

was seen in 1979, as *"well landscaped with mature trees and shrubs, and stands on high ground commanding long views to the north east across Childwall Valley and Bowring Park"*.

4.2 The appellant considers that views out of the conservation area are not as important as the reason for refusal suggests. The Inspector will see on site that the majority of buildings around Childwall Lane are very well secluded and that public views out of the conservation area are obscured either by buildings or by existing vegetation within the churchyard and adjoining gardens. The Planning Officer's report advises that *"there would be no detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area as a result of the development."*

4.3 The proposed building will be circular and single storey, with red sandstone walls and a natural sedum-planted roof, and sited on ground that is significantly lower than, and set at a considerable distance back from, Childwall Lane and the Hearse House. The maximum 4m height of the roof has been designed to be lower than the arched stained glass window (constructed 1906) on the north elevation of the church.

4.4 The appellant will demonstrate on site that the proposed building will not interrupt any existing public views from Childwall Abbey Road or Childwall Lane across the churchyard towards the valley to the north east. Views from the burial ground up towards the church will still be available and are, in any case, across private land. Views from the north-eastern end of the site towards the rear of the Hearse House and the pub will still be available over the low roof of the proposed extension. The proposed development will therefore comply with UDP policies OE11 and HD11 (iii) as it has been carefully designed to respect important views and vistas within, into and out of the conservation area.

5. Access to grave sites

5.1 The allegations of disrespectful disturbance of burial sites is a matter of great concern to the church members and they wish to strongly refute this reason for refusal. The Parochial Church Council has been diligent in tracing relatives of the deceased through those parish records that exist. The letter (dated January 2011) to all persons who were known to the PCC is submitted with the appeal documents. Statutory public notices were posted in the church, on the main porch door grilles, on the main notice board adjacent to the hearse house fronting on to Score Lane and in the Liverpool Daily Post. As a result, direct contact has been made with many of the families who have connections with the specific area of the churchyard that would be affected by the proposed extension and responses have been recorded by the Diocesan Registrar. One family in particular has expressed concern directly to the church authorities and, if requested, their relative's cremated remains could be respectfully exhumed and interred elsewhere in the graveyard at the appropriate time.

5.2 The Inspector will be aware that the Planning Officer advised the Committee that the exhumation of bodies is *"clearly an emotive issue about which residents have expressed concern but only the planning implications of the development can be taken into account not the complex moral issues that are raised."* English Heritage has explained that the basic principle regarding human remains is to leave them in situ if at all possible. The Planning Officer's report confirms that the appellant worked closely with Merseyside Archaeological Service in accordance with current best practice advice provided by the Association of Diocesan and Cathedral Archaeologists, the Church of England and English Heritage.

5.3 Matters relating to the alteration of the churchyard, including due process, are dealt with by the Church Authorities (Chancellor of the Diocese, Consistory Court and the Diocesan