



**AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED**

ACN 110 028 825

**T:** 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

**E:** [clientservices@auscript.com.au](mailto:clientservices@auscript.com.au)

**W:** [www.auscript.com.au](http://www.auscript.com.au)

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

---

O/N H-956457

**INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

**PUBLIC MEETING**

**RE: PEMULWUY PROJECT, REDFERN**

**PANEL:**

**SOO-TEE CHEONG  
DR PETER WILLIAMS  
ILONA MILLAR**

**ASSISTING PANEL:**

**MATTHEW TODD-JONES**

**LOCATION:**

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

**DATE:**

**10.00 AM, THURSDAY, 15 NOVEMBER 2018**

MR S. CHEONG: Good morning, everyone. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders past and present and to their elders from other communities who may be present today. Welcome to the public meeting for the  
5 proposal from Deicorp Limited seeking approval for a section 75W modification application to the Pemulwuy Concept approval, a section 4.551A modification application to the Pemulwuy Project approval and State Significant Development consent for the construction of three to 24 storeys student accommodation building within precinct 3 of the Pemulwuy Precinct. My name is Soo-Tee Cheong. I'm the  
10 chair of this Independent Planning Commission New South Wales panel which has been appointed to help determine this proposal. Joining me on the panels are Commissioners Ilona Millar and Dr Peter Williams and Matthew Todd-Jones from the Commission's Secretariat over there.

15 Before I continue, I should state that all appointed Commissioners must make an annual declaration of interests, identify potential conflicts with their appointed role. For the record, we are unaware of any conflicts of interest in relation to our determination of this development application. You can find additional information on the way we manage potential conflicts on our policy paper, which is available on  
20 the IPCN website. In the interests of openness and transparency, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. I would also like to note that while the Commission generally holds meetings in the area in which the subject land is located, due to the availability constraints of venues in Redfern, it was not possible on this occasion.

25 The public meeting gives us the opportunity to hear your views on the assessment report prepared by the Department of Planning and Environment before we determine the development application and modifications. The meeting is one part of our decision-making process. We have also met with the Department of Planning and Environment, the City of Sydney Council and the applicant and we have also  
30 visited the site. 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 will be published on the IPCN website.

35 Following today's meeting, we will endeavour to determine the development application as soon as possible, however there may be delays if we find the need for any additional information. Before we hear from our first registered speaker, I would like to lay out some ground rules that we expect everyone taking part in today's  
40 meeting to follow. First, today's meeting is not a debate. Our panel will not take questions from the floor and no interjections are allowed. Our aim is to provide the maximum opportunity for people to speak and be heard by the panel. Public speaking is an ordeal for many people. Though you may not agree with everything you hear today, each speaker has the right to be treated with respect and be heard in  
45 silence. Today's focus is public consultation.

Our panel is here to listen, not to comment. We may ask questions for clarification but this is usually unnecessary. It would be most beneficial if your presentation is focused on the issues of concern to you. It is important that everyone registered to speak receives a fair share of time. I will enforce timekeeping rules as chair. I  
5 reserve the right to allow additional time for the provision of further technical materials. A warning bell will sound one minute before the speaker's allotted time is up and again when it runs out. Please respect these time limits. If there are issues that you are unable to address or you feel that you could not complete the address in the allocated time, we would encourage you to provide a written submission to the  
10 Commission. Written submissions should be made to the Commission within seven days of this meeting.

Though we strive to stick to our schedule today, speakers sometimes don't turn up or decide not to speak. If you know of someone who will not be attending, please  
15 advise Matthew. I know that the Commission received three late applications to speak. Under the Commission's public meeting guidelines, it is at the discretion of the chair of the public meeting to grant a late application to speak. In this instance, due to the number of speakers scheduled for today, I have decided to grant these applications. If any speaker would like to project something onto the screen, please  
20 give it to Matthew before your presentation. If you have a copy of your presentation, it would be appreciated if you would provide a copy to the Secretariat after you speak.

Please note any information given to us may be made public. The Commission's  
25 privacy statement governs our approach to your information. If you would like a copy of our privacy statement, you can obtain one from the Secretariat or from our website. The meeting is being recorded for transcription purpose. Notes made throughout the meeting on the issues raised and will be summarised in our determination report. As you can see, there are media present. If any speaker who  
30 doesn't wish to be filmed or recorded, you are asked to make that known when you come up to speak. Finally, I ask everyone present please turn your mobile phone to silent. Thank you. I will now call on the first speaker, Jenny Munro. Would you like to come forward.

35 MS L. MUNRO: My name is Lorna Munro and I've been asked to speak on behalf of my mother, Jenny.

MR CHEONG: Okay.

40 MS MUNRO: For those of you who don't know my mother, my mother is a recognised elder who has lived in the Redfern area for more than 40 years. She has raised children and is raising grandchildren here. My mother has also been very much a part of the establishment of Aboriginal community-controlled organisations which is the very thing that identifies Redfern as a place of significance to the rest of  
45 the country, let alone the rest of the city, let alone the rest of Aboriginal Australia. My mother has also been very vocal in articulating the interests of the community. She has also been very vocal in challenging this development. She has also been one

of the people identifying how disrespectful it is to name a development plan after somebody who has died fighting to retain Aboriginal ownership of Aboriginal land.

Desecration of spirit is one of the biggest laws that you can break in this country.

5 Not only is Pemulwuy's name being used in an inappropriate way, a whole community and generations of a community have been displaced. My mother when she set up the Tent Embassy – she was concerned about the future of the community. Me, her daughter, I guess I represent that future. I'm now raising my own child in the community I grew up in, in the community I went to school in, in the community  
10 I now work in. I deliver educational programmes to local youth, local youth who often are demonised and told that they are not good enough. I've learnt a lot about social cohesion. I've learnt a lot about the issues that our community face. And the answer to solve a lot of these problems does not lie in developing the area and selling it for 99 years. That act itself is denying any type of future the community, the  
15 Aboriginal community in Sydney, will ever be able to achieve.

MR CHEONG: Excuse me. If you would like to pause, can you adjust the microphone?

20 MS MUNRO: Thank you. It pains my heart to have to talk to you today after consultation processes have been hijacked in the past and I myself have witnessed elders from the community talked over by non-Aboriginal people. I have seen the history of my community displayed and used to justify the further erasure of the community. I have used elders' achievements – I have seen their achievements  
25 being used against them and actually further dishonoured while people speak over the top of them at community consultations that are supposed to be there so that their voices are heard. I have had messages from other people that live in the area as well that have talked about how they – they don't know what's going on.

30 Nobody that I know knows what's going on, which is why people like my mother made some noise about the silence and the erasure that has been happening, the dismissal of what the Aboriginal community has achieved since the 1960s and 70s and further before that. There has always been an Aboriginal presence in the area. It is a meeting place. We know this for a fact. Colonisation has displaced our people  
35 again and again and again. Our people have only had to come – had the chance to come back more than 40 years ago. My parents were born on missions, which means that they were recorded as a part of the stock on the missions. They weren't recorded as people.

40 When those missions were closed down, there was a huge population that moved to Sydney looking for jobs, looking for safe spaces. Those people got there and they were living in slums. Women were dying giving birth. Children were going into schools with no tools to be able to survive in a white colonised world, which is why people like my mother and my father, and people like Bob Blair – and there's a huge  
45 list of people that includes people like Mum Shirl, people like Father Ted Kennedy, who noticed and recognised the desperation and they banded together and they built

the community that we have today. Please do not let these people further erase and displace the future of black Australia.

5 This is the only community that exists. When we think about Redfern, it is the  
Aboriginal history that is highlighted that echoes throughout time. These plans  
silence that. There has been no consultations. We have been attacked, threatened  
with violence for speaking out and asking questions. My mother's health has  
deteriorated due to stress purely from being silenced. I often go into schools talking  
10 about the power of voice to young people, and I often talk about how revolutionary it  
is to be handed a mic after you've been told to shut up your whole life. This  
Pemulwuy development is pretty much shutting up 99 years of Aboriginal lives and  
the future.

15 Genocide has been something that has been very successful in this country. Our  
people have been rounded up and massacred, which is why when I look around the  
room here I know for a fact that I only make up one of three Aboriginal people that  
are here physically visible today, which is testament to that genocide. It is an  
ongoing genocide when people look at the history 100 years from now. And there  
20 has been no interjection, and these things have been allowed to continue without  
challenges, or without hearing both sides properly, pretty much nailing the final nail  
on the coffin that is genocide in this country and colonialism.

This is a safe space that is created by our old people for the benefit of the community  
and the youth. These plans do not involve the youth. They don't consider people  
25 like me that have grown up in the community and are now raising children. They  
don't consider how a lot of these services were created out of a need because we had  
nowhere else to go. The Aboriginal Housing Company has had closed membership  
for quite some time. Not many people actually know what has been going on in  
there for some time. In the end, really, this organisation is not capable of being able  
30 to deliver a plan like the Pemulwuy Project, which is why it has taken them 20 years  
to be able to do so.

They have literally been caretaking a lawn, an empty block of land that has no black  
faces, has no Aboriginal families, has no school, has no businesses, has no visibility,  
35 and that has happened in my generation. The stigmatisation of Aboriginal people  
with mental health issues and substance issues has alienated a large portion of the  
Aboriginal community. There is a huge population that has had to move out west  
and they've been dispersed further, which for my people is reliving a lot of trauma.  
It's bringing up a lot of trauma. Our people have been moved on and moved on and  
40 moved on for as long as white occupation has existed in this land.

My concerns, again, is all of these things reflect us as a nation. All of these things  
reflect how people view this area, as well as this whole country. There is an  
opportunity to make some change. This opportunity needs to be grasped and not sold  
45 and leased for 99 years. We also have intergenerational poverty. We are descended  
from slaves, which is why our people have ended up needing Aboriginal housing  
services and medical services and schools. It's because we don't actually have

access to any of these things that everybody enjoys in this country, and this country is our country. Let's not forget that. And we have no say.

5 All I can do in this process is do as my mother asked, and come and speak on her behalf and speak from the heart. I have nothing prepared today. I'm literally begging on behalf of my son's future, because he's already experiencing racism at the age of two, whereas I didn't experience it until I was 12, going outside of the community, and all of these things, again, just proves that the gentrification that has happened, the management of planning – the failure of management of planning in  
10 the area is further displacing us and creating spaces that are not safe.

I'm not quite – like I'm not quite sure if people understand what it's like to be looked at like you're – you don't deserve to be here, and that is how I'm feeling in the place that I've grown up in. I have also conducted tours in the area for about nine years  
15 independently. This is a successful business model that I myself have created to honour the history, to tell the stories and to own the narrative, because if there is no faces talking about the story and reminding people how valuable this place is – and not monetary value; I'm talking about connection to land; I'm talking about narratives, history, overlapping of stories.

20 When I talk about value, I'm talking about how we value the land, which is very different to how developers value the land, and how real estates value the land, and how businesses value the land and even a lot of Aboriginal people that have very conservative views value the land. We need as much support as we can. Our  
25 community is fragmented. This development over 20 years has further fragmented and divided our community. The community that is referenced so much when we talk about Redfern doesn't actually exist due to these planning models, due to displacement, due to Department of Housing and government housing also being sold off. So all of those people that have been displaced from the block, they have  
30 been moved to the nearest housing. Those houses and that property in Waterloo is now being given away.

The only thing that we have of value is being sold and given away underneath us while we stand; while we raise our children. It has taken 20 years to get to this point,  
35 simply because people do not know what they're doing. And instead of actually acknowledging that they don't know what they're doing, they will act like they know what they're doing, which doesn't help anybody. If you don't know what you're doing, stop. Talk to the people who know what they're doing; who have been living in the community; who have been working in the community; who have been  
40 advocating for the community for generations, not just for their own benefit.

My mother has volunteered in many organisations while growing up. I didn't have a lot of the things that people with working parents had. This is the sacrifice that  
45 people like my mother has made. These sacrifices are not in vein; these sacrifices shouldn't be used to further create hardship; these sacrifices should be celebrated; this community should be celebrated the way that it is; this community should be consulting with the people that are still there, and the young people that are raising

children there. We are the future of that community. We don't have no say; we don't have no physical presence.

5 Redfern, as we know it, will not exist. It will just be another trendy suburb with Aboriginal art but no Aboriginal faces. A lot of the discourse that was created through the establishment of the Aboriginal Tent Embassy – a lot of misinformation has been put out there – and that discourse really was about asking for transparency and that is all Aboriginal people are always ever asking. We don't actually like to do things without having consensus.

10 There is a process about who talks on behalf of people and I do not recognise anybody in the Aboriginal Housing Company or the Pemulwuy plans that represent the community. In fact, it desecrates the memory and the history of the community and further erases it. To have Aboriginal people's rights to land be superseded again  
15 is very much what colonisation means in this country. It's all about reaping benefits; it's all about foreign ideas of value, which does not align with the traditional values.

And all I ask for is that it be heard and you really think about what this means, because, again, as I look around this room, I do not see anybody from my  
20 community; I do not see any Aboriginal people from my community, and let's not forget Redfern and Waterloo are really, really small suburbs. It's not a big place. We know who has lived there; we know who has made these achievements; we know who has put in the hard work; we know who has moved out and has suffered trauma as well. I think that I've spoken from the heart and done what my mother has asked  
25 me, so thank you for listening.

MR CHEONG: Thank you, Ms Munro. Now, I would like to call on the second speaker, Eli Gescheit.

30 MR E. GESCHEIT: Good morning, Mr Chairman. My name is Eli Gescheit and I'm the urban planner representing the owners of a terrace located in Hugo Street, Redfern. The main concerns for the owners relate to the proposed bulk and scale, traffic and car parking, pedestrian safety and during the construction stage. In relation to bulk and scale, this modification incorporates a significant variation to the  
35 approved building envelope. The additional floor area sought by the proposal is 9555 square metres, which equates to 55 per cent above the approved floor area.

According to the assessment report, there were various tall buildings approved in recent years located on the other side of the train station. However, the maximum  
40 height of these buildings is 18 storeys. I note the current proposal is for an unprecedented height, up to 24 storeys. There is no car parking proposed for the development, which will be increased by an additional 442 residents.

The developer has removed the proposed drop-off zone and relies on the existing  
45 time-restricted on-street car parking. How will the proposed traffic arrangements work without the drop-off zone? I've reviewed the footpath capacity study and found there are distinct irregularities with the two methodologies used. The report

addresses both methods developed by Fruin and Gill but places more weight on the Gill approach. For example, on Eveleigh Street West, Fruin's method shows a pedestrian comfort level of 290 pedestrians per hour, while Gill's method shows 2496 per hour.

5

Obviously, Gill's methodology is more favourable to the developer because this approach allows more pedestrians along the footpaths. Despite this distortion of the results, it is clear that the south side of Lawson Street will be overcrowded when relying on the comfort threshold. Overall, the pedestrian survey clearly indicates there will be a sharp increase in the number of pedestrians throughout the local footpaths. The roads are also very narrow, and further widening of the footpaths to accommodate additional pedestrians would restrict the traffic flow within the already congested roads. Should the Commission decide to approve the development, we request certain measures be adopted during the construction stage.

15

These include maintaining the already approved construction hours instead of the extended hours sought; no construction vehicles, including personal vehicles of construction workers, permitted on Vine, Hugo, Caroline and Louis Street; a well-documented, straightforward process for reporting noise violations; a clear timeframe within noise complaints will be addressed; an appointed officer within the construction company to handle noise complaints; a clear escalation path if the noise complaints are not being addressed; community consultation and notification for upcoming works that might impact residents; and, finally, ensure the safe - - -

20

25 MR CHEONG: Can I ask you to conclude, please.

MR GESCHEIT: Yes. I'm wrapping up right now – and, finally, ensure the safe pedestrian access at all times to Eveleigh Street between Lawson Street and Caroline Street. Overall, we strongly object to the proposed modifications. Thank you for your time.

30

MR CHEONG: Thank you. Now I would like to call on the third speaker, Anna Kypreos.

MS A. KYPREOS: Good morning. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to speak. My name is Anna, and I am a resident, a long-term resident, of Redfern. I've lived there for 20 years and lived in Surry Hills growing up as a child. I've not spoken publicly before in my life about an opinion that I have held, but I really feel quite compelled to speak out today and represent a part of my community, and that's why I'm here. I'm actually afraid for the future of Redfern, and so I'm here to say let's have a really good look at what we're doing here. I'm not convinced – I mean, I'm really quite concerned about the impact on the environment initially, the height and scale, the visual impact, the community and cultural impact, the density, the overshadowing and the sunlight, the foot and car traffic capacity and the parking.

45

All of those things, I don't think have really been addressed, and I'm not convinced that the people – I don't really trust that what has been put forward is in the best

interests of Redfern. I'm also not convinced – sorry. I'm not convinced that the impacts are an acceptable – definitely not the height. I mean, we're – let me just – don't want to get too ..... up. I'm also not convinced that the consistency with the similar developments around Redfern that have gone up – there's some  
5 developments around the other side of Redfern Station that have gone up that are, I – 18 storeys, are they? They're just massive, big skyscrapers, in my opinion, and add another six floors and make it 24 – I'm concerned.

10 I'm concerned that the vision for Redfern is a sprawling landscape of high-rises that is just going to continue and continue, and we're just going to lose our little community. I don't want Redfern to lose its identity. I don't trust that the future of Redfern is in the best hands. Redfern is a diverse and rich community with a lot – lots of cultural heritage, both Aboriginal and migrant, and I can just foresee the loss of a suburb that is unique to Australia. Let's value what we have at Redfern, in  
15 Redfern. Yes. Let's develop. Let's grow, but to the benefit of our community, and I just can't see that this development – it's just going to cost Redfern far too much. I do believe in the growth and development of an area, but to the benefit of our – of the people – and at what cost? I strongly object to the way the development is moving forward. Thank you.

20

MR CHEONG: Thank you. I would like to call on the fourth speaker, Elizabeth De Freitas.

25 MS E. DE FREITAS: Hi. First of all, I'd just like to say that I hate public speaking, and I'm bad at it. So apologies. First of all, I'd just like to say that I'm going to keep it quite short because I've written quite a few notes, but I've also only had five hours sleep, and I'm exhausted, but, I mean, essentially, what Lorna has said on behalf of Jenny, I wholeheartedly agree with. My – the only disclaimer would be that, as a non-Aboriginal person, I don't feel that I have any right to comment on the  
30 negotiations between the Aboriginal community and the AHC. Obviously, I have my own views, but I'm not going to talk about them publicly. I also agree with what both Eli and Anna have said. I don't see this as anything other than social cleansing. It's exactly the same thing that happened to Millers Point.

35 Initially, I had registered to speak on behalf of the Tenants Union of New South Wales. I'm not speaking on behalf of the Tenants Union of New South Wales because I did not have time to – or the Tenants Union did not have time to speak to the Koori Network about the issue, and therefore I'm not in a position to speak on their behalf. So my views are my own at this stage. What I would like to say,  
40 though, is that most – most of what I've written down has already been said. I would like to quote – and I won't cite him because I don't have his permission – but a neighbour who's basically said that, like me – that he feels that providing Aboriginal housing in the area is extremely important and should be the primary focus of any development in the area. However, the AHCs latest plans are littered with way too  
45 many compromises and trade-offs for it to enjoy community support.

I'm also concerned about Deicorp being the developer, Deicorp who have, in the past, publicly said quite racist things about the Aboriginal community, who have also been the subject of litigation. They've been to the Supreme Court about developments in – one that I'm aware of and I don't know the outcome of – in  
5 Erskineville and where – and the other concern is the number of times they have changed their name. They have dozens of ACNs, but, I mean – I've – I put myself down for 10 minutes, but I'm also conscious of the fact that, apart from Lorna, there are no other Aboriginal speakers today. So if there are any Aboriginal people in the audience who want to finish my speech for me, I'm happy for that.

10

MR CHEONG: Thank you. Thank you. The next speaker is Richard Coady – is Richard Coady.

15 MR R. COADY: Yes. I've been living in the area for 20 years and I remember meetings in the Rocks back when I was living in 41 Phillip Street in Sydney next to the first Government House site. I would go down to Rocks meetings back in the 70s and that was the number 1 thing people would say, that in order to speak you would say how long you've lived in the area: 20 years. We don't hear that any more, unfortunately. We've had a project called Save Our Sydney going for a long time  
20 and that started, really, with the first Government House site where – on the corner of Bridge and Phillip Street; right – where at the end of the 70s or so they wanted to put a – I don't know how many storey – high-rise on that site with a 99 year lease. Right?

25 And we were saying, well, the terraces in Phillip Street, the historic ones, where I started renting in a basement in '75, they were going to knock them down for a road widening. The Heritage Council has now preserved them. But the – we said, well, there should be a park on the first Government House site there, and I ended up being taken to court. I was there for 10 years paying rent and so on, and set up their  
30 embassy in one of the buildings, Unemployed Embassy. And – but that was the State Government site. Paul Lander with a petition and so forth decided to stop that, and now we have the Museum, the Sydney Museum on that site. Another site the government owned was the Opera House. Well, not the Opera House, but Bennelong Point.

35

And so that was back when there was a bit of civilisation in State Governments and they said, "Well, let's have an international competition to see what we should put there." Okay. Sydney Opera House. I think that was quite a good idea. And I expect that if Bennelong came back in a time machine he may well say, "Well, better  
40 than all the other buildings around there anyway." Right? So at least that showed some kind of respect. And the Sydney Museum – right – that's some sort of respect. Now, this is not out of my notes, actually. But the Block – I used to say that I lived in Surry Hills. I actually live near Pitt Street near the Redfern Town Hall. Right?

45 And – but when I saw the Redfern riot, after that I said, "No, I live in Redfern." Right? You know, this place is supposed to be kind of a down and out kind of place, and that's what people said. "Look, you know, what's going on here? The houses

are being demolished”. Right? You can see over the last 20 years, slowly, slowly they’re not being maintained and people were being pushed out. So we have all these high-rise on the other side of the station now. They haven’t put in a concourse to Redfern Station so you can get a lift down on the southern end. It has just been  
5 holus-bolus redevelopment. We now have, as the other lady said, a lawn in Redfern down in the block and there’s about to be a concert down there, for instance, coming up.

We used to have these sort of things all the time. Right? And what we’ve been  
10 advocating is that the old gym – right – that has been vacated by some person called Mundine, that should become a museum for modern political history of Aboriginal people. I made a film with Charlie Perkins in ’75, for instance. There should be some honouring of the Aboriginal struggle down in the block. Right? Another – and do we need some more high-rises? No. Should there be more Aboriginal housing,  
15 like many estates and so forth? Yes. And we’ve been advocating for that to take place in the Waterloo redevelopment because they’re doing it for the Chinese people. Right?

They’re doing it for the Russian people. So you can see the strugglers saying, “Well,  
20 people are being – were evicted. They had to be evicted, supposedly, to get some housing out of the block, saying otherwise they wouldn’t give them priority housing. Right? Now, what kind of arrangement was that? And then they move them a long, long way away. So the question of whether it’s a really good idea to have a mini estate put in down there is something that we question. Maybe where they want to  
25 build a pub, the student housing or the foreign students – maybe that’s the place to put a mini estate. Right? We certainly need an interpretative centre in this – down in the block and open space is what we really need around Redfern Station now.

It has been completely taken over by this high-rise rubbish and there’s – and with  
30 Redfern Community Centre, what we have now is where people can go to Redfern Community Centre. There’s paintings of famous Aboriginal people, Uncle Max and so forth. That’s the beginning of a historic – you know, commemorating a historic State site where Aboriginal people did live, came back to Redfern, and they did have a site badly managed by the Aboriginal Housing Company, all the drugs and so forth.  
35 It was always going to be a slum clearance program. Right? It was always going to be that, and then one day they would say, “Oh, dear. Look at that. There’s a slum down there”. Well, they made sure there was a slum.

“And best idea is to knock it all down and stick up a high-rise”, exactly what  
40 happened with the twin towers in New York. That was a rundown area. Right? So that’s the plan. That’s the real plan behind it all. Right? And the Aboriginal people don’t run the Aboriginal Housing Company and never have. So the land itself really should be – so with the park we’re proposing, it should be run by a proper democratic Aboriginal organisation. The park that we’re proposing maybe could be  
45 called Pemulwuy Park. Maybe the museum is the Charlie Perkins one. But it’s world famous. The block is world famous. If you’re an Aboriginal person and you come to Sydney, where do you go? Redfern Community Centre. Right?

You will be able to find some people that are Aboriginal. Where else in Sydney do they have this, an organised kind of place that has got a history? Right? We've shot much video down there at the family community days. I met Jimmy Little. They can't do it. We've got to have some place in Sydney that's – it's like the gateway to  
5 the real Australia where Aboriginal people, you know, came back after they were decimated so much. So in the paper here, I've got – it does go into this sort of detail. The Whitlam grant that bought these houses – right – I don't think Gough Whitlam had in mind, "Hey, this is a good idea. Just wait around a few decades and we can flog it off. Right? Make some money out of this".

10 Now, what would be – these days if the old tram sheds on the Bennelong Point – let's say the trams were privatised. What do you reckon? Star City, a casino? That's what they would build now. Right? Would they build the Opera House? Right? Even on the first Government House it took a lot of struggle to stop them just  
15 putting some high-rise on top of that. Whatever you think of Arthur Phillip, if he came back in the TARDIS or, you know, time machine, I think he would say, "Well, there wasn't going to be a government house there, but that's probably a good idea to have a Sydney museum about the history of Sydney and preserve that site, rather than the Hong Kong Land Company State Superannuation Board high-rise".

20 You know, we've got to preserve our own history. We've got to look after the things that we've got, even though Bennelong – a lot of argument about Bennelong. He was kidnapped and so forth. You know, that's the military occupation they did. But he did some things to try and speak for Aboriginal people. They took him to  
25 England and dressed him up and all this stuff. But I think he's honoured by the Sydney Opera House. He would say, "What's it for? Is it for singing?" I think he would probably think that's pretty good, you know. And so – and we just can't do this.

30 Originally, the student accommodation was a way to raise money, supposedly to build the Aboriginal housing. Right? It was always a ridiculous idea. What, seven storeys? Before that, the idea for Aboriginal Housing Company was to have a high-rise car park. Well, the council didn't like that either. So now it has got completely  
35 out of control and I didn't even know until yesterday in the Herald, you know, 24 storeys, you know. They've got to be joking. And, you know, so this is the last chance. This is the last chance meeting for people to say, "Why wasn't there an earlier chance?" Right? I went to the meeting at the Redfern Community Centre. It was an absolute riot.

40 People were absolutely disgusted. "What's going on?" We were led on for decades to say, "Oh, no, don't you worry about that, you know. We're just going to restore things, a few shops here and stuff like that". But it's always a lie. The government is not going to fund this kind of thing, so they got in bed with Opus Dei, or whatever  
45 they're called – Deicorp – to do this. Right? So to raise money with foreign students really – right? It's just disgusting. Okay. The Opera House, they had a lottery to build that. Right?

MR CHEONG: Mr Coady, may I ask you to confine your comments to the assessment reports?

5 MR COADY: Do you think I should talk about this rotten project, do you? But my paper here does talk about it and we've long advocated that there should be community housing for Aboriginal people. The Aboriginal Housing Company is not even registered, apparently, to run such a thing. There are other areas around in the Waterloo redevelopment where that can be done. How viable that is right near a busy station like Redfern – right? They have parks around central station. Well, 10 other people have addressed the matter of the parking, right. It's obviously ridiculous. They don't even put car parking in high-rise in Melbourne; they don't do much now; and if you try and find a park in Redfern now, right, a lot of people in multi-storey, they're parking out the entire suburb.

15 It's not only making it difficult for people who don't have any parking, but it's killing off business as well, right, because people have got nowhere to park. Right. So, you know, that's an obvious point about this, but to have to come to this point now where this is the last opportunity to object to this – we only got an email on Monday to say that I could come along and speak, right, “And you can bring along a 20 PowerPoint.” I don't know; it's going to take us a while to do a PowerPoint. I was even asking for a whiteboard. There's no whiteboard here even to say, “Well, our ideas are this”, you know. “This is for a park here.” Another part of it is to have the gym rebuilt. Well, why is there a need for a gym in this development anyway? I mean, you know, the best place for a gym – the Mundine Gym or something – is 25 down in the Waterloo estate, you know. Move that somewhere else, right. So will I go to my conclusion stuff now or what?

MR CHEONG: Yes. You can do that.

30 MR COADY: I'm just about to be turfed out. So no approvals should be given to the 99-year lease, 24-storey commercial student accommodation proposed in the block area. The current vacated grassed-over block area should be developed as a public park managed by reputable, democratically-run Aboriginal-based NGO and, as I've said before, also a modern Aboriginal political history museum should be 35 developed, at least initially in the vacated Mundine Gym, which has got that great big Aboriginal flag on it, right.

A good place to start. It's an old building and now the block's seen stuff moved out, but, at the same time, somewhere else that could be a museum for sport and that 40 some of that memorabilia could go there. And if you're talking about sport, Aboriginal participation in sport, it's about a-third of it, isn't it. So you need a lot bigger building for that kind of thing somewhere else. So the whole argument for the 99-year lease for a high-rise was that would give upfront money to build the scaled-down mini estate, and now there's doubt that that's going to that at all, from what I 45 see in the Herald, right, so that's no justification for building it as well.

And also shops in there. That was the original idea, that they could subsidise it with commercial shops. Well, the commercial shops would be just related to whoever is living there, which would be like 600 students from overseas. Well, what do you reckon the shops are going to be: more like Haymarket, I think, that Redfern and Waterloo. And even the Redfern Community Centre, that would have to completely change what it does. It has portraits of people in there, as I've mentioned before, of Aboriginal people, so it's some kind of a gateway for people to get involved.

So no State Significant approval should be given for building this commercial high-rise for temporary accommodation and, you know, really, the land – that should be – the government should step in and make sure that the land there is managed by a proper organisation and that there's full consultation about what is to be done with it. At the moment, we just have this push, push, push, higher high-rise and so forth like that. And this meeting today, for instance, is just hurriedly put on. It's not a proper consultation process, it's just something to go through to say, "Well, we ticked that box and people were given an opportunity to talk." Obviously, there's a lot more to talk about this.

And let's hope that one day we will get a government that, like, gave us the Opera House, you know. Even Paul ..... and the Labor Government gave us the Sydney Museum, but that was with government – those sites are on government land. This is private land and that's the danger of it: it's very hard to get anything rational done when, you know, it's private interests, and that's what the AHC is, it's a private organisation and it's not really accountable, you know, to the state. They think they can get away with this thing. Is that enough?

MR CHEONG: Thank you. The next speaker will be Lyall Munro. Are you going to speak on behalf of Lyall?

MS MUNRO: Yes. Lyall Munro is my father and I've been given permission by him also to come here and speak on his behalf.

MR CHEONG: Okay.

MS MUNRO: I actually have a statement written by my father and I've been given permission to read it out – or portions of it anyway. My father, Lyall Munro, is possibly one of only two founding members, along with Sister Naomi Myers. My father is one of three surviving founding members of the Aboriginal Housing Company, so it was in control of Aboriginal hands at one time. It was created by Aboriginal people with help from people like Father Ted Kennedy and his relationship with the churches.

They occupied those places – those houses. They occupied those houses and fought for the block house by house. My father says that he really hopes that there are others and that he is not one of three surviving founding members of the Aboriginal Housing Company. He says:

Our dream was to provide decent homes for our people in the inner city who, at the time, were living in slum conditions. The monstrosity proposed since is not our dream. On the contrary, it's the sully dream of those who have thought different for a long time, those who supported the Sartor legislation on  
5 gentrification; those organisations and leaders who were appointed to the Waterloo authority, which was a direct response after the murder of T.J. Hickey, which resulted in the Redfern riots, which has been used to further demonise and stigmatise Aboriginal youth, the future of the community. The hypocrisy of the authority that originally directed the movement of thousands of  
10 people, both black and white, from the inner city, going on as we speak right now, those who conveniently orchestrated the Aboriginal cleansing of The Fern and then final removal of our people from Waterloo to the suburbs and beyond. It's embarrassing to see clients and patients being bussed in and out to black organisations in Redfern, because they are not being serviced in the places that  
15 they are being moved to. This causes stress to young families. It causes – it means more money is having to be spent on transport in order for these people to come back in and use the services that have been created for them and that they don't get discriminated in. And let's not forget, this is why these Aboriginal community-controlled organisations were created in the first place;  
20 it's because Aboriginal people were turned away from real estates agents, from hospitals. They were left to die, which is why the Aboriginal Medical Service was created.

Aboriginal children were believing that they were not equal; that their lives weren't  
25 valuable because of the way that they were treated in the public school system. This can lead to many, many mental health problems and depression generationally, on top of the inherited trauma our people are already navigating. There are no health professionals in this country talking about colonial trauma, other than educators like me who are doing this for our own needs and seeing the desperation of our children:

30  
*Those who dreamed up the special relations with the Redfern Police, for whatever reason; those black organisations who stood by and watched the last home on the block demolished and never uttered a word either, the home of one of our staunchest founders and elders, Aunty Joyce Ingram. She refused to  
35 leave and actually had excavation machines at her door while she stood her ground and refused to leave.*

Aunty Joyce – just to give a bit of a context, when she was moved to – rehoused in  
40 Waterloo, her health deteriorated greatly, so did a lot of other elders. They died within years of being moved. They didn't have a home to grow old in. They had what community they knew moved out from underneath them. Children were also taken into DoCS custody and placed in other families, in white families, and were displaced outside of this area as a result of the riots. People like Aunty Joyce  
45 Ingram, people like Uncle Richard Dixon and Aunty Yvonne Dixon – these people – they're our elders and they're the people that decide what happens with the community and have for so long.

And when they were ignored and pushed out and rehoused in public housing in Waterloo, the Dixons' health also deteriorated because they had no community. Their strength and everything that kept them holding on and fighting and putting that their fire in their bellies was extinguished. Those organisations and leaders who  
5 ignored the Aboriginal Embassy protest at The Block said nothing either. Without wasting any more time, my father says, these people know who they are. It's not worth mentioning their names. But to say that their organisations are administered by the Noel Pearson's Empowered Community ethos of black gentrifying. The question here is the need for modern, comfortable, safe homes for our people in the  
10 inner city area or the provision of opulent units for hundreds of foreign students.

If by some miracle the Aboriginal Housing Company and everybody involved – people that are not actually employed that do a lot of the work are stifled and Aboriginal homes become a priority, the question then arises, what kind of  
15 blackfellas will be allowed access? Those who were moved from The Block will not be considered. There are already families that have been moved on and are only now finding their way back. It's very reminiscent of the Stolen Generation finding their place again in this community. And this is actually one place that those people came to look for more connections and to look for information. This is the black heart of  
20 this country and it beats for a reason. The people that are being moved on – they have been called criminals in the past. There is heaps more to this story that will be revealed eventually.

My father says that he understands that the new development deal is with a  
25 multinational corp for a 99-year lease with all money up-front to build comfort for rich, foreign students that can pay. Aboriginal people growing up in the area don't have access to any of these. They don't have access to housing, they don't have access to education. And these plans are further moving that access away and further displacing our people. All of these things have been created to try and better our  
30 people, not further displace and silence. Leasing property and leasing Aboriginal land for 99 years ensures that almost 100 years of generations of Aboriginal people will never have ownership of that land which kind of defies the whole term "Aboriginal ownership".

35 The land and the people will be cleansed from Redfern forever. Those attending the meeting today and who oppose the idea, he wishes good luck. Those to the contrary have a lot of work to do but don't actually have to experience the hardship doing it. My father – and I'm very, very heartbroken to read this last line, but my father says that he is ashamed to be a founding member of the Redfern Aboriginal Housing  
40 Company and, for that matter, the Aboriginal Legal Service and the Aboriginal Medical Service, too. My father calls for support and for myself, people like myself, who have had access to Aboriginal education who very much know the history and talks about it. The Aboriginal Housing Company at one stage was in the hand of Aboriginal people but has moved very far away from what they say they do. The  
45 fact that these new plans – as has been mentioned earlier, the fact that these new plans do not promise any Aboriginal housing proves that point. When an organisation has proved that they have failed to do what they set out to do in their

mission statements, it usually means that they stop functioning, they stop business and there's an audit.

5 Again, you know, as has been mentioned, this is why the five million that was  
promised after the discourse that was initiated by people like my mother and the  
setting up of the Aboriginal Tent Embassy has been given back. That agreement was  
reneged on less than a day later. The Aboriginal Housing Company do not want to be  
accountable to anybody but those who sit in that organisation. There are not many  
10 people – Aboriginal people employed by that organisation either. So they either  
need to change their mission statements or change their name because they do not  
plan to house Aboriginal people. My father has asked me to come and speak on his  
behalf. I spoke on both my parents' behalf. My mother pretty much, you know, has  
been fighting for the future. My father represents the past. And they both agree and  
both say the same thing – these plans have ignored any of the original concerns.

15 These plans have ignored the original dreams of the people that founded these  
organisations. They have failed to ignore any legacy that Aboriginal people will  
inherit. And, again, using Pemulwuy's name, they're actually desecrating a legacy.  
The Block is also home to the first early childhood learning centre – Murawina.  
20 There should be questions raised about how the Aboriginal Housing Company came  
into possession of that space because it was not a part of their plans and seems to be  
now. Murawina was the first Aboriginal early childhood centre that was very much  
founded on Aboriginal ways of knowing, epistemologies and methodologies as well  
as the deep colonialist ideology. They recognised how dangerous living in a colonial  
25 society was for young Aboriginal people. They actually took the frameworks from  
the Black Panthers because those people over there – they were dying and they had  
to take over hospitals with force.

30 Our people here didn't have to do that because other people, namely people like  
Gough Whitlam, recognised the need for Aboriginal people to be housed and to have  
an opportunity to live. We will never be able to own any houses, we will never be  
able to have an economic base. And selling and leasing this place out for the next 99  
years ensures that no people, no Aboriginal people after that will ever have access to  
any economic base. If you want to close the gap and change things, that's what  
35 needs to happen. A lot of people don't recognise that Aboriginal people are living in  
poverty and all of these issues that arise from this actually are further – they're  
further made worse by the fact that we don't have access to our own land.

40 All of these solutions come back to autonomy and self-determination and letting  
young people like myself be heard after we've been silenced in our own community.  
And, again, I don't just represent myself. I represent all of the kids that I work with,  
all of the kids that I have to tell that they are worth something, all of these kids that  
get looked at like they do not belong there by people on the street, by those traffic,  
that – those numbers. Everyone that has got up and said something today has spoken  
45 the truth. Our old people who died and never seen their dream realised – they are  
heartbroken. Their spirits are not rested. I'm fighting tears right now thinking about  
people like Uncle Bob Bellear, I'm fighting tears thinking about how strong our

elders were and what they did and how we have to keep reminding everybody else about these old people and their dreams. Their dreams do not see hundreds of students living in that area.

5 Our dreams are always tied up with the youth and the future of our people, and that is why our old people have worked so hard. They have worked themselves to death to ensure that we have these services and we have these things that they didn't have to make our lives a little bit better, to make sure that we live a little bit longer. I shouldn't have to go through a lot of the statistics that I'm referencing. This should  
10 be common knowledge. A lot of things should be common knowledge, but they're not, and that is because a lot of people like to speak on our behalf without actually talking to us, in many different ways. The young people and the elders do not want to see future generations displaced, and they do not want to see a great warrior's name aligned with something that he does not believe in.

15 Pemulwuy waged a 12-year guerrilla war in response to the colonisation and the military expeditions that were happening. Pemulwuy died fighting for his land. He didn't die to house 600 foreign students. He died to make sure that a legacy – and that there were Aboriginal people telling his story after he's already been wiped from  
20 Australian history. Let's not forget it's only in modern times that we're remembering people's names like Pemulwuy because people's names like Bennelong overshadow that and eclipse that because they are the Aboriginal people that Governor Phillip wanted to see in the colony, which is very much what my father is talking about.

25 Who are these Aboriginal people that are going to be in these houses? Because apparently the Aboriginal people who lived there before weren't good enough. This is social – this is ethnic cleansing, social cleansing. It's also just another wave of colonisation in the name of gentrification. So I think that I've said all that I can say  
30 on my father's behalf as a founding member of the Aboriginal Housing Company that has been pushed out. He has not been a part of any of these plans for a very long time, and we find out after things have been published online, which is not a really nice way to find out about your community. So thank you.

35 MR CHEONG: Thank you. The next speaker will be Mark Hanna.

MR M. HANNA: My name's Mark Hanna. I've lived and owned a terrace in Caroline Street, Redfern for the last 13 years, and I've lived in the area generally for  
40 about 20. I'm also a lawyer, and I'm familiar with how one can twist facts and words to suit one's purpose. The Pemulwuy assessment report conveniently distorts facts and ignores others to strongly support a project that's clearly anathema to the majority of the residents of the area, as evidenced by the fact that 94 per cent of the submissions, of the 183 submissions provided to the department, oppose the project in its current form. Let me raise just a few of the issues because I've only got a few  
45 minutes. (1) The department concludes, and I quote:

*The increase in height from 8 to 24 storeys would not have an adverse effect –*

sorry:

*...adverse impact on amenity in terms of overshadowing or overlooking.*

5 To support this curious conclusion, the report publishes figures 18 and 19, in an attempt to illustrate the effects of shadowing on Lawson Street and the surrounding areas. Figures 18 and 19 simply whitewash the effect of shadowing on Caroline, Hugo, Louis and Eveleigh Streets. There is one small diagram showing a large shadow at 9 am over the entire area, while the report, without any real substantiation,  
10 claims that there will be six hours of daily sun for this area in winter. Any fool can predict that, for most of the mornings, especially in winter, most of the block's residences will be cast under a dark pall by the 24-floor skyscraper dwarfing the terraces that have been there for over 100 years, I might add. (2) The quote – the report says:

15

*The proposal would not result in adverse traffic or car parking impacts.*

And it also says:

20 *The proposal would not generate additional pedestrian footpath movements that would exceed footpath capacity surrounding the site.*

One can only conclude, with the greatest of respect, that the author of this report has either neither visited the block or, with the greatest of respect to visually impaired  
25 people – blind. As it is now, not only Lawson Street but Caroline Street cannot deal with pedestrian traffic in the mornings or evenings. Pedestrians and residents on Caroline Street – and I live there. So I should know – are already forced to walk on the road. The footpaths are either blocked or too narrow, being less than half a metre in part, and the report admits that there is no proposal to do anything about the  
30 footpaths or the roads. Table 18 of the report states that the pedestrian traffic will increase in Caroline Street, for example, by a factor of – and I quote – 1000 per cent. That's 10 times. Mysteriously, it claims that, quote:

35

*This will not cause an exceedance in comfort levels for pedestrian routes.*

How do you explain that? Current truck traffic in the Block is already so heavy and so dangerous that a number of submissions have been made to the council to block off one end or the other. Some residents have been so concerned that they have attempted to make matters into their own hands and decrease the danger, yet, with  
40 600 students projected to add to the small area, as well as other Pemulwuy residents, there will be, undoubtedly, a large rise in cars, even if only one in 10, one in 10 of those students, owned or used one. As part of the solution, the department has curiously recommended that, quote:

45

*...future residents not be eligible for on-street parking.*

Now, this attempt is either an attempt to legislate segregation and a two-tiered form of residence, or it's one that I suggest the department knows would be legally unenforceable. The notion that parking will not be an issue because there are 600 students, and other various residents will be pedestrians or ride bicycles, is simply  
5 laughable. To state that the proposal would not have an adverse social or cultural effect is, as the other speakers have said, ludicrous. Firstly, it fails in its basic premise to house the Aboriginals that were once housed on the Block. Secondly, it treats the current residents of the Block with utter disdain.

10 It imposes a modern, arguably gaudy, out-of-character giant skyscraper that is 22 floors higher than the 100 year old terraces that surround it. It imposes car and foot traffic that are unsustainable without any way improving the roads or footpaths that carry the traffic. It is impossible to get council approval for even a north-facing solar power screen on terraces on the Block, yet – because they're considered  
15 unsympathetic to the heritage. Yet this skyscraper cannot even be remotely considered neutral, let alone sympathetic to the characteristics. I request one more minute, if you don't mind.

MR CHEONG: If you can conclude, please.

20

MR HANNA: I will. My fellow neighbours and I decry the destruction of our neighbourhood this project currently represents. No one would place this skyscraper in the centre of Centennial Park or Paddington. Similarly, it does not belong in the Block. Pemulwuy – and I speak as someone who greatly respects this man – was a  
25 warrior who resisted the destructive effects of colonisation. The residents of the block, in the same tradition, resist this imposition on our culture and our heritage. If I know anything about history, I know Pemulwuy would support us in our opposition to this project. Thank you.

30 MR CHEONG: I'll call on the next speaker, Gabriella Smith.

MS G. SMITH: I'm sorry. I'm not prepared. I didn't want to speak. I was intending to come to the meeting, but when I read the front page of the Herald yesterday, I thought we needed to bring some history into this. I bought my house in  
35 Redfern in May 1978. That's just over 40 years ago. I was already a friend of Ted Kennedy. I'd worked with his House of Hospitality since it started there in 1971, and I bought the house because I wanted to buy land that would be Aboriginal land. Excuse me. It was in the days when the police would raid the Empress and the Clifton Hotels practically every evening and drag people off, and it was a terrible,  
40 terrible time, and then the Aboriginal Housing Company had the money to move people into those houses. They were supposed to maintain the houses that were already slums on the rent.

There were rent strikes because people didn't want to live in houses like that, and the  
45 Aboriginal Housing Company and particularly Mick Mundine were demonised, and the division in the community started then, and, unfortunately, it's still continuing. The houses were in a terrible state. Now, over the years, the Aboriginal Housing

Company had the tenacity to keep on working for what would be good Aboriginal housing and, my goodness, against terrible opposition, and Jeff can tell you more about that, but there was wonderful work done pro bono by the architecture department of Sydney University, dear Col James, and the whole point that they  
5 recognised was you can't maintain housing without an income stream.

You can't build housing without an income stream, and so the idea of the student accommodation with a company that's willing to rent for 99 years, run it, make a lot of money and give that money now so that the Aboriginal housing can be built now –  
10 the student hostel is just to make it possible. Now, the affordable housing grant, that was granted ages ago by Tanya Plibersek, but the affordable housing grant is only granted after the housing is built. Nobody's rejecting that money. They're trying to get to the point where they can get it, but I think I'll leave it at that. I – you know, I'm an old woman. I've lived there for 40 years. I've watched a lot of progress.  
15 I've watched a lot of sadness and conflict, but we're better now than we were 40 years ago, and I want to look to a better future and to stop the conflict. There needs to be justice and truth and a voice and reconciliation.

MR CHEONG: Thank you, Ms Smith. Our last speaker will be Jeff Turnbull, if I  
20 can ask if you could come forward, please.

MR J. TURNBULL: My name's Jeff Turnbull. I have lived in Lawson Street, just round the Block, for 40 years, and I have been involved around the Pemulwuy project going back for about 15 or 16 years in the struggle to try and get something  
25 happening on that. I remember, in fact, in 2005, when the Aboriginal Tent Embassy and the Aboriginal Housing Company were actually on the same page on a media release that went out under Isabel Coe and Mick Mundine's signature when the fight was on about what the planning controls were for the Block. I don't envy you your task in doing this assessment in probably one of the most contentious and contested  
30 spaces, with a history that is very – which is very complex. But what I do want to say is that there has been a significant impact of gentrification on Redfern and Waterloo.

The Aboriginal community have been moved out and there is a need to do something  
35 about that. I also am co-spokesperson for a group called REDWatch, which covers and monitors government activity and, in particular, in the development space over Redfern, Waterloo, Eveleigh and Darlington. And one of the things that we are pushing very strongly for at the present moment in the redevelopment of the Waterloo Housing Estate is that part of the cost of doing business in Redfern and  
40 Waterloo should be five per cent affordable Aboriginal housing in addition to the five per cent housing that ..... asking for normal housing because if we don't have affordable Aboriginal housing in Redfern/Waterloo, we run the risk of ending up with a very polarised community where there's an over-representation in public housing and a smaller representation in the upper end the market from people who  
45 manage to buy in and absolutely no middle.

And we're seeing that at the present moment in terms of Aboriginal kids who have grown up in the area, moving – having to move outside and coming back and playing for the Redfern All Blacks, for example. So it is a major issue and I would certainly encourage everybody here who has an interest in trying to keep a viable Aboriginal  
5 community in Redfern to actually push very strongly for that sort of Aboriginal affordable housing coming out of the redevelopments of those sites. And that's part of the reason why I support this project. I support it because it will actually put 62 houses onto The Block. The Block has been sitting vacant when it could have been used for housing for so long. Yes, it has dragged on but that's – it has dragged on  
10 because we're past the time when government actually puts money into Aboriginal organisations to develop those organisations.

The Housing Company went down that track and weren't successful and so they've actually used the location of the land to try and actually get an outcome which does  
15 not have government support. Central to that is the zoning of that land. And I was very much involved in the mid-2000s in the fight with Frank Sartor over what that zoning was to be. And when the Housing Company wouldn't sign over control of that land for 20 years to the government, having worked with the government architect – Aboriginal Office for quite some time, there was then a fight about how  
20 the Aboriginal Housing Company could actually build Aboriginal housing on that site. I think there is an argument strongly to say that the reason why there wasn't the zoning for 18 storeys on The Block side was a function of that fight to try and stop Aboriginal housing that the Minister took at that point.

And I can see no rational reason why an Aboriginal organisation should not have exactly the same planning controls as the developers on the other side of the line, given its proximity to the station. I similarly cannot see why, given the push from the Greater Sydney Commission and UrbanGrowth, to expand the heights along the railway corridor – that if that option is there, an Aboriginal organisation should not  
30 be able to take those in the same way as any other organisation should. They are essential to the delivery of the Aboriginal housing but they are also – well, they're irrelevant to this conversation because this conversation is about what the planning controls allow and what is possible to put on that site. There are some issues around there in terms of congestion. There is at Redfern station and everything around  
35 Redfern station and the building up along that 18 storey corridor is putting more people through that space and that does need to be assessed and it's part of the fight that we're having around doing up of Redfern station and trying to get a southern concourse, which would actually resolve a lot of that issue in the long term. But, in the short term, there are certainly issues in that particular space.

The final thing I would say is that the issue about whether or not the Aboriginal Housing Company's housing should be classed as affordable as far as the Waterloo – Redfern-Waterloo Authority original public housing assessment is really one, I think, to be worked through in – because the housing company pre-dates the setting up of  
45 community housing organisations. They deliver that but in a different model. So the whole question about whether or not the community housing provisions and how that

interacts with that needs to be worked through a little bit further, but I've run out of time. Thank you.

5 MR CHEONG: Thank you. That was our last speaker for today. Can I just remind  
you, as I said earlier, that there have been other meetings that were referred to in the  
opening statement. Summaries of what was said at those meetings and this meeting  
will be placed on the Commission's website in the next few days. Everyone has  
seven days from today if they would like to make a written submission about  
10 anything to do with the Pemulwuy application. Thank you, everyone, for attending  
today. Most of all, thank you to the speakers. And thank you all for listening  
courteously to those speakers. And I will now formally declare the meeting closed.  
Thank you.

15 **RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**[11.30 am]**