

**Submission
No 201**

INQUIRY INTO SYDNEY STADIUMS STRATEGY

Name: Mrs Margaret Hogg

Date Received: 24 May 2018

**Submission
No 201**

INQUIRY INTO SYDNEY STADIUMS STRATEGY

Name: Mrs Margaret Hogg

Date received: 24 May 2018

I make this submission in protest of:

1. Inappropriate affixing of State Significant Infrastructure label- The SEARS test for which can not be granted...The CSELR has already indicated this area is unable to provide compensation /offset of canopy from the significant trees that will be taken. The HEALTH and ecological negatives to human and other animal and plant systems further hampered as a result of the West Connex ; CSELR and resultant High Rise Developments will result in physical mental and linked HEALTH COSTS to the public purse and well being;
2. The Historic "IN PERPETUITY " responsibility and commitment of these entrusted lands is being violated. Public access to these lands will be further restricted by \$\$ payment ability. - The entire appropriateness of the the current "must be equitable" unjustified decree in reflection of intended purpose simply imposed on the public has seen these lands taken rather than inanced.
1. NB. The management and trust is seen as not adhering to the Article 21 guidelines for sustainable development/living or liveability it set out. Yet It is meant to be implicit in all our planning.
2. The leasing to private entities with restrictions on exclusion to the public pose great questions of irresponsible administration upon those who sit on the board and any vested interests- personal or linked. e.g. How did we end up with a disgraced premier who not only was instrumental in the CSELR project but as Premier and minister for Gambling seems to have enabled the INGLIS/now Barker St. development to be pulled back from "Due Process" this development so out of keeping and detrimental to area and has a 0% affordable housing outcome...WHO chose him and the other members? and on what criteria and COST \$\$ to the public to earn it??. Ellis, who is hardly at a meeting and is overseas from minutes community have accessed and told me of, somehow is the chairperson and on his say rather than ariculture knowledge ; advice or any credential dictates the ground of Centennial Park on his personal Asthetic preference...you will see a big difference in Botanic Gardens principles and City of Sydney on Best Practice and administration here.
What this park is having happen is the passing to PRIVATE income of cash in the venues at the cost to the public who own it.(That makes for a BAD TENNANT);
3. 3.Size and scale of this proposed structure is in excess of previous structure and with the removal of the trees will be grotesque and dominating on the area.
4. The acoustics that previously were designed to allow noise to rise out and defuse away will be held within. As will the ventilation and poses questions of adequate design to those who play and sit within it.
5. It still will not provide weather protection and will enhance heat- I have seen no evidence to suggest otherwise.;
6. The Cost Benefit Analysis /summary presented to the public for their expenditure here is a "FARCE" as the information provided indicated the final drawings had not been done...HOW then can you cost this responsibly...Just what is the public paying for? WHO is the activity benefiting??
7. Concept plans need thorough scoping...this has not been done.
8. Refurbishment plans were not provided to the public scrutiny;
9. Members have seen more than the public however THEY are only asked to pay membership the TAX Payers will foot this bill for Private gain...According to the ICAC that may well constitute a case of FRAUD on the public and its purse and well being.. and should be tested;
10. Indications are that extra seats will not benefit the general public and will contest simply more profits and expensive seating for the Private Company.
11. The cost benefit SUMMARY presented to the public reflects a false situation as it presents the case as if the amenity did not exist already and indications are that the LONG TERM benefit shows indication of NOT IN THE PUBLIC LONG TERM BEST INTERESTS!;

12. In the current situation of need in Education Health and welfare to all of the public this is an irresponsible and unwanted expense.
I urge the committee to refuse its building.
13. The uncontrolled or directed pedestrian flowing in and around the area of pedestrian traffic is also an issue of safety to the area and to the public itself as exiting will be chaotic.
Refuse this expenditure and building. and look at the administration of this Public Asset that is being squeezed into Private manipulation.

Your Sincerely
M Hogg