



**AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED**

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: [clientservices@auscript.com.au](mailto:clientservices@auscript.com.au)

W: [www.auscript.com.au](http://www.auscript.com.au)

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

---

O/N H-993412

**INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MEETING WITH APPLICANT**

**RE: CROWN CEMETERY DEVELOPMENT VARROVILLE  
CROWN CEMETERY DEVELOPMENT WALLACIA**

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

**ASSISTING PANEL:** MATTHEW TODD-JONES  
DIANA MITCHELL

**APPLICANT:** DAVID HOY  
STEPHEN DAVIES  
FIONA BINNS  
FLORENCE JAQUET  
RICHARD FRANCIS JONES  
JAMES PERRY  
MICHAEL CALAHANE  
LINDSDAY HOLMES  
NARELLE SONTER  
KEN HOLLYOAK  
BEN SALON  
PETER O'MEARA  
DAVID DE ANGELIS  
LACHLAN SIMS  
NAZIA POKAR

**LOCATION:** **IPC OFFICE**  
**LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET**  
**SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES**

**DATE:** **10.09 AM, THURSDAY, 14 FEBRUARY**  
**2019** \_\_\_\_\_

MS D. LEESON: So good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to  
acknowledge the traditional owners on the land on which we meet and pay my  
5 respects to the elders, past, present and emerging.

Welcome to the meeting today on the two development applications from the  
Catholic Cemeteries Trust for cemetery proposals: one at Wallacia in the Penrith  
Local Government area; and one at Varroville in the Campbelltown Local  
10 Government area. The Minister for Planning has delegated his functions to the  
Independent Planning Commission under section 2.4 of the Environmental Planning  
and Assessment Act to assess these applications. The Commission is responsible for  
the finalisation of the assessment for these applications prior to directing the Sydney  
Western City Planning Panel, who are the consent authority, to determine the  
15 application.

My name is Dianne Leeson and I am the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me on the  
panel is Ross Carter and Adrian Pilton. The other attendees are Matthew Todd-Jones  
and Diana Mitchell from the Commission's Secretariat. In the interests of openness  
20 and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is  
being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the  
Commission's website.

This meeting is one part of the Commission's process of providing advice. It is  
25 taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several  
sources of information upon which the Commission will base its advice. It is  
important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues  
whenever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and you are not in a  
position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any  
30 additional information in writing which we will then put up on our website.

We will now begin, and I won't – what we will do is, I think, depending on your  
presentation, deal firstly with one site and then the other, and as they are two separate  
applications, I will take it that I have read this statement on behalf of both projects.  
35 So David, I think we are in your hands in terms of providing a presentation. We  
have a few questions which, I think, have been forwarded already through you and  
no doubt we'll have a few more as - - -

MR D. DE ANGELIS: Correct.

MS LEESON: - - - the presentation unfolds. So before we commence, if I can then ask each of you, perhaps starting up the end there, to state your name so that we can have it properly recorded in our notes of meeting.

5 MR B. SALON: Okay. My name is Ben Salon and I'm a solicitor at Mills Oakley.

MS N. SONTER: My name's Narelle Sonter, from Botanica, and I'm working on the landscape planting on the project.

10 MR K. HOLLYOAK: My name is Ken Hollyoak, from TTPP Transport Planning and I'm a transport planner.

MR P. O'MEARA: Peter O'Meara. I'm the CEO of the Catholic Cemeteries Trust.

15 MR M. CALAHANE: My name is Michael Calahane. I'm with Warren Smith & Partners and a civil engineer looking after roads and stormwater, etcetera, etcetera.

MR L. HOLMES: My name is Lindsay Holmes. I work for Travis Bush Fire and Ecology and I'm here to talk about ecology, bushfire and vegetation management  
20 planning if required.

MR D. DE ANGELIS: David De Angelis for the Catholic Metropolitan Cemeteries Trust.

25 MR J. PERRY: James Perry, FJMT Architects.

MR R. FRANCIS-JONES: And Richard Francis-Jones, FJMT Architects. We're the architects for the Varroville site.

30 MS F. BINNS: Fiona Binns, the heritage consultant for the project with Urbis.

MR S. DAVIES: And Stephen Davies, I'm the heritage consultant with Urbis.

MS F. JAQUET: I'm Florence Jaquet. I'm the landscape architect.  
35

MR D. HOY: David Hoy, regional director at Urbis and a town planner for both projects.

MR L. SIMS: Lachlan Sims, town planner at Urbis.  
40

MS N. POKAR: Nadia Pokar, town planner at Urbis.

MS LEESON: Thank you all. If we could actually get a list of that, because I think you're not necessarily all on our list here.  
45

MR HOY: No.

MS LEESON: David, could you provide that in due course?

MR HOY: I'd like – yes, I can provide that in due course, and perhaps if I could explain how we intended to answer the questions, because we wanted to get straight  
5 to the things that were sent through to us, and we are reliant on the “the picture tells a thousand words” approach. The way that – I appreciate we've got two hours and we've got two separate DAs. The questions have come through from the Commission in a way that we've sought to probably summarise both applications upfront in responding to those questions as relevant to each application. So if it's  
10 acceptable to you, we'd work through – we'd interchange between Wallacia and Varroville in answering those questions and then move into separate discussions on each, if that's – if that's acceptable.

MS LEESON: That might present us a challenge in how we post the information  
15 from today on our website; that's the only thing I'm thinking through.

MR HOY: Well, the other thing that I would add is everything that we're presenting here today, we were intending to leave with the Commission, in any event, including a range of supplementary information provided by Florence herself and Richard, and  
20 the other experts who are here are really there to answer any questions rather than to actually present.

MS LEESON: Yes. And we will require you to leave that information - - -

25 MR HOY: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - so that can be put on our website as well. Is it possible to present the overview of each proposal one-by-one?

30 MR HOY: Sure.

MS LEESON: And just tack through the issues.

MR HOY: We can – we can - - -  
35

MS LEESON: Or is your presentation set up differently?

MR HOY: What I've set – the way I've set it up is just to give an overview of the journey so far very quickly: introduce who our client is and remind everyone that  
40 these are Crown development applications and how the trust is an agent of the Crown under the Cemeteries and Crematoria Act of New South Wales. We then went through each of these questions and each of those questions can be applied to both applications, or some of them are unique to individual applications - - -

45 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR HOY: - - - so we've just – we've summarised it in a few pages - - -

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR HOY: - - - to go through those questions.

5 MS POKAR: But if we needed to separate it - - -

MR HOY: If we need to separate it, we can do it.

10 MS LEESON: Yes, I think that's probably what we'll have to do. It might be simpler if we post the material onto both websites. So it's our website, but under both projects.

MR HOY: That's fine.

15 MS LEESON: That might be the simplest thing.

MR HOY: That's fine.

MS LEESON: Okay. All right. So we'll hand over to you as - - -  
20

MR HOY: Thank you.

MS LEESON: - - - you were intending to present.

25 MR HOY: Thank you very much.

MS LEESON: Thanks, David.

30 MR HOY: Well, thank you so much, and good morning everyone. So just very quickly – and, again, any of our people around the room can answer this. The Catholic Cemeteries Trust predominantly manages publically accessible cemeteries on behalf of the Crown. They have a number of assets, including the Catholic cemetery at Rookwood that they've operated for over 150 years; Liverpool Cemetery; Kemps Creek; and, of course, Macarthur and Wallacia, which are the two  
35 cemeteries that they would ideally like to establish and run.

They also operate two small cemeteries: one at North Rocks and Greendale and, broadly, they are one of four trusts that cover – that are responsible for the internment of deceased people in metropolitan Sydney. Broadly speaking, Catholic  
40 Cemeteries Trust is responsible for the western and south western geographies of metropolitan Sydney.

I think the Department's report has summarised the issue – sorry, has summarised the state of burial demand, the burial issue quite succinctly. Both applications  
45 include research that was undertaken by colleagues of mine – of ours at Urbis, who specialise in market research, and that has really informed the whole approached to

both applications dating back to original site identification works that started in 2012. It has been quite a journey to get here today.

5 Importantly, and as picked up in the Department's report, our research is broadly aligned with work that has been carried out by cemeteries and crematoria in New South Wales that has confirmed this looming shortage of burial space to cater for a growing metropolitan demand for burial and internment in Sydney as population increases. The last points worth pointing out and re-emphasising, whilst we hear the name Catholic cemeteries, they do operate public cemeteries open to people of all 10 faiths and non-faiths and, in that instance, we do have certain faith groups that are facing imminent shortage of burials and potentially looming expiration of those supplies within the next five years. So the intention with these cemeteries is to provide space for those particular faith groups that are facing that particular critical shortage.

15 I just want to touch on very quickly the consultation process that has been undertaken in respect of both applications. I think it has been exhaustive. As a planner and a practitioner in planning in this city for over 30 years, I don't think I've seen such a – it's very rare to find such a long and protracted but well-intentioned 20 engagement with the community.

So in the case of Macarthur Memorial Park, before DA lodgement, two community information forms were held. Briefings have been held with the Scenic Hills Association, and following that, amendments were made to the plans prior to 25 lodgement. That followed on from earlier consultation with those same groups that led up to the LEP amendment process for Varroville in the years earlier.

The other thing that's worth noting is after DA lodgement, Campbelltown Council exhibited that development application for 137 days. Whilst it is acknowledged that 30 that did extend over the Christmas New Year period, we feel that that's a significant point that's worth noting. In the case of Wallacia, again, the lodgement was accelerated following a decision that was taken at the time by Penrith Council to prohibit cemeteries. A resolution was made by Penrith Council that sought to prohibit cemeteries throughout the Mulgoa Valley, notwithstanding the permissibility 35 of the site – permissibility of the cemetery use on the site when it was acquired by CMCT.

So post the lodgement of the development application for Wallacia, again, CMCT 40 undertook consultation, ran community information sessions and stakeholder briefings. Penrith Council then followed their own exhibition processes, and in that case, 79 days for a public exhibition period for the development application, again noting that it was leading up to that Christmas New Year period. You're no doubt aware that during the council's assessment of that application, we were then invited to present to a public meeting held by the Sydney Planning Panel at that time on the 45 4<sup>th</sup> of April. There was approximately 80 or 90 people at the chambers of Penrith Council who spoke, including myself.

5 So getting to those key questions that were put to us by the Commission, I just want to summarise both applications very quickly. What are the changes that have been made since the DAs were lodged? And perhaps I'll hand over to Florence, who's really been driving the whole design process, to talk through and explain these in detail.

10 MS JAQUET: Yes. So this plan here is probably – pre-dates the DA, so this is the changes that we've made pre-DA through the public consultation process and through the various RFIs and consultations we had. So the drawing that you see underneath, below all the red marks, are – is the DA plan, and then the next slide, the – this is a summary, and it's probably better if I stand up.

MR HOY: Yes.

15 MS JAQUET: Would I be heard if I - - -

MS LEESON: Please.

20 MS JAQUET: So there's a – there's two revisions on these drawings, which you'll probably see better when it's a printout. Revision A is following a council RFI, and there were mostly clarifications about the colour that we had used on the drawings which they found to be a bit misleading, so we made them bright red to make sure that they understood it was about the removal of the Cumberland Plain Woodland. It was clarification about the size of this shelter that was there. The drawings said that 25 we had two sizes, and the report said that we had three different sizes, so we had a bit of inconsistency there.

30 And as far as the – yes. And there was a review of the entrance here. Council pointed out that we needed to fine tune the entrance to make it comply with the sightlines in the RMS, which we did, so that was part of the council RFI. In doing so, it changed the riparian zone, so we have an additional offset of riparian zone on that side, and then as far as the development application and the process through the DPE, the only two points are probably better highlighted on the next one, which – 35 this entrance here, which is access C, which is the closest to the Varroville entrance, was given as an exit only, and an exit and entry on those major event. So we gave that as a concession, and the other point was we removed a car park which used to be here as part of the negotiation, and we amended that layout, and that's probably all that was changed through both processes.

40 MR HOY: So while you're up there, so we'll talk to – in terms of Wallacia, there's no – there's no – there has not been any material change to the layout. The major thing that did happen post-lodgement was the removal of the crematorium, which sat within a basement level underneath the proposed chapel. So – and the department's report picks that up. So we have formally amended the application to remove that. 45 Florence, do you want to then talk to some of the other I guess fine points?

MS JAQUET: Well, some of the bubbles that we've got – can I go back? Some of the revision bubbles that you see are just all relating to the council RFIs. So I'm happy to forensic order through that, but if that's of no interest to you, I can let it go as well.

5

MS LEESON: Are you able to explain on that diagram where you moved some of the taller headstones further away from the perimeter roads and the village? Can you - - -

10 MS JAQUET: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - just talk us through that?

MS JAQUET: Sure. So as part of the council RFI, we were asked to modify the access road. We originally had it coming out onto Mulgoa Road, and we were asked to remove that, so we made ..... there. This is one of the modifications. We also modified the type of graves that were there and we increased the quota of lawn graves, which is just plaques on beams. Then we had – which also happened here, so we have this opening in what previously was all high monumental here – we had this opening with lawn to create a view in, and we also have reduced the number of headstones and turned it into a lawn section in this corner here in response to concerns about the views from the residents across the road.

The rest of the revision bubbles that you can see are mostly due to a setback from – for groundwaters – groundwater purposes. So we have reduced the area of interment following some guidelines about a distance from riparian zones on the edge of riparian zones or watercourses. So this is what's happened in all this section up here, the north and on the edge of Jerry's Creek, and up here were a revision relating to the assessment of the vegetation – the sensitive vegetation there. So we introduced more boardwalks in areas where we originally had a path. We were asked to lift the path up to protect vegetation that was there. That probably sums it up. And as far as David says, as part of the process through the DPE, the only thing that was changed was the crematorium. That was deleted. Thank you.

MR HOY: Operational noise. So the question that was posed was given the increasing improvements in performance and availability of electrical appliances, ie, hedge trimmers, lawn mowers, maintenance vehicles and the like, we felt that this is something which applied equally – could be equally applied to both sides, so in broad terms, our client's committed to minimising noise by using, you know, whatever the most noise attenuated machinery exists at the time, bearing in mind that we're talking probably some significant technological change over the life of these cemeteries. We've got two management plans that form part of the development application package, and we're happy to provide, you know, a commitment, if you like, as part of that management – those management arrangements to that use. I would say, you know, in both cases, and speaking probably – this is probably a little bit subjective, but a cemetery is, you know, not the most noise-intensive use.



We do have a situation where we've got a golf course at Wallacia, so there's machinery associated with fairway maintenance, green maintenance and the like, as well as noise associated with anything that happens in the function centre and the clubhouse. So I think that there's a – you know, there's a fairly comparable situation that exists there. In the case of Varroville, it is farmland, and whilst it's been subject to agistment for many years, you know, it's not uncommon for slashers – tractors with slashers and farm machinery to be maintaining those properties during its current use. So I think, you know, you need to probably think of it in that context.

10 I acknowledge that we've put forward some comments around the relationships to adjoining uses, but if I look at Varroville, a school is a permissible land use in the zone, and I tend to think maybe a school is a little bit noise intensive than a cemetery at particular times forensic order the day, but nonetheless, that's our response at this point in time to noise. Happy to answer any questions if there's any – you know, we've got the operators here if you want to clarify anything further on that point.

Hours of operation – and I do apologise if we were a little bit vague on that. I think we need to remind ourselves that, again, a cemetery is a place that both operates – it's like a business, operates – has operating hours as a business, but it also is a place where people and members of the general public can go and visit their loved ones and also passively observe and reflect on people that are known and dear to them from past lives. So in the case of Varroville, the parklands will remain open during daylight hours seven days a week. There is gated – there will be gates that open and close on Varroville. That's a little bit different to Wallacia. So people will be able to use and get access to the cemetery during daylight seven days a week.

What we would make the point, though, is the chapel, the café, the function centre, the buildings would typically operate between 8 am and 6 pm seven days a week, and there may be some staff present. The administration building and the heritage outbuildings are as per what we've got up on the screen up there. So conditions that sort of restrict – conditions that seek to restrict the public's access to go in an memorialise and reflect is something which we just need to make sure that we're not compromising, but certainly understand how the operational aspects of the cemetery need to operate.

35 And, again, we were talking ahead of the meeting this morning, there are some faiths where members of the public – members of families may sit beside deceased for a period of time. Maybe you could, like – to just explain, so the Jewish faith, for example.

40 MR O'MEARA: That's a good point, Dave. This – both cemeteries are general cemeteries. They're not just for the Catholic faith. So the practice generally with, say, the Muslim faith is to bury within 24 hours, and by way of example, with the Jewish faith, the deceased is accompanied by a person who stays with the deceased for the entire time pre the interment. So that may mean that the deceased may arrive at the cemetery the day before. There may be a viewing the night before, and then

the body is – the person or persons stay with that deceased until the next day, throughout the night until the service is conducted.

5 So access to the facility for certain faiths would need to be provided outside of those trading hours, but that wouldn't necessarily mean, you know, enormous traffic levels at the cemetery in the evening. But viewings are reasonably common in certain faiths, and there are viewing facilities proposed for both chapels. So I just point that out in terms of, you know, conditioning the DA approval. Access to the facility would be required 24/7, particularly for certain faiths like Muslims and Jews and so on.

10 MS LEESON: Thank you.

15 MR HOY: So in the case of Wallacia, similar sort of approach that we're taking here where, again, the actual business operations of the cemetery, if you like, are as per what's up on the screen, and that's consistent with the development application but, again, remain open and accessible to the general public for visitation and viewing at all times. The next question you had was around the relationship to the conservation management plan in respect of – and that's relates to Varroville – and I just want to reinforce the point that the planning controls that went through to facilitate this development application unusually refer to a conservation management plan as part of the LEP provisions.

25 So the conservation management plan that's specifically listed in or specifically referred to in the LEP for Varroville ties the development, if you like, to the conservation management plan which, in turn, links back to the landscape master plan. So there is a – an integrated approach, if you like, to how we've gone about designing or planning for, designing for and ultimately delivering this cemetery. Excuse me. That was a deliberate part – deliberate action on our part because

30 Campbelltown Council at the time had made a resolution to oppose the cemetery at Varroville, and you would typically look to impose a site-specific development control plan on a site to really guide and provide added detail around development applications.

35 A DCP requires the endorsement of council. So rather than leave a void, we took the view that let's do a CMP that really spells out in a lot of detail how we would go about addressing the critical issues of visual impact, heritage management and the other environmental considerations that are critical to this site and tie it into the LEP provisions that relate to this site. So it's not just a case of cemeteries are permissible on the Varroville site, this cemetery is all that is permissible on the Varroville site, in effect, because the CMP references the master plan and in turn references the conservation practises that are talked to in this LEP – talked to in this – in the CMP. So Stephen I would like to bring forward just to explain how the design relates to the

45

MR DAVIES: Yes, well, as you probably know, the CMP is prepared in the standard way, you know, which is the endorsed manner of the Department of

Environment and Heritage. So it sets out significance of the site and develops comparative analysis and provides for policies for the management of the overall site and provides for a definitive area that we would recommend for the adjustment to the state heritage listing at present. At the moment, on State Heritage Registrar, you  
5 have Varroville Homestead which is the little handle and that provides for a number of – expansion for a number of matters which are up on the board at the moment, the outbuildings, the coach-house, the cottage and the slab hut which were excluded from that original curtilage that – and – but form part of the other buildings.

10 And I can just say on those buildings, CMCT has – even before they owned the site, in good faith, they were in parlous condition because they were not part of the Varroville Homestead – have been stabilised and there’s conservation policies developed for those to ensure that they don’t disintegrate any further. So we’re  
15 looking at those at the moment. It was also looking at the potential archaeological resources which included, amongst other things, the remnant vineyard trenching. This site, through its history, has had quite a strong history of people introducing various agricultural practices including vineyards which were quite well recorded and noted from the earliest times, from – you know, since Robert Townson’s  
20 occupation of the site from 1812 right through, really, into the fifties and sixties. There were – it was a well-known agricultural site. So they are also identified.

The remains of the former carriage drive which is now being cut off by the expressway but is still visible aerially but we can now formally identify that and  
25 include that in a curtilage and also the view from Bunbury Curran Hill which looks down – on the bottom one looks down across that landscape. It’s – the views are very important, and they’ve been identified in specific view studies and incorporated into the analysis of the conservation management plan. So the one of the – for me, one of the good things about a cemetery use on this site is that everything is very low so that the views to and from the house and to and from other aspects of the site are  
30 protected because of that particular use, notwithstanding that there’s going to be a lot of retention of, you know, landscape elements and – as part of that process.

The – we’ve been working on this CMP since 2013. So it really – it was really the  
35 beginning of the process, and I have to say, when we look through that vision and you look at what we’ve been doing, we’ve been working very closely with Florence because when we came to it, it was very important for me to think, well, is this going to have an impact. I mean, we have that responsibility, and I think that Florence was always one to take us through this because the landscape plan – the landscape master plan has been very much developed from an understanding of topography,  
40 indigenous vegetation and all those other aspects of flora and fauna on that site to protect it and then building up those opportunities. So the rooms you see really relate to the existing landforms.

So what we’ve got is in a way through the CMP process and the master plan process  
45 is a design that doesn’t actually change physically the landscape of the site. So I think that was very important for us because then we realised that if this was designed well – and we – and we’re supporting that through that master plan process,

then – and with the discrete rooms and elements of the overall site, that the significance of the site and its landscape and then those other elements I’ve just described can actually be, I suppose, integrated into a – an application which builds both from the – sort of the landscape side and the purely heritage conservation management plan process. So I think I’ve got through that.

5  
10  
15  
In relation to the dams, they’ve been an issue to in relation – at the very bottom, we’ve got the retention of dams and watercourses that have formed also very much part of the process. There has been discussed about – in the heritage side of things about retention of dams and locations. It’s important to realise that since 1812, there have been 20 different owners of the site and some of them have – you know, have had various levels of intervention into that site but over probably, what, the last 40 years, I think it is, there has virtually been – nothing has happened to the site. So it’s in a fairly degraded agricultural situation.

15  
20  
So the plan intends to reinvigorate those early plantings and understand the – sort of – I suppose, the earlier indigenous landscape aspects and then respect the overlay of the cultural aspects as well. So it’s about minimising – if we just go through some of them quickly – appropriate adaptive reuse of the buildings. We’ve – I’ve mentioned the landforms. There’s a no build area south of Varroville Homestead and a non-burial zone immediately around the Homestead, minimising intervention.

25  
MS LEESON: Can you just touch on that non-burial area immediately around the homestead?

MR DAVIES: Yes.

30  
MS LEESON: So it has 10-metre setback from the boundary. Can you explain how 10 metres was decided as an appropriate setback off the boundary?

MS JAQUET: Yes. We - - -

MR HOY: Is there a drawing you want to bring up to illustrate this?

35  
MS JAQUET: You’re aware of where it is.

MS LEESON: Yes.

40  
MS JAQUET: It’s basically along all boundaries.

MS LEESON: Yes.

45  
MS JAQUET: So – yes. So we went to council and council did not have a buffer zone or prescribed buffer zone, but we know from experience that a lot of cemeteries do on their boundaries, so we went around the various municipalities and pick an average. That’s how it came – came about, so we came to 10 metres.

MS LEESON: So it was based on an understanding of other cemeteries. It wasn't  
- - -

MS JAQUET: Yes.

5

MS LEESON: - - - necessarily a heritage view impact issue.

MS JAQUET: No.

10 MR DAVIES: No.

MS JAQUET: Not for that 10 metres. It is a buffer that we self-imposed because we believe that that's what usually typically happens, and we wanted to pre-empt, but we studied what was done elsewhere and we applied that figure.

15

MS LEESON: Okay.

MS JAQUET: And then there is the no-build zone, which goes literally from that boundary line that we have, which is the back of Varroville House. You can see it on the master plan. It's the yellow line that goes the south of the battle-axe block, and that is a no-build area, and that is where cemetery use is still allowed, but it will have to be plaques on lawn, so it's like a cemetery lawn.

20

MR DAVIES: I mean, I could just quickly say to you I think it complements that to say that the – I probably can't get up there, but the increased curtilage includes all this area of the vineyards in this particular area, so it comes off that, back through here, out through this driveway, and then including the outbuildings. So the homestead, really through – has its own sort of area of what we are recommending as state heritage significance, which would provide, you know, added guidelines, I suppose, to anything that actually happens within that particular area, and then the 10 metres are more related to these sides.

25

30

MR PILTON: Excuse me. Whilst you're up there, could you just show us where the – you're saying you're reinterpreting the former carriage drive?

35

MR DAVIES: Yes.

MR PILTON: Whereabouts that is.

MR DAVIES: Yes. That's coming back down coming through here. So this – although that is, you know, one of the roads within the master plan, the carriage drive came in through here, came back through – which was quite unusual – through the outbuildings and then – originally, and then into the homestead itself.

40

45 MR PILTON: Thank you.

MR DAVIES: And so that will be specifically designated as an interpretative sort of zone, I suppose.

5 MR O'MEARA: I think it's also important to note that the overall size of the site is in the order of 300 acres. One third of the site has been given over to passive recreational use. So two thirds of the site is for burial, but on that two thirds, 60 per cent of that is lawn grave. So effectively, that's flush on the ground memorial plaques, so it's difficult to actually sort of see. There's no visual impact. And the brief given to the architects at the very beginning was to build a cemetery where no  
10 headstone is visible internally or externally to the site. So we've constructed landscape rooms essentially where the height of headstones where there are headstones, which is only on 40 per cent of the site furthest away from Varroville House, in fact – they're not visible. You can't see a headstone when you drive through the cemetery, and you won't see one externally to the cemetery.

15 MS LEESON: Thank you.

MR DAVIES: I think we've probably got through most of those. And just the – there will be a – you know, there is then a formal interpretive strategy that will take  
20 people right through the site, both for the areas that I've just mentioned, those particular sites, and other aspects of the history of the site, including occupation and physical elements through that process.

MR HOY: Okay.

25 MR DAVIES: Were you going to say something?

MS BINNS: Sorry. I was only going to say, in reference to that interpretation of the vineyards, it retains a section as – is, and then has – and then reinterprets a section  
30 with vines on it, and then also has some that are reinterpreted as part of that lawn burial area, so it is a really sort of – very significant interpretation, and then there are other interpretation offerings as well in terms of that reinterpretation of the drive and then with a focus area around the outbuildings group also adding interpretation of the former orchards and other kind of farming elements.

35 MS LEESON: Could – would you mind just pointing that out on the plan how you – looking at the vineyard interpretation and the outhouse area?

MS BINNS: Yes. So that image actually doesn't have the outbuildings group on it.  
40 That just has – that is just the interpretation that we had there as an example. Florence is probably - - -

MR DAVIES: We could go back to the – yes. Even that would be - - -

45 MS BINNS: Yes.

MS LEESON: That will do.

MS BINNS: Yes. Florence is probably – could speak to the extent a little better in terms of - - -

MS JAQUET: Yes. I'm not sure how much detail you want.

5

MS LEESON: And particularly, I'm not quite sure I understood your question around the vineyard, with some replanting and then some burial sites. Is that within the vineyard area?

10 MS JAQUET: It's better to go back - - -

MR DAVIES: Yes.

MS LEESON: Yes.

15

MS JAQUET: - - - to the vineyard. Go back to that – just that slide that showed the vineyard. Yes. So I'll start with that. You can see from the photo here, this is Varroville House, and these are the – what we call the contour trenches. So actually, can we go back to the – you're right. Yes. So the extent of it, which is quite visible with aerial photos and various drone flights that we've done through is it starts up here where we've actually shown all these lines, and it extends probably up to here, but the best quality is up here. Here they've been really – not damaged, but they're much more eroded and they're a lot further apart. They seem to be directly relating to contours, so where it's flatter, they're further apart, and that's all you can see, contour trenches. That's what we mean.

20

MS BINNS: And the flatter areas are more degraded as well because of all the cattle on the site, so that – that slope is up to the rise, and that's why that area just at the top of – above the house is more intact.

30

MS JAQUET: So what we've suggested, in the steepest part, which is up here, which is really that photo that you saw before, we were re-establishing some vineyards within a portion of it, and that was done with consultation with OEH as to what they thought was appropriate. So probably two-thirds of it is turned back into a vineyard, and so we will reinstate vines. We want to do a bit more archaeological investigation to find out if there's any DNA about, you know, the vines that were used there, the type of posts and how they were supported, because we don't have any evidence of that.

35

But let's say we reinterpret these vines for up to a portion, and then OEH was quite keen to leave some untouched – some of these contour trenches untouched, so you could see the – what it is now and – and how it was before reinterpreted through the vineyards. In the areas that are flatter, where the contours are further apart, there is opportunity there to make the – because it is part of the lawn burial, to actually interpret those lines and keep those lines, but to insert graves and follow the contours, because they're wide enough to accommodate that, so we have offered to –

40

45

instead of having rows of graves that would basically destroy what's there, to actually – to keep those contours and follow, and that's what Fiona was referring to.

MS LEESON: Thank you.

5

MR HOY: Whilst we were on Varroville, we thought it appropriate to just continue on with that question you raised about the loop road, because that's also tied into the same consideration here, so put it back up.

10 MS JAQUET: Yes, again.

MR HOY: Sorry.

MS JAQUET: Do we want to go back to the master plan again - - -

15

MR HOY: Yes.

MS JAQUET: - - - to explain what it currently is. Okay. So if you were to go back to the master plan for 2013, which is the first one that we presented, you would see that it's different. We had one road going to – which was a dead end going to the outbuildings and then we had a loop here that came out. And it turned out to be a bit of a sticking point with RFS and bushfire access don't like dead ends. So we were asked to consider a loop road that would facilitate the traffic through. So we looked at that and we worked quite hard also with Dr Richard Lamb to try to position this road. This was pushed down. It's already in the valley itself, so that from Campbelltown it's not part of those visual corridors that should be retained, so it's not visible. It's lowset.

30 If we were to move or create a road within this steep – which is quite steep on the side of the outbuildings, we would cut into the hill too much and it was considered to be visually too invasive. So we considered the loop around the back because there is a ridge here that from the township and the visual requirement that we have from the LEP was hiding that road behind. But in doing so, it has put it closer to Varroville and we've encountered some problems at that end. So this is the loop road as it is currently proposed in the DA. And then if we go back to – because the outbuildings are proposed to be renovated and restored as part of stage 1, we – this is a temporary access to it and, again, it's entirely related to RFS.

40 So because we are going to bring people there and there's no cars allowed to go in there apart from somebody dropping off an elderly person and then coming back and parking along the road. But based on the requirement from RFS, we have – this is the existing driveway. When we refer to – what is referred to in the CMP as the Jackamans' driveway. It's the one that is currently on the south side of Varroville's existing driveway as part of the battle-axe. But at the moment, we have what is called the Jackamans' driveway, which is really flanked by – it's a mixture of coral trees and African olive that makes this tunnel of green, and that's how you access at

45



the moment. You will probably see it when we go on site. You access the outbuildings through there.

5 So we've suggested keeping the vegetation on the northern side as a protection  
visually from Varroville House and as well as to provide some shade on the  
driveway, because we considered the kids from the school, if they go and visit the  
educational facility that we've provided up there, will want to have shade when they  
walk up. And the requirement is to widen what is currently just a two point  
10 something dirt track into a 4.5 metre dirt track that is accessible by trucks for fire  
purposes – bushfire purposes. And then ask for a couple of passing bay – 20 metre  
long passing bay and a three-point turn at the end. So this is what we see in black.  
And that a is a temporary access just for stage 1.

15 MS LEESON: Thank you. So that confirms that the buildings would be restored in  
stage 1 and used in – immediately they were restored.

MR HOY: Correct.

20 MS LEESON: So they're not going to be restored and left. They will be actually  
utilised.

MR DAVIES: Accessible and used, yes.

25 MS LEESON: Okay. Thank you.

MR HOY: Where did we get up to? Sorry to jump around, but we're now jumping  
back to Wallacia, and I assume it was Wallacia where you talked about grave  
locations and flooding. So, again, centre stage, Florence. But maybe if we can just  
bring up – what we've got here are two slides out of the DA PAC that lists – that  
30 show where the current one-in-100-year flood event extends through the Wallacia  
property and then – next slide. And where flood hazard exists in terms of low and  
high flood hazard. The next slide really talks to, I guess, a response – again, a  
response to a request for information from council about confirmation about where  
interments may occur relative to those flood areas. This is an extract of – an  
35 enlarged extract of the amended plan package that was put forward in response to the  
RFI.

MS JAQUET: So as a very brief answer to your original question, yes, there's no  
burials in the one-in-100 flood plain ever. This is one of the first things that we  
40 check. So as a show of proof, I suppose, I dug up our CAD file. This is a very  
messy file, but it shows all the layers. So the area shown in this sort of brown  
colour is really the riparian zone where obviously there will be no burial. And if you  
look in there, you will see this blue line. The blue line is the one-in-five flood line,  
and the purple one, which is out here, is – and both of them – the point is that both of  
45 them are within the riparian zone, so there is no – the extent of the one-in-100  
doesn't extend. That's for Wallacia.

Now, for Macarthur, I don't have that, the reason being that – and Michael may be able to explain. We have changed the stormwater management. We had a stormwater management plan. We then submitted another one that was different. But we have checked the existing one-in-100 flood line and we are not within it. We  
5 are now at the point where – ultimately, we will check, but we have not done the model – is that correct, Michael? We've not done the model yet that shows - - -

MR CALAHANE: No, we have. We have.

10 MS JAQUET: You have.

MR CALAHANE: We've looked at existing and proposed in both Wallacia and Macarthur and we've kept a philosophy of keeping all burial spaces outside 100 year extents, so it's consistent across both sites.

15 MR HOY: Lastly, conditions. Look, broadly, we broadly agree with the draft conditions, but there's a few that we would like to raise some concerns with – not concerns – some suggested amendments to. Those are the conditions numbered in respect of both applications, rather than go through each of those individually, we  
20 have in our package of information a matrix of those conditions with comments against the ones that are referenced in the presentation there. I think the thing that's most important or a theme that's consistent across both draft sets of conditions is, I guess, a concern around those conditions that require the approval of or the endorsement of council prior to certain things occurring.

25 We've got no issue with consulting with council and working through those draft conditions in relation to things like construction management plan and the like, but I think that, given the time that has elapsed since both these applications have been on board and given that there is an extraordinarily strong commitment to document in  
30 detail both applications, we're happy to consult with council in working up those additional matters, but I don't think it's right to potentially say to the approval of council when there's no time limits placed on council to respond to each of those things.

35 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR HOY: So that's an hour gone and really our response to the questions that have been specifically raised. We would be happy to then take you through, I guess, more  
40 detail, I guess, just information sharing, if you like, about both applications separately, if that's the way that you would like to run it, but we're really in your hands as to how you think you would like to proceed here, because I do have separate presentations from myself, from Florence and from Richard. And Richard is really speaking to the visual impact considerations, more importantly, if that's - - -

45 MS LEESON: No, I think that would be good to go through both of them and just do an overview.

MR HOY: Okay.

MS LEESON: And I think it would be useful if you could tell us, as well, how you've responded to public submissions - - -

5

MR HOY: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - that have been received on both proposals.

10 MR HOY: Sure.

MS LEESON: Just so that we get an understanding of that. We will be doing a site visit next week. We will in due course be having public meetings. We will be having a look at all of those public submissions that have been made, so we would like to understand before then how you've addressed those all or not.

15

MR HOY: Okay. Can we take a two minute break, please?

MS LEESON: Certainly. Certainly.

20

MR HOY: Thank you. Because we might need to – I just need to talk to Matthew about getting those presentations just up and ready to run.

MS LEESON: We just need to load those. Okay. Fine. Well, we will take a two-minute break.

25

MR HOY: They're on the stick, but they just need to be loaded. I just want to make sure they all function. Thank you.

30 MS LEESON: Thank you.

**RECORDING SUSPENDED**

**[11.01 am]**

35

**RECORDING RESUMED**

**[11.04 am]**

MS LEESON: Have we got everybody back? We'll start again.

40

MR HOY: Okay. So - - -

MS LEESON: Thank you. Thanks, David.

45 MR HOY: So the way I thought we'd run this is I'll fly through a bit of planning background in term – in relation to both sites. I'll do these sequentially now rather than interchanged. So we'll go through Varroville first from a planning perspective.

Then I'll hand over to Florence, who will talk to landscape design in more detail, and then I'll have Richard Francis-Jones, who will speak predominantly to this issue around visual impact and visual considerations, which has really been perhaps the most intensely analysed aspect of this whole process. So without any further ado, I  
5 won't go any further. I'll get into it.

So, very quickly, the DA – this is what the DA seeks approval for. That text is entirely consistent with what has been put to you through the department's report. Excuse me. You've heard earlier Peter describe the – I guess the split, if you like, of  
10 the different uses and different burial types and the allocation of a significant part of the site, which he talks acres, I talk hectares. About 114 hectares in total. The dotted – sorry. I'm flying through my – sorry. Perhaps if I drive the mouse, please. That might be better. Thank you.

So the master plan, it's a conceptual drawing that has formed the basis of the detailed development application plans. As Florence mentioned, the master plan has evolved since its first I guess public viewing during the pre-consultation phase that we went through during the planning proposal aspect some years ago now, but nonetheless, the intent is largely unchanged. This is a long-term project, and I think it's been –  
20 part of the challenge is really trying to distil and get clear in our minds just how long we're talking about here. There is a – the proposal will be developed in stages.

It is a notional staging plan, because ultimately market demand will dictate how and when stages come on board, and as an aside, one of the interesting things that I've become educated to during this process is the progressive trend towards more  
25 cremation and less burial across society. So whilst there are still certain faith groups that it's mandatory, they mandate burial, as a societal trend, we are currently at about 60 per cent of the population are cremated when they pass away. So this is I guess what our client, who's a cemetery operator, envisages, taking into account those  
30 trends as to how this cemetery may evolve over time.

MS LEESON: That was the original staging plan that's now proposed in four stages.

35 MR HOY: Correct. Correct.

MS LEESON: That's right.

MR HOY: That's correct. And again, noting the earlier point around the - - -  
40

MS BINNS: Outbuildings.

MR HOY: - - - the outbuildings being included in stage 1. I just want to touch on again the site specific LEP provisions for Varroville. These were crafted in  
45 discussion with the planning panel and the Department of Planning at the time. They to provide, I guess, a high degree of certainty, as I said, about the actual form of the cemetery that can occur on this site, because it's specifically – the provisions

specifically refer to the – specifically refer to the conservation management plan that we’ve talked to, and the supplementary information. So this is a direct quote out of the LEP. So you just can’t develop anything here. You can’t do a traditional cemetery. You have to do this cemetery, and these are the things that you’ve got to look at and assess in detail in considering them, and that’s the whole basis around which this application has been framed.

I can just go back and point to this notion around the no-build area. This is an extract from the LEP map. The no-build area is defined in the blue, and importantly, the no-build area doesn’t mean nothing happens. It means that a lawn cemetery is the only thing that can happen on that site, and the lawn cemetery is typically reflected in the supplementary information referred to in the LEP, and these are extracts from that, so it actually gets into the detail of documenting the – and specifying and mandating by LEP law the form and function of the cemetery in that particular site. So highly unusual from a statutory planning perspective, from my experience, to see something of this detail embedded into an LEP control.

We’ve talked about the DA consultation process that we’ve been through so far. It’s been exhaustive, in my opinion. We’ve talked about the heritage response, so throughout this process – and we’ve got – as you know, we’ve got a separate process happening through the Independent Planning Commission around the curtilage issue, and we were all here a few weeks ago talking to that particular point. But there is a curtilage that’s referred to in the CMP that’s adopted in the LEP clauses, and those 104 policies contained in that CMP are really the guiding mechanisms that inform design. Excuse me.

The heritage response I guess continues to involve, it’s fair to say, Fiona and Stephen, we are still in negotiations with OEH concerning site-specific exemptions, and – but it’s fair to say that the draft conditions that are before the panel today – or the commission today, I beg your pardon, reflect a dialogue that has been evolving with OEH and the Heritage Council over the past four months since this has sort of got to the pointy end of the process. So in that sense, we’re comfortable with those conditions as they sit at the moment.

Scenic values – and I’ll get Richard to separately talk to this during his presentation, but, broadly speaking, this has been a fundamental design criteria that Florence has been guided by right from the very first iteration of the master plan and through validation and testing, relying on the advice of Richard Lamb, who unfortunately can’t be here today. But we feel that this visual impact assessment exercise has been thorough. There has been further work and dialogue with the Department of Planning during their assessment of the application that’s required some additional work to be done from particular points of view. That information has been supplied to the department and has informed their conclusions and recommendations that are before the Commission as we speak.

Traffic generation and management, as Florence mentioned earlier, there are currently four proposed access points to St Andrews Road. Whilst the traffic – the

traffic access arrangements have been amended to take account not so much of traffic management per se, but having regard to the relationship to the convent across the road and the effect of passing noise. So Florence mentioned earlier we've made some changes to the in-and-outs to, I guess, spread the concentration of traffic during  
5 peak periods. I have Ken Hollyoak from – our traffic consultant, who's happy to answer any questions on the issue of traffic. We take the view that – and we endorse the condition that requires a – what was it – 30-year review of traffic or something along those lines.

10 MS LEESON: 10-yearly.

MR HOY: 10-year. I beg your pardon. That wasn't – it was – yes. I think it's fair to say that there is a lot of changing context. It's difficult to envisage over a lifespan of a 170-year project, but I think we've had a reasonable balance – struck a  
15 reasonable balance here between planning for what we've envisaged would be a peak demand based on modelling of what happens at Rookwood and Liverpool cemeteries at particular times, but also having regard to what RMS want in terms of sightlines, but importantly how we can adjust access points to take account of that noise issue that was raised separately.

20

MS LEESON: Has that been – that information been provided to the convent across the way? Has there been any consultation on the proposed change to access arrangements with the local stakeholders?

25 MR HOY: We have not – I don't think so. I'm sorry. I'm happy to take that question on notice.

MR O'MEARA: I can give a brief explanation. There's been a number of meetings conducted with the convent across the road, briefings at the very beginning. The  
30 recent changes to the actual access and egress, our consultant that was asked to go out and do noise measurement testing, we spoke to them and asked them for permission to access the site, and the information regarding the changes to the entrance and egress were linked to both the noise impact as well as the location relative to – I forget the words – the site distances. Yes. So they are aware of the  
35 changes that we propose to the access and egress to achieve safety and noise reduction.

MS LEESON: Noise. Okay. Thank you.

40 MR HOY: Okay. Where am I up to? Sorry, I'm looking at the wrong screen. Sorry, I've just lost my spot. We've sort of touched on this acoustic issue, already. And we've talked about that earlier in response to the conditions – the questions that were put to us by the commission. Ecological considerations. Again, we've had to provide clarity around the loss of Cumberland Plain Woodland. There's an offset  
45 strategy that has been reflected in the master plan that Florence talked about earlier. And, importantly, I guess, the other thing that has really been interesting to deal with is the RFS's attitude to how we maintain road access through this site.

So there has been a little bit of push and pull from competing agencies as to what their outcomes that they are all wanting to achieve. Ultimately, we feel we've struck a balance that reasonably addresses all of those, I guess, technical considerations, but ultimately what's before you – we feel that we've addressed through the DA process  
5 and also through responses and clarity to – points to – questions for clarification that have come from the Department of Planning.

MS LEESON: David, does that mean there's no inconsistency with the CMP in  
10 accommodating the RFS requirements?

MR HOY: Not to my knowledge, but I'm happy to take that on notice and give you a clarification on that point. We've been – I think – I will say that the RFS has been front and centre in almost every reiteration of the design and the access arrangements right throughout almost up to, you know, the lead up to this hearing. The CMP – you  
15 sort of raise an interesting point because, as I said, we've sought to pre-empt the – what we thought was a gap in heritage management around Varroville House by putting forward our own CMP. As Stephen said earlier, there is no CMP under the Heritage Act that extends beyond the boundary of Varroville House.

20 MR DAVIES: As it currently stands.

MR HOY: So depending upon whatever – or if – if through the separate Planning Commission's process results in a curtilage being applied across the site under the Heritage Act, we could end up with a situation where we do have an LEP CMP that's  
25 – that talks to a curtilage potentially at odds with whatever comes out of the separate Heritage Act process. And we made that point very clear to the Heritage Council that we felt that – and also to the Planning Commission who separately heard the curtilage issue that we felt it was premature to be considering that curtilage issue when we've got a DA that's – the DA with planning controls that specify what we  
30 think is a reasonable curtilage.

So we've said they either should be dealt with concurrently or they should be at least – hear the DA – the DA should be determined first so that the heritage curtilage under the Heritage Act aligns with what has been put forward through the – what has  
35 been written into the LEP. Having said that, good – as I'm advised by my colleagues, good heritage management practices allow for heritage conservation management plans to evolve over time.

We don't have that luxury under the LEP arrangements, if you like, because it's a  
40 conservation management plan that was written at a point in time and is now embedded in the LEP. It's complex, but it's, again, one of those issues where we've sought to not shy away from the heritage issue but try and pre-empt and plan for a reasonable curtilage that respects the qualities of the site but also takes account of where OEH are trying and the Heritage Council are trying to achieve their outcomes,  
45 as well.

MR DAVIES: And can I say - - -

MR HOY: I don't know whether that was clear or not, but - - -

MS LEESON: I'm not sure if that answered my question, but - - -

5 MR HOY: But it - - -

MR DAVIES: Also within that, though, either within that area or an expanded area, there's the - we're having discussions with OEH over exemptions for activities within a state-listed area, so that's an ongoing process, as well.

10

MS BINNS: I guess with the CMP in particular, we had always taken the view that - we've always acknowledged the significance of the site. As Stephen said, we came in in 2013 to do the CMP because there was a gap. The CMP existed for the house and the house only and didn't consider those other elements, and so we looked at it and we proposed what we thought was a reasonable curtilage which included the elements that we've mentioned already but also then provided a setting because there is obviously value in a pastoral landscape setting in addition to those very specific elements that we've identified.

15

20

And so - but we never saw that as precluding the cemetery, and that was part of the exercise that we did with Florence to really - to ensure that within particularly that curtilage area that we had particularly responded to those heritage aspects and - you know, and that also goes to Pete's point earlier about - I mean, I've not seen a project where we've done the level of modelling and investigation that we've done for this particular project, and to the - such that, you know, we can look at any views. We understand. We're trying - we're retaining the ridge lines. We're retaining landscaping.

25

30

So we're retaining that rolling kind of rural landscape character and then ensuring that where we do have those burial areas that there - you know, there are different typologies which I'm sure Florence will get into in her presentation, you know, to really mitigate any of those visual impacts or to respond to specific elements within the landscape, like the vineyard trenching or - you know, so it has been something that, you know, we've been well aware of from the beginning and we've ensured that within those areas that we saw as being, you know, more significant or as sort of potentially within that heritage curtilage area that we've mitigated any impacts in the design, as well.

35

40

MR HOY: Mindful of the time.

MS LEESON: Thank you.

45

MR HOY: Thanks, Fiona. I just want to fly. So we've covered off the - we've talked about the hours of operation earlier.

MS LEESON: Yes.



MR HOY: I would like to just ask now Florence and Richard to talk through their aspects of Macarthur. I just need to bring up a separate presentation. It's all loaded. You just need to open it up.

5 MS JAQUET: How long do you want me to have? I don't want to cut into times for other people, so - - -

MS LEESON: I think – we have another sort of 35 minutes, I think, set aside.

10 MS JAQUET: Yes.

MS LEESON: So what we will do, I think, is – because you've decided to – you've offered to present to us. We will leave it to you to manage that time and we will try and be efficient in our questions that come up during that and we could perhaps go  
15 on.

MS JAQUET: I can just skim through the key points and just, you know, things that  
- - -

20 MR HOY: Do you want to drive or do you want me to?

MS JAQUET: Do I want to drive? Yes, okay. I will drive.

MR HOY: You can sit here and you can use the cursor to point to things if you  
25 want.

MS JAQUET: Yes, sure. How do I go up and down?

MR HOY: No, this – just scroll. Just - - -  
30

MS POKAR: Go to view, full mode, yes. The next one, yes, perfect. There you go.

MS JAQUET: Okay. Thank you. And up and down on there?

35 MR HOY: Just scroll, no, no, on the track wheel.

MS JAQUET: Scroll down. Okay. Yes. All right. So basically this is what you will be faced with when you go on site. It's sort of very what I describe as bucolic landscape, which is rolling hills, grassy rolling hills with clumps of trees, a mixture  
40 of Cumberland Plain Woodlands and African olives, as we said before. Existing dams. Unfortunately, they don't have as much water now. I won't go through the vision, but really I'm sure that's clear in the report, but it's really all about leaving a legacy. That's why we've got a sculpture park in there, we've got an arboretum. It's really leaving a legacy to the next generation. It's intergenerational. And as we've  
45 said before, we've got 36 hectares of public open space within all the riparian zones and the forest wall. So this is the master plan. I'm sure you've seen it before.

You can see here this curtilage area, which is the one that we've been referring to as being proposed, which goes with the vineyards, the outbuildings and the original driveway. This is the minimum as we see it. Through this, you will see, you know, all the different analyses that we did. I don't want to go through all of that. The  
5 views here is obviously the important one. We have in blue what we consider to be really important landscape views. You know, they're just very scenic. The dark blue will be the links to the other historic houses. Some of them, as mentioned in Dr Lamb's report, are no longer visible because of vegetation that has grown in between.

10 Then we have in pink the views that we know the house has benefited from over the years, and we've tried to keep things as pastoral in there as possible. So view onto the vineyards will remain more or less unchanged. The views onto the dams will be mitigated. And views onto outbuildings. And all these little orange ones that you  
15 can see are the ones that are part of that visual assessment. They're the key views from the township, and Richard will no doubt talk about that. This is all the analyses, maps that we went through. What we felt was important was, you know, as a concept behind it was the timeline. There was a lot of emphasis at the beginning that was put through – onto the European heritage. As landscape architects, we tend  
20 to be interested in the whole history. And, you know, if you look at cemetery, it's really a record of social trends.

It's the land itself has got this pattern and experience of what has happened over the years. And we thought that both of them were a good summary and narrative for  
25 what we're trying to do. It's this passing of time that is visible both on the land and relates to the cemetery use. So we've created this sort of timeline that recognises that really the history on the site starts from the ecology and the geology. We've got the tallest peak on the site that exists in the region, which is a Bunbury Curran Hill.

30 Then we've got Aboriginal history for 60,000 years and then we've got a window of 200 years of history – European history. We also picked up on the lyre bird because it's the totem animal from the Dharawal People who are the local people. You can see from the feathers, they're, sort of, to us related to the undulation of the land and you will see similarities with the architecture as well. And you will read what the  
35 text says at your leisure.

This is really the proposal summarised. We've got lawn graves. It's just we have improved from the traditional lawn cemetery on this one because the visual aspect is so important that we have removed the concrete beams. So the concrete beams are  
40 concealed. They are below. We still need them for maintenance and all you will see on the surface is the plaques – very similar to, if you're familiar with, forest lawn at Los Angeles which is very similar, but – so we've minimised the width of the roads. The - - -

45 MR PILTON: Just – sorry. Just while we're on that illustration.

MS JAQUET: Yes. Sure.

MR PILTON: Can I ask what's the material of the roads. Is it concrete? It, sort of, looks like - - -

MS JAQUET: No. Asphalt.

5

MR PERRY: Bitumen.

MR PILTON: Bitumen.

10 MS JAQUET: Yes.

MR PILTON: Okay.

MS JAQUET: And the verges are reinforced grass paving which – so we've reduced it already. We've negotiated with the RFS from their normal eight metre wide to a six and a half and in some cases – I think it is four and a half for the single roads, Michael?

MR HOLMES: Lindsay. I think it's three and a half.

20

MS JAQUET: Three and a half. Yes. I'm sorry. Mental blank.

MR PILTON: And the edging? Is there a kerb there or is it a flush edge or - - -

25 MS JAQUET: So there is a kerb to the asphalt - - -

MR PILTON: Yes.

MS JAQUET: - - - which is required. This is one of the conditions that you probably will see we will have a go at because there is a requirement in the conditions to remove that concrete kerb. We're quite happy to have it with a colour that blends in with the asphalt, but we need a kerb in terms of construction. They're suggesting a timber or a metal edge which for a road which will see that much traffic including equipment that cuts across it and goes into grave digging – this is quite a big equipment. This will be ..... within a year or two. So in terms of maintenance, it doesn't make sense - - -

30

35

MR PILTON: But the idea is that cars can pull off on to the reinforced edge.

MS JAQUET: Yes. That's right. So in here, you could see on there all these roads which are in red have got parking on the side and is literally a 2.5 metre verge on both sides of the road and then in yellow, you can see the dedicated parking that we have on the site. So it's just grass. So it minimises the visual impact. To minimise the visual impact as well as we've already alluded to is really this idea of the concealed burial rooms. We have close to the roads mostly lawn which is plaques only and then we've got some planting which conceals some of the headstones that might be in that, sort of, burial room we talked about earlier.

40

45

Now, what we've done because we made such a big claim as saying that when you drive through the cemetery you're not going to see a headstone, we took the unprecedented step to model that. So this is a rhino model that we've created in the office which basically shows all the areas of headstones in red, so that it really comes  
5 across and is very visible. We drove through all the main roads which are really the loop that goes around the back and comes out below Varroville House and the loop that goes past the function centre and comes out before Varroville House. Those two main roads we've tested. We've tested also all the property of Varroville House in this model and along St Andrews Road.

10 And we have created – you can see here, they're really very course, but there's really a hedge which it will not be, but to represent the screen planting in the model, we've simplified it as a hedge as a block. And you play with this block and you put it up and down until you cannot see a headstone. So this is what we've done for the entire  
15 site and each colour that you can see on there, represents a different height for the screen planting. So we know exactly what is required.

We've also gone through the unprecedented step with Michael who cursed me for a month because I was so pedantic about following – we've gone through the .....  
20 sections which we normally wouldn't go through before DA just to be able to say, "Yes. We can make the road follow the contours." And when it's, you know, .7 or .8 – well, sometime I wasn't happy, so we just moved the road up, but we went through the entire road system doing that.

25 Cumberland Plain Woodland, you can see here the extent of it. It's in purple and in red is what we have removed. Now, just to clarify, we have one, two, three and four spots where the road is cutting through and we have some removal due to the road and then we've got one, two, three tiny spots there which is where the Cumberland Plain Woodland has established itself on the dam wall and that created a mini heart  
30 attack in our dam engineer, so obviously, not a good spot for safety. We have also, as we pointed out in a report, earmarked this area here which is a clump of degraded Cumberland Plain Woodland because you can imagine most of it on site has been trampled by grazing and cows.

35 There is very little on the ground that is of significance and we picked that particular spot for the natural burial and in doing so, because it is against the principle of conservation, it is counted as removed, but nothing out of it is removed. The trees remain. And the true purpose of natural burial is to reinstate ecology through the use of burial. And so we have – that's why you will see it in red.

40 And we also got a number of little paths that goes through it because I insisted on having a path within the Cumberland Plain Woodland just – I think that, you know, if you say the national park is a great place to go, you need to go and experience it, so in doing so, this is a requirement, therefore, for offset. So we have provided path in  
45 areas that we know have got no vegetation on it that have been damaged, but this is where some of the offset had to go. It was part of the concept.

Very briefly, I will go through the interpretation strategy. As you will see, it goes along the theme of our timeline. It looks at not just the heritage, the European heritage, but the broad concept of the timeline and we've got in our report at the back of the interpretation strategy, some interpretation of the vineyards at the top of the  
5 Bunbury Curran Hill, which is a lookout, the vineyards at the outbuilding and the original driveway. The public art strategy is a really important part of the concept. We've got artwork going throughout the park. What you see in little pink stars are the sculptures. They're often in the main access of the buildings, but also creating focal points through to the landscaping places.

10 And then you have what we call the gateways. Again, it's trying to instil this idea that the Cumberland Plain Woodland is an important ecology. It is, sort of, sacred in a way. So each time there is a so-called footpath going in there, we have a gateway which is a bit like a ..... gate in a cemetery. It's a threshold that, sort of, tells you that  
15 you're entering something that is very special. So it's artwork as well. And just to give you an idea, this is what it might look like.

The sculptures might be on the left and the gateways might, you know, look like this. This is the environmental sustainable design. This is really a summary of where the  
20 36 hectares that we've talked about are located. This is within the area of the dashed green line. This is the staged plan as we looked which this one is the updated one. And then I put a number of – this might answer your question about how did we incorporate comments since the beginning of the process. This was the original  
25 master plan. It had different buildings.

You can see that we had a road that was coming and was trying to attempt to go through the ..... which is the vineyard. We realised very quickly that would be  
damaging, so we moved that. We also had heard of – then through the investigation through Aboriginal consultation – that the top of the ridge is significant to them, so  
30 we reduced the impact on there by meandering through some of the ..... and reducing that to a single road and, therefore, most of these roads around there were modified and you can see here in yellow is the actual alignment of the original driveway as is visible on aerial photos and here, you can see that loop that I was telling you about that we had originally in the plan.

35 The original driveway, unfortunately, settles itself – or its alignment on a new watercourse that probably appeared in the last 50 or 100 years. So it decided to go along this driveway. It now has got its imposed riparian zone on both sides, so we cannot interpret it with a path or anything within it, so this is why we're, sort of,  
40 trying to keep that alignment visually with either planting or a path alignment in the correct location. Then we had a competition for the buildings and that's where Richard came in, so we had modifications to this. And then you can see now where it became obvious that we had these vineyards where all of this was moved. This road was up here. It was moved down on the request of Richard because of visual  
45 and we incorporated that as I said before because of the RFS. We've gone through that. We've gone through that. We've gone through that. And that's it from me.

MS LEESON: Thank you, Florence.

MR HOY: Thank you.

5 MR PILTON: Thank you.

MR HOY: So Richard - - -

MS JAQUET: Do you want to swap?

10

MR JONES: So, look, I will try and be really brief and take you through our thinking since we got involved in this project. A key aspect of the design of this parkland and cemetery is an integration with the landscape and a connection with the landscape, and I think that has many dimensions to it which I will take you through.

15

Florence has already talked very well about the quality that the landscape has, the very strong topography on this site and a really rich and varied quality with watercourses and also with dams and with the various open spaces that are formed by the natural landscape. So the architecture has very much been inspired and related to that quality of landscape.

20

The other really important aspect for this project is, of course, that it's for all faiths and non-faiths. It's, in a sense, a quite ambitious project to create places for significant ceremony and ritual around passing that's open to all, and therefore, that poses a real challenge to the making of an architecture which is inclusive but can add depth and meaning to that experience and also the ambition from our client to create a memorial parkland which, in a sense, is truly Australian and is going to have a real cultural ongoing significance – I'm having a lot of trouble with that.

25

30

It's just ..... I'm used to – so we developed an idea about making these buildings which tried to look at very fundamental aspects of architecture that are perennial in their nature, and one of those was the building of a threshold or a wall and making that material out of rammed earth, out of, in a sense, a material that was the earth itself and then creating a different space that was sheltered under a roof structure.

35

So part of our – this is some of our studies for the making of the roof forms of the building which are informed by the natural form of the topography itself that we're working with. So we wanted to create this relationship between the two, really have the ground form the space where people gather and the roof create the shade and the shelter and these elements in a sense be uplifting in their character but also very open. So the beauty of the landscape that one would experience here is perhaps the most significant aspect of the rituals that take place here, and the architecture is intended to be very soft and related to that space.

40

45

So this, for example, is a view of the cafe and pavilion near the entry that sits in its setting next to the dam. So our idea was a series of pavilions that are very related that create a continuity of experience but build a kind of sense of experience and significance as you run through them and an overall effect that creates a harmony

between the architecture and the natural landscape and that positions the buildings in places, as Frances explained, that are subtle, that are not visible and that create this sense of empathy.

5 So you can see here the building that's sitting over the dam here is the function  
centre. It's a bit hard to see, but the chapel is a little bit beyond that. Here, the  
chapel is on our right. Here, the road leads up past the gatehouse. On our left there  
is the administrative building where you might go to make arrangements and so on  
10 and the chapel being by far the most visible. The others are pushed into that  
bushland setting.

So just to explain those building types, this is the overall frame of the site –  
Varroville site on our right, and the area in red here is where the buildings are  
concentrated. If we look at those buildings, starting with 1, you come in from St  
15 Andrews Drive. Number 1 is the gatehouse that you can see there. Number 2 as we  
go up is the chapel, and then number 4 – we were looking at that earlier sitting over  
the dam. Just off the entry there is the cafe and flower shop. Number 3 over to the  
right is the function centre, and number 5 over there is the administrative building.  
And number 6, finally, is the ground facilities.

20 And I just wanted to give you a brief sense of those starting with the chapel. So this  
is the arrival gathering courtyard. As you move into the chapel, you can see the quite  
fluid and very natural forms of the roof that try to create a sense of significance to  
these events but not label them perhaps with any particular faith but create a place of  
25 spiritual significance nevertheless, and the building is arranged so that it can open –  
operate as one chapel for one ceremony or three services in separate chapels. So the  
side courtyards become primary arrival space because the movement of mourners in  
and out of the ceremony – very important how we manage that and keep them  
separate. Very – rarely done very well actually in all of our research of cemeteries  
30 both in Australia and internationally.

And then the function room obviously really, really important. Often wake and other  
ceremonies take place here. It's a very different kind of atmosphere, in a way much  
more earthly connected with water but an echo, of course, of the same themes that  
35 we're trying to embody in the architecture. The cafe, too, sitting – set back from the  
dam among the trees is quite a modest building but also has that character, and then  
we move through into – you can actually just see on the right here among the trees  
the admin building and the gatehouse which is bottom left through here and then,  
finally, the ground staff facilities buildings.

40 We are building – we're making these buildings to kind of last for 100 years of more,  
so the materials are really important to have this gentle quality, have a lightness to  
them, but we want them to endure, so the materials that we're using, we want to use  
..... we want to make them in a way made out of Australian materials as much as we  
45 possibly can, bronze, stones, copper roofs, and lined with a specially treated timber  
..... which gives it enormous longevity and strength.

Now, a really important aspect that has underpinned the approach to the design of the memorial park is views, which David and also Florence have mentioned, and that has really informed the way we've thought about the architecture and positioning of the buildings in partnership with Florence in relation to the landscape to give this quality  
5 where the architecture is actually very quiet and very recessive. Now, Dr Richard Lamb has undertaken an independent analysis of view impacts, so he was separately commissioned to undertake that study, and he has outlined in his report – you have a copy of that report, the procedure that was followed with a specialist, a photo  
10 montage artist VI preparing images in relation to the criteria that are clearly very set down by him. He's not here at this meeting, unfortunately. He's one of the few consultants who isn't here. So I just wanted to quickly touch on some of that. I recognise, however, this is not my area of expertise.

Richard concludes his report by saying that they support the proposal on visual and associated landscape heritage grounds. His report is very extensive. I've just  
15 highlighted here five of the views that he wanted studied in detail, and I'll just quickly run those through. So the view from the township back over Varroville to the site being one of the key areas of interest, as well as some of those thresholds from St Andrews Drive. I keep doing that. Sorry. So here is an example of the  
20 before and proposed photo montage. So the photo montage on the right, and the before photograph here. So we're now standing looking towards the dam with our back to Varroville House, and what you can see here is the change in the landscape, and this is the exit road that leads back onto St Andrews Drive.

25 MR HOY: Can I just quickly jump in? So on that point, we weren't able to gain access to Varroville House, so that's taken from the boundary.

MR JONES: It's forward – a reasonable amount forward from it, but it's the closest  
30 as could reasonably get. And then this is back on St Andrews Drive at the driveway to Varroville House, so again, the photo montage on the right. And then a little bit further towards the south, photo montage on the right. Of course, some things you have to look quite closely at, and Richard could take us through this. Importantly, we are moving quite a long way away from where any of the buildings are or other adjustments to landscape. So now we're here at ..... Drive looking back down St  
35 Andrews Road, photo montage again on the right. And then as we move back towards the township where the view is of the roofs of those houses. Clearly, a lot of – quite a lot of detail in these, and can be subjected to close scrutiny, as well as very informed narrative from Richard Lamb.

40 MR HOY: That's it?

MR JONES: Thank you.

45 MR HOY: That's Varroville.

MS LEESON: That's Varroville.



MR HOY: Is there any other questions you'd like to ask us on Varroville before we move quickly to Wallacia?

MS LEESON: No. I think we've probably been asking along the way.

5

MR PILTON: Sorry. Can I just ask a question about lighting? I mean, if people are going to be there possibly 24 hours a day, some of the roads will have to be lit, or  
- - -

10 MR O'MEARA: One of the features of the lighting is that we've gone to great lengths to subdue any bright lighting, and the only access point between the public road and the internal facilities that would be used as an evening would be the chapel or the holding facility. So the lighting wouldn't be of a streetlight nature. It would be low and subdued and quite – almost only visible to those that were into the road,  
15 not visible to people outside the property.

MR PILTON: Okay. And just one more question, sorry.

MR HOY: Yeah.

20

MR PILTON: About sort of the landscape maintenance. Is all the grass unirrigated? Is it irrigated or is it partially irrigated?

25 MS JAQUET: Yes. This is an interesting one. Do you want to answer the irrigation, Peter? Yeah.

30 MR O'MEARA: The intent is to – we've got studies on bore water, so sinking bores across the site, and we believe that we'll be able to generate a certain amount of water from that, but we believe that it will be sort of portable water that we don't need to use to irrigate the site. There are 10 dams in total on the site. It's not proposed to empty the dams, because they're a visual feature, but we're within a kilometre of that open watercourse that runs down - - -

35 MR CALAHANE: Yes. The Water New South Wales upper canal.

MR O'MEARA: The canal.

MR CALAHANE: That's a kilometre away.

40 MR O'MEARA: Yeah. So there's some analysis being done on whether we may be able to take water from the canal when it's raining at a fraction of the costs of portable water, so we're examining that, running a pipeline from the top of the hill down to our site to irrigate the cemetery as best we can. But bearing in mind it is actually going to be staged, you would not necessarily need to irrigate the entire site,  
45 only the site – parts of the site that are being used for burial.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

MR CALAHANE: And effluent as well would probably be used, so whatever sewage we treat onsite would be reused as effluent.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

5

MR O'MEARA: One of the other reasons that we'd prefer, if we could, not to be restrained with the guttering on the roadways, we will build the roadways, but if the roadways don't have any form of channelling, it's difficult to channel and capture the water and recycle it back to the dams and the holding facilities on the site, so we'd prefer if we could to have some form of roadside channelling in order to capture water from rainwater and to be able to hold that on the site where possible.

10

MS LEESON: Is that your primary purpose for kerbing?

15 MR O'MEARA: Correct. Yeah.

MR PILTON: If you have the kerb, how do you drive onto the - - -

MR O'MEARA: It's a rollover.

20

MS JAQUET: It's a rollover.

MR O'MEARA: It's a rollover kerb.

25 MR PILTON: It's a rollover kerb.

MR O'MEARA: It's a rollover kerb. Yeah.

MR HOY: It's a - yeah. Okay.

30

MR O'MEARA: If we had a kerb which is only just, you know, metal or wood, it wouldn't sustain a 100-year life, and two, we wouldn't be able to capture the water unless we came up with a really innovative plan which we could capture water in the middle of the road or something, which is quite difficult.

35

MR CALAHANE: You'd be going to more of an industrial look, you know, having a big concrete dish drain down through the centre.

MR O'MEARA: Yeah.

40

MR CALAHANE: Which isn't great, or incorporating big massive swales either side of the road, which we did look at initially, but - - -

MR O'MEARA: Yeah.

45

MR CALAHANE: - - - from a user's point of view it wouldn't be operationally possible.

MR PILTON: Right. Okay.

MR O'MEARA: So one thought we thought of was that maybe we'd actually sort  
of – the kerbing could be coloured so that we could colour it the same colour as the  
5 road and maybe make it look more rural so it's not very obvious.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

MS LEESON: Thanks. I think we probably need to move on.  
10

MR HOY: Yeah.

MS LEESON: Did you have anything else on Varroville? No.

15 MR HOY: Okay.

MS LEESON: Of we can do Wallacia.

MR HOY: We'll fly through Wallacia, because it's only a third of the size of  
20 Varroville. 42 hectares, currently used as a golf course, and Florence will talk to,  
again, a staging approach that does intend to retain a modified golf course for part of  
the life of the site. Again, this speaks to the original proposal that was put forward  
and what we're seeking approval for. As I said earlier, the application has been  
formally amended in accordance with provisions of the Act to delete the  
25 crematorium.

The master plan, I'll let Florence talk to her – talk to this when we get to the  
landscape, when I let Florence speak to her urban design piece. Again, that will  
encompass the range and extent of burial types. Philosophy is the same. It is the  
30 same landscape garden parklands approach to Varroville to what is proposed for  
Wallacia. Staging plan, similar to the past – similar to Varroville. Again, we're  
talking about a staging approach where the first stage is furthest away from Wallacia  
township. Again, another cemetery that is intended to have a lifespan of  
approximately 150 years from today's date. Florence will show a plan that's  
35 included in the landscape package that shows how we would like to retain a modified  
golf course for stages 2 and 3 until they become required.

Hours of operation we've talked about. Zoning and permissibility, I guess this is the  
point – this is the reason why a cemetery – this is the reason why our client acquired  
40 this site. Cemeteries are permissible in the zone, and we didn't want to go through a  
similar process as what we went through at Varroville. So there is – there was some  
debate about the crematorium use, and hence we originally felt it was – could be  
argued as being ancillary in this instance, but we ultimately chose to amend the  
application to remove that. The golf course will continue to operate.  
45

I just – this is not a whole – this is just an extract out of our report, but the thing –  
unlike Varroville, there is a comprehensive DCP that applies to the broad Mulgoa

Valley. This is just extracts out of our statement of environmental effects that show a high level of compliance with all the relevant considerations against the key considerations listed in the DCP, but importantly, it does have a provision that relates to cemeteries, crematoria and funeral homes, so there are some controls that are in the DCP that speak to the design or that provide guidance as to how the design needs to respond, and we feel that we satisfied all those points.

Again, the Mulgoa Valley being an important visual catchment having some historical significance to that particular part of Metropolitan Sydney. So views and relationships to key historic items around the Mulgoa Valley, again, are reflected in council's DCP controls as something which we've taken into account through our own visual impact assessment. Building forms and the like. Planning. Again, I just – this is – there's a yes against every column. So we feel that we've adequately addressed the planning controls for the site.

Groundwater and geotech, I know that we do – we've touched on this earlier and it sort of talks to one of the questions that was raised about the location of burials relative to flooding. There's a condition in the – there's a draft condition which proposes a regime of groundwater monitoring which we think is reasonable. We didn't have the benefit in this instance, unlike Wallacia – sorry, unlike Varroville where we had a significant report prepared by a gentleman called Boyd Dent, who is an expert in cemeteries and groundwater. However, our report identifies that the geology that exists under Wallacia is very similar to what exists at Varroville, and we've taken that as a basis upon which to guide our thinking around the suitability of this site to sustain cemetery use.

Flooding, I think we've covered that off before. I want to let Florence just talk to the urban design. The visual impact, as I say, this links back to the DCP controls but, again, adopting the same design philosophy around screening, responding and amending the application as required or as requested during the assessment process to pull headstones away from the roads and the like as being, I guess, a reflection of the response – a reflection of how we've responded to issues as they've come up through the process.

I think from also – you know, unlike Varroville, Wallacia is a modified non-urban setting. It's used for, you know, a recreational pursuit, a golf course. And we've sought to rely on the existing trees that align golf – align – that line fairways wherever we can to guide how the urban design might – sorry, the landscape design might play out. I've talked to the consultation that we've been through and, again, I've talked to the conditions of consent. I will let Florence talk to her presentation, if I may, please.

MS LEESON: Thank you, David. Florence. Are you all right?

MR PILTON: I might be a new client soon.

MS JAQUET: All right. Very similar vision to the other one. You know, we base our vision on – we turn them into parklands because we think that there's a problem with cemeteries as they are now. They tend to be unusable when they're full. And if you create them as a park, you've created a social asset that continues when they're full because they become a parkland and they're useful for the community. So it's an important part of the concept, but it's – it has a very similar legacy and – and there's also this tourism destination in – Wallacia aims to and they see in a lot of ways the golf course as being a tourist distinction. It brings people from outside of the area. We wanted to continue that, and enable a destination within the park, within the cemetery itself.

I won't go through all of that. This is all the various constraints that we had. You can see here we've got watercourses, Jerry's Creek and – and this is the extent of the riparian zones. Most of the European heritage is outside of our site. You can see the red line there – where did my mouse go? It doesn't want to go there. That's all right. So this is the outline of our site, and in blue is the European heritage ..... but what is really interesting about the site is that you have these existing fairways. So you've got existing framework of trees that gives you this fantastic vista. When you stand on top of the site, you will see the Blue Mountains in the background. It guides your view in a particular direction.

So I won't go through all of that. I haven't got time, but it's – it's really saying that sustainability is a very important part, again, and legacy is a very important part. It doesn't want to do what I want it to do. Yes. Okay. Yes. No worries. So – if I go through, sorry, this one. The core principle of the design is really picking up one of these fairways and these views that when you see on site you will get it – it's that everything is directed in that direction. So we have a chapel on the top, looking onto views of the Blue Mountains to the left of the screen, and we imposed, if you want, a design narrative that relates to the cycle of life, you know, with the birth to the east where the sun rises and the death to the west, and that leads to these various shapes which are embedded within the design.

So there is a very strong axis which has got little red dots along there, and that, again, is sculptural elements that go along the journey. And then the circle that you see at the bottom is really what I call the tourism destination. It's the Jerry Creek catchment and it has – we've added some of these palms which you can see there are part of the water-sensitive urban design and storm management proposals. So we have retaining basins and wetlands within that. So that will create this, sort of, wetland floodplain and we're creating a path and a boardwalk that makes this big circle all the way around. So this is really the focal point and the public open space focus.

The rest is as you enter the main entrance and – again, sensitive vegetation community and in red the bits that are affected by the development which is minimal. And the concept there is not so much about the burial room and screening everything. This is not as imposing as we had it at Varroville. It's really creating, as we said before, a core which is mostly lawn and the headstones mostly on the

outside. And then we're creating with this boomerang-size – or boomerang-shape, I should say, planting on the edge of the road – we're creating these views which are forced literally to the left when you've got a planting on the right.

5 It shifts your focal point to various key part of the site and helps to screen off some of the headstones. So you will see headstones through there. Here we also have the lawn graves with the beams – the concrete beams. So you can see here the riparian zones, the various treatment where we've got a path and boardwalks – this is all highlighted within the report – and we're also planting all the edge of the existing  
10 dams and we're required – we have protective fencing, obviously. The water-sensitive urban design elements are key to the proposal and in orange you can see the ones that are retaining basins and wetlands and in pink is the swales and ..... retentions and then planting around all the edges of the dams, as I said.

15 On this one, we couldn't do it on Macarthur for various reasons, but here it's really important to try to utilise the spoil onsite if you can, for various reasons: first, it's not a good idea to export soil in general, but also it's a very big expense within cemetery management and operations. You generate almost a cubic metre per grave of spoil that you can't put back in, so it's really important to create it. So we've  
20 created this platform where you can see there and buffers and extra on the side to be able to screen certain things where it suits us, and that's part of the management.

And that's – yes, it's one of the many proposals that we put forward. There was another one that is even bigger and this leaves a golf course on the left-hand side  
25 which I think is just a nine hole. We had another one with 13 holes, I think, which apparently is fashionable but I don't play golf so I'm not sure, but it really brought the golf course extent all the way behind the chapel and all that top right corner was also golf course. So - - -

30 MR O'MEARA: If I could just make a comment here, if I could.

MS JAQUET: Sure.

35 MR O'MEARA: Prior to purchasing the property several years ago, we became aware that the golf course was not financially viable and that has essentially materialised into a position where the current lessee of the golf course at the moment has given notice to us that they will vacate the course – they will shut the club and golf course effectively would close. In the interim, we've negotiated a new lessee to take over the operations of the golf course and that's currently being signed off by  
40 the licensing commission because there's 30 poker machines in a fairly dilapidated club. That's being exchanged for a sum of money.

And our intent is to enter into a long-term lease with that operator who is a top ten bowls club here in New South Wales, and the intention is to develop only the  
45 cemetery on the furthest end of the golf course which probably has an expected immediate use of around 40 years. So the golf course would remain. The DA includes a renovation of the clubhouse – the golf clubhouse – which is located down

towards the village end of Wallacia. And we believe that that delivers a good outcome for the community in that they retain the sporting amenity but at the same time, we are able to achieve, if you like, a solution for the diminishing burial space in that Western Sydney corridor. So I think that's important to understand – that if this  
5 development does not proceed, there will be no golf course.

MS JAQUET: And really that is it for me. Yes.

10 MS LEESON: Okay. Terrific.

MR HOY: Thank you. We've got nothing further to present.

MS LEESON: So there's no presentation on the buildings for Wallacia?

15 MR HOY: I don't have them here, no. We weren't intending on – I think Wallacia – the presentation – it's a far more modest building. It's centrally located within the site. We're happy to answer any questions on notice. We will take questions on notice around - - -

20 MS LEESON: No, that's fine – unless there's something that comes up as we continue going through the documents. We can come back to you.

MR HOY: I think we're probably – you know, when we go onsite, I think we would be happy to answer questions around the architecture for the built form at Wallacia.

25 MR O'MEARA: It's effectively a simple chapel and an office; that's the extent of it.

MS LEESON: Thank you.

30 MR PILTON: No issues with fire – bushfires and things here?

MR HOY: No, no. We – well, it was a consideration we've taken into account. That's documented in the urban design report as far as constraints are concerned, but  
35 we can happily point out those references to RFS in any questions that you may wish to put to us. There's only one question that I've been asked to put back to the commission and that is the understanding of process moving forward from here. I think our client just – obviously we've got a site visit coming up, but we would like if it's at all possible to understand how the commission intends to finalise its  
40 deliberations on the matter, if that's at all possible.

MS LEESON: Sure. Yes, no, that's fine. So yes, we have site visit next week and meetings with councils. We will – we are still trying to lock down some dates for public meetings and depending how many requests we get to speak at the public  
45 meetings, they will be, you know, one or a bit more days each. So we're just trying to work our way through that at the moment and then once we've had the public meetings, whether we need to have any more information or dialogue with

yourselves or with agencies or with stakeholders – we will then form our – complete our analysis and report and we will then be referring that through to the consent authority.

5 So in terms of a timeframe, that's probably the thing that's most difficult to actually  
give you at the moment because we simply haven't been able to lock down yet the  
dates that we will have for those public meetings. So we don't want it to drag on  
unnecessarily. The Commissioner has a lot of things to deal with across his board, so  
it's just a question of managing diaries for the moment and getting those meetings  
10 sorted.

MR HOY: Does the Commission have an expectation for the applicant to be present  
at those public meetings?

15 MS LEESON: The applicant is more than welcome to attend the public meetings,  
and we will give some thought to whether it will be beneficial or not to have a very  
short presentation given some of the public consultation that has happened so far. So  
we will form a view on that as to whether we want you to make a high-level  
presentation. It may principally be around changes since anything was seen in the  
20 public arena last, but we will give you advice in that respect.

MR HOY: Yes. Thank you very much.

25 MS LEESON: Did you have any more questions? No? Adrian? No? Well, Thank  
you very much. That will conclude today's meeting. As I indicated earlier, we will  
provide advice to who we think would be appropriate to come to the site visits next  
week and we will come back through - - -

30 MR HOY: David. So Matthew is liaising – yes.

MS LEESON: Through David. Okay. Thank you. All right. So David and  
Matthew will liaise on the logistics. Terrific. Thank you all for coming and we will  
see you soon.

35

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**[12.12 pm]**