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GLOSSARY

ABBREVIATIONS

BCSC  Bass Coast Shire Council
FJLA  Florence Jaquet Landscape Architects
GBB  Good Better Best
GPR  Ground Penetrating Radar
NSD  No service, no attendance
SRCT  San Remo Cemetery Trust
SMCT  Southern Metropolitan Cemetery Trust
WCT  Wonthaggi Cemetery Trust

LANDSCAPE MASTERPLAN

A strategic document which informs the long term development of a site or project, sometimes referred to as a ‘mud-map’ or ‘blue print’ for the future layout of a site.

Generally expressed, in the industry, as a single word.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In January 2019, Florence Jaquet Landscape architect (FJLA) and Changing Places were commissioned to prepare a Masterplan for San Remo Cemetery, which is under the responsibility of the San Remo Cemetery Trust (SRCT). The cemetery is managed by the Trust Members who, in this case, are the Councillors who have been elected and currently hold office on the Bass Coast Shire Council (BCSC).

The overall objective is to improve amenity for members of the public and operational matters. The Masterplan will inform the long term view that recognises the role of the cemetery over the next few hundred years. It is important to recognise that the Masterplan will need to be reviewed periodically throughout the life of the cemetery to incorporate any changes in the burial practices and trends.

The Plan addresses the project purpose, objectives and key issues and includes the following:

- Land use and layout
- Access
- Character and experience (including vegetation)
- Infrastructure, management and maintenance
- Revenue opportunities

A targeted consultation process has highlighted a number of issues ranging from poor historical records especially for unmarked graves, to poor drainage, some frustrations at community level, limited interment choice and a lack of continuity in operational decision making.

A thorough analysis of the site by two specialists in their fields has found that a number of opportunities exist for the cemetery:

Operations and marketability: A number of key aspects of the cemetery’s operations would benefit from a review in approach, take advantage of commercial opportunities and enhance client satisfaction. In some ways SRCT operations reflect the past rather than optimal approaches to service delivery. A number of key recommendations were made ranging from the investigation of unmarked graves, to practical advice on grave management, to a widening of the range and quality of the products offered.

Landscape: The ad-hoc process followed to date highlights the need for a strong guiding document to rectify (where possible) the deficiencies of the past. The older section presents a range of opportunities for monumental grave infill and interpretation of the rich history of the town. Carparking issues and accessibility to key destinations can be improved with wider gravel roads. Amenities such as shelter, toilet, shade for cars and mourners have been addressed, together with the integration of the key recommendations for the operational aspects of the cemetery, especially in terms of improved interment choices. All of this is balanced against the need to maximise the use of the land for burial which in turns lengthens the life of the cemetery. The proposals are kept in character with the rural aspect of the cemetery, capitalising on magnificent views but, more importantly, understanding the revenue limitations of the site.

The masterplan offers solutions to most of the issues raised and ensures the site remains a viable and respectful proposal for the interments of the region for the next 200+ years.

Armed with this plan the Trust’s next challenge will be to raise the funds required for the implementation of the prioritised recommendations within this report.
Summary of recommendations:

Recommendation one
That the San Remo Cemetery Trust proactively promotes cremated remains interment within the Local Area.

Recommendation two
That the San Remo Cemetery Trust request BCSC to consider, research and consult on the merits of consolidating its two cemetery trust entities, into one.

Recommendation three
That the soil stock pile be sorted and spread.

Recommendation four
That a site maintenance schedule be developed.

Recommendation five
That a “Roles of Friends Group” be developed, inductions occur, and appropriate insurance cover provided by the SRCT.

Recommendation six
That SRCT identify key historical aspects of the cemetery and reference them in site signage and on the web.

Recommendation seven
That SRCT develop a Memorialisation Policy, outlining the acceptable styles, dimensions and materials applicable within its cemetery sections.

Recommendation eight
That monumental masons be required to register as contractors with the BCSC and that masons without current registrations be ineligible to submit Applications to install monuments.

Recommendation nine
That Applications for monument construction be appraised by suitably qualified staff, to ensure conformance with Australian Standards.

Recommendation ten
That a site inspection occur to identify monuments and memorials that pose a risk to the community.

Recommendation eleven
That the next lawn beam poured at San Remo Cemetery be poured flat, without a raised sloping surface.

Recommendation twelve
That the SRCT provide flower vases for community use.

Recommendation thirteen
That any inappropriate items placed within the lawn adjacent to a flat beam be removed promptly and sensitively.

Recommendation fourteen
That signs be placed within the grounds, adjacent to the interment sites, outlining acceptable items/floral policy etc.

Recommendation fifteen
That an Operating Policy be developed and made available to the community.

Recommendation sixteen
That “Good”, “Better”, “Best” merchandising principles influence the range of interment positions offered, the merchandise range and fee structures.
Recommendation seventeen
That consideration be given to utilising quality accessible bench seats as commemorative locations.

Recommendation eighteen
That a designated headstone lawn beam section be developed.

Recommendation nineteen
To meet demand, that some exclusive premium headstone lawn beams be installed near older interment areas.

Recommendation twenty
That a new full monumental section, as such, not be incorporated within the masterplan.

Recommendation twenty one
That SRCT appropriately uses the cemetery fee structure to impact demand for different cemetery sections.

Recommendation twenty two
That a Remembrance Memorial location be identified on the masterplan and a memorial design be developed in keeping with San Remo Cemetery’s character.

Recommendation twenty three
That, as far as is practical, newer sections not be designated as denominational.

Recommendation twenty four
That, diseased and unsightly shrubs and trees be regularly removed in the screen planting and from areas of low maintenance.

Recommendation twenty five
That, unmown grass be slashed more frequently in summer.

Recommendation twenty six
That, the main road be widened and extended to the lower gate, with appropriate signage for parking rules and access beyond roads.

Recommendation twenty seven
That, pedestrian access be permitted 24h/day at both gates.

Recommendation twenty eight
That, wheelchair accessible paths be provided to key destinations within the site.

Recommendation twenty nine
That, spoil be spread on site in specified locations.

Recommendation thirty
That, the provision of an accessible shelter and toilet be investigated.

Recommendation thirty one
That, fencing be upgraded in due course and match that of Anderson St frontage.

Recommendation thirty two
That, at least one watering tap be provided per new burial section and records of services kept at Council offices.

Recommendation thirty three
That, flooding/drainage issues be further investigated.

Recommendation thirty four
That, investigations with Ground Penetrating Radar or by other method be carried out before establishing any new graves or burial sections.
INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND
In January 2019, Florence Jaquet Landscape architect (FJL) and Changing Places were commissioned to prepare a Masterplan for San Remo Cemetery, which is under the responsibility of the San Remo Cemetery Trust. The cemetery is managed by the Trust Members who, in this case, are the Councillors who have been elected and currently hold office on the Bass Coast Shire Council (BCSC).

The site was established in 1880 and currently accommodates a very low number of interments (7 burials and 6 ash interments a year on average).

OBJECTIVES
The overall objective is to provide a Masterplan of the San Remo Cemetery in order to improve amenity for members of the public and to improve oversight by members of Council’s administration and Cemetery Trusts. The success of the project will be recognised by relevant stakeholders having confidence in the direction proposed by the Masterplan.

The Masterplan will inform the long term view that recognises the role of the cemetery over the next many decades. It also needs to recognise current trends in terms of burials and associated bereavement services. Over time, these trends can change, so the masterplan may need to be reviewed at regular intervals.

The Plan should address the project purpose, objectives and key issues and include the following:
- Land use and layout
- Access
- Character and experience (including vegetation)
- Infrastructure, management and maintenance
- Revenue opportunities

SCOPE
The scope of this project is to
- Present the site analysis findings in written and graphic form.
- Incorporate ideas borne out of the consultation with stakeholders and community.
- Produce a vision for the future of the cemetery that is underpinned by 4 key strategies listed below and realised through a series of projects.
  - Planned future: Guiding development through a strategic approach that recognises the long time frame in which the site will continue to be used and putting in place resource and space allocations for the orderly roll out of new burials.
  - Circulation and access: A framework for connections to assist visitors to find their way around the cemetery. Vehicle and pedestrian movement into and through the site needs to be simple, convenient, accessible to all and a positive experience for all visitors.
  - Comfort and amenity: Catering for the living recognises that a high level of amenity and excellent facilities are important at all times for families and friends. Initial and subsequent visits should deliver peace, comfort and tranquillity.
  - Operations and infrastructure: Building efficiencies through a targeted works program focussed on improved resources and support.
- Provide staging and priorities for implementation.
**METHODOLOGY**

**Briefing**
An onsite briefing session took place on 20th February 2019 with Council officers from the Governance Department together with present Cemetery Management Officer and Friends Group members. Discussions took place around Friends Group involvement, processes and various maintenance issues.

**Relevant documents**
A number of documents were made available to assist in defining the current issues facing the cemetery

- San Remo Cemetery Arborist report – by Arborzone – April 2017
- Base plan – Aerial map with Lidar contours only.

As a Feature and Level survey was not available for the site, the information shown on the Masterplan is based on extrapolation of aerial maps and broad contour maps. As a consequence, some inaccuracies are expected.

**Stakeholder consultation**
A number of interested parties were contacted for their input into the consultation process:

**Internal participants**
- Debbie Adamson – Cemetery and Committees Officer
- Sharon Fowles – Manager Governance & Information Services
- Annette Waters – Coordinator Governance & Information Services

**External participants**
- Scott Anderson – Handley & Anderson Funeral Directors
- Brian Arnold – Chair, Phillip Island Cemetery Trust
- Dr Philip Bachelor – Box Hill Cemetery
- Brett Gardner – Facilitator, Connecting Skills Australia
- Mark Leaver – Cemetery Management, MDL Constructions Pty Ltd
- Doris Legg – Friends of San Remo Cemetery Volunteer
- Peter Maclellan – Community member
- Jean Riseley – Friends of San Remo Cemetery Volunteer
- Russell Riseley – Friends of San Remo Cemetery Volunteer
- Eleanor Ross – Community member
- Estelle Russ – Cemetery Sector Governance Support Program, Health and Human Services Regulation and Reform Regulation
- Jane Ross – Friends of San Remo Cemetery Volunteer
- Pamela Rothfield – Secretary, Phillip Island Cemetery Trust
- Allan Smith – Former resident, now in Brisbane
- Dennis Talbot – Friends of San Remo Cemetery Volunteer
- Sally Thorpe – Connecting Skills Australia
- Rita Wooley – Eltham Cemetery

Their comments informed the Operations recommendations and in turn, the Landscape Masterplan.
Analysis
The issues arising from the site clearly fall into two main categories:

1. Operational matters
   A review of operational matters was conducted by Changing Places, a specialist cemetery management advisor and ex-cemetery manager. Considerations were given to governance, record keeping, signage and products/marketing.

2. Landscape/Maintenance
   A visual analysis was carried out by FJLA, cemetery specialist and landscape architects, the findings of which are graphically represented in the form of “Constraints” and “Opportunities”.

Draft masterplan
Based on the findings of the various analysis and the issues highlighted during the stakeholders consultation process, a list of issues was formulated. This provides a preliminary proposal for operational issues and landscape with realistic proposals attempting to resolve wide-ranging issues under a limited budget.

Final draft and final masterplan
Upon approval of the Draft Masterplan, the Final Draft Masterplan was drawn and is to be read in conjunction with this report. The plan was exhibited for 6 weeks and public comments sought. Upon receipt of feedback, both documents were modified and re-submitted for approval and endorsement by the SRCT.

The report is meant as a management tool to guide implementation as well as staff inductions.

The Final Masterplan provides a preliminary “yield” calculation for the site to estimate its remaining “life expectancy”.

Implementation
The main recommendations of the masterplan were formulated as a series of capital works tasks and prioritised into three main categories:

Stage 1: -Immediate needs/First priorities
Stage 2: -Medium term (should finances permit)
Stage 3: -Long-term (should finances permit)

The capital works cost estimation is to be conducted by Council.

Report format
For ease of reference and to facilitate the management of the site, the bulk of the report has been structured into (2) main chapters, each dealing with its own discipline:

1. Operations & Merchandising: (by Changing Places P/L)
2. Landscape. (By FJLA)

Chapter 1 carries its own set of recommendations which in turn informs the Landscape Masterplan.
Figure 1: Bodily disposition by cremation

Source: The Economist Sept 2018
OPERATIONS & MERCHANDISING

PROCESS
Prior to preparing this report, consultations took place with a variety of stakeholders (see Page 10). Some related council records and documents were reviewed. The desk top review material was considered in conjunction with observations made during the site visits and the responses received in relation to subsequent enquiries.

Significant input was received from: Debbie Adamson, Eleanor Ross, Peter Maclellan and the San Remo Cemetery Friends Group. Whilst their input was appreciated, Changing Places and Florence Jaquet Landscape Architects remain responsible for the content of this report.

BACKGROUND
Research by a local community historian indicates that land for the cemetery was set aside in March 1880. Subsequently, in March 1881, Hugh Anderson, Alfred Aldridge, Mark Turnbull, Thomas Bergin and George Crump were appointed as cemetery Trustees.

Nearly 140 years later, the cemetery still has large tracts of available space, some clustering of interments (reflecting in the main past religious groupings) and an indeterminate number of actual bodily interments.

As is so often the case in old cemeteries, there would appear to be some material gaps in the historic interment records and related site maps of interment locations. This has procedural implications for the approach best taken to developing new interment sections. That approach will also be influenced by changes in community expectations.

INDUSTRY TRENDS
Since the cemetery was established, the operating environment and the marketplace has evolved significantly.

Social evolution
Broader social trends impact the nature of demand for cemetery goods and services. Australian social commentators associate the last 60 years with a variety of phenomena including the

- diminution of the visible role of Christian churches
- transition from a local, to metropolitan, to a global village
- more visible evidence of multi culturalism
- breakdown of the traditional nuclear family
- increasing importance of technology
- majority of deaths resulting in cremation rather than burial
- breakdown in face to face interpersonal communications
- expectation that communication and responses to queries will be instant.

In parallel, the funeral industry has recognised some specific trends that will impact the level and nature of demand for interment space.

Bodily disposition preferences

Figure 1 illustrates the worldwide trend towards cremation, as the preferred form of bodily disposition. Within Australia, during the last 30 years, the proportion of bodily disposition by cremation has materially increased. Nationally the figure is around 65% and closer to 80% in the metropolitan areas.

Within the Bass Coast Local Area cremation is becoming more popular, especially if client families do not already have access to a local grave for interment.
When you die, would you prefer to be...

- **Buried or cremated? %**
  - Buried: 20%
  - Cremated: 58%
  - Something else: 5%
  - Don't know: 17%

- **Kept or scattered? % of those cremated**
  - Kept: 79%
  - Don't know: 13%
  - Scattered: 7%

*Figure 2: When you die, would you prefer to be...*  
*Source: https://yougov.co.uk/news/2016/08/16/majority-people-want-be-cremated-when-they-die/*

*Figure 3: Facilities under construction (Feb. 2019) (Corner of the Loch - Wonthaggi Road/Bass Highway)*
Historically the church and or the local cemetery were the normal place to inter remains. With the breakdown of the church, the scattering of population and the emergence of the disposable society… that world is gone forever. In turn, across Australia, the emergence of a trend towards “no service, no attendance” (NSD) is developing. With an NSD the coffin is delivered for cremation, without first being present at the funeral service.

Results of a study conducted in the United Kingdom (Figure 2), released in August 2016, indicated that “Nearly six in ten people (58%) want to be cremated when they die – more than three times the 17% of people who want to be buried, a new YouGov survey on attitudes to death reveals. Of these people, the vast majority (79%) would then like their ashes to be scattered somewhere. Just 7% want their ashes to be kept after they’ve been cremated.”

Scattering is in vogue. The impact of the relatively recent edict by the Roman Catholic Church, advocating placement of cremated remains in sacred places and discouraging scattering, is yet to become clear.

Funeral service styles

The increase in cremation has also generated an evolution in funeral service organisation.

Traditionally funerals were arranged as a dual service. It began at a church and was followed by a committal service at a cemetery. With the breakdown of the church and the increase in cremation, a single service structure became the norm. Cremation services more frequently were conducted in funeral directors premises or a church or a hall… and family did not attend the crematorium. Alternatively, the mourners gathered at the crematorium chapel.

Given the distance from San Remo to the cremation facilities at Springvale and Traralgon, it’s understandable that families increasingly prefer a single local service. That trend will be reinforced when local funeral directors, Handley & Anderson, open their new chapel and refreshment facility (Figure 3) later this year.

With burial, unless there is a strong church affiliation, there appears to be a local trend to having a single service at the graveside, then gathering afterwards for refreshments.

Impacts on demand

A number of factors, apart from just the critical impact of the death rate and ratio of cremation to burials, will influence the actual number of new graves that will be required to satisfy demand within the region.

Dynamic variables will be interacting:

- how many interments (bodily and or cremated) occur as second or third interments within a grave
- how many interments of bodily and cremated remains are allowed per grave
- the number of the region’s residents who are buried outside the region and vice versa
- the impact of religious preferences and the flexibility of religious preferences over time
- the impact of Interment Right fee increases upon demand for graves i.e. as the cost of graves increases, cremations become more attractive.
- the attractiveness of the bodily interment options offered by non council cemetery operators within the Local Area (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DHS Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corinella Cemetery Trust</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Gippsland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Island Cemetery Trust</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Gippsland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantville Cemetery Trust</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Gippsland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverloch Cemetery Trust</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Gippsland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilcunda Cemetery Trust</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Gippsland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang Lang Cemetery Trust</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Gippsland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Island Cemetery Trust</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Gippsland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Remo Cemetery Trust</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Gippsland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonthaggi Cemetery Trust</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Gippsland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Cemeteries within the DHHS Gippsland region (Source: DHHS web site)
Figure 4: Bass Shire forecast population


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Wonthaggi Cemetery</th>
<th>San Remo Cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interments</td>
<td>Plaques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ashes</td>
<td>Burials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*I July - 6 March 2019
The local population and the death rate will also impact demand. The Bass Coast Shire population forecast, for 2019 is 34,992 and is forecast to grow to 46,429 by 2036.

Despite the increase in the Local Area 2007 population from 27,408 to an estimated 34,386, in 2017, there has been a material decrease in the number of bodily interments conducted at the San Remo Cemetery in recent years. (Table 2). Without further research it is not easy to tell whether the relative increase in bodily interments at Wonthaggi reflects the site improvements therein or just local origin of the deceased. In both 2017/18 and in the period ended 6 March 2019, Interment Rights sold for San Remo exceeded the number of bodily interments, i.e., pre-purchases were occurring. By comparison it appears Wonthaggi is having more second interments into existing graves or more take up of previously presold positions, as in similar periods there were respectively 48 Rights sold and 52 burials, then 21 for 35 burials.

Given the low bodily interment volume, the preference for cremation and the extensive tracts of vacant land within the San Remo Cemetery it is likely that the site will service the community for more than 100 years.

As a result, the SRCT is faced with maintaining a low income site virtually in perpetuity. In these circumstances it would be prudent to consider fostering on site community participation and to position San Remo Cemetery as a preferred destination for interment.

To be able to foster demand for bodily and cremated remain interment positions, the masterplan will need to reflect the input of stakeholders during the recent consultation process. It is clear that whilst cremation is driven by price and convenience, the spending on memorialisation reflects the options available.

With the ongoing popularity of cremation as the dominant form of bodily disposition, there is a real opportunity for the SRCT to leverage the trend, fostering cremation memorialisation within its sites.

**Recommendation one**

*That the San Remo Cemetery Trust proactively promotes cremated remains interment within the Local Area.*

**EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER INPUT**

Meetings occurred with internal stakeholders at the council offices, volunteers at the cemetery and a community consultation in San Remo (Detailed feedback pages 62-70). Other insights were obtained in telephone and email communications from interested stakeholders.

The following input summary is not in order of importance or relevance to the masterplan process.

- Need for site signage, site maps and clearer, consistent approaches to numbering.
- Better range of cremation memorials.
- Need to offer a specific headstone beam section (like Phillip Island).
- Consistency in site maintenance and support of volunteers, slash more regularly and also deal with external road verge fire hazards i.e. grass outside boundary fences.
- Removal of pine trees: issues with root disturbance to monuments, impact on mowers, pine needles inhibiting native species and roots sucking moisture out of the soil. Need to raise tree branch level to make it safer for ride on mowers.
- Removal of the dead blackwood tree.
- Concern that the maintenance of separate trusts for San Remo and Wonthaggi is diminishing transparency and enables BCSC to distance itself from related issues.
- If Council not willing to manage it directly, open trust membership up to allow community participation.
- Lack of co-ordination in area maintenance between BCSC and SRCT. Mostly the front gate is maintained and not the other three boundaries. Renew fencing on Shetland Heights Road to match that on Anderson Street. Upgrade/maintain the pedestrian crossover and gate on Shetland Heights Road. This is the most visible side of the cemetery and seems to suffer an indifferent maintenance and mowing schedule.
- Drainage issues with flooding of lawn beam area and the volunteer shed.
- Need to provide flower spikes so that families don’t need glass jars etc.
- Demand for burial into religious section is diminishing.
- Council has inadequate information on local indigenous and other private interments outside cemetery boundaries.
Existing conditions
TRUST STRUCTURE

Clearly community members are aware that the Bass Coast Shire Council manages the operation of the Wonthaggi and San Remo Cemetery Trusts. Whilst technically they are three separate legal entities, that distinction is not all that transparent, even in some Council materials.

The wording of the Council’s 2014 Charter is ambiguous. It implies that they are one.

“Wonthaggi and San Remo Cemetery Charter November 2014

1.1. Nature of the Cemetery Trust

The Wonthaggi and San Remo Public Cemetery is classified as a Class B Cemetery Trust (Trust) under the Cemeteries and Crematoria Act 2003. The Trust is a body corporate with perpetual succession established by Governor in Council under the Cemeteries Act 1958 and updated within the Cemeteries and Crematoria Act 2003…

The Trusts have been entrusted by the Minister of Health to steer the Wonthaggi and San Remo Public Cemeteries.”

In day to day operations the two trusts use the same contractors, finance system and plaque suppliers. Their fee structures are similar. The same BCS councillors are on each trust. Their meetings are at the same time and the same council officer services both trusts.

As a result, combining the two would create minimal disturbance and would more closely align the governance structure with that of modern cemetery operators e.g. SMCT. It would also provide an opportunity to facilitate community participation in the trusts.

The restructured entity would be better positioned to promote uniform policies, apply consistent processes across both sites and manage external contractors.

From a DHHS perspective it appears that the fact they are not combined already likely reflects an historic oversight, rather than a conscious decision. Should BCSC wish to proceed, the process is straightforward (see Appendix A).

Recommendation two

That the San Remo Cemetery Trust request BCSC to consider, research and consult on the merits of consolidating its two cemetery trust entities, into one.

- Number of unmarked graves and areas where interments may have occurred but are not recorded.
- Utilise Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) or surface soil scraping as part of the procedure for testing viability of potential locations for new interment sections.
- Opportunities to integrate cemetery more fully into community activities e.g. link burial site information about lost seamen, to the annual blessing of the fleet.
- Enhance web access to cemetery information.
- Enhance roadside edges to better guide vehicle parking.
- Provide a permanent accessible shelter or rotunda and public toilets.
- Remove spoil earth mound. Extract the rock and ballast material and use soil to fill lower parts of the site.
- Create opportunities for remembrance memorials i.e. where no interment is actually occurring.
- Develop material on historical aspects of the site, include on web and in cemetery tour walkway signage.
- Restrict areas in which interments are able to occur or more rigorously control the placement of graves.
- Provide a local crematorium. Without allowing for the actual funeral service, it’s a three hour return trip to Springvale and 2½ hours to the Traralgon crematorium.
- Ensure continuity in approaches to cemetery operations. Staff will inevitably change but incumbents should operate within procedural and policy guidelines.
- Formally liaise with other local cemetery trusts to foster a consistent approach to issues and diminish marginal inconsistencies in approaches e.g. to headstone specifications.

These matters all warrant consideration.Whilst some go beyond the master planning brief, they all potentially impact operational viability.
SPOIL REMOVAL
Regardless of the direction from which the rubble heap is viewed, it is an eyesore. It impacts the visual amenity of the site, hinders site maintenance and will only get worse in time. It appears that the pile predominantly originated from grave excavation.

Rather than cart it for dumping at Grantville, it appears cost effective to sort the mound to remove rocks and spread the soil into low lying areas. Going forward an accessible spot needs to be designated for temporarily stock piling soil residue.

*Recommendation three*
That the soil stock pile be sorted and spread.

MAINTENANCE
Until recently, maintenance did not make provision for slashing the whole site consistently or for the regular maintenance of the recently created cremation garden area (except by volunteers).

*Recommendation four*
That a site maintenance schedule be developed.

SUPPORTING VOLUNTEERS
If the SRCT is encouraging volunteers to maintain parts of the site, it is prudent to ensure that appropriate insurances are in place to cover them, along with a charter outlining what their responsibilities are and what support the SRCT will provide.

Given the invaluable contribution volunteers make and the challenges faced in maintaining their active numbers, consideration should be given to more formally recognising their service to the community and to active promotion of related activities.

*Recommendation five*
That a “Roles of Friends Group” be developed, inductions occur, and appropriate insurance cover provided by the SRCT.

PROMOTING HISTORIC CONNECTIONS
There appear to be a number of avid historians within the local community who may be able to assist with fostering links between the cemetery and local history.

The ongoing linkages between San Remo and seafaring create an opportunity to promote awareness of the past and the cemetery. The lost fisherman monument on the San Remo foreshore could reference the related interments within the cemetery. In turn, the interment sites within the cemetery could become part of a designated walking tour.

The Sorrento cemetery has placed signage (*Figure 7*) next to the historic cemetery memorial cairn for Captain John Scott and some of his crew.

Potentially references to the cemetery and tours could be more actively promoted, possibly by Council, as part of the annual blessing of the fleet and the annual fisherman’s festival.

The walking path component through the San Remo cemetery is acknowledged in the Bass Coast Shire Council Planning Scheme. Site signage could also reference key historic interments, as part of a proactive approach to recognising the past and promoting the use of the cemetery for passive recreation in the future.

Possibly Council can be approached to suggest ways of funding accessible signage, to enhance the walking path experience.

*Recommendation six*
That SRCT identify key historical aspects of the cemetery and reference them in site signage and on the web.
Figure 8: Alignment Creep

Figure 9: Memorial styles in one section

Figure 10: Tilting headstones
OPERATIONAL MATTERS

The SRCT has inherited a number of issues associated with the historic practices at the site. Unless it develops a more proactive approach to site management it risks compounding the issues it leaves for future generations.

Irregular interment alignment

Within segments of the historic portions of the site, graves have irregular dimensions and alignment. Regrettably more recently developed monumental sections reflect ongoing issues.

Figure 8 demonstrates that either the graves have been incorrectly aligned when dug or the monumental mason has not correctly positioned (or measured) the monument or a combination thereof.

Apart from the formal full size monuments depicted in Figure 8, that interment area also has a variety of commemoration styles (Figure 9). Whilst each may reflect particular circumstances, what the visual impression suggests is that the SRCT does not have a clear policy specifying acceptable memorials or does not enforce it.

A policy needs to be developed, with a related education/consultation process (for both masons and funeral directors) and a proactive approach to site supervision implemented. The Australian Standard for Headstones and Monuments has just been revised and it should be a reference point for the SRCT's requirements.

Arguably it is unreasonable to expect the cemeteries administration person to be familiar with Australian Standards and able to interpret what are likely to be complex drawings/designs for full monuments. Complex applications should be appraised by suitably qualified staff e.g. Council building permit or engineering staff, incurring a fee.

The Australian Standard for Headstones and Cemetery Monuments AS 4204:2019 was significantly updated prior to publication in April 2019. It is available for purchase via SAI Global on 13 12 42 or via their website: www.saiglobal.com. Quite possibly local masons would be unaware of its contents.

There would be merit in consulting with other local trusts e.g. Phillip island, to align approaches. Consistency facilitates implementation.

Recommendation seven

That SRCT develops a Memorialisation Policy, outlining the acceptable styles, dimensions and materials applicable within its cemetery sections.

Recommendation eight

That monumental masons be required to register as contractors with the BCSC and that masons without current registrations be ineligible to submit applications to install monuments.

Recommendation nine

That applications for monument construction be appraised by a qualified professional, to ensure conformance with Australian Standards.

Addressing issues with memorials

Where there appear to be issues with existing memorials e.g. tilting (Figure 10), the SRCT should

- Examine the memorial permit application that was lodged for that site (if accessible)
- Ascertain whether the delivered product matched the Application and Australian Standards
- Inform the Holder of the Interment Right of the need for rectification of the memorial.

It is not the trust's financial responsibility to fix the memorial. If its deteriorating condition poses a risk to the community and if the holder of the Interment Right is not contactable or not prepared to address the issue, after due process, the SRCT should make safe i.e. lay the headstone flat.

If the particular monument or memorial is of historic or heritage significance, it may be possible to attract a benefactor to fund restoration or for the SRCT or BCSC to do so, provided due process is followed.

Recommendation ten

That a site inspection occur to identify monuments and memorials that pose a risk to the community.
Figure 11: Current lawn beam style

Figure 12: Flower vases
Lawn beam design

The lawn beam interment area is popular. Whilst the existing “raised” design arguably makes the plaques easier to read it also, by default, creates long term maintenance and safety issues. The slope on the concrete makes it harder for families to place memorabilia. Over time families have been allowed to place concrete edging, pot plants and other materials into and onto the adjacent lawn area (Figure 11). These are unsightly, an impediment to mowing and a safety issue.

To diminish risk, assist families with memorialisation and to enable the SRCT to offer alternative products the beams should be poured flat. Spiked flower vases should be made available to the public, free of charge (Figure 12). The vases are widely used in modern cemetery operations. In some cemeteries, just prior to an interment a hole for the flower spike is drilled into the beam. In others, where fresh flowers are promoted, the spikes go into the lawn. It is preferable not to create vases within a beam e.g. utilising PVC pipe pieces, as over time they create mosquito breeding positions or become sources of weed growth.

The 2015 report to the Wonthaggi Trust has more detail in relation to beam construction.

Recommendation eleven
That the next lawn beam poured at San Remo Cemetery be poured flat, without a raised sloping surface.

Recommendation twelve
That the SRCT provides flower vases for community use.

Recommendation thirteen
That any inappropriate items placed within the lawn adjacent to a flat beam be removed promptly and sensitively.

Recommendation fourteen
That signs be placed within the grounds, adjacent to the interment sites, outlining acceptable items/floral policy etc.

Cemetery Operating Policy

The aforementioned references to floral and memorialisation Policy, highlight the need for the SRCT to develop a comprehensive simple English, Operating Policy. That document would consolidate operational and management information that the community should be aware of and abide by.

As such it would provide material in relation to bookings, acceptable monuments styles (including reference to the recently released updated Australian Standards), reservations, tenure, access to burial registers, concise explanations of historic data shortfalls, hours of operation, passive site access, Friends Group etc.

Ideally the Operating Policy would sit alongside and reference the more technical Memorialisation Policy. The SRCT Floral Policy could be outlined within the Operating Policy.

Ideally a similar document or indeed one document, would cover both Wonthaggi and San Remo Cemeteries. A consistent approach diminishes risk of community confusion.

Recommendation fifteen
That an Operating Policy be developed and made available to the community.

ADDING VALUE... GOOD BETTER BEST (GBB)

Just as community members have different tastes, incomes and preferences, they may also have different ideas about the style of interment or memorial that best suits their needs.

Being realistic, whilst the Trust cannot provide an unlimited range of memorialisation styles and options, it can enhance service to the community by offering more choices and by tailoring fees to reflect the relative value of the different options that are available.

This enables families to make a choice between available options and it is also likely to foster more personalised commemoration. Over time the Trust will be able to identify the pattern of demand that has emerged and can alter the product mix accordingly.
Figure 13A: Lawn beam: Good Better Best

Figure 13B: Lawn beam: Good Better Best

Figure 14: SRCT Good & getting Better
When a broader range of choices are offered to client families, it is likely that they will, in aggregate, spend more. That is up to them. It is important that the decisions in relation to what is offered and pricing are not ad hoc.

Moving forward we would advocate that a more structured approach to merchandising and revenue generation should be adopted. The Good, Better, Best (GBB) principles were outlined in detail in the Wonthaggi 2015 Report.

In summary a client family selecting the

- “Good”, offering receives an acceptable location and or a quality product, fit for purpose, durable and able to accommodate basic words or lettering.
- “Better”, offering will offer all the attributes of “Good”, as well as something extra. Possibly it’s larger or a different colour or an alternate shape or fits more inscription or in a more pleasant area or nearer a road side.
- “Best”, offering will offer all the attributes of “Better”, as well as something else to add value. Again, it may relate to size, colour, material, the inscription capacity, the specific interment location, attributes etc.

This approach is reflected within fee structures. It applies a higher “mark up” on the “Good” component, a lesser “mark up” on the additional components that make it “Better” and then a smaller “mark up” on the “Best” components.

The logic is simple… it means that as the clients step up through the range they are getting progressively better value for their money. It is the same logic generally applied in retailing whether its clothing, make up or furniture.

Families recognise value steps. They experience them in their day to day purchasing activities.

**GBB on lawn beams**

Best practice would be to install beams well in advance of need, so that the adjacent lawn area is established before interment rights are sold for positions on that beam i.e. before interments can begin.

Currently with the concrete sloping beams, the choice of memorialisation is constrained, and all positions have the same interment right fee.

GBB can be applied in two ways.

Firstly, GBB can be based on attributes. Not all positions on a beam are equivalent. Some are nearer the end of the row and car parking. Other spots on the beam may be in wetter areas. Some will be closer to shade or seating or face in a preferred direction.

If there are discernible attribute differences, within the beam itself, it’s possible to have different fees. In effect these might be listed say as Standard Lawn Beam and Premium.

The list of Attributes used at Melbourne General Cemetery, to enable fees to be determined upon reopening the site, is included as Appendix B.

Secondly GBB can be applied via the memorialisation choices offered for the plaque i.e. the revenue is derived from the merchandise. Along the same beam with

- “Good”: the plaque is placed directly on the beam
- “Better”: the plaque is placed onto a flat granite panel, on the beam
- “Best”: the plaque is placed onto a granite desk, on the beam

Another layer of value is added via different plaque sizes, attachment options, granite panel sizes and granite colours. (Figure 13 A&B).

This approach generates additional revenue. Within Springvale, once the new B. D. Arnold Lawn opened more than 80% of client families selected a desk. It also means that families who don’t have or want to commit extra dollars are able to simply take a plaque and not the granite.

If the SRCT wanted to do so it could stock and supply the granite itself or make transparent arrangements with a local supplier to stock and install the granite, as required. Either way it’s important to install some desks on the new flat beam so that people can see the “Best” alternative. If they can see it, they are likely to choose it.
Figure 15: Eltham Cemetery

Figure 16: Premium memorials

Figure 17: Existing seats
GBB with cremation memorials

The recent clean up of the cremation interment garden has rejuvenated its appearance. The placement of location numbers along the bed edge should help to diminish confusion and “position creep” going forward.

The GBB approach is already partly implemented, as families may elect to have a plaque on a paver or “Better” on a concrete desk (Figure 14). Consideration should be given to providing a granite desk or pedestal as “Best”.

The Eltham Cemetery uses an upright bluestone pedestal (Figure 15) with a larger plaque to denote some premium positions. It is installed in a number of positions, before the Interment Right is sold. This is like installing some desks on a beam; it educates client families about opportunities. The pedestals could be in granite or bluestone or a preferred local material.

Going forward it would be possible to install a limited number of larger memorials (Figure 16) in specific locations. They might be used for placement of cremated remains or even bodily disposition.

Potentially, individual trees (outside the designated cremation garden) may be designated as “Best” ash interment sites. Locations in the tree surrounds might be sold in say quadrants for family memorials. Alternatively, locations around a specimen tree might be offered as a family memorial. Note: it’s the location for which the interment right is sold, not the tree itself.

Whilst some stakeholders might say “no-one asks for anything else”, that’s likely to be because

- they can’t see anything else or
- they are unaware of what else could be available or
- their funeral director has already told them that if you don’t put the Cremated remains in a grave, all you can do within SRct is use a wall niche or have a small plaque on a mower strip.

Existing or newer garden areas and trees can easily be utilised to create community, individual and family cremated remains interment locations. It is no different to real estate. Location and the interaction of supply and demand will determine price. “Best” is obviously the dearest.

If this cemetery is to attract more cremation memorialisation, the SRCT should ensure that the maintenance of its cremation garden area is not reliant solely upon volunteers. Every time a bodily interment occurs, or the walking trails are used, or mourners visit, the site is on display to potential clients. Maintenance should be ongoing, not always in a state of catch up.

Fees reflect GBB

Modern cemetery practice is to reflect GBB principles with fee structures. As a general rule the entry point i.e. base price for “Good”, will be a bodily interment position on a lawn beam. Headstone interment positions are more expensive and full monument sections attract higher prices (as the adjacent lawns are harder to mow, forever).

Even if a family purchase an interment right in a full monumental section, they are not obliged to install a monument fully covering the grave. As a result, they are not likely to be as easy to maintain and that needs to be reflected in the fee.

Recommendation sixteen

That “Good”, “Better”, “Best” merchandising principles influence the range of interment positions offered, the merchandise range and fee structures.

CATERING FOR THE MARKET

As strange as it may seem, the SRCT is operating a retail outlet for interment rights and related merchandise. It has already improved the range with the development of the cremation garden area. There are some further options that are relatively easy to implement.

Seats

Accessible bench seats are usually part of the cremation memorial range at metropolitan cemeteries. If SRCT is providing the infrastructure, it can actually pay for itself. Remembrance plaques might be affixed to the seat or to a pedestal or other object in front of the seat.
Figure 18: Dunwich Cemetery

Figure 19: Accessible seating

Figure 19: Phillip Island Headstone Lawn Beam
The key is to balance visual amenity, without creating trip hazards and not placing seats in positions where they impede pedestrian access to interment locations behind them. Where the seat is on a solid base it’s possible to inter cremated remains underneath the base.

To minimise intergenerational costs, it is important to recognise that the seat will be in place for a long time. Durable materials suited to the San Remo seaside location should be utilised. Dunwich Cemetery (Stradbroke Island), has bench seats around trees (Figure 18), amongst historic memorials. All seating should also be accessible (Figure 19).

**Recommendation seventeen**

That consideration be given to utilising quality accessible bench seats as commemorative locations.

**Headstone lawn beam**

SRCT can do little to redress the deterioration of some of its existing monuments. It can do a lot to diminish the issues related to construction and placement of new monuments by restricting the nature of allowable items.

Creating a specific headstone lawn beam will diversify the product offering.

The Phillip Island Cemetery has successfully taken this approach in recent years. Their beam has been tailored to its purpose. Individual graves are marked, and numbers are incorporated into the beam. It rigorously inspects what it expects, to ensure that monumental masons meet specifications and that an outer edge of the beam is left as a mower strip.

Unless there is a good reason not to, it would be sensible to adopt the same specifications for headstone beam monuments as those at Phillip Island. Doing so will save monumental masons getting confused, will simplify stock ordering and diminish the hassles that SRCT staff have enforcing the policy.

The headstone beam needs to be situated in a good location, with access to the road and preferably with better drainage than the lawn beam section. Having it distinctly separate from the lawn beam section enhances its value.

Only one beam needs to be placed initially. The market place will then determine when another beam is needed.

**Recommendation eighteen**

That a designated headstone lawn beam section be developed.

**Premium interment areas**

From time to time families may seek to acquire interment rights for locations adjacent to historic family grave areas. These sections are in various positions around the site. Often related records are unclear or incomplete. The monuments themselves often reflect past craftsmanship and may at times be in a deteriorating state.

Respecting the past, the SRCT should be quite rigorous in its approach to considering applications for interment rights in adjacent areas. The approach needs to be transparently defined and consistently applied over coming years.

In areas where staff consider that there is demand or where a family has made an inquiry and is prepared to purchase an interment right (but not to have access until SRCT ascertains the suitability of the site and prepares it) a short beam might be placed. It may be single sided and only provide for two or three interment right positions.

To diminish risk of grave creep and inadequate foundations, it is preferable that SRCT installs the beam. Before doing so the records need to be searched to ascertain the likelihood of previous interments. Ideally either Ground Penetrating Radar should be used, or the grave digging contractor engaged to scrape away surface soil to allow examination of sub surface soil strata. Doing so diminishes the risk of interfering with older interments.

The additional time and costs associated with the process and beam creation costs should be reflected in a materially higher interment right fee.

Adopting this approach will enable SRCT to more easily meet community demand for interment positions close to older areas. The higher fee will allow market forces to work. The research and soil testing will help preserve the integrity of the site. Limiting monumental works to clearly defined headstone specifications will diminish the risk that monumental work will negatively impact the ambience of the area.
Figure 20: Sorrento Cemetery
**Recommendation nineteen**

To meet demand, that some exclusive premium headstone lawn beams be installed near older interment areas.

**Full monuments**

The previous sections have outlined the usual range of bodily interment options to being

- lawn beam positions
- headstone lawn beam positions
- premium headstone beam positions.

This range is specifically catered for within the masterplan. The omission of a full monumental section reflects the

- declining demand, in this cemetery, for that style of memorialisation
- fact that even within existing monumental sections families are using rocks, pot plants, timber and headstones to memorialise, rather than full monuments
- existing sections have issues with inadequate construction, grave creep and specification variation.

In the event that a client family wishes to preselect a full monumental position, to diminish risk, that Application for an Interment Right should be accompanied by an Application for a Memorialisation Permit which is certified as conforming with Australian Standards.

An appropriate location may be available in the existing section, just inside the front gate.

If the desire is to create the location adjacent to an existing older area, then it would be prudent to defer allocation of the position until after all conforming paperwork has been received and the proposed location has been tested with GPR or soil scraping.

Taking this conservative approach recognises the issues associated with historic records and unmarked interment sites.

**Recommendation twenty**

That a new full monumental section, as such, not be incorporated within the masterplan.

**Interment right fee implications**

Clearly the long term maintenance costs of the site have intergenerational implications for both the SRCT and the Council. Given that there appear to be material issues with the dimensions, alignment and foundations of even some of the recently installed full monuments, it would be prudent governance to promote the use of the lawn beam section and the proposed headstone lawn beam. This can be done with fee differentials.

Provided client families are not continuing to place additional adornments within the lawn, the newer areas will be easier to maintain.

The simplest way to promote the desired outcome is to use the fee structure to influence demand.

A Good Better Best based approach would have the

- “Good”: lawn cemetery beam as the entry level bodily interment right position fee.
- “Better”: the headstone lawn beam would be priced above the straight lawn beam.
- “Best”: the interment rights for positions near to the existing row of monumental positions would be higher again.
- “Wow”: the Premium positions placed on smaller beams, nearer older interment locations.

The addition of “Wow” to the GBB list reflects a recent marketing approach advocated by Arrow Bronze. They have noticed that some families wanted more than what had been the top of the Arrow range. Consequently, they developed some Premium items.

SRCT is well placed to follow suit. The key to success is rigorously enforcing the SRCT memorial specifications.

**Recommendation twenty one**

That SRCT appropriately uses the cemetery fee structure to impact demand for different cemetery sections.
Figure 21: Wollongong Memorial Gardens
**Remembrance memorials**

The fact that no bodily or cremated remains are to be interred at San Remo need not be a deterrent to memorialisation. Sorrento Cemetery has created a granite Remembrance Memorial upon which plaques can be inscribed to commemorate persons whose ashes have been scattered. They also have a conifer which is the focal point of an annual community Christmas service.

Wollongong (Figure 21) has a more elaborate remembrance wall. With the benefit of hindsight, its manager acknowledges that there should have been GBB fees applied, with the upper levels set higher. The stars that have been placed lower on the wall are predominantly positioned in relation to the etched trees on the granite back drop.

**Recommendation twenty two**

*That a Remembrance Memorial location be identified on the masterplan and a memorial design be developed in keeping with San Remo Cemetery’s character.*

**Denominational sections**

The use of denominational sections is not common within modern cemetery development, unless experience already demonstrates material demand from a particular group. In older cemeteries denominational sections, it is quite common to find unsold interment rights.

Designating a section as say Presbyterian or Methodist may deter other families from selecting Interment Rights in that section. Unless the Bass LGA is materially different to most, the proportion of census respondents designating a religion will be diminishing over time.

There also does not appear to be significant local population cohort designated as being of the Jewish, Muslim or Orthodox religions i.e. those that traditionally prefer bodily interment, in their own areas.

Coupling this with the increased proportion of cremations, it’s not optimal to arbitrarily risk limiting demand in particular areas or expending limited capital creating sections which are less likely to be used. Better to go forward with more non-denominational space.

**Recommendation twenty three**

*That, as far as is practical, newer sections not be designated as denominational.*
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LANDSCAPE
EXISTING CONDITIONS

General
The site is approximately 4.5 Hectares (211m long x 211m wide approximately) and located between Anderson St and Shetland Heights Rd, San Remo.

Topography and character
The land generally slopes towards the South-West corner with a high point on the North-East corner. The land has a reasonable slope (average 1V:15H) and paradoxically, drainage issues have been reported at the site’s highest point in the lawn section.

The site is away from the town centre and is surrounded by residential properties.

Views
The upper part of the cemetery offers great views onto Philip Island and Bass Straight. Depending on one’s position on site, these views are filtered through large established trees growing on site.

Soil
No Geotechnical testing were conducted. According to grave digging contractors, soils are not expected to impede excavation for burials. Excess spoil has been stockpiled in a prominent area of the site.

Vegetation
The site is almost surrounded by a 5m deep thicket of native shrubs and trees which act as screening. These were established by the Friends Groups over many years. A few interruptions in planting allow for views in and out on the southern and western boundaries.

There is an established treed avenue (although inconsistent in species and spacing) linking the two entrances. A dozen other established trees are scattered randomly around the site.

An ornamental circular Memorial Garden was established by the Friends Group and provides an important focal point in the cemetery. A tree assessment report was conducted in April 2017. Council commissions regular tree audits every two years.

It appears that maintenance cost minimization has led to the lower portion of the site not being mown nor maintained. This resulted in the establishment of an unsightly self-seeded “forest” with grassy understorey. This grassy understorey extends up the slope. Both should be regarded as potential fire hazards & snake habitat.

Recommendation twenty four
That, diseased and unsightly shrubs and trees be regularly removed in the screen planting and from areas of low maintenance.

Recommendation twenty five
That, unmown grass be slashed more frequently in summer.

Fences and gates
A low farm fence (timber log and mesh) runs along all four boundaries although inconsistent in appearance (horizontal wires on Anderson St and sheep mesh on Shetland Heights Rd)
San Remo Cemetery Masterplan
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There are no gates at the main entrance on Anderson St and access is available 24hrs a day. A locked wooden 2.5m wide gate and an unlocked galvanised-framed pedestrian gate exist on Shetland Heights Rd and the north west corner on Anderson St. Vandalism by vehicles has not been an issue to date.

**Access and roads**

As previously mentioned, the site is accessible via one main ungated entry point along Anderson St. This northern entrance is used by the majority of visitors.

The pedestrian gates have been reported as being frequently used by local dog walkers. It forms part of a proposed pedestrian network for the municipality.

Only one road is provided from the main entrance and extends some 75m into the site in a straight line. It consists of an unsealed and gravelled single lane.

Parking tends to occur on adjacent and accessible grassed areas and mostly under the shade of existing trees. This may cause root damage and excessive compaction which shortens the life of these trees or creates management costs.

**Buildings**

There are no toilets on site.

A small garden shed, which is mostly used by the Friends Group, is located east of the main entrance. It floods during rain events.

**Services**

No electricity, drainage, sewer or telecommunication cables appear to service the site. A water main runs on the northern side of Anderson St. The water meter is located inside, by the pedestrian gate on the north/west corner of the site. The internal pipeline extends from there to the tap just east of the entrance gate with a branch leading to the memorial garden. (No plan records).
Site analysis
LANDSCAPE ISSUES
Derived from site and operational assessment and community consultation:

- Consistency in maintenance.
- Slashing internally and externally to minimise fire hazard.
- Managing scrubby vegetation to minimise fire hazard.
- Dead trees to be removed to minimise public risk.
- Drainage issues in the lawn sections.
- Existing graves scattered all over the site, rendering maintenance costly as the majority of the site needs mowing, yet unused in most parts.
- Poor grave records.
- Suspected unmarked graves throughout the site.
- Site steepness and wheelchair accessibility.
- Vehicular access available 24 hrs a day,— potential for vandalism.
- Uncontrolled carparking within the site.
- Limited products on offer.
- Maintain views.
- Lack of amenities (shelter/toilets).
- Unsightly and unstable stockpile in centre of site.
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Remembrance Memorial (Indicative only)

Headstone in garden bed

Beam “Good Better Best”

Natural burial
PROPOSALS

Vision
The cemetery already holds a certain charm and is visually appealing with its magnificent views and established trees. It has the potential to be developed into a “boutique” rural cemetery, well presented, secluded and offering products which respond to the community’s needs.

The cemetery should also be regarded as providing valuable Public Open Space for the community and adjacent residential areas, and receive funding accordingly.

The vision for the site is to provide:
- A well presented and respectful cemetery,
- A cemetery catering for the local Community,
- A cemetery retaining its rustic charm,
- A Public Open Space which commemorates its history,
- A range of quality products.

Design rationale
The Masterplan aims to provide a scenic and contemplative setting to funeral visitors as well as the wider community. It is designed as a park, capitalising on views and its rich history, offering walking paths, respite areas, toilet and shelter facilities amongst a wider choice of interments.

In response to the recommendations of the Operations and Merchandising report (pages 12-35), the Masterplan (Appendix C) offers a range of new non-denominational memorialisation options amongst the scattered existing ones, softening the very segretated layout of the original cemetery with interments in each corner of the site.

When entering from the main gate (Anderson St) the visitor will be greeted by (clockwise)
- A Memorial Precinct: a maze of garden beds set around the existing niche walls, seating and a Remembrance Memorial (memorialisation with no ashes) within a granitic sand plaza. All garden beds will offer memorialisation options. Heritage Interpretation signage would provide information and a connection to the town’s history, with a possible self-guided heritage walk available.
- A new circular garden: mirroring the very successful Friend Group’s design. This will host a new form of interment, the Premium “Headstones in Garden beds”.
- The Lawn plaques on beams: infilling all available spaces within the eastern section of the cemetery, with Premium positions associated with sea views.
- The Natural burial area: along the southern boundary, in and around existing trees. It is an area of more naturalistic character, offering “Headstones in Garden Beds” and ash interments and Natural Burial positions, in garden beds and in a forest setting.
- The “Headstones on beams” lawn graves, with Premium positions associated with sea views.
- An enlarged existing circular Memorial Garden with “Headstone in Garden beds” positions on the outer ring.
- Monumental graves: in between the existing Pioneer/Old section (north west corner) and the new monumental area close to the entry gates.
- A central spine: consisting of an enlarged gravel road with parallel parking on both sides and away from trees, maintaining the treed avenue effect in the long-term. In the centre of the site and enjoying the great views onto the sea, a shelter and associated toilet will be provided.

The rest of the report will describe each aspect of the Masterplan thematically for more detail.
Circulation

Entries, Roads and Parking

It is proposed to retain the entries as they are. In the future and should vandalism or other community situations make it prudent to do so, the main entrance could be upgraded with vehicular gates which can be locked at night.

The connection between the southern and northern entries will continue to occur via an extended and widened gravel road which will facilitate funeral circulation by taking traffic from one to the other, opening the gate only for funeral events to eliminate the need to turn around internally. The rest of the time, casual visitors can continue to do a 3-point turn where provided (halfway down the driveway) to exist from the main gate.

In steeper areas (lower part of the cemetery) the gravel should be stabilised with added cement to minimise scouring during rain events.

Parking for funerals and visitors should be encouraged on an improved and wider gravelled surface along this central road spine and away from established trees. The cemetery’s limited income potential does not justify the cost of kerbing and stormwater infrastructure. It is thought that by encouraging parking on a dedicated surface (other than grass), adverse impact and compaction around trees will be limited to a few events per year.

Overflow parking is also available in Anderson St.

The final road layout generally aims at ensuring that the visitors and funeral personnel do not have to walk more than 100m from a car to a grave. Although we usually recommend shorter walking distances, it was felt that additional roads were not financially viable. Due to the infrequency of funeral events, it is acceptable for designated funeral cars to be permitted to drive closer to a grave, as their physical impact will be limited. This should only be permitted if the funeral director can be relied upon to control the parking of other attendees at the funeral and show respect to existing infrastructure and graves.

The public should be discouraged from parking on grass and signage erected as a reminder.

Recommendation twenty six

That, the main road be widened and extended to the lower a gate, with appropriate signage for parking rules and access beyond roads.

Pedestrian

Pedestrian access can remain available 24hr a day with or without a gate by simply providing a 1m wide gap in the fence.

Providing “Universal Access” is an important aspect of the Masterplan proposals especially in light of the Public Open Space function.

Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (DDA) compliance is not always possible within lawn cemeteries and access for wheelchairs and the disabled is not always possible to each grave or ash interment as most are provided within grassed areas.

However, any paths accessing niche walls, shelters, toilets and paths generally used for recreation and/or access to public facilities within the cemetery should comply with the relevant standards if at all possible.

This implies level, firm and slip resistant surfaces (free of tripping edges), preferably 1.2m wide (min), with a suitable gradient.

A dedicated parking bay for the disabled should be sign-posted and located adjacent to main facilities and connecting to the compliant path network.
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Ground modelling

Example of shelter

Example of toilet
It is also important to improve the drainage off the grassed area to facilitate assisted wheeling onto lawns. This can be achieved by:

- Grading the lawn to a minimum of 3% (may need to be more depending on soil characteristics)
- Ensuring water can escape to an outfall
- Avoiding running concrete beams parallel to contours (as they hold water back)
- Providing a layer of sand prior to turfing.

When retrofitting or developing new areas within the cemetery, considerations should be given to preferred accessibility outcomes (Refer to Appendix D – Access considerations).

A full appraisal and individual recommendations are outside the scope of this report and could be undertaken by the Accessibility Officer from BCSC (or private consultant) and be tailored to the local conditions, practicalities and budget constraints.

The network of wheelchair accessible paths would make an ideal location for any accessible historical interpretation of the cemetery and its rich seafaring past. Cross referencing to other monuments in town (in particular the Lost Fisherman Memorial on the foreshore) would be of added value.

**Recommendation twenty seven**

That, pedestrian access be permitted 24hr/day at all gates.

**Recommendation twenty eight**

That, wheelchair accessible paths be provided to key destinations within the site.

**Ground modelling**

The site does not need re-grading for landscape nor drainage purposes.

However, the existing unsightly soil stockpile, which appears to be attributable to excess spoil from grave excavation, should be sorted and re-spread (Also refer to Recommendation three, page 21).

A new position for future spoil is proposed out of sight.

**Recommendation twenty nine**

That, spoil be spread on site in specified locations.

**Features**

The use of focal points is an essential tool in park landscape design and, in the case of this cemetery, will create some interesting views for visitors travelling through the site. This will be achieved by:

- The community is seeking more amenities on site. There is potential to install a shelter and separate toilet (off the shelf, quality design and contemporary structure from Landmark or equivalent) near the main entrance. Provide a path from the front gate to both toilet and shelter (DDA compliant).
- Sculptures: Similarly to the State Coal Mine gardens, the use of sculptures from local artists should be encouraged within all memorial areas, whether for commemorating the existing (unmarked graves or others) or for new gardens.

**Recommendation thirty**

That, the provision of an accessible shelter and toilet be investigated.
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New memorial garden
Add ornamental species to front of garden bed

New memorial garden
Continue with drought resistant planting in keeping with existing

Maintain a treed avenue along main drive

Introduce new large trees to eventually replace the large existing specimen & create a similar tree framework

Naturalistic indigenous gardens
- New large trees
- New memorial garden
- Treed avenue
- Naturalistic indigenous gardens

Three phases of planting

Ground cover planting as part of beautification and weed reduction

Improvements (historic section)
Planting

It is important to note that the vegetation has the potential to enhance the site greatly. It will provide structure, shade, habitat and visual appeal in a site which is primarily used for reflection and contemplation.

However, it is also important to acknowledge that the supply and maintenance of vegetation can be costly and the Trust's funds are limited and likely to be used for more important fixes.

The proposals are therefore kept to a realistic level and most of them can be planted and or maintained by community or volunteer groups.

- The main tree avenue linking the two entry points should be maintained and consolidated to provide structure to the planting. Any trees which fail should be replaced with an appropriate species as per the planting concept.
- Exposed boundaries where screen planting is established should be maintained and managed. This may require selective removal of dead material, infill planting and incorporation of more ornamental species in the foreground, preferably planted as tubestock to increase the chances of survival and minimise maintenance.
- Regular inspections to assess risks are required on all trees and should be carried out at a minimum of 2 years intervals or as prescribed by the arborist.
- A number of graves in the old sections do not have ledgers and are filled with either gravel or dirt. These are ideal for the establishment of weeds and add to the long term maintenance cost of the cemetery. For this reason and to improve the aesthetics of the Old section, these graves should be planted with non-invasive ground-covers such as clumping Gazanias which flower all year round and create a mat of vegetation which prohibits the establishment of weeds.
- Similarly, this technique can be applied to all unmarked graves within the old cemetery (once their location has been established), thus limiting the need for tedious and on-going mowing.
- Provide random trees within the burial areas as a source of shade, ensuring they do not obstruct views out to the sea. Careful consideration should be made with any removal of trees especially specimen trees (eg. Pine trees) - Replacement specimen trees should be of similar bulk to retain the visual character of the cemetery - Select suitable species for location and climate.
- Duplicate the circular memorial garden on the east side of the site, due to its popularity, use drought resistant native and succulents.
- Create similar garden beds and plantings in the “Memorial Precinct” around the existing niche walls.
- Create a “naturalistic” garden in the lower part of the site, with organic shapes, indigenous revegetation-style planting, following contours and integrating in and around existing trees.
Fences
Side boundary fences should remain rural in style. When an upgrade of Shetland Heights Rd frontage is required, the fence construction should match that of Anderson St, which is sturdier in design.

Recommendation thirty one
That, fencing be upgraded in due course and match that of Anderson St frontage.

Services
The cemetery can continue to operate with limited services:
- Sewerage: The new toilets should be connected to the closest sewer pipe.
- Water: reticulation to at least one tap per new section should be provided or every 50 metres apart approximately.
- Electricity: If required inside the shed or for any future water feature, solar powered systems are preferred to minimise the costs.
- Stormwater: not required.

In all cases records of service locations should be carefully kept.

Recommendation thirty two
That, at least one watering tap be provided per new burial section and records of services kept at Council offices.

Shed
If materials kept within the shed are being damaged by rain entering the shed, some action may be required. If it only causes minor nuisance without damage, then an intervention may be cost prohibitive.

To eliminate any damaging internal flooding during storm events, and assuming that water is coming from the roof run-offs (as indicated by the Friends Group), it may be required to investigate further where the water is entering and why. This could be remedied by sealing the base of the shed, raising it on an elevated pad or grinding some slope on the existing apron so the water is shed away from the walls.

Drainage
As the existing lawn area is said to be too wet under foot in wet periods, investigate the reasons and consider remediation by creating swales to direct the water away from graves and access paths.

In new areas, follow the mitigation measures described under “Proposals- Pedestrian “ on page 47.

Recommendation thirty three
That, flooding/drainage issues be further investigated.
## Product distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Product Type</th>
<th>Surface/ m²</th>
<th>Length/ m</th>
<th>Yield/ha</th>
<th>Total Graves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monumental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1115.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headstone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6701.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>2211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lawn</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>7597.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>2507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1160.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yield calculation
Interment /Yield

As previously mentioned, burial records are incomplete and the local community's memory indicate a potential for unmarked graves anywhere on site. It is therefore crucial that any new interment areas be carefully checked prior to construction either using Ground Penetrating Radar or by scraping the surface to detect signs of previous excavation.

Based on the assessment carried out by Changing Places (refer to “Operations & Merchandising” Chapter, page 13 for details) the range of products on offer would be expanded to include:

**Burials**

- Lawn graves
  - Plaques on flat concrete beam
  - Granite desk on concrete beam
  - Headstone on concrete beam
  - Headstone in garden bed (limited height)

- Monumental graves

**Cremated remains**

- Niche walls
- Plaques behind garden edge
- Pedestal in garden beds
- Individual rock in garden bed
- Ash scattering
- Remembrance area/Remembrance memorial (No ashes – just name)
- Memorial trees
- Memorial seats

The concept offers the following yield: **5986 graves**

Based on the current annual demand of 7 graves, the cemetery will be in operation for many centuries.

Assumptions:

- All graves are 1.2 x 2.4m
- Lawn graves
  - 0.7m wide beam (measure on CAD)
  - 0.3m between graves at feet
- Headstone only graves
  - 0.7m wide beam
  - 0.3m between graves at feet
- Monumental graves
  - 1.2m path
- 15% loss in land use (occasional tree, odd shapes etc..)
- 6 lawn burials/year
- 1 monumental burial/year

The above calculations are broad estimates only. They are based on burial plots only. They do not take into consideration double or triple interments within the same grave.

The cemetery's life will be further extended by second and third interments. Its life is also expected to be lengthened with its ample capacity for ash interments.

**Recommendation thirty four**

That, investigations with Ground Penetrating Radar or by other methods be carried out before establishing any new graves or burial sections.
IMPLEMENTATION

CAPITAL WORKS

It is important to recognise that it is not the role of a Masterplan to produce detailed designs for implementation. The Masterplan delivers policies, concepts and priorities for the cemetery. It establishes uses and their locations on site.

The Masterplan is the beginning of a process that entails the following sequence:

1. Adoption of the Masterplan and circulation amongst staff
2. Determination of scope for first stage and allocation of funds
3. Further investigations if required, e.g.: Geotechnical, stormwater, etc.
4. Detailed design, e.g.: Road design, concept designs gardens, drainage, services, etc.
5. Preparation of tender documents and cost estimates
6. Tendering
7. Construction on site
8. Post-construction evaluation

In allocating a budget, the possibility of external funding should be explored as the current cemetery financial position is unlikely to sustain the remediation costs.

At some other cemeteries not only volunteer Trust members but also Friends groups assist with the maintenance and other cemetery activities e.g. history tours. Promoting community involvement is one way of enhancing local awareness of and pride in the cemetery. From experience BCSC would no doubt be aware that co-ordinating and promoting volunteer activities takes time, resources and patience. It is not a quick fix.

Friends groups may conduct fund raising activities, be involved in tree planting activities, undertake some general maintenance, conduct tours etc. Their success will correlate closely with how much recognition and ongoing support and encouragement they receive from the SRct and the BCSC.

In turn if the critical issues facing the cemetery are to be addressed in a timely way significant funds will be required. One source might be additional grants from the government. SRct should be aware that there is a material difference between the Department of Health indicating that it is happy to receive grant applications and being assured of receiving funds. They have more than 500 cemetery trusts responsible to the Minister and only limited funds for grants. By their own statements addressing the backlog of issues in individual cemeteries is not regarded as their priority. Grant applications which relate to safety concerns may attract more attention.

The Masterplan identifies the following issues:

- Unsafe soil stockpile which requires sieving and re-spreading
- Any tree works dealing with unsafe trees (refer Arborist report)
- Provision of Universal access to key areas of the site
- Reduction of fire hazard by increases summer slashing and removal of dead wood in lower "scrub" area (south west corner)

Possibly the SRCT might look to the BCSC as a potential funding source. We accept the demarcation between the legal entities. Notwithstanding that it might be interesting to research cemetery records to ascertain the proportion of interments that were related to municipal addresses i.e. ratepayer related. If that proportion was significant then it may be easier for the BCSC to substantiate the making of a grant or loan to the SRCT.

If a loan was considered it would need to be within the provisions of section 46 Borrowing Powers, of the Cemeteries and Crematoria Act 2003.

It is also important to recognise the cemetery as a potential part of the provision for Public Open Space for San Remo, especially since there is a nominated walking track through the site which forms part of the broader proposed pedestrian network in the municipality.
STAGING

The staging is not based on budget constraints. As the cemetery experiences a demand of approximately 7 burial interments a year, the cost of mowing and slashing are not even covered by revenue, let alone new capital works.

The following is a suggested staging plan. It is driven by construction logic rather than interment demand.

(text in red refers to Operations and Merchandising’s recommendations)

**Stage 1 (1-5 years)**

- Carry out recommendations #1-23 (except #6) in the Operation and Merchandising chapter
- In particular, develop one row of “headstone on beam” to test market.
- In particular, develop one row of “headstone in garden bed” to test market.
- Improve permanent memorialisation at existing circular garden.
- Conduct feature and level survey for the site
- Audit trees every 2 years
- Investigate shed flood issues.
- Investigate drainage issues in existing lawn area and remedy.
- Conduct Ground Penetrating Radar (or equivalent) grave investigations prior to construction and grave expansion, for presence of existing/unmarked graves.
- Remove existing spoil stockpile, sieve and re-spread.
- Establish area and method for new spoil disposal.
- Slash unmown grass more frequently in summer.
- Add watering tap to each new burial section.
- Install accessible toilet and associated paths.

**Stage 2 (5-10 years)**

- Identify key historical aspects of the cemetery and reference them in site signage and on the web
- Develop more lawn and headstone in lawn/garden beds as market demands.
- Install new wall and memorial garden for ash interment, and associated paths,
- Conduct Ground Penetrating Radar (or equivalent) grave investigations prior to construction and grave expansion, for presence of existing/unmarked graves.
- Audit trees every 2 years.
- Widen gravel road to accommodate some parking away from trees.
- Complete/maintain main avenue planting.
- Plant specimen trees in advance of and in anticipation of any large tree removal
**Stage 3 (10-50 years)**

- Develop more lawn and headstone in lawn/garden beds as market demands.
- Develop more cremated interment positions as market demands.
- Audit trees every 2 years.
- Widen and lengthen gravel road to connect to lower gate. Upgrade gate.
- Extend path network to link all features of the cemetery.
- Install accessible shelter and associated paths.
- Replace frontage fencing on Shetland Height Rd.
- Plant specimen trees in advance of and in anticipation of any large tree removal

**COSTINGS**

Outside the scope of the report. To be supplied by Council
APPENDICES

APPENDIX A... SIMPLE PROCESS TO MERGE BASS COAST SHIRE TRUSTS

From: Estelle Russ (DHHS) <Estelle.Russ@dhhs.vic.gov.au>
Sent: Tuesday, 26 March 2019 11:51 AM
To: Russ Allison <russ@changing-places.com.au>
Subject: RE: Guide me please re Cemetery Trust mergers

Hello Russ

Thank you for calling the other day with more information about your enquiry.

I have attached page 19 of the Manual for Victorian Class B Cemetery Trusts regarding trust mergers by way of general information, however in the particular case of Wonthaggi and San Remo Cemetery Trusts, the merger process would not apply.

I conducted some research and found:
- In 1987 the Shire of Bass became the trustees of the San Remo Cemetery
- At some point between 1911 and 1985, the Borough of Wonthaggi became the trustees of the Wonthaggi Cemetery (so far I have not been able to locate a gazette notice that gives the precise date)
- In 1994 the Shire of Bass and Borough of Wonthaggi (and other councils) merged to become the Bass Coast Shire Council, which therefore inherited the management of the two cemeteries
- Ordinarily the merger of the councils would mean the merger of the two trusts into one body, however for some reason this appears not to have occurred

If the Bass Coast Shire Council wishes to pursue the merger of their trusts, they are welcome to contact the Cemetery Sector Governance Support Program. It would be a simple matter of us confirming with our Legal Branch that the terms of the council merger did not exclude the merger of the trusts, and an update to our database.

If the council then wished to change the name of the trust (for example to Bass Coast Shire Cemeteries Trust or the San Remo and Wonthaggi Cemeteries Trust), then they could apply in writing to the program. Trust names can only be changed by the Governor in Council by order published in the government gazette.

I hope this information is useful; if you would like to discuss this further please contact the Cemetery Sector Governance Support Program by phone on 1800 034 280 or email <cemeteries@dhhs.vic.gov.au>.

Kind regards,

Estelle Russ
Administration Officer | Cemetery Sector Governance Support Program
Health and Human Services Regulation Branch | Health Protection, Regulation and Emergency Management
Department of Health and Human Services | 50 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne Victoria 3000
T. 1800 034 280 | D. 03 9096 2103 | E. estelle.russ@dhhs.vic.gov.au | W. www.dhhs.vic.gov.au

The Department of Health and Human Services respectfully acknowledges the Traditional Owners of Country throughout Victoria and pays its respect to the ongoing living cultures of Aboriginal peoples.
From: Russ Allison <russ@changing-places.com.au>
Sent: Tuesday, 19 March 2019 7:35 PM
To: cemeteries@dhhs.vic.gov.au
Cc: Bryan Crampton <Byran.Crampton@dhhs.vic.gov.au>
Subject: Guide me please re Cemetery Trust mergers

Sorry to trouble you
Had no luck with Google, so thought it better to ask you directly

I would appreciate your guidance in relation to DHHS approach to Trust mergers:
• If two cemetery Vic trusts within one local government area wish to merge, what is the process that DHHS would like them to be advised to follow?

Kind Regards

Russ Allison
Director

Phone: Office (03) 9331 4697     Mobile 0418 530 512
russallison@changing-places.com.au
http://www.changing-places.com.au

This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential. It is intended exclusively for the use of the addressee or someone authorised to receive the addressee’s email. If you have received this email in error please notify me immediately by email and delete all copies of this message. Please consider the environment before printing this email.
## APPENDIX B... MGC GRAVE ATTRIBUTES MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MGC 2008 Attribute Ratings</th>
<th>1 point scored for</th>
<th>2 points scored for</th>
<th>3 points scored for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close proximity to shade trees</td>
<td>Nearby parking available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water easily accessible</td>
<td>Allows for max. of three interments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible from roadway</td>
<td>Prime position close to main entrance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close proximity to significant monuments</td>
<td>All available graves are roadside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear access for casket delivery</td>
<td>Clusters of graves available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway access to available graves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealed and drained roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views of the Dandenong Ranges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views of the city of Melbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-poured foundations in place</td>
<td>Allows for max. 2 interments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access to public transport</td>
<td>Access and egress to a cemetery entrance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headstone to run along width of grave</td>
<td>Area contains some available roadside graves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headstone to run along length of grave</td>
<td>Toilet facilities available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX D... ACCESS CONSIDERATIONS

When retrofitting or developing new areas in the cemetery, considerations should be given to preferred accessibility outcomes below.

A full appraisal and individual recommendations are to be undertaken by the Council’s Rural Access Officer in conjunction with other relevant Council staff and are to be tailored to the local conditions, practicalities and budget constraints.

Pathways
- Provision of a continuous accessible path of travel from car park or public transport stop.
- 1000mm minimum width and 2000mm overhead clearance
- Level, firm, slip resistant surface (in both wet and dry conditions)
- Tactile Ground Surface Indicators (TGSIs) for hazards and changes in direction
- Seating at regular intervals, bins, bollards, signs, etc., located clear of the path of travel (setback 500mm) with an effective colour contrast
- Refer to relevant Australian Standards for full requirements.

Accessible Car Parking
- One disability access space for every 50 car parking spaces or part thereof
- Located as close as possible to the principal pedestrian entrance, with a continuous accessible path of travel from the parking bay to the entry
- Level, firm ground surface
- Kerb ramps
- Overhead clearance for 2500mm minimum within bay
- TGSIs as required
- Refer to relevant Australian Standards for full requirements.

Signage
- Appropriate signage – clear, concise, easy to read
- Consider use of Braille and tactile markings
- Appropriate location, height and lighting
- Located at any set down area, car park or on directional pathways
- Provide direction to various facilities
- Appropriate font styles and size
- Blue international symbol of access as appropriate
- Refer to relevant Australian Standards for full requirements.

Accessible Facilities
- Unisex accessible toilet with appropriate signage
- Accessible public shelter/rotunda
• Accessible seating and bins
• Refer to relevant Australian Standards for full requirements.

**Landscaping**

• Plant species that do not develop overhanging foliage/leaves or drop seed pods, berries, leaf and bark litter
• Plants that assist visitors with way finding through the cemetery by providing orientation or directional cues, incorporating distinctive scents, sounds, appearance or texture.

Kathryn Pryor
Community facilitator - ruralaccess
### APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMUNITY CONSULTATION FEEDBACK (JUNE 2019)

**San Remo Cemetery Draft Masterplan**

Public consultation feedback comments received June 2019.

To respect respondent privacy, responses have been recorded anonymously and without details of family history or names. For the most part, where practical, responses have been recorded in full.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Consultant Response / Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It looks fabulous. I would say that the amount of lawn beams in the design will more than suffice for 100 years!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Having now completed yet a fourth reading, I must respectfully express my disappointment with this professionally prepared document purporting to be at Draft stage of a final Masterplan. Several recommendations are repetitious or closely related and ought to be redrafted into robust, holistic actions addressing the issues. E.g. Toilets and sewer connection. Spoil spread, Grass cutting, shrub maintenance.</td>
<td>• Ground Penetrating Radar and/or ground scraping are performed before any expansion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2b | Regrettably, to me it reads as a "Discussion Paper" based on a collection of data, information and opinion some of which is not factual, (drainage) then converted into a lengthy series of disjointed recommendations. These recommendations are not weighted, prioritised, notionally costed nor timed in terms of implementation. So how can the document be that vision or blueprint to guide the Trust in its planning for the "next 50-100 years"? (Or is it the "next 200 years" or "40-50 year" as all three periods are stated in the Executive Summary?) | • Agreed that timeframes need to be consistent. A staged plan of the recommendations will be delivered in the final masterplan (as it has for Wonthaggi).  
• Drainage, in differing parts of the cemetery, has been raised as an issue during the early consultation process and the plan needs to investigate water pooling onsite.  
• Costing and budget setting has not occurred yet and is to be carried out by Council.  
• Masterplan informs for the next 50-100yrs (the Plan to say many decades)  
• Yield is calculated as 200+ years  
• Implementation recommendations are for 40-50yrs, the plan will be continually reviewed. |
| 2c | I do seriously question Recommendation 2 in relation to the merits of combining the Trusts of the two cemeteries. That conversation needs significant community input and must not proceed as a default outcome by adopting a recommendation of the Masterplan. It must be a stand-alone matter and dealt with accordingly. | • Agreed. The recommendation will say "consider, research and consult the potential combining of the two Trusts"  
• We agree that community consultation is a critical element in the process. |
| 2d | Finally, I tender my sincere appreciation and support of the submission prepared by the Friends of the Cemetery Group. It is the product of a detailed and considered assessment of the Draft by a group of wise and dedicated citizens, who over many years have contributed hours of care and maintenance of the site, as well as being a vital link between the Community and the Trust. I am personally grateful for their assistance unravelling a bungled process by the Trust and administration in my securing a Right of Interment. | • Noted  
• The ongoing contribution of the Friends has been and remains invaluable. |
| 3 | It is a beautiful and peaceful cemetery, and we have our youngest son interred in the | • We agree that both sloping and flat beams have advantages and this is to |
lawn section, of which I would like to make comment on regarding your Recommendation Eleven which states:

“That the next lawn beam poured at San Remo Cemetery, be poured flat, without a raised sloping surface “.

May I say that we are very happy with the current sloping surface, because being elevated allows rainwater to drain away, and therefore not damage the bronze memorial plaques on location. Being laid flat will allow rainwater to pool, and could also present a problem with the machine driven lawn mowers causing possible damage to the memorial plaques in the event of driving too close. The sloping surface also gives prominence and dignity to the grave which should be paramount.

| 4A | The Cemetery is a very special place in the life of our family… How privileged we are to have a cemetery such as San Remo. It is a wonderful place and provides a sanctuary for family visits. It certainly has lightened the grieving process for our family.
I believe you have captured the nature of the cemetery when you talk of the character and capitalising on the magnificent views. We don’t want a Masterplan to reflect trends in Melbourne. |
| --- | --- |
| 4B | Recommendation five: Friends group to be developed. The present group certainly possesses the knowledge necessary to undertake work at the cemetery, but needs far more moral and financial support from the Council. Their role is made more difficult by their Council contact constantly changing!
Action has already occurred:
- Financial support has been made more readily accessible for the group.
- The Trust has arranged for more physical support onsite as discussed with the current friends group. |
| 4C | Recommendation sixteen: Good – Better – Best would certainly work in Melbourne cemeteries but in a rural cemetery I find it discriminatory. Obviously the only reason would be revenue raising. I think it delivers a class system to a town where it has previously never existed.
- Noted. The wording will remain, one of the challenges within rural sites is that the revenue does not usually cover operating costs, especially when sites have low interment numbers.
- By offering alternative products you are enabling the community to make choices, just as they do in most other aspects of their lives, based on tastes, incomes and preferences.
- Options provided and introduced are more often driven by the requests of community. |
| 4D | Recommendation thirty: A shelter and toilet block be erected. I believe a toilet block is unnecessary. Any services held at the Cemetery do not extend beyond an hour. Lack of toilet facilities has never seemed to be a problem. A toilet in this cemetery/park area would create problems with cleaning and maintenance. It could also create problems not currently encountered but experienced in | remain as options in the Masterplan.
- Regretably the sloping beams often lead to other material /mementos being placed within/upon the adjoining lawn and that is a safety issue.
- Where flat beams are used, construction costs should be less and families are able to have more flexible memorialisation options. |

### Recommendation Two:
Consolidation of the two cemetery trusts – San Remo and Wonthaggi: Every small town has its own foot print and this is reflected in the local cemetery. Combining San Remo with Wonthaggi would not work. Each town should develop their Cemetery to meet the needs of its community and we are two very different communities. I do not agree to combining the two.

I was surprised to find that the trustees of the San Remo Cemetery were the Councilors. They don’t live locally and probably have no personal interest in the cemetery. The Friends of the Cemetery have worked for many years to protect and enhance the cemetery and would make far better Trustees.

Agreed. The recommendation will say “consider, research and consult on the potential of combining the two Trusts”
- Both Wonthaggi and San Remo Trusts have looked for community representation in the past and have been unsuccessful. The Masterplan to say this will be further explored.
- Within Victoria a number of trusts are responsible for multiple sites and each is able to retain its own character.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Recommendation thirty three: Minor planting by the Friends Group and major tree planting by BCSC. Would not work. The Council has a habit of planting trees and then deserting them. The last large planting at the Cemetery occurred in the middle of a drought and the only reason the trees survived is that volunteers filled large garbage bins with water, placed them on the back of a ute, and watered the planting. The Contractor mentioned that he was obliged to only water the plants on two occasions after planting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Cremation: From personal experience people are not attending services where the deceased person is to be cremated. The present trend is for a Thanksgiving service and a private cremation service. I believe a lot of people are uncomfortable with a cremation service. The interment figures for San Remo Cemetery are low. Many newer families moving into San Remo have commitments in Melbourne. For this reason funeral services are often held in Melbourne. Another local trend appears to be scattering of the ashes. Placement of ashes under a small plaque amongst the trees would be a better solution to the rows of concrete presently being offered. This would be far more appropriate for this small rural cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4G</td>
<td>Removal of pine trees: You mention that the roots of the trees are causing problems. I am sure with the present day equipment that is available, this problem could be made easier. Please think very carefully before recommending the removal of the pines. Smaller native shrubs would not provide the shade presently afforded by the pine trees. The pine trees are very old and any new plantings would need many, many years to provide the same degree of shade. I have attended funerals in the Cemetery in 40deg heat and remember being very thankful of the shade offered by these mature trees. 100 kph Southerly winds straight off Bass Strait are not uncommon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4H</td>
<td>Soil heaps: Probably any new soil being stockpiled in a particular area is a good idea. Soil heaps: To totally flatten the existing mounds would be foolish. They could be lowered to smaller mounds and provide a feature of the area. Perhaps even trees could be planted into them, thereby adding extra height from the time of planting. The soil in the mounds is now compacted and would support any plantings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4I</td>
<td>You speak of the history of the Cemetery. This would be a marvelous opportunity to recognize the pioneering families of San</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
San Remo Cemetery Masterplan
Florence Jaquet Landscape Architect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4K</th>
<th>Pine needles do drop on our family graves, but it affords a softening effect to the pebbles. Nature has a habit of fighting back and who are we to stop it. Please tread softly, softly. We all need to embrace change, but it is only successful if it meets local needs. As I mentioned previously, we are constantly being told how privileged we are to have this wonderful asset in the confines of our town. I agree. Council has allowed a very short timeline for comments on the Draft Masterplan. Many locals are not even aware of the proposed changes to the Cemetery. People are surprised when told of the plan and I am sure many more responses would be forthcoming if the community members were advised of the draft Masterplan and the opportunity to respond. Perhaps even a notice at the cemetery would advise people visiting this area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>the Draft document has fallen far short of expectations, - to the extent that a second draft with subsequent feedback would seem to be required before the final Masterplan is submitted. The Draft Masterplan is extremely disappointing. It fails to meet expectations. It is far from a succinct document. Their appears to be a lack of understanding of this community and the ambiance that should be befitting to a cemetery atop a hill with its precious coastal vistas. The document contains some incorrect, irrelevant and superfluous information, along with unnecessary repetition and poorly-ordered recommendations. It does not constitute a blueprint to guide the cemetery's development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Original timeline for responding was unsatisfactory (even insulting to the community).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>p 10 name Marlene Talbot San Remo Friends Group – omitted. name Jean Riseley San Remo Friends Group – spelling of surname.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>Drainage A preoccupation throughout the document - no such problem, - all attributable to a shed which is being replaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>Unsightly mound – Mentioned numerous times, although existing agreement to reconfigure and vegetate to create a lower, attractive, feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5F</td>
<td>P11 Final Masterplan – wording confusing – surely the final Masterplan is the final document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5G</td>
<td>P 14, 15 What is the relevance of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It evidences the changing nature of both
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>photo and comment about a chapel etc some 20 + km away? NONE!</td>
<td>local service provision and community demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SH</strong></td>
<td>P19 Recommendation 2 Combining the Trusts The communities are quite disparate. Reject combining. The ideal might be to create a local Trust and this should be further explored. An alternate, creating a Shire-based entity consisting of ward councillors (and/or some otherwise interested councillors), together with some community representation from the Friends Group etc. The feasibility of this warrants investigation. Such reconstituting of the Trust would warrant being a high priority recommendation.</td>
<td>• Refer comment 4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SJ</strong></td>
<td>P21 Friends take exception to being 'inducted' and ‘charter’ is viewed as too prescriptive. Must minimise barriers to encouraging new helpers.</td>
<td>• Noted. However, this is meant to be a guideline to advise any interested community members on the types of activities undertaken. • Legislation in cemeteries is vast and it is Councils responsibility to ensure everyone working in our cemeteries are respecting the legislative requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SK</strong></td>
<td>Impressed with this P 35 Recommendation 22 - Remembrance Memorials – but not the &quot;kitch&quot; examples on pp 34,42. The Rock at Phillip Island Cemetery is most appropriate. Additional Remembrance Memorial pre Phillip Island Cemetery such as for those buried on Macellan land.</td>
<td>• The examples are just that, they are not recommended styles. • A design specific to San Remo should be developed in due course. • Text to be added to report in response/as clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SL</strong></td>
<td>P37 Which contractors? Have been told on many times that a considerable area is unsuitable for burials. Suggest further investigation and a fundamental recommendation. (See also P51).</td>
<td>• See point 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SM</strong></td>
<td>ADDITIONAL INPUT BY FRIENDS Suggest recognition of ex-service men and women with ceramic poppy.</td>
<td>• Agreed - Council Officer has already looked into this earlier this year and will be implementing in due course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SN</strong></td>
<td>P37 The excess spoil is not in the centre of the site. Intention is to reconfigure in that general location. Action agreed upon.</td>
<td>• Remove word “centre” • Refer comment 4H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
<td>P37 Recommendation 24 Removal of unsightly/diseased vegetation. An obvious part of maintenance - and is actioned by Friends and BCSC/Trust as required.</td>
<td>• Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SQ</strong></td>
<td>P37 Recommendation 25 Replace “summer” with “growing periods” Such Mowing has been arranged (and over time area will be subsumed into the lawn).</td>
<td>• Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SR</strong></td>
<td>P37 Tree Audits That Council commissions regular tree audits every two years contradicts statement on P 41 about lack of</td>
<td>• Action undertaken.Council undertakes 2 year tree audits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>P37 City Centre needs to be changed to Town Centre</td>
<td>• Agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>P39 Vandalism has occurred, amounting to stealing of niche wall plaques. Opportunities for this need to be minimised, however with wire fences even locked gates cannot prevent entry</td>
<td>• Authors refer specifically to vandalism by cars/hoons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>P46 Shelter - example is completely unsuitable for this windswept location. The shelter must be conveniently located, but must certainly not be the ‘Focal Point’ as is recommended</td>
<td>• Proposed location is appropriate in relation to views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>P 47 Recommendation 30, Shelter and Toilet Block. Surely these should be distinct buildings and unobtrusive. P 52 Recommendation 35. Compostable toilet or septic tank. Reject Completely. Sewer connection points could be accessed. (advice of Westernport Water). P46 Example of shelter contains a barbecue which would certainly not be appropriate.</td>
<td>• Agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Recommendation 31 - add the words “any road widening or car parking</td>
<td>• Agreed. Add to recommendation 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SX</td>
<td>Recommendation 33 where is the new Handley and Anderson chapel?</td>
<td>• Add into the report the location - Corner of the Loch Wonthaggi Road/Bass Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>P51 Deteriorating old graves is important issue. Friends under impression that such graves were not to be interfered with (apart from noxious weed control). Friends would welcome the right to of plant the most suitable /non invasive and low maintenance ground covers. Suggest some other ground cover than gazanias which require a lot of water - they look good when in flower but become tacky quickly - also need a lot of dead heading</td>
<td>• Legislatively, the maintenance of existing monuments i.e. their physical structure, is the responsibility of the Interment Right Holder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SZ</td>
<td>P51 Unmarked graves? How would these be marked. Would ground covers not require even more maintenance than mowing, even with a plaque on the ground?</td>
<td>• Marked upon the cemetery map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAA</td>
<td>P51 Recommendation 31 refers to “Ground Penetrating Radar before establishing any new graves or burial sites.” This is effectively an understatement. Our emphatic view is that the geological features of the whole area and the existence of unmarked burial sites must be the obvious first step before pursuing the development of the cemetery. This should be a recommendation priority.</td>
<td>• Agreed. See point 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5BB</td>
<td>P57 Pathways  Continuous pathway from public transport stop would be years into the future if ever. And there is a substantial incline from any main road!</td>
<td>• Page 57-58 refers to Council's preferred accessibility outcomes. Future designs should attempt to comply when possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5BB</td>
<td>P57 Accessible Car Parking  Impossible to comprehend first dot point of '1 space for every 50 car parking spaces.'</td>
<td>• Amend Council's guidelines: Insert one (1) disability access space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Very unprofessional document with no objectivity, predetermined.</td>
<td>• Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>Tone of report offensive:  - Dashes to ashes referencing statistics not even in our Country.  - use of the word diminution of the visible role of Christian churches  Disgusted at the suggestion to merge the two trusts and talked about how the Council has never advertised or promoted for a Community Cemetery Trust. He feels if Grantville and Coronet Bay have the correct skilled people to run a Cemetery Trust then San Remo most definitely will have.</td>
<td>• Noted  • Both Wonthaggi and San Remo Trusts have looked for community representation in the past and have been unsuccessful. This will be further explored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>doesn’t agree we have one contract for both cemeteries as it cuts out the local mowing man from being able to do it cheaper</td>
<td>• Contracts incorporate all requirements of the job not just one part. Work required is extensive and requires skilled and certified staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>not happy that the Department gives Council money for masterplans</td>
<td>• Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>doesn’t agree with being told what he can and can’t do with his plots, this is bullying</td>
<td>• Not applicable to masterplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>Consolidation of the Trusts is a great idea.</td>
<td>• Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>Can the masterplan identify if there is or should be an opportunity for the community to acquire the cemetery eventually and what that would take?</td>
<td>• See 2c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7C</td>
<td>The monumental masons requiring registration with BCSC before undertaking works and applications assessed by suitably qualified personnel is a great idea. Hopefully the 'suitably qualified personnel' will be the Class A cemeteries and not a person within Council as this would result in lengthy wait times for monument installations and a lot of pressure on the Council staff.</td>
<td>• Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7D</td>
<td>Regarding beams- A flat beam appears to encourage the placement of prohibited items like vases, statues and jars etc. I understand there should be a priority on removing these quickly to prevent build up but this is not always achievable or practical in the highly politicised environment of local</td>
<td>• Refer comment point 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
government and would not be a popular move to routinely remove items. Wouldn’t it be better to remove the temptation by installing a sloped beam? The sloped beam area at Wonthaggi is noticeably less congested with vases etc. Also, flat beams flood quicker with grass and other debris settling on the plaques - often a cause of distress for families.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7E</td>
<td>Regarding roads – A widened road, extended to other side is great. Will this operate as a one way road? There doesn’t appear to be any parking offered inside the cemetery so a one way road could make is easier to park within the cemetery during a funeral. The area is prone to flooding and shouldn’t be parked on. Also to have marked accessible parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• See 2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This will operate as a two way road with road-side parking. Refer Page 45 for more details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Marked accessible parking included in the masterplan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7F | Great masterplan and thumbs up to the hard work of Council employees in trying to make the cemetery a community friendly place to be proud of. |
|   | • Noted |
APPENDIX F: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMUNITY CONSULTATION FEEDBACK (AUGUST 2019)

San Remo Cemetery Draft Masterplan
Public Meeting- 19th August 2019 - Feedback on survey

WHAT DO YOU VALUE?
Thinking about the cemetery, what do you value most?
- Its history (x2)
- The site
- Its rustic ambience (x2)
- Lack of formality
- It is very peaceful
- A place for reflection
- Its independence and representing the San Remo Community
- The Memorial Garden
- Rugged beauty
- Large trees
- Open space

MASTERPLAN RECOMMENDATIONS
Which top three (3) items below would you like prioritized in the first stages (1-10 years) of the Masterplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Number of votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembrance memorial (Rock)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural burial</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Interpretation Signage</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headstones on beams</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New circular garden</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial precinct</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headstones in garden beds</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculptures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS / QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should Masterplan be 1 or 2 words – Master Plan or Masterplan?</td>
<td>Although some dictionaries refer to it with 2 words, the Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make it clear – can the community run the cemetery?</td>
<td>Architecture industry refers to a Masterplan as a single word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carefully consider</td>
<td>To be considered and subject to further discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Tree removal</td>
<td>Already covered in report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Indigenous species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Resilient to conditions in the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust-Community combination</td>
<td>To be considered and subject to further discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water feature for spreading of ashes – undulating area in the lower</td>
<td>Consider how ashes may affect reticulation pump and how ashes in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corner, solar powered (x3)</td>
<td>filters will be disposed of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much commercialisation (Good, Better, Best).</td>
<td>“Good, Better, Best” is a form of choice. Wording has been changed in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the toilet and shelter be better positioned at Anderson</td>
<td>the report to reflect this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Reserve across the road, rather than in the Cemetery itself?</td>
<td>Toilet at the cemetery will be used by volunteers and visiting mourners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>