



Regulatory Working Group

Revised Minutes

Wednesday 28th September 2016 - 2.00pm to 4.00pm

Ocean Shores Country Club, Orana Rd, Ocean Shores NSW 2483 (02) 6680 1008

Present:

Peter Ryan (Chair, Regulatory Working Group)
Mat Morris (General Manager, North Byron Parklands)
Matthew Evans (CEO, Village Sounds)
Neil Johnson (Community Manager, North Byron Parklands)
Claire Atkins (Community Advocate, North Byron Parklands)
Brandon Saul (Promoter, Falls Festival)
Julie Howie (Promoter, Falls Festival)
Annette Perkins (Event Coordinator, Falls Festival)
Denise Nessel (Community Representative)
Russell Eldridge (Community Representative)
Mal Kentwell (NSW Police)
Jasmin Yeow (Roads and Maritime Services)
Matt Inwood (Rural Fire Service)
Damien Hoffmeyer (NPWS)
Cr Basil Cameron (BSC)

Agenda Items

1. Introductions

The meeting opened at 2.07pm. Peter Ryan (Chair, RWG) welcomed all members of the RWG and members undertook a brief introduction around the table.

2. Apologies

Jessica Ducrou (Promoter, Splendour in the Grass)

Elise Huntley (Splendour in the Grass General Manager)

Rob Doolan (Balanced Systems)

Cr Simon Richardson (BSC)

Neil Gendle (Roads and Maritime Services)

Dimitri Young (Office of Environment and Heritage)

Alan Bawden (RFS)

3. Confirmation of previous minutes

- Last meeting was held 4th May 2016.
- Actions:
 - Use of BoM Byron Bay weather station for wind speed was obtained from the BoM whereas the Parklands wind monitoring station would have been more appropriate. This was an oversight.
 - Ecological sites were denoted in the final SITG AMP as requested;
 - DP&E advised that they were comfortable with monitoring at property boundaries, particularly in less populated areas on large or remote properties. DN questioned this, raising the ongoing issue of measuring noise at the complainant's residence rather than at the property boundary, which may be quite far from where the resident is experiencing the noise. MM advised her to contact the DP&E with this concern, and DN indicated she would do so;
 - DN was to attempt to obtain noise data from resident funded noise monitoring report covering FFB15/16 – not yet received. DN advised she would follow up the source of this data again as Parklands holds the view that it was only reasonable that data communicated to the RWG from community sources should be made available if Parklands are expected to comment on such.

- The RWG adopted the revised minutes covering the 4th May 2016 minutes; and
- The confirmed minutes to be placed on Parklands Website.

4. SITG16 Summary

Matt Evans provided the following summary covering SITG16

Overview

- Sold out event involving 32,500 patrons
- Fine weather during bump in;
- Fine weather for the duration of the event;
- Well behaved crowd;
- No critical cases requiring ambulance transport;
- 75% decrease in patients transported for Drug/Alcohol Conditions (only 1 patient transported for a prescription medication overdose); and
- 2016 was the 3rd year in a row that the total number of injuries reduced.

Noise Management

- 100% compliance with approved noise criteria including;
 - all 8 unattended continuous noise loggers;
 - all 20 attended monitoring samples in response to calls to the hotline;
 - all 291 additional attended monitoring samples;
- Perception that noise levels would increase for residents and this was not the case;
- 23 callers to the community hotline, a reduction 76% on SITG15 calls; and
- Providing an Acoustic Manager in the Community Hotline call centre with live stage sound monitoring capabilities was hugely successful.

Traffic Management

- Seamless bump in of all camping patrons (approximately 17,500) on Thursday and Friday;
- The event did experience a significant modal shift in some day patron's travel to and from site reflected in a larger than normal number of people being dropped off and collected;
- On Friday traffic cameras and traffic controllers noted upwards of 800 vehicles entering the site and dropping patrons off at Guest Services in the northern carpark between 3pm and 6pm;

- These same vehicles returned between 10.30pm and midnight greatly impacting the ability for buses to enter and depart the bus turnaround facility;
- This resulted in long delays to transport patrons offsite;
- A meeting on Saturday 23rd of July between the event, NSW Police, RMS and traffic controllers resolved to move the drop-off/pick up zone to the southern carpark which dramatically improved traffic flows at the end of the show on this day;
- An additional meeting was on Sunday 24th of July between the event, NSW Police, RMS and traffic controllers where it was agreed to also move the taxi rank to the southern carpark;
- As a result of these changes all traffic patterns were returned to normal on the Sunday evening;
- SITG has since held debriefs with RMS and NSW Police and a range of measures will be implemented in the future including the construction of a permanent drop off and taxi zone in the southern car park; and
- The new Council roundabout adjacent to the Yelgun interchange worked well.
- Yasmin Yeow from RMS asked that pedestrian management should be included in future TMPs for this event as well as more details on internal traffic movements and bus routes;
- Basil Cameron asked about buses not being made available for normal day routes on Saturday. The event advised that this was unlikely as the following day (Sunday) wasn't a school day. The event advised that to their knowledge there were no impacts on bus services. Evidence of this claim would be required to allow the event to investigate further.

Action 1: Basil Cameron to provide evidence of any such impacts on public day bus routes as he reported to the RWG to allow Parklands to make further investigations.

- Yasmin Yeow asked if there was in incident management room during events. Yasmin was advised there was and was invited to attend the next event for a tour.
- DN asked if NIR and Parklands community hotline register report have been prepared.

Action 2: Mat M to send the chairman the Noise Impact Report and the Community Hotline Register for distribution to members

5. Falls Festival Byron 2016/17 Overview

- Brandon advised that 90% plus patrons' camp on site which reduces day patron numbers;
- The event has sold out and Brandon is looking forward to a success event with continuous improvements.

6. Regulatory Update

Noise Impact Report and Parklands Community Hotline Register

- The DP&E wrote to Parklands on the 26th of August 2016 requesting a noise impact report covering SITG16 and a copy of the community hotline register;
- Both documents have now been provided to the DP&E and can be distributed to any interested parties;
- The noise impact report demonstrates full compliance with the approved noise criteria while the community hotline register for this event shows a significant reduction (76%) in calls to hotline (27 calls by 23 residents).
- Russell reported that noise was not reported to him as problematic by community members. There was one spike on the Friday that he personally noticed but this was brief in duration. DN advised some people were disturbed but not as much as in past events. All agreed that meteorological conditions were favourable for noise management during the event.

Flora and Fauna Rehabilitation Program (FFRP)

- After extensive consultation with Office of Environment and Heritage and National Parks and Wildlife Services the report was lodged with the DP&E for approval;
- To date the DP&E have advised they are still assessing the program.

7. FFB 16/17 Acoustic Management Program (AMP)

- Currently being prepared by ANE;
- Will be distributed to RWG members no later than the 12th of October 2016;
- The AMP will be submitted to DP&E on the 28th of October 2016 for approval.

8. Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan

While the FFB16/17 BEEP has been approved by the LEMC it still requires review by the RWG prior to an event. As such, the BEEP was issued to RWG members for comment. Comments were received from Matt Inwood (RFS), Alan Bawden (RFS) and Denise Nessel. The RFS comments were also endorsed by NSW Police.

Responses to the RFS comments are provided in this section of the minutes. Details of Denise Nessel's comments and Parkland's responses are provided in Appendix 1.

RFS – Matt Inwood

- 2.3: States in point 1 reference to a "dedicated emergency access road to Wooyung Road". To date this has been used on the final day of events as an egress point at various times for patron traffic. Whilst I understand the need to get patrons off site more efficiently and quickly, my concern remains that if a fire is to break out on the site whilst this road is being used, there could be a delay in access for firefighting appliances to the site, whilst general patron traffic is using this road. This is fairly substantial concern for Falls Festival, given the time of year and increased level of bush fire threat.

The emergency road to Wooyung Road has only been used under strict Police approval. Historically this use has been for less than 3 hours (e.g. at SITG16 it was used for 35 minutes to evacuate a person with a broken ankle). It is a 7 metre wide road and is designated as two way. When it has been used to bump out a number of campers the road is under full traffic control. In these situations, it is unlikely that appliances under lights and siren will be inhibited from accessing the site from this entry. Multiple alternative routes are also available for emergency vehicles to access the site (e.g. the adjacent Department of Lands Road). Condition C46 requires Parklands to provide a "satisfactory passage for emergency vehicles".

BEEP Action 1 - A plan will be prepared identifying all of the various site access options for emergency vehicles. This mapping will include grading each egress/ingress in terms of standard of roads.

- 2.5.2: States in point 7 about the "15.9ML dam with hose with standard 65mm storz fittings and hard stand area for fire appliances with an exclusion zone of 5m x 8m for dedicated Fire Vehicle access to be provided near the dam outlet". With the exception of the first SITG event in 2013, access to this dam and hose point has not been available, with event tents and stages surrounding the access point referred to. This needs to be rectified, so as to allow easy access for firefighting appliances, if required.

BEEP Action 2 – A rigid hose will be installed from the dam wall to the Spine Road allowing unimpeded access to this water supply.

- 2.5.3: Also refers to "Dedicated emergency vehicle roads"

BEEP Action 3 – Reword to "access for emergency vehicles" which aligns with the wording of Condition C46.

- 2.5.4 Event Times: Refers to ignition management. It has been previously agreed that no fires or bonfires be allowed on site for Falls Festival. Whilst this says "All bonfires are approved by RFS", given the basis for this festival, this should be reworded to the effect of "no fires on site" during Falls Festival, other than for the purposes of cooking at approved catering tents.

BEEP Action 4 – Any reference to bonfires for Falls Festival will be removed. No bonfires for FFB have ever been held or are planned to be held.

- 3.2 - Human Resources available on site.....: Refers to Police and RFS personnel, being "directed by the EMC". Given the statutory authority and responsibilities (referred to in 3.3) of both RFS and Police, I believe "directed" should be changed to "in consultation with the EMC".

BEEP Action 5 - "directed" will be changed to "in consultation with the EMC"

- 3.5: Paragraph 3: States "The egress time to evacuate the site by vehicle is approximately 4 hours". Is there any evidence to back this figure up? Given the time it takes to clear the site following an event, I believe this may be a little conservative. Also given there is mixed cars/camping now, this will be impacted whilst people have to wait for the vehicles in front of them to leave. I thought there was some modelling done by a consultant company for site evacuation and this may be worth updating.

The BEEP has a range of scenarios for patron and staff evacuation based on different fire threats. Evacuation by vehicle would only be considered in consultation with RFS and NSW Police and if there was sufficient time/distance from the fire front for this option to be considered. In other fire circumstances, protecting life is the primary goal and would generally necessitate evacuation on foot to dedicated emergency refuge areas.

- 3.5: Paragraph 7: In relation to triggers for bush fire threat scenarios, states "Each trigger can be overridden at any stage by the EMC based on site specific real time evaluation of the particular circumstances". I believe this should be changed to include consultation with Police and NSW RFS, before triggers being overridden.

BEEP Action 7 – Change to “Each trigger can be overridden at any stage by the EMC based on site specific real time evaluation of the particular circumstances after consultation with Police and NSW RFS”.

- The "Event and Camping Evacuation Plan" map should be modified to reflect car parking in NE of the site and car/campsite area's along northern campground.

BEEP Action 8 – Change Event and Camping Evacuation Plan to reflect camper car parking in the NE camping grounds.

- 3.9: States in point 4 "Fire fighting appliances". If there is a fire on or impacting the site, there is no guarantee there will be fire fighting appliances at the Primary Assembly Area, dependent on the situation at hand.

BEEP Action 9 – Change Firefighting appliances – access required direct from the site to the evac area “where safe to do so”.

- 3.9 - Phase 3, point 6: States the "EOC" will be notified of injury or death. I think this should read the "EMC" not EOC.

BEEP Action 10 – All references through the document to the EOC or ECC will now be referred to as the EMC (Emergency Management Centre) as stipulated in the definition section of the Project Approval dated 24 April 2012.

- 3.9 - Communication Systems: States "All event management, security and emergency services are linked via the 2 way radio 'chain of command' network." This wasn't the case at the last SITG event, as RFS were not supplied with radio's and at the last Falls Festival, there were significant communication issues and a delay in supplying event communications.

The RFS and NSW Police are currently located adjacent to the EMC. NSW Police have been issued with an event two-way and one will be provided to RFS.

BEEP Action 11 – RFS senior inspector/manager to be issued with an event two-way radio.

- 3.9 - Water Supply: Again states "access for RFS appliances to be provided to valve providing water from primary 15.9mL farm dam." As mentioned previously this has not been the case with a majority of past events.

A rigid hose will be installed from the dam wall to the Spine Road allowing unimpeded access to this water supply (refer Action 2).

- 3.9 - Defendable Space: "Minimum 10m defendable space..." This needs to be enforced.

Agreed. Defendable spaces are currently being reviewed as part of an update to the Bushfire Management Plan. The BMP will reiterate this requirement for events.

- Fire Management Standard 2.1.1: Relates to defendable space, which needs to be enforced.

Agreed. Defendable spaces are currently being reviewed as part of an update to the Bushfire Management Plan. The BMP will reiterate this requirement for events.

- Camping Standard: This document should include something about vehicles being mixed into camp grounds with tents and the subsequent need to ensure clearway access is made available for Fire/Emergency Service vehicles to easily traverse camp grounds.

BEEP Action 12 – Camping Standard to be updated to reflect current camping arrangements.

RFS – Alan Bawden

- The Event Plan (pg 10) does not reflect that previously car parking is provided on the north east area of the event site. Will this be the case for this event. The event plan should also better describe the various precincts within the event site i.e. camping, commercial activities, emergency services, venues, roads, water supply, etc.

Refer Action 8.

- The BEEP identifies various 'Emergency Vehicle Roads' but does not provide a description on the standard of the roads pre event i.e. usability for various types of vehicles (2wd, 4wd, light/heavy vehicle)

BEEP Action 13 – An emergency vehicle egress/ingress roads map will be prepared and added to the BEEP listing standard of roads.

- The BEEP does not highlight various vegetation hazards around the site. These influence evacuation pathways.

The Bushfire Management Plan reviewed by the RFS and approved by the Department of Planning and Environment in July 2013 specifically refers to the RFS Far North Coast Bush Fire Management Committee – Bush Fire Risk Management Plan (BFRMP) covering the venue and surrounding land uses (including vegetation types. The BFRMP identifies fire operations and response strategies including:

- 10 Asset Protection Zones around the residential areas of Ocean Shores and the remainder of nature reserve land; and
- Bushfire Suppression Map and Operational Guidelines including containment options, containment lines (fire trails), threatened assets, fire history and contact information.

BEEP Action 14 – Provide reference to the BFRMP in the BEEP.

Action 3: Damien Hoffmeyer offered to provide Parklands with a link to Billinudgel Nature Reserve fire management strategy (which is a live document).

Action 4: Matt Inwood offered to circulate the revised BMP to Far North Coast Bushfire Management Committee for consideration

- Also a pre event treatment map might be good (I note the BEEP includes a written pre event treatment plan) –that includes slashing of the adjoining land to the north including the assembly area and adjacent to the north site camp ground.

Noted.

- Finally given the traffic gridlock that occurred around the north emergency vehicle access road during the Splendour Event, a revised internal traffic management plan should be implemented to limit the use of this road for emergency access only. It is critical that the pedestrian and emergency vehicle access to the off-site assembly area and Wooyung Road remain independent to general event pedestrian and vehicle movements without significant up-grade works.

Refer to Actions 1, 6 and 13.

In other related matters to fire management and incidents in general the following points were discussed:

- Matt Inwood provided the RWG with details of the recent RFS incident simulation exercise which involved an RFS incident management team and multiple RFS action teams. This was a live simulation and involved undertaking fire simulation analysis over various hours of the incident. The exercise included Parklands, NSW Police and NPWS and the RFS Regional Operations Manager made the comment that the systems employed by the event were very well prepared and executed.
- Matt Inwood offered a pre event simulation session before FFB16/17.
- Mal Kentwell, NSW Police also ran the group through the recent incident simulations involving a crowd crush and a terror threat. Again the NSW police were very happy with the event planning, roles and responsibilities and execution of incident plans.
- Damien Hoffmeyer also advised the RWG that NPWS play a lead role on fires in national parks and nature reserves.

8. Other Business

Denise Nessel –Advised that the details (and figures) covering the proposed land swap between Parklands and OEH in the draft Flora and Fauna Rehabilitation Program were not consistent with past documentation provided to the RWG on this matter.

Action 5: Mat Morris to review and address any inconsistencies proposed relating to the proposed land swap between Parklands and OEH as covered in the Flora and Fauna Rehabilitation Program

Russell Eldridge – *Provided the following comments regarding his time as a community member on the RWG.* Russell was more optimistic now than before he joined the RWG. He believes all parties were making much more effort to not only meet regulatory responsibilities but a range of other voluntary measures. Noise was and is the major issue and he believes there have been major improvements in noise management at both events. Russell still has some concerns about the effects of adverse meteorological conditions on noise but will wait and see how this transpires. Traffic is the second big issue that has been well managed and the effort is noted to continue to improve in this area.

Russell advises he doesn't have the technical knowledge covering environment but it sounds that it is being well managed. Community liaison has improved out of site, from a lack of consultation and an adversarial stance to one of genuine engagement. Russell thanked both Neil Johnson and Mat Morris for their efforts in this area. Russell believes that the site is probably working at its capacity. Community events are as yet untested. More large events may not be beneficial.

In terms of Parklands being a good neighbour he thinks this has been demonstrated but we should not drop the ball. Please continue to listen to the community. He feels positive moving forward.

Brandon - provided a thank you to the community representatives for their tireless efforts representing a broad community.

Peter - thanked Denise and Russell for their continued efforts and the consequent improvements.

Mal Kentwell – advised that he received a letter from Sue Arnold concerning evacuations in the event of emergency. Mal tabled the letter for Parkland's information.

Mal also raised a few points he wants addressed.

1. Wants the emergency access road clarified that it is not a dedicated emergency access road, rather it is "access for emergency vehicles" raised with DP&E;
2. Lighting – because events are licensed areas there are some conflicts on lighting from fauna and flora and public safety. MM and MK to discuss further;
3. Fencing (fauna friendly) in certain locations allows people to trespass into the adjoining forest block. Needs to be human proof MM and MK to discuss;
4. Event traffic – gridlock and pedestrian issues. Need to consider pedestrian movements on TVW and the Yelgun interchange;

5. Improving traffic management for SITG17 to resolve traffic issues; and
6. Patron numbers – need clarification on paid patrons and how workers and volunteers are accounted for. RFS need this information as well.

Meeting closed at 3.47pm.

Appendix 1

To: Regulatory Working Group
From: Denise Nessel, RWG Community Representative
RE: Comments on Falls 2016 Bushfire Evacuation Plan
Date: 23 Sep 2016

I had hoped to consult Parklands' latest Bushfire Management Plan before lodging these comments on the Evacuation Plan but have not yet seen it.

Members of the community are aware of the difficulties getting people off site at this year's Splendour and have been more concerned than usual about evacuating the site in the event of a real emergency. For that reason, I paid particular attention to the latest Bushfire Evacuation Plan—the same plan that has been submitted in recent years.

One issue: The plan states “it is expected that weather events may inhibit the evacuation” but no modifications to the plan are specified in the event of such an inhibition. The evacuation modelling also did not take into account that the Primary Evacuation Area might have to be changed. What is the plan if such a change occurs? The only indication is that the NSW Police will take over and find another site. Will the police be directing pedestrians and vehicles in that case?

While the BEEP provides evacuation scenarios using the primary evacuation area (because of its suitability with respect of distance to forests and low fuel loads) it is not designed to cover all possible fire incidents. Rather the plan clearly provides roles and responsibilities for a range of event and non-event personnel to follow in an emergency. In any public evacuation situation, the NSW Police become the lead agency responsible for directing all resources to ensure the safe evacuation of patrons, staff, contractors, etc. In such circumstances, Parklands will take direction from the NSW Police regardless of what is documented in the BEEP or otherwise.

The plan states that a “range of assembly points throughout the site” are provided for emergencies, but these are not shown on the map and no mention is made of their location.

Additional “staged evacuation areas” are located in green on the figure shown on Page 24 of the BEEP.

In what way did the modelling “allow for” people who are affected by drugs/alcohol, are injured, are not alert or oriented enough to move quickly, who cannot see where they are going, or who are non-compliant for whatever reason? Such allowances are mentioned in section 3.9 Phase 3 but are not detailed in Appendix C, which is where you would expect to see them. The bullet points in section 3.9 Phase 3 introduce other concerns, though, such as medical staff who need to be alerted to attend to drug/alcohol-affected and injured individuals or police who need to be alerted to handle non-compliant people. Such developments will introduce delays. How were they allowed for in the modelling?

The computer simulation modelling is a tool used to inform the plan of estimated evacuation times. The matters raised above are real and require events, medical service providers and regulatory agencies to take measures to manage any unforeseen circumstances. While such scenarios have been included in the many inter-agency incident

simulations undertaken to date additional discussion will be included in the BEEP regarding these aspects.

The evacuation timings presented in Appendix C suggest the whole site can be evacuated in less than 15 minutes, but section 3.5 states that the time is actually “less than an hour”. Regardless of what the expected time is, the reality is that many thousands of people who are affected by alcohol and drugs and who are not alert and oriented will need to be evacuated in an emergency, possibly in the middle of the night under dangerous conditions along limited pathways. This is ought to be of great concern.

Noted.

The plan designates “vehicle and walking options” as the primary evacuation methods, mentioning both private vehicles and public transport as options, and a vehicle evacuation route is shown in Figure 3. But the massive traffic jams at Splendour 2016, as people tried to get off site in a non-emergency situation, suggest that vehicle options are highly unrealistic and should not be allowed in a real emergency. Yet in the event of an emergency, attendees will want to use their own vehicles. The modelling has apparently not allowed for that eventuality, and the plan doesn’t address the issue.

The use of private vehicles by patrons to depart the site is a key consideration that NSW Police must make in any evacuation of the event site. The parameters in making such a decision include the immediacy of the fire, the time of day or night, wind direction, external road conditions, patron intoxication, use of specific ingress/egress roads, etc. The first priority is ensuring the safety of patrons. In many cases it is envisaged that NSW Police will require patrons to evacuate on foot rather than leave the site by vehicle, however such a decision will only be made in light of the facts surrounding a particular incident.

The evacuation timing in Appendix C assumes that everything mentioned in Appendix B is already in place. Appendix B states that in the event of an “imminent bushfire circumstance”, the EMC will need to be briefed, an exit route will need to be made clear and lighting provided, directional cues will need to be in place, and impaired people will need to be helped to prepare to leave. That’s a good bit to take care of before the actual evacuation begins, especially in the event of a fast-developing fire..

Noted

These are a few of the concerns that arose when I gave thought to the emergency evacuation plan, especially in light of the people-movement problems that arose at Splendour 2016 and the fact that the area is highly prone to bush fires, with peat fires a particular risk.

Regardless of what the Local Emergency Management Committee has said about this plan, members of the community are concerned about its adequacy.

Noted.

To: Peter Ryan, Chairman RWG
From: Denise Nessel, RWG Community Representative
Date: 28 September 2016
RE: Land Dedication to National Parks

I have these questions related to Parklands' Flora and Fauna Rehabilitation Plan that I brought to the attention of the RWG at the meeting today. I would appreciate having these included in the meeting minutes as stated here:

In looking over the draft plan again, I noticed that the wrong map appears to be included in relation to the land dedication to OEH.

In Section 7.4 (Dedication of Land Parcels to the Office of Environment and Heritage) it states "*Stage 1 of the dedication of land is provided in Figure 7...*" yet Figure 7 in the document has nothing to do with the land dedication, and the map in Section 7.4 is labeled Figure 15 ("Agreed Dedication of Land"). I assume this is a mistake that should be corrected.

Corrected thank you.

A Figure 7 related to land dedication appears in other recent documents, for example, the Modification Assessment Report prepared by the Department of Planning and signed by Chris Ritchie and David Gainsford in January 2016. Figure 7 in that document shows these lands are scheduled for dedication to the OE&H:

- a. all of Lot 101 DP 856767,
- b. the very eastern section of Lot 2 DP 848618, and
- c. a narrow strip of vegetated land in Lot 10 DP 875112 to the very west of the NBP site.

No reference is made to this map or these other lands in the Flora & Fauna Rehabilitation Plan, but this is a later map than the one labeled Figure 15 in the F&FRP. So how does this Figure 7 relate to that Figure 15?

The fauna and flora rehabilitation plan now provides details and timing of all of the above parcels of land including the above as originally offered in Parkland's Environmental Assessment dated September 2010. This offer is clearly predicated upon receiving permanent approval as originally applied for in the Environmental Assessment dated September 2010.

I understand from the meeting that the DOP gave Parklands a 30-day extension of the deadline for submitting the final Flora & Fauna Rehabilitation Program. I note that Condition C20 of the recent PAC approval stated that as part of the revised ecological structure plan in the F&FRP, Parklands needs to specify the "timing for when the required parcels of land will be dedicated to the OE&H".

I trust that, as Mat indicated when I raised these questions, that the final document will make very clear what parcels the land swaps will actually involve, how many stages are specified, and when each stage is to be completed. I also trust that the maps and map references will be revised in the interests of clarity and that all relevant maps will be included.

Noted