

---

# MINUTES OF MEETING

## Liverpool/Campbelltown Community Liaison Group - Meeting 2

**DATE:** Thursday 13 August 2008 at 6:15 pm

**LOCATION:** Liverpool Central Library

**Chair:** Jim Morris

**Minutes:** Integrated Analysis Pty Ltd  
Rowena Lennings

**Community Representatives:**  
Mike Russell Liverpool  
William Rooney Liverpool

**ARTC:**  
Prue Hodgson Community Liaison Manager  
Greg Mullens Senior Project Manager  
Chris Kyriacou, Contractor, Seymour Whyte  
Matt Hurst Consultant, Planning Urban Futures  
Carlie Faint EMR (alternate)

**ICLR:**  
Rowena Lennings Integrated Analysis Pty Ltd

**Council:**  
Geoff Organ Liverpool Council  
Dick Webb Campbelltown Council

**Apologies:**  
Molly Thomas

### 1. Welcome, introductions, previous meeting record and matters arising - Chair

The Chair welcomed meeting attendees and made introductions.

There were some minor amendments to the previous meeting record.

Matters arising from the minutes not otherwise listed on the agenda:

- a) It was confirmed that lantana management falls within the parameters of the biodiversity sub-plan.
- b) It was explained that decisions regarding local traffic management should be referred

to the Traffic Committee in the relevant Local Government areas, however under the terms of the project approval consent cannot be withheld. ARTC confirmed that they would seek to negotiate mutually agreeable outcomes with Councils.

**2. Environmental Management Sub Plan – Carlie Faint**

A presentation was provided by Carlie Faint of the role of the EMR in the project  
There were no questions.

**3. Construction Overview – Greg Mullins, Project Director**

The Project Director outlined the proposed project start of September, with operational completion estimated at the end of 2009. He mentioned that station works and major associated works such as footbridges will be carried out by Gartner Rose. There will be five contractors in total and not all have been contracted yet.

**4. Constructor Introduction**

Chris Kyriacou from Seymour Whyte introduced himself and gave a brief rundown of their respective companies' achievements and current contracts.

**5. Community Involvement Plan – list of stakeholders**

ARTC Community Liaison Manager outlined upcoming communication activities and issued a list of stakeholders and requested feedback from community reps.

**6. Urban Design & Landscape Plan (UDLP)**

An overview of the UDLP was presented with examples shown of various types of walls and methods of beatification being used at stations in other areas.

Q. Who will have the responsibility for the budget for these works?

A. The contractors will administer the budget for these works however ARTC will provide direction.

Q. Where will the surface access road be located?

A. Generally between the track and the walls, however ARTC doesn't have an access road requirement.

ARTC confirmed that they are trying to retain a planting zone between the retaining walls and the noise walls and the CLG will be invited to consider the treatment of the retaining walls in more detail at future meetings.

Q. What is the process for community engagement in these decisions? A community representative made the point that although the Casula Powerhouse has state their preference for an industrial look for the retaining walls, the nearby residents of Casula should be consulted along as to the treatment of the retaining walls. ARTC agreed that this would be considered further.

A. ARTC went on to explain that affected residents are directly consulted regarding the noise walls and that Councils are considered to be major stakeholders in these decisions along with the CLG. The suggestion was made that community information days and surveys could be conducted to engage a broader spectrum of people in these decisions. The ICLR proposed to review the community engagement plans for these items and make additional recommendations if warranted.

Q. A community representative asked if he could bring visitors to the CLG meeting to discuss these issues.

A. The ICLR stated that visitors to CLGs is not a preferred way of consulting a broader cross-section of the community as this can be more effectively achieved through Community Information Days and other vehicles. ARTC confirmed that they would prefer community representatives to join the CLG.

A community representative noted that some people had told him that they been refused admission to the CLG. ARTC confirmed that they had not excluded any applicant and encouraged him to ask them to apply.

## **7. General Business**

The point was made that the information requested at the previous meeting had not yet been placed on the website.

## **8. Next Meeting**

When: Wednesday 10 September, 2008 at 6.15pm.