

Nazia Pokar

Subject: FW: Catholic Cemeteries Trust discussion this morning
Attachments: Extracted Pages.pdf

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 24 May 2018 8:41 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Catholic Cemeteries Trust discussion this morning

Good Morning Craig

As per discussions at our recent meeting at Council's offices, I attach extracts of the August 2014 study that Urbis was commissioned to undertake on behalf of CMCT. The extracts include site search criteria and weightings to enable identification of potential sites. You will note that the map that was produced included all sites identified through the process. It did not include Wallacia Golf Course due to the fact that in 2014 it was an operative golf course.

I would be grateful if you could provide a map of that land that Council referred to in the discussions as per your message below

Kind regards

DAVID HOY
REGIONAL DIRECTOR

T
D
[REDACTED]

**SHAPING
CITIES AND
COMMUNITIES**



LEVEL 23, DARLING PARK TOWER 2, 201 SUSSEX STREET
SYDNEY, NSW 2000, AUSTRALIA

Urbis recognises the traditional owners of the land on which we work.
Learn more about our [Reconciliation Action Plan](#).

This email and any files transmitted are for the intended recipient's use only. It contains information which may be confidential and/or protected by copyright. Any personal information in this email must be handled in accordance with the *Privacy Act 1988 (Cth)*. If you have received this email by mistake, please notify the sender and permanently delete the email. Any confidentiality or copyright is not waived or lost because this email has been sent to you by mistake.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 14 May 2018 5:34 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Catholic Cemeteries Trust discussion this morning

David,

I have made contact with a rep of Deerubbin LALC and tested their actual involvement or interest in involvement in the issue of Sydney’s planning and provision for cemeteries. They are aware of it and are open-minded. They are talking to one party in the industry as well as the GSC and DP&E. I will try to draw out of GSC where they fit into this and any role they could play.

They haven’t taken any binding strategic positions but they feel they may have land (up to 300 hectares) upon which they could consider such proposals. They see a range of benefits including partnering or skilling and employment of their community. They also feel that it could support government “sponsorship” of some of their aspirations for other land they have.

The person I spoke to was overseas and returns in the first week of June. He has offered to meet with me then.

We have also thought of other government owned sites that could be candidates. Some of these are commonwealth owned but under the city deal operating environment we have a somewhat more direct line of communication with them. I will pursue these.

Meanwhile, could you please send both an outline of the CCTrust’s site selection criteria and the list of other sites that are, arguably, candidates.

Thanks for today’s discussion. We will do what we can to find a way forward.

Craig Butler
Assistant General Manager



PO Box 60, PENRITH NSW 2751
www.visitpenrith.com.au
www.penrithcity.nsw.gov.au

PENRITH
CITY COUNCIL



Follow us



3 Study Criteria

The criteria applied in this study has been established having regard to the Catholic Cemeteries Board’s specific requirements in a site acquisition for potential cemetery development, as well as legislative requirements including specific controls stipulated in the current Liverpool Development Control Plan (DCP) 2008, and the proposed amendments as stated in Draft Amendment No. 36 (relating to minimum size of a cemetery development and location outside of a flood plain).

We have given each of the above criterion a particular ‘weighting’ based on the importance of that criterion. We have applied the following weighting to the criteria:

TABLE 1 – CRITERIA WEIGHTING

CRITERION NO.	CRITERION	WEIGHTING
1	Driving distance from the existing Kemps Creek Cemetery.	5%
2	Location in relation to proposed Badgerys Creek Airport (Western Sydney Airport) noise contours.	15%
3	Location in relation to flood planning areas or flood ways.	5%
4	Access to major road infrastructure.	5%
5	Size of the site.	5%
6	Appropriateness of the underlying zoning of the site.	15%
7	Current ownership structure of the site.	5%
8	Current use of the site (i.e. residential / enterprise).	5%
9	Topography of the site.	10%
10	Visibility of the site from the street frontage.	5%
11	Vegetation coverage of the site.	10%
12	Current improvements on the site.	5%
13	Development consents registered on the site.	10%
Total		100%

Of the sites identified in this research, some have met the requirement of a particular criterion better than other sites. Accordingly, for each site, we have applied a score of between 1 and 3 for each criterion, based on how well each site meets the requirements of the criteria. In our scoring;

- 1 = Unacceptable;
- 2 = May be acceptable; and
- 3 = Ideal.

For each criterion, we have defined ‘Unacceptable’, ‘May be acceptable’ and ‘Ideal’. We have provided these definitions overleaf.

TABLE 2 – CRITERIA SCORING

NO.	CRITERION	1 = UNACCEPTABLE	2 = MAY BE ACCEPTABLE	3 = IDEAL
1	Driving distance from the existing Kemps Creek Cemetery.	More than 30 kilometres	10 to 30 kilometres	Less than 10 kilometres
2	Location in relation to proposed Badgerys Creek Airport (Western Sydney Airport) noise contours.	Located wholly within the ANEF Noise Contours	Located partially within the ANEF Noise Contours	Not located within the ANEF Noise Contours
3	Location in relation to flood planning areas or flood ways.	Located wholly within a flood planning area	Located partially within a flood planning area	Not located within a flood planning area
4	Access to major road infrastructure.	Located on a local road, not in proximity to arterial road	Located on a local road, in close proximity to arterial road	Located on an arterial road
5	Size of the site.	Less than 40 Hectares or more than 200 Hectares	100 to 200 Hectares	40 to 100 Hectares
6	Appropriateness of the underlying zoning of the site.	Within a zoning that does not permit Cemetery use	Partially within a zoning that permits cemetery use	Wholly within a zoning that permits cemetery use
7	Current ownership structure of the site.	Multiple adjoining lots in different ownerships	Multiple adjoining lots in same ownership	One (1) lot in a single ownership
8	Current use of the site (i.e. residential / enterprise).	Substantial enterprise	Agriculture / poultry farm	Grazing / pasture / residence
9	Topography of the site.	Very steep topography	Very flat topography	Gently undulating topography
10	Visibility of the site from the street frontage.	Whole site is visible from street frontage	Part of the site is visible from street frontage	None of the site is visible from street frontage
11	Vegetation coverage of the site.	Completely timbered	Completely vacant and cleared	Partially timbered

NO.	CRITERION	1 = UNACCEPTABLE	2 = MAY BE ACCEPTABLE	3 = IDEAL
12	Current improvements on the site.	Substantial man made improvements which cannot be utilised	Minor improvements which may be utilised	No improvements
13	Development consents registered on the site.	N/A	N/A	Existing Development Consent for cemetery use

5 Results

The locations of the 31 identified sites are shown in the figure overleaf.

FIGURE 1 – LOCATION OF IDENTIFIED SITES

