

**Submission
No 268**

INQUIRY INTO SYDNEY STADIUMS STRATEGY

Name: Ms Kathlene Hennessy

Date Received: 25 May 2018

Sydney Stadium Redevelopment Feedback Submission

25th May 2018

It appears from the vague concept plan in the 'Summary of Business Case for the Sydney Football Stadium' that the vegetation belt and trees will be removed from site. The footprint of the site including significant trees resulting in more erosion into Centennial Parklands, part of 'The Sydney Commons'.

I do not support the removal of further trees and vegetation from the proposed site.

I do not support the use of 'The Sydney Commons' by a corporation that lock the residents of NSW from access to their land or part of that land.

I am concerned about a lack of transparency by the government around this project because the complete business case has not been made public. This is not in the public interest.

In the document Final Business Case Summary Sydney Football Stadium Redevelopment March 2018, the following points are of concern:

- No mention anywhere that the cost to the community of tree removal has been accounted for in the summary of the economic cost benefit plan. Despite methodologies used in elsewhere in Australia and the world for valuing urban forest.
- The net social benefit in the summary did not include a financial statement, we don't know whether the cost of loss of park and tree amenity has been taken into account. What is the costing of the social benefit, which could include a costing to community of vegetation clearance?
- What is the environmental economic cost of the project? This is not mentioned so we can assume no costings have taken place.
- There is no mention in the 'Summary of Business Case' how Centennial Parklands will be compensated for encroachments.

- There is no mention of where project works' depots will be located but it seems the parkland is the only location, how will the Parklands and hence the community be compensated? What is the cost of this loss of amenity to be borne by a growing a community in this area? How was this factored into a business case?
- It appears this project will be another State Significant Infrastructure Project. How could a corporate entertainment venue meet the guidelines for State Significant Infrastructure Project? This clearly a corporate hijack of development powers used for the most necessary public infrastructure.

I would like in the business case a full environmental and social amenity costing of loss of vegetation and open space to the community for the project. Specifically an 'i-Trees' environment costing as well as social costing. I would like to see a costing for replacement of canopy elsewhere in the local area. I would like to see a tree bond as an offset for the loss of vegetation that reflect true community and environmental cost were this project to go ahead.

There is a substantial public usage of the Parklands, 31 million visits in 2016 compared to an average patronage of around 15 thousand per game with only two games per month during season. The proposal strikes me as worrying elitist use of public money. What about an alternative cost benefit analysis of removing the stadium and returning it to parklands considering the level of community patronage? Surely a cost benefit analysis of public land would reflect upon the land use and whether the community is better served by retaining the site as is, a minor renovation of the site to bring it into compliance or a alternative use.

Thanks for your attention,

Kathlene Hennessy