

Stephanie Broadley

From: Mike Kusneraitis [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 April 2023 20:54
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: On site meeting 3rd March 2023 Re: The i-Transport, Placemaking Report.
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.

Dear Mike,

I to am a big fan of a local village plan, I acknowledge all the hard work that has brought it thus far.

Like John Scott MBE I to am against the section that involves any alteration to the Memorial be it visually of physically.

This memorial was constructed by many donations from residents of Englefield Green from all walks of life, and indeed has become a central focal point within the village, the annual Remembrance parade grows each year in ever increasing numbers.

The design even made the Finals of a National competition, any alterations would deflect from the views that allowed it to make these finals.

As you will be aware I sat on RBC for 16 years, through out that time people have looked for ways to reduce the traffic that passes through our village, It appears to me this idea is looking to attract more vehicles through our village.

Mike you also state in your reply " but that some land would be necessary if the full package of parking, tree band, cycle way and footpath were undertaken, and that opening the front access to the memorial to the public realm (as occurs with many similar memorials)"

May I please ask you tell me what land are you referring to? the whole front within the cemetery is consecrated Land, What similar memorials are you referring to? as far as i am aware this memorial is a one off design, I can not think of a single memorial within the Borough that of Runnymede that has used this concept as you described in the plan perhaps you can provide me the location so I may visit to form an opinion.

Whilst in general the Village plan looks great, I have to ask why can there not be a compromise by removing this part of the plan which clearly myself and others do not like, The Land is clearly consecrated, and a memorial clearly sits in place to Honour the Men and Women of Englefield Green, who gave their ultimate sacrifice.

The memorial Committee carries the routine maintenance, throughout the year, and RBC are supposed to be making repairs to the wall, of which parts are listed, the very wall this plan proposes to remove, there is also the loss of the grassed area to be considered.

whilst there have been many hours constructing this plan to date, there were equally many hours of painstaking Labour and design placed into the memorial construction, failure to compromise may have a knock on affect on the plan being able to be accepted by RBC, I ask surely there is a better option?

Mike your final comment " 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" and in your follow up email "The final outcome will be up to the

detailed designers and implementers of the scheme regulated by the restraints they find themselves under at the time, and hopefully attempting to follow the wishes of the majority of the residents at that time."

You will have to forgive me here but after 16 years sitting on the planning committee this sounds like every other developer trying to mitigate objections with every intention to proceed, I feel to save costs in this project one has to say If this design had 99% support of the village that does not over rule the legal status of the land, neither does any planning permissions if attained allow the right to build if law does not allow.

I really do hope that compromise can be achieved to avoid the inevitable costs to all concerned if agreement can not be reached.

Regards

Michael Kusneraitis.

On Monday, 10 April 2023 at 19:37:49 BST, [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear John,

I am not sure what else I can say. You have made your point loud and clear on a number of occasions, and I had hoped that by personally taking the trouble to respond rather than just leaving the response impersonally under Reg 14 it would make you aware that the message had been received, was in the records, and would be taken into account by the relevant authorities at the appropriate time.

You have quoted selectively below in that I stated it is my personal view that some land would be necessary to achieve the full package etc. This would doubtless apply to some other parts of the scheme as well as the Churchyard, and each will have its own constraints.

The final outcome will be up to the detailed designers and implementers of the scheme regulated by the restraints they find themselves under at the time, and hopefully attempting to follow the wishes of the majority of the residents at that time.

Regards, Mike Kelly

From: JOHN SCOTT [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2023 6:43 PM
To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: On site meeting 3rd March 2023 Re: The i-Transport, Placemaking Report.

Dear Mike

Thank you for your email re: the **Consecrated Land** at the front of Englefield Green Cemetery, or Section One of Englefield Green Cemetery or I Transport report, Placemaking proposals, the central area public realm.

I informed your team one year ago, during the public consultation, Alan Sloan last week and all the Borough and County Councillors representing our Village of the status of this land. I provided a plan of the cemetery which confirms again that this is **CONSECRATED LAND SET ASIDE FOR BURIALS IN PERPITUITY**.

You state in your email " Some land would be necessary if the full package of **parking, tree band**, cycle way and footpath were undertaken, and that opening the front access to the memorial to the public realm (as occurs with many similar memorials) would be a good thing. I know this is not your view, but stress this is simply my view, and I think in fairness it would be up to all the residents of Englefield Green to decide what exactly they consider the best option for their village, represented by their Councillors"

This land is Owned and Managed by RBC, However, it remains "**CONSECRATED LAND SET ASIDE FOR BURIALS IN PERPITUITY**". This land as you can see on RBC's own Cemetery Plan, covers all the Cemetery **HIGHLIGHTED IN YELLOW, identified as Consecrated land.**

I did not create this, I am in favour in principal of the Village Plan. However, I am a Village Resident who respects the status of this land and it's intended purpose, which is protected in Law, both Ecclesiastical and Judicial.

I will do anything legally possible to preserve it, and the area of Our Village Memorial and burial plots. I did state in my original objection to this part of the Village Plan:

1. The **CONSECRATED LAND** status of ALL Section One of the Englefield Green Cemetery and its protection in Law.
2. The I Transport report, Placemaking proposals drawing was inaccurate, as Alan's photographs now show, the proposed new wall will cross existing graves.

I did understand the context of the I Transport Report, which I took to be a Desktop Study see point 2 above. You seem to not understand my objection to this part and the reason why or you just chose to ignore it. So I will say it again **CONSECRATED LAND** is **CONSECRATED LAND** set aside for burial purposes only in perpetuity is just that.

I mean no disrespect to the Local Plan Committee, I am just stating fact. I am more than happy to meet and discuss this issue but it will not change the facts. I remain in favour of the majority of the Village Plan but not the development of **CONSECRATED LAND**.

Best regards

JOHN SCOTT MBE, Resident of Englefield Green

On 10/04/2023 16:38 [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear John,

Alan has sent me a copy of your e mail (copy below) and attachments. I am copying this to all to whom you sent it, though I apologise- I don't actually know you all!

Firstly, if I can put the I Transport report in context. With limited funding, we asked them to review the Placemaking proposals in respect of the central area public realm, provide some expert assessment based on more accurate plans of the existing road layout, and provide some initial costings. The

report is intended to lend credibility to the concepts contained in the Placemaking report and to provide a cost base to discuss with Surrey CC who would need to be funder and instigator of the changes. It is not intended to be a definitive design, which we recognise will depend on a number of currently undefined restraints (land ownership, underground services etc) that could result in modifications when a full design was carried out.

My personal view is that the I Transport design is taking far more land than originally envisaged, but that some land would be necessary if the full package of parking, tree band, cycle way and footpath were undertaken, and that opening the front access to the memorial to the public realm (as occurs with many similar memorials) would be a good thing. I know this is not your view, but stress this is simply my view, and I think in fairness it would be up to all the residents of Englefield Green to decide what exactly they consider the best option for their village, represented by their Councillors, if (and it is under the present financial circumstances I suspect it is a big if) Surrey CC could be persuaded to develop the scheme further.

Meantime I can assure you that your and the Memorial committees views have been recorded and responded to at Reg 14 consultation stage. These comments are the official response and form part of the ongoing Neighbourhood Plan documentation. They can be found at the Forum web site [Neighbourhood Plan - Englefield Green Village Neighbourhood Plan \(egvplan.org.uk\)](http://egvplan.org.uk) Section 16 'Responses to Regulation 16 Comments, subsection 'Residents and Business Comments and Responses' items 36 and 38.

For ease I quote below the Reg 14 response;

'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 hope you consider this to be a reasonable response at this time.

Best wishes,

Mike Kelly, Chair, EGVForum Steering Committee

On the 4th April John wrote;

Subject: On site meeting 3rd March 2023 Re: The i-Transport, Placemaking Report.

Hello everyone

Just a note Re: The above

Further to my emails regarding the Consecrated Land known as Section One of Englefield Green Cemetery and the implications for the i -Transport, Placemaking Report. (Page 24 - As Is Drawing and Page 22 – What is proposed). Doc attached.

The Rev Judith Allford arranged a meeting with **Mr Alan Sloan** of the Englefield Green Village Forum (in an informal capacity), and me, (**John Scott**) as Chairman of the Englefield Green Memorial trust, and herself.

The meeting took place on Monday 3rd April 2023, around the Cross of Sacrifice and the Village Memorial, on Section One Englefield Green Cemetery. We talked about various issues which are contained in my notes attached. I view this as a good step forward and thank everyone involved.

By John Scott MBE