

Australian Technology Park –Response to Submissions- RTBU RMA

1. Timing of response. Given the volume of documentation that has to be analysed the proposed closing date for submissions of June 3 2016 is too short and limits a considered reply.

2. The consolation process has been inadequate. The consultation response is included in Appendix B Response to Public Submissions and Community Outcomes Report. The RTBU RMA has had first hand experiences of the consultation process and these were detailed in our submission.

As an elected trade union official for over twenty years I have been involved in literally hundreds of consultations processes. The ATP process ranks as one of most meaningless. Spin, glossy brochures, one on one discussion in which the most basic information could not be provided and a failure to respond to written requests for information were hallmarks of the ATP consultation process.

The distinct experience of our organisation was that of a process in which decisions were already made, that the commercial interests of Mirvac and the CBA were preeminent and the needs of the community came a distant second.

3. What does the Local Community want?

The propose development of the Redfern Waterloo area extends over many years with many reports. One of the latest was the *“Central to Eveleigh Urban Transformation and Transport program: Consultation Feedback report on vision, key moves and design principles.”*¹

A number of themes referred to in the Executive Summary that emerged from the consultation included:

- That it is a place for all types of people: a wide range of housing for all types of people of all income levels...
- Make the new places connect with us. The concept of integration was seen as an essential element to delivering new homes and jobs in the area. Connections whether physical or social were highly valued... people wanted to move around neighbourhoods.
- We need to feel safe and secure. This included a range of blue and white collar jobs.
- We want to see improvements before new people live and work here. Improving key road and rail facilities were key issues.

The Report under Key Move 8 says. *“Arts, cultural and heritage initiatives will be guided through a co-ordination advisory group.”*²

The RTBU RMA notes the detailed Interpretation plan for the ATP has a number of items relating to arts, cultural and heritage initiatives and has many intersections with this key move. The RTBU RMA asks: has the Advisory Group been established and through appropriate government agencies can the arts, cultural and heritage initiatives for the Eveleigh precinct be co-ordinated?

¹ Central to Eveleigh: Urban Transformation and Transport Program: Consultation, Feedback Report on Vision, Key Moves and Design Principles. Urban Growth, October, 2015

² Op Cit p20.

4. A significant component of the original RTBU RMA submission concerned the ATP Heritage Impact Statement. (HIS) The RTBU RMA notes that the proponent's response includes "Addendum to Heritage impact Statement ATP Redevelopment". In addition to the Addendum to the HIS, ATP heritage issues are also addressed in "Appendix B- Response to Public Submissions" at pages 16-23.

In the following section the RTBU RMA comments on a number of issues brought up in the "Response to Public Submissions."

a. Issue: Loss of heritage items-former foundry. The Comment notes *"it is intended that the former foundry will be interpreted within the new development in some form, subject to detailed design."*

In our view this is recognition of the importance of the foundry but it does not examine or recognise submissions about new forms. The RTBU argued for a workers wall recognising the employees of the workshops for the 100 odd years of their existence and the development of a video/sound instillation which replicated the workings of the foundry.

This issue of a commemorative workers wall is also taken up on P20 of the Response in the following terms *"this had been identified as an option to consider in pre-existing interpretive documentation and will be considered as part of a suite of interpretive options as part of the interpretive planning process."*

b. Issue: "Ignoring the significant social history of Aboriginal people who were employed in the workshops and involved in trade union activities etc." The response recognises that the interpretation plan included in the Addendum to the HIS will ensure that all *"aspects of the social history of the site will be fully considered and that appropriate aboriginal consultation will be undertaken."*

This is an advance on what was contained in the HIS. The CMP and EWS interpretation plan referred to the role of trade unions in fighting for aboriginal workplace rights and this needs to be included in the Interpretation Plan.

c. Issue: Existing CMP must be adhered to and not watered down. A significant component of the RTBU RMA HIS response was devoted to the selective use of policies within the CMP and the non-reference to a number of policies including social and cultural issues in the HIS.

These important matters are now to be considered in the Interpretation Plan forming part of the Addendum to the HIS.

d. Issue: the EIS did not take into account material contained in the Social and Oral history volumes that form part of the CMP " The Response acknowledged that the information was not specifically reviewed as part of the preparation of the HIS and said *"The information will be further explored at the appropriate point of the development process – which is as part of the interpretation planning phase."*

An important issue is to what uses this material will be put to. The RTBU RMA in its submission made a number of practical suggestions.

e. Issue: Suggestion to allocate funds for a comprehensive interpretation strategy for the whole site. The Response indicated “the HIS addendum outlines the Interpretation planning process which follows the NSW Heritage Division Interpretation guidelines and policies.”

The RTBU RMA notes that this detail is an improvement on the original HIS and now includes workers and railway associations as key stakeholders together with an improvement in the consultation process.

We suggest an explanation needs to be given about the relationship between Interpretation planning process in the HIS Addendum and the existing Eveleigh Workshops Interpretation Plan. (EWIP)

Prima facie, the RTBU RMA believes as the EWIP forms part of the CMP then the interpretation planning process will be supplementing rather than replacing the legally binding EWIP.

g. Issue “ Suggestion to establish a living heritage and cultural centre at the site with space and resources for all archival records and management plans , historical documents, oral histories, videos and photographs”. The Response noted “*this request falls outside the scope of the proposal and is likely to be a more a more respectful and useful point of the development process which is part of the interpretation planning phase.*”

The RTBU RMA asks how this suggestion will be addressed in this phase. For example, by undertaking a detailed examination which includes full stakeholder involvement and costings for establishing and maintaining a living heritage and cultural centre?

h. Issue: Failure of the HIS to address the binary nature of the Eveleigh precinct. Response: “*the binary nature of the site is part of a long term site management process across all key Eveleigh precinct sites that requires input from numerous stakeholders, and does not form part of the approvals process.*” The RTBU RMA has earlier in the submission made a positive suggestion concerning the combining of the arts, cultural and heritage initiatives of the North and South Eveleigh precincts.

Fragmentation was part of the problem identified by our submission. We identified this as a governance issue. The multiplicity of private and public stakeholders meant in our view only the NSW government was capable of addressing these issues due to conflicting private sector objectives and the need to make progress on a range of outstanding issues.

I. Issue: the HIS fails to successfully address labour, aboriginal and community history. Response: “*this significant history will be addressed as part of the Interpretation Planning process.*” The RTBU RMA notes the response.

j. Issue HIS doesn’t include contemporary adaptive re -use. The RTBU RMA notes the response “*this proposal does not include the adaptive reuse of the Locomotive Workshops.*” This and other issues will be the subject of a further DA.

The RTBU RMA asks for an indication as to when this application is to be made? There is likely to be an overlap between the interpretations strategies for the ATP precinct and the Locomotive Workshops on a range of issues.

K.Issue: the HIS should include engagement with former workers. The RTBU RMA notes the response: *“this is intended to be incorporated in the community consultation process to be implemented as part of the Interpretation Planning process.”*

M.Issue.” Mirvac undertake work on the cultural, social and political significance of the site and reflects these stories in the interpretation of the site...” The RTBU RMA notes the Response *“this will form part of the interpretation process.”*

5. Addendum to HIS –Comments by RTBU RMA.

1. Issue 2.2 Landscape and Public Domain Works. The RTBU RMA supports the submission by the Heritage Council *“that the landscape and public domain works should incorporate the strategies outlined in the Interpretation strategy for the site and be implemented as part of proposed works prior to an occupation certificate being issued.”* It is noted the Response agrees to the suggestion made by the Heritage Council.

2. Issue 2.3 Interpretations Plan. This issue concerns an updated Interpretation Plan to address the proposed redevelopment including interpretation of foundry walls and methods to retain and interpret moveable heritage throughout the site. The Heritage Council submitted the final interpretation should be provide to the Heritage Council for comment prior to finalising the detailed design for the project given the sites significance.

The response noted the need for an updated interpretation plan in accordance with NSW Heritage Division Guidelines.

The response indicated that the Interpretation plan be completed in 3 separate stages.

Stage 1 related to a process to be completed prior to a Construction certificate being issued. It outlines through 6 dot points the process from review to conclusions and recommendations.

The RTBU RMA makes the following comments concerning the proposed process.

a.The overall ATP site will be subject to 2 Development applications. The current one for the commercial development of the site and the second at a future date for the Locomotive workshops. There is already an Eveleigh Workshops Interpretation Plan which is part of the Covenant. The two plans must be symbiotic.

b. In dot point 2 preliminary stakeholder consultation reference is made to relevant railway associations.

The paragraph following the 6 dot point notes *“ Mirvac are proposing that a part of the process for preparing the interpretation plan there would be meaningful engagement with key stakeholders , including former workers who retain a close interest in the site , the volunteers , ATP and the local community, including the Aboriginal community. Therefore in order to allow this process to occur properly at a site of this significance and scale adequate time and resources are required.”*

Given the comments of dot point 3 included reference to railway associations and the vital role played by trade unions throughout the operations of the workshops the RTBU RMA suggests this paragraph should be revised to include railway associations.

The RTBU RMA suggests that the Interpretation Plan is prepared as a requirement of consent for the DA not as a condition of consent. Given the history of the site including the Covenant accompanying the sale this highlights the importance of the site and the need for strict procedures to be adopted for the Implementation Plan.

Stage 2. Stage 2 Content Development (During Construction program prior to Occupation Certificate.) The RTBU RMA suggests that key stakeholders be consulted in dot points 3, 4 and 5.

Stage 3 – Interpretation Plan (During Construction program, prior to occupation certificate. The RTBU suggests that key stakeholders be consulted in dot points 1 and 2 of this stage.

The RTBU RMA argues for the consultation to be meaningful all key stakeholders need to be also involved in dot points 4-6 of Stage one; dot points 3,4 and 5 of Stage 2 and dot points 1 and 2 of Stage 3. The RTBU RMA the additional consultation outlined should be a conditional requirement for approval of the DA.

The RTBU suggests that as timelines and resources have been identified by the proponent as key issues for the 3 Stages of the Interpretation Plan they be detailed at the earliest opportunity by the Proponent.

6. Response to Public submissions: Other Issues

1. Issue: Local Jobs.” *Why are the CBA and Mirvac not supporting local workers, local jobs and local businesses?”* Response: *“Mircac and CBA will support local suppliers and workers where possible.”*

As unionists with experience in dealing with job creation and local labour markets the RTBU RMA notes that the Redfern Waterloo area is one of socio economic disadvantage. We suggest that with appropriate resources from two of Australia’s largest companies together with state, federal and local government and local organisations working together in partnership, jobs for locals can be created.

The Central to Eveleigh Urban Growth Consultation Feedback Report had as a key theme the creation of blue and white collar jobs.

The NSW Government focus on job creation has been through the prism of ATP as set out in the above document *“(it will) drive local economic growth in innovative knowledge intensive, education, creative, cultural and digital industries. ATP is key to the vision for thriving creative and digital industries.... We will assess the existing Aboriginal workplace training and placement services available in the area with a view to facilitating uptake of these services on a range of local infrastructure initiatives as part of the tendering process for development projects.”*³

The two major companies involved in the project CBA and Mirvac cover the financial services and construction industries, a mix of white and blue collar jobs.

The RTBU RMA believes there is a unique opportunity for all stakeholders to come together to formulate and implement a local jobs program including apprenticeships and traineeships for the

³ Op Cit p17

Redfern- Waterloo community and tendering processes for the ATP site should include these matters concerning a local jobs as a condition of the DA.

2. Issue: Redfern Waterloo Contributions Development. Mirvac seeks not to pay the required levy. The Response notes *“The proposed upgrades to the public domain are considered to benefit the wider local community.”*

The RTBU RMA makes the following comments:

(i) In announcing the sale of the ATP both the NSW Government through the press release of the Minister and Mirvac's announcement to the stock exchange emphasised *“Mirvac and its partners have made a commitment to revitalise the existing technology precinct”*. From day one this was part of their vision. In our view it is disingenuous to argue *“that Mirvac has gone above what is typically delivered in suburban business parks”*

(ii) The development contributions to be paid are for facilities on privately owned property. The upgrades will not go to the wider Redfern Waterloo precinct. The core of the ATP project is a commercial property development with 10,000 employees who will be the primary beneficiaries of the upgraded public domain.

Reference is made in the Public Response document to public domain and community facilities as the key ingredients in the overall public benefit arguments. In the public consultation the four story community building was highlighted as a major benefit for the community as was child care facilities.

The spin and the reality have turned out to be somewhat different. The four storey community building will now have one floor for dedicated community facilities and the child care facilities will be overwhelmingly used by workers on site.

(iii) The Mirvac consortium paid \$ 263m for the ATP site. Mirvac are seeking to have the \$8.6 m payable under the Redfern Waterloo Contributions Plan waived. This represents a discount of over 3% on the price paid for the ATP. The RTBU RMA argues this should not be allowed to happen.