

Meeting Minutes - Sydney Football Stadium Redevelopment Community Consultative Committee (CCC)

Meeting No. 4, Wednesday 8 May – 5.30 pm – 8.00 pm

Location: Rugby House, Corner Moore Park Road and Driver Avenue, Moore Park

Attendees: **Chairperson:** Margaret Harvie.

Community representatives: Linda Gosling, Chelsea Ford, Sofie Mason-Jones, Julie Osborne, Michael Waterhouse, Robert Postema.

Local Government representative: Mayor Kathy Neilson (Randwick City Council), Cr Philip Thalys (City of Sydney Council).

Sydney Football Stadium Representatives: Tom Kennedy, Infrastructure NSW (INSW); Kerrie Mather, Chief Executive Officer, Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust; Angus Morten, Senior Project Manager, Lendlease.

Note taker: Sandra Spate.

Guest: David Gainsford, Executive Director, Priority Projects Assessments, Department of Planning and Environment

Guest speakers: Joshua Milston - Arup-transport, Allison Heller - Ethos Urban, Andrew McWhinney - Intelligent Risk, Scott Boogaard - Aspect Studios.

Apologies: Vivienne Skinner; Denise Ora, Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust

Item no.	Description	Actions/ Who by
1.	Welcome, apologies	
1.1	The Chair acknowledged we are meeting on Aboriginal land and paid respect to elders past and present.	
1.2	Chelsea Ford (CF) notified she is an apology for the July meeting and Linda Gosling (LG) gave her apologies for the June meeting. Margaret Harvie reminded the group that we can negotiate the dates from meeting to meeting based on availability.	
2.	Introductions as required	
3.	Declarations of pecuniary and other interests <i>Michael Waterhouse</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>his super fund has shares with Lendlease</i> • <i>is a member of the SCG trust.</i> <i>Sofie Mason-Jones is on a wait list for the SCG Trust.</i>	
4.	Stage 2 Project update	
4.1	Tom Kennedy (TK) from Infrastructure NSW (INSW) delivered the Stage 2 update as per the presentation distributed. The presentation included an outline of the Stage 2 Environmental Assessment pre-lodgement consultation activities; Modification 1 to reduce the site boundary; and Modification 2 for additional groundworks to remove existing slab and piles and for stormwater diversion to ensure no damage to stormwater infrastructure during demolition. Stage 1 modifications were not part of the original Stage 1 since soil contamination status was not known at the time.	

4.2	<p>Philip Thalys (PT) asked what the information sessions will include. Will there be information on the three designs? Is the winning design a work in development?</p> <p>TK replied there will be information boards similar to public sessions last year and experts on transport, heritage, environmentally sustainable development, landscape architects and people to answer questions about Stage 1 demolition. There won't be information on the three designs. There haven't been many changes to the winning design since the competition. The Design Integrity Panel will assess changes.</p> <p>Sofie Mason-Jones (SMJ) asked if there will be an accessibility consultant.</p> <p>TK said there will not be a consultant specialising in this area but information on accessibility can be made available when this is requested at the information sessions.</p>	
4.3	<p>Robert Postema (RP) requested that roles of experts be clearer at upcoming information sessions. The last round was misleading with consultants wearing INSW badges.</p> <p>PT agrees consultants roles need to be transparent. At a recent public meeting Department of Planning (DPE) staff wore identifiable t-shirts and consultants badges.</p>	INSW to clearly distinguish between staff and consultants in future information sessions.
4.4	<p>LG asked whether the tennis nets will be demolished.</p> <p>TK replied the outdoor nets are not part of the project.</p>	
4.5	<p>LG asked whether Stage 1 modifications have been submitted to DPE. Will modifications result in more dust? Will existing limits on noise and dust apply to modifications?</p> <p>David Gainsford (DG) said as these are considered minor changes there won't be the full range of public consultation but they will be on the website for comment.</p> <p>TK and Angus Morten (AM) replied existing limits will apply. Noise is within levels already assessed. The slab removal is similar to activities taking place such as existing jackhammering. Stormwater works will be relatively quiet with excavation in loose soil.</p> <p>SMJ asked why the changes represented in the modifications weren't included in the original design.</p> <p>TK and AM said there were too many unknowns which couldn't previously be tested. The site boundary modification has been lodged with DPE and Mod 2 is expected to be lodged next week.</p>	INSW to notify the CCC when Modifications 1 and 2 go on exhibition.
5.	<p>Transport, Traffic and Parking Assessment (conditions B10, B16, C42, C44, C46) – Joshua Milston</p>	
5.1	<p>Joshua Milston (JM) from Arup delivered the Transport Assessment presentation as per the presentation provided in advance to CCC members.</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1 assessment was for 45,000 capacity. Stage 2 is for 45,000 plus the SCG. • Arrival patterns haven't significantly changed. • There is no event parking increase. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With light rail completion there is improved pedestrian access via Devonshire Street and improved pedestrian/car intersection safety. A cycle route is proposed for Moore Park Road and a new bus loop in Moore Park. Construction traffic management will be similar to Stage 1. Stage 2 is expected to generate approximately 60 traffic movements a day. 	
5.2	<p>PT asked if there is historical data available showing changes over time. Capacity has been 45,000 for years and a large area has been allocated for parking.</p> <p>JM replied there is little data available. There is crude data from 5 years ago. EQ is available for parking but there are restrictions.</p>	
5.3	<p>CF asked about operation of the rank for 20 taxis on Moore Park Rd noting it is outside an apartment block.</p> <p>Julie Osborne (JO) asked how the Lang Road rank will work with only two lanes for traffic and the equestrian centre.</p> <p>JM replied the potential taxi rank in Moore Park Rd is for particular events only, perhaps half a dozen a year. 99% of the time it would be for parking. The lay up in Lang Rd would only be for events which conclude in the evening. It is not one size fits all.</p>	
5.4	<p>RP showed sets of photos of impacts / parking and traffic congestion related to a rugby test and another set for a Swans' game. Photos show hire cars and Ubers in Regent Street parking illegally. Drivers sat in cars, blocked access to Leinster Street so residents couldn't get in or out and no ranger was in sight. Regent Street was completely choked with hire cars blocking driveways and garages. In Oatley Rd and Moore Park Rd people stand in the cycle lane dialling Uber, people double park and taxis park. More private boxes in the stadium will worsen the problem. He suggested we have a once in a generation opportunity to deal with the problem but it is not dealt with here. The current plan doesn't address this. There was an attempt at the Swans game to channel taxis, Uber and private cars in Driver Ave but it ended in chaos. Ubers shared lanes with buses. Cars backed up. People were getting out of cars. There needs to be more consideration of drop off zones.</p> <p>RP suggested there is an opportunity for a proper drop off zone in Driver Ave for Uber and taxis. With 6m of height under the stairways there must be enough space for a drop zone as with the Opera House. We need more than holding pens to solve the issues.</p> <p>MW reported the issue at the Victoria Barracks end of Moore Park Rd is a different issue with more drop off room. The bigger issue is parking with cars parking across doorways and garages. Neighbours who have challenged drivers suggesting they will get booked meet the reply that four in the car will share the cost. Parking is such an important issue for the new stadium. If these problems are not addressed with a proper parking strategy the current shambles will be perpetuated.</p>	
5.5	<p>SMJ asked whether there is kiss and ride.</p> <p>JM replied there are two formal drop off zones in Driver Ave north and south during the match. A bigger issue is pick up with no ability to wait on the kerbside. There is no ability to rank for Uber.</p> <p>SMJ asked if two drop offs are adequate for two events.</p>	

	<p>JM replied INSW/ Arup is working with TfNSW on a geo fence option similar to Bankwest where Uber isn't allowed into the precinct once the game starts. People who call Uber after the game are directed to walk to an area outside the precinct.</p> <p>PT asked with remote parking and comments about the taxi ranks would this have the same impact on residents as those in Oxford St?</p> <p>JM said these are for lay over only and won't have people not getting on and off there. Lang Rd won't be used for many events.</p>	
5.6	<p>RP suggested the strategy doesn't deal with hire cars. The increasing number of boxes will increase the number of hire cars. People don't know there is a drop-off zone. There is chaos. Why have hire cars the ability to drop off but not people with disability?</p> <p>JM said the majority of drop offs are taxis and Ubers. Taxis can rank and Ubers disperse but hire cars are still there. People with disability can be dropped off underneath but generally it is desirable to get cars out of the precinct.</p> <p>CF suggested this doesn't get cars out of the precinct. People are trading up using Uber or hire cars. A lot will loiter as was the case with the airport.</p> <p>TK noted the geo fence to keep Uber out of the precinct during games. INSW will talk to Transport for NSW (TfNSW) about hire cars.</p>	
5.7	<p>LG suggested the map presented shows parking in areas on EP2 and EP3 despite the promises of the Moore Park Master Plan 2040 that it won't allow parking.</p> <p>MW said Condition B 16 calls for a report on parking impacts. This hasn't been provided. Conditions B12 calls for the stadium's design and operation to contribute positively toward and support the principles and strategies within the Moore Park Master Plan 2040. The transport plan indicates parking to remain on EP2 and EP3. This contradicts the Moore Park Masterplan's intention to remove temporary event on-grass parking and the Landscape Plan objective of supporting removal of parking on green space.</p> <p>SMJ said the assessment needs to demonstrate if EP2 and EP3 parking goes the plan can accommodate parking requirements. Has the assessment considered the phasing out of event parking? Where will the difference be made up?</p> <p>TK replied INSW is supportive of the removal of event parking but this is a decision for the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trusts (CPMPT). The Moore Park Master Plan 2040 looks at satellite parking.</p> <p>MW disagreed that this was a matter for CPMPT</p> <p>SMJ suggested satellite parking isn't one for one.</p> <p>JM said the Stage 1 assessment notes 45,000 can be accommodated if this parking is removed.</p> <p>JO raised concerns that with a third of patrons arriving by private car and 18% by Uber or taxi, 50% of the 45,000 will arrive by car. She noted the slide on Optus stadium banning cars. She asked why we can't do this. It could be an initiative of the SCG. This would be great, along with integrated ticketing. It would be a great for us to do something like Optus.</p> <p>TK replied INSW doesn't control the land. NSW is the only state not to mandate integrated ticketing. This is club by club but TfNSW is looking to</p>	

	<p>mandate it. The Green Travel Plan will encourage more people onto sustainable transport.</p> <p>JO suggested Moore Park and Centennial Park could be paid to ban cars.</p> <p>SMJ asked with 35% coming by car, how many carspaces are generated by EP2?</p> <p>JM replied 5,500 cars calculated at 3 people per car.</p> <p>PT asked if there is an option to intensify parking at MP1. He asked what the cost is for stacked cars.</p> <p>TK replied there isn't an option. It is not part of the project.</p> <p>JM said the cost of stacked cars is \$50,00 per car space.</p>	
5.8	<p>Kathy Neilson (KN) supports comments around parking and travel. She is concerned about how people walking up Devonshire Steet will cross Moore Park. Access is blocked by a substation wall.</p> <p>JM said there is a pathway across Moore Park. Once the light rail is complete there will be direct access across Moore Park. People will cross South Dowling St to the new bridge. He can confirm this when the light rail is complete.</p> <p>KN asked if the path will go through the existing playing fields and if so, will this impact the ability to play on the fields?</p> <p>TK will investigate and respond.</p>	<p>INSW/ Arup to confirm access across Moore Park once light rail is complete.</p> <p>INSW to report back on whether the path crosses playing fields and impacts on fields.</p>
5.9	<p>KN originally thought light rail may provide a solution for moving people to and from the stadium as she thought the stop would be closer to the SFS but it is closer to Lang Rd than the stadium. People still have traipse a fair distance.</p> <p>JM said there were design constraints including not being able to cross the bus loop.</p>	
5.10	<p>LG suggests Devonshire St makes sense as the main pedestrian route but is there room?</p> <p>RP asked if there are safety issues with trams here.</p> <p>JM replied there is capacity on the footpaths according to surveys that have been undertaken and footpaths are down either side of the road.</p>	
5.11	<p>CF suggested connectivity to some areas such as the north west is lacking. People from there or the north shore won't catch the train to central then walk up Devonshire St. People won't change unless it is easy. It is difficult to get to the eastern suburbs and Paddington. In Melbourne it is easy.</p> <p>TK said a mind shifted is needed. It is quicker to Central from here than Flinders Street is to Melbourne stadium but the walk in Melbourne is part of the event. There needs to be education and change culture.</p> <p>JO asked to what extent INSW has worked with TfNSW around buses to the site for events. Has heavy rail been considered?</p> <p>JM replied they have worked with TfNSW. Public bus is used by a low proportion of people. They would need to look at the bus plan after light rail is complete. People from Malabar and Coogee will still have to use buses and there will still be stops in Anzac Pde. Heavy rail isn't considered.</p> <p>SMJ is surprised and saddened to see just 15% using light rail.</p> <p>JM replied this is based on capacity. 70% arrive within an hour before.</p> <p>SMJ agree banning cars is similar to supermarkets banning plastic bags. If done, if cars are taken off Moore Park green space where will they go? Have</p>	

	<p>there been discussions with bike share schemes to set up a properly run scheme? Centennial Park has problems with bikes dumped.</p> <p>JM replied discussions have been with TfNSW who engage with bike share operators.</p> <p>MW noted the transport modal share in the Transport Plan, that with special event buses and now light rail the best indicated is a 2% drop in car use (virtually no reduction) from 35% to 33%. He suggested a more radical approach needs to be adopted as light rail was basically just offsetting those that currently arrive by special bus.</p> <p>JM replied this is a conservative assessment. It may drop further with the Green Travel Plan and monitoring.</p> <p>TK noted a comment from the City of Sydney about a stretch target for mode share. This is an aim. Current assessment is pre the Green Travel Plan.</p> <p>RP asked what it would take to achieve a ban on cars.</p> <p>TK replied the implementation of the Moore Park Master Plan 2040 would. It is up to the Trusts to decide.</p> <p>JO asked if is possible for the SCG Trust to do. If not, why not?</p> <p>KM noted that public transport was part of the business case with Optus stadium and included the delivery of a brand new train station.</p> <p>SMJ asked if no parking on Moore Park has been part of the assessment.</p> <p>JM and TK replied it has. If this is the case people won't be able to drive. The number of parking spaces in the CBD drives numbers of cars coming into the city. During a double header event last year with 78,000, people knew they had to arrive by different modes.</p> <p>JO and LG suggested it would be great if we could say there isn't any more cars. It would be a positive for the Government and the stadium.</p>	
	7.00 pm - BREAK and refreshments (10 minutes)	
6	Security, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design and Anti-social Behaviour Strategy (conditions C53 and C54) – Alison Heller, Andrew McWhinney, Scott Boogaard.	
6.1	TK introduced Scott Boogaard (SB) from Aspect Studios, Alison Heller (AH) from Ethos Urban and Andrew McWhinney (AMc) from Intelligent Risk.	
6.2	Scott Boogaard delivered the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design presentation.	
6.3	Alison Heller delivered the presentation on the SFS Anti-social Behaviour Strategy.	
6.4	Andrew McWhinney delivered the Security presentation which included hostile vehicle management.	
6.5	<p>CF asked about threats from airborne vehicles such as drones. Is this an increasing problem?</p> <p>AMc said CASA has responsibility for regulating use of drones around crowded places. Technology is being developed to deal with the issue but there are currently no specific measures to prevent drones around the site. It is currently a law enforcement authority issue rather than for the venue operator.</p>	

6.6	<p>MW said the presentation suggested feedback for Stage 1 didn't raise concerns about specific anti-social behaviours. He reported he and other residents have commenced chaining their gates when events are on so people don't enter and urinate in their yards. People are often drunk. Most violence occurs after soccer. How far does CCTV extend and does it incorporate facial recognition technology to enable disbaring of offenders? It needs to cover areas away from the immediate surrounds as many impacts are further away. He suggested with more people being pushed towards Paddington the situation there will worsen.</p> <p>AH replied there is CCTV.</p> <p>AMc said facial recognition will be a part of CCTV. As technology develops there is potential to register people. Away from the stadium, it is covered by councils CCTV. It is understood anti-social behaviour extends to the wider precinct. Protocols will be developed around sharing CCTV and other information to discourage and manage anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>SMJ appreciated the informative presentations. She noted at the main points of access to Devonshire St before games the mood is jolly but afterwards people are urinating, scratching cars, running across the Cleveland St intersection and South Dowling St playing chicken with traffic. Does the Anti-social Behaviour Strategy reach out to the clubs to involve them in helping to improve behaviour? How far does the influence of safety officers extend? She hopes the light rail corridor completion improves safety rather than simply funnelling the problem up Devonshire St for residents.</p> <p>AH replied it is intended to be a multi-stakeholder strategy to address issues of people leaving, managing crowds and responsible service of alcohol. The Strategy includes police and security. Everyone in the community will have access to it. There is a set radius around the venue which safety officers deal with then police deal with neighbourhoods. They are consulting with police in the preparation of the strategy.</p> <p>TK asked whether residents report instances of anti-social behaviour to police so consultants can get an idea of where incidents are occurring.</p>	
6.7	<p>PT asked, with people coming in from different sides, what is break down of incidents in Paddington and Surry Hills? The CPTED Strategy lacks specificity. He doesn't see passive surveillance with poor sight lines on the western side of the stadium. He considers it a triumph of bad design. Knock down the NRL building or knock an end off it to provide a direct sight line from Moore Park Rd to Driver Ave. The problem can be fixed so fix it.</p> <p>TK replied the building is outside the project scope and boundary.</p> <p>PT encourages INSW to move the boundary again to fix a bad public space outcome.</p>	
6.8	<p>LG noted a lot of anti social behaviour comes from alcohol. What is the alcohol policy for the stadium? Responsible service of alcohol isn't enough. People are going to pubs in Surry Hills and Paddington. How readily available is alcohol, how expensive and what type is available?</p> <p>AH replied regulation of alcohol applies to venues and the stadium. The main way to mitigate is by responsible service of alcohol.</p> <p>PT noted there will be bigger bars.</p>	

6.9	Kathy Nielsen (KN) suggested issues with crowd management and concerns in dealing with a panic situation and large numbers on the steps. How will people get in and out of the stadium?	
6.10	<p>LG raised concerns with fencing and barriers at Moore Park Rd conflicting with the desire for opening the area up. Having people spilling onto Moore Park Rd conflicts with maintaining the avenue aspect.</p> <p>SB replied there are planters along Moore Park Rd with entry points funnelling out and bollards. There is a need to open up the stadium more as a public space but there are plantings and tree zones. Walls are slightly raised. There is an intention for a bike path on Moore Park Rd in future.</p> <p>Julie Osborne (JO) asked if there will be pedestrian access on Moore Park Rd. SB confirmed the footpath on Moore Park Road will remain.</p>	
6.11	RP raised placement of bins on match day with post game rubbish an issue. Rubbish problems are reduced when bins are available.	
6.12	<p>MW noted a reference to evidence of consultation regarding transport and asked if there is an opportunity for the CCC to provide feedback on transport and parking. If so is this to be written comments? There have been comments tonight on parking and he is concerned these issues will slip away.</p> <p>DG said the intention was to provide an opportunity for the CCC to see the formation of plans before submission of the EIS. Input from this forum is part of the feedback. CCC members can follow this up with written feedback and are encouraged to do so. This feedback continues to be fed in to designers. It is not the DPE expectation that all issues are addressed here. The EIS will be on exhibition and ideas will be fed back through that process.</p>	
7.	Actions from the previous meeting	
7.1	<p>Actioned from last meeting or for noting only – not discussion (see separate responses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INSW/LL to consider placing notices on the website for particular noisy events and a schedule of future noisy activities on the website and provided to the CCC. • Request to include updates on all monitoring results in the project newsletter that goes to the community. • INSW to provide in the next community newsletter information about experiences to date with vibration monitoring. • Request that INSW/DPE document the experience around the community's desire for dilapidation reports as a lesson learned for future projects. • Further response from INSW to MW's questions will be attached to the final minutes. <i>(note that this was delayed but has now been attached and uploaded with to the minutes on the website)</i> • INSW is requested to provide clearer responses to communication in the future • INSW to email presentations to CCC members – done immediately following the meeting. • CCC members to provide additional comments on presentations to MH by 17 April – done and response to INSW/ DPE finalised 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite representatives of the Centennial Park Trust and Moore Park Trust to the next meeting. – INSW has issued this invitation. • CCC final terms of reference – issued • INSW/LL to consider noise monitoring at Kippax Lake – to be acted on see attachment. • The CCC requests INSW provide shadow diagrams comparing the proposal to the current stadium. • INSW to provide numbers for public seating, members and corporate seating. • Request that the Hazmat building contamination report is made available on the INSW website – now provided – refer to link. 	
7.2	<p>For response/ update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INSW to seek from CoS ratepayer details for the CoS dilapidation zone so they can be contacted with respect to dilapidation surveys. <p>PT reported the City of Sydney is unable to give out the database. The action is closed.</p>	
8.	<p>Request for CCC input to the environmental audit on conditions of consent related to the demolition of the stadium</p>	
8.1	<p>MH reported as part of Conditions of Consent (CoC) the scope of the environmental audit comes to the CCC for input. WolfPeak is the private company appointed to undertake the Independent Audit (IA) commencing Friday. They are looking for feedback on the scope of the audit either from the meeting or over the next few days.</p> <p>DG suggested CoCs often require audits during the construction phase. The IA is often generic and provides a view on whether conditions of approval are being met or if improvements are required. The purpose of consulting the CCC is for feedback on what in particular this could be focussed on.</p> <p>MW suggested difficulties with this given the audit is this Friday and noise monitoring at Kippax Lake doesn't commence till 13 May.</p> <p>AM and TK reported the audit goes through noise exceedances, traffic plans and other subplans and looks at work and activities on site which at this stage is demolition.</p> <p>SMJ asked that the scope of the audit specify that observation is part of the audit process. MH will pass this on to the auditor.</p> <p>Community members asked whether the audit looks at the Transport Management Plan and other Stage 2 elements.</p> <p>DG replied this would be the case if part of Conditions of Consent for Stage 2. MH asked that feedback be sent to her for forwarding to WolfPeak.</p> <p>LG suggested difficulties in providing suggestions e.g. on dust monitoring as monitoring results are opaque and not easily understood.</p> <p>TK suggested providing this comment to INSW who can change the way data is presented.</p>	
9.	<p>INSW response to CCC concerns – Michael Waterhouse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to hold over these concerns for meeting 5 – to encompass a workshop component to have comment on a number of Stage 2 issues. 	

9.1	<p>DG understands the competitive design process and jury decisions are in accordance with City of Sydney’s Local Environment Plan (LEP) requirements. The Competitive Alternative Designs Report talks through the process, how the jury came to a decision.</p> <p>TK said the draft Competitive Alternative Designs Report will be sent to CCC members, noting it is still a draft report. This can be discussed further at the meeting on 27 May.</p> <p>PT noted there are usually six alternative designs. It is hard to comment when the CCC hasn’t seen the alternative designs.</p> <p>Community members asked whether the report includes how the jury got to their decision and what happens with community feedback.</p> <p>TK replied the report does include how the jury reached a decision. The overarching design meets requirements of the LEP. Any comments about the winning design will not be addressed as part of the Competitive Design Alternatives Report and will be considered as feedback on the architectural and landscape reports.</p>	
10.	Round the room	
10.1	<p>LG reported a complaint that a resident felt the newsletter was propaganda. The resident wanted dust monitoring results. When told they are on the website the resident suggested they should be in the newsletter along with any exceedances.</p>	
10.2	<p>RP asked whether there are dust issues and whether Lend Lease is watering as they demolish.</p> <p>AM replied large water canons are blowing. Dust like appearance was likely the spray from these.</p>	
10.3	<p>PT is keen to see an unredacted version of the contract. How can it be commercial in confidence when we as the citizens of NSW form one part of the contract?</p> <p>AM said only personal information such as names are redacted.</p> <p>MH said she has been told that the financial details are available.</p> <p>PT reported the court documents were not available on the website.</p>	
10.4	<p>PT requested on behalf of the City of Sydney that INSW present to the Design Advisory Panel.</p> <p>TK said INSW is happy to talk with council officers- request to be taken off line.</p>	
10.4	<p>SMJ thought the newsletter was good. It is good to hear about compliance so people don’t have to look on the website for this information.</p>	
11.1	Correspondence directed to the CCC / Chairperson – none to report	
11.2	Report of Community Complaints - There was one dust complaint and one noise exceedance due to tree pruning which was a one off event.	
12.	Project update and look ahead - Construction update – Angus Morten AM reported the eastern roof will come down towards the end of the month.	
13.	Next meeting	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting Monday 27 May 2019 	
	The meeting closed at 8.13pm	

Items for response from CCC #3

Actions	Answer
<p>INSW/LL to consider placing notices on the website for particular noisy events and a schedule of future noisy activities to be provided on the website and to the CCC.</p>	<p>Completed. Information regarding upcoming high noise events has been placed in the 'Latest Updates' section of the website - link. All website updates will be communicated to the CCC as promised.</p> <p>It is noted that best endeavours will be used to advise ahead of time, however there is no fixed timing for noisy works.</p>
<p>INSW/LL to consider noise monitoring at Kippax Lake.</p>	<p>A noise monitor will be installed on 13 May 2019.</p>
<p>NSW to provide in the next community newsletter information about experiences to date with vibration monitoring</p>	<p>Completed. Details of environmental monitoring has been included in the latest project newsletter and results placed in the 'library' section of the website</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise - link • Dust - link • Vibration - link
<p>The CCC requests that INSW seek from CoS ratepayer details for the CoS dilapidation zone so they can be contacted with respect to dilapidation surveys.</p>	<p>Completed. A request for rate payer details was sent to the City of Sydney.</p>
<p>Request that INSW/DPE document the experience around the community's desire for dilapidation reports as a lesson learned for future projects.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The CCC requests INSW provide shadow diagrams comparing the proposal to the current stadium.</p>	<p>Agreement to present diagrams at meeting five.</p>
<p>INSW to provide numbers for public seating, members and corporate seating.</p>	<p>While overall capacity is the same, there has been a reallocation of reserved areas resulting in an increase of public seating capacity by up to 1300.</p>
<p>Request that the Hazmat building contamination report is made available on the INSW website.</p>	<p>The report is available on the website - link</p>

Request to include updates on all monitoring results in the project newsletter that goes to the community.	Details of environmental monitoring will be noted in future project updates and on the website.
INSW to consider whether an updated report on Busby's Bore can be provided to the next meeting.	An update will be provided at meeting four.
Invite Moore Park Trust to meetings when required	CPMPT has been invited to the meeting four and confirmed their attendance.
INSW is requested to provide clearer responses to communication in the future	Noted.
Material presented is consistent with Cox Architects competition entry. PT asked to see updated plans. DR said these could be presented at the next meeting.	Agree to present updated plans at the meeting five.
Invite representatives of the Centennial Park Trust and Moore Park Trust to the next meeting.	As noted above.
Request to see alternative stadium scheme designs.	The unsuccessful schemes will be presented at meeting five on 27 May.
Request for the Lendlease contract to be released.	<p>The only sections of the Lendlease contract that have been redacted in the version which is currently on the project website are for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The financials - for commercial in confidence reasons • Insurances – for commercial reasons • Contact details - for privacy reasons • Management plans – as they are the intellectual property of Lendlease. <p>The financial details which were noted during the Court proceedings have not been redacted. See the following links to the contract which is online –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 1 - link • Volume 2 - link

Michael Waterhouse Questions and additional responses:

Original Question	Response	MW Concern about the response	Follow up response
<p>Page 6 Condition A1 - all reasonable measures must be taken to prevent or minimise any material harm to the environment that may result from construction. Does INSW consider this obligation to extend beyond the construction site to include Moore Park and, in particular, Kippax lake and its surrounds?</p>	<p>INSW and Lendlease are committed to minimising environmental impacts. Details of how we will be minimising these impacts can be found in the Construction Environment Management Plan and Sub Plans.</p>	<p>Please read the question. It refers specifically to Moore Park, which being outside the boundary of the SFS Redevelopment worksite, INSW and LL seem to regard as being not particularly relevant.</p>	<p>INSW and LL take responsibility for any impact caused by the project. This includes both inside the SFSR site boundary and to the surrounding environment. The ways in which the project manages those impacts is detailed in the Construction Environment Management Plan and Sub Plans and monitoring of the contractor's responsibilities.</p>
<p>Will independent environmental audits (S3. C51-53 Page 36) and INSW responses be provided to the CCC?</p>	<p>Environmental Audits will be made publicly available as required by condition A20.</p>	<p>Please read the question. A20 makes no reference to the CCC. I'm not talking here about what's available publicly on INSW's website but our capacity to discuss environmental audits and INSW's responses to them within the CCC.</p>	<p>CCC members will be notified when environmental audits are made public and any questions regarding them can be raised at CCC meetings.</p>

<p>Given potential Stage 1 impacts of noise and dust on Moore Park, is it intended to invite the Executive Director of the CP&MPT to any meetings where issues which have a bearing on the Park are to be discussed?</p>	<p>The CCC is not the only means of project communication and coordination. All project communication activities are outlined in the Community Communication Strategy which was provided to CCC members prior to the first CCC meeting and is available on the project website. Separate meetings will be arranged with CPMPT to discuss any issues and stage 2 planning approvals.</p>	<p>Please read the question. I have no doubt that INSW will be talking to CPMPT. That isn't at issue. I'm asking whether CPMPT will be invited to be present at any CCC meetings where issues which have a bearing on Moore Park are to be discussed. This includes for Item 8 of the Agenda's for this week's meeting so we can satisfy ourselves that what we are being told is consistent with CPMPT's understanding. If the Government has decided to include Public Spaces in the portfolio of the Minister for Planning, and bearing in mind the Premier's recent comments about the environment, then INSW might show a little more sensitivity to our concerns regarding the environmental impact of the SFS Redevelopment, including its impact on Moore Park.</p>	<p>CPMPT will be invited to attend the May meeting.</p>
--	--	---	---