

MINUTES

Reference:	Kingston Arts Precinct (KAP) Project
Meeting Name:	KAP – Evo Energy SDA Substation Discussion 02
Client:	Australian Capital Territory (ACT) Government - Suburban Land Agency (SLA)
Meeting date / time:	Tuesday, 27 May 2025 – 11.30am
Meeting location:	Online (Microsoft Teams)

Attendees

[illegible]

Apologies

Name	Initials	Organisation	Role	Email

Item	Description	Action	Date
1.0	Welcome and Introduction		
1.1	- TG facilitated an introduction of all attendees, restating that we are in the process of submitting the SDA. - ED continued presentation of slide pack of SDA Comments as key topic for the meeting following on from the previous meeting held on 23/05/2025.		

MINUTES

Item	Description	Action	Date
2.0	New Evo Switching Stations		
2.1	AHj noted proposed location of new evo switching stations could be both located in a single yellow block shown in the image below, or separated out so one switching station is located in each yellow block, noting a minimum offset of 5 – 6m must be maintained from the building and wall. 		
	- RW noted the requirement to discuss this further with DL offline. - RW queried duration of time required for Evo to develop drawings for switching stations and incoming cables. - NK noted preference is to have switching stations kept together, Evo currently waiting on QL-B survey results to see where the cables in the ground are for confirmation of switching station locations. Engagement with SafeEarth to make sure there is no impact on public safety is also required for selection of location. Finalised location will take approx. 1 month. - RW noted this group will reconvene in 1 month to review.		
3.0	SDA Feedback		
3.1	- Trees: - Boundary location around substation to be confirmed post RW discussion with DL. - RM noted tree canopy gets bigger over time and project is to comply with Evo requirements and to look at government requirements for trees and tree protection zones for protected trees. Cables need to be 1.5m from canopy as per Evo requirement, Government requirement is 2m distance and requires approval. - RM noted project needs to see if we can find enough clear space from existing assets to meet everyone's requirements.		
3.2	- HV Cables - ED queried if any further detail can be provided on the HV cables? - TA noted that discussion is to be offline between RW and Evo. - RW noted no surface junction boxes are required. RW noted Evo consultant is currently developing a drawing and design and will issue through to project team when it is received.		
3.3	- Substation - SJ noted a 10m setback from the substation has been included and highlighted on the drawings. The approach taken is that as a zone where we need to consider fire protection, buildings will not be occupied like the current heritage building. - Public paths are within the 10m zone.		

MINUTES

Item	Description	Action	Date
	○ Arup to work with Evo to understand the setback requirements ○ SJ noted that the blast walls were constructed in 2022 and project requests if blast studies conducted and any additional information can be provided ○ RM noted the Evo team will dig back through documentation to see if this can be made available. ○ RW queried if the 10m setback is insufficient, what would the zone distance be? ○ RM noted Evo will need to review this.		
	● Levels: ○ ED noted the removal of soil highlighted over the HV cable located behind the substation appears to be removal of soil of an artificial mound. ○ CD noted the concern was that if the cable rating would be reduced as these are feeder cables and we need to maintain minimum depth for cable ratings. Any soil removal risks those assets. Evo accept minimum depth levels in that area and request the design team provide what the ground level will be so Evo can assess and know if works will need to be done.		
3.4	○ ED noted ground levels across the entire site will be changing and a closer detailed review will need to be undertaken to confirm all levels. Further noting that many instances of the existing conditions have significantly less cover than the typical minimum depth required. ▪ Evo noted they would need to assess on case-by-case basis where assets do not have minimum depth coverage. ○ ED queried what the general requirement is for depth increase ○ RM noted it would be best to conduct pothole surveys to validate cable depths.		

4.0 Action Items

1	RW to meet with DL and discuss switching stations and boundary offsets offline.	SLA	6-Jun-25
2	RW to issue HV cable drawings when they are completed by Evo.	SLA	TBC
3	RM to issue blast wall studies and drawings if they can be made available.	EVO	10-Jun-25

Meeting concluded at 12.30pm. Minutes taken by [REDACTED]