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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

What is this document:

This document is a conservation management plan which consists of an historical analysis of the cemetery and a management section based on the site’s underlying determined heritage significance.

In completing the analysis the document attempts to assemble all the known information bearing on the use and history of the place by reviewing early archived documents such as plans and gazettes and local newspapers. Government records where available are also examined and it is here (particularly Dept. of Health Cemetery files) that most information can be found.

The management section is designed to identify the importance of individual built elements of the site and determine what might be done to them over the long term. Some elements are of high significance and should be retained (at least) with consideration given to repair and restoration. At the opposite end of the scale are elements of No or Intrusive on significance and these might be demolished or removed or in the case of Intrusive (on significance), the element should be removed when the opportunity presents.

These management actions have a bearing on buildings, structures, paths, infrastructure and trees. In some cases permits must be sought to alter or sometimes repair infrastructure elements.

What this document doesn’t do:

The document does not set out to find EVERY piece of historical information about the place as the task would be never ending. Some information (such as burial certificates) will also never have any bearing on the management of the site. The CMP does not identify all the graves within the site but does make comment on their styles, the general state of the graves and identifies those of importance for historical or aesthetic reasons.

The cemetery graves cannot (in accordance with the Cemeteries and Crematoria Act 2003) be cared for by Cemeteries Trusts. The Act however does allow Trusts to carry out minimal work to prevent graves being damaged or being a source of danger to the public.

Some graves within Keilor Cemetery are however of great public interest.

Summary of Recommendations

The most important, early and obvious elements of the cemetery are the trees which include the early Sugar Gums and the Monterey Cypress which are found in distinct rows as well as the occasional stand-alone tree. These Gums and Cypress need monitoring over summer periods to ensure their survival. The Trust should maintain in the long term the picket fence recently erected along its west and north boundaries. While not of historic importance, the fence is appropriate to the site. None of the buildings, infrastructure or road surfaces on the site are important.

There is a zone of roadways which partially reflects the original arrangement and these portions along with a core of early graves are the areas where the Trust should concentrate its energies in terms of the historic elements.

The need to obtain permits: City of Brimbank

The Keilor Cemetery is listed as a heritage place in the City of Brimbank Planning Scheme (as HO50). Permits are required for developmental works, primarily the construction of new buildings (of greater than
3.0sqm), structures and road works but not for the normal burial processes by holders of burial rights. This is outlined in section 4.5.

The Brimbank planning scheme also contains tree controls which requires that the trimming or removal of trees on the heritage site may require permits. The most important heritage trees are identified in the report at the end of this document and are predicted to have a maximum 25 years of life. See Appendix D. This will mean that a tree replacement scheme may have to be commenced by 2025 and extended into 2035.

The planning scheme also includes an incorporated document covering what does and doesn't require a permit and is included as an appendix. The incorporated plan is however short on detail.

Summary of Significance

There is a short statement of cultural heritage significance provided by the City of Brimbank. There is a second slightly lengthier statement included in the Incorporated Plan also authored by the City of Brimbank. There is a small amount of further information to be added to this but the statement actually requires reworking to a contemporary format and the revised statement can be found in Section 3.5.

Funding for works

Much of the Cemetery and graves are well maintained. It is primarily the trees which need ongoing attention as the enduring heritage elements of the site. Outside funding (i.e. monies raised through donations or grants) may need to be sought from time to time to maintain at least the most important pioneer graves on the site.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background, Brief and Methodology

This Conservation Management Plan (CMP) was prepared to document the history and cultural significance of the Keilor Cemetery to better inform the decision-making process prior to further work and alterations to the site’s structures and significant features. This conservation management plan was commissioned by The Greater Metropolitan Cemeteries Trust (GMCT) in 2014. The Greater Metropolitan Cemeteries Trust recognise historic value in the Keilor Cemetery and have commissioned this CMP despite the fact the site has no formal heritage protections.

The report has been compiled with reference to key cultural heritage documents used by heritage and collections management practitioners in Australia:

- The Australia ICOMOS charter for the conservation of places of cultural significance: The Burra Charter 2013. (See Appendix C.)

The report also takes into account two documents produced by Heritage Victoria:

- ‘Conservation Management Plans: Managing Heritage Places – A Guide’ (June 2010); and

Conservation Analysis

This Conservation Management Plan aims to become a guide for the future management of this cemetery. This plan describes the history of the cemetery, its significance, its current condition and recommendations for future maintenance. By implementing these recommendations, the cemetery should remain in a good condition for future years and retain its significance.

Methodology and Process

This Conservation Management Plan follows two steps. Firstly, the cemetery and all of its features are accurately described and recorded. This allows us to understand the character of the place, its significance, the available resources and its constraints. Secondly, we can determine what works need to be carried out when and by whom.

The process in preparing the Conservation Management Plan is:

- Assessing the cultural significance of the cemetery through the current physical condition of the cemetery and researching its history.
- Produce a conservation policy for all significant elements of the cemetery.
• Develop conservation strategies to support policies, considering the resources available.
• Implement these conservation strategies.

All of these steps are to be written and agreed upon before any works begin.

1.2 Site Ownership

The site was originally a Crown Reserve set aside in 1856 for the establishment of a public cemetery under the control of nominated Trustees. The original Trustees were formed from interested parties (and some parliamentary members) of various occupations, then subsequently the role was taken over by the Shire of Keilor, subsequently the City of Keilor and in 1994 the City of Brimbank following local government amalgamations during the Kennett term of Government. The successor to the Council is the Greater Metropolitan Cemetery Trust which came into being in 2010.

1.3 Study Team

The study team who prepared this report comprised:

David Wixted  Principal Architect, *heritage ALLIANCE*
Ellen Ogborne  Graduate Architect, *heritage ALLIANCE*
Stephen Fitzgerald  Stephen Fitzgerald Arboriculture

1.4 Copyright

Copyright is held jointly by heritage ALLIANCE, Stephen Fitzgerald Arboriculture and the Greater Metropolitan Cemeteries Trust.

1.5 Acknowledgments

We would like to thank those who assisted the study and particularly:

Noela Bajjali (Manager Corporate Information and Records), Ian Robertson (Manager Planning & Design) and Richard Thomas (Landscape Architect) of GMCT.

1.6 Definitions

1.6.1 *Place* means site, area, building or other work, group of buildings or other works together with associated contents and surrounds.

1.6.2 *Cultural significance* means aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present or future generations.

1.6.3 *Social value* embraces the qualities for which a place has become a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment to a majority or minority group.

1.6.4 *Fabric* means all the physical material of the *place*.

1.6.5 *Conservation* means all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its *cultural significance*. It includes maintenance and may according to circumstance include *preservation, restoration, reconstruction and adaptation* and will be commonly a combination of more than one of these.

1.6.6 *Maintenance* means the continuous protective care of the *fabric*, contents and setting of a *place*, and is to be distinguished from repair. Repair involves *restoration or reconstruction* and it should be treated accordingly.
1.6.7 Preservation means maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.

1.6.8 Restoration means returning the existing fabric of a place to a known earlier state by removing accretions or by reassembling existing components without the introduction of new material.

1.6.9 Reconstruction means returning a Place as nearly as possible to a known earlier state and is distinguished by the introduction of materials (new or old) into the fabric. This is not to be confused with either recreation or conjectural reconstruction which are outside the scope of this Charter.

1.6.10 Adaptation means modifying a place to suit proposed compatible uses.

1.6.11 Compatible use means a use which involves no change to the culturally significant fabric, changes which are substantially reversible, or changes which require a minimal impact.

1.7 Abbreviations

The following are used:

- GG: Government Gazette
- GMCT: Greater Metropolitan Cemeteries Trust
- HV: Heritage Victoria
- ICOMOS: International Council on Monuments and Sites
- MMBW: Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works
- NTV: National Trust Victoria
- PROV: Public Records Office Victoria
- RNE: Register of National Estate
- SLV: State Library of Victoria
2.0 PHYSICAL SURVEY

2.1 The Site

The Keilor cemetery is on a plateau east of the township of Keilor and was once close to the road between Mt Alexander and Melbourne and this was one of the major routes to the northern Goldfields of Victoria from the 1850s. Road works in the period after 1990 changed all that and the cemetery is now in a large island surrounded by roads and freeway interchanges and is difficult to access. Even the Old Keilor Road to Keilor is now difficult to access as it is crossed by other major traffic routes. The cemetery has through these road works lost its connection to other heritage places in Keilor. Even Keilor now seems like something of a lost township as it is bypassed by the Calder Freeway.

The site was also once more squarish in shape (see figure 2) but is now an elongated polygon following the resumption of land for road works with the cemetery being able to gain some of the residual land for further extensions.

Figure 1: Keilor Cemetery, Cemetery Road Keilor City of Brimbank. Approx area outlined in red. Source: Google maps

The land itself is mostly flat but toward the west the plateau falls rapidly down an escarpment to the township of Keilor which is something in the vicinity of 900 meters away on the opposite side of the Saltwater River (now Maribyrnong River) which is a mere creek by the time it has reached Keilor.
Within the cemetery there are graves made with traditional surrounds in stone (often marble and granite) and later concrete, a large number of unmarked graves, and now toward the south and east a large number of contemporary black granite European style graves and a large mausoleum.

The original site layout (a north south oval shape within a squarish site) is now difficult to discern and even in 1945 the site appeared to be very under-utilised as the district was substantially rural in nature. It is only in more recent years that closer settlement has substantially started to fill out the surrounding landscape particularly over the last two and half decades. So few burials occurred within the original cemetery bounds (1856-1945) that even here they are overwhelmed by the new graves after 1945.

A number of highly visible elements mark the site, the most obvious being the Monterey Cypress planted along cemetery road behind the cemetery fence. These bifurcated trees make a very visible contribution to the presence of the site and are presumed to be the ones planted in circa 1934-36 and after. On an aerial of 1945, the entire site is surrounded by these trees which appear to be still juvenile and possibly number over 300 along the four sides. A second interior group of trees once bordered the oval shape and are possibly eucalypts and these are (in the aerial) clearly more established. It is known that there was a substantial planting of Sugar Gums (*Eucalypt Cladocalyx*) in 1897 along Cemetery Road and the internally planted eucalypts may be related. The 1945 aerial shows a small number of these Sugar Gums (less than 20) down Cemetery Road. On Cemetery Road and part of Ely Court is a long picket fence of recent origin (circa 2014-15).

Most of the original path and oval layout (the one adopted in 1870), is almost impossible to identify although parts of the existing road system are based on the original path system but the edges of the original oval and the various outlying planting reserves have been blurred by burials since 1945.

---

1 The aerial is not reproduced here in full due to quality reasons. A copy of the aerial can be seen at http://1945.melbourne

Figure 4: A sugar gum on the northern fence line which appears to be something of a north east marker of the old boundary. A line of trees between this tree and two others at the south were removed after 1984. Source: Heritage ALLIANCE 2014

Figure 5: Above: Interior cypress on the right side of the old north south central road. Possibly planted 1934 and after. Source: Heritage ALLIANCE 2014
At the heart of the old part of the cemetery is a group of early Catholic burials identifiable by their materials and their unusual offset layout. Some of these date from 1860 such as the Davies grave with a marble headstone.

Some of the earliest burials are located by unusual metal markers. Whether this resulted from simple metal craft in the Keilor Township or were part of a tradition amongst a group of citizens (a craft known particularly to German settlers) is unknown. They remain one of the more unusual markers found in an Australian cemetery. Other metal markers (at St Kilda and Bendigo) were cast with lettering or purchased as a cast plate and painted.

Figures 6 and Figure 7: Metal Markers in the oldest part of the cemetery to persons unknown. This appears to be the early Catholic section of the cemetery. Source: heritage ALLIANCE 2014

2.2 Structures

Historic Elements

There is little account of what was on the land during the years 1856-1945 as many records do not exist. There are notes about fencing replacements from post and strand wire to sawn posts in Jarrah with wire and ring lock fencing (a wire netting type).

The present fencing (pickets on rails) was constructed in 2014-15 but it has no known historic precedent. Notes in the cemetery files suggest that the fencing was only ever strung wire or strung wire with netting.

There is also mention of a waiting room on site (presumably in timber near the entrance) but when this was established or removed is unrecorded. It is likely to have been constructed by the council without the need for an architect. No caretaker’s or sexton’s house is recorded as having been established.

A set of privies is recorded as having been relocated and later an expensive toilet block in concrete panels is said to have been installed although where is unclear.

The Mausoleum

The mausoleum has been constructed in several stage. The earliest phase (Ingram Construction of Madison, Mississippi) dates to May 2000 - 2001 with further stages in 2003 and 2007-2008 by Harmer architects of Collingwood.
The Administration Office

The administrative office at the gate entry (the one we see today) was constructed in 1996 to a design by Jim Earle architect with some modification by Russel Brown Engineer and a rear extension by Philip Harmer architects (in 2004). The front building is primarily of brick with a colorbond roof and completed in faux federation country style. The rear extension is mainly glazed brick, metal and glass. Jim Earle had presented his scheme in 1993 with a probable cost of $220,000 but by 1996 this figure was $260,000. Modifications by Brown changed some structural conditions and the final cost plus other side works came in around $209,000. According to Trustee minute notes of 1995 the original office (when the Cemetery had one administrative employee) was erected in the early 1970s. This small office also had associated change rooms and toilet block and was inadequate for the 6 employees of 1995².

² Brimbank City Council, Keilor Cemetery Trust Minutes 12 December 1995, p. 3.
Toilet Block, Flower Stall

A second brick building is found just inside the entry. This was erected in 1984 as a toilet block. In October 1996 the new administrative office was complete and there followed discussions about demolishing the existing flower stall (in a small ugly brick building near the entry) and rehousing it in a small relocated machinery shed which would become surplus when the works yard was expanded\(^3\). This was followed by calling tenders for flower selling as the existing flower seller had not been engaged through a public process.

\(^3\) City of Brimbank, Keilor Cemetery Trust Minutes 10 Oct 1996.
Paths

The present day road paths throughout the site are all asphalt with concrete edging and all in the one unified arrangement.

This work commenced in January 1998 under the Brimbank Council as Trustee and extended into the new eastern area as part of the total redevelopment of the site. New drainage was also required. There had already been some works in the 1980s to drain the original area of the site and prevent waterlogging. The new road work and drainage gave an impetus to resolving the waterlogging that was also occurring.

The original path arrangement was reworked in 1988 in anticipation of the works to the new eastern extension and it was during 1998 that the links to the new eastern extension were permanently embedded.

The works carried out in 1998 were also to permanently establish the layout of the east extension, not just in pathways but also in the landscaping and irrigation.

2.3 Trees

For many years there had been no mention of trees on site but there appears to be information relating to two sets of activities. The first is the planting of Sugar Gums along the Cemetery Road in 1897 and these can be identified in aerials of 1945 showing what appear to be established native plantings.

A second wave of more serious planting started in 1934 with just over 100 Monterey Cypress planted and this is was put off a number of times as the council awaited the establishment of a water scheme for St Albans-Keilor which finally reached the cemetery in 1933-34 as a 1 inch galvanised pipe. From then on

---

4 City of Brimbank, Keilor Cemetery Trust Minutes 10 Feb 1998
5 CEM File 263 PROV has returns over a number of years indicating an intention to plant trees once the water scheme arrives and once it does a large number of trees (primarily cypress) are planted.
trees were planted regularly and then followed by shrubs and it is conceivable that over 300 trees may have been planted by 1936-37 and particularly to mark the squared perimeter of the site.

The 1945 aerial shows a very close planting of juvenile Cypress (and Sugar Gums) all the way around the four boundaries. These would have been thinned as they grew, possibly by removing two out of every three trees. The trees on the western boundary today best represent the intense planting of the 1940 -1945 era although there are one or two tree spaces now unfilled.

A hand drawing of the cemetery\(^6\) in 1984 prior to the eastern area expansion shows that there was still a thick band of Sugar Gums and Cypress around the north, east and south sides of the cemetery. Sometime after, many of these trees were removed along the northern and southern sides and all of the eastern side as part of the expansion programme. Today there are no trees marking the east boundary alignment.

There are other trees on site but it is the Gums and Cypress which represent the earliest phases of surviving planting. No doubt there have been other periods of deliberate planting but none have been recorded and none so thorough-going.

The Trustee Minutes of 1998 note that tree maintenance in the cemetery has never been a programmed event rather it would appear, an ad-hoc arrangement and the trust determined to appoint a tree management company to look at all trees at a cost of $18,745.\(^7\)

---

\(^6\) Dept of Sustainability and Environment (Crown Lands) file on Keilor Cemetery Reserve.

\(^7\) City of Brimbank, Keilor Cemetery Trust Minutes 10 Feb 1998
3.0 ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

3.1 History of Keilor

The Wurundjeri people of the Kulin Nation were the first people to inhabit the area in and around Melbourne. Seven clans of the Wurundjeri people inhabited their own territories, bounded by ancient traditional lines. They lived a semi-nomadic lifestyle, moving according to the seasons and availability of food and water. The Wurundjeri people lived in this area for forty thousand years before it was discovered by Europeans.

One of the first Europeans to explore the Saltwater River was Charles Grimes, an Englishman who had come to New South Wales in 1791. Grimes was appointed the position of Acting Surveyor of New South Wales. He was instructed to explore and ‘walk around’ Port Phillip by Governor Philip Gidley King in order to learn of the areas suitability for a settlement. The Government’s fear of French discoveries and settlement hastened their movements to explore Port Phillip.

Grimes and an exploration team, Lieutenant Charles Robbins, convict gardener James Fleming, surgeon Dr. Daniel McCallum, surveyor James Meehan and a ship’s crew, travelled from Sydney Cove aboard the schooner Cumberland. They were instructed to explore the soils and timber of King Island and Port Phillip.

Grimes produced a map of their explorations and notes the area as “open grassy plains, without timber, soil stiff clay and very stony.” Overall, Grimes’ report of the exploration was not positive. He did write in his journal ‘the most eligible place I have seen for a settlement is on the Freshwater River’ – it was in this area that John Batman over three decades later chose as the ‘place for a village’.

In 1835, John Batman and John Pascoe Fawkner travelled from Van Diemen’s Land (Tasmania) and arrived at Port Phillip in anticipation of discovering a suitable area for a settlement. A report from The Hobart Town Courier on the 22nd of May 1835 announced:

‘The ‘Rebecca’ sloop, the property of Mr Robert Scott, sailed during the week for Port Phillip, under the charge of Capt. J.B. Harwood, having on board several persons, whose curiosity has led them to seek in the uninhabited wilds of the coast of New Holland, a realisation of golden expectations. We doubt their success very much – nevertheless we are not desirous to damp the anticipation of those already gone, or of those going. Mr Batman is on board the ‘Rebecca’, having under his charge several black natives, for the purpose of exploring the country.’

Batman and his team arrived in Port Phillip where they explored the area around the Yarra Yarra and Saltwater Rivers. Batman wrote in his journal on the 4th of June 1835, ‘On we then Kept up the River for a few miles and stopped for the Night, in a corner alongside the River I gave it the Name of Gumm’s Corner’. The area described in Batman’s journal, Gumm’s Corner named after James Gumm a convict servant, later became the Keilor Village Reserve.

On the 6th of June 1835, Batman and his team met with the elders of native people of the area, the Wurundjeri people. A deed was signed in which Batman received the rights to the land in exchange for a yearly owing of goods including blankets, tomahawks, knives, scissors, looking glasses, handkerchiefs,

---

9 Laskowski, Christine, Steele Creek and The Lady of the Lake, published by Christine Laskowski, Essendon, Victoria p15
10 Laskowski, Christine, Steele Creek and The Lady of the Lake, p15
11 Laskowski, Christine, Steele Creek and The Lady of the Lake, p15
clothes and flour. On the 8th of June 1835, Batman discovered the area of the freshwater Yarra Yarra River and declared, ‘this will be the place for a village’.

Batman and his team returned from Port Phillip on the 11th of June 1835 and were very positive with their discoveries. They saw the potential for settlement and sheep pasturage.

Settlers and sheep soon came from Van Diemen’s Land and moved onto unoccupied land realizing its potential for pastoral and agricultural activities. However, in August 1835, Governor Richard Bourke of New South Wales declared that the settlers of Port Phillip were trespassing on Crown land and announced that Batman’s deed with the Wurundjeri people was invalid. The New South Wales Government set up a licensing system where the new settlers or ‘squatters’ were required to hold annual licenses for tenancy of the land. In 1842 the Government organized the sale of the land in Port Phillip and advertised the land sales in the Port Phillip Herald:

“The holders of land receipts under the regulations of 21st January, 1841, will be allowed to select without competition, from the lands now advertised, and at the fixed price of £1 per acre, in satisfaction of their orders; but this permission will only extend to within one month from the day of sale, namely to the 19th day of September inclusive, on order that the public may have due notice of the lots thus disposed of.”

In 1839 pastoralists James Watson and Alexander McLean Hunter first settled Keilor. The 1840s saw large areas of land on the outskirts of the town used for sheep and agricultural farming. The Hunter brothers built the first ‘Keilor Inn’ and later built the bluestone hotel ‘Galway Arms’ opposite in the late 1840s. Keilor officially became a ‘village’ when it was gazetted on the 16th of January 1850. The layout plan was made available at the Office of the Surveyor General Sydney or the Survey Office Melbourne. Land sales took place within three years particularly in the vicinity of the core of the Village and there upon followed sales for farmlets and larger farms further out.

The discovery of gold in Victoria in 1851 catalysed Keilor from a small quiet place to a thriving township. Keilor became a stopover along the way for diggers travelling to the goldfields at Ballarat and Bendigo. The gold rushes saw an increase in the population of Victoria. “It was not until the 1850s and the Gold Rush Period that Keilor could claim any notoriety when it became a stop-over on the way to the goldfields and the ‘Village’ became a ‘bustling’ community with several Blacksmiths, Hotels, Caroline Chisolm Shelter Sheds and other assorted businesses.”

Figure 6 gives an idea of the Keilor landscape in the 1850s.

Keilor saw many changes throughout its history and evolved to suit the needs of the time. The period of 1835 to 1850 was a time of pastoralism. The 1860s through to the 1950s saw market gardens; farmlands, flat grasslands and river valley landscapes define the area. From the 1950s, after World War II, Keilor became a region of suburbia. The Post World War II immigration program brought a change to the region. Affordable land, industrial estates and work vacancies led to a significant attraction to the area. Ethnic communities were attracted to Keilor which led to increasing suburbanization. As a result of the immigration program, many ethnic communities came to represent the region with housing now covering what had previously been paddocks all the way from Niddrie through to what is now Calder Park.

12 Laskowski, Christine, Steele Creek and The Lady of the Lake, p12
13 City of Keilor Souvenir 1863-1963
14 Jennison, Susan, Keilor’s Heritage
3.2 History of the Keilor General Cemetery

Early beginnings, the land reserve

The records held by the Public Records Office in Department of Health files include a series of very early site plans, many undated and in poor condition.

The earliest official published documentation referred to in the Government Gazette appears in 1883 when a notice of land reserved for the cemetery refers back to an Order (in Council) of 11th November 1856 setting aside land for the cemetery. One of the early plans in the Dept. of Health file identifies a cemetery to be on Section XXII of the Parish of Keilor rather than Section XLIV (44) where it is now. This plan also shows the layout as more of a rectangular grid pattern of 10 chains by 7.5 chains giving 7.5 acres. It is however difficult to reconcile this location (Section XXII) with the Parish Plan of Doutta Galla. An early copy of the parish plan may identify this land section XXII.

More realistic plans were subsequently drawn (but also date unknown) putting the cemetery in its current location but in an idealised subdivision of the then vacant land south of a series of strip farm blocks on the south side of the main road to Sunbury - Kyneton and Mt Alexander. This proposal was for an oval shaped cemetery within a squared land section with a perimeter road and planting reserves as per Figure 9 below.

The earliest drawing of the oval shape (although partially missing), shows the interior divided into regular shapes with allocations for Church of England (3ac 0r 30p) Church of Scotland (2ac 2 r 11p) Catholic (2ac 1r 16p), Wesleyans (0ac 3r 21p), other denominations (0ac 1r 26p) and roadway (0ac 3r 0p). The total was in excess of 10 acres (4.05 ha).

Figure 13: Township of Keilor from South side of Bridge, circa 1855, by S.T. Gill. Source: La Trobe Picture Collection, State Library of Victoria.
Figure 14: Earliest plan of site, undated but possibly circa 1854-55. Source: Laskowski, Christine, Steele Creek and The Lady of the Lake (also found in CEM file, Dept. of Health (PROV)).

Figure 15: Fragmentary layout plan (partial) of cemetery undated but prior to November 1856 showing a simplistic break-up of denominations. North to LHS. Source: CEM file, Dept. of Health (PROV).
Figure 16: Idealised layout of the cemetery undated but possibly early 1856. The surrounding roads subsequently did not take up a radial shape although the plantation segments were implemented. Source: CEM file, Dept. of Health (PROV).
Figure 17: Approved plan of November 1856 with oval shape and gardenesque styled interior pathways. Side notes on the drawing are later. North to top, Macedon - Mt Alexander Road along top edge. Source: CEM file, Dept. of Health (PROV).
By the time of laying out this oval scheme in November 1856, the site had taken on a more ‘gardenesque’ appearance with an irregular pathway arrangement within the oval outline and this appears to have been the 10 acre site arrangement approved by the Order in Council.

This layout may not have been well set out on the ground as the progression of burials started to create problems culminating in complaints that the Catholic burials were starting to intrude into other denominational areas.

As reported in The Argus of Wednesday 9 February 1870, a deputation from the Keilor Trustees met with the Minister for Lands;

> Mr. Harbison introduced a deputation from the trustees of the Keilor Cemetery. It appeared that the trustees were anxious have the cemetery laid out afresh. It was laid out as long ago as 1856, by a surveyor of the department, but three years later his plan was deviated from, and burials took place according to a different arrangement from what was first intended. The trustees were now desirous of having the ground Marked out for the benefit of the different denominations according to the first design, with such modifications as might be necessary in consequence of burials that had taken place. They had applied to the Public Works department, which promised the services of a surveyor, and they now came to the Minister for Lands to get that promise fulfilled. Mr. McKean, as instructed by the assistant commissioner, told the deputation that the department had had nothing to do with the laying-out of burial-grounds since 1860. After some discussion, however, he undertook to have a survey made as requested, but gave the deputation plainly to understand that if the plan drawn up in accordance with the wishes of the trustees was in any way objectionable to particular religious denominations from an interference with what might be consecrated ground, he would not adopt it.

An investigation by the Lands Dept. Surveyor Mr Harding did discover discrepancies over the location of burials and he proposed a redistribution of the land and path locations to take this into account. The new land plan of 1870 designed by Mr Harding reduced some areas (such as the Wesleyans and Other Denominations) but now included areas for Independents and Baptists. The overall internal path system was now made even more eccentric than the original plan giving the arrangement a truly gardenesque randomised shape within the overall oval arrangement.

This arrangement lasted until 1883 when the size of the cemetery was officially increased to 14 acres 32 perch but this was more of a takeover of the land and roadways surrounding the oval rather than annexing a four acre piece of adjacent lands. Thus the oval shape started to be subsumed by a regularised rectangular shape around which new roads were created and maintained for the next 110 years until the eastern most boundary road was subsumed as part of larger land extensions toward the east (gazetted 1993 and 1995).

Although land was expanded the burial sites continued to be around the original heart of the site and an inspection today will show that some areas (such as the southernmost Church of England denominational area) was never utilised as originally intended but later became filled with European style graves as evidenced today.

These latter annexures of the 1990s were facilitated by the Calder Freeway implementation and the augmentation and widening of linking roads. Further annexures to the cemetery’s land have been made as part of road closures as well as to include larger tracts of land to the north and east of the site purchased from freeholders to provide more room for burials over the coming decades. The last tract of additional land (of an amorphous shape) was gazetted in 2007.
Figure 18: New layout in 1870 by Mr Harding adopting an even more gardenesque layout of the interior to account for burials which were outside the original denominational layout. The new layout also accounts for some expanded denominational areas. This shape lasted until 1883 when the perimeter land was added to the official size of the cemetery thereby disguising the original oval shape. Source: CEM file, Dept. of Health (PROV).
Figure 19: Cemetery as squared up and gazetted in 1883 at 14 acres 32 perches containing all the early land and surrounding roads and plantations. Around it are various road closures from 1977 to 1995 to cause the increase to the layout of the cemetery.

Trustees & Rules and Regulations

In 1857 the Trustees were appointed as per Gazette notice GG 57, p 1955 which saw the appointment of several MLAs and three others who no doubt were local landholders. Presumably there may have been difficulties in obtaining local names for the position of trustees. The first gazetted rules and fees were in the Government Gazette of 1870, p. 1266 by which time the Trustees were more from the local community than seconded MLAs.

Public Lands Office,
Melbourne, 17th October, 1857.

TRUSTEES OF THE GROUND SET APART AT KEILOR AS A SITE FOR A GENERAL CEMETERY.

HIS Excellency the Governor, with the advice of the Executive Council, has been pleased to approve of the appointment of

John L. Foster, M.L.A.,
George Holmes,
John O'Shanesy, M.L.A.,
Patrick Phelan, M.L.A.,
Thomas Bertram, and
James Robinson,

to be the Trustees of the ground set apart at Keilor as a site for a General Cemetery, under the provisions of the Act 17 Victoria No. 12.

By His Excellency's Command,

DAVID MOORE.

Figure 20: Gov. Gazette of 1857 with the first official list of trustees. Source: Government Gazette 57, p 1955
Over the years further gazettals were made to keep abreast of the costs of running the cemetery as well as changes to rules.

In 1925 the individual trustee system was supplanted by the Shire of Keilor (1871-1961)\(^5\) as trustees, then the City of Keilor (1961-1994) and subsequently the City of Brimbank (1994-2010) after which the GMCT took over.

Little appears to have happened at the cemetery apart from burials as the Council minute books of the 1930s indicate only occasional works such as purchase of grave labels (cast metal numbered keys) in 1930, fence repairs and tree planting in 1934 once the St Albans – Keilor water supply scheme had reached the area. For a cost of £7.10s the council purchased over 100 cypress in 1934\(^6\).

**Burials**

The denominational arrangement of the cemetery was based on the prevailing religious denominations found in the population of the Keilor area. Not only was this common practice and based on the regular population surveys taken by the Government, but there is even a note on a drawing identifying that this is how the reshaping of the cemetery was determined. The most contemporary survey had been taken in April 1854 and this would have allowed sufficient time to unravel the statistics relating to religion. Despite sufficient land being allocated (or rather over allocated), the average number of burials in the early years was low and even returns in the period prior to the Second World War showed that maximum yearly burials were often no more than 12. By 1927 the total burials was 508 which averages just 72 in a decade after the opening of the cemetery. This is something of a testament to the agricultural nature of the area with its low population. In 1930 the Council (as Trustees) started purchasing grave labels (numbered cast keys) in lots of 100 to mark out all the graves (by then around 500). The purchase was spread over 5 years and by 1934 they were having difficulty identifying a small percentage of older graves which had not been well recorded. They were also having a better plan of the site drawn up to help with identifying the location of graves but more importantly, unused space.

After the Second World War things started to change as more land was consumed in closer settlement and returning servicemen started to establish homes of their own. Melbourne’s outlying areas such as the once sleepy and rural Keilor, developed with new housing and radical population increases. Onto this, immigration added a population of displaced persons from Europe and many of those who had been agricultural labourers sought a block of land of their own. Australia took in migrants from Eastern Europe, Greece and Italy directly after the war and as this generation died their kin brought new burial traditions to not only Keilor Cemetery but many other cemetery sites across metropolitan Melbourne and other parts of Australia. By 1949 the burial numbers started to increase dramatically and by the end of 1949 the total burials were 1043 with 64 in that year alone. In the decade 1950-1960 the burial numbers had doubled to 2,000 and by the end of 1969 the number of burials was near to 3,000. Similarly at the end of 1979 the numbers of burials was around 4,000. There has never has been a count of ethnicity but clearly the burials in the last 70 years (1945-2015) has outstripped the burials over the years 1856-1945 (90 years) in number and diversity of ethnic origin.

The total burial number is now in the vicinity of 17,000 although these are now spread across traditional in ground graves and the large mausoleum which was constructed in three stages the first of which

---

\(^5\) Victorian Government Gazette 1925, p2095
commenced around the year 2000. Stages 2 and 3 were constructed by Harmer Architects in 2003 and 2008 respectively. Stage 4 is yet to commence to add more crypt space.

Figure 21: The mausoleum first commenced around 2000 as seen in late 2014. This view is primarily of the original section (stage 1) with a side wing by Harmer Architects just to the right hand side. Source: Heritage ALLIANCE. 2014.

Change of Name

In 1980 the cemetery had a change of name from Keilor Public Cemetery to Keilor General Cemetery. The denominational system was also done away with but an exact date for this has not been identified. This became a common practice when it has become clear that some compartments were unlikely to ever fill (such as Wesleyan and Baptists) whereas Catholic and Church of England were usually filled earlier in the life of a cemetery. Other denominations are now often advancing beyond existing capacity such as Chinese and Muslim in some locations, and other Christian off-shoots such as Russian and Greek Orthodox along with “new age” proselytising churches.

Other Contemporary Newspaper Reports

Surprisingly the cemetery is rarely mentioned in the local newspapers apart from funerals and it being useful as a turning point in the 19th C fox-hunting days where dogs and foxes coursed across the farmlands from the south and turned back around the top end of the cemetery site.

---

16 Cemetery File CEM263-02 Returns to Health Dept during 1930s. PROV
### Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Melbourne and Williamstown are declared open for closer settlement</td>
<td>GG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Gazettal of a portion of the Keilor area as a site for a village. Closer settlement must (after January 8th) occur within this designated area.</td>
<td>GG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Early land sales of alienated land within the Village of Keilor i.e. west of the Saltwater River conducted by Lands Office.</td>
<td>CEM File, Newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Early closer settlement land sales map (earliest map of Keilor). Land sales take place for land on the east of the river. This is a resale of land already given title from the 1851 sales.</td>
<td>CEM File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>A series of drawings of the site are held in the Dept. of Health File at PROV. These show idealised versions of the cemetery as well as simplistic layouts possibly produced in the 1855-56 period.</td>
<td>CEM File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Map of cemetery drawn up (grid pattern), 2nd map of cemetery, third map of cemetery accepted by Gov. as being the plan approved in Nov 1856. (No actual gazettal produced for the site)</td>
<td>CEM file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>First group of trustees appointed.</td>
<td>GG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>2nd group of trustees appointed after some have left the district</td>
<td>Newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Re-gazettal of the site as a 14 acre 32p cemetery reserve taking in the old planting reservations.</td>
<td>GG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Planting of sugar gums along cemetery road</td>
<td>CEM File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Commencement of applying grave labels 1930-34 throughout the cemetery. At this time more than 500 burials were registered but not all locations were able to be identified.</td>
<td>CEM File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-33</td>
<td>Mentions of dilapidation of timber fence and need to carry out repairs</td>
<td>CEM File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Mapping of site to identify used and unused grave spaces.</td>
<td>CEM File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933-34</td>
<td>Water from the St Albans – Keilor scheme finally reaches the cemetery as a singular small water pipe.</td>
<td>CEM File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-36</td>
<td>Period of intense tree planting to beautify the site with over 100 cypress planted in 1934 alone</td>
<td>CEM File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Erection of brick toilet block on entry driveway by City of Keilor. No architect identified.</td>
<td>Trust Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Drainage installed to older cemetery area to prevent waterlogging. Labour arranged through a Commonwealth employment scheme.</td>
<td>Trust Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Preparation of a plan showing existing conditions at the site to allow for future extension and road layout.</td>
<td>Trust Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>New road works anticipating extensions to cemetery to occur to the east.</td>
<td>Trust Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Year burials indicate that the cemetery will run out of space in 1990-91. Planning for roads to the east side of the site to match up with the newly proposed extension. It is possible that this is the time when the east side trees</td>
<td>Trust Minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
started to be removed in anticipation of the new extension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Construction of Administrative offices by Jim Earle architect</td>
<td>Trust Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Paving of roads, landscaping and irrigation of eastern area. Programme to maintain trees. Extension to Works compound hard standing concrete areas</td>
<td>Trust Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Commencement of phase I of mausoleum</td>
<td>Trust Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Stage II of mausoleum (wing)</td>
<td>Trust Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Stage III of mausoleum (wing)</td>
<td>Trust Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Greater Melbourne Cemetery Trust takes over running of Cemetery</td>
<td>Trust Minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: GG = Government Gazette, GMCT = files, minute books and papers held by GMCT; CEM file = Heath Dept file held by PROV.

### 3.3 Contextual History

#### The Cemetery Movement

Planning for the disposal of the dead as well as attitudes to death were major concerns of Britain’s Victorian Age and accompanied the century’s legacy of great sanitary reforms. With phenomenal shifts in the population from rural to town-and-city concentrations, Britain’s urban graveyards quickly became overcrowded leading to consequences injurious to health and offensive to decency. Graves, particularly those of the poor, had never been secure in graveyards, and increasingly burials were not possible without digging up other bodily remains. J.C. Loudon (1783-1843), landscape gardener and writer, knew of a graveyard in which 45 coffins were packed into one plot. It is little wonder that bodies were taken to graveyards at night and buried the next morning with little or no ceremony, and few relatives going to the graveside for committal.

As reaction to the gruesome horrors of urban graveyards set in, the movement towards establishing large metropolitan garden cemeteries gained momentum, and the cemetery, as we know it became a phenomenon of cities and towns.

Other factors were also propelling the establishment of cemeteries. The nineteenth century was an age when Governments increasingly reacted to the concerns of its citizens for greater religious tolerance and the increasing dissent towards the established (Church of England) church and the rise of the independence of other denominations. Those who were not Anglicans felt they should not have to be buried in Church of England parish churchyards or burial grounds attached to churches. The new cemeteries provided for all religious persuasions and some had their own Anglican, Roman Catholic and Nonconformist chapels. The grounds were divided into two areas; one consecrated by the Church of England Bishop in whose diocese the ground lay, the other comprising unconsecrated and non-denominational burial land.

The patterns that shaped Britain’s emergent middle-class life also shaped its commemoration of death. The values of individualism and bourgeois respectability associated with everyday life in the nineteenth century.

---

17 Curl, *The Victorian Celebration of Death*, p38.
18 Ibid. p101.
century metropolis also found expression in a new funeral culture that accompanied the advent of cemeteries. There were standards of mourning to maintain, and the display of a funeral marked one’s gentility ‘or at least of a hankering after gentility’.19 Undertaking became a commercial enterprise. The rich could afford an elaborate rite of passage, and the less wealthy were expected to make a show with ‘a good send-off’ often with the body displayed in an open coffin in the front parlour of the stricken household.

The latter also often held their own services in the home but both culminated in the committal of the body at a graveside burial. Funerary monuments proliferated; built to stand in perpetuity, they defined one’s social place but also allowed those of uncertain social position to posthumously advertise their success. Monuments were like a sculpture gallery, a lesson in styles and taste and many of the more spectacular examples were architecturally designed.

The choicest jobs for architects however were for designs of complete cemeteries. Ensembles of Gothic or Renaissance chapels, handsome gatehouses and monumental entrance gates became the norm for new cemeteries, with the whole providing cleverly designed paths within an enclosed ‘world where nature, architecture, art, and landscape gardening combined in an illusion of quiet, peaceful, permanent rest for the middle-class dead’.20 While rendering the grounds more beautiful, trees and shrubs could also be educational, with their varieties attractively labelled for the enlightenment of those who walked there. Many of the new cemeteries in the English provinces were an attempt at civic improvement by private enterprise, often much needed in towns of rapid industrial development.

Père-Lachaise and the Glasgow Necropolis

The prototype for the nineteenth century cemetery as a landscaped funerary garden emerged in 1804 in Père-Lachaise Cemetery, established in Paris on a hill to the east of the city. Instead of being buried in a church or malodorous churchyard, the dead could be fashionably interred in ‘a terrestrial Paradise, an Elysium, and an Arcady, where the enchantments of landscape-gardening, nature, art, and architecture alleviated the gloom of the grave’.21 Owing much to the English landscaped garden of the eighteenth century, Père-Lachaise soon became world-famous with its influence shaping an entirely new funerary culture in the western world. Plans for a spectacular Scottish version of the cemetery followed in 1831, with a proposal for converting a rocky hillside park into an ornamental cemetery, to be known as the Glasgow Necropolis. A cemetery of such beauty and awe-affecting melancholy would ‘extend religious feelings’, benefit public morals, improve manners, extend virtuous and generous feelings and convincingly express ‘a nation’s progress’ in civilisation and the arts, claimed promoter John Strang (1795-1863).22 Many of the buildings and monuments were architect-designed, including the bridge, façade, lodge, and Egyptian vaults.

English Cemeteries: Kensal Green, Nunhead, Highgate, Abney Park and Brompton

Improving the system of burial in the London metropolis began to gain momentum by the late 1820s and early 1830s generating a great deal of discussion in publications, meetings and parliamentary debate. In April 1830, an exhibition of proposals by architect Francis Goodwin (1784-1835) was held for a ‘Grand National Cemetery’, with buildings constructed in the Greek Revival style.23 However the scheme failed to

---

19 Ibid. p195.  
20 Ibid. pp 88-89.  
21 Ibid. p 26.  
22 Ibid. pp 46-47.  
23 Ibid. p 49.
gain backing. J.C. Loudon, who, in 1843 published a comprehensive book on designing, planting and managing cemeteries, wrote to the *Morning Advertiser*, proposing a scheme for several cemeteries equidistant from each other and from the centre of London. They were laid out more formally than Père-Lachaise, which Loudon thought to be too difficult to administer. Only a month later, in May 1830, a petition was presented to the House of Commons seeking the removal of metropolitan burial grounds to places where they would be less ‘prejudicial to the health of the inhabitants’.

Several of the more influential promoters of new cemeteries formed the General Cemetery Company, and in July 1831 their purchase of 32 hectares (77 acres) of land at Kensal Green was approved. In November, when a competition was announced for designs for a chapel, gateway, and lodge, there was no shortage of architects able and willing to submit designs. The quite radical concept of the modern cemetery was fast becoming a fashionable design proposition, and Kensal Green attracted some 46 submissions. Although Henry Edward Kendall (1776-1875) won the competition, his Gothic designs never eventuated. Gothic, in 1832, was considered florid, and still had associations with pre-Reformation England. Greek Revival, the prevailing style of the day, would have held more attraction to the Company’s ‘polite society’ clientele.

The General Cemetery of All Souls at Kensal Green opened in 1833, and in the same year classical designs were prepared for two chapels, one for Anglicans (built 1836-37), one for Dissenters (built 1833-34), a colonnade over catacombs, and an entrance gate and lodge (both 1833-34). Beneath the chapels were brick catacombs comprising shelves for the placement of coffins. More expensive than burial plots, the catacomb became a feature of the contemporary cemetery and in the 1850s there were even plans to build catacombs at two cemeteries in the Victorian goldfields towns of Back Creek (Bendigo) and Campbell’s Creek (Castlemaine). Planted and laid out in walks, with parterres and borders of flowers, Kensal Green’s attractive grounds and handsome Greek buildings soon proved to be enormously popular, its fashionable status elevated by the graves of several aristocrats, members of the royal family and monuments of rare or imposing architectural quality.

In 1938 the cemetery was extended and a crematorium was built in a simplified Scandinavian Classical style. Many cemetery companies followed on from Kensal Green, but this cemetery company remains the only private cemetery company in London from this period still in existence.

More commercial cemeteries formed in rapid succession in provinces like Leeds and Birmingham, as well as around London. Stephen Geary (1797-1854) architect, entrepreneur, and member of the London Cemetery Company, is associated with the founding of the Cemeteries of Highgate, Nunhead, Peckham, Westminster, Gravesend and Brighton. He may have undertaken the initial surveys and plans for north London’s Cemetery of St James, Highgate, including designs for its spectacular ring of Egyptian-style catacombs around an existing Cedar of Lebanon, as well as the cemetery’s perimeter walls and the two chapels on either side of the Tudor gatehouse. Like Kensal Green, it had two chapels, one for Anglicans, and the other for Dissenters with parts of the cemetery ground reserved for unconsecrated and consecrated burials (the Anglican section was consecrated on 20 May 1839). Highgate ‘became the definitive cemetery of the London bourgeoisie’. Less formal than Kensal Green, Curl writes:

---

25 Ibid. p 50.
26 Christopher Brooks (1989), quoted from Curl, p 92.
It is certainly one of the most remarkable creations of the Victorian Age, one of the most unashamedly Romantic: the spooky Egyptianising architecture is unforgettably wonderful, and the catacomb complex, with its climax at the Upper Terrace, is unquestionably a brilliant piece of scenographic design.\textsuperscript{27}

The London Cemetery Company proceeded with a second enterprise in 1840 at Nunhead, south of the river. By now, A.W.N. Pugin’s views on the moral superiority of Gothic architecture (promoted in his publication, \textit{Contrasts}, of 1836) were gaining currency, and from 1837 the Houses of Parliament at Westminster were arising beside the Thames as the prime example of the new Gothic fashion, so it was no surprise that the cemetery’s Anglican and Dissenters’ Chapels were designed in the Gothic style of the fourteenth century. Neoclassicism however, was still employed for the entrance-gate piers and two symmetrical lodge gates.

The Abney Park Cemetery of 32 acres was also founded in 1840 in London. Established by the Abney Park Cemetery Company, it differed from its predecessors by being open to all religions, with no separations into denominational divisions and with no consecration of the burial ground ever occurring. The structures included an ecumenical Gothic Chapel built in brick with stone dressings, a small catacomb in an underground chamber separated from the Chapel, and Portland stone Egyptian Revival entrance-gates and lodges. The grounds inherited a landscape of lush planting, which was retained and enhanced by adding some 2,500 varieties of trees and shrubs and over 1000 roses, forming an arboretum and rosarium, with many of the species labelled. The Cemetery catered for the more modest burials of workers and accordingly lacks the grand monuments of Highgate or Kensal Green. It was taken over by the London Borough of Hackney Council in 1978.

Stephen Geary was also involved in establishing Brompton Cemetery, which was opened on 39 acres by the West of London and Westminster Cemetery Company in 1840.\textsuperscript{28} Comprising an Anglican Chapel inspired by the Italian Renaissance, circular colonnade, catacombs and gateway in the form of a triumphal arch, it was also to include Roman Catholic and Dissenters’ Chapels, but due to financial problems they were never built. The Cemetery suffered financial ruin and in 1851 the government acquired it from the company. It was becoming evident that the business of cemetery planning, construction and management did not marry well with the interests of a speculative company.

The Cemeteries Clauses Act of 1847 had enacted general powers to regulate commercial cemeteries and was based on the Acts under which many of the earlier company-formed cemeteries were established. The problem with the majority of the new cemeteries was that they were dedicated to those who were able to afford a grave site and monument. There was little interest shown in attracting the poor, and problems were mounting on how to dispose of the masses of working-class dead, many of whom ended up in the small, overcrowded burial grounds still open in urban centres. The situation was compounded by outbreaks of cholera throughout 1848 and 1849. In 1850 the General Board of Health proposed to close all urban burial-grounds and purchase all existing cemeteries founded by joint-stock companies, some of which would be closed. Kensal Green was retained and expanded, and huge, new public cemeteries were created, providing the means for a civilised burial to be available to people of all classes. The Better Provision for the Interment of the Dead Act was passed in 1850,\textsuperscript{29} followed by the Metropolitan Burial Act of

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid. p 92.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid. p 95.
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid. p 137.
1852, which remained the principal legislation on the subject until largely repealed in 1972.\textsuperscript{30} These enactments effectively ended the burial crisis and set up a workable system of affordable public interment.
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Old Melbourne Cemetery

Melbourne’s earliest burials occurred informally on Burial Hill, now the Flagstaff Gardens, from May 1836 when the small Port Phillip settlement of squatters was still illegal. The location of Melbourne was confirmed for official settlement with the arrival of Captain Lonsdale as commandant, on 1 October that year. NSW Governor Richard Bourke followed him in March 1837 along with surveyor, Robert Hoddle who commenced surveying and planning Melbourne on a rectangular grid within a town reserve of approximately three miles by one mile, parallel with the river. Hoddle (1794-1881) included a cemetery surveyed to the north-west just within the town reserve area, bounded by Victoria Street. The four-hectare cemetery is now covered by the car park of the Queen Victoria Market.\textsuperscript{31} Apparently in response to a request by the Presbyterians, who objected to mixed burials, he divided the cemetery into denominational sections, making it the first denominationally sectioned cemetery in Australia.\textsuperscript{32} Other denominations represented were Episcopalian (Church of England) and Roman Catholic, with Wesleyans, Independents, Jews and Quakers occupying smaller sections. An additional portion was also set aside for Aboriginal burials. The Church of England Bishop of Australia, William Grant Broughton (1788-1853),\textsuperscript{33} consecrated the cemetery in April 1838, although burials had commenced in 1837.\textsuperscript{34}

Hoddle’s cemetery illustrated the new shift in burial practice away from church graveyards (a characteristic of early Sydney) to the public cemetery, but it was still a world away from the design of London’s Kensal

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{30} May, p 25.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Lewis, p 27.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Spicer, ‘Old Melbourne’ in Sagazio (ed.), p 32.
\end{itemize}
Green, which had opened just four years previously in 1833. Functionally planned and laid out, Melbourne’s public cemetery displayed little ornamentation, and was initially enclosed by a wooden fence. This was replaced by iron railings on bluestone footings, built by public subscription in 1869, well after the cemetery had closed. The monuments, many carved from soft sandstone, were largely of rudimentary tablet form, and iron railings enclosed some graves. Seventy historically significant headstones were transferred to the Fawkner Cemetery to form the Pioneer Section in the 1920s after the cemetery had long remained neglected since its closure in the early 1850s. Some 914 remains were also exhumed and reburied in Fawkner as well as in Melbourne General, Boroondara (Kew), St Kilda and Cheltenham cemeteries.

**Melbourne General Cemetery**

On 25 June 1847, Melbourne was created a city by letters patent of Queen Victoria. The town had grown rapidly, and with it emerged the same concerns about urban burial and public health that had gained momentum in England. By 1849 the Council of the Corporation of Melbourne was claiming that the overcrowded 1837 cemetery was ‘in dangerous proximity to the inhabited portions of the city’. They approached the NSW Government and in 1850 plans were drawn up for a new cemetery, following the passing of a NSW act of parliament. Invitations to five cemetery trustees went out in early 1851, and in September 1852, the position of architect and surveyor for the new Melbourne cemetery was advertised in the Government Gazette, and Albert Purchas (1825-1909) was appointed.

Born in Chepstowe, in the county of Monmouthshire, Wales, Purchas had only been in the colony a year, and had been working as a civil engineer, surveyor and architect in contract jobs for Surveyor-General Robert Hoddle, one of them to survey the new village of Hawthorn. In addition to the position advertised for the cemetery he was also appointed as secretary to the trustees and provided with a salary of £450 a year. By contrast a cemetery keeper and sexton was earning £156 a year.

A map of Melbourne drawn by Purchas in 1853 or 1854 shows the 33½ acre reserve for the new cemetery well beyond the town grid drawn by Hoddle. Carved from the swathe of public parkland to the north of the city just beyond the university, the Melbourne General Cemetery was Victoria’s first modern cemetery. Designed on the principals of England’s large metropolitan garden cemeteries, it displayed elements of Romantic and formal styles, combining serpentine roadways within which paths defined burials and denominational sections. Whereas each religious denomination represented at the Old Cemetery held its allotted land under a separate government grant and was responsible for managing its own portion, the new Melbourne General comprised one land grant and one management body of denominational representatives. This system would guard against the haphazard arrangement and neglectful management that characterized the old cemetery.

The old cemetery was declared officially closed, and the new Melbourne General Cemetery opened in June 1853, the same year that the University of Melbourne was established. Designed to function not only as a

---

35 Melbourne was created a Bishop’s See of the Church of England, to which Dr Charles Perry was appointed bishop, and by virtue of this, the town of Melbourne was elevated to the status of city. Dunstan, p149; it is estimated that as many as 10,000 burials may have occurred at the Old Melbourne Cemetery (see Cannon, p129).
36 Government Gazette, 1 September 1852.
38 Chambers, p99.
place of burial but also as a modern civic amenity, this cemetery was to be just as important as a landscaped park, gallery, library or museum for decorous recreation and education. It accorded with the suggestion of the Argus newspaper a year earlier, that Melbourne’s new burial ground should be a cemetery and public garden combined, thereby providing an opportunity for the education of popular taste in a society ‘destitute as it is, of almost every means of popular education in art and taste’. Botanist Baron Sir Ferdinand von Mueller (1825-1896) provided advice on the ornamental plantings from 1860, and the grounds went on to be ornamented with a number of gate-keeper’s lodges (north gate of 1867 by Charles Webb), Jewish chapel (1854), iron gates (1869 Charles Webb), Roman Catholic Chapel (1871 and 1888 by William Wardell), iron fence (1876, by Morgan Jageurs), rockeries, several shade pavilions, denominational iron markers and many distinguished monuments. The Melbourne General Cemetery predates Sydney’s Rookwood Cemetery of 1867, which is the largest nineteenth century cemetery in the world.

Suburban and Regional Cemeteries

The speed with which Melbourne passed from a relatively small community to a metropolis distinguished by elaborate urban and city needs soon necessitated further action to accommodate its burial requirements. A number of suburban public cemeteries followed Melbourne General Cemetery in quick succession throughout the 1850s and 1860s including St Kilda (1855), Brighton (1855), Keilor (1856), Williamstown (1857), Boroondara (1858), Box Hill (1858), Templestowe (1858), Oakleigh (1859), Coburg (1860) and Footscray (1860). Growing country centres also applied to the government for grants of Crown Land to be reserved for cemetery purposes or sought to have Crown land surveyed for cemetery purposes. Some examples include Back Creek (later known as Bendigo Cemetery) (1854-57); Wangaratta (c.1857), Dandenong (1857), Keilor (1857), Daylesford (1857), Belfast (later known as Port Fairy) (1857); Avoca (1857), Heathcote (1857), Ballarat (1857), Murghebooluc (1857), Epping (1858) and Smythesdale (1859). Many of these cemeteries were set up as a result of public meetings of concerned citizens and local church groups, and the legislation governing their establishment was influenced by the English legislation of the early 1850s, which saw public cemeteries administered by trustees.

In 1854 the Victorian government passed an Act for the Establishment and Management of Cemeteries in the Colony of Victoria. It empowered the government to appoint and dismiss trustees and to approve the rules and regulations for a cemetery’s administration, and a scale of fees and charges for graves, as recommended by the trustees. It also stated that a ‘burial ground must be distant one mile at least from any town’. Initially local councils were to have the responsibility for the management and trusteeship of cemeteries, under the Municipal Institutions Act and the Public Health Act, both of 1854. The initial work of setting up the cemetery (its reservation from sale, dimensions and access and gazettals) were handled by the Department of Crown Lands and Survey. However by the 1860s Victoria’s public cemeteries were under the Public Works Department, followed by the Department of Crown Lands and Survey from 1873 to 1888, and the Chief Secretary’s Department from 1888 to 1890. In 1890 responsibility passed to the Department of Health (Public Health Act 1889). A new act governing Victoria’s 600 cemeteries was proclaimed in the Cemeteries Act 1958. This was superseded by the Cemeteries and Crematoria Act 2003, which is administered by the Department of Human Services.

---

41 Argus, 7 February 1852, p 2.  
42 Mackay et al., p 8.  
43 Sagazio, p 13.  
44 Quoted from ‘Self Guided Tour of the Bendigo Cemetery, 145 Years of History 1858-1993’.
3.4 Comparative Analysis

Victorian 19th Century Cemeteries

A number of extant Victorian metropolitan cemeteries were established in, or prior to, the 1850s, in Victoria, including: Brighton (1854) Eastern Cemetery, Geelong (1829); Boroondara Cemetery Kew (1855); Geelong West Cemetery (1856); Williamstown Cemetery (1857).

Many of these are in a gardenesque layout (Melbourne General, Brighton) and this design also translated to country cemeteries (Bendigo’s Carpenter Street and White Hills). A number of these cemeteries appear to have been influenced by (or were a copy of) the original gardenesque designs for Melbourne General by Albert Purchas.

Comparative sites: metropolitan cemeteries of State importance are:

St Kilda

A small scale cemetery of 8 hectares with the first interment in 1855. The site has a layout influenced by the gardenesque and a surrounding high brick wall on three sides with a metal palisade fence on the main frontage.

No large monuments but a site with many graves of people of state and national significance. The cemetery also contains a number of graves with significance for aesthetic and rarity reasons. The original gatehouse was demolished in the 1970s.

Williamstown Cemetery

Williamstown Cemetery was established in 1857, to replace a makeshift cemetery at Point Gellibrand. A master plan was developed c.1912 to extend the original 6 hectare site but this was never fully executed.

According to the CMP, there were several structures associated with the cemetery. These included a timber mortuary chapel, which doubled as a rest-house, and office (c1858-89, demolished); propagating yard and fernery; a central fountain (c1892); and a gatekeeper’s sentinel’s box (c.1896, demolished). Other landscape features included seating, compartment markers, finger posts to toilets (c1879), toilets and rubbish baskets (c1889). In 1913 the rubbish bins were replaced by ‘sugar baskets’, and then by galvanised drums in 1937. Several work sheds have been located around the cemetery at various times.

The new chapel was opened in 1937 and designed in a Tudor-revival style. In 1939, entrance gates from the St Kilda Town Hall and posts from the Exhibition Gardens were relocated to the cemetery. The residence was demolished c1966 and the current residence erected. New sheds were erected to replace earlier sheds around this time.

Melbourne General Cemetery

Established in 1850 this is a large metropolitan cemetery of 45 hectares. As the largest inner metropolitan cemetery, the site is of national significance for the graves and monuments of historical and aesthetic importance. The design is directly comparable to the gardenesque style of Boroondara and features such as the rotundas are identical as Albert Purchas was responsible for a number of works at both Boroondara and Melbourne General.
Brighton

A moderately scaled cemetery of established in 1854 with the first burial the following year. The site has a brick surrounding wall and gatehouse lodge of 1892. Comparative to Boroondara in scale, design and content. A number of interesting monuments of aesthetic significance such as the Egyptian style tomb.

Coburg

A smaller scale cemetery established in 1859. There are no surviving early structures although cottages and offices were built in the 1880s-1910s period. The surrounding fence is wire and nothing of the original remains. The original remnants are really the layout as well as cypress trees most probably planted around 1914-15. Few monuments of aesthetic importance but a number of people of local importance.

Victorian era comparative national sites: metropolitan cemeteries.

Toowong (Brisbane) Queensland

A large and undulating site of 43 hectares, established in 1866 covering a number of small foothills at the base of Mt Cootha. This unfenced site holds a number of monuments of similar scale and diversity and has graves of historical, aesthetic and rarity significance at the State level.

In this cemetery there are also many monuments of aesthetic significance and a number of excellent examples of stone sculpting.

There is a substantial collection of trees and the whole has the feel of undulating parkland. The cemetery is utilized to nowhere near its capacity.

West Terrace (Adelaide) South Australia

The City of Adelaide’s earliest cemetery and reputed to be the oldest continuous cemetery in Australia having been provided for in Colonel Light’s plan of Adelaide of 1837. The cemetery is a flat piece of ground, of 20 hectares, on the edge of the city CBD. There are however others in the Sydney area which predate the Adelaide cemetery which commenced as church yard cemeteries.

Cornelian Bay (Hobart), Tasmania

Some distance from Hobart on the upper estuary of the Derwent River, this moderate sized cemetery was established in 1872 and contains graves of aesthetic, historical and rarity significance. It was recently found to contain graves with monuments to the design of the noted English Gothicism architect AWN Pugin.

Rookwood Cemetery (Western Sydney) New South Wales

Established in 1866 with the first burial in 1867, this is a cemetery of immense scale and the largest in the world at 284 hectares and in excess of 1 million burials. There are sections of the cemetery which are unfilled. The cemetery contains early relocated burials, the site has a gardenesque layout, is simply fenced and contains a number of denominational chapels (some very large) and gatehouses. The whole of the cemetery is divided into a number of trustee ships on a denominational arrangement.

Waverley Cemetery (Bronte), New South Wales

A municipal cemetery of medium scale and comparable at 16 hectares, with a spectacular setting overlooking the Pacific Ocean. The site contains a small number of large monuments and is unfenced. The entrance is marked by an office and lodge.

The cemetery plan is partly irregular but substantially on a grid iron pattern.
3.5 Assessment of Significance

The Burra Charter (the Australia ICOMOS Charter for the conservation of places of cultural significance) sets out guidelines for the assessment of significant places. According to the Charter, a place is a site, area, building or other work, group of buildings or other works together with associated contents and surrounds. Four criteria are defined by the Charter to aid the assessment of the cultural significance of a place, these being: Aesthetic, Historic, Scientific and Social.

Aesthetic Value

The Burra Charter defines aesthetic value as follows:

A place may have aesthetic value because of the form, scale, colour, texture and material of the fabric; and smells and sounds associated with the place and its use.

Keilor cemetery was until the 1960s and 1970s still very much a rural cemetery but after 2000 it radically developed as a suburban cemetery with the construction of the new mausoleum. Sometime during the 1960s and 70s the cemetery started to have European style graves which introduced a new form and texture to the site. The aesthetics of the old cemetery were very much bound up in the shape of the site and the trees planted in the late 19th century and around 1934 when there was a massive effort to plant hundreds of trees. What is highly noticeable now at this site is the historic trees and how they were used to edge the boundaries. There are few high profile large-scale grave monuments.

Historic Value

The Burra Charter defines historic value as follows:

Historic value encompasses the history of aesthetics, science and society, and therefore to a large extent underlies aesthetic, social and scientific value. A place may have historic value because it has influenced, or been influenced by, a historic figure, event, phase or activity. It may also have historic value as the site of an important event. For any given place the significance will be greater where evidence of the association or events survives in situ, or where settings are substantially intact, than where it has been changed or evidence does not survive. However, some events or associations may be so important that the place retains significance regardless of subsequent treatment.

The site has historic values for its very early establishment in the Melbourne region. Its approval in 1856 is unusual in the context of the development of Melbourne and its surrounding districts where many other cemetery sites were established later. The Government of the day may have anticipated that Keilor would develop quickly than it did given that it was a day's journey from Melbourne on the road to the Mt Alexander diggings.

Scientific Value

The Burra Charter defines scientific value as follows:

The scientific or research value of a place will depend upon the importance of the data involved, on its rarity, quality or representativeness, and on the degree to which the place may contribute further substantial information.

There is nothing apparent which would indicate that the site is of scientific importance or has scientific values.
Social Value

The Burra Charter defines social value as follows:

Social value embraces the qualities for which a place has become a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment to a majority or minority group.

The site has social importance for the length of time it has been a cemetery (approx. 160 years) serving what was for a long period considered a rural constituency but more recently part of the urban conurbation of Melbourne itself.

Revised Statement of Significance

There are two statements authored by Brimbank Council which have been discovered during this research and it is proposed to revise the information given the historic research for this CMP.

Statement of Significance (Original City of Brimbank Statement)

This Statement has been found on line in the Victorian heritage database:

Keilor Cemetery is of historical and cultural significance, as one of the oldest cemeteries in Melbourne, after the Melbourne General Cemetery, and as the resting place of local people from many diverse cultural traditions, from Irish, Scots, English and German settlers of the later 19th century to migrants from Europe in more recent times. The memorials in the cemetery include some excellent examples of the stone mason's craft.

Description

A new related picket fence extends around the north and west boundaries of the cemetery and is believed to replace remnants of an earlier post and wire fence, and possibly an even earlier post and rail fence, with short sections of timber picket fencing near the entrances. An immature Monterey cypress row is on the perimeter. There are notable and typical early headstones (J. Delahey, 1912; Bridget Connolly, 1886, by Jageurs & Son; Eric Sinnott, 1912, drowned at Brighton; Williamson family, 1931, restored; Bridget Gorman (O'Neil) c.1870; Fred Tate of Pleasant Vale, 1915; Margaret Beale, 1878-). There is a strong European and Eastern character to the majority of the more recent memorials. Many graves are in good condition. The cemetery has new related shelters, a recent brick house at the main entrance, good signage, extensive recent gardens and mature older trees, which include three Pinus canariensis and some large gums (Eucalyptus cladocalyx).

Mature exotic trees and some planted eucalypts (possibly Sugar Gums) define most of the boundaries of the original cemetery reserve, although as the site has been extended to the east, this boundary is not well defined. In addition there are mature trees used as landscaping elements on the internal roadways, in particular, a pair at the north west corner, probably marking the original entrance.

Statement included as part of the Incorporated Plan C84.

What is significant?

The Keilor Cemetery contains gravestones and monuments that date back to the 1860s. The cemetery has a row of Cypress around its south-western perimeter and many of the memorials in the cemetery are considered to be excellent examples of stone mason’s craft.
Why is it significant?

The Keilor Cemetery was established in 1856, three years after the Melbourne General Cemetery opened. The cemetery contains gravestones and monuments placed on the site before the cemetery officially opened. The cemetery is much older than most cemeteries in Melbourne and its multi-cultural character in recent years distinguishes it from most country cemeteries. It is the resting place of local people from many diverse cultural traditions, including an unlocated grave of an Aboriginal woman, European migrants from the later part of the 19th century, and in recent times commemorate local people from various ethnic backgrounds. The cemetery contains a burial register.

Statement of Significance (revised and reformatted City of Brimbank statement)

What is significant?

The Keilor Cemetery at Cemetery Road Keilor, is an early Victorian cemetery which now contains a large mausoleum (in stages built 2000, 2003, 2008). The original cemetery contains a number of early burials and memorials dating from 1856 along with an early gardenesque layout (albeit overlain with new paths) and a large number of trees remaining from substantial planting programmes during 1897 and 1934-36.

The cemetery layout was approved in 1856 some six years after the declaration of approval for the establishment of Keilor Village which no doubt was expected to grow as a stopover on the road to the Mt Alexander gold diggings. This never eventuated and Keilor remained something of a rural village until after the Second World War. The cemetery layout was expanded in 1883 to 14 acres 32 perch but this was barely consumed after more than 100 years. More recent burials in a European tradition did start to consume the cemetery which then had to be substantially expanded in the mid-1980 and 1990s. A number of the trees planted in the 1890s and 1930s were removed for this expansion and this has substantially changed the appearance of the site. The new larger site has meant the loss of definition of the old site along with the construction of a new large mausoleum on the new eastern side of the cemetery.

This site is part of the traditional land of the Wurundjeri people.

How is it significant?

Keilor Cemetery is important to the course and pattern of Victoria's cultural history, it has the potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Victoria's cultural history and it has social importance at the local level for its development during the early settlement period of Victoria.

Why is it significant?

Keilor Cemetery is significant at the local level for the following reasons:

Keilor Cemetery was established in 1856 not long after the declaration of the settlement of Keilor as a village followed by the first land transactions in 1851. Its original layout was an oval shape with internal meandering gardenesque paths set in a larger idealised layout with radiating roads which never eventuated. The internal paths had to be realigned in 1870 to account for out of alignment burials. Not all the compartments were taken up and indeed some remained un-occupied until the late 20th century when immigration and urbanisation brought new populations to what had once been a rural landscape. In the late 1980s the cemetery land was expanded and the original roadways realigned thereby making it difficult to read the original layout. In the 1990s the whole area was subject to freeway alignments and compulsory acquisition which substantially isolated the cemetery from easy access.
The site has a small number of visible early settler burials of various nationalities and also contains a number of Eucalyptus cladocalyx (Sugar Gums) of the late 19th century and Hesperocyparis/Cupresses Macrocarpa (Monterey Cypress) from the mid-1930s. Nineteenth century plantings of E’ Cladocalyx also occur outside the cemetery.

3.6 Further Research

Further research should be undertaken by cataloguing any documents held by the Trustees. This would be invaluable for confirming issues raised in this Conservation Plan, for site planning and for repair of monuments. It is presumed some of these documents and drawings will be original submissions to the trustees for the construction of various monuments on the site.

Translation of the minute books into a searchable document would also be useful as would be a translation of official Trustee returns on the PROV file. This would allow a more accurate record of burial numbers. Presently some of the documents are available on line (City of Brimbank trustee minutes) but many are not. The PROV holds a good collection of Council minutes as well as the Cemetery file from the Department of Health which also contains the earliest notes on the cemetery’s development.
4.0 CONSERVATION POLICY STATEMENT

4.1 Constraints and Requirements

Development of buildings and spaces and their reuse depends to a large extent on the importance of the building or structure as a whole and the relative importance of the spaces contained within.

The surrounding landscape and views to the sites features of primary importance are also prime considerations in retaining the cultural significance of the place.

Development involving a greater degree of alteration may occur in areas of lesser or no significance, minor alterations may occur in areas of contributory significance while areas, structures and built fabric of primary significance should be subjected only to minimal and easily reversible changes. Primary spaces and structures should also be considered for restoration and reconstruction of missing features as funding permits.

Such restoration and reconstruction work should be based on documentary and physical evidence such as photographs, oral histories and as-built drawings.

The following tables indicate the relative significance of the building exteriors, the spaces between buildings and the interior spaces.

4.2 Site Significance (precis)

The site is significant

- For its layout planning of 1856- & 1870 which partially remains today as a modified gardenesque arrangement.
- For the monuments to persons of the period 1856 to circa 1945 with some emphasis on the period to the end of the 19th century by which time there were less than 250 burials and a very small number of actual monuments. Many burials remain unmarked.
- For the views within the site and across the site from Cemetery Road and Ely Court. From here the most important features are the trees and the surrounding fence marking out the alignment of the cemetery as at 1883 when additional land was reserved.

As a result of this the components of the site have been assessed for the relative contribution each makes to the overall heritage significance of the place. Policies in regard to works can then be established which while retaining the overall cultural significance of the place, discriminate between areas, structures and objects of relatively little importance, and those of moderate and greatest importance.

4.3 Elements of Primary, Contributory, Lesser and No Significance

Primary Significance:

The elements which contribute to the understanding of the cemetery in a highly significant manner are:

- All of the land reserved for a cemetery in 1856 and 1883 and excluding all other extensions
- The cemetery paths which are now bituminised and in some areas modified into a more simplistic arrangement
- The Cypress and other exotic trees (such as Canary Island Pines) particularly along the boundaries
The Sugar Gums which are more randomised in their planting

The main grave monuments of the mid-19th century

**Contributory Significance**

The elements which contribute to the understanding of the site in a secondary manner and which also support the elements of primary significance are:

- The monuments to persons of historical significance for their contribution to the development of the Keilor area, or who were involved in important local historical events
- The picket fence along Ely Court and Cemetery Road as it marks out the alignments of the original site (albeit it now extends across the extended site post 1990). The fence is of more recent origin and its fabric is not of importance, rather it is the marking of the alignment which is important
- Trees other than sugar gums or cypress in hedge groups which are of primary significance.

**Lesser or No significance**

Lesser or No significance indicates that the place or structure does not contribute in any substantive manner to understanding the Significance of a heritage place.

- Entry Gatehouse and extension
- Toilets, sheds and the like
- Shelters and arbour structures
- Gardens
- The niche walls
- The lawn graves
- All of the cemetery infrastructure including bins, taps, signs etc.
- All graves after approximately 1945 (although this is an arbitrary date)
- All of the land extensions made after 1883 (which are primarily late 20th C extensions)

**4.4 Site Specific Policies**

The policies are based on an understanding of the relative contribution of each component of the site.

**Future Development general policies**

Future development for structures such as public structures (toilets, offices etc.) and works buildings should account for the following if it is intended to develop new facilities.

Siting considerations should take into account:

- A Location that is not dominant in the views from the primary site entrance
- A height that does not dominate the surrounding structures
- A design that is compatible in form and scale to the 19th Century structures at the site (i.e. the primary use of bricks is encouraged as are visible roof forms depending on the circumstance) but this relates only to construction on the land of the 1856 and 1883 reserves
A location which minimises damage to infrastructure and monuments of primary or contributory significance

This is not to suggest that an identifiably new structure would be inappropriate, it is dependent on design and dominance and the ability to blend it into the landscape of the cemetery.

Suggested locations and forms would be:

- In the area of the works sheds
- Of maximum one storey
- Constructed with primary surfaces of masonry with roofs which have a low reflectivity value. This masonry should be substantially brick with some integrated local stone for paving, part walls, cladding to columns and base walls

Grounds

The grounds of the cemetery are of primary significance and are almost fully developed. The undeveloped sites have been sold and will be used, possibly within the next two decades. The grounds (while extensive) should only be considered to be of importance for the lands reserved 1856-1883.

Policy

New development for burial structures (not being individual graves) may be undertaken where there is available space and its placement, height and materials will not disturb the visual connection between the various historic features of the site or be seen as detracting elements of the landscape particularly in the view across the site from the west toward the east. And north toward the south. Clusters of these structures should be avoided in favour of spreading the structures out in the landscape.

Recommended Actions

Any new development will most probably have to be in the location of existing buildings given that all ground space is already taken up.

Location of new developments should be considered in terms of the relationship between buildings and important trees (particularly their root zone) and pathways and the long views from the north boundary.

Note: It will be impossible to recover the original oval arrangement of the cemetery grounds as the boundaries between burial land and roadways started to be modified as early as 1883 although this may have been only in spot locations whereas burials after about 1945 would have substantially impacted the old boundary lines. More recent tree removals would have also removed any notion of the old layout. In 1945 it was still possible to detect the old oval shape in aerials of the site and this was mainly due to tree plantings which have since given way to graves.

The entry gatehouse, the flower stall and toilet block

The gatehouse and nearby toilets and flower stall are all of no heritage significance.

Policy

As an element of low significance all these buildings might be demolished, retained or relocated. The gatehouse might be retained as a useful element but the present day toilets and flower shop shed add no aesthetic to the site and being minor they might be demolished or relocated and the functions reallocated.
as part of the next mausoleum extension. It is likely that the rearrangement of the site with the new north and east extensions of the site might also create opportunities for reassessing where these might be.

**Recommended Actions**

Consideration should be given to relocation and integration of these services into the new mausoleum and new construction on the new land extensions on the north. The vastness of the new site may even give rise to a second flower stall outlet or at least an attempt at centralising the existing one.

**The Mausoleum**

The mausoleum is of no heritage significance and sits on land reserved for the cemetery after the 1990s.

**Policy**

As an element of low significance the mausoleum might be demolished, retained or relocated. It is proposed to add stage 4 to the rear of the existing building. The new work should be no higher than the existing building and there is no need for the building to be fully enclosed. New services should be added to this building (toilets, storage, water collection etc.) to augment the main cemetery services.

**Recommended Actions**

Consideration should be given to relocation and integration of existing office services into this building and accessing the new cemetery from Ely Court. The extension should be planned to allow for rainwater harvesting. Consideration should be given to having the central area as a courtyard zone.

**The work sheds**

These are of No historic significance and appear to lie just inside the 1883 east boundary of the heritage site.

**Policy**

As elements of no significance (and much is just outside the heritage area) they may be demolished or altered provided that any work does not impact on the adjacent land of heritage significance.

**Recommended Actions**

It may be appropriate to concentrate some further facilities in this area alongside the workshops if and as required.

**The Pathways**

The major paths (as illustrated on all the cemetery maps) are of primary significance where those paths (now asphalted roads) follow the old pathway pattern of 1870.

**Policy**

As the paths are important elements in understanding the style of landscape introduced to the cemetery, it is important to maintain the existing pattern of paths in a logical programme.

**Recommended Actions**

No action required. Retain paths in existing pattern as they are in good condition.
The Drainage System

The asphalt roads have simple spoon drains and these are fortunately of very low prominence and should be retained. A site drainage system was introduced by the Keilor council in 1984 and appears to adequately and appropriately cope with draining the land.

Policy

Continue to assist in draining the land to prevent waterlogging. This system may or not cope with flash flooding and this may require some investigation.

Recommended Actions

No further action is required at this time although similar drainage works may be required on the newly acquired land. Clean out drains on a regular basis.

The Plantings

The major exotic cemetery plantings (Monterey Cypress and Canary Island Pines) and the Sugar Gums are of primary significance to the site. Canary Island Pines are also found in the old Keilor Village and may have been introduced across the Shire as a method of beautification.

Policy

Maintenance of the major significant (exotic) plantings is essential to the site. They must be maintained to high standards and should not be removed unless there is good reason to do so. Where they are part of row plantings, any removals should be replaced as soon as possible. Permits are required from the City of Brimbank to trim, lop or remove trees.

Where senescence sets in, the trees should be carefully managed, and if removed, a tree of the same species of minimum 2m high be planted and regularly maintained for a minimum of two years.

The alternative view is that replanting in the same species may not be appropriate to cope with future climate change and long dry periods. Replacement with an alternate tree type will have to be subject to discussion and agreement particularly as it is a matter requiring permits from the City of Brimbank. This is a problem for the long term rather than an immediate term issue.

The various rows of trees should be managed although they may be replaced from time to time where loss of limbs and senescence makes replacement necessary. Tree rows must be replaced in a sequenced manner rather than removing all trees at the same time.

The arboriculturalist report appended to this CMP will assist in decision-making about the importance of the trees found at the historic site and required actions.

Recommended Actions

Implement a management programme which causes the trees to be inspected every year, along with chipping and mulching of branches and regular watering particularly during summer with slow drip water barrels. The cemetery may have to install substantive rain-water tanks to feed the trees during the drought periods now being experienced.

Lesser Monuments

There are numerous monuments in this category. They are contributory to the overall significance of the place.
Policy

The bulk of the cemetery monuments make up the social, aesthetic and historic body of the cemetery. It is important that monuments to persons of historic significance or events, monuments of aesthetic significance, monuments of rarity value are not destroyed through the actions of the Trustees in a search for new burial space and are prevented where-ever possible from collapse. Prevention must take on a whole of cemetery approach starting with prevention of soil heave and desiccation. Prevention may also involve a small dump of stabilised gravel on some sinking graves.

Recommended Actions

Carry out consultation with the local historical society, Friends of the Cemetery and National Trust if there are proposals to allow development in older parts of the cemetery to ensure that the historical importance of the site is not overwhelmed.

Elements of Lesser or No significance

Various elements on the site have no intrinsic historic, architectural, or aesthetic significance. They include all buildings and most of the infrastructure (excluding paths which follow the old system). While the fabric of the new timber fences are not of heritage significance, its presence contributes to the aesthetics of the site and interprets the original boundary.

Policy

These elements may be altered in a contemporary manner provided that the alterations do not impact on the overall significance or aesthetics of the heritage place. Alterations which do not take into account the principal of aesthetic and siting “compatibility” should be avoided.

General Policy: Minor Works Recommended and Not Recommended for the grounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works which may and should be done</th>
<th>Works which should not be done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paths &amp; Drains</strong></td>
<td><strong>Paths</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue a system of repairing the asphalt paths in asphalt.</td>
<td>Changing the paths to concrete, changing the edging of the asphalted driveways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not extent the asphalt areas without specific reason to do so.</td>
<td>Minimise the use of bluestone blocks as this looks out of place in what is now a completely changed system of asphalted paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the further use of asphalt in the heritage area. If paths are required consider simple gravel or crushed brick paths.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue with a system of under-ground drainage and crushed brick paths to assist in site drainage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Monuments</th>
<th>The Monuments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrying out repairs to the important monuments in association with an approved plan.</td>
<td>Allowing owners or the public to carry out repairs on unstable monuments, cleaning of the monuments (particularly stone) with any chemicals other than mild detergent, painting of copper elements, setting monuments in cement (such as headstones), or using ferrous cramps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of stainless steel dowels and epoxy resin to join broken stone pieces (no resin or mortar to be on the joint edge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of lime mortars and white cement mortars for repointing to be carried out by experienced mason.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propping and chocking up of leaning monuments as preventative action along with filling and consolidating holes and areas undermined by animals or tree roots. Fill areas outside graves where filling will prevent collapse of the grave. Some graves have been undermined by burrows and these should be filled as a preventative to collapse. Weeding of graves</td>
<td>instead of stainless steel or bronze. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td>Grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulching on site of all plant material and distributed in a plan drawn up by landscape architects. This may be distributed amongst existing important plantings and areas where it is intended to retain soil moisture or slow washaway areas. Planting of ground covers to prevent desiccation of soils. Backfilling areas near graves where collapse can be prevented by small amounts of soils.</td>
<td>Leaving mounds of soils which collect rainwater and rubbish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>Trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of trees as part of a programme established with a horticulturalist/arboriculturalist. Severing tree roots that are buckling walls WITH the aid of a Tree surgeon. Do not sever the root ball of the tree.</td>
<td>Lopping of trees leading to mis-shaping or unbalancing of limbs. Arbitrary removal of trees without consulting an arborist (unless they have fully blown down) Undertaking work in the root protection zone of a tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Infrastructure</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run cables and pipework underground avoiding all tree roots except if the protected cable can be threaded through. Develop a suite of hard landscape elements e.g. taps, seating, signage, lighting that runs to a common standard across all GMCT sites. The suite of items should be developed primarily with aesthetic considerations in mind.</td>
<td>Discontinue the practice of having standard off the shelf items installed by local council or allowing works to be carried out by local council without oversight of standards by GMCT. All items (seating, lights, taps, bins) should be chosen for aesthetic appropriateness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.5 Future Use and Development**

The site is unlikely to ever be used for anything other than a cemetery, so future USE is essentially not an issue. Continuing expansion has and is occurring and to a certain extent started to overwhelm the original site. The new sites should be contained with their own aesthetic which should differ to original site and should be seen as physical divided from the original at least by the existing Ely Court roadway. This is being suggested to prevent the site becoming an amorphous agglomeration without distinction between original historic area with its own set of historic and aesthetic values and subsequent large extensions.
The Keilor Cemetery is formally statutorily protected from inappropriate development by its inclusion in the City of Brimbank’s planning scheme under Heritage Overlay HO50. The planning scheme also identifies that there is an Incorporated Plan (C84 part I) controlling the development of the cemetery and this is attached in the Appendices. The City of Brimbank Planning Scheme also identifies that tree controls apply.

**Tree controls:** The Brimbank Planning Scheme clause 93.06 ‘Remove, Destroy or Lop a Tree’ outlines that all trees in sound health, structure and are in a position that can be reasonably designed around should be retained; all trees that are significant for aesthetic, ecological, cultural or historic reasons should be retained.

The Brimbank Planning Scheme defines a ‘Cemetery’ as “Land used to dispose of human remains by burial. It may include funeral chapels or the like”.

**Clause 15 Built Environment and Heritage:** “Planning should ensure all new land use and development appropriately responds to its landscape, valued built form and cultural context, and protect places and sites with significance heritage, architectural, aesthetic, scientific and cultural value.”

**Clause 15.03 Heritage Conservation:** The objective of this clause is to ensure the conservation of places of heritage significance. Strategies to achieve this are to identify, assess and document places of natural and cultural heritage significance as a basis for their inclusion in the planning scheme and to provide for the protection and conservation of heritage places.

**Clause 43.01 Heritage Overlay:** The purpose of this clause is to conserve and enhance heritage places of natural of cultural significance and to ensure that development does not adversely affect the significance of heritage places. This clause outlines and goes into detail of when it is necessary to obtain a permit, when a permit is not required, when there is an exemption from submitting notice and review, and what the decision guidelines are.

**Incorporated Plan:** The incorporated plan (found in the appendices) identifies works which do and do not require a permit. The document however is non-specific in that further interpretation is required as to which are the important trees and what areas are of importance. Two specific exemptions are the construction of buildings under 3sqm and less than 2m high (i.e. basically a small shed) and allowing signs under 1sqm in area. This CMP should be used especially the tree report, to identify works to specific trees which are considered to be the most important being the Sugar Gums and the Monterey Cypress which are the oldest in the cemetery and deliberately planted through specific Trustee schemes.
Formal heritage protection is **not** included on any of the following registers despite it being of heritage importance.

- Victorian Heritage Register;
- The closed Register of the National Estate;
- National Heritage List;
- National Trust of Victoria

### 4.6 The Impact of Climate Change on the Historic Environment

“*Climate change is one of the most important and urgent problems facing us today.*”\(^{45}\) - English Heritage. In 2007, the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change published its fourth assessment report on climate change. The panel reported that the global atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide have significantly increased as a result of human activities since 1750. The panel also reported that “*the linear warming trend over the last 50 years is nearly twice that for the last 100 years*, and *widespread changes in extreme temperatures have been observed over the last 50 years.*” Much of the historic environment has already experienced and survived this climatic change and therefore may show resilience to future climate changes. However, there are many historic sites and objects that are at risk from future climate change. Without action limiting further decay, the historic environment may become irreparably damaged and cultural, social and economic benefits will be lost. This may significantly impair...

\(^{45}\) English Heritage, *Climate Change and the Historic Environment*, January 2008, p1
future generations in understanding and enjoying their cultural heritage. The “non-renewable character” of historic sites needs to be considered and any amendments and adaptations should be well planned. Some of the direct impacts of climate change on the historic environment are: rising sea levels endangering historic landscapes, structures, buildings and archaeology; an increase in the extremes in wetting and drying accelerating stone decay; increase in intense rainfall accelerating erosion and damaging flooding; changes in vegetation patterns altering the visibility and integrity of historic landscapes; a warming climate which leads to difficulty in conserving historically significant trees; and changes in the distribution of pests threatening the integrity of historic buildings and landscapes.

“Historic assets are a fragile and non-renewable resource, the significance of which can be reduced or lost as a result of poorly conceived changes. Decisions on how, when or whether to make adaptive changes to historic assets in order to enhance their resilience to climate change should be based on a good understanding of the pressures they are likely to face. It is important therefore that decision makers understand the uncertainties inherent in current climate change predictions and the timescales over which changes are likely to occur.”

According to the Victorian Climate Change Adaptation Program 2008 Summary, the state of Victoria is expected to warm at a slightly faster rate than the global average. It is estimated that by 2030, the annual average temperatures will increase by approximately 0.8°C and by 2070 the average annual temperature could increase by 1.4°C. This predicted warming weather will also likely increase the chance and intensity of bushfires. It is estimated that the number of “extreme” fire danger days will increase by 5 to 40% by 2020.

The significant potential climate change impacts on historic sites that can cause damage in a single incident are floods, rising sea levels, fire and severe storms. Other potential impacts are temperature rise, increased solar radiation, decreasing humidity and the movement of unstable clay sub soils, which generally cause damage over a period of time.

Cemetery sites are directly affected by the impacts of climate change, and particularly in Victoria. Some recommendations to reduce the vulnerabilities of cemeteries to climate change are:

- **Trees, gardens and landscapes:** Identify vulnerable trees, gardens and landscapes of historic and cultural significance and implement watering regimes and conservation. Particularly vulnerable will be some of the pines and cypress which cannot withstand severe drought.

- **Movable objects:** Identify movable objects which are or could be vulnerable to extreme temperatures, humidity and solar radiation. Develop strategies for their protection and providing a stable environment.

---

47 The Victorian Climate Change Adaptation Program, *Climate Change in Victoria 2008 Summary*, p9
• **Graves**: Memorials or graves made of stone are particularly at risk of decay due to the climatic effect of acid rain. Acid rain, where pollutants such as sulphur dioxide are absorbed into the air and deposited back to the land or on structures through rainfall, has a damaging effect on stone particularly marble and limestones. These traditional materials contain calcium carbonate, and when combined with sulphur dioxide a hard gypsum is created on the surface. This hard layer deprives the naturally occurring ‘breathing’ process of water absorbing into the stone and drying out again which is imperative in maintaining the materials structural stability. When this ‘breathing’ process is blocked, moisture in the stone cannot dry out and crystals form behind the hard layer. The crystals consequently multiply and ‘shatter’ the face of the stone. This process is known as ‘spalling’. This problem can initially seem insignificant and merely an aesthetic issue, however, if left untreated the spalling process increases and exposes the stone further to weathering and ultimately weakens its structural stability. Many outdoor marbles are already showing signs of “sugaring” where they are affected by pollutant affected.

• **Buildings**: Historic buildings are at risk from the impacts brought on by climate change such as floods and flash flooding, rising sea levels, fire and severe storms. These climatic events can cause severe damage to historic buildings in one event. Other potential impacts are temperature rise, increased solar radiation, decreasing humidity and the movement of unstable clay sub soils, which generally cause slow damage over a period of time. The maintenance of historic buildings is important as vulnerable buildings can be severely and irreparably damaged as a consequence of a climatic event. Catastrophic flash flooding and severe hailstorms are becoming increasing problems in Australia particularly along the heavily populated east coast.

• **Coastal places**: Identify coastal sites that are vulnerable to rising sea levels and severe storms. Develop strategies for their protection and create a method of recording if loss is anticipated.

Overall, it is highly recommended to regularly maintain historic sites. Well maintained sites will become more resilient to the impacts of climate change. Severe climatic events will cause more damage to sites that are already vulnerable due to a lack of maintenance. For any unoccupied buildings or structures on site, it is beneficial to find a use for the building or structure as to not lead it into disrepair.

---


5.0 CONSERVATION WORKS

5.1 Conservation, Maintenance and repair works to the site by priority

Following an inspection of the buildings and infrastructure the recommended external repairs are categorised as: High Priority (within 1 year), Medium Priority (1 to 3 years) & low priority (3-5 years).

URGENT matters should be addressed without delay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Trees</td>
<td>Trimming and balancing of trees</td>
<td>Low - medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Gums</td>
<td>Trimming and balancing</td>
<td>Low - medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>Nil, no heritage buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths</td>
<td>Nil, these are asphalted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>Nil, the fences are not original but are in new condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Maintenance Works

These works are essential maintenance and repairs to bring the site up to good condition and maintain it at that level.

Some items are overdue maintenance, some are maintenance repair as a result of a damage event (e.g. leaking downpipes) and some are items of development required for the ongoing use of the site.

Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paths</td>
<td>Cracking up, invasive planting</td>
<td>Half yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drains</td>
<td>Clogging of storm drain boxes</td>
<td>Quarterly or after heavy rains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clogging of surface drains</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>Inspect for damage, failing limbs, dying trees</td>
<td>Half Yearly and after every heavy storm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintenance of Monuments: Not the responsibility of the GMCT

**Metals:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cast Iron</td>
<td>Historically Long period of use: High carbon content 3-5%</td>
<td>Use steel wool, steel metal brushes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used for decorative components, non-structural uses (e.g. cast posts, marker plates finials)</td>
<td>Remove surface corrosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treat with rust converter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where material is to be overpainted, paint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrought Iron</td>
<td>Historically Long period of use: peak use in 1850s. Low carbon content &lt; 1%</td>
<td>As for cast work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass</td>
<td>Made of a Copper and Zinc alloy        Decorative uses (plaques)</td>
<td>Clean with brass brush (care not to scratch surface)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>Made of a Copper and Tin alloy        Decorative uses (doors, railings, posts)</td>
<td>Use, Cleaning, patination &amp; Hot waxing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>Marble has a hard surface when cured in air but will sugar (i.e. crystallize) when attacked by pollutants. Can curl where excessively exposed to sunlight</td>
<td>Wash off pollutants with distilled water from time to time (from mostly horizontal surfaces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>Easily worked but some sandstone friable and will crumble. Known poor sources have been used for building in Victoria (e.g. Barabool)</td>
<td>May need replacing if it is an un-decorated element that is failing or crumbling. Retain where the element is decorated or has historic text, consider replacement if some other simpler block form of stone if the stone is decayed beyond is structural capacity. Where stone required pinning, use stainless steel metal dowels or cramps (do not use iron bindings or pins as these corrode)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluestone</td>
<td>Dark dense stone, long lasting often used on early gravestones.</td>
<td>Generally durable, may need cleaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>Variety of colours (grey, red etc.)</td>
<td>Generally durable and may just require simple washing with soft detergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>Off white colour, soft when freshly cut, hardens over time</td>
<td>Can decay in contact with sandstones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>Dark appearance, layered material. Some slate is of local origin.</td>
<td>Can delaminate from rain or exposure to harsh sunlight on one side of the stone (differential heating).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortars</td>
<td>Mortars vary in hardness from soft (19^{\text{th}}) C to medium hardness in the earlier parts of the 20\text{th} century to hard in the second half of the 20\text{th} century. Hardness should be considered in conjunction with the material it is being used with. Soft mortar: 1 lime 3 sand 2 lime 1 cement 9 sand Medium Hardness 2 cement 1 lime 9 sand Hard mortar 1 cement 3 sand</td>
<td>Most structures in the cemetery will be from the 19\text{th} and early 20\text{th} century and use of soft and medium hardness mortars are appropriate. Some structures will use white cement where the pointing is required to be distinctive. Hard mortars are likely to have been employed on structures post 1950s. Maintenance of mortars should consider hardness, sand colour and method of raking the joint (flush, raked horizontal, v jointed, semicircular, etc.). The method of jointing will define the aesthetic qualities of a masonry structure. New work should follow the best available adjacent sample of original work. Where a structure is tuck-pointed (i.e. uses fine lime markings set out like joints) a specialist tuck pointer should be employed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.3 Risk Management of the Site

These risk management tables are a predictive indicator for the ongoing management of the site and attempts to identify where likely detriment will arise.

*N- Nil to Negligible impact, L- low impact, M – medium impact, H – high impact*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building / feature</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Present impact</th>
<th>Future impact</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grave Monuments</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-L</td>
<td>Low Potential for grass fires in the area of the monuments as there are paths of crushed brick and asphalt. Fire could be spread to trees and thence all cypress trees particularly during longer and dryer summer periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vandalism &amp; theft</td>
<td>L-M</td>
<td>L-M</td>
<td>Risk of vandalism and theft is related to its slightly isolated location and to metal prices although there is almost no bronze or copper at this site. Few reported incidents of racially/religious related vandalism, but theft related to price of copper, bronze and brass has seen removal of grave railings in other cemeteries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Adequacy</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undermining of monuments remains a problem (due to uncontrolled tree growth and nesting vermin, and particularly subsidence and collapse of graves). At this site the collapse of earth is minimal. Climate change may bring future problems with drying out of the earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Factors</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk of vermin (rats) and uncontrolled invasive plant damage Future Weathering is a problem particularly in times of climatic changes, vermin nesting under graves is a problem (cats, rabbits, foxes etc.) Invasive vegetation is a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Use</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Damage by visitors to the more interesting monuments (see also vandalism) is low to medium risk, however there is potential for injury to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*heritage ALLIANCE*
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visitors (subsidence, falling and overturning masonry). As the site expands, the heritage area may receive fewer visitors.

This is the prime cause of all cemeteries declining and damage to monuments i.e. lack of continuing management supervision in this part of the greater site.

Monuments are not really managed apart from occasional care by descendant owners who are often unskilled when it comes to care of heritage places and the science of materials.

Monuments are subject to the greatest risk of all in part due to the present Cemeteries Act which does not allow work to monuments by the Trustees where they are owned by others. The Act therefore is the creator of some of the issues which arise with all monuments at a cemetery. As the greater site expands it is likely this area will no longer be oversighted as often as it is now and some problems of vandalism and drainage may go un-noticed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building / feature</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Present impact</th>
<th>Future impact</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>High Potential for wild fires within the cypress rows. (Either as the result of a grass fire or deliberately lit). Drying out will continue with climatic changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vandalism &amp; theft</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>The trees are the least likely to be vandalised as they are not within the ‘track’ of the normal visitor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural Adequacy</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Undermining of trees remains a problem due to High winds, limited root space, lack of tree management and senescence particularly as the trees are over 110 years old (Sugar Gums) or 80 years old (Cypress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Factors</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>Risk of vermin (rats) in tree burrows and root area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Severity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture/drainage</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermin</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Vegetation</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weathering due to climate changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Use</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Use</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; management risks</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Future Management Issues for the site

The site is currently professionally managed (as would be expected) and it appears to have been well managed for a long time although it is evident from the records that there were long periods when not much happened due to the low take up rate of burials. Greater numbers of burials over recent decades has seen the cemetery substantially expand and the historic part is now just a minor part of the total cemetery.

The site has over time seen the introduction of asphalted roadways with spoon drains and the introduction of site drainage which has prevented the area being waterlogged and as a result maintained good soil moisture, preventing graves from subsiding. Trees have remained reasonably healthy.

With increasing climate change conditions, the trees will need water supplied when there are lengthy periods of no rain and rainwater should be collected from the new mausoleum and drip fed to the important trees whether they are historic or not. Climatic changes will also see a drying out of the soils and the future probable subsidence of the early graves unless soil moisture is stabilised. This may have to be done through a combination of providing mulch and introducing water retaining granules within the soil throughout much of the area of the old cemetery.
One of the more recent aspects of changes in climatic conditions has been sudden heavy rains, high winds and increasing frequencies of hail and dramatic increases in hail stone sizes.

These sudden gusts and storm showers have caused the up-rooting of trees and more often the breaking of limbs which fall across buildings and other property and create structural damage.

Increased storm showers have also caused storm drains to back up, house gutters to back flow and general sudden flooding.

Hail frequency (and hail stone sizes) has been damaging property (smashing roofs and windows), damaging cars and killing small animals as well as stripping trees.

Some of this will be difficult to predict or prevent. The most that can be done will be to ensure improved maintenance of gutters, downpipes, drains and the creation of additional drain ways.

Drying out of vegetation during long summers has led to hotter wild fires which can often spread in difficult terrain. In recent years fires have been very damaging to life, property, livestock and vegetation. To ensure this is controlled will mean greater vigilance against letting fuel (deadwoods) build up and better response to fire outbreaks. This could mean the introduction of more outdoor hydrants supplied off mains water and fire prevention training for site staff.

The GMCT may have to undertake audits of their sites specifically to identify the level of risks associated with this phenomenon and to train works staff in fire prevention work and fire control.

5.5 Summary of Recommendations

Works

- Continue to maintain the historic trees, (all Cypress and Sugar Gums). Plant infill trees where these have been removed or have become senescent particularly along Ely Court and Cemetery Road where some Cypress have been removed. Along Ely Court where many Cypress have been removed some should be re-established to give a better sense of alignment. Although many were established on Thor Court along the south side, there is no need to re-establish replacement Cypress. As the trees become senescent replace them with a tree of similar qualities as the Cypress may be less tolerant to drought conditions.

- Retain where possible the outline of the original road system in the earliest part of the cemetery although it is understood that the current arrangement is unlikely to be ‘undone’.

- Continue to undertake maintenance works which do not affect the early graves (circa 1856-1945) and do not allow the 19th century graves to collapse if they can be prevented from doing so.

- If there is an opportunity remove some or all buildings as none are of heritage significance. Allow for development of buildings and services in areas other than the original cemetery area. Expansion of existing buildings should be resisted in favour of new buildings located on adjacent land.

- Continue to maintain the new picket fence along Cemetery Road and Ely Court rather than create another design. While it is not a recreation of an original fence (which appear to have simply been strained wire fence and more recently in timber) it is entirely appropriate to the site but only necessary on the Ely Court and Cemetery Road sides. On Thor Court it should continue as chain wire.
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APPENDIX A       PLANS OF THE CEMETERY

Keilor Cemetery - Map 1 Boundaries

Map 1: Area of the early cemetery and 19th century extension
Map 2: Areas of significance within the early cemetery
Map 3: Plan of Keilor cemetery as at 2015. Lettering (A – Z) indicates contemporary compartment numbers.
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APPENDIX C    THE BURRA CHARTER

The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance

Preamble

Considering the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice 1964), and the Resolutions of the 5th General Assembly of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) (Moscow 1978), the Burra Charter was adopted by Australia ICOMOS (the Australian National Committee of ICOMOS) on 19 August 1979 at Burra, South Australia. Revisions were adopted on 23 February 1981, 23 April 1988 and 26 November 1999.

The Burra Charter provides guidance for the conservation and management of places of cultural significance (cultural heritage places), and is based on the knowledge and experience of Australia ICOMOS members.

Conservation is an integral part of the management of places of cultural significance and is an ongoing responsibility.

Who is the Charter for?

The Charter sets a standard of practice for those who provide advice, make decisions about, or undertake works to places of cultural significance, including owners, managers and custodians.

Using the Charter

The Charter should be read as a whole. Many articles are interdependent. Articles in the Conservation Principles section are often further developed in the Conservation Processes and Conservation Practice sections. Headings have been included for ease of reading but do not form part of the Charter.

The Charter is self-contained, but aspects of its use and application are further explained in the following Australia ICOMOS documents:

- Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural Significance;
- Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Conservation Policy;
- Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Procedures for Undertaking Studies and Reports;

What places does the Charter apply to?

The Charter can be applied to all types of places of cultural significance including natural, indigenous and historic places with cultural values.

The standards of other organisations may also be relevant. These include the Australian Natural Heritage Charter and the Draft Guidelines for the Protection, Management and Use of Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Cultural Heritage Places.

Why conserve?

Places of cultural significance enrich people's lives, often providing a deep and inspirational sense of connection to community and landscape, to the past and to lived experiences. They are historical records that are important as tangible expressions of Australian identity and experience. Places of cultural significance reflect the diversity of our communities, telling us about who we are and the past that has formed us and the Australian landscape. They are irreplaceable and precious.

These places of cultural significance must be conserved for present and future generations.

The Burra Charter advocates a cautious approach to change: do as much as necessary to care for the place and to make it useable, but otherwise change it as little as possible so that its cultural significance is retained.
Article 1  Definitions

For the purpose of this Charter:

1.1  Place means site, area, land, landscape, building or other work, group of buildings or other works, and may include components, contents, spaces and views.

The concept of place should be broadly interpreted. The elements described in Article 1.1 may include memorials, trees, gardens, parks, places of historical events, urban areas, towns, industrial places, archaeological sites and spiritual and religious places.

1.2  Cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations.

Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects.

Places may have a range of values for different individuals or groups.

The term cultural significance is synonymous with heritage significance and cultural heritage value.

Cultural significance may change as a result of the continuing history of the place.

Understanding of cultural significance may change as a result of new information.

1.3  Fabric means all the physical material of the place including components, fixtures, contents, and objects.

Fabric includes building interiors and sub-surface remains, as well as excavated material.

Fabric may define spaces and these may be important elements of the significance of the place.

1.4  Conservation means all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance.

1.5  Maintenance means the continuous protective care of the fabric and setting of a place, and is to be distinguished from repair. Repair involves restoration or reconstruction.

The distinctions referred to, for example in relation to roof gutters, are

- maintenance and regular inspection and cleaning of gutters;
- repair involving restoration and returning of dislodged gutters;
- repair involving reconstruction and replacing decayed gutters.

1.6  Preservation means maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.

It is recognised that all places and their components change over time at varying rates.

1.7  Restoration means returning the existing fabric of a place to a known earlier state by removing accretions or by reassembling existing components without the introduction of new material.

1.8  Reconstruction means returning a place to a known earlier state and is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material into the fabric.

New material may include recycled material salvaged from other places. This should not be to the detriment of any place of cultural significance.

1.9  Adaptation means modifying a place to suit the existing use or a proposed use.

1.10 Use means the functions of a place, as well as the activities and practices that may occur at the place.

1.11 Compatible use means a use which respects the cultural significance of a place. Such a use involves no, or minimal, impact on cultural significance.
1.12 Setting means the area around a place, which may include the visual catchment.

1.13 Related place means a place that contributes to the cultural significance of another place.

1.14 Related object means an object that contributes to the cultural significance of a place but is not at the place.

1.15 Associations mean the special connections that exist between people and a place. Associations may include social or spiritual values and cultural responsibilities for a place.

1.16 Meanings denote what a place signifies, indicates, evokes or expresses. Meanings generally relate to intangible aspects such as symbolic qualities and memories.

1.17 Interpretation means all the ways of presenting the cultural significance of a place.

Interpretation may be a combination of the treatment of the fabric (e.g. maintenance, restoration, reconstruction); the use of and activities at the place; and the use of introduced explanatory material.

**Conservation Principles**

**Article 2 Conservation and Management**

2.1 Places of cultural significance should be conserved.

2.2 The aim of conservation is to retain the cultural significance of a place.

2.3 Conservation is an integral part of good management of places of cultural significance.

2.4 Places of cultural significance should be safeguarded and not put at risk or left in a vulnerable state.

**Article 3 Cautious approach**

3.1 Conservation is based on a respect for the existing fabric, use, associations and meanings. It requires a cautious approach of changing as much as necessary but as little as possible. The traces of additions, alterations and earlier treatments to the fabric of a place are evidence of its history and uses which may be part of its significance. Conservation action should assist and not impede their understanding.

3.2 Changes to a place should not distort the physical or other evidence it provides, nor be based on conjecture.

**Article 4 Knowledge, skills and techniques**

4.1 Conservation should make use of all the knowledge, skills and disciplines which can contribute to the study and care of the place.

4.2 Traditional techniques and materials are preferred for the conservation of significant fabric. In some circumstances modern techniques and materials which offer substantial conservation benefits may be appropriate. The use of modern materials and techniques must be supported by firm scientific evidence or by a body of experience.

**Article 5 Values**

5.1 Conservation of a place should identify and take into consideration all aspects of cultural and natural significance without unwarranted emphasis on any one value at the expense of others. Conservation of places with natural significance is explained in the Australian Natural Heritage Charter. This Charter defines natural significance to mean the importance of ecosystems, biological diversity and geodiversity for their existence value, or for present or future generations in terms of their scientific, social, aesthetic and life-support value.

5.2 Relative degrees of cultural significance may lead to different conservation actions at a place. A cautious approach is needed, as understanding of cultural significance may change. This article should not be used
Article 6 Burra Charter Process

6.1 The cultural significance of a place and other issues affecting its future are best understood by a sequence of collecting and analysing information before making decisions. Understanding cultural significance comes first, then development of policy and finally management of the place in accordance with the policy. The Burra Charter process, or sequence of investigations, decisions and actions, is illustrated in the accompanying flowchart.

6.2 The policy for managing a place must be based on an understanding of its cultural significance.

6.3 Policy development should also include consideration of other factors affecting the future of a place such as the owner’s needs, resources, external constraints and its physical condition.

Article 7 Use

7.1 Where the use of a place is of cultural significance it should be retained.

7.2 A place should have a compatible use. The policy should identify a use or combination of uses or constraints on uses that retain the cultural significance of the place. New use of a place should involve minimal change, to significant fabric and use; should respect associations and meanings; and where appropriate should provide for continuation of practices which contribute to the cultural significance of the place.

Article 8 Setting

8.1 Conservation requires the retention of an appropriate visual setting and other relationships that contribute to the cultural significance of the place.

New construction, demolition, intrusions or other changes which would adversely affect the setting or relationships are not appropriate.

Aspects of the visual setting may include use, siting, bulk, form, scale, character, colour, texture and materials.

Other relationships, such as historical connections, may contribute to interpretation, appreciation, enjoyment or experience of the place.

Article 9 Location

9.1 The physical location of a place is part of its cultural significance. A building, work or other component of a place should remain in its historical location. Relocation is generally unacceptable unless this is the sole practical means of ensuring its survival.

9.2 Some buildings, works or other components of places were designed to be readily removable or already have a history of relocation. Provided such buildings, works or other components do not have significant links with their present location, removal may be appropriate.

9.3 If any building, work or other component is moved, it should be moved to an appropriate location and given an appropriate use. Such action should not be to the detriment of any place of cultural significance.

Article 10 Contents

Contents, fixtures and objects which contribute to the cultural significance of a place should be retained at that place. Their removal is unacceptable unless it is: the sole means of ensuring their security and preservation; on a temporary basis for treatment or exhibition; for cultural reasons; for health and safety; or to protect the place. Such contents, fixtures and objects should be returned where circumstances permit and it is culturally appropriate.
Article 11 Related Places and Objects

The contribution which related places and related objects make to the cultural significance of the place should be retained.

Article 12 Participation

Conservation, interpretation and management of a place should provide for the participation of people for whom the place has special associations and meanings, or who have social, spiritual or other cultural responsibilities for the place.

Article 13 Co-existence of Cultural Values

Co-existence of cultural values should be recognised, respected and encouraged, especially in cases where they conflict.

For some places, conflicting cultural values may affect policy development and management decisions. In this article, the term cultural values refers to those beliefs which are important to a cultural group, including but not limited to political, religious, spiritual and moral beliefs. This is broader than values associated with cultural significance.

Conservation Processes

Article 14 Conservation Processes

Conservation may, according to circumstance, include the processes of: retention or reintroduction of a use; retention of associations and meanings; maintenance, preservation, restoration, reconstruction, adaptation and interpretation; and will commonly include a combination of more than one of these. There may be circumstances where no action is required to achieve conservation.

Article 15 Change

15.1 Change may be necessary to retain cultural significance, but is undesirable where it reduces cultural significance. The amount of change to a place should be guided by the cultural significance of the place and its appropriate interpretation. When change is being considered, a range of options should be explored to seek the option which minimises the reduction of cultural significance.

15.2 Changes which reduce cultural significance should be reversible, and be reversed when circumstances permit. Reversible changes should be considered temporary. Non-reversible change should only be used as a last resort and should not prevent future conservation action.

15.3 Demolition of significant fabric of a place is generally not acceptable. However, in some cases minor demolition may be appropriate as part of conservation. Removed significant fabric should be reinstated when circumstances permit.

15.4 The contributions of all aspects of cultural significance of a place should be respected. If a place includes fabric, uses, associations or meanings of different periods, or different aspects of cultural significance, emphasising or interpreting one period or aspect at the expense of another can only be justified when what is left out, removed or diminished is of slight cultural significance and that which is emphasised or interpreted is of much greater cultural significance.

Article 16 Maintenance

Maintenance is fundamental to conservation and should be undertaken where fabric is of cultural significance and its maintenance is necessary to retain that cultural significance.

Article 17 Preservation

Preservation is appropriate where the existing fabric or its condition constitutes evidence of cultural
significance, or where insufficient evidence is available to allow other conservation processes to be carried out.

Preservation protects fabric without obscuring the evidence of its construction and use. The process should always be applied:

• where the evidence of the fabric is of such significance that it should not be altered;
• where insufficient investigation has been carried out to permit policy decisions to be taken in accord with Articles 26 to 28.

New work (e.g. stabilisation) may be carried out in association with preservation when its purpose is the physical protection of the fabric and when it is consistent with Article 22.

Article 18 Restoration and reconstruction

Restoration and reconstruction should reveal culturally significant aspects of the place.

Article 19 Restoration

 Restoration is appropriate only if there is sufficient evidence of an earlier state of the fabric.

Article 20 Reconstruction

20.1 Reconstruction is appropriate only where a place is incomplete through damage or alteration, and only where there is sufficient evidence to reproduce an earlier state of the fabric. In rare cases, reconstruction may also be appropriate as part of a use or practice that retains the cultural significance of the place.

20.2 Reconstruction should be identifiable on close inspection or through additional interpretation.

Article 21 Adaptation

Adaptation must be limited to that which is essential to a use for the place determined in accordance with Articles 6 and 7

21.1 Adaptation is acceptable only where the adaptation has minimal impact on the cultural significance of the place. Adaptation is acceptable only where the adaptation has minimal impact on the cultural significance of the place.

21.2 Adaptation should involve minimal change to significant fabric, achieved only after considering alternatives.

Article 22 New Work

22.1 New work such as additions to the place may be acceptable where it does not distort or obscure the cultural significance of the place, or detract from its interpretation and appreciation. New work may be sympathetic if its siting, bulk, form, scale, character, colour, texture and material are similar to the existing fabric, but imitation should be avoided.

22.2 New work should be readily identifiable as such.

Article 23 Conserving Use

Continuing, modifying or reinstating a significant use may be appropriate and preferred forms of conservation. These may require changes to significant fabric but they should be minimised. In some cases, continuing a significant use or practice may involve substantial new work.

Article 24 Retaining associations and meanings

24.1 Significant associations between people and a place should be respected, retained and not obscured. Opportunities for the interpretation, commemoration and celebration of these associations should be investigated and implemented. For many places associations will be linked to use.
24.2 Significant meanings, including spiritual values, of a place should be respected. Opportunities for the continuation or revival of these meanings should be investigated and implemented.

**Article 25 Interpretation**

The cultural significance of many places is not readily apparent, and should be explained by interpretation. Interpretation should enhance understanding and enjoyment, and be culturally appropriate.

**Article 26 Applying the Burra Charter process**

26.1 Work on a place should be preceded by studies to understand the place which should include analysis of physical, documentary, oral and other evidence, drawing on appropriate knowledge, skills and disciplines. The results of studies should be up to date, regularly reviewed and revised as necessary.

26.2 Written statements of cultural significance and policy for the place should be prepared, justified and accompanied by supporting evidence. The statements of significance and policy should be incorporated into a management plan for the place. Statements of significance and policy should be kept up to date by regular review and revision as necessary. The management plan may deal with other matters related to the management of the place.

26.2 Groups and individuals with associations with a place as well as those involved in its management should be provided with opportunities to contribute to and participate in understanding the cultural significance of the place. Where appropriate they should also have opportunities to participate in its conservation and management.

**Article 27 Managing Change**

27.1 The impact of proposed changes on the cultural significance of a place should be analysed with reference to the statement of significance and the policy for managing the place. It may be necessary to modify proposed changes following analysis to better retain cultural significance.

27.2 Existing fabric, use, associations and meanings should be adequately recorded before any changes are made to the place.

**Article 28 Disturbance of Fabric**

Disturbance of significant fabric for study, or to obtain evidence, should be minimised. Study of a place by any disturbance of the fabric, including archaeological excavation, should only be undertaken to provide data essential for decisions on the conservation of the place, or to obtain important evidence about to be lost or made inaccessible. Investigation of a place which requires disturbance of the fabric, apart from that necessary to make decisions, may be appropriate provided that it is consistent with the policy for the place. Such investigation should be based on important research questions which have potential to substantially add to knowledge, which cannot be answered in other ways and which minimises disturbance of significant fabric.

**Article 29 Responsibility for Decisions**

The organisations and individuals responsible for management decisions should be named and specific responsibility taken for each such decision.

**Article 30 Direction, Supervision and Implementation**

Competent direction and supervision should be maintained at all stages, and any changes should be implemented by people with appropriate knowledge and skills.

**Article 31 Documenting evidence and decisions**

A log of new evidence and additional decisions should be kept.
Article 32  Records

32.1 The records associated with the conservation of a place should be placed in a permanent archive and made publicly available, subject to requirements of security and privacy, and where this is culturally appropriate.

32.2 Records about the history of a place should be protected and made publicly available, subject to requirements of security and privacy, and where this is culturally appropriate.

Article 33  Removed Fabric

Significant fabric which has been removed from a place including contents, fixtures and objects, should be catalogued, and protected in accordance with its cultural significance.

Where possible and culturally appropriate, removed significant fabric including contents, fixtures and objects, should be kept at the place.

Article 34  Resources

Adequate resources should be provided for conservation. The best conservation often involves the least work and can be inexpensive.
## APPENDIX D  LIST OF PLANTS SUITABLE FOR USE IN 19th AND EARLY 20th CENTURY CEMETERIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LARGE TREES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abies nordmanniana</td>
<td>Caucasian Fir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abies pinsapo</td>
<td>Spanish Fir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acmena smithii</td>
<td>Lilly Pilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agonis flexuosa</td>
<td>Weeping Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araucaria bidwillii</td>
<td>Bunya Bunya Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araucaria cunninghamii</td>
<td>Hoop Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araucaria heterophylla</td>
<td>Norfolk Island Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brachychiton populorus</td>
<td>Kurrajong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calocedrus decurrens</td>
<td>Incense Cedar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedrus atlantica</td>
<td>Atlas Cedar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedrus atlantica f. glauca</td>
<td>Blue Atlas Cedar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>Deodar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamaecyparis funebris</td>
<td>Funeral Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamaecyparis lawsoniana</td>
<td>Lawson Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinnamomum camphora</td>
<td>Camphor Laurel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus glabra</td>
<td>Smooth Arizona Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus lusitanica</td>
<td>Mexican Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus sempervirens</td>
<td>Italian Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus torulosa</td>
<td>Bhutan Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus macrocarpa (now Hesperocyparis macrocarpa)</td>
<td>Monterey Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus macrocarpa 'Horizontalis Aurea'</td>
<td>Golden Monterey Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus spp. (indigenous species)</td>
<td>Sugar Gum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus ficifolia</td>
<td>Red Flowering Gum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ficus macrophylla</td>
<td>Moreton Bay Fig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ficus platypoda</td>
<td>Toromeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ficus rubiginosa</td>
<td>Port Jackson Fig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniperus chinensis</td>
<td>Chinese Juniper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniperus virginiana</td>
<td>Pencil Juniper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagunaria patersonia</td>
<td>Norfolk Island Hibiscus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora</td>
<td>Southern Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picea abies</td>
<td>Norway Spruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picea sitchensis</td>
<td>Sitka Spruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picea smithiana</td>
<td>West Himalayan Spruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus canariensis</td>
<td>Canary Island Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus halepensis</td>
<td>Aleppo Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus nigra var. martima</td>
<td>Corsican Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Stone Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus ponderosa</td>
<td>Western Yellow Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus radiata</td>
<td>Monterey Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus roxburghii</td>
<td>Long-leaved Indian Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus canariensis</td>
<td>Algerian Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus cerris</td>
<td>Turkey Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus ilex</td>
<td>Holly Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus robur</td>
<td>English Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus suber</td>
<td>Cork Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salix babylonica</td>
<td>Weeping Willow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schinus molle var. areira</td>
<td>Pepper Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoiadendron giganteum</td>
<td>Sierra Redwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syzygium paniculatum</td>
<td>Brush Cherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuja plicata</td>
<td>Western Red Cedar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lophostemon confertus</td>
<td>Brush Box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus parvifolia</td>
<td>Chinese Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus procera</td>
<td>English Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus x hollandica</td>
<td>Dutch Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus glabra</td>
<td>Wych Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterhousea floribunda</td>
<td>Weeping Lilly Pilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL TO MEDIUM TREES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbutus unedo</td>
<td>Irish Strawberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbutus x andrachnoides</td>
<td>Hybrid Strawberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex aquifolium</td>
<td>English Holly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurus nobilis</td>
<td>Bay Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morus alba</td>
<td>White Mulberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photinia serrulata</td>
<td>Chinese Hawthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platycladus orientalis</td>
<td>Chinese Arbor-Vitae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shrub</strong></td>
<td><strong>Luminary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prunus laurocerasus</strong></td>
<td>Cherry Laurel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prunus lusitanica</strong></td>
<td>Portuguese Laurel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxus baccata</strong></td>
<td>Yew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxus baccata 'Fastigiata'</strong></td>
<td>Irish Yew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PALMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chamaerops humilis</strong></td>
<td>Dwarf Fan Palm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Livistona australis</strong></td>
<td>Cabbage Palm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phoenix canariensis</strong></td>
<td>Canary Island Date Palm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trachycarpus fortunei</strong></td>
<td>Chinese Windmill Palm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washingtonia filifera</strong></td>
<td>Desert Fan Palm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washingtonia robusta</strong></td>
<td>Washington Palm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHRUBS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buxus sempervirens</strong></td>
<td>English Box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camellia japonica (old cultivars)</strong></td>
<td>Camellia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceratonia siliqua</strong></td>
<td>Carob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choisya ternata</strong></td>
<td>Mexican Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cordyline australis</strong></td>
<td>New Zealand Cabbage Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duranta erecta</strong></td>
<td>Sky Flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elaeagnus pungens</strong></td>
<td>Thorny Elaeagnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Euonymus europaea</strong></td>
<td>European Spindle Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Euonymus japonica (and cultivars)</strong></td>
<td>Japanese Spindle Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juniperus communis</strong></td>
<td>Common Juniper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lonicera fragrantissima</strong></td>
<td>Winter Honeysuckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malvaviscus arboreus</strong></td>
<td>Scarlet Wax-mallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michelia figo</strong></td>
<td>Port Wine Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Myrtus communis</strong></td>
<td>Common Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nerium oleander (and cultivars)</strong></td>
<td>Oleander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pheladephos coronarius</strong></td>
<td>Mock Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photinia glabra</strong></td>
<td>Japanese Photini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pittosporum crassifolium</strong></td>
<td>Karo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pittosporum euginioides</strong></td>
<td>Lemonwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pittosporum tenuifolium</strong></td>
<td>Kohuhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhaphiolepis indica</strong></td>
<td>Indian Hawthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhaphiolepis umbellata</strong></td>
<td>Yedda Hawthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spiraea species</strong></td>
<td>Mayflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbaceous Plant</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Viburnum tinus</em></td>
<td>Cape Honeysuckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Teocmaria capensis</em></td>
<td>Laurustinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Viburnum x burkwoodii</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOW SHRUBS AND HERBACEOUS PLANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agapanthus praecox subsp. orientalis</em></td>
<td>Blue Agapanthus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agapanthus praecox subsp. orientalis</em> 'Albidus'</td>
<td>White Agapanthus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Centranthus ruber</em></td>
<td>Red Valerian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Coleonema album</em></td>
<td>White Diosma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Coleonema pulchrum</em></td>
<td>Pink Diosma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Crassula species</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dietes bicolor</em></td>
<td>Butterfly Flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dietes iridioides</em></td>
<td>African Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Echeveria species</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hebe species</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Indigofera incarnata</em></td>
<td>Chinese Indigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lavandula augustifolia subsp. augustifolia</em></td>
<td>English Lavender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lavandula dentata</em></td>
<td>French Lavender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ligustrum ovalifolium</em></td>
<td>Californian Privet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ligustrum japonicum</em></td>
<td>Wax-leaf Privet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pelargonium x domesticum</em> cultivars</td>
<td>Pelargonium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pelargonium x hortorum</em> cultivars</td>
<td>Geranium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rosa species and cultivars</em></td>
<td>Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rosmarinus officinalis</em></td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Yucca filamentosa</em></td>
<td>Thread-bearing Mound-lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUND COVERS, BULBS AND GRASSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Amaryllis belladonna</em></td>
<td>Belladonna Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Canna x generalis</em> and cultivars</td>
<td>Canna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Freesia species</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hedera helix and cultivars</em></td>
<td>Ivy (may be invasive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hyacinthoides hispanicus</em></td>
<td>Bluebell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Iris species and cultivars</em></td>
<td>Flag Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Iris unguicularis</em></td>
<td>Winter Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ixia species</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Leucojum vernum</em></td>
<td>Snowflake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Narcissus species and cultivars</em></td>
<td>Jonquil, Daffodil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxalis hirta</td>
<td>Cuban Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxalis purpurea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygonatum multiflorum</td>
<td>Solomon’s Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scilla peruviana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparaxis species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themedoa australis (and other native grasses: Danthonia, Poa, Stipa, etc)</td>
<td>Kangaroo Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tritonia lineata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinca major</td>
<td>Periwinkle (may be invasive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinca minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola odorata</td>
<td>Violet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola hederacea</td>
<td>Austral Violet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zantedeschia aethiopica</td>
<td>Arum Lily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Species indigenous to the area: trees, shrubs, grasses and ground covers should be conserved where possible. They often contribute to the landscape character of the cemetery and its setting. They should, however, be removed if they are causing damage to structures or interfering with planted species.
APPENDIX E  INCORPORATED PLAN

KEILOR CEMETERY INCORPORATED PLAN (C84)

1.0 Application

This incorporated plan applies to the Keilor Cemetery.

2.0 Statement of Significance

What is significant?  The Keilor Cemetery contains gravestones and monuments that date back to the 1860s. The cemetery has a row of Cypress Pines around its south-western perimeter and many of the memorials in the cemetery are considered to be excellent examples of stone mason’s craft.

Why is it significant?  The Keilor Cemetery was established in 1856, three years after the Melbourne General Cemetery opened. The cemetery contains gravestones and monuments placed on the site before the cemetery officially opened. The cemetery is much older than most cemeteries in Melbourne and its multi-cultural character in recent years distinguishes it from most country cemeteries. It is the resting place of local people from many diverse cultural traditions, including an unlocated grave of an Aboriginal woman, European migrants from the later part of the 19th century, and in recent times commemorate local people from various ethnic backgrounds. The cemetery contains a burial register.

3.0 Elements of particular significance

The following buildings, areas, structures and trees within the Keilor Cemetery are of particular significance:

• Row of Cypress Pines on south-western perimeter of site
• Canary Pines located within the site
• Picket fences
• Monuments
• Gates on the south-western boundary

4.0 No Planning Permit Required

Under Clause 43.01-2 of the Planning Scheme, no planning permit is required for the following development within that portion of the Keilor Cemetery subject to the Heritage Overlay:

Interments, burials and erection of monuments, re-use of graves, burial of cremated remains, and exhumation of remains in accordance with the Cemeteries Act 1958 (as amended).

Stabilisation, conservation and repair of monuments. Emergency and safety works to prevent damage and injury to property and the public. Monument works undertaken in accordance with Australian Standard AS4204 Headstones and Cemetery Monuments.

Demolition, alteration or removal of buildings and monuments except those specified in section 3.0 (elements of particular significance) above. Removal, destruction, pruning or lopping of trees except those specified in section 3.0 (elements of particular significance) above.

Construction of a building provided the building is less than 3.0 square metres in area and 2.0 metres in height.

Construction and repairs to roads and paths, fences and gates, drainage and irrigation systems.

Construction or display of signage provided the sign is less than 1.0 square metre in area.
This report is reproduced as a separate appendix and contains data sheets for the most important tree species on the site.
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Keilor Cemetery Heritage Tree Assessment

Brief
Arboriculture Pty Ltd has been retained by Heritage Alliance to inspect trees at Keilor Cemetery and provide estimations of which trees may be planted in or prior to 1945.

Method
Trees estimated to have been planted prior to 1945 were inspected and given an estimated planting period designation. Planting period was estimated based on the consultant’s experience and knowledge of specimens of known age as well as analysis of a 1945 aerial photograph\(^1\) and information regarding planting periods in the cemetery provided by David Wixted (Heritage Alliance).

Tree inspections were carried out on 1/07/2015.

Summary
The oldest trees at the Keilor Cemetery appeared to be 2 large Sugar Gums (Eucalyptus cladocalyx) planted at or around 1897 (pers. com. D. Wixted).

Large dark areas seen in a 1945 aerial photo of the cemetery in the locations of the 2 Sugar Gum trees are most likely their mature canopies at the time. The trees are in relatively good condition considering their age and presently only require pruning to remove deadwood.

Approximately 59 Monterey Cypress (Hesperocyparis macrocarpa, syn. Cupressus macrocarpa) trees occur as rows along the western boundary (Cemetery Road) and the western parts of the north and south boundaries.

Small dark points seen in a 1945 aerial photo of the cemetery in the locations of the Cypress rows are most likely their young canopies at the time.

The trees are in varying conditions with some having thin canopies indicating possible decline of health. According to cemetery staff several trees have died or failed and been removed in recent years. It is likely that some of the trees will decline and/or fail in the next 5-10 years leaving the row broken in

places. Planning needs to be done for replacement of individual trees and/or sections of the rows.

Thee other large, overmature Monterey Cypress specimens exist within the cemetery. The trees appear as comparatively large dark areas on a 1945 aerial photo of the cemetery indicating that they were most likely in or reaching maturity when the Cypress row was plated around 1934-1936. Two of the Cypress trees were assessed as having short life expectancies and will most likely die or decline enough to warrant removal within the next 5-10 years.

**Summary Details and Discussion**

Table 1 Trees estimated to have been planted circa 1945 or earlier at Keilor Cemetery. Photo references refer to Appendix 1 Photos, Map Ref refers to Appendix 2 Tree Location Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Ref</th>
<th>Species (Common Name) (number of specimens)</th>
<th>Landscape Life Expectancy</th>
<th>Height x dbh (est. only)</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eucalyptus cladocalyx Sugar Gum (x 1)</td>
<td>10-25 years</td>
<td>25-29m x 178cm</td>
<td>c.1897</td>
<td>Visible as large canopy in 1945 aerial, Wounds &amp; cavities in stems &amp; branches, Photo 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eucalyptus cladocalyx Sugar Gum (x 2)</td>
<td>10-25 years</td>
<td>20-24m x 70cm</td>
<td>c.1934-1936</td>
<td>Visible as small canopy in 1945 aerial, Photo 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eucalyptus cladocalyx Sugar Gum (x 1)</td>
<td>10-25 years</td>
<td>20-24m x 111cm</td>
<td>c.1920-1935</td>
<td>Visible as medium canopy in 1945 aerial, Wounds &amp; cavities in stems &amp; branches, Previously lopped, Bifurcation defects of stem, Photo 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eucalyptus cladocalyx Sugar Gum (x 1)</td>
<td>10-25 years</td>
<td>20-24m x 171cm</td>
<td>c.1897</td>
<td>Visible as large canopy in 1945 aerial, Wounds &amp; cavities in stems &amp; branches, Previously lopped, Photo 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hesperocyparis macrocarpa Monterey Cypress (x 1)</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>15-19m x 106cm</td>
<td>c.1900-1920</td>
<td>Visible as medium canopy in 1945 aerial, Photo 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hesperocyparis macrocarpa Monterey Cypress (x 1)</td>
<td>10-25 years</td>
<td>15-19m x 106cm</td>
<td>c.1900-1920</td>
<td>Visible as medium canopy in 1945 aerial, Photo 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hesperocyparis macrocarpa Monterey Cypress (x 1)</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>10-14m x 125cm</td>
<td>c.1900-1920</td>
<td>Visible as large canopy in 1945 aerial, Large branch is cable braced &amp; declining in health, Photo 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eucalyptus cladocalyx Sugar Gum (x 1)</td>
<td>10-25 years</td>
<td>15-19m x 106cm</td>
<td>c.1900-1920</td>
<td>Visible as medium canopy in 1945 aerial, Photo 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hesperocyparis macrocarpa Monterey Cypress (x 18)</td>
<td>10-25 years</td>
<td>10-14m x 60-80cm</td>
<td>c.1934-36</td>
<td>Visible as small canopies in 1945 aerial, Photo 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Diameter (cm)</td>
<td>Assessment Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Hesperocyparis macrocarpa</em> Monterey Cypress (x 2)</td>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>Visible as small canopies in 1945 aerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Hesperocyparis macrocarpa</em> Monterey Cypress (x 7)</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>Visible as small canopies in 1945 aerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>Hesperocyparis macrocarpa</em> Monterey Cypress (x 13)</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>Visible as small canopies in 1945 aerial, Declining - some have failed recently, thin canopies dieback, Photo 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>Hesperocyparis macrocarpa</em> Monterey Cypress (x 19)</td>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>Visible as small canopies in 1945 aerial, some trees will most likely decline and die over next 5-10 years, Photo 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stephen Fitzgerald  
BAppSc (Melb.) AdvCertHort, AdvCertArb, (Burnley)
Appendix 1
Photos
Keilor Cemetery

Photo 1 from south-east: Tree 1

Photo 2 from east: Tree group 2 (2 trees)

Photo 3 from south-east: Tree 3

Photo 4 from south: Tree 4

Photo 5 from east: Tree 6 left, tree 5 right

Photo 6 from east: Tree 7

Photo 7 from north: Tree 8

Photo 8 from east: Tree group 9 (18 trees)

Photo 9: Tree group 11 (7 trees)
Photo 10: Tree group 13 (19 trees)
Appendix 2 - Tree Location Plan

Trees estimated to have been planted circa 1945 or prior at Keilor Cemetery
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