



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-965015

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING

**RE: LOCOMOTIVE WORKSHOPS PROJECT,
AUSTRALIAN TECHNOLOGY PARK**

PANEL:

**JOHN HANN
PROF ZADA LIPMAN
ADRIAN PILTON**

ASSISTING PANEL:

MATTHEW TODD-JONES

LOCATION:

**OXFORD ROOM 1
RYDGES SYDNEY CENTRAL
28 ALBION STREET
SURRY HILLS, NEW SOUTH WALES**

DATE:

10.03 AM, FRIDAY, 30 NOVEMBER 2018

MR J. HANN: Good morning, everybody. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and I would also like to pay my respects to their elders past and present and to the elders from other communities who may be here today. Welcome to this public meeting for the two
5 state significant development applications for Mirvac Projects Proprietary Limited seeking approval for the adaptive re-use of the Locomotive Workshop at the Australian Technology Park in Eveleigh for commercial and retail uses. My name is John Hann. I am the chair of this Independent Planning Commission New South Wales panel which has been appointed to determine these applications. Joining me
10 on the panel are Commissioners Zada Lipman and Adrian Pilton and Matthew Todd-Jones from the Commission Secretariat.

So before I continue, I would like to state that all appointed Commissioners must make an annual declaration of interest identifying potential conflicts with their
15 appointed role. For the record – thank you – for the record, we are unaware of any conflicts in relation to our determination of these applications. You can find additional information on the way we manage potential conflicts in our policy paper which is available on the Commission’s website. In the interests of openness and transparency, today’s meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced
20 and made available on the Commission’s website.

I would also like to note that while the Commission generally hold meetings in the area in which the subject land is located, due to the availability of constraints and being in the Redfern area, it was not possible on this occasion. So the main
25 purpose – today’s public meeting gives us an opportunity to hear your views on the assessment report prepared by the Department of Planning and Environment, and before we determine the development applications. So where are we in the process? This meeting is one part of our decision-making process. We also have met with the Department of Planning and Environment and the applicant and we visited the site.
30

The Commission may also convene with relevant stakeholders if clarification or additional information is required on matters raised. Records of all meetings will be included in our determination report which we published on the Commission’s website. So the next steps. Following today’s meeting, we will endeavour to
35 determine the development application as soon as possible; however, there may be delays if we need additional information. So some ground rules for today. Before we hear from our first registered speaker, I would like to lay some ground rules that we expect everyone that is taking part in today’s meeting to follow.

40 First, today’s meeting is not a debate. Our panel will not take questions from the floor and there are no interjections allowed. Our aim is to provide maximum opportunity for people to speak and be heard. Public speaking can be an ordeal for many people. Though you may not agree with everything you hear today, each speaker is – has the right to be treated with respect and heard in silence. Today’s
45 focus is public consultation. Our panel is here to listen, not to comment. You may

ask questions for clarification, but this usually unnecessary. It will be most beneficial if your presentation is focused on the issues of particular concern to you. It's important that everyone registered to speak receives a fair share of time. I will enforce the time keeping rules.

5

As chair, I reserve the right to allow additional time for provision of technical materials. A warning bell will sound one minute before the speaker's allotted time is up and again when it runs out, so if you could please respect these time limits. If there are issues where you're unable to address or you feel you could not completely address in the allocated time, we would encourage you to provide a written statement to the Commission. Written submissions should be made to us within the next seven days or the seven days from this meeting. Though we will strive to stick to our schedule today, speakers sometimes don't show or decide not to speak. If you know someone who will not be attending and it registered to speak, if you could just let Matthew know, that would be much appreciated. If you would like to project something onto the screen, please give it to Matthew before your presentation.

If you have a copy of your presentation, it would be appreciated if you could provide a copy to the Secretary after you speak. Please note any information you give us may be made public. The Commission's privacy statement governs our approach to your information. If you would like a copy of our privacy statement, you can obtain one from the Secretary or you can download it from our website. Audio recordings of this meeting are not allowed except for the official recording for transcript purposes. Notes may be made throughout the day on issues raised and they will be summarised in our determination report. And, finally, I would like everyone present, if you could please switch off your mobile phones to silent. And so thank you. If I could call the first speaker. So, Roger Jowett.

MR R. JOWETT: Commissioners, thanks very much for the opportunity to address you today on these vital issues. Just a procedural matter. I've taken the opportunity to prepare a draft of the Association's submissions, and that draft includes a number of exhibits, probably 7 or 8, that might facilitate, hopefully, your understanding of our submissions if I was to distribute a copy of each of those documents in a consolidated form to each of the Commissioners.

35

MR HANN: That would be fine. If you could provide it to Matthew, that's the best thing to do, Roger. Thank you very much.

MR JOWETT: Thank you very much, Commissioners. In terms of the RTBURMA submission framework, we have commenced with a general background, and we think that's important because of the uniqueness of these two DA applications. And we say that with an understanding that the scope of the DAs, in my view, and I'm not quite sure, is probably a first for the Planning Assessment Commission. I say that because in relation to heritage interpretation, the substance of these applications covers three areas. It covers the building fabric. It covers the heritage movable collection.

45

And it covers social and labour history. Overwhelming, when one looks at the statutory framework in New South Wales and the applications that have been made, invariably if they – to my knowledge, invariably they have heritage implications, then that heritage implication is confined to the built fabric, or in simple terms, the buildings. Now, this isn't the case in those circumstances, and the history of this matter which has been going on for some 30 years, is that each of these components form what we call from the Association with tongue in cheek, is the BMW of heritage interpretation, that is, buildings, machines and workers. So I think that's an important point to make.

In terms of why this application is – has a further degree of uniqueness, is the public covenant which attaches to the sale of the ATP to a private sector owner. Now, in the history of New South Wales, I believe this is the first detail covenant to apply in these circumstances of covering those three areas, and of course, one presumes what the framers and implementers of that framework were attempting to achieve, was the ensuring of the underpinning documents of the covenant were adhered to. So that's an important issue of a question forming: have those public covenants and their underpinning documents been complied with? Now, that was a question which was raised in the – sorry, in the Department's assessment report, but was not responded to.

Now, it is a vexed issue, and we have, in our submission, made a number of references to it. The third area which I believe has a degree of uniqueness, is the fact that this is the second adaptive reuse for the Locomotive Workshops. In summary, we argue as an organisation, that the applications before you before the people of New South Wales who owned and operated through a public instrumentality, a major public workshop for over 100 years. So tens of thousands of workers, not only in that workshop but throughout New South Wales railway systems, have an attachment, and in conjunction with the community, with these heritage facilitates.

Why we say once in a generation opportunity is because we believe these applications and the attendant consequences when delivered will impact on heritage interpretation for at least years, hence the reason why this is a once in a generation opportunity. The second area of our submission goes to social and labour history, and we have referred to three exhibits in the materials we have provided to the Commission. One was just to locate the social and labour history within a context, and that context in the first instance of our exhibit was extracts from the social and labour issues that were contained in the ATP Conservation Management Plan. Just a small quote:

The site represents a component of the working life and social context of many Australians. It reflects not only on those who worked at Eveleigh but all those who worked on the railway systems throughout the country. It is probably a reflection on the industrial worker up to the 1980s. It will not happen again. The manager and owners of the ATP are seen as custodians of the history and continuing the story and have associated responsibilities – a duty to conserve and communicate the history of the place.

The second exhibit in our – under the heading Social and Labour History is an assessment of the social and labour history component of the department’s assessment report.. Now, in our view, on any reckoning, that assessment is very thin. It runs to a couple of lines, in fact. So no analysis was taken. No understanding or written understanding of what the issues are, the history, what’s in contention, and what are the potential directions for social and labour history to take. Now, that for the association raises somewhat of a conundrum which we phrased in the following form:

10 *Thus there arises the curious situation of stage 1 of the HIP being determined*
 in the earlier application, SSD applications for the redevelopment of the
 workshops being made with a heritage interpretation a key component,
15 *however very little heritage material has been submitted by the applicant,*
 particularly in the area of social and labour heritage, nor any analysis being
 undertaken by the department in its report, nor is the ability of the community
 to make their views known nor has the PAC the opportunity to conduct an
 independent assessment of the applicant’s stage 2 HIP, the most important
 component of heritage interpretation.

20 This is not a transparent process being advocated by Mirvac. Mirvac has previously indicated that stage 2 interpretation would be finalised in late 2017 or early 2018, and of course that has not occurred. The association puts forward in its submissions a number of steps to remediate what we see as the deficiencies of the department’s assessment report. I won’t go through those in detail. What we do highlight in this part of our exhibit is the history of the worker’s wall.

 That is a vexed history to say the least, and for us it exemplifies the considerable difficulties the organisation has faced in the consulting process, whether they’re the process, whether they’re the structure of the consulting framework, and to address these views, the RTBU RMA has put forward a number of proposals by which we believe the consultation process can be improved and we’ve included them in our conditions of consent. In addition, we’ve provided some email exchanges between the parties which we believe substantiates our view that the consultative process has been seriously flawed. In terms of a potential direction, the RTBU RMA has referred to the IAP2’s Public Participation Spectrum.

30 From the RTBU point of view, I don’t think we’ve quite hit the chart yet, but in terms of where we would like to be, in terms of a community organisation, we would see an overlap between the heading involve/collaborate. We now move on to the third component of our submission which is the very important area of the moveable heritage collection. What we’ve done in our submission is the extracts from the ATP Conservation Management Plan which of course refer to how many items there are in the collection. In the case of the collection, it is very much the case of the whole being greater than the sum of the parts.

45 And when one considers there are some 400 plus objects in the collection, to certain components of it undermines, in our view, the whole integrity of the

collection. So what we have before us, in our view – though it’s hard to get information because we’re so far – we’re so early in the process – is a view that the collections are going to be considerably downsized. Now – and that we refer to in a number of places in our – in our submission. Now, we do make the point that the
5 collection has already been rationalised and disposal and decommissioning carried out over the space of a generation. In our view, the base collection as it now stands should remain intact and any attempts to dilute it should be rebuffed and included in the conditions of consent.

10 There’s perhaps one caveat there, and that is the proposal by Tourist Heritage and Mirvac to look at the reuse of equipment. We think that based on the history of this particular issue and the matters involved, it’s not a viable proposition and the efficacy of such a solution upon examination, in our view, will not be shown to hold
15 water. Now, we’ve suggested a process by which that can complete – can be quickly examined. We just make the point that this – and as a member of the – or ex-member of the rail industry – this has been an issue that has been around for 30 years.

It’s commented on in very straightforward terms in the CMP and it involves issues of
20 OHS, skills, power supplies, training modules, cost, and the fact that in our understanding this is thus far a blue skies proposal. The RTBU RMA has examined the assessment report which has a chapter and some pages on the moveable collection and we’ve made a number of comments and referred to a number of issues. In summary of that part of our submission, we say quite clearly there are
25 many unknowns in the stage 2 HOS concerning the MHC.

It is not possible to argue at this stage whether the heritage interpretation documents in the public covenant will be complied with or not. This represents a conundrum for the association and other key stakeholders and is the basis of the association’s
30 conditions of consent. I might just add there that the assessment report doesn’t contain any reference to the public covenant, and I think that’s against the public interest, in terms of the reasons behind the covenant, and I think that should be part of this PAC determination.

35 The next area of the Union’s submission is the travelator and loading dock. The Association, like a number of others, such as the Heritage Council, have indicated that the – and the applicant has boldly stated – the reasons for the travelator are related to economic grounds. Now, what the Association has done: has examined the various economic impact assessments and critical factors as access documents
40 supplied by the applicant.

In our view, upon an examination of that, combined with an analysis of the business model of the applicant, combine to mean that the economic arguments, as put
45 forward by the applicant, fall to the ground. They in fact have no substance. That is our conclusion, following an economic examination of the material put forward, and – both in the assessment report, which we have quoted, and also in those documents

provided by the applicant. In short, the RTBU RMA argues that the travelator should not go ahead, and also the same with the loading dock.

5 In terms of conditions of consent, the RTBU, in its submission, has included some
detailed proposals relating to conditions of consent, which we would ask the PAC to
include in its deliberations and findings. They include: the exclusive use of bays 1
and 2 for the heritage interpretation and exhibition space, subject of course to the
ongoing use of the active blacksmithing workshop; continued ownership and public
access to all items in the ATP movable collection; community consultation process;
10 and also eight areas of investigation and inclusion with the conditions of consent.

One relates to transport heritage, which I will refer to. Another relates to potential
for making operational items. Three: assemblages of machines. Four: the future of
heritage interpretation in the commercial bays 5 to 15. Five: the specific details of
15 how the intangible cultural heritage of the EWS will be addressed in an ongoing
public manner within the framework of the public covenant. Six: a financial plan
for the interpretation, maintenance and management of the MAT and the intangible
cultural heritage. Seven: a volunteers engagement plan. And eight: public
consultation on this report and its recommendations prior to the submission to the
20 Secretary for approval. Thanks very much for your attention, and the ability to make
a submission before you today.

MR HANN: Thank you very much, Roger. Could I ask for the next speaker,
Geoffrey Turnbull, if he's here.
25

MR G. TURNBULL: Thank you for the opportunity to speak about this matter. I'm
speaking as the co-spokesperson for REDWatch, which is a 15 year old group that
was set up to try and deliver outcomes for the local community, as well as
government and for developers in the area. So we're basically trying to, if you like,
30 leverage community voices into that discussion, and get outcomes that work for
community.

I sat on the RWA's Built Environment Ministerial Advisory Committee, and Premier
Keneally's Redfern Waterloo Heritage Taskforce; and that followed a successful
35 campaign to keep active heritage blacksmithing in bays 1 and 2. And I also sit on
Mirvac's ATP Advisory Panel and the ATP Community Liaison Group, and attend
heritage stakeholder meetings when they're held.

I want to start by saying that we are not simply dealing with this DA as a
40 development within another heritage building, where there is need to assess the
impact on heritage fabric. As Roger has said, we're dealing here with a site that
houses an irreplaceable movable heritage collection, and a complex range of heritage
obligations. It is on the State Heritage Register, and it has a range of heritage
documents and obligations, all of which need to be assessed in this discussion.
45

When the site was sold, it was added to – there was an unprecedented heritage
covenant that was added to the title, that included government-like obligations on

Mirvac in relation to the movable heritage collection. We recommend that that covenant and its obligations be referenced as needing to be addressed in conditions relating to the stage 2 heritage interpretation plan, currently condition 4(e), by adding “and the heritage covenant” after the words “division guidelines”.

5

We welcome condition E9 regarding the ongoing curation, interpretation and conservation recommended, as this also covers areas covered by the heritage covenant, and we would like to have added to the end of that condition “and compliance with the heritage covenant.” That would require additionally that the heritage covenant be also defined in the condition’s definitions.

10

A great concern is that this development is proposed to proceed before the stage 2 heritage interpretation plan is finalised or in place. In effect, the development is proceeding without the key heritage impacts and offsets being assessed. We are in the “trust the developer” territory, given that the tensions between commercial floor space return and the potential costs of best practice heritage interpretation are potentially in conflict.

15

Let’s be frank: the equipment in the movable heritage equipment takes up floor space that could be used for commercial floor space. The risk is high that, if the stage 2 heritage interpretation plan is left until after the fit-out, that the heritage interpretation will lose out. We submit that condition E6, on fit-outs being consistent with the stage 2 heritage interpretation plan, should stand; and that this means that the HIP needs to be in place before the fit-out DAs.

20

25

We do not know where the heritage might end up, because the stage 2 heritage interpretation plan is not yet completed; and we won’t know that until the occupation. We had hoped that by now we would have a clear idea of how Mirvac intends to deal with the heritage obligations, but we do not. That means that the mobile heritage collection will be packed up for construction, without any guarantee of what will come back where. We do not know how it will be displayed, maintained, promoted as a heritage attractor, and how the intangible cultural heritage it can help to illustrate will occur.

30

We object to conditions E4, E5 and E6 being prior to occupation. We agree with the heritage office that the stage 2 heritage interpretation plan should be approved prior to the first construction certificate. If this is not possible, then it definitely needs to be in place prior to the fit-out DAs. We further object to the proponent’s proposal to amend E6. The stage 2 heritage interpretation plan must be in place before the fit-out DAs are assessed. This probably requires E4 to E6 also to move to either section C or to section D.

35

40

It is precisely because there is no stage 2 heritage interpretation plan that we are of the firm view that the approval should be modified, so that the options for interpretation are not excluded by the approvals. For REDWatch, there are at least three areas that need to be protected. The first one is: bays 1 and 2 should not be approved for non-heritage-related commercial purposes.

45

We have argued in our submission that the loading dock should not be approved for that reason. With this looking like it will go ahead, we are adamant that there should be no further encroachment on bays 1 and 2 until the stage 2 heritage interpretation plan is agreed. These are the most intact heritage bays, and there should be no loss of this space to commercial uses until an assessment can be made in relation to the stage 2 heritage interpretation plan.

There are a range of issues that have been included, including the potential erosion of the amount of space dedicated to heritage interpretation, and potential conflicting uses with the ramping up of active heritage blacksmithing in bays 1 and 2 south that need to be considered. The second area relates to the movable heritage. And nothing in the current heritage collection should be disposed of or decommissioned until after a second-stage HIP is in place, and an independent assessment of impact is carried out.

The entire movable collection is to be retained and accessible on-site. The suggestion that some of the collection be transferred for potential heritage trade use needs to have its viability tested, and its impact on the intactness of the movable heritage collection assessed. There is, in our view, a commercial incentive for Mirvac to transfer equipment offsite, and for there to be further losses in the completeness of the collection that they have an obligation to house, interpret, maintain and manage.

The third area is in cultural heritage, where the stage 2 HIP needs to deal with the intangible cultural heritage, storage, and heritage tourism attractors to the site. Space needs to be available for a potential historical records and artefacts repository and heritage centre. REDWatch is concerned that to date, heritage discussions have been largely handled by a heritage subpanel made up of the heritage office and council, and only occasional heritage stakeholder meetings. Heritage updates have been provided to other groups, like the Advisory Panel and the Community Liaison Group, on which I sit.

Given the importance of heritage issues to the Locomotive Workshop, we are of the view that the role of the heritage stakeholders and independent heritage experts needs to be strengthened. We note, Mirvac has argued that the existing Community Liaison Group should continue. This works for residents potentially impacted by the construction aspects of the development. This group does not, however, contain representatives from heritage interest groups, that will have a particular interest in the Loco development and in the stage 2 HIP.

Rather than establish a wider Community Liaison Group for the Loco development, we propose that a heritage stakeholder liaison group be conditioned under B10 to ensure that the heritage community is kept informed and has the opportunity to feedback on construction of the Locomotive Workshop and the stage 2 HIP.

We further note that the heritage importance of the Loco development and stage 2 HIP also requires changes to the community communication strategy in C10, so that

the heritage groups and stakeholders are specifically covered by this strategy, and not just the affected landholders, etcetera, that are currently referenced. The change should also reflect into condition C11, to ensure that heritage interest groups are consulted in relation to the development and the stage 2 HIP.

5

Given the need for the above heritage stakeholder liaison group and the inclusion of heritage stakeholders in the community consultation strategy, we think that there's probably need for a wider group. Whether or not that's the same group that we're talking about in terms of setting up that heritage reference group, or whether it's putting something together quite specifically for dealing with and feeding into the stage 2 HIP, we've left open.

10
15 But we believe that condition E4 should propose a panel to advise on the stage 2 HIP, made up of representatives from the Heritage Council, in addition to – because they would currently be there – relevant heritage experts and representatives from heritage stakeholders. Those suggestions for external people could actually come from the heritage committee that we've suggested. Thank you; I've run out of time.

20 MR HANN: Thank you, Geoffrey. Could I ask Mr Richard Butcher, please.

20

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Did you want Richard?

MR HANN: Yes, indeed.

25 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Okay.

MR HANN: Yes. Sorry. I didn't speak loud enough.

30 MR R. BUTCHER: Sorry, I had trouble hearing you.

30

MR HANN: Okay. No, no. I think I've got it switched on. Thank you, Richard.

35 MR R. BUTCHER: Well, thank you, Commissioners. And thank you, people which are interested in our great Eveleigh Railway Workshops, because – I suppose, some of you in the room may have the book that I spent seven years to develop, The Great Eveleigh Railway Workshops. That was motivated by another book, but – by a philanthropist, Caroline Simpson, and the great photographer David Moore, one of Australia's greatest black-and-white photographers. They produced the book, and they had a big show on at the art gallery in Sydney, and they asked me to go
40 down there, and I had a look at the captions, and that was written on all the photographs. And I said to David and Caroline – I said – and the photographs were magnificent, at 900 to 1000 dollars each – but I said, "What you've written underneath is absolutely awful."

45 There's 2000 – or 2 million people follow railways in this state and the book will just go down the gurgler like that. Long story short, they gave me all the ask whether I would do it and that's what I've done. Anyway, I do have two comprehensive

historical files to hand in to you people with a lot of information and I think the main thing is to find out the bloke that you're looking at – me, Richard Butcher, standing here. So thank you for the opportunity to everyone being allowed to speak.

5 I've had a long involvement because I served at Eveleigh as a blacksmith. That was
60 years ago – I think 62 years to be precise. I'm a fellow at Welding Institute of
Australia. I'm an author. I'm a publisher. I'm a mechanical engineer. I've got a
Diploma of Teaching and later on I will read out further information to let you know
my involvement and why I get concerned about our great Eveleigh Rail Workshops.
10 Well, my name is Richard Butcher. I was a former blacksmith at Eveleigh. And in
the 1950s, I was encouraged to study and go further in my career.

I started in a country town at Casino, the only blacksmith they ever put on there. But
funny thing, each year I managed to top the State of New South Wales in what I
15 would study in my trade. When it got to fourth year, the Commissioner for
Railways, Reg Winsor, kind of rang me and said, "you've done very well, son. We
would like you to come down to headquarters at the Wynyard Railway Station to
learn locomotive design and this type of work. I didn't do very well at school –
calculus, DST and all this type of thing – I wasn't very good at it. But anyway, I
20 decided to do some study and for all those years, I received prizes, topped the state,
and in my fifth year, the combined unions at Eveleigh in bay 5 gave me a special
award.

All apprentices in the country – you had to attend a city workshop to get more
25 experience, and that experience that I – from Casino was remarkable – at 83 years of
age, just about, the Powerhouse Museum, museums all around the state and interstate
still ask an old chappy like me, "How do you do a job?" And that's the world we
live in. Okay. So I put my thinking cap on. I enrolled at Sydney TAFE College and
studied all the advanced welding courses available, including heat treatment
30 metallurgy. I studied for four nights a week and over a period of 14 years, I did all
that study – not bad for a kid that didn't want to learn when I went to the bush. This
included mechanical engineering courses and additional special metallurgy topics.

All this work was very, very highly skilled type of work at the time. So down at
35 Eveleigh, I finished at Wynyard and then was appointed to bays 1 and 2 and 3 at
Eveleigh Workshops as a blacksmith. The training was magnificent. We did a lot of
fire welding. Fire welding is practically unheard of now and I will talk about that a
little bit later on there, how it enlightened some people. A lot of these things are
totally lost today. I served at the Davy Press. The work was very hot. The work
40 was darn heavy. I also served at the 40 hundredweight double art steam hammer.
The forges in bay 1 – a young blacksmith sits here today – 60 years ago I used those
two forges – I actually used those two forges.

The blacksmith shop, I think, from memory, is 131 years of age and still nearly
45 constantly been in operation which I think is absolutely magnificent. The work
carried out by the railways was very high precision. When you had to lengthen or
shorten a connecting rod on a locomotive or accompanying rods, it was taken down

to the tool room where there were special tables and micrometres there to measure everything to a thousandth of an inch, and the silly old blacksmith – “you go down like this”, and I say, “no, I doubt one thou one thou” – that’s what it was all about.

5

So I did those years of studying. Then things changed – the career changed. The railways advertised for an understudy to the chief welding engineer of the railways at the Wilson Street testing laboratories. The chief mechanical engineer, cranky old fellow, simply said, “I’m cutting this short. Butcher has got the job.” Unions were very powerful back then and for my study effort, he just – Mr Herd just looked at everything Butcher’s had done, and he said, “I don’t give a hoot” – he said more than that – he said, “I don’t give a hoot what the unions say, Butcher has got the job”, and that’s precisely what happened. I didn’t have any challengers at all. So a young boy from the bush put on a suit, a dustcoat and I learned a whole new, wholly interesting new world.

15

It was so darn interesting. Welding up, for instance, the Macdonaldtown gasometer – yes, it had gas in it and I was – I’m still here, aren’t I? I welded it up and it didn’t blow up. All the chemists and all the other people shot through and they left me and another chappy to do all the work. I first actually visited the shop interest back in 1952 when I was a much younger fellow. There were over 5000 belt-driven machines when I walked through the workshops in that era. There were lathes, milling machines, filing machines, wheel lathes. There was wheel lathes big and small for different sized wheels. There was leather belts flapping everywhere – you couldn’t do it today.

20

25

They were driven by line shaftings running through the workshops. In the earlier days, at the turn of the century, when men came to work with bowler hats and suits on, they were driven – each rail was driven by little steam engines, little donkey engines to drive all that machinery – a lot of heritage there. So 4900 men and women worked there under her old wrought iron roof. We can go into metallurgy if you want me to. Steam issued from the roof. When you went by on a train out of bays 1, 2, 4 and 4A there was always steam being emitted because it was basically a steam workshop. It was noisy.

35

There was no hearing protection. We weren’t allowed to wear gloves because you were called a sook if you wore gloves. We had leather boots on, but we never had hot water to wash in. We simply were given a galvanised iron bucket and you heat a piece of steel, up with fire, put it in – you got the right temperature. When they blew the first whistle, you start to have a wash and then you had to hang your dock up on the board. Back in that era, I loved opera. I used to go and watch Richard Bonyng and Dame Joan Sutherland and I even stood out there one day and got Pavarotti’s signature when he was a young man, unknown to the world, and I hope I didn’t – I’ve still got the program, probably historic now.

45

Well, the workshops overall – well, in the earlier days, there was a huge foundry – massive foundry – three to four thousand cast iron brake shoes were cast a week till

they changed and went for and then more problems started. There was a massive patternmaking shop, two levels in it – all bulldozed. There was a welding shop. There were huge steel racks and the steel racks were about – bigger than this wall here and every piece of steel had colours on the end because as a blacksmith in a forge, you had to identify what type of materials you were working with. There's
5 1000 varieties.

People say aluminium – yes, how many varieties of aluminium is there? Same as stainless steel – this type of thing. And even Red Square has been bulldozed, and
10 Red Square – people know a bit of their history. It was the place where the Great Strike of 1917 kind of culminated from. People used to gather there. That's all gone. There were little steam cranes in the workshops, if you go by, where the spring shop used to stand – there's a little crane there, I think it's number 1083. It's a little steam crane. They used to have a magnet on it and it had dynamo on the
15 locomotive. They would turn the dynamo on, run it over a truck, activate the dynamo and pick up scrap and then take I understand that down to the big foundry.

The foundry was a very, very active place. Locomotive boilers locos entered the workshops. They were made like new again by highly-skilled boilermakers and
20 people. And because I had a lot of time involved with this type of thing, I could tell you a story but maybe we haven't got time, but it's an interesting story where we in Australia could build a thing. We have a famous locomotive here – I wasn't going to say this, but I am – we have a famous locomotive – 3801 – the Germans had built three boilers for it and not one of the boilers had been accepted, yet we maintain and
25 run a fleet of up to 1200 locomotives.

She built at Eveleigh 185 brand spanking new steam locomotives, generally designed here by some of our famous chief mechanical engineers. She maintained a fleet of other locomotives too – later years it was diesels. The diversity of the work was
30 enormous. Eveleigh employed, for instance, a ratcatcher, a clock winder – yes, the railways, you wouldn't believe it, would you. There was watch repairers. In bays 15, we had the tool room, a place where they had everything and anything – gauges – not only for the railways but a lot of gauges for outside organisations. The diversity of tradespeople – there were blacksmiths, there were tinsmiths, there were
35 coppersmiths, there were angle iron smiths and I could keep going. It was a huge employer of people.

Metal – metalling of bearings was carried out. Even at my age – said nearly 83, but I still do work for Powerhouse Museum and organisations like that ask me “how do
40 you do it” type of thing. Okay. Lachlan Valley is a private railway group based out of Cowra, now moving into Orange. They've got two mainline locomotives and I keep them running by my years of skill and welding knowledge. I'm – I appreciate other groups of people which finds that I'm a life member of Transport Heritage New South Wales at Thirlmere which I actually helped with a team build and create
45 Thirlmere – 1974 to 1981. I'm also a life member of Transport Heritage Valley Heights Depot.

I assist the Sydney Powerhouse Museum. I'm an honorary member of Lachlan Valley Railway. I served as a mainline running fitter on the main line looking after steam locomotives. If you ever go down to Harris Street, you see the little museum down there with the locomotive 1243; that was back in 1982. She was the last steam locomotive – last train into Warwick Farm racecourse. It was my duty to look after her for that day; she turned 100 years of age media involvement – along with the original blacksmith Guido Gouverneur we shot a – we had shot a documentary that won the best documentary in the mid-1990s for a story about Eveleigh.

10 MR HANN: Richard, I will ask you if you could wrap that up fairly quickly.

MR BUTCHER: Yes.

MR HANN: Thank you.

15 MR BUTCHER: I want to present these copies of what's in there. But, if you don't mind, it was a member of the Smithsonian Institute. The Smithsonian Institute said, Eveleigh Railway Workshops is one of the last – world's last surviving Victorian railway workshops. Many parts are intact, showing the fabric of the age of steam: 20 the twin cast iron columns, the wrought iron roof, the dirt floors. All this is part of the heritage of Eveleigh – let alone the hydraulics room outside bays 2 and 3. It was a huge training organisation. Every year, over 300 apprentices were trained at Eveleigh, and those tradesmen went out as top-class tradesmen. In bays 6, 7 and 8, there were new machines with leather belts. Some were really long belts. They 25 produced Machinists stood on wooden timber floors, because the floors used to get cold. In the wintertime, they had 44-gallon drums, where they lit up wood to warm the shop up. The fellows driving the cranes didn't like it.

MR HANN: Richard, we'll need to wrap it now, because we've - - -

30 MR BUTCHER: Yes.

MR HANN: - - - got other speakers that are - - -

35 MR BUTCHER: Well - - -

MR HANN: - - - needing to - - -

MR BUTCHER: I think - - -

40 MR HANN: We do appreciate your deep knowledge of - - -

MR BUTCHER: Thank you very much.

45 MR HANN: - - - the site. Thank you very much.

MR BUTCHER: Can I just say one final – 12 lines?

MR HANN: You may.

MR BUTCHER: Gratias. A working day. As each day commenced at historic
Eveleigh, while Richard Butcher worked there, the 1950s, the smiths' shops had
5 large portholes high in the end of the polychrome brickwork. They acted like a stage
spotlight. As the sun rose of a day, the sun shone through, and they gradually moved
along the floor, casting shadows and a white beam of light – like a spotlight. Within
the rays from the sun were minute particles of coal and coke, swirling and dancing
about, shimmering and glittering, as the smoke rose from all around. Another day in
10 the life of Eveleigh. The stage was set. The actors were in position. Let the forges
glow bright, the furnaces glow white, the steam engine explode, and the anvils ring.
This was another good day at Eveleigh.

MR HANN: Thank you very much, Richard. We much appreciate it. Could I ask
15 our next speaker, Lucy Taksa.

PROF L. TAKSA: Good morning, and thank you so much for giving me the
opportunity to speak and to express some of my concerns. I'm an academic
historian. I have a vested interest, as a scholar who has been researching this site
20 since 1983. I've been funded by a wide range of public bodies to do that research,
including the Australia Council, through grants from the Australian Research
Council, New South Wales Department of Planning, and the New South Wales
Migration Heritage Centre.

25 I'm not going to rehash what both Roger and Geoff have said, but I want it on record
that I completely support everything and their particularities. What I wanted to do
was to actually give you a far broader understanding of the significance of the
intangible cultural heritage, and its broader implications for the state's industrial
heritage, and also the nation's.

30 I'm going to give you a little bit about the work that I've done, and I think, really – I
won't spend too much on that, other than to say, besides doing all the research that
I've done over many decades, I've sat on heritage committees relating to – and
working parties – relating to Eveleigh; I've chaired the Board of State Records New
35 South Wales for two terms; and I've contributed to what I would call hundreds of
Claytons community and expert consultations, all to little avail. Accordingly, I
believe there has been a dereliction of duty by government authorities, and now by
Mirvac, in regard to the intangible cultural heritage of this site and its interpretation.

40 There have been over 30 conservation management plans and interpretation plans –
I've bunched them together – paid for by the public purse. All have been outsourced
to heritage consultants, with little effort to engage with scholarly historical expertise.
That consultation and engagement has been minimal. No heritage interpretation
plans have been implemented, although the first plan put up was in 1996. There has,
45 in fact, been no accountability.

The significance of Eveleigh's heritage is not limited to its labour and social history, although, I believe, these are very important. Eveleigh has been connected to all aspects of Australia's economic, political, military and social history. It has immense, cross-generational significance. The site was a microcosm of multicultural Australia from the beginning of full operations in 1885 to '87. Initially, migrants came mainly from the UK and North America, but also during the 19th century there were small numbers from various European countries, and also from Syria.

From the 1950s, of course, we had migrants from Europe and the Middle East; and from the 1970s, from Asia and Latin America. The descendants of its employees can be found in all walks of life today. I have a database of over 27,000 workers simply from 1887 to the early 1940s from government records, where they've been available.

Just in my industry alone, academia, I can provide evidence of leading academics, employed at Sydney, UNSW, UTS and Macquarie, whose fathers or grandfathers worked there, including my own Vice Chancellor at Macquarie Uni. Other descendants include Paul Keating, Bob Carr; I believe John Robertson's and John Hewson's forebears worked there; and I think that it extends further.

Eveleigh has had a huge impact on Australia's history of citizenship. Over 25 members of the New South Wales state and federal Parliaments began their working lives there. Included among them were three premiers of New South Wales and one Governor-General, as well as many aldermen in municipal councils right across Sydney, and numerous mayors.

But the workshops themselves also provided broader functions. You've heard Richard talk about the self-sufficiency internally. But I think it's really, really important to recognise that Eveleigh was drawn into serving the Empire and the nation in 1901, when they were engaged in building a Royal Train for Australia's first Governor-General. Their work was linked to the opening of the first federal Parliament; numerous royal visits, from the early 20th century up to 1954, and the visit of Queen Elizabeth.

They were involved in munitions manufacture during two World Wars. During the influenza pandemic, 22,000 masks were created there – mask frames were created at Eveleigh – in 1919. During the 1930s, baby clinic carriages were built there, and later converted for the use of the Far West Children's Home, still in Manly, that supported Indigenous children. And in 1936, in cooperation with the Department of Health, the workshops were engaged in fitting out a dental clinic car for regional New South Wales. In other words, their significance is not limited to the locality here, which is what a lot of the developers and government owners would have you believe.

In the 1930s, Eveleigh workers fought against fascism in Australia, and for Aboriginal citizenship rights. From the 1930s until the 1960s, fighting for Aboriginal children who were jailed in western New South Wales, Albert Namatjira,

and so on and so forth; I don't want to go into detail here. But these are just a limited number of examples of the site's intangible cultural heritage, that numerous people have talked about, but that you don't know about, and that you should know about in making your determinations.

5

Since the early 1990s, the owners and managers of this site have paid lip service to this heritage. While they've recognised Eveleigh's architectural and technological significance, and protected a few of the buildings and machinery collections, such recognition has not extended to the site's social value. On the contrary, the records of the lives of ordinary men and women have not been preserved in situ.

10

And why is this relevant? In 2002, UNESCO's World Heritage Convention formally recognised that industrial sites are important milestones in the history of humanity, because they testify to the ordeals and exploits of those who worked in them. On 17 October 2003, the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Globally was adopted by the 32nd session of UNESCO's General Conference. I can give you the references to these. The Convention defines "intangible cultural heritage" as:

15

20

...the practices, representations, expressions, as well as the knowledge and skills that community groups and in some cases individuals recognise as part of their cultural heritage. Intangible cultural heritage is manifested in oral traditions, social practices, and traditional craftsmanship –

25

which Richard ably described. The text of the convention emphasises that the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage is a complex process, involving many actors, commencing with the communities and groups that are its very lifeblood, who are represented here today.

30

The lip service given by Mirvac and its predecessors to community consultations makes a mockery of this Convention. Since the early 1990s, hundreds of thousands of dollars have been expended on interpretation plans that reduce cultural heritage to proposals for installations of portraits of former workers in one bay, or other ephemeral digital displays. The immensely significant activities involved in Indigenous reconciliation, from the 1930s, is hardly effectively recognised by the creation of an "Indigenous garden" installed by Mirvac. This is a shame.

35

40

This sort of lip service is more patently evident in the website entitled Eveleigh Stories, again produced by consultants, which consists mainly of a listing of primary and secondary sources that any undergraduate could put together, combined with a handful of personal stories and photos, without any interpretation. On the contrary, "interpretation" has been reduced to self-guided tours that celebrate the heritage of the area. Who has the capacity to self-guide their tours through such complex cultural heritage?

45

What we've witnessed over decades is a quick-fix approach, that reflects a marketing, branding and compliance orientation to heritage. For all of Mirvac's self-

branding as an organisation committed to corporate social responsibility, it has not taken the responsibility that is required to provide proper resourcing – which a rich company could do – for adequate, nuanced interpretation, as compared to other, lesser significant sites. And I'm not going to have time to tell you, but I suggest you
5 have a look at the Inveresk Workshops in Launceston, where government set up a museum in conjunction with a community and cultural precinct. Midland Redevelopment Authority, in Perth, sought my advice, in 2001 and '02 I advised the development of a workers' wall and an interpretive centre – I will be two minutes; is that all right?

10

MR HANN: Yes, that's okay.

PROF TAKSA: To house memorabilia and oral histories alongside redevelopment of the site for new public and private uses. I'm not suggesting we shouldn't have
15 those uses, but such developments at these sites – and at Ipswich, where they set up a social history museum to recognise the heritage – and these sites are not as significant as Eveleigh, nationally – drawing on UK precedent of the Steam Museum at the Swindon Railway Workshops, where a private commercial entity has combined to support the local museum, supported book publishing, and so on.

20

Such outcomes have occurred because of a willingness of public and private authorities to engage with and fund appropriate interpretation of industrial heritage, and, most importantly, to set up the sort of advisory bodies that consist of something more than self-referential representatives, which is what has been suggested here.

25

These developments illustrate an accountability to the past, and also to the present. Instead of relying on consultants, as has occurred to poor effect in New South Wales, these cases have drawn on scholarly expertise and broad-ranging community input, and also oversight. I first raised these proposals in 1999, with Bob Carr, and have
30 continued to do so ever since. My suggestion for the commemorative wall in 1999 was to draw on the welcome wall at Darling Harbour, at the maritime museum, which is so important to connect people to place, and to create memoryscapes across generations.

35

I recommend that we really do need a place as a repository for all of the memorabilia, all of the oral histories that have been collected by me and by government authorities that have been responsible for the place, where there is none. All this knowledge, this cultural heritage, will be lost without adequate resourcing. I think the formation of a coordinating committee, as has been suggested, is very
40 important.

45

But most of all – and I'm biased here, as an academic – I believe that it is crucially important for historical expertise to be drawn from our universities, and not simply consultants, who, as we know, produce very superficial accounts, cobbled together in very short timeframes, to their masters. Today, this is even more relevant, given the Federal Innovation Agenda, which promotes collaboration between universities and industry.

And I really do think that we need to think very carefully about the New South Wales Government's Heritage Trades Training strategy, with all the caveats that the predecessors have said, because what we really need is not only the conservation of the machinery, but advantageous educational, employment and financial outcomes for people across generations: that is, the sharing of knowledge.

I fear that the current proposal to set up a limited and self-referential oversight group, without relevant scholarly expertise, will continue to waste large amounts of money on consultancy reports and piecemeal and ad-hoc installations, that have little real value for current and future generations. The marginalisation of – sorry – of Eveleigh's intangible cultural heritage invariably limits understanding of continuities and discontinuities, and how the past becomes part of the present. I'm almost finished. As a result - - -

MR HANN: If you could wrap it up now, that'd be - - -

PROF TAKSA: Yes.

MR HANN: - - - appreciated.

20

PROF TAKSA: One paragraph.

MR HANN: Thank you.

PROF TAKSA: As a result, problematic and simplistic representations of the site's significance, which conceal the gendered and culturally diverse nature of the site's history – history which could be used for educational purposes, and act as a corrective in some of the serious issues relating to poor employment practices, sexual harassment and racism at work in our society today, whose roots are there at Eveleigh, which need to be shared to be learnt from – in short, the site's intangible cultural heritage – could be used for social good, and not just the economic benefit for one of the country's largest developers. More than simply being a showplace for a severed past, effective interpretation can ensure that Eveleigh provides a link in the memory chain of this country's history. Thank you very much for your patience.

35

MR HANN: Thank you, Lucy. Could I ask on Peter Murphy, if you're here.

MR JOWETT: I might be able to assist. I'm a friend of – well, I have knowledge of Peter. He's got a number of conflicting appointments today. He's - - -

40

MR HANN: Right.

MR JOWETT: - - - hosting an international visitor, so I think that might have interfered with his ability to attend this hearing.

45

MR HANN: Okay, Roger. Thanks very much for letting us know. So that would bring us to our last speaker, Juliet Suich.

MS J. SUICH: Thanks very much for the opportunity to talk with you today and thanks everybody for making the time to be here and showing your interest in Eveleigh and the Locomotive Workshops. My name is Juliet Suich. I'm a qualified town planner and an ecologist. I run a small consulting business. I was previously
5 employed by the Redfern-Waterloo authority, by the Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority and later, Urban Growth, to advise on planning and development matters associated with Eveleigh, the Locomotive Workshops and the Redfern-Waterloo Precinct more broadly. Subsequently I was engaged by the Australian Technology Park to assist during the preparation for sale of the site and
10 the transition of ownership to private owners.

I appreciate the opportunity to talk to you today and I'm here because I hope to share with you my understanding of the value and the unique attributes and many people who have been involved with the Locomotive Workshops and Eveleigh more broadly
15 over its long history. Those people include ex-railway workers, community members, volunteers and ex-employees whom I was privileged to work with and learn from over many years. Like myself, they feel a passionate connection with the place because of its unique attributes. Also important are the stories, the culture, the ideas, the workers' rights which have originated there, being cultivated and nurtured
20 there, and have, as yet, barely been disseminated to the wider public, and people before me have spoken much more eloquently about those. I'm not going to dwell on that.

Many of the Locomotive Workshops' unique attributes including the voluminous spaces of bays 1 and 2 and the exhibition hall, the active blacksmith in use, and the complex and extensive collection of machinery, tools and equipment, as well as the intangible stories of the people who worked here, are threatened by the proposed development and draft consent in its current form. I understand the development process and the enormous uplift in value which the proposed development and the
25 previously approved developments on the site will bring. I also understand the cost of maintenance of this heritage place and the collection. I therefore take this opportunity to respectfully request that the Commission give further and due consideration to the need for public benefit associated with this project to be fully demonstrated prior to any approval.
35

Details of proposed short and long-term outcomes for each element and assemblage in the collection, the active blacksmith in use, and future interpretation, should not be left until renewed spaces are ready to be occupied. The active blacksmithing activity in bays 1 and 2 south is the highest and best form of interpretation and conservation
40 that could be hoped for at Eveleigh. It demonstrates the difficulty of working in the place and conserves and teaches skills that would otherwise be lost.

The proposed development and the OEH and DPE assessments of the proposal do not adequately consider the potential for conflicting café, retail, restaurant land uses, currently proposed in bays 1 and 2, to render active blacksmithing unviable. During
45 my work at the RWA and ATP, I was required to attend to complaints arising from adjacent tenancies due to the noisy, dusty, smelly nature of the blacksmithing use,

and this was despite the existence of an acoustic wall between bays 2 and 3, between the blacksmithing use and all of the adjacent tenancies.

5 These noises and smells are authentic and true and the potential for them to communicate the reality of conditions at Eveleigh should be conserved and enhanced. This is necessary because the proposed location of these café, retail, restaurant uses in bays 1 and 2 is highly likely to give rise to land use conflict that will negatively impact on the ability of the blacksmithing to continue viably and sustainably. I urge the Commissioners to visit the working blacksmith shop, to
10 understand the place and its significance, the smells, the noises, the dust, the activities, and I respectfully request the Commission to require the proponent, the current blacksmithing tenant and OEH to collaborate and identify more compatible uses to be collocated with interpretation space in bays 1 and 2.

15 The Eveleigh Stories website contains a small portion of the great Eveleigh stories, and I was in part responsible for the production of that. I accept Lucy's criticism that it's not an adequate interpretation of this great place and the many stories and people that have been involved in this place, but it does include some special bits and pieces, one of which is a video of the last operating day of the Davy Press, and I urge you to
20 have a look at the video. Once you've viewed it, it's easy to appreciate the importance of conservation the Davy Press assemblage in situ and intact.

The footage demonstrates clearly the important special relationships between the Davy Press and its furnace required to operate this equipment, a spatial relationship
25 that is highly significant because it permits some understanding of the scale, the heat, the danger, and the expertise required by a team of 10 to 12 men to operate the press, one that will be adversely affected by the proposed loading dock despite the glazing proposed in revised designs. I respectfully request the Commission require the proponent and the heritage office to work together to identify a solution to the sites
30 loading and truck movements that respects this highly significant assemblage and conserves it intact and in situ. This is necessary because this story will only increase in importance as more labour, jobs and tasks are automated over the coming years.

35 This is an essential part of our shared labour and social history and deserves greater consideration and better solutions than that provided by the revised proposal. I also respectfully request that the Commission examine in more detail the implications of the location of the loading dock and travel path across Innovation Plaza, which is the main pedestrian pathway through the site. This consideration should include regard to the public positive covenant for public access that applies to the land, and which
40 should probably be assessed under section 4.15E of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act with regard to public interest. I would like to touch in more detail on the public positive covenants that apply to the land, including one relating to public access which I've just mentioned, the public access to the site and also the heritage significance of the place, including the collection, and one public positive
45 covenant relating to the heritage management of the place.

I was engaged with ATP at the time these were prepared and I am providing to you my recollection of what those covenants were established to convey. I'm not aware of any changes that have been made to those covenants since then, but there may have been some. The covenants were intended to help ensure that heritage
5 management and public access to the place and its heritage was maintained once the site was in private ownership. My recollection is that at the time of exchange of ownership, they required a private owner to comply with section 170 and 170A of the Heritage Act as if it were a government instrumentality. They also required the owner to manage the land in accordance with a suite of heritage documents.

10 These include the endorsed Conservation Management Plan, the draft Movable Collection Management Plan and the Heritage Asset Management Strategy. The covenants were in part prepared in response to community and OEH concern, Office of Environment and Heritage concern about the loss of public ownership of these
15 important heritage buildings, collection, and intangible cultural heritage. At the time of its creation, it was endorsed by the heritage council as an appropriate management measure for the site. The DPE assessment report has concluded that the proposed development is in the public interest as it will increase public access to the Locomotive Workshop and the in situ and movable heritable collection.

20 I do not consider that this has been demonstrated in the DPE assessment report or in the agency comments. It's also important to note that the Secretary's environmental assessment requirements published on 26 June 2017 required the environmental assessment to demonstrate consistent with the Heritage Public Positive Covenant,
25 including, but not limited, to the CMP for the Locomotive Workshop and the ATP. The environmental assessment submitted did not, to my knowledge, address the consistency of the proposed development with that positive covenant, and specifically, it did not address consistency with the heritage documents that apply to the site, including the section 170 register and the draft Movable Collection
30 Management Plan.

I respectfully request that the Commission require or undertake a detailed compliance audit of the proposed development against the requirements of the public
35 positive covenants that apply to the land. The draft Movable Collection Management Plan and section 170 register which is an Excel spreadsheet of some many, many thousands of cells full of information, itemise approximately 400 items, structures and assemblages as part of the collection.

40 This means that the collection is actually vastly larger than this as many assemblages of tools and the associated equipment have never, ever been individually counted or audited. The draft Movable Collection Management Plan prepared by Futurepast Heritage Consulting and publically exhibited in 2015 set out maintenance priorities and recommendations for the management of this collection. The draft Movable
45 Collection Management Plan was prepared in tandem with an update of the section 170 heritage register for the collection which was undertaken by volunteers, volunteers supervised by Futurepast Consulting. That update audited the collection elements individually including a risk assessment of every item and the application

of tags to the many items of machinery and equipment that had not been previously tagged. Richard Butcher generously volunteered an incredible amount of time and effort towards this process, as did a number of other unique women who shared Richard's enthusiasm and passion for conversation of the knowledge of this vast collection.

There are very few people still living apart from Richard Butcher and his blacksmithing people who retain a working knowledge of the elements of this collection. The proposed conditions of consent although the disturbance, removal from site, storage, and eventual possible exhibition of some small parts of the collection that can be accommodated in the proposed exhibition space. The heritage covenant required that the owner manage and maintain the heritage significance of the site in accordance with section 170 and 170A of the Act – Heritage Act. The intention of this was to help ensure that heritage management and interpretation was carried out to the same standard as is required for government owners of heritage collections, as the Heritage Act makes no provision for private owners of collections such as this.

I respectfully request that the Commission require the proponent to use the draft movable collection management plan and the section 170 register as the basis for recording and publicising the changes proposed to each element of the collection, compiling comprehensive information about each piece's significance, condition, maintenance requirements, together with any former or present use, prior to any disturbance, removal or storage.

A revised movable collection management plan and section 170 register that also details the intended outcomes for each element of the collection, whether it be for decommissioning, disposal or storage, short or long-term, and identifying which elements of the collection will be able to be accommodated in the vastly reduced proposed exhibition and interpretation spaces, should be publicly exhibited prior to any construction certificate for areas in which the collection is currently housed.

This is necessary to ensure the public benefit associated with the proposed development is fully understood, and to ensure that the significance of the collection, intact and in situ, its research potential and value, is not lost through the construction process and necessary transitional movement and storage. I note for the record that my submission requested that compliance with the covenants be addressed up front in the development process, and considered in the assessment process. To my knowledge, this issue was not raised in the DPE request for further information, the proponent's response to submissions, or the assessment report.

With regard to the consideration of submissions contained in the DPE assessment report, I would respectfully request the Commission require DPE to undertake a more thorough and rigorous review of submissions prior to any approval. The assessment report's limited consideration of a number of detailed and complex issues raised in submissions is not consistent with the CMP vision, which requires that ATP

will be managed to engage with workers both past and present, local people, and the wider community.

5 And this is necessary because of the unique circumstances of this case. Much
expertise in relation to the site and the collection is held outside of OEH, and the
professional advisors working for the proponent, by members of the public, some of
whom made submissions. Knowledge of the working details of the machinery and
tools is held by academics, blacksmiths who worked and work at the site, as well as
10 heritage professionals who have been involved in the site over time. These people
and their knowledge of the site, its cultural, tangible and intangible history, should be
given due consideration. I will conclude there, and provide some draft conditions of
consent for my submission.

15 MR HANN: Thank you, Juliet.

MS SUICH: Thanks.

MR HANN: Well, thank you to all speakers, and that brings us to the conclusion of
this public meeting. And on behalf of the panel, I thank you for making the time;
20 particularly the speakers, for putting the effort into each of your submissions. And,
please, if you've got more documented material, then we'd be very interested in that.
If you could just supply it to the secretariat, Matthew. And if you don't have it here
today, then certainly within the next seven days, that would be much appreciated by
the panel. So thank you all.
25

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[11.19 am]