

Southwark Council

Cemetery Strategy



April 2012

This Strategy has been co-ordinated and prepared by Harrison Design Development Ltd on behalf of Southwark Council with inputs from Julie Rugg of Cemetery Research Group (University of York) and Ron Dunn of Dunn and Co.

This Strategy has been developed in conjunction with the client team by Harrison Design Development, landscape architects and specialist cemetery designers, with inputs from the Cemetery Research Group at the University of York (Dr Julie Rugg) and Mr. Ron Dunn of Dunn and Co. bereavement specialists.

The Southwark client team has included Deborah McKenzie, Rebecca Towers, John Wade, and Avril Kirby, under the direction of Des Waters.

Contents

- Executive Summary
- Location Plan
- 1.0 Introduction, Scope
- 2.0 Background
- 3.0 The Cemeteries
- 4.0 Consultation
- 5.0 The Legal Framework
- 6.0 Cemetery Strategy – Short and Medium Term
- 7.0 Cemetery Strategy – Long Term
- 8.0 Risk, Costs
- 9.0 Next Steps

Figures

| | |
|---|------------|
| Figure 1 Historic Plot Overlay Camberwell Old | 048.02.09 |
| Figure 2 Historic Square Overlay Camberwell New | 048-02.09A |
| Figure 3 Short and Medium Term Options Camberwell Old | 048-02.05 |
| Figure 4 Short and Medium Term Options Camberwell New | 048-02.06 |
| Figure 5 Short and Long Term Options Camberwell Old | 048-02.07 |
| Figure 6 Short and Long Options Camberwell New | 048-02.08 |

Appendices

| | |
|------------|---|
| Appendix 1 | Historic Layout Plans |
| Appendix 2 | Greater London General Powers Act Section 9 |
| Appendix 3 | Sample Burial Data Camberwell New |
| Appendix 4 | Short and Medium Term Cost Illustrations |
| Appendix 5 | Short and Medium Term Options - Illustrations |
| Appendix 6 | Consultation Options - Illustrations |

Executive Summary

This Cemetery Strategy for Southwark Council seeks to address the chronic shortage of burial space in the borough. The Strategy focusses on practical options for burial within the current cemetery areas within Southwark but also takes account of potential options for burial outside of those areas.

This Strategy is informed by earlier studies commissioned by Southwark in respect of the cemeteries and also by the *Audit of London Burial Provision* (commissioned by the Greater London Authority and undertaken by the Cemetery Research Group, University of York in March 2011). The Audit revealed that in many London boroughs supply of burial space is becoming critical. In April 2011 a number of options to provide burial space were highlighted in a report to Southwark Council cabinet. The cabinet approved that these options should be pursued. Over the Summer of 2011 a programme of public consultation was carried out seeking views on future burial provision in the Borough.

This Strategy considers a range of options addressing short, medium and long term provision of burial space, and is focussed on the Camberwell Old Cemetery and Camberwell New Cemetery.

The 'immediate' options presented to cabinet have been considered and are being developed alongside and as part of the 'short term' options proposed in this report. These include recently decontaminated land at the old Honor Oak Nursery site, as well as an area of old public (or common) graves in the south of Camberwell Old which requires to be 'topped up' with soil to enable it to receive burials. A wooded area of virgin ground in the west of Camberwell New is similarly proposed to be taken forward. In addition further burial is proposed for the remainder of the old nursery site, and for a second area of public graves that had previously been 'topped up' in the north of Camberwell Old. Specific capacity for Muslim burials is also proposed.

'Medium Term' options from 2022 onward include the re-use of unmarked public graves older than 75 years old (and in most instances nearly 95 years old) in consecrated parts of Camberwell Old and Camberwell New. This would be subject to

church permission (a 'Faculty') and any remains encountered would be re-interred and recorded in a consecrated grave adjacent. This has been approach has been successful elsewhere, notably in the City of London Cemetery. In addition, in the medium term, it is proposed that rights to private graves older than 75 years could be cancelled under the provisions of an Act of parliament of 1975. Unused space in that grave could then be reclaimed for burial, or alternatively, if the grave is set within consecrated ground, the grave could be re-used subject to a Faculty. In these instances memorials would be selected and where appropriate restored and re-inscribed. The whole process would require the adherence to a Conservation Management Plan bespoke to each cemetery. Reclamation of graves along with the restoration/re-inscription of memorials has also been successfully implemented at the City of London.

Other measures proposed in the medium term include development of mausoleum sites in Camberwell Old and Camberwell New and the remediation and use of a disturbed area of ground (currently being investigated) in the north west of Camberwell Old.

A range of actions need to be taken to progress these options including that existing records need to be collated digitally and reviewed thoroughly. A protocol for assessing the heritage value of graves and memorial needs to be introduced along with a code for the treatment and recording of historic memorials. New record keeping and management procedures will also need to be introduced. Periodic reviews (nearing the end of the short and medium term periods) would be required to check whether supply of plots is meeting demand and to consider, at each critical stage, what next steps need to be taken. Medium term options potentially provide space until 2040 depending on burial rates and delivery of space.

Long term options proposed include the re-use and reclamation of both private and public graves. At Camberwell Old successive clearances of memorials in the late 20C, combined with the irregular and tight layout of plots and the numerous recent graves slotted in between historic graves, makes comprehensive re-use difficult. In addition the overgrown nature of parts of the site and the heritage value of other parts, makes comprehensive re-use inappropriate in parts. For these reasons

Camberwell New is proposed for *re-use* in the long term and that is proposed alongside continued but more limited reclamation and/or re-use in Camberwell Old.


There are however a number of critical issues to resolve in delivering this Strategy. Firstly, whilst other authorities in London may re-use private graves in areas that are not consecrated (under the provisions of Acts of parliament of 1976 and 2007) that same provision does not extend to Southwark on account of the way the 2007 Act is drafted. This needs legal clarification and/or a change in the law to remedy and it is proposed that Southwark should pursue that matter in the short and medium term.

Second, other than for some limited areas of public burial, most areas of Camberwell New do not become 'old' enough for re-use until at least 2045, by which time all the short and medium term options will have been exhausted. Some of the shortfall in capacity might be made up by taking up a portion of Honor Oak Park, (1/3rd) whilst retaining the football pitches and substantively enhancing the remainder of the Park. Recognising that this is likely to be unpopular and, at this point in time, not an option preferred by the Council the Strategy considers it essential that the authority should also conduct a review of Nunhead Cemetery to ascertain whether, mindful of the particular sensitivities and status of that cemetery, there is any scope for limited reclamation/re-use in conjunction with restoration. In addition, working in partnership with other London authorities, the council should seek to secure alternative burial space, (potentially also including natural burial space) by way of an additional landholding.

Having met the shortfall and subject to having resolved the legal issue and gained Faculty approval, Camberwell New might potentially be capable of carefully planned re-use in the long term.

Moving toward a system whereby sustainable, cyclical, re use of burial space is achieved on a long term basis is a goal. Achieving that goal will not only depend on future demographics and burial preferences but it will also require a new approach to the management of Southwark's cemeteries.

Location Plan



1.0 INTRODUCTION, SCOPE

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This documents sets out a Cemetery Strategy for Southwark. It seeks to address the current critical shortage of burial space in Southwark by recommending short and medium-term options for developing burial space and then considers options for providing burial in the long term. The Strategy considers risks inherent in the process and looks to way to mitigate those risks. Estimated costs are set out for short and medium term options and the next steps that need to be taken to develop the Strategy are outlined.

1.2 Scope

1.2.1 This document follows a period of research and investigation over summer of 2011 carried out in response to a brief provided by Southwark Council. That brief set out requirements to develop proposals for burial areas for immediate use within Camberwell Old and Camberwell New Cemeteries in Southwark. The brief also required the production of Masterplan and Conservation Management Plans for the cemeteries. Inherent in both of these tasks is a requirement to understand and recommend on the potential for providing burial space on an on-going basis within Southwark. Further to direction from the client team at Southwark that potential has been summarised in the form of this Cemetery Strategy.

1.2.2 Given this brief the Strategy focusses on practical options for burial within the current cemetery areas within Southwark but also takes account of potential options for burial outside of those areas. The Strategy does not detail the changing population demographic and burial/mortality rates, nor consider charging structure , but instead relies on previous studies carried out for Southwark including the '*Business Process Review*, (September 2007 , Peter Mitchell Associates) and '*A feasibility on the Future Available Burial Space within the London Borough of Southwark*' (Cemetery Development Services September 2010) as well as '*Audit of London Burial Provision*' (commissioned by the Greater London Authority and undertaken

by the Cemetery Research Group, University of York in March 2011). There are differences between these studies in the predicted future burial demand.

1.3 Content

1.3.1 After this introduction the document is set out under the headings

- Background
- The Cemeteries
- Consultation
- The Legal Framework
- Cemetery Strategy – Short and Medium Term
- Cemetery Strategy – Long Term
- Risk, Costs
- Next Steps

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 Context and History

- 2.1.1 Southwark has faced a critical shortage of burial space on several occasions before. Camberwell Old Cemetery, established in 1856 in response to shortage of burial space elsewhere in the borough, was itself becoming full in the early 1900's leading to the purchase of land at Honor Oak Golf Club for Camberwell New Cemetery, opened in 1927. The opening of the Crematorium within Camberwell New Cemetery in 1939 slowed the utilisation of the burial space in Camberwell New and in 1954 a significant portion of the landholding was given over to playing fields (Honor Oak Park). However by the 1980's space in Camberwell New was becoming critical and in early 1990's a section of the park in the north east was taken back for cemetery use. Similarly in November 2000 planning consent was granted to develop the cemetery over part of the landholding in the south west, (originally the site of a fireworks factory and subsequently a council nursery in the latter half of the 20th century). That 'extension' was opened in 2001.
- 2.1.2 The *Audit of London Burial Provision* commissioned by the Greater London and undertaken by the Cemetery Research Group, University of York in March 2011 revealed that there are boroughs in all quarters of the capital where supply is deemed to be critical, and where demand is likely to be exhausted within the next ten years. Across London as a whole the potential land held in reserve (not all of which has planning consent for burial) might meet only around on fifth of the projected demand. Moreover the diminution of supply in boroughs currently deemed critical will displace demand to adjacent boroughs which might otherwise have met burial need for the next 10-20 years.
- 2.1.3 The lack of burial space can be considered a London-wide problem, and even where Southwark were to resolve its own burial shortage it may still be impacted upon by lack of burial space elsewhere. The lack of burial space London wide is addressed within the Mayors Plan (Chapter 7, policy 7.23) which provides that:

- the Mayor will work with boroughs to protect existing burial spaces and to promote new provision; and in that,
- in the preparation of Local Development Frameworks Boroughs should ensure provision is made for London's burial needs, including the needs of those groups for whom burial is the only option; and,
- provision should be based on the principle of proximity to local communities and reflect the different requirements for types of provision.

2.2 April 2011 Cabinet Report

2.2.1 In this context and faced again with an imminent lack of burial space, a Cabinet Report addressing supply of burial space was put to Southwark Council in April 2011. This was in part informed by the process review and feasibility studies noted above. The Cabinet Report recommended making available £410k to develop up to 1750 plots in sites in Camberwell Old and Camberwell New. The Cabinet Report also recommended presenting and consulting with the public on longer term options including:

- Use of virgin ground
- Use all or some of Honor Oak Recreation Ground
- Re- use Private Graves
- Re-use Public (Common or Ordinary) Graves
- Use of Burial Chambers
- Find a burial site outside of Southwark
- Share a cemetery space elsewhere or buy graves off someone else
- Work with other local authorities to source land for a new cemetery
- Stop Burying in Southwark

2.2.2 The Cabinet supported these recommendations but it was noted that use of Honor Oak Recreation ground was a 'least preferred option'.

2.2.3 Alongside the process of developing areas for immediate use and at the same time as researching and developing this Strategy, Southwark Council have also therefore been conducting an extensive process of public

consultation using the options noted above, the results of which have informed this Strategy.

- 2.2.4 In practice the option of use of 'virgin space' within the cemeteries did not feature significantly in the consultation process because available virgin space has largely already been accounted for.

2.3 Options Completed as at January 2011

- 2.3.1 **Area A-:** in Camberwell New, the former site of the fireworks factory/old nursery had in recent years been subject to illegal tipping of waste soils (which also extended into the adjacent site B – the former nursery. Both sites A and B had been encompassed within the November 2000 planning consent. By early 2011 a contract for the removal of those soils was nearing completion and site A was levelled soiled and seeded. In early summer 2011 work commenced to carry out final investigations to check underlying ground conditions, and to discharge outstanding planning matters. Phase 1 of the work was progressed over August/September 2011 releasing 210 plots and Phase 2 is planned to complete imminently to release a total of 435 plots.

- 2.3.2 **Area E:** - Over a similar timeframe a small pocket of virgin land was identified and developed in Camberwell Old (c 50 plots)

- 2.3.1 Proposals for the two remaining areas identified in the Cabinet Report namely Area F: – top up over Public graves off Woodvale, Camberwell Old and **Area D1:** -virgin land adjacent to One Tree Hill (Camberwell New) are under development and reported upon below.

- 2.3.2 With areas A and E completed there would be around 2 years supply

2.4 Burial Demand

- 2.4.1 Currently demand for burial is at around 210 (new) plots per years. The demand is predominantly for double depth plots reflected in the fact that total burials stand at around 380 per year.
- 2.4.2 The *Process Review* and *Feasibility Study* reports point to a relative young but growing population in Southwark. A consequence of this is that burial rates may be currently slightly in decline but burial rates (assuming preferences for burial versus cremation do not change) are likely to increase for the next 30 years or so before declining. Detailed prediction of burial demand through analysis of demographic trends is beyond the scope of this study. Figures presented in the previous CDSL study are therefore-used, however it is noted that these present different demand figures, lower than that noted within the Burial Audit. The actual burial demand will need to be monitored as part of the review process.
- 2.4.3 Southwark's population has a significant and high proportion of people of Black Caribbean and African origin people. The religious and cultural preferences of these groups are for burial. There is also a strong Catholic tradition in the borough also with a preference for burial.
- 2.4.4 There is also a strong demand for elaborate and oversized 'casket' type burials in Southwark which is a likely reflection the cultural mix of the borough.

3.0 THE CEMETERIES

3.1 General

3.1.1 Southwark has three operational Cemeteries:

- Nunhead Cemetery
- Camberwell Old Cemetery
- Camberwell New Cemetery

3.2.2 This section describes the history and characteristics of the cemeteries focussing on factors that influence their potential to continue to receive burials. These include:

- the pattern historic development and consecration
- burial pattern and age structure and burial records
- plot sizes and memorial types
- heritage and nature conservation

3.2 Nunhead Cemetery (All Saints)

3.2.1 Nunhead Cemetery is the oldest and most historic of Southwark's cemeteries. It has not been considered as the main focus of this study given that it is to a large extent a Local Nature Reserve and a listed landscape included on English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. A significant number of its monument are also Listed.

3.2.2 An Act of Parliament in 1975 (see below) set out provisions associated with the transfer of Nunhead Cemetery into Southwark Council ownership, and made provisions and prescriptions for its use and management. Nunhead Cemetery has an active Friends Group who do not consider *re-use* and *reclamation* of historic graves to be appropriate for Nunhead.

3.3 Camberwell Old Cemetery

History

3.3.1 The history of the cemetery and its burial patterns has been studied with reference to the burial records (see below), St Giles Vestry Minutes, historic

Ordnance Surveys and plans and records held at Southwark Local Studies Library and the Metropolitan Archives. Ron Woollacott in his publications *“Camberwell Old Cemetery – London’s’ Forgotten Valhalla”* and *“Southwark’s Burial Places Past and Present”* comprehensively describe the cemetery history whilst useful reference is also available in *“London Cemeteries An illustrated Guide and Gazetteer”* by Hugh Meller.

3.3.2 Camberwell Old Cemetery was opened in 1856. The original layout included the distinctive central ‘butterfly’ arrangement of looping carriageways as well as two elongated loops extending north toward Ryedale Road. (See Figure 1 and Appendix 1)

3.3.3 The cemetery was numbered by way of a grid of ‘squares’ sequenced from south to north and east to west (No1 lies off Wood Vale running to No 86 alongside Forest Hill Road). The squares are in fact rectangles 44m long by 27m wide. The boundaries of the squares do not co-ordinate with any paths or carriageways or site boundaries, nor are they aligned to north.

3.3.4 The cemetery was extended toward Langton Rise in the west (squares 87 to 96) and toward Underhill Road in the north west (sections 100-108) after 1874. In some areas it appears that the pathways giving access off the ‘butterfly’ to the north post 1874 extension were laid out over graves.

3.3.5 Original buildings by Sir George Gilbert Scott included an Anglican chapel set within a carriageway loop in the centre of the cemetery and a non-conformist chapel within a loop on the southern side and a Roman Catholic Chapel set adjacent to Wood Vale all have now been demolished. The original Lodge of Forest Hill Road remains, now as a private residence.

Consecrations

3.3.6 From Records of the St Giles Vestry Board and other sources land within the main ‘butterfly’ arrangement extending to a line approximately from Theraphia Rd to Overhill Road was Consecrated in 1856. Land north of this

line to Ryedale Road was consecrated in 1862. Land south and west of the 'butterfly' along Wood Vale and Langton Rise was left un-consecrated

- 3.3.7 Land within the north-west part of 1874 extension was consecrated in 1913 excepting for a 41' (12.5m) strip along the northern boundary, a 12' (4m strip along the Underhill Rd boundary and squares 105, 106, 107 – land which was left unconsecrated.

Burial Pattern Private Graves

- 3.3.8 Private plots were sold mainly facing onto the paths and carriageways. Well-connected and affluent families took plots in sq58 (eg the Horniman family) and selected prominent plots on the corners of the paths carriageways around the Anglican Chapel. These are often sizeable memorials, some have features such as obelisks and statues, and some are vaults. The majority of early private plots were taken up generally (but not always) in an irregular sequence of uptake fanning out along the pathways from the central area. However there was no apparent planning or rationale to this sequence. As the cemetery filled up, successive rows further away from the pathways were taken up and exhausted and eventually the space between first row and pathways were infilled. Finally many of the pathways themselves were infilled, (some of these infilled paths, visible on the burial plans, may in fact have been planned but never implemented).
- 3.3.9 An important consequence of this pattern of development is that the private plots (which were allocated the next number in sequence in the Purchase Register (see below)) could be positioned nearly anywhere in the cemetery, irrespective of date of purchase.
- 3.3.10 Whilst private burials reduced after the opening of Camberwell New, Camberwell Old has continued to receive 2nd 3rd and even 4th interments into historic plots throughout the latter half of the 20th century and into the 21st. Moreover, additional new plots have been located between private plots notably throughout the 1980s. Where depths have been sufficient new

burials have also taken place over the top of Public burials (albeit sometimes only to single depth) for instance in sq 4, 5, 95. Recent infilling of paths has also taken place eg in sq, 17 and sq1.26.

- 3.3.11 Many burial areas were cleared of monuments in the 1950s and again in 1976 and 1977. Other clearances have occurred incrementally. The private burial areas with the northern sections (north of the butterfly) have been left to become overgrown with dense cover of regenerating woodland and scrub enveloping the memorials many of which have fallen. For these reasons it is now very difficult to identify clearly the private plot arrangements in many areas.
- 3.3.12 The approximate outlines of private burial areas have been identified by overlaying the digital scans of Burial Plans (see below) with current Ordnance survey base, and current topographic survey data. The outlines of the private burial areas, as far as they can be deduced from their irregular numbering, has then been traced and highlighted in cyan on the Historic Plot Overlay- Figure 1. This approach clearly has limitations and inaccuracies (arising from accuracy of the original plotting, the scaling and overlay process and the accuracy of the OS base) but it gives a broad indication of the extent of private burial areas.

Burial Pattern - Public Graves

- 3.3.13 Throughout its early history public burials vastly outnumbered private grave sales and proceeded at a very great pace. Woollacott notes that by 1874 30,000 burials had taken place rising to 100,000 burials by 1893 and in 1898 burials were proceeding at a rate of 76 per week with Public graves being dug to accommodate up to 20 bodies each. By the time of the opening of the New Cemetery in 1927 burials in Camberwell Old had reached 279,714.
- 3.3.14 Public grave areas were set back from the pathways behind the Private graves. They were then laid out mostly but not always in rows aligned 'head to toe' and such patterns were evident on the Burial Plan (see below) highlight the Public areas. Given the difficult conditions in which Public

graves were dug (tightly spaced, extremely deep, dug by hand often in wet clay) aligning head to toe leaving a gap (mid feather) between rows potentially minimised risk of collapse. Often plot numbering 'jumps' about or alternates in any one area suggesting graves were being dug so as not to be adjacent to one another. Several plots are likely to have been in use in different parts of the cemetery over the same periods of time. Many Public areas were subjected to successive second and even third 'waves' of digging - infilling mid-feathers between previous rows of interments (sometimes termed 'intermediate' arrangements).


- 3.3.15 Some Public burial areas were subsequently land raised and filled again (see areas F, G, below) and retained with low retaining walls. Trial pitting suggests that in these areas there remains around 3' minimum cover.
- 3.3.16 Public graves were allocated numbers within the Purchase Register in blocks of several hundred at a time. There is however no separate 'plot register' (see below) detailing interments within public graves. This means that it is not possible (at present) to readily ascertain the exact age (since last interment) of any public grave. From the records it appears that in June 1926 a batch of plots were the last pre war allocations as Public plots. Then, after the opening of Camberwell New Cemetery in 1927, all Public burials were directed to the New Cemetery.
- 3.3.17 However in 1949, Camberwell Old started receiving Public burials again. From the records it appears that these burials (within plots numbered higher than 30499) generally lie in squares 2, and 7 (between F and F1) and also infilling paths in sq 21,100, and 101 and also in an area in the north west corner of sq 103. Other areas may also have received later Public burials.
- 3.3.18 In addition between 1893 and 1954 9029 still born babies were also buried in Public graves and recorded in separate register. These were buried within the normal plot sequence. Human remains exhumed from other sites including the Quaker Burial Ground in Peckham, and the Lock Burial Ground

Newham were also interred in Camberwell Old in the 1960's within public grave graves .

- 3.3.19 Early on Public burials were largely left without memorials although it was Public practice throughout the 1930s, 40s 50s and 60s to make use of a small memorial stone in Southwark's cemeteries . Nearly all of these stones have now been cleared and Public areas are mostly identifiable in that they are clear. In particular the areas between the heavily wooded private graves in the north east of the site (H2,H3, J,K, and L- see below) are seen as open grassland areas. The approximate outline of the Public areas has been plotted through identifying areas with sequential numbering on the historic plot overlays and are depicted in green (pre 1927) (brown where post 1945).
- 3.3.20 Limitations in respect of the accuracy of these outlines applies as noted above. In addition this approach has relied on recognition of Public areas from the apparent sequencing of numbers on the Burial Plans. In order to verify that all plots are indeed public (and indeed pre 1927 or post 1945 as highlighted) individual areas would need to be checked thoroughly against the records- see below.

Age Structure

- 3.3.21 Because of the distribution of use across of various parts of the cemetery at any one time, infill burial along path edges and in the paths themselves, as well as 'intermediate' burials and 'created' burial spaces, the age structure (period elapsed since last interment) of the cemetery is 'mixed' with very few areas appearing to have a uniform and clearly apparent age structure. In addition the time elapsed since last interment has been re-set by the 2nd 3rd and 4th (and even 5th) family burials in any one grave and this renders some areas that appear very old on the face of it, to be younger than they might appear.



- KEY**
- Consecrated Area
 - Un-consecrated Area
 - 68 Section (Square) (approximated from Burial Plan overlay)
 - Public Graves (no rights) Pre-dating 1927 (subject to final checking)
 - Public Graves (no rights) Post-dating 1927 (subject to final checking)
 - Private Graves (exclusive rights)- mixed ages
 - ⊕ Private Graves (exclusive rights) infilled within Public Grave areas
 - ⊕ Private/Public Graves under current paths
 - ⊕ Historic paths and features
 - ⊕ Historic paths and features





FIGURE 1 rev B
Drawing number: 048.02.09

HISTORIC PLOT OVERLAY: CAMBERWELL OLD





- KEY**
- Public Graves (no rights)- approximate
 - Virgin ground - approximate
 - Consecrated Boundary
 - Un-Consecrated Boundary
 - 85 85 Section/Square No. (Consecrated / un-consecrated)
 - 84 Original Planned Section /Square Numbering (1940)




FIGURE 2 rev B
Drawing number: 048.02.09A

HISTORIC SQUARE OVERLAY: CAMBERWELL NEW



3.4 Camberwell New Cemetery

History

- 3.4.1 In 1901 68 acres of freehold land at Honor Oak were purchased to form Camberwell New Cemetery but the greater part of the land was initially let to Honor Oak and Forest Hill Golf Club with a smaller area in the south-west (south of the line of an old canal) let as a fireworks factory. The New Cemetery was opened on May 23rd 1927.
- 3.4.2 The layout (see Appendix 1) was designed broadly symmetrically around a central carriageway axis which leads directly to the central double Chapel (the west side being a non-conformist chapel and the east being Anglican). There is a circular carriageway around the Chapel and a series arcing carriageways. However in contrast to Camberwell Old the majority of the layout was set out to be orthogonal and symmetrical with carriageways and paths.
- 3.4.3 The recording of burials, was arranged in a series of squares but in contrast to Camberwell Old these were actually set out as squares (approximately 40yds x 40yds) and many of the paths/carriageways were designed to coincide with the boundaries of the squares. This is important because it potentially makes tracing of plots easier both on plan and on the ground.
- 3.4.4 The development of the cemetery and the consecration pattern is illustrated in Figure 2. This layout was proposed to extended as far as the railway in the south and up to Honor Oak Park road (including the allotments in the west) but the layout was never fully developed as planned. Initially the cemetery extended along the boundary with Brenchley Gardens (New Road) up to one tree Hill (sq 120) in the west and to Brockley Way in the east, whilst the remainder of the land holding remained as golf course and fireworks factory.

- 3.4.5 Around 1940 the cemetery was extended to fully include squares 80, 90, 101, 102, 103 and 112 (as far as the current boundary with the allotments) but squares to the south of this (91-94/81-84) in the west and squares 27-30/40-42 in the east and the current area of Honor Oak Park all remained as Golf Course.
- 3.4.6 Around 1954 the squares 91-94/81-84 were taken into the cemetery so as to extend to the current boundary with the Park. At that time the Honor Oak Park was laid out.
- 3.4.7 By 1970/71 the Honor Oak Nursery and small car park had been laid out south of the Cemetery. In 1990/1991 the squares 27-30/40-42 in the east were taken into the cemetery. The carriageway layout in the 1990's section was not laid out in accordance with the original plan such that the squares. It is notable in this area that the plot alignments also drifted from the orthogonal alignments and became less regular.
- 3.4.8 In 2001 the extension area between the Park and the nursery (on the line of the canal and fireworks factory) was laid out. Squares in the extension should have been numbered 61/62/73/74 to meet the original numbering but in practice the extension was numbered as squares 63/64/72/73/74.

Consecrations

- 3.4.9 In general, and with the exception of the 2001 extension, the south west half of the cemetery is consecrated the east is not (converse to the Chapel arrangement). Consecrations occurred broadly in line with extensions in 1927, 1940 and then in 1954.

Burial Pattern Private and Public Graves

- 3.4.10 Burial plot numbering at Camberwell New used the same system as at Camberwell Old, i.e private plots were allocated the next number in the sequence irrespective as to where they were located within the cemetery whilst blocks of plot numbers (of several hundred) were reserved for public

plots. This gives rise to the apparently random sequencing of plot numbers seen on the ground.

3.4.11 As with Camberwell Old an exercise has been carried out overlaying the current Ordnance Survey with the Burial Plans. Areas of Public and Private graves have been identified and these are shown on Figure 2.

3.4.12 From the overlays and site inspection a small part of the site adjacent to One Tree Hill in sq 120 (Site D1) has been identified as virgin. Nearby the part wooded area extending north, sq109-117,118,119 (Site D2) is identified as aged between 1927 and 1945

Age Structure

3.4.13 As was the case with Camberwell Old, use of the cemetery did not follow a sequential pattern on the ground and rather burials were distributed across different parts of the cemetery from 1927. Similar to Camberwell Old there are also areas where, as space has become constrained, more recent burials have been slotted in at ends and in between of rows and in paths and planting areas. Similarly the age structure (time since last interment) has been complicated by 2nd and 3rd interments. Nevertheless Camberwell New is distinctly more structured in terms of age than Camberwell Old. This is not least because it was opened and extended in 4 distinct phases.

3.4.14 A sampling exercise has been conducted by checking through the '*Index Book /Day Book*' (see section 3.7 below). A sample of all burials with surname starting with the letter 'B, including all private and public burials were correlated against a square number and decade of burial. This data was then analysed by square and the percentage of burials of a given age (eg 75 years old in 1915), based on the sample, was calculated. Simplified results are illustrated at Appendix 3.

3.4.15 What is apparent is that each area of public burials appears to have been used up completely (without subsequent burials) starting in (non

consecrated) squares 109/117 then moving to 118/119. Public burials space in consecrated square 1, 36, and 24 were also filled up completely early on.

3.4.16 The pattern in the private plot areas is much less structured, but generally squares 108/116 in the west as well as plots around chapel were filled early on. On the ground the age distribution of graves appears narrower in any one area (more structured) than suggested by the sample. This is because any one square may extend across pathways taking in areas of both older and more recent burials (eg sq 89).

3.5 Plot Sizes and Memorial Types – Camberwell Old and Camberwell New

3.5.1 Plot and grave sizes in many modern lawn cemeteries are:

- Plot size: 4' wide x9'0" long (1.22mx 2.74m).
- Graves: 2'2" wide x7'0" long (0.66m x 2.15m) (allowing routine excavations of graves)
- Oversized graves for caskets burial: 30"wide x 8" long (0.760mx2.44m)
- Memorial raft: 18" wide (450mm) (at head of each plot)

3.5.2 Private plots sizes early on in Camberwell Old were very tight by modern day standards:

Plots: 2'11" (to 4'0") wide x 6'9" (to 7'6") or 0.89m (to 1.22m) x 2.06m (to 2.29m)

Kerb (or curb) sets: 2'6" x 6'6" (0.76mx1.98m)

3.5.3 Most historic memorials at Camberwell Old are kerb set type but larger grander monuments include obelisk, statue and vault types occupy larger plots usually on prominent corners and within the historic core of the site.

3.5.4 Common burial areas vary but generally appear as:

Plots: 4'x 7'6" (1.22x2.28m)

3.5.5 Much of Camberwell New is laid out on rectilinear kerb set arrangements with sizes of:

Plots: 3'6" (to 3'10") wide x7'11" (to 8'6") long or 1.07m (to 1.12m) x 2.42m (to 2.59m)

3.5.6. Older Lawn burial areas (back to back) at Camberwell New are more generous in length at :

Plots: 3'6" wide x 8'7" (with approx 15"/30" single/double memorial area)
(1.07m wide x 2.62m long + 380/760mm memorial)

3.6 Plot size, Memorial Arrangements, and Management Implications

3.6.1 There are a number of implications arising from the differing plot sizes, memorial arrangements, and historic management practices as set out below.

Kerb Sets and Lawn Burial

3.6.2 Much Camberwell Old and Camberwell New include kerb (or curb) set areas. These are usually very densely arranged and:

- are difficult to access for the public attending a funeral and the tight spacing and uneven ground between kerb sets can be unsafe to access;
- are difficult in operational terms in that the kerb set and the concrete landing they ordinarily sit on are difficult to move and set down (for the purposes of accessing the grave for second interments), risking damage or disturbance of adjacent kerb sets in the process of achieving safe working room;
- often have insufficient to access for machine- making inefficient hand digging necessary;
- can be difficult to make safe when memorials become unstable.

3.6.3 Modern 'lawn' type burial arrangements started to appear in the 1970s in Camberwell New and have continued up until the present day in the current extension area. The total plot size (including space for headstone arrangement) in these lawn burials areas is less efficient in space than the kerb set areas but much easier to manageable and maintain. Having the memorial sited at the head of the grave, on un-disturbed ground (either in lawn or gravel strip or on sitting a concrete raft) means it is less liable to subsidence (unlike where memorials are placed over a grave) and memorials can be placed immediately after the burial.

3.6.4 In Camberwell New memorial 'rafts' were-used only after 2001 in the extension. These were laid in concrete. Rafts are being trialled in gravel at Camberwell Old. 'Back to back' plots with memorials sited on concrete or gravel memorial rafts and facing away from one another facilitates simple lawn cutting with larger machines and reduced strimming. The recent practice of allowing an 18" 'garden' area in front of each memorial significantly undermines the advantages of having a back to back lawn lawn arrangement.

3.6.5 Rafts also facilitate more regular laying out of plots- ultimately making record keeping and future management easier and more reliable.

Identifying Graves and Plots

3.6.6 There are significant difficulties in seeking to clearly identify historic private graves at Camberwell Old. In many areas (where not regenerated as woodland) the historic burial pattern has been lost or cannot be clearly recognised on account of:

- successive clearances of memorials;
- the lack of a rectilinear or clear pattern in the original layout exacerbated by;
- more recent 'intermediate' and 'infill' plots, and,
- the loss of identifiable features such as paths; and,
- poor record keeping in the past (in terms of the accuracy of burial plans).

3.6.7 In areas that have regenerated as woodland at Camberwell Old:

- there appears to have been less clearances of memorials- theoretically making plots/graves more identifiable; but,
- plots cannot be readily accessed and inscriptions cannot be read in their current condition; and,
- trees and scrub are damaging memorials which cannot then be readily made safe, making public access difficult and potentially unsafe.

3.6.8 In Camberwell New the private grave/plots can be readily be identified and records and burial plans can, at present, be cross referenced. It should be borne in mind that as time passes and memorials deteriorate (with some needing require removal for safety reasons), this identification and cross referencing will become increasingly difficult.

3.6.9 Individual plots within Public burials areas simply cannot be identified with any accuracy. The general extent of them may be plotted through the overlay process, site survey and potentially trial excavation. Further to which a searching of the records is required to ascertain the whereabouts and age of any particular interment.

Historic and Modern Plot Sizes

3.6.10 People (and coffins) are getting bigger and routinely excavations are carried out wider than 26" (660mm) and longer than 7". This can cause problems on the smaller historic plot sizes where the amount of undisturbed ground (mid feather and head/toe feather) remaining between adjacent graves becomes diminished to a point where grave stability becomes a concern. The lack of width can be alleviated to some extent by:

- the use of strong, narrow profile, proprietary metal shoring; or
- where there is ample choice of plots, siting successive graves away from one another.

However the increasing length of coffins may cause particular difficulties in seeking to re-use or reclaim extensive areas of smaller historic plots (and this may be potentially difficult to resolve in the case of Camberwell Old).

3.6.11 In Southwark the growing preference for oversized casket 'style' coffins poses a particular difficulty in that they simply cannot fit within historic plot sizes. They may require oversized plots (at 5' wide for instance) - a prospect that needs to be considered in the laying out of new burial space. The scale of fees is being reviewed to reflect the less efficient use of scarce land where larger plots are necessary simply to meet such preferences.

3.7 Records

3.7.1 Record keeping is governed by the provisions of sections 9 and 11 of the Local Authorities Cemeteries Order 1977 (Statutory Instrument No 204) ('LACO'). Record keeping in Southwark varies according to cemetery. Nunhead has a different arrangement of record keeping from Camberwell Old and Camberwell New. Camberwell Old and New have separate registers and plot numbering for. The registers include:

- i. *Register of Burials* including entries: burial entry no./name/description of person buried/age of deceased/ abode/date of burial/ceremony performed by/ place of burial and no of grant (private/ordinary)/ no of grave/no. of square/ consecrated/unconsecrated/ receipt/remarks.
- ii. *Index Book* (also known as Day Book) : This has been transcribed from the Register Of Burials and is arranged first in date order but sorted alphabetically (by surname). Entries include: date/surname/christian name/age of deceased/no of grave/no of square/ ground (consecrated/unconsecrated)/ Ordinary or Private
- iii. *Register of Purchased Vaults and Graves* (the Grave Register): Private grave purchases are recorded including No of order/date of order/ name of purchaser and abode/name of person buried and late abode/no of grave/no of square/ depth of grave/ subsequent interments/ memorial (type)/no of grant date of seal.
- iv. *Burial Plans*: these are paginated by square and record the position of plots in layout form each annotated with plot number. The plans do not distinguish between private and public graves nor consecrated/unconsecrated ground.

3.7.2 Every so often within the *Register of Purchase Vaults and Graves* sequences or blocks of several hundred plots appear 'missing'. As noted above these blocks of plot numbers have in fact been allocated to public graves.

3.7.3 Key implications of this record keeping include:

- With there being no separate plot register for public burials it is not possible, at present, to ascertain which burials have taken place in any particular plot/grave and when. The last date of internment can be broadly deduced but there is the possibility, without further research that later burials have taken place in public plots.
- It is difficult, at first inspection of the plans to ascertain whether a plot without a memorial is public or private this requires a searching through the various registers.
- Finding a plot number in any one square both on the Plan and subsequently on the ground can be difficult particularly in Camberwell New.

3.7.4 As a consequence of the above, accurate mapping out exact age structures of public and private areas is slow and laborious and at Camberwell Old this factor (along with difficulties of identifying plots and graves on the ground (3.6.6)) makes management in respect of re-use and reclamation potentially difficult.

3.8 Cemetery Infrastructure

3.8.1 Camberwell Old requires significant investment in its infrastructure:

- whilst it is not laid out to accommodate larger vehicles found in modern corteges has curvilinear carriageways that can generally accommodate such traffic;
- the northern carriageway loops have all but disintegrated remaining as narrow crumbling tarmac paths;
- the main carriageway loops are various states of repair with some generally in poor condition (in some areas the base and wearing course

surfaces are currently broken through which leads quickly to failure of the surfacing);

- many smaller paths have been lost altogether (buried over) or lost in grass or undergrowth making access difficult;
- a significant proportion of the northern area is entirely overgrown in regenerating woodland (over private graves) with rough grass over public grave areas (see below);
- boundary railings and gates on Forest Road are in reasonable repair as is the gate at Langton Rise/Wood Vale corner
- Wood Vale, Langton Rise and Underhill Road timber boundary fencing is in poor condition;
- boundary fences to the rears of Ryedale Road and Forest Hill are in poor repair and breached in many places;
- stop taps and water system are in need of upgrade and repair;
- there are significant issues in terms of spoil of various unrecorded sources needing to be investigated and remediated/regarded in the north west.

3.8.2 There are no shelter/chapel/reception facilities on the site. Whilst not unique to Southwark (many burial authorities operate multiple over sites), it poses operational challenges and can cause problems of orientation and inconvenience to service users. The fact that there is no service yard available for storage of surplus soil or to temporarily hold displaced memorials is a more significant issue that needs to be addressed.

3.8.3 Camberwell New also requires significant investment in its infrastructure if to continue to receive burials:

- the orthogonal layout includes a number of corners that present real difficulties in accommodating large modern cortege vehicles;
- the western parts of the cemetery in particular include carriageways that are narrow and disintegrating;
- the site is split in that the access to the 2001 extension area crosses the access to Honor Oak Park and there is no proper access for

hearses/corteges to the extension area nor to the adjacent old nursery site (site B);

- boundary railings and the gateway along Brenchley Gardens are in need of substantial refurbishment;
- railings along the Honor Oak Park./ allotments/ One Tree Hill boundary are in poor to very poor repair;
- stop taps and water system are in need of upgrade and repair.

3.8.4 The chapel and reception facilities on the site are good by comparison to many authorities, albeit reception facilities might be considered undersized given the predicted growth in demand for the services in the future.

3.9 Heritage Assets

3.9.1 In conjunction with this Strategy an assessment of the heritage asset is being undertaken. In terms of layout and monumentation Camberwell Old has more historical interest than is the case for Camberwell New. However it is by no means on a par with Nunhead in terms of heritage value. Ron Woollacott in *“Camberwell Old Cemetery – London’s’ Forgotten Valhalla”* describes some of the noteworthy plots/graves within Camberwell Old.

3.9.2 In summary the value of the historic asset at Camberwell Old lies in:

- the survival of much of original 1856/1874 layout which, (albeit the layout is not credited to any particular or notable designer of the day);
- the existing gate and lodge house in Gothic Revival Style off Forest Hill Road by the eminent Victorian architect Sir George Gilbert Scott (1811-1878);
- the existing gate on the corner of Wood Vale/Langton Rise in similar Gothic revival style (but with newly replaced metalwork);
- numerous historic graves and monuments, mostly sited at the historic core of the site. Whilst these are not on the size nor of scale seen in Nunhead many are culturally important at a local, regional and, arguably, national/international level. A small number are listed including that of James John Berkley (1819-1962) Railway Engineer,

Charles Waters founder of the International Bible Reading Association (1840-1910);

- a distinctive and handsome first world war memorial , south of the main gates set within the surround of the second world war memorial an Portland stone wall inscribed with the names of servicemen buried within the cemetery;
- a substantial monument to civilians who lost their lives in a WW1 zeppelin raid;
- the attractive pattern of kerb sets arranged on curving pathways in the historic core has a particularly distinctive historic character.

3.9.3 Many of the monuments to eminent persons of cultural importance have been removed. A large number of those remaining are in particularly poor repair and some are cordoned off as their condition makes it advisable to deter public access. Excepting at the very southern margin many of the monuments in the wooded/overgrown northern part of the site appear to be less substantial and less distinctive in style/.architectural.

3.9.4 There is a real risk to the heritage asset in that:

- in the coming years the remaining monuments of cultural and/or architectural distinction/significance will continue to degrade;
- some of the more substantial monuments particularly in the wooded area may fall and be lost altogether;
- the cultural and genealogical record associated with remaining graves and memorials of more modest significance may become inaccessible and or be lost altogether as woodland vegetation continues to break up kerb sets and topple monuments.

3.9.5 Camberwell New being less historic does not have the same heritage value as Camberwell Old. Its main historic and cultural value lies in:

- the double Chapel, a fine impressive building in neo gothic style by Aston Webb and Sons. The former Anglican chapel on the west side is now converted to the offices whilst the non conformist chapel remains in

use as a chapel. A distinctive grand arch divides the two set below an impressive tower supported by flying buttresses;

- the main gates and boundary railing and plinth wall along Brenchley Gardens;
- limited areas with distinctive historic character predominantly of kerb sets and particularly areas set around the Chapel;
- a small enclosed plot contains the graves of officers of the salvation army including that of General Wilfred Kitching ((1893-1991)

3.9.6 As with Camberwell Old there is a real risk that the cultural and genealogical record associated older memorials of more modest significance may continue to deteriorate as monuments become unstable and kerb sets deteriorate. The boundary railings along Brenchley Gardens are at risk and in need of refurbishment.

3.10 Nature Conservation and Arboriculture

3.10.1 Nature conservation surveys have been carried out for both Camberwell New and Camberwell Old in 2011. An arboricultural overview has similarly been carried out.

Camberwell Old

3.10.2 Camberwell Old is a Site of Importance Nature Conservation of Borough Importance (Grade 1) (SINC). The Cemetery has been the subject of a nature conservation assessment (carried out by Catherine Bickmore Associates in July 2011). That assessment included a Phase 1 Habitat Survey and a broad overview of the whole cemetery, alongside more detailed surveys of areas potentially affected by proposals for re-use. The assessment finds that the Cemetery as a whole consisted of common and widespread habitats which are easy to re-establish and that the importance of the SINC lies mainly on account of its extent and location in an otherwise built-up area.

3.10.3 Much of the sites southern parts and grassland to the rear of Rydeale Road is characterized as being of 'amenity grassland' with a fringes of scrub. It

advises that the nature conservation interest of the amenity grassland does not offer a constraint in terms of burial but that habitat connectivity provided by the scrub around the periphery of the site should be retained as far as possible.

3.10.4 Grassland around the kerb sets particularly at the heart of the site is characterised and species poor. Private burial areas now overgrown are characterised as being Semi mature broadleaved woodland whilst the disturbed area in the west and along Underhill Road is noted as scrub.

3.10.5 Mitigation in respect of any potential intensification in terms of burial is suggested to include:

- removal of trees /shrubs outside nesting season;
- checking of trees for bat surveys;
- retention of deadwood where possible or its removal to margins;
- careful removal of understory;
- retention of oaks as flagship species with high biodiversity value.

3.10.6 Opportunities to improve nature conservation value highlighted included:

- planting of native scrub such as hawthorn, hazel and holly;
- relaxed mowing regime to grassland margins;
- provision of fruiting scrub;
- retention of marginal scrub;
- production of a cemetery Conservation Management Plan.

Camberwell New

3.10.7 The cemetery is a Site of Borough Importance (Grade II) for nature conservation however its importance comes mostly from its location and extent as an area of open space within an otherwise built up area. The majority of the site consists of amenity grassland and species-poor semi-improved grassland between graves. These habitats are of little conservation interest.

3.10.8 The wooded area in the south western part of the site forms the edge of the woodland on the adjacent One Tree Hill Site of Borough Importance (Grade I), and is likely to support breeding birds and possibly roosting and foraging bats, hedgehog, stag beetle and sheltering amphibians/reptiles and therefore provides local nature conservation interest to the site. Scattered trees, hedgerows and scrub belts around the site also provide local conservation interest and potential for birds.

3.10.9 Mitigation in the event of intensification of burial activities and opportunities to enhance biodiversity within the cemetery site are given and these are similar to those for Camberwell Old.

Arboriculture

3.10.10 An arboricultural overview of the sites reveals that at Camberwell Old there are is a backlog of arboricultural management work to be done with numerous trees that require management or indeed removal on account of their condition. In many instance such management would enable better specimens adjacent to thrive. In summary there are:

- a number of large mature trees, oak, lime, hornbeam and yew which merit detailed consideration in terms of retention in the long term;
- a number of horsechestnuts, many of which are substantial and mature but which are also suffering considerably from blight (many having significant signs of crown die back, and which require management or removal);
- numerous regenerated sycamore including large mature specimens some of which merit retention but many in poor form;
- numerous ash, rowan, hawthorn and prunus, particularly in the south of the cemetery many of which are over-mature or in poor condition and some of which merit removal;
- occasional large poplar, including lombardy poplar some of which need careful inspection (further to which some may require removal);
- occasional large bay bushes likely to date from original planting;

- extensive areas of dense mixed broadleaved woodland with scrub understorey, predominantly of ash and sycamore. These are regenerating within areas of unmanaged private graves.

3.10.11 Camberwell New has a similar legacy of trees needing management work:

- there are fewer substantial specimens of any merit within the central part of the cemetery;
- in the west of the site there is a dense woodland predominantly of oak and sycamore, which forms a continuation of woodland within One Tree Hill;
- in this areas there are a small number of large veteran oak some of which are partially fallen, and which may date back to original woodland and field boundaries;
- there are numerous Lombardy poplar on the west and south boundaries of the site;
- a number of horsechestnuts across the site are suffering considerably from blight;
- conifers (*chamaecyparissus/leylandii*) mark recent internal boundaries within the site.

4.0 CONSULTATION

4.1 Consultation Arrangements

4.1.1 From 4th July to 30th September 2011, Southwark Council carried out a consultation with residents and stakeholders. A questionnaire was made available in paper and digital form and on the web, and there were a series of consultation events in Honor Oak Park and other venues around the Borough. Meetings were also held with Funeral Directors, faith groups, community groups, and the Diocese.

4.1.2 The eight options previously presented to the Council members (2.2.1 above) were illustrated and presented within the questionnaire and at the consultation events as the basis for the consultation (see illustrations Appendix 6).

4.1.3 The consultation collected views of both Southwark residents and other stakeholders, there were 942 responses to the questionnaire, and over 170 people attended consultation meetings. Many were open and vocal about this highly sensitive subject. Over 1,000 individual often detailed comments were received. The responses were subsequently analysed by a specialist consultant and detailed results are available in a separate report.

4.2 Summary of Findings

4.2.1 The results of the questionnaire indicate that of the residents opting for cremation (77%):

- many cited reasons for their preferences as lack of space in the borough and loss of valuable green space vital to the health and enjoyment of the population; and,
- similar reasons were cited for discontinuing the provision of burial.

4.2.2 Some who said burial was not important stated that they were in favour of burial outside the borough potentially achieved in partnership with other Local Authorities,

4.2.3 Of the residents preferring burial (22%):

- many emphasised emotional attachment to their home place/ Borough /connections to family buried in Southwark / and the ability to visit graves without travelling; and,
- family and cultural traditions were reasons given for continued provision of burial space.

4.2.4 There were concerns that if burial was moved out of the Borough, people's ability to visit loved ones graves would be diminished.

Preferred options

4.2.5 Respondents expressed preference for the various options, in the following order:

- Re-use of public (common) graves- was considered the most sustainable option with least impact on both the Borough's open spaces and bereaved relatives.
- Re-use of private graves.
- Use of burial chambers/mausolea where maximising the the use of available space. The potential for vandalism and mechanism for ultimate disposal of remains were raised as concerns.
- Working with other local authorities to source shared land for new cemeteries.
- A new Southwark burial site outside the borough (not greatly supported, for the reasons of reduced accessibility).
- Buying of grave space from a private supplier- was not a popular option and considered to be problematic on account of lack of confidence in the sustainability of the service.
- Stopping burial in Southwark -received very little support and even those preferring cremation were in favour of people having burial as a choice.
- Use of some or all of Honor Oak Recreation Ground for burials was the least favoured option and the one that attracted the most comment (214 comments were made objecting to the use of the park). A small

number of respondents were favour of using some or all of Honor Oak Recreation Ground for burial.

4.2.6 In respect of re-use options people felt that all efforts would need to be made to contact living family members and that records should be kept of re-used graves with alternative memorials to the deceased created.

4.2.7 Interest was expressed in woodland burials, these being thought of as sustainable and environmentally friendly, albeit this may have been considered as appropriate outside the Borough as part of a package of options offered.

5.0 LEGAL FRAMEWORK

5.1 Reclamation and Reuse – General

5.1.1 Recent changes in legislation give London Boroughs the authority to reclaim or reuse graves in certain defined circumstances as explained below in text derived from *An Audit of London Burial Provision*. **Table 1**, (below) summarises the legal framework.

5.1.2 Restrictions of the disturbance of human remains were introduced in s25 of the Burial Act 1857 which provides that

‘It shall not be unlawful to remove any body or the remains of a body which may have been interred in any place of burial, without a licence of one of Her Majesties Principle Secretaries of State ‘

Reclamation

5.1.3 Across London in general legislation to permit reclamation of grave space was established under S9 of the Greater London (General Powers) Act 1976, which permits burial authorities in London to extinguish burial rights in graves where no interment had taken place for 75 years. As yet unused space (depth) within the grave can then be used for the purpose of further interment. This process would not disturb any existing remains in the grave, and has been termed ‘*reclamation*’. Similar provision was made in Southwark at section s21 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1975 (“the 1975 Act”).

5.1.4 Under the *Local Authorities Cemeteries Order 1977* burial authorities also have the authority to ‘reclaim’ rights in reserved graves purchased at least 75 years ago but into which no burials have taken place. Such graves would also become available for new burials.

Re-use

5.1.5 A further option was opened to London boroughs by s74 of the London Local Authorities Act 2007, which permits burial authorities – following the notification procedure set out in the 1976 Act – to re-use the full depth of any reclaimed grave in order to permit more interments. The provision relates to

graves that are at least 75 years old, but does not require a licence to be sought from the Ministry of Justice. It was anticipated that this amendment would facilitate what has been termed a 'lift and deepen' approach to grave re-use, whereby any disinterred remains from a particular grave would be placed in another container and re-interred deeper in the same grave, freeing the desired depth for re-use.

- 5.1.6 Similar provisions for re-use are also made in respect of graves within City of London Cemeteries by reference to the City of London (Various Powers Act 1969 (the 1969 Act).

Re-Use under Faculty Jurisdiction

- 5.1.7 S25 of the Burial Act 1857 does not apply 'in cases where a body is removed from one consecrated place of burial to another by Faculty granted by the Dioceses for that purpose. This process of re-use does not use a 'lift and deepen' method, since the legislation specifies the removal of remains from one consecrated place to another. Rather, the process disinters remains and relocates them to a 'designated grave'. In practice having cancelled any rights under the 1975 Act (the minimum age limit of 75 years would need to be applied) *re-use* could then take place subject to agreement through Faculty. Similar processes and procedures (as seen under the 1975 and 1976 Acts) are likely to be applied in terms of notifications, again subject to agreement under the Faculty.

5.2 Legal Situation – Southwark

- 5.2.1 The provisions of The Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1976 specifically excludes certain cemeteries within Southwark . Section 9(11)(c) of the Act set out that :

"cemetery" means a cemetery provided and maintained by a burial authority but does not include the cemeteries in the borough of Southwark known as the Nunhead (All Saints) cemetery, the Camberwell Old cemetery and the Camberwell New cemetery.

Table 1

| Process | Legislation | Function | Applicable to | Disturbance of Remains allowed? |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------------|
| Reclamation | s 21 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1975 ("the 1975 Act"). | Burial authority able to extinguish burial rights | Purchased grave where the last interment was 75 years previously Un-consecrated ground; and/or consecrated ground <i>if</i> Faculty secured APPLIES TO SOUTHWARK | No |
| Reclamation | S9 of the Greater London (General Powers) Act 1976 (the 1976 Act) | Burial authority able to extinguish burial rights | Purchased grave where the last interment was 75 years previously Un-consecrated ground; and/or consecrated ground <i>if</i> Faculty secured DOES NOT APPLY TO SOUTHWARK | No |
| Reclamation and re-use | S74, London Local Authorities Act, 2007 | Burial authority able to disturb remains in graves where right had been extinguished under the 1976 Act | Purchased grave where the last interment was 75 years previously Un-consecrated ground; consecrated ground <i>if</i> Faculty secured. NOT APPLICABLE TO SOUTHWARK AT PRESENT | Yes |
| Re-use under Faculty jurisdiction | Permitted under s25 Burial Act, 1857 | Disturbance of remains permitted in consecrated land where body is moved from one consecrated place to another, under Faculty | No time limit on previous burial Consecrated land only, if Faculty secured | Yes |

5.2.2 Legal advice provided by Counsel to Southwark Council considers that it is likely that the reason why those three Southwark cemeteries were exempted from s9 of the 1976 Act was not because it was considered inappropriate for Southwark to have the power to extinguish burial rights in this way, but simply because provision for Southwark had already been made in virtually identical terms the previous year in s21 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1975 ("the 1975 Act").

5.2.3 However s74 in the London Local Authorities Act 2007 provides for re-use after cancellation of rights only under the 1976 Act (and the 1969 Act) but not the 1975 Act thus:

74 Power to disturb human remains

(1) Where a burial authority has extinguished—

(a) a right of burial in a grave space under section 6 (power to extinguish rights of burial in cemetery lands) of the Act of 1969; or

(b) a right of interment in respect of a grave under section 9 of the Act of 1976,

the burial authority may disturb or authorise the disturbance of human remains interred in the grave for the purpose of increasing the space for interments in the grave.

- 5.2.4 On first reading this suggests that, having cancelled rights on private graves older than 75 years old, Southwark would not then be able to re-use the graves within Camberwell Old, or Camberwell New or Nunhead under the 2007 Act. Legal Advice suggests that the omission of reference to the 1975 Act within the 2007 Act may be no more than a drafting error, however any re-use under the auspices of the 2007 Act would be open to challenge. Legal advice provided to Southwark Council suggests that to enable *re-use* under the 2007 Act would require legal remedy, by seeking amendment of s74 of the 2007 Act

5.3 Summary of Reclamation and Re-use according to Burial Type

- 5.3.1 This legislative framework provides different opportunities according to whether the graves are Private (with exclusive rights of burial) or Public (also known as Common or Ordinary Graves) and according to whether the ground is consecrated or un-consecrated.

Public Graves – Un-consecrated

- 5.3.2 Counter-intuitively these graves are the most 'protected' of all graves. Any space available above the last burial can be used for new burial (subject to minimum limits of soil cover- generally around 900mm). But these graves cannot be re-used under the legislation nor under a Faculty. In practice in many cemeteries public graves are been made available for new burials by topping up soil levels and creating new burial layouts .

Public Graves – Consecrated

- 5.3.3 These graves can similarly be used for new burial (subject to minimum limits of soil cover) but they can also be potentially be *re-used* under Faculty (and subject to any stipulations under that Faculty).

Private Graves – Un-Consecrated

- 5.3.3 Rights to these graves could potentially be cancelled where older than 75 years under the 1975 Act. Available grave space could then be *reclaimed* without disturbance of any human remains encountered (subject to minimum limits of soil cover. In due course subject to the legal remedy noted above graves with rights cancelled in this way might be re-used.

Private Graves –Consecrated

- 5.3.3 Rights to these graves could potentially be cancelled where older than 75 years, under the 1975 Act. Available grave space could then be *reclaimed* without disturbance of any human remains encountered (subject to minimum limits of soil cover and subject to obtaining a Faculty). Alternatively having cancelled rights to these graves under the 1975 Act, the graves could potentially be *re-used* under Faculty jurisdiction with disturbance of human remains (which would need to be re-interred to a consecrated grave adjacent).

6.0 CEMETERY STRATEGY SHORT AND MEDIUM TERM

6.1 Introduction

- 6.1.1 The Cemetery Strategy is arranged as short present (to 2022), medium (2022-2040) and long term (2040+). The Strategy is focussed on Camberwell Old and Camberwell New, albeit recommendations are made for Nunhead Cemetery.
- 6.1.2 The Strategy informed by the responses to the public consultation, as well as by current planning policy, is thus founded on three principles:
- the Council should seek to continue to provide a burial service to meet local needs; and,
 - in doing so, the Council should make best use of the existing cemeteries including by means of re-use or reclamation of public and private graves; and
 - the Council should continue to work closely with other authorities locally and across London to make burial provision.
- 6.1.3 The Short term strategy involves physical works that would enable new burial areas to be developed in both cemeteries without recourse to reclamation or re-use .
- 6.1.4 The Medium-Term strategy relies predominantly on re- use under Faculty of older areas of public graves (mainly in Camberwell Old) alongside some limited reclaim (and re-use where possible) of private graves. Associated with this would be an investment in restoration of the heritage of Camberwell Old. Three potential Mausoleum sites are also proposed.
- 6.1.5 The Long Term Strategy relies on more comprehensive re-use and reclamation of old graves centred mainly on Camberwell New and this is described in section 7.0 below.
- 6.1.6 There are considerable constraints and risk in seeking to progress the Strategy. Foreseeable risks along with approximate costs are set out against each option as summarised in Section 8.0

6.2 Short Term Options (to 2022)

6.2.1 These are identified in green on Table 1 and on Figures 3 and 4 and illustrated in Appendix 5. Areas to be delivered initially include those set out in the Council cabinet paper in April 2011. Sites include:

- **(Site A)** – further extension of the layout completed in 2011 at Camberwell New Cemetery over recently de-contaminated ground adjacent to Honor Oak Station;
- **(Site F)** – new burial layout over previously used public burial areas in the Camberwell Old Cemetery alongside Wood Vale through process of raising the ground levels (soil top up) subject to planning approval;
- **(Site B)** – use of the remaining part of Honor Oak Nursery site having raised soil levels to ensure adequate depth above difficult ground conditions is available for double depth burials;
- **(Site D1)** – use of unused space (virgin ground) in Camberwell New Cemetery involving the partial clearance of woodland and the creation of new footpaths ;
- **(Site H1)** – a new burial layout, sited in the north of Camberwell Old, laid out over an area previously used for public burials but which has already been ‘topped up’ with soil in the past.
- **Muslim Burial** – expansion of existing site (within Nunhead) on previously topped up ground, and provision elsewhere in new layouts.

6.2.2 Investment in the infrastructure would be required to enable appropriate access and this would include as a minimum~:

- at Camberwell New- comprehensive remodelling of the road access and boundaries around the old nursery/yard/car park to give an attractive access both to Honor Oak Park and to the extended burial areas;
- repairs and modifications to exiting carriageways in the west of Camberwell New along with associated footpath works (the latter requiring planning permission)
- reconstruction (and extension) of existing carriageways and footpaths in the north of Camberwell Old, potentially including planning application where carriageway/paths are extended.

6.3 Medium Term (2022-2040)

6.3.1 Having exhausted the physical solutions by 2022 (or before according to demand) the Strategy looks to provide burial space in Camberwell Old through.

- a. Re-use of public graves (in consecrated areas and subject to a Faculty) in which new lawn new layouts would be set out over public areas where last burials took place more than 75 years ago. Any remains found would be lifted and re interred in a new consecrated grave at the ends of the new burial rows.
- b. A combination of re-use and/or reclaim and/or new layout making use of additional soil depth all subject to investigations, remediation and re-profiling of areas previously disturbed and topped up with soil (in the north-west of Camberwell Old), also subject to Faculty and potentially planning approval.
- c. Reclaim of private graves - in south and western parts of Camberwell Old where there has been significant clearance of existing historic monuments. This would Carried out under the auspices of the 1975 Act (and under Faculty where concentrated). This would be subject to being able to confirm records and identify grave locations. The reclaim would offer the opportunity of restore monuments (whilst re-inscribing them) and to record cultural and heritage significance for posterity.
- d. Re-use in these private grave areas and where consecrated, subject to cancellation of rights under the 1975 Act, subject to Faculty. This again would offer the opportunity to record , restore re-inscribe and reuse certain monuments
- e. Re-use in these private grave areas where suitable and where not consecrated, subject to cancellation of rights under the 1975 Act, but only subject to Southwark Council having secured the necessary legal change (or clarification to the law) to enable application of re-use under the 2007 Act
- f. Mausoleums – installation of above ground mausoleum niches.

6.3.2 Areas to be developed in this way would include:

- **(G1/G2)** –re-use (a) of public grave areas in the open grass in southern part of Camberwell Old; (commenced in 2022 in an area of public burial that appears last used prior to 1927- ie 95 years old)
- **(Z)** – re-use/reclaim/new layout subject to detailed investigation and feasibility of previously disturbed and topped up area subject to planning approval, EA approval and subject to Faculty in part;
- **(H2/H3) & (JKL)** – re-use (a) of public grave areas in the glades and part wooded areas in southern part of Camberwell Old; (commenced in 2027/2029 in areas of public burial that appears last used prior to 1927- ie around 100 years old)
- **(D2)**– re-use (a) of public grave areas in the glades and part wooded areas in western part of Camberwell New; (commenced in 2032 on area of public burial which would be generally 90+ years old))
- **(R1/R2)** re-use/reclaim of selected older graves under the 1975 Act and subject to Faculty;
- **(T, Q1-Q5)** re-use/reclaim of selected older graves under the 1975 Act and subject to Faculty;
- **(I1, I2, B)** mausoleum sites on the vacant sites of the old chapels Camberwell Old subject site investigation, sensitive bespoke design, planning approval and Faculty and the potential incorporation of an embankment mausoleum on fringes of site B, Camberwell New

6.3.3 The move to *reclamation* and or *re-use* relies on being certain of the location of individual graves and of the date to last interment and, in respect of reclamation, the depth to last interment. That in turn relies on having a high level of confidence in being able to identify plots on the ground that cross reference well to the Burial Plan and to the Purchase Register. In addition in instances of *reclaim* it may be necessary to rod the grave to ascertain actual depth to interment as opposed to the depth recorded in the Purchase Register. These issues are further addressed in the ‘Risk’ section below, and in summary will rely on improving records, detailed site work and

considerable pre-planning and research, using appropriately trained/qualified staff.

6.3.4 Given the age structure and disposition of private graves and ad-hoc survival of memorials in Camberwell Old, *re-use* and/or *reclaim* of graves older than 75 years under 6.3.1 c),d), and e) would necessarily take place on an opportunistic basis (rather than be a comprehensive re-use of the entire area). However the certain areas which appear older with identifiable plots might be prioritised for *re-use/reclaim* over areas where plots are less identifiable and/ or age structure is more mixed.

6.3.5 If assumptions in terms of rate of delivery of plots and burial rate prove correct the medium and short term burial options could potentially meet needs until 2040.

6.4 Review Process

6.4.1 There are considerable uncertainties in terms of burial demand relating to:

- demographic change, burial /cremation/alternative preferences leading to uncertain burial demand ;
- the ability of other authorities in London to meet burial needs;
- the increasing size of people (and plots);
- future demand/market for 'woodland' or natural burial;
- demand for reclaimed/reused graves or restored memorials;.

6.4.2 Alongside this there are uncertainties in terms of rate of delivery of plot capacity relating to:

- requirements for Faculty, planning and EA approvals;
- heritage and nature conservation constraints;
- implications of record reviews;
- technical and cost constraints.

6.4.3 For these reasons it is imperative that this Strategy and these details are reviewed at key stages including in 2020 (nearing the end of the short-term period), and in 2030 and in 2040 (at medium and end points of the medium-term period).

6.5 Other Considerations

6.5.1 For reasons explained below (see 7.2) it is currently anticipated that at the end of the medium term period, in 2040, and before long term options become available, there is likely to be a period during which demand cannot be met. For this reason in the short and medium term it is advised that Southwark not only ensure reviews as described are carried out but also;

- continue to work with other local authorities to secure additional burial space of at least 2000-3000 plots on alternative site(s);
- investigate options of directly providing (or partnering to supply) woodland or natural burial. This so as to offer choice and meet a potential growing demand in that sector;
- consider a detailed review of Nunhead Cemetery with a view to highly selective *reclaim* or *reuse* being taken forward in a very sensitive manner in association with careful restoration of the heritage assets. This could include a form of 'woodland' burial with no memorialisation offered at a premium rate and releasing funds for restoration.

6.5.2 It is acknowledged that these options will not all be universally popular, but a balanced range of options is likely be necessary so as to provide flexibility and to enable the authority move to a situation in the very long term where sustainable *re-use* is possible within the existing landholding.

6.5.3 *Re-use* of graves in non-consecrated areas in Southwark (using the lift and deepen method) may only be achieved further to a change in law or clarification in the courts to permit the application of the 2007 Act. Given this form of re-use may useful to some limited extent in the medium term (T Q1,Q2,Q3,Q4 in Camberwell Old) and is envisaged as essential in the long term strategy (see below) this legal change/clarification will need to be pursued by Southwark Council in the short and medium term.

6.6.4 If the *mausoleum* options are to be developed so as to be sustainable (with niches being leased and re-used as they are on the continent) then Southwark would be advised to work closely with industry bodies with a view to seeking legal provision to allow that form of use.

NOTE 1. Faculty Approval Process:

Consult with Diocese and follow notice procedures. Seek permission from relatives and obtain Faculty approval. Exhume remains for re-interment in appropriate new grave.

NOTE 3. Record review:

Re-use and/or re-clamation relies on a comprehensive review of burial records to check on period since last interment, and/or depth available to last interment combined with site checking/recording of identifiable plots.

Z Re-use/Re-claim/Soil Top Up Public Area

Re-use of Public graves under Faculty (1) (where consecrated) in combination with re-modelling of existing soil profiles and top up (including removal of unsuitable spoil and additional import of soil) to give sufficient depth to enable new burial lay outs. Maximum of 1000 plots, all subject to further feasibility study.

(R1-R3, T, Q1-Q5)


Private Lawn / Kerb Set Areas


'Reclaim' grave space where available under Faculty (1) (where consecrated) or under 1975 Act (where non consecrated) and/or limited 'Re-use' under Faculty (1) where consecrated. All subject to detailed record review and plot identification (3) on a plot by plot basis. Assume simple headstone in lawn arrangement (no kerb sets) with predominantly new memorials but in accordance with a heritage code. (from 2022)



F, F.1. Burial on Unconsecrated Public Areas: subject to soil top-up (assume double depth burial). Approximately 800 plots.





G1,G2 Re-use of Public Graves (Re use under Faculty) 1. Approximately 455 plots.

KEY

 Short term (2011-2022)

 Medium term (2022-2040)

 New/refurbished carriageway
 New/refurbished footpath

 New/refurbished carriageway
 New/refurbished carriageway (subject to extinguishing rights)
 New/refurbished footpath
 New/refurbished footpath (subject to extinguishing rights)

H1. New Burial Layout-Public Areas

New Lawn burial layout on previously topped up and unused space . Approximately 480 plots.

H2, H3. Re-use of Public Graves

New Lawn burial layout on Public areas under Faculty(1) Approximately 840 plots.

J,K,L. Re-use of Public Graves

New Lawn burial layout on Public areas under Faculty (1) Approximately 1060 plots.

I.1, I2 Mausolea

Purpose designed structure on sites of chapels assumed end accessed and triple height.

E. New Layout

Scrub clearance and burial on new plot layout. (Already completed in October 2011)





FIGURE 3

rev C

Drawing number: 048.02.05

SHORT & MEDIUM TERM OPTIONS: CAMBERWELL OLD



- KEY**
- Short term (2011-2022)
 - Medium term (2022-2040)
 - New/refurbished carriageway
 - New/refurbished footpath
 - New/refurbished footpath (subject to extinguishing rights)
 - New/refurbished carriageway
 - New/refurbished footpath
 - New/refurbished footpath (subject to extinguishing rights)

A Area extended south. Phase 1 complete. Phase 2 to complete following drainage. 435 plots.

D1. Burial into previously unused land following clearances and preparation with new plot layout. Approx 220 plots.

B. Lawn burial area raised above over existing variable ground conditions with imported material Approx 900 plots.

D1 Re-use of Public graves under Faculty) 1. Approximately 1000 plots.

I Mausoleum built into embankment.



NOTE 1. Faculty Approval Process:
 Consult with Diocese and follow notice procedures. Seek permission from relatives and obtain Faculty approval. Exhume remains for re-interment in appropriate new grave.

NOTE 3. Record review:
 Re-use and/or re-clamation relies on a comprehensive review of burial records to check on period since last interment, and/or depth available to last interment combined with site checking/recording of identifiable plots.

FIGURE 4 rev B
 Drawing number: 048.02.06

SHORT & MEDIUM TERM OPTIONS: CAMBERWELL NEW



Table 2: Short and Medium Term Options

(see colour code -figures 3 and 4)

| Site | Max No. of plots | Target Start Date | Approx End Date | Cost of fees £ (2011 pricing) | Cost of delivery £ | Total Cost £ | Cost per plot/£ | Legal/Regulatory/ Ecclesiastical Requirements/ Processes | Infrastructure | Risks <i>Opportunities</i> | Notes |
|--|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------------|---|---|--|--|
| A Lawn Burial (Honor Oak De-contaminated Site) C'New | 435 210pa | 1/2012 | 2/2014 | £25.2K | £76.2K | 101.4K | £233 | Confirm planning status | Use existing access. Walk-distance not ideal Resolve drainage issues for Phase 2 Concrete memorial rafts | Cost of £600/month (£35 plot for spoil disposal). <i>Possible use of embankment for cremated remains</i> | Due to complete imminently |
| F & F1 Lawn Burial Soil Top up over Public Graves C'Old | 806 244pa | 2/2014 | 5/2017 | £44.8K | £382.7 | £427.6K | £530 | Planning Consent Highways Consent Notifications in respect of Public Graves where visited Extinguish rights & notifications of Private graves (s21GLC(GP) 1975) to achieve access. | Difficult access for grave digging and funerals- new path to cross over Private graves (rights to be extinguished) Modified alignment to Green Chain Walk Gravel/concrete memorial rafts | Significant Tree Loss Sets difficult precedent in terms of build up around trees. Potential drainage issues Potential Objections Risk of: -encountering Public graves of less than 75 years old unless robust data check in place - not being able to plot/locate Private graves -graves at shallower depths than those so far encountered in trial pitting | |
| B Lawn Burial within new burial area established over Nursery Site C'New | 900 285pa | 5/2017 | 7/2020 | £120K | £673.6K | £793.7K | £882 | Requires full planning application. | Re-configure access and yard and car park areas. Import raised platform of earth for burials over existing difficult ground walls and bases New steps paths boundary fencing Planted boundary Concrete memorial rafts | Potential geological /stability issues relating to surcharging Issues with unforeseen pockets of difficult ground conditions <i>Possible use of embankment for cremated remains</i> <i>Resolves currently under-utilised area</i> | Requires desk and potentially intrusive study of underlying geology. Alternative option of import and construct chambers over difficult ground conditions available |

Southwark Council Cemetery Strategy

| Site | Max No. of plots | Target Start Date | Approx End Date | Cost of fees £ (2011 pricing) | Cost of delivery £ (2011 pricing) | Total Cost | Cost per plot/£ | Legal/Regulatory/ Ecclesiastical Requirements/Processes | Infrastructure | Risks <i>Opportunities</i> | Notes |
|---|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------------|---|--|--|---|
| G1 G2 Lawn Burial within previously topped up area on Consecrated Ground | 430 | 10/2022 | 2/2024 | £16.2K | £66.3K | £82.6K | £192 | <p>Faculty application for new layout.</p> <p>Faculty application for re-use of Public graves</p> <p>Extinguish rights & notifications of Private graves (s21GLC(GP) 1975) to achieve access.</p> | <p>Establish new route for public and grave-digging plant into area across private graves adjacent</p> <p>Gravel/concrete memorial rafts</p> | <p>Some tree loss</p> <p>Potential Objections</p> <p>Risk of: -encountering Public graves of less than 75 years old unless robust data check in place</p> <p>- not being able to plot/locate graves of less than 75 years old</p> <p>-graves at shallower depths than those so far encountered in trial pitting</p> | <p>Requires -additional trial pits -bat surveys -detailed records review using digital filtering</p> <p>Assumes lift and re-inter remains in consecrated grave at end of row</p> |
| Z | 1000 | 2/2024 | 1/2027 | £207.3K | £1,078m | £1,294m | £1294 | <p>Faculty application for new layout.</p> <p>Agreement with EA over remediation strategy</p> <p>Planning application for remediation/soil movement/access</p> <p>Extinguish rights & notifications of Private graves (s21GLC(GP) 1975) to achieve access.</p> | <p>Proposals will be subject to</p> <p>Gravel/concrete memorial rafts</p> | <p>Some tree loss</p> <p>Potential Objections</p> <p>Risk of: -encountering Public graves of less than 75 years old unless robust data check in place</p> <p>- not being able to plot/locate graves of less than 75 years old</p> <p>-graves at shallower depths than those so far encountered in trial pitting</p> <p><i>Resolves currently under-utilised area</i></p> | <p>Requires -trial pits -clearance -full topo -full arb and bat surveys -detailed records review using digital filtering - full feasibility study</p> |
| H2 H3 | 775 | 1/2027 | 4/2029 | £37.2K | £166.7K | £203.9K | £263 | <p>Faculty application for new layout.</p> <p>Faculty application for re-use of Public graves</p> <p>Planning application if extended paths constructed through private burial areas.</p> <p>Extinguish rights & notifications of Private graves (s21GLC(GP) 1975) to achieve access.</p> | <p>Uses re-surfaced main access implemented with H1</p> <p>Extend access and paths through private grave areas adjacent</p> <p>Protect and sign 'overgrown' private grave areas adjacent</p> <p>Protect resident amenity with planting and buffer strip and 'amenity' area</p> <p>Gravel/concrete memorial rafts</p> | <p>Tree loss Proximity to housing Potential Objections</p> <p>Difficult access via private graves adjacent</p> <p>Risk of: -encountering Public graves of less than 75 years old unless robust data check in place</p> <p>- not being able to plot/locate graves of less than 75 years old</p> <p>-graves at shallower depths than those so far encountered in trial pitting</p> | <p>Original burial areas extend close to rear of Forest Hill Rd rear gardens</p> <p>Requires -trial pits -clearance -full topo -full arb and bat surveys -detailed records review using digital filtering</p> <p>Assumes lift and re-inter remains in consecrated grave at end of row</p> |

Southwark Council Cemetery Strategy

| Site | Max No. of plots | Target Start Date | Approx End Date | Cost of fees £ (2011 pricing) | Cost of delivery £ (2011 pricing) | Total Cost | Cost per plot/£ | Legal/Regulatory/ Ecclesiastical Requirements/Processes | Infrastructure | Risks <i>Opportunities</i> | Notes |
|--|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------------|---|--|--|--|
| J K | 1060 | 4/2029 | 3/2032 | £47.2K | £193.9K | £241.1K | £227 | <p>Faculty application for new layout.</p> <p>Extinguish rights & notifications of Private graves (s21GLC(GP) 1975) to achieve access.</p> | <p>Uses re-surfaced main access implemented with H1</p> <p>Extend access and paths through private grave areas adjacent</p> <p>Protect and sign 'overgrown' private grave areas adjacent</p> <p>Gravel/concrete memorial rafts</p> | <p>Significant tree loss</p> <p>Potential Objections</p> <p>Risk of: -encountering Public graves of less than 75 years old unless robust data check in place</p> <p>- not being able to plot/locate graves of less than 75 years old</p> <p>-graves at shallower depths than those so far encountered in trial pitting</p> | <p>Requires</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -trial pits -clearance -full topo -full arb and bat surveys -detailed records review using digital filtering <p>Assumes lift and re-inter remains in consecrated grave at end of row</p> |
| D2 | 1000 | 3/2032 | 1/2035 | £46.3K | £224.2K | £270.5K | £270 | <p>Faculty application for new layout.</p> <p>Faculty application for re-use of Public graves</p> <p>Planning application for new paths</p> <p>Extinguish rights & notifications of Private graves (s21GLC(GP) 1975) to achieve access.</p> | <p>Potential planning application for access</p> <p>Upgrade/modifications to existing c'ways to allow cortege access</p> <p>Gravel/concrete memorial rafts</p> | <p>As above</p> | <p>Requires</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -further trial pits -clearance - follow on arb and bat surveys -detailed records review using digital filtering <p>Assumes lift and re-inter remains in consecrated grave at end of row</p> |
| Camberwell Old – Areas R1,R2,T Q1,Q2,Q3,Q4 | ?max 50 per annum =1000-1600max? | 2022 | 2040 | ? | ? | | | <p>Faculty for use of graves where in consecrated areas (S and parts of Q2)</p> <p>Extinguish rights & notifications of Private graves (s21GLC(GP) 1975) to enable Re-claim of unused grave space .</p> <p>Re-use under 2007 act (but only subject to change in law or legal clarification through the courts of the application of the 2007 act)</p> | <p>Relies on ongoing maintenance of carriageways of main butterfly loop (C Old)</p> <p>Would involve restoration and or /re-inscription of existing memorials (including simple headstones and full kerb sets) and or new simple headstones in simple style.</p> | <p>Potential Objections (general public)</p> <p>Risk of: -Not being able to achieve/find significant numbers of graves. - decreasing availability of graves as surface evidence (memorial stones etc) of graves become increasingly lost over time. - risk of low uptake (un developed market for reclaimed grave spaces especially where using restored/re-inscribed monuments</p> <p><i>Opportunity to record cultural/historical value of older burial areas for posterity</i></p> <p><i>Significant opportunity to enable re investment in older areas without significant loss in character</i></p> | <p>Involves opportunistic approach to reclaiming (of only those graves found to have sufficient depth to enable further interments</p> <p>Requires comprehensive research of records (and rodding of plots) to check un-used depth in existing graves and to check on age of last interment</p> <p>Involves setting up of a Memorial Panel</p> |

Southwark Council Cemetery Strategy

| Site | Max No. of plots | Target Start Date | Approx End Date | Cost of fees £ (2011 pricing) | Cost of delivery £ | Total Cost | Cost per plot/£ | Legal/Regulatory/ Ecclesiastical Requirements/Processes | Infrastructure | Risks <i>Opportunities</i> | Notes |
|--|--|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|-----------------|---|---|--|--|
| Mausoleum Sites Camberwell Old (Sites I.1, I.2) Camberwell New (Site B – embankm't) | 300 (Site B0) 400 Sites I.1, I.2 (Old chapel sites) | 2022 | 2040 | ? | £700-1200 (according to system/) | | | Requires planning permission Requires Faculty Permission | Relies on ongoing maintenance of carriageways of main butterfly loop (C Old) Relies on being taken forward as an adjunct to Site B works | Risk of refusal of planning consent unless designed sympathetically to integrate with qualities that complement Camberwell Old Risk of - low uptake initially (lack of market) -change in the law (enabling re-use of mausolea) not happening in long term (making it impossible to lease and re-use the spaces thus rendering upon the Council a long term liability for maintenance with no guarantee of future long term revenue). -numbers noted being achieved on account of technical issues | Could be implemented earlier to enable early promotion of mausolea. Assumes triple height mausolea, end loading, centrally located in 2xdouble rows in each of I1,I2 Could be achieved through PFI type initiative |
| Estimated potential end date | | | Jan 2040 | | | | | | | | |

7.0 CEMETERY STRATEGY-LONG TERM

7.1 Long Term Potential for Re-use and Reclamation

7.1.1 Given the potential difficulties in identifying plots in Camberwell Old, and given the mixed age structure and the heritage value of the site, it does not lend itself to comprehensive *re-use*, (as described in 3.3.21, 6.3.3 and 6.3.4 above).

7.1.2 Despite the fact that it is a newer cemetery, Camberwell New is considered to offer more opportunity for *re-use*. The sampling analysis of age structure (3.4.13 to 3.4.16 above) reveals that even though the age structure is not well stratified there are likely to be distinct areas where most graves mature (to be more than 75 years old) around the same time.

7.2 Shortfall in Provision

7.2.1 Subject to the findings of more detailed studies (as noted under 6.3.3) (and except for area D2) most of Camberwell New will not be mature enough (older than 75 years) until 2045 and thus will not be available for *re-use* until then. Depending on demand and supply (and the findings of the interim reviews) this is likely to leave a shortfall of a minimum of 5 years (from) 2004 (or potentially sooner if burial demand rises more significantly in line with the *Audit* figures) where there will not be enough available space to sustain burial within Camberwell Old and New cemeteries alone.

7.2.2 For this reason a fall-back position has been identified whereby a part (around 1/3rd) of the Honor Oak Park, around the chapel and in the west might be earmarked for burial use. This would enable existing football pitches to be retained and could be taken forward with a programme of enhancement and re-modelling of the remainder of the Park. It is recognised that is likely to continue to be an unpopular and undesirable option. In order to avoid being in that situation, the Council should therefore also look to ensure the options noted in 6.5 are pursued.

NOTE 1. Faculty Approval Process:

Consult with Diocese and follow notice procedures. Seek permission from relatives and obtain Faculty approval. Exhume remains for re-interment in appropriate new grave.

NOTE 2. Memorial Heritage Code:

Reclamation/Re-use of Private Graves in significant historic areas: Individual plots re-claimed (i.e. burial on top of existing remains) or re-used (existing remains lifted and re-interred in consecrated place adjacent (only where consecrated land and subject to faculty approval). Graves /Memorials of cultural/artistic/technical significance would not be offered for use/resale Memorials to reclaimed/re-used plots wherever possible, would be retained, re-sold, 'reversed', restored and re-inscribed as appropriate in accordance with a 'Memorial Heritage Code'. Where memorial retention is not possible, new memorials would be aesthetically appropriate to complement the historic setting.

NOTE 3. Record review:

Re-use and/or re-clamation relies on a comprehensive review of burial records to check on periods since last interment, and/or depth available to last interment combined with site checking/recording of identifiable plots.

KEY



Historic Monuments (U1 -12)
Progressively restore areas of large / distinctive historic memorials (statues / obelisks / vaults). Re-clamation/re-use of grave space under faculty on a very limited basis in accordance with a strict heritage code. Aim to restore original monuments even where not re-used/reclaimed. (from 2045)




Historic Monuments - Wooded (V1-4)
Progressively clear dense woodland/ scrub and restore areas of large / distinctive historic memorials (statues / obelisks / vaults). Offer re-clamation/re-use of grave space under faculty on a limited basis in accordance with a strict heritage code, restoring and re-inscribing original monuments. (from 2045)



Historic Core (S, X, X1, Y, Y1, W1-4)
Reclaim grave space where available (under faculty where consecrated/ under 1975 act where non consecrated) and/or limited Re-use under faculty where consecrated. Restore, reverse and re-inscribe historic & distinctive kerb-set / headstones, on existing plot arrangement in accordance with a heritage code. (from 2045)



Private Lawn / Kerb-set Areas (R1-R3, T, Q1-5)
Reclaim grave space where available (under faculty where consecrated/ under 1975 act where non consecrated) and/or limited Re-use under faculty where consecrated. All subject to detailed record review and on a plot by plot basis Assume simple headstone in lawn arrangement (no kerb sets) with predominantly new memorials according to heritage code. (ongoing from 2022)



Mausoleum (I.1 I.2)
Purpose designed structure on sites of chapels assumed end accessed and triple height (from 2022)



New / refurbished Carriageway
New / refurbished Footpath



Short / Medium Term Strategy
Burials previously carried out under short / mid term strategy proposals on new lawn burial layouts



Secondary Woodland (O1-6)
Maintain as woodland, manage for wildlife and landscape, include some progressive thinning. Develop programme of sequential clearance of scrub, survey and recording of monuments.



FIGURE 5

rev B

Drawing number: 048.02.07

LONG TERM OPTIONS: CAMBERWELL OLD





KEY


- Private kerb set areas- Consecrated (B,D,E,G)
Re-use graves and convert to lawn burial (but with memorial on plot)
Selected kerb set memorials retained and re-stored/re-inscribed in accordance with Heritage Code. (Subject to faculty, and record review).
- Public lawn areas- Consecrated (F,H)
Re-use public graves on new lawn burial plot layout. (subject to faculty).
- Private Lawn Burial areas- Consecrated (K,L,O)
Re-use graves on original lawn burial plot layout (subject to faculty).
- Historic Core Private Kerb- set (GH)
- Private Kerb Set Areas - Un-consecrated (C,J,M)
Re-use graves and convert to lawn burial (but with memorial on plot)
Selected kerb set memorials retained and re-stored/re-inscribed in accordance with Heritage Code. (Subject to change in legislation, and record review).
- Private Lawn Areas - Un-consecrated (M,N,P)
Re-use as lawn burial on existing lawn burial layout. (Subject to change in legislation, subject to record review).
- Public Burial Areas (Un-consecrated) (I)
New lawn burial arrangement subject to topping up soil levels
- Historic Private kerb set - Un-consecrated (Cc)
Reclaim/re-use graves. (Subject to change in legislation and record review). Retain original plot layout and kerb sets - to be re-stored/re-inscribed in accordance with Heritage Code
- New Lawn Burial - Un-consecrated (AA)
New lawn burial area -around a smaller, enhanced Park-but only as and where the short and medium term burial cannot be extended to 2045

AREA REFERENCE AND TARGET DATE FOR BURIALS

| | | | | | |
|----|-----------|----|-----------|----|-----------|
| A# | 2040-2050 | G# | 2065-2075 | M# | 2085-2095 |
| B# | 2045-2055 | H# | 2065-2075 | N# | 2095 + |
| C# | 2045-2055 | I# | 2065-2075 | O# | 2095+ |
| D# | 2050-2055 | J# | 2075-2085 | P# | 2095+ |
| E# | 2055-2065 | K# | 2075-2085 | | |
| F# | 2055-2065 | L# | 2085-2095 | | |

Target dates and areas subject to detail record review and periodic monitoring and review.

- New / refurbished Carriageway
- New / refurbished Footpath
- Short / Medium Term Strategy
Burial carried out under short / medium term strategy proposals (to 2040)
- Consecrated Boundary
- Un-Consecrated Boundary
- 85 85 Section No. (Consecrated / un-consecrated)



NOTE 1. Faculty Approval Process:
Consult with Dioese and follow notice procedures. Seek permission from relatives and obtain Faculty approval. Exhume remains for re-interment in appropriate new grave.

NOTE 2. Memorial Heritage Code:
Reclamation/Re-use of Private Graves in historic core areas: Individual plots re-claimed (i.e. burial on top of existing remains) or re-used (existing remains lifted and re-interred in consecrated place adjacent (only where consecrated land and subject to faculty approval). Graves /Memorials of cultural/artistical/technical significance would not be offered for use/resale Memorials to reclaimed/re-used plots wherever possible, would be retained, re-sold, "reversed", restored and re-inscribed as appropriate in accordance with a 'Memorial Heritage Code'. Where memorial retention is not possible, new memorials would be aesthetically appropriate to complement the historic setting.

NOTE 3. Record review:
Re-use and/or re-clamation relies on a comprehensive review of burial records to check on period since last interment, and/or depth available to last interment combined with site checking/recording of identifiable plots.

FIGURE 6 rev B
Drawing number: 048.02.08

LONG TERM OPTIONS: CAMBERWELL NEW



- 7.2.4 After 2045 subject to a combination of Faculty permission and change /clarification of the law there appears to be potential for sequential and progressive *reuse* and *reclamation* at Camberwell New. **Table 3** provides a summary of how various areas within the cemetery might potentially be managed and re-used or reclaimed where appropriate.
- 7.2.5 This re-use and *reclamation* would rely on being able to develop methods for accurately surveying, recording, and laying out new burials on a grave by grave basis using historic kerb-sets areas. As noted above (sub section 3.6) the densely laid out historic plots may render some areas as being unworkable or (more likely) may result in less than comprehensive *re-use* in certain areas.
- 7.2.6 Because this approach to cemetery management and re-use is largely untested and will involving a complex range of issues and constraints, the process will need to involve considerable pre-planning, monitoring and review with a view to adopting a revised strategy if certain approaches and cannot be progressed.
- 7.2.7 In the very long term, if *re-use* and *reclamation* is delivered correctly the Strategy offers the potential to enable supply of burial space indefinitely without the need to continue to extend the cemetery landholding.

Table 3: Long Term Options

(see colour code -figures 5 and 6)

| Site | Max No plots <i>Assumed rate pa</i> | Approx. Start | Approx End | Legal/Regulatory/ Ecclesiastical Requirements/ Processes | Infrastructure | Risks <i>Opportunities</i> | Notes (Version 8) |
|--|--|---------------|------------|---|--|--|---|
| AA Honor Park | 1900 plots over 1ha | 2040 | 2045 | Requires Planning Permission | Accessible off adjacent carriageway(s) with some new paths. Requires alteration to boundary plus investment to enhance Park . Likely to involve revised drainage system (subject to investigation) | Significant risk of objection from local people Risk of unknown difficulties with unforeseen ground conditions including modifications to drainage. <i>Remainder of park and playing fields potentially significantly enhanced through additional investment</i> | Applies as fall back position <u>only</u> at very end of short and medium term period (from 2040) if burial rates increase and/ or availability of other short/medium term plots do not materialise |
| BB,BC Camberwel I New Sq 108/109/11 6/ 99/98/ PRIVATE | 1500 (Based on historic kerb set plots: undersized) <i>c.350pa</i> | 2045 | 2055 | Assumes comprehensive (90%+) Re-use of graves converted to lawn burial (but with memorial sited on plot) Selected kerb set memorials retained and re-stored/re-inscribed in accordance with Heritage Code All subject to Faculty | Carriageways and paths treatments extended and maintained from original short-medium term delivery. | Historic plot layouts undersized (!) could cause significant access/burial constraints Risk of family/grave owner objections and thus lack of availability of requisite number graves Difficult access Risk of not being able: -to plot/locate graves generally -to plot/locate graves of less than 75 years old Risks of objection in relation to perceived loss of genealogy resource/heritage/cultural heritage. <i>Opportunity to record genealogy resource /heritage / cultural heritage for posterity.</i> <i>Opportunity to restore/re-inscribe selected monuments and memorials (eg to front rows)</i> | Requires significant pre planning, recording and research Assumes burial rate has peaked and may begin to fall |
| CC Camberwel I New Sq 67 PRIVATE | (included in 1500 above) | 2045 | 2055 | Assumes comprehensive (90%+) re-use of graves converted to lawn burial (but with memorial sited on plot) Selected kerb-set memorials retained and re-stored/re-inscribed in accordance with Heritage Code Re-use through 'Lift and deepen' (subject to change in the law to enable application of s74 LLA Act 2007). | Maintain carriageways | As above + Requires change in law to enable re-use of un-consecrated graves, <i>Opportunities as above</i> | As above |
| CD Camberwel I New Sq 67 PRIVATE | (Included in 1500 above) | 2045 | 2055 | Reclaim/ restore graves (Reclaim grave space without disturbance of remains - extinguish rights & notifications of private graves (s21GLC(GP) Act 1975)) Re-use through 'Lift and deepen' (subject to change in the law to enable application of s74 LLA Act 2007). | Maintain Carriageways Significant memorials at fronts of square retained | As above + Requires change in law to enable re-use of un-consecrated graves, <i>Opportunities as above</i> | Emphasis on restoration As above Requires development of new procedures and promotion/development of a new market for Reclaimed/Re-used graves with restored memorials |

| Site | Max No plots Assumed rate pa | Approx. Start | Approx. End | Legal/Regulatory/ Ecclesiastical Requirements/ Processes | Infrastructure | Risks Opportunities | Notes |
|---|---|---------------|-------------|--|---|--|---|
| DD,DE Camberwell I New Sq 110/111/11 2/ 118/119 PRIVATE | 1500 (Based on historic kerb set plots: under-sized) <i>c.350pa</i> | 2050 | 2055 | Assumes comprehensive (90%+) Re-use of graves converted to lawn burial (but with memorial sited on plot) Selected kerb set memorials retained and re-stored/re-inscribed in accordance with Heritage Code All subject to Faculty | Carriageways and paths treatments extended and maintained from original short-medium term delivery. | Historic plot layouts undersized (!) could cause significant access/burial constraints Risk of family/grave owner objections and thus lack of availability of requisite number graves Difficult access Risk of not being able: -to plot/locate graves generally -to plot/locate graves of less than 75 years old Risks of objection in relation to perceived loss of genealogy resource/heritage/cultural heritage. <i>Opportunity to record genealogy resource /heritage / cultural heritage for posterity.</i> <i>Opportunity to restore/re-inscribe selected monuments and memorials (eg to front rows)</i> | Requires significant pre planning, recording and research Requires development of new procedures and promotion/development of a new market for Reclaimed/Re-used graves with restored memorials |
| S,X,X1,Y,Y 1,W1-W4 Camberwell I Old Private Historic Core | 1300 Reclaim + Re-use <i>c50pa</i> | 2045 | 2065 | Assumes: -'scatter-gun' pattern of uptake of reclamations within historic areas under 1975 Act and similarly a: -'scatter-gun' uptake of re-use under Faculty within historic areas and/or: -requires change in law to enable re-use through application of the 2007 Act in un-consecrated areas. | Assumes grave reclamation/re-use according to available depth with associated restoration/re-inscription of memorials and/or replacement 'heritage memorials' | Risks of objection in relation to perceived loss of genealogy resource/heritage/cultural heritage. Requires change in law for <u>re-use</u> of un-consecrated areas (W1-W4) Higher costs associated with re-claim/re-sue where associated with restoration/reuse of memorials may deter uptake <i>Opportunity to record genealogy resource/heritage/cultural heritage for posterity and or to restore memorials .</i> <i>Opportunity to restore monuments and memorials</i> | Requires significant pre planning, recording and research Requires development of new procedures and promotion/development of a new market for Reclaimed/Re-used graves with restored memorials. |
| EE Camberwell I New Sq 100/101/10 2/ 103 PRIVATE | 1900 (Based on historic kerb set plots: under-sized) <i>c.32.5pa</i> | 2055 | 2065 | As DD DE above | As DD DE above | As DD DE above | As above |

Southwark Council Cemetery Strategy

| Site | Max No plots Assumed rate per annum | Approx. Start | Approx. End | Legal/Regulatory/Ecclesiastical Requirements/ Processes | Infrastructure | Risks Opportunities | Notes |
|---|--|---------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|
| FF, FG Camberwell I New Sq's 100/101/102/103 PUBLIC | 580 (Based on new plots: layouts of 1.22x 2.7m+raft) <i>c.325pa</i> | 2055 | 2065 | Assumes complete re-use of Public grave areas under Faculty in consecrated squares forming new layout. Extinguish rights & notifications of Private graves (s21GLC(GP) 1975) to achieve access. | Carriageways and paths upgraded and maintained from original short-medium term delivery. Gravel or concrete rafts | Some tree loss Potential Objections Risk of: -encountering Public graves of less than 75 years old unless robust data check in place - not being able to plot/locate graves of less than 75 years old -graves at shallower depths than those so far encountered in trial pitting | Assumes lift and re-inter remains in consecrated grave at end of row |
| GG Camberwell I New Sq's 79/80/90 PRIVATE | 1200 (Based on historic kerb set plots: under-sized) <i>c.300pa</i> | 2065 | 2075 | Assumes comprehensive (90%+) Re-use of graves converted to lawn burial (but with memorial sited on plot) Selected kerb set memorials retained and re-stored/re-inscribed in accordance with Heritage Code All subject to Faculty | Carriageways and paths treatments extended and maintained from original short-medium term delivery. Assumes some significant memorials at fronts of older squares retained, all other areas convert to lawn burial. | Historic plot layouts undersized (!) could cause significant access/burial constraints Risk of family/grave owner objections and thus lack of availability of requisite number graves Difficult access Risk of not being able: -to plot/locate graves generally -to plot/locate graves of less than 75 years old Risks of objection in relation to perceived loss of genealogy resource/heritage/cultural heritage. <i>Opportunity to record genealogy resource /heritage / cultural heritage for posterity.</i> <i>Opportunity to restore/re-inscribe selected monuments and memorials (eg to front rows)</i> | Requires significant pre planning, recording and research Requires development of new procedures and promotion/development of a new market for Reclaimed/Re-used graves with restored memorials |
| GH Camberwell I New Sq 79 PRIVATE | (included in 1200 above under GG) | 2065 | 2075 | Reclaim/ restore graves (Reclaim grave space without disturbance of remains - extinguish rights & notifications of private graves (s21GLC(GP) Act 1975)) Re-use under Faculty | Maintain Carriageways Significant memorials at fronts of square retained | As above <i>Opportunities as above</i> | Emphasis on restoration As above |
| HH HG Camberwell I New Sq's 90/93/94/112 PUBLIC | 1000 (Based on new plots: layouts of 1.22x 2.7m+raft) <i>c.300pa</i> | 2065 | 2075 | Assumes complete re-use of Public grave areas under Faculty in consecrated squares forming new layout. Extinguish rights & notifications of Private graves (s21GLC(GP) 1975) to achieve access. | Carriageways and paths upgraded and maintained from original short-medium term delivery. | Some tree loss Potential Objections Risk of: -encountering Public graves of less than 75 years old unless robust data check in place - not being able to plot/locate graves of less than 75 years old -graves at shallower depths than those so far encountered in trial pitting | Assumes lift and re-inter remains in consecrated grave at end of row |

Southwark Council Cemetery Strategy

| Site | Max No plots Assumed rate per annum | Approx. Start | Approx. End | Legal/Regulatory/Ecclesiastical Requirements/ Processes | Infrastructure | Risks Opportunities | Notes |
|--|---|---------------|-------------|--|---|--|---|
| <p>II</p> <p>Camberwell I New</p> <p>Sq's 6/14/15/25/37</p> <p>Soil top up</p> <p>PUBLIC</p> | <p>800</p> <p>(Based on new plots: layouts of 1.22x 2.7m+raft)</p> <p>c300pa</p> | 2065 | 2075 | <p>Assumes complete re-use of Public grave areas under Faculty in consecrated squares forming new layout.</p> <p>Extinguish rights & notifications of Private graves (s21GLC(GP) 1975) to achieve access.</p> | | <p>Significant Tree Loss</p> <p>Sets difficult precedent in terms of build up around trees.</p> <p>Potential drainage issues</p> <p>Potential Objections</p> <p>Risk of: -encountering Public graves of less than 75 years old unless robust data check in place</p> <p>- not being able to plot/locate Private graves</p> <p>-graves at shallower depths than those so far encountered in trial pitting</p> | |
| <p>JJ JK JL</p> <p>Camberwell I New Sq</p> <p>6/15/25/26/37/39/52/53 / 78</p> <p>PRIVATE</p> | <p>2900</p> <p>(Based on historic kerb set plots: under-sized)</p> <p>c290pa</p> | 2075 | 2085 | <p>Assumes comprehensive (90%+) re-use of graves converted to lawn burial (but with memorial sited on plot) Selected kerb-set memorials retained and re-stored/re-inscribed in accordance with Heritage Code</p> <p>Re-use through 'Lift and deepen' (subject to change in the law to enable application of s74 LLA Act 2007).</p> | <p>Carriageways and paths treatments extended and maintained from original short-medium term delivery.</p> <p>Assumes some significant memorials at fronts of older squares retained, all other areas convert to lawn burial.</p> | <p>Historic kerb set plot layouts undersized (!) could cause significant access/burial constraints</p> <p>Risk of family/grave owner objections and thus lack of availability of requisite number graves</p> <p>Difficult access</p> <p>Risk of not being able: -to plot/locate graves generally -to plot/locate graves of less than 75 years old</p> <p>Risks of objection in relation to perceived loss of genealogy resource/heritage/cultural heritage.</p> <p>+ Requires change in law to enable re-use of un-consecrated graves, <i>Opportunity to record genealogy resource /heritage / cultural heritage for posterity.</i></p> <p><i>Opportunity to restore/re-inscribe selected monuments and memorials (eg to front rows)</i></p> | <p>Requires significant pre planning, recording and research</p> <p>Requires development of new procedures and promotion/development of a new market for Reclaimed/Re-used graves with restored memorials</p> |
| <p>KK KL</p> <p>Camberwell I New</p> <p>Sq's 69/78/89/91 /</p> <p>PRIVATE</p> | <p>(Included within 2900 above)</p> <p>(Based on historic plot: lawn burial)</p> <p>c290pa</p> | 2075 | 2085 | <p>Assumes comprehensive (90%+) Re-use of graves mostly already laid out as lawn burial</p> <p>All subject to Faculty</p> | As above | <p>Risks of objection in relation to perceived loss of genealogy resource/heritage/cultural heritage.</p> <p>Risk of family/grave owner objections and thus lack of availability of requisite number graves</p> <p><i>Opportunity to record genealogy resource /heritage / cultural heritage for posterity.</i></p> | As above |

Southwark Council Cemetery Strategy

| Site | Max No plots <i>Assumed rate paid</i> | Approx. Start | Approx. End | Legal/Regulatory/Ecclesiastical Requirements/ Processes | Infrastructure | Risks <i>Opportunities</i> | Notes |
|---|---|---------------|-------------|---|----------------|--|-----------|
| LL, LN, LM Camberwell New Sqs 81/83/84/92 PRIVATE | 2900 (including MM to MQ below) (Based on historic lawn burial) <i>c2900pa</i> | 2085 | 2095 | Assumes comprehensive (90%+) Re-use of graves mostly already laid out as lawn burial All subject to Faculty | As above | As above | As above |
| MM Camberwell New Sqs 38 PRIVATE | (included in 2900 above) (MM Based on historic kerb set plots: under-sized) <i>c2900p</i> | 2085 | 2095 | Assumes comprehensive (90%+) re-use of graves as Lawn burial Where not already lawn (MM) convert to lawn burial (but with memorial sited on plot) Re-use through 'Lift and deepen' (subject to change in the law to enable application of s74 LLA Act 2007). | As above | As JJ above | As above. |
| MN to-MQ Camberwell New Sqs 16/54/ 66/68 PRIVATE | (incl in 2900 above) (MN to MQ Based on historic plot: lawn burial) <i>c2900pa</i> | 2085 | 2095 | Assumes comprehensive (90%+) re-use of graves as Lawn burial Re-use through 'Lift and deepen' (subject to change in the law to enable application of s74 LLA Act 2007). | As above | Risks of objection in relation to perceived loss of genealogy resource/heritage/cultural heritage. Risk of family/grave owner objections and thus lack of availability of requisite number graves <i>Opportunity to record genealogy resource /heritage / cultural heritage for posterity.</i> | As above. |
| NN-NS, Camberwell New Sqs 17/27/28/29 / 30/40/41/ 55/56 PRIVATE | 3350 (incl O) and PP below) Total remainder potentially available plots (Based on all remaining sections of historic plot/lawn burials) ? | 2095 | 2105? | As above Re-use through 'Lift and deepen' (subject to change in the law to enable application of s74 LLA Act 2007). | As above | As above | As above |
| OO Camberwell New Sqs 82 PRIVATE | As above ? | 2095 | 2105? | Assumes comprehensive (90%+) Re-use of graves mostly already laid out as lawn burial All subject to Faculty | As Above | As above. | As Above |
| PP Camberwell New Sqs 63/64/ 72/73/74/ PRIVATE | As above ? | 2095 | 2105? | As above Re-use through 'Lift and deepen' (subject to change in the law to enable application of s74 LLA Act 2007). | As above | As above | As above |

8.0 RISKS AND COSTS

8.1 Risks- Short Term

8.1.1 Risk in re developing short term burial areas in Camberwell Old and Camberwell New include:

- i. risk that efficient layouts cannot be achieved due to the desirability of retaining significant trees, and /or local objection to the removal of trees;
- ii. potential difficulties in achieving appropriate drainage due to the clay soils;
- iii. difficult ground conditions or geotechnical issues (old Honor Oak Nursery site);
- iv. difficulties in achieving new footpath or carriageway access where that involves cancelling rights across old private graves adjacent;
- v. risks of encountering public graves at shallower depths than suggested by trail pitting;
- vi. difficulties in locating/identifying private or public graves in and around new burial layouts and /or risks of encountering poorly recorded graves
- vii. risks in obtaining planning Faculty and other approvals;
- viii. risks that burial rates (currently at 210 per annum) will increase more rapidly than assumed on account of differences in modelling and or demographic trends and/or increased demand from areas outside Southwark as burial supply in other London Boroughs becomes critical or exhausted;
- ix. risk that numbers of plots deliverable fall short of those predicted because of the various and complex constraints and/or continued increased demand for larger plot sizes driving down numbers achievable (see 6.5).

8.1.2 These risk can be minimised in the short term through ensuring:

- each phase of work is appropriately planned with adequate lead in times and budgets allowed for advance surveying and site investigation trial pitting, public consultation and planning consent;

- each phase of work is explained as part of the Strategy and the renewal and restoration aspects are planned as part of broader Conservation Management Plans for the cemeteries;
- full and ongoing dialogue is conducted with the Diocese
- the review and monitoring process is robust, and includes ongoing review of burial demand.

8.2 Medium Term

8.2.1 Many of the risk noted above in terms of technical constraints, arboricultural and nature conservation constraints also apply in respect of medium term options. Similar risk also apply in terms of approval, Faculty, and burial demand and similar mitigation also therefore applies.

8.2.2 In the medium-term there is a heavy reliance on the *re-use* of consecrated public burial areas. Risks inherent in this include:

- i. encountering graves of less than 75 years old (and potential legal challenge) unless robust data check in place (see 3.7.3, 3.7.4);
- ii. difficulties in not being able to plot/locate graves of less than 75 years old within any target area;
- iii. difficulties in locating/identifying private or public graves in and around new burial layouts and /or risks of encountering poorly recorded graves
- iv. graves at shallower depths than those so far encountered in trial pitting/rodding and/or less advanced decomposition leading to more substantial remains being encountered and potentially making re-use inappropriate/unworkable;
- v. a potential mismatch between the religious demographic of the deceased and the use of consecrated land;
- vi. risk of not securing Faculty on account of the above.

8.2.3 In order to mitigate against (i) (ii) and (iii) it is advised that all the records for each cemetery be entered into a new digital Burial Register. Ideally this could be cross referenced onto digital GIS cemetery plans (with plot numbers). This should enable the data to be digitally filtered by different fields enabling actual age of all the plots any one area to be able to checked.

If GIS burial plans are not used/ created then plot numbers in any one area (where that area is being considered for re-use) would need to be collated manually and the data interrogated against those entries/plots- a task which whilst laborious should be practicable with the aid of a digital register.

8.2.4 In order to mitigate against (iii) and (iv) additional trial digging should be conducted.

8.2.5 In order to mitigate against (v) and (vi) Southwark should:

- carefully record religious denomination, and identify trends. It may be necessary to reserve graves in non-consecrated parts for non-Anglicans and this may involve bringing forward G1/G2 for instance to make them available sooner;
- work closely with the Diocese in all stages of the process.

8.2.6 Similar risks and mitigation (to the above) also applies in terms of the more limited reclamation and re-use of private graves proposed in Camberwell Old in the medium term. In addition risks include that:

- vii. demand may be low re-used/reclaimed graves;
- viii. demand may be low for restored/re-inscribed monuments;
- ix. there may be concern /objection at perceived loss of heritage/genealogical resource.

8.2.6 In order to mitigate these risks and so as to conduct re-use properly Southwark will need to implement and demonstrate:

- a thorough approach to plot/memorial assessment in association with a 'Heritage Code';
- a thorough approach to surveying, photographing and otherwise recording all inscriptions and details in an accessible manner, (potentially making records available on-line in association with a genealogy specialist);
- re-use and reclamation is carried out in accordance with a Conservation Management Plan which provides for reinvestment in the cemeteries;

- pre-preparation of memorials, ready for re inscription, so as to make the offer more readily understood and the memorials more saleable.

8.2.7 As noted above Southwark will need to work closely with the Diocese and other authorities to develop these processes. For this reason the current development of general guidance on re-use under the direction of LEDNET is particularly welcome. In addition Southwark will need to continue to liaise closely with local Funeral Directors to communicate, explain, and receive feedback on the Strategy.

8.2.8 Above all there is a risk that plots might not be delivered/ at a rate that meets demand, especially if burial space is exhausted as is predicted elsewhere in London. This is particularly important given that this approach to cemetery management and re-use is largely untested and will involving a complex range of issues and constraints. To mitigate against this requires:

- continued joint-working /close cooperation with other boroughs;
- a thorough monitoring and review process (with a view to adopting a revised strategy if certain approaches are not successful); and
- pursuit of the other options noted (alternative burial sites in partnership with other authorities/natural burial /review of Nunhead) in the short and medium term.

8.3 Long Term

8.3.1 Risks associated with long term *re-use* and *reclamation* are similar to those noted above in 8.2. In addition due to the small plot historic sizes in Older parts of Camberwell New particular attention and pre planning will need to be given to developing a method of preparation, re-use and memorialisation to enable areas to be utilised comprehensively.

8.3.2 The most significant risk for Southwark to the long term strategy is that a change in the law in respect of the 2007 Act is not forthcoming. For that reason Southwark need to continue efforts to make that change happen.

8.3.3 Without a change in the law (enabling re-use of mausolea) there is also risk of long term liabilities for maintenance (without corresponding income from interments, once they are full). There is no real way of minimising this risk other than working with industry bodies to press for change in legislation.

8.4 Costs

8.4.1 Outline cost estimates have been set out for plot provision in the short and medium terms. In broad terms the approximate basic costs in delivering the short and medium term range from around £220 to £1300 (at today's prices). Adding project contingencies (to deal with potential complications given the nature of ground conditions) this would total around £4.7m (and around £5.2m including costs already committed to deliver projects already underway). Costs are illustrated at Appendix 4. This would deliver in the order of 9100 plots. Costs per plot thus averages at around £570/plot. That figure is higher than typical costs involved in setting out new basic infrastructure, boundary treatments and memorials rafts on a new, straightforward, greenfield site. However taking account the cost of land acquisition and potential costs of any built facilities such costs are however likely to be cheaper than developing similar capacity on new site(s). In addition to these costs, it needs to be recognised that there will be on-going costs associated with maintaining the infrastructure of the cemeteries, not only to fulfil their function as spaces for burial, but also as attractive open space for the benefit of the wider public.

9.0 NEXT STEPS

9.1 Short and Medium Term

9.1.1 Next steps in pursuing this short term options Cemetery Strategy will involve:

- ongoing dialogue with the Diocese;
- securing funds for short term programme of works;
- managing a programme of investigation works for each of the sites;
- securing planning consents;
- check and progress requirements to cancel rights on private graves where required for access;
- develop programme of infrastructure repairs and new works;
- layout new burial areas,
- include provision for Muslim burial;
- develop better ways of ways of managing plot and grave preparation through training and design, so as to avoid inefficiencies in plot layouts, include development of alternative larger plot sizes with appropriate charging structure;
- develop and implement broader management aims in accordance with Conservation Management Plan(s) within Camberwell Old and Camberwell New Cemeteries.

9.1.2 At the same time Southwark must:

- pursue clarification/change in law in respect of re-use under 2007 Act;
- achieve digitisation of records in combination with a management system; and,
- re-check initial findings within this Strategy in terms of age structure of common graves to proposed for re-use in the medium term;
- work closely with other London burial authorities on guidance and alternative sites including potential natural burial site(s);
- review opportunities at Nunhead Cemetery;
- continue to work closely with local community and friends groups, other interest groups, and funeral directors to explain and receive feedback on the Strategy.