

PAC Determination: Eveleigh Workshops DAs

RTBU RMA Submission Framework

1. Background –the uniqueness of these applications

1. Scope – 3 heritage interpretation issues , built fabric , machine collection and social and labour history of the workshop
2. Public Covenant – private sector ownership
3. Second Adaptive- reuse of the Workshops

Summary: once in a generation opportunity

2. Social and Labour History

1. Extracts from the Conservation Management Plan- **Exhibit**
2. Department of Planning and Environment: Assessment Report: RTBU RMA analysis of the Reports analysis of ERW social and Labour history- Exhibit. Includes comments about Workers Wall, Archive /Research Centre, shortcomings in consultation process, procedures and structures; and suggestions to remedy the deficiencies of the Assessment Report- **Exhibit**
3. RTBU RMA: deficiencies of consultation. **Exhibit**. Emails to the Applicant. IAP2's Public Participation Spectrum.

3. Moveable Heritage Collection –Exhibit -Extracts from CMP-RTBU RMA concerns including Davy Press.

4. Travelator: Exhibit: RTBU RMA arguments as to why it should not proceed.

5. RTBU RMA Conditions of Consent: Exhibit

Social and Labour Issues: ATP Conservation Management Plan

The CMP has many references to workers, unions and industrial issues, social and political rights. Section 2.7 Labour and community history with sub headings consisting of Eveleigh as a place of work, unions and the Eveleigh Railway workshops, Aboriginals at Eveleigh and Migrant workers at Eveleigh.

Themes covered in these sections include: conditions of work, Workers conditions and the many strikes by unions to improve them, skills of workers, long and full time employment, and high union density. The history of unions within the workshops , industrial action , the introduction of the Taylor system, surveillance of workers, the Great Strike of 1917, unions being instrumental in providing work and social services , including language classes ad advocating workers' rights, Aboriginal workers at Eveleigh the support given to them in by unions and shop committees in advancing their rights, the fact the aboriginal workers were paid less than other workers and the campaigns to end this injustice by obtaining equal pay and the importance of migrant workers in the workshops post world war 2 and the problems they faced.

There are many examples in the CMP of similar references including: *" the site represents a component of the working life and social context of many Australians. It reflects upon not only those who worked at Eveleigh but all those who worker on the railway systems throughout the country... it is probably a reflection on the industrial worker up tot eh 1980s. It will not occur again."*

"The manager and owners of the ATP site seen as custodians of the history and continuing story, and have associated responsibilities – a duty- to conserve and communicate the history of the place."

Themes of Social Heritage Value -Theme 3: The significance of Eveleigh as a Place of Work

"The ERW were a place of lifelong hard work. Workshop participants noted that the type of industrial labour performed at Eveleigh is no longer common in Australia, but was once a significant source fo employment... this theme which held a lot of meaning to the community was not sufficiently acknowledged by the existing statement of significance for the ERW listing and not currently reflected at the ATP itself."

8.2 Constraints and Opportunities arising from significance: Includes

" the need to communicate the social significance of the site for former workers and the local community as a testament to the lives of thousands of workers as a site of struggle for workers right and improved working conditions"

8.5. 5 Eveleigh Railway Workshops Interpretation Plan 2012. Sets out strategies to communicate the significance and history of the site for future visitors and residents, in particular social history. (the plan proposes the installation of portraits of former workers reflecting diversity of the working environment".)

Policy Objective 10 Interpretation: *"the story of ERW is a great Australian story." Action." The Eveleigh Railway Workshops Interpretation Plan Implementation Strategy should be adopted as a whole where feasible and where funding permits".*

Assessment Report - Locomotive Workshops

Extracts concerning Social and Labour History

1. The Assessment report at **6.2.3 Heritage Interpretation** notes: the three stage process for heritage interpretation: *"The Applicant advised the fact that stage 2 of the HIP is currently being drafted and will be further refined and detailed, including consultation with key stakeholders during the detailed design development of the Locomotive Workshop and following determination of the SSD applications."*

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 Heritage Interpretation a key component. 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 Applicants stage 2 HIP, the most important component of heritage interpretation. This is not a transparent and accountable process being advocated by Mirvac. Mirvac has previously indicated that stage 2 interpretation would be finalised in late 2017 or early 2018.

The Association argues this failure by the Department to engage with social and labour history is a major weakness of the Report and should be remedied by the PAC in its Determination.

The Association suggests that the PAC in its Determination take a number of steps to remedy this deficiency. These include

- A positive statement and section within the PAC determination supporting the importance of social and labour history in heritage interpretation of the Eveleigh Workshops and this can be done by referencing the comments and actions contained in the various Public Covenant documents and the views of key stakeholders to date.
- The Association in its condition of consent has made number proposals to address the weaknesses in social and labour history identified in our submission.
 1. These include changes to the consultation framework, consultation structures, and adopting international best practice consultation procedures.
 2. Recognising and implementing the Departments Heritage Interpretation Policy which argues **"Good research is at the heart of effective interpretation."** By engaging a historian who specialises in the social and labour history of the ERW. Our suggestion parallels the acceptance by the applicant of a specialist being engaged for the machinery collection and this being extended to the equally important social and labour history interpretation.
 3. The preparation of a financial plan for stage 2 and 3 of the HIP for social and labour history.

Stage 2 involves specific interpretative content development- see accompanying document presented by Mirvac at a consultative session on Feb 15 2018 which gives an indication of breadth of issues to be addressed, many of which concern the union but no further direct discussion has occurred in relation to these or other issues with the Union since that date although the Union has made suggestion for heritage interpretation but our suggestions have not been responded to.

Workers Wall

The Departments Assessment Report refers to a long standing workers, union, academic and community proposals for a Workers Wall but no further comments or analysis was made.

The Association argues there are many examples where the DAs for Eveleigh redevelopment do not address the Public Covenant and underpinning documents or where there is difficulty ascertaining whether or not there is genuine support for many of the proposals contained in these documents. The history of the proposal and Mirvac responses, though often vague and uncertain are detailed below. This example does demonstrate in the Associations view the weakness of the consultative procedures and consultative structures and a failure to engage with unions.

Analysis of the history of the Workers Wall.

1. ATP CMP December 2013. At 8.5.4 The Eveleigh steering Committee identified the following key issues and considerations for the former railway workshops including
 - A workers wall

2. The workers wall was referred to in the ERWIP in the following terms:

"A large scale interpretative artwork is proposed that combines the names of workers who were severely injured or killed in industrial accidents at ERW 1881-1889 with the name so the 65 plus trades performed at ERW. Additionally this artwork could be extended to include all those employed at the ERW depending on surviving staff records and research resources. To create the desired effect and legibility for on-site visitors and perhaps even passing train passengers this artwork would need to be at a very large scale and might be incorporated into the site landscaping works."

3. **Heritage Impact Statement ATP Redevelopment, December 2015.** This document included: **Appendix 1: Summary of development against Heritage Policies for the ATP Site.** In relation to the Workers Wall it said:

Constraint/Requirement: quotes from CIMP as referred to above which included a workers wall.

Will the Proposed Mirvac Redevelopment comply? Interpretation implemented as part of the Mirvac redevelopment of the site will be able to ensure compliance with the key considerations raised by the Taskforce and Eveleigh Steering Committee.

Potential impact: Comprehensive and engaging interpretation implemented within the ATP site (to be refined through the final interpretation plan) including management of the

moveable heritage collections, links to other rail heritage places, will be a positive impact for the heritage significance of the site.

Comments. NA

4. Interpretation Strategy for Australian Technology Park, September 2016. This document included at p43 *Table 1: Summary of Proposed Interpretative Works for the ERW Site (from 3D Projects 2012 from the Previous IP.* In relation to the Workers Wall it said:

Description. Quotes from ERWIP IP

Proposed location in the 3D projects Location Report. Flexible

Comments /opportunities: potential to incorporate into landscaping as a public artwork with one of the public domain areas. Not necessarily need to be on such a large scale as proposed. Opportunities to incorporate into the Public Domain through paving or the like.

Timeframe Considerations: could be considered during ATP interpretation. Potential locations in Public Domain areas.

5. ATP Redevelopment SSDA7317 JBA –response to public submissions

Item raised. Suggestion to construct a Commemorative Workers Wall at Eveleigh with space and resources to remember the working lives of the working men and women who worked there the 1880 and the late 1980s.

Proponents Response. This had been identified as an option in pre-existing documentation and will be considered as part of a suite of interpretative options as part of the interpretative planning process.

6. Mirvac DA Locomotive Workshops Redevelopment, November 2017. Appendix M Heritage and Archaeological Impact Statement, Part 3 November 2017. At p43 it repeats the comments made in the November 2016 HIS referred to above. At p54 reference is made to the Midlands workers wall. At P106 it says “a public art strategy has been prepared for the Mirvac redevelopment of the ATP site...development of appropriate concepts and locations for public artwork would require additional consultation with Mirvac, the local community, and FJMT/Sissons in collaboration with Aspect. However, artworks could potentially incorporate such things as ... Workers Wall.”

7. Mirvac.ATP Heritage Response to submissions. Final Report. May 2018.

P17 “Issue –RTBU Development consent should ensure that the concepts for a workers wall and foundry interpretation is included in the HIS

Response. The stage 2 interpretatin strategy will include many different concepts that will be fianlised as a result of a detailed design and consultation process. ...concepts for appropriate homage to the workers of Eveleigh have already been identified within consultation sessions. Initial ideas for capturing the significance of the workers in a commemorative format have been discussed with the Heritage Sub panel, the community,

“Archive & Research Centre: 3D interpretative element. Description: All existing and future ERW related publications to be collected, collated and stored centrally, preferably on site at ERW within an

says:

2. Interpretation Strategy for Australian Technology Park Draft Report September 2016 at p46 it

Visitor Information Centre. ”

Consideration should be given to accommodate an Archive & Research Centre that might double as an ERW suitable ERW location to accommodate an Archive & Research Centre that might double as an ERW government staff and consultants, as well as historians and general researchers by appointment.

1. Eveleigh Railways Workshops Interpretation Strategy, 2012. At section 5.4.1 “Archive and Research Centre. It is proposed that copies of all existing and future ERW–related published histories, heritage studies and masterplans, oral history recordings, and transcripts, artefact inventories, site plans, photographs and original ERW on site archival ephemera are collected and stored centrally, preferably on site at the ERW, for easy access by government agencies and

The RTBU RMA has also undertaken a review of the comments that have been made in various documents and heritage interpretations statements about an Archive and Research Centre.

Archive & Research Centre

conditions of consent.

The consultative process referred to excludes key stakeholders including unions and is confined to a government and semi government agency whose deliberations are not public and do not obtain the benefit of the views of other stakeholders. Changes to this form of behind the scenes non inclusive consultation have been put forward in the Associations

not in any way address the objectives of a Workers Wall. projections are temporary, limited to night time with limited hours of operation and does contribution of former generations of railworkers. One has to remember that vivid style require a tangible, permanent, concrete, identifiable and individual expression of the permanent monument to their contributions at the workshops nor their descendants who alternative. It does not address the collective aspiration and identity of Eveleigh workers, a academics over many years. The Association is strongly opposed to this ill defend Wall. An ill defined homage is not a substitute for the proposal advanced by unions and Association comment. The Applicant has failed to directly address the issue of the Workers

to any SSD approval granted”.

considered unnecessary for a condition of consent requiring specific interpretative elements committee) and will be required to be approved by the DPE prior to implementation, it is Heritage Division and the City of Sydney (as part of the ongoing heritage sub panel Since the stage 2 interpretation strategy will be developed in close consultation with NSW

achievements at Eveleigh.

former workers and specifically the RTBU at consultation sessions in late 2017 and early 2018. It includes potential use of the external northern wall of the locomotive workshop for vivid style projections to create an ever changing commemoration for workers and their

Archive & Research Centre that could double as an ERW Visitor Information Centre. Proposed location: none proposed

Comments/opportunities: ATP buildings are privately owned which is not commensurate with suggested use of the site for a public Archive and Research Centre. Timeframe Considerations: not proposed for this project.””

3. Mirvac DAs for the Redevelopment of the Locomotive Workshops .Appendix M: Heritage and Archaeological Impact Statement Locomotive Workshop (Bays 1-4a), November 2017.

At p9 it says “the loading dock has created the most negative impact in terms of changes to space...in order to offset and help minimise the visual impacts associated with creation of the loading dock, the following heritage initiatives have been proposed including: a dedicated heritage exhibition space (not static), and archival repository, to be located within the mezzanine above the loading dock”

4. Mirvac ATP Locomotive Workshop Heritage Response to Submissions. Final Report May 2018.

P38 “Issue RTBU. The proposal for the Archive/Research located above a loading dock, is an appropriate location for such a centre. Further discussion needs to occur as to the location, function and physical details of such a centre.

Heritage Response: the proposal not responded.”

Roger Jowett

From: Roger Jowett <rogerjowett@bigpond.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 13 March 2018 1:22 PM
To: 'ATP Communications'
Subject: - Stage 2 Heritage Interpretation Workshop - Public Domain at ATP Further Comments By RTBU RMA

Dear Kim: in response to your email of 27th February the following information is provided.

1. Additional Resources: a. Lucy Taksa: Women at Eveleigh: in Peter O'Connor: On Wooden Rails b. L. Taksa: paper titled: Issue Pertaining to absence of attention to Intangible Cultural History at the NSW Eveleigh Railways Workshops. c. Combined Unions Cultural Committee: Trains of Treasure. See article : The Promotion of working class culture : arts and working life in the NSW railways d. Various Union Publications including ARU and AEU; rail unions shop committee publications; shop committee publications : Eveleigh News and the Magnet.e. Eveleigh Oral History Project: Summer Hill films : interviews with 7 former Eveleigh employees on Eveleigh walking tour.
2. Key Storylines: a. the RTBU RMA recommends that the first priority for the Public Domain art work should be a Workers Wall which celebrates in the words of the Taksa article referred to above " a workers wall celebrates those who ensured the efficiency of railway transport through their work at Eveleigh ; provides a source of pride for those workers and their families and recognises the sites cultural heritage and adds meaning to the industrial past for future generations". The RTBU RMA suggests that the Carriageworks development of the ATP public art strategy include the Workers Wall and that in consultation with the community and past workers a commemorative wall be developed. In addition to the workers wall the RTBU RMA suggests that a list of occupations working at the ERW be included in a commemorative representation together with a list of those Eveleigh workers who were killed or seriously injured on the job. Both of these suggestion encompass many of the Key Storylines that have been referred to. b. A key storyline should be developed around Red Square which is referred to in the DA for the redevelopment of the ELW. It could include a range of materials including portraits, audio visual, stories of prominent unionists, significant disputes , union and shop committee newspapers/booklets etc. c. The RTBU RMA suggests attention be given to integrating a number of storylines. One of the current weaknesses is that there appears to be no overview of the production process with a description of the roles of various workshops , bays and the workers involved. This could be addressed in a number of ways. One suggestion was made in the ERW Interpretation Plan 2012 re a Relics Showcase. Another possible avenue is an overview of the steps involved in the production of a steam locomotive. At the recent workshop a suggestion was made that Innovation Plaza could be featured as representing industrial development, city within a city, cutting edge technology, innovation and workers skills. This overview could provide a segue into the ATP technology of the 21st century with the marriage of industrial capitalism and post-industrial capitalism.
3. Public Domain Consultative Strategies: The RTBU RMA has requested on several occasions the the provision of various public domain resources but Mirvac has refused. We once again make a request for the materials as not having access to them undermines our ability to participate in the consultative process. Concerning the Public Art Strategy being developed by Carriageworks the RTBU RMA requests that we be consulted before the strategy is finalises and becomes a fait accompli.

The RTBU RMA notes that several heritage interpretation strategies are being simultaneously pursued including the Public Art strategy, buildings 1,2 and 3 and the current ELW DA. We request that further consultation be undertaken on an integrated interpretation strategy.

If you have any queries of comments please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully, Roger Jowett. (RTBU RMA.)

Roger Jowett

From: Roger Jowett <rogerjowett@bigpond.com>
Sent: Thursday, 19 April 2018 1:24 PM
To: Kim Elliott (kim.elliott@mirvac.com)
Subject: Notes of Feb Community Workshop
Attachments: Scan.pdf

Dear Kim: at the further public domain workshop held on 6th April I was asked to supply a copy of the community workshops notes of 15th Feb. which I took and reported back on as reporter from the Group .

I have attached for you information a scan of my working notes from our group. One or two sections didn't appear in full such as the left top hand corner where our group wanted an integrated strategy which covered the public domain, the Eveleigh Loco Workshops and the public art strategy. Also in the top right hand corner is a mention to the workers wall which I referred to in my report back to the wider group. These comments should form part of the record of the meeting which were undertaken by Mirvac employees /contractors.

On behalf of the RTBU RMA I request a copy of these notes by available to the RTBU RMA.

Our organisation would also like to know how the substantial feedback and ideas provided by community workshop participants is being represented in the development of concepts and designs for the public domain.

At the recent 6th April workshop about the public domain Mirvac was provided with considerable information on ARU activists who could be included in the portraits section of interpretation. They included, Stan Jones , Fred Wingrave, Jack Maddox, Luigi Cavelleri, Dick Nicholls and Ted Walsham. The ARU photo collection was referred to be me as a potential source of materials for stage 2 of the heritage interpretation strategy. Natalie asked if I could facilitate her being given access to this collection. If Natalie wishes to pursue, this which is an action we would certainly encourage, she can give me a ring on 0432105509 or email me.

At both workshops and in a range of submissions made by the RTBU RMA to various Mirvac DAs we have emphasised the importance of the Workers Wall to past and present unionists and community members . The workers wall was mentioned in passing at the recent workshop by Natalie as potentially being represented in some form on Locomotive Street. The RTBU RMA requests that Mirvac provide details of what is proposed in respect of the Workers wall which is a prominent feature of both the CMP and ERWS 2012 IP.

Kind regards, Roger Jowett. RTBU RMA

Roger Jowett

From: Roger Jowett <rogerjowett@bigpond.com>
Sent: Monday, 15 October 2018 2:05 PM
To: 'Kim Elliott'
Subject: RE: Heritage Sub-Panel

Hi Kim: Could you please forward the information as requested. Regards, Roger Jowett.

From: Kim Elliott [<mailto:kim.elliott@mirvac.com>]
Sent: Thursday, 6 September 2018 6:25 PM
To: Roger Jowett
Subject: RE: Heritage Sub-Panel

Hi Roger,

My apologies, I was off unwell when this original e-mail came through and it has been missed. My apologies.

I will locate this information and provide over the coming days.

Kind regards, Kim

Kim Elliott
ATP Communications and Engagement Manager
Office and Industrial

T +61 2 9080 8125
2 Locomotive St, Eveleigh NSW 2015



Reimagine urban life

[Electronic Data Transmission Disclaimer](#)

From: Roger Jowett <rogerjowett@bigpond.com>
Sent: Thursday, 6 September 2018 10:54 AM
To: Kim Elliott <kim.elliott@mirvac.com>
Subject: FW: Heritage Sub-Panel

Dear Kim: on behalf of the RTBU RMA I sent this request for information some weeks ago and haven't had a response. Your assistance in this matter would be appreciated.

Yours faithfully, Roger Jowett.

From: Roger Jowett [<mailto:rogerjowett@bigpond.com>]
Sent: Monday, 13 August 2018 10:28 AM
To: Kim Elliott (kim.elliott@mirvac.com)
Subject: Heritage Sub-Panel

Dear Kim: the RTBU RMA requests copies of the minutes, decisions, recommendations and reports of the Heritage Sub- Panel.

Your assistance in providing these materials at the earliest opportunity would be appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

IAP2'S PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SPECTRUM

The IAP2 Federation has developed the Spectrum to help groups define the public's role in any public participation process. The IAP2 Spectrum is quickly becoming an International standard.

INCREASING IMPACT ON THE DECISION



| INFORM | CONSULT | INVOLVE | COLLABORATE | EMPOWER |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p>To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.</p> | <p>To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.</p> | <p>To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.</p> | <p>To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.</p> | <p>To place final decision making in the hands of the public.</p> |
| <p>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION GOAL</p> | | | | |
| <p>We will keep you informed.</p> | | | | |
| <p>We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</p> | | | | |
| <p>We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</p> | | | | |
| <p>We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.</p> | | | | |
| <p>PROMISE TO THE PUBLIC</p> | | | | |
| <p>We will implement what you decide.</p> | | | | |

Moveable Heritage Collection

Extracts from the ATP Conservation Management Plan

NSW Environment and Heritage –Statement of Significance.

"The Eveleigh Locomotive Workshops collection consists of over 400 individual items and represents a significant component of the Eveleigh Railway workshops and is a substantial remnant of the equipment that was on site during the operational period of the workshops. The equipment includes a nearly complete assemblage from the Blacksmiths shop, significant portions of the Spring Shop and Wheel shop and remnants of the of the hydraulic power train which drove the equipment. These are the most complete in situ collections of this type in Australia

"In the case of the ATP moveable Heritage Collection, it is very much the case of "the whole being greater than the sum of the parts."

"That the ERW Machinery collection has been reduced and rationalised several times since the closure of the workshops.items in the current collection has been assessed as having a key or contributory nature to the significance of the ERW with only a few exceptions."

Reuse of Machines. "the potential for reinstating some of the machinery to operational condition and use has been identified has been proposed in the past and it remains theoretically possible. However in a number of significant cases, this course of action is problematic." Reasons outlined include failure to meet current OHS standards, skills, power supplies and Ancillaries and tools.

It needs to borne in mind that the Eveleigh MHC has been significantly rationalised since the workshop closure. The Association argues it should be not be further rationalised. This should be subject to a condition of consent. (Subject of outcomes of negotiations with Transport Heritage for reuse of certain equipment. This matter is also included in our Conditions of Consent.)

The Departments Assessment Report is relatively brief in its MHC analysis with the issues largely confined to one section consisting of a few pages. The Association argues there are a number of unresolved issues which remain to be addressed. This is tempered by the fact that the important stage 2 of the HIP remains in its infancy. The Association argues that a number of Conditions of Consent relating to the MHC should be adopted.

The overall area allocated to heritage interpretation will be significantly reduced though a number of factors could influence the final outcome. The Assessment Report commented on several occasions on the importance for heritage interpretation of exhibition space, curation and presentation.

A number of factors affect the space to display the MHC. The commercial space for bays 5-15 is 27, 458 **Extracts from the ATP Conservation Management Plan**

NSW Environment and Heritage –Statement of Significance.

“The Eveleigh Locomotive Workshops collection consists of over 400 individual items and represents a significant component of the Eveleigh Railway workshops and is a substantial remnant of the equipment that was on site during the operational period of the workshops. The equipment includes a nearly complete assemblage from the Blacksmiths shop, significant portions of the Spring Shop and Wheel shop and remnants of the of the hydraulic power train which drove the equipment. These are the most complete in situ collections of this type in Australia

“In the case of the ATP moveable Heritage Collection, it is very much the case of “the whole being greater than the sum of the parts.”

“That the ERW Machinery collection has been reduced and rationalised several times since the closure of the workshops.items in the current collection has been assessed as having a key or contributory nature to the significance of the ERW with only a few exceptions.”

Reuse of Machines. *“the potential for reinstating some of the machinery to operational condition and use has been identified has been proposed in the past and it remains theoretically possible. However in a number of significant cases, this course of action is problematic.”* Reasons outlined include failure to meet current OHS standards, skills, power supplies and Ancillaries and tools.

It needs to borne in mind that the Eveleigh MHC has been significantly rationalised since the workshop closure. The Association argues it should be not be further rationalised. This should be subject to a condition of consent. (Subject of outcomes of negotiations with Transport Heritage for reuse of certain equipment.) This matter is also included in our Conditions of Consent.)

The Departments Assessment Report is relatively brief in its MHC analysis with the issues largely confined to one section consisting of a few pages. The Association argues there are a number of unresolved issues which remain to be addressed. This is tempered by the fact that the important stage 2 of the HIP remains in its infancy. the Association argues that a number of Conditions of Consent relating to the MHC should be adopted.

The overall area allocated to heritage interpretation will be significantly reduced though a number of factors could influence the final outcome. The Association requests PAC calculate the before and after gross floor area changes to the heritage Interpretation exhibition space as a consequence of the DAs. The Assessment Report commented on several occasions the importance for heritage interpretation of exhibition space, curation and presentation.

Transport Heritage and Mirvac are in negotiation to transfer a significant part of the collection from Bay 9 away from the locomotive workshops for use in training apprentices in the repair and maintenance of steam trains. The Association does not question the merit of the proposal but we do raise serious doubts about its practicality. This proposal in various forms has been circulating in the industry for a generation as indicated earlier in the CMP quote. That it has not been implemented to date is testimony to the difficulties encountered. From discussions held with industry sources the following issues were raised: the proposal is in the blue sky category without a business plan or budget, complex industrial and competency based training issues are involved in designing

competency modules to train the apprentices, formidable logistical and cost issues are involved in restoring heritage items of machinery, OHS matters, lack of parts, power sources, lack of skilled tradesmen to act as mentors etc. This issue could be resolved relatively quickly as it impacts on a number of aspects of the MHC and the public access to the collecting under a cloud.

The various MHC plans and the Assessment Report in part have raised issues including

- The provenance of the machinery and the ability/desirability to return the machines to the bay/location associated with their use (taking into account a number of the original places of origin no longer exist); machine assemblages and ability to reinstate a machines association; the ability to group machines used in particular operations in order to get a better understanding of the nature of the production process which helps considerably in interpretation
- Relocation of machines as a consequence of a number of decisions about heritage exhibition space. This applies to a range of machinery including the spring shop machines. What is the future of machines originally from bays 5-15? An important aspect of the Assessment Report was increasing the use of public access to the collection. How is this to be addressed in those Bays, for example, the public currently has access to Bays 9-13.
- The ability to make operational currently out of use machines. It is noted that there are plans to refurbish and operationalise two furnaces for use in the blacksmiths operations and this is supported by the Association. As to other potential candidates this is a subject that needs to be subject specialist analysis with a report to make available to the community for comment.
- Mirvac have indicated that they want to move away from a static collection and have a more dynamic curatorial policy which involves more frequent rotation of machines though no details are available although it is indicated this will occur in stage 2 of the HIS.
- The issues referred to above have caused considerable anxiety in the community about the reduction in the machine collection, potential storage of parts of the collection or decommissioning.

Another matter which we recommend should be included in the PAC Determination but was missing from the Assessment Report and the Applicants various DA documents was the role of volunteers. These were included in the MHC and HMAS documents and are referred to in the following terms” *volunteer involvement in the interpretation and maintenance of the collection is a highly important for heritage interpretation and should be facilitated and encouraged.*”

A plan should be drawn up to grow the numbers of volunteers to be involved in heritage interpretation and maintenance. This issue is included in Association’s conditions of Consent.

An issue which can be overlooked is the interpretation of the Davy press the most iconic item in Eveleigh MHC and the separation of the constituent parts. In the view of the Association this is an act of heritage vandalism and must be reversed.

In addition the issue of relating the various items of the machinery collection to the workers who operated them, their classifications, wage rates, conditions under which the work was performed and the OHS challenges presented by the machinery should all be included in stage 2 heritage interpretations and Conditions of Consent should incorporate these matters.

On the evidence presented it would appear the amount of heritage interpretation space will be diminished. When one considers the conversion of bays 9-13 to commercial uses, the potential removal of machinery from bay 9 , the loading dock and associated back of house functions and the allocation of significant floor area to retail use in bays 1 and 2 then a significant change may occur.

The Association notes the acceptance by the applicant of the suggestion from a government agency that a machinery collections expert is employed to provide assistance and that this is to be incorporated into a condition of consent. This is supported by the Association. However we suggest a sub panel be formed which includes members of the community who have expertise in the MHC and these members are included together with the Heritage Council and Council in resolving stage 2 interpretation issues with Secretary of the Department.

The Association has listed a number of issues which could dramatically impact on the MHC and if implemented would be contrary to the Public covenant and its underpinning documents.

The Association argues the starting point for the PAC should be support of a prima facie position that all 400 odd items of the MHC should be retained and that the exhibition space be allocated to interpretation be all of Bays 1 and 2, subject to blacksmithing operations; the entire collection be exhibited within the workshop and this be incorporated into the stage 2 interpretation plan and be a condition of consent. Any changes to this prima facie position are endorsed by the consent of all parties who form and sub panel referred to earlier.

Quite clearly there are many unknowns in the stage 2 HIS 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 Associations condition of consent.

Travelator and Loading Dock

Travelator

The arguments of the Applicant are based on economic grounds. Two economic studies were undertaken by the Applicant to garner support for the contention: "there are seven critical success factors that must be met in order to ensure the successful development, operation and activation of any everyday retail offer at the Locomotive Workshop. **These critical success factors are all interrelated, with each being redundant without the others.**"¹(Applicants highlighting).

The Association has in Appendix A to this section analysed the business model, socio demographic factors at play within the Redfern District, the large market gap in retail space in the district, the applicants exceedance of industry benchmarks, suggested supermarket revenue growth projections and concluded that the absence of the travelator will not make one iota of difference to the economic viability to the supermarket/ retail proposal.

The Applicants economic analysis outlines key factors for success in relation to the travelator :

"We consider

- *The provision of direct access to all weather car parking would be more is more sustainable for the locomotive workshop precinct. As the precinct is established and operates this will provide appoint of difference to similar offers without undercover parking in the main trade area.*
- *removes the need for pedestrians t cross locomotive street , creating a safer environment*
- *enables customers locomotive workshop offer and broader precinct more quickly and efficiently when arriving by car*
- *All weather access parking is likely to be greater attractor to retailers and other business who would seek to locate at the Locomotive Workshops, as it allows for easy access for their customer base. This provides an alternative to other forms and enables an everyday shop for the local community whilst reinforcing repeat visors from car users wanting to do a larger shop."*

A number of points are made by the Association in response. The key Factors for Economic Success consultants Report briefly examined a number of allegedly similar case studies. A comparative analysis of interrelated critical success factors between the case studies and the Eveleigh Workshop was not carried out. However a quick examination reveals that a number do not have car parking or have limited car parking. None have the superb combination of the three heritage interpretation features possessed by the Locomotive Workshops.

The retail offering for the Locomotive Workshop differs to many retail precincts in that the that primary customer base are the workers on site, as the Departments Assessment Report indicates "the applicant contended that no specific car parking is proposed or required for the retail

¹ Letter from consultants MacroPlan Dimisi, 21 Feb 2018. Re: Key Factors to Success. See also Locomotive Workshop: Key factors to success, October 2017, MacroPlanDimisi and Locomotive Workshop, ATP. Eveleigh: Economic Impact Assessment, October 2017. MacroPlanDimisi.

component as these uses will largely serve the employees of ATP and surrounding residents with 85 to 90% of visitors walking to the retail component.”

The travel management plan for the workers on site has established an 80% public usage target for the 10,000 CBA employees coming to the ATP site.

The total car parking spaces for the entire ATP precinct is 1531 and the lower ground floor for building 2,(from which the travelator will be linked via a tunnel to the ground floor supermarket) was reconfigured to provide 201 parking spaces for visitors to the Locomotive Workshop and ATP .

The Association argues these general dot point arguments do not add up to a “ **fundamental threshold requirement**” when the purpose of the car parking in building 2 is analysed: no specific parking for the supermarket/ retail component, the number of customers who will be walking as compared to arriving by car, the latter a few %. The Association argues the critical success factors, based on economic arguments, put forward as the justification for the travelator are not soundly based when subjected to analysis. In addition the Association believes the travelator adversely impacts on the heritage industrial character of the built fabric of the Workshops. **The travelator should be rejected by the PAC in its Determination.**

Loading Dock:

The impacts of the loading dock and its associated back of house facilities are substantial for a variety of reasons as bays 1 and 2 are the primary heritage space in the Locomotive Workshops. The heritage interpretation and exhibition space will be substantially reduced because of the dock and other proposals. The loading dock is incompatible with a heritage and exhibition space. The most significant component of the machine collection is recognised by all to be the Davy Press. The Davy press assemblage will be effectively voided by the intervention of the loading dock and the public will be unable to appreciate the scale and grandeur of the Davy Press assemblage.

The proposed delivery service to and from the loading dock through the most heavily pedestrianised route of the ATP and through Innovation Plaza with associated loss of a tree presents an unacceptable risk to public safety.

The Association argues that the relocation of the loading dock away from Bays 1 and 2 may cause a marginal decrease in productivity but the overall analysis suggests this is more than outweighed by the economic benefits accruing to the developer and a retail offer that is able to complement the many heritage interpretation elements of the Locomotive Workshop.

The Association recommends the Loading dock should be rejected by the PAC in its Determination.

Appendix A

- The ATP entire 13 hectare site was bought by Mirvac. The Association argues the three commercial buildings being built for the Commonwealth Bank and the redevelopment of the Locomotive Workshops should be added together to understand the financial outcomes for the company and its shareholders. The Mirvac/CBA agreement to build and lease 3 buildings with a gross floor area of 100,000sq.m plus 3000sq.m retail space was one of the biggest projects of this type ever undertaken in Australia. The wow factor for the ATP site is the unparalleled customer attractor of the Locomotive Workshops built fabric, machine collection and social and labour history.
- Mirvac is Australia's 48th largest company. It is an integrated, diversified Australian property group. Its business model is based on integration e.g. commercial and retail, as in the ATP site, repositioning within the retail market and unlocking value for shareholders e.g. Redfern and surrounding district with the Locomotive Workshop retail proposal.
- Inner-city neighbourhoods are seen as the most profitable retail markets with a socio demographic profile that is 30% higher than average incomes across Sydney, 19% lower unemployment, 10 times more population per square km Vs the Sydney average, and 65% higher population growth. This combination has allowed Mirvac to significantly outperform its peers due to its concentration on inner city neighbourhoods in Sydney (e.g. Mirvac owns Broadway and Harbourside (Darling harbour) (Darling Harbour) retail precincts) and Melbourne. For example its supermarkets perform 30% above industry benchmarks.
- There is a severe shortage of supermarket floor space in the Redfern and surrounding districts main trade area. It is 27% below the typical provision across metropolitan Sydney. Mirvac's supermarket /retail proposal meets a market gap, can easily be absorbed, will result in no reduction in service provision across the main trade area and will have a negligible impact on district retailers. Supermarket revenue is anticipated to increase from \$36m to \$122m in 2031, an increase of over 300% and during the same period worker/residents population in the main trade areas will increase from 96,000 to 173,000 an increase of 79%.²
- The economic reports only briefly examined destination and cultural heritage tourism by referencing a few generalised figures.
- The capital spends by Mirvac for the ATP site are \$443m for the CBA buildings and \$137.06m for the locomotive workshops. \$48.4 for the retail development and \$88.62 m for commercial. A total capital spend of \$580.06m

² Mirvac Economic Assessment Report referred to earlier.

RTBU RMA –Conditions of Consent

Issue: cultural tourism and destination precinct.

A requirement that the Applicant prepare a Report which details the program for encouraging cultural heritage tourism and heritage interpretation destination visits.

Issue: Heritage Interpretation: Moveable Heritage Collection and Social and History

1. The Applicant is required to:

a. ensure that Bays 1 and 2 of the Eveleigh Locomotive Workshops be used exclusively for heritage Interpretation and exhibition space for both the Moveable and in situ Machine Collection and for the intangible cultural heritage of the Workshops in a manner that is compatible with continued and ongoing use of the active Blacksmithing workshop.

b. continue ownership and provide public access to all items in the ATP Movable Asset Collection. All items to be retained on site with no further disposal or decommissioning occur.

c. establish a community consultation process for stage 2 of the HIP that:

i. creates a Heritage Interpretation sub panel which consists of the MHC heritage specialist, an historian with specialist knowledge of the intangible cultural history of the Eveleigh Locomotive Workshops, two community representatives with explicit knowledge of the Workshops social and labour history and two with specialist knowledge of the MHC collection and its heritage significance, a representative of the Heritage Council and City of Sydney Heritage specialists to produce a report/s for approval by the Secretary of the Department before the first occupation certificate, which includes an investigation and recommendations in relation to:

i. the efficacy of Transport Heritage obtaining a part of the movable heritage collection

ii. The further potential for making operational items from the MHC

iii. what assemblages machines can be grouped in e.g. spring shop machines and which machines/assemblages can be located in their original location

iv. the future of heritage interpretation in the commercial bays 5-15

v. the specific details of how the intangible cultural heritage of the EWS will be addressed in an ongoing manner within the framework of the Public Covenant

vi. a financial plan for the interpretation, maintenance and management of the MHC and the intangible cultural heritage

vii. a volunteer's engagement plan

viii. public consultation on the report and its recommendations prior to submission to the Secretary for approval