

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of DPE PSVC SFS Submissions Mailbox
Sent: Tue, 10 Jul 2018 07:12:05 +0000
To: 'DPEPortal@grace.com.au'
Subject: FW: HPE CM: Submission Details for James McRae (object)

From: system@accelo.com [mailto:system@accelo.com] **On Behalf Of** James McRae
Sent: Tuesday, 10 July 2018 11:51 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: HPE CM: Submission Details for James McRae (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Agreed to false or misleading information statements: yes

Name: James McRae
 Email: james.mcrae2@bigpond.com

Address:
 9 Bennett Street

Surry Hills, NSW
 2010

Content:
 Submission to Major Projects objecting to Application SSD 9249 Sydney Football Stadium
 Redevelopment.

I have a number of reasons for my objection to the application for redevelopment of the Sydney Football Stadium, I will try to keep these relevant and short. Firstly the redevelopment includes the removal of 26 trees. These trees have existed where they since before the current and existing stadium was erected. Therefore the removal of any tree in this redevelopment is unnecessary and will only serve to add to the pollution in the area and remove what little shade there is when a patron of the venue before entering the stadium. If the existing stadium was built around these trees then a new stadium must only proceed with all existing trees being protected.

My second objection to the development is the based on the justification used in the approval process. If it is the case that the current stadium is has become a fire hazard and unsafe for patrons, despite no changes to legislation in the area of compliance for the stadium, why has their been no criminal investigation or charges against the management and board for allowing the existing stadium to become unsafe. More so, why is the existing stadium still hosting events or multiple events each week if it no longer meets the fire code. Surely if the safety concerns were true, the current stadium would have been shut down and therefore redevelopment would justification would carry some weight. As it is, if the current stadium is still operating and if as the SCG board say "it is an accident waiting to happen" the SCG board and Stadium management must be held accountable as this is negligence on their behalf. This has not happened, leading me to conclude this, the main argument for the approval of application SSD 9249 is false and therefore this application must be rejected.

Lastly if this application does go ahead, deconstruction and construction must be limited to access through driver avenue to protect pedestrians and other motorist on the heavily used Moore Park road. During the construction of the recently build UTS/ Rugby Australia building at this location, pedestrian safety was put at risk on a daily basis with not government or council department enforcing regulations. Pedestrians were forced onto the roadway on Moore Park road daily with no safety cones or barriers in place, this was very difficult to do with a wheel chair and a pram. The application SSD 9249 therefore, if approved, must have restricted access to the site with substantial penalties for any breach in order to protect the safe passage for pedestrians and motorists. Driver Avenue is a minor rarely used road and all construction vehicles can access this site safely through this option. I could add more but going into a the waste of public funds or the right of government to spend these public funds seems. The argued grounds of safety are the biggest concern as this argument is flawed by the continued operations of the existing Sydney Football Stadium

IP Address: cpe-101-161-9-84.bpb-n-r-036.cht.nsw.bigpond.net.au - 101.161.9.84

Submission: Online Submission from James McRae (object)

https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=270485

Submission for Job: #9249 Sydney Football Stadium Redevelopment

https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=9249

Site: #3891 Sydney Football Stadium

https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=3891

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of DPE PSVC SFS Submissions Mailbox
Sent: Tue, 10 Jul 2018 07:15:58 +0000
To: 'DPEPortal@grace.com.au'
Subject: FW: HPE CM: Submission Details for Winfield Reid (object)

From: system@accelo.com [mailto:system@accelo.com] **On Behalf Of** Winfield Reid
Sent: Tuesday, 10 July 2018 1:46 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: HPE CM: Submission Details for Winfield Reid (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Agreed to false or misleading information statements: yes

Name: Winfield Reid
 Email: Reido@bigpond.net.au

Address:
 28 martin road

Centennial park, NSW
 2021

Content:
 How many times do we have to submit our objections ?
 Would NYC build a stadium in Central Park in the first place and then compound the error ?
 Or spend money on this vs other more pressing needs ?
 Would any city increase the eyesore , congestion etc when the demographics are going west ?
 I am a lifelong liberal but you'll never get my vote again if this proceeds.

IP Address: cpe-101-164-51-131.cxui-cr-103.cht.nsw.bigpond.net.au - 101.164.51.131
 Submission: Online Submission from Winfield Reid (object)
https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=270577

Submission for Job: #9249 Sydney Football Stadium Redevelopment
https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=9249

Site: #3891 Sydney Football Stadium
https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=3891

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of DPE PSVC SFS Submissions Mailbox
Sent: Tue, 10 Jul 2018 07:24:26 +0000
To: 'DPEPortal@grace.com.au'
Subject: FW: HPE CM: Submission Details for Robert Bressan of concerned resident (object)

From: system@accelo.com [mailto:system@accelo.com] **On Behalf Of** Robert Bressan
Sent: Tuesday, 10 July 2018 4:09 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: HPE CM: Submission Details for Robert Bressan of concerned resident (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Agreed to false or misleading information statements: yes

Name: Robert Bressan
Organisation: concerned resident (2021)
Email: robertbressan@bressangroup.net

Address:
33 robertson Rd

sydney, NSW
2021

Content:

I object on the following grounds

- 1.unnecessary and unjustifiable expenditure of funds
2. much cheaper, more effective and less disruption to upgrade the existing stadium
3. undemocratic lack of public consultation and consultation of SFS members
4. insufficient time given to deal with the Application- public highjacking!
5. dangerous show of arrogance, lack of professional skills and of good judgement by the Government.
6. apparently repetition of other major failures eg Cotter Bridge.

IP Address: - 101.187.68.175

Submission: Online Submission from Robert Bressan of concerned resident (object)
https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=270683

Submission for Job: #9249 Sydney Football Stadium Redevelopment
https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=9249

Site: #3891 Sydney Football Stadium
https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=3891

DENNIS ALEXANDER.

5 CROSS ST
KYLE BAY 2221
PH. 0419-249 129

10 JULY 2018.

DIRECTOR - SOCIAL & OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE ASSESSMENTS.
PLANNING SERVICES
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT
GPO BOX 39.
SYDNEY 2001

SYDNEY FOOTBALL STADIUM REDEVELOPMENT.
AP # SSD 9249

Thankyou for your notification

1. I support the demolition of the Stadium
2. I object to its rebuilding on this or nearby site at Moore Park,
3. I support the building of a new multi function complex that includes a new stadium on the brick pit site at the Homebush Olympic site.

The reasons for these statements are.

1. The existing stadium was built on land handed to the State Government in the mid 1980s being the surplus Army Engineers Depot that is understood as ancillary to the Victoria Barracks on the opposite side of Moore Park Rd. It was sought that the State Govt utilise the land for community purposes, a kindergarden a senior citizens centre or even an extension of the Moore Park open space.

The proposal for a stadium was opposed by residents possibly due to its immense impact on the residential amenity of South Paddington

The stadium proposal was approved by State Parliament supported by Michael Cleary & Bob Carr by ignoring planning impacts & viability also the residents objections. Opened in January 1988 the stadium stands in its bulk & scale with little curtilage as a misfit piece of infrastructure that ought not to have proceeded.

It over towers the residential surrounds, its lighting spill of a night affecting much of the surrounding area.

Patrons park out the residential area, those who use public transport have to take the long walk from Central Station crossing busy roads or head up through Regent St Paddington to the Oxford St busses. The light rail, if it is ever operational & reliably functional may not be chosen by the bulk of the patrons due to availability, wait time & cost.

To rebuild a similar stadium here with similar configuration & patron demands will face the same set of problems: misfit, lack of curtilage, residential amenity impacts poor accessibility.

Yes - the existing Stadium ought to be demolished

No - it should not be rebuilt to repeat the same folly.

Yes - If there is a need for a stadium it must be rebuilt on a more appropriate site that offers excellent access for patrons, low residential impacts, generous curtilage & multifunction design & ancillary uses that may flow from nearby facilities.

2. I object to a new stadium at Moore Park:

It is the wrong place for it & the existing stadium was wrong & should never have been built.

Don't repeat past mistakes - CORRECT THEM.

Turn this land into a community facility that is utilised every day of the week - not alienated again

3. A new Stadium at Homebush.

Homebush Olympic Centre is or was central Sydney near the demographic centre or was when it was built for the Olympics in 2000. It has many sporting facilities, open space park land heavy rail access. It also has a large site, the brick pit, that then could not be built on due to a family of green gold bell frogs. It is time to review that decision & utilise this valuable site.

There is perhaps no better site for the new stadium than the brick pit. It has all the attributes that Moore Park does not have & more.

The frogs could be relocated - possibly to Moore Park. The void that now exists at the brick pit could be utilised for many uses with openings for sun & light. With the new stadium forming the roof.

Perhaps -

- An annex to the Power House Museum at Ultimo.

- An annex to the Art Gallery

- Other sporting facilities.

- A Sports hall of fame.

- Space for the Royal Easter Show.

- Parking

- A combination of all or other uses.

The new stadium above would take over from the Moore Park Stadium without the loss of the facility that the proposed plan imposes - loss of the facility for perhaps 2 years during the demolition & rebuild.

It would be multi purpose - additionally for Concerts rallies perhaps Easter Show, or 2040 Olympics. Not a facility that is unused & sits waiting for the odd football match.

I have attached a copy of the Fin Review article of 4 July 2018 p32. on Parth's new Optus Stadium

Compare the Optus - award winning stadium. It has curtilage not jammed into a site too small. Perhaps this is what could be achieved at Homebush for an award - international recognition - that's what the State Government is telling us it is trying to achieve - to win visitors to Sydney.

I do not have any political intents or made donations, my views & ideas are expressed in the hope of achieving a beneficial outcome for the people of New South Wales.

Thank you for your considerations of the matters raised.

Yours Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Hall' or similar, with a large loop at the bottom.

Attached Copy of Financial Review 4 July 2018 p32.



Perth's Optus Stadium, designed by Hassell, Cox and HKS, won the top overall WA award for architecture.

No queues for the loo at WA 'cathedral of our time'

Michael Bleby

Perth's Optus Stadium, a choir rehearsal room at St George's Cathedral and a small renovated federation house won the top Western Australia architecture awards for showing good design at different cost levels.

The newly built stadium, home of the West Coast Eagles, dominated the state awards last week, winning the overall George Temple-Poole Award, as well as top gongs for public architecture, sustainable architecture, the award for use of lighting and the Colorbond Award for Steel Architecture.

In a mix of the sacred and profane, the Hassell, Cox and HKS-designed stadium that formally opened in January on the Burswood Peninsula won plaudits for the role it played as "the cathedral of our time", juror Peter Hobbs said.

"That's the importance, as a unifying enterprise for the community," Mr Hobbs told *The Australian Financial Review*. "Having 60,000 people yelling their guts out is the biggest celebration you'll get."

But the \$1.8 billion stadium also showed how good design could make a difference. The stadium, which had a "light touch" and made visitors feel

close to the action, also understood the circulation of punters at a game and was able to relieve two key pressure points – the queues for drinks and toilets, he said.

"The way the food and beverage and going to the dunny at half time works – there's no queues," Mr Hobbs said. "You get up and walk in."

A more traditional cathedral, the main Anglican church in the CBD, won the top awards for heritage and interior architecture for the Cadogan Song School, a Palassis Architects-designed rehearsal room and storage space for the cathedral's nationally respected choir that connected the crypt-level space with the main body of the church.

The reported \$4 million construction cost was covered by British aristocrat Earl Cadogan, of the family behind prominent UK landowner Cadogan Estates and a friend of the former Anglican Dean of Perth, John Shepherd.

"This is this tiny little insertion into a very historic precinct at the base of St George's cathedral," Mr Hobbs said. "You've got to get up from this level up into the cathedral."

The external staircase – also open to the public – linking the rooms to the

cathedral was enclosed in a precast concrete cross-vaulted structure with tuning fork-like spire.

"It's a really good example of private development being very sensitive," he said. "It's completely unlocked an area of the city."

At the small end of the cost scale, the Orange Grove renovation of a semi-detached house north of the Perth city centre by architects vittinoAshe won the top award for additions and alterations for showing that living spaces could be comfortable and attractive even if they were small.

"You go into this small little house with an unprepossessing front door, open the door and all of a sudden everything is gorgeous," Mr Hobbs said.

"It just an acceptance that spaces can be small as long as they're well designed."

The awards showed that good architecture could be done at many different price points and still make spaces better for the people in them.

"One project was worth \$1.8 billion, one project was worth a couple of million but was only 50 square metres and there's a house which was probably built for \$300,000 and hand built," he said. "All of them displayed a mastery of architecture".

DPEScanned

Subject: FW: OBJECTION - SSD 9249 SFS Redevelopment Stage 1 - I could not find this one

From: Roy Bishop [<mailto:campaigns@good.do>]

Sent: Tuesday, 10 July 2018 11:05 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: OBJECTION - SSD 9249 SFS Redevelopment Stage 1

I object to this application. My key concerns are:

- bulk and scale and visual impact
- impact on Moore Park and loss of trees
- increase in patron numbers and events
- impact on heritage precinct and adjoining residential areas
- impacts on traffic, parking and amenity
- the stadium as part of a larger entertainment precinct
- plans to demolish the current stadium lack justification
- the government funding of \$730m+ to redevelop the site
- false data provided in demolition vs upgrade options
- the business case was not properly reviewed
- failure to disclose important information
- lack of information in the context of the proposed entertainment precinct.

The application should be rejected.

Yours sincerely, Roy Bishop 28 Myrtle St, Chippendale NSW 2008, Australia

_____ This email was sent by Roy Bishop via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Roy provided an email address (maniroy@ozemail.com.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Roy Bishop at maniroy@ozemail.com.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html