

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the EIS.

My name is Peter Tzannes and I am a Centennial Park resident. I came to this precinct in 1951 and I am passionate about the parklands and its sporting stadia.

I have spent most of my adult life protecting these two iconic areas of Sydney. I am a member of Centennial Park's CCC and was on the SCGT's Members Advisory Group and Trust's Advisory Group committees.

The Centennial Parklands are integral to the beauty of our city, the health of its people and for tourism.

The sporting stadia too are also important to our city.

ONE SHOULD NOT BE SUBSERVIENT TO THE OTHER. Nor should one diminish the other for gain, advantage or other commercial reasons.

It should be remembered the demolition of the original SFS (which was paid for by the members of the SCGT) is a contentious issue for many citizens of NSW because it is being paid by the taxpayers. It is not Government money- it is paid by the people of NSW.

I am adding extra information which I feel is extremely relevant and which I unfortunately left out.

In my responses to you and in my emails and letters on this issue I have informed you that I was against this rebuild. I did not believe it was necessary when a much cheaper remedy was available.

That said I also stated that if we were to go ahead with the knock down and rebuild we should do the job properly. The design, the quality of the construction and the concept of what is needed should be of the highest order.

I expressed concern that the method originally chosen of D and C very often delivered a poor outcome. It undermines the integrity of the design so as to save a small percentage of the total cost.

Therefore the following points are made in an attempt to achieve a better outcome and just as importantly I emphasise the need for a holistic approach for the whole area including its surrounding parklands and residential precincts.

I want to emphasise certain concerns I have with Stage 2.

Size of proposed building.

In earlier submissions concern was expressed as to the bulk of the proposed new stadium. It is massive and sits on land directly opposite Moore Park East and within the Paddington precinct. Moore Park East is part of the historic Centennial Parklands and the new building will dwarf the trees and overwhelm its landscape.

It is not reasonable to adversely impact the Centennial Parklands. The surrounding Paddington precinct is low rise and of heritage significant. The huge size of the stadium destroys the balance of this historic suburb and diminishes its beauty.

The original SFS was sensitively designed to ensure its impact on the surrounding precinct was minimal. Hence the lowered portions in the middle of the stadium when viewed from Moore Park Rd. The new stadium should follow that example of responsible design. Surely the overall objective is to enhance our city while providing for better facilities.

Signage.

I notice in the EIS that the SCGT has abandoned the idea of placing external screens on the stadium. This I welcome as the adverse impact on the parklands would have been immense. May we please have that set in writing to ensure there is no return of the screens.

I am not in favour and hence object to any signage on the exterior of the new stadium. The stadium

is built with taxpayers money -none from the SCGT. To allow signage is to put money into the coffers of the SCGT at the expense of Moore Park East which would lose its tranquility and ambience due to light spill, view lines and park harmony. You will notice there is no Sydney Cricket Ground sign on the SCG.

If there is an urgent need for signage it should be confined to the site of the present sign on the corner of Moore Park Rd and Driver Ave. This should be elegant, no larger than that which exists today, and could include the sponsor's name and event dates. It should not be used for advertising.

#### Roof

There should be a full retractable roof on the stadium. This could contain sound during concerts.

#### Car Parking on Centennial Park lands.

The Moore Park Masterplan clearly states that car parking is to be reduced to zero on its grasslands. This was to occur very soon after the Light Rail become operational. I strongly support this. The Moore Park Masterplan is well known by the SCGT. However, in its submissions, the SCGT has stated that Centennial Park should not reduce car parking on its lands, which is for the benefit of the SCGT patrons. This is ironic as the SCGT itself has removed most of its patrons' car parking on its own lands so as to build income producing multi-storey buildings. I strongly object to any car parking on the grasslands of the Parklands. Thought should be given to underground (under the stadium) car parking.

#### Traffic issues.

It has been highlighted often that the traffic gridlock during events is increasing. Little or no regard has been given to this important issue. Clearly, the greater the traffic congestion during events the less attractive would be the experience for patrons of the SCGT. Similarly, residents in the surrounding precincts are very badly affected by the traffic gridlock during events. Ways to address this problem need to be pursued now. Obviously, by providing parking one attracts cars. Cars need to be removed totally from Moore Park East so as to free up the Lang Rd / Driver Ave intersection. This would allow the EQ carpark to empty more quickly and the surrounding areas to have less gridlock.

Integrated public transport/ entry ticketing would encourage greater public transport use and should be urgently introduced. Areas should be provided for better access for Uber and Taxi services.

#### Centennial Parkland damage.

It is proposed that in order to attract pedestrian traffic across Moore Park West and Moore Park East paths should be constructed across them. This land grab should be avoided as it splits the playing field areas which have already been diminished in area due to the Tibby Cotter Bridge and the Light Rail.

The number of cricket fields now on the Moore Park complex are less than half of 20 years ago.

#### Patron access /egress to the new stadium.

I note that the access/egress of patrons visiting the new SFS will be level around three quarters of the stadium. However, the last quarter, the western access from Driver Ave will necessitate the use of a staircase approximately 6 metres high (2 storeys) This is by far the entry point of the majority of the SFS patrons. This is because it is the access point closest to the Light Rail, bus services, Anzac Pde and those who use Central Railway and walk to the stadium.

There is to be a lift with a capacity for 15 people to help those with needs.. I hear that there is now a proposal to build a second lift. My concern is that if a disaster were to occur (say a terrorist act, a fire etc) panic would cause people to run to escape. People fleeing would rush to the escape exits which would be a 2 storey flight of stairs. Pushing from behind could result in a fall which would lead to multiple falls and people will be crushed to death as a result. Two storey staircases should not even be considered. If the need for a two storey stair is because of the need to have sufficient height for vehicles to enter the stadium the plans should be revised to lower the road (water table is not an excuse) through to the field under the stadium thus allowing a much shorter staircase.

Frequency of events in the new stadium.

The stadium rebuild is for the professional sporting bodies. The use for concerts or other events in the three areas - SFS, Sydney Cricket Ground and the old Showground (now EQ) was restricted to 6 major events per calendar year. I cannot see in any of the literature any mention of the frequency of entertainment type events. This is very important and should be included in the EIS. There should be no increase in the number of events permissible. The total events per year figure was the result of many studies which demonstrated the disruption to the amenity of local residents was markedly diminished by noise, traffic congestion, parking issues and a high incidence of antisocial behaviour.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Peter Tzannes