INQUIRY INTO SYDNEY STADIUMS STRATEGY

Name:Name suppressedDate Received:27 May 2018

Partially Confidential

Dear Inquiry,

In terms of the process of public information & consultation about the demolition and building of the Parramatta Stadium, I offer the following.

Firstly, as I live 2 blocks for the Stadium, I was astonished that no serious dialogue was entered into with those nearby. When I say serious it was only very late, a week or so prior to when the Environmental Impact Statement was due for submission that there was any notification that the Stadium demolition and rebuild was confirmed. During the following period for public comment I read the EIS and was stunned at the claims made concerning community consultation:

- the limited number of organisations listed and their nature,
- hasty and superficial survey of fauna and impact on parklands surrounding [the Grey Headed Flying Fox survey was a visual survey conducted for one period of a couple of hours close in the final week before the EIS had to be submitted. It declared that the permanent and protected colony were not impacted by the stadium because they flew around the lights. But seriously flying foxes avoid particular spectrums of light when daily foraging. There was no investigation of the presence of the micro bats known to be in the district. There was no time]
- the casual attitude represented in the slight mentions of the closure of the pool, with no replacement or even plan proposed at that stage. [The land of the pool (not part of the park) was resumed without investigation of its real legal status at the time. The alterations to law allowing state government to take crown land for what ever purposes they deemed was not yet in place. The cavalier demolition ignored the fact that locals/ returned service people raised all funds for its construction - not state government or council. No offer of financial restitution to locals for its cost was offered. No understanding of the fact that 4 local schools are now denied pool access - are forced now to spend thousands per year bussing kids to more distant places. Rehab patients and national diving trainees were not consulted before the pool was taken away nor were offers of funds to support alternative provisions made. At the time of writing there is still no close pool. Kids paddling a supervised section of Parramatta Lake Park is not a substitute.]
- lack of disclosure of the dumping of waste such as from James Hardie enterprises, likely to be contaminated were to be dug up with no warnings to the school, other workers and residents adjacent to the site. [Neither were/are there any clearly visible signs or advice to those who walk, park and exercise in the construction's vicinity.]
- unclear and scant declarations to do with massive retail provisions that were to be included in the design. They barely were signaled.
- lack of declaration of potentially year-round light & sound pollution, traffic & parking congestion that will affect the area mentioned [See from 2:07 mins in utube clip for power consumption and light pollution output depicted <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6yMxFj_Tpbk</u> There are only 4 roads that cross the river, north-south which are clogged by 30 minute traffic queues for a couple of kilometres every day this is without the crowds traveling to the Stadium weekly. The light rail & its 5 year construction will exacerbate the problem severely.]

Taken together it all speaks to an endeavour to speed approvals through to avoid any extensive community responses. In fact, it appears to show a contempt of people living, going to school & engaged in non-sports work in the district. It is as if the State government agencies such as Venues NSW believe they automatically know better than any of the population or simply could not be bothered. It is because there is a material strategy to force people who currently live here out of district? Or was the rush for State Government agencies driven by commercial competition with other sites or were overly close relations with developer builders the driver that meant this was pushed through with inadequate community consultation? These are both very common perceptions that circulate at the moment. Not only do developments need to be clear of influence from interests that can profit from tax payer investments, they also need to be seen to be clear.

When the demolition of the pool were discussed at an large public meeting of community who presented constructively alternative architectural plans for the site including the stadium - it was claimed that no alternative amendments to building plans could even be considered to incorporate a pool next door because this would mean the few degrees of reangling required would mean that some parts of grass on the pitch would not get sufficient light! (There but for a few blades of grass).

As it happens, there is a fair chance that the Parramatta Stadium may be opened and revenue and profits garnered before funds and plans are in place for the 'new' swimming centre or its first sod turned.

<u>About the organisations consulted</u> - Publicity and the idea behind a new stadium **offered** to football clubs focuses on fans as if they are **the** extent of a community - fans are principally consumers, buyers of entertainment and merchandise etc. who come from across Sydney for their various reasons. So are the consumers who buy tickets to concerts - making corporate entertainment companies a lot of profit. Entertainment corporations do not stage concerts as charities. These don't represent the needs of real people who live in a district. (And what's more all this for only 6,000 extra seats when previously one end of the oval had no seating built in it.)

It needs to be remembered this Stadium construction was not planned to be at a big distance from current residents and future apartment building residents unlike the locations of other stadiums in Olympic & Moore Parks.

Thank you for receiving and taking time to read this submission.

Yours sincerely,