

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

Meeting No. 8, Monday 23 September – 5.30 pm – 8.00 pm

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

**Attendees:** **Chairperson:** Margaret Harvie. **Note taker:** Sandra Spate.

**Community representatives:** Chelsea Ford, Sofie Mason-Jones, Julie Osborne, Robert Postema, Vivienne Skinner, Linda Gosling - Paddington Society Representative, Steve Rankine.

**Local Government representative:** Cr Philip Thalys (City of Sydney Council), Mr Alan Bright (for Mayor Kathy Neilson of Randwick City Council), Peter Monks (Waverley Council)

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

**Guests:** David Gainsford, Executive Director, Infrastructure Assessments, Department of Planning, Industry and Environment; Tom Kennedy, Environmental Planning, INSW.

**Apologies:** Tom Harley, John Wakefield, Kathy Nielsen

Item no.	Description	Actions/ who
1.	<p><b>Welcome</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overview of tonight's agenda</li> <li>Introductions to the two new CCC members</li> </ul>	
1.1	The Chair acknowledged Aboriginal people on whose land we meet and acknowledged elders past and present.	
1.	<p><b>Steve Rankine (SR)</b> was introduced as the new member replacing Michael Waterhouse. SR applied for membership at the beginning of the CCC process. He thanked the CCC for the opportunity to participate.</p> <p><b>Tom Harley (TH)</b> is an apology for tonight but will represent the Alliance of Moore Park Sports on the CCC.</p> <p>The Chair met prior to the meeting with both new members to orientate them to the CCC.</p>	
2.	<b>Declarations of pecuniary and other interests</b>	
2.1	<b>Sofie Mason-Jones (SMJ)</b> is on the wait list for members to the SCG Trust.	
3.	<p><b>Report / discussion on Actions from the last meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update on communication with the Disability Council of NSW and the Australian Human Rights Commission.</li> <li>Status of consultation with the SGSA.</li> </ul>	
3.1	<p><b>Update on communication with the Disability Council of NSW and the Australian Human Rights Commission.</b></p> <p><b>Tom Gellibrand (TG)</b> met with the Chair and another member of the Disability Council of NSW regarding design. They gave positive feedback and suggested meeting with the City of Sydney Accessibility Committee. This will happen next year.</p> <p>Positive feedback was received from the Accessible Transport Advisory Committee but they didn't feel a need to meet.</p> <p>INSW hasn't heard back from the Australian Human rights Commission.</p>	

3.2	<p><b>Status of consultation with the SGSA.</b></p> <p>TG reported the UK Sports Ground Safety Authority (SGSA) publishes a guide which is an approach for good design of stadia. The guide was used to inform Cox designs and will be reviewed at the start of the design development by the successful tenderer. INSW is not yet in a position to produce an assessment based on this guideline.</p> <p><b>Julie Osborne (JO)</b> asked if the SGSA agreed that two elevators provided adequate access.</p> <p><b>Tom Kennedy (TK)</b> said the SGSA had acknowledged the stair precedent and lift strategy documents were considered adequate.</p> <p>TG noted the at grade access and more points of access was viewed very positively by the Disability Council. Councils have particular focus on access and equitable access is a focus of all levels of government.</p>	<p>INSW to distribute the link to the SGSA Guide.</p> <p>Sportsground Safety Authority,</p>
4	<p><b>Project update – Stage 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update on Construction Contractor</li> </ul>	
4.1	<p><b>Update on Construction Contractor</b></p> <p>TG reported tenders out for the construction contractor are expected to close in late October 2019 with an aim to execute a contract by the end of the year. This is a tight timeframe. Meantime, INSW is meeting tenderers with interactive sessions, site visits and providing them with Lend Lease’s work on design to ensure questions about risks are dealt with during tender phase and not carried into their submissions. Consideration is being given to undertaking preparatory work such as preparation of management plans to assist with early commencement.</p>	
4.2	<p><b>Linda Gosling (LG)</b> asked if there were only two bidders.</p> <p>TG replied these are Multiplex and John Holland.</p> <p><b>Vivienne Skinner (VS)</b> asked if that was enough.</p> <p>TG replied INSW preferred three and engaged with prospective tenderers but ended with two. Both tenderers are committed and have good teams.</p> <p><b>SMJ</b> asked if tenderers were provided a capped budget or were asked to price construction of the plan in the current Development Application.</p> <p><b>TG</b> said the latter and that tenders will be within the Governments announced budget and timeframe. The overall budget is \$729m. After Stage 1 works and other factors are considered tenderers are able to work out what the available budget will be. Work on the stadium is to be completed by March 2022.</p> <p><b>Chelsea Ford (CF)</b> asked whether a pitch was made to other construction companies as well as the two shortlisted. She noted discussion at previous meetings as to whether there are enough construction companies in the Australian market capable of meeting the requirements of such a large scale project.</p> <p><b>TG</b> said INSW had looked at those who submitted Expressions of Interest for Sydney Modern, the Western Sydney Stadium and others involved in the construction of the Adelaide and Perth stadia. There was an obvious commitment from the two who have tendered. There is money involved in making bids and companies don’t do that lightly.</p>	
4.3	<p><b>VS</b> suggested the community is now keen to get the stadium built given there is now a big hole.</p> <p><b>TG</b> noted a lot is happening and that tenders close end October. The program is to have the contract let this year. More detail can be shared next year.</p>	
4.4	<p><b>LG</b> asked if the new contractor will have to follow the approved DA.</p> <p><b>TG</b> replied they would and would need to report against compliance to Conditions of Consent. There are conversations around choices of material</p>	

	(concrete versus structural steel) to ensure an efficient structure. INSW wants to ensure the fan experience and public domain are fantastic while ensuring efficient design. They will talk to the contractor about how to do that. INSW is stimulating interactive sessions with tenderers and they choose the topics. A probity advisor to INSW sits in on these meetings.	
4.5	<p><b>JO</b> suggested an obvious way to save money is to reduce the area underneath which is high and creates issues for residents and the public. Has thought been given to reducing that?</p> <p><b>TG</b> noted the tabled document (summary of Response to Submissions) looks at changing the overall height and the relative level of the playing field. The argument for reducing the roofing is about reducing bulk. Contractors can look at additional measures. Regarding the area underneath, the ring road is needed for operation and speed of movement and can't be compromised while ventilation ducting has to be included.</p> <p><b>LG</b> asked whether the DA sets the external materials.</p> <p><b>TG</b> replied this is largely the case. Some minor changes can be made.</p> <p><b>VS</b> asked about the drop in the playing field noting previous major discussions around this.</p> <p><b>TG and TK</b> said the level of the playing field has been slightly reduced from the level of the old SFS but not significantly.</p>	
4.6	<p><b>SMJ</b> noted that INSW did not proceed with Lendlease for the Stage 2 works due to Lendlease advising they were unable to meet the Government's budget and timeframe. Have there been major design changes to reduce costs and address the public submissions that would enable the other tenderers to meet the budget and timeframe?</p> <p><b>TK</b> said that changes have been in line with design development.</p> <p><b>SR</b> asked why new builders can build within budget if Lend Lease couldn't.</p> <p><b>TG</b> said there are two competing for the job. He expects they will put forward different propositions on how to undertake construction. Speeding up construction makes it cheaper. He expects smart design, programs and methodology.</p> <p><b>VS</b> has heard suggestions that it will be superior to Optus Stadium in Perth and that had a budget of \$1.5 billion for 60,000 seats.</p> <p><b>Kerrie Mather (KM)</b> explained that Perth Optus is a much larger stadium and includes a train station. Seat size and structure cost is not a linear equation.</p> <p><b>TG</b> noted Perth is an oval stadium.</p> <p><b>LG</b> reported comments that the Western stadium is a lesser quality, and questioned that the Perth stadium budget included the train station.</p> <p><b>TG</b> replied Bankwest holds 30,000 and is a great experience, exciting with steep seating. SFS will be a similar experience with spectator noise and views close to the action.</p>	
5.	<b>Response to submissions as result of the exhibition of Stage 2</b>	
5.1	<p>A summary of the Response to Submissions was distributed in advance of the meeting for the information of CCC members. The full report is on the website: <a href="https://majorprojects.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/prweb/PRRestService/mp/01/getContent?AttachRef=SSD-9835%2120190902T043930.854%20GMT">https://majorprojects.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/prweb/PRRestService/mp/01/getContent?AttachRef=SSD-9835%2120190902T043930.854%20GMT</a></p> <p>TK delivered a presentation about the response to submissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stairs at Driver Avenue remain due to topographical features of the site and the need to get people to the common level. Cox's study of national and international stadia indicate stairs are a common feature of stadia.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding lift capacity assessment it was confirmed two lifts are adequate. Two forms of modelling were undertaken based on an upper limit of 55,000 people for concert mode.</li> <li>Regarding overshadowing, the roof has come down 2m at either end but most shadow is from the western bulk. The impact on Moore Park is less than an hour during the winter solstice with no shadow in summer.</li> <li>Regarding pedestrian access pinch points - design amendments have allowed rationalisation of stairs with a view to maintaining pedestrian access. Removal of the NRL building is outside the scope of this project.</li> <li>Regarding roof changes, the overall height of 84.5 remains same but there is a 2m reduction at the leading edge for a better street frontage on Moore Park Road. 2,500 sqm of roof has been taken out and the gross floor area has shrunk</li> <li>On transport the Response to Submissions report commits to an event management plan in tandem with the green travel plan encouraging a mode shift. Light rail is expected to change the landscape. Light rail will bring people from Randwick as well as Central.</li> <li>The updated visual impact assessment confirms negligible or no impacts on heritage. There is ongoing Aboriginal involvement around interpretation. A key theme is Indigenous heritage, in particular sporting heritage.</li> </ul>	
5.2	<b>Philip Thalys (PT)</b> asked how many of the stadia studied regarding stairs were Cox designs. He suggested many were.	
5.3	<p><b>JO</b> asked about the capacity of the lifts.  <b>TK</b> replied they were 33 person capacity.  <b>Angus Morten (AM)</b> said they could hold two motorised wheelchairs with assistants for each.  <b>LG</b> asked whether a comparative study was undertaken looking at how lifts correlate to seat capacity at other stadia.  <b>TK</b> said precedents weren't looked at. The disability consultant (ARUP, who do a lot of work for Transport for NSW deemed the lifts adequate. The main parameter for lifts is the half hour after the game and it was deemed they were adequate on this basis. The arrival profile is over two hours.  <b>VS</b> suggested it odd that with a wonderful new stadium two lifts is deemed enough for all. Does it take into account able bodied people who will use the lifts in preference to stairs?  <b>TK</b> said modelling was for 55,000 events e.g. concert which assumes 2% will require the lift and exit is within half an hour.  <b>JO and SMJ</b> suggested issues with lazy people getting into lifts first, ahead of persons with accessibility needs. With a state of the art stadium why not add another lift?  <b>TK</b> said the issues is that it wouldn't be used most of the time.  <b>TG</b> suggested that only one lift is required but a second ensures access at all time (i.e. if one is out).</p>	
5.4	<p><b>PT</b> said cross sections provided at the meeting suggest an overall greater height.  <b>VS</b> asked for confirmation that the floor space has shrunk. This was confirmed.  <b>SMJ</b> asked whether the roof still covers all seating and that the drip line extends beyond the seating.  <b>TK</b> confirmed this is still the case.  <b>LG</b> asked what is the height of the leading edge on Moore Park Road.</p>	<p><b>INSW (TK)</b> will distribute updated cross section diagrams.  <b>INSW (TK)</b> will provide the height of the leading edge on Moore Park Road.</p>

<p>5.5</p>	<p><b>SMJ</b> asked who is involved in the event management plan.</p> <p><b>TK</b> replied the SCG Trust (chair), Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust (CMPT), TfNSW, City of Sydney and other stakeholders. A meeting with TfNSW indicated a commitment to re-implement the Moore Park Transport Working Group.</p> <p><b>PT</b> noted no change regarding the reduction of parking on Moore Park.</p> <p><b>TK</b> said the Response to Submissions is consistent with previous statements in regard to parking.</p> <p><b>JO</b> suggested wording of 'it will need to devise plan to offset' pushed it back to the Moore Park Trust to solve the issue. It makes it sound like it's their problem.</p> <p><b>TK</b> replied the Moore Park Masterplan mentions removal of parking, but this is predicated on satellite parking arrangements. The SEARS requirement is for assessment against the Moore Park Masterplan which is predicated on satellite parking.</p> <p><b>JO</b> doesn't interpret it to be predicated on satellite parking. It suggests looking at use of the golf club but is not predicated on alternatives. She noted some submissions in favour of parking but a lot against.</p> <p><b>TK</b> replied the Masterplan is clear it will remove parking from Moore Park East but not that there will be a reduction in parking within the precinct.</p> <p><b>LG</b> would like to see a commitment in the DA that Moore Park car parking is ruled out.</p> <p><b>SMJ</b> noted the DA and various sporting codes state that parking is needed. The Response to Submissions reconfirms that parking is needed but there remain questions around when the parking on Moore Park East (on Centennial Parklands land) would be phased out. What triggers its removal? Who is responsible? The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment is responsible for assessing the DA and needs to be satisfied that the development is capable of phasing out parking on Moore Park East consistent with the Moore Park Masterplan.</p> <p><b>TK</b> said that should parking go there needs to be a mode shift to active transport, public transport or satellite parking. This and other projects need to adapt.</p> <p><b>JO</b> said the stadium project doesn't address issues outside the boundary. If more public transport is needed now is the opportunity to deal with this. The green travel plan doesn't change the dial. Light rail will only do so much. There will need to be something else. This is a big issue.</p> <p><b>SMJ</b> asked if a shuttle from the university or racecourse is being considered to optimise existing parking in the area .</p> <p><b>TK</b> said a shuttle wouldn't be needed as the light rail will run from these areas and won't be full from that direction. Yes, park there and catch the light rail.</p> <p><b>KM</b> explained that in terms of capacity the stadium is in the same location with the same number of seats as the previous SFS.</p> <p><b>LG and JO</b> said the current (previous) arrangement was not working.</p> <p><b>David Gainsford (DG)</b> acknowledged parking was a key issue from the start. This issue has been taken on board by the Department. There is liaison with Centennial and Moore Park Trust and the SCG Trust. Denise Ora talked of light rail as the catalyst for removal of parking. DPIE haven't yet formed an opinion as part of the assessment.</p> <p><b>VS</b> said Moore Park can't be improved and beautified as open space for an increasing population if rendered unusable by parking.</p> <p><b>PT</b> raised the issue of Uber and limousines.</p> <p><b>TK</b> replied TfNSW's preference is for a geobubble to be enacted at the end of the match to disperse people from the area. This has worked at Bankwest. There</p>	
------------	--	--

	<p>hasn't yet been discussion on where that might be. The app tells people where to walk to meet uber. There would be multiple locations.</p> <p><b>PT</b> suggested residents wouldn't want dispersal to residential areas.</p> <p><b>LG</b> asked if the geobubble would be a Condition of Consent but it won't address limos.</p> <p><b>TK</b> said mitigation measures are part of the commitment and are in the transport management plan. There is the possibility of a condition. INSW can only make changes related to the SFS. Discussions with TfNSW also involve precinct issues.</p> <p><b>KM</b> reported the SCG Trust has been meeting with TfNSW on how light rail, Uber and the new bus loop will work.</p> <p><b>PT</b> asked whether a condition of consent could capture the whole area. Could a precinct wide transport plan be invited?</p> <p><b>TK</b> replied that this can sometimes happen on someone else's land, but it is difficult and often legally unenforceable.</p> <p><b>DG</b> noted there will be monitoring requirements over a period to inform improvements.</p> <p><b>Alan Bright (AB)</b> reported on a condition around parking issues at the new acute care building at Prince of Wales hospital. The condition requires the hospital to come up with a precinct wide strategy. If not they have to provide additional parking by the occupation date. There is a requirement to work with council to look at underutilised parking at other locations.</p> <p><b>DG</b> reported the acute services building has no new parking but additional demand. A green travel plan is required for the area and it was felt a precinct based approach was the most sensible.</p> <p><b>PT</b> asked why this couldn't be done here. A lot of buildings being demolished in the city have less car parking.</p>	
5.6	<p><b>SR</b> questioned why only one pedestrian link into Paddington is shown on the map. Many people cut across and there is an obvious link to Bondi Junction railway. There doesn't seem to have been much thought as to what happens in Paddington. There needs to be better funnels out of Paddington. Businesses would like people in Paddington but need to look at getting them to Oxford St without grief to residents. Perhaps consider shuttle buses and bikes. Oxford St is great distributor. The 333 bus is a great service and on game days could provide for a fantastic whole day experience. Businesses are trying to make Oxford St a more attractive place for business and community. He encouraged for there to be thought as to how this can link in to this project.</p> <p><b>TK</b> said most feedback didn't favour people dispersing through Paddington. There are mechanisms such as the green travel plan and a travel guide can be incorporated into the management plan to encourage people to walk. The intention of the map is to show connections to transport modes.</p> <p><b>SR</b> asked why not a connection to Bondi Junction?</p> <p><b>JO</b> agrees the eastern suburbs line is a great line.</p> <p><b>TK and LG</b> suggested most people come from Central.</p> <p><b>SMJ</b> asked about progress on encouraging bike operators to promote a bike hub and exchange. Hundreds of bikes are currently dumped in the parklands. Bike share isn't done well yet. Is a bike operator considered as part of the management plan?</p> <p><b>TK</b> replied it hasn't been included but there is ongoing monitoring. The stadium will provide bike racks along Moore Park Rd. Bankwest has a 250 bike rack.</p> <p><b>KM</b> suggested most people arrive in groups.</p>	

5.7	<p><b>PT</b> questioned the views depicted around heritage impacts. He asked if an archaeological study had been undertaken.</p> <p><b>TK</b> said private (from properties) and public views are included.</p> <p><b>AM</b> indicated that work had not been below ground.</p>	
5.8	<p><b>JO</b> asked if the number of events would be capped.</p> <p><b>TK</b> replied the former Allianz stadium was not capped. Stage 1 approval put forward the notion of 52 but this wasn't from the proponent. There is a desire to ensure the investment is best utilised. If scheduling of regular events fills the calendar a cap would pose risk to emerging or outlying events such as women's sports.</p> <p><b>LG</b> suggested events could be prioritised if a cap was in place. Unlike other stadia this is close to residential properties and there are real cumulative impacts.</p> <p><b>TK</b> suggested a cap wouldn't make a difference to the number of events. He confirmed a cap on concerts but there is no proposed cap on other events.</p> <p><b>TK</b> said there is no current or proposed cap.</p> <p><b>CF</b> suggested a rolling cap on annual attendances to enable outlier events not to be overlooked.</p> <p><b>TK</b> suggested this would be difficult to implement. Operators will always want to sell the maximum number of tickets and numbers won't be known till the end. If numbers are reached in October you may need to cancel the rest of events.</p> <p><b>LG</b> said so then residents just have to cop it.</p> <p><b>JO</b> asked what happens with this response from INSW?</p> <p><b>DG</b> noted it is a live issue and one arising in submissions. The Department has sought good information from INSW about the impacts of having no cap. The Department will assess this issue on the merits of the argument then make decisions. They are also conscious the first couple years of operations will coincide with ANZ Stadium being out of action so there will likely be stronger demand.</p> <p><b>CF</b> suggested that like lock out laws where we are robbing Peter to pay Paul. There are different perspectives of businesses on Oxford St and Surry Hills and event organisers vs residents.</p> <p><b>DG</b> said the department will consider the economic argument of unlimited events against social and environmental impacts. 52 events is the maximum number of events suggested by historical data.</p>	
5.9	<p><b>SMJ</b> asked what size event triggers parking on Moore Park east.</p> <p><b>KM</b> thinks it is all events but not just SFS events. It is also used by the Horden Pavilion and for events in EQ.</p>	
5.10	<p><b>TK</b> responded to suggestions made in a Sydney Morning Herald (SMH) article about Fox Studio's objection to the DA. Fox engaged an acoustician. Their review was predicated on a different construction methodology and different equipment than is intended to be used for Stage 2. There were no issues or complaints around Stage 1 works. INSW continues to meet regularly with Fox and they have agreed to work together during the scheduled filming next year. Acoustic on site measuring will occur during filming.</p> <p><b>LG</b> asked if Fox is happy with this. It was alarming to learn about it via the SMH.</p> <p><b>TK</b> said it has to be managed. Redevelopment works can be done while filming. Dialogue will continue.</p> <p><b>TK</b> reported the SMH article that noted design changes was taken verbatim from the Response to Submissions report.</p>	
5.11	<p><b>VS</b> asked about questions regarding Aurecon's water modelling report in Response to Submissions. The report said it would be consistent with previous stadium flows directed away from sports areas but contained within the precinct</p>	

	<p>and there could be 10mm to 50mm over Driver Ave. Is INSW confident there won't be a lot of run off given the stadium abuts Driver Ave and Kippax Lake?  <b>TK</b> replied it demonstrates no increase in flooding off-site. They will install a large detention basin to store water. It currently flows over Driver Ave but will continue to do so at the same rate. The lowest point on Driver Ave is between the SFS and the SCG. It is no worse than the current and predicts a 1:100 year flood.  <b>Robert Postema (RP)</b> asked if water is harvested from detention tanks rather than released.  <b>TK and AM</b> clarified that water from the rainwater tanks is reused but not stormwater. The stormwater detention tank needs to be empty for the next storm event so water is captured and released slowly. It can't be stored.</p>	
5.12	<p><b>SMJ</b> asked whether any photovoltaic panels are visible from the parklands.  <b>AM</b> said these have to be on the eastern and western edges of the north side so are mainly on the Moore Park Road side.  <b>LG</b> asked if they are within the plane of the roof.  <b>TK</b> said they are as close to the fabric as possible.  <b>SMJ</b> asked about location of signage particularly facing parklands.  It was confirmed that signage is at the middle level facing parklands.</p>	
5.13	<p><b>PT</b> asked about changes to pedestrian access to Moore Park Road and Driver Ave, particularly the pinch points.  <b>TK</b> replied there is a rationalisation of stairs to MP1 and revised plant bed.  <b>PT</b> asked if it is possible to see the whole plan.  <b>TK</b> noted it is in the Response to Submissions report. He will forward the relevant section to the CCC.  <b>RP</b> asked about removal of landscaping to some tiers.  <b>TK</b> replied some terraces have shrunk so no longer allow landscaping.  <b>LG</b> asked if this was a consequence of the reduction of height and footprint.  <b>RP</b> asked whether the landscaping was purely aesthetic.  <b>TK</b> replied in the affirmative to both questions.</p>	<p><b>INSW (TK)</b> to send relevant pages of the Response to Submissions report – the originally submitted landscape master plan and the revised landscape master plan submitted with the response to submissions  <b>INSW (TK)</b> to distribute to the CCC the before and after sections showing changes to landscaping of terraces and location.</p>
6	<p><b>Project update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on Stage One works</li> <li>• Report of Community Complaints</li> </ul> <p>Dust concerns in light of high winds</p>	
6.1	<p><b>Update on Stage One works</b></p> <p><b>AM</b> reported demolition of the west wing to ground level. Site clearing is expected to be complete towards the end of October or early November. Stormwater diversion work will start in four weeks and continue into early next year.  <b>LG</b> asked if Lend Lease would still be on site for commencement of construction.  <b>AM</b> said he expects Lend Lease to be on site till January. There may be some overlap.</p>	

6.2	<p><b>Report of Community Complaints</b></p> <p>There was one dust complaint on 7 September during heavy winds. Dust suppression was upgraded with more water and sprinkler fans.</p>	
6.3	<p><b>Dust concerns in light of high winds</b></p> <p>RP reported dust settling overnight on Moore Park Road with the slightest breeze. All cars on the road are covered in a fine layer of silt. He considered that more was required than the water cannons during daylight demolition.</p> <p>SMJ suggested hessian strips as covering till construction.</p> <p>LG said residents are worried about the site being left before construction starts.</p> <p>AM will investigate measures. He encourages people to formalise their complaints so issues can be dealt with.</p>	AM to investigate overnight dust issues.
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Correspondence</b> directed to the CCC / Chairperson</li> </ul>	
7.1	Margaret Harvie (MH) reported there has been no correspondence.	
8.	<p><b>What we are hearing from the community?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Round the room</b> – this is where communication to CCC members from the community is raised</li> </ul>	
8.1	RP noted the dust issue raised previously and that truck holding on Moore Park Road should be addressed.	
8.2	<p>SMJ noted concerns about lit signage visible from the Kippax Lake side. She asked whether there is one name sign on each side and noted the community is asking for confirmation that TV screens are no longer part of the proposal.</p> <p>TK confirmed this is the case.</p> <p>RP asked if there are rules governing use of colours for naming signs.</p> <p>TK doesn't know of any restrictions regarding colours.</p> <p>SMJ said the phasing out of carparking on Moore Park East still needs to be resolved. There should be a sunset clause or plan for another location. She is hearing parking is needed. What is the trigger for its phase out? She would like to see Moore Park used as parkland, consistent with the Moore Park Masterplan.</p>	
8.3	<p>LG presented an email from a resident (attached below in full). Concerns include car parking in South Paddington with fans preferring to arrive by car and inadequate capacity on the streets. Her suggestion is for the City of Sydney to implement 15 minute parking on event days and encouraging the use of parking stations.</p> <p>There was discussion about the need for Council to be ruthless in enforcing limits. She was concerned about the lack of mention of limos. She felt that integrated ticketing needs to be made compulsory by the SCG Trust and a cap on events. The email also pointed to the lack of address of security and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>There was discussion about the fact that measures are limited to boundaries of the site but effects go beyond the site.</p> <p>PT said parking restrictions are a real option for City of Sydney to look at.</p> <p>MH suggested that some issues in the email might be for the address of the City of Sydney and that this be forwarded to them.</p>	PT is requested to forward the email and in particular concerns about parking to relevant staff in CoS.
8.4	<p>LG raised the issue of integrated ticketing.</p> <p>KM reported most of the sports partners have integrated ticketing. The TfNSW is talking to the Swans currently.</p> <p>JO asked whether integrated ticketing covers any mode of public transport and is it publicised extensively?</p>	

	<p><b>KM</b> replied it covers all transport. It is expensive to implement but a great initiative. Each code makes its own deals with TfNSW. The SCG Trust wants to talk to TfNSW ahead of the light rail about multi modal ticketing and communications, how to increase access and promote transport. We need to get it right. The Trust is working with each sports partner and Centennial Parklands Trust to ensure all issue the same information. Light rail is being used as a catalyst for the behaviour change. People need to be made aware that they should walk via Devonshire Street where there is better pedestrian access rather than Foveaux St. A broad body of work is underway. Public transport remains a challenge particularly with families and the elderly preferring to arrive by car. Large parts of Sydney are not directly connected by public transport. Parking needs to be accessible and convenient.</p> <p><b>LG</b> asked if integrated ticketing could be a condition of use.</p> <p><b>KM</b> said the Trust can't mandate it but TfNSW is working directly with sporting organisations. The SCG Trust continues to advocate for more public transport and she would love to see heavy rail.</p> <p><b>JO and SMJ</b> thought that the moves around integrated ticketing are positive. The Swans have it for away games at Homebush and it good news to hear it may be starting for home games.</p>	
8.5	<p><b>JO</b> reinforced the messages around car parking and capped numbers of events which are issues for residents. It's good to hear about integrated ticketing.</p>	
8.6	<p><b>SR</b> would like to see more linking of Oxford St and the SFS. It doesn't seem to be on the agenda and more thought is needed to link to the existing heavy rail or buses up Oxford St.</p>	
8.7	<p><b>KM</b> noted likely growth in events from women's sports. All home teams at the SFS and SCG have or are incubating a women's home team. A constraint on numbers of events would likely mean only men would play on major grounds with women relegated to lesser grounds.</p>	
8.8	<p><b>PT</b> read key sections from the City of Sydney's letter of response to the Response to Submissions (RTS) report including issues of Moore Park Steps and equitable access, inadequacy of the Green Travel Plan, access and traffic generation and environmental sustainability of design. Key points read out were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RTS states iteratively that the stadium will depend mainly on the Green Travel Plan (GTP) for achieving sustainable transport without reducing on-site car parking spaces. However, the GTP remains insufficient in committing to targets for sustainable transport or set targets in private car reduction;</li> <li>• There is a lack of consideration made to the NSW Governments ambition of net zero carbon emissions 2050 and how the development, being a major construction project and public infrastructure, can contribute to this goal. Given the emergence of low carbon concrete solutions (notably geopolymers cement), the project should look to use this alternative at least for concrete works around the stadium edge to demonstrate commitment to innovation and market stimulation of sustainable building materials.</li> </ul> <p>He asked for INSW's response.</p> <p><b>TK</b> noted the Department of Planning will receive the response from City of Sydney and will provide it to INSW and indicate if they are seeking INSW to respond.</p>	

	<p><b>DG</b> said the Department doesn't solicit responses to the Response to Submissions report but people are free to make submissions. They won't publish these as submissions but will take the issues on board. The Department goes back to agencies and councils for their formal feedback. If issues arise through that process that the Department feels have not been addressed they request supplementary information or clarifications from INSW which are then put on the Departments website. If other questions arise people can continue to provide input till the final assessment. As more than 25 objections were received the Minister for Planning becomes the determining authority. The Department makes a recommendation to the Minister. If it is approved it is subject to conditions of consent.</p> <p><b>LG</b> asked when the determination is expected to be finalised</p> <p><b>DG</b> replied it is well advanced. It may be finalised within a couple of months.</p> <p><b>SMJ</b> asked whether Stage 2 conditions would be satisfied by a private certifier as with Stage 1.</p> <p><b>DG</b> suggested some issues will come back to the Department but others will be by private certifier.</p>	
9.	<p><b>Next meeting - Meeting 9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The determination and conditions of consent will be on the Department of Planning website. INSW may not be in a position to respond to these this year. There will be little other new information till a contract is awarded.</li> <li>As it was determined there would be little to discuss if a meeting were held this year the CCC agreed to a date for the next meeting of <b>Wednesday 5 February 2020.</b></li> </ul>	
	<b>Close 8:05pm</b>	

See below letter from resident (received by Linda Gosling) in response to the Response to Submissions Report.

### **Car parking**

- Stadium clients have been lobbying actively recently for parking nearby (for fans over 50 and those with families). Fans prefer to arrive by car and will continue to seek local on street parking especially as it is "free" and they are entitled to park as taxpayers, <https://www.smh.com.au/national/nsw/car-park-or-parkland-stoush-erupts-over-moore-park-stadium-car-spaces-20190820-p52ix0.html#comments>*
- Current capacity is inadequate, resulting in frustration for residents and fans, and creating dangerous situations in narrow streets (double parking, banks of hire cars, illegal parking on corners etc). Even if the new stadium doesn't increase patronage (which it will as fans "try it out") there is still a significant problem.*
- Sydney City Council and Sydney electorate should consider the Suncorp approach: "Suncorp Stadium is a public transport destination. On event days, **parking** restrictions will apply in the local Lang Park (here: Paddington) Traffic Area surrounding the Stadium. Fifteen minute **parking** limits will apply in this area from two hours before Gates Open time through to the conclusion of the game, unless otherwise signed."*
- Alternatively there are city parking stations (e.g. Goulburn Street) that might be prepared to deliver a park and commute service to the Stadium. It's also only a short walk to Eddy Avenue, or a quick bus trip/walk to the Chalmers Street light rail station. Why not offer cheap parking with a reserved place and free light rail travel as part of the ticket price. Parking also exists in Haymarket near the light rail.*
- Sydney City Council needs to be ruthless in enforcing local parking restrictions.*

### **Public Transport**

- *There is no mention of limousines. They arrive just before starting time, hang around double parked nearby and leave with the main exit rush. These vehicles have become increasingly popular, cause a safety hazard and nuisance (drivers spend their time chatting in the street, taking calls for next bookings etc) and escape being booked (drivers see the rangers coming, drive away and return when it's "safe").*
- *Integrated ticketing would be implemented if the SCGT made it a compulsory requirement for clubs to use the Stadium. Clubs are key lobbyists in the provision of convenient parking and are there to serve their members' preferences (and therefore the clubs' viability). Integrated ticketing should be mandatory for any club, entertainment company etc applying to use the Stadium.*

### **Caps**

- *The flexible approach to the number of events makes it all the more important to have appropriate controls and systems applying to parking and transport. There has been a hundred years of some sport on the area but this has been expanded and commercialised. The precinct has been a residential area for a longer period of time 1820's. It should not be degraded further by commercial exploitation.*

### **Security and Anti-Social Behaviour**

- *Total cop-out (pun intended) – any control or supervision finishes at the Stadium. Fans do urinate in the street etc as well as being noisy, revving cars, ripping up plantings etc. This issue and parking are the two main problems for residents. Fans arrive, go to the pub (where the beer is full strength and cheaper), go to the game half drunk and then return to the pubs to complete the job. They probably leave their cars parked here overnight.*
- *The SCGT could consider providing toilet facilities or porta loos along Moore Park Road. Could be useful for coach drivers/travellers as well.*
- *I don't think it's unreasonable for the SCGT to pay for an appropriate number of security guards/police to supervise fans leaving via Regent Street and Oatley Road. Pubs do it for the relatively small number of patrons they have. The Stadium discharges thousands of revved up/intoxicated/tribal fans after each match. The SCGT and clubs (or at least their executives and players) make amazing profits. Is there a legal/OHS responsibility for the fans to be given safe passage to their transport home? It would be interesting to see a test case.*