

## Stephanie Broadley

---

**From:** Marisa Heath [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 31 March 2023 22:51  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Englefield Green Village Neighbourhood Forum, Draft Neighbourhood Plan, Consultation February 28th – 11th April 2023

**Categories:** Sent to Steph

**CAUTION:** This email originated from an external sender. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Apologies John, I presumed that because the original email was addressed to Mr Broadley that I was just included for information. I am afraid this does need a planning technical answer in relation to the neighbourhood plan etc which I cannot provide, however my personal view is that I would want to protect the work you have done in the cemetery and the fact it is consecrated land and I think this does need a re-think. I am happy to raise it with Mike Kelly and others and also I think it would be hard to gain wide support for this and the funding too.

Best,

Marisa

Marisa Heath  
Cabinet Member for Environment  
Member for Englefield Green & Egham  
Surrey County Council  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** JOHN SCOTT [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Friday, 31 March 2023 at 22:28

[REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Englefield Green Village Neighbourhood Forum, Draft Neighbourhood Plan, Consultation February 28th – 11th April 2023

**Caution:** This email originated from outside Surrey County Council.  
Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms Broadley, Cllr Heath and Cllr King

Further to my email dated 20th March 2023 regarding the above, I received an automated acknowledgement, however I have not heard anything since. I understand you are a very busy department but I am a very concerned resident, still worried about the future of Englefield Green Cemetery and availability of burial plots plus the proposed development (walkways, cycleway, cycle rack and block paving) on Consecrated Ground. (Between the Cross of Sacrifice at the entrance to EG Cemetery, the Village Memorial in the centre of Section One and the footpath to St Jude's Church).

My objection has been treated with indifference by the Village Forum, (Letter no 36 in the public consultation report) as I have said before a Cemetery and Consecrated Ground remain just that, protected by law (ecclesiastical and judicial).

I ask again what is RBC's Planning Departments and RBC Ward Councillors Stance on this issue?

I trust I will get a response in time of me to respond again prior to the 11th April deadline. I am sure all the EG Ward Councillors would also like to know what is about to happen/proposed in their ward.

I thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter.

Regards John Scott MBE

On 20/03/2023 19:06 JOHN SCOTT [REDACTED] wrote:

Stephanie Broadley, Senior Planning Officer-Planning Policy

Runnymede Borough Council

Dear Ms Broadley

**Re: Englefield Green Village Neighbourhood Forum, Draft**

**Neighbourhood Plan, Consultation February 28th – 11th April 2023**

Thank you for your email dated 18<sup>th</sup> March 2023, providing me with an update on the consultation process and access information. I checked my letter and the forum teams response.

**My Letter as a resident to the forum – listed in their report as No 36.**

I confirm, I am fully supportive in principle, the need to have a Village Plan. I have advocated a Village Plan since I was a Committee Member of EGVRA 1994 – 2001. I understand the hard work, time and cost devoted to the production of the plan in its current form. I also commend the Forum Team for their resulting document.

However, I still remain very concerned about the proposal to change the very character of Section One in our Village Cemetery. It is CONSECrated LAND, set aside for burial, and as such it is afforded legal protection in perpetuity. It is vital and should be retained in its present form. In their response to my letter (36) NP state in **bold** below:

NP comment: **Noted**

**The purpose of the Central Area Remodelling scheme is explained in the Placemaking document and the I Transport limited study has been carried out to demonstrate, in principle, the feasibility of the scheme, highlight the problem areas, and provide an initial costing. There is a long way to go before a scheme is designed or carried out.**

**The concerns are noted, and solutions will need to be found.**

I ask for clarification, before this Plan is adopted by Runnymede Borough Council, can The Village Forum Team, RBC Planning Department, the EGVRA Committee, and Ward Councillors confirm their agreement to:

- in principle, the use of **CONSECrated LAND**, set aside for burial in perpetuity, as a public walkway, bicycle park and cycleway, to facilitate additional car parking.
- 
- in principle, the removal of all remaining burial plots in Section One of our Village Cemetery. Thereby removing the availability of future burial plots from village residents, resulting in Village residents having to be buried elsewhere, away from the village?

- 
- in **principle** put our village residents/pedestrians (elderly Village residents, school children) at risk by putting the footpath between the road traffic, parking cars on one side and a cycleway on the other?

NP comment: **The concerns are noted, and solutions will need to be found.**

I say there is no reason to find solutions, – this part of the NP should not happen, as it would be illegal and should be removed from the plan completely.

However, if the Forum Team and RBC Planning Department proceed, unfortunately, it will undoubtedly end in court.

NP comment: **Changes to Englefield Green Neighbourhood Plan : None**

NP comment: **Changes to other documents : None**

From their statements above, the Forum Team still plan to proceed,

However, a Cemetery is a Cemetery, CONSECRATED LAND is CONSECRATED LAND, no matter how inconvenient that may be.

The Forum Team and RBC Planning Department need to locate additional parking in an alternative location or rationalise existing parking only twenty metres away.

Your advice on this matter would be much appreciated.

Kind regards

John Scott MBE

---

This email and any attachments with it are intended for the addressee only. It may be confidential and may be the subject of legal and/or professional privilege.

If you have received it in error please notify the sender and destroy it. You may not use it or copy it to anyone else. The content may be personal or contain personal opinions and cannot be taken as an expression of the County Council's position.

Surrey County Council reserves the right to monitor all incoming and outgoing mail. Whilst every care has been taken to check this e-mail for viruses, it is your responsibility to carry out any checks upon receipt.

[Visit the Surrey County Council website](#)

---