

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

MACARTHUR MEMORIAL PARK

URBIS STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS REPORT WERE:

Director	David Hoy
Senior Consultant	Cameron Nixon, Kate Ryan
Job Code	SA7399
Version	Final

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	4
1.1.	Overview	4
1.2.	Structure of this Report	4
1.3.	Purpose of this report.....	4
1.4.	Reference Drawing and Supporting Documentation	4
2.	Campbelltown City Council	6
2.1.	Heritage	6
2.2.	Traffic	9
2.3.	Stormwater.....	10
2.4.	Vegetation Removal/Land Slip Risk	11
2.5.	Landscape Design Response	11
2.6.	Acoustic	11
2.7.	Bushfire	13
2.8.	Contamination	13
2.9.	Flora and Fauna.....	14
2.10.	Tree Assessment Report	16
2.11.	Vegetation Management Plan	17
2.12.	Landscape Species Plan	17
2.13.	Landscape Masterplan.....	18
2.14.	Public Art Strategy	18
2.15.	Additional Information	18
3.	Agency Submissions.....	20
3.1.	Heritage Council of NSW;	20
3.2.	NSW Roads and Maritime Services	20
3.3.	NSW Rural Fire Service.....	21
3.4.	NSW Department of Industry – Water	21
4.	Public Submissions.....	22
4.1.	Submissions in Objection	22
5.	Conclusion	30
Disclaimer	31	

Appendix A	Amended Landscape PLans
Appendix B	Amended Civil Engineering Plans
Appendix C	Landscape Design Report
Appendix D	Interpretation Strategy Report
Appendix E	Public Art Plan
Appendix F	Landslip Report
Appendix G	Dam Stability Assessment
Appendix H	Remediation Action Plan
Appendix I	Traffic Impact Assessment
Appendix J	Acoustic Assessment
Appendix K	Bushfire Report
Appendix L	Flora and Fauna Report
Appendix M	Tree Report
Appendix N	Vegetation Management Plan
Appendix O	Watercourse Assessment

Appendix P Finishes Schedule

TABLES:

Table 1 – Additional Consultant Documentation	5
Table 2 – Response to Heritage Items raised by CCC	6
Table 3 – Response to Traffic Items raised by CCC	9
Table 4 –Response to Stormwater Items raised by CCC.....	10
Table 5 – Response to Vegetation Removal/Land Slip Risk items raised by CCC.....	11
Table 6 – Response to Landscape Design Reponse item raised by CCC.....	11
Table 7 – Response to Acoustic Items raised by CCC	11
Table 8 – Response to Bushfire Items raised by CCC	13
Table 9 – Response to Contamination Items raised by CCC.....	13
Table 10 – Response to Flora and Fauna Items raised by CCC.....	14
Table 11 – Response to Tree Assessment Items raised by CCC	16
Table 12 – Response to Vegetation Management Plan items raised by CCC.....	17
Table 13 – Response to Landscape Species Plan items raised by CCC	17
Table 14 – Response to Landscape Masterplan items raised by CCC.....	18
Table 15 – Response to Additional Information items raised by CCC	18
Table 16 – Response to NSW Roads and Maritime Services.....	20
Table 17 – Response to the Scenic Hills Association Submission	22
Table 18 – Response to Varro Ville House Owners Submission	23
Table 19 – Response to the Discalced Carmelite Nuns Submission	24
Table 20 – National Trust of Australia Submission	26
Table 21 – Response to Additional Items raised by public submissions.....	27

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. OVERVIEW

This Response to Submissions Report has been prepared on behalf of the Catholic Metropolitan Cemeteries Trust (**CMCT**), the proponent for the Development Application referred to as 3293/2017/DA-C for the Macarthur Memorial Park. The application was lodged with Campbelltown City Council (**CCC**) on 17 October 2017 and seeks approval for the construction and use of a new cemetery and parklands at 166-176 St Andrew Road Varroville.

The application was placed on public exhibition on 07 November 2017 and following its conclusion, CCC issued correspondence dated 29 May requesting that the applicant respond to a series of additional information requests. On 04 June 2018 the NSW Minister for Planning delegated the matter to the Independent Planning Commission (**IPC**). Following an initial review of the application the IPC requested that the NSW Department of Planning and Environment (**DPE**) undertake the formal assessment of the application. The DPE has subsequently requested the proponent to respond to the matters raised by CCC in its correspondence dated 29 May 2018.

This report provides a comprehensive response to each of the issues raised both by DPE as well as the submissions received during the public exhibition, with the provision of additional justification and technical information where relevant. All plans and attachments listed as Appendixes of this document were submitted separately to the DPE in a corresponding numbered format as laid out on Table 1 below on 18 September 2018.

Amendments to the proposal to respond to key issues and amended mitigation measures have also been provided and are documented in this report

1.2. STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT

This Response to Submissions Report is structured as follows:

- Section 2 – Campbelltown City Council: Provides a response to key issues raised following the assessment undertaken by CCC, as outlined in the correspondence dated 18 December 2015.
- Section 3 - Agency Submissions: Provides a summary of the issues raised in the agency submissions and a response to each of these, including provision of additional or amended technical information as appropriate.
- Section 4 – Public Submissions: provides a response to the items raised by the public during the public notification of the application.
- Section 5 - Conclusion.

1.3. PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

This report has been prepared to provide a consolidated response to all information requests and public submissions received regarding the Development Application for the Macarthur Memorial Park.

In the interest of clarity, we note that significant portions of this document have been submitted to the DPE to allow for the assessment of the application to progress whilst additional technical studies were finalised.

1.4. REFERENCE DRAWING AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

This Response to Submissions is supported by the following technical studies listed in the appendices of this report and as submitted separately to the DPE on the 18th of September as discussed above. This information is intended to supersede and/or supplement those originally lodged in October 2017. All other consultant reports remain unchanged from the original Statement of Environmental Effects.

Table 1 – Additional Consultant Documentation

Requirement	Prepared By	Reference
Amended Landscape Plans	FJLA	A
Amended Civil Engineering Plans	Warren Smith and Partners	B
Landscape Design Report	FJLA	C
Interpretation Strategy Report	FJLA	D
Public Art Plan	FJLA	E
Landslip Report	JK Geotechnics	F
Dam Stability Assessment	JK Geotechnics	G
Remediation Action Plan	Environmental Investigation Services	H
Traffic Impact Assessment	The Transport Planning Partnership	I
Acoustic Assessment	Acoustic Studios	J
Bushfire Report	Travers Ecology	K
Flora and Fauna Report	Travers Ecology	L
Tree Report	Travers Ecology	M
Vegetation Management Plan	Travers Ecology	N
Watercourse Assessment	Travers Ecology	O
Finishes Schedule	FJMT	P

2. CAMPBELLTOWN CITY COUNCIL

2.1. HERITAGE

Table 2 – Response to Heritage Items raised by CCC

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>1. Insufficient details of proposed landscape furniture have been provided to properly assess the impact of the proposal on heritage values of the site and adjoining Varroville State Heritage Item;</p>	<p>Proposed landscape furniture (seating, drinking fountains and water stations) within the park is described in the Landscape Design Response report (LDR) on pages 72-74 and 77-79.</p> <p>These elements are small and unlikely to impact on the heritage value of the site. The furniture within the Outbuilding precinct consist of monolithic square concrete blocks (2 x 2m), recessive in the landscape and randomly positioned (shown as white rectangles on the enlargement/plan on page 44 of the Interpretation Strategy report). They may be adorned with decorative patterns on the concrete faces to contribute to the site's Heritage Interpretation.</p>
<p>2. The proposed access road (Road No. 11), toilet block and car park area should all be relocated as currently these structures are located within the 'No build' area designated to reduce the impact to the Sate Heritage Register Listed Item – Varroville Homestead. This area is highly significant as part of the wider landscape of the homestead and any new structures, and specifically a car park in this area, will affect that relationship and significance;</p>	<p>The "no build area" is detailed for the site under Clause 7.7 (3) of the CLEP2015 states that the eastern portion of the development is <i>not capable of accommodating development other than a lawn cemetery and associated fencing.</i></p> <p>For the purpose of the CLEP2015 lawn cemetery is defined as:</p> <p><i>a cemetery in which monuments and grave markers memorialising the interment of deceased persons do not extend above natural ground level.</i></p> <p>Cemetery is defined by the CLEP2015 as</p> <p><i>a building or place used primarily for the interment of deceased persons or pets or their ashes, whether or not it contains an associated building for conducting memorial services.</i></p> <p>The proposed structures within the area does not alter the place as a whole being used for the interment of deceased persons.</p> <p>The road, carpark and toilets are proposed to allow for access by the public to the restored out buildings to ensure that this heritage can be retained and celebrated.</p>
<p>3. The proposed road width and verges are excessive and intrusive within wider Varroville landscape;</p>	<p>The proposed road widths and verges have been proposed to allow for emergency vehicle access throughout the site and has been designed following significant discussion with the Rural Fire Service. Further narrowing of the road is not feasible whilst considering the access needs of the site. It is considered that the reduction in road width and verges would preclude the efficient and safe operation of the site.</p>

Information Request	Proponent Response
	<p>We further note that the road network has been proposed to minimise cut and fill associated with the road network to allow for the preservation of the existing landscape.</p>
<p>4. The proposed Access C is too close to the existing driveway for Varroville Homestead and should be relocated further away;</p>	<p>Access Point C could not feasibly be moved to the west of the site without impacting on the riparian aspects of the site. The relocation of the road to the east would result in the access point impacting on Access Point D.</p> <p>The location of Access Point C is in accordance with the masterplan identified by the Conservation Management Plan which is endorsed for the site under Clause 7.8A of the CLEP2015.</p>
<p>5. The loop road (road No. 10) connected to Road No. 3 from proposed Access C should be redesigned as a pedestrian walkway to reduce the amount of hardstand close to Varroville homestead;</p>	<p>The location of road number 10 is in accordance with the masterplan identified by the Conservation Management Plan which is endorsed for the site under Clause 7.8A of the CLEP2015.</p> <p>The redesign as a pedestrian walkway is inconsistent with the road network of the Macarthur Memorial Park as a whole.</p>
<p>6. To minimise the impact of the proposal on the heritage significance of Varroville House and its curtilage, you are requested to consider amending the DA to include a greater 'buffer' zone surrounding Varroville House where no gravesites, walking paths, roads, car parks, picnic areas or any other works, structure or activities would be permitted other than perhaps landscaping complementary to the landscaping surrounding Varroville House;</p>	<p>The 10m setback to Varroville House has been proposed following consideration of the burial typology. As lawn burial is proposed to the north, east and west of Varroville House the overall impact on the heritage of the site is considered to be minor which would not be impacted on by additional setbacks. The low headstones proposed to the south of Varroville House benefits from landscaping the visual impact of which is again considered minor which would not benefit from an additional setback.</p>
<p>7. Additional information is required demonstrating how the proposed development is consistent with Clause 7.7(3) of CLEP 2015 as the proposal includes car parking structures, toilet facilities, sculptures between 2-5m high, shelters, bird hides, water stations and a soil depot within the "No Build" area designated by the LEP;</p>	<p>Clause 7.7 (3) of the CLEP2015 states that the eastern portion of the development is <i>not capable of accommodating development other than a lawn cemetery and associated fencing.</i></p> <p>For the purpose of the CLEP2015 lawn cemetery is defined as:</p> <p><i>a cemetery in which monuments and grave markers memorialising the interment of deceased persons do not extend above natural ground level.</i></p> <p>Cemetery is defined by the CLEP2015 as</p> <p><i>a building or place used primarily for the interment of deceased persons or pets or their ashes, whether or not it contains an associated building for conducting memorial services.</i></p> <p>In accordance with the land use definition prescribed by the CLEP the primary use of the place will be for the internment of deceased persons. In accordance with this clause all monuments and grave markers memorialising the interment of deceased persons in the eastern portion of the site is restricted to flush</p>

Information Request	Proponent Response
	<p>lawn plaques which will not extend above the natural ground level</p> <p>We note that no sculptures are proposed within the no build area. The remaining facilities do not detract from the place being used for the internment of deceased persons and are directly associated with this use by allowing mourners to use the site.</p>
<p>8. A preliminary structural impact assessment on Varroville House and associated structures must be submitted addressing all proposed works in proximity to this State Heritage Item;</p>	<p>The physical development that comprises Varroville House is located approximately 70m from the proposed development site with no significant works located within 100m of Varroville House. The request for a preliminary structural assessment is considered to be an unnecessary requirement for the purpose of a Development Application.</p>
<p>9. Further details must be provided in respect of the intended future use of the restored heritage buildings (i.e. the Outbuildings Precinct) noting that the HIS indicates use for "educational purposes" although CLEP 2015 only permits use of this part of the land for lawn cemetery and fencing;</p>	<p>The outbuildings are proposed to be restored in accordance with the architectural plans submitted as part of the Development Application and used for interpretive purposes by allowing the public to access the facilities. This is no intention for the site to operate as an educational establishment.</p>
<p>10. Additional Visual Impact Assessment is required specifically addressing the views to and from Varroville Homestead at 196 St Andrews Road and how they will be impacted by the proposed development. In particular, the additional assessment should consider views between the Homestead and other areas of heritage significance within the Site (such as the western dams, vineyard and other trenching areas and former driveway) as well as between the Homestead and other vantage points such as Sunbury Curran and the views/vistas as identified by the Conservation Management Plan.</p> <p>The Visual Impact Assessment should include all proposed structures (e.g. cafe, function centre, headstones, roads, water stations, shelters, sculptures, etc) to ascertain whether views will be obscured by these structures.</p> <p>In addition, assessment of impacts of the proposed landscaping across the Site is required to ascertain the impact on views as well as the overall setting of the Homestead and associated heritage features of the site when viewed from within and from outside of the Site.</p>	<p>The CMCT has made multiple requests to the owner of Varroville House to allow photomontages to be prepared when viewed from Varroville House. These requests have been denied by the sites owner.</p> <p>The existing Visual Impact Assessment has considered the effect of the proposed built structures and the proposed landscape on the site, on views to Varroville House.</p>

2.2. TRAFFIC

Table 3 – Response to Traffic Items raised by CCC

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>1. Peak Visitation Periods and Cumulative Impacts</p> <p>The Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) does not consider potential traffic generation during special holidays and All Saints Day. Nor does it consider the cumulative traffic impacts on the road network from visitors as well as the potential traffic generation from funerals, especially when the burial plot capacity increases over the various stages of construction. An amended TIA that considers these peaks and cumulative impacts is required prior to determination of the DA.</p>	<p>Additional traffic modelling has been undertaken by TTPP to address Council’s comments (Appendix I). The study assumes a trip increase of 20% in the site’s traffic generation for the weekday holidays and a 25% increase for the weekend peak for special public holidays (such as Mother’s Day, Father’s Day and All Souls Day).</p> <p>The supplementary traffic modelling models for a future case scenario taking into account visitor trip generation as well as funeral trip generation when burial capacity has increased with time. The study models the cumulative traffic impacts at the year 2038.</p>
<p>2. Intersection Analyses</p> <p>The TIA only models the impact of the proposal on one intersection and this is insufficient to assess the impacts of the proposed development. A revised TIA must be submitted which assesses the following intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Andrews Road / Campbelltown Road (NB: the RMS has indicated that there are no current plans to extend St Andrews Road to Camden Valley Way); • Spitfire Drive / Thunderbolt Drive; • Spitfire Drive/ Raby Road; and Raby Road / Thunderbolt Drive. <p>In addition, further information regarding the forecast split of traffic using the four proposed Site Access points must be submitted and if necessary, all access points should be modelled.</p> <p>All intersections shall be modelled in SIDRA with all assumptions included in the revised TIA report. Modelling is to be based on at least a 20-year design horizon with respect to background growth. Background growth estimates shall be obtained in discussion with Council as Council has a traffic model and recent traffic data which may be of assistance.</p> <p>A digital copy of all SIDRA modelling files must be provided for further investigation by Council.</p>	<p>The supplementary traffic modelling report at Appendix I provides an assessment of the traffic impacts of the proposal on the additional requested intersections.</p> <p>The supplementary modelling provides the forecasted split of trips for the four proposed vehicle access points.</p> <p>SIDRA modelling has been undertaken for the following scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Conditions • Post Development (incl. traffic generation on special holidays) • Year 2038 (without Development) • Year 2038 Post Development (incl. traffic generation on special holidays). <p>The modelling results indicate that the proposed development would have a minor impact to the study intersections with performance levels generally consistent. Overall it is considered that any capacity constraints would not be the result of the Macarthur Memorial Park.</p>
<p>3. Sight Distances</p> <p>The TIA indicates that all new Site access driveways will not comply with the Austroads required Sight Distances and will require relocation of the boundary treatments and trimming/ removal of the roadside vegetation. However, no details in this regard have been submitted as part of the DA.</p>	<p>Drawing C8.01 of the amended Civil Engineering plans attached as Appendix B provides information on relevant sightlines from Access A including extent of vegetation trimming/removal. As it is a proposed maintenance access, utilisation will be low. The Safe Intersection Sight Distance is achieved on the southbound approach. The majority of movements at this intersection are envisaged to be right turn movements entering the cemetery and</p>

Information Request	Proponent Response
Further details regarding the extent of vegetation and boundary treatment amendments is required prior to determination of the DA and this may necessitate amended architectural, landscape and civil engineering plans.	left turn movements exiting the cemetery as it is anticipated all maintenance vehicles will be coming from the Hume Motorway/Campbelltown direction. Drawing C8.01 of the amended Civil Engineering plans attached as Appendix B provides information on relevant sightlines from Access C including extent of vegetation trimming/removal. This access may be limited to left in/left out movements as it is the first intersection people will encounter coming from the residential area and therefore motorists may use it in preference to the main Access B.
2.4 Road Widening Insufficient details have been provided with regard to the proposed design for Access B including details of impact on trees, drainage and whether any localised road widening is required.	The supplementary Civil Engineering Plans prepared by Warren Smith and Partners and attached as Appendix B detail the localised road widening at Access Road B. The plans also detail the required vegetation trimming and removal. Drainage will be unaffected in this location, as confirmed in the supplementary plans at Appendix B .

2.3. STORMWATER

Table 4 –Response to Stormwater Items raised by CCC

Information Request	Proponent Response
1. Chapel Location The proposed Chapel straddles an existing overland flow path. Site inspection of the small headwater catchment located in the adjoining Council land showed evidence of significant Hewlettian (saturation excess) flow, as well as interflow, contributing to overland flow. The soil layer hydraulic conductivities provided in the Soil Landscapes of the Wollongong Port Hacking 1: 100,000 sheet would be expected to result in significant Hewlettian flow in the right circumstances. In this regard the hydrologic model used to generate overland flow only accounts for Hortonian (infiltration excess) flow. Hewlettian flow can be dominant in small headwater catchments such as the subcatchments draining to the road above the Chapel. This possibility and how overland flow can be diverted away from the Chapel must be addressed in an amended Flood Assessment.	Whilst it is acknowledged that Hewlettian flow may be occurring at the site, by definition, should a flood event occur, this method of flow generation will be minor relative to overland flow. As such, the design put in place by Warren Smith & Partners, will function to divert the flow such that it is controlled and drained in an orderly fashion. Hence, regardless of its origin (whether Hewlettian or Hortonian), flow will not reach the chapel. The design consists of a swale and kerb and gutter system on Road 1 north (and upstream) of the Chapel. This is shown the amended civil engineering plans (Drawing C7.01- Stormwater Layout Plan) attached as Appendix B of this report.
2. Technical Information Required The following technical information is required: 1.The TUFLOW model developed for the proposal must be submitted to Council. The model should show results of the full range of rainfall events considered for the study, the minimum duration of rainfall event should be 15minutes. The Max files	The TUFLOW model and MUSIC model have been submitted electronically in conjunction with this report. The respective models demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Campbelltown Development Control Plan.

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>must be sent with the model results. The results layers should be readable in MapInfo.</p> <p>2.The MUSIC model is required to be submitted for review.</p>	

2.4. VEGETATION REMOVAL/LAND SLIP RISK

Table 5 – Response to Vegetation Removal/Land Slip Risk items raised by CCC

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>1. Insufficient information has been submitted to properly assess the risk of land slip in areas of moderate and high stability risk, particularly in regard to the extensive revegetation works proposed, which are not referred to in the Stability Assessment. An amended Stability Assessment and an amended Vegetation Management Plan are required providing detailed recommendations in regard to vegetation removal and replanting areas, practices and timeframes and drainage control.</p> <p>Furthermore, additional information is required to assess the stability of the existing dams and if necessary, detailed recommendations for suitable stability measures must be prepared.</p>	<p>An additional land slip assessment has been prepared for the application by JK Geotechnics and is attached as Appendix F of the report with an amended Vegetation Management Plan provided as Appendix N of this report.</p> <p>A Geotechnical Assessment has been undertaken by JK Geotechnics and is attached as Appendix G of this report. The assessment has confirmed that without immediate improvement it is likely that a breach could occur at any moment.</p> <p>The proposed development will seek to undertake the appropriate works to facilitate the improvement of the embankments in a matter which will ensure the long term safety of the environment.</p>

2.5. LANDSCAPE DESIGN RESPONSE

Table 6 – Response to Landscape Design Reponse item raised by CCC

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>1. The Landscape Design Response (LDR) does not include the presence of Picton Soil Landscape at the north western vegetated part of the site which has limitations of steep slopes, mass movement (slump) hazard, water erosion hazard, localised shallow soils, localised surface movement potential; some impermeable and highly plastic subsoils. There are localised soil erosion tunnels and rills on the ephemeral drainage lines on the site which needs to be carefully managed in the VMP and remediated on the site.</p>	<p>An area of Picton Soils has been added on our map (page 10 of the LDR report) to the extent shown in the Soil Stability Assessment report by Douglas and Partners where the subject is addressed in details. The proponent is are aware of the stability issues and had already made reference to it in the LDR, both the text on the plan and in the left column (page 10 of LDR report).</p>

2.6. ACOUSTIC

Table 7 – Response to Acoustic Items raised by CCC

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>The Acoustic Assessment only addresses Stage 1 of the proposal and this is insufficient to enable approval to be granted to subsequent stages. Furthermore, the Stage 1 shown in the Acoustic Report does not correlate to Stage 1 shown on other</p>	<p>The Acoustic Report submitted as part of the application has been amended to consider the holistic impact of the proposed development in</p>

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>documentation submitted with the DA. An updated acoustic report is required should approval be sought for development outside the "Stage 1" area identified in the Acoustic Report.</p> <p>The Acoustic Assessment recommends that noise mitigation measures are required to mitigate adverse external road noise impacts although no detailed recommendations are included, and no other documentation submitted with the DA provides information in regard to how the design has been amended to include such mitigation and contrary to the SEE suggestion, Conditions of Consent cannot be imposed to address this matter.</p> <p>The Acoustic Assessment does not include any assessment of potential noise impacts associated with site activities such as grave digging, lawn mowing, hedge trimming, etc which are likely to cause significant disturbance to surrounding properties, particularly the residence at Varroville House.</p> <p>An amended Acoustic Assessment must be submitted addressing the above matters prior to determination of the DA and where necessary amended plans may also be required. Where any proposed mitigation measures involve removal or addition of vegetation or other built structures, other relevant amended supporting plans and reports must also be submitted.</p>	<p>accordance with the comments received from CCC and is attached as Appendix J of this report.</p> <p>The Acoustic Assessment concludes the following:</p> <p>Based on the traffic generation estimates associated with the MMP, traffic noise generation along St. Andrews Road is expected to exceed the relevant criteria at the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel for all Stages between 2 and 5 dB above the absolute criteria. • Mount Carmel Retreat Centre at full development only and only by 1 dB which is considered marginal. <p>Property treatment to the Parish of Mount Carmel to include alternative means of ventilation such that windows can remain closed should be considered and will require a more detailed review.</p> <p>It is however noted that the prediction of traffic noise levels for the full development (beyond 100 years) is considered unreliable, given the significant changes in transportation and technology that are likely to occur over this period. Any assumptions made today as to the way in which a community might travel to the development beyond the foreseeable future cannot, in our view, be used as the basis for establishing a noise mitigation treatment that might be relevant for the full development.</p> <p>As a consequence of this factor, it is recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That within 5 years of the commencement of operations within Stage 1, a review of actual traffic noise levels be undertaken at the Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel. Mitigation - provision of an alternative means of ventilation (such as mechanical ventilation or air conditioning should it not already exist) enabling windows to be kept closed in order to achieve the relevant criteria could then be proposed and negotiated with the property owners. • Subsequent 5 yearly traffic noise reviews be implemented throughout the stages of the development to confirm whether or not traffic noise levels do increase and the extent of the actual impact. The need for further mitigation should be considered within these reviews

2.7. BUSHFIRE

Table 8 – Response to Bushfire Items raised by CCC

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>1. Road Access</p> <p>Additional information is required to demonstrate that all internal roads for each stage will be through roads or dead ends no longer than 100m with a 12m outer radius turning circle, noting that some roads in Stage 1 and Stage 4 will be dead ends until later stages are completed.</p>	<p>The supplementary Civil Engineering Plans prepared by Warren Smith and Partners and attached as Appendix B provide information in relation to proposed layout of internal roads throughout each construction stage.</p>
<p>2. APZs</p> <p>The Bushfire report must be amended to detail how the proposed APZs around buildings will be achieved given the requirement to maximise the conservation of trees - e.g. will this be through weed removal, modification of understorey, trimming of canopy. A detailed plan of proposed APZ works is required and this must be consistent with the FFAR and the VMP.</p>	<p>In accordance with the comments received from CCC the bushfire report has been updated to reflect a detailed plan of works. A copy of this bushfire report is attached as Appendix K of this report.</p> <p>The amended bushfire report is consistent with the amended FFAR and VMP as required by CCC.</p>

2.8. CONTAMINATION

Table 9 – Response to Contamination Items raised by CCC

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>A Detailed Site Inspection (OSI) by Douglas Partners September 2017 has recommended a Remediation Action Plan (RAP) be prepared to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fuel/ oil spillage near TP 14 - RAP to inform how to remediate and validate; Lead (at TP17) and zinc contamination (at TP 17, 39 and 41) - RAP to inform how to remediate and validate (NB: Drawing 9 in Appendix A shows the Test Pit locations but omits TP 39); Dieldrin and Aldrin pesticides near the homestead and sheds; Asbestos near the former homesteads and sheds - RAP to identify HazMat Survey prior to demolition and disposed of by licensed contractor and ground surface inspection after demolition and hand removal; Poly Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH) in surface soils next to timber power poles - RAP to investigate and delineate impact, remediate and validate. <p>The OSI also recommends an Unexpected Finds Protocol be prepared.</p> <p>A RAP must be prepared and submitted prior to determination of the DA and will not be considered as a Deferred Commencement matter.</p>	<p>In accordance with the request from Campbelltown City Council a RAP has been prepared for the site and is attached as Appendix H.</p> <p>The RAP concludes that the site can be made suitable for the proposed use of the site as a cemetery.</p>

2.9. FLORA AND FAUNA

Table 10 – Response to Flora and Fauna Items raised by CCC

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>1. Inconsistencies</p> <p>1. The submitted Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE) indicates that 35ha of native vegetation will be conserved whereas the Flora and Fauna Assessment Report (FFAR) indicates that there is 23.53ha of native vegetation of which 1.73 ha will be impacted resulting in retention of 21. Bha. The actual area of native vegetation to be retained must be clarified.</p> <p>2. The SEE indicates that 119 trees are proposed to be removed although the FFAR indicates that 35 trees are to be removed. The actual number of trees to be removed must be clarified.</p>	<p>1.73 ha of native vegetation will be impacted by the proposal. Of this 1.73 ha 0.5 ha of moderate or better quality vegetation and 1.23 ha is of low condition vegetation will be lost. 21.80ha of Cumberland Plain Woodland will be retained under the proposal.</p> <p>This is further detailed in the Flora and Fauna Assessment attached as Appendix L of this report.</p> <p>119 trees will be removed by the proposal. This is comprised of 91 trees with an unsafe SULE rating and 28 trees which are within or immediately adjacent to the development footprint.</p> <p>This is reflected in the Tree Report attached as Appendix M of this report.</p>
<p>1. Natural Burials</p> <p>Council is not supportive of burials under remnant CPW trees and further information is required in this regard.</p> <p>The SEE indicates that there will be burials around each remnant tree at the rate of 5 every five years at double depth and that there will be ash interment although no justification has been provided why there will be reburials after 5 years as comparable cemeteries in Kemps Creek and Gungahlin ACT have a 30-year reburial period in natural burial areas.</p> <p>There is also no description of whether the burials will be horizontal or vertical and no assessment of the impact of leachate or deep digging on the remnant trees in either the Arborists Report or the FFAR.</p>	<p>A small portion of Cumberland Plain Woodland is proposed to be used as a natural burial area. Whilst the trees will be retained on site they have been classified as “removed” for the purpose of the Flora and Fauna Assessment prepared by Travers and attached as Appendix L.</p> <p>All graves within the Natural Burial area are double depth and permit two burial interments. The purchase is, initially, for 30 years, and can be renewed on expiry.</p> <p>Coffin materials within the natural burial area will be biodegradable and made of wicker, sea grass, bamboo, cardboard or similar materials.</p> <p>Materials which cannot be used include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any type of plastic or metal fittings (exclusive of nails and screws) • PVC, glass, ceramic, metal, treated varnished timber, toxic glues or plastic sheeting inside the coffin/casket. • Non-biodegradable material inside or outside the coffin/casket. <p>Embalming fluids will not be used in preparing the deceased for burial within the natural burial area of the Macarthur Memorial Park.</p>
<p>2. Migratory Species</p> <p>The FFAR must be amended to include an assessment of the impact of removal of the dam/s on EPBC migratory species such as Cattle Egret, waterbirds, frogs or on aquatic fauna utilising the dam.</p>	<p>Dams which are retained by the project will be restored as vegetated wetlands. The existing dam walls have however been deemed unsafe, therefore these larger dams will be reconstructed. This will happen in succession with the upper dams repaired first so open water habitat will be present throughout this process. The result will attempt to achieve a similar extent of open water surface however the wetland may be shallower. This will also increase potential for fringing macrophytes and other aquatic</p>

Information Request	Proponent Response
	<p>surface vegetation. This process will eventually enhance long term-habitat potential for waterfowl and wading birds as well as frog breeding and small reptiles.</p>
<p>3. Habitat Trees</p> <p>The FFAR indicates that 15 significant habitat trees and 87 habitat trees (Table 4.5) occur on the site with 35 trees requiring removal according to the Tree Assessment Report (TAR), six of which occur along the roads HT2 (T413), HT4 (T1437), HT5 (T1438), T1362, SHT9 (T1364) and T1365. The exact location of the habitat trees to be removed must be mapped within the FFAR at A3 scale with a readable Legend.</p> <p>The map (Figure 4) appears to contain an error where HT2 should read as T415 (not T413) in the text to align with Table 4.5 and the TAR. Figure 4 must be amended to include the location of HT2 (T413), HT4 (T1437), HT5 (T1438), T1362, SHT9 (T1364) and T1365. Figures 3 & 4 must be resubmitted at A3 scale with mapping labels legible.</p>	<p>An updated tree removal plan has been provided in the tree report attached as Appendix M of this report with relevant maps reproduced at A3 size as requested.</p>
<p>4. Moist Shale Woodland EEC</p> <p>The presence of Moist Shale Woodland on the site is of note as this does not occur elsewhere in the Campbelltown LGA. The FFAR however does not provide an adequate justification for its identification. It states 'There was not a lot of difference in species make up between the Cumberland Plain Woodland and Moist Shale Woodland. ' ... 'However, the soil type, aspect and topography are more suited to this vegetation unit as opposed to Cumberland Plain Woodland vegetation however.'</p> <p>No reference has been made to the NSW Scientific Committee Final Determination or any systematic floristic study to justify the identification of Moist Shale Woodland as being present on the site. There is no mention of what the soil type is or how this links to the identification of the vegetation community. The species list does not indicate which quadrats or random meander the species were located within and does not demonstrate how this vegetation community identification was derived.</p> <p>The FFAR must be amended to provide discussion and evidence of how the identification of this community was determined as being present on the site.</p> <p>If the vegetation is found not to be MSW then a number of the DA documents will require updating to reflect this.</p>	<p>As noted in the Flora and Fauna assessment attached as Appendix L of this report In June 2018, Travers bushfire & ecology revisited the escarpment area and undertook a series of 20x20m plots and a meander to determine if some of the more mesic species were present that would indicate Moist Shale Woodland. The results showed these mesic species are absent, even though the soil types, topography and south facing slopes were present.</p> <p>Tozer (2003) and OEH (2013) describe a variation of Cumberland Plain Woodland which occurs in the southern part of the Cumberland Plain Woodland on the hills. One (1) of the dominant sub-canopy species present is <i>Acacia implexa</i> which helps to distinguish this variation, and it was present on the escarpment.</p> <p>Therefore, Moist Shale Woodland has been removed from the figures and redescribed as part of the Cumberland Plain Woodland community.</p>
<p>5. Koala Habitat</p> <p>The FFAR has not examined the draft Campbelltown Comprehensive Koala Plan of Management 2016 that maps the land at Varroville as being land to which the</p>	<p>A Koala survey has been undertaken s part of the FFAR and is attached Appendix L of this report. The survey has confirmed that Koalas are not</p>

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>Plan applies. It also maps the land as 'Potential koala habitat - Secondary (Class B). Both the CKPoM and SEPP 44 Guidelines (Circular B35) Section 2.1, state that to investigate whether that potential koala habitat is- core koala habitat requires a survey to be undertaken on the site in accordance using standard reportable techniques of koala survey.</p> <p>Therefore, a koala survey must be undertaken on the site in order to investigate whether the site is core koala habitat, using standard reportable techniques of koala survey in accordance with Circular B35 - SEPP 44 Koala Habitat Protection Guidelines - Section 2.1 <i>Investigating Potential Koala Habitat for Core Koala Habitat (i)-(iv)</i>, such as RG-bSAT technique outlined in Appendix D of the CKPoM.</p> <p>6. Asset Protection Zones</p> <p>A map of the APZs must be provided as an overlay within the FFAR and the impacts of APZ establishment and maintenance need to be described along with methods to minimise the impacts.</p>	<p>present on the site and the proposed development is fully compliant with the requirements of SEPP 44.</p> <p>A Map of the APZs has been provided within the FFAR as requested by CCC.</p>

2.10. TREE ASSESSMENT REPORT

Table 11 – Response to Tree Assessment Items raised by CCC

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>The Tree Assessment Report (TAR) states that there will be 28 trees removed for the development and 91 trees removed due to safety reasons; totalling 119 trees. It states that there are 89 hollow-bearing trees on the site but does not quantify the number of hollow bearing trees to be removed. The number of hollow bearing trees to be removed must be identified in an amended TAR.</p> <p>The statement that 'no tree will have the TPZ impacted by the proposed development' implies that there is no reason to remove trees due to the development and this shall be clarified and if correct, amended plans and supporting reports must be submitted.</p> <p>The Schedule 2 map 'Tree Survey and Assessment (Overview)' must be submitted at A3 size or larger with legible legends, all codes appearing as the top layer and identified in the legend.</p> <p>How tree management will be addressed through the five development stages of the 150-year planning time frame must be addressed in an amended TAR including replacement of the trees removed as part of the development and ongoing tree replacement as trees senesce through time.</p>	<p>The proposed development seeks to remove 33 habitat trees all of which are identified as being poor health. This is noted within the updated tree assessment report attached as Appendix M of this report.</p> <p>Within the life of the memorial park, trees will be assessed on a regular basis by an appointed arborist. If for any reason a tree is nominated for removal, it is to be replaced with the same species at a ratio of 2:1. Should any disease, soil conditions or damage be the cause of tree loss, the arborist is to recommend mitigation measures to enhance the trees' health and protect the replacement plants.</p>

2.11. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

Table 12 – Response to Vegetation Management Plan items raised by CCC

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>The VMP must be amended to extend to 20 years as it states that the restoration program will be at least 20 years. The plan must be reviewed every five years.</p> <p>Any development consent will be subject to a condition requiring a new VMP to be prepared at every new development phase throughout the 150-year life of the planning approval.</p> <p>Section 3.1.1 Management Zone A - Escarpment Reserve must be amended to include the weed removal techniques that are appropriate for the steep land within this zone. It must detail how vegetation restoration and soil erosion control techniques are to be coordinated in the large erosion gullies within the zone.</p> <p>The VMP must be amended to recognise that riparian restoration is to be undertaken in a manner so as to not destabilise or further destabilise creek banks and that techniques such as 'All weeds will be stripped from the riparian corridor within the site' are inappropriate.</p> <p>The VMP must be amended to include appropriate techniques for riparian restoration including staged removal of small areas of the riparian zone weeds using manual techniques such as 'cut and paint' and 'drill and frill', bagging and removal of weed propagules from the site, reuse of logs to stabilise the creek bank. In revegetation areas along the creek the use of pegged and overlapped jute matting and long-stem planting should be included as a suitable technique. The VMP must specify planting density of trees, shrubs and ground covers for the riparian zones in addition to CPW and MSW areas.</p>	<p>The Vegetation Management Plan will be reviewed every 5 years as requested and can be enforced as a condition of development consent.</p> <p>The amended Vegetation Management Plan is attached as Appendix N of this report which confirms the management for the proposed revegetation works. This includes the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using cut-and-paint or drill-and-fill techniques to minimise soil disturbance within Management Zone A across a 20 year plus timeline. • Stabilisation of creek embankments; • Staged removal of weed thickets along creek line embankments using manual techniques • Progressive restoration to a natural state where remnant native vegetation is present

2.12. LANDSCAPE SPECIES PLAN

Table 13 – Response to Landscape Species Plan items raised by CCC

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>The Landscape Species Plan must be amended to change the colours used as there are three similar shades of green and there are no codes on the plan making it impossible to evaluate where the different tree species are proposed for planting. For example, where are the Turpentine trees, a species that is not indigenous to the site, proposed for planting?</p>	<p>The Landscape Species Plan has been amended in accordance with the request from CCC. and is attached as Appendix A of this report.</p>

2.13. LANDSCAPE MASTERPLAN

Table 14 – Response to Landscape Masterplan items raised by CCC

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>The Overall Site Plan must be amended to have clearer hatching as it is not possible to read the map to distinguish between the four types of burial zones in the legend. There is no legend key for the orange circular symbol within the natural burial area.</p> <p>Although the legend indicates a symbol for Cumberland Plain Woodland to be cleared and there are areas of CPW to be cleared referred to in the FFAR, there are no areas of clearing shown on the site plan.</p>	<p>The overall site plan has been amended in accordance with the request from CCC and is attached as Appendix A of this report.</p>

2.14. PUBLIC ART STRATEGY

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>The proposed Public Art Strategy includes indicative maximum heights for sculptures up to 10m in height which exceeds the LEP building height of 9m. Further information is required for all proposed sculptures and gateways (including to St Andrews Road), particularly where it is intended to exceed the 9m building height limit or alternatively, consent for sculptures will be subject to future development application/s.</p>	<p>The public art strategy has been revised and reducing the maximum height of art works of 9m to ensure compliance with the CLEP.</p> <p>Formal design of the artwork will be compliant with the Public Art Plan which has been revised as part of this report and attached as Appendix E of this report. Detailed design will however require the engagement of individual artists and as such the following condition is proposed.</p> <p>PUBLIC ART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) High quality public art work(s) shall be installed in accordance with a Public Art Strategy endorsed by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment/Campbelltown City Council in relation to the site. b) Prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate for above ground building works, a Detailed Public Art Plan, prepared in accordance with the Public Art Strategy, must be submitted to and approved by Council's Director, City Planning, Development and Transport. c) Public art is to be installed, to the satisfaction of Council, prior to the issue of the relevant Occupation Certificate

2.15. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Table 15 – Response to Additional Information items raised by CCC

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>1. Fencing and Gates</p> <p>Detailed fencing and gate (including adjoining walls) designs including materials and finishes are required to be submitted prior to determination.</p>	<p>Design detail of the proposed fencing is [provided within the Landscape Design Response attached as Appendix C of this report. 3 separate typology of fences are proposed based on the location along St Andrews Road or the perimeter of the site.</p>

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>2. Materials and Finishes</p> <p>A detailed Materials and Finishes Schedule for all buildings must be submitted prior to determination.</p>	<p>A Materials and Finishes Schedule was submitted as part of the Development Application and is attached as Appendix P of this report for further consideration. The Design Report prepared by FJMT and submitted as part of the Development Application provides further information regarding the proposed building materials.</p>
<p>3. Waterbody Safety</p> <p>An assessment relating to safety near waterbodies must be submitted for consideration by Council's Executive Manager Infrastructure, including depth of waterbodies, fencing, safety equipment, etc, noting that there are playgrounds areas proposed near waterbodies contrary to the assertions within the Landscape Design Response document submitted with the DA.</p>	<p>The edges of retained dams will be modified to ensure safety bench compliance (1:5 above NWL and 1:8 below as per RLSS's Guidelines for Water Safety in Urban Water Developments).</p> <p>Where compliance is impossible dam edges and wall will be fenced off as required by the relevant Australian Standards.</p>
<p>4. Pathways through Vegetation</p> <p>Further details relating to the proposed pathways through vegetation on the upper slopes of the northern part of the Site must be submitted including an assessment of the visual impact of these pathways cutting through vegetation to be retained/revegetated, drainage, landslip/stability, materials, etc.</p>	<p>The proposed pathways through the vegetation has been removed from the upper slopes of the site as reflected in the amended landscaping plans attached as Appendix A of this report.</p>

3. AGENCY SUBMISSIONS

A total of 4 submissions were received from various government agencies, roads and utility providers, and other stakeholders, including:

- Heritage Council of NSW;
- NSW Roads and Maritime Services
- NSW Rural Fire Service; and
- NSW Department of Industry - Water

The following sections provide a response to the issues raised in each of the submissions.

3.1. HERITAGE COUNCIL OF NSW

Following a meeting on 06 December and 07 February 2018 the Heritage Council of NSW provided 7 comments for consideration by the applicant. These comments were included in Council's additional information request. A response to these comments which has been undertaken in **Section 2.1** of this report.

3.2. NSW ROADS AND MARITIME SERVICES

On 09 January 2018 the NSW Roads and Maritime Services requested additional information to advance the assessment of the application. A summary of the response provided to the NSW Roads and Maritime Services is provided below.

Table 16 – Response to NSW Roads and Maritime Services

Information Request	Proponent Response
It is noted that the subject proposal seeks new vehicular access on St Andrews Road, which is currently under the care and control of Council. Council should be satisfied that the proposed access arrangements are safe and efficient.	CCC have raised no concerns with the quantity of entrances proposed off St Andrews Road which are considered to be suitable for the proposed development.
<p>The submitted Traffic Report indicates that approximately 70 percent of the expected vehicle movements from the proposal will be travelling via the St Andrews Road/ Campbelltown Road roundabout intersection. However, the proponent has not carried out a traffic impact assessment on this intersection. Given there are no current plans to extend St Andrews Road to Camden Valley Way the proponent should consider the traffic impacts on this intersection.</p> <p>It is requested that the applicant undertakes detailed traffic modelling (including the background traffic growth using EMME data if required) for Campbelltown Road/St Andrews Road roundabout and determine whether the proposed additional traffic would trigger improvements to the roundabout.</p>	<p>The supplementary traffic modelling report at Appendix I provides an assessment of the traffic impacts of the proposal on the additional requested intersections.</p> <p>The supplementary modelling provides the forecasted split of trips for the four proposed vehicle access points.</p> <p>SIDRA modelling has been undertaken for the following scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Conditions • Post Development (incl. traffic generation on special holidays) • Year 2038 (without Development) • Year 2038 Post Development (incl. traffic generation on special holidays). <p>The modelling confirms that the development of the Macarthur Memorial Park would not trigger the requirement for the roundabout to be upgraded</p>
The submitted traffic generation analysis does not consider potential traffic generation during special holidays and All Saints Day. Nor does it consider the cumulative traffic impacts on the road network from	Additional traffic modelling has been undertaken by TTPP to address Council's comments (Appendix I). The study assumes a trip increase of 20% in the site's traffic generation for the weekday holidays and

Information Request	Proponent Response
<p>visitors as well as the potential traffic generation from funerals, especially when the burial plot capacity increases over the various stages of construction.</p>	<p>a 25% increase for the weekend peak for special public holidays (such as Mother's Day, Father's Day and All Souls Day).</p> <p>The supplementary traffic modelling models for a future case scenario taking into account visitor trip generation as well as funeral trip generation when burial capacity has increased with time. The study models the cumulative traffic impacts at the year 2038.</p> <p>The modelling confirms that the development of the Macarthur Memorial Park would not trigger the requirement for the local road network to be upgraded beyond that proposed by the application.</p>
<p>The Statement of Environmental Effects proposes the burial sites to be provided in five stages over a 150 year period. The anticipated total capacity of the proposed cemetery is 136,000 plots. It is recommended that Council only considers Stage 1 and that Stages 2 – 5 are not approved until the cumulative traffic impacts are adequately addressed. Future stages should be subject to separate applications and require detailed traffic assessment utilising the traffic volumes at the time of lodgement. This approach will ensure that appropriate network upgrades are identified for each stage of this development</p>	<p>As noted above the modelling undertaken for the site and submitted in conjunction with the application has considered the cumulative impacts of the proposed development in full.</p> <p>The modelling confirms that the development of the Macarthur Memorial Park would not trigger the requirement for the local road network to be upgraded beyond that proposed by the application.</p>

3.3. NSW RURAL FIRE SERVICE

The NSW Rural Fire Service recommended a series of conditions to accompany any Development Application which would be issued for the site. The proponent confirms they are satisfied with the conditions and no amendments proposed to or warranted as a result of comments received from the NSW Rural Fire Service.

3.4. NSW DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY – WATER

The NSW Department of Industry – Water confirmed that the Development Application is exempt from approval under Section 91E of the Water Management Act. No amendment to the scheme or the proposal are warranted as a result of the submission received by the NSW Department of Industry - Water.

4. PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

A total of 67 submissions were received from members of the public and community groups during the public notification of the application and reviewed by Urbis. A total of 30 submissions were received in support of the proposal whilst the remaining 37 opposed the application.

This report has not provided a response to the submissions of support however it is noted that these submissions were received by local residents, community groups and parties within the internment industry.

4.1. SUBMISSIONS IN OBJECTION

4.1.1. Scenic Hills Association

A review of the Scenic Hills Association submission has been undertaken and a detailed response to the issues is provided in **Table 17**.

Table 17 – Response to the Scenic Hills Association Submission

Submission Matter	Response
Heritage Conservation	<p>The MMP concept is underpinned by a strong understanding of the heritage values and significance of the place (including built form, the cultural landscape, views and vistas, European and Indigenous archaeology etc). This has informed every aspect of the proposal, from the treatment of the landscape, the location and different types of memorialisation, tree plantings, siting of roads, siting and architectural design of new buildings, the conservation and adaptive reuse of the outbuildings precinct, on-site detention and treatment of the dams, reinterpretation of significant landscape elements, provision for public art, and regeneration of CPW.</p> <p>A Conservation Management Plan has been endorsed for the site by the DPE under the provisions of the CLEP2015. A detailed assessment against the 104 adopted policies have been undertaken by the Heritage Impact Statement submitted with the Development Application.</p> <p>As the DPE is aware Section 1.17 Ministerial Directions are not relevant to Development Applications.</p>
Scenic Impact	<p>As previously noted the CMCT has made multiple requests to the owner of Varroville House to allow photomontages to be prepared when viewed from Varroville House. These requests have been denied.</p> <p>The existing Visual Impact Assessment has considered the effect of the proposed built structures and the proposed landscape on the site, on views to Varroville House. The house is not visible from locations off site that would be negatively affected.</p> <p>It is noted that the visual impact assessment referred to by the Scenic Hills Association has not been made publicly available or formally adopted by any government agency.</p>
Land Stability	<p>As previously noted an additional land slip assessment has been prepared for the application by JK Geotechnics and is attached as Appendix F of the report with an amended Vegetation Management Plan provided as Appendix N of this report.</p> <p>A Geotechnical Assessment has been undertaken by JK Geotechnics and is attached as Appendix G of this report. The assessment has confirmed that without immediate improvement it is likely that a breach could occur at any moment.</p>

Submission Matter	Response
	<p>The proposed development will seek to undertake the appropriate works to facilitate the improvement of the embankments in a matter which will ensure the long term safety of the environment.</p> <p>It is further noted that the walking paths proposed throughout the western portion of the site have been completely removed.</p>
Public Interest	<p>As demonstrated not only by the Urbis Cemetery Demand Report submitted with the Planning Proposal for the site, the Metropolitan Sydney Cemetery Capacity Report and the representations of multiple faith based organisations as part of the public submission the need for the Macarthur Memorial Park is critical in addressing a documented shortage. A failure to provide for the burial requirements of the Metropolitan Sydney community would in our opinion lead to a failure to provide critical infrastructure for which this is a demonstrable need.</p> <p>The proposal has additional public benefits by rendering the site accessible by members of the public. The proposed open space which will not be used for burials will ensure this access is maintained for all members of the community in perpetuity.</p> <p>For this reason the proposal is considered to be in the public interest.</p>

4.1.2. Varro Ville House Owners

A review of the Varro Ville House Owners submission has been undertaken and a detailed response to the issues is provided in **Table 18**.

Table 18 – Response to Varro Ville House Owners Submission

Submission Matter	Response
Security	<p>The proposal is considered to increase the overall safety of the site and its surrounds by allowing for a regularly staffed use to operate on the site.</p> <p>Regular security monitors and CCTV will be installed by CMCT to allow for monitoring of the site and the long term safe operation of the site.</p>
Heritage Assessment	<p>The curtilage study referenced by the owners of Varro Ville House has not been made available to the proponent nor has it been formally adopted by any level of government be it state or local.</p> <p>As previously noted however A Conservation Management Plan has been endorsed for the site by the DPE under the provisions of the CLEP2015. A detailed assessment against the 104 adopted policies have been undertaken by the Heritage Impact Statement submitted with the Development Application.</p>
Land Value	<p>The submission has provided no evidence that the approval of the Macarthur Memorial Park would have an impact on property prices. It is further noted this does not form a matter for consideration under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.</p>
Project Need	<p>The Metropolitan Sydney Cemetery Capacity Report and Cemetery Demand Report prepared by Urbis for the site specific Planning Proposal identifies Metropolitan Sydney will have no burial space in 2056. If the capacity of the proposed cemetery at Varroville is</p>

Submission Matter	Response
	<p>included in projections, between zero and 13 years cemetery capacity would be remaining at 2056.</p> <p>The need for the project has been established.</p>
Land Stability Assessment	<p>As previously noted an additional land slip assessment has been prepared for the application by JK Geotechnics and is attached as Appendix F of the report with an amended Vegetation Management Plan provided as Appendix N of this report.</p> <p>A Geotechnical Assessment has been undertaken by JK Geotechnics and is attached as Appendix G of this report. The assessment has confirmed that without immediate improvement it is likely that a breach could occur at any moment.</p> <p>The proposed development will seek to undertake the appropriate works to facilitate the improvement of the embankments in a matter which will ensure the long term safety of the environment.</p> <p>It is further noted that the walking paths proposed throughout the western portion of the site have been completely removed.</p>
Permissibility	<p>The CLEP2015 as presently gazetted permits the development of the subject site as a cemetery subject to compliance with the relevant planning controls. As noted throughout this report and the originally submitted Statement of Environmental Effects the proposal complies with the requirements of the CLEP2015.</p> <p>The use of the site as a cemetery is therefore permitted with development consent.</p>

4.1.3. Discalced Carmelite Nuns Varroville

A review of the Discalced Carmelite Nuns Varroville submission has been undertaken and a detailed response to the issues is provided in **Table 19**.

Table 19 – Response to the Discalced Carmelite Nuns Submission

Submission Matter	Response
Project Need	<p>The Metropolitan Sydney Cemetery Capacity Report and Cemetery Demand Report prepared by Urbis for the site specific Planning Proposal identifies Metropolitan Sydney will have no burial space in 2056. If the capacity of the proposed cemetery at Varroville is included in projections, between zero and 13 years cemetery capacity would be remaining at 2056.</p> <p>The need for the project has been established.</p>
Constraints on the site	<p>The site constraints are acknowledged by all parties and have directly guided the design of the proposed Macarthur Memorial Park. The location of matters such as headstones, plaques, buildings and the road network directly demonstrate how the sites constraints have been considered to provide a scheme which will allow the development to occur on the site.</p>
Parklands along St Andrews Road	<p>Apart from the channalised right hand turn lane from St Andrews Road no augmentation to the road network is proposed or required. Any further upgrade of St Andrews Road is not proposed by this application or announced by the NSW Government.</p>
Stability Assessment	<p>As previously noted an additional land slip assessment has been prepared for the application by JK Geotechnics and is attached as</p>

Submission Matter	Response
	<p>Appendix F of the report with an amended Vegetation Management Plan provided as Appendix N of this report.</p> <p>A Geotechnical Assessment has been undertaken by JK Geotechnics and is attached as Appendix G of this report. The assessment has confirmed that without immediate improvement it is likely that a breach could occur.</p> <p>The proposed development will seek to undertake the appropriate works to facilitate the improvement of the embankments in a matter which will ensure the long term safety of the environment.</p>
Traffic Impact Assessment	<p>The supplementary traffic modelling report at Appendix I provides an assessment of the traffic impacts of the proposal on the additional requested intersections.</p> <p>The supplementary modelling provides the forecasted split of trips for the four proposed vehicle access points.</p> <p>SIDRA modelling has been undertaken for the following scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Conditions • Post Development (incl. traffic generation on special holidays) • Year 2038 (without Development) • Year 2038 Post Development (incl. traffic generation on special holidays). <p>The modelling results indicate that the proposed development would have a minor impact to the study intersections with performance levels generally consistent. Overall it is considered that any capacity constraints would not be the result of the Macarthur Memorial Park.</p>
Acoustic Assessment	<p>As previously noted the Acoustic Report submitted as part of the application has been amended to consider the holistic impact of the proposed development in accordance with the comments received from CCC and is attached as Appendix J of this report.</p> <p>The Acoustic Assessment concludes the following:</p> <p>Based on the traffic generation estimates associated with the MMP, traffic noise generation along St. Andrews Road is expected to exceed the relevant criteria at the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel for all Stages between 2 and 5 dB above the absolute criteria. • Mount Carmel Retreat Centre at full development only and only by 1 dB which is considered marginal. <p>Property treatment to the Parish of Mount Carmel to include alternative means of ventilation such that windows can remain closed should be considered and will required a more detailed review.</p> <p>It is however noted that the prediction of traffic noise levels for the full development (beyond 100 years) is considered unreliable, given the significant changes in transportation and technology that are likely to occur over this period. Any assumptions made today as to the way in which a community might travel to the development beyond the foreseeable future cannot, in our view, be used as the basis for establishing a noise mitigation treatment that might be relevant for the full development.</p>

Submission Matter	Response
	<p>As a consequence of this factor, it is recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That within 5 years of the commencement of operations within Stage 1, a review of actual traffic noise levels be undertaken at the Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel. Mitigation - provision of an alternative means of ventilation (such as mechanical ventilation or air conditioning should it not already exist) enabling windows to be kept closed in order to achieve the relevant criteria could then be proposed and negotiated with the property owners. <p>Subsequent 5 yearly traffic noise reviews be implemented throughout the stages of the development to confirm whether or not traffic noise levels do increase and the extent of the actual impact. The need for further mitigation should be considered within these reviews</p>

4.1.4. National Trust of Australia

A review of the National Trust of Australia submission has been undertaken and a detailed response to the issues is provided in **Table 21**.

Table 20 – National Trust of Australia Submission

Submission Matter	Response
<p>The cemetery does not meet a need for burial space in the Macarthur and South-West Sydney Regions</p>	<p>The Metropolitan Sydney Cemetery Capacity Report and Cemetery Demand Report prepared by Urbis for the site specific Planning Proposal identifies Metropolitan Sydney will have no burial space in 2056. If the capacity of the proposed cemetery at Varroville is included in projections, between zero and 13 years cemetery capacity would be remaining at 2056.</p> <p>The need for the project has been established.</p>
<p>The Provisions of the Greater Sydney Region Plan and the Western City District Plan</p>	<p>It is considered that the Greater Sydney Region Plan and the Western City District Plan are not strictly matters for consideration under section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.</p> <p>We note however Cemeteries the Greater Sydney Region Plan states that:</p> <p>“Cemeteries and crematoria are key social infrastructure that also need to be accessible geographically and economically, and reflective of a diversity of cultures and backgrounds. A growing Greater Sydney requires additional land for burials and cremations with associated facilities such as reception space and car parking.”</p> <p>It is therefore in the public interest that the objects of the Sydney Region Plan be acknowledged as this proposal is consistent with its objectives.</p>
<p>Proposed Destruction of the Early Colonial Period Remnant Viticultural Trenching</p>	<p>No burials are proposed within the identified Viticultural Trenching area of the site.</p>
<p>Development Application based on outdated supporting reports</p>	<p>As noted throughout this report the <i>Curtilage Study Varro Ville, May 2016</i> by Orwell and Peter Phillips has not been made available to the proponent and has not been adopted by any government agency.</p>

4.1.5. Additional Submissions in Opposition

The key reasons of opposition highlighted by the remaining private residents and the proposals response are summarised in **Table 22** below

Table 21 – Response to Additional Items raised by public submissions

Submission matter	Response
Scenic amenity destroyed by placement of roads, graves etc	<p>As noted in the Visual Impact Assessment prepared and submitted as part of the Development Application 3D modelling of the Site, buildings and landscape in rendered photomontages of representative views prepared by VI on advice from RLA, show that the proposed development of the Site in the DA would not significantly degrade the quality or significantly alter the character of the Site.</p> <p>The internal character of views in the parts of the Site that are of low sensitivity to external views will be significantly changed, however the character of the Scenic Hills as perceived from Campbelltown would be maintained</p>
Consultation has not occurred with surrounding land owners	The Development Application was notified from 7 November 2017 and 26 March 2018. The proponent also undertook 2 community information sessions prior to the lodgement of the Development Application.
Flooding of the site may affect water quality.	No burials have been proposed within riparian corridors or within land identified by the CLEP2015 as being flood prone land.
There has been no assessment of other suitable cemetery sites	No other sites within the Campbelltown Local Government Area permit the development of a new cemetery as a result of the provisions of the CLEP2015. Further no significant cemeteries are located within the Campbelltown Local Government Area.
The biodiversity offset arrangements are vague and do not appropriately	The Biodiversity offset arrangements have been detailed within the Flora and Fauna Assessment Report prepared by Travers and attached as Appendix L .
The no-build area is deceptive – there is nothing stopping above ground tombs and crypts being built in these areas.	No above ground tombs or crypts are proposed within the no build area.
The application should not be determined until the proposed heritage curtilage extension is determined.	The proposal is unaware of the status of the curtilage extension. It is noted that the Development Application was lodged prior to the curtilage being considered by the relevant authorities.
The heritage assessment must consider the works undertaken by Orwell & Peter Phillips; and work done by Geoffrey Britton Environmental and Heritage Consultant for the owners of adjacent Varroville homestead to properly assess the proposal's impact.	The works completed by Orwell & Peter Phillips; and work done by Geoffrey Britton Environmental and Heritage Consultant has not been released to the proponent or adopted by any government. Completing an assessment of this works is therefore unachievable.

Submission matter	Response
The number of buildings proposed is excessive.	Each building located on the site has been designed to accommodate a specific purpose. The floor plates of each building but rather will meet the requirements of CMCT and are responsive to site conditions.
The number of roads proposed is excessive	The proposed road network has been designed to allow equitable access to the entirety of the site to ensure the site facilities can be used by all parties accessing the site.
The scenic hills should be reserved for public passive recreation space.	Public passive recreation space is proposed as part of the application along St Andrews Road.
<p>Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dams hold historical value and should not be altered or built over. • Historic Vineyard areas should not be used for burials 	<p>The proposed dams are currently unsafe and will be at high risk of failing. The proposed development seeks to repair the dams in a manner reflective of their heritage value.</p> <p>No burials are proposed within the identified historic vineyard areas.</p>
<p>Cemetery Demand</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest Lawn will have burial capacity for an additional 70 years, why is a cemetery in Varroville needed, consider the CCNSW 2017 Capacity Report notes that South west Sydney is “well served” for burial space. • The cemetery is being built to cater for burial demand from the CBD and eastern suburbs. • Why is the DA proceeding before the GSC review the need for land for cemeteries and crematoria in the Sydney Region? 	<p>As previously noted the Metropolitan Sydney Cemetery Capacity Report identifies Metropolitan Sydney will have no burial space in 2056. If the capacity of the proposed cemetery at Varroville is included in projections, between zero and 13 years cemetery capacity would be remaining at 2056.</p> <p>The need for the project is clearly established.</p>
<p>Traffic generation and road networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Andrew’s Road is a no through road and cannot accommodate the demand created by the cemetery. • St Andrews Road should be extended to link to the Camden Valley Way. • Increased traffic will create safety issues for school children crossing St Andrews Road. 	<p>Additional traffic modelling has been undertaken by TTPP to address Council’s comments (Appendix I). The study assumes a trip increase of 20% in the site’s traffic generation for the weekday holidays and a 25% increase for the weekend peak for special public holidays (such as Mother’s Day, Father’s Day and All Souls Day).</p> <p>The supplementary traffic modelling models for a future case scenario taking into account visitor trip generation as well as funeral trip generation when burial capacity has increased with time. The study models the cumulative traffic impacts at the year 2038.</p>
The development sets a precedence for similar development and intensification of the Scenic Hills.	<p>The supplementary traffic modelling report at Appendix I provides an assessment of the traffic impacts of the proposal on the additional requested intersections.</p> <p>The supplementary modelling provides the forecasted split of trips for the four proposed vehicle access points.</p>

Submission matter	Response
	<p>SIDRA modelling has been undertaken for the following scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Conditions • Post Development (incl. traffic generation on special holidays) • Year 2038 (without Development) • Year 2038 Post Development (incl. traffic generation on special holidays). <p>The modelling results indicate that the proposed development would have a minor impact to the study intersections with performance levels generally consistent. Overall it is considered that any capacity constraints would not be the result of the Macarthur Memorial Park.</p>
Cemeteries encourage vandalism.	<p>The proposal is considered to increase the overall safety of the site and its surrounds by allowing for a regularly staffed use to operate on the site.</p> <p>Regular security monitors and CCTV will be installed by CMCT to allow for monitoring of the site and the long term safe operation of the site.</p>

5. CONCLUSION

This Response to Submissions Report has been prepared on behalf of the Catholic Metropolitan Cemeteries Trust, the proponent for the Development Application relating to the Macarthur Memorial Park. The application was lodged with Campbelltown City Council on 17 October 2017 and seeks approval for the construction and use of a new cemetery and parklands at 166-176 St Andrew Road Varroville. The proposal has been modified in order to respond to the key issues raised by the public and agencies during the exhibition period.

The additional justification and technical information, appropriately respond to all relevant issues raised in the submissions. We reaffirm that this project represents critical infrastructure due to the significant shortfall in burial space in metropolitan Sydney. The proposed development addresses this shortfall whilst ensuring that the environmental constraints of the site are appropriately considered. The proposal therefore is considered well-worthy of support from the NSW Department of Planning and Environment and ultimately approval from the NSW Independent Planning Commission.

DISCLAIMER

This report is dated 21 June 2018 and incorporates information and events up to that date only and excludes any information arising, or event occurring, after that date which may affect the validity of Urbis Pty Ltd's (**Urbis**) opinion in this report. Urbis prepared this report on the instructions, and for the benefit only, of Catholic Metropolitan Cemeteries Trust (**Instructing Party**) for the purpose of Request for Additional Information (**Purpose**) and not for any other purpose or use. To the extent permitted by applicable law, Urbis expressly disclaims all liability, whether direct or indirect, to the Instructing Party which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose other than the Purpose, and to any other person which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose whatsoever (including the Purpose).

In preparing this report, Urbis was required to make judgements which may be affected by unforeseen future events, the likelihood and effects of which are not capable of precise assessment.

All surveys, forecasts, projections and recommendations contained in or associated with this report are made in good faith and on the basis of information supplied to Urbis at the date of this report, and upon which Urbis relied. Achievement of the projections and budgets set out in this report will depend, among other things, on the actions of others over which Urbis has no control.

In preparing this report, Urbis may rely on or refer to documents in a language other than English, which Urbis may arrange to be translated. Urbis is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of such translations and disclaims any liability for any statement or opinion made in this report being inaccurate or incomplete arising from such translations.

Whilst Urbis has made all reasonable inquiries it believes necessary in preparing this report, it is not responsible for determining the completeness or accuracy of information provided to it. Urbis (including its officers and personnel) is not liable for any errors or omissions, including in information provided by the Instructing Party or another person or upon which Urbis relies, provided that such errors or omissions are not made by Urbis recklessly or in bad faith.

This report has been prepared with due care and diligence by Urbis and the statements and opinions given by Urbis in this report are given in good faith and in the reasonable belief that they are correct and not misleading, subject to the limitations above.

APPENDIX A AMENDED LANDSCAPE PLANS

APPENDIX B AMENDED CIVIL ENGINEERING PLANS

APPENDIX C LANDSCAPE DESIGN REPORT

APPENDIX D INTERPRETATION STRATEGY REPORT

APPENDIX E PUBLIC ART PLAN

APPENDIX F LANDSLIP REPORT

APPENDIX G DAM STABILITY ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX H REMEDIATION ACTION PLAN

APPENDIX I TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX J ACOUSTIC ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX K BUSHFIRE REPORT

APPENDIX L FLORA AND FAUNA REPORT

APPENDIX M TREE REPORT

APPENDIX N VEGETATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

APPENDIX O WATERCOURSE ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX P FINISHES SCHEDULE



BRISBANE

Level 7, 123 Albert Street
Brisbane QLD 4000
Australia
T +61 7 3007 3800

MELBOURNE

Level 12, 120 Collins Street
Melbourne VIC 3000
Australia
T +61 3 8663 4888

PERTH

Level 14, The Quadrant
1 William Street
Perth WA 6000
Australia
T +61 8 9346 0500

SYDNEY

Level 23, Darling Park Tower 2
201 Sussex Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia
T +61 2 8233 9900