction of the site appears to be unworkable due to the narrow access paths and proximity to fragile graves. In addition, the operational use of the gardeners' building (including staff areas, toilets, storage, workshop, kitchen and vehicles) is incompatible with the active cemetery's tranquility. Staff traffic, workshop and engine noise and smells of diesel fumes and cooking would disrupt mourners and degrade the environment of the Mound.</p> <p>4. Planning issues</p> <p>The lack of consultation of grave owners at an early stage in making the plans is a real failure. Many of us, as grave owners and loved ones of grave owners, only found out via word of mouth. Transparency has been lacking throughout the planning process. Furthermore, these plans could be in breach of Metropolitan Open Land protections and Grade I listed status guidelines.</p> <p>5. Suggestions for Alternatives</p> <p>I have been informed that other objectors are proposing alternative locations for the Gardeners' Building to relocate it to a less sensitive area, such as near existing maintenance facilities and/or the southern perimeter of the cemetery. This would ensure that the very actively visited Mound site would be preserved in its tranquility. It would also be advisable for the building to use more discreet landscaping features in order to have a lesser visual impact.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5407/P	Tania Stok	202 Alexander Park Road London N227UQ	13/05/2025 13:02:21	OBJ	<p>I am a grave owner of my recently deceased Father and Mother. Our family grave will be profoundly affected by the proposed development, it is on the mound which is an area full of the most recent burials within the Cemetery and therefore a very personal, painful, reflective and impactful area for many families who have their beloved relatives buried there and will be right next to the proposed building and toilets, yet alone a substantial building site.</p> <p>We as grave owners have not been informed of this application, which is truly shocking as we are the ones who are going to be deeply affected.</p> <p>In 2013 we were shown various available plots throughout the Old and New cemetery, and after considerable consideration decided with my then alive father that the mound would be a beautiful resting place for our beloved mother due to its tranquility, the setting, raised on a hill overlooking trees, nature and the graves below full of birdsong, peace, privacy and beautiful views and that it would be a beautiful final and appropriate resting place in her beloved Highgate Cemetery.</p> <p>We would never ever have chosen this plot had we felt there would be a threat of a large scale building being built completely adjacent to their grave, I am extremely upset about this proposal.</p> <p>Our grave is very close to the pathway with beautiful views into the trees and is bathed in sunlight and has an open feeling and it is a stunning and peaceful place to visit and reflect and feel close to my beloved parents.</p> <p>It I is extremely painful and feels extremely shocking and unacceptable for us to contemplate our parents sanctuary being completely destroyed, and without being consulted, surely all the grave owners on the mound and adjacent to the site should have been the first to be consulted.</p> <p>I read in the comments many positive approvals, these do not seem to be from people who are directly affected with their loved ones graves on the mound.</p> <p>Please, please could an alternative site be considered.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5407/P	Matthew Fielden	128 MERCERS ROAD LONDON N19 4PU	13/05/2025 23:42:29	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir / Madam,</p> <p>I am writing to formally object to Planning Application 2024/5407/P. Specifically, the proposal to build a new Gardeners' Building on the Mound.</p> <p>My sister is buried on the Mound and my parents have the plot next to her.</p> <p>I have two points to make.</p> <p>Firstly, I was surprised and saddened to learn of the proposal to build a new Gardeners' Building on the Mound. In a place as large as Highgate Cemetery why choose to locate a works facility, garage, mess and toilet etc. right up against an area where there are new graves and ongoing remembrance and mourning? This is clearly insensitive and unnecessary.</p> <p>From briefly reading the Design and Access Statement Volume 3, it would seem that The Trust is privileging the overall aesthetics of the Cemetery and the practical requirements of the gardeners, volunteers and visitors over the sanctity of the Mound as a public burial ground and place of ongoing remembrance and mourning.</p> <p>It also brings the three aims of the Friends of Highgate Cemetery Trust into conflict with each other raising questions about overall stewardship.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to preserve Highgate Cemetery as a place of historic and other interest and beauty; 2. to permit the Cemetery to be used as a public burial ground; and 3. to secure the repair, restoration and preservation of the Cemetery for the public benefit. <p>The Design and Access Statement Volume 3 itself recognises the problem, stating 'one of the challenges for Gardeners' Building is its isolated & contextually sensitive location - surrounded by a (sic) what is still a functioning Cemetery - yet still provide essential amenities for the day-to-day operations of the site'. I would argue this brings the very Concept of a new Gardeners' Building on the Mound into question and that the proposal needs to be stopped and an alternative more suitable location found.</p> <p>More broadly, the Design and Access Statement Volume 3 states 'The Architectural Masterplan is comprised of two parts: improvements to existing buildings and a series of new buildings. Both are underpinned with an approach to improve the use of the Cemetery by its users - Grave Owner, Visitors, Staff & Volunteers. Existing buildings largely opened up to the public and new buildings designed to sit sensitively and carefully into this significant setting' (p.18).</p> <p>As the son and brother of Grave Owners I feel that the proposal to build a new Gardeners' Building on the Mound does not improve my use of the Cemetery. I feel that the new building (as a works facility etc.) will by definition not sit sensitively and carefully into the significant setting of the Mound.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>Secondly, I was disappointed to see that this proposal has been in development for some years and consulted on previously (PPA process) and yet I only found out about the proposal and the current consultation from another Grave Owner in mid-April. The signs on the Mound are very recent and as far as I'm aware Highgate Cemetery has made no effort to gather and consult Grave Owners as a constituency - this is a serious and disappointing oversight which raises questions over the integrity of the consultation process.</p> <p>The Highgate Cemetery Statement of Community Involvement November 2024 by Steve McAdam states that 'Effective consultation and engagement on a project of such distinctiveness as the conservation of Highgate Cemetery needed to ensure that great care was taken to include the appropriate experts, historians, visitors, grave owners and local residents' (p.15) - this has clearly not happened in relation to the proposal to build a new Gardeners' Building on the Mound - which is a breach of trust with the Grave Owners there.</p> <p>Please reject this application in relation to a new Gardeners' Building on the Mound. I urge the Highgate Cemetery Board of Trustees and Executive to consider the views of Grave Owners and reconsider their plans.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Matthew Fielden</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5407/P	Edward Hall	Hampstead Theatre Eton Ave London NW3 3EU	14/05/2025 02:07:38	OBJ	<p>To: Camden Council Planning Department Re: Objection to Planning Application 2024/5407/P – Proposed Gardeners' Building at Highgate Cemetery (Project 6)</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I am writing to submit a formal and deeply felt objection to Planning Application 2024/5407/P, which proposes the construction of a new Gardeners' Building on the Mound at Highgate Cemetery. As someone with a close family member buried on the Mound, I must express both personal distress and a broader set of serious concerns regarding this plan. While I understand the cemetery's need for functional updates, this proposal is incompatible with the heritage, ecology, spiritual atmosphere, and core purpose of Highgate Cemetery. It reflects a worrying drift toward commercialisation and operational convenience at the expense of the site's sanctity and the trust of families and mourners.</p> <p>1. Visual Intrusion and Incompatible Design</p> <p>The proposed building is visually and architecturally discordant with its Grade I listed surroundings. Its height—rising 5 metres above the Mound and nearly 8 metres above the lower path—is excessive. Its industrial features (including roller shutters, loading bays, staircases, and concrete façade) are out of place in a cemetery of national historic importance. The building's bulk and modernity would dominate and overshadow the Mound, obstructing established sightlines to graves, trees, and sky, and permanently damaging the character of the landscape. The cemetery's visual renderings do not truthfully reflect the impact of the proposal. The photomontages include distorted human figures and angles that downplay the structure's true scale. This misrepresentation undermines public confidence and prevents a fair understanding of the proposal's consequences.</p> <p>2. Emotional and Spiritual Harm</p> <p>The Mound is not just a topographic feature; it is a sacred, active area of mourning with some of the cemetery's most recent graves, including those of children. Many families, like mine, visit regularly for quiet reflection. The installation of a large operational facility—with public access, elevated walkways, vehicle bays, and even a viewing platform—profoundly violates the atmosphere of reverence and sanctuary that mourners depend upon. The inclusion of a viewing platform is especially inappropriate. It suggests a commercial or touristic motive that sits uncomfortably within a space of grief. Highgate Cemetery is not, and must never become, a theme park. Furthermore, families who purchased graves on the Mound were assured it would remain undisturbed. The current proposal represents not only a breach of this assurance but a rupture of trust and an ethical failure in stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>3. Accessibility and Safety Concerns</p> <p>The proposed development would significantly reduce the main pedestrian path—currently the only access route—to as little as 1.2 metres. This is plainly inadequate for wheelchair users or those accompanying them, and creates a genuine safety hazard given the proximity to elevated structures and construction equipment. During the construction phase, the entire area would likely be inaccessible. This will deny mourners the ability to visit and tend graves for a prolonged period—a distressing and unacceptable consequence for an active burial site.</p> <p>4. Environmental and Heritage Impact</p> <p>The proposed structure would eliminate existing green space, including an established wildflower bank, alter the Mound's microclimate by casting deep shadows, and make it</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>significantly harder for grave owners to maintain planting schemes.</p> <p>These changes are directly at odds with the cemetery's listing status and its designation as Metropolitan Open Land. Planning policies that safeguard openness, ecological sensitivity, and historical integrity would be compromised. Shadow diagrams and environmental assessments requested by the public have not been transparently provided, raising additional concerns about procedural integrity.</p> <p>5. Operational Suitability and Location</p> <p>Functionally, the Mound is a poor location for an operational hub. The footpaths are narrow and the terrain fragile. The presence of vehicles and operational staff will necessarily increase noise, traffic, and wear—conditions unsuitable for a site of mourning. The inclusion of staff toilets, showers, and commercial service features within such close proximity to graves is not only inappropriate but disrespectful.</p> <p>Alternative solutions have been proposed and should be revisited, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanding existing facilities at the East Cemetery entrance; • Relocating operations to less sensitive peripheral areas; • Employing low-impact, demountable structures; • Refurbishing underused storage and garage areas. <p>6. Lack of Consultation and Procedural Failures</p> <p>Many family members were not adequately notified of the application in a timely or direct manner. Notices were sent as late as March, and the consultation process appears to have prioritised gaining supportive comments from unrelated stakeholders while excluding those most affected. This selective engagement has fostered mistrust and considerable resentment among families.</p> <p>7. Erosion of Ethical Responsibilities</p> <p>At the heart of this objection lies a question of custodianship. Highgate Cemetery is a site of national significance—but also of deep personal meaning to those who have entrusted loved ones to its care. A development of this nature should not proceed without the full and informed participation of the people it most directly affects. It is ethically indefensible to prioritise operational or commercial interests over the integrity of graves and the wellbeing of mourners.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The Gardeners' Building, as proposed, would cause irreversible harm to the character, accessibility, ecology, and sacred atmosphere of Highgate Cemetery. It is a dissonant intrusion into one of the most vulnerable and emotionally significant areas of the site. There are alternative, practical, and more sensitive ways to meet operational needs—ways that do not violate the cemetery's spirit, duty of care, or planning protections. I respectfully urge Camden Council to reject this planning application and call for a transparent, inclusive, and heritage-led rethink of how to accommodate operational needs without sacrificing the trust and peace of grieving families.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5407/P	Marek Stok	19 Burlington Road Enfield En2 0ll	13/05/2025 11:13:54	OBJ	<p>My parents are buried on the mound.</p> <p>I object to the proposed building next to it. The grave site was specifically chosen by my father while he was alive for the views and tranquility. Having a large building next to it would completely change that character and the idea of large scale construction and possible disturbance of the grave is distressing. I also fail to understand why a toilet would be proposed to be built next to an active burial site, this seems particularly insensitive.</p> <p>I am also saddened that no contact was made by the cemetery regarding this proposal. The gardeners building & toilet should be sited elsewhere and not immediately adjacent to an area full of recent graves.</p>
2024/5407/P	Charlotte Evans	20 south Luton place Cardiff CF240EX	13/05/2025 10:11:14	COMMNT	<p>To planning,</p> <p>I object to the building of a gardeners building by my fathers grave because as visitors and gardeners will use the building this will interrupt my grieving at my fathers grave.</p> <p>At present the mound is peaceful and tranquil and we have a nice view of the cemetery around us. Building this gardeners building and toilet will result in lots of people around my fathers grave which will make me feel very uncomfortable. Please could they build it somewhere else on the site and secure the mound wall in another way.</p>