

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

Meeting No. 6, Wednesday 19 June – 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, Michael Waterhouse, Robert Postema, Vivienne Skinner, Geoff Ludowyke – Paddington Society Representative

Local Government representative: Mayor Kathy Neilson (Randwick City Council), Cr Philip Thalys (City of Sydney Council), Waverley Council (TBA)

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

Note taker: Sandra Spate.

Guests: David Gainsford, Executive Director, Priority Projects Assessments, Department of Planning and Environment, Denise Ora, Executive Director, Botanic Gardens & Centennial Parklands, Carla Armanet, Director Sport & Recreation, Botanic Gardens & Centennial Parklands, Russell Lee- Cox Architecture

Apologies: none

Item no.	Description	Actions/ Who by
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome • Acknowledgement of Country • Overview of tonight's agenda 	
2.	Introductions	
	Denise Ora (DO), Executive Director, Botanic Gardens & Centennial Parklands, Carla Armanet (CA), Director Sport & Recreation, Botanic Gardens & Centennial Parklands and Geoff Ludowyke (GL) – Paddington Society Representative were introduced to the meeting.	
3.	<p>Declarations of pecuniary and other interests</p> <p><i>Michael Waterhouse</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>his super fund has shares with Lendlease</i> • <i>is a member of the SCG trust.</i> <p><i>Sofie Mason-Jones is on a wait list for the SCG Trust.</i></p>	
4.	DPIE Exhibition of Stage 2	
4.1	David Gainsford (DG) reported the EIS for Stage 2 (stadium and operations) is on exhibition from today for 28 days till Wednesday 17 July. Submissions are received by the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) and CCC members and the community are encouraged to make submissions through the portal on the DPIE website. DPIE numbers and collates submissions. INSW is then instructed to respond to issues. The Response to Submissions Report goes onto the DPIE website. The DPIE ensures all issues are addressed in the report. An assessment is	

	<p>made then a recommendation to the Minister for Planning for determination.</p> <p>DG explained the DPIE checks the EIS against the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARS) to ensure all requirements have been addressed.</p>	
4.2	<p>GL asked whether there is a mechanism for acknowledgement of submissions through the portal.</p> <p>DG replied there is. There is an option to register to be notified. Notification about further steps will also be provided to those who register.</p>	
4.3	<p>Julie Osborne (JO) was unable to find the correct link.</p> <p>The link is included below.</p> <p>https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/major-projects/project/10736</p> <p>Vivienne Skinner (VS) asked if the general public would have difficulties locating the EIS on the website.</p> <p>MH replied it shouldn't be difficult. It can be found under the project name or geographical location or postcode. People used to the old system may find it more difficult but the new website is easier for the general public.</p>	<p>Include the link to Stage 2 EIS in the minutes.</p>
5.	<p>Presentation from Botanic Gardens and Centennial Parklands ED on Moore Park Master Plan – Denise Ora</p>	
5.1	<p>DO presented on the Moore Park Masterplan 2040 which is the vision for Moore Park.</p> <p>A controversial aspect is the progressive removal of on-grass event parking. The 2040 Masterplan released in 2017 and endorsed by the then Minister provides for the progressive removal of on-grass event parking concurrently with the operation of the light rail.</p> <p>If and when parking goes the Centennial Park & Moore Park Trust (CPMPT) will start removing it in a phased approach. With the proposed commencement of light rail in January 2020 the CPMT is looking to start the transition mid 2020. A Sydney common with cricket, open space, enhanced playground and Kippax Lake improvements was always intended for the space and is expressed in the 2040 Master Plan. The Tramway Oval and changed bus loop has already provided an enhancement to the area and given back more green space. The Tramway Oval has restricted access at present in order to provide appropriate levels of Turf establishment and to avoid damage caused by off lead dogs. This will be reviewed later in 2019.</p> <p>There is a conversation around what happens if parking stays. This is not an outcome that would be accepted by CPMPT or Community Groups. CPMPT do however understand the need for phased approach. It is understood that more than one group would be needed to make this happen and that finding a solution is not the sole responsibility of CPMPT. There would be a need to work as a precinct for a viable alternative. Alternatives such as dispersement have been investigated.</p> <p>There are unknowns around full impacts of light rail and hence why CPMPT have not made any decision to commence phased approach of removal of</p>	

	<p>any parking until mid 2020 to provide opportunity for Light Rail and Transport NSW to have an established event mode including bus services. If parking is not removed then nothing changes and the area is not enhanced. Some cars have to go for the northern amenities block to be constructed.</p> <p>Plans are for a transition to create a community cricket space (North Kippax) and revitalise the park and children’s garden with the least amount of funding. There is opportunity in the Moore Park west for turf, hybrid turf or a synthetic multi-use fields also in Showground Fields once Light Rail Compound is removed.</p> <p>The commitment in the Masterplan is a win/ win for the community, but there would need to be a much broader discussion and escalation to find alternative parking solution for the current 2,500 on-grass event parking spaces. What is clear is that we cannot revitalise these areas and provide better community space without this.</p> <p>CPMPT has done as much as it can towards the Masterplan until the transition. The stadium plans weren’t finalised prior to the Masterplan. Further discussions will need to take place with respect to finding solutions that will assist all codes..</p>	
5.2	<p>GL asked about the financial consequence of removing parking. He noted an urban myth circulating that the CPMPT has delayed removing parking as they don’t want to lose the revenue stream.</p> <p>DO replied revenue is around \$500,000. CPMPT would have to look at alternatives such as sporting codes access fees. But they wouldn’t have included it in the Masterplan if they didn’t want to do it. A commitment has been made. Light rail is a major component. Alternatives have to be looked at and decisions made.</p> <p>GL asked whether the Board’s position has been made clear to the Government, that the Government has to contribute to solving the problem. No one seems to be taking leadership.</p> <p>DO noted the issue can of course be political. There was talk one time of building a car park under Moore Park but this was dismissed at the time. It is not CPMPTs sole responsibility to find alternative solution. Kerrie Mather (KM) noted the SCG Trust has been working in close collaboration with CPMPT throughout. They have looked at opportunities for park and ride e.g. from the racecourse or school. A transitional time is needed to determine how to go forward. The Masterplan talks about light rail and a working group. The bigger audience needs to find a solution.</p>	
5.3	<p>Phil Thalys (PT) suggested the CCC had been underwhelmed by the presentation on the Green Travel Plan which said a bus service will be cancelled but everyone can get on the light rail. We were expecting to see staged removal of parking addressed. Residents are concerned people will park on the streets of Paddington.</p> <p>Michael Waterhouse (MW) said both supply and demand needs to be looked at, not simply supply contracting but also what the demand is going to be. An issue of concern regarding the presentation was the indicator that the sum total of the Transport Plan and Green Travel Strategy was a</p>	

	<p>reduction of around 2% in demand for parking. We can approach this by upsetting sporting codes by indicating that on a given date there will be 500 or 1,000 fewer parking places. INSW hasn't got another plan. There needs to be a green travel plan which works progressively to reduce demand for car parking space. INSW and the Parkland Trust needs to work together. Conditions of Consent require the DA to provide support and contribute to the Masterplan, but it is blatantly opposed to it. He doesn't have the answer but there has to be a transport plan able to reduce the demand for parking at the same time as supply is reduced.</p> <p>DO said we have to have a shared win outcome, to see something go back to the community. We have a delay here and need to look at the dispersal program e.g. at ES Marks (athletic field).</p>	
5.4	<p>JO was involved with the CPMPT when they were developing the Masterplan. There was huge community support for removal of parking. Parking is a core issue for this group. She agrees collaboration is needed. She would love to more leadership around integrated ticketing and the removal of parking.</p> <p>Robert Postema (RP) noted sports clubs are adamant about retaining parking.</p> <p>JO agreed clubs say they don't want it to go but there needs to be an alternative.</p> <p>Sofie Mason-Jones (SMJ) said the Stage 2 DA relies on the 2,000 to 2,500 parking spaces. How can the DA be consistent with the Moore Park Masterplan if it relies on on-grass parking? She assumes the Parklands Trust was consulted during the preparation of the DA.</p> <p>DO replied there were discussions with the CPMPT during Stage 1 and Stage 2 preparations and INSW is aware of the Moore Park Masterplan.</p> <p>JO doesn't want a DA that relies on parking on green space.</p> <p>RP asked whether this means the Trust has given consent to car parking on grassed areas.</p> <p>DO said CPMPT hasn't given consent. It won't allow a condition saying the stadium relies on on-grass parking. If that is a condition in the DA CPMPT can't approve it as it is contrary to the Masterplan.</p> <p>SMJ said it would have been different if the presentation had demonstrated an ability to phase out parking but it didn't. It said the issue of event parking is CPMPTs problem. The Transport Plan needs to show how parking could phased out without it becoming a community issue. INSW said if parking is there we will continue to use it.</p> <p>David Riches (DR) said the CPMPT didn't approve the DA. It is solely on SCG Trust land. There is no application for works on CPMPT land but there has been extensive consultation. The Transport Plan will contemplate advance planning. He acknowledges the phasing out of car parking is a weakness.</p> <p>SMJ said while the stadium is on SCG land the car parking is on Parkland Trust land. She asked DG about INSW's point that it is the stadium site that is the subject of the development application when it will continue to rely on parking on Moore Park. Any other development applications would have to</p>	

	<p>say where parking would exist. Be honest that the two are linked. She questions how the DPIE will assess the project on the footprint of the stadium when external car parking is such a strong component. The traffic assessment fell short. It is predicated on the car spaces. Not what is the needed and where they are going to go.</p> <p>DG acknowledged the link. The impact of the new stadium will be intensified if parking is not addressed. There is a condition that it be consistent with the Masterplan. These issues will be part of DPIE consideration.</p> <p>Tom Gellibrand (TG) said INSW weren't able to look into a crystal ball to determine what spaces will be removed, what will be relocated or what replaced, to make assumptions about how many and when.</p>	
5.5	<p>KM reported on a meeting of sports codes this afternoon with strong views that without another solution reduction of parking will impact on attendance by families, people with prams and from further away. We need a precinct-wide holistic solution looking at public transport, active transport, pedestrian access and parking. SCG Trust has encouraged staff to use other modes. There is a need to call for the Government to take holistic view. There is a need for integrated transport solutions. Since last meeting SCG Trust has started discussions with Uber to take away cars away from the residential area. SCG Trust is trying to take a leadership role. More public transport is needed and to look at investment in an underground car park.</p>	
5.6	<p>VS noted in cities such Berlin people put prams on public transport. She thought light rail would be family friendly. People currently don't know differently. Someone needs to start. Throw the ball into the pond and say this will happen from this date. Currently the documents are saying it has nothing to do with us it is Parklands Trusts land.</p> <p>GL and JO agree this is a problem that has been solved elsewhere in the world and at other stadia in Australia. There is a need to find a solution to the codes' need for family friendly access.</p> <p>PT noted 70,000 cars parking previously. There has been movement in the right direction but not as part of this project. Part of the DA is permission to use parking on Moore Park lands. The Transport Plan relies on this.</p> <p>Chelsea Ford (CF) asked why can't parking be stopped tomorrow.</p> <p>DO replied progressive removal of parking will happen. It will be concurrent with light rail operations as there is no other means of transport. It has been affected by light rail delays. There is a new Minister for Public Spaces and getting good community outcomes would be part of remit.</p> <p>RP feels that unless someone sets a line in the sand clubs won't be forced to deal with the issue.</p> <p>Kathy Neilson (KN) is depressed with light rail outcomes. It could have been so much better with a closer drop-off to Moore Park and the stadium.</p> <p>MW understands why codes are opposed but they want to use green space for parking 60 days of the year depriving the community of using the land for the other 300 days. It is a skewed view.</p>	

5.7	<p>VS suggests a public relations campaign showing what the village green concept will look like, what could be.</p> <p>KN suggested more is being made to feature of the Anzac memorial which will likely generate more money.</p>	
5.8	<p>GL asked if the schools are part of the domain of the CPMPT lands.</p> <p>DO replied they are not impart of CPMPT lands.</p>	
6.	<p>Actions from meeting 4 and 5</p> <p>For response/ update – meeting 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cox architects to include dimensions on drawings • INSW to update drawings to correctly show the height of the roof • INSW to provide CCC with data on adequacy and number of lifts • INSW to provide information on how design complies with disability requirements of National Construction Code • INSW provide response at next meeting around consideration of height. <p>Discussion of response to Actions from meeting 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INSW to clearly distinguish between staff and consultants in future information sessions. • INSW to notify the CCC when Modifications 1 and 2 go on exhibition. • INSW to report back on whether the path crosses playing fields and impacts on fields • INSW/ Arup to confirm access across Moore Park once light rail is complete. • Further commentary required in relation to security issues surrounding drones – Response to be provided 	
6.1	<p>Russell Lee (RL), Cox Architecture, delivered a presentation in response to the questions and actions around design. (Presentation on website with these meeting notes)</p> <p>RL presented revised drawings. Key points of the presentation are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following discussion at the last meeting a second lift is part of the access from Driver Ave. A further two service lifts from the main concourse could provide additional lift capacity. • The issue of desirability for a specific drop off point for people with disability has led to MP1 car park being reconfigured for a dedicated drop off zone and clear pick up point. The wheelchair drop-off within the MP1 car park has a pavement bringing people to the entry. (In response to a questions RL replied the footpath to the entrance is not covered). • Roof height is being reduced. • RL outlined the process of ensuring compliance to the National Construction Code, Australian Standards and the Disability Discrimination Act and named the experts on disability access involved in different stages as iAccess and Before Compliance. <i>The document "DDA Compliance Statement – Performance Solutions</i> 	

	<p><i>Stage 2 DA Submission – Concept Amended III” had been circulated to CCC members prior to the meeting (more information on compliance is available in the presentation).</i></p>	
6.2	<p>GL asked whether car spaces can be reconfigured to get disability drop-off closer to the lifts. He noted access is subject to weather (uncovered pathway) and closer points will be filled with cars.</p> <p>RL replied this can be looked at but it is relatively easy to navigate from the car park to the lift.</p> <p>VS suggested finding space for a second lift is positive but how about two more? She spoke to a sustainability expert who was astonished at the number of lifts for a 45,000 capacity stadium. The expert thought four would be a minimum.</p> <p>RL said there is sufficient area for additional lifts. Capacity studies aren’t yet finalised. Advice to date is that one lift is sufficient. Two are being provided with potential access to a further two.</p> <p>SMJ asked about the lift carrying capacity.</p> <p>RL replied they are 2m wide x 2.4 deep so a 16 person capacity.</p> <p>PT said that at railway stations a 17 person capacity is regarded as a small lift and 24 large.</p> <p>RL noted studies are not complete and design is to be finalised factoring in general circulation, advice from an access consultant, plus fire engineering and safe passage of people out.</p>	
6.3	<p>JO asked whether the stairs remain.</p> <p>RP asked for confirmation that access is ground level to Driver Ave then lifts.</p> <p>RL replied that the stairs remain. Nothing on the other levels change.</p> <p>VS suggested that neither Bankwest nor Optus Stadium in Perth have monumental height, but Bankwest has a ramp. Do these stadia work well?</p> <p>DR confirmed Bankwest works well. Access is at grade on the northern end but there are 6m stairs at the southern end. Perth is similar with a 50/50 split in entry use.</p> <p>Angus Morten (AM) suggested 15,000 use each entry at Bankwest.</p> <p>JO noted over 60% expected to use Driver Ave.</p> <p>MW suggested there is significant risk of falling down stairs with 20,000 people rushing to get out. He suggested it ironic that Tony Shepherd’s comments were around a priority for improving safety and referring to the Hillsborough catastrophe. He predicts something catastrophic will happen due egress via stairs. Going down is more dangerous than going up.</p> <p>DR replied Optus Stadium has a 6m stair case and he is not aware of any safety issues with 800,000 attendances. Stairs are designed to Sports Grounds Safety Authority (SGSA) guidelines regarding width, tread, height of risers and provisions at the top of stairs. They allow one and a half times the width of normal circulation. People come to the top and slow down on descent. They are designed to be safe.</p> <p>GL asked if there is an alternative e.g. a ramp.</p> <p>SMJ suggested sinking the stadium could be an alternative.</p>	

	<p>RL replied the stadium has to have stairs. They have looked at the water table and dropping the stadium 3m but to keep the concourse at the same level stairs have to be included somewhere. The preference is for this to be at the Moore Park Rd end with a suitable outcome for the three major corners.</p> <p>PT said the SCG has escalators. He asked whether there are images of the effects from Paddington with incredible change in scale.</p> <p>SMJ asked why the stairs have to be at the primary entrance.</p> <p>RL said there is more room for stairs at the primary entrance.</p>	
6.4	<p>JO asked about height from Moore Park Rd.</p> <p>RL said the roofline in the DA of 65 was set by acoustic requirements but can drop a further 3m by swinging the roof down. Acoustic engineers have given latitude to bring the edge in from Moore Park Road. This has been tested with acoustic engineers. The RL at Moore Park Rd is 45, the overall RL is 62.</p> <p>SMJ said it is still at least 5 storeys.</p> <p>RP asked how changes to the roofline would impact the number of seats.</p> <p>RL said the amenity of the project is maintained. They will continue to look at whether it can be brought down further if performance is guaranteed.</p> <p>DR said there is no change to seating capacity.</p> <p>JO suggested it is a massive stadium in size for no extra seats.</p> <p>PT is surprised to see how low the corner at Moore Park Rd appears in images presented. PT thought the image was not representative of the bulk the stadium would present to Paddington. A view down Oatley Road would be more representative of impacts on Paddington.</p>	
6.5	<p>RP asked for feedback on a 4.3m services driveway instead of the 6m currently proposed.</p> <p>RL replied they are looking at pulling the height down but the constraint is the garbage truck of 5m then some clearance.</p>	
6.6	<p>VS asked if the cladding colour had changed.</p> <p>RL replied the original had more silver but this picks up more bronze.</p>	
6.7	<p>KN asked what emergency procedures would be in place to evacuate people with disability in emergency as lifts can't be used.</p> <p>RL said there are refuges within the building and emergency stairs. Fire wardens are responsible for assisting people.</p>	
6.8	<p>MW acknowledges we have been taken through the process of complying with disability guidelines but the bottom line is outcomes. The response seems to be ensuring access is in the future. He cited the example of the Brisbane Exhibition Centre having to spend millions to accommodate changes after a complaint to the Human Rights Commission. It hadn't been taken into account in the early stages. He is frustrated he has laid out issues and had no response from INSW. He is concerned that if left to too late the DA process it could come unstuck.</p> <p>TG suggested RL has provided an answer around progressive assurance. It can't be assured the building is capable of occupation till complete. It is the final step. It has to be demonstrated that the DA has undertaken to comply</p>	

	<p>with standards. Conditions are issued, then experts check compliance, then experts ensure construction complies. Then the final certification is issued. If the client skips step 2 they haven't built in accordance to requirements and won't get an occupancy certificate. It starts with codes, then experts, then occupation. The process is important. You don't take the risk of getting to the end without going through the process.</p> <p>MW said the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) has a potentially significant impact on the design of the stadium. It is a crucial piece which shouldn't be left till later.</p> <p>TG replied it is in the design.</p> <p>MW asked whether it is included in the DA. Is there no possibility to change the design to include a ramp?</p> <p>SMJ suggested a modification to approval can be lodged. Progressional advice is that the design has the ability to meet standards. There is a lack of detail but it has the ability.</p> <p>GL asked if there is a separate road for disability access or do they have to compete with members and rely on the SCG Trust to ensure access.</p> <p>RL said the SCG Trust will need to manage disability access.</p>	
6.9	<p>SMJ asked whether the design is an improvement for access over the previous stadium.</p> <p>RL replied it is. The entrance was previously on the north and north east. It is viewed as a safer solution, the bonus being the north west and east are also on grade.</p> <p>SMJ asked whether stairs have improved access.</p> <p>RL said they have. They allow faster entry. Previously only members had eastern entry and there was no disability access. The corporate area at the southern end had 6 to 7m stairs. Access provisions are generally an improvement.</p>	
6.10	<p>RP asked how ongoing tweaking of the design sits within the approval process.</p> <p>DG replied it is not unusual to review design which is often based on a conceptual design not detailed design. As it develops design is reviewed. Depending on the nature of changes a modification process is required or not.</p> <p>DR said the DA contains 30 drawings. There are 3,000 for construction. All designs are sent to the SGSA in London for review. All the details referred to by MW have been reviewed. Patrons have already been walking down internal stairs by the time they come to the concourse stairs.</p>	
6.11	<p>VS asked if there is still an intention for photovoltaic cells on the roof.</p> <p>RL replied there is. It is in the EIS report. Cells are integrated with roofing.</p>	
6.12	<p>SMJ asked about the external screen wrap.</p> <p>RL said this has gone. There is no screen on the outside. The only screens are the four naming rights screens.</p>	

6.13	<p>RP noted the reference to drones in the presentation on safety (and response in the answers to questions circulated prior to the meeting). A few people had questions which CCC members felt weren't adequately addressed. They were in relation to terrorism issues.</p> <p>CF said it was highlighted that outside the space airport there is no plan for protection of public spaces.</p> <p>KM noted that the SCG has approval processes for their use by media. All security intelligence, threat and assessment is overseen by law enforcement agencies and SCG works closely with them.</p>	
6.14	<p>In thanking Russel for his presentation on issues of concern to the CCC MH urged CCC members to put their concerns in the submissions they make to DPIE as part of the EIS process.</p>	
7.00pm – BREAK and refreshments		
7.	<p>Subsequent CCC questions/ issues raised (since meeting 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disability access • Driver Avenue steps – risk of falling • Other issues 	
7.1	<p>MW said he had made an effort to identify issues and felt he got an off-hand response from INSW. He then undertook further research and sought advice. He felt he had identified cause for concern and provided subsequent questions to which he felt he didn't receive a response. He would like to see written response. He said his questions were designed to illicit facts to enable an informed discussion.</p> <p>MH suggested she thought INSW had made an attempt to answer questions around process. She suggested going through MW's question now but can't guarantee MW will be satisfied with the answers.</p> <p>MW said it is not a matter of not liking responses. The questions were designed to illicit facts and he would like written responses. His understanding was that questions would get written responses.</p> <p>TG suggested the key value of the CCC is to understand key issues of concern and to take these on board when preparing plans and the EIS. The role is not to fix things in a meeting.</p> <p>SMJ noted questions raised months ago as to whether the DDA applies to the development. The answer at that time was that it did not and MW further researched the issue. The CCC was told by Cox the DDA doesn't apply to the stairs but to getting into the building. The question is how does the primary access at grade, then the wall of stairs satisfy requirements under the DDA? The understanding is that Cox had said it doesn't apply to getting to the site but only getting into the building.</p> <p>DR suggested he always said DDA applies.</p> <p>TG suggested the DDA starts when getting out of the car, then the route crossing the kerb and gutter. In his experience it relates to operations of the stadium as well as where you are coming from.</p> <p>MW noted current confusion. It was said the DDA doesn't apply to public areas. He is trying to understand the facts. At the moment there is a</p>	<p>(a). TG to confirm the extent to which the DDA applies to the public domain and to access from Driver Ave.</p> <p>(b). INSW to write to the Accessible Transport Advisory Committee, the Disability Council of NSW and the Australian Human Rights Commission and offer to meet, present and gain feedback on the stage 2 proposal.</p>

	<p>superficial response. He still has concerns. He is happy for INSW to acknowledge the concern and come back with answers.</p> <p>PT has followed up with City of Sydney. The Inclusion Advisory Panel follows design all the way through not just around compliance but best practice. They involve two NSW forums: The Transport Advisory Committee and the Disability Council of NSW.</p> <p>MW noted the final paragraph in his question says the Australian Human Rights Commission “can advise how best to ensure that the Driver Avenue entrance does not discriminate under the DDA. In my view, this advice should be sought and included in the Stage 2 EIS.”</p> <p>PT asked whether C37 Disability Access Review is part of the application as it may be prudent for future claims.</p> <p>AM replied it is included.</p> <p>SMJ noted the report talks of compliance in getting into the stadium but confirmation is needed around DDA compliance applying to getting from Driver Ave to the stadium.</p>	
7.2	<p>Regarding a series of questions emailed by MW for response from INSW, MW said he was trying to understand on behalf of the community where we stand. Questions and responses included below:</p> <p><u>NSW has twice stated at CCC meetings that it has not employed a consultant to provide a report on access issues. Does that remain the situation?</u></p> <p>Response. No</p> <p><u>If a consultant has now been employed, when were they appointed and what is their name?</u></p> <p>They have been appointed at stages as per presentation and named (iAccess and Before Compliance). INSW circulated a report prior to this meeting “DDA Compliance Statement – Performance Solutions Stage 2 DA Submission – Concept Amended III”</p> <p><u>Are they members of the Association of Consultants in Access Australia Inc.?</u></p> <p>AM understands they are. This will be confirmed.</p> <p><u>When will INSW provide the CCC with their report (in full)? When will the CCC have an opportunity to discuss its conclusions?</u></p> <p>SMJ asked if the report addresses getting into the site. Has the scope of the report broadened? GL asked if the report is available now for discussion. INSW said the report will be available for discussion at the next meeting. There has been discussion around detailed design and what applies to the public domain.</p> <p><u>Has INSW approached the Australian Human Rights Commission and sought its advice about how best to ensure that the Driver Avenue entrance does</u></p>	<p>AM to confirm consultants are members of the Association of Consultants in Access Australia Inc.</p>

	<p><u>not discriminate under the DDA? 7. If so, will INSW provide its report on this to the CCC?</u></p> <p>INSW will identify the most appropriate body. TG is happy ask the different groups (Australian Human Rights Commission, Transport Advisory Committee and Disability Council of NSW) for the opportunity to present designs, get their feedback and report back to the CCC.</p> <p><u>Section 3 of the Stage 2 SEARS requires INSW to</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Provide details of strategies to mitigate risks at points of crowd swell (i.e. pedestrian crossing / refuge points, circulation around the stadium, and approach and departure points).</u> • <u>Provide details of stadium emergency and evacuation procedures, including a draft Emergency Response and Evacuation Principles, which addresses issues of public and crowd safety and behaviour management.</u> <p>DR replied each element of SEARS is addressed in the EIS.</p> <p><u>Has INSW (whether in its own right or using a consultant) undertaken a review of research on the risk of falls on steps used by substantial numbers of people (not necessarily associated with stadia)? Has it undertaken an assessment of the risks of such falls on the Driver Avenue steps? If so, will this be provided to the CCC for discussion?</u></p> <p>DR replied they haven't. Designs have been referred to the leading UK authority on sportsgrounds, the SGSA. He is happy to circulate the SGSA report.</p> <p><u>When does INSW propose to put the Stage 2 EIS on exhibition?</u></p> <p>As discussed under item 4.</p> <p>MH said she appreciated that the EIS is a large document. It can be difficult to find particular items. If the CCC wants to ask about locating particular items in the EIS can INSW provide this information?</p> <p>INSW replied they can.</p>	
7.3	<p>GL asked whether an ambulance can get from Moore Park Rd to the other entrance.</p> <p>AM replied they can, there is 360 degree access.</p> <p>KM noted the bollards can drop at Figtree Place.</p>	
8.	<p>Project update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on Stage One works • Update on Stage Two planning • Report of Community Complaints 	
8.1	<p>Update on Stage One works</p> <p>AM reported most of the stand is down with the eastern stand coming down last week. They are now sorting the last of the rubble. Next is demolition of the Sheridan Building then the Roosters building. Lendlease will move into</p>	

	the site accommodation in the coming weeks. Demolition will be finished over the coming two or three months.	
8.2	GL asked about outcomes of vibration monitoring. AM replied they have been good. There was one spike of 20 when a bin was dropped. The exclusion zone has now been extended.	
8.3	KM asked about timing of demolition of the Sheridan Building. AM replied it is after site accommodation is established in about three weeks.	
8.4	Update on Stage Two planning This has been covered in the slide presentation (agenda item 6).	
8.5	Report of Community Complaints <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AM noted three complaints in May regarding dust. Dust suppression was increased. Monitors are not recording exceedances. • DR said the overall number of complaints is low at seven. • AM noted one of the first complaints was from a driver going up the wrong street. The driver was removed from site. There haven't been problems since then. 	
9.	What we are hearing from the community? - Round the room	All
9.1	SMJ suggested it was a good meeting and progress was made. The outstanding issue for comment remains parking on Moore Park. She hears from people on the Surry Hills side and they like that Moore Park East is getting attention. But the Transport Plan relies on this parking. INSW needs to show how parking can be phased out to be consistent with the Masterplan. She doesn't think 6m stairs is improving access. Can we test whether it needs to be that high? And testing the bulk and scale. The increase in height needs to be demonstrated as needed against seating capacity. MW and JO concurred with SMJ on the parking issue consistently raised.	
9.2	KN can't believe the number seats remain the same and there is still no retractable roof.	
9.3	RP endorses the efforts in looking at reducing the height issue.	
9.4	VS also considers it to have been a good meeting. She hopes message and language around parking reflect a new reality and the government starts addressing this now.	
9.5	CF also considers it a good meeting. She encourages the view that people have particular roles and responsibilities and believes there is a need to trust that things will happen. People have particular jobs for a reason. CCC agitation has been powerful and she strongly supports this. Safety nets are built into businesses. We have an advocate focus and then move on.	
9.6	KM reiterated the issue of having no suitable replacement identified for parking posing a challenge for attendances by families and others.	

9.7	<p>GL thought the meeting valuable. On behalf of the Paddington Society he notes key points as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connectivity from Moore Park Rd to EQ. This has been promised for a long time; • Busby's Bore is a valuable heritage item. They are pleased it has its own naming and the society would appreciate any efforts to highlight what is underneath and that no further damage occurs; • No encroachment on Moore Park. Stadium users should recognise the amenity of residents and pedestrians. The type of people using the new public domain 365 days is unknown. Will there be skateboarders? It needs to be monitored to ensure no adverse use; • Lights and name rights – how bright? Will they affect sleep? • Noise from concerts – there needs to be recognition that two schools in Moore Park buildings are used at night and may be impacted by noise. 	
10.	Correspondence directed to the CCC / Chairperson – nothing external to report	
11.	<p>Next meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting 7 – Monday 29 July 2019 • Consideration of reschedule of meeting 8 – from August 21 to 18 or 25 September 	
11.1	<p>The date of upcoming meetings to be decided. The August meeting may not be required but this is to be decided at the next meeting. The next meeting is 29 July by which time DPIE will have received submissions but not analysed them. INSW hopes to have developed a Response to Submissions Report by September.</p>	
11.2	<p>MW reported he would resign from the CCC. He joined the CCC with the intention of making a difference but is not convinced his participation has. His concerns are that we have a stadium set in a dense urban area adjacent to parklands and he believes INSW has shown no interest in this context. The old stadium blended within the setting. This is a monolithic structure as viewed from the park and Paddington and he feels INSW and Cox are disinterested. There have been some small wins but he doesn't know if he wishes to sustain the time and effort he has so far put in. He intended to resign tonight but would like to follow through on the Australian Human Rights Commission discussion if it occurs at the next meeting.</p> <p>MH asked to be advised of his intention to inform process of finding a replacement from those who originally nominated and missed out.</p>	
12.	Final questions/ comments	
	As this is DR's last meeting the CCC thanked him for his work with the CCC.	
	Close 8.30pm	