

Meeting Notes - Sydney Football Stadium Community Consultative Committee (CCC) Meeting No. 2, Wednesday 6 March, 5.30 pm – 8.45 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, Robert Postema

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

In attendance: Sandra Spate, notetaker.

Apologies: None

Item no.	Description	Actions/Who by
1.	<p>Welcome, apologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification of process issues/questions around the agenda, meeting notes, etc. Overview of tonight's agenda and adjustments in response to suggestions. 	
1.1	The Chair acknowledged this meeting is on Aboriginal land and paid respect to elders past, present and future.	
1.2	<p>Margaret Harvie (MH) welcomed attendees to meeting Number 2. She read out an email from Tom Jones, Woollahra Council, noting the Council would not be participating in the SFS CCC.</p> <p>An extract from the email is:</p> <p>"On 11 February 2019 Woollahra Council considered a notice of motion about the Sydney Football Stadium which included the following part: <i>F. Council actively participates in the consultation process as available to Council.</i>"</p> <p>The notice of motion was not adopted by the Council. Accordingly, I have to advise you that neither I nor any other member of Woollahra Council will be attending future CCC meetings."</p>	
1.3	<p>MH gave the rationale for the order of matters in the agenda and processes around finalising meeting notes.</p> <p>Actions from the previous meeting will be dealt with up front.</p> <p>Draft notes are sent to members. Changes come back to the chair who will include changes unless she contacts the person to say otherwise. Further disputes around the notes can come back to the following meeting.</p> <p>Members generally agreed it is useful to see suggestions others have made and that this can occur if members of the CCC copy all members when they provide comments on the notes to the Chair.</p>	
2.	Introductions around the room	
2.1	<p>Introductions were made for the benefit of two new attendees.</p> <p>Robert Postema (RP) is a resident of Moore Park Road.</p> <p>Cr Philip Thalys (PT) is a City of Sydney (CoS) councillor.</p>	

3.	Declarations of pecuniary and other interests	
3.1	<p>Michael Waterhouse (MW)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • His super fund has shares with Lendlease • Is a member of the SCG trust <p>Sofie Mason-Jones (SMJ) is on a wait list for the SCG Trust</p>	
3.2	<p>MW asked whether it is necessary to include this on the agenda each meeting.</p> <p>MH explained it is on the agenda to avoid having the conversation each meeting. As it is recorded in meeting notes anyway there was no objection to this remaining in the agenda.</p>	
4.	Actions from the previous meeting	
4.1	<p>Answers to Jeanette Brokman’s questions (INSW)</p> <p>Written responses to the questions were provided at the meeting. MH emailed Jeanette, sent the link to the minutes and asked if she had further questions. She had not heard back. (since the meeting Jeanette thanked MH for the information)</p> <p>Proposes the action be closed – MH will notify Jeanette when the answers to questions become part of the meeting notes.</p> <p>The meeting agreed that this closes this action.</p> <p>Linda Gosling (LG) clarified that the answers are included in the minutes.</p> <p>MW asked if there is a short cut to the process of having questions to the Chair then communicated via the CCC to be addressed.</p> <p>MH suggested most correspondence needs to go to the project team for INSW/ Lendlease response. We are facilitating them getting this response.</p> <p>MW asked that these responses be circulated to members.</p> <p>SMJ asked if there is a requirement for questions and answers to be on the project website. She suggested this happens with some projects as often the same questions come up frequently. People can then see answers to any questions they may have.</p> <p>David Riches (DR) indicated that while this is not a requirement, he is happy to take the suggestion on board.</p> <p>Chelsea Ford (CF) suggested going forward the email address that they are directed to should be INSW rather than Plancom to provide timely answers and cut out the middle person.</p> <p>Julie Osborne (JO) and LG think it important the CCC is aware of questions and answers.</p> <p>MH will always table correspondence to the CCC at the meeting, but it is important to direct people with questions about the project to INSW. The three emails received since the last meeting, directed to me as Chairperson will come to the meeting tonight.</p>	<p>Attach the questions and answers to the minutes. (complete)</p> <p>INSW to consider posting questions from the community and answers on the project website.</p>
4.2	<p>Report on CoS receipt of updated plans incorporating feedback (LL)</p> <p>Angus Morten (AM) reported the four subplans (B14 Noise & Vibration, B16 Soil & Water, B17 Air Quality & B19 Traffic & Pedestrian)) went to CoS. Comments came back and all comments from CoS were addressed except the issue of truck lengths. CoS requested a limit of 12.5m. Lendlease intends to maintain 19m as this will reduce the number of truck movement numbers.</p> <p>This is in the Traffic Management Plan which is on the website.</p>	<p>Lendlease to provide the link to the Traffic Management Plan to the CCC.</p> <p>PT to provide MH with updated outstanding comments from CoS</p>

	<p>PT asked where truck routes are. Residents want to know the routes of 19m vehicles. The extent of dilapidation reports required would also relate to the designated truck routes.</p> <p>AM said truck routes are consistent with those submitted to and approved by the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE).</p> <p>Vivienne Skinner (VS) asked for the link to the Traffic Management Plan to be provided to the CCC.</p> <p>MW noted a letter from the Lord Mayor of Sydney which indicated that staff had assessed the plans and found them to be unacceptable. He is concerned that council finds them unacceptable.</p> <p>AM indicated that the CoS concerns had been addressed and updated plans provided to council on 29 January.</p> <p>PT tabled City of Sydney Schedule of Comments on DA conditions and responses, and the letter dated 20 February from the Lord Mayor.</p> <p>SMJ asked, as the updated plans don't go back to DPE but are signed off by a private certifier, what is the process for the certifier to address comments?</p> <p>AM said they took advice from RMS and the Traffic Management Plan which saw benefit in larger trucks and less movements. On 29 January a week after receiving comments Lendlease sent CoS updated plans.</p> <p>PT is yet to be advised by council staff that responses provided to date have been adequately addressed in the Schedule of Comments.</p> <p>AM hasn't been advised that the revised plans are unacceptable.</p> <p>MH suggested PT ask council staff to review and update the Schedule of Comments document that was tabled in the light of actions taken since this document and determine the outstanding issues. MH can circulate a revised version prior to the next meeting.</p> <p>MW suggested that some issues may be appropriately addressed by the CCC and other could be addressed between council and Lendlease.</p> <p>PT said that Schedule of Comments notes inadequacies in the responses to date, and that Lendlease's assertion in the meeting that these have been dealt is not necessarily the end of the conversation. DPE and INSW/ Lendlease to advise CoS.</p> <p>PT agreed to ask CoS staff to update the comments.</p>	<p>for circulation prior to the next meeting.</p>
<p>4.3</p>	<p><u>CoS feedback on management plans (CoS)</u></p> <p>These were tabled at the meeting.</p> <p>JO expressed concerns that if these comments are to be dealt with at a later meeting, demolition may start with CoS issues outstanding. What are the ramifications of this?</p> <p>MH said from a planning perspective the issues have been dealt with by the certifier. CoS concern that issues are not adequately addressed is for discussion between CoS and Lendlease but does not have a bearing on demolition going ahead.</p> <p>JO asked how timing fits with resolution of these issues.</p> <p>AM said there are changes that mean plans are updated as part of consent conditions. Lendlease will continue to talk to council regarding Management Plans.</p>	
<p>4.4</p>	<p><u>Stage 2 documents to be provided to the CCC prior to a presentation at the April meeting. (INSW)</u></p> <p>DR proposes to come to the April meeting with a detailed presentation. Months of work have gone into the preparation of Stage 2 plans and reports and they are at an advanced stage. He expects it will require two meetings for their presentations and suggests April and May. Plans must</p>	<p>Items for the next meeting are Stage 2 documents and presentation by Cox Architect and Aspect Studios.</p>

	<p>come to the CCC. He proposes to invite Cox Architects to the next meeting for a presentation on progress with architectural design and Aspect Studios around concept public domain design.</p> <p>VS asked that it be made clear to Aspect Studios that the precinct and park need to be integrated. She is nervous that this integration will not occur.</p> <p>DR replied a requirement for design is use of an design integrity panel comprising a number of people including the former government architect.</p> <p>LG asked that Aspect Studios include heritage interpretation of Busby's Bore in their design (see 4.9).</p>	
4.5	<p>Address of questions from MW at this meeting (INSW)</p> <p>MW said INSW has addressed earlier questions not those that had been captured in the minutes.</p> <p>It was agreed that in fact the wrong questions had been addressed.</p>	<p>INSW to address the question and MH to circulate responses to MW and the CCC members within two weeks.</p>
4.6	<p>AM to request EPA attend the next CCC meeting (LL)</p> <p>AM reported that as the concrete crusher is no longer proposed there is no need for the EPA to attend the next meeting.</p> <p>MW suggested EPA involvement is still desirable as community members don't have technical understanding of concepts such as 75 decibels (dB), vibration issues and sensitive receivers. From EPA submissions they are clearly not happy with responses from INSW. We need experts from council or EPA to provide a view on what is acceptable.</p> <p>DR noted Lendlease has specialist advisers which are independent and peer reviewed. There is reluctance for the EPA to attend meetings. The only time INSW has been able to get EPA to attend was to a planning focus meeting.</p> <p>AM has tried to engage EPA in preparation of plans and tried again last week to invite them here but they don't want to come.</p> <p>There was discussion from members about whether the best way to proceed is for the CCC to invite the EPA or invite council experts if councils have such experts.</p> <p>VS suggested a letter from the CCC inviting EPA to attend.</p> <p>SMJ asked as Stage 1 is split into two sections, soft demolition which has been occurring and hard demolition for which subplans are approved what is it that the EPA would be commenting on if they attended?</p> <p>AM noted EPA regard their role as regulating Lendlease to comply with rules.</p> <p>MW said the CCC still needs experts for the meeting to explain noise, vibration, dilapidation and other issues.</p> <p>CF said we need to get experts to transcribe what it will sound like and what the vibrations represent in terms the community can understand so we can then go back to the community and say it will affect people in this way. She feels that it would be in the interests of the EPA to attend to take advice from this group as they will receive complaints from the community.</p> <p>RP considered that it will take effort to try to get the EPA to attend and there is a likelihood that they won't.</p> <p>DR suggested the brief to a noise consultant should be to advise the group of any major environmental noise risks and mitigation measures.</p> <p>VS suggested that council noise experts be invited as one off e.g. a council acoustic engineer for a presentation on noise.</p>	<p>Lendlease and INSW consultants be invited to present to the CCC data, in a form that can be understood by CCC members. The first presentation should be on noise and vibration.</p>

	<p>SMJ asked whether the proponents could bring their noise consultant to present on noise and to break it down into lay terms. The sound report indicates levels of sound but we want to know what that would sound like. There was some discussion around whether these consultants are independent enough, whether there is a conflict of interests and whether this advice would be objective.</p> <p>DR suggested INSW could arrange a presentation by their noise consultant for stage 1 works and the CCC can then consider whether they need further expert advice.</p> <p>LG suggested the four subplans be looked at in this way with expert advice being provided on noise, vibration, traffic and air quality.</p> <p>AM said noise and vibration could be similar with dust/ air quality separately.</p> <p>MW suggested the EPA concerns could be a starting point to frame questions to consultants.</p> <p>PT drew attention to the CoS comments particularly B14 around deficiencies in the Noise and Vibration Management Sub-Plan and B16 Construction Soil and Water Management Plan. He advises that during the meeting he had sent an email to CoS asking to be briefed on these issues and asking if a Council noise expert can attend to brief the CCC.</p> <p>JO reiterated the need to understand 75dB in terms of what it will sound like and how the mitigation works. She would also be keen for council experts to advise.</p> <p>Kathy Neilson (KN) noted she had asked whether someone else from Randwick City Council could attend to advise her tonight and was told they couldn't.</p> <p>MH reiterated that specialist can be invited to contribute for a particular purpose but in general we are discouraging meeting observers.</p> <p>SMJ questioned what was to be gained at this stage with sub plans already signed off. Have final plans gone to council? She feels we are spinning our wheels here if comments have been reviewed, addressed and subplans approved. Is there an ability to amend the four subplans? Why look at the CoS comments unless it is intended this results in changes?</p> <p>PT reiterated that Lendlease responses to date were not accepted by the CoS.</p> <p>AM noted he had indicated to CoS that he was happy to sit down with them and go through the subplans but nothing resulted from that invitation.</p> <p>DR noted it is common practice to provide briefings of reports to CCCs. The CCC is not the assessment body but can benefit by being provided information on impacts and mitigation measures to take back to the community.</p> <p>MH summarised discussion that at this stage we are not going to request the EPA to attend but instead request presentations from Lendlease/ INSW consultants to understanding data of the subplans and to consider specific concerns as raised by CoS.</p> <p>The first presentation will be on noise and vibration. (others being in priority order air quality and then traffic)</p>	
4.7	<p><u>Investigate ways to alert CCC members of new postings on the website. (INSW)</u></p> <p>This was explored but INSW found no automated way to do this.</p> <p>MW asked how then do we know when something has changed?</p> <p>DR suggested the chair could be advised by INSW to send onto the CCC.</p>	INSW to advise Chair of new postings to the website to then advise the CCC

	<p>MH noted there are changes to the DPE website for major projects. The community can request alerts for specific projects such as Sydney Football Stadium.</p> <p>PT suggested recent changes to the Major Project website are contentious, with informed members of the community saying content appears to be dumbed down.</p> <p>MH said while planners may not be happy with the change it represents a better view for the public and it is much easier to find the most recent documents/approvals/applications.</p>	
4.8	<p><u>Update on preconstruction dilapidation reports (LL)</u></p> <p>AM reported in addition to adjoining properties dilapidation reports will be done on the opposite (northern) side of Moore Park Road between the Olympic Hotel & Driver Avenue: the footpath to the property line – what can be seen from the street.</p> <p>PT said a mere visual inspection from outside the property is inadequate and doesn't meet CoS requirements for dilapidation reports. Such reports need to consider the whole building and be undertaken with the agreement of the landowner. After all Lendlease is undertaking major demolition and excavation, and houses may be on sand and many up to 150 years old. He suggests reports also need to be done on houses in Oatley Rd and Poate Rd.</p> <p>JO referred to experience with the light rail where several houses were badly damaged and the project refuses to compensate unless proven in court. It is a big and sensitive issue. A lot of foundations here are directly on the ground. Damage with the light rail was due to laying tracks which is a smaller vibration impact than might be expected here.</p> <p>SMJ asked whether vibration experts have identified properties likely to be affected.</p> <p>AM - The first step is to do dilapidation reports as required in conditions of consent then extend to the other side of the street.</p> <p>PT said it is common practice to go into private properties for dilapidation reports.</p> <p>AM asked whether the concern is around truck movements or demolition vibration.</p> <p>JO and VS said both.</p> <p>LG asked whether dilapidation reports provide a benchmark. This was confirmed.</p> <p>PT noted the Lord Mayors letter. He suggests CoS requested area as a minimum.</p> <p>DR will take this discussion with CoS off line.</p> <p>MW agreed that a wider net should be considered to include the impact of truck movements.</p> <p>MH - In summary, the CCC members conveyed their concern about the need for dilapidation reports and potential for property damage. There will be a conversation between INSW and CoS regarding these concerns. Dilapidation will be on the agenda for the next meeting.</p>	<p>INSW talk to CoS regarding concerns around dilapidation.</p> <p>Dilapidation, and the need for reports be included in the agenda for the next meeting.</p>
4.9	<p><u>Methodology to protect Busby's Bore during the project (INSW)</u></p> <p>Report on the methodology was forwarded to members with the agenda.</p> <p>LG noted Paddington Society concerns that this is a valuable heritage item. Can INSW share the results of investigations e.g. where the wells are and what condition they are in? Have findings from the investigation of the shaft modified the methodology? When monitoring vibration impacts the community would like to know if criteria are exceeded.</p>	<p>INSW to consider whether an updated report on Busby's Bore can be provided to the next meeting.</p>

	<p>PT asked that any correspondence about the bore from the Office of Environment and Heritage be forwarded to CoS. Is there an updated report with progress since the initial report? Can there be an update from INSW on current status?</p> <p>LG asked if Sydney Water had to give consent for access. This was confirmed to be the case.</p> <p>LG said the Paddington Society would like some interpretation in the public domain about the bore. Marking of the shafts and the route would be desirable in Stage 2.</p> <p>DR said investigations have been undertaken and mitigations are now in place. Wells have been identified where possible. He'll take on notice the question of whether an updated report can be provided to the next meeting.</p>	
5.	<p>Project update and look ahead</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction update • Concrete crushing • Review the extent of Sensitive Receivers • Dilapidation 	
5.1	<p>Concrete crushing</p> <p>DR reported that a condition of consent was that the concrete crushing be housed in a structure and stockpiled. With over 100,000 cubic metres a lot would not have been able to be stored and would have been transported offsite anyway. There were additional concerns around the visual impact of the structure, noise due to an open structure and effects of wind on the stockpile. This all led to the decision to put demolition material onto trucks and take it off site. A lot of the recycle targets will still be met but not on site.</p> <p>JO asked whether crushed material would then be brought back to the site.</p> <p>DR said some will come back to provide a working road base but the number of truck movements would stay at 40 a day.</p> <p>AM said truck movements will still be a maximum of 40 a day but it will occur over a longer period.</p> <p>PT noted that the overall total number of truck movements will increase – and asked by how many.</p> <p>DR said the volume of crushed material wasn't initially understood. Half would have been left on site and the rest removed anyway. There are pros and cons with both approaches.</p> <p>SMJ asked whether it is 40 trucks or 40 movements.</p> <p>AM and DR confirmed it is 40 trucks per day in and out so 80 movements but no change to the overall number per day.</p> <p>PT suggested there would still be dust generated from site from demolition and cut up material.</p> <p>DR replied there will be less dust this way.</p> <p>MW asked where on the site the demolition material is stored.</p> <p>AM replied most would be on the pitch and trucked out.</p> <p>MW asked if any would be retained on site.</p> <p>DR replied it wouldn't but will still be reused.</p>	
5.2	<p>Construction update</p> <p>AM reported that the soft strip has mostly finished. MP1 car park has been taken over and fencing installed. The main entry will be the old members car park. Most services have been disconnected. Tree protection is in</p>	

	<p>place. AM indicated on the map the two figs and trees outside the boundary that are being protected.</p> <p>MW asked whether the perimeter to Moore Park stays.</p> <p>AM confirmed it does.</p> <p>PT noted that trees along the Moore Park Rd frontage in front of the new Rugby building had already been cut down, and that other established in the rugby car park would be being cut down.</p> <p>AM indicated all outside the site boundary stay. He indicated on the site diagram everything within the boundary to be demolished.</p> <p>DR noted the Sheridan Building and the tennis courts go but NRL and UTS building stay.</p> <p>LG asked how those facilities will be replaced.</p> <p>Kerrie Mather (KM) said the Sheridan building offices will likely be in the stadium structure; the Waratahs have moved move permanently to Daceyville; the Roosters and SCG offices may be accommodated in the stadium structure behind the stands; merchandise in the stadium; indoor cricket will be smaller and in the southern area stadium; cricket will move to Wilson Park, Homebush permanently. They will have a small presence here in the stadium or at the SCG. Members facilities will be on the western side of the stand where they are now but will be redeveloped.</p>	
5.3	<p>PT asked why, in the light of recent comments by Tony Shepherd, this stadium is being demolished and not the SCG which also has no anti-terrorism or crowd crush provisions?</p> <p>DR replied it is to acknowledge current standards.</p> <p>KM noted the SFS is a single integrated structure. The SCG is made up of independent stands which have been, and will be progressively updated. Noting that moving the stadium footprint has flow on impacts.</p> <p>PT questioned the relevance of being integrated or progressively updated. Surely you can't cherry pick such safety criteria?</p> <p>LG asked whether the stadium will have a vertical wall to accommodate all the facilities. She is worried about bulk.</p> <p>KM said these facilities will not drive stadium structure or size, they are taking advantage of empty areas that will already exist under and behind the stands which may be suitable for these facilities and offices at a later stage.</p> <p>SMJ said the Stage 1 approval envelope indicated a 30% increase in height over the existing structure.</p> <p>DR will present on this at the next meeting.</p> <p>VS asked about flammability of seating. She suggested there is a lack of consistency in the concerns.</p> <p>KM said many of the SFS seats were flammable. These were disposed of rather than given away. Some of the SFS seats had been replaced and these newer seats were given away. The occupancy certificate for SFS expired last year. Up till then operational measures compensated for the lack of fire compartmentalisation. The SCG has fire compartmentalisation and a number of the stands have fire sprinklers.</p> <p>PT challenged the public statements about the SFS. He would expect the same assessment to be made for the SCG. Claims about why the SFS is being demolished include seats, facilities, crowd crush and space around the stadium, separate external threats and attack. He attended a football game at the SFS this year while it was under the interim certificate. Was he at risk as a member of the public? These are questions asked consistently in the community.</p>	KM will respond at the next meeting re the question of seating.

	<p>DR noted the SCG is outside the Terms of Reference. The new stadium development should comply with current best practice.</p> <p>VS said people are asking the question. She asked what are the differences with the SCG seating?</p> <p>KM will take the question on notice and respond at the next meeting.</p>	
5.4	<p>MW said when looking beyond the concept plan it would be useful when thinking of new facilities such as swimming pool and tennis courts what impacts these will have on other areas. He is concerned about potential spill over to Moore Park.</p>	
5.5	<p>Community Consultation Strategy</p> <p>AM reported that as well as the CCC there is a project website, email address and a hotline. Project updates are provided quarterly. Meetings with key stakeholders include Fox Studios, the Barracks, the child care centre and the entertainment quarter.</p> <p>VS asked whether the Parklands Trust is included in key stakeholder meetings.</p> <p>AM will check.</p>	<p>AM to confirm whether the Centennial Parklands Trust is included in key stakeholder meetings.</p>
6	<p>Report of Complaints</p> <p>Correspondence directed to the CCC</p> <p>Round the room</p>	
6.1	<p>Report of Complaints</p> <p>Complaints were tabled at the meeting.</p> <p>AM reported two complaints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The first was of a truck using the wrong road in South Paddington area. Delta was spoken to and the driver has been removed from the team. - The second involved noise monitors being installed within the precinct (NRL building) and confusion in communication about their installation. <p>PT asked what happens if Delta drivers or other drivers again use the wrong streets.</p> <p>AM said this happened early in the project and hasn't happened since. Rules are enforced and subcontractors are expected to follow the rules. Trucks are tracked and logged diligently. The person who transgressed had their employment terminated. A complaint from a resident resulted in Lendlease meeting with them. The issue was addressed, and it was reported to DPE within the required seven days. It was also registered on the complaints register.</p> <p>DR asked whether these are Delta trucks or owner drivers.</p> <p>AM will check this.</p>	
6.2	<p>Correspondence directed to the CCC</p> <p>All correspondence to the CCC email address will be presented to the group. Correspondence since the last meeting was tabled.</p> <p>The first email was responded to, pointing to the Minutes of the CCC meeting and that the CCC had raised the dilapidation issue. There has been no response. The second was a letter to the Minister cc'd to the CCC and the third has come in recent days and is more general concern about the stadium development.</p> <p>JO noted correspondence has raised the importance of dilapidation reports. We are starting to get the flavour of concerns in the community and she expects the communications to increase. They are more for a project response than for the CCC.</p>	<p>Chair to respond to letters from residents of Moore Park Road re dilapidation (<i>note that the one directed to the CCC had been responded to</i>)</p> <p>INSW to report to the next meeting on the planned extent of the dilapidation surveys.</p>

	<p>KN suggested this is a perfect example of why dilapidation reports need to be done.</p> <p>VS suggested our role is to pass this correspondence on to the relevant body and ask that the CCC be copied in to replies. She suggested that if there was a door knock 99% of people would agree to a dilapidation report.</p> <p>MW suggested responses to correspondence needs to say the issue is under consideration by the CCC. When the dilapidation process is more thoroughly undertaken, we as community representatives can communicate back to the community about what is being done. We need to assure the community that there is an effective and focused response.</p> <p>SMJ asked whether there is an option for dilapidation reports to be offered to residents.</p> <p>DR said this is an option.</p> <p>SMJ and JO asked about the timeframe and where the line would stop.</p> <p>DR suggested the zone of influence is determined by geology.</p> <p>PT said CoS would expect minimum application of CoS standards for dilapidation reports.</p> <p>RP asked for confirmation that INSW is inferring an opportunity may be given to residents for dilapidation reports.</p> <p>DR confirmed this.</p> <p>RP in that case he suggests that the CCC formally ask that dilapidation reports be offered to residents.</p> <p>KN suggested that the CoS framework be used.</p> <p>CF asked if there is a budgetary reason it has not been done.</p> <p>DR said there isn't.</p> <p>CF asked why then the delay? Why these difficult, laborious conversations? It is obvious that is it required. Why not just do it.</p> <p>MW asked if Victoria Barracks is included.</p> <p>PT said only part is included in the CoS framework. Suggested that it should be worked out with the Barracks.</p> <p>There was general agreement that correspondence be passed on to INSW and/or where appropriate Lendlease. A response should come from the CCC to say thank you and indicate that we are directing their concern to the relevant body.</p> <p>The two pieces of correspondence mentioning dilapidation should point to the CCC's active consideration and concern about this issue.</p> <p><i>A fourth piece of communication from Dominic Wy Kanak received on 7 February was subsequently recorded as communication to the CCC and circulated to members 14 March 2019</i></p>	
7.	<p><u>CCC Terms of Reference</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Discussion of Terms of Reference (ToR) that were circulated</i> • <i>Further draft based on comments at this meeting will come back to the next CCC meeting.</i> 	
7.1	<p><u>Discussion of potential changes to the Terms of Reference that were circulated further to comments made by members</u></p> <p>SMJ noted the ToR doesn't mention the ability of the CCC to make submissions on future Development Applications. Should this be included in the ToR?</p> <p>DR replied there is no constraints on members making submissions as individuals but the CCC can't make a submission as a group.</p> <p>LG and RP suggested the ability for people to make submissions on their own behalf be stated as an addition to the ToR.</p>	MH to send draft meeting dates to CCC through til August 2019

<p>KN asked that councillors be allowed to bring a planner or another council officer to advise the councillor during the meeting.</p> <p>PT endorsed this view. The three individuals from councils don't have technical expertise. It is a penalty that prevents councillors responding to issues on the night.</p> <p>JO would personally endorse this.</p> <p>MH said if she makes this rule for councils she would have to do the same for all in the room, potentially having 30 people here. She is reluctant to do this. A particular expert can be invited on a particular topic.</p> <p>VS suggested there is some wisdom in inviting a specific expert, however someone sitting next to a councillor would need to talk to them or there is no purpose and this could be distracting for the broader meeting.</p> <p>KN suggested this not to cause angst but to get more information to the community. It is a way for say, the chief town planner, to sit behind, to assist, not to participate. Randwick City Council was not part of the planning approval process and would have better chance of answering questions if people who deal with these issues all the time could attend.</p> <p>MH replied that for other CCCs councils send officers/ planning staff to represent the Council. For this CCC councils have chosen to send elected representatives. She does not have a problem with a request for an invitation for a particular reason/ a specific agenda item.</p> <p>JO sympathises with the request for an expert in attendance rather than waiting a month to be further along with the conversation.</p> <p>SMJ asked whether councils have experts on air quality or vibration.</p> <p>CF suggests common sense should prevail in what is contained in the ToR. The more that is put in the more restrictive it becomes. She has been advised at times not to put things in. It doesn't mean things can't happen but there is risk with so many details. She doesn't feel the issue of submissions needs to be included.</p> <p>MW raised concerns about the frequency of meetings and who sets the agenda. If an issue arises the CCC thinks needs to be discussed who sets the agenda? He wants assurances that community and council representatives can raise particular issues. Frequency of meetings at 4 - 5 times a year becomes a concern for discussion of emerging issues. He would rather have the meetings monthly and then review on a monthly basis if these are required. He suggests the need to set dates in advance on a monthly basis so people can make the necessary arrangements.</p> <p>MH noted that the Community Consultative Committee Guidelines are to be read in conjunction with the ToR, suggest meeting times are flexible to accommodate different stages of the project. Page 8 says "If there are important or urgent matters requiring consideration, any member of the committee may ask the independent chairperson to convene an extraordinary meeting of the committee".</p> <p>DR noted INSW will need monthly meetings through to August 2019.</p> <p>MW said there is nothing in the ToR to say members can request a meeting.</p> <p>SMJ suggests this be clarified in the ToR.</p> <p>There was general agreement that we set meeting dates in advance then reconfirm each date at the meeting prior.</p> <p>MW said if meetings are monthly issues can be addressed in a timely manner. Some community feedback suggests the CCC is another obfuscation by government. He approaches the CCC from a constructive point of view as a committee set up to interact with the community and pass on information. He is concerned that the ToR not be too prescriptive</p>	
---	--

	<p>but responsive to raising issues. It is important we have confidence in the process.</p> <p>Dominic Wy Kanak (DWK) asked that he be added as an additional alternate for Waverley Council along with Mr Monks.</p> <p>DWK asked if all correspondence to the CCC email address is presented to the committee.</p> <p>MH replied all emails to the CCC come here and are presented.</p> <p>DWK suggested the email advising of his litigation against the Chairperson (by DWK via the NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal) wasn't presented to the meeting.</p> <p>MH presumed the email and the litigation was directed to her as she was the one named. She offered to circulate it if it is intended to be directed to the CCC.</p> <p>DWK suggested this discussion be taken off line.</p> <p>DWK asked regarding the ToR whether the CCC has innate power? Can we make decisions in the form of resolutions as opposed to discussions referred to INSW and Lendlease?</p> <p>MH replied we can express the groups concern about dilapidation, but it is not a decision-making body.</p> <p>DWK asked if the CCC can request the proponent approach residents in Oatley Rd for more detailed dilapidation reports. Can we demand that the proponent approach more than the Moore Park Neighbours to request if those property owners would want to have internal Assessment for Dilapidation Reports.</p> <p>MH said we can express the request in that way.</p> <p>DWK feels it should be more of an assertion that the CCC is asking for things be done. There is a lag if we don't get a report until the next meeting especially with dilapidation reports, given what has happened in other projects. We need to learn the lessons from history of other infrastructure projects.</p>	
7.2	<p><u>Adoption of terms of reference/ further draft for review to be produced as required.</u></p> <p>MH will provide the CCC with a revised version incorporating feedback for finalisation at the next meeting.</p>	
8	<p>Round the table with final questions/ comments</p>	
8.1	<p>VS reported receiving correspondence from the Green Building Council of Australia expressing concern that the structure is not following the green building code. They have sent a letter to the Premier asking why but have not had a response. She noted the good example of the Optus stadium in Perth.</p> <p>VS will forward the letter to DR.</p> <p>DR expressed surprise this was the case. He noted that at the time of the western Sydney stadium there was no applicable green standard so the US framework, the LEED goal was used. During that time the Australian standard was developed.</p> <p>VS said the Green Building Council needs to be told that.</p> <p>MW said it was also an opportunity to tell the community.</p>	<p>DR to provide a response to the Green Building Council of Australia and to the CCC by the next meeting.</p>
8.2	<p>SMJ asked how consultation with residents will be targeted to inform the Stage 2.</p> <p>DR said similarly to Stage 1 with individual door knocks, open days and community newsletters.</p>	<p>Design presentation to be provided for the next meeting</p>

	<p>SMJ asked how suggestions will be used to inform the design.</p> <p>DR said it depends what the suggestions are. The design is fairly resolved.</p> <p>SMJ suggested issues around shadowing and visual impacts. She is personally happy that access is enlarged but is concerned about shadowing on Moore Park and that the shadowing over Centennial Parklands, including Moore Park, not exceed what exists now. Impacts on public space need to be considered.</p>	
8.3	<p>CF suggested the roundabout way of doing things leaves us with feelings of powerlessness. She has grave concerns around dilapidation, the traffic routes and impact on pedestrians, parking and the area generally. She will be keen to see a presentation on traffic and pedestrian issues soon.</p> <p>MH indicated that this will be the next presentation for the CCC to follow one on noise/vibration and air quality.</p>	
8.4	<p>PT noted concerns at the loss of community facilities such as the pool have been raised with him. He thinks more than one meeting is required to address this. There is a loss of many associated facilities. What will happens with parking for events?</p> <p>DR said MP1 is out of action.</p> <p>KM said tenant staff and existing workers will use EQ.</p> <p>MW is concerned there be no spill over of parking onto Moore Park during construction.</p> <p>PT asked where construction workers will park.</p> <p>AM replied workers will park on site at B1.</p>	
8.5	<p>LG stated that dilapidation, air quality, Busby Bore protection and reduced parking in South Paddington are current community concerns. She asked whether Hazmat reports have been issued as part of documentation. She hasn't found these on the website. There has been air quality monitoring for locations on the site but nothing on Moore Park Rd or beyond for residential impacts.</p> <p>AM replied dust monitors are on site on the southern Moore Park Rd boundary. The best location is on site closer to the source. Further away dilutes readings.</p> <p>SMJ understands there is a requirement to monitor at the closest sensitive receiver.</p> <p>AM said this monitor is on site to prevent people interfering with it. It is as close to the sensitive receiver as possible on the site boundary. Further away pollutants are dispersed.</p> <p>LG asked about noise receivers. Documents identify the child care centre and UTS Sports but surely houses across the road on Moore Park Rd are also sensitive noise receivers.</p> <p>AM replied it is the same as with dust. Further away dilutes the source.</p> <p>LG is concerned about noise reflections off walls further up the hill and would like further discussion on this when the noise and vibration consultant provides a presentation.</p>	
8.6	<p>MW reported results extracted from the survey are in the Moore Park Society newsletter. Another newsletter is due out in a week to 10 days and will include some further issues that have been raised here. Feedback is that the park should be protected at all costs. Each newsletter appears a week after meetings and will contain a few points from this meeting. If this is a problem let MW know.</p>	

8.7	JO is concern about parking, traffic and dilapidation. An issue with dilapidation reports with the light rail was that resident still has to prove in court the damage was a direct of the project. That is concerning and makes the dilapidation report useless.	
8.8	DWK has had feedback of general suspicions around why the demolition is going ahead, and lack of consistency round fire issues and safety raised. Waverley Council has commissioned an independent study of traffic management for the operations. Other concerns are the preservation of heritage of Busby's Bore. The community is in favour of preserving the heritage and making it a feature of the development. JO asked if the CCC can see a copy of the Waverley traffic report.	DWK to send Waverley traffic report to the CCC when it is complete.
8.9	RP understands as part of the EIS contractors are not to park on Moore Park Rd. He would like to see this reinforced. There has been a noticeable increase in parking by outsiders since project began. There is also requirement for notice if any section of the road need to be blocked. Residents got up last week to find Energy Australia having blocked 10 car spaces without notice. When challenged they couldn't produce permits but seemed to think they didn't need them.	
	Next meeting - Confirmed 10 April 2019 at 5.30pm	
	Close 8.45pm.	

Attachment 1.

Sydney Football Stadium Redevelopment – Community Consultative Committee

Actions from SFSR meeting 1:

1. Tabled question from Jeanette Brokman and Michael Waterhouse (INSW)

Jeanette Brokman	
Question	Response
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?	An injunction has been put in place by the Court until Friday 8 March 2019. No hard demolition work can take place during this time.
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.	Community members can express their views to members of the CCC or alternatively they can email the Chair via the following email - sfsgcc@plancom.com.au
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.	Consultation with the CCC and community will form part of the stage 2 environmental assessment. Details will be communicated in due course.
Michael Waterhouse	
Will there be scope for Committee members to put forward short notes – no more than 1-2 pages – from time to time on issues so the rest of the Committee has time to consider these before a meeting? This could facilitate discussion. Thus it would be helpful if INSW or Lend Lease were to provide details, including photos, of the proposed concrete crusher before the meeting. I've looked at some online and they appear to take many forms. Equally, I could do a short note outlining our concerns head of the meeting.	INSW will provide information in advance of meetings where appropriate and feasible. Questions being tabled is ongoing as per the first meeting.
Would it be possible to have an OHP at the meeting with a map of the site up on a screen, as well as a laser pointer? If we're to have a meaningful discussion about location options for the concrete crusher, it's going to be difficult where some Committee members are less	AV equipment will be provided for the meeting.

<p>familiar with the site than others. I'd certainly find it a lot easier to highlight options in this way.</p>	
<p>Will you circulate contact details for each CCC member? We had these on the SCG TAG and I think it helps communication, though I appreciate you'll want to ensure that any papers for the whole CCC are channelled through you.</p>	<p>Action item complete.</p> <p>Questions to the proponents should be sent to the project email. Details are listed on the project website.</p> <p>Questions regarding the CCC should be sent to the Chair for her actioning.</p>
<p>In an email to the TAG, Kerrie Mather mentioned that Minutes of the CCC meetings will be made public on the Infrastructure NSW website within two weeks of the meeting. It would be helpful if, at the first meeting, you take us through the process of what this will involve e.g. whether views expressed by individual members will be attributed to them, the time members will have to consider and comment on draft Minutes before they're made public, whether there'll be a restriction on us disclosing information arising at meetings ahead of the Minutes appearing on the INSW website, and so on. Regarding the "views expressed by individual members", it's obviously not practical to do this verbatim, but it's also important for our credibility that we be seen to be raising issues of concern to the community.</p>	<p>CCC guidelines detail how the minutes will be distributed.</p> <p>Comments will be attributed to individual members in the minutes.</p>
<p>I appreciate that the CCC is not a decision-making entity, but I trust we'll conclude with a clear idea of decisions that are being made on issues we discuss. Where decisions are made subsequently, I assume we'll be formally notified and that there'll be no restriction on disclosure. Thus, I'm sure community representatives will want to finish the meeting on 7th February knowing when a decision will be made on the concrete crusher, by whom and what that decision is as soon as it's made. –</p>	<p>The concrete crusher was an agenda item at the first meeting. Lendlease presented details of the concrete crusher to members and a subsequent discussion took place which was minuted.</p> <p>A follow up discussion will take place and the second meeting on 6 March 2019.</p>

2. Report on CoS receipt of updated plans incorporating feedback (LL)

- Lendlease met with the City of Sydney on 19 December 2018 to discuss the project and plans to be issued to Council.
- The following sub plans were issued to Council in accordance with the conditions of consent on the below dates:
 - 10 January 2019
 - B19 - Construction Traffic & Pedestrian Management Plan (CPTMP)
 - B14 - Construction Noise & Vibration Management Plan
 - B17 – Construction Air Quality Management Plan

18 January 2019

- B16 - Construction Soil & Water Management Plan.
 - On 23 January 2019 the City of Sydney provided comments on the above plans.
 - On 29 January 2019 the Construction Environment Management Plan and sub plans were updated to reflect comments.
 - All comments, with the exception one (detailed below) were accepted and reflected in the final plans.
 - The one comment from Council that was not accepted was in relation to restricting the largest vehicle to a 12.5 metre Heavy Rigid Vehicle. The Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan still includes the use of 19 metre long Articulated Vehicles which was reviewed and supported by Roads and Maritime Services, the Transport Management Centre, Sydney Light Rail and the Sydney Coordination Office.
- 3. CoS feedback on plans to be provided to the chair for circulation to the CCC (CoS)-** Provided by City of Sydney Council at the meeting.
- 4. Stage 2 documents to be provided to the CCC prior to a presentation at the April meeting (INSW) -** A copy of the relevant stage 2 presentation will be provided in advance of the April 2019 meeting as noted in the meeting one minutes.
- 5. Questions from MW to be attached to the minutes (MH) -** Complete
- 6. AM to request EPA attend the next CCC meeting (LL)-** Due to concrete crushing taking place offsite, EPA attendance is no longer required.
- 7. Investigate ways to alert CCC members of new postings on the website (INSW) -** All project updates, notifications, CCC minutes and presentations that are uploaded to the project website will be emailed to the CCC members by the Chairperson or project team. For other updates including text changes and imagery, we encourage CCC members to regularly check the website.
- 8. Update on dilapidation reports (LL)**
- Dilapidation surveys of the adjoining properties and public infrastructure including roads, gutters and footpaths as required by the conditions of consent are now complete.
 - In addition to the requirements outlined in the consent conditions, Lendlease will prepare dilapidation reports to the:
 - Footpath including gutter along Moore Park Road for the extent of the SFSR northern works boundary.
 - Building fence and wall to properties along Moore Park Road for the extent of the SFSR northern works boundary.
- 9. Report on methodology to protect Busby Bore during the project (INSW)**
- Protection of Busby's Bore has taken place in accordance with the methodology document listed on the Department of Planning and Environments website - <https://majorprojects.accelo.com/public/a925eefe16128a058dcd7a8dd7450dbb/2018-09-14%20Attachment%208-%20Methodology%20Statement%20Working%20Near%20Busbys%20Bore.pdf>