

Meeting Notes - Sydney Football Stadium Community Consultative Committee (CCC) Meeting No. 3, Wednesday 10 April – 5.30 pm – 9.15 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, Vivienne Skinner, Michael Waterhouse, Robert Postema.

Local Government representative: Cr Philip Thalys (City of Sydney Council), Deputy Mayor Dominic Wy Kanak (Waverley Council), Mayor Kathy Neilson (Randwick City Council).

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

Note taker: Sandra Spate

Guests: David Gainsford, Executive Director, Department of Planning and Environment, Tom Kennedy, Planning - INSW.

Guest speakers: Russell Lee, Cox Architecture; Jess Hodge, Aspect Studios; Kit Bullas, Aspect Studios; Tom Aubusson, Acoustic Logic; Tracey Hau, SJB; Nic Hall, Wilkinson Murray;

Apologies: Julie Osborne

Item no.	Description	Actions/Who by
1.	Welcome, apologies	
1.1	The Chair acknowledged we are meeting on Aboriginal land and paid respects to Elders past and present.	
1.2	Margaret Harvie (MH) noted that with respect to the presentations that are part of Conditions of Consent additional considerations/ issues can be forwarded to her by email within a week of the meeting. MH will collate the information from the minutes and the additional input received from CCC members and will send this back to CCC members for their further feedback prior to providing this as input to INSW to help shape the Stage 2 documentation. Additional input is due in one week (by Wednesday 17 April).	
1.3	MH clarified processes around actions from meetings. It needs to be clear at the meeting that an action is requested. MH will indicate an action to the note taker. Once an action has been triggered, we will try not to revisit the discussion at that meeting.	
2.	Introductions as required	
2.1	MH noted experts would attend at different times during the meeting to present on various matters.	
3.	Declarations of pecuniary and other interests	
	Michael Waterhouse (MW) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> His super fund has shares with Lendlease Is a member of the SCG trust Sofie Mason-Jones (SMJ) is on a wait list for the SCG Trust	
4.	Noise and Vibration Presentation by Acoustic Logic and discussion - Tom Aubusson (TA) <i>Copy of presentation to be forwarded</i>	

4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project noise limits for residential areas of 75 decibels (dB). • LEQ (Less than or equal to) average is over 15 minutes. (note that The Leq is best described as the average sound level over the period of the measurement.) • A bus or truck may spike at 105 dB, but average road noise is 70 to 75dB. • The project noise levels are therefore about the same as traffic noise levels. 	
4.2	<p>Questions raised by CCC members and responses.</p> <p>Q. Is this cumulative, 75dB from the project added to the existing noises? A. No, it identifies any exceedance over 75dB.</p> <p>Q. Is there any monitoring on the other side of Moore Park Road? A. Yes, at the child care centre at Oatley Street. The others are on site. Only one is required across the road as all residents are equidistant from site.</p> <p>Q. Is there a noise monitor Kippax Lake? A. Not currently. Kippax Lake is further away than most noise sensitive receivers and monitors comply with Conditions of Consent. However, noise monitors can be moved.</p> <p>Q. What is the likely duration of current noise levels from demolition? How much quieter will it be after demolition? A. Demolition, usually the noisiest activity, is expected to finish around September. After that construction is usually 5dB less than demolition.</p> <p>Q. Are 80 truck movements per day within the 75dB? A. 80 truck movements a day is about 60dB LEG average.</p> <p>Q. Does the noise plan specify times for extreme noise events such as occurred yesterday? A. Times aren't specified but there are respite periods. Yesterday was roof removal. The next section will come off next week. These are the two biggest noise generating events.</p> <p>Q. Can demolition activities and noise impacts be plotted between now and September? A. The graph in the Noise Management Plan indicates predicted noise levels from various activities. Predicted noise levels were around 62, 63dB but recorded levels are less.</p> <p>There have been no exceedances to date.</p> <p>Demolition of the roof is expected to be complete next week. Jackhammering of concrete and removal is expected to be a consistent activity for the next few months after this.</p> <p>Q. What is the process for noise complaints? Have there been complaints? Has the consent authority received complaints? A. There is an email address and complaints phone number . There have been no noise complaints logged but one dust complaint. Noise monitoring is live and continuous. If levels come close to exceedance Lendlease is notified immediately. (The Department of Planning confirmed later during the meeting it had not received noise complaints.)</p> <p>Q. Are noise monitoring results available to the public? A. Noise levels are included in fortnightly monitoring reports. Lendlease reports to the Department of Planning (DPE) and is required to confirm there</p>	<p>(a). INSW/LL to consider placing notices on the website for particular noisy events e.g. to notify this current period that the community may hear loud noises due to roof removal.</p> <p>(b). A schedule of noisy activities to be provided on the website and to the CCC.</p> <p>(c). INSW/LL to consider noise monitoring at Kippax Lake.</p>

	<p>are no exceedances. They are required to notify the Department within 48 hours if exceedances occur and there is an automatic notification to the Department and the CCC.</p> <p>Q. Are there other criteria for noise such as low frequency noise? Different frequencies have nuisance value.</p> <p>A. There is no detail yet on excavation as part of Stage 2. There won't be deep excavation. For intermittent noise there is a modifying factor of 5dB, but this is not used in demolition.</p>	
4.3	<p>Other concerns/issues.</p> <p>Location of monitors including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impacts on sensitive wildlife around Kippax Lake. If monitoring is not occurring, there how do we know whether there is a problem? Conditions of Consent say all feasible and reasonable measures be undertaken to minimise harm on the environment. On this basis a noise monitor should be installed at Kippax Lake. • Potential of noise impacts further away from monitors. Sometimes noise levels from matches are worse uphill from the stadium than closer to the source. • Impacts on cricket net area next to Driver Avenue. <p>Feeling that there is underestimation of impacts on the community including need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consider average noise over an hour, e.g. with 10 truck movements an hour. • notify for particularly noisy events • consider noise impacts from jack hammering, breaking up concrete. 	
4.4	<p>Responses from INSW/ consultant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location of monitors can be reconsidered, and monitors moved. • There are limited studies on impacts of noise on wildlife and there are no standard criteria for measuring this. Measures are based on land use. Kippax Lake is listed as a passive recreation area where 65dBa criteria could apply. <i>(Note the conditions of consent state that works must not exceed 75dBA)</i> • Residents are expected to be shielded from some noise impacts which will be contained within the bowl and activities such as breaking up concrete shielded by buildings. 	
4.5	<p>Vibration – Angus Morten (AM) and TA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vibration monitoring at Busby's Bore recorded a couple of exceedances of around 3mm. Heritage consultants were called to undertake inspections and ensure no damage. • There have been no exceedances near residential areas. 	
4.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MW noted previous correspondence from a resident about the impact of vibration on 140 year old houses built on sand. It is important to communicate that the concerns are being heard. Assurances need to be communicated to the community. • TA and AM noted movement of barely 5mm at Busby's Bore means that at the distance of 40m on the other side of Moore Park Road levels wouldn't approach this. • MH has responded to all correspondence but received no further communications. She is happy to pass on assurances but will provide assurances to the community more generally. 	<p>INSW to provide in the next community newsletter information about experiences to date with vibration monitoring.</p>

5	Presentation on the proposed approach to dilapidation – Angus Morten	
5.1	David Riches (DR) and AM reported residents in the CoS dilapidation zone have been approached. Of the 35 properties approached 15 of these have requested dilapidation reports and these will occur over coming weeks. Offers were for external inspection, visuals of fence and property, or internal inspections. Most requests were for internal. Requests went to property addresses.	
	<p>Community members viewed this as a good result.</p> <p>Concerns were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That notices may have gone to leaseholders rather than owners. • That other properties on truck routes may be affected. • That this is occurring only at the insistence of this committee. <p>Residents had different views on the importance of these surveys to that foreseen. Lessons such as this should be used to alert future infrastructure projects to be more responsive to the community concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That a lot of time in these meetings has been spent to get to the point of having dilapidations reports. It would be good if there were guidelines around this activity for the benefit of future projects. <p>AM noted if it had been a condition of consent it would have been done but it hadn't been viewed as necessary.</p> <p>David Gainsford (DG) noted the Department of Planning doesn't specify a distance for the reports. A general rule of thumb is 50m, but it is not for the Department to make that judgement. It depends on a range of factors and risk assessment as part of the EIS. Also, in response to the community as has resulted from this process.</p>	<p>(a) The CCC requests that INSW seek from CoS ratepayer details for the CoS dilapidation zone so they can be contacted with respect to dilapidation surveys.</p> <p>(b) Request that INSW/DPE document the experience around the community's desire for dilapidation reports as a lesson learned for future projects.</p>
6.	<p>Competitive Design Alternatives Presentation – David Riches</p> <p>Related to Schedule 2, Condition B6</p> <p><i>Copy of the PPT presentation made available to the CCC in advance of the meeting</i></p>	
6.1	DR noted the requirement of the City of Sydney LEP for a design competition to ensure design excellence.	
6.2	<p>Questions and answers.</p> <p>Q. Were participants in the design competition provided with a budget for the stadium?</p> <p>A. Yes and entrants were also paid for their entries.</p> <p>Q. Why was Cox chosen?</p> <p>A. It was based on the report of the jury.</p> <p>Q. Can we see the jury report and the other entries?</p> <p>A. It is confidential.</p> <p>Q. Concerns have been raised around the absence of roofing over the whole stadium. Were proponents required to tender on this type of roof? Did all designs have the same roofline?</p> <p>A. The brief was for a roof to the drip line. This was based on costings and budget. Roof line of all designs was within a couple of metres of each other.</p>	

6.3	<p>Other concerns/issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reservations from the community about height and profile. • If INSW paid for the designs surely it is their intellectual property and they have the right to make these available <p>Responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsuccessful bidders asked for, and received permission to publish their designs on their own websites. <i>(PT searched during the meeting and could not find the entry on the website of a runner-up)</i> 	
7.	<p>Architectural Presentation – Cox Architecture - Russell Lee (RL) <i>Copy of the PPT presentation made available to the CCC in advance of the meeting</i></p>	
7.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roof extends to the edge of the seat line in the most efficient way, reducing the amount of material and keeping height down. • The spans are double the current, 60m vs 30m, and lighter, using less steel. • The East and West sections accommodate more seating than North and South. 	
7.2	<p>Questions and answers</p> <p>Q. Does the roof cover all seats? A. It covers all seats as opposed to 60% in the previous stadium.</p> <p>Q. What is the height compared to the previous stadium? A. It is no higher than the top of the current masts and ½ metre below the approved envelope of RL 85.</p> <p>Q. It is bulkier than the previous stadium and why has the northern end little covering of seating which would mitigate impacts on Paddington? A. We are trying to mitigate acoustic impacts on Paddington. A 25m high wall is needed to mitigate impacts along Moore Park Road. The roof is the lowest it could be within the constraints. There are two levels of seating on the northern and southern sides and three on the east and west. The envelope has been pulled in and there is more external circulation and more entry points.</p> <p>Q. How far south has the footprint moved? A. It is 5m further south from the existing with 15m minimum clear all round.</p> <p>Q. To comply with international rugby code guidelines doesn't it need to be 30m? Are crowd crush and terrorism guidelines separate? A. There are recommendations for offsets for security at major events. For Olympic events no vehicles within 100m and a 50m offset for pedestrians. This stadium can't meet those. If there is a major international event these risks will need to be managed. It has been sent to the UK for a compliance audit by the eminent authority on sports grounds and it satisfies their standards. It meets UK Green Guide standards. There is a degree of closure by gates near the SCG for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) requirements. On event days the area around the stadium is opened up with access and activation in the northern area.</p> <p>Q. How does 85m height compare to the existing. A. It is to the top of the existing masts.</p> <p>Q. Why is the envelope so big? It currently sits well below Moore Park Road. What is accommodation inside building? Can a section view be provided to give a better understanding?</p>	<p>(a). The CCC requests INSW provide shadow diagrams comparing the proposal to the current stadium.</p> <p>(b). INSW to provide numbers for public seating, members and corporate seating.</p>

	<p>A. The new SFS is four levels like the previous stadium. Levels one and two are general public and some members seating. Level three is media and public corporate seating. Level four is public and member seating. The Stage 2 EIS will include all plans.</p> <p>Q. Can we see the plans before the DA is lodged? Otherwise we don't have sufficient time for meaningful comment.</p> <p>A. Lodgement is early June. It will be on exhibition early to mid June. There is a process of pre-lodgement consultation which includes the CCC and then broader public consultation such as drop in centres with the exhibition. It can come back to the CCC for another presentation.</p> <p>Q. How has the gross floor area and seating numbers changed?</p> <p>A. Seating numbers are similar but there are more generous facilities, circulation and more toilets. The gross floor area has doubled.</p> <p>Q. Has the Green Building Council been contacted?</p> <p>A. Yes. They have confirmed there is now a rating tool which was not in existence at the start. They are putting something to INSW in coming days.</p> <p>Q. Does the design cater for music and concerts as well as sport?</p> <p>A. It is primarily for sports but can cater for music, concerts, community and other events.</p> <p>Q. Do amenities meet international standards?</p> <p>A. They meet the Football Advisory Council UK standards.</p> <p>Q. Is the point of the project to increase the corporate space, and by how much?</p> <p>A. There are a similar number of corporate suites and reserves. It is not the number but the deployment for different experiences.</p> <p>Q. Will there be more for the general public other than additional toilets? Will there be more or less public seating?</p> <p><i>Question taken on notice - While overall capacity is the same a reallocation of reserved areas has increased public seating.</i></p>	
7.3	<p>Concern</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seating capacity hasn't increased yet this was the primary justification for the increase in height. <p>Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current stadium is on three levels. • There will now be four levels at the east and west. There is a segregated members' level and dedicated media and corporate function on level 3. • Media facilities have been an issue previously. • Extra steps have meant extra height. • Seats have been brought closer to the field of play by choosing a steep seating rake of 34 degrees. This accelerates height. <p>Other concerns/issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surely it would have been possible for architects to make internal changes to the existing. • A retractable roof would have been preferable. • Desire to understand how shadowing from the existing stadium compares to the shadowing from the new stadium and that this be shown for a more meaningful understanding of impacts. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A member noted that this information was in Stage 1 approval. (reference to this information to be sought) * 	
7.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MW presented photographs taken from the opposite side of Kippax Lake comparing the current view of the stadium to what is proposed (see photos attached to these meeting notes). He noted the dominant nature of the proposal and impacts on passive recreation at Kippax Lake. It is visually imposing and there will be visual, and sound impacts from the large screen. If there is to be a large screen it should face MP1 (the car park) PT said the scale to Paddington is more jarring. Currently the stadium dips to Moore Park Road and the sky can be seen through the masts. The new stadium is solid. It is much bigger but with no increase in seating. <p>Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RL indicated the height is partly due to the entrance level. It currently arrives half a level down. There is only a 300 sq. m LED screen over the SW entry that is incorporated into the overall façade screen. It is likely to be used in a similar fashion to now as part of the pre-match and during the game, not continuous. 	
	Break and refreshments	
8.	<p>Landscape Presentation – Aspect Studios - Jess Hodge (JH) and Tracey Hau (TH)</p> <p>Including review of the Moore Park Masterplan 2040 - Schedule 2, condition B13</p> <p><i>Copy of the PPT presentation made available to the CCC in advance of the meeting</i></p>	
8.1	<p>Key points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An aim to make the public domain green, comfortable and permeable and to respond to the context. Welcome people with seamless connection. The public concourse is lifted to Moore Park Road eliminating the need for fences and walls. 270 degrees of public access. Key entry points such as Moore Park steps are community gathering places. 	
8.2	<p>Questions and answers</p> <p>Q. What trees will be used? A. A range of trees, predominantly native, some large scale and others smaller, some deciduous to allow sunlight in winter.</p> <p>Q. How does Moore Park steps improve pedestrian flow? The current arrangement is at grade. Won't steps slow the flow? The current access at grade is inviting and in harmony with Kippax Lake. What is the driver for stairs? A. The Moore Park Masterplan identified Driver Avenue as a cycle connection. The stairs are wider than the current ramp of which only the central portion is used. The external concourse is level with Moore Park Road. There is easy access to the concourse. The existing ramp from Driver Avenue goes half way then stairs into the building. Most public seating is in the northwest corner and will come in at grade level.</p> <p>Q. Why is there not easy access to all accommodation instead of stairs?</p>	

	<p>A. The design doesn't allow for access flush to the road. There is provision of a lift for access.</p> <p>Q. What is the height increase?</p> <p>A. 6m</p> <p>Q. Is water flow stored and re-used?</p> <p>A. Rainwater facilities are included in the footprint of the stadium and will be used to flush toilets and irrigate the stadium planting.</p> <p>Q. Is the playing field permeable as there used to be flooding and there are still storm water issues?</p> <p>A. There is real grass with no structure or concrete underneath.</p> <p>Q. Regarding 270 degree public access, what is the reason for closure of the rest?</p> <p>A. There is no where to go till there are future links to Fox Studios and Entertainment Quarter. Currently it is considered unsafe access due to lack of passive surveillance</p> <p>Q. Will Busby's Bore be further preserved as part of this project? Is it sealed and can it be used for storm water? Is there any part of it that can viewed?</p> <p>A. Though INSW would like to celebrate the bore (visually) investigations to 12m haven't revealed much and it was unsafe to go further. Shafts of 1m diameter were full of rubble and cleaned to 12m. There is some stoneware but fragile and 2 to 3m down.</p> <p>Q. Is more detail on Aboriginal heritage available?</p> <p>A. This will be included in a detailed heritage report being prepared by Curio Projects.</p> <p>Q. Will there be demonstration plantings of endangered species or communities?</p> <p>A. Yes, particularly the Eastern Banksia Scrub. There is a preference to use endemic species. Plant selection will be fine tuned with appropriate input.</p> <p>Q. Will old photographs be used to show old land, old country?</p> <p>A. There will be an interpretation strategy. There is a desire to draw on old photos, but the final strategy is still to be determined.</p> <p>Q. Will provision of retail wining and dining and pop ups be open to external applicants or restricted to the stadium caterer?</p> <p>A. This is yet to be determined. Currently there is exclusivity for the existing catering company.</p>	
8.3	<p>Other comments/ concerns/ issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It adds another complexity to the Moore Park Masterplan. There are questions over how well it integrates. The stairs have a visual impact when approached from Moore Park and are incompatible with the Masterplan. Why not curve around and mask with foliage? There needs to be an integrated approach not a silo approach for the stadium. • There is a need for more than one lift. Or a ramp on the western side. • Public sports facilities are welcome. • It would be preferable if there were better connections. • the public domain is compromised with a dead end on the eastern side, lack of 24 hour access, bad sight lines and an overly steep grade. • Car parking is a major issue and should have been included in the project. It needs to be revisited. MP1 is a poor car park and would have benefited from landscaping. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to consider and respond to all the presentations and information has been inadequate. • There are pros and cons in allowing competition to EQ and Oxford Street in catering. It could be great if it is not a white elephant. Barangaroo has done it well but not EQ and Fox. • Consider outside food providers and flag disability access. Sydney hasn't done disability access well. • If the stadium was a commercial building it would have to have had ramp access. Access is a huge problem and needs addressing in ways other than lifts. With the whole stadium being knocked down and started from scratch the access point challenge should have been addressed better. One lift is inadequate. • The existing Rugby building on Driver Avenue is a real pinch-point to the Stadium circulation and could be modified in such a large project. • There are some good elements on the northern and eastern sides. More attention needs to be given to integration with Moore Park east, Kippax Lake and improved pedestrian flow. • Recognition needs to be given to Indigenous people and artwork from indigenous people. There needs to be provision for public art. • There is potential for the area to become a skateboard mecca. This needs consideration. 	
8.4	<p>Responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing building pinches access on Driver Avenue and public connections aren't obvious. • There is 15m minimum width around the concourse. • Patronage of food and wine outlets could be an issue. Barangaroo is a large area with a lot of commercial activity and tourism. • A ramp would need a 1:14 which would be of a length that is difficult for a person in a wheelchair. Lifts provide a practical solution. • There will be provision for Indigenous art and public artworks. • Anti-skateboard measures have been included. 	
9.	<p>Air Quality and Dust Presentation and discussion – Wilkinson Murray - Nic Hall (NH)</p> <p><i>Copy of presentation to be forwarded</i></p>	
9.1	<p>Questions, answers and comments</p> <p>Q. Is there continuous air quality monitoring? A. There are four monitors on the north, south, east and west boundaries. These provide averages each hour. High levels were recorded on 26 March but similar readings at the EPA Randwick monitoring station suggests the spike was Sydney wide rather than from site.</p> <p>Q. What is the dust composed of? Are there hazardous materials? A. The Hazmat report identified no asbestos or other hazardous material.</p> <p>Q. What is the reason monitors are on-site? The closest sensitive receivers are off-site. The child care centre, Kippax Lake and residents are sensitive receivers. Residents within 40m are worried about impacts. A. It is unlikely an exceedance would occur on the other side of Moore Park Road if an exceedance was not triggered on site. There are sensitive receivers off-site, but impacts would be expected to be worse on site.</p> <p>Q. Could this depend on weather conditions? Impacts may occur that are not picked up on site.</p>	<p>(a). Request that the Hazmat building contamination report is made available on the INSW website.</p> <p>(b.) Request to include updates on all monitoring results in the project newsletter that goes to the community.</p>

	<p>A. Monitors are on common on boundary fences. If there is visible dust off site mitigation measures will address this.</p> <p>Comment: The conversation is reminiscent of that around vibration and misses the point about community concerns. While dust is most concentrated on site concerns are for residents and businesses in the area.</p> <p>Response: Wilkinson Murray considers monitoring locations appropriate to pick up exceedances on and off site.</p> <p>Q. Are there any carcinogens? What does low risk, medium and high risk mean? There is little information in the reports. What is the science behind these?</p> <p>A. The report talks of the likelihood of risks to health. National Environment Protection Measures (NEPM) sets acceptable air quality for health and well being. These are considered in setting goals. High, medium and low looks at the likelihood of adverse impacts from works if there is no mitigation. With high risk activity there needs to be enough mitigation to turn this to low risk. Air quality consultants identify emissions and measures to reduce these. Risk assessments look at what dust could be produced if not mitigated and what measures are required to reduce the risk to acceptable levels.</p> <p>Q. With a lot of activity yesterday what were the results of monitoring? If levels are high is there a reduction in work?</p> <p>A. Nothing was triggered yesterday.</p> <p>Q. Does the EPA or a regulatory authority monitor performance over time?</p> <p>A. Regular audits are submitted to DPE as a part of Conditions of Consent.</p> <p>Comment: Can monthly updates be provided to the community that dust, noise and vibration are performing to an acceptable standard? This provides assurance to the community.</p>	
10	Actions from the previous meeting	
10.1	<p>Those Actioned from last meeting or for noting only – not discussion</p> <p>Actioned from last meeting or for noting only – not discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions and answers attached to the minutes. (complete) • Lendlease to provide the link to the Traffic Management Plan to the CCC. • INSW responded to MW question – circulated with the meeting minutes. • INSW to advise Chair of new postings to the website to then advise the CCC (ongoing) • Chair to respond to letters from residents of Moore Park Road re dilapidation – <i>Complete and responses tabled</i> • MH to send draft meeting dates to CCC through till August 2019 (complete) 	
10.2	<p>Items for this agenda – for noting not discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 2 documents and presentation by Cox Architect and Aspect Studios. • Design presentation • Lendlease and INSW consultants to present to the CCC noise / vibration data, in a form that can be understood by CCC members. • Dilapidation, and the need for reports – report on the planned extent of the dilapidation surveys. 	
10.3	For response/ update	
10.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for INSW to post questions from the community and answers on the project website. 	

	The response is no. The action is complete.	
10.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PT to provide MH with updated outstanding comments from CoS for circulation prior to the next meeting. <p>PT has no updated comments from staff. CoS responded to plans and there has been communication from INSW to CoS about these.</p> <p>The action is complete.</p>	
10.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> INSW to talk to CoS regarding concerns around dilapidation. <p>This has been addressed by current action. The action is complete.</p>	
10.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> INSW to consider whether an updated report on Busby's Bore can be provided to the next meeting. <p>More information will be provided through the newsletter.</p>	The action remains open.
10.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KM will response to the question of seating. <p>This information was provided. The action is complete.</p>	
10.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AM to confirm whether the Centennial Parklands Trust is included in key stakeholder meetings. <p>Centennial Parklands Trust have been contacted since last meeting. They are part of the government steering committee for the project. Moore Park Trust participates.</p> <p>MW asked they be invited to attend meetings and provide views where relevant.</p>	Invite Moore Park Trust to meetings when required.
10.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR to provide a response to the Green Building Council of Australia and to the CCC. <p>Contact has been made with Green Building Council. The action is closed.</p>	
10.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DWK to send Waverley traffic report to the CCC when it is complete. <p>This will be provided to MH for distribution when it becomes available. Action is closed at this time.</p>	
11	What we are hearing from the community?	
11.1	<p>Correspondence directed to the CCC / Chairperson</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None received directly – One email via Linda Gosling. This has been reported to the CCC along with the response. Issues related to this communication had been discussed in this meeting under Air quality. MW indicated dissatisfaction with the INSW response to his correspondence. He doesn't consider his questions have been answered. He is not asking for a detailed response, simply yes or no answers. DR will respond further. He is also happy to invite a representative from the Moore Park Trust to future meetings. While questions forwarded by Linda Gosling (LG) were addressed in this meeting, she feels they were not adequately addressed in the email response provided. Telling people to look at reports they have already looked at is not a response. The meeting asked for clearer responses in future. 	<p>(a) Further response from INSW to MW's questions will be attached to the final minutes.</p> <p>(b) INSW is requested to provide clearer responses to communication in the future</p>
11.2	Report of Community Complaints	
	<p>AM reported there were no complaints in March. The report for March is on the website. There was one complaint in April about dust. A check of monitors showed it wasn't the result of this site.</p> <p>DG noted the DPE compliance team haven't received complaints.</p>	

	<p>LG suggested people complain to CCC members, but these aren't logged as complaints.</p> <p>AM urged CCC members to suggest people email or phone in complaints so that they are logged.</p> <p>Robert Postema (RP) reported enquiries he has made via that means have been responded to.</p> <p>Reminder that the email and phone that community should contact for complaints are communityfsr@lendlease.com</p> <p>Phone number: 1800 717 704.</p> <p><i>(It is subsequently noted that the website asks "for more information or to provide feedback on construction works" – it is not clear that this is for complaints)</i></p>	
12	<p>Project update and look ahead</p> <p>Construction update</p>	
12.1	<p>The roof on the eastern side came down last week. The western side will come down next week. Trucks will remove the roof material from the site. The goal is to complete demolition by the end of September.</p>	
13	<p>CCC Terms of Reference</p> <p>Discussion of changes to the Terms of Reference based on those of last meeting and further comments by MW. Adoption of terms of reference</p>	
13.1	<p>MH noted she had rejected one comment received from MW as it is repeating a point already included.</p>	
13.2	<p>The meeting agreed to the revised Terms of Reference.</p>	
14	<p>Next meeting</p> <p>8 May 2019.</p>	
14.1	<p>MH noted at each meeting we can gauge whether the next date suits most people. If not, the date can be changed.</p>	
14.2	<p>Philip Thalys (PT) reiterated the view of a number of the CCC members (including MW) that tonight's meeting didn't allow enough time for discussion of actions arising from presentations. It should have been longer, or an additional meeting held.</p> <p>CCC members can email additional comments and these will be captured. The presentations will be sent to members in coming days. CCC members have till Wednesday 17 April to provide additional comments.</p> <p>DR noted the material presented tonight is consistent with Cox Architects competition entry from last year.</p> <p>PT asked to see updated plans.</p> <p>DR said these could be presented at the next meeting.</p>	<p>(a). MH/INSW email presentations to CCC members.</p> <p>(b). CCC members to provide additional comments on presentations to MH by 17 April.</p>
15	<p>Round the table with final questions/ comments</p>	
15.1	<p>SMJ thanked Lendlease for making the offer of dilapidation reports for people on Moore Park Road. When will these be done? The sooner the better given the stage of demolition.</p> <p>AM said people will be contacted next week and reports hopefully done by the end of the month.</p>	

15.2	<p>Dominic Wy Kanak (DWK) suggested contact details on the website be changed from enquiries to complaints, or enquiries and complaints. Is feedback from this meeting about the roof coming down logged as an issue? AM replied matters addressed in this forum are not on the complaints register. MH reiterated use of email and phone line to register complaints.</p>	
15.3	<p>LG expressed concern from local residents about the bulk of the design for the new stadium from the perspective of the resident visual impact.</p>	
15.4	<p>PT urged the exhibition of the three alternative designs. He asked if there will be ongoing review of design. What is the timing of DA lodgement and exhibition? New issues for the public domain will be important to be considered. PT and LG would like to see the jury report on why Cox was chosen. DR replied that the design assurance panel meets to ensure quality of design as it evolves. He reported CoS was invited to participate in the original jury which they did initially but then stood down. The DA is likely to be lodged in early June and on exhibition later in June for a minimum of 28 days. PT and LG expressed concern that with only two meetings between now and then there will little chance to influence the DA before lodgement. PT asked if the Lendlease contract could be released. AM replied it is on the website.</p>	
15.5	<p>SMJ asked that the Centennial Park Trust and Moore Park Trust attend the next meeting for consideration of how the development supports the Moore Park Masterplan.</p>	<p>Invite representatives of the Centennial Park Trust and Moore Park Trust to the next meeting.</p>
	<p>The meeting closed at 9.15pm.</p>	

VIEW FROM MOORE PARK

