

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

Meeting No. 1, Thursday 7 February – 6.00 pm – 9.00 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, Vivienne Skinner, Michael Waterhouse

**Local Government representative:** Cr Jess Scully (City of Sydney Council), Mayor John Wakefield (Waverley Council), Mayor Kathy Neilson (Randwick City Council), Tom Jones, Urban Design Planner (Woollahra Municipal Council)

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

**In attendance:** David Gainsford, Executive Director, Department of Planning and Environment (DPE); Sandra Spate, notetaker; Dominic Wy Kanak (Deputy Mayor Waverley Council)

**Apologies:** Robert Postema

Item no.	Description	Actions/Who by
1.	<p><b>Welcome, apologies</b></p> <p><b>Overview of the composition of the CCC and selection process</b></p> <p><b>Overview of tonight’s agenda and regular agendas</b></p>	
1.1	The Chair acknowledged we are meeting on Aboriginal land and paid respect to elders past, present and future.	
1.2	<p>Two observers were present at that time: David Gainsford, Executive Director, Department of Planning and Environment (DPE); Sandra Spate, notetaker. (a third observer Wy Kanak attended the meeting later)</p> <p><b>Margaret Harvie (MH)</b> reported on selection processes. 23 applications were received. Most selected are in close proximity to site. Five of the CCC members selected are residents very close to the stadium and likely to be directly impacted, one a local business owner and one a community member with local organisation connections residing less than two kms away. Most members are connected to various local organisations. All are on the CCC as ‘individual’ members except for one representing the Paddington Society. When that representative can’t attend another representative from the Paddington Society can attend. There aren’t replacements for individuals unable to attend. ‘Alternates’ (as defined by the DPE guidelines for CCCs) are used when there is a need to replace someone in a more long term capacity.</p>	
1.3	<p><b>MH</b> suggested the agenda is a two way communication process providing a chance to ask questions and for the proponent to learn what the community is thinking.</p> <p>There were links to a number of the project plans and documents that were forwarded to members in advance of the meeting. It was not expected that members read all these documents. It was to make members familiar with the project documents that are currently available.</p> <p>There is much interest in discussing the merit of the project. While the chair is happy to hear views on this it is not the focus of the meeting.</p> <p>The first few meetings are usually a period of intense learning to then enable the community to have more say.</p> <p>The chair intends to run meetings strictly. Going round the room for views is a fair way to ensure everyone has the opportunity to have a say.</p>	

1.4	<p><b>Jess Scully (JS)</b> raised concerns with the Code of Conduct around confidentiality. As a an elected Councillor with the City of Sydney she needs to discuss matters raised with councillors, staff and constituents.</p> <p><b>MH</b> clarified there are no restrictions on this. She noted the clause from CCC guidelines which says “committee members may ask for certain information to be kept confidential by the committee”.</p> <p>It was clarified that confidentiality is by exception rather than a blanket rule.</p> <p>All members have signed the Code of Conduct document.</p>	
1.5	<p><b>JS</b> asked permission to table a letter to the Minister signed by mayors of three councils. This was tabled later in the agenda.</p>	
1.6	<p><b>Mayor John Wakefield (JW)</b> arrived at the meeting with the Deputy Mayor of Waverley that he requested be an observer.</p> <p><b>MH</b> noted observers are invited to attend at the Chair’s discretion.</p> <p>The Chairperson in consultation with the members agreed to accept the Waverley Deputy Mayor’s attendance as an observer on this occasion on condition of non participation in the meeting.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Introductions around the room</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who your are?</li> <li>• Who you represent?</li> <li>• Why you want to be here?</li> <li>• Anything else you want to tell the CCC about yourself?</li> </ul>	
2.1	<p><b>MH</b> outlined her role to facilitate the input of all stakeholders and her commitment to authentic community engagement.</p> <p>A press release suggested she is a communications consultant. Community engagement is profession of its own and it not just about communications. The role is to assist the two way exchange between proponents and the community. She is a member of, and trainer for the professional association International Association for Public Participation (IAP2). She works with a range of organisations to help to have community interests represented in decision making. Her consultancy work and training has included the Councils represented on the CCC.</p> <p>In 2013 she provided services to the value of \$480 to Lendlease community engagement staff to review the issues for reporting for their stakeholder engagement database.</p> <p>MH lives in Potts Point.</p> <p><b>Linda Gosling (LG)</b> asked who appoints the Chairperson.</p> <p><b>MH</b> said she is appointed by DPE and paid by Infrastructure NSW (INSW).</p> <p><b>David Gainsford (DG)</b> noted the DPE has a panel of independent chairs for CCCs. Following review of the available chairpersons MH was selected by DPE as being the most suitable person for this role. Once appointed the proponent pays the chair.</p> <p><b>JS</b> reported that the councils are not questioning the competency of MH but there is a perception of conflict of interest regarding previous work for the proponent. This development doesn’t meet standards normally imposed by the City of Sydney. The process needs to be seen as providing rigorous, impartial and consistent oversight.</p> <p><b>JW</b> supported JS’s view. The definition of conflict of interest is in the public’s perception and council view is of a conflict of interest in having</p>	

	<p>worked for Lendlease twice. MH clarified that the second reference was to being the community engagement manager on the Port Botany Terminal Expansion project with Boulderstone, a company that was subsequently purchased by Lendlease.</p> <p><b>MH</b> made her current role clear and asked if the CCC members were comfortable with that.</p> <p><b>DG</b> noted DPE were aware of the concerns that have been expressed and are comfortable there is no conflict of interest in this situation. DPE has responded in writing to the concerns received. If there are further concerns these should be forwarded in writing.</p> <p><b>JW</b> disputed having received a written reply from DPE.</p>	
2.2	<p>The two observers outlined their roles.</p> <p><b>Sandra Spate (SS)</b> is an independent minute taker and has taken notes for CCCs over many years for numerous infrastructure projects including Port Botany Terminal Expansion, Lane Cove tunnel, Enfield Intermodal Terminal and St Catherine's Development.</p> <p><b>DG</b> is Executive Director, DPE and looks after the assessment of major infrastructure projects as part of the assessment team.</p>	
2.3	<p><b>DG</b> outlined the role of the DPE, the structure of the consent and CCC requirements.</p> <p>DPE sets requirements for impact assessment and makes a recommendation to the Minister for Planning. The proponent is INSW and the Minister of Planning is the consent authority.</p> <p>The DPE recommended to the Minister approval of stage 1 which includes the concept proposal and demolition.</p> <p>DPE has received the application for Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements for stage 2 for construction of the new stadium. The EIS is expected soon and with this will include the full range of consultation and notification requirements.</p> <p>DPE has a compliance function outside the assessment team with a team that investigates breaches of approval. They are actively involved in site inspections and following up complaints.</p> <p>Schedule 2 deals with concept approval and parameters for how stage 2 goes ahead. Schedule 3 is around demolition. Some conditions require documents to go to DPE for approval, some go to a certifier and some to neither.</p> <p>Definitions include construction, demolition and demolition soft strip. Construction is a term common to all developments. In this case demolition is a subset of construction. Demolition soft strip works (e.g. removal of seats) can occur without have to comply with all conditions.</p> <p>The Conditions of Approval allow INSW to apply for staging work and DPE has approved staging. The first stage of demolition excludes the concrete crusher and has been approved. The concrete crusher is part of the second stage of demolition and documents relating to that have not yet been submitted.</p> <p><b>Michael Waterhouse (MW)</b> asked for the likely timeframe.</p> <p><b>DG</b> noted there are two steps in the first stage of demolition. It was acknowledged that a challenge in the Land and Environment Court on the concepts and stage one consent has commenced. He will have to take questions around timing on notice given validity of consent is before the courts .</p> <p>The Conditions of Approval require establishment of a CCC. Department guidelines outline functions of CCCs but these are guidelines only. MH</p>	

	<p>was chosen from a panel of independent chairs. CCCs are typically established after approval to provide ongoing dialogue between proponent, community and business.</p> <p>This not the only form of consultation required by the proponent. Conditions require establishment of a project website, ongoing contact with surrounding residents and a phone line for complaints. The CCC is just one of a range of requirements for engaging the community.</p>	
2.4	<p>Other CCC members outlined their background and interest.</p> <p><b>MW</b> has a background in Commonwealth Government and finance, is a nearby resident and also the Chairman of Saving Moore Park Inc. He tabled a note outlining the role of this group. Its objectives include protecting and enhancing the park for future generations. He hopes through the CCC to have an opportunity to look at impacts on the community before decisions are taken. If that doesn't occur, it can't be regarded as meaningful. He invited other CCC members to be included on the Saving Moore Park newsletter email list.</p> <p><b>Vivienne Skinner (VS)</b> is also a member of Saving Moore Park and has been on the Centennial Parklands CCC and is on the Moore Park Trust. She is keen to protect these parklands.</p> <p><b>Tom Jones (TJ)</b> is an urban designer With Woollahra Council and is here to observe. Council has not yet determined a position on the proposal.</p> <p><b>Kathy Neilson (KN)</b> is Mayor of Randwick. Council has great concerns with the proposal and with the lack of consultation. She is disappointed that this meeting is the first time she has seen an effort to communicate.</p> <p><b>Chelsea Ford (CF)</b> is a business woman who lives in Potts Point. Her interest is in enabling the conversation between big and small business to give small business a voice.</p> <p><b>JS</b> is one of ten elected councillors to the City of Sydney (CoS) which is the Local Government Area for the stadium. She is concerned residents and visitors have been left out of the process and that proper processes for major projects are not being followed. She said there are requirements for documents to be submitted to Council (such as Construction and Environment Management Plans and sub plans for noise, traffic, vibration, traffic). These were deemed unacceptable by CoS and she wants to know the requirements on the proponent to address this. CoS doesn't have the usual powers of oversight for this project. She is concerned that council expert staff aren't permitted to attend as observers to advise the councillors attending the meeting.</p> <p>Angus Morten (AM) indicated that comments from Council have been addressed and that updated plans have been submitted back to Council.</p> <p><b>Julie Osborne (JO)</b> is co-chair of the Centennial Park Residents Association which represents surrounding streets. Focus of concern is on vibration, traffic and noise. She is concerned about the impact issues raised by the CoS representative. If there is to be a stadium, she wants surrounding residents to be able to continue to enjoy the area.</p> <p><b>LG</b> represents the Paddington Society on the CCC and is a long time resident of the area. Goals of the society are to protect heritage and amenity. She lives in Regent Street and has seen long term impacts including from the current stadium. Almost all of her neighbours are not in favour of redevelopment. She has concerns that protection of parklands is being diminished and concerns about conflicts between heritage and a huge facility. Visual impacts with streets and apartment</p>	

	<p>overlooking the area and light spills, acoustics, traffic and behaviour are other concerns.</p> <p><b>JW</b> is in his second term as Mayor of Waverley and has served on Council for 15 years. Council provided numerous letters to DPE around traffic and access due to location on a main arterial road and light spill visible from apartments. The loosely articulated shopping component impacts on Bondi Junction. Council has requested traffic studies be presented to them without success until the legal action was threatened. Council was willing to sit down with the Minister but took the extreme step of legal action when he refused. He thinks there has been ungodly haste to convene the CCC through an extraordinary meeting clause which is unprecedented. Integral aspects of the Conditions of Approval are the formation of a CCC and a presentation on the concrete crusher. He expects a presentation tonight on the crusher will be a tick box exercise. He asked that the item of the crusher be postponed till he has the opportunity to pass information on to his Council's technical experts.</p> <p><b>MH</b> noted the formation of the CCC has occurred and this meeting is the first meeting of the CCC. There is an intention to present information about the concrete crusher to the meeting tonight. This is as per the request of at least one CCC member in addition to it being an item for the proponent. <b>MH</b> reiterated that the CCC has an advisory function and conduit between the community and the proponent, it is not a decision making entity.</p> <p><b>AM</b> said while the crusher is an important issue for the community and that information will be presented tonight the contractor is not yet in position to decide on the details of the concrete crusher.</p> <p><b>JW</b> asked whether there is a quorum for the CCC.</p> <p><b>MH</b> replied there is no requirement for a quorum but that all but one member, absent for family issues, are present tonight.</p> <p><b>Sofie Mason- Jones (SMJ)</b> has 15 years experience as a town planner and has lived in the City of Sydney for 20 years. She currently lives at Surry Hills and is on the Centennial Parklands CCC. She sees her role as a conduit between projects and people and hopes to influence decision makers in a positive way. She noted stage 1 is not just for demolition but the building envelope and height. Her concerns are that sunlight be preserved for Moore Park east. She hopes to provide a voice for people in Surry Hills and influence Stage 2.</p> <p><b>Kerrie Mather (KM)</b> is the new CEO for the Sydney Cricket and Sportsground Trust.</p> <p><b>David Riches (DR)</b> heads the projects group in INSW which procures and delivers on behalf of government. He is involved in a range of large and small projects. He was involved in the proponent's application in 2018. A contract was signed late last year by Lendlease for construction and delivery.</p> <p><b>AM</b> is the senior project manager for Lendlease and has worked on the Parramatta Stadium and with that CCC.</p>	
2.5	<p><b>KN</b> asked about numbers of community members on the CCC.</p> <p><b>MH</b> said six of the seven community members are present tonight with an apology from the community member who is actually the closest to site.</p> <p><b>KN</b> suggested this doesn't seem like many community members.</p> <p><b>MH</b> said the CCC operates under DPE guidelines which went out for public consultation and were endorsed two years ago. CCCs that</p>	

	<p>operate under DPE conditions of consent around the State all operate under these guidelines.</p> <p><b>LG</b> asked if all members have equal standing.</p> <p><b>MH</b> replied yes. This is not a decision making body but a consultative body providing feedback from the community. It is a conduit from the community to the proponent.</p> <p><b>JW</b> noted the CCC forms part of the statutory body of conditions of consent.</p> <p><b>JS</b> noted no quorum, no voting or advisory role but a consultative committee. Would it be a valid meeting if no one attended? Why was this meeting accelerated and if it is exercising its function as a CCC meeting?</p> <p><b>DG</b> said the CCC is an advisory committee.</p> <p><b>MH</b> said the meetings wouldn't go ahead if a number of people indicated that they could not attend as with other CCCs she is involved with. There was a request from INSW for an extraordinary meeting. She reiterated that she understands the objection to the stadium and is happy to hear these views but the CCC exists to be a conduit of information to and from the community.</p> <p><b>JW</b> does not consider that this CCC meets the conditions of consent as an extraordinary meeting instead of an ordinary one with four weeks notice and also because Council advisers were not allowed to attend.</p>	
3.	<b>Declarations of pecuniary and other interests</b>	
3.1	<p>Michael Waterhouse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• his super fund has shares with Lendlease</li> <li>• is a member of the SCG trust.</li> </ul> <p>Sofie Mason-Jones is on a wait list for the SCG Trust.</p>	
4.	<b>Correspondence to the CCC</b>	
4.1	<p><b>MH</b> indicated that this is the part of the agenda when we might consider questions and comments from members of the community. These would be submitted to me for the committee. These might be to my email or via <a href="mailto:sfscce@plancom.com.au">sfscce@plancom.com.au</a></p> <p><b>MH</b> tabled correspondence from Jeanette Brokman (community member who is not on the CCC)</p> <p>Content of the email was:</p> <p>"Given the wider community concerns, and that the T &amp; C for the Committee have not been confirmed, ask that the following be tabled to the Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Given the news about the legal proceedings, can the CCC confirm with relevant parties, if major demolition works will commence tomorrow as indicated by the Premier earlier this week, or if this will now be formally postponed?</li> <li>2. Given the CCC does not include representation for a number of suburbs that will be impacted by the SFS redevelopment, please confirm the process to enable community representation and feedback from suburbs not represented.</li> <li>3. Approval for stage 1 indicates that the CCC will be proactively involved in stage 2, however the process for wider community engagement prior to the lodgement of the SSD is not defined. Please advise how the CCC will ensure wider public views are included in any feedback to the government and or Infrastructure NSW." </li></ol>	

	<p><b>MH</b> asked how the committee would like to deal with this correspondence. She reiterated that this was the way for the public to bring items to the CCC through emailing her to come to the CCC.</p> <p><b>SMJ</b> asked if the composition of the CCC has been made public to date and whether it will be.</p> <p><b>MH</b> said it hasn't to date and that this was a matter for discussion of the CCC. She is proposing that names will be published in the CCC minutes but she doesn't envisage more profiling of the names of CCC members.</p> <p><b>MW</b> asked if CCC members names could be mentioned in the Saving Moore Park newsletter. Members agreed to this request.</p> <p><b>JS</b> asked what the answers to the above questions are.</p> <p><b>CF</b> suggested that the answers to these questions might be addressed in the minutes.</p> <p><b>DR</b> said that in relation to <b>question 1</b> the hearing yesterday set further hearing dates of 20, 21 and 22 February. Work will not cease but currently involve soft strip out only. <b>AM</b> advised that Lendlease is not due to do hard demolition till late February. This is our advice at this stage only, not an undertaking. It is not appropriate to comment beyond that.</p> <p><b>JW</b> said in relation to <b>question 2</b> that the Councils do represent the suburbs that will be impacted.</p>	
4.2	<p><b>JW</b> suggested if it is inappropriate to discuss some items in the light of legal case pending that the meeting be deferred and be properly formed with four weeks notice.</p> <p><b>JS</b> asked how legal proceedings will impinge on the work of the committee.</p> <p><b>DG</b> noted many developments go through legal proceedings. These don't defer conditions of consent which remain valid unless the court rules otherwise.</p>	
4.3	<p><b>SMJ</b> noted it is not a requirement of conditions of consent that the CCC view Construction and Environmental Management Plans for demolition. What is the role of the CCC? Can the CCC influence plans?</p> <p><b>JW</b> said the exception is the concrete crusher which is required to be presented. He asked for a firm indication of timelines for hard demolition.</p> <p><b>JS</b> repeated concerns that this is deemed an official meeting to receive presentation of the concrete crusher while legal action is pending.</p> <p><b>MW</b> understands Lendlease and INSW is not planning to provide a report tonight to tick boxes. That would not be meaningful consultation. He sees this as the beginning of consultation. He has raised a number of concerns around the concrete crusher and understands Lendlease and INSW are seeking feedback from the community. The above discussion is putting the cart before the horse.</p>	
5.	<p><b>What we are hearing from the community?</b> <i>(regular item for the future)</i></p> <p><i>Note that this item, at the request of members was returned to at the end of the meeting – it was recognised in advance that there may not be sufficient time to do justice this item at this (first) meeting. In the future it will come at this point in the agenda.</i></p> <p><i>In these particular notes please look to item 10 for the content related to “What we are hearing from the community?”.</i></p>	

5.1	<p><b>JS</b> asked to table a letter sent by the mayors of City of Sydney Council, Randwick City Council and Waverley Council to the Minister for Planning, Anthony Roberts to express councils views that the establishment of the CCC has not been in accordance with Department guidelines and should be delayed until those guidelines are satisfied.</p>	
6.	<p><b>Overview of the CCC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Roles and responsibilities</b></li> <li>• <b>Roles related to the Conditions of Approval</b></li> <li>• <b>Our CCC Terms of Reference</b> – draft to be tabled at this meeting and discussed in detail at the next meeting</li> </ul> <p><b>Questions from members about the CCC operations</b></p> <p><b>Question of sharing email addresses/ contact details</b></p>	
6.1	<p><b>CCC Terms of Reference</b></p> <p>The draft Terms of Reference (ToR) was tabled at the meeting.</p> <p><b>MH</b> suggests members take it away for consideration, provide comments in advance of the next meeting and we have a detailed discussion at that next meeting. The content of the ToR take into account the DPE guidelines for CCCs.</p> <p>She drew attention to the items on pages 2 and 3 of the draft ToR that outline the specific tasks of the CCC in relation to the conditions of consent in stages 1 and 2.</p> <p><b>JS</b> sought clarification that there is no requirement that the CCC endorse the presentations. The proponent seeks advice but gives no undertaking.</p> <p><b>MH</b> replied that the CCCs role is to provide input before the proponent makes final decisions. This is a community consultative committee not a decision making body. She understands there is frustration at the level of influence but the CCC has a role in helping the proponent to learn from the CCC members what may not be acceptable to the community. The CCC conditions of consent expect interaction.</p> <p>There was some discussion around the wording and meaning of the conditions of consent that are outlined in the ToR. They have been reworded to be in a format suitable for the use of the CCC.</p> <p><b>JW</b> noted the ToR is under the PlanCom letterhead.</p> <p><b>MH</b> said the version handed out is a draft for consideration of the CCC. Proposed revisions to wording will be receive from the group.</p> <p><b>JS and JW</b> raised the issue of allowing technical advisers from councils to attend as observers. They feel the community representatives and council respresentatives could benefit from their advice. <b>JS</b> suggested she doesn't have the expertise to take meeting content back to council and would benefit from impartial, detailed advice.</p> <p><b>JW</b> requests Waverley Director of Planning be able to attend.</p>	<p>CCC members will review the Terms of Reference and will be asked to provide feedback a week in advance of the next meeting in preparation for discussion at the meeting.</p>
6.1	<p><b>MH</b> replied this CCC is primarily a forum for consultation between community members and the proponent. Community members are key to this process. She doesn't want community views overshadowed by council experts. Councils have other avenues to work with Lendlease.</p> <p><b>MW</b> - While he doesn't have expertise on technical issues <b>MW</b> doesn't wish to be overwhelmed by people spouting views about decibels. He thinks there will be times when we need expertise and it would be a pity to rule this out but having six people from council will be overwhelming. When considering the concrete crusher it would be</p>	

	<p>useful to have someone from EPA. But we won't require expert advice till we have sorted the ToR.</p> <p><b>MH</b> noted ability under the ToR to call in the required expertise. The Chair has say on observers attending. Experts will be allowed by invitation but there will not be open slather for observers. Once the ToR are in place it is envisaged experts will be invited as required.</p>	
6.2	<p><b>Contact details</b></p> <p><b>MH</b> asked whether the CCC was happy for her to send out open emails or whether people would prefer their email addresses masked.</p> <p>The CCC agreed to open emails among committee members.</p>	
7.	<p><b>Project Overview</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scope</li> <li>• Roles and responsibilities of Lend Lease, The SCG and INSW</li> </ul>	
7.	<p><b>DR</b> presented slides on the scope and roles and responsibilities.</p> <p><b>MW</b> sought assurances (see attachment) on the concrete crusher. He flagged the need for the CCC to have the information necessary for it to make informed judgements. In this regard, it's evident from the EPA's EIS submissions that it had serious misgivings about INSW's views and approach concerning noise and dust. Thus it's important that the EPA be present during presentations on these matters, so the CCC can have the benefit of their expertise.</p> <p><b>AM</b> replied saying Lendlease is currently working through issues around the crusher. A crusher would not usually be enclosed. He is seeking EPA attendance at CCC meetings.</p> <p><b>SMJ</b> referred to conditions B25 and B26 around requirements for the concrete crusher location and design. This is to be presented to the CCC and there is a requirement to include the EPA. She asked what is the ability of the CCC and the EPA to influence the location?</p> <p><b>JO</b> asked whether there will be a presentation tonight and whether this fulfils condition B26.</p> <p><b>DR</b> replied there is a presentation tonight but this does not fulfil condition B26. INSW and Lendlease are looking at a variety of options and seeking feedback from this committee and others such as the NRL, Rugby Union, the SCG. Issues have arisen regarding the environmental impacts and the requirement to house the crusher in an enclosure. The nature of the enclosure would be similar to that used on Sydney Metro which is a large structure and this is of concern. INSW are currently seeking feedback to inform the final decision.</p> <p><b>MW</b> queried how big 90,000 tonnes of concrete aggregate was and where it might be located. He was concerned about the dust that such a pile would generate and sought assurance that a report on this would be discussed by the CCC before a decision is taken.</p> <p><b>DR and AM</b> agreed this would be.</p> <p><b>JW</b> asked when a report could be expected.</p> <p><b>AM</b> replied the draft is currently being developed.</p> <p><b>JS</b> sought confirmation that concrete crusher plans will be put to the CCC at least twice more and that conditions B25 and B26 are not deemed to have been met.</p> <p><b>DR</b> confirmed this is the case. He noted that INSW engaged Lendlease as the contractor late last year. Lendlease has now engaged a demolition subcontractor. INSW is now in a position to influence the contractor and subcontractor but till then was not in a position to provide this information.</p>	

8.	<p><b>Construction update and look ahead</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activity planned in the coming 2 months</li> <li>• Concrete Crushing</li> </ul>	
8.1	<p><b>AM</b> presented a construction update (see attached presentation). The site office has been located at the Sheridan Building. Soft strip demolition is approved and removal of seating and internal fit out commenced after January 30. This is expected to take four to six weeks. At the end of the month (February) major roof structure demolition is expected to begin. Isolation of services will be undertaken in coming weeks.</p> <p><b>DR</b> noted the power substation is at Allianz and there is still live power. The power cut over program is next week.</p>	
8.2	<p><b>LG</b> asked for detail on structure demolition. Would cranes be used?</p> <p><b>AM</b> replied that the soft strip enables furniture removal in coming weeks. The next major demolition is cutting the roof which is done in sections. Once seats are removed it is then lowered on to the bowl, then to the pitch with large excavators.</p> <p><b>JW</b> asked if it is then removed by articulated vehicles (long vehicles with pivot joints).</p> <p><b>AM</b> replied that it is. There is approval under conditions of consent for soft strip removal and full demolition which is expected to commence at the end of the month.</p>	
8.3	<p>Questions were asked about the difference between soft and hard demolition.</p> <p>Soft strip is occurring currently (removal of seats and internal fit out) and major demolition (hard demolition involving the roof and other stadium structures) will commence at the end of February.</p>	
8.4	<p><b>SMJ</b> asked whether all of the demolition subplans had gone to council. She noted evidence is to be provided to DPE of consultation with council and the EPA.</p> <p><b>AM</b> replied that a meeting late last year was held to discuss plans. The process is that plans are issued to council for review, feedback is provided by Council, comments are addressed and actioned where possible. Plans are then reissued to council (<i>they were emailed 29/01/2019</i>).</p> <p><b>JS</b> suggested plans provided to CoS haven't included the updated plans.</p> <p><b>AM</b> noted that plans that are validated by the certifier go to council prior to uploading. Similarly traffic plans to RMS and to council.</p> <p><b>JS</b> indicated that CoS found the plans deficient and asked if she could circulate CoS feedback to the CCC.</p> <p><b>MH</b> said they could be sent to her for circulation.</p> <p><b>SMJ</b> sought confirmation that after consultation with EPA and council the plans are approved by the private certifier then go to DPE for information.</p> <p><b>DG</b> – confirmed this</p>	<p>(a) AM to confirm CoS has received updated plans incorporating feedback.</p> <p>(b) JS to provide CoS feedback on plans to the chair for circulation to the CCC.</p>
8.5	<p><b>Project Overview</b></p> <p><b>DR</b> explained as part of his presentation on the roles and responsibilities that SCG is to be the operator.</p> <p><b>DR</b> reported the roof will be demolished first with a duration of two to three months. Demolition of the concrete frame can't start until after this. It is anticipated the concrete crusher could not start operating until May so there is time to look at how.</p>	

	<p><b>JO</b> asked about the size of the crusher (as per the photo in the presentation).</p> <p><b>AM</b> noted it was needed to work through 90,000 tonnes of concrete &amp; would be in a shed of approx. size 20m x 10m x 8m high &amp; would not contain the stockpiles.</p> <p><b>DR</b> said they needed to look at acoustic and dust suppression in relation to potential impacts on Kippax Lake.</p> <p><b>MW</b> asked if they would investigate crushing off-site.</p> <p><b>AM</b> said this will be looked at.</p> <p><b>JO</b> suggested there will be a lot of noise and dust associated with the crusher.</p> <p><b>AM</b> said this is not inconsistent with other city demolition jobs.</p> <p><b>MW</b> noted proximity to residents unlike other city jobs.</p> <p><b>DR</b> said they originally contemplated the crusher on site to recycle as much material on site as they could but are not convinced the benefits warrant the problems.</p> <p><b>AM</b> said on site crushing would decrease truck movements and this worked well at Parramatta but environmental issues have raised concerns. There was no acoustic enclosure at Parramatta. If the concerns can't be addressed other solutions will need to be investigated.</p> <p><b>DR</b> said the stockpile would take up much of the MP1 carpark which is a problem as the site offices need to go there.</p> <p><b>SMJ</b> asked how long would the crusher operate.</p> <p><b>AM</b> replied roughly four months.</p>	
8.6	<p><b>SMJ</b> asked what hours of operation would be.</p> <p><b>AM</b> said standard hours of operation apply, 7am to 6pm weekdays and 8am to 1pm Saturdays but with respite periods. Noise monitors will be installed.</p>	
8.7	<p><b>JW</b> asked about management of the stockpile. It is a large scale hose down. There is pre crushed and post.</p> <p><b>AM</b> noted the stockpile wouldn't be housed in a shed but that environmental measures will be in place.</p> <p><b>JS</b> asked the potential size of the stockpile and what protection will be in place.</p> <p><b>AM</b> replied there are a lot of factors still to be determined. Demolition will produce 90,000 tonnes of concrete (this is approximately the size of a football pitch and 10m high). It may be that not all material is kept on site. Some would be used as piling mats (<i>the base for a piling rig</i>) and consumed early in the process. At Parramatta none of the material was moved off site. Lendlease will try and store what can be used on site.</p> <p><b>TJ</b> suggested there was considerable environmental impact if that amount of aggregate is to be move off-site. There are two sides of the environmental considerations given this type of material usually travels around 100 kms. He noted a lot amenity issues with excavation that has occurred in Woollahra.</p> <p><b>JW</b> suggested engineers could work out broad volumes and throughput. It is unlikely all would be used. Some containing steel is likely to be removed.</p> <p><b>AM</b> said it depends how thick the piling mat would be and this depends on ground conditions. This will be known shortly.</p>	

8.8	<p><b>JS</b> asked where the stockpile is planned to be stored.</p> <p><b>AM</b> replied this needs to be finalised when they determine how much.</p> <p><b>JO</b> asked whether storage will be on parkland.</p> <p><b>DR</b> said it wouldn't. Everything will be on site.</p>	
8.9	<p><b>VS</b> asked for a timeframe for clarifying these unknowns.</p> <p><b>DR</b> replied this will be known over coming weeks, likely by the next CCC.</p>	
8.10	<p><b>SMJ</b> asked whether the subplans are required to be submitted to EPA and councils for the extraction of materials from the concrete crusher.</p> <p>This was confirmed.</p> <p><b>SMJ</b> asked about the date for lodgement of the Stage 2 application, given the SEARS have already been applied for.</p> <p><b>DG</b> said the application date is taken as when the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is lodged.</p> <p><b>DR</b> said an indicative time for this application is April.</p>	
8.11	<p><b>LG</b> asked whether the foundations are being excavated.</p> <p><b>AM</b> said the slab is being removed but no ground excavation. Existing piles will stay and the detailed excavation is part of a future stage 2 application.</p>	
9.	<p><b>Timing of future meetings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best day/ time for the group</li> <li>• Next meeting potentially the week commencing 4 March</li> </ul>	
9.1	<p>There was consensus that meetings generally be held on Wednesdays at 5.30pm. The next meeting was agreed to be Wednesday 6 March at 5.30pm based on the availability of all those at the meeting.</p> <p><b>SMJ</b> noted April 2019 for possible submission of the Stage 2 EIS. A number of the consent conditions related to Stage 2 require the subplans to come to the CCC for information. Can copies be provided 2-3 days before the CCC meetings?</p> <p><b>DR</b> does not expect draft reports before the March meeting. Stage 2 DA documents can be provided before a presentation. Presentations prior to exhibition have been helpful to other CCCs.</p> <p><b>AM</b> said there will be a presentation on the concrete crusher at the March meeting.</p>	<p>INSW to provide Stage 2 documents to the CCC prior to a presentation at the April meeting.</p>
10.	<p><b>Round the table with final questions/ comments</b></p>	
10.1	<p><b>MW</b> has forwarded to the CCC a document of issues and questions around the concrete crusher, noise and dust, air and water quality (attached to minutes). He asked that issues be addressed at the next meeting with answers linked back to his questions. EPA appears less than happy with responses from INSW and he requests EPA attend the next meeting.</p> <p><b>AM</b> said these questions will be addressed in a report at the next meeting. He has contacted EPA and makes a commitment to try and get them to attend the next meeting.</p>	<p>(a) SS and MH to attach questions from MW to the minutes.</p> <p>(b) Question raised by MW to be addressed at the next meeting.</p> <p>(c) AM to request EPA attend the next CCC meeting.</p>
10.2	<p><b>MH</b> noted minutes as prepared by SS go back to MH who checks and forwards them to the proponent. They are then sent to the CCC for comment. When finalised they are placed on the INSW project website.</p>	

10.3	<p><b>SMJ</b> is pleased to hear of the requirement for the CCC but the conditions of consent don't seem to ensure consultation with the community prior to decisions. She would like to know how much the CCC can influence decisions and provide meaningful input. The CCC represents people living around here and she hopes it has some ability to influence things in positive way for the best outcome for the community and the environment not just to receive presentations.</p>	
10.4	<p><b>JW</b> noted concerns around the formation of the CCC, adherence to hours of work, dust minimisation and noise. He has respect for Lendlease and expects they will adhere to conditions of consent. He has respect for the Chair's competency and expertise and apologises if he previously seemed over prickly but he would be remiss if he didn't raise these issues. He regards this committee as eyes and ears on the ground. Waverley Council will continue to have either himself or a staff member in attendance and will be active participants in a proper way irrespective of concerns currently being thrashed out in court.</p>	
10.5	<p><b>LG</b> has concerns around Busby's Bore due to its location near the stockpile and potential impacts of the crusher in relation to dust and weight. She has particular concerns around heritage and understands there is a report which would be good to see. The community would like to be assured of protection of the bore from vibration and load.</p> <p><b>AM</b> said their geotech team will undertake investigations and protection of Busby's Bore is part of the conditions of consent.</p> <p><b>DR</b> reported there has been collaboration with Sydney Water as it is their asset. Their heritage officer has been on site and while it is hard to determine in drought they think they can resolve issues of the location and depth with Sydney Water. There will be vibration monitors at the bore.</p>	
10.6	<p><b>LG</b> asked when the stage 2 DA is open for submissions.</p> <p><b>DR</b> replied the EIS is due to DPE towards the end of April.</p> <p><b>DG</b> said if DPE receives the EIS at the end of April it will then go through the document by potentially mid May. It then goes back to INSW and then to exhibition for a minimum of 28 days.</p> <p><b>LG</b> asked if ancillary buildings will be demolished. If so, what is the plan for those facilities and what will be the future location of current activities. People are worried about this.</p> <p><b>DR</b> reported that the SCG and other tenants will be temporarily moved to the entertainment quarter.</p> <p><b>KM</b> noted that the Swans move would be permanent. Sydney FC are considering its options.</p> <p><b>LG</b> asked if the community can see overall plans including facilities being demolished.</p> <p><b>DR</b> noted the SCG are currently having conversations with various users of facilities.</p> <p><b>KM</b> advised that this info on ancillary functions would be clear in the Stage 2 Building DA.</p>	
10.7	<p><b>SMJ</b> noted the photomontages prepared to obtain approval for the building envelope were taken from under the Tibby Cotter bridge or footpath along Driver Ave and not from around Kippax Lake. They don't show intrusiveness into the parklands. The EIS for Stage 1 indicated a requirement for the field of play sunlight to be preserved at the SCG . Can the same approach be applied to sunlight on Moore Park East to limit impact on parklands?</p>	

10.8	<p><b>JO</b> said the local community is jaded from the experience with light rail. There have been vibration impacts on surrounding houses. This was monitored then the impact denied. People are not happy. She wouldn't want to see this occurring with this project.</p> <p><b>JS</b> reported similar problems with WestConnex with cracking impacts denied. She asked whether residents here have had dilapidation reports.</p> <p><b>AM</b> said immediately adjacent properties have had dilapidation reports. <b>JS</b> asked whether this included the residents across the road.</p> <p><b>AM</b> said they weren't included. It includes Fox studios, this building and public assets such as footpaths.</p> <p><b>JS</b> said it is a significant issue that houses such as those at Oatley &amp; Moore Park Rds aren't included. Some of these houses are terraces so it's like a set of dominoes. The fact that no residents are included in dilapidation reports is a concern. People are consulted but have no power and increasingly lack faith in government processes.</p> <p><b>JO</b> said some houses sit on sand which is an issue. She is also concerned about Poate, Furber and Cook Roads and the need for dilapidation reports.</p>	
10.9	<p><b>JS</b> said other than lack of dilapidation, air quality is a huge issue. Although cutting is within the stadium, concrete dust is an issue once the stadium is cut up. There is a condition of consent to stop cutting two hours prior to a game. This doesn't take into account impacts on people training and other health impacts. Another issue is the land grab of parklands which have been reduced to third of land originally set aside. People are upset. Dilapidation is a key issue.</p>	
10.10	<p><b>CF</b> voiced three main issues as a business owner.</p> <p>Firstly, after the experience of light rail and Westconnex, timeliness and efficiency of the project within a reasonable timeframe. George St is nowhere near its time line. Stress imbues a lack of trust, powerlessness and anger in the business community.</p> <p>Secondly, speak plain English. Part of tonight's meeting has been spent trying to understand what people are saying.</p> <p>Thirdly, make it easy for people to continue to work. Shop in the area, don't abandon businesses. More people now work from home so noise impacts and threat to internet connectivity are issues.</p>	
10.11	<p><b>KN</b> noted a major concern with the CCC is lack of time for feedback to residents and time to hear from them and balance information. She looks forward to the next meeting, but presentations need to allow us to take these to the wider community we represent.</p> <p><b>MH</b> noted again the need for weightier presentations at the first few meetings for people to learn about the project then there is more shift to learning from the community based on the proposed approaches.</p> <p><b>KN</b> suggested other committees have started at an earlier stage with more genuine opportunity including input from specialists.</p>	
10.12	<p><b>TJ</b> reported that Woollahra Council doesn't have a position yet but is interested in the project. There is notice of motion next week. There has been lively discussion and residents represented by council have an interest.</p>	
10.13	<p><b>VS</b> said there is almost universal deep opposition to the proposal even from her sport loving neighbours. They assume the CCC is a box ticking exercise and she hopes she can counter this view. She will communicate</p>	

	<p>with members of the Saving Moore Park group. A survey with 400 responses had only one response in favour of the proposal. The brief note on the survey responses is attached to these minutes.</p> <p><b>MW</b> noted the high response rate of 400 shows the importance the community attaches to Moore Park. If impacts on wildlife and users aren't managed carefully the proponents can expect vocal criticism as the project unfolds. There is frustration that INSW looks at issues solely in terms of the site but impacts go well beyond the boundary. The failure to do any dilapidation reports for residents across the road from the Stadium (as per 10.8) is another example of INSW only looking at impacts within the site boundary.</p>	
10.14	<p><b>JO</b> supports comments about staging and the inability of the community to see the whole plan. People are not happy. This leads to suspicion not just about location of buildings but the size of the stadium. People are keen to understand and review impacts. At the moment people don't know and are throwing out all kinds of speculation about scale and light spill.</p> <p><b>DR</b> noted there will be a presentation to the CCC in early April including the input of expert advice.</p>	
10.15	<p>The committee agreed to direct residents to the email address <a href="mailto:sfscce@plancom.com.au">sfscce@plancom.com.au</a> to communicate to the CCC.</p> <p>Matters/document to be circulated to the entire CCC should be directed via MH to help manage and control communications.</p> <p><b>MW</b> noted community members need other avenues for when things go wrong such as noise and dust.</p> <p><b>AM</b> said there is a complaints phone number and an email address advertised on the website and this is on hoarding.</p> <p><b>MH</b> noted there will be a report on complaints on the agenda at each meeting and these complaints are also published on the website via the link that was sent to the CCC last week.</p> <p><b>MW</b> asked whether there is means to alert the CCC members if there are new postings on the INSW website?</p>	<p>Lendlease/INSW to investigate ways to alert CCC members of new postings on the website.</p>
10.16	<p><b>JS</b> asked whether a dilapidation report had been done for Victoria Barracks.</p> <p><b>AM</b> - it hasn't.</p> <p><b>JS</b> considers that this a significant issue.</p>	
	<p><b>Close:</b> The meeting closed at 9:00pm</p>	

Attachment 1. Concerns forwarded by MW

## **Community Concerns re Noise and Dust**

### **Concrete Crusher: Location**

The concrete crusher should not be located close to the western boundary of the site compound facing Moore Park, but

- (a) within the stadium shell, as originally proposed by INSW, or
- (b) In the existing swimming pool, or
- (c) close to the Arthur Morris gates.

We seek INSW's assurance that when it has evaluated the various options and come to a view about where the concrete crusher should be located, a report will be provided to the CCC before a final decision is taken. This will provide the CCC with an opportunity to discuss the preferred location, so that members can record their views on this and other optional locations.

### **Noise**

We seek INSW's assurance that

- (a) the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Construction Noise and Vibration Management Sub-plan (CNVMS) will be prepared in accordance with Condition B12.
- (b) Once INSW comes to a view about where the concrete crusher should be located, it will provide the CCC with a detailed assessment of potential noise impacts on residents, Moore Park users and wildlife in and around the Kippax Lake area.
- (c) The EPA will be represented at the CCC's discussion of that report.
- (d) Any reservations the EPA has regarding noise impacts associated with the final decision will be recorded in the CNVMS.
- (e) the CEMP will be provided to the CCC for discussion before demolition commences.

### **Dust: air quality and water runoff**

We seek INSW's assurance that, in addition to our request above regarding the CEMP,

- (a) the Air Quality Sub-Plan and the Soil and Water Management Plan will be provided to the CCC for discussion before demolition commences, with the EPA in attendance.
- (b) Any reservations the EPA has regarding noise impacts associated with the final decision will be recorded in the CNVMS.

### Some Questions for the CCC

#### Obligation to Minimise Harm to the Environment

1. S2. 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?
2. Will independent environmental audits (S3. C51-53 Page 36) and INSW responses be provided to the CCC?

#### Discussion of Plans by the CCC

1. Towards the end of the Conditions of Consent document Ethos Urban indicates a detailed Demolition and Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) is to be prepared by Lend Lease (page 4, S1-CM1). Is this the same as the Construction Environmental Management Plan? If so, why are the items to be included different? If different, will this be provided to and discussed by the CCC?
2. Is it proposed that the various planning approval documents for which Margaret Harvie provided links in her email of 3 February will be listed for discussion by the CCC at a future meeting or will CCC consideration be on an exception basis, where someone wishes to raise an issue?
3. When will the CCC be presented with a report and management plan for Busby's Bore?
4. The City of Sydney requested a detailed methodology for the mitigation of dust impacts. Has this been provided? Can it be provided to and discussed by the CCC?

#### Communications with the community

1. Margaret Harvie has advised that the community can communicate to the CCC via [sfscce@plancom.com.au](mailto:sfscce@plancom.com.au) and such communications will be dealt with under Correspondence at CCC meetings. This is fine for non-time critical issues. However, will a dedicated phone line/email address also be provided which the community can use to contact a Responsible Person as and when there are operational issues about which they wish to express concerns and where some action is required? Will a record be kept of such issues and a report provided monthly to the CCC?

#### Notifications to CCC

1. Various actions have to be completed before the commencement of construction (ie. demolition) eg Schedule 3 A20 (page 21), B3 (page 23), B6 (page 23). Will the CCC be advised when these have been done and demolition is to begin?
2. Would it be possible for CCC members to be notified whenever document(s) are added to the INSW SFS Redevelopment project website?

#### Timetable

Stage	Indicative Timing
Stage 1: Site establishment	January 2019
Stage 1: Demolition of ancillary buildings (exc. Cricket NSW)	February 2019 – May 2019
Stage 1: Demolition of Cricket NSW building and indoor wickets	September 2019 – October 2019
Stage 1: Demolition of Sydney Football Stadium Roof	January 2019 – July 2019
Stage 1: Demolition of Sydney Football Stadium Structure	January 2019 – December 2019
Stage 2: Construction of new stadium (subject to further detail in Stage 2 planning application)	October 2019 – June 2021
Stage 2: Testing and commissioning (subject to further detail in Stage 2 planning application)	June 2021 – February 2022
Stage 2: Commencement of stadium operation	March 2022

3. This high level timetable was produced by INSW. It would be helpful for the Committee's understanding of progress if INSW could provide members with a timetable for different steps within Stage 1? For example, we need to know when the report on the siting, design and operation of the concrete crusher is expected to be presented to the Committee, when it will begin operating, when it's expected to complete its work, etc.

### **Participation of Centennial Park & Moore Park Trust representative**

1. 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? This will also be important in Stage 2, when the Moore Park Master Plan integration issues will be addressed?

Attachment 3: From MW

### **What we are hearing from the community?**

Saving Moore Park survey regarding Moore Park; closed off at end of January.

Didn't have as a focus the impact of the demolition of the SFS and construction of a new stadium. More than 400 responses which in itself says a lot about the importance the community attaches to the Park.

You can take a line through these as to how people will react if the demolition process impacts unduly on the Park's users and wildlife.

Still sifting through responses. However a few things stand out:

- Need to protect the last vestiges of open space of this kind for our children and future generations.
- Protecting the "lungs of the city" as well as an invaluable environment for bird, animal and plant life. Would London consider carving up Hyde Park? Would New York consider carving up Central Park? No! Why do we constantly have to fight the NSW Govt to protect valuable Moore Park?
- Moore Park should be protected as valuable green space in our community, not treated like free land for developers or used for car parking.
- Acknowledge that large cities need open green space and public areas for many reasons. These are precious and will never be returned if once destroyed.
- Too much of the park was sacrificed for the likely dud SLR, and the SCG Trust is now wanting to take over much of Moore Park to support the expanded activities of the proposed new stadium.

Saving Moore Park Inc.  
7 February 2019