

Record of key issues (Questions or comments raised by community)

Issue	Key points
Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Query over whether the bleachers are covered in the design submitted as part of the Development Application (DA). • Query over what is intended by the facilities – reference to preschool. • Concern about the process and question about intent – putting in a preschool application on land not zoned for that purpose and no preschool planned for the new building. • Concern that an incorrect DA was submitted without correction – question over whether the application should have been refused upfront. • Concern over the proposed height of the building and question over who really needs it. • Question over how vandalism will be prevented i.e. will basketball courts be fenced? • Query over the process for change of use at a later date.
DA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question over the timing of the lease consideration and the DA consultation • DA consultation needs to be longer and all cards should be on the table, with more detail against the criteria. • Why was DA able to be lodged? • DA should be withdrawn.
Consultation and community engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over the lack of consultation. • Neighbours should include all those on the edge of the park and should be considered for future consultation. • Comment that a good way to restore trust would be to withdraw the DA and resubmit after proper consultation. • Community would like to be engaged in whatever happens from here.
Roads and traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that the development is not taking into account the increase in traffic through the suburb. • Request that Roads ACT address this for a number of suburbs – north and south. • ACT P&C Association parent feeling that safety outside schools is being compromised. • Would like to see traffic and road analysis to address and calm the traffic – new car park will assist the issue but technical analysis and data tracking by Roads ACT is needed. • Detailed traffic assessment is needed as part of the process. • Reiteration of need for engagement with Roads ACT. • Safety of children and parents is paramount. • Regarding any plans for the remnant portion of lease. Is it all for car parks? What does trafficable area really mean?
Process and information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Query over how long the development will take.
Community use and access to oval and proposed facility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity over how the schools will access the site is needed. • Commitment to it being available as a community facility needs to be considered and upheld in the long term. • Access for community and other schools – will it be available?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining an oval does not require a multi-million dollar development on the oval to bring it back on line. • How will the rest of the community be catered for? It is not just about schools. • The community values open space – not minimisation of the available space. • What level of use would this really have given location to Southwell Park? • Will government maintain this oval to the level of Southwell if a large building is built? • Defined community use needs to be clarified and considered. • Concern that the open space will never be retrieved once the structure is built. • The need for the community has not been assessed. • Percentage of time and availability to other schools is critical and needs clarity. • Making spaces more usable is beneficial. • Can the draft agreement between school principals about access arrangements be made available? • Strategic and sensible commitment to access for other schools is needed and in an ongoing way.
Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue with public land-take creep. • Query about vandalism and fencing. • Lack of clarity around proposed use of the site in relation to basketball courts, preschool and community meeting space. • Noise issues should be considered. • Need to consider the future with light rail, more people in the area and the possible need for more facilities.
Sub-lease	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question over whether there are any plans for the remnant part of the car park site within the sub-lease. • Question over how long the sub-lease lasts and what happens when it expires. • Question over why SRS isn't building the facility if the restoration of the oval is a priority. • Query over why SRS is sub-letting urban open space to a private school • Can the draft terms of a sub-lease be made available?
Demographics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average age of Lyneham residents is not reflected in need for a sportsground.
Community confidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue of confidence given the way this process has been managed. Extended consultation and open dialogue will help general levels of trust. • Real purpose of project is unclear – process to date has reduced community trust.