

## Brian Kirk

---

**From:** Amy Watson on behalf of DPE PSVC Keysites Assessments Mailbox  
**Sent:** Friday, 27 October 2017 4:56 PM  
**To:** Brian Kirk  
**Subject:** FW: Pemulwuy submission  
**Attachments:** Pemulwuy Renee Hall.pdf

**From:** Salome Halle [mailto:rsalomehall@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, 27 October 2017 1:09 PM  
**To:** DPE PSVC Keysites Assessments Mailbox <keysitesassessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Subject:** Pemulwuy submission

Renee Hall

**APPLICATION BY ABORIGINAL HOUSING COMPANY MP 06\_0101 MOD 2 - SSD 8135 PEMULWUY PROJECT REDFERN  
– CONCEPT PLAN MODIFICATION & NEW STUDENT ACCOMMODATION BUILDING**

APPLICATION BY ABORIGINAL HOUSING COMPANY MP 06\_0101 MOD 2 - SSD 8135 PEMULWUY  
PROJECT REDFERN – CONCEPT PLAN MODIFICATION & NEW STUDENT ACCOMMODATION  
BUILDING

## OBJECTION

1. My name is Renee Hall
2. I am a member of the Redfern Aboriginal Tent Embassy, which was established to protest the development at the Block and to fight for affordable Aboriginal housing.
3. I wish to submit my **objection** to the above proposals for the following reasons:

### SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR OBJECTION

- A. Lack of community notification and consultation about the development.
- B. The proposals are not in the public interest, especially not in the interests of the Aboriginal community which has occupied this land for centuries.
- C. The development will have unacceptable social impacts in the locality, resulting in the further displacement of many Aboriginal people.
- D. The development desecrates the historical and cultural significance of the land to the Aboriginal people.
- E. The proposals are not in the greater public interest.
- F. The proposals do not achieve compatibility with the existing streetscape in terms of size, scale and materials.
- G. The proposals would have unacceptable visual impacts on the streetscape and visual amenity.
- H. The proposals are inconsistent with existing land uses in the immediate vicinity.
- I. The development is significantly higher than any other site in the general vicinity.
- J. The dramatic increase in storey height is excessive and not in the public interest.

- K. The provision for affordable Aboriginal housing in the plans are completely inadequate and disproportionate.
- L. The development is completely out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood.
- M. The height, bulk and scale of the development will have a significant impact on nearby heritage listings.
- N. The development will create significant and unacceptable overshadowing to the surrounding properties, as well as invade their privacy and amenity.
- O. The development will create unsustainable traffic and parking issues in an area already under pressure.
- P. Should these developments be approved, they set a dangerous precedent for future developments in the area, opening the floodgates.
- Q. The developments have not been designed to maximise residential amenity or minimise the effects on surrounding properties and do not comply with the amenity design quality principle of SEPP 65 and do not meet the objectives of the ADG.
- R. The development is incompatible with the particular nature of the existing land uses and would detrimentally impact on the local community, which is not in the public interest.
- S. The proposed developments do not achieve design excellence.

#### **LACK OF COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**

- There has been no community consultation
- At the “public meeting” hosted by the Aboriginal Housing Company in March 2017, Aboriginal voices and dissenters were shut down immediately.
- Great disrespect was shown to Aboriginal elders and those opposing the development.
- Proper Aboriginal protocols were not followed at all.

#### **NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST**

- The land known as the Block was the first urban buy-back of Aboriginal land in the country.
- This alone makes it unique, and of special cultural and historical significance.
- The proposed development promises only 62 homes built for Aboriginal people.

- Yet it gives 24 storeys of student accommodation to overseas students.
- The original plan of 6 storeys of student accommodation to 62 Aboriginal houses was unfair and disproportionate. Now at 24 storeys and no change to the Aboriginal housing proportion, it is catastrophic.
- There is no guarantee that the Aboriginal housing component, as small as it is, will be built first or at the same time. Or ever.
- In order to fund the 24 storey development, the Aboriginal Housing Company is proposing to lease the development for 99 years, with the rental paid up front.
- This does not take into account the increased rental over 99 years and most destructively, takes Aboriginal land out of the hands of Aboriginal people for at least a century.

#### **THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IS INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE EXISTING STREETScape & AREA**

- The proposal has increased from a maximum of 6 storeys, with a Floor Space Ratio of 2:9:1 and 154 student beds to a maximum of 24 storeys, Floor Space Ratio of 7:16:1 and 522 accommodation rooms.
- This is more than triple the original approval.
- At 24 storeys, the proposed height is several times higher than anything in the local area. Even the TNT buildings a significant distance away, are only 12 storeys.
- The immediate surrounding buildings are only 2 storeys. They are historical terrace houses, completely different in style and character to the proposed development. These homes will be overshadowed, their privacy invaded as the development will look directly into their windows.
- Even the first draft proposal of 16 storeys is too high for the local area and will have massive impacts on it.
- The proposed development is too large for the small site allotted to it.
- A drive around the Block and surrounds (Vine, Louis, Caroline, Eveleigh and Lawson Streets) on any weekday will show you that traffic and parking is at breaking point. The influx of more cars, more bicycles and more people will be devastating to an area already under pressure.

Yours faithfully

Renee Hall