



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-995127

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH CAMPBELLTOWN COUNCIL

RE: CROWN CEMETERY DEVELOPMENT VARROVILLE

PANEL: **DIANNE LEESON**
 ROSS CARTER
 ADRIAN PILTON

ASSISTING PANEL: **DIANA MITCHELL**

COUNCIL: **ANDREW MacGEE**
 JIM BALDWIN

LOCATION: **91 QUEEN STREET**
 CAMPBELLTOWN, NEW SOUTH WALES

DATE: **9.57 AM, TUESDAY, 19 FEBRUARY 2019**

MS D. LEESON: All right. Well, we will start.

MR J. BALDWIN: Yes. Sure.

5 MS LEESON: So welcome. We normal have a formal introductory statement.

MR BALDWIN: Right. Okay.

10 MS LEESON: But we've had a little bit of an administrative hiccup this morning, so bear with me while I try and recall some of it – how it goes.

MR BALDWIN: That's fine. That's fine.

15 MS LEESON: But we would like to acknowledge first off the traditional owners - - -

MR BALDWIN: Yes.

20 MS LEESON: - - - of the land on whose site we're meeting today and pay our respects to their elders past, present and emerging. We are members of the Independent Planning Commission. We are here today to speak with Campbelltown Council about the Varroville Estate and the proposed Varroville Cemetery by the Catholic Metropolitan Cemeteries Trust. I'm Dianne Leeson. I'm the chair of the panel for the purposes of this assessment. And I'm joined by Ross Carter and Adrian
25 Pilton as fellow Commissioners and accompanied by Diana Mitchell as a planning officer from the Secretariat. This morning we would like to discuss with council the proposal at hand and as you've noted we are recording this meeting the interests of transparency. It's a custom we have with all of our proposals now and the transcripts of this will be posted on to the Commission's website - - -

30 MR BALDWIN: All right.

35 MS LEESON: - - - so the interested parties may have a look. We will today be going for a site visit up to Varroville and then from there, we will be going off to another project this afternoon. So if I can then start proceedings today. I think we've provided you with an agenda. It would be helpful if you could perhaps outline for us council's view of the proposal and the process that you've been through to date and we will open up to some fairly general questions. If I can hand to you.

40 MR BALDWIN: Fantastic. Thank you for the opportunity, first of all. Just to give you a potted history, I suppose, in how we've come to this point. Some years ago, 2015 – or '14, I think the Catholic Cemeteries Trust presented themselves to the council staff and proposed just a general conversation about the proposal potentially to take on the construction of a cemetery on this site we're talking about. And from
45 that point in time, we went through a process of thinking about is this what the council or community sees fit for the use of that land or not.

The Cemeteries Trust took it on themselves to instead of – an opinion that was probably well founded that they could have just put a DA in – an application in directly, but they took it on themselves to make sure that it was okay through the statutory planning lines and therefore instead went the planning proposal route and –
5 to ensure that it was clear that a cemetery could be built or developed on that land. And so over a few years, the planning proposal process went by but, of course, initially, as it always is, the council, being the relevant planning authority at the time, takes on that in the first instance.

10 So the planning proposal in a bureaucratic sense we would go through that proposal – or the process. Ultimately, when the officers see the proposal of sufficient merit to take to council in the first instance to see if the council, in fact, was of a mind to let it go through to Gateway – that’s where it went to. The council objected to that and said, “No, we don’t want this. We object to the development”. The proponent then
15 put in a gateway review and the JRPP at the time would be the first entity to deal with that matter, but the Department of Planning, as it always does, through etiquette, it asked the council, the local council, if it wants to be the RPA, the Relevant Planning Authority. And, of course, the council rejected that because of the contradiction it would have if it said “Yes” in that it had already shown its hand and
20 it did not want the development on that site. The JRPP took - - -

MS LEESON: Sorry, Jim.

MR BALDWIN: Yes?
25

MS LEESON: Just so that I’m clear on that. The council officers in assessing the proposal at that point thought there was sufficient merit to take it through to council.

MR BALDWIN: Absolutely.
30

MS LEESON: And it was council - - -

MR BALDWIN: The – and this is the way – whether it’s the same in any other council – I’m sure it is – but the council staff, of course, are employed to undertake a
35 without prejudice assessment of all things at planning law, so regardless of what we think about anything in terms of our own personal opinions, we must put it in front of the – with the council how it stands at law, so our recommendations on that basis would have been yes, it does fit the parameters planning laws exist at the time being regardless of what the council might think about it. So they have the right to
40 then make a decision on the – by themselves, regardless of the recommendations of the officers. We will always do that without fear or favour. We will put it in front of them. Your Honour, I always use the example – it doesn’t matter what I think about a brothel, I will still say it’s permissible – there it is. And the council make a decision. So we do that without fear or favour. And so the council made the
45 decision to reject the planning proposal - - -

MS LEESON:

MR BALDWIN: - - - not to let it go through. They strongly objected, in fact. And we made a submission, ultimately, a few submissions to the panel in the process showing our strong objections to the proposal as it stood. So, post the offer of being the RPA – the council rejected that offer and still continued to object and make
5 – take every opportunity to object through the process of the planning proposal. As it goes, the Gateway did issue a Gateway approval with conditions and off the back of that, it goes through its own process ultimately to public exhibition. The Department of Planning takes carriage of that, not council any more. So the Department of Planning took that public exhibition – handled all that and the
10 JRPP dealt with that matter. Ultimately, the decision came to council – not to the council but physically in council chambers. The JRPP had a meeting, a public meeting, and where a number of people, including council, and I represented council for that matter, objected to the planning proposal. Ultimately, the JRPP and the Minister approved the – or making the plan. So the LEP was amended to allow the
15 word “cemetery” and other things to be entered into the LEP. So it was permissible. So without doubt they could now move to a DA, to a development application, which was fine. That’s the process and there it is.

So some 12 months – or in that order, maybe 18 months at most, I think, finally, a
20 development application was lodged with the council, being the assessing authority, I suppose, in that respect. And we again, putting our hat on, as in planning – where does the planning law exist – without prejudice undertake our assessments. There was a lot of work in that and we were at the stage and we did, in fact, send a first letter asking certain questions, a number of questions. There was a lot of gaps. And
25 it was at that point where the proponent requested the Minister take the matter away from the council. So we had never been responded to, of course, on that request for further information ever, however, we did as much as we could for the Department to say, “Well, these are the questions we have asked to assist with the process of the assessment”.

30 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR BALDWIN: Yes. So it comes to pass that we’ve only just found out that, in fact, an assessment report has been finalised. And it would have been good for this
35 panel right now if we had have had time to actually look at that assessment report and go through and see if we saw any deficiencies in that report - - -

MS LEESON: Sorry. Assessment report finalised by?

40 MR A MacGEE: From the Department of Planning.

MS LEESON: From the Department?

45 MR MacGEE: Yes.

MR BALDWIN: Yes.

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR BALDWIN: So – I mean, I will jump – you know, there’s questions here later
on that you will be asking us, “What are you” – you know, well, just on a cursory
5 look at the report, we see there’s gaps, we see there’s questions already in that
second report. We would like the opportunity to actually provide to the IPC our
thoughts on that. And in terms of the conditions, we see the conditions as being
quite vague and nondescript in certain areas. And I think, you know, as practitioners
in this world, we can see there’s a lot of problems in some of the conditions that are
10 laid out. And notwithstanding the outcome, the council itself, the council – the
council and community object to the proposal but it has come through to the here
we are now - - -

MS LEESON: Okay.

15 MR BALDWIN: - - - for various reasons and I can go through those reasons, but
we’ve made many submissions on that ground, particularly the Scenic Hills – if I can
say the Scenic Hills is one most identifier for Campbelltown. It is probably the most
important identifier for Campbelltown. It sets it apart from any other metropolitan
20 city. And it stands very seriously on any development on that front. Anything that
goes into there is of interest to the council and at every stage, the council has said no
to development on that front. This includes the cemetery.

MS LEESON: Yes. To your earlier point about only recently seeing the assessment
25 report done by the department and saying that council would have some further
comment on that and around the conditions and the nature of the assessment, saying
– I think you said you thought there were some gaps in there.

MR BALDWIN: Yes. Absolutely.

30 MS LEESON: The Commission would happily receive any submission from
council to be able to have a look at that.

MR BALDWIN: That’s good. That’s fantastic.

35 MS LEESON: So we are at the moment trying to finalise our dates for public
meetings - - -

MR BALDWIN: Yes.

40 MS LEESON: - - - which we think will – probably going to be the last week of
March - - -

MS D. MITCHELL: Last week of March.

45

MS LEESON: - - - at this stage but that's subject to confirmation. If it's humanly possible to have that advice from council before then so that we can at least understand that - - -

5 MR BALDWIN: Of course. Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - that would be really appreciated - - -

MR MacGEE: Yes. No problem at all.

10

MR BALDWIN: Yes. That's not a problem at all.

MS LEESON: Okay. Thanks, Jim.

15 MR BALDWIN: Not a problem at all.

MS LEESON: Okay. So to then the issues of the assessment of the department or what you thought were gaps in that. Are you able to sort of walk us through any of those this morning?

20

MR BALDWIN: I can take you to one, just as an example.

MS LEESON: Yes. As an example?

25 MR BALDWIN: Yes.

MS LEESON: Yes.

MR MacGEE: Yes. So we have just gotten through the proposed conditions.

30

MR BALDWIN: So we were just going through these conditions and I was – and I just picked up on one that's particularly important and it talks about – it's condition 14, draft condition 14 and it talks about traffic generally, about the impact on traffic and puts to the proponents obligation moving forward as the volumes increase through the cemetery, what its obligations are to undertake roadworks or those sorts of things. That's generally what it's talking about. But it does say the applicant:

35

...must undertake a traffic verification study –

40 which – we're not sure what "verification" means. It's not a word that's generally used in – I'm an engineer too and it's not generally a word we use in engineering but:

45

verification study every 10 years from the year 2038 to the satisfaction of the council and the RMS to verify –

and it goes on, and I will take you to that. But, essentially, it doesn't say that it needs to quantify what has happened previously. It's to a point where it can start from 2038 and, essentially, say, "Well, you know, the thing is broken. This is what has happened over time."

5

It increased in traffic over time. In 2038, we'll now take stock of how collapsed the road is or the structure is. We will bring it back up to speed to meet today so for three days it will suit but for the next 10 years, when we come back again, it will be deficient for the next 10 years because it's only now that we need to consider how broken or deficient the road is. And it's only you require me to bring it up to that standard to date, not to the standard that we will need in 10 years time. So we're not future-proofing the road. We're actually going to be bringing up to the standard today so it's always deficient. So there's vagaries in that and they're only compelled to take stock of what's going on at that point in time.

15

MS LEESON: I think there are probably two things in the – one is what the traffic assessment should be and we welcome you taking that up in your advice to us - - -

MR BALDWIN: Yes. Yes.

20

MS LEESON: - - - so that we can properly understand it. The second thing is that when we met with the department and we talked about the conditions generally, they acknowledged that they're not the consent authority and they thought that conditions around those sorts of issues would be appropriate. And so they weren't suggesting

25

MR BALDWIN: Right.

MR MacGEE: Okay. Not the suggested wording.

30

MS LEESON: - - - that they are the finally worded conditions - - -

MR MacGEE: Okay.

MS LEESON: - - - because they have acknowledge that they're not the consent authority in this case. You might want to have a look at the transcripts on the Commission's website of that meeting - - -

40

MR MacGEE: Right.

MS LEESON: - - - to be clear.

MR MacGEE: Right.

MS LEESON: I'm sure it was in the – I'm not making it up. I'm sure that I recall the department being quite clear that - - -

45

MR MacGEE: Okay.

MS LEESON: - - - it was really a guide to the consent authority about what sorts of conditions - - -

5

MR MacGEE: Okay.

MS LEESON: What sorts of issues conditions might address.

10 MR MacGEE: So is that the planning panel then or yourselves?

MS LEESON: It will be the planning panel.

15 MR MacGEE: Yes. So we usually provide the conditions to them so in a roundabout way, we'd end up being involved in the drafting - - -

MR BALDWIN: In drafting the conditions.

MS LEESON: In the drafting of the conditions.

20

MR MacGEE: I get it. Okay.

MR BALDWIN: Right. Okay.

25 MS LEESON: There's a process.

MR BALDWIN: Okay. Well, in that one – there was about three or four different questions in that one condition.

30 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR BALDWIN: So if that's the process, we can be part of that.

35 MS LEESON: Yes. So if that helps to clarify it, that's probably just worth mentioning that.

MR BALDWIN: What it does, I suppose, it gives us confidence that, in fact, this is not it. We have got - - -

40 MS LEESON: Correct.

MR BALDWIN: Yeah, that's the point.

45 MS LEESON: Correct.

MR BALDWIN: We have got a part to play in the formation of those conditions to make sure it does cover off what we know to be required in - - -

MS LEESON: Should it be approved.

MR BALDWIN: That's right.

5 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR BALDWIN: If it's approved - - -

10 MR MacGEE: Yeah, because we had some other things that aren't actually addressed in those as well so if there's an opportunity for us to add some additional things that we put on a normal or any other commercial development in the city that aren't addressed in these, now that – with that in mind, it's actually a lot more - - -

15 MS LEESON: And if you include that in the sort of advice you want to give to us - - -

MR MacGEE: Yes. Absolutely.

20 MS LEESON: - - - then that would be fine.

MR MacGEE: Yes. Okay.

MS LEESON: Okay.

25 MR BALDWIN: So we're of course at this stage and that's how it has come to pass, through the – and council's objection stands to the development itself. Of course the LEP allows certain things now and here we are, the right of the owner, of course to put a DA in and have it assessed – duly assessed but still, if it would take it on board that council strongly objects to such a development in that area. Now, Andrew, we
30 did, when the DA comes in and for us to be able to write a letter to the proponent saying all these questions, what were the headline issues?

MR MacGEE: We – have you seen the letter we wrote to the applicant? It was
35 about – had about 16 points in it, from various things that we've gleaned from the submission that came in with the application. We had bounced it around in here to different professions to get their comments and so we came up with that list of things that we thought needed some more work to be done in – just to answer questions or to quantify some inconsistencies in the different reports, which is no surprise, to be honest, given the scale of the development. So some of the bigger ones out of that
40 were relating to water cycle management across the site, vegetation management.

We have got a very significant, or potential significant issue with some vegetation across the top, which you will see when you go out there today, about land stability. There's a real concern that if that area is re-vegetated, which it's proposed to be – at
45 the moment it's mostly African olive – there needs to be some real critical thinking done in the process to remove that olive and keep the ground stable because it's quite steep. So we went into some detail about things like that. Since – there was, yeah,

the traffic issues that we talked about so we asked for some more detailed modelling to be done and some extra intersections to be considered that hadn't been done in the original

5 We did some – we forwarded on the response that we got from the Heritage Office which asked a few questions about the curtilage of Varroville. And geotechnical stuff as well; the ground stability and all that sort of thing, again – and the dams. There's a series of dams that run through there so all that sort of stuff needed to be thought of. We had some questions about the road. And then, probably one of the
10 bigger ticket ones was the development's compliance or otherwise with the LEP because there's a – there was a no-build area identified in that which, under the application when it came in, had some structures shown in that which we didn't think accorded with the terms of that LEP clause.

15 MR BALDWIN: If I could just – the issue I suppose to council, broadly, doesn't just extend to the daytime visual, you know, matter of – it's a night time – especially in a blanket of dark – blanket that the scenic hills provide in the night time. So this building we're talking about, these buildings – this set of buildings, you know,
20 intruding on that dark blanket that exists now. It's not just daytime visual impact, it's night time. And the lighting, the up lighting and – those intrusions we're very sensitive to and this is a common theme when we talk to developers year on, year out, about how – not just daytime but the night time effect – impact on the scenic hills, which is really important for council.

25 MR R. CARTER: So, Jim, you mentioned earlier – you said there was a series of issues that were the basis of council's objection and scenic hills - - -

MR BALDWIN: Yes.

30 MR CARTER: - - - which has got back the daytime visual but also this dark blanket and night time one.

MR BALDWIN: Yes.

35 MR CARTER: What were the other issues that were sort of the - - -

MR BALDWIN: So there's – I suppose the story that we always talk about for anyone who comes to the council – the town area and even discusses the opportunity for any type of development in the area is that the council itself – sees itself distinctly
40 different and that's one of the pieces that pulls – as a distinct difference to any other metropolitan area. And two green belts. We're very linear as a council, not large and bulky. We're a very linear council running along a corridor, along a railway corridor. We're very fortunate – extremely fortunate to have very, very close green links to all of the metropolitan centre.

45 So people can be living in rural environments and be very close to those infrastructure pieces and that's a quality that we want to protect. And that includes a

rural quality. And the LEP at the time – which has been of course amended – rural – the word “rural” came in over and over and over again in that rural context and that sense of place. So if I give you an example and it might well – if you have the time, it might well be a good idea – there’s – you can see the school behind you.
5 It’s St Greg’s on – if you just keep going round.

MS LEESON: Yes.

10 MR BALDWIN: You both – you both can see the school on top on the hill.

MS LEESON: Yes.

15 MR BALDWIN: St Greg’s College, now that was a one-way stop, turn back to Campbelltown. You couldn’t get across to Camden. Now, Gregory Hills Drive connects to Gregory Hills on the other side of Camden. This is only 2017. So it’s a great example of people who drive from Camden will be experiencing an urban context, a very dense urban context. They will subtly seeing that, driving along. They understand what it is. Then they will hit the Scenic Hills.

20 They will hit the hill. Now, if we could – if we did develop in there, and you could develop in certain ways in that – there’s a boundary, an LGA, Local Government boundary, which is the Campbelltown boundary. It’s very, very close to the other side of the hill. So for us to have an experience where people can actually drive through and all those areas and actually stop, “Hang on. I’m in a rural context now.
25 I’m in an open space or rural environment, and I feel something different. It’s not just changing from Camden to Campbelltown. I don’t know where they finish and I don’t know where they start.”

30 So it’s very powerful and council are very cognisant of the power of that, on how people take a read of what Campbelltown really is, and so they defend that that Scenic Hills perimeter. And that’s one of the things. It’s not just the daytime visual from the valley and back in, because in some cases you can’t even see the Scenic Hills in some areas so it doesn’t really matter so much, but it’s when you’re moving around and when you’re coming into the town, how do you take a read of what
35 Campbelltown is? And that’s really important. And so the protection of that Scenic Hills premise and that other flank which is the Georges River frank, is really important to Campbelltown.

40 So this in itself, you moved on the freeway. As you move up and down the freeway from Sydney to wherever you’re going south – Melbourne wherever it might be, you look left, you look right and you can see this area, and again, you take a read on what Campbelltown might be. And we often see city centres, and you know, Melbourne is a great example of that. As you move down a Melbourne freeway heading towards Melbourne it’s a fairly flat city, as we know, and you’re corralled
45 into Melbourne from the outskirts of basically by sound walls, and those little gets you get, all you see is a sea of houses. And you don’t get any context of where the town centre is.

You don't get any read of what anything is. You don't understand what the place is. So it's really important. Those flanks are visual context as you move along those places, the freeway. And that's the main conduit to – you know, people don't pass through Campbelltown generally. They pass by, and they get a read. And this
5 essentially what we base our development construct on for protecting the Scenic Hills, protecting the Georges River and those elements. It's incredibly important in our wider Western Sydney Parkland conversation in protecting that again.

10 You know, you have the Western Sydney Parklands coming down. It stops at the moment. We have a grand vision and we think we can do this, of connecting those Parklands right through the down south Nepean River, right through to the Australian Botanic Gardens, right across the top, and have that for public use so people can enjoy it. At the moment it's essentially a private – mostly private land, so people can't get there unless they're invited on the land, but we're looking at a public
15 to actually show when people enjoy what we know is there. So these elements are so essential to Campbelltown, anything we do, anything policy we create, has to have an essence of that sitting as a layer in there.

20 MS LEESON: We have a wealth of materials that has been provided to us. The proponents' – you know, the individual assessment reports, various submissions, and what have you. I don't actually recall seeing amongst all that material an identifying boundary of the Scenic Hills area. It might be there. I don't recall seeing it. Is there a mapped boundary to what you would call the Scenic Hills area?

25 MR BALDWIN: No. No, generally there's no border, no actual limit or – there is an element of a document that hasn't – it's not public. It's – that we look at a contour – essentially, as a single contour that we work with. It's more Sydney Water catchment sort of construct, first of all, and also when you look back and you stand back and you look at these places from different aspects though Campbelltown,
30 picking up where those last houses are, the remnants of houses area, and if that's the line, we can see it clearly. We will now look at that – where Scenic Hills actually lies. We had done some visual studies previously, some 10, 15 years ago. They had been used in informing the previous LEP, but certainly there's no defined boundary as it stands right now. I couldn't give you a document that shows you there's
35 absolutely the line. No, it's essentially, like I say, the place that is generally that opportunity to move through, and as long as we can keep a decent length or a decent size in that area, that's what we're trying to protect.

40 MR MacGEE: There was some discourse about it in the Greater Sydney Commission's Western City District Plan as well. It's mentioned in that.

45 MS LEESON: You mentioned the view corridors and things and we've got the consultant's report showing us where they've done their visual assessment from. Are there particular points that you would recommend we go and have a look from why we're out here?

MR BALDWIN: Yes, it's really just the – it's difficult in that the main – like I like, the main conduit is the freeway, so to actually pull up on the freeway is – you can't really do that. It's the actually driving past and seeing those open spaces and – but, you know, and that's where it is, so on the trip home, I mean, you will take – you
5 will see, you will note, but internally at the moment, how it is – is generally it's only the local, or those visitors to a local area, family friends, that actually get close to Varroville at the moment, other than for the freeway. There's no other road generally, like road that moves past or around that area. So the freeway is the point at the moment. But when you're coming back, though, and you stand – I
10 suppose we're talking about vehicle distance from the railway on the eastern flank, so through the valley, and so you pick up again – the other side is Minto. I think Minto is the opposing - - -

MR MacGEE: St Andrews.
15

MR BALDWIN: St Andrews is the opposing location, and it rises so it gives you a very, very understanding of – extremely good understanding.

MR MacGEE: In the applicant's visual assessment there were some photographs
20 taken from St Andrews suburb. I don't know if you recall those. It looked across the highway.

MS LEESON: Yes.

MR MacGEE: If you wanted to look at that with our own eyes, compare it to the
25 picture, that would be a good spot, I think.

MS LEESON: Okay. Thank you.

MR MacGEE: So, yes, I just wanted to say as well, all that Jim has been mentioning
30 is reflected in the LEP clause itself, if you wouldn't mind me reading it out, if that's okay.

MS LEESON: Not at all.
35

MR MacGEE: So:

*The development for the cemetery is permitted with consent but only if the
40 consent authority is satisfied.*

And the first subclause is that:

*Development will complement the landscape and scenic quality of the site,
45 particularly when viewed from surrounding areas including the Campbelltown urban area, Varroville Homestead and the Hume Highway.*

So that in a couple of lines sums up our position. Yes.

MS LEESON: And we will be going on site today. We won't be getting onto Varroville Homestead.

MR MacGEE: No. Right.

5

MS LEESON: But we will get as close as we can to the boundaries of the sites - - -

MR MacGEE: Yes.

10 MS LEESON: - - - just so that we can try and approximate what that view will be.

MR MacGEE: Yes. Yes. Well, it's surrounded on all four sides by the site, so it – I've spent quite a bit of time on the site myself when the application first came in by Cemeteries Trust.

15

MR BALDWIN: There's some fantastic sites on there. We

MR MacGEE: Beautiful place.

20 MR BALDWIN: You know, you see Sydney skyline. All those sort of things. You get opportunities like that. And you will see from the freeway also that due to the topography, some parts of that site disappear behind hills and you might not see that from a freeway, so it's a – there's a leading part that you would – you know, interact with the freeway, and distant views, and there's the night time issues and all
25 those sort of things that from a distance you pick up on, but then there's valleys behind which are tucked away from the freeway. But, again, ultimately, and I see through even the conditions – the draft – we call it draft conditions, that there seems to be conditions written from different agencies in there, which we would expect.

30 MS LEESON: Quite likely, yes.

MR BALDWIN: Yes. And the RMS have obviously had a hand in some way in that condition. And it's – it has by way an inference talk about the other side of St Andrews Road which is Camden Valley Way. And St Andrews Road at Camden
35 Valley Way at the moment is essentially a five-land intersection going into a single dirt road - - -

MR MacGEE: Not wider than this room, yes.

40 MR BALDWIN: It's a goat track. It's one car either way, essentially, road. So they've pre-empted – it's a five-lane intersection intersection going down to a very – four houses, I think, and services, I think.

MR MacGEE: Not even, yes.

45

MR BALDWIN: I think we were a road that goes to a dead end because the watercourse goes through and breaks the connection between St Andrews Road this side and St Andrews Road that side.

5 MS LEESON: Right.

MR BALDWIN: So there's no connection at the moment through both sides, but the RMS in the intersection have shown a five-lane intersection pre-empting possibly a future connection through. Given the cemetery is there too, that might require such a connection, instead of just one way in, one way out. So that's when we will start to get a movement of traffic through if this was approved, and again, the visual context and the opportunity for Campbelltown to maintain what it believes to be special and different, and stands it apart from other metropolitan centres. So these are the sort of thing – if this goes, therefore that is achievable. That might not be what Council wants. It wants to maintain the pristine nature of Scenic Hills. This causes that – this causes the road to go through. Without that, the road doesn't go through. We're happy – you know, and that's – they're the multiplying issues that come out of this.

MS LEESON: Okay. The – Andrew, you're probably quite familiar with the proposed layout of the site.

MR MacGEE: Yes.

MS LEESON: And the no-build areas across here.

MR MacGEE: Yes.

MS LEESON: But they're proposing the chapel and office and administrative buildings across on this part of the site.

MR MacGEE: Yes.

MS LEESON: Will that have – coming back to the night time lighting issue - - -

MR MacGEE: Yeah.

MS LEESON: - - - do you feel that that will have any lighting impact from surrounding areas with the location of these facilities here?

MR MacGEE: Yeah. Most concerned about the chapel building and also any pathway lighting so seeing the lights through the site as well. We have – when we had a pre-application meeting with the proponent a while before they lodged the DA, we did talk about this issue and we were promised that we would be given some visual analysis of the night time impact of the development, which hasn't, or didn't come in with the DA. It was only the daytime study that was done. So – now, there were some comments in their planning stuff about that, about low lux lighting and all that sort of thing and then, in fact, most of the lighting I think would have been

switched off at night time but we haven't had any firm commitment to no lighting and whether or not that's possible I'm not sure because of BCA matters about fire and building exit signs and all that sort of stuff. So that's probably the most prominent building, to be honest, from the highway in particular.

5

MS LEESON: So the chapel.

MR MacGEE: Yep.

10 MR PILTON: And that's visible from the highway?

MR MacGEE: From my recollection of the visual study presented - - -

MR BALDWIN: Yes. That's - - -

15

MR MacGEE: Yes.

MR BALDWIN: I agree with that.

20 MR MacGEE: Yes. These – the ones closer to St Andrews Road and that function room not so much because that's in a bit of a valley through there.

MS LEESON: Yes.

25 MR MacGEE: There's a valley that sort of runs like that. That's one of the highest points. This is another high point of the site. So it's really that one there and what can we do to try and minimise its impact. There's no vegetation planned to be established in front of it or anything like that. And from the floor plans, I think you can kind of see it has been designed to actually open up across the site so it's
30 unlikely that they would want to have any vegetation in front of it either.

MS LEESON: We did have a brief conversation with – we had a conversation with the applicant around some of the night time issues and the hours of operation and they were certainly suggesting that it would be effectively low level bollard type
35 lighting - - -

MR MacGEE: Yep.

MS LEESON: - - - through any walkways.

40

MR MacGEE: Yep. That's consistent with our conversation. Yes.

MS LEESON: But we have not seen - - -

45 MR BALDWIN: No.

MS LEESON: - - - the documentation to necessarily support - - -

MR BALDWIN: Okay.

MS LEESON: Well, I haven't seen it - - -

5 MR BALDWIN: No. We haven't - - -

MS LEESON: - - - in the documents to date. It's not to say that it's not necessarily there but I just haven't come across it yet so - - -

10 MR BALDWIN: The – I suppose – not speaking for the applicant but I can see, you know, in a construct of what they would want to do, I understand that they wanted to start at the western end first.

MR PILTON: Yes.

15

MR BALDWIN: It was – and it's about trying to – you know, probably trying to stay away from other people or other areas and taking a long time to go and have the least impact they could, I think, possibly, on anyone else or any other person interacting in this area, whether it be the community, whether it be owners around –
20 surrounding owners. But in that, therefore, the need to put a building in stage – well, their stage 1 even though it's a single stage – their stage 1 is obvious, you know, if this is the first part. But that's what I understood and the reason why the building may be there. It also give I suppose a nice outlook and all of that. It's elevated. But then there's competing issues of what we need. So like Andrew said, there is a value
25 there but I understand their staging sort of forces our hand a bit further up the hill at the moment and a desire - - -

MS LEESON: Yes. Stage 1 is definitely down here - - -

30 MR BALDWIN: Yes. Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - and looking to do the outbuildings - - -

MR BALDWIN: That's right.

35

MS LEESON: - - - refurbishment and reuse.

MR BALDWIN: Yes. That's right.

40 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR BALDWIN: So that's a bit of a Segway into – to finish my question, heritage was very, very, very important to the council and the council held an opinion that any development in that area around, in particular, Varroville house would have a
45 deleterious effect on the place, the setting, and so significant that it would reduce the importance of Varroville house in its setting as it is. So they are very concerned about how this – even though, yes, we could all talk about and hear the applicant

saying we will do so many things to make sure we protect the presence and place of Varroville, council are extremely concerned this won't be the case and it will take away from the importance of Varroville and the valley of Varroville to the community.

5

MR MacGEE: And it's not just the house itself too. These farm dams, for example
- - -

MR BALDWIN: That's right - - -

10

MR MacGEE: - - - had Charles Sturt's involvement in their design and construction.

MR BALDWIN: They have been - - -

15

MR MacGEE: There's an old - very old vineyard and stuff like that as well. So it's not - - -

MS LEESON: Yes. The vineyard - the vineyard was up here.

20

MR BALDWIN: That's right. That's right.

MR MacGEE: Yes. Yeah. You can still see the markings there - - -

25

MR BALDWIN: - - - Yep.

MR MacGEE: - - - that you will see today when you go over it today.

30

MS LEESON: And they describe to us, if you like, a bit of a reinterpretation of keeping those trenches - - -

MR BALDWIN: Yeah.

35

MR PILTON: They were going to plant vines along there. That was on the drawings.

MS LEESON: Replant some vines - - -

40

MR MacGEE: That's right. Yep.

MS LEESON: - - - and use them - I think grave markers to reinterpret some of the trench area.

45

MR MacGEE: Yep.

MR BALDWIN: Yes, that's right.

MR MacGEE: Yeah.

MR CARTER: So council's view was that both the homestead and the entire setting, that anything happening to that would be deleterious to the - - -

5

MR BALDWIN: Yes. It's certainly – you know, and we understand and we were going to ask the question of – there's the other curtilage now that's been dealt with. But notwithstanding a curtilage, it – and we understand, of course, that it is the place. It is ultimately the sense of place, being able to understand when you are on Varroville what it was, what it is and what it was to be in that sense. And with other elements invading that space, one can't really understand what it might have been in the day. And if that's the – it's not just the building, not just the structure but it's all things, this does go to reducing the value of that site.

10

15 MS LEESON: The curtilage issue is being considered by another commission - - -

MR BALDWIN: Yes. Okay.

MS LEESON: - - - as a separate exercise.

20

MR BALDWIN: Yes.

MS LEESON: We are dealing with this area.

25 MR BALDWIN: Yes.

MS LEESON: How the two might come together, well, a question of timing perhaps and how things happen - - -

30 MR BALDWIN: That's right.

MS LEESON: - - - but we have got no line of sight to - - -

MR BALDWIN: No.

35

MS LEESON: - - - how the other project or the assessment is being conducted. We can only deal with what's in front of us.

MR BALDWIN: Of course. Absolutely.

40

MS LEESON: Okay. We touched on traffic and the proponent I think has now looked at an alternative access and egress. Is council across that?

MR MacGEE: I noticed one of them had changed to exit only.

45

MS LEESON: Access C becomes exit only.

MR MacGEE: Yes.

MS LEESON: Except in times of special events. So it might be Easter time or Mother's Day - - -

5

MR BALDWIN: Right.

MS LEESON: You know, that's - - -

10 MR BALDWIN: Infrequent.

MS LEESON: Infrequent.

MR BALDWIN: Right.

15

MS LEESON: So that's I think currently the proposal and - - -

MR MacGEE: Yes.

20 MS LEESON: - - - probably requires a bit more assessment.

MR MacGEE: One of the things that we had in our correspondence with the applicant was seeking some more – probably more specific detail about the intersections of those driveways because – and you will see when you visit the site, there's a whole lot of trees in the road reserve. And so it wasn't immediately obvious from the plans that we were provided with - - -

25

MR BALDWIN: Yes.

30 MR MacGEE: - - - at the start how sightlines and intersection shapes and things like that would be dealt with. I haven't found that detail in what we have got uploaded from the Department of Planning yet either. But then again, it's probably not unreasonable to have that prior to a construction certificate condition or something like that to get that information.

35

MS LEESON: And the specific detail of that is, should it be approved, something that will be worked through with council and RMS involvement in terms of intersection design and - - -

40 MR MacGEE: Probably just be the council at the moment.

MS LEESON: Just the council?

MR MacGEE: Yeah, because it's for driveways only, not actual public roads. But that detail about – because there's a fence proposed along the road and you – I keep on saying it, you will see when you go there's quite significant trees in the road reserve there so – and even the change in level. St Andrews Road is up here and then

45

where the gates are proposed the site drops away reasonably quickly as well so how you're coming up that hill to see what's coming and things like that. So haven't seen that detail yet. We asked for it but we haven't seen it yet but probably something that we could deal with as a more detailed condition than what we've seen in there so far.

5
10
15
MR BALDWIN: Well, that's right. And the opportunity to actually redress that condition because the condition itself doesn't go as far as it's needed and the point here is there's only really one way or a few ways in and out of that property at the moment and they are through what is essentially a suburban context. So the impact on those small and intersections is going to be great and it's unknown and, therefore, the impost on what this brings to the community is important to understand and quantify. And at the moment, the conditions, just for example, only talks about just St Andrews Road and some obligations, possibly in 10 years, have a look and what's broken, now bring it up to speed. No, not good enough. We have got to go forward and make sure it's good for 10 years and then we redress. It hasn't – you know, it hasn't considered at all those other intersections that will be I suppose impacted.

20 MS LEESON: And your work, does it identify those intersections that you would like to see considered?

MR BALDWIN: We – yes. Absolutely.

25 MR MacGEE: Yes. Our correspondence did identify ones that needed some more work.

MS LEESON: Okay.

30 MR MacGEE: I noticed there is a revised report that was submitted to the Planning Department and considered in the assessment report.

MS LEESON: Okay.

35 MR MacGEE: So I understand that that was done but it wasn't provided to the council to review

40 MR BALDWIN: It is it is normal, I suppose, if I was to draw an example another development, a development that may bring a quantum of vehicle movement beyond what is normal. And it was a State Significant Development that was – there's more truck movement and beyond what would be expected normally on the – on certain local roads.

45 With that comes a requirement to – for that proponent put to the council, whether it be a contribution through section 94 or section 7.11 contributions or through other means – money back into the council or the RMS – it's RMS roads – to upgrade those and make sure those roads are maintained at a certain level. That would

otherwise not be – you know, in terms of its life cycle, these trucks as they are do shorten the life cycle of that road.

5 Similarly, here, we have a program, of course, on our local roads to update – upgrade those roads and the RMS has the same. This does something different. So, again, the development itself should put back into the council or the RMS, at least, to maintain and upgrade those roads in perpetuity, always, because it's – the development brings the traffic. Nothing else did.

10 MR MacGEE: Yes. And the other thing that we had in that letter was the council with Camden and Wollondilly have prepared in the last couple of years a very detailed traffic forecast and model. And we offered to provide that information to the applicant to incorporate into their modelling but, to my knowledge, that hasn't
15 been taken up, as well, so that's a bit of a concern. I don't think that the Department of Planning did that - - -

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR MacGEE: - - - from what I know.
20

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR MacGEE: And so we would welcome – we – actually, in the correspondence, the applicant offered to provide - - -
25

MS LEESON: So you've offered to provide it?

MR MacGEE: - - - that data – yes.

30 MS LEESON: Has it been provided - - -

MR MacGEE: Not to my knowledge.

MS LEESON: - - - or you just made the offer? Okay.
35

MR MacGEE: Yes. So we will – my correspondence with the Planning Department officer – I was never asked to provide that information or anything like that. And I can't imagine they would have done directly to a different section of the council where that information is kept without letting me know. So that's a bit of a worry, as
40 well, because we've got information there, which I've forecast traffic up to 2036 or thereabouts, which is well and truly when this would be operating, and so – yes. We would have enjoyed – not enjoyed but welcomed being part of that modelling - - -

MS LEESON: Right.
45

MR MacGEE: - - - just to check them, as well.

MR CARTER: So – sorry. With the – so with the intersections, there’s concern about the detail of, I guess, the engineering and safety aspects, but you also mentioned the vegetation. Is there an issue around the importance of the vegetation for council, as well? Is that part of the visual character as well as potentially
5 Cumberland land or – yes - - -

MR MacGEE: Yes. Well, it’s part of the

MS LEESON: You mean a contest – not a contest but a conflict between sightlines
10 - - -

MR BALDWIN: That’s right.

MS LEESON: - - - and safety - - -
15

MR BALDWIN: That’s right.

MS LEESON: - - - and the Cumberland Woodland?

20 MR BALDWIN: Absolutely. There will be always that considered.

MR MacGEE: So that’s specific to these driveways, not so much other intersections further down the road, but - - -

25 MR CARTER: To the driveways? Yes?

MR MacGEE: Yes. And you will get a sense when you drive up there, too. It’s a very well confined rural road. No kerb and gutter, trees either side - - -

30 MR BALDWIN:

MR MacGEE: Yes. So - - -

MR PILTON: So, presumably, they will be putting kerbs and gutters and things in
35 for the entries and so on, so – yes.

MR MacGEE: Yes. I would say they would have to formalise those. But, again, we don’t have that detail at this stage.

40 MS LEESON: Does – speaking of kerbs and gutters, would council have a view on whether there should be kerbs and gutters on the roads internal to the site?

MR MacGEE: We’ve said no to that because of the potential visual impact and that was agreed to by the applicant, to my knowledge.

45 MS LEESON: So it would be a visual impact thing?

MR MacGEE: That was the main reason for it, yes.

MR BALDWIN: We're looking at more soft levels of drainage solutions hard
- - -

5

MR MacGEE: Yes, using - - -

MR PILTON: You would prefer drainage swales rather than - - -

10 MR BALDWIN: That's right.

MR PILTON: Yes.

MR MacGEE: Yes. Well, I mean, from - - -

15

MR BALDWIN: being what it is, Scenic Hills, it – ultimately, if something was approved, we certainly wouldn't want a suburb up there.

MR MacGEE: No. It would be like a - - -

20

MR BALDWIN:

MR MacGEE: Yes. It would be a sealed road but it would have soft edges, with lawns along each side - - -

25

MR BALDWIN: If – you know, if there's a point where someone might say that the outcome would hopefully if it was approved still emulate some level of rural aspect.

30 MS LEESON: And the Heritage response has – Heritage Council's response has looked at the issue of kerbing, as well?

MR MacGEE: That's right. And, yes, they agreed with what we said, as well. And I understand that the Rural Fire Service doesn't have an issue with that in terms of their access.

35

MS LEESON: I think the RFSs principal concerns were around the widths of the roadways - - -

MR MacGEE: That's right.

40

MS LEESON: - - - and trees – the clearance - - -

MR MacGEE: That's right.

45 MR BALDWIN: And site – like you said, site distances. Yes.

MS LEESON: Is there anything else on traffic and roads or - - -

MR PILTON: No, I

MS LEESON: No. I wouldn't mind understanding council's position re noise and that would be probably operational and traffic. Have you considered noise impacts
5 from the proposal?

MR BALDWIN: So that was

MR MacGEE: It was in our correspondence that some more work be done on that
10 and I understand it has happened. So the main noise source, from what we would have thought anecdotally would be the operation of the machines maintaining the site and then visitors, car door shutting – things like that – and then the – probably the most sensitive receptors would have been Varroville House and then the Carmelite Retreat just across the road in about that location - - -

15

MR BALDWIN: The nuns, yes.

MR BALDWIN: So – and then the response that I've seen in this report – he deals with that. It talks about the operation of the site, some respite times when no
20 machinery would be used and things of that nature. We haven't done a detailed review of it, I must say, at this point in time - - -

MS LEESON: That's fine. I was just exploring whether you had had an opportunity to think it through and whether there were any issues you would like us
25 to be aware of. But the Carmelite Nuns issue has been raised, yes - - -

MR BALDWIN: Yes - - -

MS LEESON: - - - and, sort of, the general nature of machinery working on the
30

MR BALDWIN: That's

MR MacGEE: Yes.

35 MS LEESON: - - - whether it's of rural character or whether it's more than that.

MR MacGEE: I – speaking personally, this is no – nothing to do with this – I actually live across the road from the cemetery myself, right now. So I know how they work pretty well and what sort of machines get used and things like that. So it's
40 not a huge impact but given the typography of the land and the expectation from people living around there of what might happen - - -

MR BALDWIN: The – it's – the issue, I suppose, becomes – and this is not different to any other thing we see. If I give the example – like, the airport. We can
45 go through and do an assessment based against planning – certain planning laws and that's – and take into consideration acoustic law and what's acceptable, you know, sleep disturbance levels that's fine. And we can always in a way, I suppose, put

up measures that mitigate or at least meet those standards and we can have reports from acoustic consultants that say:

5 *...put this in practice ... do this ... do that ... and at this you will meet the standard –*

the standard being 15 dB(A) or 35 dB(A) or 60 dB(A) whatever – you know, those sorts of things. That's fine. You can do that in a scientific sense. But what you come from in this – particularly in this circumstance is you come from a base that's
10 equivalent to zero in a humans' context and they live in a base where it is zero, so the smallest impact is an impact. It's not about the science of meeting a 35 dB(A) rule.

It's actually – something has happened and now I'm sensing – I'm hypersensitive and I enjoy this atmosphere, I enjoy something that was never there. Yes, you can
15 show me that it meets 35 dB(A) or whatever it might be, but that's not – I'm impacted. My life is impacted. My existence here is impacted by that movement of that machine which has been brought here and it's not what's the real environment with you know, and so that's the issues, I suppose – even though they might be
20 able to comply through standards, it's not the point. And that's like the airport. We will be able to do that – tell the story – but it's something that's – suddenly it's there and it wasn't there and that's where the nuns and others – it's incredibly sensitive for them and I understand that.

25 MS LEESON: Okay. No. Thanks for that. Adrian, do you have any questions for council?

MR PILTON: No.

30 MS LEESON: Ross, is there anything else you want to - - -

MR CARTER: I think that covers off – yes

MS LEESON: I think that has been most helpful.

35 MR PILTON: Yes.

MS LEESON: Thank you very much.

40 MR BALDWIN: Well, we appreciate the time.

MR MacGEE: Yes. Thank you.

MS LEESON: No, no. We appreciate yours. Thank you.

45 MR PILTON: I would certainly appreciate getting your further information down the track.

MR BALDWIN: Yes.

MS LEESON: Yes.

5 MR MacGEE: Yes. We would welcome that opportunity as well - - -

MR PILTON: Did we get copies of the correspondence between the council and
- - -

10 MR BALDWIN: The letter you're talking about?

MR PILTON: Yes.

MR BALDWIN: Yes, we can do that. It's not a problem.

15

MR PILTON: I don't know if it's on our side or not?

MR MacGEE: It's – yes. We supplied it to the Commission. It is on your website
now - - -

20

MS LEESON: It's on our website.

MR PILTON: Okay. Sorry. There's so many documents – I can't remember.

25 MR BALDWIN: Yes, of course.

MS LEESON: We're dealing with two cemetery proposals - - -

MR MacGEE: Yes.

30

MR BALDWIN: Yes, you are.

MS LEESON: - - - at the same time - - -

35 MR BALDWIN: That's right.

MS LEESON: - - - and both of them have a lot of information. So it's flipping
between them quickly - - -

40 MR MacGEE: I don't envy you, I've got to say.

MR BALDWIN: which one?

45 MS LEESON: So there's a little bit of that, but we do know that we had a bit of a
challenge getting submissions loaded onto the website and some of the information –
just making sure that it was all coming through. And you were at a different stage in
the process - - -

MR BALDWIN: Yes, that's right.

MS LEESON: - - - than Penrith was.

5 MR BALDWIN: That's right.

MS LEESON: So - - -

10 MR MacGEE: No, it looks complete from what I've seen on there, so I must admit I was checking now. I can't see anything from your meeting with the Planning Department, so I wouldn't mind - - -

MR PILTON: It's up – it's up now, I think.

15 MS LEESON: Those transcripts should be up.

MR MacGEE: Yes, I've - - -

20 MS LEESON: I got a note – we got a note last week, I think, to say they were up.

MR MacGEE: Okay. I will do some more digging and maybe just write to Diana if I need some more help, if that's okay.

25 MS MITCHELL: Yes.

MS LEESON: Check with Diana if - - -

30 MS MITCHELL: Sure. Definitely. I'm actually just looking at the website now and I can't see them, but it might be because it's a different version being on a mobile device versus a – yes.

MS LEESON: If you're talking technology, I'm the wrong person to be speaking to.

35 MR MacGEE: Would there be – would you be interested in indulging me for a second and pointing to a few spots where it's worth you going on the site, if you don't mind?

MS LEESON: Yes, please. Absolutely.

40 MR MacGEE: From the times I've been there, you come on around this area and then - - -

MR BALDWIN: So this is the freeway down here.

45 MR MacGEE: Yes, the freeway is down here.

MS LEESON: All right. Yes.

MR MacGEE: This is the high point of the site across the top. Behind here we've got one hectare of rural residential lots along the street courts on James Road. And then beyond that is the gross centres area down – 400 square metre lot.

5 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR MacGEE: So when you come up St Andrews Road, you come in about here, around there, I think, and the first thing you will see, there's a farm building and other cattle yards and different bits and pieces down here. It's well worth a trip up
10 the top here if you can get up there. I actually walked all the way here but it's very steep through there and you've got to walk through the trees, because you can actually see the city and everything that way.

MS LEESON: Okay.
15

MR MacGEE: So - - -

MS LEESON: How long would that walk be up there?

20 MR MacGEE: About 10 minutes.

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR BALDWIN: So I think from this area here you can see the city. There's a hill
25 here.

MR MacGEE: Yes.

MR BALDWIN: Beautiful views from there.
30

MR MacGEE: That's a high point, just there.

MR BALDWIN: Just accessing to this point, might it better that if you continue to drive past and down the street - - -
35

MR MacGEE: Yes.

MR BALDWIN: There's a street just here. The only street.

40 MR MacGEE: Yes.

MS LEESON: That's St James Road.

MR BALDWIN: St James Road. Come to the end, there's a double-headed cul-de-sac right hand, left hand. Do the right hand. The cul-de-sac – pull up the cul-de-sac
45 and you can go into Council lands, a park, and just follow just walk along.

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR BALDWIN: It's - - -

5 MR MacGEE: It's actually - - -

MR BALDWIN: It's contained by African olive on either side, but there's an open – just mowed area. It takes you to a Telstra or a telecommunications – just a pole. It's probably a – if you look behind yourself you see the railway and the gantries out
10 there. There's probably a walk of half a kay, you know, 500 metre walk to the end, and that's, you're looking now over - - -

MS LEESON: And looking across the sign.

15 MR BALDWIN: Yes. Yes.

MR MacGEE: Across there, yes.

MR BALDWIN: You might be able to see through the
20

MR MacGEE: Yes. And it's worth a trip here to see that. We were a bit worried about this building being put on what appears to be a natural watercourse.

MS LEESON: Watercourse.
25

MR MacGEE: And I can see the applicant has done some work on that. And then, yes, just after you've done that bit, perhaps follow it around this way and do that circuit there. There's – these dams are quite interesting.

30 MR BALDWIN: Have you got someone assisting you on site?

MS LEESON: The applicant will come on site with us.

MR BALDWIN: Good. Yes. Good, because it is a bit tricky
35

MS LEESON: So we're going to meet them.

MR BALDWIN: Good. Good. Yes. Good. Good.

40 MS LEESON: And they will take us around. And I'm sure there will be things they would like us to see.

MR BALDWIN: Yes, that's fine.

45 MS LEESON: But I think we're interested to know from the Council's perspective what you think we should have a look at as well.

MR MacGEE: Yes. Well, and you mentioned before, anything you can do – a looking at the house itself, so it's in up the front there.

MS LEESON: And sort of these views.

5

MR MacGEE: Yes.

MR BALDWIN: Well, it's – exactly. The pen is going the right way. It's from and to. It's certainly from. It's certainly – you know that experience of being on that site and understanding from that site what it was. It's one thing to look back on. It's tree and it's – so you can't see through essentially because we've got boundary trees and vegetation. But it's one thing to be on the site and to be looking out. that's very important. So you will see get down here and drive past pretty – very close, actually close.

15

MS LEESON: Well, some of the burial plots are proposed to be quite close, you know, 10 metre set off from the boundary, so we're quite interested to see what that's like from the boundary but also - - -

20 MR BALDWIN: That's right.

MS LEESON: - - - how far back the homestead is.

MR BALDWIN: Yes.

25

MS LEESON: Which – so there's two dimensions there of interest.

MR BALDWIN: That's right.

30 MR MacGEE: Yes.

MR BALDWIN: Absolutely. Yes. It's – if you have the opportunity – I don't know if you can drive on these things, but keep your GPS on it. Keep it open and just watch where you are. Just open your Google up, your Google Maps.

35

MS LEESON: Yes.

MR BALDWIN: And just see yourself moving through the site, and so you get a really good understanding of where you are on Google Maps.

40

MR CARTER: Okay. So if we sort of circumnavigate the outside - - -

MR BALDWIN: Yes. Yes.

45 MR CARTER: - - - from that high point where the proposed chapel is around near the vineyard high point.

MR BALDWIN: Yes. You will probably run around here. They will probably drop you down through here and across and then back up that way.

MR CARTER: Yes. Okay.

5

MR BALDWIN: That's generally – it cuts down through here generally.

MS LEESON: Is there a formed road up through here at the moment?

10 MR BALDWIN: I'm not sure it's up that high. I think this is probably where – it's – there's no roads. There's just paddocks. You will be driving through cow paddocks and cattle will be chasing you, you know. That's about it. But it's through gates, so I will open a gate up and close a gate.

15 MR CARTER: And trying to look to and then from these three sides of the barrier.

MR BALDWIN: Yes. Yes.

MS LEESON: Okay. All right. I think that's probably all we wanted to go through today, but if there's anything else that comes up we will come through the secretary and back to you, Andrew or - - -

MR MacGEE: Sure.

25 MR BALDWIN: Yes, absolutely. Like, Andrew, myself, yes, absolutely.

MS LEESON: - - - Jim, if there's anything we want.

MR BALDWIN: Yes.

30

MS LEESON: And you will make available those couple of things to Diana, the – I forgot what it was now.

MR BALDWIN: The letter?

35

MS LEESON: There was the letter we – we think we have the letter.

MS MITCHELL: Yes, we do. We do have the letter here.

40 MR BALDWIN: You've got that. That's okay. Yes.

MS LEESON: The – your own assessment work that was done, yes.

MR BALDWIN: Yes. Yes. We will – but we need to give a response on that, though, the conditions.

45

MS LEESON: The gaps on the – your assessment of the gaps of the Department’s assessment.

MR BALDWIN: Yes, our position. That’s right. Yes.

5

MS LEESON: All right. Very good.

MR MacGEE: And some – yes, if you wouldn’t mind, some comments on these as well, but – even though we understand now that they can be embellished, some more

10

MR BALDWIN: But that’s what we will respond on – those, on that basis.

MR MacGEE: Yes.

15

MR BALDWIN: Yes.

MS LEESON: Yes. So as I say, have a look at the Department’s transcript, but I think you will find that’s probably more guidance than anything - - -

20

MR MacGEE: Okay. That’s good to know.

MR BALDWIN: Right.

25

MS LEESON: - - - rather than definitive wording.

MR BALDWIN: Okay. Yes.

MR PILTON: I just had a look at the site. I couldn’t see the transcripts on site.

30

MS MITCHELL: Yes. Actually, I just confirmed they’re not available yet. They will be shortly.

MR MacGEE: Okay. If you can just send me an email perhaps when they go up, that would be great.

35

MS LEESON: When they are.

MS MITCHELL: Yes, sure.

40

MS LEESON: Thanks, Diana.

MS MITCHELL: All right.

45

MS LEESON: Thank you very much.

MR BALDWIN: Excellent.

MR MacGEE: Thank you. Thank you for taking the time to come and see us.

MS LEESON: That will conclude our meeting. Thank you.

5

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[10.54 am]