

**REPORT ON PROCEEDINGS BEFORE**

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**INQUIRY INTO SYDNEY STADIUMS STRATEGY**

**CORRECTED PROOF**

**At Macquarie Room, Parliament House, Sydney, on Friday 8 June 2018**

**The Committee met at 9.00 a.m.**

**PRESENT**

The Hon. Robert Brown (Chair)

Mr Justin Field  
The Hon. John Graham  
The Hon. Trevor Khan  
Mr Scot MacDonald  
The Hon. Taylor Martin  
The Hon. Lynda Voltz



**The CHAIR:** Welcome to the first public hearing of the Public Works Committee's inquiry into the New South Wales Government's Sydney stadiums strategy. Before I commence, I acknowledge the Gadigal people who are the traditional custodians of this land. I also pay my respects to the elders past and present of the Eora nation and extend that respect to other Aboriginals present. Today is the first hearing of this inquiry. Today we will hear from the Office of Sport, Venues NSW, Infrastructure NSW, Sydney Olympic Park Authority, Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust, Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust, and the City of Sydney.

Today's public hearing is open to the public and is being broadcast live via the Parliament's website. A transcript of today's hearing will be placed on the Committee's website when it becomes available. In accordance with the broadcasting guidelines, whilst members of the media may film or record Committee members and witnesses, people in the public gallery should not be the primary focus of filming or photography. I remind media representatives that they must take responsibility for what they publish about the Committee's proceedings. It is important to remember that parliamentary privilege does not apply to what witnesses may say outside of their evidence at the hearing. I urge witnesses to be careful about any comments they may make to the media or others after they complete their evidence or before they give evidence as such comments may not be protected by parliamentary privilege. Guidelines for broadcast of proceedings are available from the secretariat.

There may be some questions that a witness could only answer if they had more time or with certain documents to hand. In those circumstances, witnesses are advised that they can take a question on notice and provide an answer within 21 days. Witnesses are advised that any messages should be delivered to Committee members through the Committee staff. There are some staff at the rear table to whom witnesses may directly hand messages. To aid the audibility of the hearing, I remind both Committee members and witnesses to speak into the microphones. In addition, several seats have been reserved near the loudspeakers for persons in the public gallery who may have hearing difficulties.

I welcome people into the public gallery today and remind everyone in the audience that this hearing is not an open forum for comment from the floor. Audience interruptions can make it difficult for witnesses to communicate with the Committee and for Hansard to record accurately the proceedings of the hearings. Finally, everyone must turn off their mobile phones or switch them to silent for the duration of the hearing.

**MATT MILLER**, Chief Executive Officer, NSW Office of Sport, sworn and examined

**The CHAIR:** Welcome. Would you like to make a brief opening statement?

**Mr MILLER:** Thank you, Chair, I would, and thank you for the opportunity to attend. I would like to provide some opening comments with the aim of providing the Committee some context for the rest of the day. The Office of Sport is a relatively new agency, created in July 2014 as an executive agency within the New South Wales Government. I have held the role of chief executive since November 2014. The Office of Sport is responsible for planning, managing and delivering high-quality venues and facilities, sport and active recreation development programs, high-performance sport and ensuring ongoing sport integrity and safety. Critically, the office is also responsible for sport policy and strategy and provides oversight and coordination of government sport-related entities to enhance coherence and alignment of effort in the sport and active recreation sector.

In relation to stadia, the Office of Sport has an ongoing role in formulating stadia strategy advice to government. The Office of Sport prepared the "Rebuilding the Major Stadia Network Strategy Announcement" in September 2015 and has contributed to the preparation of preliminary plans for the redevelopment of Stadium Australia before Infrastructure NSW was engaged to do so at the end of 2017. Implementation of stadia strategy is complex and necessarily involves a range of inputs from various government agencies. Infrastructure NSW, which led to the production of the 2018 business cases for Sydney Football Stadium and Stadium Australia from late November 2017, is also responsible for the delivery of the works for the Western Sydney Stadium and for the upcoming works for the Sydney Football Stadium and, potentially, Stadium Australia. Venues NSW, which owns and operates four major stadia within the network and which also led the development of the business cases for the Western Sydney Stadium, has provided technical input to the strategic business cases for Stadium Australia and information on content, attendances and specific operational data.

Sydney Olympic Park Authority provided advice on the interface between Stadium Australia and the broader Sydney Olympic Park precinct and other elements of the stadia strategy. The Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust that owns and operates two major stadia within the network provided technical input into the business case for the Sydney Football Stadium including information on content, attendances and specific operational data. NSW Treasury has overseen an external review of the business cases for Western Sydney Stadium, Sydney Football Stadium and the strategic business case for Stadium Australia. The involvement of these agencies is ongoing and coordinated through various steering committees and project control groups. In completing my opening remarks, I assure the Committee of our unwavering commitment and intent to assist the Committee in its deliberations.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** On 14 April 2016 Mike Baird made an announcement that the transformation of ANZ Stadium into a world-class rectangular venue would be fast-tracked. Were you present at that announcement?

**Mr MILLER:** No, I was not.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Did you support that announcement?

**Mr MILLER:** It is the Government's announcement.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You provided the details?

**Mr MILLER:** We provided and did a lot of work in the lead-up to that announcement.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** On Tuesday 27 October 2015 you wrote to Tony Shepherd, the Chair of the Sydney Cricket Ground Trust, did you not?

**Mr MILLER:** I may have. I am not familiar with the document that you are referring to.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** He provided to you a document on stadium announcement feedback in which you stated, "The explicit statements re gaming events that are most logically placed at the largest venue in the network sends a message that is discordant with the Premier's thinking as I understand it." That is because Tony Shepherd had identified that a new stadium at Moore Park would attract the National Rugby League [NRL] grand finals, State of Origins, the Bledisloe Cup, Wallaby Test and Socceroos World Cup qualifiers. You had a problem with that, did you not?

**Mr MILLER:** I ask the member if she could provide me with the emails that she is referring to? Can you repeat the question?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You had a problem with that, did you not? You had a problem with the idea that Tony Shepherd thought that a new stadium at Moore Park would get the State of Origin, the National

Rugby League grand final and the Bledisloe Cup, and that was not consistent with the Premier's thinking, which was that those should remain at the largest venue in New South Wales, which was ANZ Stadium?

**Mr MILLER:** At that point the matter of allocation of content between the two major stadiums, that is the Sydney Football Stadium and Stadium Australia, was a matter of investigation and part of business cases being developed.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** That is not what your email says. Your email says that it is at odds with the Premier's thinking.

**Mr MILLER:** Various parties would be making submissions that they should, in fact, have certain matches allocated to those stadiums, but consistent with the Government's stadia strategy—right game, right place—blockbuster events would be allocated accordingly following completion of whatever the Government's final decision on redevelopment options would be.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Would the idea that the National Rugby League Grand Final and the State of Origin being moved to Moore Park be consistent Paul Doorn's comments that, "Unless the real plan is to cannibalise ANZ Stadium there could literally never be a seat sat on in a new 50,000 seat stadium in Moore Park"?

**Mr MILLER:** Again, I would simply point to the fact that the major blockbuster events have always relied on them being undertaken or conducted at Stadium Australia at Sydney Olympic Park.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** How do we get from an announcement on 14 April 2016 that ANZ Stadium will be fast-tracked, to a view that the content was still up for discussion?

**Mr MILLER:** I am not sure what the question is.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** How do we get from an announcement on Thursday 14 April 2016 that ANZ Stadium would be the priority and fast-tracked, to ANZ Stadium now not being fast-tracked and the priority?

**Mr MILLER:** That later announcement being when?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The Government's recent announcement that Moore Park would be the priority?

**Mr MILLER:** The Government's recent announcement that they are intending to commence with a redevelopment of the Sydney Football Stadium is not linked directly to where the blockbuster events are intended to be played.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** How do we get from 14 April 2016 that ANZ Stadium was a priority, would be fast-tracked and would begin in this term of government, to an announcement now that Moore Park will be the stadium begun in this term of Government? How do we get from that point to this point?

**Mr MILLER:** There has been a series of costings and options analyses and draft business case preparation that has informed Government's decision in November 2017 to change the order in which the stadium strategy will be implemented.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** What changed that order? What was the trigger to overturn the announcement?

**Mr MILLER:** The primary trigger as I understand it, was the information on costings and the advice that we provided that having done extensive analysis of various options for the refurbishment of Stadium Australia, including the full redevelopment of that stadium, that the costs were significantly higher than those that had originally been expected.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Where is the information on those costings? Where is the base case information and the business plan?

**Mr MILLER:** The information on the costings, as I understand it, is contained in the summary business case that has been provided.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Could you please provide this to the witness. Your Minister said in the House yesterday that all the details outlining the safety audits, costings and the base case are provided in that document. Could you identify the page that is on?

**Mr MILLER:** We are now talking about the Sydney Football Stadium, not Stadium Australia?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Yes, the Sydney Football Stadium.

**Mr MILLER:** The honourable member, on a quick scan I cannot see the costs of safety and security being outlined in this document.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** We will move on. Mr Miller, would it be correct to say, that Allianz Stadium complied with the requirements of the building codes at the time it was built and it can be argued that a building that has not had a change in use does not need to consider the current codes?

**Mr MILLER:** Could you repeat the question?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Would it be correct to say, that Allianz Stadium complied with the requirements of the building codes at the time it was built and that it can be argued that a building which has not had a change in use does not need to consider current codes?

**Mr MILLER:** I think that question is best directed to Mr Barkley, the chief executive of the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Surely your safety audit that you changed your decision on was based on a certificate of occupancy, which is assessed on the building codes at the moment rather than the building codes at the time? You would have checked whether it is correct to say that Allianz Stadium complied with the requirements of the codes at the time it was built, which is a requirement of the certificate of occupancy, and it can be argued that a building which has not had a change in use does not need to consider current codes?

**Mr MILLER:** I can only repeat my answer to your question, and that is that it is a matter most appropriately answered by Mr Barkley.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** You are at the centre of advising on these deals. Surely you have a view you can put to the Committee on that question?

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Point of order: The witness has answered twice now that the answer he wants to give is to refer it to another person.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I will move on to a different question.

**The CHAIR:** I uphold the point of order.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Did you ask Mr Barkley why he requested a certificate of occupancy?

**Mr MILLER:** No.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Have you had a request for a certificate of occupancy for WIN Stadium?

**Mr MILLER:** I would have to take advice from the venue manager for WIN Stadium, which is Venues NSW.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Newcastle Stadium?

**Mr MILLER:** Same answer. These are operational matters which are best answered by the relevant venue manager.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Have you had a look at the safety audits they provided?

**The CHAIR:** We will move on to the cross bench.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I will follow up on that line of questioning. What was the point at which the Office of Sport became aware that there may be safety or security concerns at Allianz Stadium?

**Mr MILLER:** My recollection is around, let me check my notes, mid to late 2016.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Given that the stadium was built at a certain time and building codes change over a certain time, the argument is now being made that it is not compliant with certain elements of the code. The sort of security concerns we are talking about have been around for some period of time. It seems the first point at which safety and security concerns were raised were only in the context of frustration from some of the venues that the stadium strategy was not going in the direction that they wanted it to.

**Mr MILLER:** That is speculation on which I am not prepared to comment.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Does the Office of Sport maintain any sort of oversight over these venues in terms of ensuring they maintain compliance with safety and security?

**Mr MILLER:** The Office of Sport's role is not to be the policeman over those venue management authorities, be it the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust or Venues NSW. That is the responsibility, in

governance terms, of the bodies or the trust and, in the case of Venues NSW, the board to assure those positions are compliant.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** These are matters that would be of interest to the sports and to the codes that you maintain relationships with. They are obviously wanting venues that are safe and secure and that meet the needs of their members and supporters. It was never raised before 2016 that there were issues around disability access, access to toilets or long lines for food. It seems the first moment these issues were raised with you were right in the heart of a big public debate around the prioritisation of stadiums; would that be fair to say?

**Mr MILLER:** The issue of building compliance and code compliance is somewhat different from issues of long queues and fan experience, so I think we need to be very clear that there are some differentiations there. As I have indicated, the responsibility to meet building compliance matters rests with the respective venue managers.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Fair enough. The entire government submission links the development of the stadium strategy to key targets identified in the Government's NSW 2021 plan: increasing participation in sport, recreational arts and cultural activities both in rural areas and in the city. Have you done any work to make assessments for government to be able to make decisions on the recreational and sporting needs of either the community in and around the central business district or in regional New South Wales?

**Mr MILLER:** That particular work was commenced by the Office of Sport not long after it was created in 2015 in a piece of work called the Future Needs of Sport Infrastructure Study. In more recent times that work has continued into some planning work in relation to the needs and best ways to address the community sport infrastructure needs in Greater Sydney, flowing on from the work of the Greater Sydney Commission, and in regional New South Wales building on regional sports plans which have been developed across the State.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Are they all public documents?

**Mr MILLER:** My understanding is that the regional sports plans have been subject to extensive community consultation. They are in the final stages of completion and will become public documents.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Before they have been completed and before they become public documents, some pretty substantial decisions have been made about sporting infrastructure that is supposed to have been designed to try to meet targets around increasing participation in sport and recreational cultural activities across the State; would that be fair to say?

**Mr MILLER:** No, because the investments that I think you are alluding to in relation to stadia are not specifically designed to drive increased participation. The work that I referred to in relation to community sport infrastructure, future needs of sport, the work for Greater Sydney facilities needs and the recent announcements by government of funding in those areas, both regionally and in Sydney, is not specifically more directed to supporting participation in relation to stadia. It is clearly targeted to drive more event experience, supporting major sporting and entertainment event strategies, not participation.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** That is in direct conflict with the Government's submission. Its argument is that the whole rationale around developing the priority action to develop the stadium strategy was about meeting two key targets identified in the plan. Both of those were to increase participation in sport, recreational, arts and cultural activities. I am trying to understand how a decision was made to make a massive investment into these two stadiums in particular, apparently to meet these targets, but you are now saying that they are not designed to increase participation.

**Mr MILLER:** The targets that I think you are referring to have been superseded under the current Government so they relate to targets that were expressed in the first term of the Government in about 2012. The other point I would offer is that there is an indirect benefit driving participation from the investment in major stadia but it is less direct and not the primary purpose for building major stadia. I repeat, in my view, the reason for building stadia is to support fan experience at major sport and entertainment events, which supports the visitor economy. It is not designed to directly drive participation at the grassroots level in sport.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Would you not agree that the participation rate assumptions are pretty critical to the ultimate outcome of business cases for both stadiums?

**Mr MILLER:** Participation if you choose to use the language of "participation" meaning "attendance".

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Attendance?

**Mr MILLER:** Attendance at the stadium. So maybe I am caught in a different use of—

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Let's talk attendance then.

**Mr MILLER:** Attendance rather than participation. Absolutely attendance at stadiums is an important element of the stadium strategy. As noted in the business cases, based on evidence gathered not just within New South Wales but internationally and nationally, the business cases are expecting uplifts of around 15 per cent.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Wow.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** What is the basis of that assumption? We have a pretty long track record of attendance at the games of various codes in Australia. Why would you make that assumption?

**Mr MILLER:** I have not made the assumption. That is the expertise brought to the business case deliberations by KPMG, the consultants that were contracted by the Office of Sport to provide that expertise to Government.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Would you be prepared to table that KPMG analysis for the Committee?

**Mr MILLER:** I understand the report has been sought as part of the Standing Order 52.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Thank you.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Can you just explain how they made that assumption when in fact the newest stadium internationally that was identified in the Brogden report, which was Singapore stadium, has had a decrease in crowd numbers?

**Mr MILLER:** I would have to take that on notice.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** What events do you think would be held in a new ANZ Stadium that would not otherwise be able to be held in that stadium if it was retained as it is?

**Mr MILLER:** There are two elements to the question. One is about the important point of retaining existing events, because nationally there is massively increased competition from other governments investing in their stadia. South Australia, Western Australia and Victoria are continuing to invest in their stadiums. One of the risks in not investing is in fact a loss of existing content. But to the specifics of your question, my understanding of the business cases is that there is a small uplift in the number of big international events that would be attracted to a world-class stadium network that the Government is intending to build through its stadia strategy.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Those probably would not happen even at a refurbished or a new Allianz Stadium. They are more likely to go to the largest venue, is that correct?

**Mr MILLER:** It depends on the event. That is the whole purpose in taking a network focus. Through the strategy we have been very clear about building a network based approach that has an ability and a flexibility to cater for and deliver world-class experience at stadiums of varying capacities.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Would you be able to outline for the Committee the Government's stadia strategy? How did it develop? Could you tell us more about the chronology of the strategy from formulation through to the rollout?

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** That is a great question.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** That is a good question. We would like to hear that.

**Mr MILLER:** Given the Government's stadia strategy is founded on some work done in 2012, prior to the creation of the Office of Sport, that is the foundation document as I see it. In 2014, Infrastructure NSW made some recommendations about the importance of government committing to investment in the Sports Infrastructure Strategy for the stadia as a part of its update to the State Infrastructure Strategy. These are two key base or founding documents. The next iteration or evolution of the strategy is September 2015 and the Office of Sport had had a significant input into the development of that and there was an announcement consistent with—and I think this is a key point—the 2012 document, which focused on the benefits of consolidation of a diverse set of stadia in this State and, in particular, in Sydney.

The 2015 document set aside \$600 million and foreshadowed that that was only part of what would be needed. It talked about the need for a new Western Sydney Stadium. It talked about the need for a new Sydney Football Stadium with the capacity of 50,000 to 55,000 seats. It talked about the importance of redeveloping Stadium Australia, potentially with a roof. It foreshadowed the need for a new indoor arena, and it also talked about—as we would understand and has been subsequently proven through the work of the Greater Sydney Commission—a new outer Western Sydney Stadium. It also identified the need to continue the upgrades of the stadiums at the Sydney Cricket Ground. The 2015 document, for me, probably represents the major statement around the holistic nature of a stadia network strategy and since that time a series of investigations have been carried out to enable that strategy to be implemented.



**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Following on from what Mr Field was asking and your answer about retaining the suite of events and the potential risk if we did not follow the strategy and the refurbishment that you are talking about, can you go into more detail about the potential loss of those significant events or world-class events?

**Mr MILLER:** I think some of the answers to that question are probably better put to the venue managers who work on a daily basis with the key hirers. From my perspective, it is very clear that those key hirers, such as National Rugby League, for example, maximise their opportunities for revenue generation as evidenced in the use of, for example, the Melbourne Cricket Ground [MCG] for State of Origin this week. There is very clear evidence that with the update to South Australia the vastly improved fan experience that is reported is that the attraction to the codes or the venue hirers from better quality stadiums is inarguable because it drives greater attendance at those events and promotes their codes in much better way.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** That is domestics. Can you make a comment about the competition in a global sense?

**Mr MILLER:** I would have to take that on notice, I am sorry.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Mr Miller, I understand you have experience in other jurisdictions; you have just mentioned other States in Australia. Can you explain to us how New South Wales compares to other States in terms of major sporting infrastructure? In particular, what has been the experience of Adelaide and Perth since opening new infrastructure? Would you also expand on why Victoria is pursuing a similar strategy to that of New South Wales?

**Mr MILLER:** Could you repeat the question?

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** I understand that you have experience in other jurisdictions, in other States; is that correct?

**Mr MILLER:** I do not have personal experience in other jurisdictions.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Are you able to explain the experience of other States with their stadia strategy, particularly with new infrastructure being built in Adelaide and Perth? I would also like to know more about why it is that Perth is pursuing a similar strategy to New South Wales.

**Mr MILLER:** I would not hold myself out to be in a position to provide that information. I would take that on notice or refer you to the venue managers that deal with their counterparts in those jurisdictions on a regular basis.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** What is the role of the Office of Sport in coordinating this strategy?

**Mr MILLER:** As I was alluding to earlier, the primary function of the office is around sport policy and strategy. That is for all sport-related activity. When we come to stadia, that is no different, so it has a role in working with the various agencies that I outlined in my opening comments to deliver an integrated view to ensure coherence of action and strategy across the various elements in the network. That is specifically designed to avoid some of the historic ad hoc investment and to take a network view in where the best value for the public in New South Wales will come as a result of investment in important social infrastructure, which is what stadia are.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Speaking about the network view, why is it that Sydney needs a network of venues of different sizes? Would you be able to expand on how many assets are in that network strategy and describe the role that they play?

**Mr MILLER:** The network strategy, since 2012, has highlighted around seven key venues. That 2012 document talked about the need to consolidate from something like 21 or 14 tier one, tier two venues, consistent with the path trodden by Victoria, into those seven important venues. Those venues are the Western Sydney Stadium, Sydney Football Stadium, Stadium Australia and the Sydney Cricket Ground and, importantly, as I alluded to earlier, with the growth and demographic shifts occurring in Western Sydney, a new outer Western Sydney stadium at some point. The other items that were identified in the strategy reflect the shift in the landscape around the need for indoor arenas for sport and entertainment, and that has also been a part of the strategy.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Is the Government investing in high-performance sport only or will other areas of sport benefit from this investment?

**Mr MILLER:** The Government has shown over the past few years that it has moved to invest not only in sport infrastructure but also community sport in the form of the Active Kids program, which has been running now for almost 12 months—almost six months in this financial year. As I was alluding to earlier, it has also made conscious investments to complement its intended investments in stadia in community sport infrastructure.

I alluded earlier to the Regional Sports Infrastructure Fund and, more recently, the Greater Sydney Sports Facility Fund, which is now open for submissions. These are important complements to investment in stadia. It is important to recognise, however, that as we move into community sport infrastructure, it is not the sole purview of State Government. We are looking to partner, in particular, with councils and community in the delivery of that infrastructure.

**The CHAIR:** I ask for a point of clarification, Mr Miller. When you refer to the outer Western Sydney Stadium, that is not Parramatta Stadium, is it?

**Mr MILLER:** Parramatta Stadium is the Western Sydney Stadium. What has been foreshadowed in the Government's stadia strategy is a stadium out of Western Sydney. As a Queenslander, I would say west of the M7.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Why are the attendance figures for the Sydney Cricket Ground Trust area, including Sydney Cricket Ground and the gymnasium, included in the Government's submission to the inquiry? Why do we not have the Allianz Stadium figures?

**Mr MILLER:** The Allianz attendance figures would be available. The submission that was made simply provided a more integrated view based on the precincts.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In the Sydney Olympic Park precinct did you include the aquatic centre, Tennis NSW and Netball Central?

**Mr MILLER:** No.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Why were they included in the Sydney Cricket Ground Trust submission then?

**Mr MILLER:** I would have to take that on notice.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Could you supply those figures for Allianz? They would be more helpful than the figures we have got in front of the Committee.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Could you also take on notice with Allianz a question about the number of complimentary tickets that are handed out and how many are provided to the Minister's office?

**Mr MILLER:** I will definitely take that on notice.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In a statement Stuart Ayres said, "the Government has clear advice that Allianz Stadium will not be able to obtain an occupancy certificate past 2019." Did you provide him with that advice?

**Mr MILLER:** No, the trust provided that advice based upon, as I understand it, a report from a consultant.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Have you asked why they got an occupancy certificate?

**Mr MILLER:** As I indicated earlier, that matter should be addressed to Mr Barkley.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** But Mr Ayres is your Minister.

**Mr MILLER:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The Office of Sport is doing the input for stadiums. Is that correct?

**Mr MILLER:** The Office of Sport coordinates the input for stadia strategy. The matter to which the member is referring is an operational matter for the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Yet in a letter from Henry Davis York to the Minister about steps taken by the trust to notify the Government, it states that the trust had communicated this matter to Government by sending Matt Miller a letter, dated 6 May 2016, providing information that was supported by the Asset Technology Pacific report on 10 May 2016. Is that correct. Do you have that report?

**Mr MILLER:** No.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Did you get that report?

**Mr MILLER:** I can recall that I got a letter around that time.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** They say that was the Asset Technology Pacific report, dated 10 May 2016. Is that correct?

**Mr MILLER:** I would need to check, but, as I indicated, I do recall receiving advice from the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I have a copy of that report here. It includes items such as the refurbishment of the pool decking, the refurbishment of the squash courts, lounge areas being recreated and suite upgrades. Is it fair to say that the safety, security and compliance [SSC] issues that were raised with you included those items?

**Mr MILLER:** I would have to take that on notice to confirm what you are saying.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In their evidence provided by a legal document from Henry Davis York they say that that is what they provided you with as part of the SSC issues. Is that true?

**Mr MILLER:** As I have indicated, without having the documents and an opportunity to review what you are saying, I cannot mislead the Committee.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I have the document here. Would you like to have a look?

**Mr MILLER:** I would like to take it on notice.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You said the Brogden report was the most important document that you considered. Is that correct?

**Mr MILLER:** The Government's response to the stadia strategy steering group, which was chaired by Mr Brogden, was formed based on that group's work.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** During budget estimates, we asked, "What was the total cost of the Brogden report?" Your answer on notice was, "No member of the committee has been paid for their work, however, the Office of Sport has reimbursed \$60.77 in expenses for car parking costs." Was that answer correct?

**Mr MILLER:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** It is correct, is it? I did a Government Information (Public Access) Act request and I got a response that included the name of the consultant, MI Associates, and the amount paid to the consultant, which was \$37,353. The consultant was commissioned to develop a stadia strategy to provide clear direction that future capital investment is prioritised to New South Wales Government owned or leased stadia. This is the Brogden report. What is the total cost of the Brogden report?

**Mr MILLER:** I will have to take that on notice.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Can I ask about the extra blockbuster events that you have referred to that underpin the benefit-cost ratio [BCR]? What are the events that you are relying on?

**Mr MILLER:** The additional events?

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Yes.

**Mr MILLER:** They would be events such as touring matches by teams such as, as we have evidenced, some of the English Premier League teams coming out here. They would be events such as the major baseball league that we have experienced at the Sydney Cricket Ground. Those styles of events.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** The BCR is highly reliant on these events and you are relying on up to 20 more of them to support the BCR for both these stadia.

**Mr MILLER:** It is not my understanding that we are relying on 20 more of those sorts of events.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Can you identify the Allianz Stadium events that you relied on for the BCR on Allianz Stadium?

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Point of order: I heard the buzzer go.

**The CHAIR:** You did but I will be the arbiter of when a question is finished. Having said that, I do feel that it is fair to pass on to Mr Field.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I may follow that same line of questioning. In response to one of the Government's questions about the potential loss of signature events, you suggested that the question would be better put to the venue operators. But sport is the key driver of attendance at both of the stadiums that we have been talking about this morning, particularly at the Sydney Cricket Ground, correct?

**Mr MILLER:** Are you talking about the Sydney Cricket Ground or—

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Sorry, I meant Allianz Stadium.

**Mr MILLER:** The key drivers of attendance at all stadia are a mix of entertainment events—

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** But it is overwhelmingly sport, correct? You maintain a relationship with the codes that ultimately drive most of the attendance at those venues. This would directly be a question to you with regard to the potential events, which, in the main, are the major sporting codes in Australia, correct?

**Mr MILLER:** That proposition is not one that I would agree with.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Is it your contention that the loss of major events would be less if the Government was to prioritise the rebuilding of Allianz Stadium over and above work at Stadium Australia?

**Mr MILLER:** No.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Then why has the Government chosen to prioritise Allianz over Stadium Australia?

**Mr MILLER:** The Government, through its strategy, has adopted a network approach. The order in which it has chosen to proceed was based primarily on the need to deal with the safety and security issues at the Sydney Football Stadium. The announced strategy allows for both pieces of upgrade or redevelopment to overlap and be done in similar time frames.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** If that was the main priority how is it that the Office of Sport only had the issues of safety and security raised with it in 2016, after the initial stadia strategy was released?

**Mr MILLER:** Because the office only became aware of the issues in 2016.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Is that the key thing you are saying has changed?

**Mr MILLER:** In terms of the change in order. As I indicated earlier, after extensive investigations into options for the redevelopment of Stadium Australia, the costs of those sorts of options indicated that there was a need to reconsider, within the envelop of funding available from Government, what was the best investment strategy for the people of New South Wales and what generated the greatest public value.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** We have had totally conflicting commentary about avoiding a loss of potentially signature events and having a stadia-wide strategy and dealing with the security and compliance issues at Allianz Stadium. So this really comes down to competing business cases. What events have been relied on—new events, I assume—for the business case for Allianz? What new events are being assumed as part of the business case?

**Mr MILLER:** I will take that on notice.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** What attendance was used for the Allianz BCR? Were they the numbers that were provided in the Government's submission?

**Mr MILLER:** I will take that on notice

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I am happy to cede the rest of my time.

**The CHAIR:** That is your choice. We have one minute and 44 seconds left.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Has the Office of Sport been involved in any discussions with Centennial and Moore Park trust regarding the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust lands and the stadium strategy?

**Mr MILLER:** I would have met with Kim Ellis early in my time in this role, but if the question is directed to formal meetings in respect of the stadia strategy, the answer is no.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** So you have had no meetings with Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust?

**Mr MILLER:** I have had a couple of informal meetings with Mr Ellis, but not in relation to the stadia strategy.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** How did we get the 2015 Brogden report identifying a new stadium on Moore Park land if no-one spoke to them?

**Mr MILLER:** My answer was in respect of myself. If your question was in respect of the Office of Sport I would have to take the question on notice and check who else spoke to them. Clearly, in the development of the Brogden report, for which the Office of Sport provided secretarial support, there was extensive consultation with a range of stakeholders, including Centennial Park Trust.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** What was the nature of those negotiations?

**Mr MILLER:** I did not use the word "negotiation". I said there was extensive consultation with those people and a raft of people in the development of the Stadia Strategy Implementation Plan of 2015, which, as I alluded to earlier, was the foundational document to the Government's announcement in September 2015.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Can I take you back to earlier comments you made about the risks of ad hoc investment. Just to be perfectly clear in my mind, I think you raised the year of 2012 and said that prior to 2012 there was an ad hoc investment approach, lack of a network with respect to the consideration of stadia. Is that the case?

**Mr MILLER:** Yes.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** So, prior to 2012 it was ad hoc. What is the risk of ad hoc investment or the lack of framework as it was before—

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** It has been pretty ad hoc recently.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** I am talking about prior to 2012. We need to be clear that it was ad hoc prior to that. What are the risks of that?

**Mr MILLER:** The risks, in my view, go to the potential exposure of misdirecting the investment funding, which is scarce and needs to be allocated optimally for public value. By not founding any investment decisions in a more holistic strategy you end up with the potential risk of misallocation of resources.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** They are large investments. I think that has been remarked on before. Prior to 2012 we have established that it was ad hoc. We are not talking about one-year, two-year or five-year time frames, are we? If you make investments in an ad hoc way, as happened prior to 2012, the time frame will be 10, 20 or 40 years. So the downside is—

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Point of order: I have not heard the witness say that the investment prior to 2012 was ad hoc. I ask that the person asking the question actually ask a question rather than make statements.

**The CHAIR:** I will not uphold the point of order. The witness is quite capable of answering as he sees fit. Everybody gets a chance to ask questions—Government, Opposition and cross-bench.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** So what are the risks of long-term mis-investments?

**Mr MILLER:** Stadia, by their nature, are social infrastructure with long life cycle elements to them. The investment decisions need to be taken in a very prudent way based on all the sorts of checks and balances that are contemplated in the current Government infrastructure assurance investment framework, which is oversighted by Infrastructure NSW. We are talking about life cycles of 30 to 50 years for these stadiums, and I think that that is reflected in the summary business cases that have been provided.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** So you would have consequences socially and economically, and with respect to sport and Treasury, et cetera. Is that the case?

**Mr MILLER:** Yes.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Mr Miller, would you be able to confirm that the redeveloped Sydney Football Stadium [SFS] will be developed on Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust land only, and not spill outside of those boundaries?

**Mr MILLER:** Yes.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** That is a great answer. Thank you.

**The CHAIR:** As there are no more questions from Government members I will go back to Ms Voltz. You have precisely four minutes to get an answer.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** With regard to the business case that was put forward there is an Allianz Stadium Physical Security Review high-level security design plan that was requested by Alliance Stadium. Did that relate to Driver Avenue and Moore Park Road?

**Mr MILLER:** I will have to take that on notice, I am sorry.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Do you know if the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust requested any of those physical security and high-level security design plans?

**Mr MILLER:** Was the question about the Centennial Park Trust?

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Yes.

**Mr MILLER:** I do not know.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Do you know if the letter that was signed by Minister Ayres and David Elliott relied on that document? I assume your office had a hand in drafting that letter.

**Mr MILLER:** I do not believe that the office had any involvement in drafting that letter.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** I would like to ask about the business case. The reference there is to "internationally peer-reviewed academic research", that supports the attendance figures.

**Mr MILLER:** What is the question?

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** What is that internationally peer-reviewed academic research?

**Mr MILLER:** I will take it on notice but it has been provided, as I indicated, by KPMG.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** That is the KPMG analysis but you are saying that that research has also been provided.

**Mr MILLER:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** The BCR comes in at less than one. How do we get that the stadiums pay for themselves over a two-year period with \$2 billion when the BCR is coming in at less than one?

**Mr MILLER:** The business case analysis clearly indicates that the stadiums do not pay for themselves over two years.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** So the Premier's statement that they do is incorrect.

**Mr MILLER:** I do not wish to speculate on the Premier's statement.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Does the BCR of less than one fulfil the Government's requirements under restart funding?

**Mr MILLER:** No, because Restart funding requires a BCR of one or greater.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Where is funding for the stadium coming from?

**Mr MILLER:** As with other government investments, it has options to choose funding sources and strategies outside of Restart.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** But there is Restart funding.

**Mr MILLER:** Could you clarify the question?

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Was \$1 billion allocated from Restart NSW funding for the stadium, or are you saying that it is not going to come from there?

**Mr MILLER:** I am saying that the Government, when it makes its funding allocation as opposed to when it approves its funding, will source from an appropriate funding source, based on what the business cases allow it to source from. If, in fact, the final business case does not support a BCR of greater than one then the Government has to look to other mechanisms to fund it.

**The CHAIR:** I call time and draw this session to a close. Thank you for agreeing to attend, Mr Miller. I am sure there will be questions on notice. We would like replies to those questions within 21 days of your receiving written questions on notice.

**(The witness withdrew)**

**PAUL DOORN**, Chief Executive Officer, Venues NSW, sworn and examined

**The CHAIR:** Before we proceed to questions, would you like to make a brief opening statement?

**Mr DOORN:** I have prepared a short opening statement by way of providing a brief overview of Venues NSW. Venues NSW is a statutory authority [*audio malfunction*]. The principal functions of Venues NSW include: maintaining and improving the authority's land; establishing and managing sporting grounds, sporting facilities and recreational facilities; undertaking or providing commercial or retail activities and facilities on the authority's land; and ensuring proper asset management plans are in place and are implemented for the authority's land. The responsible Minister for the authority is the Minister for Sport, and staff are employed in the public service under the Government Sector Employment Act 2013.

Venues NSW is governed by a board of management charged with setting the strategic direction and for the performance of the authority. Venues NSW is part of the New South Wales industry cluster within the Office of Sport portfolio. Venues NSW is the key owner, coordinator and promoter of a portfolio of key publicly owned assets, sporting events and sports and entertainment venues, including in Sydney. We own, on behalf of the Government, the ANZ Stadium and, upon its completion, the new Western Sydney Stadium, in Parramatta. In the Hunter, Venues NSW owns Macdonald Jones Stadium, the Newcastle Entertainment Centre and the showground. In the Illawarra, Venues NSW owns the WIN Stadium and the WIN Entertainment Centre.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Can you tell me how many of those venues have certificates of occupancy?

**Mr DOORN:** All our venues have current certificates.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Can you provide a copy of those?

**Mr DOORN:** Sure, but not today, of course.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** When were they done?

**Mr DOORN:** The dates I will have to find for you, but when I provide the information I will provide the dates.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Were they issued at the start of occupancy or subsequently?

**Mr DOORN:** I can advise you that all our certificates are in place.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Were they issued originally?

**Mr DOORN:** I will have to take that on notice.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Do any of them have multiple certificates of occupancy, as is the case for Allianz Stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** I will have to take that question on notice.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Can you look at whether there is a time frame on any of these certificates of occupancy?

**Mr DOORN:** Certainly.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Is obtaining certificates of occupancy on a time line part of the standard venue management plan for these venues? I am not asking about the specifics of any one occupancy plan, but is it part of your normal practice for venue management?

**Mr DOORN:** It certainly is part of the overarching management of all our assets. We make sure that we are compliant with all requirements, and so I can assure you that Venues NSW is compliant.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Compliance is a requirement, but a certificate of occupancy is issued to allow someone to occupy a building under a development application. The 2007 planning Act specifically states that it is a requirement at the time of occupancy. You say you have certificates of occupancy, so you obviously think you have them. Are your certificates of occupancy provided for you to occupy the venues, as is required under the Act, or do you get them as an ongoing part of your management?

**Mr DOORN:** I said that we have them in place and that I would provide that advice to you.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Do you have them in place, the way that every building in Australia has them in place, or do you have them in place because that is a requirement of your ongoing management structure?

**Mr DOORN:** My position is that we have all of those in place and, as part of our annual management plans, all those requirements are held and enacted every year. They are part of our plans—such as our emergency management plans—and they are all up to date.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In the draft speaking points from Venues NSW you state that Sydney is the only State capital where the mode reconfigured oval of the biggest stadium does not align with its major content—rectangular. Is that correct?

**Mr DOORN:** That is correct.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** When you are competing in the market on behalf of New South Wales, you are competing with Brisbane, which has a rectangular stadium with how many seats?

**Mr DOORN:** Just less than 55,000.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** And you are competing with the MCG, which is oval and seats 100,000?

**Mr DOORN:** Yes, between 90,000 and 100,000, depending on what sport is being played.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** How do you attract an event to New South Wales, if those events can go to Brisbane with 55,000 seats or the MCG with 100,000 seats? What is the difference in New South Wales?

**Mr DOORN:** Ultimately, the attracting factor is the yield that the hirer will generate from that particular event.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** If you can get a yield higher than 55,000 in a rectangular stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** It is a combination of factors. As I said, the yield is really important. The yield depends on the hirer being able to sell those seats. Having a stadium of a certain size is great, but actually being able to sell tickets so that each seat is occupied is really important.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** For the FFA World Cup qualifiers, particularly the big attraction such as Uruguay, the State of Origin, the NRL Grand Final, what would be the difference between the yield in Brisbane and the yield at ANZ Stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** As I said, the yield is really important. I am not aware of the commercial deals that are done in other venues, but having large numbers of people attend events is a really important starting point.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The difference between 55,000 and 75,000—

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Is 20,000.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** New South Wales Rugby League funds grassroots community organisations, and the difference between the venue capacities represents millions of dollars, does it not?

**Mr DOORN:** Most definitely. Our core responsibilities include making sure that we are in partnership with our hirers, because we want them to do well out of their events.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** If you wanted to give New South Wales an advantage, would you go for a stadium with a seating capacity of more than 55,000?

**Mr DOORN:** As Venues NSW is the owner of an asset that currently has 83,500 seats, most definitely. We are very proactive and very supportive of the Government's announcement that it wants to redevelop ANZ Stadium into a world-class 70,000 seat stadium.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Can you elaborate on an email sent to you by Arthur Stanley? He said that the leaking of the ANZ redevelopment costings was a monumentally dumb communication strategy, unless the aim was to blow open the debate again. Did you have a conversation with him about that email?

**Mr DOORN:** No, not necessarily. Arthur Stanley—

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Was that no or not necessarily?

**Mr DOORN:** The answer is not a simple yes or no, because I have many conversations with Arthur Stanley and other staff who work for independent contractors that support our stadium network. Yes, I have spoken to Arthur Stanley.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Was one of those conversations about this issue?

**Mr DOORN:** Yes, I have spoken to Arthur Stanley in relation to a number of emails that he sent.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In regards to that email, what was your view on that statement?



**Mr DOORN:** Can you repeat the statement?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** "The leaking of the ANZ Stadium redevelopment costings was a monumentally dumb communication strategy, unless the aim was to blow open the debate again."

**Mr DOORN:** I did not talk to Arthur Stanley in relation to a debate as to whether he thought he was right or wrong. I had a conversation with Mr Stanley about the appropriateness of sending emails like that.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** So you did discuss it?

**Mr DOORN:** I did discuss the email, or those emails.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Why did you have a conversation with him about the appropriateness of sending that view to yourself and Christine McLoughlin?

**Mr DOORN:** Why did I have a conversation with Arthur?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Yes.

**Mr DOORN:** Because Arthur is entitled to his view. I will not as a government employer endorse or support those sorts of views.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** So you did not think it was monumentally dumb and it did not blow the debate open again?

**Mr DOORN:** I did not enter into a debate as to whether he was right or wrong.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** But it did blow the debate open again, did it not?

**Mr DOORN:** That could be your observation.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Arthur Stanley said, "The imagery supplied by the Government for the future ANZ Stadium was poor and this adversely affected public sentiment for our redevelopment." Did you have a conversation with him about that email?

**Mr DOORN:** I did. Largely because Mr Stanley controls, through his work at ANZ Stadium, a large number of images for ANZ Stadium, we did talk about what was appropriate and what was developed. But clearly those images were developed through the work done by Infrastructure NSW, so it was not necessarily under our control as to what images were going to be released.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** What about the email from Christine McLoughlin to Arthur Stanley, which you were copied in on, which said, "Let's discuss tomorrow how we follow up on inaccuracies such as the cost of the ANZ rebuild."?

**Mr DOORN:** I am aware of the email you are referring to but I am not aware, off the top of my head, what the reference was related to—the inaccuracies of an article? As you can appreciate, I guess as an observer of the media over the last couple of years, there has been much written around the stadia. Sometimes it is close to the point, sometimes it is widely off the mark.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In the email from Christine McLoughlin to Arthur Stanley and yourself she said, "follow up on inaccuracies such as the cost of the ANZ rebuild". Did you ask her what the inaccuracies were?

**Mr DOORN:** I am sure we have had a conversation around following up—again, my point before was, not knowing which article you are referring to—and as part of my role I am often following up with people around what are the accurate numbers and details related to our business.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** That email was on 10 December 2017 and that was when the information came out that the rebuild would cost \$1.3 billion. Was that correct or incorrect?

**Mr DOORN:** A statement of \$1.3 billion would be incorrect.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** What was the actual cost of the rebuild of ANZ Stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** There were multiple options done. One of the options that was costed and publicly talked about was \$1.25 billion for the complete redevelopment of ANZ Stadium.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Have you had a look at the original costings that were done by Stadium Australia, before you took ownership, for a reconfiguration of the stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** The answer is that I have seen some design work but I have not seen any detail on the costings for that design work.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Have you asked them for a copy?

**Mr DOORN:** I have a strong high-level summary but, again, that was done at a different time under a different process. So the Government was not going to buy into a procurement process that was not done by us, with all the rigour that we put around our costings. Yes, I was aware at the time that it was rumoured to be between \$700 million and \$800 million but I have not pursued that any further.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Was there a reason for not pursuing it?

**Mr DOORN:** Largely because it was done third party. Again, once the Government owned the asset it determined that it would follow through and develop its own methodology, to develop its own options analysis and its costings for the options analysis.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Why would you not use the consultant's report that was already there and available to you? Have you asked them whether they would object to handing it over?

**Mr DOORN:** No, I have not.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Given that you are the owner, you would have taken the asset on with all the legacies that entails?

**Mr DOORN:** Legacies of the asset, not necessarily legacies of the concepts that were done before that.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Why would you not then own the plans that had been paid for as part of that stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** As I stated before, the Government has its own way of dealing with and developing its own options analysis. It then develops a costing on a rigour that sits around that. I am not commenting whether it was rigorous or not, I am just saying that the Government did not buy into those previous drawings or plans.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The Government's argument for restructuring Sydney's Stadium Australia into Venues NSW was that report and that it wanted to control the rebuild. The Government's whole argument for changing the legislation was to control the report it was based on, so why would you not then get a copy of that report?

**The CHAIR:** Order! Mr Field has indicated that he will allow Ms Voltz to continue with questions.

**Mr DOORN:** My apologies, I think the report that you are referring to—I am not sure that it is 100 per cent accurate to say that the Government bought it back based on that particular report. The Government looked to buy back Stadium Australia to build it back into the network because it was, in fact, a critical part of the puzzle around investing in government-owned assets.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** How much did that cost the public?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** We already know that. You might say that but that is not what the Minister said on the record. We put it to the Government that we would not support the legislation unless the Sydney Cricket Ground Trust was also included. The Minister's argument on the record was the reason it was being amended, and only Sydney Olympic Park Stadium was going on, was because they wanted to control the rebuild.

**Mr DOORN:** I am not disagreeing with you. One hundred per cent the purpose of buying it back was so that the Government could invest in its own network. The point I am trying to make is that it did not buyback the stadium based on a set of concepts or drawings that were done by the private sector before we took ownership.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** But it based it on the fact that its priority was to reconfigure ANZ Stadium and \$750 million was the figure that was spoken about at the time.

**Mr DOORN:** I agree with you that the concept of converting it into a rectangle was a critical part of the decision-making process.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The \$750 million was based on that report but you never asked for it?

**Mr DOORN:** Again, the Government, once it bought back the asset, made the decision that it would follow its own process for design options and then costings.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Which part of the Government followed that process?

**Mr DOORN:** Infrastructure NSW has been responsible for the development of the strategic business case for ANZ Stadium and there have been many people involved in the process, led mostly through 2017 by the NSW Office of Sport, and then in 2018 by Infrastructure NSW.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** They came up with the reconfiguration cost of \$1.3 billion?

**Mr DOORN:** It was \$1.25 billion. But that was one of the options of the full redevelopment costing.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** What were the other options?

**Mr DOORN:** Obviously in all business cases you start with a do nothing option and then you have got various other refurbishing options.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** What was the range of the other options?

**Mr DOORN:** For the costings? I think they will be included in the business case, which at the moment is still cabinet-in-confidence.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The business case that we do not have. We do not have any details in the business case summary, do we?

**Mr DOORN:** Of other options?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Yes.

**Mr DOORN:** Just bear with me for a moment. No, it actually does talk about three different options in the business case summary.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** What is the range of prices for those?

**Mr DOORN:** Option one talks about the remodelling—that is the preferred option for the Government—estimated cost \$810 million. Option two, to rebuild the stadium with 70,000 seats, with the cost at \$1.292 billion. Option three, the cost to rebuild the stadium with the same range of facilities with 75,000 seats at \$1.33 billion.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** So how did a redevelopment costing of \$1.25 billion come out?

**Mr DOORN:** That was the work that was done in 2017. That is the part that we were intensively involved in. That has obviously been updated. You were correct, Ms Voltz; I was wrong.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** It is actually \$810 million?

**Mr DOORN:** Now the refurbishment option the Government has announced at approximately—because we are still at the strategic business case—at \$810 million.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** That is consistent with the initial report and the ballpark figure in the original consultancy, which you have just said was between \$700 million and \$800 million.

**Mr DOORN:** If you are talking price points alone, they are not inconsistent.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Arthur Stanley's statement was probably correct: "The leaking of the ANZ Stadium redevelopment costings was a monumentally dumb communication strategy, unless the aim was to blow open the debate again." That was not the figure that you ended up with in the business case.

**Mr DOORN:** Again, that would be your assumption. It would be difficult for me to comment because I am not suggesting that I am endorsing Arthur Stanley's position.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** But you did make this statement: "The current dilemma for the Government on the priorities for the redevelopment of the stadium network would not be a problem if there was just one governance structure for the whole stadia network."

**Mr DOORN:** And I stand by that. When we are talking in such a sensitive area, and because it is so much money and you are talking about the complicated nature of running a stadia network, it is important to be able to have a holistic view. At the moment we do have two entities that are running it. My job is to put forward to the Government the best possible case for the venues that we own and operate. So we will continue to do that.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** If the Government's original argument had been that the ANZ Stadium had to be in the Venues NSW structure so you could control the rebuild, why would that be different for the Sydney Football Stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** I think the Government has certainly committed to governance reform. Bringing ANZ Stadium into Venues NSW is the first step.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The first step? You think they may also be bringing in the Sydney Football Stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** I just say it is the first step.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Has the change to prioritise the rebuild of Allianz had a material impact on any discussions that you have been having with potential users of the venues in your network?

**Mr DOORN:** Certainly the whole debate over the last, say, 18 months is destabilising from a content provider's perspective. The level of uncertainty has made it difficult. But overwhelmingly our feedback from hirers is that they are tremendously excited about the result that they are going to get from these fabulous new assets. It has been challenging because it has taken a long time to land the current position.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** The previous witness, Mr Matt Miller, laid it at the feet of Venues NSW with regards to meeting the primary driver of this reform, which was to increase the number of world-class events that were coming to New South Wales. Is it your opinion that the State will be in a better position to attract world-class events to New South Wales as a result of the prioritisation of the rebuild of Allianz?

**Mr DOORN:** It is my position that our hirers will be much better off once the work is done across the stadia network.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Is it fair to conclude then that until such time as the refurbishment of ANZ occurs the State will not be in a better position? This is all predicated on that being completed.

**Mr DOORN:** I think it is fair to say that until the work is done we will remain in the status quo. Effectively, most definitely with a redeveloped stadia network, whether that is Allianz, or Allianz and ANZ and the new Western Sydney Stadium, most definitely people will be better off.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Some organisations will be negotiating for potential events in your stadia network substantially in the future. Have there been any events that have been lost as a result of the decision to reprioritise Allianz?

**Mr DOORN:** We are still working through. The decision was only in March this year for the prioritisation of Allianz over ANZ. We are still working through all the implications of that. The announcement as it currently stands has ANZ starting after Allianz but actually finishing well before Allianz. So we are out of action at ANZ Stadium for a period of about 22 months. Looking at what are the opportunities, where we have lost content, where we can displace that content to other venues, because Western Sydney Stadium will come online just after Allianz is currently proposed to be knocked down. It actually provides a terrific opportunity to try to hold as much as you can. But we know that the Bledisloe is already going to Perth in 2019. So yes, we will potentially lose events during this phase.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** What other events might you lose?

**Mr DOORN:** Again, this is just speculation at the moment because it is hard to say which events we will keep and which ones we will lose because they are the negotiations we are having at the moment. Issues to do with where will the rugby sevens play—fortunately, they are going to stay at the showground. We are looking at a whole range of different options.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Give us a feel for what sorts of discussions you are having at the moment.

**Mr DOORN:** Of course, our venues cater for both sport and entertainment. We are having conversations with people for sporting events and also for entertainment events. We are looking at conversations with people who are concert promoters looking to come to Australia during that particular time and whether that suits their schedule or not. They are the sorts of people that we are currently engaged with.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** All that is predicated on a completion time for refurbishment at ANZ of when?

**Mr DOORN:** ANZ would be completed midway through 2021.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** You are confident that is where it will land?

**Mr DOORN:** We are doing the work now to make sure that is the case.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** The Government's submission that the final business case is expected in—I do not think they specify a time. When would you expect it to be out? When would it need to be out to ensure a completion date of 2021?

**Mr DOORN:** As early as practicable, as early as possible next year.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** You would expect the business case to be out as early as possible next year?

**Mr DOORN:** Yes.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Right before the State election?

**Mr DOORN:** Or after. I am not saying it is January-February, I am saying in that first quarter or second quarter of next year. A lot of those sorts of conversations are clearly outside of my control. I am driven by trying to have everything in place so that we can do the necessary work from the end of 2019.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Sure, but—

**The CHAIR:** I will now move on to Government questions.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Is it true that the bulk of the investment will be going to Western Sydney?

**Mr DOORN:** Most definitely. If you combine the investment for Western Sydney Stadium and ANZ Stadium, or Stadium Australia, the bulk of the Government's current commitments will be going to Western Sydney.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** How many assets would that provide?

**Mr DOORN:** Of the ones that are proposed at the moment, two of the three are in Western Sydney.

**The CHAIR:** A point of clarification, of course, that also includes Parramatta Stadium because Parramatta Stadium is west of the Olympic Park?

**Mr DOORN:** Indeed.

**The CHAIR:** So Parramatta Stadium is part of what is happening in Western Sydney?

**Mr DOORN:** By definition, Sydney Olympic Park in Western Sydney, and the new Western Sydney Stadium in Parramatta is in Western Sydney.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Would you be able to provide an update on Western Sydney Stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** Certainly. Western Sydney Stadium has now just under one year to go until work will be finalised there. We anticipate getting the key, so to speak—although I am sure it will be swipe cards by then—as early as possible around quarter two of next year. Then we have a place to operationalise the stadium during that time, then we will be working towards our very first event next year.

**The CHAIR:** I ask a point of clarification. I am not sure whether it comes under your purview, does that include the completion of a new swimming venue?

**Mr DOORN:** That does not come under my purview.

**The CHAIR:** Thank you. That is all I need to know.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Would you be able to expand a little more on how the stadium there will change the stadia landscape in Sydney and enhance sporting throughout Sydney?

**The CHAIR:** It will bugger up Victoria Road.

**Mr DOORN:** Actually, that is at the very end of Victoria Road. It will be a focal point for those travelling down Victoria Road.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** A brand new beacon.

**Mr DOORN:** There is a beacon at the end that will attract the eyes of people coming towards the stadium with some fabulous technology that wraps around from an LED perspective. Effectively, we believe that the Western Sydney Stadium will not only transform the precinct that is Parramatta where there is so much work happening, but also the sporting landscape as well, as a small 30,000-seat stadium, purpose built for events such as club football and small international events. This stadium will be the steepest stadium in Australia, steeper than SunCorp Stadium. So the sense of being close to the action will be unbelievable at Western Sydney Stadium.

**The CHAIR:** And the sense of vertigo.

**Mr DOORN:** All people will be able to access the field of play because you will enter it at the concourse level, without worrying about whether you are nervous of heights or steepness, then effectively there is a spot for everyone. It will also transform the way clubs hire our venues. The ability for clubs to be able to think more strategically around electronic signage, digital signage, corporate sponsors, a whole range of different products. But fundamentally there are 27,000 seats. So, 27,000 of the 30,000 seats will be for general admission. It will be a fabulous facility for people to come and watch. From our perspective, it will not only transform Parramatta as one of the critical first steps for the transformation there but also it will transform the sporting landscape.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** How will that impact on the experience of spectators going there compared to what we have today?

**Mr DOORN:** At the moment it is fair to say that one of the things that Mr Miller talked about was the predication of increasing the fan experience across our venues to increase participation numbers. Being so close to the action, when you compare yourself to ANZ Stadium or other venues, you will be much closer. You will have a greater selection of food and beverage opportunities as well. One of the bits of feedback that we have from people from the stadia strategies, you want to be able to embed your precincts into areas that are very much sport and entertainment precincts. The close proximity to the city, the close proximity to the light rail that has now been announced going down very close, not next to the stadium but two streets away to allow a little bit of natural selection to get there. Then of course the opportunity to engage with the city around Eat Street and other places will be fantastic.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Would you be able to provide a comparison between Sydney and other cities around Australia and perhaps even the world, in terms of sporting infrastructure?

**Mr DOORN:** There is no doubt about it, the 2000 Olympic Games was the pinnacle for sport in New South Wales and Australia. Since that particular point in time we have not invested in our stadia, the ones that I am responsible for, and largely it is a case of saying that this is an opportunity to really benchmark ourselves against others. For those who have been to the new Perth stadium—which is a wonderful stadium—really sitting not yet in a precinct like we have got in New South Wales, but the venue itself becomes a destination. The new Adelaide has dramatically increased the crowd numbers for both the two Australian Football League [AFL] teams that are playing there, and as a result it has been the destination for major content changes for cricket. That is where they introduced the day-night test match with the pink ball. The ability to be able to sit in the landscape but actually work for sports outcomes as well as the asset owner has been very important.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Mr Martin has just asked me to ask a supplementary question to that. You are saying that the new Perth and new Adelaide are destinations. Is the corollary of that that our ageing assets are becoming less of a destination, people are choosing not to go because of age and all the other issues associated with them?

**Mr DOORN:** First and foremost, there is more choice in the market now. There are more stadiums with the introduction of the upgrade for Etihad and the MCG and AAMI Park in Melbourne. There is more choice available to hirers; so that is a really important thing. In order to stay one step ahead of the game, it is really important to continually invest in your own facilities to make them attractive for the hirer for them to achieve their goals.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** And the consequence of not investing?

**Mr DOORN:** Clearly, the State loses out on those significant infrastructure numbers. If I drew your attention to last year at ANZ Stadium as an example, for the State of Origin we had over 82,000 people there. For Guns N' Roses we had 87,000 people over the two nights. Adele, which was enormous for us, over two nights we had 194,000. So the sheer visitation for these sorts of things is enormous. I guess from our perspective, if you looked at the Arsenal numbers as an example—we organised Arsenal to come to Australia and only in Sydney, only at ANZ Stadium—80,000 watched them play Sydney FC; 83,000 watched them play the Wanderers. But out of that audience, Destination NSW estimated that 35,000 people travelled either internationally or from interstate. So the ability for us to be able to drive that visitor economy through those big venues and to make sure that they are sufficient for the hirer to want to be able to come and get that yield, and for us to be attractive enough to drive people to them, is a really important thing.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Thank you. It is important that you mention the visitor economy. Would you be able to explain the visitor economy in regards to Stadium Australia and perhaps talk a bit more on why we need to convert it to a permanent rectangle, and the impact that will have on the visitor economy?

**Mr DOORN:** The concept of moving the current stadium from its oval status to rectangular status is really important.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** It should be a priority really, should it not?

**Mr DOORN:** It is a really important thing. So from our perspective, the concept of moving it to rectangle is based on the fact that after the Olympic Games, which was a wonderful experience, the world has moved on. Eighty per cent of the content going through our venues now are for rectangular-based content and, at the moment, if you are sitting on the sides it is not too bad—it is not the world's greatest experience; it certainly does not compare to SunCorp—but if you are sitting behind the goalposts, where a large chunk of seats are, you are a long way away. Moving the seats into a permanent rectangle, we will move some seats in some cases up to 40 metres

further forward. That will dramatically change the atmosphere, not just for the people running onto the field, because people will be closer to them, but for those that are buying tickets and actually engaging the crowd. So therefore, they become tickets that are much easier to sell. So from our perspective, certainly the visitor economy is driven by the attractiveness of the stadium, and the attractiveness of the stadium is really what drives people wanting to come; so there are international acts that will come through the doors as well.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Do you happen to have any data on where spectators may come from in the future?

**Mr DOORN:** All I can refer to, I think, is the 2016 report from Destination NSW that had about 3½ million came to Australia in 2016 to attend or to participate in a sporting event. Again, the data that I was talking about in relation to Arsenal was really important, and having witnessed the State of Origin in Melbourne, the concept of hopefully a sellout crowd in a couple of weeks to watch us go 2-0 in the series. If I could reflect on last year's one: 19,000 visitors of the 83,000-odd people that attended the stadium last year stayed overnight in the city. According to Destination NSW, that contributed \$12 million into the visitor economy. So from our perspective it was fabulous, and from an iconic perspective the brand that we are trying to get for Sydney and for our stadia network, 3.5 million watched that event. So from a stadia, from a branding perspective, it is really important to continue to be able to get those assets.

**The CHAIR:** Do you know \$12 million would buy a lot of hay for starving cattle and sheep? That is good.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Can I just ask why the Government entered into a memorandum of understanding [MOU] with the NRL and what benefit that brings of, say, 25 years of the grand final staying in New South Wales?

**Mr DOORN:** Not just 25 years of the grand final, but 25 years of the State of Origin as well. The MOU, as you would expect, talks about the commitments made by the Government to upgrade the stadia network, but it also talks about the commitments that the NRL was going to bring, that being the 25 years of grand finals and State of Origin.

**The CHAIR:** Twenty-five years of Blues winning.

**Mr DOORN:** We are hoping that we are about to enter into a victory—

**The CHAIR:** A new phase.

**Mr DOORN:** A new phase, that is right.

**The CHAIR:** I will now hand over to the Opposition.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** In the New South Wales Government submission, Venues NSW provide the attendance figures. Why have you provided the attendance figures for the SCG Trust venues altogether rather than just for Allianz?

**Mr DOORN:** In order to pull together that submission—the Office of Sport did that—we provided our data. I cannot comment about who supplied the other data and for what rationale.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** That is not what the New South Wales Government submission says, but it includes a range of other figures, including the Stomp stair climbing challenge, the fitness centre visits and the SCG Tour Experience. You would agree that prevents a head-to-head comparison with the actual Stadium Australia attendance figures in the New South Wales Government submission?

**Mr DOORN:** Sorry, I am just struggling with your question. Is the question that it is not apples and apples?

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Correct. You would agree with that, with these current figures?

**Mr DOORN:** We submitted our information to the Office of Sport and I have glanced through the report in advance of today but I have not really analysed it to that level of detail.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** So you are stating that the statement that "Venues NSW have provided the attendance figures below" is not accurate for those other venues?

**Mr DOORN:** Sorry, the statement should read that Venues NSW contributed the figures for ANZ Stadium.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You mentioned Western Sydney Stadium so I will just ask you this while you are here. The Minister answered in both estimates and in a question on notice that the cost for Western Sydney

Stadium was \$300 million. Within a year, at estimates and in answer to a question on notice, that figure had risen to \$360 million. Can you tell me why the figure blew out from \$300 million to \$360 million?

**Mr DOORN:** My understanding is that the budget set for that project was \$360 million. During the time that Mr Ayres may have responded to that the only conclusion I can come to is that that was during the phase by which we broke down the project into the contract price for Lend Lease, which is now publicly available. So there are costs associated with doing that project that are to the contractor and some that are to the State for the development of that project.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** So the \$300 million answer to the 2015-16 estimates was not correct?

**Mr DOORN:** No, that is not what I am saying. I am saying at that particular time that might have been what was known, but I cannot tell you if it was correct or not because of the contextual issue.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In regards to your statements regarding Arsenal coming and State of Origin, they are the big events that are pulling the tourists, are they not?

**Mr DOORN:** Most definitely. I think, just to go to a comment that was made earlier, visitor numbers are driven largely by week-in, week-out content; revenue is driven by—

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Driven by the big events. And the big events essentially go to ANZ Stadium. Is that correct?

**Mr DOORN:** No. There are different events that go to different locations. Even for the planning for Western Sydney Stadium, we will be having major events.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I know you will be having major events, but I am talking about the big events: State of Origin, Arsenal.

**Mr DOORN:** Currently, those big events you refer to go to ANZ Stadium.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** That is right, and if you only had a 55,000-seat stadium would they still be going there or would they go somewhere else?

**Mr DOORN:** I think it is fair to say that the choice of where you play is determined by the hirer. There are currently big events, to use your language, that go to the Sydney Football Stadium. A good example of that are some of rugby internationals that are being played there. I think the game against Ireland in two weeks will be another large event at that particular venue. The ones that are played at ANZ, yes, we are chasing the sorts of events that are at the 70,000 seats and above.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** And they are the ones that bring in the big tourists.

**Mr DOORN:** I would imagine both would, but I can only talk about our business. So, yes, 100 per cent we are driven by trying to get a schedule of events into future years that will drive those sorts of returns for the State.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** A British Lions test, for example, would bring in a lot of tourists.

**Mr DOORN:** Most definitely; it is like the Ashes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** That is right, because they are the big events, are they not, that drive the market?

**Mr DOORN:** The Ashes is a major event, most definitely.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The T20 World Cup?

**Mr DOORN:** Played at the Sydney Cricket Ground, yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In fact, when you are talking about Perth and Adelaide, what you are talking about is cricket and AFL, are you not?

**Mr DOORN:** And also concerts. As I mentioned before, Bledisloe is going to the Perth Stadium, or Optus Stadium as it is now known, in 2019.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** When I put to the Minister for Sport in Western Australia that there was a concern in New South Wales that Perth Stadium was the competition for us he actually laughed and said, "Well, we're not in the same market."

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Sorry, you are giving evidence as to a conversation? You are talking about Western Australia?



**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** We are not in competition with Perth, are we?

**Mr DOORN:** I mentioned before about the number or volume of new assets across Australia. Actually, they are in direct competition. Whether I use Arsenal or Chelsea—let's use Chelsea as a good example. Chelsea is only coming to one place in Australia this year and that is Perth.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** That is pretty unique. If it is the big events, not sport, they are going to go to all of the capitals. There are going to try to get into the market in all the capitals. You are not really competing in that space.

**Mr DOORN:** I would probably disagree, Mr Field, largely because the market here says that if you want to drive the visitor economy you try to do something special; that is only in one place. So it is not all of our market but it is a large chunk of our market. Take Arsenal for example. The exclusive deal that the Government signed with Arsenal was that it was solely for Sydney. Therefore, if you are desperate, if you are an Arsenal fan, if you are a Gunners fan, you are going to fly in from Darwin and from Perth.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** They are pretty rare though. How many a year would be one-off events in one city only?

**Mr DOORN:** I think it is the new model, to be honest. The growth of sport in Asia means that more and more Northern Hemisphere teams are coming to Australia. A good case in point, believe it or not, is the United States basketball team to play at Etihad Stadium in Melbourne under cover against the Boomers before they go to their big championships in China. So they are flying to Australia—unfortunately to Melbourne, not Sydney—where they will base themselves and then go back to Asia.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** It would be remiss of me as a Green not to mention this. We were talking before about 3.5 million attendance in 2016. In 2016, 51.77 million people attended national parks in New South Wales. Sometimes we overblow a bit the amount that those big sporting events contribute to the visitor economy. I am not sure if you have any comments on that but I thought it would be a good perspective.

**Mr DOORN:** I love the national parks as well; I am a big fan.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Good answer.

**The CHAIR:** It is a great place to build a stadium.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I wonder if they come for the national parks and they stay for a sporting event eventually.

**Mr DOORN:** I think they would be studying that.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I understand that the memorandum of understanding requires Allianz Stadium to be knocked down by the end of the year. Have I got that correct?

**Mr DOORN:** I might need to check that. I can say that government approvals were due to be in place by the end of this year or perhaps work had to have started in 2018.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Do you think that the Government's focus on that, as part of the memorandum of understanding, is going to set back the ANZ Stadium completion date? The time lines matter if we are talking about the basis for these decisions is to put New South Wales in the best place to attract the best events. Is the focus on the timetable likely to set back the ANZ Stadium completion date?

**Mr DOORN:** With all due respect, I am not fully aware of the detail of all the work that is happening for the Sydney Football Stadium. We are pretty flat chat with our own design works. Will it set back ANZ Stadium? If that is the critical part of the question, I don't know but I don't think so would be my guesstimate today. I know it is not estimates but guesstimates. They are two separate projects. Allianz Stadium is on a timetable that strategically has us starting our work after our largest event of the year, the NRL grand final, and then trying to pursue that work during that time. Are the two connected? Yes. But are they reliant on each other from a time perspective? I would probably need to know more about the Sydney Football Stadium time frame to comment.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** What component of the attendance and the venues that you control is the NRL?

**Mr DOORN:** The number that we typically refer to—I only operate rectangular venues and you can assume ANZ Stadium is in that mix. From our perspective, the vast majority of our content is rectangular. I do not know what it would be exactly but we only own rectangle. So rugby union, rugby league and football are predominantly our major sporting codes.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** But it is substantial, right?

**Mr DOORN:** It is substantial.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** NRL would be more than 50 per cent?

**Mr DOORN:** Yes, most definitely.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** More than 70 per cent?

**Mr DOORN:** Again I am only having an estimate here, but it is much closer to 80 per cent.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** With that relationship between the Government and the NRL, the prioritisation of Allianz Stadium is a pretty significant strategic point for your venues?

**Mr DOORN:** I would not like to say that NRL is any more special. They are all special, whether it is the Australian Rugby Union or the Football Federation Australia. The growth of football in the country, that is a really important relationship as well.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In relation to the three NRL teams that you identify in the business case for the Western Sydney Stadium, what are the three NRL teams that are going to play at the Western Sydney Stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** It is fair to say that a bit has changed since we started that work. The number of NRL games was probably the determining factor; not necessarily the NRL clubs. As I mentioned before, we are now noticing that the uncertainty in the market about what is going to happen and when has meant that it has been more challenging to lock in clubs up until this particular point because they were uncertain about when things were happening. The Government's most recent announcement has provided that certainty and allowed us to go forward into commercial agreements. There is no doubt that the Eels and the Wanderers are our major anchor tenants but predominantly the stadium is being developed as a home for multiple teams. We are in final commercial negotiations at the moment, but it is a range of clubs playing a number of games. It is not a case of saying that a whole club is going to pick up and move there permanently.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** So there will not be three NRL teams playing at the Western Sydney Stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** I suggest that there would be more than three clubs but they will not be playing every single one of their home games at that stadium.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You have identified 30 NRL games to play out of that stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** Yes, we are working towards that goal.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Are they coming from suburban stadiums?

**Mr DOORN:** They are coming from a range of different places.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The games are played at ANZ, Allianz and Western Sydney stadiums or they are played at suburban stadiums, are they not?

**Mr DOORN:** That is right. During the displacement years there will be a content that comes from within the network. We would like to think that we are trying to find a way to provide a really good, structured commercial deal for clubs to move away from their current home bases.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Are you saying that in the long term you want them to move away from suburban grounds and come to those stadiums?

**Mr DOORN:** As a commercial operator, most definitely. We are looking at finding ways to incentivise clubs to come and play out of our venues.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Is that what the business case is premised on?

**Mr DOORN:** Increased content from NRL clubs is included in the business case.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The Government has committed, on the record in *Hansard*, that no NRL games would be lost from ANZ Stadium in the long term. So none of these NRL games will be coming from ANZ Stadium to Western Sydney Stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** It is hard to see in the long term because we have commercial contracts with our hirers. Commercial contracts, by their very nature, have an end date and it is up to the club to determine where they will play in the future. So that is a challenge if you want me to answer today.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** The concept of a network that these assets are interlinked and interrelate is quite intriguing. Some say that we can leave one particular asset—say, Allianz Stadium—as is despite the safety concerns and hazards. How important is it to follow through with the whole plan?

**Mr DOORN:** From a business perspective, the driver for changing the way in which people engage with our venues—not just for sport but for sport and entertainment and other things—is an important thing. To deliver on the current Government's say, it has been a long time. As the earlier witness described, it has been a challenge to get to this point but now we are seeing the endgame. When people will visit Western Sydney Stadium for the first, second or tenth time in 2018, they will see a dramatic way in which they engage with the people on the field and the way in which they go with their family and friends socially.

It is increasingly important to find new ways to engage with and encourage people to go to venues. If I think about my own home environment, I have a medium-sized television. When I visit other people's houses they have a home theatre and couches that recline. It is increasingly challenging to get people out of the home environment and along to football games or codes and other events across our stadiums. The network, what you are seeing through the pictures from the Sydney Football Stadium or a redeveloped ANZ Stadium, will dramatically transform the landscape. It will also provide opportunities for people to be more social with each other and actually draw them out of their homes. Not just from an economic perspective and the benefits it brings from visitor economy or even a government-owned asset perspective, the social benefits will be really important as well.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Let's face it, when people think of a stadium they think football but what other kind of events with new assets being built?

**Mr DOORN:** We have touched on the importance of major events. Across our venues, one of the most popular events during the year is the Monster Jam. It is a huge event, incredibly loud. To see little kids getting around with these massive headphones is incredibly cute.

There is a mixture of products that we run through our stadiums. We draw our eye to the future. The investment for today has to last another 20 to 40 years into the future. What does the stadium look like into the future? Futurists are starting to say, "yes, we might see e-sports championships". The fact that kids are gaming now is an incredibly large growth area in the United States. Qudos Bank is not government owned but sitting next to us at the moment, not government operated, recently held their own e-games. I think they are up to 14,000 people sitting there watching people gaming.

The ability to be able to do that into the future with the technology infrastructure that will go into facilities—just before Pirtek Stadium closed down we allowed some drone racing to happen inside the stadium, which was a marvellous experience. If you could find a way for my eyes to track the drones as they zoom through the stadium that will be even better. But even futurists are starting to talk about holographic games you might be watching the rugby union test match in Twickenham but it is being beamed to holograms in venues in Australia in the future. I know the next five years is challenging. We will see that with Western Sydney Stadium. Through this infrastructure we are trying to project ourselves for the next 10 to 20 years into the future.

**The CHAIR:** Do not forget paintball.

**Mr DOORN:** If you can have the paintball experience without the pain.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You can play paintball anyway.

**The CHAIR:** Would it not be great with 80,000 people watching it?

**Mr DOORN:** I would not mind the paintball experience without the pain, to be honest. I can appreciate that. For us this is a fantastic opportunity to reset or recalibrate the sporting landscape and we are extremely excited about the future.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** They are not really sports though, are they?

**Mr DOORN:** What is that?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** They are not really sports.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** That was the point of my question, to ask outside of just sport what else was happening.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Mr Doorn, I am looking forward to the next big television screen at MacDonald-Jones stadium, that conversation continues.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** A tireless advocate.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** I am pitching.

**The CHAIR:** You are not bragging, Mr MacDonald?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** He wonders why Newcastle stadium is not getting investment.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** On that theme, but going back to Mr Field's question about the risks of not investing and being ad hoc: Can you draw on experiences overseas where this is not done properly? Are you looking overseas for examples where this is not done properly and the consequences to sport, tourism and the economy? Can you give us a picture?

**Mr DOORN:** You do not have to look overseas to see the way in which stadiums can degrade very quickly if they are not being used and maximised to their full potential. That is one of the challenges with suburban grounds, even in Sydney. Looking overseas, clearly where you have private owners investing and doing deals with regional cities or large towns across North American is a good example and saying three years after that investment, "We are picking up and moving the franchise elsewhere". There is a reason in Australia that government predominantly, with the exception of one venue owned by the Australian Football League in Melbourne, are government-owned assets. It is largely because the cost to upgrade and upkeep them is comprehensive.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** "Comprehensive"?

**Mr DOORN:** The cost to maintain a facility is a large cost, it is significant. From our perspective, having the levers within government to maximise, to find ways for people to utilise your venues to increase the participation is really important. A good example is for ANZ Stadium this year we have done a deal with the NRL and transport where we have done a three-way plan: the NRL will reduce their ticket prices for all NRL club games; we have provided integrated ticketing, so trains to major events are all free of charge, and; the stadium has come to the party with one of our criticisms, and we have reduced the food prices on a rolling nature across our venues. That has been a game changer in the way in which we think about trying to maximise our value. Overseas they do not get that because it is often one team-one town centric.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Can I clarify what were the costs of the rebuild of ANZ Stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** I quoted a figure that was at the end of 2017, which was the 1.25, but going back and having a look at the published business case the number is 1.33 for the rebuild?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** For the rebuild?

**Mr DOORN:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Have you got the business case review [BCR] for a rebuild on ANZ Stadium? What was the original BCR based on the 2016 announcement?

**Mr DOORN:** That work was not done at that particular point in time.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You have no idea what the BCR would be?

**Mr DOORN:** I would not say that. There has been a lot of work done that is Cabinet-in-confidence, so I would not say I have no idea.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Could you give us what the BCR would be?

**Mr DOORN:** My understanding is that is Cabinet-in-confidence.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Why is that Cabinet-in-confidence?

**Mr DOORN:** Because this was all part of the proposal that went to government.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** The documents might be Cabinet-in-confidence.

**The CHAIR:** We will not get into a debate on that. That will be for another time.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** If we do not know what the BCR is, how can we compare whether it is a better investment to do ANZ first or Allianz?

**Mr DOORN:** I do not know if necessarily the decision around what goes second—because remember the Sydney Stadium is actually first, what goes next is perhaps a better way to describe it—is solely based on BCR. My understanding is that it has largely got to do with the urgency of works that are required and that is at the Sydney Football Stadium.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Have you had a look at their documents on the urgency of work?

**Mr DOORN:** No.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Are there any urgent works needed at ANZ Stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** There are always things that could be done to improve the visitor experience, but from a safety and security perspective we are very comfortable with where we sit.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You would have done assessments around earthquake risk for ANZ Stadium?

**Mr DOORN:** We continue to do assessments across a range of different things. I will have to check specifically about earthquakes for you.

**The CHAIR:** Take that on notice.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** To this point of the BCR, I understand there has been a strategic business case out in the public realm. There is a figure out there in the public realm?

**Mr DOORN:** For what?

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** The BCR?

**Mr DOORN:** Yes, there is. It is the BCR that has been published for the preferred government option of option one. The BCR for Stadium Australia is 0.87 for a strategic business case. I would make the special mention that there is a journey that you go on in order to get to final business case and as you go further into that journey it becomes more and more complex. Things like the redevelopment around the red zone at ANZ Stadium are yet to be taken into consideration from a BCR perspective. Things like the introduction of what we hope will be another government announcement around the Metro West for Sydney Olympic Park having a station, the release of the Sydney Olympic Park master plan. Those things we will be analysing over the next however many months it takes to factor out what those things will look like to go from the strategic business case to the final business case.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** You would assume if those things were included it would become higher, not lower?

**Mr DOORN:** My only comment would be, in my job I assume nothing until we have done the work.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** It tends to be the key driver in terms of economic benefit for the State?

**Mr DOORN:** The BCR?

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Yes.

**Mr DOORN:** It is a pretty good indicator, that is why it is relied upon.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** If more people can get there because public transport options are improved then under what circumstances would it fall?

**Mr DOORN:** Increased costs would be an example. I am not an economist but that would be one of the things, if costs were to skyrocket that would be a challenging feature.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Mr Doorn, you made a comment about the game changing now there is certainty following the latest Government announcement. Can you elaborate what you are able to do with that certainty in terms of planning and talking to content providers and those sorts of things?

**Mr DOORN:** Certainly. As I mentioned in one of the earlier questions, the current challenge for us has been the uncertainty in the market place. Being able to define when things will start and finish, what will happen as a result of that, allows us to engage much more deeply with content providers, not just for here for club-based football, but for international acts as well. That is certainly helping us. It also means that people like the NRL clubs, if we take the Eels who are moving into Western Sydney Stadium, once that final commercial deal is done they will be able to plan for what that fan experience looks like. We would anticipate trying to drive a change for clubland football, increasing their membership numbers, what does it mean for their throughput, what does it mean for their yields from these particular facilities.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Can you comment on how far out? Are we talking about 2020 now you have this certainty?

**Mr DOORN:** The dramatic impact will commence from when the Western Sydney Stadium opens in early 2019. That will be the litmus test for all the other clubs. They will be able to see what you can do in a new

stadium, what it does for your own financials in terms of the way in which you create a yield from those products using different products to before.

In the old days the fan experience might have been about the jumping castle and the face painting experience, but going forward what does that digital interface mean? What does it mean about the way in which we collect information—and I mean that in the nicest possible way—around customers that use our facilities? How long has it taken them to travel? What were the touch points along the journey? What did they like? What did they not like? All those sorts of digital experience will actually improve the fan experience going forward. People will start to see that effectively from our perspective when Western Sydney Stadium really kicks into play.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Apart from content providers are there any other stakeholders you want to mention?

**Mr DOORN:** The way in which we are working very closely with council in particular at Parramatta around what it means for transforming their city. Other government stakeholders like Transport are also really important.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** This could potentially help to transform Parramatta and Western Sydney.

**Mr DOORN:** This is a major first step in transforming that whole sport and entertainment precinct.

**The CHAIR:** I think you have wrung that out enough, Mr MacDonald. Thank you, Mr Doorn, for agreeing to give evidence today. There will be some questions on notice, I have no doubt. The Committee would like answers to those questions on notice within 21 days of you receiving them in writing. Once again, thank you.

**Mr DOORN:** Thank you.

**(The witness withdrew)**

**(Short adjournment)**

**CHARLES MOORE**, Chief Executive Officer, Sydney Olympic Park Authority, sworn and examined

**NICK HUBBLE**, Executive Director Commercial, Sydney Olympic Park Authority, sworn and examined

**The CHAIR:** We have a quorum, so we will proceed. Gentlemen, before we proceed to questions from the Committee, would either or both of you like to make a brief opening statement?

**Mr MOORE:** I would like to make an opening statement.

**The CHAIR:** Mr Moore, please proceed.

**Mr MOORE:** I would like to introduce myself and Nick Hubble in a little bit more detail and provide a brief overview of the authority's role. Mr Hubble is our executive director of our commercial operations, which includes responsibility for our development business. He also, in effect, acts as our chief financial officer. Myself, I joined the organisation some 18 months ago as chief executive officer. I have come with a background of running publicly listed companies, particularly in the real estate space. Jointly we are responsible for the day to day operations as well as the setting and execution of the strategic direction of the authority and the precinct that the authority manages.

Sydney Olympic Park Authority [SOPA] is responsible for managing and developing the 640 hectares that is known as Sydney Olympic Park. The Sydney Olympic Park Authority Act 2001 effectively requires the authority to make all reasonable efforts to ensure that Sydney Olympic Park becomes an active and vibrant town centre; that it is a premium destination for cultural, entertainment, recreation and sporting events; that any new development carried out in the precinct is in accordance with the Act and complies with best practice environmental and town planning standards; and that the natural heritage of the parklands is protected and, in fact, enhanced.

Within that context the authority has overseen close to \$3 billion of private sector investment since 2000 and is very excited about the benefits that our proposed new master plan will deliver and in fact can already be evidenced by the additional \$2.7 billion of investment currently underway within the precinct. Sydney Olympic Park currently hosts over 12 million visitors a year. With respect to any Victorians in the room, we would argue that we are Australia's premier events destination, with over five million visitors attending major events in any given year. There are more than 50 days in the year on which we host more than 30,000 customers within the precinct.

As an example, over the past year our four key major stadia attendance rates have been, as we know, ANZ at 1.5 million customers; Spotless and the Sydney Showground actually host about 1.8 million people including the Royal Easter Show, which continues to be the Southern Hemisphere's largest ticketed event; Qudos hosted about 800,000 people; and our aquatic centre is the most successful legacy Olympic pool in the world. It currently has about 1.1 million people a year visit for a swim. This visitation is very important to us. It ensures that we are offering a vibrant and economically sustainable precinct for government. In regards to the ANZ Stadium in itself, for clarity, SOPA is the head lessor of the asset. The lease expires in January 2031. Over the past two years the asset has delivered 23 events where the crowds have exceeded 50,000 people, so it is a very important driver to those visitation numbers. That concludes my opening remarks.

**The CHAIR:** Thank you very much. We will now proceed to questions.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I assume you have seen the government submission to this inquiry.

**Mr MOORE:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The submission has Stadium Australia attendance for 2016-17 as 1.5 million. For the Sydney Cricket Ground [SCG] trust stadia it is 1.852 million. Given that they included in that their swimming pool, gym and surrounding precincts, a better figure if you did like for like would have been Sydney Olympic Park, five million, and the Sydney Cricket Ground trust stadia, 1.8 million. Is that correct?

**Mr MOORE:** For clarity, in that submission I understand that it was Venues that supplied the figure of 1.5 million for ANZ Stadium and the SCG trust supplied their numbers. If we take a holistic view of the entire precinct, yes, using the five million number is correct for those four stadia that I highlighted in my opening comments.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Did you have any input into the Government's submission to our inquiry?

**Mr MOORE:** The final submission?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Yes.

**Mr MOORE:** The Office of Sport undertook that submission.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Did Sydney Olympic Park include any information in the submission? You did not make your own submission, so I assume you have been included in the Government's submission?

**Mr MOORE:** You will note that that submission does not specifically nominate the Sydney Olympic Park Authority. We were not consulted in that submission; it does not name us.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Were you consulted about the business case that the Government released on stadiums?

**Mr MOORE:** We were absolutely consulted in that case. We have supplied a large amount of data in due diligence on the way through. In fact, I was a member of the Stadium Australia steering committee which met on a regular basis throughout 2017. My role for that committee was effectively to ensure that there was compatibility with the objectives of our master plan and that there was going to be good interface between the stadium and the public realm.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Did you see the business case before it was released?

**Mr MOORE:** I was a contributor to the business case. We did not see the final business case.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Mr Hubble, how long have you worked at Sydney Olympic Park?

**Mr HUBBLE:** For about 14, 15 years.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** With regard to stadium strategy and government, you would have some understanding about stadiums around Australia and who you are competing with? Is that a fair assumption?

**Mr HUBBLE:** I would certainly have some understanding of stadia. The ANZ Stadium is an asset that reverts back to the authority in 2031. The interest was essentially around the reversionary interests that the authority has when that asset returns to SOPA's ownership.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** So far as the investment that is happening in other States, would you say that other States have reacted to the investment by New South Wales in the Sydney Olympic infrastructure or do you think that the other States are investing to get a competitive advantage because they see a gap in the New South Wales market?

**Mr HUBBLE:** It is hard for me to comment on that. There are a range of reasons why jurisdictions make investments. Sometimes it is for competitive reasons or political reasons. I could not comment.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Sometimes because we care.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I take you to the business case. Within that is an identified indoor sports stadium strategy?

**Mr MOORE:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** And a feasibility study that was undertaken in February 2017. Have you seen that feasibility study?

**Mr MOORE:** We contributed to that in that the feasibility study was driven by the Office of Sport using independent consultant Deloitte. There was effectively a call for expressions of interest and we submitted an upgrade of what is currently the tennis centre as an option to be considered by government.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** February 2017 until now is a long time for a feasibility study to be undertaken, is it not? Have you been given any indication when it will be released?

**Mr MOORE:** We completed our work and submitted towards the end of Q1 2017. There was some dialogue and interaction with independent consultant Deloitte after that, and we continue to await the outcome.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You do not know if they have finalised the indoor feasibility study?

**Mr MOORE:** That would be a matter for government.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** With regard to the tennis centre in New South Wales, you had a master plan sitting there for more than three years to put a roof on that venue and effectively turn it into an indoor stadium?

**Mr MOORE:** It would be remiss of us in respect of long-term strategic planning of all of our assets not to have visions and aspirations of how we can improve them and continue to enhance the customer experience to ensure that they remain safe and economically viable assets. Specifically with regard to the tennis centre, there



has been extensive consultation with a wide range of stakeholders about the various options that the tennis centre could provide tennis as well as other content users, and that includes the option of putting a roof over the centre.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Which are the other events that would go into that venue with the roof?

**Mr MOORE:** In terms of stakeholder engagement, I do not know if they would—to use your terminology—go into them, but potential users of that space could include netball, badminton, basketball.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The medium-ranged sports?

**Mr MOORE:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** That is with a view to extending that market? For example, netball has gone from one to two professional teams.

**Mr MOORE:** Netball is a rapidly growing sport. Its crowds say it could most definitely deal with a mid-sized stadium.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** And basketball is looking at extending its professional women's teams in particular?

**Mr MOORE:** That is what we understand.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Essentially it is the women's sports that are expanding. It would get an advantage if the tennis centre was expanded?

**Mr HUBBLE:** Most of the additional content that we identified that would go into that arena was around women's sport. The issue for Netball NSW is that its teams currently play out of one of our venues, which has a limited seating capacity. There are situations when they have moved to Qudos Bank Arena, which has got a substantially higher seating capacity. But that comes at a cost. One of the other areas that they face is that if there is a national tour going on, Qudos Bank Arena would prefer to have a big act, which brings a far greater financial return. That is why netball and the Swifts and the Giants were identified as tenants that could go into what is essentially a lower cost venue with higher seating capacity.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In your original statement you mentioned the \$2.7 billion redevelopment that is going on around Sydney Olympic Park. How important is the stadium as an economic driver to the urban renewal that goes on around Sydney Olympic Park?

**Mr MOORE:** The master plan considers the densification and diversification of usage right across the park. A key aim of that is to broaden and diversify the economic usage. Whilst we are Australia's premier event destination and we want to maintain, enhance and protect that status, we also want the park to be more than just a place people go for a big game or concert. Diversifying usage is important and the master plan contemplates the ability to add gross floor area—building, in effect—to the outside of the stadium.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Was Sydney Olympic Park aware of Stadium Australian's proposal to redevelop the stadium—the report that was done came in around \$700 million to \$800 million—that formed the basis of Mike Baird's 2016 announcement?

**Mr MOORE:** That predates my role.

**Mr HUBBLE:** Yes, we were aware of a proposal. From my recollection, it was a design done by BVN Architects and I think the company that was involved in potential construction was Laing O'Rourke.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** One of your earlier comments gave me the feeling that Sydney Olympic Park Authority's level of involvement in the redevelopment of Stadium Australian was more around design and how it fits in with the overall use of the park. Have you got a view on the current options that are being put forward for redevelopment? Is that something that you have taken a position on as an organisation?

**Mr MOORE:** In terms of the individual designs, I think there are far more experience people in the field of operating venues and the like that could answer your question more specifically. If I took a higher order approach to that though, I think the authority, as the long-term term leasor, will at some point in the future potentially inherent the asset back. We would like to see the asset repositioned to enhance its competitiveness in the market place.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** What do you mean by repositioned? Do you mean physically or the capacity for it to attract content? Do you mean repositioning it in the market or physically repositioning it?

**Mr MOORE:** No, to attract content. You have got to remember that it is one of our key assets. It attracts 1.5 million visitors a year out of the five million visitors that attend major events. You can see straight away that

it is a key driver to our local economy. Our local shopkeepers and tenants rely, to a large degree, on these large events to be able to sell coffee, ice cream and one or two beers pre and post match. From our perspective, it is very important that all of our assets provide a good customer experience, because we want them to keep coming back. We want the assets to remain competitive to ensure that we retain the existing content. Ideally, they would be in a position to be able to provide an offer that attracts new content and new visitors to drive that local economy.

A second observation is that an upgrade, refurbishment or redevelopment of the stadium would be a great opportunity to reposition the plant and equipment. The reality is that it is an aging asset and some of the plant and equipment is heading towards the end of its life cycle; but is not at the end of its lifecycle. An opportunity to improve the ongoing maintenance costs of plant and equipment, given that we are going to be the long-term owner at some point in time, would be a good one.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** This morning a question was raised about the occupation certification [OC] that Allianz obtained. We asked Mr Doorn some questions about occupation certificates for ANZ and the other stadiums. I would imagine that you, as the future venue owner and body responsible for all the other venues within the precinct, would be very well aware of whether an occupation certificate is required or not. Can you tell me when the occupation certificate for ANZ Stadium was obtained?

**Mr MOORE:** I will make some opening remarks and Mr Hubble has some good detail for you on this sort of stuff. The first observation, and it is an important one, is that it is in fact a lease obligation of our tenant Venues NSW to make sure it is compliant with all building and regulatory code requirements of the asset during the term of the lease.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** And keep it insured?

**Mr MOORE:** Yes.

**Mr HUBBLE:** The original occupation certificate to ANZ Stadium was issued at the time it was constructed. It was under a different regime then. The Olympic Coordination Authority was established and it was responsible for certification of occupation. Subsequent to that, there were some post-Olympics works that took place in the venue and there was an overseer of that. I am not a planning expert, but usually an OC happens when the building is finished and the owner wants to occupy or if significant works happen down the track.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** So you would not be aware of any new occupation certificate that was obtained by Stadium Australia since that work was done? One was obtained when the work was done and none others would have been obtained since then?

**Mr HUBBLE:** Only following the conduct of new works.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Only when there was a change of use and you did more to building works and had a development application put forward?

**Mr HUBBLE:** Change of use is not the hurdle; it is usually if there is a development application to do works.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Do you not require, as the owner of the facilities, the tenants to obtain one on a regular basis, for example every two years or so?

**Mr MOORE:** There are the ongoing fire inspections that happen under the various regulations.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** If the tenant did not meet the requirements of a fire inspection would you require them to get an updated occupation certificate?

**Mr MOORE:** We have a general requirement that if the tenant is in breach of any requirements under the lease they need to report it to us.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** How involved are you in the development of the business case for the redevelopment of the stadium?

**Mr MOORE:** As I said, we were a contributor. That was predominantly to ensure that the discussions were in line with and incorporated our aspirations more broadly in terms of the master plan and the higher level objections that we have, which I outlined to you during my opening statement.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** It is still being developed. Are you still engaged in that process? As far as we are aware, it is not completed.

**Mr MOORE:** As I said, I sat of the steering committee on a regular basis throughout 2017. The committee has been meeting on a more ad hoc basis this year.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** As it has not been completed yet I am assuming that you will be involved in the ultimate decisions around how the business case is completed before it gets presented to Government or wherever it needs to get presented. In the Government's submission there was an indication that it has not been completed. I am assuming that the steering committee will see the final document before it goes forward?

**Mr MOORE:** I am not sure of the final processes so I am not in a position to answer you.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** When was the last meeting, that you are aware of, of that steering committee?

**Mr MOORE:** There has been some interaction around the table on an ad hoc basis, as I said, with Infrastructure NSW.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** When was the last formal meeting?

**Mr MOORE:** The last time I sat in an Infrastructure NSW meeting would have been eight to 10 weeks ago.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** The venues put to us that it is still the current plan to have completion of a redeveloped Stadium Australia by 2021. How does that fit in with other works that are in train around the precinct? Is that something that you are working to? Do you expect that there will be any barriers to that occurring?

**Mr MOORE:** I am not sure that the timing has been formally signed off. I do not think there is a formal program in place yet. We are still in a discovery and design phase, and there is a lot of water to go under that bridge. I would say more broadly that we are excited about seeing that project kick off. There are plenty of examples globally of how redevelopment of stadia network accelerates the gentrification of the public domain and land usages that surround stadia. So we see that this would be a catalyst to help us continue to drive forward the execution of our master plan.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** It is pretty gentrified around there already, isn't it?

**Mr MOORE:** Come on! If we are all honest the pre- and post-game experience around the stadium at the moment is pretty terrible.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** I was thinking of Newington.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Can you clarify that you are the landlord; you are not the operator.

**Mr MOORE:** That is correct in regards to ANZ stadium, whereas we are the landlord and operator of, say, the swimming pool.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Okay. So that informs your role in the Government stadia strategy.

**Mr MOORE:** Correct.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Can you give me a little insight into some of the projects that are underway in the park?

**Mr MOORE:** I will give the development guy—Mr Hubble—a moment in the sun. There is \$2.7 billion of private sector work underway at the moment. Nick can supply some details on those.

**Mr HUBBLE:** Sydney Olympic Park is a mixed use zone. "Mixed use" means that there is residential and commercial development and retail. We have all of those developments taking place in the precinct now. Initially the park was focused on commercial office development. You may recall that the Commonwealth Bank of Australia was a tenant in the precinct. A number of major firms followed. Samsung now has a base in the park as does the Thales group, Lion Nathan and a host of education bodies including the University of Western Sydney. The early phases of the precinct developed the commercial office space. We have 18,000 people who work in Sydney Olympic Park now. Residential development has been the more recent change in the precinct. We are now getting residents in the park.

Mirvac are doing a substantial development at the moment. There are a number of other transactions underway. There are long-term projections for residents in the precinct. Under our old master plan it was for about 12,000 people. Under the new master plan that grows.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Can I interrupt you there. You are obviously having a lot of engagement with people looking at investing and looking at investment. If we hit the brakes today on rebuilds and refurbishment, what would those conversations be like?

**Mr HUBBLE:** I am speaking to people in the development industry quite often. The stadium often comes up in conversation, as you could imagine. We have a new licensed premises—a development application

has just been approved—which is right next to ANZ stadium near Cathy Freeman Park. So you can imagine that the future of ANZ stadium is something that they are very concerned about. One of the great things about Sydney Olympic Park is that it is a really active precinct. A lot of residents surprisingly come to the park because they love the events. They love the vibrancy that the events bring. So, the future of Stadium Australia—ANZ Stadium—is of significant importance to them in their decision-making.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Can you give us a little bit more insight into that. Do they go into detail in asking you what it is going to look like, the time frames and the level of investment or things like that?

**Mr MOORE:** As Nick said, we have continuous dialogue with a wide variety of potential capital investors in the park. One of the aspirations of the master plan is to see about 100,000 square metres of retail development within the park. To put that in context, if you shop on the North Shore it would be about the size of two Chatswood Chase or if you shop in the inner west, it would be the equivalent of two Westfield Burwoods. Today we have about 32 retailers—the coffee is okay—so that is a big growth number.

The private sector is very focused on two elements. One is the delivery of additional public transport. The light rail and the potential delivery of the metro are catalytic in terms of giving capital certainty to invest. There has also been a lot of conversation around the stadium—the size and what it is. If we go back to the key category of our job to attract visitation, those visitors are potential shoppers. They are potentially people who will use the retail facilities. The design of the retail space will be orientated, to a degree, to enhance the customer experience pre and post event. That has a number of knock-on benefits. At the moment people, frankly, cannot wait to leave. That places significant pressure on our transport infrastructure.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** So you want them to linger.

**Mr MOORE:** If we could deliver a better retail experience people will linger, and that will take the pressure off the transport infrastructure. That is an example.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** I would like to drill down a bit more. You are having those conversations with people who want to develop and build. What about the people who finance them? That is really important. Has the conversation with them since then in terms of certainty with the announcement that was made by the Government a little while back?

**Mr MOORE:** I do not think it is for us to comment about financing arrangements that the private sector may or may not enter into, with respect to developments. That is between the developer and the banks. We are one step removed.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Can you talk a little but more about your master plan.

**Mr MOORE:** As I outlined, currently we have about 500,000 square metres of space developed within the park—predominantly, as Nick was saying, commercial and, more recently, some residential space plus a very small amount of retail space. Aspirationally, our revised master plan envisages about 1.9 million square metres of potential development space which will obviously take a decade or more to deliver. As I was saying, it pays tribute to, and acknowledges, the importance of maintaining us as Australia's premier event destination, but we want to see a much broader and more diversified economy—one that goes way beyond the event day. The master plan would like to see, literally, a doubling of jobs within the park.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** A doubling of jobs?

**Mr MOORE:** A doubling of jobs. That is, in effect, a doubling of the office area that is currently there. To contextualise that, that would make it a market larger than St Leonards or Chatswood or the Green Square, Mascot office markets.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** That sounds really good. Does that also go to the potential for events and sports at the venues? I know you are not a content provider, but how would it work if you are building a better experience and multi-use venue outside the park? What would be the consequences for events and sports, in your view?

**Mr MOORE:** It would be our view only; we do not have a direct dialogue in the case of ANZ or Spotless with the promoters. We feel that an enhanced amenity would make it more accommodating for more content to think about going to Sydney Olympic Park, because the experience, frankly, would be better. Another key component of the master plan is an increase in the number of hotels that we have within the park. Currently, we have just over 800 hotel rooms, which is a limiting factor in the conference and exhibition space, in particular. You have to remember that facilities such as ANZ use their space not on game days for conferences and exhibitions. We would like to see a significant increase in the number of hotel rooms.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Is that possible within the master plan and the stadium strategy?

**Mr MOORE:** Exactly. They are going to be—

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Complementary.

**Mr MOORE:** —complementary.

**The CHAIR:** I am looking for clarification. In the master plan some consideration is given in the plan to renew, expand, change or whatever the stadium. What would be the differences in the outcomes—the what ifs—if the stadium was not developed, left as it is? Did you have a scenario where nothing was done compared with a scenario where the stadium was upgraded or replaced? Secondly, what was the difference in outcomes in terms of the rate at which you could develop the other aspects—the commercial, the retail, the hotels et cetera? Did you consider the two scenarios, and if so what were the specific differences?

**Mr MOORE:** My first observation is that the master plan process commenced before Stadia Network turned up.

**The CHAIR:** I understand that.

**Mr MOORE:** But it certainly acknowledges the opportunity to develop the space around the stadium, so in its existing footprint. Secondly, when there appeared to be the opportunity of a complete rebuild of the stadium—so changing the footprint—one of the effects would have been, given that the footprint would reduce, giving back more space that potentially we could, as the landlord, develop on and add additional gross floor area to the site.

**The CHAIR:** Good answer.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You may have heard in earlier evidence that Western Sydney Stadium was originally envisaged to cost \$300 million, but by the time they signed the contract it was \$360 million. This reflects a recent pattern of infrastructure project costs blowing out. Given that Allianz is now slated to be first cab off the rank, what are the implications to ANZ Stadium of cost blowouts in infrastructure projects?

**Mr MOORE:** I do not think that we are in a position to respond to that question.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In terms of the indoor sports stadium, have you had any indication from government about when a decision will be made?

**Mr MOORE:** We are unaware of the time frame at this point.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Have you asked the Government? Has Sydney Olympic Park Authority approached the Minister in this regard?

**Mr MOORE:** We approach the Minister on many occasions about our strategy and direction around a number of our assets, but, as I said, at this point in time there is no date.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** There is no plan at the moment to progress?

**Mr MOORE:** No, I did not say that. I just said there is no date.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Have you asked about this specific issue?

**Mr MOORE:** The conversation around the tennis centre is a live one within the machinery of government, absolutely.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Is it still being pursued?

**Mr MOORE:** We are still pursuing it.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In regards to the covering of the tennis centre, you finalised your design plans, which I received under a Government Information (Public Access) Act application. When did you provide your plans to the Minister's office?

**Mr MOORE:** The observation that I would make is that we are on a journey around the tennis centre, and we are in very preliminary feasibility stages. A number of options have been thrown up and tested from time to time. Even within our own planning, as we go on that journey, the vision and options change. We have supplied to the Minister's office from time to time a variety of different options around what we could do in terms of preliminary design.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You have provided architectural designs.

**Mr MOORE:** Yes, but very preliminary.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** They contain probably more design than we have seen on the Sydney Football Stadium.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I go back to the last steering committee meeting. You mentioned that you attended a meeting maybe eight to 10 weeks ago. Can you indicate whether the status of the business case was discussed at that meeting?

**Mr MOORE:** I cannot actually recall the status of the business case at that point in time.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Have you seen a draft business plan at this point?

**Mr MOORE:** A business plan or a business case?

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** A business case.

**Mr MOORE:** No, I have not seen a draft business case at this point.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I asked a question about the completion date of 2021, which seems critical to the MOU that the Government has signed with the various parties because the parties have indicated that plenty of water is still to go under the bridge between now and then. Please expand on your answer. Are you concerned that that time line may not be met? What do you see as the barriers to the time line being met?

**Mr MOORE:** An MOU for what?

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** The MOU between government, the NRL and the various parties interested in the stadium strategy generally hinges on completion by 2021, so sports can be played at Stadium Australia. It seems critical to the stadium strategy, and you suggested that a completion date of 2021 hinges on some factors. What are those factors?

**Mr MOORE:** The observation around the MOU with the Australian Rugby League is not with the Sydney Olympic Park Authority. We have not seen that at the moment.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Sure, but it hinges on the 2021 completion date. Obviously, you control the rest of the precinct. Is it feasible to get the project completed on time?

**Mr MOORE:** You said the completion date is 2021. I have not seen the MOU, so I cannot comment on that. I would expect that there are a whole bunch of terms and conditions in there. I do not know; I have not seen the MOU.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** I use the example of the swimming centre. You are both landlord and operator of that centre. Is that right?

**Mr MOORE:** Yes, that is correct.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** You would have, for instance, insurances covering those facilities. Is that right?

**Mr HUBBLE:** We do have insurance, and the insurances are under the Treasury Managed Fund, which is a coordinated insurance arrangement.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** There would be a public liability component as well as a property component of that.

**Mr HUBBLE:** That is right.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Previous witnesses have been asked about obtaining occupancy certificates. Those certificates reflect the building code that existed at the time the premises were constructed. Did you hear any of that evidence?

**Mr HUBBLE:** Yes, I did.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** What interests me is that building codes and requirements with regard to buildings—for instance, fire codes—change over time. Is that right?

**Mr HUBBLE:** Yes.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** With regards to insurance, for instance, the insurer will require that you have at least attempted to comply with new codes rather than the ones that existed when the building was constructed. Is that right?

**Mr HUBBLE:** I could not confirm that one way or the other.

**Mr MOORE:** That is not our area of expertise. We can take it on notice and come back to you.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** I suggest that as a building ages the insurer may require some confirmation that the building is appropriate to the use that it is being put. That can be done by a new occupancy certificate, can it not?

**Mr HUBBLE:** That might be the case in commercial insurance but we are under the Treasury Managed Fund so I presume it is different.

**The CHAIR:** You can take that question on notice.

**Mr HUBBLE:** Thank you.

**The CHAIR:** Thank you for agreeing to appear before the Committee today. I have no doubt that you will be sent some questions on notice. The Committee requires those questions to be answered within 21 days of receipt.

**(The witnesses withdrew)**

**JAMES BETTS**, Chief Executive Officer, Infrastructure NSW, affirmed and examined

**DAVID RICHES**, Executive Program Director, Infrastructure NSW, affirmed and examined

**JANETT MILLIGAN**, Adviser, Infrastructure NSW, sworn and examined

**The CHAIR:** Before we proceed to questioning, would one of you like to make a brief opening statement?

**Mr BETTS:** I want to take the opportunity to clarify the various functions that Infrastructure NSW performs that are relevant to the inquiry. We have performed a number of functions that might be relevant. We were established by an Act of Parliament in 2011, which defined our functions. As the Chief Executive Officer I report to the Premier. The Premier requires me to provide her with, amongst other things, independent, long-term advice on infrastructure priorities for the State through the NSW State Infrastructure Strategy, which is released every five years, or more frequently if directed by the Premier, and it looks 20 years into the future. That is published. It is recommendations to the Government. We published State infrastructure strategies in 2012, 2014 and more recently in 2018.

The second function we perform is the supervision of the Restart NSW Fund. That fund was established by statute and it has \$30 billion in it at the moment. That funding is largely derived from long-term leases of assets and, by law, the fund can only be accessed on the recommendation of Infrastructure NSW by reference to my board, which has a majority of independent members on it. Before we make any recommendations for access to that fund for a project, we require that it should be supported by a business case and that the business case should demonstrate a benefit-cost ratio of greater than one. We perform an assurance function for the Government, which is again independent, where we review how all the major projects across government are travelling and we report on time, on budget and other aspects of the performance of those projects through to—

**The CHAIR:** Did you say assurance or insurance?

**Mr BETTS:** Assurance. Project assurance is basically an external review of all the capital projects the Government is delivering to identify any risks and to make sure that they are appropriately mitigated, where possible. Again, that is an independent arm's-length function. The fourth function we perform is rather different, and that is project procurement and delivery. We tend to perform that on behalf of, and as the agent of, agencies across government that may not have their own mature in-house capital delivery capability—projects like the International Convention Centre, the Anzac Memorial upgrade in Hyde Park, the Clarence correctional facility at Grafton, the Walsh Bay Arts Precinct and the Art Gallery of New South Wales.

The Sydney Football Stadium is also one of those projects where, through an authorisation order from the Premier, we will be undertaking and overseeing the procurement as well as supervising the demolition and construction of that project and, subject to an investment decision, the Government expects that in 2019 we are likely to play a similar role in the refurbishment of Stadium Australia. Clearly in the last capacity as project deliverer, that is not an independent function. That is a function where, like any other agency delivering a project which involves significant amounts of taxpayer money, the budget, the scope, the time frames and the planning pathways for that project are determined by Ministers, not independently by us.

Where we are delivering projects, the assurance function that I alluded to, is performed not by Infrastructure NSW—because we cannot mark our own home work—but rather by New South Wales Treasury. Unlike the NSW State Infrastructure Strategy, unlike the assurance and Restart functions, the project oversight and delivery function, which Mr Riches oversees, is not independent of ministerial agency and control. We are on footing with, say, Transport for NSW, Roads and Maritime Services or Health Infrastructure NSW in that respect.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Given that the benefit-cost ratio put forward in your business case is less than one, we can assume that the money is not coming out of Restart NSW funding?

**Mr BETTS:** That is correct.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** So it will all come from—

**Mr BETTS:** Some alternative funding source to be determined by New South Wales Treasury—from consolidated revenue, for instance.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** So it is coming out of consolidated revenue?

**Mr BETTS:** Yes.



**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You put together the business case. In April 2016 then Premier Mike Baird made an announcement that the transformation of ANZ Stadium would be fast-tracked and that it would be the first priority. He then handed that process over to Infrastructure NSW. How did you get from that announcement to Allianz Stadium being the priority?

**Mr BETTS:** Sorry, what did he hand over to Infrastructure NSW?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** At the time the NSW Office of Sport was overseeing the progress of the stadia strategy. At that time then Premier Baird said that the transformation of ANZ Stadium and Allianz Stadium would be managed and delivered by Infrastructure NSW.

**Mr BETTS:** Final investment decisions on either of those stadia were not taken until March this year. We were asked to step-in and oversee the production of business cases for both Stadium Australia and the Sydney Football Stadium in December last year. Prior to that we had had only very limited involvement in the development of the stadium strategy, specifically some work that Mr Riches had undertaken to support the examination of options for the refurbishment of Stadium Australia, but nothing material beyond that.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Former Premier Baird said that ANZ Stadium would happen first and that it would be in this term of government. He also said that Allianz Stadium would happen in the next term of government. How did that announcement change?

**Mr BETTS:** I do not know. That is a question you would have to ask the Government. I am here to talk about the functions that Infrastructure NSW performs, which does not include the generation of the stadium strategy itself.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** What you are essentially saying is that it was not premised on your business case for the Sydney Football Stadium redevelopment, that you were merely asked to provide a business case and to prioritise Allianz Stadium?

**Mr BETTS:** We were asked to produce two things in December last year. One was a final business case, a strategic business case and a final business case for Sydney Football Stadium, and a strategic business case for Stadium Australia, and that is what we have done. Those business cases identify options and do the economic and financial analysis around the costs and benefits of the various options for both those stadia. Then it is for government to determine what investment decision it wants to take at the end of that on the basis of the analysis we have produced and for government to decide the order in which those stadia get built.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** So, essentially—

**Mr BETTS:** And the Government announced its decisions on 29 March.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** But it made an announcement in November last year that it was going to in fact develop both stadiums and that Allianz would be the first stadium redeveloped.

**Mr BETTS:** Correct.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** But you had no input into that decision by the Government?

**Mr BETTS:** Correct.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Even though you were identified in that decision as going to have carriage of those two projects?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** No, that is the previous one. At that time you had not overseen any of the documentation that had been provided to government, safety audits, certificates of occupancy?

**Mr BETTS:** No. As I have explained, the only involvement we had was work that Mr Riches had undertaken which was limited to the identification of costings associated with refurbishment options for Stadium Australia. Beyond that, the involvement of Infrastructure NSW was largely confined to the recommendations we had made in the State infrastructure strategies that I have described, which were recommendations at a very high level of generality that the Government should undertake business cases or other planning for potential investments in the stadia network.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Did you have any input into the inquiry submission that the Committee received from the New South Wales Government?

**Mr BETTS:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Did you develop it?

**Mr BETTS:** We had input to it, yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** But you did not write it?

**Mr BETTS:** We wrote sections of it, which found their way into the final draft. But I understand, I think it may have been the Office of Sport who had final carriage of it.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** So the Office of Sport put this together?

**Mr BETTS:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Even though you have delivery of both stadiums?

**Mr BETTS:** An agency needed to coordinate that, otherwise we would have had multiple, confusing submissions from different Government agencies and the view was taken that it would be more convenient for the Committee to have a single, coordinated input from government, and the Office of Sport kindly agreed to coordinate that.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Paragraph 6.2 of that submission has the conditional certificate of occupancy. In that it identifies earthquake design of the building as a risk factor. Have you seen any reports on that provided by the Sydney Cricket Ground Trust?

**Mr BETTS:** Yes. When we were embarking on the process of preparing the business case for Sydney Football Stadium we were given a range of different documentation by the trust, which was important because we needed to identify a base case to feed into the business case which would, if you like, be defining the minimum works necessary to enable the stadium to continue to operate safely.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** As part of the costings that have been done—and I am assuming that is within the \$141 million or the \$350 million figure that has been put forward—which one does the earthquake fall into?

**Mr BETTS:** I am not sure which figures you are exactly referring to there. The cost of the base case as per the business case summary is the \$341 million.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** \$341 million. Does that include the earthquake design of the building?

**Mr BETTS:** It addresses all the issues which are identified in those reports, insofar as they can be addressed.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** What is the risk rating for earthquake for Sydney Football Stadium?

**Mr BETTS:** You would have to ask the Sydney Cricket Ground Trust that. They are the owner and operator of the asset.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I am asking you.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Let him answer.

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I ask you because you have overseen the business case—

**Mr BETTS:** Yes, we have.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** —put forward that it is going to cost \$340 million to redesign. I am wondering why earthquake is something that is being singled out and how much the works that have been identified for earthquake remediation are?

**Mr BETTS:** You are the one singling it out. There are a range of different non-compliance issues which need to be addressed, including things like Disability Discrimination Act compliance and non-compliance with building codes or contemporary standards for crowd egress. In developing the business case—

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Sorry, that is—

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Point of order: There have been a number of occasions when the witness has been attempting to answer and the member is cutting across the witness. The witness is making very pertinent points. I think the entire Committee is entitled to hear what he has to say.

**Mr BETTS:** I am going to ask—

**The CHAIR:** Excuse me, Mr Betts. My reading of this particular witness is that he is a most competent witness and capable as a senior public servant to answer questions in whichever way he deems fit. However, I will note that witnesses should not be badgered, they should be allowed to answer a question. This witness does not

seem to be time wasting. I will not uphold the point of order. I ask members to put their questions clearly and succinctly and allow the witness time to answer.

**Mr BETTS:** Thank you, Chair. We were in receipt of a number of reports which had been commissioned by the Sydney Cricket Ground Trust, and it was important for us to define the base case against which all options could be measured. That base case, as I have tried to explain, was a do-minimum base case, the works, which are strictly necessary to achieve code compliance and enable the stadium to operate for a 30-year period. On receipt of those documents we reviewed them, we established that they had been conducted, undertaken by reputable advisers. We also, as we were compiling the business case, instigated an external review auspiced by New South Wales Treasury, which involved experts in stadium design who came in and reviewed those documents for us. They were able to ask questions of the author of one of the key documents, which was prepared by Blackett, Maguire and Goldsmith, which is the independent certifier.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Of those documents, you just said that they did not comply with building codes. Would it be correct to say that Allianz Stadium complied with the requirements of the building code at the time it was built and that it can be argued that a building which has not had a change of use does not need to consider the current code?

**Mr BETTS:** I will ask David Riches to answer that question. But I would say that there are aspects of the design of that stadium which would clearly need to be addressed. There was a time limit in terms of the occupancy certificate but there was also considerable expense associated with the operational workarounds necessary to keep the stadium operating safely.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** That was not my question. My question was, is it correct to say that Allianz Stadium complied with the requirements of the building code at the time that it was built?

**Mr BETTS:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** And that it can be argued that a building which has not changed its use does not need to comply with the current codes. You said it did not comply with the building code, it had not changed its use.

**Mr BETTS:** Mr Riches, would you like to answer?

**Mr RICHES:** Yes. It did comply at the time of completion in January 1988, unquestionably. Many of the codes that have now been referred to obviously are subsequent to 1988. The seismic code specifically was introduced shortly after the Newcastle earthquake. The Building Code of Australia has changed and the disability access code has changed. From my experience, it is appropriate to say that you do not necessarily have to comply with codes.

**The CHAIR:** Exactly.

**Mr RICHES:** Unless there is a major change of use or development.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In fact the Act says that, does it not?

**Mr RICHES:** The Act says that. The trust has also identified other weaknesses in the building which require enhancement, which have been included in that budget price. It is probably more appropriate for the trust to recognise those.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** And one of those is earthquakes?

**Mr RICHES:** One of which is earthquakes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** How much is that?

**Mr RICHES:** I need the detailed documentation.

**Mr BETTS:** You could ask the trust that question.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** But you were provided, were you not, for the base case to come up with the \$340 million, were you not?

**Mr RICHES:** Yes, we did. And the pricing for those works was undertaken by Rider Levett Bucknall, one of the international leading quantity surveyor firms.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Have you seen that report?

**Mr RICHES:** Yes, I have.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Do you have a copy of that report there?

**Mr RICHES:** I do.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Could you table it for the Committee?

**Mr BETTS:** You would need to go through the normal process for acquiring these documents.

**The CHAIR:** Order! I think the answer is no, the witness is not prepared to table the document without instruction. We will leave it at that. The Committee will proceed to acquire the document by other methods.

**Mr BETTS:** To summarise, the costs associated with bringing that stadium up to a reasonably modern standard and enabling it to operate for 30 years were estimated by a highly reputable international firm and were subject to external review through a gateway process, auspiced by New South Wales Treasury, and at the end of that we ended up with a base case which would have enabled the stadium to continue to operate, as you correctly identified, but to operate in a way which failed to comply with modern contemporary standards, for instance for things like disability access. It is a matter of judgement for Ministers and elected officials to determine whether it is an acceptable outcome in 2018 for Sydney to have a premium football stadium which is not accessible for people with disabilities. A reasonable person might form a judgment that that is not the case.

**The CHAIR:** A committee may interrogate those assertions, though.

**Mr BETTS:** Yes, indeed.

**The CHAIR:** And that is why we are here. We will now move on to Mr Field.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** You mentioned that in developing the base case for the business case you were in possession of a range of documents that were supplied by the trust. Were those documents all self-initiated or were any of those requested?

**Mr BETTS:** Self-initiated by whom?

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** By the trust.

**Mr BETTS:** I think that most of them were self-initiated by the trust, but you would have to ask them that.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** You were developing a base case in order to have a base on which to develop the rest of the business case. Did you ask them to commission any documents to enable you to make decisions about what that base would be, or was that already done by the trust?

**Mr BETTS:** A lot of work had already been done by the trust, which was good from our point of view; it enabled us to proceed reasonably expeditiously with the preparation of the business case without having to do a whole bunch of work from scratch. But we did not take the reports at face value; as I said, they were subjected to independent scrutiny, including through the gateway process, and reviewed by Mr Riches, who has considerable expertise in major construction.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** But the timing is interesting here, would you not agree, because it seems to me, particularly the occupancy certificate and the reporting around that and the safety concerns, they are relatively contemporary documents, 2016—a time when a lot of these considerations were being made within government. Surely these safety issues and disability access did not start being an issue in 2016; these were issues before. Did you see any evidence in the documents that were supplied by the trust that they had been raising these issues with government prior to 2016? Had any documents been produced or acquired by the trust to make their case before 2016?

**Mr BETTS:** As I have explained, our involvement in the production of the business cases begins in December 2017.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Sure, but those documents they provided to you were from back then. Is that right?

**Mr BETTS:** They were reasonably contemporary, yes. They were reasonably recent—your hypothesis on that is correct—but you would have to ask the trust about prior analysis they had done and what representations they might have made to government before the end of 2017.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Okay, we will. In the business case summary that has been released, you make a range of assumptions around attendance, and that is quite critical for the final outcomes of the business case, obviously. What is the basis of you making an assumption that with options 1 and 2, which are quite similar in terms of attendance and number of events, you would have on average about 3,000 more people at each event?

**Mr BETTS:** That is a good question and in a moment I will ask Janett Milligan to address that. The broad approach that we adopted was to agree with the Office of Sport what reasonable assumptions could be made around the fixtures that would be attracted by each of the venues and to ensure that they were consistent across the stadium network as it was upgraded.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** So they gave you a list of fixtures that they assumed would play in a redeveloped stadium?

**Mr BETTS:** Yes. We asked for reasonable, mutually consistent assumptions that could be made across the various business cases about where fixtures would be taking place, and we used that as an input to the analysis around attendances.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Are you able to provide that list of fixtures to the Committee?

**Mr BETTS:** I am sure we could provide that to the Committee. But I would say that these were assumptions that we needed to make. They were reasonable assumptions, they were evidence-based assumptions; they are not contractual commitments for any particular club to play at any particular venue, but I think you have acknowledged that is reasonable. We had to make some working assumptions about where games would be played and we also drew on considerable evidence and research undertaken across Australia and internationally by KPMG on the impacts on attendances at fixtures at equivalent facilities where they had undertaken upgrades equivalent to the ones that were being proposed for Sydney Football Stadium. I will ask Ms Milligan to answer that.

**Ms MILLIGAN:** Yes, there are two components, of course: the number of events that are assumed at the stadium, and the attendances we assume. I might go to the second one first. The business case analyses sets what they call the starting point for attendances. They have used five-year averages per type of event. For example, if it is an NRL club event, they have looked at the five-year average for that tenant, or where the tenant is not yet identified, the five-year average for city-based teams. They have done a five-year average because the attendances at sporting events tracks very closely to the on-field performance. So you can sort of chart it and almost sort of predict what is going to happen next.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I appreciate you taking us through that, but it may assist the Committee if we were able to have a look at those documents in order to better understand them. I am not sure that is useful to go through them in detail.

**The CHAIR:** So your question is: Can the witness take it on notice and table the documents? Is that your question?

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Yes, can you take it on notice?

**Mr BETTS:** Yes, we are happy to.

**Ms MILLIGAN:** I could provide some very quick information that might help. Long-term averages were the starting point; there was an assumption based on the research of what the uplift would be, and that is around about 15 per cent. So the figures that you see in the summary are a function of the number of events and long-term averages for those events, with uplift that is based on very firm evidence of what happens if you refurbish or redevelop a stadium.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** The Government has been very careful in the submission to make clear that the development of Allianz will "vastly improve the venue's integration with parklands and the residential communities that border the SCG precinct", but of course will only occur on SCG Trust-administered land. I want to try and get to the bottom of that a little bit more. You are obviously developing a site and there is going to be engagement with the community and all the stakeholders in that process. Can you just put on the record I guess a guarantee of the fact that the stadium will only be on SCG-administered land?

**Mr BETTS:** Yes.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Are there any components of the development that you are considering that might go outside of SCG-administered land? Because they are careful to say the stadium in the submission. Are there any components of the development that will be outside SCG Trust-administered land?

**Mr RICHES:** I might answer that. There may be a requirement to have some pathways linking the new stadium to the Tibby Cotter Bridge, enabling people to find their way over to the light rail stop also.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Just pathways? Is that what is meant by "the venue's integration with parklands and the residential communities that border the SCG precinct"? Is that just pathways?

**Mr RICHES:** The integration of the master plan will be clearly shown in urban design guidelines as part of the EIS submission. However, there has been a large emphasis on opening up the porosity through the site so that pedestrians can move from Paddington in and around the site, down the stairs and down to Driver Avenue and then across to Moore Park. It requires the removal of the fence along Moore Park Road. In consultation to date, that has been quite well received.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** What consultations have they been?

**Mr RICHES:** We have had a preliminary community consultation, as required under our SEARS. SEARS was issued in May.

**The CHAIR:** Can I ask you what is SEARS?

**Mr RICHES:** SEARS is Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements, the initiation phase of the planning approval process. We have met with local community groups, we have met with the Lord Mayor, the local member.

**Mr BETTS:** We have issued 23,000 letters, 83 stakeholder letters, four newspaper ads, had 12 stakeholders meetings, four pop-up stalls, 78 attendees to member information sessions, and three community information sessions—that is before the environmental impact statement is put on exhibition, which is obviously the centrepiece in the public consultation. So it has been exhaustive and we have been able to identify a range of key issues important to the community. I think it would be regarded as negligent if we were not looking at questions of opening up the precinct, particularly for pedestrian access, in the context of the enhanced public transport that the light rail will bring.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** What date at this stage would you expect the EIS to go on exhibition?

**Mr BETTS:** Shortly.

**The CHAIR:** Can you be more specific?

**Mr BETTS:** It is not a decision for me; it is a decision for the planning Minister. But very shortly.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** When would you expect to submit the EIS to the planning Minister?

**Mr BETTS:** The documentation is complete, from our point of view; so it is in the system ready to go. We are not talking months here; we are talking days or weeks.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** And that is for the redevelopment of the site? That is the design that is ready to go?

**Mr BETTS:** Yes.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Can I jump in on that, because I just want to ask about some other date?

**The CHAIR:** Just before we get carried away, Mr Field has probably another 10 minutes up his sleeve because the Government are going to allow you to ask a couple of extra questions. Are you sure you have finished your questions?

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Yes.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Thank you for that information. Based on that, when are you expecting the stage one planning approval to go on exhibition?

**Mr BETTS:** Do you mean the environmental impact statement?

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** No, you have answered about the environmental impact statement, have you not?

**Mr BETTS:** Yes, I think I have.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Which is shortly. That is as specific as you can be.

**Mr BETTS:** It is not for me. I do not determine it. It is for the planning Minister.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** That is absolutely understood. What is your indicative timing for the next step which, as I understand, would be putting the overall stage one planning approval on exhibition?

**Mr RICHES:** All the relevant documentation for the planning application is complete. Environmental studies are completed and finished, and community consultation process is satisfied. The application is ready for lodgement now. It could go on exhibition within weeks.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** What is your indicative timing for achieving planning consent?

**Mr BETTS:** We are planning on the basis that we will obtain stage one planning approval in November this year. But that is not something that we control. That is at the discretion of the planning Minister.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** I understand. But you must have a timing for it. It is November this year—thank you for that. What is your indicative timing for commencement of demolition?

**Mr BETTS:** Our intention would be to commence demolition in January.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** January 2019?

**Mr BETTS:** That is correct.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** How long will the demolition take?

**Mr BETTS:** I will ask Mr Riches to respond.

**Mr RICHES:** We have been speaking to demolition contractors. The total duration of the demolition phase is 12 months. We would expect part of the work to be completed, sufficient for a builder to start piling works, after month nine.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Twelve months is double the amount of time that it took for Parramatta Stadium. What will the early months of the demolition look like? Will you take the seats out? Can you give us an feeling of what you will be doing in those early months?

**Mr RICHES:** For the early phase, there are the hoardings erected. The most challenging part of the demolition process is the removal of the structural steel roof, so that process will commence. It also requires the early demolition of the Easts and Waratahs building, facing the MP1 car park, which gives demolition access through that zone. The early months would be removal of those buildings, providing access to the site and commencement of the removal of the roof structure from the east side moving to the west side.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** This will be February or March into April next year.

**Mr RICHES:** Yes.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Your indicative timing for the planning consent is faster than what was managed for Parramatta, a smaller project. How confident are you of that timing?

**Mr RICHES:** The Parramatta planning application was lodged in July and the determination was issued on 5 or 6 December 2016. It took five months. If we lodge in June, we are expecting a determination in November, in five months.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** You are expecting to track their timing for that, although the demolition will be twice as long.

**Mr RICHES:** Yes, but the environmental impacts are no different.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** When you spoke about the Moore Park demolition and the pathway through Moore Park, you did not mention Driver Avenue. Is Driver Avenue included in this proposal?

**Mr RICHES:** It is really a question for the operator or the Sydney Cricket Ground Trust. However, there are no works proposed to Driver Avenue. It remains open on other than match days, with the operational overlay, as it is at the moment.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Who owns Driver Avenue?

**Mr RICHES:** It is land not owned by the SCG Trust?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** That is right.

**Mr RICHES:** Then I am not sure either if it is owned by the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust. I am not quite certain. I will take that on notice.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** As part of the development application going forward to your environmental impact statement, you do not envisage permanently closing Driver Avenue?

**Mr RICHES:** No.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I will return to the business case. When you did the business case review, what figures did you rely on for Sydney Football Stadium? Given that we have not seen separated figures for

Allianz Stadium, did you deal with the Sydney Cricket Ground Trust figures as a whole, as we have seen in the State Government documentation, or were they separated?

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Is this for attendance?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** It is for attendance at Allianz.

**Mr BETTS:** I will ask Ms Milligan to respond to that.

**Ms MILLIGAN:** The attendance figures are per event, so it was not difficult to separate them. We have made assumptions around events in that particular stadium, so the business case includes assumed attendance numbers simply for that venue.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** What is the assumed total annual attendance for the base case for the Sydney Football Stadium?

**Ms MILLIGAN:** The base case assumes the loss of some events now. I will preface it by saying that the base case is not exactly what they are doing now, but the base case figure is 719,000.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** How much lower is that from what they are doing now?

**Ms MILLIGAN:** I do not have that figure with me.

**Mr BETTS:** We can take that on notice.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** What is the number of events in the annual event calendar for the base case for the SFS?

**Mr BETTS:** If it saves time, we will take that on notice.

**Ms MILLIGAN:** The answer is 34 to 37. The reason it is a range is because you get some games every second year.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** How much lower is that than what you are doing at the moment?

**Ms MILLIGAN:** It is a few, but I will have to come back on that.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** If you want to take that question on notice, that is fine.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I will return to the occupancy certificates. Can you provide on notice a breakdown of the \$341 million and what the costs were for that base case?

**Mr BETTS:** I will have to check on that because obviously the information is contained in the business case, which is cabinet-in-confidence. It is not within my remit to be able to give a commitment on that. I do not want to give a commitment that I cannot back.

**The CHAIR:** We will ask that question to you formally.

**Mr BETTS:** That would be appreciated.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The \$141 million is from the Rider Levett Bucknall [RLB] report that you have that we have already asked about. You then have an additional \$341 million on top of that. Is that correct?

**Mr RICHES:** No, that is not correct. The \$341 million is for our base case capital cost. That is inclusive of the code compliance matters and a general refurbishment to the food and beverage areas and the toilet facilities.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Is that based on the Asset Technologies Pacific report?

**Mr RICHES:** It is based on the reports that the SCG Trust had commissioned and analysed by Rider Levett Bucknall who prepared the cost report.

**Mr BETTS:** It is consistent with that documentation.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** So it is the Asset Technologies Pacific report from May 2016.

**Mr RICHES:** There may be additional reports to support it.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Have you seen the letter that was sent to the Minister about the notification from Tony Shepherd from Henry Davis York?

**Mr BETTS:** I do not know. Can you provide me with a copy of the document? I might see if I can recognise it. It is a bit hard to respond to.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** It is okay if you do not. I was wondering if you saw it.



**Mr BETTS:** I think we may have seen it. I think the package of documents that was provided to us included legal advice that the trust received in relation to the potential legal ramifications of the deficiencies.

**The CHAIR:** Would you like to take that on notice?

**Mr BETTS:** Yes, to confirm it. Again, I do not want to mislead.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Do you think the legal advice about the possible ramifications was from Henry Davis York, or was there other legal advice as well?

**Mr BETTS:** I am not aware of any other legal advice.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In that, they said that they sent a letter to Mr Matt Miller, including the 10 May report and the fire safety report. They followed that up with the total asset management that was also done by Asset Technologies Pacific.

**Mr BETTS:** That sounds like a pretty comprehensive set of documents, does not it?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** It is from those documents that the RLB overview has taken their information—I assume, I have not seen it.

**Mr BETTS:** It sounds like a very comprehensive set of documents and substantial due diligence undertaken to establish the deficiencies in the condition of the stadium, which is what you would want.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Mr Betts, I wanted to pick up on a point you made earlier regarding elected officials judging what is an acceptable standard in these facilities. Would Infrastructure NSW agree that it is unacceptable for Allianz Stadium to need 350 female toilets when it now has 48?

**Mr BETTS:** That would be a judgement for elected officials to make or for members of the community to make, perhaps.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** What about 404 wheelchair access points needed when it now has 28?

**Mr BETTS:** It would be surprising if one built a modern contemporary facility with that deficiency, in terms of provision for people with a disability.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** What about the fact that there are no fire sprinklers in Allianz?

**Mr BETTS:** That goes to the point about the need for very expensive workarounds to ensure the safety of the facility and the opportunity to reduce the operational costs of those workarounds by investing in contemporary facilities.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** What about the fact that there are 400 food and beverage points needed and there are only 139 at the moment, how does that impact on spectator experience?

**Mr BETTS:** The spectator experience is clearly what attracts people to attend events at venues like the Sydney Football Stadium and put money into the visitor economy for New South Wales.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Regarding the poor disability access, I am surprised on a benefit-cost analysis in modern times we cannot place a monetised figure on the less than optimal disability access. Is that not possible?

**Mr BETTS:** It is difficult because the Disability Discrimination Act is based around human rights considerations rather than calculations of economic expediency. We would look at the value that would be derived for consumers, including consumers with a disability, having a contemporary stadium as opposed to one that is 30 years out of date. But, it is very hard to put a monetary value on that kind of very important social policy consideration.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** That does not make its way into the BCR at all?

**Mr BETTS:** Only through the generalised calculation of consumer surpluses and consumer benefits. You could argue that is a qualitative benefit, which is not captured in a BCR but the elected officials might want to take into account in reaching a decision as to what upgrade to the facility, if any, they wanted to fund.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** The ongoing use of the Moore Park land for parking, which is used for events, the environmental impact statement, and your expectation around events at the new built stadium, how will that change parking considerations across those precincts and, obviously, the traffic considerations for local residents?

**Mr BETTS:** I will ask Mr Riches to answer that in a minute. The EIS that we are putting at this stage is to enable us to proceed with demolition. We look at construction impacts and we look at the traffic impacts in

steady-state as well. We are not building a stadium which is any larger than the one that is there at the moment in any material sense.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** You are expecting a significant uptick in the number of people coming?

**Mr BETTS:** That is a fair point. It is an uptick of around 10 to 15 per cent depending on what assumptions you use.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Per year.

**Mr BETTS:** But we will also have a light rail service going through and a range of other transport options. These issues—traffic, parking, access for trucks and so on—will be comprehensively addressed in the EIS. I will hand over to Mr Riches who will give you more detail.

**Mr RICHES:** I can confirm that there will be a EIS. We have engaged Arup as our transport engineers. They have undertaken exhaustive analysis. They started the existing analysis in January of this year on match days to determine the volume of traffic at critical intersection points. We are looking at two modes for parking: one as is at the moment with parking on Moore Park East, and one without. The modal change is significant. The light rail can deliver quite a few patrons to the venues. The improved pedestrian access from Central Station, particularly up Devonshire Street and across the Tibby Cotter Bridge to the stadium, we think will improve pedestrian flows dramatically to the site. The bus arrangement from Central Station remains in place. The analysis will come forward in the EIS, but at this point in time there are no real difficulties with parking. There is no change to parking on site, it is retained in current numbers. In terms of car parking, the community has raised issues about parking on-street in the streets in Paddington; that is largely an enforcement issue that the City of Sydney should address.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** These considerations will be in the EIS that is imminent?

**Mr RICHES:** Yes.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Have you engaged directly with the City of Sydney and its traffic and transport experts?

**Mr RICHES:** We have. We had preliminary discussions. We briefed the city's assessment team Friday two weeks ago.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Would they not have the ultimate expertise in traffic management in the city, and they were engaged two weeks ago on an EIS that has been completed?

**Mr BETTS:** The EIS is on exhibition for the purpose of consultation to feed into this.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I am sure, but stakeholder engagement with a key stakeholder you would assume would happen a little bit before two weeks out from the EIS potentially being lodged.

**Mr RICHES:** Given there is no real change to the volume of parking.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Except for a 15 per cent year on year increase in attendance.

**Ms MILLIGAN:** Not year on year.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I am pretty sure that is what it says in the business case.

**Ms MILLIGAN:** Let me clarify, it is a one-off 15 per cent that is maintained.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** The traffic point stands.

**The Hon. LYNDY VOLTZ:** Look at it this way: 26,000, which is what you average new attendance at, is significantly more than average crowds now.

**The CHAIR:** Order! We have reached the allotted time. Thank for your evidence. It was clinical and open. There may be questions on notice, we ask that any replies to questions on notice be back to us within 21 days of receipt of those questions. Thank you for your expert advice.

**(The witnesses withdrew)**

**JAMIE BARKLEY**, Chief Executive Officer, Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust, sworn and examined

**DEBORAH KELLY**, General Manager, Strategy and Major Projects, Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust, affirmed and examined

**The CHAIR:** Would either of you like to make an opening statement before we proceed to questions?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes. Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust is responsible for operating two of the most celebrated sports stadiums in Australia. These include, the Sydney Cricket Ground and the Sydney Football Stadium, which is known as Allianz Stadium. Together these two grounds make up a sports precinct of international standing and include a sports museum, a member's fitness facility and club facilities. We host nearly 100 sports events every year. Besides major events and other sporting events the trust grounds are also the hub for education, fitness and a bustling commercial community. The precinct comprises: the Stadium Fitness Centre; the Azure Cafe; a campus for the University of Technology, Sydney; the head offices of two of Australia's leading national sports, National Rugby League and the Australian Rugby Union; the headquarters of Cricket New South Wales, AFL NSW, the Sydney Roosters, and; other nonsporting tenancies such as the Stadium Sports Medicine Clinic and the Imaging Clinic for X-ray.

The trust is governed by the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Act to provide and look after the lands dedicated under that Act. The Governor appoints 13 members to the board of trustees who are charged with the responsibility of the care, control and management of those lands. Two additional members are elected by the membership. Our vision is to celebrate sport, create history, enhance entertainment and share the experience with the people of New South Wales and Australia. The journey to our city's original sporting precinct has been a rite of passage for many Sydneysiders since long before the Sydney Cricket Ground [SCG] first cricket test match which was staged in 1882. Prior to this, sport was first played in the precinct at Moore Park in 1854. The original sportsground was opened in 1903. It was constructed in 1899. The sportsground was then replaced by the current Sydney Football Stadium [SFS] in 1988.

The first intercolonial rugby match was played at the ground in 1882. Rugby league took over in 1911 when New South Wales played New Zealand. The grounds have been witness to the golden years of Australian sport, from Ashes glory to the St George Dragons winning 11 premierships straight. Our recent partnership with the AFL has seen the Sydney Swans achieve record crowds at the SCG. We have also enjoyed rugby success more recently with the international rugby sevens girls and many Bledisloe Cups since the opening of the stadium in 1988. Going back further, the venue has been very proud to have staged the 1938 Empire Games, which are now known as the Commonwealth Games. More recently we were delighted to stage the Major League Baseball opening series game between the Arizona Diamondbacks and the Los Angeles Dodgers, a very successful event for New South Wales.

Allianz Stadium has been the destination for fans and tourists since it opened in 1988. The ground has hosted rugby league, rugby union, football and even American college football. It has staged boxing events. It has staged cultural events like the Edinburgh Military Tattoo and also many, many concerts. It has been the precinct of champions to our teams that call it home—the Sydney Roosters, the New South Wales Waratahs and Sydney FC. All three major sporting codes and those teams have won premierships at our grounds. Allianz Stadium is the busiest rectangular tier 1 stadium in the country, hosting more events than any other stadium in its class. We look forward to being the custodians of the redeveloped Sydney Football Stadium for all of New South Wales to enjoy.

**The CHAIR:** Thank you. The Opposition will commence asking questions.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Mr Barkley, what are the figures for the attendance at ticketed events at Allianz Stadium for the last year?

**Mr BARKLEY:** I think the actual attendance is approximately 800,000 that would have attended rugby league, rugby union and soccer—and American college football was also staged in the last financial year.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Do you have the exact figures with you?

**Mr BARKLEY:** I can get those for you.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Will you take that on notice?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Perhaps for the last few years would be useful.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Actually, yes, if we could we get them for the last five years, given that is what they—

**The CHAIR:** Do you agree as to what the question is?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Yes—five years is fine. Will you take that on notice?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes. The attendance is about 750,000 to 800,000. That is just for sporting events that are staged at our grounds and the concert events that are staged. In addition to that we have about 300,000 people that attend the precinct on any day, which is made up of the people who work at the precinct and also attend the fitness centre.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** When you included your figures for the government submission to this inquiry, did that include people who work in the precinct such as those who work in the University of Technology Sydney building?

**Mr BARKLEY:** I do not think so, because they would not have been counted on a daily basis. We can only count those that have been accessed through a turnstile, most likely.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You do not think that included those figures.

**Mr BARKLEY:** No.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Did it include the gym?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Did it include the tours?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Does it include anything to do with the Entertainment Quarter?

**Mr BARKLEY:** No.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** It does include the stair climbing challenge though.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** That would have been at the stadium.

**Mr BARKLEY:** It is a ticketed event.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I assume that means running up the stadium, does it?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes, and it was a small number too.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Like stadium golf.

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Would it be fair to say that Allianz Stadium complied with the requirements of the code at the time it was built?

**The CHAIR:** I assume the Hon. Lynda Voltz means the Building Code.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Yes.

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Would it also be fair to say that it can be argued that a building that has not changed its use does not need to consider the current codes in a certificate of occupancy?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Were you advised of that by any of your independent consultants?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Have all the works that have been undertaken at the SFS since 1988 also complied with the code at the time of those works?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** When you were looking at risk factors did you consider the turf on the field of play as a risk factor?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** How much was needed to fix that field of play as a risk factor as part of the SSC? How much did you think would need to be spent to fix that issue?

**Mr BARKLEY:** The turf is an important part of any business which operates in sporting infrastructure. We replace turf on an ongoing basis in any given year, so we would have replaced the turf one month ago to see out the schedule of this year's events. Prior to that, though, a stadium that is about 30 years ago would have rebuilt its playing field. In 2001 the SCG was totally rebuilt. What that means is that the construction profile of the playing field needs to be rebuilt to about half a metre deep. It requires irrigation and levelling of the ground to ensure that the ground is not heavily compacted and therefore drains of all rainfall on a quick basis. The SFS has never been rebuilt in its 30-year history. As a result of that it is heavily compacted and requires a lot of annual maintenance costs to ensure the turf is up to standard.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Yes, but you identified it as a safety risk. How much was required to fix up the safety risk that were associated?

**Mr BARKLEY:** That would have been estimated at about \$4 million.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** About \$4 million?

**Ms KELLY:** Eight million dollars.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Eight million dollars. Okay. You identified earthquake works as well in your SSC. What was the risk factor of that? Was it high, low or medium?

**The CHAIR:** Before you proceed, what is SSC?

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Ms Kelly probably knows.

**Ms KELLY:** Safety, security and compliance works.

**Mr BARKLEY:** The stadium was designed in the early 1980s and opened in 1988. The Building Code ordinance that it was built to was 1906. So it did not comply with the seismic activity requirements of an earthquake. The earthquake in Newcastle of 1989 required the Building Code to be updated for the first time, so any venue constructed after 1989 would comply with the seismic activity requirements of earthquake.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Yes. That was not my question. I asked: What was the risk level that you associated with the likelihood of earthquake in your SSC?

**Ms KELLY:** Can I take that on notice?

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Sure. I do not know if you have it in front of you—what was the amount you were required to spend for earthquake mediation?

**Ms KELLY:** It was \$21.654 million.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** In 2014-15 as part of the national football stadium concept [FSC], the base case median compliance work for the FSC was costed at \$128.2 million—is that right?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Were earthquake and turf risks included in that base case?

**Ms KELLY:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** They were. So how do we get from \$128 million to \$341 million? Were they included at those amounts?

**Ms KELLY:** The \$128 million was for safety, security and compliance works only. The \$341 million you refer to is the base case works contained in the final business case produced by Infrastructure NSW.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Which of those are not required for safety and security?

**Ms KELLY:** They are all required.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Why were they not in the smaller figure?

**Ms KELLY:** The 128 is simply safety, security and compliance. The 341 relates to other amenity upgrades to give the stadium a life of more than 30 years.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** So amenity, not safety and security?

**Ms KELLY:** We are looking at a design life of 30 years.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The SSC figure is 128.2; is that correct?

**Ms KELLY:** It was at the time it was produced.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** It is now 141?

**Ms KELLY:** Subject to escalation, the scope of works remains the same.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** I saw you nod. Is that a yes to the 141?

**Ms KELLY:** The scope of works remains the same. It is subject to escalation.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** It is basically the old figure plus inflation?

**Ms KELLY:** Correct.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Are they the figures that are identified in the ATP report of 10 May?

**Ms KELLY:** The ATP report is broadly the same scope of works.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In respect of events that have been identified, we heard from Infrastructure NSW. I am assuming you were here. It assumed that there would be a loss of events when it took into consideration their attendance figure as their base case. What loss of events did they identify? Did you provide that data?

**Mr BARKLEY:** No. What lost events did they refer to?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** They did not, that is why I am asking you.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Are you aware that the base case assumptions rely on the loss of events from the Sydney Football Stadium?

**Ms KELLY:** I am not sure the base case relies on a loss of events.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Does it factor them in?

**Ms KELLY:** It was expected that there would be a loss of events from the stadium, given contemporary standards and expectations of the community and what Allianz Stadium was able to deliver under a base-case scenario.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** And you provided that data to Infrastructure NSW?

**Ms KELLY:** We provided a number of assumptions to INSW. It was responsible for production of the final business case.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Is that a report that the Sydney Cricket Ground commissioned? Did you just provide data or did you commission a report?

**Ms KELLY:** We provided a number assumptions to INSW.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** It was not in a commissioned report? Was it done in-house?

**Ms KELLY:** Correct.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Can those assumptions be provided to the Committee?

**Ms KELLY:** You would need to talk to INSW about that.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** It was your document that was provided.

**Ms KELLY:** They produced it.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I thought you provided the assumptions to—

**Ms KELLY:** We did.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** So it is your document. I am asking whether—

**Ms KELLY:** We provided a set of assumptions to INSW.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** At their request?

**Ms KELLY:** They took those assumptions on board and produced a final business case.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** We want your assumptions, not their final business case.

**Mr BARKLEY:** We will take it on notice.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** What date was the Allianz Stadium: Physical Security review and High Level Security Design Plan 2016 commissioned by the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust?

**Mr BARKLEY:** What report is that, please?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Allianz Stadium: Physical Security review and High Level Security Design Plan. It is in the business case. I think we were informed by Infrastructure NSW that it was commissioned by the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust.

**Mr BARKLEY:** There have been a number of companies.

**Ms KELLY:** We need more detail.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Would you like to take it on notice and provide the detail?

**Ms KELLY:** Yes. Could you give me the reference, please?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** We will provide questions on notice to you in writing. You do not have to write anything down.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Can you tell us the companies that have been involved in those assessments?

**The CHAIR:** Let us take the whole question on notice. They can provide that information in the answers to questions on notice. Mr Field, you have the lemon.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I want to return to questions on the certificate of occupancy. I assume Blakett Maguire and Goldsmith [BMG] undertook the work to assess and provide a certificate of occupancy?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Sure. The first opportunity the trust had to review the current stadium strategy was in 2011-12. There were reports conducted in 2013 that identified what the base case would be. That included the safety, security and compliance issues. We then had access to that information, which contributed to the stadium strategy that was first discussed in about 2012. I think it was Minister Annesley who called for that paper. We then undertook numerous works in 2014. In 2015, we again updated the safety, security and compliance matters.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** What do you mean by "updated" those matters?

**Mr BARKLEY:** It is a document in relation to the Total Asset Management plan. Every year we have a government requirement to report on the Total Assessment Management plan. We have complied with those guidelines, and those guidelines would capture the concerns we had about safety, security and compliance. The number, as others have discussed, has only escalated from \$128.1 million to \$141 million at the moment. We updated that again in 2015. And, again, annually, it was updated in 2016 to the number that we have discussed today.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** You have been identifying for some time that there had been deficiencies in that space. Why did you seek to obtain a certificate of occupancy, which was determined on 23 December 2016? When did you commission that to be done?

**Ms KELLY:** Mr Field, would it be helpful if I gave you a chronology of events?

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** We have just had the chronology.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** We have had chronology. We want the date you commissioned the certificate of occupancy from Blakett Maguire and Goldsmith.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Can I say this: If she wants to give a chronology—

**The CHAIR:** Are you taking a point of order?

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Yes, I am.

**The CHAIR:** Point of order.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** If she wants to give a full answer, it can be taken out of our time.

**The CHAIR:** By "she", I assume you mean Ms Kelly?

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Yes, the witness. Sorry.

**The CHAIR:** The witness has offered to give the inquiry a time line. Could you please do so, Ms Kelly, and if there are further questions we can move on from that.

**Ms KELLY:** Thank you, Chairman. The stadia strategy, as Mr Barkley outlined, was developed in 2012. In 2013 Allianz Stadium was approximately 25 years old and, in line with Treasury's guidelines of the practical asset life of a stadium of 20 to 30 years, the trust reviewed the state of its infrastructure at that time. As you would have seen from the report tabled last night, the ATP report, there were various specialist engineering assessments undertaken in 2013-14. In 2014, the trust outlined and reviewed its master plan. The base case included in the feasibility assessments for Allianz Stadium at this time were costed at \$128.1 million, which is the same scope of works we have previously discussed today.

In 2015, the Government formed the Stadia Strategy Steering Group. The Brogden report was issued later that same year and recommended that a new 55,000- to 60,000-seat stadium be built at Moore Park. The Trust received \$5.8 million from the Government to proceed with the concept design. In September 2015 Premier Baird announced that a new 50,000- to 55,000-seat stadium would be built at Moore Park. On 14 April 2016, Premier Baird changed the order of priority of stadium investment in New South Wales: Allianz Stadium was only to be refurbished and then only in the next term of government. Up to this point, the SCG Trust had been working on the basis that a new stadium would be built at Moore Park.

The trust deemed it prudent to re-perform all of the safety, security and compliance audits that it had previously commissioned in 2013-14 due to the extended operating life of the stadium and the changed security environment that we now find ourselves in. Tier one consultants, in their respective disciplines, were engaged in this regard. They were: project management services by MI Associates; architecture by populous; structural engineering on both seismic and non-seismic concerns, Arup; BCA, which is the Building Code of Australia, by BMG; disability and Disability Discrimination Act requirements, iAccess; fire engineering and egress modelling, Arup; security, Intelligent Risks; and the Quantity Surveying and cost planner who pulled all the various segments together to cost them, Rider Levett Bucknall. The scope of the works were to extend the life of Allianz Stadium for approximately five years into the next term of government per the media release in April.

RLB costed these works at \$136.2 million. Given the extended operating time frame of the trust, it also sought to update the OC to reflect the existing state of Allianz Stadium infrastructure. The OC considered a three-year operating time frame. Minimal capital expenditure was designed to mitigate only some of the very serious and high risks associated with Allianz Stadium, which are fire and emergency egress. This was costed at \$23.8 million to be spent within a three-year time frame, with \$18.6 million to be spent in the first year. The OC could be renewed for up to three years to 31 December 2019. The OC was first issued on 23 December 2016. The trust, at that time, also submitted to Treasury a request for funding for the safety, security and compliance works of \$136.2 million.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** What date did that request go in?

**Ms KELLY:** I will have to take that on notice. In 2017, the trust was advised that Treasury had not approved the \$136.2 million funding request due to a broader consideration of the stadium investment strategy to be undertaken by the Government in 2017. On 23 November 2017, the Government announced a new stadium at Moore Park with up to 45,000 seats. The OC was renewed on 31 December 2017 for a further 12 months.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I get the logic in that time line, but it does not answer the original question, which was about the occupation certificate. When did you commission that work to be done?

**Ms KELLY:** It would have been done off the back of the other safety, security and compliance audit works, which had all been commissioned in 2016. BMG needed to consider the state of infrastructure and the risks highlighted by those consultants in putting together a new set of terms and conditions under which the OC would be issued.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** But you have no obligation to get a new OC, right? I assume you made the decision so that you would have something to put before government to bolster your claim to Treasury. I understand that that is a totally legitimate strategy to take, but you had no legal obligation to get a new OC, correct?

**Ms KELLY:** Patron safety is what the trust takes most seriously.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Yes, but you had patron safety concerns well before 2016 and you did not seek one before then. Fire safety was an issue back then, right?

**Ms KELLY:** It was updated based on the state of current infrastructure. It was deemed prudent at the time. Up until that point in time, the trust had been working on the fact that a new stadium was to be built at Moore Park.



**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** It was deemed prudent, but there is absolutely no legal basis for you going out and commissioning or requesting an OC. The idea that it lapsed at a certain period has no legal standing or basis at all. That is something that you are using to make your case to Government for funding, correct?

**Ms KELLY:** The legal aspect is not my area of expertise.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Mr Barkley just confirmed that independent consultants said that it could be argued that it was not necessary. The question I just asked was whether it was necessary to have an OC.

**Ms KELLY:** That was not my understanding of your question, but that is okay.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Mr Barkley is looking quizzical.

**The CHAIR:** Order! Mr Justin Field can continue with his questioning.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Perhaps Ms Voltz can come back to that question.

**The CHAIR:** That will be up to Ms Voltz.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I agree. Earlier, you were asked some questions about the assumption, and you undertook to take a question on notice about the assumptions around what events might have been lost if none of this work was done. I was hoping to go a little bit further with those assumptions, because the business case clearly outlines an assumption of increased attendance and an increase in the number of events, although it is slightly different for the different options. Did you provide those assumptions to Infrastructure NSW around the likely new events with a redeveloped stadium?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes. With a new stadium, we would be able to stage additional international events in particular, for example the opening of the American college football series and the World Rugby Sevens Series. There are numerous other events that we are considering staging with the new stadium. For example, we staged the Royal Edinburgh Military Tattoo in 2005 and 2010. Looking forward, we would hope to do a major ice hockey opening series game in the stadium, as we did with the Major League Baseball.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** They play on a slightly different surfaces though, right?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes. No-one thought we would be able to deliver Major League Baseball events in Australia either, but now they do travel the world and they are going to London's Olympic stadium. We would be very interested in staging additional events such as the opening series of the ice hockey for the National Ice Hockey League.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Are you able to provide the assumptions about the additional events and how you arrived at those assumptions?

**Mr BARKLEY:** We will take it on notice.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Are any of those assumptions based on contractual agreements that you have already signed or entered into for these sports?

**Mr BARKLEY:** No. Sometimes they are not sports.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Barry Manilow might come to town.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** He might, but the majority of your attendance—

**Mr BARKLEY:** The new stadium will deliver a much-improved opportunity for New South Wales to stage concerts in the central business district. It is an important opportunity for us as well. There are other cultural events that we would be looking to stage as well.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Concerns have been raised about how potential redevelopment might impact on the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust lands. With the current parking arrangements, there is overflow parking that impacts on the grass. What is your understanding of how traffic and parking will work with the redevelopment?

**Mr BARKLEY:** It needs to be a major factor within the environmental impact statement. There is a lot of work that Infrastructure NSW is currently conducting with its independent experts to assess the possibilities around how people will travel to a new stadium in the future. The introduction of light rail will take a lot of spectators. It can deliver up to 9,000 people per hour—that is a large number of people. The connection to Devonshire Street and Central railway station, which is also being redeveloped, is another great opportunity for people in Sydney to be able to move in and around Moore Park. Current analysis shows that almost half the people who attend our grounds are doing it through pedestrianisation. The use of the car is limited. The most recent analysis shows that the uptake of Uber is now at 14 per cent, compared to taxi services, which is at 7 per cent and

declining. We anticipate that there needs to be an opportunity to rework the way that people travel to Moore Park. It is the same for Perth Stadium, the Melbourne Cricket Ground and Adelaide Oval. A large number of people are now walking to these stadiums, and it is all part of the right of passage.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Earlier this morning we discussed acceptable standards. Would the trust agree that it is unacceptable that while Allianz Stadium needs 350 female toilets, at the moment there are only 48?

**Mr BARKLEY:** It goes without saying that when the stadium was designed in the 1980s and opened in 1988 the demographic profile of people who attended sporting events was significantly different. There was no soccer or A-League 30 years ago. In fact, there was no Super Rugby competition either. The prospect of staging concerts and other cultural events did not exist 30 years ago. The Royal Edinburgh Military Tattoo delivered a totally different demographic that had never attended the stadium before. During the space of a week, 200,000 people attended the stadium. They were quite an elderly group of people and they had to find their way there.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** I was going to say that I presumed it was all old Scots.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** My daughters were there in their little kilts.

**Mr BARKLEY:** These are special events, but the point I would like to make is that the demographic has changed significantly. For sport to survive and be financially viable in this city and any city of Australia it needs attract as many women to the events as it does men. For example, the Sydney Swans and the AFL is now attracting about 50 per cent women to its sporting events. Rugby league and rugby union are not that far behind. The new soccer sports provide an opportunity for more diverse groups of people to attend our stadium. The 38 toilets is unacceptable. We need to provide an opportunity for people to go to a stadium—we talk about match-day experience—but the experience of going to our grounds is extremely poor.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Particularly for women.

**Mr BARKLEY:** We are now the poor cousins of Australian sport. The men are not that much better off. We can focus on the 38 public toilets that we have for women on the main concourse, but it is just as bad for the men. I think the days have passed where people can be treated the way they are in the current stadium design.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** What about disability access? I understand that we need over 400 wheelchair accessible spots and that at the moment there are only 28.

**Mr BARKLEY:** That is totally unacceptable.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** It is totally unacceptable.

**Mr BARKLEY:** The difficulty in trying to fix that now is that you cannot get access to all parts of the stadium because you do not have lift access. We do not have escalators like modern stadiums do. To get to other parts of the stadium—we have an obligation to provide everyone with the same opportunity—is not possible in the current stadium design.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** What would happen in the event of an emergency?

**Mr BARKLEY:** If we had an emergency evacuation we do not comply with the international standards or the green guide for operating stadiums anywhere in the world. The current modelling for an evacuation of the stadium is some 23 or 28 minutes, whereas the guide is eight minutes to be evacuated and in a safe place.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Yet there are still people who claim that this upgrade—this rebuild—is not needed.

**Mr BARKLEY:** That is correct. The difficulty is that we have narrow aisle ways. We have narrow public concourses. We have too few exits in the case of an emergency evacuation from this stadium.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Is it also true there are no fire sprinklers?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Yes. In the building code under which it was built they were not required, but you would not go into too many stadiums in the world now and not find a fire safety plan and also fire sprinklers. To undertake the works necessary for the fire sprinklers is not about putting them in the ceiling. We cannot get enough high-pressure water. Our hydrants are not sufficient to meet the needs on an ongoing basis. The infrastructure amendments to the concrete decks and the plats, which is what the patrons sit on, would need to be rectified to ensure that we get the appropriate sprinkler system in place.

Even if we could have done that you can imagine what the procurement method would have been for the fire sprinkler system. Even if we had funding, and we had proceeded with it, it would have been an 18-month to two-year project.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Would you have been off line for that time?

**Mr BARKLEY:** There would have been significant disruption to patrons, but we would have worked around that. It would have taken a significant amount of time to undertake the whole procurement method and then the installation of the fire sprinkler system.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** My understanding is that there is some pretty significant risk mitigation going on to ensure that people can still attend events in Sydney safely, but of course that is just not acceptable for a global city like Sydney. What kind of risk mitigation is going on at the moment?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Deborah can add to this. We have been directed, under the occupational certificate, to provide an operational plan. The operational plan requires that we do not have pyrotechnics or fireworks. As you know in the A-League soccer there has been a tendency in the past for some games and some teams to let off flares. In our stadium the seats are highly flammable. They are not fire rated and they do not comply. At one game the soccer spectators set off about 23 flares. They burn at 1,500 degrees, I think. That is an extremely high risk when we are operating a stadium. If there was a case for emergency evacuation the trust was very determined to ensure that we provide the highest level of patron safety we could.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** You raised a number of serious safety issues just then. When were you first aware of these safety issues at that level?

**Mr BARKLEY:** I think the trust was determined, after the soccer games, to ensure that we could provide patron safety. It was a new way for sporting events to be managed.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** When was that?

**Mr BARKLEY:** The A-League has been operating for about 11 seasons but the Western Sydney Wanderers were not part of the original A-League competition. I think about five years ago there was a tendency for flares to be let off in the stadium for the first time, but I can check that.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** But with respect to the significant safety concerns you are raising, you are saying that the trust was aware of those approximately five years ago and discussed. Is that the evidence you are giving?

**Ms KELLY:** I believe that was covered in my chronology, which I am happy to go through again.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** I do not believe it was. When was the trust first aware of these significant safety issues?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Deborah has indicated that it was in 2013-14, when the engineering assessments were completed.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** I want to give you a chance to respond to one statement in the New South Wales Government submission, which I understand you had input into. It says:

6.3 The conditional certification of occupancy and the caveats to this were not raised as part of any funding request to Government during the 2017-18 budget process.

That is the Government's submission. You are listed as part of the Government's submission. Do you want to respond to that?

**Ms KELLY:** I am not sure that that is correct, but I will take it on notice.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Do you have a copy of the Rider Levett Bucknall report?

**Ms KELLY:** Detailing which cost plan?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Detailing the \$141 million.

**Mr BARKLEY:** We will take it on notice.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** With respect to the point raised by Mr Graham, you said that you made a submission to Treasury—\$136.2 million. The submission suggests that there was not any submission made in this budget round. Was the \$136.2 million made in the previous financial year? Did you make it again for this budget round?

**Ms KELLY:** The \$136.2 million was submitted to Treasury in late 2016 for the 2017-18 budget.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** There is an inconsistency there between what you have said and what the Government said in its submission. I turn to the point raised by Mr Barkley in response to the Government's question. You said that you were directed by the occupation certificate. Let us be really clear about this. The OC is your construct. You commissioned it for your own purposes but you do not have any requirement to comply with that. It has no legal standing at all. So it is not correct to say that you have been directed by it. You might want to take action with it and use it but—just to clarify your position—you are not directed by that in any way, shape or form, are you?

**Mr BARKLEY:** Patron safety is very important to the trust.

**The CHAIR:** That was probably a pretty good answer.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Ms Kelly you gave a chronology there and touched on security. I would like to hear a little bit more about it. I think you said that 2013 was the year that it really started to become an issue. Can you give me a quick outline of some of those security issues and what you are aiming for?

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Point of order: I am a little bit concerned about some security issues being ventilated.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Just the headlines.

**The CHAIR:** It was not really a point of order, but I will uphold it. I think we will finish there. I thank the witnesses for their expert advice and the time lines et cetera that were provided. The members will have questions that they want to place on notice. I ask that you reply to those questions on notice within 21 days of when you receive them. Thank you very much for attending.

**(The witnesses withdrew)**

**(Luncheon adjournment)**

**KIM ELLIS**, Executive Director, Botanic Gardens and Centennial Parklands, affirmed and examined

**The CHAIR:** Prior to proceeding with questions, would you like to make a brief opening statement?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes, thank you. In my role I am responsible for two trusts, the Botanic Gardens Trust and the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust and I am here today on behalf of the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust. Centennial Parklands is one of the most visited public parklands in the world, with over 31 million visits annually. It covers 360 hectares, including three major urban parks, Centennial Park, Queens Park and Moore Park. The trust is responsible for the strategic direction and operational management of the parklands, as well as the individual operation of those three parks. Our primary objective is to secure a sustainable future for the parklands and its assets. We are positioned in the Office of Environment and Heritage under the Department of Planning and Environment. The Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust Act 1983 guides our management parameters, and the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust Regulations 2014 guide our operational parameters.

Moore Park, which I understand to be the focus of today's evidence, was declared a public park in 1866. It is at the crossroad of some of the busiest thoroughfares in Sydney, with a greenbelt of nearly 4,000 trees, and numerous sports fields and walking paths. It is adjacent to some of the busiest publicly accessible sporting and entertainment precincts in Australia. It features a range of very high-profile, highly prized venues including Moore Park Golf, the Entertainment Quarter, Fox Studios, the Royal Hall of Industries, Hordern Pavilion, the Centennial Parklands Equestrian Centre, the Parklands Sports Centre and E.S. Marks Athletics Field. In May 2017 the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust issued the Moore Park Master Plan 2040, which charts the 20-year plan for the care and operation of Moore Park. This plan was developed over two years and included extensive consultation with both the community and the key stakeholders in the Moore Park district. This is a reference document by which the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust measures all decisions about Moore Park.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust has a committee that oversees the management of Driver Avenue. Is that right?

**Mr ELLIS:** Driver Avenue is a separate trust. It consists of the same members as the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust and it has separate meetings from the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust meetings.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** But it is within your purview?

**Mr ELLIS:** That is correct, yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You will have seen articles in the *Daily Telegraph* regarding a letter sent by Minister Ayres and Minister Elliot regarding the closure of Driver Avenue. Do you recall those articles?

**Mr ELLIS:** I do not recall the specific articles, no.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** There was an article in the *Daily Telegraph* on 18 April regarding a counterterrorism report. Was that report commissioned by the Driver Avenue trust?

**Mr ELLIS:** If it is the same report that I am aware of, that report was commissioned by the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust into areas in Driver Avenue. That report is a protected report, and I cannot discuss it at a public hearing. I would refer you to the New South Wales police for more details.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** It was not your report; it was a report by the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust?

**Mr ELLIS:** That is correct.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Based on that report, the Minister for Sport wrote to the then Attorney General, Gabrielle Upton, requesting that consideration be given to Driver Avenue being closed. Did that request come before your committee?

**Mr ELLIS:** The closure of Driver Avenue has been addressed in the Moore Park master plan as a long-term objective of the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust. But the view of the trust is that Driver Avenue should not be closed until extensive traffic analysis has been done, widescale public consultation has been undertaken and detailed work with the stakeholders that utilise Driver Avenue, such as the Entertainment Quarter, Fox Studios and the cricket trust to ensure that any closure of Driver Avenue can be done in a way that allows continued operation of that area.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Will the plans for the rebuild of the football stadium include the closure of Driver Avenue?

**Mr ELLIS:** You would have to refer that question to the cricket trust. I have not seen the final plans.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** But you would have to give consent for the closure of Driver Avenue, because it is your land.

**Mr ELLIS:** Absolutely.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** What about the plans to build pathways from Tibby Cotter Bridge to the football stadium that we have heard about today?

**Mr ELLIS:** There are already extensive pathways throughout Moore Park. The Moore Park Master Plan 2040 forecasts additional pathways to allow better access through the parklands, particularly for disabled access and access for people pushing strollers and other wheeled devices. The detail of those pathways has not been determined, but we would anticipate, as part of the construction of the stadium and the improvement of pedestrian access to Central, there would be additional pathways built.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** I have in front of me a document containing question-and-answer talking points sent by the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust in November 2017, from Phillip Heads to Tony Shepherd, regarding the stadium rebuild. The document states that Kippax Lake is a wonderful feature of the Sydney Cricket Ground precinct. It is actually not part of that precinct, is it?

**Mr ELLIS:** Kippax Lake is part of Moore Park and is under the responsibility of the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust. We view Moore Park as a collection of a range of different stakeholders, and I can only assume that that response was done in the context of viewing Moore Park as a general part of the precinct of the cricket trust.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Other than about access to pathways, has the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust approached you about any works in front of the forecourt of the Sydney Football Stadium?

**Mr ELLIS:** We have had no specific plans in the context of the current proposal for a new stadium to deal with the areas outside the cricket trust's footprint. We do have an ongoing routine operational working group, but no plans have been tabled at that with the detail of what might happen in the Moore Park or Kippax Lake area.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Have you seen a concept design for the Sydney Football Stadium?

**Mr ELLIS:** The only concept designs we have seen were in 2016, and no subsequent designs since then.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Is there no way of knowing how the stadium will impact on your facility until you see those designs?

**Mr ELLIS:** We are working with Infrastructure NSW, which has engaged us in its preliminary work. My belief is that progressively, as Infrastructure NSW develops those designs, we will be engaged and consulted.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** The Entertainment Quarter precinct, which is part of your facilities, is leased to a company. Is that right?

**Mr ELLIS:** That is correct. The Entertainment Quarter is leased to Carsingha Investments, with approximately 26 years remaining on that lease. We are the landlord and Carsingha is the tenant.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** What is the relationship between you and your tenant with regard to any proposals put forward by the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust about development on Entertainment Quarter land? If additional buildings were to be developed on that land or there were to be changes to the use of that land, would that require your approval?

**Mr ELLIS:** The lease requires consent from the landowner—that is, us—before any major changes or development can occur on the site.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Have any approaches been made to you concerning organisations that are currently housed on Sydney Cricket Ground land, particularly around the Sydney Football Stadium?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes. There is some ongoing discussion at the moment between my commercial team and the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust on the potential to relocate some of the tenants, on a temporary basis, in the Entertainment Quarter, but we have had no formal proposal as to the scale or quantity of that.

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Centennial and Moore Park Trust used to look after the car parking but it is now leased out to the Sydney Cricket Ground. They actually handle the parking but as it is on your land you get the revenue. Is that correct?

**Mr ELLIS:** It is correct in a broad form. There is an ongoing arrangement between the Cricket Trust and the Centennial and Moore Park Trust. During event days we control the operations in the Moore Park area but the parking itself is operated by the Sydney Cricket Ground. There is a sharing of the revenue from that to

cover our costs and to cover some of the costs of the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust. That is an effective working arrangement now.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** What input have you had into the environmental impact statement [EIS] in terms of traffic management?

**Mr ELLIS:** We are working with Infrastructure NSW at the moment. We will be putting a submission into the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements [SEARs]. That will cover issues such as car parking, pedestrian access and other things.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The guidelines for the SEARs have already been issued?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** That is the EIS?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** So you would expect to have that submitted as part of the EIS before it goes on display?

**Mr ELLIS:** Absolutely.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You have not done that yet?

**Mr ELLIS:** It is within days of being completed. We are maintaining very close contact with Infrastructure NSW. They will have that input. We have been engaging with them on a progressive basis, so they understand the issues that we have been raising progressively.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** The Committee heard earlier today from Mr Betts that they have completed the EIS and that it was imminent. It could even be put on display for public comment within a matter of days, if not weeks. Clearly they have moved forward without your submission.

**Mr ELLIS:** I would assume that the reason why it is days away is because they are waiting for our submission to be able to complete the EIS.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** They said as far as they are concerned it is completed.

**Mr ELLIS:** I cannot speak for them. My assumption is that they are waiting on our submission before they release it finally.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I do not think that is their assumption.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** The Committee would appreciate it if you could take that on notice and check that.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Has there been any request for increased parking capacity as part of the stadium redevelopment?

**Mr ELLIS:** No, not at all. The Moore Park Master Plan reflects that from the introduction of the light rail there will be a progressive removal of car parking from the green spaces—the grass on Moore Park. The Cricket Trust is aware of that, and that is part of the master plan that has been issued.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I apologise if I have missed something that might have answered this question. Do you see the redevelopment plans, as you are currently aware of them, as being consistent with the Moore Park Master Plan 2040?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** You mentioned earlier that you have not seen any designs since 2016. I know that you are going to make a submission to the SEARs, but have you made any form of submissions to Infrastructure NSW over the last six months or 12 months about the planning process?

**Mr ELLIS:** We have been engaged by Infrastructure NSW and we have had a series of meetings with them, particularly over the past eight weeks, where we have had expressed a range of issues that concern us—they are particularly related to issues in the protection of Moore Park such as car parking, pedestrian access, security, provision of utilities, those sorts of things. They are being finalised into a submission for SEARs.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** You mentioned the temporary placement of some of the current tenants in the Entertainment Quarter. Has Infrastructure NSW asked you any questions about access to any current open space or playing fields for temporary works to be done as part of the demolition and construction process?

**Mr ELLIS:** Absolutely not. The whole-of-government response, which you have received, makes it clear that we have been advised by the Government that there will be no construction on the green space and that there will be no staging or construction activity on the green space either. That is what we are sticking with at the moment.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** So there will not be any temporary placement for any structure associated with tenants who might be asked to temporarily move? There will be no temporary spots used on Moore Park land as a result of any aspect of the redevelopment?

**Mr ELLIS:** There will be no construction elements. We are developing a long-term strategic plan for sporting fields throughout Moore Park. It is not specifically related to temporary accommodation of the teams for the work on Allianz Stadium; it is to create a long-term plan which provides a balance of community and high performance sports throughout Moore Park. We are doing that now in order to accommodate the potential for some of these teams that need additional fields now. It is a long-term plan, not a temporary solution.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** During the redevelopment period will there be any additional use by high-performance teams of the playing fields on Moore Park land?

**Mr ELLIS:** There maybe. I cannot give you an answer to that yet because the planning has not been completed. What I can say is that the trust has an 80:20 rule on fields—80 per cent community use and 20 per cent elite use—and that will be maintained.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** So in the long-term plan there will be more sporting fields?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Where will they be situated?

**Mr ELLIS:** At the end of the light rail construction additional fields will be put in Moore Park west. There is a better alignment of fields in Moore Park south—

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Is that up near the Sydney Boys High School?

**Mr ELLIS:** Between Sydney Boys High School and the Korean War Memorial—in between Anzac Parade and South Dowling Street. So a better alignment of playing fields in there to provide additional playing surfaces. The long-term return of green space with the removal of cars will allow for additional cricket pitches and other fields in Moore Park east. Then a better alignment of fields in Moore Park south—to the south of Lang Road—to allow more playing fields in there. The long-term aim is to improve the quality and capacity of playing fields in Moore Park.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Some changes are being modelled around pedestrian access and I am sure there will be some changes to other roads, maybe street furniture and the like. I understand that Dacey Avenue and Lang Road are part of the broader long-term plans. Will any of the changes to traffic infrastructure encroach on existing playing fields?

**Mr ELLIS:** No.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In 2007 the Government did a feasibility study for an indoor sports stadium. Has the Centennial and Moore Park Trust been approached or had any input into that feasibility study?

**Mr ELLIS:** We have. We have been approached by both the NSW Office of Sport and by a number of different codes seeking our views on a range of proposals, particularly utilisation of existing sporting fields or existing assets such as the tennis courts. In all cases we have not been asked to provide a great deal of technical input, but rather our view. Our view remains that the Moore Park Master Plan is the guide for how the site will be used into the future. If it can be accommodated within the Moore Park Master Plan that is fine, but if it requires construction or loss of green space it will not be allowed.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Where are the tennis courts located?

**Mr ELLIS:** The tennis courts are located in Moore Park south—to the southern side of Lang Road—on the corner bounded by Lang Road and Anzac Parade. It is quite a large sports centre. It includes a synthetic field, 11 tennis courts—

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I know the one.

**Mr ELLIS:** And a large netball court area.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** It is a big piece of land.

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes.



**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** What are the visitation numbers for a year to your precinct?

**Mr ELLIS:** In Centennial Parklands we do not have people counters, so I cannot give you accurate numbers. We have a triennial survey, which consists of telephone, internet and physical surveys on the ground. That gives us a consistency in growth and numbers, which we are quite confident in. Currently we say it is 31 million visits to Centennial Park, Moore Park and Queens Park but I cannot get much more granular than that.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** When the parking is removed, is the expectation that people will use Fox Studios?

**Mr ELLIS:** No. What the Moore Park Master Plan 2040 does is forecast growth and utilisation in the area. With the implementation of the light rail with the capacity of in excess of 8,000 passengers an hour, that will take up a lot of the current car utilisation. We are also retaining and potentially enhancing the bus access to provide bus access to places the light rail does not go. The increasing use of alternative forms of transport, such as Uber and car ridesharing, will assist us to accommodate less car parking. The master plan forecasts some additional remote car parking. So a dispersed car parking plan that puts some additional car parking at Moore Park Golf Course, and at E. S. Marks Athletics Field, which allows us to free up that area in Moore Park East for public recreation.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Where is the increased bus capacity?

**Mr ELLIS:** It may not be an increased bus capacity, it will be a more operationally efficient bus capacity, in the area that it currently is. That is directly adjacent to the cricket ground in Moore Park. The other thing I forgot to mention is, we also anticipate that with the improved pathways down to Central station, better wayfinding, better lighting, that there will be a much higher utilisation of pedestrian access to and from the area.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You would have looked at the original 2015 Brogden report that was released by the Government that identified a 55,000-seat stadium going on Moore Park lands?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Were you consulted as part of the Brogden report?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes, we were.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Were you asked about your land being made available for that stadium?

**Mr ELLIS:** I do not recall the Brogden report going through details about Moore Park being utilised for that stadium. My understanding is the first time we were aware of that was in February 2016. At that time the trust expressed concern about the use of Moore Park and then shortly afterwards the Premier made a statement that there would be no construction on Moore Park.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** The report was completed in 2015 but not released to the public until February 2016, and that would have been the first time you were aware of it, is that what you are saying?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** There was no consultation with you whatsoever about putting a stadium on the site?

**Mr ELLIS:** Not prior to February 2016, no.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Did it surprise you that had been the Government's position?

**Mr ELLIS:** As I said, when we became aware of it the trust expressed concern over the utilisation of Moore Park and the Government response to that was quite prompt to say that no construction would occur on Moore Park.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** What was the year the master plan goes out to?

**Mr ELLIS:** 2040.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** In that plan, if I heard you correctly, you identified additional pathways?

**Mr ELLIS:** That is correct.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Can you tell me the rationale behind that?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes. The master plan forecasts regional growth in the area, so growth in the surrounding suburbs, particularly in areas such as Green Square. It identifies the park lands, Moore Park particularly, but all of the park lands as becoming increasingly popular because of the high density of occupation in those areas. The

consequence of that is we need to provide both cycleways and pedestrian ways to allow people to get from those high density suburbs into the park lands, recognising it becomes the recreation, both passive and active, for those people. The plan identifies additional pathways, some utilising the current routes, Dacey Avenue, Lang Road, Cleveland Street, those sort of areas, by improving the access along the pathways there, and in some cases new pathways. The plan identifies a 10-metre wide pathway around the Moore Park Golf Course to improve accessibility and access through.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** There has been discussion about this, that does not degrade the parkland in your view in any way?

**Mr ELLIS:** Not at all. Public park lands worldwide have pathways to provide accessibility and it is particularly critical to provide both disabled access and access for families where they have strollers.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Expanding on that, what would happen if you did not build those pathways?

**Mr ELLIS:** I think we would limit the ability of people from the surrounding suburbs to get into the park lands, and our charter is to provide public access and recreation space. It is very important for us to ensure that it is easy, accessible and suits all elements of the community.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** When you prepared that master plan, even back then you were looking at connectivity, say with Central station and the light rail or whatever it might have been?

**Mr ELLIS:** Absolutely. The trust has had a long-term plan to improve accessibility from Moore Park to Central Station. There has always been plans to get pathways through the Surry Hills area into Central station. What is happening now is basically delivering on the trust's intent of improving access.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** I think I heard you make a statement that you are returning green space. Do you want to expand on that?

**Mr ELLIS:** That is correct, certainly. The Moore Park Master Plan 2040 includes about an 11 per cent increase in green space in Moore Park. That is made up of three key elements. The first is the return of green space by the removal of car parking from Moore Park east. The second is the creation of public accessible walkways around the golf course, so a 10- metre walkway all around Moore Park Golf Course. The third element is by taking areas that are currently degraded or inaccessible, such as Mount Steele and parts of the top of Moore Park east and Moore Park west and returning those into a state where they have picnic areas and pathways to allow people to get into them?

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Where is Mount Steele?

**Mr ELLIS:** Mount Steele is a small mound—I am not sure "mount" is the right word—but a small mound in between Bat and Ball Oval and the Moore Park Golf Course. It has quite spectacular views of the city, but it is very difficult to get to at the moment.

**The CHAIR:** Is that where the slides used to be?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes, absolutely.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** I am quite impressed by that; 11 per cent increase in green space?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** That is pretty impressive.

**Mr ELLIS:** The largest space of that, of course, is removing cars from parking on the grass, which effectively makes the land untenable for anything except walking a dog.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Because it compacts it?

**Mr ELLIS:** It compacts the soil, it creates rutting. Grass will not grow when it is regularly driven on, and we cannot put irrigation into it because irrigation heads are damaged by vehicles. By removing the cars it allows us to improve the pasture, so to speak, and it will turn it back into really fine, accessible areas.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** On that theme of the 11 per cent, how long will that take you to deliver those three streams?

**Mr ELLIS:** It will depend on a range of issues. The work is already going on to improve the inaccessible green spaces. We have planted over 200 trees in the last 18 months into Moore Park. There is a very strong re-greening program going on. Work on the golf course will progress as we redesign parts of the golf course, and as we can get bits of the golf course back it will come at an incremental level. The returning of the Moore Park

car parking areas to green space will happen concurrently with the delivery of the light rail. We are waiting for the finalisation of the light rail and the restoration of those areas.

**The CHAIR:** A point of clarification: The additional pathways that are going in are part of your long-term plan, they are not predicated on the redevelopment of the stadium are they?

**Mr ELLIS:** The master plan forecasts footpaths for our purposes.

**The CHAIR:** And the light rail gives you the opportunity to remove the cars?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Just for clarification, would you be able to let us know if you are satisfied that the Premier and the Minister for Environment have committed not to encroach on the Centennial Parklands?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** So you are comfortable with everything that has been offered—all communications?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** And that is well communicated to the public?

**Mr ELLIS:** Yes. There are public statements from the Premier that there will be no construction on Moore Park and that there will be no construction impacts on Moore Park. That has been communicated through our community consultative communities, through our regular contact with community groups, and we have confidence that is what is going to happen.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I just want to be careful of what we mean by impacts, because I imagine the demolition will have hundreds of trucks running for periods from early in the morning until late, possibly after dark. This is land that you have talked about, and rightly so. I have used it a lot myself; people walk and ride through it. Can you quantify what level of engagement you have had in the development of the concept plan about that sort of impact, because it might not be on the land but there is going to be a lot of movement in and around Moore Park? Have you been engaged on that? Are you comfortable with what that impact will be?

**Mr ELLIS:** Our engagement with Infrastructure NSW to date has given us confidence that they are taking into account our requirements to protect the Moore Park area during construction. It is too early to do detailed planning for the construction and its likely consequences in the area. But we have made it clear to Infrastructure NSW that that will need to be managed to ensure that there is no change to operation, and I am comfortable with the responses we have received from Infrastructure NSW that they will take that into account.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** It is likely the demolition and the removal of materials could have a more significant impact than the construction potentially, and that EIS is imminent. Do you have an indication of how many trucks a day will be moving in and out of the area? Are you aware of what time constraints there might be on those demolition movements?

**Mr ELLIS:** No.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** In your input into the EIS process are you likely to express a view on those issues?

**Mr ELLIS:** If the EIS contains that sort of detail I would be surprised at this stage. The number of truck movements, I think that is a planning issue that will come out and we will participate in quite significantly. We will certainly have a view and will be expressing very strongly our need to protect the parkland—to conduct dilapidation reports prior to the trucks entering the site, to manage the staging of the vehicles. There is a range of issues that will need to be dealt with.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Following on from the removal of cars and the works that are being upgraded, what is the additional funding the Government is providing for that that you guys have identified in the master plan?

**Mr ELLIS:** We will progressively identify the cost of each stage of that and we will be submitting those as bids for funding. So there is no additional funding identified at this stage, but we will progressively—

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Certainly ask for some.

**Mr ELLIS:** We will certainly be asking for money.

**The CHAIR:** What you need is a couple of million bucks to build a new small-bore rifle range for Sydney Boys High on the Moore Park land. Thank you very much for your evidence, Mr Ellis. The Committee will probably be deliberating this afternoon on the length of time we are going to allow for questions on notice. At the moment the resolution is 21 days, but we may shorten that. If I could just foreshadow that we may be asking for answers to questions on notice within 10 days, subject to the Committee agreeing, so that we get those answers before our next meeting, which will be on 19 June. Thank you very much for agreeing to see us; we appreciate your evidence.

**(The witness withdrew)**

**(Short adjournment)**

**LAURENCE JOHNSON**, Program Manager, Public Domain Strategy, City of Sydney, affirmed and examined  
**CLOVER MOORE**, Lord Mayor, City of Sydney, sworn and examined  
**SEBASTIAN SMYTH**, Executive Manager, City Access and Transport, City of Sydney, affirmed and examined  
**GRAHAM JAHN**, Director, Planning Development and Transport, City of Sydney, affirmed and examined

**The CHAIR:** Would any of you like to make an opening statement?

**Ms MOORE:** The proposal to demolish and rebuild the Allianz Stadium is a scandalous expenditure of approximately \$700 million of public money for a private-owned facility to support the blatant empire building of the politically influential Sydney Cricket Ground Trust. A centralised sports administrative body should have assessed and made recommendations on the sports and stadium needs of the Sydney metropolitan area. I want to focus on the impact on Moore Park and the impact on the surrounding densely populated area—the most densely populated area in Australia—of the Allianz proposal. Moore Park is a vitally important open space to meet the needs of Sydney's increasing numbers of residents and visitors. Eighty per cent of our residents live in apartments, but in my time as member for Bligh and Sydney, and as well as Lord Mayor, I have seen public land continually degraded by successive governments.

In 1811, Lachlan Macquarie set aside 1,000 acres as the Sydney Common for the use and benefit of all people now and in the future. Moore Park, as part of the Common, was established in 1866. It was 153 hectares; it is 115 hectares now. The surrounding area is growing rapidly. Green Square to the south-west will be Australia's most densely populated residential area by 2030. It will have 61,000 residents, the size of Wagga, and have 22,000 workers. The city's Open Space, Sports and Recreation Needs Study 2016 identifies that by 2030, up to 20 more sports fields, 18 multipurpose courts, 21 full size indoor courts for basketball and other sports, and 11 indoor multipurpose courts will be needed. The study by the NSW Office of Sport identified the need for 674 priority community sports projects across New South Wales, including 522 projects submitted by councils. Over 200,000 people signed a petition calling on the Government to abandon its sports big business plan and put the money into local community sports.

Moore Park faces massive threats: the redevelopment of the Allianz Stadium; the closure of Driver Avenue; expanded car parks; destruction of trees and parkland for light rail; development of the former Royal Easter Show Showground Entertainment Quarter even though it is public land; transfer of the Hordern Pavilion in the Royal Hall of Industries for elite sport; and a major motorway and intersection further reducing parkland, destroying trees and channelling traffic from WestConnex to Moore Park. This would be unthinkable for New York's Central Park or for London's Hyde Park or St James Park. Unfortunately for Moore Park, the stadium proposal is the latest in a long history of assaults. I have got some information and history for you about Moore Park that I do not have time to tell you now.

**The CHAIR:** Is there anything else that you would like to add, Lord Mayor?

**Ms MOORE:** I will respond to questions. I noted that you wanted a short introduction of three minutes, so I cut it down as much as I could. But I am handing round the material that I would like to have said which you will be able to get individually.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** It is pretty safe to say that when the Government made its 2015 announcement as part of the Brogden report, it did not consult you about a plan to build a 55,000-seat stadium on Moore Park lands.

**Ms MOORE:** That is right. They did not.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In April 2016, the Mike Baird-led Government announced that the ANZ Stadium would be their priority. That is a recognition of how controversial building on Moore Park lands is. Did they consult you when they changed their priority and decided to rebuild Allianz Stadium?

**Ms MOORE:** No, not as Lord Mayor. I do not know if our staff had discussions.

**Mr JAHN:** No.

**Mr SMYTH:** No.

**Mr JOHNSON:** No.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** When did the Government first approach you about their plans to rebuild Allianz Stadium?

**Ms MOORE:** I think probably like you I read about it in the newspaper, but it is an incredibly important part of the provision of open space in the City of Sydney. As I have just said it has been incredibly important to me as the elected representative for the area for over 30 years.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Did the Government consult you as part of its Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements application and ask you to make any submissions as part of the environmental impact statement [EIS] process?

**Ms MOORE:** The answer to that is yes, I think.

**Mr JAHN:** Infrastructure NSW [INSW] held a stakeholder consultation at the stadium to which the City of Sydney representatives from the staff were invited. That is one of two events where we have had contact with INSW about the stadium.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Did they provide you with any design concept plans of the stadium itself, as opposed to the footprint on which they planned to build?

**Mr JAHN:** At that particular event I believe it was just the footprint.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Have you subsequently seen any design plans for the stadium?

**Mr JAHN:** I have not.

**Ms MOORE:** Mr Jahn is the director of planning. He negotiates with all the major developers in the city. This is a significant proposal that I briefly outlined will have a significant impact in terms of the benefit for the people of Sydney.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Did the Government brief you on their letter, Minister Stuart Ayres or Minister David Elliott, requesting the closure of Driver Avenue?

**Mr JAHN:** I have not seen such a letter.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** There have been no approaches to the City of Sydney council regarding that?

**Mr JAHN:** Not that I am aware of as a senior staff member.

**Ms MOORE:** No.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** As someone expert in planning, when is a certificate of occupancy normally issued?

**Mr JAHN:** At the end of a project.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** When there is a development application [DA]?

**Mr JAHN:** There has to be a development application and a construction certificate to permit construction.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Would you issue a certificate of occupation for a building or a stadium that complied with the requirements of the code at the time it was built and had a certificate of occupancy at that time, would you then provide a new certificate of occupancy when there has been no further DA?

**Mr JAHN:** Not normally, no.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** What would be the explanation for Allianz Stadium requesting a certificate of occupancy and what would be its legal standing?

**Mr JAHN:** I can only speculate because I have not heard of this issue before. But it could only be that they might not have a certificate of occupancy. I am only speculating on the answer to that question.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** They would have had a certificate of occupancy in 1988. They have had a certificate of occupancy at their request issued on 23 December 2016, that was after Mike Baird announced that ANZ Stadium would be the priority. Could I show you a copy of that document. Does that look like a certificate of occupancy that would normally be provided as part of a planning approval?

**Mr JAHN:** It does represent similar to a document provided after a planning approval.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Have you seen them issued at any other time other than as part of a planning approvals process or a change of use on an existing building?

**Mr JAHN:** It can be issued following a development application completion and it can be issued following a modification application completion.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** That is consistent with the planning Act 2007?

**Mr JAHN:** It is. But, since we are not the consent authority for the stadium, the Department of Planning is, it does not come across our desk.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Any certificate of occupancy issued outside those two criteria may be useful to an organisation to look at internally but carries no legal requirements under the planning Act, is that correct?

**Mr JAHN:** The time that it is required by the planning Act is at the completion of the modification or the primary development application.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** I will ask about the timing issues that might apply. We took evidence from Infrastructure NSW about how quickly they are going to move the proposal for Sydney Football Stadium through the planning process. They expect planning consent for stage one in November this year and then they will move to demolition in January next year, that will take 12 months. You would have seen a lot of these big projects move through the planning system. Have you got any views about what pressure that puts on a planning system, to move a large proposal like this through the planning system so quickly?

**Ms MOORE:** Mr Jahn can answer that question best. My understanding is that you do not usually do demolition at stage one.

**Mr JAHN:** The stadium sits within the jurisdiction of the City of Sydney local environmental plan [LEP] 2012. That is different to the film studios and the entertainment quarter, which was the former Moore Park Show Ground. That was extracted from the City of Sydney LEP and sits under the State Environmental Planning Policy [SEPP] especially designed for that land, which is SEPP 47. The Sydney LEP is quite comprehensive and sets out the steps that need to be followed regardless of who the consent authority may be. The time for assessment or approvals is very largely dependent on the affectations and the operational impacts that a proposal might have.

To answer your question, I could answer it in perhaps three ways. First, the operational impacts: the replacement of the stadium is likely to be based on an infrastructure upgrade for a range of events including sporting events that would be aimed at attracting much greater patronage and operability. Normally a business case would be along those lines. Those operational impacts on the existing stadium at full or even half full capacity are known issues, in terms of crowd management and safety, capacity on the surrounding road network and pedestrian access and noise, for example. The assessment of those operational impacts, if the investment is going to rely on some assumptions, would need to be considered.

The second thing is the planning steps. The stadium and its surrounds, as I mentioned, sits in the LEP 2012. It is on two separate lots. Both lots are affected by State heritage listing and require the concurrence and even the approval of the Heritage Council. In addition to those time consuming processes they have to consider site contamination and remediation, traffic and transport impacts, particularly if they are going to be amplified by the operational impacts in my first point. Possible Sydney Water concurrence under the water management Act, Roads and Maritime Services and Transport for NSW referrals and approvals and the Environmental Protection Authority.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** Does that time line sound realistic to you given other projects of this scale?

**Mr JAHN:** Given the range of considerations, this time line looks to us as being rushed and difficult to achieve, given the thorough consideration and external concurrences that are required.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I want to take you to the planning issues and how the Government has decided to put forward its planning proposal. I have a email from David Riches, Infrastructure NSW, where he notes that delegation of the Minister's functions to the Public Accounts Committee [PAC] applies in certain circumstances it knows that residents, if 25 members of the public have made a submission and rejection that they have standing. It also notes that a trigger for a PAC referral would be triggered if the council were to object to the application. Due to that consideration they then decided not to have the Sydney Cricket Ground Trust as the applicant to go through the PAC, but to make Infrastructure NSW the applicant. Does it concern you that that is the process that has been adopted?

**Mr JAHN:** The process that they proposed involves a full environmental impact statement and public notification and submissions. My limited knowledge tells me that that is a preferable process than what may be the fast-track process available to the Sydney Cricket Ground. The legislation is designed for much smaller impact.

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** You are referring to who approves, not who the proponent is of the project. You are referring to the possibility here that the Minister for Sport might just sign this off rapidly rather than put this through the planning process.

**Mr JAHN:** We would say that proper public notification and making of submissions is a far more appropriate—

**The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM:** I think my colleague is asking about a different question which is the proponent appears to have been selected in order to cut off some of the options for the city to object.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** That is because, if it had been put in by the Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Trust, they are a statutory corporation and the council would have standing. By making it Infrastructure NSW it is therefore a public authority and the council has no standing.

**Mr JAHN:** My understanding of that matter, which was reported in the media, is that it is a double-edged sword. On the one hand you are not getting proper public notification, environmental assessment and impacts, and there is appeal, versus there being proper assessment, impacts, public notification and there is no appeal. I understand the distinction between a corporation and an authority. One way avoids public engagement and there is an appeal; the other way has public engagement and seems to eliminate an appeal.

**Ms MOORE:** I want to add to what has been said. With Infrastructure NSW being the applicant, my understanding—and perhaps Mr Jahn can elaborate on this—is that they are only being responsible for the footprint. It is not an all-of-government approach. And yet this is very significant parkland. That is why I have given the Committee the material about the history of Moore Park, the concerns and the intensity of residential development in the area. The impacts of this proposal, setting aside the importance of community—money is not being spent on community sport—for the city area, it is a very congested area now.

When we have games at Allianz now that only have 15,000 people attending, we have gridlock on our streets because the streets are already very congested. The proposal is to increase that activity by 300 per cent. That is going to have a very significant impact—and that will flow into the city—on the whole Moore Park area, on the parkland and on the operation of that area for that whole day that that performance is on. As well as that, there is also the addition of proposing large concerts and the flow-on effects of that, and whether or not it is a good thing to be doing that on the edge of a congested city rather than in the centre of the population in Western Sydney. As Infrastructure NSW is the applicant, they cannot be looking at the traffic, the transport, the impact on the parks and the congestion. They can only look at their development application. The sorts of considerations that should be dealt with in such a significant development application as this do not have to be dealt with or cannot be dealt with by Infrastructure NSW. Is that right, Mr Jahn?

**Mr JAHN:** The matter the lord mayor is referring to is the lot that Infrastructure NSW have authorisation to handle. But the pedestrian connections, the traffic management and the parking arrangements involve a whole range of other authorities and will require other budgets to address, which Infrastructure NSW—

**The CHAIR:** I think we understand.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** My question was going to that. I get the sense you would have preferred a much more holistic planning process that included consideration of all those factors. I would not mind pulling apart the consultations to date because I think this is important. Mr Jahn mentioned that you had been involved in two consultations. The Committee received evidence earlier in the day from Mr Betts from Infrastructure NSW that the environmental impact statement for the demolition and for the concept plan is imminent. They put it to us that it was largely complete in their mind and could be opened for public consultation at any time from now. Have you had any one on one meetings with Infrastructure NSW on the details in the concept plan and in the demolition side of that plan as to specific traffic management impacts, the time line or the hours of operation that will be in that plan? Have you had any specific engagement about the details in that EIS?

**Mr JAHN:** We have not had specific engagement about the details. I mentioned we have had a joint INSW-Department of Planning and Environment consultation of stakeholders at the stadium. That was very general. We had a one on one meeting with David Riches with the chief executive officer—very high level. And then I have had one meeting, but that was looking at none of the matters that you described. It was just looking at the general timetable.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Would you expect for a project of this scale to have deeper level conversations before we got to this stage?

**Ms MOORE:** Absolutely.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** What would that normally look like?



**Ms MOORE:** Even establishing the need for a project like this would be something that you would do, and that is what we do at the city. You have that preliminary conversation with the community about what should happen and then you move into the detailed work. With the documents that I circulated to the Committee is a copy of something I received from a resident. There were two open days where people could go along to the stadium and find out about it, which I encouraged people to attend. I think the Committee will find the reading of his document very interesting in how he was treated and how little information he actually got when he attended. And I think that is pretty typical. I would say as an elected representative, as the mayor, our officers and the community do not have a detailed understanding of what is proposed, and nor are they happy about it.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** While I absolutely agree with you that this should have been dealt with at the front end about the need and engagement with the community, a political decision has clearly been made and now we are dealing with the consequences of a specific project about to start with an imminent EIS. What would you normally expect the level of engagement to be? Would there be some sort of committee set up with the key stakeholders to help develop that EIS? How would it normally work?

**Mr JAHN:** It does vary quite a bit. For example, the Macquarie proposal in Martin Place is a State significant development. It involves quite considerable consultation. It involves a schedule of meetings with different teams on public domain, on the project generally, prior to certain submissions being made. This has not followed that detailed process but then there is a quite considerable variability with the Government, from almost having no consultation right through to proper and full consultation—it really just depends on the impacts as assessed by the proponent and how they need to consult with the city.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I would assume that there have been historical traffic surveys and analysis done around that area. You mentioned traffic congestion as a result of activities and events at Moore Park as a consideration. Has there been any work done by the City of Sydney that could spell out what the likely impacts of this are going to be?

**Mr SMYTH:** Usually the burden of evidence in that regard is on the proponent. What we do know is that there are about 6,000 parking spaces available for an event: 3,000 are formalised—multi-deck parking or hardstand—and just over 3,000 are temporary parking on the grassland itself. If that parking loads over the space of two hours for a big football match or a concert, usually that would take the equivalent of, from different directions, four lanes of traffic. If that happens anywhere near a peak hour, whether it is on a weekend, during a midday, evenings or morning—it is usually the evenings—that area is probably 90 per cent saturated already, so adding that load has a very profound impact. You do not need to do research to understand that. You just travel through there on a bus or in a car or on a bicycle and you can see a convergence of vehicles from north, south, east or west on that area. Again, we do not usually do impact assessments like that; the proponent does that. But we know it is currently a problem. Any additional use, more events or bigger events are going to result in that happening more frequently and more acutely.

**Ms MOORE:** We could perhaps take that on notice and come back with information about traffic movement in the area, if that would be helpful.

**The CHAIR:** That would be helpful.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** It would be. I assume the concept plan that is part of the EIS must have some assumptions around traffic impacts. Would that normally happen at a concept stage?

**Mr JAHN:** It would be normal with a project that is a significant traffic generating proposal to deal with the substantive operational impacts such as traffic management and servicing, even at this stage. This is what I was referring to under operational impacts that are essential. If there are going to be enhanced programmable activities, enhanced operation, enhanced technology, increased patronage, increased events, you need to assess and understand the traffic impacts that are going to be generated by them.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** I am assuming Infrastructure NSW has engaged a consultant to inform their EIS? Has that consultant engaged with the City of Sydney?

**Mr SMYTH:** We have seen no projections or modelling of traffic impacts.

**Mr JAHN:** That is not to say that Infrastructure NSW has not engaged a consultant to undertake that work.

**The CHAIR:** A point of clarification then. The City of Sydney has not been asked to give any advice in that respect either?

**Mr JAHN:** I am not aware of that advice being sought and neither are my immediate officers aware.

**The CHAIR:** Thank you.

**Mr JUSTIN FIELD:** Councillor Moore, I think you have mentioned previous studies into the need for open space sports fields within your local government area [LGA]. Can you talk us through what that need is?

**Ms MOORE:** I will start off and then I will hand over to Mr Johnson, because that is his area. We did an open space sports and recreational needs study because of the dramatic increase in the population of the city. The Green Square area I referred to is going to have a population—just looking at populations, at the moment we have 8,500 residents per square kilometre compared with Bayside, 3,400; Burwood, 5,000; inner west, 5,000; Randwick, 4,000. However, when Green Square is completed we are going to have 22,000 residents per square kilometre.

**Mr JAHN:** In Green Square.

**Ms MOORE:** Within the Green Square area, which is adjacent to this parkland. The emphasis on what I wanted to say before and on the material I have given you about the importance of Moore Park, this is the parkland that is adjacent to where these people are moving in, so it is incredibly important. We are not only worried about the increased traffic in the area and the impact that it will have on the amenity of the area, but also it is the degradation and annihilation of the parkland that is an essential need for people—80 per cent of whom are living in apartments. That is the significance. I will ask if Mr Johnson wants to add anything to that.

**Mr JOHNSON:** Some key points in our study was the supply of open space and sporting facilities for the community. Some facilities do not meet current demand and certainly in the future, with population growth, it will certainly exceed what we have already. A key point that was made in the study is that green open space needs to be thought about as critical infrastructure to support growth and density and the livability of the city. Moore Park being 115 hectares, which is about 30 per cent of our open space component within our LGA, is critical infrastructure from our point of view to support that growth, and particularly for Green Square, which, on the fringe, will have 61,000 people when it is finally built out.

This whole notion of park and open space being thought about as critical infrastructure has been taken up by the Department of Planning and Environment with their Greener Places policy and fed through with the Greater Sydney Commission in conceptualising the importance of open space to support the growth that is coming. The Office of Sport has taken up that challenge of how to facilitate more facilities across the whole metro area to account for that increased future demand.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** We heard earlier from Mr Kim Ellis, the Executive Director of the Botanic Gardens and Centennial Parklands. Your assertion that there will be a degradation of Moore Park is in stark contrast to Kim Ellis who said it is improving. What is your response to that?

**Ms MOORE:** I would strongly disagree with Mr Ellis on that, as with the community. I have given you a rundown in that document I have handed out about the impacts of what has happened in Moore Park and how it has been reduced and how there have been proposals over the years to further degrade it. I have represented this area since 1988 as the State member and as mayor. Before that, I was an alderman. For all of those years we have been battling with trying to retain that area of open space in the city. One of the very serious impacts now is the Centennial and Moore Park Trust has failed in its responsibilities in not ensuring the removal of car parks on the parkland. That is one serious problem. It was committed to in 2003 that all car parking would be taken off Moore Park. That simply has not happened.

We are really concerned about this proposal because we think it is going to further increase car parking on the parkland. What we would like to see this Committee recommending as result of this inquiry is that there be no parking on the parkland, that people come in on the light rail, which is soon to be completed, or buses, or they walk, but that they do not come in and generate road traffic and then generate the degradation and impact on the parkland. We need every square centimetre of parkland in Moore Park for this dramatically increasing community.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** How is it acceptable for a global city such as Sydney to have the worst facilities for major sporting and entertainment events in this country?

**Ms MOORE:** I have not said that that is acceptable. What I have said—

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** That is the issue we are trying to address.

**Ms MOORE:** —is that before a decision was made about where public moneys would be spent that the needs across a metropolitan area should have been assessed. I would think that if public money is going to be spent on such a facility and not on community sport, which is a clearer greater need, then it should be going to a facility in the centre of the population, and that is Western Sydney. It is not on the edge of the global city, which is congested, and on the edge of major parkland for a global city—probably the most used parkland in the country.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Councillor Moore you asserted in your opening that you disagree with such a large investment in private land?

**Ms MOORE:** Yes.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Are you aware that the trust is actually a government body?

**Ms MOORE:** I am aware the trust is a government body, but I will get Mr Jahn to talk about the history of the site and the fact it was a private development.

**Mr JAHN:** What the Lord Mayor is referring to is that the money was raised by debentures at the time in order to build that 1988 stadium and no public funds were used at all. The difference between what occurred at the time in the creation of the stadium compared to now is the difference between essentially raising private capital versus public funding.

**Ms MOORE:** The people who contributed to that construction were given lifetime seats in the stadium and that is why 19,000 seats are not sat upon when matches are on, apparently.

**Mr JAHN:** Across both stadiums. There are currently 8,000 seats reserved within Sydney Football Stadium.

**Ms MOORE:** The question the Committee could be asking is why is all this public money being invested in something that was a private project?

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Does not your view on the Sydney Football Stadium directly contradict your views of the Powerhouse?

**Ms MOORE:** How is that?

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** You would like the sporting facilities be moved to Western Sydney but you want to keep museum facilities like the Powerhouse and hold to them as they move to Western Sydney.

**Ms MOORE:** I strongly support the retention of the Powerhouse, which was purpose built on that site, in the City of Sydney, and I strongly support arts facilities being constructed in Western Sydney. In fact, if these public monies were not spent on Allianz Stadium they could be spent on a new museum facility for Western Sydney.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Do you believe it is appropriate that the Government would receive independent advice that the current condition of Allianz Stadium puts people's safety at risk and take no action? How would that be prudent?

**Ms MOORE:** I think it is extraordinary that a body such as the Sydney Cricket Ground, which has been responsible for Allianz Stadium, has not maintained the standards. Since I became Lord Mayor in 2004, we have renewed and upgraded all our public buildings. We had to close the Sydney Town Hall for two years so that we could renew it because it was no longer safe in terms of fire safety. We have upgraded Glebe Town Hall, Paddington Town Hall, Alexandria Town Hall and Erskineville Town Hall. That is what public authorities do—they look after their assets and buildings, renew them and ensure that they are safe for the public. It is a duty of care.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Agreed. Could you confirm if any council staff were present at the design review panel on May 18 when design concepts were shown?

**Mr JAHN:** I have attended one design review panel, which is what I referred to in the initial statement. It was a high-level briefing and there was a timetable discussed.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Has anyone else here today that is giving evidence personally interacted with Infrastructure NSW?

**Mr JOHNSON:** I went to the broad briefing that Mr Jahn mentioned on 18 May at Town Hall House, which gave an overview of the timetable with the community consultation person.

**Mr JAHN:** That was the stakeholder briefing at the stadium.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Councillor Moore, have you interacted with Infrastructure NSW?

**Ms MOORE:** No.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** At all?

**Ms MOORE:** No.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** That is strange.

**Mr SMYTH:** I have been to a gateway briefing for the Alexandria to Moore Park connectivity upgrade, but no Infrastructure NSW staff were there; it was its consultants.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** Councillor Moore, if there was a council building with significant fire, safety and security issues and the cost to replace and remediate the issues was very similar to rebuilding the asset, what action would you take with public money?

**Ms MOORE:** When I became mayor and was briefed on the state of the Sydney Town Hall that was exactly what I was told—it was a fire hazard. What we did was we allocated \$40 million of public money to restore that building. I have to say that that investment now means that if I want to use the Town Hall I have to book it about a year ahead because it is now so popular because of the work that we have done to renew it. But we kept the building and renewed it.

**The CHAIR:** I have a point of clarification. Is the Town Hall heritage listed?

**Ms MOORE:** Yes, it is heritage listed.

**The CHAIR:** That might provide part of the answer.

**Ms MOORE:** Allianz Stadium was an award-winning facility by one of our best architects with an international reputation.

**The CHAIR:** Philip Cox.

**Ms MOORE:** Yes. And I will add that it sits very lightly on the landscape, which is important. It is adjacent to Paddington, which is a very significant conservation area, and adjacent to the parkland, which is the most important parkland in our country. It was important that it was that lightweight structure.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Ms Moore, earlier you were asked some questions about meetings with Infrastructure NSW. I would suggest that you check your diary and maybe take the question on notice. We are getting different advice from Infrastructure NSW.

**Ms MOORE:** I would have to check that. I do not have a recollection of being briefed by Infrastructure NSW, but I have a very demanding diary, as you would expect, and I will check that. I might have made a mistake and if I have I will correct it.

**The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN:** But you cannot recall plans being put in front of you or being shown footprint designs?

**Ms MOORE:** I might have had a general conversation but I do not recall it. I am sure I would have the relevant staff—

**The CHAIR:** Councillor, you can take it on notice and come back to us if there is any need to.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** In reference to Mr Martin's earlier questions, we had Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust representatives give us extensive evidence for about 45 minutes, and I have to say that they were aligned with much of your letter and report about open space, connectivity and car park spacing. There were not a lot of points of difference in terms of what you are both after. With light rail coming, they made the statement that there would be car parks removed. They told us that the refurbishment of the stadium goes hand in hand with what you are trying to achieve and what Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust is trying to achieve. Are you saying that that is not possible?

**Ms MOORE:** Mr Johnson and Mr Smyth would like to speak to on that but—

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** Particularly on the transport. They made comments about how this could lead to better connectivity, better pedestrian access and better cycleway, walkways and pathways. It did not sound incompatible.

**Mr SMYTH:** The big question is whether the parking spaces that are removed from the temporary parking on the grass are replaced by permanent structured car parking facilities. We have come across plans prepared in 2015—they are not for application; they are future concepts—that show 6,000 car park spaces in structured car parks. Two are under the parkland between Anzac Parade and the Eastern Distributor. If the temporary car parking capacity was replaced by permanent car parking capacity, it would be far more expensive to construct. It costs somewhere between \$50,000 and \$80,000 a space. When any car parking provider or owner spends that sort of cash building a facility, the incentive is to fill it with paying customers not only on event days, but on every day of the week.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** I suggest that you set up a meeting with the trust. They made a very clear statement—they repeated it a number of times—that there would a 11 per cent increase in green space, most of which would come from the removal of car parks. That is not me saying that; it is them.

**Mr SMYTH:** Again, the question goes further than the physical attributes of the car parking to the operational attributes, such as how often the car parks are filled and to what capacity the car park are filled. That is what causes impacts on the transport systems; not the presence of lack of presence of certain models of car parking.

**Ms MOORE:** Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust or the SCG did put up a proposal in recent years to put a car park under Moore Park west and it was absolutely opposed by the community. We all know about the degradation on top of the domain car park. That is the sort of thing that happens. This is precious parkland that was dedicated to the people of Sydney for their benefit; not for car parking.

**Mr SCOT MacDONALD:** That was their words exactly.

**The CHAIR:** We will call a halt there. Lord Mayor, thank you for agreeing to come to give evidence and for bringing your team with you. There may be some questions on notice from the Committee. Normally committees ask that returns be made within 21 days of the questions being sent. We are on a bit of time squeeze here because we will be having another public hearing on 29 June. What we may resolve to do this afternoon is to advise witnesses that we would like the replies back within 10 days. I know that causes difficulties. In either case, we would very much appreciate you being able to supply us with answers to those questions on notice. Once again, I thank you very much for coming in to give evidence. It was very valuable.

**(The witnesses withdrew)**

**(The Committee adjourned at 4.18 p.m.)**