

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5407/P	Jeremy Watson	38 Estelle Road London NW3 2JY	14/05/2025 17:03:12	OBJ	<p>From: Jeremy Watson 38 Estelle Road NW3 2JY [REDACTED]</p> <p>I would like to OBJECT to the planning application 2024/5407/P. Personally I was abroad visiting elderly relatives when the March 28th email was sent (itself as a result of grave owner pressure) and I am coming late to this. More time needs to be given for us to digest the ~700 pages of application PDFs. I expect to revise the text of this objection given the time.</p> <p>Procedural concerns - Failure to Consult As a key stakeholder – a grave owner on The Mound, immediately adjacent to the “Project 6” euphemistically known as the Gardeners’ Building, also appearing as the “Gardeners’ Vehicle Garage” – I am astounded that I was not notified or consulted when this application was initially published on Dec 3rd 2024. This appears to be the case for ALL the other mound grave owners. Our invoice for the mound plot was received by email in 2021 so clearly the Trust had our details from the start. I gather that it took meetings and pressure for the March 28th 2025 email to be sent – months after the formal consultation period had ended in January. We were clearly deliberately excluded from the consultation. Meanwhile insiders, who will likely benefit from the new kitchens, showers, toilets and office with its impressive stolen view, submitted their “support” notices back in January.</p> <p>When a neighbour applies for planning permission for dormer window, I get notifications on lampposts etc, and often also by post. However as effectively a 75-year leaseholder on the Mound, in a Grade 1 listed public cemetery (Historic parks & gardens), with the Grade 1 Marx monument only 70 metres away, I was not even notified. This is despite the project having been running since 2019. Clearly the Trust has our details and bears most of the responsibility, but it seems that Camden Council should also have an obligation to ensure notification of key stakeholders. The consultation period should therefore be extended (again?) so that all key stakeholders can be properly informed and consulted.</p> <p>Apparently where there were posters, they were placed far from the mound, until very recently. Where owners have attempted to leave information for other owners, this has been deliberately removed.</p> <p>The visualisations supplied are insufficient, and angles and scales reduce the apparent impact compared to the reality of the proposal. Amir has kindly provided some scale using architect’s measuring poles and rough visualisations of his own.</p> <p>More time needs to be given for more faithful representations of the impact to be created, distributed, and consulted on.</p> <p>Mound Graves date later than 2005 The cemetery has an area of 37 acres; having walked most of the perimeter my impression is that a large proportion of this, especially in the southern end of the East cemetery, is occupied by 100+-year-old grave stones which have lost most of their lettering and appear to all intents and purposes abandoned and forgotten by their associated families (indeed efforts by the cemetery have failed to trace putative owners). The mound on the other hand has only been populated since 2005: this is visible in satellite photos. So clearly the mound plot owners are far more engaged than those with plots dating from the 19th century.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>Demographic Profile of Grave Owners - Younger</p> <p>The mound plots were also extremely expensive, meaning that many of them, such as our own, were purchased for people dying young, in the prime of life, with wide circles of friends and relations, justifying the huge expense. In effect many occupants are children and siblings of owners, rather than parents and grandparents. The demographic profile of owners, relatives and friends visiting the graves is therefore much younger, which means we will be visiting much further into the future. This means that the impact of the new Tractor Shed & Toilet Block will last much longer and affect more people.</p> <p>Alternative Locations</p> <p>There also appears to be a 8 – 10m wide strip of unoccupied land alongside Stoneleigh Terrace, over 100m in length, low-lying and undesirable for grave usage, which could be better used for the various storage & accommodation purposes ascribed to Project 6. The strip also has an existing access. A handful of 100+yo graves could be recovered in order to widen the access and the strip. Part of the area has already been identified for skip storage (D&A Vol 2 - S3.6 Maintenance, Skips, & Storage Areas - P23).</p> <p>Inappropriate massing and form</p> <p>Like many others I object to the incongruous building in the sensitive cemetery setting – more sensitive given that the mound contains recent graves.</p> <p>Obstruction of key views and site lines</p> <p>The 2019 Conservation Plan itself lists the view from the interior of the mound as a historic view to be preserved (D&A Vol 2 P9 Historic Views). The new building blocks the view along most of the length of the mound, placing it with a view of “aggregated layered concrete”, metal railings, steel security gates and steps.</p> <p>Privatisation of the existing public view over public space</p> <p>Bizarrely, the public mound view which will be blocked, is recreated and presented as the view from the new offices. (P95 D&A vol 1)</p> <p>Perhaps disingenuously the mound is marked as “Grave Owners Only” but the view is essentially open to the public, and the sign is presumably to be removed once all the plots are occupied.</p> <p>Shading and environmental effects</p> <p>Many of the graves will be shaded in the winter by the new building.</p> <p>Noise and Activity</p> <p>The Tractor Shed and Workshop will inevitably generate significant noise and disturbance adjacent to this area of increased sensitivity. There will be vehicle manoeuvres, workshop noise, staff chatter, people stepping out to make phone calls, smoke and drink coffee. While all this may need to take place somewhere, it’s entirely inappropriate to place it next to the new graves, when alternative less sensitive locations are available.</p> <p>Access</p> <p>The mound perimeter path is currently just about adequate; however the proposal appears to narrow it and place seating benches alongside the narrowed stretch, which will have the effect of</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					excluding wheelchairs users or embarrass them by forcing them to ask seated people to move.
					<p>Loss of Tranquillity and Solitude</p> <p>The bulk of visitors to the mound are relatively new mourners. The structure looks utilitarian and is clearly facing away from the mound, dishonouring its users. The diagrams list various extractor fans for the toilets and kitchen, and an Air-Source Heat Pump, which will all generate unwelcome droning mechanical noise.</p>
					<p>Metropolitan Open Land</p> <p>As I understand it the cemetery is designated MOL. The Gardeners' tractor shed toilets workshop and offices clearly contravene the MOL guidelines.</p>
					<p>Grade 1 listed Landscape Character</p> <p>The existing landscape separates service buildings from burial grounds. The proposed garage is located immediately adjacent to active burials, and partitions those graves from the rest of the cemetery. It is fundamentally incompatible with the heritage values of the cemetery.</p>
					<p>Camden Panel Concerns ignored</p> <p>The Camden Design Panel has explicitly raised concerns about the Gardeners' Tractor Shed and its effect on openness, but the proposals have moved forward unchanged. The CDP calls for maintenance and support buildings to be located near the periphery not in its active heart.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5407/P	William Watson	38 Estelle Road London NW3 2JY	14/05/2025 17:27:26	OBJ	<p>William Watson 38 Estelle Road London NW3 2JY [REDACTED]</p> <p>I would like to object to the Highgate Cemetery planning application. My mother was buried in a Mound plot only 4 years ago aged 54 and yet we were not notified or consulted, let alone involved in the planning process. Specifically, Project 6 the “Gardener’s Building” impinges on our frequent visits to my mother’s grave. My grandfather is gravely ill and owns the plot adjacent to hers; we expect to be spending a lot of time there. I have numerous concerns, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of consultation, procedural failings Visual impact and “massing” of the rectangular building Noise of the proposed vehicle movements and workshop Extractor fans from the toilets, kitchen, showers, and Air Source Heat Pump. Blocking public view over the east cemetery and limiting it to occupants of the offices. Narrowing the path around the mound so it is no longer sufficiently accessible. <p>We were only notified recently by other mound grave owners. I am in my mid-20s and expect to be visiting the Mound over the next 50 or more years. I cannot understand the level of insensitivity and underhandedness which has guided the process of planning and proposing this ugly noisy building adjacent to one of the most sensitive spots in the 37 acres of the cemetery. More time needs to be allocated to allow all of us associated with graves in the mound to fully assess the proposals and properly lay out our objections. I understand that the cemetery is grade 1 listed and I don’t understand how a building separating the most actively used part of the cemetery off from the rest can possibly be contemplated by the planning authorities. I’m told that the Camden Design Panel has raised concerns of its own but this building has remained in the plans essentially unchanged. From my frequent visits to the cemetery there seem to be many more appropriate locations for the vehicle storage and staff facilities either close to the entrance, in the West Cemetery as currently, or down in the south of the East cemetery where there is a long unoccupied strip adjacent to a band of apparently abandoned graves. Is there an ulterior unstated intention to rent out the new building with its “prime” views over the interior of the cemetery? Looking at the early statements of support they all seem to be insiders who will no doubt benefit personally from access to the new offices and facilities for their own events. Is this why it isn’t proposed in a more obscure, peripheral, less prominent and sensitive spot?</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5407/P	Julia Hogben	9 Rookfield Avenue	14/05/2025 23:21:01	PETITNO BJE	<p>I am a friend of a grave owner whose beloved wife, and my friend, is buried on the Mound. I have read the objections to planning application which other Mound grave owners have submitted online.</p> <p>I too object to the proposed erection of a Gardeners Building near the Mound. As proposed, both during its construction and when it is in use, it will significantly disturb the tranquility and beauty of the Mound and the beautiful views from it that bereaved grave owners and their families find comfort in. Whilst it is crucial to accommodate facilities to enable staff and volunteers to maintain Highgate Cemetery and to make it hospitable to volunteers and visitors, surely the Cemetery's essence is as a sanctuary in which the dead may rest in peace, protected, respected and undisturbed, and in which their bereaved families may visit, also respected and undisturbed. The proposed building will make both impossible.</p> <p>In addition to objecting to the proposed Gardeners building, I consider that Camden Council's actions in relation to this planning application have failed to comply with its statutory duty as regards the planning process.</p> <p>Camden Council has a duty to consider whether there are planning policy reasons to engage other consultees who – whilst not designated in law – are likely to have an interest in a proposed development (non-statutory consultees).</p> <p>Camden Council's Statement of Community Involvement April 2024 states it will involve key stakeholders when it considers planning applications. The Mound grave owners are clearly key stakeholders in this application and Camden Council's decision not to consult them is unreasonable.</p> <p>Camden Council has failed to follow the principles and guidelines in its Statement of Community Involvement April 2024. It has failed to engage - as key stakeholders – the Mound grave owners. By failing to consult the Mound grave owner key stakeholders how can Camden “ensure that new development responds positively and sensitively to local context and character ... and that the right uses are provided in the right place”? (Statement of Community Involvement April 2024).</p> <p>Camden Council has failed to seek views of the Mound grave owners at the earliest possible stages and throughout the planning process to ensure that communities have the best chance of positively influencing decisions. (Statement of Community Involvement April 2024).</p> <p>Camden Council has a statutory duty to consult with a number of local organisations including Neighbourhood Forums (Statement of Community Involvement, Appendix 3). Neighbourhood Forums represent the people in the area directly affected by a planning application. Highgate Cemetery does not have a Neighbourhood Forum but in this case the equivalent people most closely affected by this planning application are the Mound grave owners and, on this ground also, Camden Council should have consulted them.</p> <p>For these reasons, amongst others, I object to the construction of the proposed Gardeners Building and to the planning process in this case.</p>
		N10 3TS			

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5407/P	Nicholas Taylor	20 Makepeace Avenue N6 6EJ N6 6EJ	14/05/2025 15:03:36	OBJNOT	<p>I have already commented on this application but I have recently undertaken some measurements on site to understand better the impact of the proposed Gardeners Building on the Platform</p> <p>I refer you to Hopkins' drawing no. HGC HAL GB ZZ DR A, revision PO1. The drawing subject is Project 6 Gardeners' Building Sections</p> <p>The short section North shows the footpath on top of the Platform having a width of 1200mm. At present the footpath is 1550mm wide. Thus the footpath, which is the ONLY means of access for people visiting the graves at the Platform, will be reduced by 350mm</p> <p>You may think this is only a small reduction. However, note that the grave of Dr Goodchild, for example, is only 280mm from the eastern edge of the footpath. Other graves are also very close to the footpath</p> <p>I think that a building which rises 3.5m above the footpath and is only about 1.3m from the graves will be extremely obtrusive. It will harm the tranquil and verdant atmosphere which visitors to the Platform (myself and my family included) enjoy</p> <p>I note that the gardeners currently rely on shipping containers, which is clearly sub standard. I would have thought that it would be cheaper and certainly less harmful to locate the new gardeners' building in the same general location as the containers</p>
2024/5407/P	Agnieszka Slominska	1 Sandstone Place N19 5TU	14/05/2025 21:48:34	OBJ	<p>Objecting the large two story building to accommodate vehicles and offices by the Mound. The place is sacred to families whose loved ones rest near by as well as it's a place for meditation, prayer and reflection on life, death. The large building and vehicles will disturb the peace and tranquility of the place.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5407/P	TOM PIGOTT-SMITH	38 Crescent Rd	14/05/2025 09:53:51	OBJ	<p>Further to my objection of yesterday I quote from correspondence with Ian Dungavell (Chief Executive, Friends of Highgate Cemetery Trust who are behind this application)</p> <p>"Regarding planning consent, Camden Council will take into account all representations received up to the date of the planning committee meeting, which we expect might be in June"</p> <p>Comments in fact close today, 14/05/2025. This happens, coincidentally, to be the date of the Trust's AGM at which plans are being presented.</p> <p>This is further to the Trust's failure to notify grave owners on "the mound" that any planning application had been made, let alone one which would have such a direct impact on their loved ones' graves.</p> <p>We discovered in late April that an application had been made in December 2024 because other grave owners had spotted the application.</p> <p>There has been a systematic campaign by the Trust to withhold information and to mislead grave owners on the mound about the application.</p> <p>Even still, the gardeners are being instructed to clear away any materials from graves that give details about how to object to the application.</p> <p>I respectfully suggest that this be taken into account when officers review this application. There would be many more objections had this been open to genuine scrutiny by key stakeholders at an earlier date.</p> <p>Yours,</p> <p>Tom Pigott-Smith</p>
2024/5407/P	Judy & Brian Fielden	7 Chalcot Gardens London NW3 4YB	14/05/2025 13:22:07	OBJ	<p>From Judy & Brian Fielden, 7 Chalcot Gardens</p> <p>We are horrified to learn of building, and future usage proposals, which will affect the view, calm peace and serenity of The Mound section of Highgate Cemetery. In September 2021 no mention, or even thought of such a plan, by those in authority was made when, as anguished bereaved parents, we agreed with our beloved daughter's husband, children and brother that this would be the most suitable final resting place. One which we, family and friends might visit, tend her grave, mourn and spend some tranquil time. If any of the work in the vicinity of The Mound is permitted, future visits, from all who have loved ones buried there, will become even more stressful.</p>