

Westco



Camberwell Cemetery: Area B October – November 2016



Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1: BACKGROUND.....	4
1.2: SUBSEQUENT ENGAGEMENT	4
1.3: NEXT STEPS	4
2. FEEDBACK	5
2.1: 4 TH OCTOBER STAKEHOLDER MEETING.....	5
2.2: 17 TH OCTOBER FUNERAL DIRECTORS FORUM	5
2.3: EMAIL RESPONSE	6
2.4: DROP-IN SESSION, 19 TH OCTOBER.....	7
QUALITY ASSURANCE	11
CONTACT DETAILS	12

1. Introduction

1.1: Background

In June and July 2016 Southwark Council consulted on the design and layout of a proposal for Area B which would make the site suitable for burial. Area B was previously identified in the Southwark's 2012 Cemetery Strategy as a possible short term option to address the shortage of burial space within the borough. The results of this consultation can be found in the "Camberwell Cemeteries Consultation: Area B report" which is available on Southwark Council's website.

Based on the feedback from the consultation the Land Use Consultants (LUC) were asked to develop several new proposals.

1.2: Subsequent engagement

Southwark Council published the results of the consultation along with the three new proposals for burial within Area B. Along with the original proposal, these options include:

- Option 1 – Consultation Layout
- Option 2 – Revised traditional layout
- Option 3 – Meadow burial
- Option 4 – Woodland burial

More details on these options can be found on Southwark Council's [website](#).

Residents and stakeholders were encouraged to attend a drop-in session at the Brenchley Gardens Community Hall between 10:00am and 7:00pm on the 19th October 2016, where they could meet representatives from Southwark Council and the LUC to discuss the results of the previous consultation and the new proposals.

Residents and stakeholders were encouraged to give feedback on the proposals by noting comments at the drop in session and/or emailing their feedback to parks@southwark.gov.uk.

1.3: Next steps

This summary report contains feedback from this engagement exercise for Councillor Ian Wingfield's consideration.

2. Feedback

2.1: 4th October Stakeholder Meeting

On the 4th October Southwark Council met with stakeholders to discuss the new proposals of Area B. Some stakeholders believe that the options report produced in response to the consultation was good but highlighted that a large proportion of people were against burial.

Friends of Camberwell Cemeteries' also read out a response to the revised proposals highlighting; new burial within inner cities is a 'destructive waste' of green space; burial within this area provides only a short term solution which does not provide burial for people from all different faiths; Southwark Council also offers no guarantee that meadows or trees planted in Area B under Option 3 or 4 would be protected in the long-term. Instead they oppose all burial within Area B and argue that council should not make a decision about the Old Nursery site until after the review of the Cemetery Strategy and subsequent consultation.

2.2: 17th October Funeral Directors Forum

On the 17th October Southwark Council met with representatives from local funeral directors and discussed the new proposals for Area B. Funeral directors felt that Area B should concentrate on offering traditional burial. From their experience, demand for meadow and woodland burial is low and Camberwell Cemeteries already offer this form of burial elsewhere within their existing grounds.

2.3: Email response

Email response to new proposals

	Total response		Response to options presented (Options 1 – 4)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Option 1 – Consultation Layout	1	0%	1	2%
Option 2 – Revised Traditional Layout	1	0%	1	2%
Option 3 – Meadow Burial Layout	11	5%	11	28%
Option 4 – Woodland Burial Layout	29	15%	28	71%
No burial	127	66%		
No decision on Area B should be made until the Cemetery Strategy has been reviewed	93	48%		
No preference	2	1%		
Total	192		39	

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100% because some respondents have multiple preferences

Please see appendix 1 for verbatim email responses.

2.4: Drop-in session, 19th October

Comment card feedback

Area B option response

I approve of opening up this space, but it is very important to keep a substantial area undisturbed for nature. The wildlife area should be maintained for nature – not allowed to become woodland. I found the remains of a hedgehog in Area B in the grass. Hedgehogs are rare locally – it’s really important to respect the fact that wildlife has moved into this area due to the fact that it has been left for years. I therefore approve of keeping all the boundaries as in your plan - the trees and the wildlife slope. I do not want to see the leylandi or any other trees felled. So my comments should see in the context of protecting the existing nature first and foremost as a priority/

I support the meadow option. When developing the site, please protect the life already on it. I'd like to see a survey of the wild flowers and the same species used to seed the new meadow.

I am happy for this to be used for burial - I think this is the best way to protect it as Metropolitan Open Land for future generations. Option 4 please – Meadowland.

I do not want to see any more lawn graves. Of the two options which are not lawn graves – woodland and meadow, meadow gives more room for burials and allows couples to be buried together.

Meadows and nature “reserves” please.

I think either the meadow or the woodland options would be best.

Go for option 3

The open space

Spring flowers

Regeneration

Option 4

3 acres of inner city woods could benefit the borough in as much as £10million ecosystem services every year

Option 4

Option to deliver woods

Why is there no option 5 no burial?

Option 4

Has to be woodland if it means the cemeteries become nature reserve

Feedback

No decision should be made on this site until Southwark has finished the Cemetery Strategy Review;

<p>it is in the middle of a strategy all these proposals are based on.</p>
<p>Feedback</p> <p>Why is this planning happening? Now while Southwark is in the middle of a complete review of the hugely unpopular and out of date 2011/12 cemetery strategy these plans are based on?</p>
<p>Feedback</p> <p>Why is there no option 5- no burial</p> <p>Why has this public engagement exercise ignored. They key result of the summer consultation??</p> <p>76% of residents said 'no burial' on this site.</p>
<p>Option 5 no burial</p> <p>This site should not be used for burial 76% of residents said 'no burial' on this site</p>
<p>Why is Southwark rushing ahead on this while in the middle of a Cemetery Strategy Review?</p> <p>It must stop and Southwark should do a proper burial needs assessment.</p>
<p>I support option 4 –woodland</p> <p>If there must be burial at all</p> <p>Prefer space to be used for a new burial at all</p> <p>Prefer space to be used for a new football pitch</p>

Drop-in session notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of Southwark’s cemeteries should be turned into woodland • 100 acres of woodland would have an economic benefit (in terms of clean air and water) of £157million per year • In addition woodland provides many other health, wellbeing and community benefits • Not entirely sure what to do with those that have a preference for burial but the needs of this group should be balanced with the needs of the community • The council should do a needs assessment that presents residents with alternative burial options, weighed up against the benefits of wild open space • Conducted their own survey specifically focusing on minorities who would have a preference for burial and only 2 people out of 100 felt that it would be inappropriate to have woodland burial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 3 is preferred because it will fit well with the One Tree Hill
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preference for Option 3 as well as incorporating landscaping to create an artificial dell • However, there is a concern that none of these proposals are viable because of significant opposition to burial • Camberwell Cemetery’s should be considered part of the great north wood • Pleased that none of the proposals suggest that the land should be topped up • If the council does a good job the council could encourage a lot of people to visit the cemetery
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Think that Option 4 (woodland burial) is there favourite but that they would choose option 3 because it is more realistic • The council should make sure that the car park and Honor Oak Recreation is accessible for

<p>emergency services – especially on weekends</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preference for option 3 • Would like some form of natural hoarding around the maintenance depot • Combination of option 4 and 3 would be best for the wildlife
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 3 (meadow burial) would be the best option as it would have low maintenance costs and also balances multiple needs well • It would also allow people to be buried together
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 3 would be the preferred option • Option 3 would provide a more pleasant space for mourners than a depressing cemetery
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council should not be pressing ahead with Area B when a cemetery strategy review will begin in the next couple of months • The land was earmarked for community use • By pressing ahead with the current strategy while a new strategy is being developed the council seems to be disingenuous • Doesn't think the council should be doing private burial anyways • Angry at the loss off trees overall including other parts of the cemetery • The council should focus on re-use rather than extending the cemetery and the council has said they will be looking into this but haven't shown that they are doing anything • Replacement woodland has little ecological value in comparison to natural woodland • To save money the council should retain the hard standing and use the area as a market garden • Feels that there shouldn't even be burial in central London in this day and age • Councillors should be a these exhibition to answer the big picture questions about the strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burial in Area B (preferably option 3) would be the best way to ensure the land used to build houses/new buildings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainly concerned about access to Honor Oak Recreation • Option 3 is most preferred option
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meadow burial is the most preferred option
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about equality issue • If the council is providing burial for the minority that have a preference for burial, then it should provide burial for all those who have a preference for burial (i.e. orthodox Muslims and Jewish residents) • Orthodox Muslims cannot be buried in Nunhead cemetery because there are no fences preventing animals such as dogs entering and walking over the graves. Also the graves don't all face towards mecca • The council should also be upfront an honest that they do not provide burials for all minorities • However, encouraged by option 3, feels the council is moving towards a compromise situation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about drainage, and cemeteries encroaching on Honor Oak Recreation Ground
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pond will/cemetery will not offer much space for school gatherings • Graves are pretty compacted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Translocate trees and newly planted trees need at least 5 years of watering/maintenance • The council should look into legal issue related to the woodland burial. Grave spaces are not allowed to be sold for use of one person for over 99 years. Woodland burial indicates that these spaces are more permanent than that. Is the council legally allowed to do this?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 3 is preferred and there is a feeling that this would help protect Honor Oak Recreation from use • Meadows will also add diversity to the area, contrasting with the field and the woodlands • The council should also make sure that Honor Oak Rec is also accessible during any developments that take place on this site for pedestrians and vehicles • Would like to the access route and gate opposite Kelvington Road on Brenchley gardens to provide a route here
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There could be a conflict between cyclists and pedestrians on footpaths • Issues with maintenance of meadows – could be more expensive than the council has

previously considered

- Do not trust the council to deliver option 4
- Concerned that option 4 will be used as a justification to remove trees elsewhere
- Feel that the council should manage Area B as a brownfield site, allowing it to grow wild in its own way
- They would also like to know what guarantees the council can offer to ensure that if we go ahead with woodland burial, this proposal would be followed through even if demand was low for woodland burial
- Concern about a number of issues associated with woodland and meadow burial, for instance people wanting graves to be marked and also the view that they have a grave forever, not for a set amount of time
- The council should do a needs/demand survey that is demographically representative of the borough and base their survey on this
- This should be balanced against the need for green space
- Half of people who want to be buried in Southwark are not able to because of religious reasons
- Disinformation saying that the site is 'toxic' when it is only slightly contaminated, 50 trial pits were dug and only 2 found contaminated material.
- Re-use wouldn't be appropriate for at least half of those who want to be buried in Southwark for religious reasons
- Don't want burial to happen
- Should be planted with native broadleaf species of trees
- The woodland management plan must have commitment for involvement of the local community in the management of the woodland

• Option 4 ... if there has to be burial

• Option 4

• Option 4

Quality Assurance

Quality is central to our work and our aim is to consistently provide a service that exceeds the requirements and expectations of our clients. To maintain this we actively pursue quality improvements that enable each member of the team to do their job right first time, every time.

We are proud to be a Market Research Society Company Partner and abide by the quality commitment required. Company Partners abide by the MRS Code of Conduct and publicly commit to the very highest research standards as approved by the MRS. This is an indication that the organisation provides high quality, trustworthy services. All staff abide by the Market Research Society's Code of Conduct. Our Director of Research is also a Certified Member of the MRS.

We also follow the code of Marketing & Social Research Practice of the International Chamber of Commerce/European Society for Opinion and Market Research (ESOMAR).

ISO 20252:2012

We are fully accredited to the international standard for the management of market research (ISO20252:2012). It is designed to drive quality improvements and our adherence demonstrates that Westco is an industry leader.

To meet this standard we have a quality manual, training and processes to ensure we can set and maintain standards for quality assurance, project management, data collection, preparation and processing. The accreditation process is on-going and repeat visits from the auditor will take place. All staff receive training on Westco quality standards and the implications for their job role.

As part of our ISO 20252:2012 accreditation Westco must ensure that all sub-contractors are compliant with our quality processes.

Contact Details

The authors of this report have sought to ensure that it is an accurate reflection of the research that has taken place. It is therefore important that the findings continue to be accurately reflected in any future internal or external publication. If you wish to reference the findings from this report, please contact the authors to ensure that your interpretation is correct.

Insight Team

City Hall

64 Victoria Street

London

SW1E 6QP

Name: Rishi Moulton

Tel: 02076414298

Email: rmoulton@westcotrading.com

www.westcotrading.com



Westco Trading Ltd
64 Victoria St,
London SW1E 6QP
020 7641 1805
info@westcotrading.co.uk

Novemeber 2016