

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

Meeting No. 9, Wednesday 5 February 2020 – 5.30 pm – 8.00 pm

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

Attendees: **Chairperson:** Margaret Harvie.

Community representatives: Chelsea Ford, Sofie Mason-Jones, Julie Osborne, Robert Postema, John Fowler - Paddington Society Representative, Steve Rankine.

Local Government representative: Mayor Danny Said (Randwick City Council), Cr Philip Thalys (City of Sydney Council), Mayor Paula Masselos (Waverly Council).

Sydney Football Stadium Representatives: Tom Gellibrand, Head Projects NSW, Infrastructure NSW (INSW); Peter Hynd, SFS Project Director, Infrastructure NSW; Kerrie Mather, Chief Executive Officer, Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust.

Note taker: Sandra Spate.

Guests: Erica van den Honert, Director, Infrastructure Management, Planning and Assessment - Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE); Paul Cassel, Project Director, John Holland; Tiffany Jones, Communications and Stakeholder Manager, John Holland.

Apologies: Vivienne Skinner, Linda Gosling, Tom Harley

Item no.	Description	Actions/ Who
1.	Welcome	
1.1	Margaret Harvie (MH) acknowledged the Aboriginal people on whose land we meet and acknowledged elder's past and present.	
1.2	MH noted that correspondence from Vivienne Skinner (VS) and Linda Gosling (LG) has been forwarded to the CCC. INSW and DPIE have provided responses to VS in the agenda distributed. Erica van den Honert (EvdH) will further deal with conditions of consent as related to the CCC as an agenda item. The CCC role in relation to these was raised in an email from Linda Gosling.	
1.3	Introductions around the table. MH reported services of Leanne Smith have been secured for future note taking and thanked Sandra Spate who is retiring for her services to the CCC. Tom Gellibrand (TG) introduced Peter Hynd (PH) , SFS project director for INSW. He has previously worked on the Sydney Metro project. Paul Cassel (PC) Project Director and Tiffany Jones (TJ) Communications and Stakeholder Manager from John Holland were introduced – Tiffany will proactively liaise with stakeholders.	
2.	Declarations of pecuniary and other interests – none to declare	
3	Report / discussion on Actions from the last meeting <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. INSW to distribute the link to the SGSA Guide. Sportsground Safety Authority 2. INSW will distribute updated cross section diagrams. 3. INSW will provide the height of the leading edge on Moore Park Road. 	

	<p>4. INSW to send relevant pages of the Response to Submissions report – the originally submitted landscape master plan and the revised landscape master plan submitted with the response to submissions</p> <p>5. INSW to distribute to the CCC the before and after sections showing changes to landscaping of terraces and location.</p> <p>6. AM to investigate overnight dust issues.</p> <p>7. PT is requested to forward the email (that was sent to LG) and in particular concerns about parking to the relevant staff in CoS.</p> <p>Responses to actions were emailed to CCC members. Further discussion below on outstanding items.</p>	
3.1	<p>INSW to distribute the link to the Sports Ground Safety Authority (SGSA) Guide.</p> <p>TG reported the Guide can't be distributed as it is owned by the SGSA. INSW has access via a paid licence but can't extend that to others.</p> <p>Philip Thalys (PT) asked that a summary of elements of the Guide that were used in the design be distributed with particular reference to the public domain, pinch points, stairs and circulation. He asked if the SGSA Guide arose from the Hillsborough disaster. He noted 30m standards around stadia for circulation. Pinch points here are less. He would like to understand reasons for the variance. He also asked whether guides from other sporting codes were used. If so could summaries of these be provided to the next meeting.</p> <p>PH noted the SGSA guide is tied into the Hillsborough disaster with a move away from standing and improved circulation safety.</p>	<p>INSW to provide to the next meeting a summary of the SGSA elements used in design.</p> <p>INSW to investigate with Cox whether guides from sporting codes were used in design and if summaries of these can be provided to the CCC.</p>
3.2	<p>INSW will distribute updated cross section diagrams.</p> <p>INSW will provide the height of the leading edge on Moore Park Road.</p> <p>INSW to distribute to the CCC the before and after sections showing changes to landscaping of terraces and location.</p> <p>INSW will provide the height of the leading edge on Moore Park Road.</p> <p>These were distributed via email in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>PT suggested that these diagrams don't show the height of the new stadium relative to Moore Park Road or the terraces opposite. He had asked for a section diagram superimposed on the old stadium with houses opposite as a point of reference.</p>	<p>INSW to provide updated cross section diagrams that have the urban context of Moore Park Road and the height of the previous stadium.</p>
3.3	<p>AM to investigate overnight dust issues.</p> <p>Discussed under agenda item 4.</p>	
3.4	<p>PT is requested to forward the email (that was sent to LG) and in particular concerns about parking to the relevant staff in CoS.</p> <p>PT has asked Council staff to follow this up.</p>	
4.	<p>Stage One Update (Peter Hynd)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on current activities • Report of Community Complaints • Update on dust issues 	

4.1	<p>Update on current activities</p> <p>PH delivered the update. The presentation delivered will be uploaded on the website with these meeting notes.</p> <p>December saw the finalisation of the tender for the Stage 2 contractor with a contract for Stage 2 work entered into on 16 December. John Holland is mobilising on site activity and design.</p> <p>Lendlease has completed above ground demolition for Stage 1. Relocation of stormwater pipes is expected to be complete this month along with the last of the earthworks. Final stockpiling of material will be on the old bowl and left for John Holland to take over at the end of February. All records are being shared by the two contractors with a transfer of knowledge to John Holland.</p>	
4.2	<p>PT asked if there had been additional findings about Busby's Bore. PH replied there hadn't. There will be investigations on Monday of indigenous heritage.</p>	
4.3	<p>Sofie Mason-Jones (SMJ) asked if Lendlease is responsible for completion of Stage 1 approval requirements.</p> <p>PH replied they are. High voltage cable work at the corner of Paddington Lane will be transferred to John Holland.</p>	
4.4	<p>Steve Rankine (SR) asked if there had been design changes and compromises to be able to achieve a competitive tender.</p> <p>TG replied the contract with Lendlease was always predicated on 2 stages. Lendlease Stage 2 offer was evaluated and Government formed the opinion they could get better value by going back to the market. There were two bids in a competitive field. INSW demonstrated to Government that the winning bid from John Holland was more competitive than that from Lendlease and a better value outcome.</p> <p>Julie Osborne (JO) asked if designs needed to be adjusted to keep costs down e.g. removal of the LED curtain. Some codes say it is the main reason they supported the new stadium. Has there been compromised in the current design?</p> <p>TG replied the LED curtain was never in the scope of the project and it doesn't exist in an outdoor setting anywhere in the world. The same outcomes can be achieved through lighting and seat colour.</p> <p>SMJ suggested Lendlease had said there was no reference design for their bid.</p> <p>TG replied that is was executed on the basis that design would be carried out throughout Stage 1 with Stage 2 final pricing received by LendLease post design. INSW was always entitled to reject Lendlease's Stage 2 offer. INSW undertook due diligence and took advice from the market. INSW are happy with the result. INSW worked closely with Lendlease and made it clear it was not a performance issue.</p> <p>SMJ asked if John Holland's contract is within the original budget.</p> <p>TG replied \$729 million was originally allocated. It is now at \$828 million.</p> <p>PT asked if tenderers were paid costs to tender.</p> <p>TG replied partial bid costs were paid in line with treasury guidelines.</p>	

	<p>PT asked if two bidders is a valid tender. TG replied it is. Robert Postema (RP) asked if there was additional scope in this bid. PH replied there are upgrades to internal finishes and the audio visual specifications.</p>	
4.5	<p>PT asked whether design changes restrict free movement around the upper tier. People were supposed to be able to walk all round with a sight of the action but screens and seating seem to block this. It seems to change the experience which was one of the main reasons for the stadium. He would also like more information on the vertical glass wall rather than pillar. He is wondering what the changes are and whether they are improvements. He refers to comparison drawings from Cox for June 2019 and June 2020. Are drawings pre-John Holland involvement? TG will take this question on notice. JO raised concerns with design changes. CCC members need to know what these changes are before talking to the community. RP asked for clarification on Cox's role now. TG replied that Cox now works with John Holland. They are required to continue to design in accordance with Conditions of Approval (CoA) but are now getting to detailed design. A test of concurrence ensures consistency with approval. He noted some changes have been made in response to submissions. They are not just about cost. Danny Said (DS) is confused about changes to save money when the John Holland contract is costing \$100m more. The government said the SFS would be delivered on time and on budget. The John Holland contract is said to be better value so is the additional cost due to improvements? PT suggested the \$729m was always wrong. Paula Masselos (PM) suggested supposed savings weren't really savings as it was always going to cost more. TG replied the outcome of the tendering process provided a better commercial position. The statements DS refers to come from some time back. Once the bid came from Lendlease it was evident the trajectory would be beyond the \$729m. Lendlease's bid for Stage 2 was well above that from John Holland. The original design was done a long time ago and roughly costed. A number was arrived at and \$729 allocated. Since then things have moved, the design changed, planning approval has been received and a contract signed. SR is interested to know what has changed. Lendlease thought there was no chance of the government going beyond the \$729m. What has changed? How can there be such a big difference between bids by two respected construction companies? He is surprised that John Holland can deliver where Lendlease weren't able to if not much has changed in scope. PH noted there are upgrades to audio visuals and finishes. He said it is hard to compare bids. The other tenderer (Multiplex) was also more competitive than Lendlease. Contractors look at risk differently and differences are often in pricing risk.</p>	<p>INSW to provide information on whether changes to the upper tier restrict all round movement and what other changes have been made.</p>

	<p>TG said the \$828m includes demolition costs and fencing. He confirmed there was no escalation of demolition costs which is included in the \$828m. While he can't provide detail of the bids these are not always in line with what is asked and there is a need to adjust the bid for risk. This adds costs.</p> <p>JO would like to see an update at the next meeting on where we are with design.</p> <p>TG said this will happen regularly. John Holland is starting to go through the design program. Regular updates will be shared as they occur.</p> <p>PT questioned why the contract is not a public document when the people of NSW are paying for it and there is no competitive aspect.</p> <p>TG indicated that there is a commercial element to these that can't be made public.</p>	
4.6	<p>SMJ asked for the timeframe for completion.</p> <p>TG replied it will be finished in time for the 2022 rugby league grand final.</p> <p>PT asked if this is because the Olympic Stadium is being renovated as that usually host the grand final.</p> <p>TG replied the game's administration decide where the grand final is held but the SFS will be ready for the 2022 rugby league grand final.</p> <p>Homebush will still be being rebuilt.</p> <p>SMJ asked for confirmation that it is a 2½ year construction program.</p> <p>This was confirmed.</p>	
4.2	<p>Community Complaints / Update on dust issues</p> <p>PH reported on the dust complaints at the end of last year. INSW ensured Lendlease were following controls but there were challenging conditions with drought and horrendous weather leading up to Christmas. Lendlease is using a spray road sealant and water carts. A polymer seal is used on stockpiles. John Holland will use similar methods and INSW will continue to manage it with John Holland.</p> <p>RP reported dust has been a major problem. Large numbers of trucks have been on site and he has seen a lot of dust generated. INSW needs to keep onto it.</p> <p>TJ asked if he has seen a reduction in dust since the polymer has been used. RP was not sure that dust was mitigated by the polymer as he had only just returned from holiday.</p> <p>PH said the spray is a green substance which can breakdown if vehicles drive over it and does need to be reapplied.</p> <p>RP suggests applying it in the evening after the site shuts.</p> <p>There was some general discussion about how much of the dust is attributed to site or how much is general Sydney air quality given weather conditions (dust/bushfires/drought) as people in other areas have also been subjected to brown and orange dust.</p>	
5.	<p>Presentation by DPIE on the outcome of the EIS application and resulting conditions of approval - Conditions referencing the CCC were outlined and these are attached below.</p>	

5.1	<p>Erica van den Honert (EvdH) outlined the roles of the Department of Planning (DPIE) in relation to project approval. Karen Harragon oversees the social and other infrastructure team who is involved with assessment up to approval. Following approval, Erica’s infrastructure management team ensures CoA are met in terms of post-approval requirements and documentation and works closely with the compliance team to ensure the conditions, e.g. those around dust, noise etc. are met.</p>	
5.2	<p>TJ noted the private certifiers for the project are Blackett, Maguire and Goldsmith.</p> <p>SMJ asked if variations in detailed design are certified by DPIE or the private certifier.</p> <p>PC said the certifier ensures developing design is consistent with CoA and meets other regulatory requirements of various agencies. Certifiers are not structural engineering certifiers. If variations meet conditions of approval they can be signed off by the private certifier.</p> <p>SMJ asked if DPIE is comfortable with circulation space sitting with the private certifier. She noted Condition B7 talks of detailed design plans going to the authorised certifier for approval.</p> <p>PT noted the practice by City of Sydney and many other councils is that changes other than to materials comes back to council for approval. Other design quality issues come back to council as a precondition for the construction certificate. He thinks to do otherwise is extremely bad practice and doesn’t understand why the DPIE would allow less stringent conditions than those for more minor projects. With a competitive design process he would expect the design panel to have an ongoing role which is standard practice for major projects.</p> <p>SMJ noted the CCC has asked previously that any major changes go back to the DPIE and not the private certifier.</p> <p>Chelsea Ford (CF) asked with novation if Cox can talk to John Holland. Is there a line of communication?</p> <p>PH replied that condition A21 require Cox and Aspect to stay on to the next stage and have been novated to satisfy that condition (i.e. Cox and Aspect are directly managed by JHG who are responsible for finalising the detailed design).</p> <p>TG said there is an expectation of conversation between INSW and John Hollands technical advisers. There is no reason to not expect contact between John Holland, Cox, Aspect and INSW. Detailed designs will be submitted and there will be time to comment. With novation, Cox won the design competition and the best way to maintain integrity of design is for the architect to work with John Holland to generate design through to completion. He would argue novation is a good way to ensure integrity.</p> <p>PT said architects don’t agree with this.</p> <p>JO suggested difficulties in the combination of novation and a private certifier with concerns the combination would have inadequate oversight. She would want a government review for independence.</p> <p>PC said John Holland tendered on a detailed government brief of what is to be delivered. Design has mostly been prepared by Cox with a level of detail. John Holland has responded with price. John Holland is delivering what it has been asked to under the contract including meeting the detailed project brief.</p>	<p>INSW to present on the latest design and any changes from the last design that the CCC saw.</p>

	<p>John Fowler (JF) thinks it is an issue of public oversight of conditions. If faults are found in 15 years where does the oversight come from if a private certifier has approved? It used to be local government with oversight. Residents are here in perpetuity.</p> <p>PH said planning approval is bound into the contract. John Holland has to abide by planning approval. The contract articulates what needs to be done and the preliminary design. John Holland and designers produce detailed design from this and submit these to government. INSW has the opportunity to comment on these and has specialist technical advisors to support the design review process. It is similar to processes on that undertaken on Sydney Metro North West.</p> <p>RP said there is a disconnect to where we got to as a committee and now, the iterative process of design and changes. The last committee meeting had in mind design at a certain point. We don't know what the difference is between that design and the contract, design changes going forward and what say we have in that.</p> <p>TG said designs were reasonably advanced when the Stage 2 contract went out to tender, he estimates around 60%. This is a good basis for the next level of detailed design. We need to get to the point of drawings issued for construction.</p> <p>RP said the CCC needs to know that it will be the same height, bulk, scale and the same concourse.</p> <p>JO said there needs to be oversight of change.</p> <p>MH noted there will be a presentation to the next meeting on the latest design.</p>	
BREAK and refreshments		
5.3	<p>Agenda item 5 cont.</p> <p>EvdH noted the development may only be carried out in accordance with approved plans. If not in accordance a modification has to be submitted to the DPIE.</p> <p>MH noted that where these are significant, they need to be exhibited and approved.</p> <p>EvdH said that the CCC is a condition and continuation of this CCC from Stage 1 to Stage 2 is allowed at the request of INSW. It is then signed off by the DPIE.</p> <p>When construction is complete there needs to be a CCC for 12 months from the commencement of operations. This can be the same CCC or a different one.</p> <p>Conditions requiring broader consultation and the conditions around input from the CCC outlined in the conditions (those from the presentation) are pasted below in the meeting notes.</p>	
5.4	<p>DS asked if condition B22 regarding the Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is still with Lendlease or has it switched to John Holland.</p> <p>PC replied the CEMP for Stage 2 is being finalised.</p>	
5.5	<p>SMJ asked what are DPIE's expectations around consultation in regard to the Event Management Plan. Is it just a presentation or how feedback has been considered?</p> <p>EvdH replied evidence needs to be provided of plans presented with a reasonable timeframe for comment. DPIE asks for evidence of</p>	

	consultation, what has been done with the input, why/why not incorporated. The period for consultation is generally two weeks and a record of attempts to engage is to be provided.	
6.	Stage 2 Construction Contract - Introduction to the John Holland Team	
6.1	PC reported John Holland is one of the largest contractors in Australia and major builder of government infrastructure projects. They include engineering as well as building and he thinks it a good fit for the project. The team is based in Pymont prior to location on site. They are working to develop detailed design from the concept designs. John Holland expects to start on site in mid March if the site is handed over in February. Under consent conditions detailed design has to satisfy design criteria. Procurement packages are underway. TJ has started consulting with sensitive receivers.	
6.2	RP asked if there would be a website. TJ indicated that information would be on INSW website. PC said there will be a dedicated 1800 number and email. Planning documents will all be on the DPIE website. PH said INSW will work closely with John Holland to satisfy conditions. They are out and about meeting stakeholders. The partnership will deliver on and manage expectations of the community. TG noted Matt Bourne, who worked on the Trumper and Noble stands, will be working with the John Holland team.	
6.3	RP asked to what extent the Stage 1 Traffic Management Plan, dust plans etc. will inform John Holland plans. PH replied INSW is in the process of finalising the plan. Stage 2 plans are an evolution from Stage 1 plans. They will be similar plans.	
6.4	RP asked if there is going to be a representative from the sports clubs attending as was discussed. MH reported Tom Harley will attend but is an apology for this meeting.	
7.	Correspondence directed to the CCC / Chairperson	
7.1	Saving Moore Park (via Vivienne Skinner) – as per the responses to the correspondence pasted below and distributed in advance of the meeting. DPIE has responded to the first two issues raised and INSW the next five.	
7.2	PT asked if there is any movement on car parking on Moore Park which is the huge issue. SMJ suggested condition D50 defers the conversation for 2 years and 2 months. The plan must be prepared in consultation with CCC and others three months prior to operation. There is a passion in the community to remove parking from Moore Park plus a desire from sports codes to have some parking. It would be good to hear if it is needed, why, and for how long. For us on the CCC there is a strong desire to return the parklands. There is now a condition it will be phased out but no solution. The way Condition D50 is worded nothing needs to be done for two years. JO suggested it is not necessarily delayed. The Centennial Parklands Masterplan is tied to the implementation of the light rail and this has happened. Feedback from the CCC and the community indicates this is by far the biggest issue.	

	<p>JF said proposals from government bureaucracies talk about intentions and what is proposed but there is no commitment. The community is becoming cynical about what will come. There should be a specific response in writing about what will be done.</p> <p>PT said a timetable for action for removal of car parking on Moore Park should be requested.</p> <p>Kerrie Mather (KM) said the timeline is consistent with the Moore Park Masterplan 2040.</p> <p>SMJ noted the Masterplan talks of progressive phasing out of parking when the light rail is in operation. That is now.</p> <p>EvdH said construction parking on surrounding parkland has to be avoided during construction.</p> <p>KM noted there has already been a reduction in parking spaces associated with light rail. In the past 3 to 4 years there has been a reduction of 500 spaces. 200 spaces have been allocated to Kippax Lake green space.</p> <p>The Trust has advocated to sports for the implementation of integrated ticketing and the Swans are implementing this. She hopes the majority will. There has been a progressive shift to public transport since light rail opening and the SCG Trust is keen to promote it. Opal data from 28 December with a 34,000 event showed 21% modal share for light rail. That is pleasing and with more promotion there is likely to be an uplift in modal shift. SGC Trust is also advocating to TfNSW for buses from that light rail route to be used to serve other potential underserved routes. It would be good if advocacy could also come from others. The sports tell us that convenient parking is important for families and the elderly. During the stadium construction approximately 700 spaces in MP1 are also unavailable putting more pressure on parking. If parking is taken away without convenient alternatives in place people will park on surrounding streets.</p> <p>JF said the real problem is Sydney basin wide which uses a lot of road transport. He accepts the car park is currently closed but it would be good to see data on car use. Families with mixed generations will go by car and want to park. They are the backbone of sports events. They park on Moore Park. We need a plan of management. Maybe provide priority parking for families and increase the public transport modal spike for others. Currently wording is only about intention.</p> <p>SR doesn't believe the response on parking is adequate. Let's have a plan, not just talk about 2 ½ years. If the plan is to continue to park on Moore Park, let us know so the community can take this up elsewhere. We need a timeline for deliverables.</p> <p>PM also has concerns about increased traffic in the area.</p> <p>EvdH noted the requirement for a plan to go to the Planning Secretary three months prior to operation doesn't mean we can't start sooner.</p> <p>PT suggested if there are four or more in a car a lower fixed amount could be charged for parking, if less in a car a premium rate could be charged. This could be done independently of consent requirements.</p> <p>JO said ultimately the community wants no parking on the grass. Transitional steps send the wrong message. Congestion is a problem. If</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>parking is not an option, do we need satellite areas? She supports the move to integrated ticketing and light rail but if parking is not available we need an alternate plan.</p> <p>SMJ noted by the time it opens the stadium won't have been used for 4 years. We don't want people to have a choice of parking on the green space but we need other options. With this length of time people would like to see Moore Park parking gone by operation.</p> <p>DS suggested thinking outside the square. Light rail to Kingsford will be operating by March. Randwick Council knows of parking places, car parks, not normally used on weekends. He is happy to talk to people such as the racecourse, as a tram stops in front, but Council needs to be asked. A lot of Roosters and Swans supporters live on the Randwick side and could use 2 or 4 hour parking and then walk. But now parking is timed at 10 minutes. Let's plan this rather than have a free for all. Park and shuttle people. He is also aware of a dedicated light rail line from Central separate from normal services that could be used. Suggest doing a deal with the NRL and Swans.</p> <p>PT noted the dedicated line has a tangible effect but is not reported in the green travel plan.</p>	
8.	Role of the CCC – from Linda Gosling	
8.1	<p>MH noted questions raised by Linda Gosling on the role of the CCC and questions as to why the CCC didn't have roles in certain conditions of consent (see attachment to the minutes).</p> <p>They were emailed in advance of the meeting and also addressed in item 5.1.</p> <p>There was no further discussion on the items.</p>	
9.	What we are hearing from the community - Round the room	
9.1	<p>PM raised the perennial issue of traffic, and particularly construction traffic. Condition B32 notes Council is to be consulted. Where is the traffic management plan up to? Council would like to see it. She wouldn't like to see project parking pushed to the Waverley area, particularly given Bondi Junction transport links. She is also concerned at impacts of construction vehicles at bottlenecks having knock on impacts in the Waverley area.</p> <p>PH reported the Traffic Management Plan for Stage 2 is being developed and is an evolution of Stage 1. The main entry points remain Driver Ave. Major construction traffic routes are consistent with Stage 1. He will send the draft plan to Council when available. The Stage 1 plan is already publicly available. Concerns were raised by TfNSW about Oxford St due to it being peak morning priority bus route. Most construction traffic comes from South Dowling St, not through Waverley. Most steel and concrete comes from the south or west of the city. Parking issues will be looked at as with other such projects. They will look at satellite options as there is limited parking on site. It is about educating and managing the workforce and sub-contractors. Parking management is an element covered in on-site inductions. There is no parking on local streets. Light rail is a benefit. As soon as they become aware of issues these are managed, re-</p>	<p>PH to forward the Stage 1 Construction Management Plan to PM and send the Stage 2 plan when available.</p>

	<p>inductions held, and increasing consequences for breaches. Tiffany is the main contact for the community around this.</p> <p>SR asked about tradie trucks and tools.</p> <p>PC said all subcontractor materials and tools are brought onto site and then locked up on site. Materials are delivered then the workforce uses a range of modes including public transport.</p>	
9.2	<p>PT reported the City of Sydney is keen to progress the cycleway in Moore Park Road. This is an opportunity for the three councils. He personally would like to push for the cycleway in Flinders St. It would be great if locals could get to the site by bike.</p> <p>PH noted bike parking is included in stadium plans.</p> <p>SR said this links with the current discussion on how to change Oxford St a to more community based area. Bikes could help this. Anything to help link Oxford St to here is positive. Good links is the core issue. He is talking to the Paddington Society, BIKEast, CoS. All can pull together to assists links.</p>	
9.3	<p>CF is curious about the ultimate decision making around parking in terms of integrated ticketing. Is there a timeline around decisions and consequences so the scenario regarding Moore Park parking progresses? Who makes decisions and when? There are many stakeholders. Who takes the leadership? It seems nebulous.</p> <p>KM said it is complex. They are being asked to consider things on others' land. It will require time to do properly. It needs decent market information. There needs to be a transport demand study. Light rail has just opened. We need to see operations over time. A number of sports may take up integrated ticketing. We need to wait till the end of the season to see the uptake.</p> <p>JF suggests engaging Denise Ora and the Centennial Parklands and Moore Park Trust to see where the Masterplan is up to at the end of 2022. Use a season to work on modal arrangements to look at data for the operations stage.</p> <p>CF is still none the wiser. Who takes leadership? Jobs get done when someone is responsible.</p> <p>JF suggested inviting Centennial Parklands and Moore Park trust to present to the meeting. They could provide information on who is using Moore Park parking now and present a plan of management for existing parking when the stadium opens.</p> <p>SMJ supported inviting Denise Ora to attend the next CCC to get the position of the Centennial Parklands Trust on when the plan for existing parking on Moore Park will be implemented. She said parking is still used on Moore Park east now even with the stadium out of action.</p> <p>SR suggested at the next meeting INSW/ SCG Trust comes back to the CCC with who is responsible.</p>	<p>INSW to invite Denise Ora to the next meeting to present the Centennial Parklands Trust position on when the plan for removal of parking on Moore Park will be implemented and who is responsible.</p>
9.	<p>Next meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting 10 – 6 May 2020 	
10.	Final questions/ comments	
	Close: The meeting closed at 8.20pm.	

Correspondence from Vivien Skinner – Saving Moore Park- received by email 21 January 2020

Issue raised	
<p>Consent Condition D50 breaches the commitment given by the Parliamentary Secretary for the Environment in Parliament in June that When the light rail opens, our Government will remove on-grass parking for sporting events from Moore Park East.</p>	<p>The condition requires the Applicant to prepare an Event Car Parking Management Plan (ECMP) and submit it to the Planning Secretary for approval at least 3 months prior to the commencement of operation of the stadium.</p> <p>The condition, amongst other obligations, requires the Applicant to plan for the progressive removal of on-grass car parking on Moore Park East, based on consultation with Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust. It also requires the Applicant to consider alternative strategies to provide car parking for the stadium patrons on event days. Progressive phasing out of on-grass parking on Moore Park East is consistent with the Moore Park Masterplan 2040.</p>
<p>Given the urgency the community attaches to action to the removal of car parking from Moore Park, it is of concern that the Consent Condition D50 only requires INSW to consider alternative strategies for the removal of car parking from Moore Park. It must set out a plan and a date for achieving this.</p>	<p>The Department understands the community concerns to avoid on-grass car parking in Moore Park East. The Department notes that Moore Park Masterplan 2040 requires progressive removal of on-grass car parking on Moore Park East and alternative locations for car parking to be explored. Condition D50 requires the Applicant to provide alternative parking strategies, consistent with the Masterplan</p> <p>The Department notes that the development consent for SSD-9835 does not allow parking of construction vehicles on Moore Park. Consequently, the Department has made it a mandatory requirement for the Applicant to submit an ECMP prior to the commencement of operation of the future stadium.</p> <p>The Department is committed to community members and stakeholders being provided regular updates on the progress of the Event Car Parking Management Plan, including through the Community Consultative Committee process.</p>
<p>When does INSW intend providing its report? Any delay means that remediation of the park will not occur, to the community's detriment.</p>	<p>INSW will develop a number of the operationally focussed plans as early as practicable, and to fully comply with the planning approval.</p> <p>A number of these plans require significant input from the detailed design and delivery phases of the stadium project, as well as input from relevant stakeholders particularly operational input from the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust.</p>
<p>In framing the plan, INSW should consider the wholistic experience of patrons, which takes into account not only the time it takes patrons to get from the cars to the stadium, but the time spent in queues arriving at and leaving the precinct and associated traffic congestion.</p>	<p>INSW concurs that the experience of stadium patrons is an important factor to consider in the development of the report.</p>
<p>It should also explicitly take into account the loss of amenity experienced by the community directly associated with car parking on the Park and indirectly through the damage done to the Park by cars.</p>	<p>INSW notes that the plan would take into account considerations of all relevant stakeholder as required by the condition of the planning approval.</p>

<p>INSW should also have regard for the Parliamentary motion, supported by the Government, opposing any damage to, or encroachment on, Moore Park as a result of the SFS redevelopment.</p>	<p>INSW notes that the plan would take into account considerations of all relevant stakeholders as required by the condition of the planning approval.</p>
<p>The draft Plan should be submitted for the CCC's consideration before it is submitted to Government.</p>	<p>INSW notes that it intends to consult with all relevant stakeholders in satisfying the condition of the planning approval.</p>

Correspondence (excerpt) from Linda Gosling – role of CCC – received by email 28 January 2020

. . . I would like to see an item on the role of the CCC in the design documentation, construction & operation phases (this latter for one year I believe) of the Stadium, in particular noting where CCC/community involvement is mandated in DA consent conditions e.g. Conditions B16-19, D 28, D 49. The Paddington Society would like some consultation by INSW in regards to DA conditions B7 & B12 Detailed Design Plans (in regards to the facade & public domain design), to B46 the Heritage Interpretation Plan, to D12 the Pedestrian Infrastructure within the Moore Park Precinct, to D14 the Green Travel Plan, to D28 the Event Management Plan, to D48 the Operational Noise Management Plan, to D49 the Social Impact Monitoring Program, to E23 Outdoor Lighting impacts - as all of these directly affect local Paddington residents
 Then, a discussion is needed as to frequency of our meetings from now on, & the communication to us of the Plans as they evolve.

10/2/20

NSW Planning & Environment

Sydney Football Stadium – Stage 2 (SSD 9835)

5 February 2020

Erica van den Honert
Director, Infrastructure assessments, Infrastructure Management
Department of Planning and Environment

1

DPIE teams: roles and functions

- Three key teams within the Department relevant to the project:
 - Social and other Infrastructure (assessment)
 - Infrastructure Management (post approvals)
 - Compliance
- Post approval documents are submitted to the IM team
- Once these documents or requests are approved, monitoring of how they are implemented transfers to the Compliance team

NSW Planning & Environment

2

EIS and Consent

- EIS exhibition date:
 - Start: 19 June 2019
 - Finish: 24 July 2019
- Consent approval date:
 - 6 December 2019
- Link to SSD 9835
- Conditions of consent – SFS Stage 2
<https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/major-projects/project/10736>

NSW Planning & Environment

3

Conditions relating to the Community Consultative Committee (CCC) – Stage 1 and Stage 2

Stage 1, #16	Stage 2, #16
Prior to the commencement of the demolition works (excluding demolition soft-strip), a Community Consultative Committee (CCC) must be established for the development in accordance with the Department's Community Consultative Committee Guidelines: State Significant Projects (2016). The CCC must begin to exercise functions in accordance with such Guidelines before the commencement of demolition works (excluding demolition soft-strip), and continue to do so for the duration of the demolition works on the site and for at least twelve months following the completion of construction works under this consent.	Prior to the commencement of construction, a Community Consultative Committee (CCC) must be established for the development in accordance with the Department's Community Consultative Committee Guidelines: State Significant Projects (2016). The CCC must begin to exercise functions in accordance with such Guidelines before the commencement of construction and continue to do so for the duration of the construction on the site.
<p>Note: The CCC is an advisory committee only in accordance with the Guidelines, the Committee should comprise an independent chair and appropriate representation from the Applicant, Council and the local community.</p>	
<p>CCC established in Stage 1 may continue into Stage 2 as per condition B18 of SSD 9835</p>	

NSW Planning & Environment

CA: Consulting Authority
DPE: Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
NSW: Infrastructure NSW
SSSP: Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust
TNSW: Transport for NSW

4

10/2/20

Conditions relating to the CCC – Stage 2

Cond	Requirement
B17	At the completion of construction, the SCSGT (on behalf of the Applicant) may refresh the membership of the CCC for the operational phase of the stadium. The CCC is to be in operation for at least 12 months from the commencement of operation. The membership and terms of reference for any revised CCC are to be provided to the Planning Secretary prior to being implemented.
B18	Notwithstanding condition B16 and B17, the Planning Secretary may agree in writing to allow the continuation of Community Consultative Committee (CCC) established pursuant development consent SSD-9249 to exercise its functions in accordance with Community Consultative Committee Guidelines: State Significant Projects (2016) for the duration of construction and for at least one year following the completion of construction or until the submission of the second Post-Occupation Compliance Report required by this development consent.

NSW Planning & Environment

5

Conditions relating to CCC – Stage 2

Cond	Topic	Requirement	Approval/Endorsement
D4	Post-construction Dilapidation Reportbe submitted to Council, CCC, Heritage Division and the Planning Secretary for information.....	-
D17	Event Traffic and Transport Management Plansubmit a copy of the endorsed Plan to CCC, Planning Secretary, Certifying Authority, and Council.....	TNSW
D28	Event Management Planevidence of consultation with CCC.....	DPIE
D30	Flood Evacuation Plan a copy of the plan must be submitted to the Planning Secretary, Council and CCC for information.....	Certifying Authority

NSW Planning & Environment

6

Conditions relating to CCC – Stage 2

Cond	Topic	Requirement	Approval/Endorsement
D49	Social Impact Monitoring Programbe informed by engagement with surrounding landowners/occupiers and relevant stakeholders, the CCC, City of Sydney Council, SCSGT and Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust.....	DPIE
D50	Event Car Parking Management Planbe prepared in consultation with the TNSW, City of Sydney Council, SCSGT, CCC and Centennial; Park and Moore Park Trust.....	DPIE

NSW Planning & Environment

7