

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BURIAL GROUND AND GARDEN OF REMEMBRANCE COMMITTEE
HELD ON 1st JULY 2004 AT 6.30 p.m. AT PAVILION, MANOR FIELD**

Present : Cllr Mr A Barnett
Cllr Mrs J Burns
Cllr Mrs Y Coutts
Cllr Mrs A Oxtoby (Chairman)

In attendance : Mrs J Hoad (Clerk)

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies had been received from Cllr Mr J Gaywood.

2. Minutes of the last meeting

RESOLVED: That, the minutes of the meeting of the Burial Ground and Garden of Remembrance Committee held on 19th May 2004 be approved and signed as a correct record, subject to the following correction to show that Cllr Mrs Burns arrived at the meeting at 6.35 p.m. and the start of the adjournment as being 6.36 p.m.

3. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Mrs A Oxtoby declared a personal interest under minute item 5, in respect of the grave of the late P McClelland, as the wife of the deceased is an acquaintance.

Cllr Mrs Y Coutts declared a personal interest under minute item 5, in respect of the grave of the late P McClelland, as the wife of the deceased is an acquaintance.

4. Burial Law and Policy in the 21st Century

The Committee considered a consultation documentation issued by the Home Officer on the practicalities of legislation, regulation and maintenance of burial grounds and burial procedures, including the exhumation and possible re use of old burial grounds.

RECOMMENDED: That, the Council respond to the questions raised in the consultation document, "Burial Law and Policy in the 21st Century" as set out in appendix 1 attached to these minutes.

5. Rules and regulations

The Committee examined the rules and regulations in respect of the Burial Ground and Garden of Remembrance.

RECOMMENDED: That, the wording "...as soon as conveniently may be after the lapse of such a period as may reasonably suffice for the natural subsidence of the earth..." contained under regulation 17 in respect of the rules and regulation for the Hartley Burial Ground be deleted and the wording "...once a sufficient period of time has elapsed allowing for natural subsidence of the earth..." be inserted, as set out in appendix 2 attached to these minutes.

The Committee noted that at the last Council meeting it had been resolved that, (1) the decision to request the families of the late P McClelland and J Morgan to remove the decorative stones from the surface of the graves and for the graves to be turfed, had been rescinded and, (2) the families of the late J Morgan and P McClelland be asked to remove the decorative stones from the surface of the grave and for the graves to be redressed as agreed with the Burial Authority. In light of this decision, the Committee considered what surface dressing would be acceptable.

RESOLVED: That, the families of the late P McClelland and J Morgan be requested to remove the decorative stones from the surface of the graves of the late P McClelland and J Morgan and that they be informed that the Burial Authority would prefer the graves to be covered with turf, but would accept peat or woodchip of a suitable grade as a surface dressing on the graves.

6. Health and Safety

(a) The Committee considered a letter dated 3rd June 2004 from S P Gay, in response to a letter from the Council expressing concern over the standard of repairs undertaken to a number of memorials located the Burial Ground.

RESOLVED: That, (1) the letter dated 3rd June 2004 from S P Gay be noted and, (2) the memorials identified as still giving some cause for concern, as detailed in a letter dated 18th May 2004 from the Council to S P Gay, be further examined to ensure the remedial work undertaken by S P Gay has been carried out to an acceptable standard.

(b) The Committee was informed that a different contact address had been obtained for a relative of the Cuddy family and that a further letter had been sent, but to date no response had been received. During the site inspection before the start of the meeting, it was noted that the grave and the memorial had not been rectified to comply with the Burial Authority's rules and regulations, inasmuch as the grave was still defined by means of a tile kerb and the surface dressed with stones and the memorial was oversized, both in height and width. The Committee noted that no remedial work could be undertaken to the memorial to reduce its width.

RESOLVED: That, (1) Mr Munday be asked to remove the decorative stones and the tile kerb surrounding the Cuddy grave and to lay turf over the surface of the grave and, (2) a quotation be obtained to lower the memorial on the Cuddy grave, to ensure the height of the memorial does not exceed 3 feet, to comply with the Burial Authority's rules and regulations and (3) no further action be taken to rectify the width of the memorial.

(c) The Committee considered a report on the works carried out in the Burial Ground and Garden of Remembrance since the last meeting.

RESOLVED: That, the report attached as appendix 3 to these minutes be noted.

7. Visual Inspection

The Committee examined the weekly visual inspection report from 15th March to 7th June 2004. The report indicated that a number of memorials located in the Burial Ground remained insecure and that some memorials located in the closed churchyard were damaged. The Committee noted that the issue over the insecure memorials was being taken up with S P Gay, (minute item 6(a)).

Due to the age of the memorials in the closed church yard, the Committee considered that they would always be identified as being damaged, but this added to the character of the church yard and did not necessarily constitute a hazard. The Committee considered an alteration to the wording on the visual inspection check list, to record whether the memorials were secure even though they may be damaged.

RESOLVED: That, (1) the weekly visual inspection report for the period 15th March to 7th June 2004 be noted and (2) the wording on page 2 in respect of the inspection of memorials in the closed church yard be amended, as set out in appendix 4 attached to these minutes, to record whether the memorials are secure even though they may be damaged.

8. Garden of Remembrance

(a) The Committee considered matters arising from the site inspection undertaken before the start of the meeting.

RESOLVED: That, (1) Mr Munday be asked to keep the Garden of Remembrance free from floral tributes and potted plants and (2) Mr Munday be asked to wash down the glass on the notice board.

(b) The Committee considered a quotation from Mr Munday to mark an area of ground as a new Garden of Remembrance. As the quotation exceeded the expenditure authorised by the Council at its meeting held on 5th April 2004, the Committee agreed it would have to refer the acceptance of the quotation back to the Council.

RECOMMENDED: That, the quotation dated 11th June 2004 from Mr Munday for the sum of £216.81 to set out a new Garden of Remembrance be accepted.

9. Burial Ground

The Committee considered matters arising from the site inspection undertaken before the start of the meeting.

RESOLVED: That, (1) the Clerk's action to contact the relatives of the late A and R Smeath asking them to remove decorative stones placed on the surface of the grave be confirmed and (2) arrangements be made for the graves of the late L J Tomkins g. 228, G M Fryer g. 234, D I Kollnberger g.491, M White g. 420, S A Shephard g 409 (including removal of kerb), B & J I Dooley g. 416, and F J Howell g. 411 to be turfed.

10. Closed Church Yard

(a) The Committee considered matters arising from the site inspection undertaken before the start of the meeting.

RESOLVED: That, Mr Munday be asked to provide a quotation to spray the bramble on the southern boundary in the closed church yard, including the tree stump located next to the Best memorial.

(b) The Committee examined a land survey of the closed church yard.

(c) The Committee considered an e mail from the Parochial Church Council informing the Council that the condition of the footpath between the Burial Ground and the Closed Church will be discussed at its next meeting.

11. Financial Report

The Committee considered a financial report indicating the net position of the Burial Ground and Garden of Remembrance Committee as at 24th June 2004.

RESOLVED: That, the report as set out in appendix 5 attached to these minutes be noted.

12. Date of the next meeting

Wednesday 22nd September 2004 at 6.30p.m. at the Manor Field, Pavilion.

A site inspection will take place before the start of the meeting at 6.00 p.m.

The meeting closed at 7.55 p.m.

Signed:.....
Chairman

Date:.....

**BURIAL LAW AND POLICY IN THE 21ST CENTURY
ANNEX C – QUESTIONS ON WHICH VIEWS ARE SOUGHT**

Question 1:

The Government believes that any review of current burial law needs to address the case for legislation applying to all burial grounds consistently, even if some burial grounds, such as Church of England churchyards, were to continue to be subject to relevant ecclesiastical law. It would accordingly welcome views on:

- a) Whether there should be a single statute to establish the broad framework in which burial grounds should operate; *Agree*
- b) What aspects that broad framework might or ought to include (and what might be better left to other areas of law, such as planning);
- c) Whether there should be exceptions for different providers, or different types of burial ground, and, if so, what those exceptions might be.

Question 2:

The Government would welcome views on whether provision of burial grounds should be left to the market, or whether there should be a statutory obligation on local authorities to provide burial facilities. *Should be a statutory obligation on local authorities*

Question 3:

The Government invites views on whether any change to the existing discretionary powers of local authorities to provide burial grounds should be based on a requirement to make an assessment of community needs, for example, every 10 years (geared to statements in their Local Plan); to take account of all local existing non-municipal burial facilities (and any re-useable sites, if appropriate – see Part D); to ensure adequate provision for particular cultural and faith needs, and for diversity of demand. The Government does not believe that diversity can necessarily be achieved at the lowest tier of local government, and that the aim should therefore be to provide adequate diversity of provision at district/London borough level. *Good practice to reassess*

Question 4:

The Government would welcome comments on the practicalities of requiring such needs assessments, their frequency and scope, and the implications for practice in relation to the compulsory purchase of land. It would also be helpful to receive views on how parish, town and district Councils, local authorities in Wales, Church of England and Church in Wales diocesan and other religious authorities, might work together to provide an appropriate level and variety of burial facilities for all their communities. *No comment.*

Question 5:

If diversity of provision is important, but it is not feasible to provide such diversity within first tier local authorities, is there a case for restricting the power to establish burial grounds to district-level authorities only, or even to county-level councils (or unitary authorities in Wales)? Or can adequate, diverse, local, facilities be provided through consortia of district level authorities? Or would some other tier of government, or other mechanism, be appropriate? *No comment.*

Question 6:

Views on the viability and practicality of leaving responsibility for local authority burial grounds within first tier councils are invited. Views would also be appreciated on the potential benefits of larger scale burial authorities, for example economies of scale in terms of training and developing expertise. *No comment*

Question 7:

The costs of ensuring adequate provision of burial facilities are not strictly an issue for consideration within a consultation exercise on burial law, but views on the financial implications for first or second tier local authorities of any obligatory provision of burial facilities would be welcome. *Responsibility for ensuring adequate burial facilities should be kept local, but additional funding should be provided from central government to meet the demands of further regulation.*

Question 8:

The Government believes that while the information required can normally be expected to be provided voluntarily by the various cemetery managers, statutory authority to obtain the data would be desirable and a statutory obligation to report on the opening of cemeteries would provide an essential mechanism to ensure that central information was up to date. Views on the need for such provisions are invited. *Not applicable.*

Question 9:

The Government would welcome views on the case for additional regulation of the detailed aspects of cemetery operations set out in the above paragraphs, and in particular on the appropriate mechanisms for referral or appeal of any local decisions. One possibility would be for them to be made to the Home Office, as is already the case in some instances but alternatives might be more effective, such as a dedicated tribunal or other body. *No comment.*

Question 10:

The Government would welcome views on whether a statutory obligation to bury or otherwise dispose of those who have died should be created. If so, on whom such an obligation should be placed, within what period of time, and what exceptions should there be (for example where the remains are required as evidence for a court case)? *No comment.*

Question 11:

The Government believes that there should be scope for improving the standards of maintenance, restoration and safety in burial grounds through more precise definitions, reinforced through more effective staff training and enforcement measures, underpinned by guidance and new funding schemes. Views are invited on whether this is the right approach, whether new legislation alone will deliver the benefits required, or whether funding issues also need to be resolved before substantial progress can be expected. *The funding issues needs to be resolved before any new legislation is implemented.*

Question 12:

The Government considers that, on the whole, service standards can be improved by guidance rather than regulation, especially where it may take time for standards to be established and bedded in. But views would be welcome on whether it would be helpful or constructive to place obligations on burial ground managers to take account of guidance on these issues in planning for the future, or to consult relevant experts, for example, on the options available for developing the environment of their sites. *More guidance would be useful.*

Question 13:

The Government does not believe that it would be the task of an inspectorate to undertake all these functions, although, if such a body was established, it might well contribute to policy development, standard setting, training and research needs. Views would, however, be welcome on:

- whether compliance with regulation and good practice would be dependent on the availability of a field force to provide a local presence of experience and expertise;
- where that resource should be drawn from;
- whether a standing body would be needed or whether it would be feasible to draw on existing sources;
- what frequency of inspections might be required;
- what size of any standing body might be needed;
- whether all burial grounds should be subject to inspection, or whether some should be exempt (if so, which ones and why)

The Council would not wish to see an inspectorate established.

Question 14:

APPENDIX 1

Views are invited as to whether the case for an inspectorate has been made out, whether the costs are likely to justify the benefits, and whether the costs might more appropriately be recovered from the industry, rather than from the taxpayer, perhaps through a system of licensing cemeteries. *Not applicable.*

Question 15:

The Government believes that it is right to continue to protect human remains from unauthorised disturbance. Where statutory provision has been made for remains to be exhumed or removed, it is important that the remains should be treated at all times with dignity and respect, however old the remains might be. The Government believes that disturbance may be justified only in limited circumstances:

- in the interests of justice (for example, exhumation on the order of a coroner);
- for personal reasons by the next of kin of the deceased;
- on grounds of public health or nuisance;
- in the public interest (in connection with site developments which have public or other planning consent);
- for scientific purposes (eg for archaeological research);
- for other exceptional reasons (the case for exhumation for the purpose of re-use of old graves is discussed below).

Agree

Question 16:

The Government would welcome views on whether these grounds are too narrow (or too wide). *No comment.*

Question 17:

The Government would welcome views on the case for licensing the disturbance of all human remains, cremated or otherwise, which have been interred or otherwise given a permanent resting place. *No comment.*

Question 18:

The Government would welcome views on whether:

- authority to licence the exhumation of remains should be retained centrally; *Agree*
- such authority might be delegated to the burial authority/burial ground manager; *No comment*
- the criteria for the grant or refusal of licences should be regulated in statute; *Do not agree*
- there should be a formal appeal mechanism; *Agree*
- fees should be charged, or chargeable; *No comment*
- procedures and criteria should be more closely aligned with those relating to faculties; *No comment*
- whether archaeological remains should be subject to the same regulation, or be unregulated, or more lightly regulated; *Should be more lightly regulated*

Question 19:

It would also be helpful to have views on:

- what the criteria should be for the grant of licences or faculties;
- how old buried remains might need to be to justify any relaxation of the regulation of their disturbance.

No comment

Question 20:

Views are invited on the case for the delegation of authority for the removal of remains in these circumstances, and to whom such authority might be delegated. *Should be regulated centrally*

Question 21:

The Government believes that statutory provision to require the removal of remains before a burial site is developed reflects a proper balance between the need for respect towards those who have died, sensitivity towards the bereaved and their descendents, and the interests of public and private sector developers. However, views would be welcome on:

- whether the existing legislation might be rationalised for general application;
- whether there is sufficient protection of the interests of those who have died and their families, for example in relation to the ability to prevent development, or to have the costs of re-burial reimbursed, or to restrict making the graves inaccessible; and *No comment*
- whether the notice arrangements (two weeks) or the time allowed to make private arrangements for reburials (two months) are too short or too long; *Both too short*
- whether there might be circumstances in which the prescribed procedures should be disapplied, for example because the site or the remains are so old.

Question 22:

Given the sensitivities on this issue, the Government believes that the arguments in favour of the re-use of graves need to be tested, in particular, so as to gauge public concerns and acceptability, and to determine the practicality and economics of any new approach, having regard to the need for any exceptions and safeguards. Comments are therefore invited on the principle as to whether the disturbance of remains would be justified in the interests of preserving and funding local, viable burial grounds, and reducing demands for new land for burials. *No comment*

Question 23:

Comments are invited on the potential impact of re-using graves on the character of a burial ground, and how any adverse effect might be mitigated. Views would also be welcome on how tombstones and memorials should be dealt with where graves were to be re-used (for example, new or additional memorials, additional names on existing memorials or the details of further burials to be recorded in books of remembrance). *The Council would wish to preserve the history contained in churchyards.*

Question 24:

The Government would welcome views on whether the age of the grave should be the appropriate criterion to determine whether a grave might be re-used. If so, is 100 years the appropriate length of time? Should it be longer, or shorter? And if so, on what basis? Should there be any linkage to the time granted for exclusive rights of burial? Or to the 50 years from the date of burial which, under the Disused Burial Grounds (Amendment) Act 1981, qualifies the next of kin to prevent the development of a burial ground? Should re-use depend on a shortage of burial space in the particular local area? *200 years should be the appropriate time*

Question 25:

Alternatively, might a more scientific approach be adopted which determined that only graves containing skeletal remains were used? Would this be practical? (Decomposition would mainly depend on local soil conditions, might not be accurately predictable, and might involve a period of time considerably longer or shorter than 100 years). *No comment*

Question 26:

The Government believes that, if graves were to be re-used, the lift and deepen method would be the preferred approach. Views are invited on any foreseen disadvantages of this method, or advantages of alternative methods. *Agree*

Question 27:

It would also be helpful to have views on whether particular methods of re-using graves should be prescribed, or whether burial ground managers should be free to adopt whatever method appeared appropriate according to

local circumstances. *Agree that burial ground managers should be free to adopt whatever method appeared appropriate for the re use of graves.*

Question 28:

The Government would welcome comments on any or all of these factors. *No comment*

Question 29:

The Government believes that local consultation about any re-use of graves would be essential, but that it would be important for such exercises to be undertaken on a consistent basis. Comments are invited on the need for consultation and what might properly be addressed in such consultation, including:

- best estimates of remaining burial space and demand;
- details of any additional burial grounds already earmarked or acquired, and reasons why it is not proposed to use them;
- details of any local burial facilities which will not be subject to a re-use scheme;
- proposed criteria for exempting graves or cemeteries from re-use, or details of graves and cemeteries already identified for exemption;
- proposed method of re-use; and
- implications for burial charges.

No comment

Question 30:

Whether and how such consultation might usefully be undertaken jointly with other burial ground providers would be appreciated. *Could be included within the local plan*

Question 31:

The Government would welcome views on the proposed exceptions to any re-use arrangements, in particular: *Agree there should be exceptions*

- whether the exceptions proposed are the right ones, or whether there should be others;
- whether it would be right to enable exceptions, in effect, to be purchased;
- whether the criteria for identifying exceptions are sufficiently clear, or flexible, to be effective; and
- Whether the need for sustainable land use is such that exceptions should not be permitted in any circumstances.

Question 32:

The Government would find it helpful to learn what importance ought to be attached to the introduction of good cemetery practices prior to any adoption of a re-use regime. *No comment*

Question 33:

The Government would welcome views on:

- whether there is a need for additional regulatory arrangements before any re-use schemes might be introduced; *Agree*
- what such arrangements might require (for example, regular inspection of cemeteries to assess general compliance with burial legislation or one-off inspections to determine suitability or competence to operate a re-use scheme); *No comment*

APPENDIX 1

- whether they might need to cover all burial bodies (including churches and private cemetery owners); and
- How best they might be put in place (for example, a new Government inspectorate, self-regulation, or the development of other regulatory bodies for the purpose).

Question 34:

The Government proposes that, were it to be persuaded that the re-use of graves should be established, it would be right to leave decisions about whether to use such graves entirely to the individuals and families concerned. However, it would seem appropriate to ensure that the public was properly informed about the nature of any grave or grave space that might be purchased, both as to the fact that the grave had been previously used, and that it would be expected to be re-used again in due course. It would also be important to ensure that information about the availability of any virgin burial facilities was also provided in response to enquiries or applications to purchase a grave. *No comment*

Question 35:

Should the practice of closing Church of England churchyards which are full by Order in Council be changed?

- If so, in what circumstances should decisions be made? Where a churchyard is full, on what criteria should it be decided whether it should be closed or provision made for re-use? In particular, what weight should be attached to the importance of the churchyard as an open space and the conservation of its character, including existing monuments? *Considerable amount of weight should be attached to the importance of the churchyard*
- Should there be a procedure for declaring a churchyard full without formally closing it, so that special steps may be taken for its future use?
- Where a churchyard is full, should the Church of England and Church in Wales authorities be given statutory power to require the relevant local authority to provide for the cost of preparing the ground for re-use? *Do not agree*
- Should there be provision for reopening close churchyards at the request of the church authorities? If so, in what circumstances should such decisions be made and on what criteria? *Agree with reopening closed churchyards. No further comment.*

Question 36:

To what extent should special provision be made on theological, pastoral or other grounds for the reuse for burials of land, which has been consecrated for Christian burials by the Church of England or Church in Wales but which is part of a municipal or private cemetery rather than a churchyard, or for reuse of land set aside for burials according to any other particular religious tradition? *Assessed in consultation with the Church*

Question 37:

The Government takes the view that unauthorised disturbances of human remains is, and should remain, a serious matter, that there is a continuing need for buried remains to be protected within the criminal law, and that there is widespread public support for such protection. Views on whether the re-use of graves would be likely to undermine respect for the dead and, if so, suggestions as to how this might be mitigated would be welcome. *No comment*

Council's suggested response indicated in red italics

**PARISH COUNCIL OF HARTLEY
HARTLEY BURIAL GROUND
RULES and REGULATIONS**

These RULES and REGULATIONS are made by the Hartley Parish Council, acting as the Burial Authority for the Parish of HARTLEY, by virtue of the powers vested in it by Section 38 of the Burial Act, 1852.

1. Throughout these Rules and Regulations -

“The Board” means the Parish Council of Hartley

“The Burial Ground” means the Burial Ground provided by the Council, adjoining the Churchyard.

“Grave” means a burial place formed in the ground by excavation and without any internal wall of brickwork or stone work or any other artificial lining.

GENERAL

2. One portion of the Ground is consecrated for Burial according to the rites of the Church of England; the other is unconsecrated. All burials are to be conducted in a decent and orderly manner.

3. Notice of intended interments shall be given to the Clerk to the Burial Board, or his representative in Hartley. If the interment is to be in an earth grave, three clear days' notice at least shall be given. The notice shall be exclusive of Sundays, Christmas Day, Good Friday, Bank and Public Holidays. No notice will be received on these days.

4. All interments shall take place between the hours of 9.30 a.m. and 4.00 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays and between the hours of 9.30 a.m. and 2.30 p.m. on Saturdays. The exact hour in all cases shall be subject to arrangement with the officiating Minister by the person giving notice of interment.

5. The Certificate for Disposal of the person to be buried or the Coroner's Certificate where an inquest has been held, must be given on arrival to the Clerk to the Burial Board or his representative.

6. A plan of the Burial Ground has been made upon which every grave space has been marked and each grave space has been sufficiently designated on the ground to correspond with each grave space on the plan.

7. The selection of the grave space shall be made by the Burial Board.

8. The depth of every grave shall be recorded in the Register of Graves.

9. Where the exclusive right of burial in a grave space has been purchased, the Board has itself the right to re-open at any time that grave for the interment of the body of any other person or persons.

10. All fees and charges of the Board are to be paid to the duly authorised Officer of the Board on giving notice of interment and before the work is begun in respect of which they are payable; and the receipt for all interment fees shall if required, be produced to the Burial Board's Representative previous to the funeral procession entering the Burial Ground.

11. A Register of Burials will be kept by the Clerk to the Burial Board who will at all reasonable times make searches and supply certified extracts therefrom.

12. Each grave shall be dug in the middle of its grave space.

13. Grave digging will be arranged by the Burial Board. The first burial in any grave not exclusively purchased shall be 9 ft. for the bottom of the grave, below the level of the surrounding ground. No coffin shall be buried in any grave the top of which shall lie less than 4 ft. 0 ins. below the level of the surrounding ground.

14. A person shall not, in the Burial Ground, cause a body to be buried in a grave unless the coffin is effectively separated from any other coffin already in the grave by means of a layer of earth not less than six inches in thickness.

15. Where in the Burial Ground, any grave is re-opened for the purpose of making another interment therein, a person shall not disturb any human remains interred therein, or remove therefrom any soil which is offensive.

16. Coffins of wood, or other approved material shall be used in earth graves.

17. Every person who, in the Burial Ground, buries a body in a grave in respect of which an exclusive right of burial has been granted by the Burial Board shall, ~~as soon as conveniently may be after the lapse of such a period as may reasonably suffice for the natural subsidence of the earth~~ ** once a sufficient period of time has elapsed allowing for natural subsidence of the earth* with which the grave has been filled up, cause the surface of the grave to be properly covered with fresh turf, or with any grave stone or monument approved by the Board. In every case, except where an approved monument is erected, the surface of the grave will be left level with the surrounding ground.

MONUMENTS

18. All gravestones, monuments, memorials and inscriptions shall be subject to the approval of the Burial Board and a copy of every inscription and drawing showing the form and dimensions and material of every gravestone, monument or memorial, or memorial proposed to be erected shall be left at the address of the Clerk to the Burial Board for approval.

19. All monuments shall be constructed in a manner and of materials to be approved by the Board and when commenced shall be proceeded with without unreasonable delay from day to day until completed, or the sanction for their erection may be withdrawn and uncompleted work to be removed.

APPENDIX 2

No hewing or dressing of stones is permitted within the Burial Ground or in its approaches; and all rubbish, refuse, stones & etc remaining after the work is completed shall be removed by the person erecting the monument.

20. All gravestones, monuments and memorials shall be kept neat and clean and in good order by the owners thereof at their own expense, and in default thereof such gravestones, monuments and memorials shall be forfeited to the Board, who shall be entitled to take possession thereof and remove or repair them as they may think fit. No shrubs or trees are to be planted in the Burial Ground. The Board has the right to remove plants and shrubs.

21. A reference number to every grave shall be at the back of the monument, memorial or stone and shall not be removable by the owner.

22. All fees and charges of the Board must be paid to a duly authorised Officer before permission to enter the Burial Ground to carry out the necessary monumental work is granted and the receipt for all fees paid shall, if required, be produced to the Clerk to the Burial Board.

23. Whosoever shall wilfully commit any of the following acts within the precincts of the Burial Ground and the approaches thereto shall be liable, under the provisions of the Burial Acts (1852-1906), and other incorporated Acts.

- (1) damage, deface or destroy any gravestone, monument, tablet, memorial or inscription,
- (2) damage or destroy any wall, fence, tree, plant or shrub,
- (3) play at any game or sport,
- (4) discharge any firearm except at a military funeral,
- (5) cause any disturbance in the conduct of a burial,
- (6) commit any nuisance,
- (7) put up any bill or poster,
- (8) do any other damage or mischief,

No dogs at large are allowed in the Burial Ground. Those being taken through must be kept on a lead and in order. The Burial Board reserves the right to amend these Rules at any time if considered necessary.

By order of the Parish Council of Hartley on 21st July 2000

** proposed amendment shown in italics*

Appendix 3

Report on works carried out in the Burial Ground and Garden of Remembrance since the last meeting.

(1) The Garden of Remembrance has been cleared out and dug over and the bluebells have been relocated.

(2) The following graves have been turfed:

P M Taylor grave no 466

M & R pain grave no 433

D E M & C Horgan grave no 452

J & B J Doughty grave no 82

(3) The concrete kerb around the edge of the grave of the late P Cloke has been removed and placed in the shed for the relatives to collect at a later date, should they so wish. Mr Munday has also been requested to turf the surface of the grave as soon as the flowers on the grave have finished flowering.

Hartley Parish Council
Summary of Receipts and Payments
 Cost Centre 4 Burial Grounds

Code	Title	Receipts		Payments		Net Position	
		Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Underspend (+) /Overspend (-)	
90	Grass cutting			850.00		116.00	734.00
91	General maintenance			600.00		139.85	460.15
92	Maintenance contract			1,800.00		596.00	1,204.00
93	Spoil removal			300.00			300.00
94	Plinth						0.00
95	Graves/interments		95.00				95.00
96	Interment of ashes						0.00
97	Memorials						0.00
98	Plaques						0.00
99	New B/G grass cut						100.00
	New B/G advance						
100	wks			1,000.00			1,000.00
101	All/St grass cut			650.00		200.00	450.00
102	All/St gen main			200.00			200.00
103	Health and Safety			600.00			600.00
104	Lay by			50.00			50.00
105	Blue Sacks						0.00
NET TOTAL		0.00	95.00	6,150.00		1,051.85	5,193.15
V.A.T.			0.00			5.25	
GROSS TOTAL			95.00			1,057.10	