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Most contemporary research accounts for conflict within cemetery space, but does not consider potentially contested and poorly understood role of cemeteries within their broader cityscape. This paper draws on stories from cemetery managers across England and Wales to narrate this multifunctionality, as they hold the pivotal role which oversees both the day to day running of the cemetery, and its strategic role within a given municipality. The paper outlines how cemeteries hold multiple functions in the cities in which they are located, specifically contributing to greenspace or green infrastructure, civic identity and local place attachment. These varying city level roles in turn impact on what is deemed (il)legitimate behaviour within the cemetery. Moreover, they raise important considerations for urban planners and policymakers who currently have little guidance on planning for new or existing cemeteries but are critical in the ongoing successful development of cities.

Introduction

This paper aims to reassess the role cemeteries play in cities so that their spatial significance can be made clearer, as well as beginning to develop an understanding of how more informed planning and management can positively affect cemetery space within cities. Despite national media attention around undersupply of burial space in the UK and numerous incidences of local concerns about full cemeteries and churchyards (e.g. Bingham, 2014), there is limited policy or research at local or
national level to guide the planning of cemeteries, crematoria or other spaces of death, bodily disposal and remembrance (McClymont, 2014). However, to be able to adequately address how to provide new cemetery space, or to manage existing cemeteries, it is important to understand the functions which they have in cities. To do this, the depth and complexity of their role and current position needs investigating and analysing.

Critically, the paper argues that contemporary research accounts for conflict within cemetery space, but does not consider the implications of this for the role of cemeteries in a broader cityscape. Cemeteries not only hold multiple competing meanings and functions within themselves, but also their role within the urban context is complex, multifaceted and potentially conflictual. This paper focuses on ‘multifunctionality’ (Woodthorpe, 2011) at the level of the cemetery in the city, asserting the myriad and at times conflicting role that these sites play within the city. This therefore establishes the backdrop against which decisions about city management, and future provision of sites should be made. The notion that cemeteries hold multiple roles is well-established. Specifically, Woodthorpe (2011) identifies three overarching competing functions: ‘emotion, commerce and community’ (Woodthorpe, 2011, p261). Cemeteries’ role as an emotional space includes not only grief and sadness of those attending funerals, or visiting a grave, but also angry interactions with staff often about maintenance or access issues. The commercial landscape of cemeteries relates to concerns over both the cost of funerals for individuals, and its role in public sector funding regimes, whether as a liability in terms of maintenance costs, or crematoria as a source of revenue. As a community landscape, the cemetery is seen as having a wider role as a resource for the local population, and includes hosting heritage events and entering competitions such as the ‘Green Flag’ award. The concept of multifunctionality expresses the possibility of all these different meanings being held together in one simultaneous physical and temporal landscape, and is a useful way of framing the conflicting demands placed upon cemetery space. However, such analysis does not consider the broader role of cemetery space within their wider urban cultural
context (Wingren, 2013). Research into this, and its implications for city management and planning, is limited especially in England and Wales. To address this, the paper presents research findings from in-depth interviews with local authority cemetery managers in nine UK cities. These are presented as stories of the cemetery in the city, as the paper also highlights the importance of narrative and storytelling in urban studies. This approach allows the depth, complexity and interwoven nature of cemetery space to be outlined most effectively. It gives voice to the cemetery manager as an unheard yet important raconteur, able to link site specific cemetery issues with their broader strategic position within the city as their job fulfils this role—both quotidian management of the cemetery and advocating for the service within the overall municipal authority.

The consideration of cemeteries’ role in cities is relevant for the management and understanding of a wider range of ‘deathscapes’: spaces of bodily disposal, death and remembrance, concurring with Rugg’s (2000, p272) claim that ‘the nature of burial space is not immutable... the passage of time alone can change the nature and meaning of individual sites’. Cemeteries are not easily or precisely defined (Arffman, 2000, Rugg, 2000, 2006) but enmesh with other sites of burial and remembrance, and their meanings, use and interpretation change over time. This includes consideration about ‘green’ or natural burial (Davies and Rumble, 2012, Clayden & Dixon 2007) and siting and design issues around crematoria (Grainger, 2005). Crematoria are frequently, but not exclusively found within cemeteries, and development of new facilities is often controversial. Alternatively, natural burial is ‘seen as a solution to problems associated with the management of cemeteries’(Clayden & Dixon, 2007, p40), however, the management and development of these sites within their broader spatial context is equally unsatisfactory and inconsistent (Rothschild, 2014). What is critical here is the need to consider the wider role of public deathscapes in their spatial context, and how this relates to city management and planning. Cemeteries, especially those managed by the public sector offer an inclusive insight into this as their remit is to cater for the whole of their municipality.
However, at present, UK planning has little to say about cemeteries\(^1\), and their role in cities and neighbourhoods, beyond a consideration of their role as heritage assets and green spaces (EH/EN 2007). Important as it is in understanding how they function as part of ‘green infrastructure’- a broad term encompassing all green space, it does not adequately address all of their roles. Moreover, cemeteries have a complex legal position with no statutory duty on local authorities to provide burial grounds (Myska & Morrice 2011, p23); however, public health legislation requires that local authorities provide suitable means to dispose of the dead. Ownership and management can reside with charities or faith groups, as well as the burial authorities, and different rules apply to open and closed facilities (Monckton, 2011). This multifaceted legal and organisational backdrop, alongside the lack of substantive policy guidance, further complicates issues of the practical management and public perception of cemeteries. Planning does not address issues of conflict between cemeteries’ death/bodily disposal functions, or, moreover, with the broader concerns of civic identity and local place attachment which emerge from international research (Wingren, 2013, Matthey et al, 2013). It is therefore necessary to develop a more considered understanding of the role cemeteries play within contemporary English and Welsh cities, specifically, of how civic identity, place attachment and green infrastructure are articulated in the narratives of cemetery managers. These three topics are then explored with reference to their implications for planning.

---

\(^1\) The National Planning Policy Framework (CLG, 2012), which provides overarching guidance on the role, scope and purpose of the planning system has no mention of cemeteries. As this document represents a reduction from over 1300 to 65 pages of guidance, this may not be a surprise, but within pre NPPF national planning policy, the only reference to cemeteries was in the typology of open space detailed in PPG17: Planning for open space, sport and recreation. No detailed consideration is given to the value, management or future provision of cemeteries or burial space on a national basis apart from that within the non-statutory ‘Paradise preserved’ (English Heritage/English Nature, 2007). This focuses on their role as spaces of heritage and biodiversity, describing cemeteries as ‘pockets of countryside locked within urban areas’ (EH/EN 2007, p5), and aims to bring these more nuanced and complex ideas into mainstream cemetery management. At the next tier down, local authority planning, under a quarter of local plans contain any specific guidance about developing new cemeteries, with a sizeable minority not even mentioning the word ‘cemetery’ in their entire document. Those that do, largely classify cemeteries with other aspects of green space/green infrastructure, or state their development would be permitted on greenbelt land, or mention a particular heritage interest in a given cemetery (McClymont, 2014).
The cemetery within the city

Cemeteries occupy a potentially contradictory space within the urban landscape, and have done from their inception to the present. Developed in the eighteenth century as a ‘proper place of death’ cemeteries aimed to provide hygienic and respectable places of burial where churchyards could no longer cope with expanding urban populations (Rugg, 2006). However, over the following two hundred years, this has gradually become eroded; with cemeteries’ role, both within the city and within their own ‘walls’ becoming less clear cut. The Victorian cemetery was conceived as a place of leisure and botanical interest, as well as interment and hygienic disposal of dead bodies (Tarlow, 2000), serving both the living and the dead. They provided needed green spaces for recreation, learning and scientific interest in biodiversity. However, social and cultural shifts in the 20th century weakened cemeteries’ monopoly on disposal of the dead. Partly due the loosening ties of religion and societal convention, and partly due to changes in technology, there is now “increasing temporal and spatial separation of the forms of bodily disposal and rituals associated with the commemoration of the deceased” (Kellacher and Worpole, 2010; p161). As Rugg (2006) argues, “after World War II, cemeteries had begun to lose their importance as a communal context in which grief could be framed” (p225). Specifically, the increase in cremation meant that bereaved people were no longer always physically linked to a cemetery as the location of the remains of the deceased person, as ashes can be scattered more freely, or kept, potentially in the home.

This posited loss of shared meaning in the post war period also has implications for memorialisation of other parts of the city. On the one hand this offers more individual freedom and choice, however, on the other, it also individualises and isolates grief, potentially dislocating individuals from a broader context of meaning making by the loss of common rites (Maddrell, 2013). This further implies that as the spatial context for grief and mourning has become more personal or individualised, the shared space of the cemetery in the city no longer holds the same shared meaning amongst its citizens. Moreover, Clayden and Dixon (2007) claim that ‘the traditional
cemetery has been accused of no longer serving the needs of bereaved people’ (p241); not adapting the changing belief patterns or being suitable maintained for the requirements of mourners. Issues of poor quality design, especially in the UK context are seen as furthering this notion of decline (Clayden & Woudstra, 2003), highlighting the importance for planning and city management to understand and address these issues.

This then raises questions over the value of cemeteries, especially in a climate of perceived pressure on land for development. As cemeteries no longer hold the monopoly on spatial memorialisation of the dead, their meaning and importance in the city needs to be justified in other ways. Despite often being established by secular institutions such as local authorities, cemeteries are often used and valued as sacred places (Rugg, 2000, Francis et al, 2005, Maddrell, 2013) and “(t)he sites are able to carry multiple social and political meanings” (Rugg, 2000, p264). This means that their role in urban space has a greater spiritual quality than those of parks, muddling the assumed ability to assign places singular instrumental functions (McClymont, 2015). No singular use or interpretation holds primacy over the other, and the concomitant existence of multiple interpretations can lead to both practical and symbolic problems. The ongoing tension between cemeteries as a place of public promenade, and private reflection and bodily interment, coupled with a shift away from burial and towards cremation further complicates their spatial significance both as places themselves and as part of a cityscape.

This leads on to questions of what behaviour is appropriate or legitimate in cemetery space; because the way the place is defined will in turn (de)legitimise certain actions. Consideration of (in)appropriate practice includes the ways in which graves and other memorials in cemeteries are marked and decorated, the sorts of items are suitable to be left on graves or trees, as well as inferring assumptions about good taste. Woodthorpe (2010) argues ‘there are powerful normalising discourses in the cemetery about what constitutes ‘fitting’ memorialising activity” (p131). These
concerns are taken up by Deering (2010) who discusses ‘unofficial’ behaviour in cemeteries, beyond that of memorialisation, and assesses what is considered anti-social and hence illegitimate behaviour. Through research with young people, she presents cemeteries places of contested and conflicting meaning and behaviour offering opportunities for “drinking, having sex and creating general disturbance” (p89) as well as use more widely legitimate recreational purposes, such as walking and birdwatching, beyond just mourning. It is evident from this, as well as the issues over memorialisation that multiple uses and meanings of cemetery space cannot always easily co-exist. Cemeteries can become a place to judge and police (in)appropriate behaviour; highlighting public limits to their role as private places. They are important political and cultural landscapes, with multiple and contested meanings which in turn frame what behaviour may or may not be deemed legitimate therein. Depending on what or who a cemeteries represents, or more widely, what part(s) in plays within its (urban) context, certain activities and identities are (de)legitimised. This includes issues of civic identity and cultural diversity.

These issues are considered by Matthey et al (2013), Reims (1999) and Wingren (2013). Specifically, they discuss the accommodation of multicultural or multifaith populations within public cemeteries, and the impact this has on the symbolic presentation of the city’s identity. Wingren’s (2013, p170) claim that ‘(t)he cemetery is a place that mirrors society, and a place where inherited and deep-rooted cultural differences become visible’ illustrates the role they have in hosting material public memory. These cultural differences are displayed through the diversity of memorial practices.

Further, Matthey at al’s (2013) argument that the evocation of the (potential) need for Muslim burial space creates a category, and in turn legitimates the Muslim population as part of the city: a category of citizens who need to be provided for within the civic space of the public cemetery. These arguments illustrate the importance of the cemetery beyond its own boundaries. Cemeteries are ‘communicative symbolic practices that construct and express individual and collective ethnic
and cultural identity’ (Reims, 1999, p147). Therefore the role which they play within the city is an intrinsic part of place identity: cemeteries represent the people of that place and in turn publically and visually present a version of the place in which they are located: a collection of private individual (practices) becoming more than a sum of their parts.

Cemeteries have a role in promoting civic identity and local place attachment (cf Hayden, 1997), and those managing them need to consider this, as well as environmental and neighbourhood siting issues. Contemporary research from the US (Coutts et al, 2013), Australia (Bennett & Davies, 2015), the Netherlands (Van Steen, & Pellenbarg, 2006), and Romania (Tudor et al, 2013, Nita et al, 2014) highlight some of these issues. These works illustrate how some issues arising from the contested roles cemeteries hold can cause complications for their development and planning, however, they do not discuss these challenges alongside cemeteries’ more cultural and symbolic functions within the city. To successfully manage established cemeteries and develop new ones, it is important to understand their function in its full complexity. To do so, the paper now turns to cemetery managers’ stories to explore this dynamic and changing landscape further.

**Stories of the city: narrative and place**

The research findings presented in this paper are from in-depth interviews with local authority cemetery managers in England and Wales, and contain photographs of cemeteries in the same cities. The paper presents six key narratives which articulate the multifunctional position cemeteries hold within contemporary cities, as places of green space, civic identity and local place attachment. These narratives are supplemented and contextualised by additional themes which emerge from the research findings, and supported by photographs. Interviews were semi structured, covering the same topics amongst all participants whilst allowing interviewees to discuss what was important to them and their area. Interviews took place at the cemetery managers’ work place, and were on a
one-to-one basis (although interruptions from colleagues happened in most cases). Local authority management and service structures vary from council to council but all interviewees were the heads of the Bereavement or Cemeteries and Crematoria service – some doing just this, and others with a wider remit, but this service remaining their main focus. The interviews were digitally recorded, then professionally transcribed. Interviews ranged from one to two hours in length, and followed the same broad schedule which covered interviewees’ background, role of the service within the local authority, their perceptions of change in the use of cemetery space over time, and their view on its role within the city. The chosen cities/local authority areas (Bristol, Cardiff, Liverpool, Manchester, Plymouth, Sandwell (West Midlands), Southampton, Nottingham, Milton Keynes) comprise some of the major urban areas in England and Wales outside of London, are all single tier councils, and represent the majority of the ‘Core Cities’ group. The aim was not to achieve a statistically representative sample, but broad coverage of issues of a range (in terms of wealth, location, history, ethnic diversity) of large urban areas outside of London. As the majority of research into contemporary cemeteries focuses on London (Woodthorpe, 2010, 2011, Francis et al 2005), this research aims to give a more geographically broad picture to illustrate whether similar issues for cemeteries are present across the UK. In addition, it focused on local authority cemeteries rather than churchyards or private burial grounds which target a particular audience (such as a woodland/natural burial or faith-specific sites), as they aim to serve the whole population of their area. The findings therefore may apply to other burial grounds, or to churchyards, as stated earlier, with reference to definitional difficulties.

To adequately explore these findings, it is necessary to draw on ideas of narrative in qualitative social science. By using extended direct quotes, the paper aims to make visible the professional narrative of cemetery managers’ experiences and interpretations in ‘ways that do not diminish the weight of the original voices from the field yet give an author the opportunity to create some added meaning’ (Czarniawska, 2007, p23). It is not to claim that by doing this the role and position of the
researcher can be avoided and any ‘pure’ version of a cemetery managers’ world can be provided, however, the aim is to present more a subtle and nuanced understanding. In this way, the research can be seen as presenting an alternative narrative of cemeteries in cities, one which is ‘real not right’, (following Sikes, 2005), giving a wider audience to voices not often heard.

The importance of narrative, or storytelling, in place, and planning is well documented (Finnegan, 1998, Throgmorton, 2003, Sandercock, 2003). Finnegan’s (1998) study of Milton Keynes uses narrative and stories to bring ‘together multiple narrations relative to one key topic’ (p9). In a similar vein, Jervis Read’s (2012) discussion of resettlement in Delhi sees narratives as “forms of spatial practice that seek to influence and shape relations with others and their experience of place too” (p91). Within a geopolitical context, Cope and Latchman (2009) demonstrate how conflicting narratives of decline influence the possible future trajectories for Buffalo, New York, stating ‘there are many “Buffaloes”...and thus many identified causes of decline and possible sources of redemption” (p152). Narratives shape places as much as they are shaped by the place in which they are located or told. They are powerful tools in the debates about placemaking and place identity. Cemetery managers use narratives to situate themselves, and their version of the sites they manage within the city; spatially, practically and culturally, verbally locating cemeteries’ role in providing green space, and as an expression of civic identity and local place attachment. They narrate the cemetery’s multi-layered role in the cityscape.

Moreover, specifically in planning, storytelling plays an important role: “listening to and telling stories are fundamental activities in everyday planning practice” (Van Hulst, 2012, p. 302). Storytelling can be a way to bring diverse and divergent views together, but around certain shared normative goals (Sandercock, 2003, Throgmorton, 2003). Planners have a role in interpreting numerous facts and opinions pertaining to their area, articulating these into a coherent narrative vision about a better place, telling a positive tale about the future. Planning as storytelling sees the
power of rhetoric, but also sees the potential of this as a positive force, and one in which multiple stories have a place (Throgmorton, 2003). By drawing on cemetery managers’ stories of the cemetery in the city, this paper aims to bring these presently unheard voices into the debate about the priorities for urban futures, weaving these spaces in to broader understandings of good, or better, places.

In each of the following three sections, two stories are presented by way of extended quotes which illustrate the complex dynamics of cemeteries’ position within the city. These narratives are important seen in their wholeness as they demonstrate and develop they nuanced position of cemetery space. The discussion which leads out of them is enhanced and illustrated by photographs, and a discussion of relevant themes from the research, highlighting the interplay of the two levels of multifunctionality: site and city scale.

Stories of the City 1: Cemeteries as part of a city’s ‘Green Infrastructure’

Yes. It’s a very difficult thing to manage at times, because on the one hand, you think cemetery’s a very green oasis in a residential area, not everybody’s got gardens, and maybe some people who live in flats may at the weekend like to walk through a cemetery, I’m conscious as I say that it’s not just cemetery grave visitors that come here. And so we have thought from time to time that we put nesting boxes out for birds, and we’d like to see animal life in the cemetery and encourage it. But over at South Bristol, I think there may have been some development in the, the Avon Gorge bowl, especially in the area that they were considering building a new football stadium, there’s so much development going on outside of our grounds, we’ve
started to get a lot of regular deer visit the cemetery, and of course, people who place flowers which are expensive on graves, they’ve asked us if we can shoot the deer, so on the one hand, you know, I’m looking at a wildlife survey, and on the other hand I’m trying to stop guns from being fired at these deer. And you know, we have had baby deer killed in the cemetery. I don’t really know how you deal with this, because it’s, I’ve got my opinion, and I very often try to persuade people that if they’re visiting a loved one, maybe that loved one might have liked to have seen the wildlife in the cemetery, but that’s very little consolation if they’ve eaten £20 worth of roses, so there’s a contradiction of interests.

That is a problem. Ideally you want the cemeteries to be open to the public. At the moment, I’ll tell you our biggest problem at the moment, fly tipping. Two of our cemeteries, well, one of our cemeteries is having huge problems with fly tipping, to the extent, it’s the one one near the hospital, we actually have a gatekeeper, because what people were doing, you have to pay to park at the general hospital, you don’t have to pay to park in the cemetery. And a few years ago it got to the stage where people were blocking both sides of the main driveway and funeral parties couldn’t get through, so we employ a gatekeeper who just sits there, and runs after people when he sees them park. That in itself is a problem, and that particular cemetery is one way, so you come in at the hospital end, and you leave at the top. We’ve had people driving in that way as a short cut to avoid the traffic and nearly knocking people over, which we were trying to deal with, but then what was happening was people were coming in that way, dumping rubbish, fridges, freezers, tellies, rubble,
and then driving out again. So we’ve closed those gates off, so they have to come in past the gatekeeper. But that’s caused complaints.

These two narratives illustrate key concerns about cemeteries role as greenspace. They both demonstrate a sense of the physical development of the city, forthcoming and established. They illustrate the relationship and proximity of the cemetery to other buildings: the hospital, small houses and flats, and indicate the flows of people and traffic between these places, and therefore how the cemetery is part of this complex network, and not something removed, and only conceivable as a discrete entity inside of its own walls. They demonstrate how cemeteries’ roles may change as other parts of the city are developed or altered, and how developments or changes within the cemetery can impact on the wider city, its flows and functions, whether this is restricting traffic or allowing wildlife. Within this network, cemeteries’ formal designation as green space is seen as potentially problematic. Issues around parking would not necessarily have the same implications in parks, and the conflicts with biodiversity/wildlife are also unlikely to be evident, or at least unlikely to cause such profound emotional reactions, in other green spaces. Cemeteries do share common concerns with parks, flytipping can be a problem in both for example, however, their role in the city is not the same as parks, and problems may arise if the two are conflated.

These concerns were echoed by issues raised about the conflicts in managing the green aspects of the site. For example, opinion was divided between cemetery managers on the importance of initiatives such as ‘Green Flag’ awards for high quality public space. Some saw such things as a distraction from their core functions of a cemetery: providing for bereaved people, others as an important way of getting external recognition for their good work. Another issue of latent conflict is in debates about ‘friends’ groups. Some managers saw these as an asset, some as a problem; some as both! In historic and largely closed cemeteries, ‘friends’ groups were often seen as providing a useful service in promoting the history of the site, catering for visitors and aiding maintenance. On
the other hand, friends groups were not always seen positively, viewing them potentially detracting from the core functions of the cemetery, being too focused on single issues at the expense of the strategic priorities of the site or area. Moreover, conflicts between different interest groups were noted: groups with an interesting in heritage upsetting groups with an interest in biodiversity for example, by removing ivy or brambles from headstones so that the inscription could be read more easily. This illustrates that the conflicts played out at site level—here about the relative importance of biodiversity are influenced by those at city scale. Whether a cemetery is primarily designed as fulfilling the role of green public space in the city impacts on how important initiatives such as green flag are. In turn, this impacts on the importance of ‘friends’ groups, as public involvement is one of the requirements for this award. If their role in the city is not only this, the role and relative importance of ‘friends’ groups is not so high, or at least, it has to be weighed against other factors; specifically the role of cemeteries in civic memory and local place attachment.

Stories of the City 2: Cemeteries as Civic Memory

Well, how it works is, if you’re from outside the borough, from outside the city, and you want to be buried within Liverpool, you’ve got to pay a fee to be buried in Liverpool, and that’s purely because most local authorities want to protect the land they have for their own residents, so they try to discourage people coming from outside, and that’s particularly so in the city, and Liverpool have got, Liverpool’s population was dispersed during the 1960s, a lot of outlying areas, Speke, that now falls within Knowsley, but most of them want to come back and be buried within Liverpool, and to be honest, there’s probably people all over the world that would, you know, scousers that want to come back to Liverpool and be buried, but we’ve
got, obviously we have to protect the land for the interests of the residents that are still here.

We have, I’m trying to think, seven different types, main types of funerals here. We have a Quaker burial ground, the only one in Plymouth. Erm, at one of my other cemeteries, I have Hebrew and Muslim and they’re next door to one another. And we spoke with the Rabbi, and we spoke with the Imam, and they said it’s the same god, why should we be worried? That’s what Plymouth traditionally is about, they didn’t mind in the slightest. Erm, I have Anglican ground here, Roman Catholic, we have a lot of Chinese Christians, and a lot of Greek Orthodox, and, yes, that’s what this cemetery’s about. We have a lot of war graves, obviously, and we do have one designated area for the war graves, and they’re all maintained, we maintain them, but we’re paid by the war graves commission. ... because it’s a family cemetery, and if that was mum and dad or grandfather, erm, we don’t mind in the slightest if they want to have a grave next to it, you know, we’re not going to say no you can’t, you must go to the military area, it’s family, you know, why not? We’ve got Serbs, from the first war, ... we have just about anything you could think of. We don’t mind in the slightest. ..., it’s literally, we are here as a public, there are a lot of different religions, and there are an awful lot of different nationalities and communities in Plymouth.

These two accounts present the importance of stories in creating and propagating place identity (Cope & Latcham, 2009). The cultural or symbolic role cemeteries have in representing the places in which they are located (Matthey et al, 2013, Reims, 1999, Wingren, 2013) is evident in these narratives. Liverpool’s civic pride and internationally durable identity is evident from the first
account, Plymouth’s history as a naval base and port, constructed within narratives of tolerance emerge from the second. These narratives position cemeteries as multicultural, material repository of civic history (Hayden, 1997) rather than simply (public) green space. They tell the stories of the people, individual citizens who can, and do, mark their remembrance in individually meaningful ways. Across all sites, memorials and graves were personally marked, with many managers commenting on changing public attitudes and sensibilities to memorialisation, citing the death of Diana, Princess of Wales, the Hillsborough disaster and a more general increasing individualisation in society as the causes of this. Bringing these together in the shared space of a cemetery allows managers of these spaces to articulate a shared civic identity which is beyond just the sum of individual memorials or graves.

In terms of their role in mediating this, managers saw their role as defending those who did not necessarily ‘shout the loudest’- either literally, or in terms of their memorialisation styles. This in turn often led to angry encounters with the public: issues of dog faeces, the level of grass cutting being all causing strong emotional reactions. Managers all commented on how one person, or family’s use of their grave plot could negatively impinge on their neighbour’s, and had a strong belief that as the local authority, they had a role in protecting the interests of everyone: an attitude was described as coming from a less easily quantifiable sense of civic duty, or public service. Articulating cemeteries as places of civic memory for the whole city has two levels of important implications. First, within the cityscape, their role and function is not therefore just that of green space. This has implications of the both the development of future sites and the management of current ones. Secondly, cemeteries role in providing a place of civic memory for the whole city has implications about what memorial behaviours are appropriate, and what role cemetery managers should or could have in policing this.
Yes, and in a way, the Jewish cemetery, we have to, erm, we have to control that, we unfortunately, well I think it was very clever of the person, cemetery was full, apart from the Jewish section, which is obviously for Jewish burials, so the cemetery is full for the rest of Bletchley, or Whalley Drive in Bletchley which the cemetery’s in, and so there’s no more space there, but the Jewish section, because it’s not very well used, they’ve got quite a lot of space, and somebody, many years ago, when I wasn’t in the authority I’m in here, I was in the office in a clerical role, which is a build up to this job, because nobody else perhaps wanted it, I was in a more junior role, somebody in Bletchley said that they were Jewish and they wanted to be buried in the cemetery, and so we allowed them to be buried in the Jewish section, because they asked to be buried in there, but unfortunately they weren’t Jewish, which I think is quite imaginative, that somebody thought actually I want my partner buried in Bletchley because that’s where I want them, but there’s no space for them in the general, so I’ll just claim that they’re Jewish. But that obviously didn’t go down very well with the synagogue that we deal with locally in Milton Keynes, so now when we have a request for that, we have a sort of a, not a list of questions, but we ask them, do you, are you an orthodox...yes, or are you, I always think, well how could I do that with a gentleman, I could find out with a gentleman! [laughs] But obviously we ask them do they go to the synagogue, we don’t make enquiries with the local, we have a contact with the local synagogue and say, this person is claiming to be from the Jewish faith, and then in a sense we have a relationship with the local synagogue to, for enquiries on that, they would obviously only use a Jewish funeral director, and they obviously require certain sort of things only at that grave
I think, you know, upon the initial opening of Highwood, I think the initial impression was that everyone would move from Bulwall cemetery certainly, shut up shop there and away we go at Highwood. And even now, a couple of years down the line, it’s still not the case, and even next year, we’re looking at the potential to move a few of the staff, but not all of them. So, we’ll see how that goes. But ultimately, Highwood is the future site for Nottingham. And then I guess we’ll see how things go, but potentially the administration function etc will need to move over in that direction in the next few years. But certainly trying to get people to kind of adopt Highwood as the burial ground now is no easy task. We have got reduced prices there at the moment to try and encourage people that way, but you know, you talk about Wilford Hill, they’ve been there for so long that that’s where people want to go, unfortunately we are going to be approaching a time where you know, they can’t do that. So we’re trying to encourage people up to Highwood where we can. And you know, things like green flag awards, and slanting to the environmental issues and that, hopefully that all helps to promote a nicer environmental place and that,

These final two narratives are more complex and weave together issue of identity, place attachment, and the role of the local authority- in the specific city contexts of Nottingham and Milton Keynes; they also raise issues which cannot readily be illustrated by photographs. The story of the Bletchley ‘fake Jew’, and the difficulty of encouraging Nottingham residents to be buried in Highwood both illustrate the importance of place attachment in cemeteries. In the first case, personal attachment to place is more important than religion, or other aspects of identity: a person wants burial in a given
location so much, they will assume a false identity. In the second, it is hard to recreate this
attachment in a new site, especially one located beyond/away from currently used ones. Location is
more important that financial or perceived environmental benefits. People were not ‘bought off’ by
discounted plots, or attracted by the ‘green’ credential of a site if it did not provide the necessary
emotional links of place attachment.

This raises questions in relation to the financial aspects of cemeteries; something else that is not
adequately explored by their designation as urban greenspace. Issues included having different
prices for residents of the municipality, and those outside the area. Further, most managers
discussed how hard it was to quantify the value of cemetery space to those who used it, but many
claimed visitors would pay to come to cemeteries while they would not to parks, stressing the
importance of both continued bonds with the dead, but also with the chosen location for burial. A
further potential complication was the pressure to make money for the local authority. As many
interviewees were also the manager of the crematoria for the local authority, their service was one
of the few local authority functions able to run at a profit. Although most managers did not see the
role of bereavement services as financing other aspects of local government, most argued that
because of the money paid by many families; for graves, memorials and funeral services, cemetery
maintenance and service was of the utmost importance, and this again was something which
differentiated the space from that of parks or greenspace, and holds an interesting position in
relations to cemeteries as places of civic identity. The commercial position of cemeteries is thus a
highly complex one; with people potentially prepared to pay to access the space, however, not
interested in financial incentives to change burial sites. This hints at the strength of emotional
attachment to both dead friends/relatives, and to their ‘final resting place’. Places hold emotional
value not just because of the bodily remains of the deceased being located there. Continuing bonds
with the dead are mediated through pre-existing place attachment, this therefore having bearing on
the maintenance of current cemeteries, but more importantly, on the suitable locations for development of new ones.

Conclusions

The ‘stories of the city’ told here put multifunctional cemetery space into broader perspective. They raise questions about how these diverse landscapes interact within flows of people who pass by and through the cemetery, and in turn, how this space plays a role in meaning making for the city as a whole. As well as being part of green infrastructure, cemeteries are spatial vessels of civic identity, telling diverse histories of the city and representing intangible notions of the character of a given place. They are also places which both allow for, and perform, local place attachment; connecting individuals with broader based identities and enabling locality mediated continuing bonds with the dead. Specifically, cemeteries’ multifunctionality within the city is as important as is their internal multifunctionality, and each has an impact on each other. Something can only be seen as a legitimate action within the cemetery if that action is fitting with a particular urban scale function: ‘friends’ groups are an important part of urban greenspace, municipal management of individual memorials is a valid role in a place of civic identity, questions of cost have a dubious and uneven role in places of strong local attachment, rather than following any assumed economic model.

The paper is not claiming that cemeteries are unique within urban space as holding more than one role. However, the span of diversity, and the strength of feeling which they evoke mean these are more prominent and potentially problematic than, for example parks offering both recreation and biodiversity habitats, or schools offering both educational facilities and community services such as swimming pools. Moreover, these multiple roles are not necessarily contradictory: in most cases, despite instances of conflict, cemeteries existed peacefully, managing their multifunctionality without trouble most of the time. However, issues arise when different roles do conflict, such as
wildlife eating floral tributes, and one person’s sense of personal place attachment expressed as ostentatious memorialisation clashing with a greater sense of civic identity. On the one hand, these are everyday local disputes, to be managed within the space of the cemetery, on the other; they have a wider reach about meaning and function. If wildlife is kept away from cemeteries, this challenges their role as greenspace. If it is not, it has implications about how personal place attachment can be managed, and continuing bonds maintained. There is also a fine line between individual memorialisation practices being able to show the diversity and identity of a city, and some individual’s practices stopping others. One manager commented that so many windchimes and scarves have been placed on one memorial tree, that the tree itself died; these practices also conflicting with cemeteries as greenspace. If cemeteries represent and function as places of shared civic identity, they need to be designed and located in ways which will enable this, this may in turn raise challenges for local place attachment.

These findings raise questions for planners and urban managers seeking both to develop new settlements and manage existing ones. Policies need to be flexible and progressive enough to accommodate and enhance the multiple roles that cemetery space has in its urban context. This relates to considerations about location for new sites: the wildlife in the vicinity, the right place-based emotional connections to develop identity and maintain bonds with the deceased and an ability to attract all sections of the population to represent diverse civic identity. When thinking about existing cemeteries, planners need to assess what sorts of developments would be suitable in close proximity; consider the impact on wildlife, but also on cemeteries as important civic space and deeply held expressions of personal identity. In so doing, the place of the cemetery in the city can remain multifunctional and unique.
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