

Mistake in Inquiry testimony re the site purchase, 31 July 2018.

This paper demonstrates that false evidence was given at the Inquiry hearing of Monday, 28 May 2018. The relevant extract comes from the transcript, page 11-12.

The Hon. SHAYNE MALLARD: *But there was a council resolution of a previously elected council in support of the sale and the Powerhouse project?*

Mr DYER: *Yes, that is right.*

The Hon. SHAYNE MALLARD: *So that was guiding Ms Chadwick in her deliberations.*

Mr DYER: *This process [land sale] had been aligned with the council policy from the previous council—*

The Hon. SHAYNE MALLARD: *That is right.*

Mr DYER: *—and all the way through to the administration period, yes.*

The Hon. SHAYNE MALLARD: *It is important to note that.*

Mr DYER: *I am not sure that it is suggested that we were not involved. We were. We were involved in the negotiation with State Government Property for the sale of the land, the option arrangements on the land.*

The Hon. WALT SECORD: *Can you take me through it? Can you recall when those discussions began?*

Mr DYER: *As I said, I think they commenced in 2015 and they concluded—is that right? I am sorry, I have got my dates mixed again. They probably commenced in late 2016—that is better—and were finalised in 2017, as we previously stated.*

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: *Was there a rush to get it done before the administrator left?*

Mr DYER: *No, I would not describe it as a rush to get it done.*

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: *How would you describe it then?*

Mr DYER: *The negotiations had been undertaken over quite a protracted period. In fact, it was a process which took longer than I would have liked it to. But we got it done and took it to a council meeting on July 27, as I understand, for authorisation.*

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: *For the signature to happen.*

The facts are simple: the previous (democratically elected) had been resolutely opposed to the sale of the riverside land for the purpose of building the museum.

The relevant resolutions are **Resolution 16308, 14 December 2015; Resolution 16353, 14 January 2016; and Resolution 16646, 9 May 2016.** The fact that it was discussed at the 9 May 2016 meeting, the last meeting of the elected council, gives clear indication of the importance placed by the elected council on the views expressed.

Resolution 16308 (Minutes, 14 December 2015)

That Council receive and note the draft minutes of the Riverside Theatres Advisory Board meeting held on 26 November 2015, however Council wishes to disagree with comments in the Minutes under Item 3, Parramatta Culture Arts and Entertainment Plan as it is not necessarily the view of Council that the Riverbank Site would be supported as the preferred site for the relocation of the Powerhouse Museum in Parramatta.

Resolution 16353 (Minutes, 14 January 2016)

... included the following recommendations in Suspension of Standing Orders, re the relocation of the Powerhouse Museum, where' The Lord Mayor ruled that the matter was one of urgency'. Resolved:

1. **That** the Lord Mayor write to the relevant Ministers expressing our community's concern about the possible relocation of Powerhouse Museum.
2. **That** Parramatta City Council, through the Lord Mayor, commence a campaign supporting the possible relocation of the Powerhouse Museum to be at Parramatta Golf Course located near Parramatta High School or at Old King school or the Parramatta Jail site and the reasons therefore.
3. **That** the campaign consist of a meeting to be arranged via the state members between the Lord Mayor and the Minister, appropriate correspondence to the relevant local Members of Parliament and an appropriate media campaign.
4. **That** the community be made aware of the state government agenda on the Powerhouse Museum.
5. **That** it be noted it is imperative that the state government understand that Parramatta City Council has policy and budget approved for the part of River.
6. **That** Parramatta City Council outline the money invested through purchase of properties for Parramatta City Council to achieve our vision for our River foreshore.
7. **That** it be noted if the government insists or force the location of the Powerhouse Museum on our River foreshore, it will result in a negative impact on Parramatta City Council and its vision as a River City and this is the only parcel of land that our Council can develop and invest in a public domain that will be beneficial to our local residents and business.
8. Further, that the option of Powerhouse Museum being located on the Riverbank Foreshore will lead to a financial implication for Parramatta City Council and the City.

Resolution 16571, Minutes 11 April 2016 (p22)

'The Lord Mayor provided details on the State Government's recent selection of the Parramatta River Foreshore as the preferred site for the new Powerhouse Museum together with advice on the recent meeting held with the Minister for Infrastructure. **Councillor Chedid**

raised concerns that the footprint of the proposal may eliminate Council's vision for the Riverbank Foreshores and may have an impact on the current Expression of Interest for this area.'

Resolved: *That Council staff provide a report on the action that has transpired to date in relation to the relocation of the Powerhouse Museum.*

Resolution 16646, Minutes, 9 May 2016 (p22)

At the very last meeting of the elected council The Lord Mayor ruled that a motion to suspend standing orders to consider the Powerhouse Museum and the Riverbank was one of urgency. It was resolved:

(a) *That Council write to the relevant Minister referencing the agreement, in principle, that the State Government would design the new Powerhouse Museum within the appropriate Council footprint to ensure that the Museum does not disadvantage Council in achieving its vision for the river and not disadvantage Council's strategic asset on the site.*

(b) *Further, that a report be prepared outlining the discussions that have taken place to date.*

(There is no evidence that any such report has ever been made as part of the assessment process. We have been seeking the details of all such discussions for over two years, but cannot obtain them. There is no other discussion of the project in the minutes of the former elected council).