

## **2. Moore Park Master Plan Review**

Consent condition B12 requires a comprehensive review of the Moore Park Masterplan 2040 to identify:

a) specific principles, moves, opportunities and strategies within the plan which can be supported either directly or indirectly by the development; and

b) how the development on the site can contribute positively towards and support the principles, moves, opportunities and strategies within the Masterplan.

Appendix G identifies various project opportunities which are deemed to support or contribute positively towards the Moore Park Master Plan (MPMP). Appendix C (pages 53-64) takes the project opportunities and adds public domain implementation information.

### **Theme 1: Green**

1.1 Project Opportunity - Trees: Gaps in the existing tree cover represent an opportunity to consolidate the existing planting strategy. SFS development should explore opportunities to extend the parkland into the site, provide new avenue tree planting and reinforce the green threshold along the eastern boundary of Moore Park, maximising sound, shade and visual amenity for park users.

Comment: We support filling gaps in the existing tree cover in Moore Park and the concept of extending the parkland into the site. The latter could be achieved very effectively by having a tree lined avenue from Driver Avenue up to the stadium entrance. A single Port Jackson fig (*Ficus Rubiginosa*), a handful of spotted gum trees (*Corymbia maculata*) and low-level plantings will not disguise the fact that the proposed six metre high bank of steps has the opposite effect, representing a vertical barrier. We support other comments in Item 1.1.

1.2 Project Opportunity - Landscaping The core issues here are (a) rejuvenating the Park's open space, including removing temporary on-grass event car parking, and (b) maximising opportunities for passive and active recreation.

Comment: The issue of car parking on Moore Park is discussed in a separate submission. We welcome the observation that the SFS redevelopment will look to support the aspiration to replace on-grass car parking with an enhanced landscape through (a) the provision of stronger pedestrian connections with Paddington through the SFS site, and (b) the promotion of public transport. We simply note here that the identified outcomes of the Green Travel Plan suggest that the proposed efforts to promote public transport are likely to have minimal impact on the demand for on-grass car parking.

The 'Public Domain implementation' in Appendix C itemises confuses actions which are consistent with the MPMP with actions that contribute positively towards and support the principles, moves, opportunities and strategies within it. At best, the actions are loosely

consistent with the Plan. The suggestion that “The Moore Park Steps are encouraged to be used for fitness purposes and callisthenics - an extension of boot camp style fitness activities within Moore Park.” is contrived; such activities do not occur within the Park.

1.3 Project Opportunity - Wildlife: Explore opportunities to engage with landscape and stitch the stadium into Moore Park, alongside safety of movement through the site. As noted, a key element of the MPMP is to protect and conserve the Kippax Lake area.

Comment: We assume that “stitching the stadium into Moore Park” means visually linking the SFS site with the Park. The six metre high barrier of steps is clearly inconsistent with this. People on the stadium site may have a nice view over Moore Park from the belvedere lookout but looking at the SFS from the Park, they’ll be faced with a substantial visual barrier. Judicious plantings won’t reverse the visual impact of this. The issue is discussed further in our submission on the Driver Avenue steps.

We do not support any proposals which would involve the Park being more than a transit zone for SFS patrons. So if “stitching” also implies a spill over of SFS patrons onto the Park, this would not be acceptable.

We support plant selections which are suitable for fruit foraging by flying foxes, although very few eg *Corymbia maculata* (spotted gum) appear to meet that description. However, we question the need for or desirability of bat roosting boxes. While flying foxes forage in Moore Park, they do not currently roost there but in Centennial Park. So the installation of roosting boxes may interfere with their natural roosting behaviour.

## **Theme 2: Heritage**

2.1 Project Opportunity - Built heritage: The SFS should respect its landscape setting. It should respond to the “Moore Park Conservation Area”.

Comment: This issue is discussed in Section (3) of our first submission. We do not understand how the statement that the SFS project should respond to the “Moore Park Conservation Area” relates to built heritage? That said, we endorse the view that the stadium design should respect its landscape setting. In this regard, we do not know whether the original proposal for a 300 square metre video screen facing Moore Park is still intended. The reference to “digital mesh on the stadium façade” (6.1 below) suggests it is. If so, this would be very confronting and hardly respectful of the landscape setting.

Under ‘public domain implementation’, there’s a pompous and yet meaningless statement: “The notion of precinct gateways as seen in the surrounding parkland context is applied to the stadium entries through walling and signage placement.”

2.2 Project Opportunity - Living heritage: Landscaping selection should reinforce the existing language of trees around the Moore Park precinct into the site and so acknowledge the heritage significance of planting within the precinct. Public domain implementation - “The public domain design references the notion of the 19<sup>th</sup> century cultural landscape and interprets this in a contemporary way.”

Comment: We support the statement about the heritage significance of Moore Park plantings but note that this is ignored by the proposed planting of many *Corymbia maculata* (spotted gum) trees around the SFS precinct. These aren't in keeping with predominant Moore Park tree types. Planting trees which are completely different to most of those in Moore Park cannot reasonably be described as a "contemporary way" of interpreting the 19<sup>th</sup> century cultural landscape. Rather than acknowledging the "living heritage", it justifies completely different plantings by giving the proposal a fancy description.

2.3 Interpretation Project Opportunity: The MPMP emphasises the need to communicate the Park's history and significance through story and interpretation.

Comment: We support imaginative historical interpretation in a way which integrates the history of the SFS and SCG site with that of Moore Park. This issue is discussed at greater length in Section (5) of our first submission.

### **Theme 3: Access**

3.1 Project Opportunity - Public transport: Public Transport could be promoted through the design of the public domain, green travel plan and the operational overlay of the SFS. The MPMP proposes that public transport timetables should reflect higher levels of activity at Moore Park on event days.

Comment: The effectiveness of the Green Travel Plan in promoting the use of public transport is discussed in our submission on Car Parking on Moore Park. For reasons best known to TfNSW, a dramatic reduction in the use of special event buses is proposed which will have the opposite effect to that envisaged in the MPMP.

Public Domain Implementation - Improved path connections will be made linking the western site entry to Tibby Cotter Bridge.

Comment: We don't know what's proposed here, as no further information is provided. However, we note with concern the reference to two grand stairways that "align with the lines of pedestrian movement either side of Kippax Lake" (EIS, page 74). The construction of any new pedestrian paths on either side of Kippax Lake would have a devastating impact on the amenity the lake provides for the community. We see no need for any further pathways linking the Tibby Cotter bridge with the SFS.

3.2 Project Opportunity - Parking: The MPMP proposes a whole-of-government approach to visitor access on major event days, with on-grass parking replaced by parking at dispersed locations. This will ease traffic flow congestion in conjunction with events. The Plan also envisages that the light rail will reduce the number of cars travelling to and from the area.

Comment: The on-grass parking issue is discussed in our submission on Car Parking on Moore Park. Suffice it to say here that, rather than a whole-of-government approach, it is being viewed in isolation from the SFS redevelopment. The potential traffic congestion benefits and the impact on the community of maintaining the status quo are being ignored.

The Plan's expectations that the light rail will reduce the number of cars is not borne out in INSW's projections, with increased light rail numbers broadly being offset by reduced special event buses.

**3.3 Project Opportunity - Entries:** The Driver Avenue Terraces should clearly articulate the threshold to Moore Park through a change in levels and provide opportunities for the public to view and engage with Moore Park.

**Public Domain Implementation** – (1) The Moore Park Steps sit adjacent to the site boundary creating a more pronounced presence on (and) within Moore Park and a monumental entry experience for patrons. (2) By elevating the stadium entry on Driver Avenue, the public domain level is able to tie more seamlessly with the northern site boundary and Moore Park Road public domain allowing increased permeability and pedestrian movement.

**Comment:** Various issues associated with the Moore Park steps are discussed in our submission No. 4. Although there are pictorial representations of the steps and their location, the only justification for having access and egress via the main entrance via two six metre high banks of steps is in PDI (2) immediately above. An objective is to engage with Moore Park, and yet as PDI (1) acknowledges the steps create a more pronounced presence on and within Moore Park. Low level plantings will not disguise the fact that, viewed from the Park, the proposed steps will represent a significant vertical barrier.

**3.4 & 3.5 Project Opportunity – Walk and cycle paths:** It is proposed that cycle racks for 60 bicycles be provided in Moore Park, adjacent to the proposed Driver Avenue steps, to meet the needs of those attending the SFS. (EIS, page 87; Appendix C, page 26; Appendix H, p. 22)

**Comment:** We support the provision of bicycle racks to accommodate greater use of bicycles by those attending events at the stadium (Green Travel Plan, Appendix H, page 17). However, we believe that locating bicycle racks on the parkland for the sole benefit of those attending events is conceptually little different to providing car parking on the Park, and we do not support this – least of all close to Kippax Lake.

Bicycle racks should all be located on SCG Trust land. If it is deemed necessary to locate bicycle racks in the Park (and we recognise that the MPMP proposes increasing the number of bicycle parking stations around Moore Park, page 27), they should be on the paved area outside the SCG, not on parkland. Patrons who have the energy to cycle to the Stadium will presumably not mind leaving their bike a short distance away and walking the remaining distance to the SFS.

## **Theme 4: Sport**

**4.1 Project Opportunity - Community sports:** The SFS project is a significant opportunity to provide complementary public domain spaces which support community sport use within Moore Park. It is proposed that the public domain surrounding the stadium will provide a platform for free activities including informal sports, small-scale play and passive recreation. (EIS, page 73)

Comment: No reference is made to what is undoubtedly the principal opportunity: the enhanced scope for community sports flowing from the removal of on-grass parking in Moore Park and the subsequent remediation of the parkland. We support the sporting activities that might be made available within the SFS precinct – basketball hoop, exercise equipment and table tennis. Skate boarding was mentioned at the CCC; we do not support this. Any sporting activities should only be adopted once there is clear support from residents living in the immediate area, given the potential for noise and anti-social activity to affect their amenity adversely.

4.2 Project Opportunity – High performance sports: The public domain design should integrate opportunities for fan based programs in plaza spaces surrounding the stadium.

Comment: We do not understand what this has to do with high performance sports. As noted below in our comment on 6.1, we are opposed to any fan-based programs on Moore Park. They should be confined to the SFS precinct.

## **Theme 5: Leisure**

5.1 Project Opportunity – Walking: We support the permeability of the site and the new pedestrian path through the site connecting Paddington to Moore Park.

5.2 Project Opportunity – Playgrounds: The new Driver Avenue entrance should support the enhancement of the Kippax Lake area through the provision of an active and dynamic stadium “front door” that will provide opportunities to view and engage with the park.

Comment: We can see no meaningful connection between the MPMP’s focus on enhancing the Kippax Lake area as a new community destination and the “active and dynamic front door” – in reality two six metre high banks of steps. The contrast between this description of the main stadium entry point and the passive recreation space that surrounds Kippax lake is self-evident. When events are on at the SFS, the community is denied access to large areas of Moore Park. With 70% of patrons expected to access the stadium via the Driver Avenue entrance, passive recreation next to Kippax lake will be impossible on event days. On non-event days, the ‘dynamic’ entrance will do nothing to enhance the Kippax Lake area.

Public Domain Implementation – (1) The Moore Park Steps provide a grand entry to the new Stadium while providing an address to Moore Park. (2) By introducing a landscaped terrace within the stairs, the park is encouraged in to the stadium.

Comment: We don’t understand what this has to do with the Playgrounds project opportunity. It is yet another example of padding to make the project opportunities and implementation look impressive when in fact they amount to little or nothing.

## **Theme 6: Entertainment**

6.1 Project Opportunity – Events: Consideration has been given to the fan and walk-up experience of the SFS to heighten the event day experience for patrons. Opportunities for digital mesh on the stadium facade should be integrated to provide visual activation of the

stadium facade and underpin activation of the public domain pre and post event. [Appendix HH, page 24: The proposed media mesh screen on the building façade in this location has been removed from the design.]

Comment: A diagram on page 14 of Appendix I proposes a large “Kippax Lake Meeting Area”. We have been unable to find any other reference to this, but strongly oppose any suggestion that there should be a meeting area (a ‘fan zone’ by another name) anywhere near Kippax Lake or indeed anywhere in Moore Park because of the potential impact on wildlife and community use.

Any fan-based programs should be confined to the SFS precinct, and then at some distance from the Kippax Lake area. This is one aspect of the MPMP with which we disagree because of the impact of fan-based activities on wildlife and birdlife in and around Kippax Lake and on the community’s access to the Park for recreation. The damaging impact of a fan zone in Moore Park would be accentuated by the noise levels and intrusive nature of the digital mesh or screen on the stadium façade. (While the location of the screen has been changed, no information is provided in the EIS about where it will be located.)

6.2 Project Opportunity – Wine and Dine: The SFS should support new food and beverage offerings with the potential for outward facing tenancies which would directly service spaces in the public domain.

Comment: Page 60 of the Stage 1 EIS stated that the Stage 2 DA would include further details regarding any ancillary land uses associated with the stadium such as merchandise stores, food and beverage and visitors and member’s information. It also stated that details of anticipated trading hours and the scale of these ancillary facilities would be provided. None of this information is included in the EIS.

While we appreciate the necessity of food and beverage retail outlets on event days, we are opposed to the precinct becoming a de facto shopping centre on non-event days, because of the impact on the amenity of parkland and nearby residents.

6.3 Project Opportunity – Venues: The new SFS should deliver a higher quality, flexible and resilient sporting/event facility and public domain that will be capable of facilitating a wider range of experiences and attract a more diverse audience to the precinct.

Comment: We are concerned about what the “wider range of experiences” might entail. The existing cap on the number of concerts is to remain unchanged, while it is difficult to see how the patrons who will attend football events at the new SFS will differ from those who have attended the former SFS in the past. This seems to open the door in an uncontrolled and unspecified way to an expanded range of activities which may have significant impacts on Moore Park and the amenity of nearby residents.