



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-970124

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH APPLICANT

RE: NORTH BYRON PARKLANDS CULTURAL EVENT SITE MOD 3

PANEL: **PROF RICHARD MACKAY AM
ANDREW HUTTON
CATHERINE HIRD**

ASSISTING PANEL: **DAVID KOPPERS
JORGE VAN DEN BRANDE**

APPLICANT: **MATHEW MORRIS
STEVE CONNELLY
PHIL JONES**

LOCATION: **IPC OFFICE
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES**

DATE: **3.03 PM, TUESDAY, 4 DECEMBER 2018**

PROF R. MACKAY AM: We will get underway. And, look, formally, good afternoon and welcome. And before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we're meeting, the Gadigal people of the Eora nation. I pay my respects to their elders past and present and extend those
5 respects to any indigenous people in attendance today. Welcome to this meeting on development application MP090028, MOD 3 and State Significant Development 8169 in relation to the North Byron Parklands Cultural Events Site. From Billinudgel Property Proprietary Limited, the applicant, who seeks approval for the ongoing use of the site for cultural, education and outdoor events for up to 20 events
10 per – event days per year, a concurrent modification request to amend the terms of existing concept plan approval to reflect the types of permanent cultural events that would be held at the site.

I'm Professor Richard Mackay and the chair of the Independent Planning
15 Commission Panel, and joining me are my fellow Commissioners Andrew Hutton and Catherine Hird. And the other attendees of the meeting are Mr Matt Morris, General Manager North Byron Parklands; Mr Steve Connelly, Planners North; Mr Phil Jones, Phil Jones Environmental Planning; and from the Commission's Secretariat, David Koppers, Team Leader, and Jorge Van Den Brande, Planning
20 Officer. In the interests of openness and transparency, and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. And I would ask that when everybody speaks for the first time, they just commence by saying their name clearly and slowly so that that can be picked up on the transcript, please.

This meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of the process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision. It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we
30 consider it appropriate. If you're asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing which we will then also put on the website. And the same applies to any documents that you might hand across today. All of that goes on to a website. Are there any questions about the process for today? Well, then I think we
35 can get underway. And if it's all right, what we find is it's probably better if we ask questions as we go, rather than sort of save them all up to the end because then we will all engage with particular matter or issue. So thank you. Welcome again. And over to you guys.

40 MR M. MORRIS: Well, thank you very much for your time – Matthew Morris – for your time, Commissioners. We appreciate you're very busy. I suppose the purpose of today for us is really to just provide a bit of a snapshot of where we've been in the planning process, where we are now and, most importantly, to impart to you any responses to any questions or issues that you may have in reading the immense
45 amount of information that has been generated from this project application.

To give you a feel for the project, we purchased a property in September 2007. We have been in the planning pipeline for the best part of 10 years. That started with Byron Shire Council with a development application for a one-off trial approval for Splendour in the Grass, which was subsequently invalidated in the Planning and - - -

5

MS C. HIRD: Land.

MR MORRIS: - - - Land Environment Court. Thank you. And since that time we've then made application in August 2010 under the part 3A provisions at that stage. That was determined in April 2012 as a trial, so the Planning and Assessment Commission, as it was known then - - -

10

PROF MACKAY: Yes.

MR MORRIS: - - - took a precautionary principle, decided rather than grant permanent approval, which was a little bit different to the department's recommendations, granted a five-year trial approval. That was subsequently through some - a modification extended to 31 August 2019, specifically to give us some further time as part of the application which formed the SEARs in December 2017 and 2018, as here we find ourselves with a report from the department and now heading into the public meeting.

20

PROF MACKAY: Yes.

MR MORRIS: Splendour in the Grass and the Falls Festivals are probably two of Australia's most iconic music - contemporary music events in Australia. Splendour in the Grass originated in Byron and outgrew its locality that was originally at Ewingsdale Road in Byron. And I suggest to you that both events are extremely popular in terms of the - you know, the way that they sell out. So in Splendour's case, very, very short period of time, high demand. And likewise for Falls Festival.

30

To date, we've been operating for a total of eight days a year. We did have a licence - or, sorry, as part of the trial approval - the ability to have a third event, and I think it's important to highlight to you guys that the demand for - in the music industry has changed over the past decade, and we've seen a lot of new entrants to the market and we've seen a lot of those entrants exit the market. And, in fact, it seems to be that the events that have managed to continue are ones that have had some legacy and ones that have some brand in the marketplace. We've held 11 events today. You would probably be familiar with the glide path that was granted to us as part of the trial approval. And subsequently, we now have Splendour operating at 35,000 patrons and Falls Festival at 25,000 patrons.

35

40

In terms of the key externalities that relate to this particular project, I think it's fair to say that, really, the two big ones are traffic and noise. In 2013, in July, when Splendour had its first event, we did have a significant traffic congestion issue at the Tweed Valley Way, the main entrance. That did cause some locals considerable issues in terms of being able to move from one side of the site to the other on that

45

road. That was addressed quickly at that event and, subsequently, we haven't had those issues again, although in 2016 we did have some congestion that impacted more the patrons on-site because of the fact that we had an inability to move some of our buses on and off the site due to on-site congestion.

5

But if you look at the primary litmus test, that is, our community hotline – and the community hotline has stayed the same number for the past 11 events – it has been advertised by way of a 3500-person letterbox drop, so to all of the catchment in, say, a three to four-kilometre radius. It's advertised in three papers. And basically, it's our conduit to the wider community in terms of issues that they may be experiencing as part of our activities. If you look at the calls that were made in 2013 to Splendour, we received 37 calls regarding traffic. Since that time, we haven't got above three. And in a number of cases, four to five events, we've had no recordings whatsoever of any traffic.

15

So we've worked very, very closely with New South Wales Police and RMS to ensure that as modes of transport change over time, we've been responsive to that. And one of those modal changes was that in 2016 we had the situation whereby we had a very large number of mums and dads and/or brothers and sisters or friends dropping off people, and we used to our drop-off area and guest services in the north car park. And as a response to that, we ended up moving that facility to the south, working with RMS and police on the Friday, identifying that as an issue, moving it to the south on the Saturday. We still didn't move the taxis and Ubers down on that time. We still had some congestion on that Saturday. Again, in conference with both of those agencies, on the Sunday we were back to normal and have been employing that system since.

20

25

It's probably fair to say that we've been operating with a set of infrastructure that isn't always fit for purpose given the fact that we've been granted a trial approval, and we've had that balancing act of investing capital commensurate with trying to maintain some sort of business certainty, which has been very difficult. So to date, we've invested around \$25 million in the project which, I guess, in terms of normal business process, can be seen as a bit of a punt, if you like, because of the lack of certainty with respect to the planning approval process. That said, we do feel confident that with the robust nature of what we've provided in terms of the EIS and then the additional information from the response to submission, that we've fairly addressed all of the issues and concerns, but we would be very pleased to hear from you guys.

30

35

I will just finish that summary in terms of the noise. So noise has been probably the biggest challenge for us, and that has been reflected again through the community hotline and through the – if you like, the history of noise limits that were granted to us. So in the first instance, we were granted a background plus regime. Backgrounds and Yelgun and Wooyung typically at night can drop to as low as 30 or 32 decibels. Interestingly, through that approvals process the Commission only focused on the A-weighted or the higher end, the shorter wavelength, less-intrusive

40

45

sound component or spectrum. And as such, we weren't regulated for the bottom end.

5 So again, for Splendour, and, to a lesser degree, Falls, we did receive a large number of complaints, somewhere in the hundred and hundred and thirty sort of mark. So it was a significant number of complaints, and I think too it was fair to say that this was the first time the activity had taken place in that setting, and hence people were a little uncertain as to what – you know, what they should be hearing, what is acceptable, what is not acceptable. After a number of years of operation under that regime, and also receiving some penalty infringement notices from the compliance side of the Department of Planning, we then took it upon ourselves to try and rectify the issue because what was out of step was that those regime – that set of noise criteria were entirely different to any other outdoor venue in Australia. So they were completely different.

15 Other venues throughout Australia typically had absolute limits at the boundary or at the affected receiver. They also had limits for the A-weighting and the lower frequency. So we were pleased that once we received those – that approval to that modification that the numbers of complaints had dramatically reduced. In some instances, it's down to seven complaints for an event. So I think, you know, those sorts of things have shown that we've been able to look from a continuous improvement process to respond to those externalities.

25 The final point I will make is that there was very great concern from the public back in the public meeting for the trial approval of the Planning Assessment Commission, that there would be this significant increase in antisocial behaviour, that there would be, you know, all sorts of manner of disturbances to residences and, in some instances, residents fearing their own safety in their own home. Real concerns that, you know, needed to be considered and addressed. However, through the evolution of and rollout and implantation of the project, these have not come to light. There certainly has been instances where we might have had some localised litter, and there may have been instances where there might have been, in a residential area, some noise disturbance when some of our patrons have returned in the evening. Not dissimilar to a whole range of other activities that people partake in, you know - - -

35 MS HIRD: Byron Bay.

MR MORRIS: - - - up in Byron Bay. So it has been a complex network of stakeholders that we've tried to appease and take on board and to genuinely consider the concerns and issues that they have and to integrate those into our systems and processes. And I think that has been reflected by trying to be proactive in terms of the way that we manage noise, whereby now we actually have a whole range of acoustic engineers out in the field taking samples continuously, regardless of whether there has been a complaint or not, and through the experience that we've got now determining if, in fact, we're getting close to that point where if we kept – we didn't modify either the tone and frequency or the volume, the decibel level, we would likely start to see some calls coming from the community hotline. And that has been

the same through a range of measures and monitoring regimes that we've put in place. So at that point I will take a breath, and if – happy to answer any questions.

5 PROF MACKAY: Yes, well, just on that last point, would you mind stepping us through, just on a typical night, you've got acoustic engineers - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes.

10 PROF MACKAY: - - - kind of where they go - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes.

15 PROF MACKAY: - - - they've taken a measure, something is looking – that it's trending or it's just over where it should be, and what happens?

MR MORRIS: Great.

PROF MACKAY: Just that kind of - - -

20 MR MORRIS: Sure.

PROF MACKAY: - - - nuts and bolts.

25 MR MORRIS: So invariably, we have between two and four acoustic consultants out in the field at one time. We have a noise control manager at site next to the event manager, who has a direct line to the stage manager to modify or change certain components of the frequency or noise or volume. We invariably place our acoustic engineers north or south of the site. But depending on the prevailing meteorological conditions, if we have sourced receiver winds heading to the north, invariably, we
30 might change that round where we will put three of the engineers to the north and keep one to the south, or if there's a north-east/north-west we will - - -

PROF MACKAY: Yes.

35 MS HIRD: Yes.

MR MORRIS: - - - modify accordingly. Their primary responsibility is when a call has been made to the community hotline, the noise control manager is notified of the location. He or she is also notified of what that particular caller is experiencing. So
40 we ask a number of questions to the caller: "Can you hear the bottom end? Can you hear the vocals? Is it disturbing you inside the house or just outside the house?" And we go through a range of questions to determine what the issue at hand is. We ask them we they would like to have an attendant monitoring sample taken, and we
45 also ask them if they would like us to phone back the details and results of that particular sample.

Now, what we've been doing at the last four or five events is, regardless of whether they ask us to take the sample, we have been going out and taking the sample anyway. So we undertake the sample. The way that the current approval is structured, that if there is a problem, we have exceeded the limit, we have a period of
5 around three or so minutes to identify what it was, whether it was a tonal or volume issue. We call it back, we make some adjustments and we take another 10-minutes sample. If that failed, that is a noncompliance. If it didn't, we've just deemed that we've been able to rectify the issue. We then call that back to the caller and provide them those details. We keep a record of all of the details. They're transparently
10 reported to – as part of the community hotline report, which is on our website which forms part of the performance report. And invariably, we're asked by the department to undertake a noise impact report that, once again, elicits all of the functions and samples and processes that we have in place.

15 But to give you a bit of an understanding, we've taken for each event approximately 220 attended 10-minute samples. So there's a massive amount of data that has been repeated now 11 times. So we have an incredibly detailed understanding of the noise issues that relate to the catchment in question, and I think that's why we've been more successful these days in managing that particular issue. We've also,
20 interestingly, been able to find where there has been certain hotspots within, say, South Golden Beach or Ocean Shores where people in a very tight cluster are calling us, yet when we've gone down there we – the music is either inaudible or is well below the limit. And we've had, thankfully, also the Department of Planning's noise specialist be able to go out with the acoustic engineers and to verify independently that that is the case. So I think, you know, the results speaks for themselves in that
25 respect.

I think also, the last point I would make on that is people are now recognising that under the current approval we actually have, if you like, a licence to pollute in terms
30 of noise to a certain level. There has been an approval granted to make a certain amount of noise. So the criteria is not inaudibility. It is that there may be some noise. And I appreciate that some people, regardless, see that as completely unacceptable. However, we have been operating within the bounds of that approval.

35 PROF MACKAY: Sure. Thank you. Andrew, Catherine, do you have - - -

MS HIRD: Well, I just - - -

40 PROF MACKAY: - - - questions at this point?

MS HIRD: On noise or on traffic?

PROF MACKAY: Well, I guess on traffic, on antisocial behaviour or noise, while we're - - -

45 MS HIRD: Just one question.

MR MORRIS: Yes.

MS HIRD: When people come to your venue - - -

5 MR MORRIS: Yes.

MS HIRD: - - - and you give them a ticket, do you provide them with a sort of a behaviour list or something like that sort of can mitigate some of these impacts as well, like - - -

10 MR MORRIS: Yes.

MS HIRD: I mean, they themselves can create a lot of noise between 2 and 3 in the morning, as well, without you.

15 MR MORRIS: Absolutely. Yes.

MS HIRD: So is there a – something – I didn't see in any documentation - - -

20 MR MORRIS: Sure.

MS HIRD: - - - but sort of a list, say - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes. It's a really good question. Look, there's actually a number of gateways of - - -

25 MS HIRD: Yes.

MR MORRIS: That that information is provided, and the first and foremost is on the event's website. There's – of particular – be much more of an emphasis in terms of behaviour and how people conduct themselves - - -

30 MS HIRD: Yes.

35 MR MORRIS: - - - at events, and so we do – and the events specifically do provide, in digestible sort of language, the dos and don'ts of the site.

MS HIRD: Yes, okay. Yes, that's what I'm – yes.

40 MR MORRIS: What can and can't be brought to site, what will not be tolerated at the site - - -

MS HIRD: Yes.

45 MR MORRIS: And that can cut across antisocial behaviour but also issues to do with sexuality and - - -

MS HIRD: And alcohol's not allowed, I understand.

MR MORRIS: - - - harassment. Correct. You know, all those – fireworks. All of those sorts of things. So they're imparted. You know, we – and I will be straight
5 with you. We have had issues with fireworks on the New Year's Eve one where we've had – you know, when you have 20,000 campers or, as I call them, guests, it – you know, it's very difficult, even with all of the security and bag searches that we do and the roving security, you know, not to always identify that, so we have had, you know, in cases, you know, some small fireworks being set off. We've actually
10 also identified particular patrons that have set those off and they've been evicted. When they get to site – so there's also – the terms and conditions provide all of that information further.

MS HIRD: Yes. Okay. Yes.
15

MR MORRIS: And when they get to site, that information is imparted on a range of information boards that are throughout the site, so, for example, when you're lining up to go to have your shower, there are information boards about just reminding
20 people what is cool and what is not appropriate at the site. We have a range of what we call Red Frogs volunteers, so that's about 50 individuals. Their whole reason for being is to keep the eyes and ears of the event and look for people that might be, you know, distressed or in some form of need for medical assistance or, you know, just not really acting appropriately. We have some 300 to 330 security guards on site. We have the pay-for-service police, usually 50 or 60 police, and we've also got a
25 very large contingency of staff that are also trained, and to that end, we've just recently gone through our training for sexual harassment and what happens when someone has claimed that they've been a victim of that and how we manage that because that is a real issue that - - -

MS HIRD: Yes. Yes.
30

MR MORRIS: - - - you know, we need to - - -

MS HIRD: Particularly lately, yes.
35

MR MORRIS: Yes, exactly. So, you know, we're always and responding to and training our staff to ensure that they can handle a wide range of issues. And I think, you know, the relationships that we've built with the New South Wales Police in particular, in terms of not only just the police but the counter-terrorism unit, has been
40 fantastic.

MS HIRD: Yes. I was going to ask about that. You know, a lot of other public venues have got to spend an enormous amount of money with barriers and things like that for - - -
45

MR MORRIS: Yes.

MS HIRD: - - - sometimes a very low risk of terrorism - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes.

5 MS HIRD: - - - but they have to do it. So are you - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes.

MS HIRD: - - - required - - -

10 MR MORRIS: Absolutely.

MS HIRD: Yes.

15 MR MORRIS: So we've got a range of vehicle mitigation measures and barriers and bollards and - - -

MS HIRD: Yes.

20 MR MORRIS: - - - those sorts of things, and, you know, again, with hats off to the police, we've been doing a lot of simulations with them to identify a whole range of scenarios that we need to be able to be cognisant of and respond to, so when you have that many human beings in a particular site, there's a very large responsibility. To that end, we have, you know, a range of assistance and processes. Maybe it's

25 timely that I just - - -

PROF MACKAY: Yes.

MS HIRD: Yes.

30 MR MORRIS: - - - issue the Commissioners with a print-out here that – I draw your attention to. There you go, Jorge.

MS HIRD: That's great. Yes, fantastic.

35 PROF MACKAY: Could I just check that this has been given to Jorge electronically, please?

MR MORRIS: It can be - - -

40 PROF MACKAY: Yes, please.

MR MORRIS: - - - and will be, yes. No problem.

45 PROF MACKAY: Thank you.

MR MORRIS: I – if we do the fold-out there, I just – I guess this is a really articulate diagram in terms of what takes place, and there’s actually a box just before Parklands at the top there that is the concept and project approval, so there’s kind of two elements to how I’ve developed a range of systems and processes for the site, and that’s obviously the regulatory driven ones, which come from consent itself, so they’re the conditions of approval. And there’s also a range of key performance indicator requirements that get generated through our own internal environmental health and safety management manual.

10 And to that effect, the EHSMM, the very difficult acronym to state, is a range of plans that are specifically developed for the site that are required to be met by the event, so if I just walk you through very – on – at a high level, we have an event management plan that talks about how the event should be laid out and where it will be laid out and all of the elements that come into that, transport management plan, the traffic control plan, the noise management plan, flora and fauna management plan, the koala plan of management, the bushfire management plan, the bushfire emergency evacuation plan, the flood risk management plan, the surface water management plan, the wastewater management plan, and for those activities outside of events, the construction environment management plan if we’re building anything there. What comes out of those management plans - - -

PROF MACKAY: Sorry to interrupt, but - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes.

PROF MACKAY: - - - could I just check – presumably, the event management plan is per event.

MR MORRIS: It is per event; however - - -

PROF MACKAY: But everything else is common or - - -

MR MORRIS: These are, if you like, the venue-specific ones, so this is what we require the events to undertake. So with that event management plan, it’s more of a framework that says, “You shall have this, this and this if you’re going to undertake - - -

PROF MACKAY: Yes.

MR MORRIS: - - - an activity at the site.”

PROF MACKAY: But there’s one koala management plan - - -

MR MORRIS: Correct.

PROF MACKAY: - - - for the site.

MR MORRIS: That's correct.

PROF MACKAY: Not one per event.

5 MR MORRIS: That is correct. However, for example - - -

PROF MACKAY: Thank you.

10 MR MORRIS: - - - for a traffic control plan, there will be an event-specific one, so
- - -

PROF MACKAY: Okay.

15 MR MORRIS: Under that then becomes a range of monitoring programs, and in
there we've got the traffic monitoring program, the acoustic monitoring program.
We have a very robust flora and fauna monitoring program which sees three
ecologists undertaking their work a month prior to during the event and a month post
to determine changes there. The flood monitoring program, and that's tied to all of
20 the flood telemetry and Bureau of Meteorology telemetry that we've got on site and
the stormwater monitoring program. And then the range of reporting requirements
there, which – and that's not animal performance report; that is annual performance
report. My apologies. The noise impact report. The community hotline report, as
we touched on before.

25 I also generate an environmental health and safety management audit report, and
that's a document that we use internally to identify opportunities for improvement.
A traffic evaluation report. And then sitting under there, we report before and after
every event to the regulatory working group, which are made up of those particular
agencies and also community representatives. I take the requirements of the
30 environmental health and safety management manual and the consent conditions and
I distil them into what I call an event management manual, and this is the Bible for
an organisation like Splendour or for Falls that come to the site. They cannot operate
without fulfilling these requirements, and that is a more detailed event-specific
management plan. The safety management plan and all of these various different
35 plans that are required to undertake the activities at the site.

MS HIRD: Okay. So when we go to the monitoring programs, we're not
monitoring the wastewater that's happening?

40 MR MORRIS: We are monitoring, but I haven't got a specific plan that sits there.
So under water, in the broader scheme of things, I do because I have a groundwater
monitoring program that I submit to Byron Shire Council as part of the approval –
the section 68 approval they gave for the greywater treatment system. So it is
actually captured there; I just haven't listed it out as - - -

45

MS HIRD: Right. And - - -

- MR MORRIS: Because I go to the nth degree if I put every single monitoring point on there.
- 5 MS HIRD: And so where – about your – these are the – your regulatory working group. You’ve got no one there from New South Wales Health.
- MR MORRIS: So the regulatory working group was stipulated by the consent conditions of which agencies would be there.
- 10 MS HIRD: Right. Okay.
- MR MORRIS: I deal with the Department of Health through another organisation or committee called the Local Emergency Management committee.
- 15 MS HIRD: Okay. Right.
- MR MORRIS: So – and they are intrinsically involved with us, particularly for now, for the potable water management system that we have.
- 20 MS HIRD: But not the wastewater.
- MR MORRIS: But not the wastewater, that’s correct. No. Because council actually are the regulatory agency for that wastewater for that particular approval, that section 68, they haven’t come into play on that one.
- 25 MS HIRD: Right. So at the moment, you’ve got approval, as I understand, for the composting toilets and the septic tanks and some storage tanks. I’ve seen all that.
- MR MORRIS: Yes.
- 30 MS HIRD: And then we have a design for a
- MR MORRIS: That’s right. For a - - -
- 35 MS HIRD: But that’s not being subject to a section 68 process. Is that correct?
- MR MORRIS: That would be, I – as I understand it, so if the Commission sees fit to approve us and accept that particular concept in terms of dealing with that particular steam, we would have to go and seek under a detailed design - - -
- 40 MS HIRD: You’d have to go to - - -
- MR MORRIS: - - - to Byron Shire again.
- 45 MS HIRD: Now - - -
- MR MORRIS: Yes.

MS HIRD: Byron Shire Council hasn't seemed too enthusiastic about the wastewater to the point that it's – there's a grey area reading the material which says what – you know, if it fails, it's got to be trucked offsite. Okay.

5 MR MORRIS: Yes.

MS HIRD: So have you got an agreement with Byron Council to take all your wastewater in that event?

10 MR MORRIS: We have but we – so to – I'll step back one step first.

MS HIRD: Yes, no, please do.

MR MORRIS: So as part of our environmental policy - - -

15

MS HIRD: Yes.

MR MORRIS: - - - we have a policy where we – what we generate on site we want to try and manage on site, so - - -

20

MS HIRD: Yes, yes. Yes.

MR MORRIS: - - - in the first instance, we'd like to have an expanded ability to deal with these streams on site. We believe that the system that we've put forward, subject to some additional sort of design considerations, is something that's suitable. It's low-tech. It's sustainable. And we also know that the council have approved the very same type at Steiner Shearwater, albeit a much smaller one.

25

MS HIRD: That's right.

30

MR MORRIS: And I think council really just hadn't had a lot of experience, other than that particular one, in terms of the approval process. We met with them and talked them through the process, and their treatment people, after they'd made their submissions, seemed to be a lot more comfortable with that. To answer your question in terms of do we have an ongoing agreement with them for disposing of their STP, we don't have an ongoing agreement because they won't issue an ongoing agreement. It's always been event to event. However, I do have two other organisations whereby we can send this as a resource, so that one is – or they're both in the soil and fertiliser conditioning industry, and I have in place for this event now licences, both New South Wales and Queensland EPA, to undertake that.

35

40

I don't like that because I have to truck the material between 65 and 80 kilometres from the site. It's doable. It's highly doable. It's actually cheaper than disposing off to Byron Shire Council. And, I suppose, the other point I should make about that, and this needs to be very clearly understood, is that - - -

45

MS HIRD: Yes.

MR MORRIS: - - - every other outdoor venue in Australia, apart from Woodford, dispose of their wastewater streams offsite. We have worked long and hard and with, you know, a range of experts in this area to come up with something that we could utilise as a resource water-wise on the site, recognising the importance of
5 making sure that contaminants such as nitrogen and phosphorous are adequately dealt with and that we don't have any impacts downstream. Having said that, the downstream catchment, as well, that we should note is just full of sugarcane and they just have – you know, it – I find it peculiar that they have the right to throw on as much - - -

10 MS HIRD: Yes, it's - - -

MR MORRIS: - - - artificial fertilizer as they like, but that's - - -

15 MS HIRD: Yes, I understand what you're saying.

MR MORRIS: - - - not the box you're looking at, so I won't go down that path.

20 PROF MACKAY: That's beyond our - - -

MR MORRIS: That is totally beyond the scope. So I understand that.

MS HIRD: Yes.

25 PROF MACKAY: Sorry to interrupt, but could I just ask, is – I don't recall seeing that arrangement about two other receivers of the wastewater anywhere in the documents.

MR MORRIS: So that wouldn't have been in the documents because - - -

30 PROF MACKAY: Yes.

MR MORRIS: - - - we've only come to that arrangement of recent because it was – some negotiations that we've been doing for about four or five months because we
35 wanted to have some surety that if the commission didn't see fit to approve the wastewater component of it, that we had - - -

PROF MACKAY: Give you an alternative.

40 MR MORRIS: - - - options to go elsewhere. But we're very confident we still would have the ability to work with the Byron Shire Council and dispose of liquescent waste to their facilities.

45 PROF MACKAY: Is that something from a – just seek a short letter from you that we could put on the website – I mean, if it's a matter for which we're going to have regard - - -

MR MORRIS: Sure.

PROF MACKAY: - - - it needs to be in the public domain so that someone else can
- - -

5 MR MORRIS: Yes.

PROF MACKAY: - - - choose to respond to it.

10 MR MORRIS: Yes. Absolutely.

PROF MACKAY: I think that would be helpful.

MR MORRIS: Sure.

15 PROF MACKAY: So thank you.

MS HIRD: So when we get this, no other festival, of course, is going to have a
conference centre like you're now proposing.

20 MR MORRIS: Correct.

MS HIRD: So that changes the comparisons, then, to the other ones.

25 MR MORRIS: It does. There probably won't be another conference centre that has
a composting flushing toilet with a half-litre flush as well. So, again, in terms of the
- this was the problem that we had with GHD which were the - - -

MS HIRD: I've seen them down in the snowfield, Mount Selwyn, yes.

30 MR MORRIS: Yes, excellent. And I guess this - - -

MS HIRD: yes.

35 MR MORRIS: This was the - one of the issues that, again, I'm being very
transparent about that was raised by GHD, the independent engineers - - -

MS HIRD: Yes.

40 MR MORRIS: - - - for the department. And the particular engineer that we had just
had great difficulty getting his head around the demand rates that we had stated we
felt individual patrons of the conference - - -

MS HIRD: So this is based on - - -

45 MR MORRIS: - - - centre would generate - - -

MS HIRD: - - - the Woodford – is it Woodford experience it’s being modelled on or
- - -

5 MR MORRIS: No, this hasn’t – the Woodford – so the Woodford system is the
complete opposite of what we want. It is a very traditional anaerobic digester, very
energy intensive and has great issues with ramping up and down for the - - -

MS HIRD: Yes, I understand that. Yes.

10 MR MORRIS: - - - peak loads that it has got. It’s a nightmare. So hats off to them.
They’re a fabulous organisation and we work very closely with them, but the system,
we felt, was – we might as well just have our own, you know, traditional STP. And
what we really wanted to move towards was can we reuse, you know, this as a
resource.

15

MS HIRD: Yes.

20 MR MORRIS: Is it able to be done on a sustainable basis, and is it – got to be low
energy. So we felt that this has ticked all those boxes. We recognise there is – the
devil’s in the detail in terms of, you know, how we get to a plant form that the Byron
Shire Council will feel comfortable, but we believe we can work with them to that.
They’ve done one or two of those in the shire already. This is, granted, more
significant, but at the same time, we’re not dealing with industrial sludge and
wastewater. We’re dealing with wastewater streams that we know a lot about and
25 that there are technologies and technologies that can be inserted into a particular
treatment trained to deal with specific contaminants.

MS HIRD: Yes, I mean, you’ve got a problem downstream because you still
30 haven’t got a lot of nitrogen and phosphorus out. So you need to do some
harvesting, otherwise, that will just simply go through to the - - -

MR MORRIS: Sure.

35 MS HIRD: - - - groundwater tables. So - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes. Yes.

MS HIRD: - - - I think – as I understand it, you will be required to go through a
40 section 68 process - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes.

MS HIRD: - - - which will take a different route to perhaps how you’ve been
45 looking at it previously, I think.

MR MORRIS: And it may well do, and there might - - -

MS HIRD: Yes. Yes.

MR MORRIS: - - - be some compromise there whereby we just recognise, “Okay. We’ve got to – even though we don’t want to, we’ve got to change this aspect of it.”

5 MS HIRD: So have you – and I think the other thing that I can see about it is that it’s very intensive with its monitoring to make sure you’re meeting those BODs and those MMPs - - -

10 MR MORRIS: Absolutely.

MS HIRD: - - - and faecal coliforms and some of those may - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes, as it needs to be.

15 MS HIRD: Yes, that’s true.

MR MORRIS: Yes, as it needs to be. So - - -

20 MS HIRD: So there will be - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes.

MS HIRD: You talk about the people you employed for noise. It might be that your wastewater treatment system gets nearly as bad.

25 MR MORRIS: It could be. It could be – believe me, there will be a wastewater management plan and monitoring program that will form into this as well. So - - -

30 MS HIRD: And you’re comfortable that you’re – that’s financially viable in terms of your - - -

MR MORRIS: Look, I think at the end of the day, we have to do the numbers on the system that ends up being approved.

35 MS HIRD: Yes.

MR MORRIS: And, really, it will come down to a cost-benefit, but I comfortably say that, thankfully, the board that I deal with also have a philosophical understanding that they’re not just about looking at the economics. They will also weigh up the environmental and social considerations, and I think that’s why – my background, I’m an environmental scientist by trade. I only came onto this project, albeit, nearly 11 years ago - - -

40 MS HIRD: Right.

45

MR MORRIS: - - - on that basis that these other elements have to be considered. And I think that's – you know, they've tried to lay their – you know, hang their hat on that, and I think that has been evidenced again through the habitat restoration program that has been implemented over time and the number of trees that have been
5 planted, the nest boxes that have been, you know, deployed and the very substantial ecological assessment work that has been done. We have had over 220 days of onsite ecological assessment on the site. I mean, this has been more monitored and assessed than I would imagine some of the larger projects that come across your desk that, you know, one would just inherently believe would have the likelihood of a
10 much greater impact.

MS HIRD: Something – just one question. Did you ever consider – you were looking at a potable pipeline going out to the site in case you couldn't catch enough water – putting in a sewer pipeline down to the nearest sewage treatment plant. So
15 that - - -

MR MORRIS: We - - -

MS HIRD: - - - would get rid of a lot – I mean, probably very expensive, but - - -
20

MR MORRIS: Yes.

MS HIRD: - - - get rid of a lot issues.

MR MORRIS: Catherine, you're - - -
25

MS HIRD: Yes.

MR MORRIS: - - - absolutely right and that was point A.
30

MS HIRD: Yes.

MR MORRIS: That's where we started with and we costed that out and we also discussed it with council. They were, at the high level, agreeable to it, but, you
35 know, not necessarily, you know, always that thrilled about the idea. But it is an option and it's one that could still be alive - - -

MS HIRD: Okay.

MR MORRIS: - - - depending on the outcome of the determination otherwise.
40

MS HIRD: Yes. Yes. That has been all my questions.

PROF MACKAY: We sort of jumped into wastewater there. Andrew, have you got
45 some questions?

MR HUTTON: No, not in wastewater, but got a general question which I – if the timing is appropriate. I think – look, I mean I’ve got a question that kind of goes a bit to wastewater, and I should say you should not read any inference or message in the questions because we’re seeking to understand. So sometimes we’re perfectly happy about the information that’s in the documents - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes.

MR HUTTON: - - - and that’s the substantive stuff and the question is actually tangential, but there has been – you know, all these years of trial events and learning and incremental improvement, and so this is the application for the permanent – for permanency. But you still don’t have a clear position on is the wastewater going to go offsite or be treated onsite.

MR MORRIS: Our preference is for onsite.

MR HUTTON: Right.

MR MORRIS: We have the facilities, agreements and capability - - -

MR HUTTON: To do it.

MR MORRIS: - - - to do offsite. Offsite is just a commercial decision.

MS HIRD: Yes. Yes, so probably - - -

MR HUTTON: Yes - - -

MR MORRIS: At the end of the day, there are service providers both in northern New South Wales and across the border willing to deal with this. It’s a very straightforward, black and white cost-benefit analysis for us.

MR HUTTON: Okay.

MR MORRIS: Less clear is how much the council in the future, with a growing area and a council that’s almost insolvent – just due to its very low rate base - - -

MR HUTTON: Yes.

MR MORRIS: - - - and let’s be fair about that, how much they wish to or are able to accept. Again, they deal very much in peaks and troughs with - - -

MS HIRD: Yes.

MR MORRIS: - - - demands as well. So they have some real considerations that they have to weigh up from the services they provide, but at the end of the day, it really is just a commercial decision for us. We would like to have the flexibility to

have an approval that allows us to investigate and work with council to come up with a long-term sustainable solution that can see vast majority of that stream, being water being reused.

5 PROF MACKAY: Okay. So if I can reflect that back, the intention and desire is to have treatment management onsite?

MR MORRIS: Yes.

10 PROF MACKAY: The way in which the application is framed and I think the way in which the department's assessment report is framed is to say, "Okay. Let's have some performance standards with some things that we measure" - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes.

15 PROF MACKAY: - - - "some counts," and insofar as you might find, down the track, actually, for your numbers and whatever, those performance standards can't be met, you've got the send offsite option.

20 MR MORRIS: Correct.

PROF MACKAY: Or insofar as whatever else happens in terms of harvesting doesn't deal with nitrogen and phosphorus or – just - - -

25 MR MORRIS: That's - - -

PROF MACKAY: - - - it's just not going to be cost-effective - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes.

30 PROF MACKAY: - - - for a reason we haven't seen, you still have a rock-solid plan B which is - - -

MS HIRD: Yes.

35

MR MORRIS: Yes.

PROF MACKAY: - - - pay some money to have it shipped away.

40 MR MORRIS: A 100 per cent because we – if - - -

PROF MACKAY: So I've got that right? Yes.

45 MR MORRIS: You have, 100 per cent, got that right, Richard. If I didn't have that redundancy available - - -

MS HIRD: Yes.

MR MORRIS: - - - we wouldn't be operating. And so, so far as to say, if you decided to put a red line through the whole wastewater section of the draft conditions, that would not be detrimental to the project. It would be disappointing. It would – for me, personally, it would be disappointing in the sense that it doesn't
5 give us the opportunity to be more sustainable, and that's really what I'm hoping that we can achieve there.

MS HIRD: Thanks for that.

10 MR P. JONES: And I guess with a lot of modelling based around the wastewater and which indicates that it can be managed to within the requirements over a long term.

MR MORRIS: Yes.

15

MS HIRD: Yes.

MR MORRIS: And we've picked the most stringent numbers too in terms of the quality of that.

20

MS HIRD: I think the Queensland – yes, the section 68 process technically should issue – it's a fit for purpose kind of thing - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes.

25

MS HIRD: - - - we do a much more detailed analysis, and so - - -

MR MORRIS: Correct.

30 MS HIRD: - - - one of the issues is the faecal coliforms - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes.

MS HIRD: - - - and that can be managed in different ways, like you can have what we call holding periods where nobody's there and I think you sort of alluded to that. The other is the MMP. You've got to demonstrate that your harvest – it's not only in the reed bed, and the other one - - -

35

MR MORRIS: That's right. For the full lifecycle.

40

MS HIRD: - - - it's you're harvesting down of the full lifecycle.

MR MORRIS: Absolutely.

45 MS HIRD: So that's a little bit missing in what has been done to date - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes, it's understood.

MS HIRD: - - - that time. But, yes, absolutely.

MR MORRIS: Yes.

5 MS HIRD: All those options are there. So that's what we - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes.

MS HIRD: - - - would go through and then - - -

10 MR MORRIS: I think so.

MS HIRD: - - - you work out - - -

15 MR MORRIS: Correct, yes. I think, yes, we did mention to the department - - -

MS HIRD: Yes.

MR MORRIS: - - - it would be great if we get to choose, you know, the technology
20 fix within – you guys – at the end of the day, you guys set the discharge limits, and if
we can meet them in a system that is amenable to the registry authority being Byron
Shire Council and fits with under your approval, then we will go forward on that
basis.

25 MS HIRD: Well, it's like your noise thing - - -

MR MORRIS: Correct.

MS HIRD: You haven't asked for a licence to pollute water and so - - -

30 MR MORRIS: Yes.

MS HIRD: - - - your aim is not to do that.

35 MR MORRIS: Correct.

MS HIRD: So it's virtually nil.

MR MORRIS: Yes.

40 MS HIRD: Yes. Yes.

MR MORRIS: Exactly. Yes.

45 PROF MACKAY: Andrew.

MR S. CONNELLY: Phil, you should have announced your name.

MR JONES: Yes. Apologies. Phil Jones.

PROF MACKAY: Thanks, Steve.

5 MS HIRD: I didn't - - -

MR MORRIS: And that was Steve Connelly.

MR HUTTON: Yes.

10

MS HIRD: I have the only female voice.

PROF MACKAY: Yes.

15 MS HIRD: So I'm lucky. Yes.

MR HUTTON: Just a more broad question. I guess you've had the benefit of the trial period. I'm keen – and you've touched on traffic and noise as two key issues. But I'm also keen to hear from you, in your words, some of the other learnings and lessons that have come out of that trial period that you've taken forward in this application. Have you got some other examples and, you know, lessons learned, I guess, from that trial period?

MR MORRIS: Well, look, one of the big things was that the trial approval that we were granted was a huge disincentive for us to be able to engage with the community, both in terms of providing a world-class venue – to a local catchment, to a local community. And so it was only at MOD 3, when we were able to also allow up to 10 community event days up to 1500, that we were able to capitalise on that, not in a monetary term, because we didn't charge for the venue, but for us to be able to start to genuinely create some relationships with the community.

And I think it was at that point when we started to bring on board a number of events, such as the Far North Coast Zone Cross Country – which has 11 schools, from Tweed Heads to Evans Head, and 500 students, and about that many parents that came down and saw the place, because they weren't our normal demographic, from the events, and they could see what a wonderful place it was – through to the equestrian endurance horse event as well, so that I think we've been able to demonstrate more clearly the benefits that're available to the community, that we weren't before.

40

And I think that was one of the learnings, that you have to bring the community along with you. And I'm very keen, if this approval gets up, that, for example, where we've asked for events up to 25,000, be they a one-day or a combined – that they might start to be events that, you know – we here collectively would be more interested in going to something like Fleetwood Mac or Elton John. So again, changing the demographic, because while we've got two very successful national

45

and internationally recognised events at this venue, there's so much more that can be done.

5 And that can even lend itself to partnering with universities, partnering with some of the TAFEs and other institutes. I mean, we work very closely with the Madhima Gulgan Bush Regeneration Team, who've been working on our site for nearly a decade now, local Indigenous people that have been teaching us a lot about the land. And most recently – we just had an event called the Fields of Healing. And there were Indigenous leaders from all round the world that came to that. And that was a particularly successful event, because there were a lot of people that came to that event that do not like - - -

MR CONNELLY: Rock and roll.

15 MR MORRIS: - - - rock and roll and who – you know, what our main bread and butter is. But, you know, I'm not going to say they've changed their mind. But they did get to come firsthand - - -

MR HUTTON: Yes.

20 MR MORRIS: Feel at peace with the property and have a look around in a non-threatening way. So, look, if I could be brutally honest as well, Andrew, I think probably the – you know, my owners would probably choke if I said this. But I think in retrospect, in hindsight, the decision by the Planning and Assessment Commission to require a trial was, in fact, very good thing, because it did give us both the motivation but also the opportunity to really develop a range of systems and processes which, I think, if you look at the framework that I've alluded to, is far and above what you would see for other outdoor events and, you know, even events that're held in the Domain or in Centennial Park. I don't think they'd have that level of detail attached to them.

30 MR HUTTON: So as part of your application, you proposed a staged – incremental stage increase in patrons which is consistent with the previous finding. I'm interested about you adopting that approach rather than putting forward an application that was to take it to the 42 and a half or 50,000 people.

MR MORRIS: Okay.

MR HUTTON: Talk us through that.

40 MR MORRIS: Well, if you recall, the department did recommend 50,000 back in 2012 - - -

MR HUTTON: Yes.

45 MR MORRIS: - - - before it was decided that there should be glide path.

MR HUTTON: Yes.

MR MORRIS: We've successfully operated an event at 35,000, 32 and a half thousand and 25,000. So we've already got those milestones well and truly done.
5 We have a whole range of the government agencies that are responsible are involved, recognising that they were well-managed events at those levels. We made a decision that we felt it would be the most appropriate glide path to have – still have those incremental increases. What has been recommended is slightly different to what we've asked for. We did believe that 42,554 Splendour-only was an achievable
10 stepping stone, if you like, and we did that because we felt it would be disingenuous to just jump to that higher level when, in fact, we've had this historical pathway of incremental increases.

Now, the framework that has been proffered by the department is now looking at
15 5000-person increments, and I think they've included in there a recognition of past performance so that that might be next event from Splendour, as an example, starts at 40,000 and then goes to 45 and to 50. Now, drilling into why they've made those decisions, it has really come from the RMS. The RMS are a very risk-adverse organisation and, you know, rightly so with the activity they deal with. And so in
20 their responsive submission they talked about that incremental increase, and I think the department has adopted it on that basis. Not something – you know, we would prefer – it has been nearly 10 years now. We would prefer that we were able to get to 50 in less jumps. But, you know, we're willing to accept what has been included in the assessment report.

25 Having said that, though, we would like to bring to your attention – and I will move to Steve – Steve, you can probably highlight them on this – in relation to Falls Festival, because we believe we've already got runs on the board with them that we would like to be able to start at a higher level there.

30 MR CONNELLY: Yes. So Steve Connelly, for the tape. We think the consent conditions that have been drafted are pretty good. They're logical and coherent and we've wrestled with some other ones before, and we've looked at consent conditions from other sides and we're pretty happy. There are two things we would like to
35 change, though. We think that the 5000 steps are too small. We've got a need to make the site work, and it requires much more infrastructure to be built to be – to work at its most efficient way, and so we will be putting to you in the oral submissions we make in the locality that we think the steps that are set out in the EIS are the appropriate ones. So the 42 and a half and then 50.

40 And the other thing we would like to do is the consent as drafted as allows for recognition in relation to the Splendour in the Grass of the historic successful approvals, and a performance report basis that allows it to increment up to a level of
45 40,000 if the other site infrastructure, external site infrastructure is built. So rely on the fact that you've done a 35,000 successfully. To go to 40 or more, things need to be built. And if we're able to build them in time, then we could do that. We would basically like the same provisions to apply to the Falls Festival. So at the moment,

that element of relying on the fact that the site has completed satisfactorily a 35,000 event, we can't see any reason why the consent can't reflect the ability to rely on that satisfactory performance to run a Falls Festival at that point in time.

5 MS HIRD: So all those extra toilet blocks would be constructed - - -

MR CONNELLY: Of course, yes.

10 MS HIRD: - - - at that stage and we would have resolved the wastewater issue one way or another.

MR CONNELLY: Yes.

MR MORRIS: That's right.

15

MR CONNELLY: Yes. For the – for Splendour?

MS HIRD: Yes.

20 MR CONNELLY: Yes. For Falls - - -

MS HIRD: Falls? No?

MR CONNELLY: Well, it won't need any additional - - -

25

MR MORRIS: No.

MR CONNELLY: - - - external works to be completed. The external works - - -

30 MR MORRIS: Would have been done from Splendour.

MR CONNELLY: Yes. Yes, true.

35 MR MORRIS: But it will benefit from the additional infrastructure work such as the Wooyung Road egress/ingress and the gate A change for the public transport. So just vicariously, it will have an easier operational capacity. I think the argument we're saying here is that we've done a 35,000 and a 32. Why can't Falls, if it could sell the tickets to 35, just automatically go to that, subject to the infrastructure that we've nominated, then that has been nominated for built prior to Splendour going to 40.

40

MS HIRD: So there would be - - -

PROF MACKAY: Except that event - - -

45 MS HIRD: - - - issue.

PROF MACKAY: Sorry.

MS HIRD: Sorry. There would be a traffic - - -

5 PROF MACKAY: I was going to say, this particular table 5 indicates that a number of the area facility and works are non-specific and not linked to patron numbers, and the annotation talks about constructed progressively as funding permits.

MR MORRIS: That's right. So they're not critical in the sense that we couldn't actually operate the event. They are nice to have, if you like.

10 PROF MACKAY: Yes.

MR MORRIS: So, you know, for example - - -

MR CONNELLY: Rather, the ones that are dearest required.

15 MR MORRIS: Yes.

PROF MACKAY: Yes.

20 MR CONNELLY: So the 42 and the - - -

PROF MACKAY: Yes.

MR CONNELLY: - - - 50 steps, they - - -

25 PROF MACKAY: Which relate to – principally relate to car parking and transport.

MR MORRIS: Transport. That's right.

30 PROF MACKAY: Access to the site.

MR MORRIS: That's exactly right.

MR CONNELLY: Yes.

35 PROF MACKAY: That's your application, isn't it?

MR MORRIS: Correct.

40 MR CONNELLY: Yes.

PROF MACKAY: Yes.

MR MORRIS: That is.

45 PROF MACKAY: So most of that is consistent with the draft consent conditions, but there are some subtle – there are some changes.

MR MORRIS: That's right.

MR CONNELLY: Yes.

5 PROF MACKAY: Yes, yes. Okay.

MR MORRIS: It really just is in terms of that glide path, but it – from a commerciality point of view, it is very important for Falls. I mean, the one thing that worries me as a venue operator is that an event is capable of selling a particular
10 number of tickets and that if it can't be accommodated at our venue, that it, you know, feasibly could be moved to South East Queensland, as an example. So I'm trying to protect that, and I think if you look at it, you know, on a fairness basis and a performance basis, the fact that we've had events at that level already with the existing infrastructure – and we're saying, can we have Falls at that level, but it will
15 also have the additional infrastructure that we've promised to do – that it – you know, it stands on its merit. So - - -

PROF MACKAY: I may have missed this. But is there any operating subtlety – difference between the two? Is there any sort of structural reason, in terms of format,
20 content, program - - -

MR MORRIS: No.

PROF MACKAY: - - - stages arrangement, that you - - -
25

MR MORRIS: No.

MR CONNELLY: They - - -

30 PROF MACKAY: - - - would consider them differently?

MS HIRD: There's traffic, isn't there? Because you've got more traffic around Christmastime than you do in July.

35 MR MORRIS: You've got some - - -

PROF MACKAY: Okay.

MR MORRIS: - - - additional background.
40

MS HIRD: Yes.

PROF MACKAY: Okay.

45 MR MORRIS: But, you know, the modelling and even, you know, comments from RMS is that they're not, you know - - -

- MS HIRD: Yes.
- MR MORRIS: They're not too concerned about that. So - - -
- 5 MR CONNELLY: Yes. So there are things that the different promoters do to make their venue or their festival look different to the other. But in the main - - -
- MR MORRIS: They're fairly cosmetic.
- 10 MR CONNELLY: - - - they are more subtleties with marketing and signage and not so much to do with the physical - - -
- PROF MACKAY: Yes.
- 15 MR CONNELLY: - - - characteristics for the layout.
- PROF MACKAY: So - - -
- MR MORRIS: I believe you – we've got a site visit - - -
- 20 MS HIRD: Yes.
- MR MORRIS: On the 11th, I think it is.
- 25 MR J. VAN DEN BRANDE: Tuesday.
- MS HIRD: Yes. Tuesday. Yes.
- MR MORRIS: So that'll be the first few days of bump-in for Falls Festival. So you guys will need to have been inducted online. So I'll have those details to Jorge and, you know, all the appropriate - - -
- 30 MS HIRD: So I won't be able to wear my high heels. Is that it?
- 35 MR MORRIS: No. It'll be enclosed shoes and a broad-brimmed hat - - -
- MR CONNELLY: Steel-cap.
- MR MORRIS: - - - and long sleeves and all that. But, you know, all joking aside, it'll give you an opportunity to actually just start to see some of the activities that're onsite. So – and look, I'm – sorry. I don't have a watch on me. What – how we're going for time - - -
- 40 MR HUTTON: No. Good. Good.
- 45 MR VAN DEN BRANDE: 4 o'clock. It's 4 o'clock.

MR MORRIS: We're okay? Great.

MR HUTTON: So can you define "bump-in". That's the period that – as I understand it, that leads up to a festival. So we're not talking about patrons turning
5 up.

MR MORRIS: That's correct.

MR HUTTON: We're talking about stages and - - -

10 MR MORRIS: That's right.

MR HUTTON: - - - those sorts of things.

15 MR MORRIS: So different events have different levels of complexity. Splendour in the Grass is possibly the most complex - - -

MR HUTTON: Yes.

20 MR MORRIS: - - - event to put on, because the promoter is so focused on providing such a broad range of offerings. So, you know, everything from, you know, the Forum, which is a 400-person tent that has, you know, Q&A – and you – we usually get Tony Jones along to speak there – through to the Science Tent through to having a Moët bar through to having cinema - - -

25 MR CONNELLY: Little Splendour.

MR MORRIS: Yes, Little Splendour. So – and it's very, very detailed, and so the bump-in period typically is that 21-day period whereby the site is put together, and
30 that includes all of the staging and all of the temporary structures, and then the décor and the fitting out, and then the final range of things such as, you know, all the emergency evacuation and extinguishers and signage and camping layouts and all of those sorts of things. Typically, it's a bit of a J-curve, the way that it operates, so the first week of bump-in, there's probably no more than 20 or 25 people, 30, you know
35 – sometimes – it depends on the day, but typically, it's fairly low numbers of human beings just doing, sort of, movement of equipment and stuff on site to get ready for – on the second week when we have more people there, and maybe by the third week, we have four or five hundred people working there.

40 This is a 660-acre property. When you come to site, you'll understand the enormity of the site. You'll understand the buffers that we have there. We've never had a complaint received at the hotline or at my office number in relation to anything to do with bump-in, so it's such a big site that, you know, these sorts of activities can take place and it's – you know, no one would really know.

45 MR CONNELLY: But it is truly fantastic to see these people build a town, effectively, in a couple of weeks.

MR HUTTON: In 21 days.

MR CONNELLY: Yes.

5 MR HUTTON: And then so bump out, is it a similar period?

MR MORRIS: It is. It's about 14 days bump out.

MR HUTTON: Right.

10

MR MORRIS: So typically, it's easier to pack down for some strange reason than
- - -

MS HIRD: New lexicon.

15

MR MORRIS: It's like a big Rubik's cube, I think, is probably the best way to put
it. Yes.

20

MS HIRD: Just one other question, though, on a condition of consent where you're
going to give one dollar per patron to the council, is that aligned to the cost of living
or something? I'm just imagining in 2035 that one dollar may not be - - -

25

MR MORRIS: Look, it mightn't be. I've met with Simon Richardson, the mayor,
about six times on this now. He was using us as a bit of spearhead to – in his
frustration that the State Government wouldn't allow a bed tax of any description,
hence, you know, we have this, as I alluded to before, a rate base that doesn't really
cover the cost of having 2.1 million visitors to the site – or to the region, sorry.

30

MS HIRD: Yes, yes.

35

MR MORRIS: So he was looking for a voluntary contribution scheme whereby
festivals would charge their patrons a particular figure, and it landed at a dollar. And
some of the accommodation providers would also provide a similar or potentially
more because they're there permanently. What we've done under the voluntary – or
the proposed voluntary planning agreement is that we've said we would do up to
120,000, which, on the numbers at the moment, would be more than a dollar per
patron. But again, the mechanics of it need to be finalised by the - - -

40

MS HIRD: Yes, yes.

MR MORRIS: By the council. I think our only caveat on all of that was, "Please
spend the money in Brunswick Heads and North", because that's the catchment we
live in - - -

45

MS HIRD: That's right.

- MR MORRIS: - - - and operate in, and it would be appropriate. That's above and beyond the - - -
- MS HIRD: Developer, yes – contribution.
- 5 MR MORRIS: Well, even that aside - - -
- MS HIRD: Yes.
- 10 MR MORRIS: Sorry, I was going to say the community grants fund, which is another dollar per person which we've been doing for, you know, the last 11 events and has generated, you know, some four or five hundred thousand dollars for local communities and schools and the like. So we're very popular with the local schools, actually. So – particularly Ocean Shores. They've benefited from a now what will
15 be a \$50,000 music grants program. So that has been great for them.
- PROF MACKAY: Other questions? I think I'm out.
- MR HUTTON: Yes, I think I'm happy, thanks, Chair. Yes.
- 20 PROF MACKAY: Catherine?
- MS HIRD: Yes, I think we're okay. So we may see some of you on our site visit; is that right? If we've got any more.
- 25 MR MORRIS: Can I just ask, Jorge had asked that I – he has invited some community groups to come along to the site visit. I'm just a little bit lacking in the understanding of what that sort of format would be and what I should be prepared for in terms - - -
- 30 PROF MACKAY: Thank - - -
- MR MORRIS: - - - of moving people around the site.
- 35 PROF MACKAY: Thank you. That's a great question, and thanks. A fundamental sort of operating ethos of the Independent Planning Commission is the transparency piece, so the site visit is about the Commissioners understanding the place and being informed. So insofar as people want to make representations, public meeting or meeting like this – that's the time to be saying, "We want some changes to the
40 proposed consent conditions." Public meeting is the time for people to say, "This is where I live. This is my noise issue." A site visit is simply about informing us, so why are we seeking to extend the invitation to the public? It's so that they can see what happens, so it's transparent.
- 45 MR MORRIS: Yes.

PROF MACKAY: I will not have them make representations. The one thing they can do is say, "Look, can we just stop here. I'd like to point out that that's my house over there."

5 MS HIRD: Yes.

MR MORRIS: Yes.

10 PROF MACKAY: So we're seeing something they've made reference to in the public meeting the previous day.

MR MORRIS: Sure. Yes.

15 PROF MACKAY: We may stop and say, "Look, could someone please explain to us where would the stage be. Which way would it face?"

MR MORRIS: Yes.

20 PROF MACKAY: "Oh, is that noise receptor 18? Now we get it."

MR MORRIS: Sure.

PROF MACKAY: That sort of discussion.

25 MR MORRIS: Yes.

PROF MACKAY: But we won't – again, with the proponent - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes.

30 PROF MACKAY: - - - if you start making representations, I'll – as politely as I can, but - - -

MR MORRIS: Yes.

35 PROF MACKAY: - - - very firmly shut you down.

MR MORRIS: Yes.

40 PROF MACKAY: So that's – so - - -

MR MORRIS: As the proponent, we won't be. I guess I just wanted to understand how - - -

45 PROF MACKAY: Yes, so that's the idea.

MR MORRIS: Yes.

PROF MACKAY: And I did just make a note then – have we made arrangements presumable for online inductions? I don't think we have very many registrants.

5 MR MORRIS: No, and, look, I've got that in train with Jorge. We're under control with that.

PROF MACKAY: Okay.

10 MR MORRIS: I'll get that out. You guys are going to have to undertake the competency-based online induction as well because I need everyone to be inducted that comes onto the site.

PROF MACKAY: Yes, understood.

15 MR MORRIS: We induct about 3000 over the people, so it's - - -

MR HUTTON: And through Jorge, if there's any PPE or - - -

20 MR MORRIS: Of course.

MR HUTTON: Please let us know.

MR MORRIS: Absolutely.

25 MR HUTTON: So we can come prepared.

MR MORRIS: In terms of the transportation, if it's acceptable to the Commissioners - - -

30 MR HUTTON: Yes.

MR MORRIS: - - - I propose that we use one of these facilities that we have there, which is a tractor with a very large trailer as long as this but it's been purpose-built with seating and a roof on it. That saves me hiring a bus if it's all right.

35 PROF MACKAY: Sounds good.

MS HIRD: Yes.

40 MR MORRIS: And – yes, it's – we move thousands of patrons that way, and it's licensed and safe and – as it would be. Excellent. Is there anything else, gentlemen, that - - -

45 MR CONNELLY: The edits to the conditions that we aspire to are at the back of this document that we handed up

PROF MACKAY: Thank you.

MS HIRD: Thank you.

PROF MACKAY: So if we – if – I just say - - -

5 MR MORRIS: Just – I think the last two pages there and - - -

PROF MACKAY: Okay. So on – so on the final two pages – final three pages of this document table today - - -

10 MR MORRIS: Yes.

PROF MACKAY: - - - are actual specific request to changes to the - - -

MR CONNELLY: Yes.

15 PROF MACKAY: - - - to the draft consent conditions. That’s very helpful. Thank you for highlighting them, Steve.

MR CONNELLY: Yes. So the bits that are for deletion are shown through in the cross through and changes and additional words are in red.

20 PROF MACKAY: Okay. Thank you for that. Okay. Can I just check whether there’s anything on the secretariat that we haven’t or should cover? No?

25 MR MORRIS: Sorry, may I ask one last question.

PROF MACKAY: Absolutely.

MR MORRIS: In terms of the site visit, there will be the site visit that’s just with the commissioners and the proponents. Is that correct for the – or are you doing it all in one go?

30 PROF MACKAY: I thought it was all in one.

35 MS HIRD: Yes.

MR MORRIS: All in one?

PROF MACKAY: I think the point is they just see what we see - - -

40 MR MORRIS: Easy. Easy.

PROF MACKAY: - - - so that the idea is that there’s just no secrets about this process.

45 MR MORRIS: Yes. Yes.

MS HIRD: Yes.

MR MORRIS: Hey, look, we - - -

5 PROF MACKAY: You want to give us this document, that's fine.

MR MORRIS: Yes, yes.

10 PROF MACKAY: It goes up on the website. People make a note of it.

MR MORRIS: That's fine, and, look, we've – we agree with that and I think we're being transparent. We've had nearly three community meetings. We've invited people onto the site and - - -

15 PROF MACKAY: Yes.

MR MORRIS: - - - we're very happy to walk them around, but - - -

20 PROF MACKAY: All right. Well, in that case, I will thank you again for joining - - -

MR MORRIS: Thank you, Richard.

25 PROF MACKAY: - - - us today and I will declare the meeting formally closed. Thank you.

MR MORRIS: Thank you.

30 **RECORDING CONCLUDED**

[4.07 pm]