



**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-993411

**INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT**

**RE: CROWN CEMETERY DEVELOPMENT VARROVILLE**

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

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

**DEPARTMENT OF  
PLANNING AND  
ENVIRONMENT:** **CHRIS RITCHIE**  
**SALLY MUNK**  
**KANE WINWOOD**

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

**DATE:** **8.57 AM, THURSDAY, 14 FEBRUARY 2019**

MS D. LEESON: So good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of land on which we meet and pay my respects to their elders, past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today on the two development applications from the Catholic Cemeteries Trust for cemetery  
5 proposals, one at Wallacia in the Penrith local government area and one at Varroville in the Campbelltown local government area. The Minister for Planning has delegated his functions to the Independent Planning Commission under section 2.4 of the Environmental Planning Assessment Act to assess these applications.

10 The Commission is responsible for the finalisation of the assessment of these applications prior to directing the Sydney Western City Planning Panel who are the consent authority to determine the 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  
15 Commission Secretariat. In the interests of openness 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.

20 This meeting is one part of the Commission's process of providing advice. It is 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're not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any  
25 additional information in writing which we will then put up on our website. We will now begin. Thank you and welcome again.

30 So if we can turn to the Varroville project first and we will spend some time going through that and then we will swap and go onto the Wallacia one. We have through Matthew and Diana provided you a list of some questions to get it started today, but we do have some additional questions that have come up between us. So we will go through those as well.

I would like to ask the first question, I think, which is probably an introduction to the process and I think we would like to understand in the terms of Varroville, a clear  
35 description of the changes from the original proposal what was lodged and what's now proposed and assessed by the department and so covering things around heritage, staging, layout, etcetera.

40 MS S. MUNK: So the - - -

MS LEESON: I'm sorry. If you could first off just introduce yourself for the transcript process and then George will be able to manage it from there on. Sorry, Sally.

45 MS MUNK: That's all right. So my name is Sally Munk from the Department of Planning. I have been the officer looking at the Varroville application on behalf of

the department. So in terms of the changes that have been made to that application, they primarily relate to issues that came up through the assessment with relation to noise and then also heritage matters. There hasn't been any sort of, what we would consider, a significant amendment to the application that would warrant any sort of  
5 formal procedural changes or matters to be undertaken, for example, under clause 55 of the Regulation. The changes have been made relate mostly to traffic flows within the site which reduce the amount of noise that would be impacting on the adjacent residents on St Andrews Road. There's a number of religious developments on the opposite side of the road - - -

10 MS LEESON: Yes.

MS MUNK: - - - and that raised some concerns with the development. So we've made some changes in negotiations with the applicant to the amount of traffic that  
15 would be travelling past those through changes to traffic flow - - -

MS LEESON: That's making - - -

20 MS MUNK: - - - within the development.

MS LEESON: - - - road access C a one way out.

MS MUNK: So access – yes. So access B which is their main entry point at the northern end of St Andrews Road is now an entry only. That was originally both an  
25 entry and an exit point. That is now entry only. Then again access C which is just further to the south alongside St Andrews Road which is quite close to the homestead – Varroville homestead driveway – is now an exit only. That was also originally an in and out access point. That is now an exit only. They will be allowed to use that  
30 access C during special occasions – sort of, special events where there are a significant amount of traffic expected where they would be able to split the traffic flow between access B and access C on those days. But that will only be on certain special religious ceremonies - - -

35 MS LEESON: Yes.

MS MUNK: - - - Mother's Day, Father's Day, that sort of thing, during the year.

MS LEESON: Okay.

40 MS MUNK: The other changes mostly relate to the outbuildings precinct - - -

MS LEESON: Yes.

45 MS MUNK: - - - which is the area of - - -

MR .....: Yes.

MS MUNK: - - - heritage buildings, yes, to the – adjacent to the homestead. So there was originally proposed a carpark in that area as well as a new toilet block building and the Heritage Council specifically raised concerns about those particular developments in that area in close proximity to the outbuildings precinct and it also  
5 lies within a no build area which are specified in the Campbelltown LEP where there's not to be any new structures in that area built other than those relating to a lawn cemetery. So we – the applicant has agreed to remove the carpark and they're going to incorporate the toilet block into the existing dairy building. So it will be a restoration and reconfiguration of that existing heritage building which the Heritage  
10 Council said will probably be okay, but they would obviously then be needed to provide some more detail around that.

MS LEESON: Just on that, and it comes to the question of staging, are there also amenities to be provided in stage 1 that would mean that the outbuildings precinct is  
15 not required earlier? I'm trying to – sorry.

MS MUNK: Yes. Yes.

MS LEESON: I'm trying to understand the staging and what might be needed to  
20 happen in the outbuildings precinct early on - - -

MS MUNK: Sure.

MS LEESON: - - - because there's a question around the loop road - - -  
25

MS MUNK: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - which will be used to access that.

MS MUNK: Okay. So figure 7 in the department's assessment report sets out the  
30 staging for the development. So originally it was a five staged development - - -

MS LEESON: Yes.

MS MUNK: - - - when it was lodged and as part of the final discussions we've had  
35 with the applicant when we were finalising our assessment, they've advised us that they've now changed it to a four stage development and that was as a result of just the market and what they believed would be required over the life of the development in terms of how they would progress the development across the site.  
40 So – yes. Stage 4 is where those outbuildings actually lie, and that new development would actually occur in terms of the toilet block and the loop road that goes in between the outbuildings and the homestead. What is part of stage 1, however, is just the restoration of those buildings. So there won't actually be any new development as part of stage 1, but the restoration of the outbuildings precinct will  
45 form part of stage 1.

MR A. PILTON: There wouldn't even a footpath going to the toilet block or anything?

MS MUNK: No. No.

5

MS LEESON: So they would be restored, but not used.

MS MUNK: They will be restored, but not used.

10 MR PILTON: Okay.

MS LEESON: Okay. So that access road issue or that loop road issue becomes - - -

MS MUNK: Doesn't - - -

15

MS LEESON: - - - a matter for later.

MS MUNK: That's correct. Yes. Not until stage 4.

20 MS LEESON: Okay. And that being the case, then there will be amenities on the stage 1 development.

MS MUNK: Yes. Yes. That would cater for the development of stage 1.

25 MS LEESON: Okay. Thank you. Perhaps, Ross, you want to explore the implications of the Heritage Council correspondence because that's where we're at – at the moment dealing with the heritage. We might as well deal with heritage first and then we can come to some of the other issues.

30 MR R. CARTER: Yes. And I guess in that sense, question 1 and 2 really flow together, so the practical implications of the current heritage listing proposal. But we've also had a substantial piece of advice from the Heritage Council on 29 November including recommendations of conditions, so I think if you, sort of, tell us how that relates and I guess the panel wants to turn its mind to well how our heritage  
35 issue is best dealt with on the site and how does that, sort of, interplay.

MS MUNK: Yes. So part of our assessment, we did consult with the Heritage Council on the application. The proposal to extend the heritage – the curtilage of the heritage listing to the homestead is obviously something that hasn't been determined  
40 yet, so it didn't form part of our consideration because it hasn't actually been made yet. So in terms of what accounted for the State Heritage listing as part of our assessment and our consideration purely relates to what is currently on the listing and on the register as on the day of our assessment being finalised. However, should that extension to the heritage curtilage be determined and approved and agreed to, it  
45 would cover obviously a significant portion of the site and figure 4 in our assessment report sets out the extent of that curtilage extension. It's in the red.

MS LEESON: Yes. Yes.

MS MUNK: So, as you can see, it does cover a significant portion of the site. So a key point to make is that if that curtilage is extended and it's listed on the State  
5 Heritage Register it doesn't preclude development of the site as a cemetery. It just means that it becomes an integrated development application and the consent authority would need to consult again with the Heritage Council because then they would be subject to an approval under the Heritage Act.

10 However, having said that, there are provisions that are made for certain activities where there are exemptions in place for, for example, maintenance activities, repair activities, and actually there is one specific exemption that relates to cemeteries – Burial Sites and Cemeteries, Exemption No. 14, which is – there's a schedule and I can provide the Commission with a copy of the publication.

15 MS LEESON: That's in the Heritage Act, is it?

MS MUNK: That is a public document put out by the Heritage Council which specifies all of the exemptions to what is required and what is not required in terms  
20 of a heritage approval. There is also - - -

MS LEESON: If we could get that, that would be appreciated. Thanks.

MS MUNK: Yes. Yes. I can send that – provide that to you. There is also  
25 provisions for where there is a conservation management plan in place, in which case for Varroville there is a conservation management plan that was prepared and submitted as part of the original planning proposal for the site and has been again submitted as part of this application. The Heritage Council may choose to waive the requirement for a heritage approval across the site but that the applicant would need  
30 to apply for that and that probably would be – it probably would be recommended that you discuss further more with the Heritage Council regarding exemptions and approvals and what specifically may be appropriate for this site being that I'm not a heritage expert. But there are publications that I can send you. There's two publications – one around exemptions and one around the approvals process that may  
35 assist with your consideration.

MS LEESON: Thank you. Yes, I think part of what we're trying to understand is whether the Heritage Council's response to the application covers off their concerns. So they seem to have addressed all of the issues raised in the application, looked at  
40 the response to their submission and given effectively – and taken into account the rural fire services, the submission, etcetera – taken that into account and seem to be accepting of the proposal just so long as those issues are conditioned in a consent.

MS MUNK: Yes, that's correct. So that correspondence that we received late last  
45 year on 29 November set out a number of issues that had been raised in their original correspondence. Then it had information around how the applicant had then addressed those and then the Heritage Council had specified whether or not they

agreed with the applicant's response and, if not, whether something specifically needed to be conditioned.

5 And I've provided the Commission – I can provide the Commission with sort of a cross-check table to show the issues that were raised by the Heritage Council and where in our commissions that we've recommended that those conditions be inserted into any consent. So we have addressed all of those matters raised by the Heritage Council and they have indicated to us that they – assuming the conditions are applied that they would be able to support the proposal.

10

MS LEESON: Yes.

15 MR C. RITCHIE: So Chris – Chris Ritchie, director of industry assessments. So for the Varroville project we knew that heritage was going to be a key issue. We had had discussions with Heritage in terms of the issues that they had raised. We had meetings with them and the project changes that Sally has outlined, a lot of that hasn't got to deal with addressing some of those heritage issues that the council had raised.

20 So Sally has explained in terms of the listing – should that occur – the process would then be more formalised in terms of having a heritage approval as an integrated development application. So we sort of knew that that would be an issue that we would have to consider but in terms of the decision not being made that our assessment proceeded on the basis that it wasn't an integrated approval at that time  
25 but, should it occur, it just means a formal approval from Heritage would be required.

MR CARTER: And it would be really handy to get that table – thanks, Sally.

30 MS LEESON: Yes. So we've seen the Heritage Council's own table which says if these things are picked up - - -

MS MUNK: Yes.

35 MS LEESON: - - - their concerns would be appropriately addressed.

MS MUNK: Yes.

40 MS LEESON: But if we can see your cross-referencing of that to the conditions - - -

MS MUNK: Yes, that's to show where those conditions are that - - -

MS LEESON: - - - that would be useful.

45 MS MUNK: Yes, to confirm we have picked up on all those requirements as supplied by the Heritage Council.

MS LEESON: Okay. Thank you. Adrian, have you got any questions on heritage while we're - - -

5 MR PILTON: Not really, no. Well, actually, yes. I mean, I'm trying to get my mind around sort of the interlink between the curtilage study and ours. The proponent's lawyers are pretty strong about the way we've got to do it either first or separately or – or at least together. I mean, what are all the planning implications of that – I mean, as far as you're concerned? I mean, do we look at it separately, do we look at them together, should we look at the curtilage study before we consider this  
10 or should we not look at the curtilage study.

MR RITCHIE: I think that's a matter - - -

15 MR PILTON: That makes sense.

MS LEESON: I think that's a matter for - - -

MR RITCHIE: That's a matter for the IPC.

20 MS LEESON: - - - the Commission and - - -

MR PILTON: For us, is it? Okay.

25 MS LEESON: - - - the Commission is dealing with the two projects or the two matters separately. So we can only – in my view we can only deal with what's in front of us at the moment.

MR PILTON: Okay. Yes.

30 MS LEESON: We understand from this figure 4 what the proposed curtilage expansion is.

MR PILTON: Yes.

35 MS LEESON: And I think, having regard to the Heritage Council's comments and that curtilage, we need to work through in our mind the implications of that.

MR PILTON: Okay.

40 MS LEESON: And I think this cross-checking issue that Sally has offered to provide – this cross-check table – will help us to some extent in that.

45 MR PILTON: Okay. Yes. One other little question – the vineyard area over here – I can't, to be honest, understand these drawings because I can't read the writing on the things – are they proposing graves on those venue terraces or are they left alone?

MS MUNK: I believe they're left alone but I might have to take that question on notice and confirm - - -

MR PILTON: And the extension of that is - - -

5

MS MUNK: - - - the detailed plans.

MR PILTON: Have you looked at any of the sort of archaeological implications of those terraces? Are they important?

10

MS MUNK: They do have heritage significance.

MR PILTON: Yes. Okay.

15 MS MUNK: So that has been accounted for in the assessment. Yes.

MR PILTON: I had better look through the heritage – yes.

MS LEESON: Yes.

20

MR PILTON: Thank you.

MS LEESON: Okay. In relation to the location of graves, there's said to be a 10 metre setback from the Varroville Homestead boundary of lawn graves. And then within a 50 to 100 metre distance from the boundary, headstones of, I think, 300 or 400 millimetres. Is the department satisfied that the 10 metre offset is sufficient to protect views from the Homestead – from the house?

25

MS MUNK: So obviously our assessment, we referred it to the Heritage Council and we've taken their advice in terms of the impacts from a heritage perspective and from their letter on 29 November they indicated they were satisfied, subject to the conditions they recommended in – included. We also, as part of our assessment, did do a visual impact assessment and we had asked the applicant to elaborate and provide additional analysis as part of our assessment, which they did provide, to show that the views to and from Varroville House across the site and then also from a number of key vantage points would be satisfactory - - -

30

35

MS LEESON: Okay.

40 MS MUNK: - - - and wouldn't have a detrimental impact on the rural and scenic landscape.

MS LEESON: We're doing a site visit next week and so we will be obviously having a look at that from our own perspective and we will look at – I think try and look at it from those various vantage points you picked up in the visual impact assessment.

45

MS MUNK: Yes.

MS LEESON: Okay.

5 MR CARTER: I just had one around operational noise and obviously there's a  
couple of very sensitive receivers but also I would assume that a cemetery  
environment is seen as being generally sort of sensitive for its own clients, in a sense,  
and I was just wondering if there had been any consideration – and I will ask the  
proponent this as well – about using a range of different sorts of appliances that are  
10 now becoming more available that are quite a lot quieter. So, you know, electrical  
appliances across a range of applications – just whether they had considered that and  
whether or not that would make a difference to – you know, to the noise levels,  
particularly from that sort of day-to-day operation perspective.

15 MS MUNK: Yes. I mean, it wasn't something that we considered to be so much of  
an issue. We do have an internal noise expert who reviewed the application that  
specifically looked at the noise assessment done by the applicant and their main  
concern was associated with the road traffic noise – that ongoing noise that would be  
throughout the day and that's why we've ended up making – and negotiating with the  
20 applicant for them to make these traffic flow amendments.

MS LEESON: To the internal roads.

MS MUNK: To the - - -  
25

MS LEESON: The access points.

MS MUNK: Yes, to the access points and how the traffic flows within the  
development to reduce the road traffic noise impacts. In terms of maintenance the  
30 advice that we received was more that those noises are not out of character with the  
existing rural environment where you would have, you know, a lot of maintenance  
activities going on on other properties around, including the properties across the  
road, most likely. And that those wouldn't be sustained activities; they would be at  
regular intervals and - - -

35 MR CARTER: Intermittent.

MS MUNK: - - - you know, intermittent.

40 MR CARTER: Okay.

MS MUNK: And we have made a specific recommendation in our conditions for  
the applicant to consult with specifically some of those religious developments  
across the road in terms of what respite periods may be appropriate for certain times  
45 of the day for those activities not to occur so they don't interfere with the adjacent  
developments.

MR RITCHIE: The other issue is the site is actually quite large in terms of setting back from some of those sensitive users but there is opportunity through those conditions to focus on maybe that sort of closer location along the road. But as you can sort of move back towards the property, I don't see that as being a key sort of  
5 noise contributor because it will be quite set back.

MR CARTER: Okay. So the traffic noise was the dominating issue. Yes.

MR RITCHIE: That's the predominant – that's the key - - -  
10

MS MUNK: For us it was the main - - -

MR RITCHIE: - - - the key predominant noise from the project. And that's why a lot of that focus on our assessment in terms of the changes was around that traffic  
15 noise.

MS LEESON: While we're talking about traffic, can you clarify for us the cumulative traffic analysis that was done. I struggled with it a little because I could interpret it that that traffic assessment was looking at future development should St  
20 Andrews Road be taken further and I wanted to be clear about whether it's assuming that the cemetery development, if approved, would be responsible for cumulative traffic, taking into account those other developments and, therefore, intersection improvements.

MS MUNK: So - - -  
25

MS LEESON: Or whether it's related only to traffic generated by the cemetery proposal.

MS MUNK: So the assessment that was done to support the application originally didn't look at traffic associated with the special events like special religious occasions and Mother's Day, Father's Day, and it didn't look far enough into the future. So council had requested that they go away and do an additional analysis which they did do as part of their response to submissions which is where we picked  
35 up on the assessment. So as part of that second assessment that they did, they did look at the additional traffic generated during special occasions and then they also did a projection of what the traffic would be into the future for a period of about 20 years to the year 2038 and that looks at what is currently existing.

They look at what the projection is based on the generation from the proposed development and then they have to consider also – the cumulative traffic impact has to also consider other potential developments that may occur. Now, in the particular area where Varroville is proposed there is a lot of development to the north of new subdivisions and there is the potential for St Andrews Road to be linked up to  
45 Camden Valley Way to the north but at this point in time no one actually knows if that's going to happen or not.

So RMS raise concern that there was – it was very difficult for the applicant to be able to assess accurately beyond about – or they indicated 60 years in their submission but really council was looking at only about a 20 year timeframe – what was really going to be happening in that area into the future. So what we have suggested in our conditions and recommended in our conditions is that every 10 years the applicant re-look at traffic, both construction and operational traffic, and see is it verifying against what they predicted in their analysis that they've done for this application; does that align with what the predictions showed; is there actually needs for upgrades; did the predictions underestimate or overestimate what the traffic generation was going to be?

MS LEESON: Of their own activity.

MS MUNK: Not so much of their own activity. I think they probably would be able to be, you know, probably more accurate around that. It's more about what's happening in the area because it's a bit of an unknown in terms of how much more development might happen in the area and whether that connection of St Andrews Road to the north is going to happen. So every 10 years, they would reassess and verify and check where they're at with their traffic impacts.

MS LEESON: Okay.

MS MUNK: Where it shows that their development is actually the cause of the level of service of key intersections to be reduced, then they would be – or roads to be, you know, dilapidated or in need of upgrading, then they would be responsible for upgrading that, and they - - -

MS LEESON: That's the clarification I was seeking - - -

MS MUNK: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - that they would be responsible essentially only for an impact that they had generated - - -

MS MUNK: That they had generated.

MS LEESON: - - - not for the impact of cumulative other development - - -

MS MUNK: No.

40

MR RITCHIE: That's - - -

MS LEESON: - - - further to the north.

45 MS MUNK: No.

MR RITCHIE: And that's not their responsibility. So - - -

MS LEESON: No.

MS MUNK: That's not their - - -

5 MS LEESON: No.

MS MUNK: If it - - -

MR RITCHIE: And - - -

10 MS LEESON: And that's what – it wasn't quite clear in - - -

MR RITCHIE: It is - - -

15 MS LEESON: - - - the document.

MR RITCHIE: The condition is worded like that, that basically if it shows that they're the cause, then they will be responsible - - -

20 MS MUNK: Yes, there would need - - -

MR RITCHIE: - - - for any upgrades.

MS MUNK: - - - to be a nexus between the development - - -

25 MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MS MUNK: - - - and that need - - -

30 MS LEESON: Yes.

MS MUNK: - - - for an upgrade - - -

MS LEESON: Yes, thank you. Yes. No, thanks. That's - - -

35 MS MUNK: - - - for them having – to be bearing the cost of that upgrade.

MS LEESON: That's the clarification - - -

40 MR RITCHIE: Because there is - - -

MS LEESON: - - - I was looking for.

MR RITCHIE: - - - particularly also not just to the north but to the west, there's a

45 lot of development that's happening, new estates and a large residential expansion.

MS LEESON: Okay. Okay. We've talked about heritage, and I don't think – I mean, we were trying to clarify whether the applicant had had access to the Curtilage Study or not. I think we're assuming – well, our understanding is that they haven't had access to the Curtilage Study.

5

MS MUNK: That's - - -

MS LEESON: Is that your understanding?

10 MS MUNK: Yes, our understanding is that they haven't.

MS LEESON: Yes, okay. Thanks.

15 MR CARTER: Just to go back onto the groundwater issues. So at Wallacia, there was quite a lot of discussion around standing groundwater levels, and I just want to move onto that in a moment. But I guess it just raised the question about whether there was a similar issue at Varroville and whether or not any thought had been given to conditions around that or does the site not have the same - - -

20 MS MUNK: It doesn't have the same sort of - - -

MS LEESON: It doesn't have the same.

25 MS MUNK: - - - groundwater conditions.

MS LEESON: Okay.

MS MUNK: There's no standing groundwater and no aquifer present under the site.

30 MR CARTER: Okay.

35 MS LEESON: Okay. We've then had a look at the draft conditions that the department has prepared and had a couple of clarifications, I suppose, to raise with you. The first one was around condition 6 which to my reading applied only to the loop road between stages 3 and 4, and I was wondering whether, in fact, that might be required to apply to all of the roads.

40 MS MUNK: Yes, so we have broken up our conditions into how they relate to each issue. There is a separate section just on bushfire, and within that, there is a condition, number 45, that we've recommended - - -

MS LEESON: Okay.

45 MS MUNK: - - - that says that:

*All roads must comply with the Planning for Bushfire Protection Requirements.*

So - - -

MS LEESON: Okay. Yes.

5 MS MUNK: It's - - -

MS LEESON: Yes.

10 MS MUNK: The condition 6 which talks about a loop road, it's really just reiterating that it would also need to comply with it. So it's a bit of a double-up, I suppose - - -

MS LEESON: Yes. Okay.

15 MS MUNK: - - - in terms of reiterating that the RFS requirements must be satisfied - - -

MS LEESON: That 45 will pick it up.

20 MS MUNK: - - - as well, and 45 picks it up as well.

MS LEESON: Thanks.

25 MR RITCHIE: And just to clarify, we thought it would assist the IPC to – as we were writing the assessment report, if there were thoughts or conditions that we thought might be important for the consent authority to include, we included those as an appendix to our report. The consent authority will still have to condition things they see as being relevant. There were ideas and thoughts in terms of what we saw as important coming out of our assessment. So, as Sally has explained, as we've  
30 gone through the issues, we've recommended conditions in there. There might be others that the IPC or the panel would also consider as important as well.

35 MS LEESON: Yes. Okay. Thanks. And then there are a couple of others that I think we've given you the benefit of having a look at in terms of the 10-metre setback - - -

MS MUNK: Yes.

40 MS LEESON: - - - and the rationale for that.

MS MUNK: So in terms of the 10-metre setback and that 50 to 100 metre zone for the headstones, they're quite clearly specified and shown on the landscape plans that were submitted as part of the package of drawings as part of the application. So we didn't consider it necessary to then also condition that as a restriction.

45 MS LEESON: Okay. All right. Thank you. And condition 14, cumulative traffic impacts, I think we've - - -

MR RITCHIE: Discussed, yes.

MS MUNK: We've covered off on that one.

5 MS LEESON: - - - discussed already.

MS MUNK: Yes.

10 MS LEESON: Okay. Ross, was there anything else on Varroville that you wanted to explore this morning?

MR CARTER: No.

15 MS LEESON: No.

MR PILTON: I had a couple of queries.

MS LEESON: Adrian.

20 MR PILTON: I think I read somewhere in here in your assessment about the – that you weren't keen on tree-lined roads and things - - -

MS MUNK: Yes.

25 MR PILTON: - - - because it was against the landscape pattern. Has anything been done about that? Has that been taken anywhere or is that a condition or - - -

MS MUNK: There is a condition that specifies - - -

30 MR PILTON: Okay.

MS MUNK: - - - that they're not to have those linear street planting and avenue plantings. It's actually a condition that was recommended by the Heritage Council  
- - -  
35

MR PILTON: Yes.

MS MUNK: - - - specifically that we've included to ensure that happens.

40 MR PILTON: Okay. What's the other one I had? And slope stability: it seems to be pretty vague in here. Is there any – I can't tell from these drawings about the earthworks. Are there any major earthworks that might raise any concern about slope stability or - - -

45 MS MUNK: Look, they have done an analysis of slope stability, and they've provided technical reports to support those assessments. They are proposing to do some works to a number of the dams around the site, and they've looked at the

stability of those as well. So we didn't – council didn't raise any concerns in their request for information to the applicant after their assessment of the original application, and we didn't see it as a key issue - - -

5 MR PILTON: Okay.

MS MUNK: - - - for our assessment.

10 MR PILTON: Okay. What else did I have? I don't think I've got anything else at the moment really.

MS LEESON: Just – thanks, Adrian. Just on – you say council's initial assessment. I'm not sure that I've seen council's initial assessment report. Have – has the department?

15 MS MUNK: So for Varroville, the point at which the application came to us was soon after the council had exhibited the application. They then sent out a letter – I think it was 29 May, from memory – requesting additional information from the applicant. They never actually wrote an assessment report - - -

20 MS LEESON: Right.

MS MUNK: - - - because it wasn't progressed far enough down the assessment process.

25 MS LEESON: Okay.

MS MUNK: So for Varroville, there was no council assessment report. There's only a request for information letter which we have been provided with.

30 MS LEESON: Okay. Thank you. Well, we're meeting with council next week. So we will be able to explore their concerns and issues with them. Do you know, given that they exhibited the proposal, whether they received submissions?

35 MS MUNK: Yes, they did receive submissions.

MS LEESON: They – sorry. They did receive submissions, but have you seen those submissions?

40 MS MUNK: Yes, so when we first received the application, we requested all of the relevant documents from Campbelltown City Council, and that included all of the relevant submissions from the public as well as the agencies that they had consulted with.

45 MS LEESON: Okay. Because we're obviously concerned to make sure that we see all of the submissions and have good regard to those as we do our considerations. So we will follow up - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes. So we're - - -

MS LEESON: We are on Wallacia still trying to get public submissions loaded.

5 MR RITCHIE: Yes. So we're equally the same. So we obtain information from council - - -

MS LEESON: Yes.

10 MR RITCHIE: - - - any submissions they received. We went and visited the site in September. We considered responses to those submissions, other information provided by the applicant as part of our assessment.

MS LEESON: Okay. No. Thanks. I mean, I know you've made reference to them.  
15

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MS LEESON: And they can – you know, they're grouped together in terms of the Carmelites and the immediate stakeholders.  
20

MR RITCHIE: Yes. Yes. Yes.

MS LEESON: Do you know if there were broader submissions from further afield?

25 MS MUNK: We didn't actually do a geographical analysis.

MS LEESON: Okay.

MS MUNK: So if you would like to know where they all came from more specifically, I would need to take that on notice.  
30

MS LEESON: We can perhaps ask Campbelltown for that. If they don't have that information, we might come back - - -

35 MR RITCHIE: Sure.

MS LEESON: - - - to you for that if that's all right.

MS MUNK: Sure. Okay.  
40

MS LEESON: Okay. Terrific.

MR PILTON: May I just ask one more question. Condition 49 is saying about 36 hectares should be provided as publically accessible passive open space. What  
45 actually did you have in mind? Is it sort of that's okay to walk around the graveyard, and is that the idea?

MS MUNK: Yes, so the application actually proposes that 36 hectares as part of the proposal. It wasn't something that we specifically required. The character of the development is not specifically only just for graves and that. It's actually supposed to encourage people to come and experience a parkland environment as well and for the public to be able to utilise it as a public open space area with paths and walkways and - - -

MR PILTON: Yes.

10 MS MUNK: - - - other facilities, a playground.

MR PILTON: So there's nothing specific. It's just there will be - - -

MS MUNK: It's - - -

15 MR PILTON: - - - 36 hectares at least.

MS MUNK: There will be - - -

20 MR PILTON: Yes, at least.

MS MUNK: - - - 36 hectares. It's really just reiterating what they had - - -

MR PILTON: Okay.

25 MS MUNK: - - - committed to and said they would do in their application. We wanted to make sure that that was to be delivered.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

30 MS LEESON: Thank you. Nothing further from you, Ross?

MR CARTER: Nothing further.

35 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR CARTER: That's it.

MS LEESON: Is that all right for you, Adrian?

40 MR PILTON: Yes, that's fine.

MS LEESON: Okay.

45 MR PILTON: Thank you.

MS LEESON: Well, thank you for that. If that's then the wrap-up of our questions this morning on Varroville, we will turn to Wallacia.

5 **RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**[9.32 am]**