

Transcript

Transcript

City of Sydney Waterloo Public Meeting Alexandria Town Hall 73 Garden Street, Alexandria

Wednesday, 6 March 2019 at 6pm

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Millie Ingram is going to give us a Welcome to Country to begin tonight's proceedings. Thanks, Millie. (Applause).

AUNTY MILLIE INGRAM: Thanks, Clover. Good evening, special guests and everybody that's here tonight. I am honoured to be here to give you a Welcome to Country here at this very, very important forum.

I would like to acknowledge the Gadigal people of the Eora Nation as the traditional custodians of the land on which we are standing tonight, on which we are meeting tonight, and I pay my respects to all of our Elders, both yours and mine, who have made modern Australia what it is today and my ancestors who made Australia what it was up until 1788 and kept it nice and pristine.

I'm going to say a few words. A lot has happened in the last 230 years that is not good. It saddens me to see the Darling River and the Murray River dying and the dying of the Menindee Lakes. With that I always say that we're not responsible for what happened 200 years ago, 100 years ago or 50 years ago, but we are responsible for what happens today. So let's always work together, all of us, and we've got so much to do.

I've just got to say a little bit of history, Clover. I was here in the 60s, the early 60s, I first came to Sydney in the late 1950s, and in the 1960s they did a similar type of exercise, dispersing all the poor people out, all the working class, when they closed down all the factories and all the industry in and around Redfern, Paddington, Surry Hills and Balmain and they moved everybody out to Liverpool and Mount Druitt and further. And you can see them doing the same thing again. So don't move from where they want you to move, please, because you don't come back. (Applause).

Transcript

I've got to take this opportunity to say to Clover I'm really proud of what this council is doing in support of the working-class people here. I endorse every one of the council's resolutions that I have seen, that I've got a copy of today, and particularly item C, where you're proposing the different ratio because when I attended one of the consultations, they said we're going to have 70% private and 30% divided between social and affordable. I said that is outrageous - on our land. It's government land, our land.

So let's stick with it and let's look at what we have to do, and let's all do it together. We are all Australians and this is our country. We, the Aboriginal people just happen to be the unique people who are the First Australians, but we're all Australians together, so let's work together.

I don't want to see high-rise ghettos here in 50 years' time.

But I'm not here to tell you all about that. You've got experts here. But I've seen it all before because they will turf you out. So don't move. Just sit and squat and don't let them come in. We'll join you. (applause).

Thank you very much and I'm happy to be here and I just hope it's totally successful. Thank you, Clover. (Applause).

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: So thank you, Millie, for that Welcome and your opinion about what's going on and what's happened, and I too would like to acknowledge the original custodians of our land. They did look after the place for 60,000 years before we arrived and started to spoil it and we honour the role that they've played.

I'd like to acknowledge the member for Newtown, Jenny Leong - do you want to stand up so that everyone can see you guys (applause) - Councillor Jess Scully (applause), Councillor Jess Miller (applause), and the Deputy Lord Mayor, Linda Scott (applause). Over there is our CEO and we also have here tonight the former government architect Peter Mould, who is going to speak to you - do you want to stand up, Peter (applause) - and Richard Johnson (applause), who is Honorary Professor of the Environment at the University of New South Wales.

So welcome. Tonight's presentation is in response to the State's gross overdevelopment proposal for the Waterloo Housing Estate and the pitiful proposed increase in social and affordable housing on this scarce inner-city public land.

I'm going to speak briefly before I hand over to Graham Jahn, our Director City Planning, who has worked with his staff on an alternative proposal or approach. Then we'll hear from Peter Mould and Richard Johnson.

There will be an opportunity for questions later and Eddie Greenaway and his staff will also be available to discuss questions relating to specific social

Transcript

housing matters if there's anyone here who wants to raise them. Eddie, can you just stand up and wave your hand? Thank you.

So what I want to say is this. If the Government scheme goes ahead, we will see massive overdevelopment of valuable inner-city public land. It will bring catastrophic traffic through Waterloo, Redfern and surrounding areas and it will overshadow much of the area and the small amount of green space that is proposed.

Under the Government's preferred scheme, all existing buildings on the Waterloo Estate would be demolished and replaced with new buildings, including towers up to 40 storeys. It will mean Waterloo will have three times its existing density, making it the highest density in Australia and some would say anywhere in the world.

But the housing estate is already dense. It already has 2,012 housing units, including 2 towers of 29 storeys. The Government is proposing to triple that number to 6,800 housing units. It is proposing 6 towers up to 40 storeys, 10 towers up to 32 storeys, 24 towers up to 15 storeys, and 63 towers up to 7 storeys.

These figures were confirmed by UrbanGrowth at their last public presentation and those of you who were there will remember I got up and said, "This is what your plans are showing, is this what is there?", and they said yes, it was. This density is unprecedented in Australia and is more equivalent to development in Hong Kong.

But despite the massive increase, there will only be another 28 - 28 - social housing units. There is no commitment to secure the miserly 5% of affordable housing in perpetuity - what they do is say it will be affordable housing for 10 years and then it's sold - and there's no commitment to affordable housing for the area's Aboriginal population. It is a lost opportunity given the urgent need to increase social and affordable housing.

There has also been an increase in homelessness shown by our most recent street count and there is a need for more worker housing in the city. Don't forget, the City of Sydney is the engine room of the national economy. 25% of the State's economy is happening in our 26 square kilometres and it's 10% of the national economy and it's overtaken the mining industry in terms of its economic output. And I say to you if you can't build social and affordable housing on public land, then where can you?

Adjacent to the housing redevelopment is another State-significant site, the Waterloo Metro, with a proposed further 700 housing units in 3 towers of 25, 27 and 29 storeys. Even though it is right next door, it is being considered as an entirely separate proposal and so the cumulative impacts of both are not being taken into account.

Transcript

I believe that this is a shockingly negligent way to plan for our community and our city and I think it's another example of the New South Wales Government strong-arming local communities to achieve growth at any and at all costs.

In response, the City has addressed both the built form and the housing mix and come up with an alternate plan. Our planners have reduced density to 5,300 homes, which is still over twice the current number of housing units, but in low-rise buildings producing development more aligned with Potts Point and Elizabeth Bay. Buildings will range from 4 to 13 storeys with a predominant form 4 to 9 storeys.

We want to keep some buildings on the site, including the Turanga and Matavai towers, which will reduce the cost of development and lessen the planned relocation of tenants to other areas while the project is being constructed because what we've found about the eviction of those public housing tenants in Millers Point is that just being taken out of their area, even though they might have moved to good housing in Pyrmont or Glebe, it's the loss of what they're used to, it's the loss of their environment, it's the loss of the community they know, and some of them have died and that is just the result of that massive removal of people that we've seen in Millers Point.

As well as proposing a better, more humane built form, we are also proposing a more responsible mix of housing on the site. The Government proposal is for 5% affordable, for 30% social and 65% private. Our proposal is for 20% affordable, particularly to include the Aboriginal community; 50% social instead of 30%; and 30% private instead of 65%. (Applause). We believe this is a responsible mix given that this is public land and given the city's housing crisis in terms of increasing homelessness, the scandalous social housing waiting list and the growing unaffordability of city housing.

So I also want to say to you the City has the track record to prove we can manage large-scale developments and do them well. Our Green Square, which has been on the drawing board since 1995 and more active since 2004, is powering ahead now. The growing community is integrating with the existing population and we're providing the facilities for shopping, for recreation, for open space that is appropriate for a development of that size. We are still, however, waiting for the State Government to fulfil their responsibilities, particularly for new transport and education.

So I think it's fair to say that the City does have the track record and the Government doesn't. We don't support the Government's vision for Waterloo and we're calling on the Government to hand back planning control of the estate to the city.

RESIDENT: Hear, Hear!

(Applause)

Transcript

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: What the Government did was designated this site as state significant and so they took the control out of our hands, even though we are the planning authority, and the controls that would normally apply to developers are not applying to the Government. Craig Knowles was the one, when he was Labor Planning Minister, who introduced state significance and he said to me it's really about state initiatives like railway stations or hospitals, it's not about residential apartments. I think it's absolutely shocking that this Government keeps taking huge areas of residential out of the local government authority and then planning them with the results that we could see potentially here.

So we don't support their vision for Waterloo. We're calling on them to hand back control of the estate to the City. We know what needs to be done, we know how to do it, and we know how to protect our communities. I hope you will all stand with us in this fight for one of our great inner-city communities and for the right to have people-focused planning in Sydney.

I want to now hand over to Graham Jahn, who will take you through the Government's proposal. So the purpose of tonight is to inform you about the Government scheme and our alternate proposal and then we urge you to let the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition know what you think, and we've given you that handout with the details of their mail address and their email, so that they know what this community thinks about what is being proposed. Thanks very much for coming (applause).

Channel Seven are here and they're interested in filming. I think it would be a great idea if they can do that. Does anyone mind? No, good. There you are, Channel Seven.

GRAHAM JAHN: Thank you, Clover.

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: If you're wondering what's happening on this screen over here, we have an amazing person who's sort of better than Hansard who's taking down every word and putting it on the screen in case you find it difficult to hear. (Applause).

GRAHAM JAHN: Of the many things that you wanted to get across, we should remember also that we have an MOU [Memorandum of Understanding] with housing to develop the Glebe Estate, which is under construction and it was done through our city planning controls and LEP. So there's proof and a track record.

This short presentation is going to explain the intent of the City's alternate approach with just a bit of background as well. The approach is not a plan. We have only had a few months to work up the bones of a proposition since the Government's plans were put on exhibition seeking comment both from the community and from stakeholders and the challenge we set ourselves

Transcript

was what is the maximum development for that particular site - that is in dwellings - and achieve a better place outcome, which is state parlance, or, in city parlance, design excellence in terms of buildings, landscape and place.

As many of you are aware, this is not the first proposal for the renewal of Waterloo. Back in 1973 the Housing Commission of NSW proposed a much larger Waterloo renewal scheme that also included towers for what is the conservation area south of Redfern Park, and in the centre of the picture is Wellington Street and on the right of the picture you can actually see that Waterloo Park North was actually extended.

A proclamation was made over land in Waterloo with a variety of terrace houses, stables, outhouses and factory buildings and this gradually, over time, led to a period of disrepair because there was a prohibition on doing alterations and additions to those buildings and the Government acquired them and part of that area was rehabilitated and part was demolished.

The project involved police, protests, there was a green ban all, in the tumult of change being proposed in The Rocks, Waterloo and Woolloomooloo at the same time, and The Rocks was effectively saved from demolition. Woolloomooloo was rehabilitated under the 1974 agreement signed by Gough Whitlam and Tom Lewis and witnessed by Nicholas Shehadie in the Sydney Town Hall.

Fast forward, a draft renewal plan was drawn up for Redfern and Waterloo in 2010. It kept the towers, but in-filled on the remaining sites in both Redfern and Waterloo. The community had hoped that the refurbishment of the towers in Waterloo would be included in that project. It was known as BEP2. It was around the time of the Redfern-Waterloo Authority. This was the City's submission in 2011 - it was exhibited in April, the submission I think was in August - where we asked for it not to be called up under the then part 3A of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act.

Now, the Redfern-Waterloo Authority was wound up and UrbanGrowth was formed and it was to be the urban developer of choice for state land holdings on certain designated sites. The illustration on the right at the time was from their website. If we look a little closer and we enlarge, it shows the Waterloo estate very indicatively back in 2016. So the indication are the orange blocks are 18 to 32 storeys, the yellow 9 to 17, and the blue blocks were very indicatively up to 8 storeys.

After that, there was an illustration looking down Raglan Street showing the redevelopment at that stage near the proposed Waterloo Railway Station. By this moment the decision had been made to demolish the two 30-storey towers and the four 18-storey blocks.

Now, our concerns about the effects of too much residential high rise evolved from the 2016 version of the Waterloo Estate which was around 7,000

Transcript

units. The towers were around 32 storeys as this was the upper limit of permission from the aviation authorities and the density of the towers stood out when compared to the Green Square area, even to the Green Square town centre or to the East Village area.

And at that time the park was located one block to the east compared to where it is suggested now and the southern park position was roughly the same. The metro block at the time, shown at the bottom of the slide, had three indicative rectangular towers, but the down draft on Botany Road meant that the circular towers that are preferred today would perform better.

Now, we met with Minister Hazzard, who was the responsible Housing Minister, to express our concern that the application of Communities Plus just didn't work at Waterloo and wasn't producing a good outcome. In 2016 we asked for a change, by the way. The only change that happened was a change of Minister.

In 2018 the estate was disconnected from the metro project and three options were exhibited. The targets varied from approximately 6,500 to 7,000. Option 1 updated the two 30-storey towers. We supported that idea, for two reasons: it creates a layered history, a sense of place, the heritage reasons and rehabilitation in good architectural hands can produce interesting results; and it would be cheaper than full demolition and rebuilding.

It also reduces the pressure to build about, we estimate, 1,000 additional units under that 70:30 formula and we saw the value in the consolidated parkland approach of option 3, but not the idea of decommissioning the George Street cycleway or using it for open space or leaving that unaddressed as an issue.

Now, living in Sydney, it's useful to compare areas to understand what's happening and this diagram is - we looked at areas with a similar amount of dwellings compared to the metro estate, the metro and the estate combined, which is around 7,500. So you can see that the estate, which is shown in orange, has about the same dwellings as Kings Cross, Potts Point and Rushcutters Bay combined covering 49 hectares. I can repeat that. The orange site, which is the Waterloo and metro sites, is equal to the dwellings of Kings Cross, Potts Point and Rushcutters Bay combined covering 49 hectares and it's equivalent to the other blue areas, approximately, on a dwelling count.

But another way of looking at it is a comparison by area. So we look at other dense sites around 20 hectares of that combined block and you can see that Waterloo is 7,500 dwellings, in the same area in Elizabeth Bay is around 3,200, in Potts Point is around 3,100. That's about half the dwelling density. So this is just a sort of comparison, understanding of denser places in Sydney.

So the preferred master plan was released by Land and Housing Corporation in January targeting around 6,800 dwellings - it was expressed as

Transcript

6,700 to 6,900, so let's say 6,800 - in 17 towers, this time up to 40 storeys, although we as the local government authority have not been informed that the aviation rules have been relaxed for these height restrictions, but let's assume that they are eventually.

The plan involves complete demolition of every building on public land and therefore really has little built heritage or heritage layer outcomes for the new community. We modelled the proposed building envelopes to understand the urban space and we were convinced that an alternative approach could produce a better place and one of our reference points was a dense place that we know people want to live in that has a rail station like Kings Cross and Potts Point.

One measure of place success when you are relying on a minimum green area is does it have the required winter sunlight and in our testing the browner areas are where it doesn't meet this requirement in our view and there is inadequate sunlight also on Waterloo Park North as a result.

Now, we considered the urban renewal, what we were doing in other places nearby, in north Green Square urban renewal area and we've got an emphasis on open place, on quality in the public domain and sunlight. So we used those learnings from Green Square, from Victoria Park, Epsom Park, Lachlan Precinct, and matched them to our reference experience, which is Kings Cross and Potts Point, with smaller and more compact buildings.

We also considered many community housing projects up and down the west coast of America, such as this example in San Francisco from 2011, and we looked at the uses of the ground floor for social venture bakeries or support services or how they use the roofs for productive community gardens, for example. And of the 30 or 40 projects that were documented, good community housing related well to the street and greenery with clear private and public spaces and many paid attention to being sociable spaces.

Now, a larger comparable scheme is Regent Park in Toronto. This is an ongoing renewal project. It covers 28 hectares. It's planned to have 7,980 dwellings consisting of a breakdown of 2,080 social, 448 market, and 5,400 private. Now, when complete, it will be in the order of 280 dwellings per hectare with a 2 hectare park and a playing field and the tallest towers are around the same height as the two current towers at Waterloo.

In the UK, particularly around London, boroughs such as Croydon and Hackney with major post-war housing estates are increasing density through renewal projects in quality medium-rise buildings and the recently completed Kings Crescent Estate is a renewal and refurbishment project in Hackney in East London and the scale varies from 5 to 12 storeys and consists of around 50% affordable and 50% private. A component of affordable, known as shared ownership, is part of the London renewal mix which has not been much explored in Australia.

Transcript

So with that kind of background, we set out to explore a genuine alternative to the tall tower estate model. We sought the maximum density that delivered, in our view, a good and defensible place and it would still be the densest 20 hectares of residential locality around, but what we looked for was a reduction in residential building height by more than half with consequent reduced shadows; we wanted to minimise the cost and disruption to the community in particular because it's got the largest extant community in a renewal project; medium-rise high density, but we did not know how many dwellings would come of it; that meets or exceeds open space and maximum solar access requirements; and has a true sense of place.

We considered in our approach how the ground plan could accommodate uses integrated beyond the site. So the blue shows potential ground-level retail, cultural, commercial uses, including those spaces beyond the site of the estate.

Now, George Street could be the focus of a shopping street with creative enterprise opposite the park and potential community space and services could be dispersed, which is the yellow. And we looked at how this reduced height could benefit a consolidated park idea for better sunlight access, how George Street south of the park could be reinvented as a local shopping street for the precinct, how the new street we propose between George and Pitt Street might feel compared to its width, and we also did a study of how people might move through the site given the change in geography from east to west, and here we see what could be a series of interconnected landscape spaces providing a through-site link approach.

Another factor that we took into account was the retention of high-value trees, which in this alternate approach achieves 64%, and although LAHC's preferred master plan shows two parks, we wanted to explore one larger park of about 2.2 hectares and in this view we see a 13-storey apartment scale facing the park with 4- and 7- to 9-storey buildings elsewhere, that is other than the refurbished and updated towers.

We considered how this approach might make for a better urban experience, remembering this is an alternative approach to 40-storey towers. And we prepared some other images showing the retail interface with the park and the interface between community or playground spaces and the park, and in this shot we see the refurbished and updated towers in the distance. We also saw the value in retaining and updating these slimmer towers possibly as social or affordable housing, but our alternative approach does not turn on this issue. (Video played)

GRAHAM JAHN: So we have wanted to recognise in that heritage layer the meaning of the public artwork *We Live Here 2017* and I want to thank and

Transcript

credit Clare Lewis, Carolina Sorensen, Tom Spark and Rotor Works for this clip of their short film. (Applause).

So this staging approach is just indicative. The aim should be to minimise disruption, as I mentioned, moving only once, staying within the estate boundaries, and of course I believe that Land and Housing Corporation project people share that concern.

So we took a quick look at how this might be done. So that was how we might switch - this is just a suggestion, a reference of how it might be done, stage 3, stage 4, stage 5, stage 6, and stage 7. It doesn't matter if it's exactly this staging, but we needed to understand that it could be done, it could keep everyone on the estate.

So, in conclusion, we have in a very short period of time explored what we think is a genuine alternative with lower to medium high rise for 9- and 13-storey buildings. We've modelled it on great places to live with mixed incomes and it comes out at about 270 or 280 dwellings per hectare, which actually is pretty much exactly the same as Regents Park in Ontario. The heritage retention adds an opportunity, saves money and builds a sense of place, retaining trees that are rated highly with high value, a more equitable distribution of development on the public and private building sites and it reinforces the finer-grain neighbourhood and scale for our most vulnerable.

So this animation illustrates the City of Sydney's approach, the alternative. You can see the two tower retention there. And now we compare the proposal to the Government's, the City of Sydney. That's the proposal and that is our approach. And this is the current preferred master plan versus our approach. (Applause).

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Thanks very much, Graham Jahn, and the fabulous team at the City. Give them a huge clap. (Applause).

I'd now like to invite Peter Mould, the former government architect, to speak to you. Both Peter Mould and Richard Johnson have worked with our team on developing this approach. They are both part of our Design Advisory Panel. We set up a panel back in 2008, 10 years ago, so that all our private projects, and you've seen our private projects and how fantastic they are, and the public development going through the city go through the design advisory panel so that we're making sure we're getting the best possible outcome for our city. They do fantastic work and you've seen those results in the projects. Whether they're Redfern Park or Sydney Park or the Green Square Library, Surry Hills library, all those proposals have gone through our Design Advisory Panel. So I'm very pleased to invite Peter Mould to talk to you. Peter. (Applause).

Transcript

PETER MOULD: Thank you, Clover. First can I say it's been a privilege working with the City and the incredible staff and consultants they've brought to this.

When I first saw the proposal by the State, it was very hard to interrogate. It was only a couple of drawings and a few images and you couldn't really understand the intensity or the integrity of it, and the City's team have investigated that very thoroughly and you've seen by their doing the analysis what some of the impacts are.

I think what's fundamentally important is the City then took an approach of looking at what they could do as an alternative, not saying "We don't like this", but saying "How can we maximise density here with another model, another way?" I think that's fundamentally important because what the City is proposing is very dense, very dense, and it's proposing a different way of achieving that density.

One of the problematic things with the state development with so many towers is that they cause overshadowing. It's very good when you're at the top of the tower and you've got a great view. When you're down on the ground, certainly the analysis shows that the public open spaces, the public streets that we all occupy, they'll be more shadowed, be more windy and therefore probably less nice places to be.

So taking the approach of reducing the scale, taking the approach of putting that density into slimmer buildings, almost unifying the height so you can get a lot of density in has brought about a new model. It's a model that we haven't seen tested thoroughly in Australia or in Sydney and I think it's really good. I think the difficulty we're having with density in Australia now and all our cities should get denser and must get denser I believe, they have of course to be reinforced by public transport systems which support that density, and in this instance having it next to a metro station is good, but the other thing that's fundamentally important is that that density has to be achieved with good amenity as well. At the moment most of the models we see for density are towers and towers and towers on podiums. To see a model that represents very high density but without towers I think is a fundamental shift in thinking and therefore very good.

I have to say that all the thinking and the things you've seen here haven't just happening by people sketching on a piece of paper. There's been thorough analysis, there's been deep analysis of apartment amenities, there's been deep analysis of the public realm and how it would work, and I think it presents a really viable option for a way forward. I congratulate the City on that.

I think the State's proposal needs some interrogation, it needs some investigation. What worries me with any proposal that has towers is that the experience we've learnt from in Sydney is that if a tower is scheduled at 40,

Transcript

that's probably the starting point, not the finishing point. Too often developers in the development industry, driven by the market forces which they operate under - and that's all fine and understood - tend to want to stretch the limits rather than work within them. So I think there's a fundamental flaw there that the tower model makes us suspect to.

So that's really all I wanted to say, but I also particularly want to thank the City for undertaking this work, it's fundamental work, to help interrogate and understand how development can and should happen. (Applause).

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Thanks, Peter. So I'd now like to introduce Professor Richard Johnson. (Applause).

PROF. RICHARD JOHNSON: Well, after such thorough and interesting presentations, there's not much that I can add other than my support. I think there's no question in my mind that this is a well-considered proposal. It's responsible, it's sustainable city making with appropriate densities near a metro station, well-considered densities.

The City, as we know and have heard, has great experience in understanding successful neighbourhoods and used this knowledge in a very rigorous way to evolve this alternative. The scheme is based upon sound urban design and neighbourhood planning principles. They're tested principles and there are many successful precedents both in Sydney and in other great cities of the world that would give us confidence that this alternative could be a really special place if it was developed.

The proposal has a very fine grain of low-rise buildings and refurbished existing buildings with a major park and a finer network of connected public landscape spaces. It continues the existing pattern of streets, preserving a high proportion of existing mature trees, ensures easy connection with the adjoining precincts, and it's simpler and less disruptive to implement. I can only end by fully endorsing the City's inspired alternative and thank them for their energy and enthusiasm in protecting and visioning our city into the future. (Applause).

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Thanks, Richard. So now we'll go to questions and/or statements from you. We will have roving mics. Who's taking the mics around? Okay. And we will have Graham and Richard and Peter to answer those questions that you ask. So at the back first and then up here. If you can just say your name, it makes it easier.

SANDY: My name is Sandy. I'm a local resident. I just want to know what we have to do to get this plan implemented. (Applause).

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Well, you have to I think lobby really hard the Government, the Minister. I wouldn't go to the Minister, I'd go to the Premier. The Minister has endorsed this proposal, has endorsed the Government

Transcript

proposal, and I just have a quote from the local paper. Minister Pru Goward said "residents had been extensively consulted and the Government's master plan would make Waterloo one of Sydney's most attractive suburbs". So I wouldn't go to the Minister, I'd go to the Premier and I'd go to the Leader of the Opposition. We're into election mode and this is the time when we find political leaders listen. So that's what you all have to do. (Applause).

MICHAEL: Could we please have a text version of everything that's said here tonight sent to our email addresses, to everyone here?

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Is that feasible? Can we do that - a copy of what's been said, the text?

YVETTE ANDREWS: Yes, I don't think that would be a problem.

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Okay, so have you all filled in your email addresses? If you've filled in your email addresses, we can get the text to you of tonight, yes.

SPEAKER: We also have the actual council report which we could email out. That describes everything that Graham went through.

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Yes, and we'll email you the council report, and you can also go to our website. But we did have handouts there for people who don't use the internet. If you just want to put down your thoughts and leave them with us tonight, you can do that too. So somewhere else there and then we'll come over here.

SHARON: Hi, my name is Sharon, I'm a local resident. I just wanted to say the consultation you were talking about, we all talked to them, but I think there was a lot of falling on deaf ears, particularly one of the reports saying, "Oh, everyone was quite happy about 40 storeys" and it's like well, hello, I don't think so.

But one thing I wanted to say about your plan and something I read in your newsletter about water recycling in development, would your plan include things like water recycling or renewable energy or addressing the urban heat island effect, all sorts of things like that, it's really important that that is included as well. Plus once it's built it's maintained because this has been the massive problem with this whole estate over the years. It's just been left to rot and the poor people living in there have not had it maintained properly.

GRAHAM JAHN: Thank you. The City has actually already built a complete recycling facility for water and it's located on the former South Sydney Hospital site and it's meant to serve the greater Green Square area. At the moment it's just being trialled around the town centre, but it's there, has the capacity to be enlarged and this project would fall within that catchment edge. So the water

Transcript

and the energy would be critically important to achieve high sustainability as we move towards the state and the Federal Governments' agreed target at least on a carbon neutral future at 2050. (Applause).

SHARON: Excellent, thank you.

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Yes, that's great.

TRISH: My name is Trish. I've lived in Waterloo for 30 years in housing and I've worked in Alexandria for the last 20 something years, so I have vested interests as well.

But I have three questions: Firstly, a shopping centre in George Street, what about the railway? Apparently the railway complex is going to put in a large shopping complex, so is there really a need for it?

Secondly, will the buildings have balconies or private outdoor spaces, which I know people in the high rises desperately need?

And the third question, do we really need to increase density on public land to accommodate private housing? (Applause).

GRAHAM JAHN: So, I think in order, the metro site has got some provision for retail, but it's at concept stage. It's yet to see what the tenderers believe the development should have. The tenderers might have a different view about the state of the market for residential or the appropriateness of employment or the amount of retail. So there's an industry response which is going to shape what happens on the metro site. Whereas we are suggesting an alternative piece of thinking, which is to do a local neighbourhood street and have sufficient capacity at different price points for different businesses to coexist. One thing that major gentrification does is that the kinds of businesses that you are used to can't continue to operate at the higher rent. So that is something that I think needs to be considered. You had a second --

TRISH: Balconies.

GRAHAM JAHN: Balconies. So the updating could include the provision of balconies.

?

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: All right, thank you.

GRAHAM JAHN: Very good. Thank you. So we have included the potential adaption of Martin and Daniel Solander in that plan. And the balcony question is that the updating could include those balconies to the retained buildings - that's the two buildings in question - naturally --

Transcript

RESIDENT: Of course the new buildings.

RESIDENT: Why do we actually need to use public housing to accommodate private housing? Why do we have to increase density to do that?

GRAHAM JAHN: So this is a planning study of what a lower-rise development could be as opposed to high rise. The issue of the private housing versus social, that mix, is purely a financial question, how is it funded. So, for example, in Britain they ended up getting national government funding to assist the boroughs to do their projects. In Australia maybe get national funding exactly the same that occurred when the first housing estates were put in Surry Hills, Northcote and so on. That is purely a factor of how the project is funded.

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Can I just add to that that we've developed a proposal or approach which is different from the Government and we're presenting it to you tonight and getting your feedback and your feedback will be included in how we develop this approach. So everything you're saying to us tonight and the feedback we get on the website or through the things that you note down tonight can be included. So we're letting you know what the Government is proposing, the alternative that we've put up that we think is better for creating a better living environment, but our proposal is something that can change and develop as we hear from you and present to government.

KAREN: Hi, my name is Karen. I live in the neighbourhood, I live in Redfern, and I have three questions - sorry, but they'll be very quick. The first is can you explain why we need to accept the density considering that we have Green Square right next to us and it just seems slightly illogical that we have these two highly dense areas next to one another.

My second question is, one of the problems with the government plan is that they separated the metro development from the Waterloo Estate so we couldn't understand how both of those developments would impact our community. Does this plan take into consideration both of those developments?

And then my third question is - Redfern is an Aboriginal heartland. aAnd I just don't see a lot of Aboriginal designers or architects involved in any of the plans. I don't want to just see dot murals on a couple of walls at the end of all of this. I just don't - has this plan - I understand that we're very lucky and fortunate to have these esteemed architects, but what about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander designers, architects? I haven't seen any of that in any of the plans. (Applause).

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Okay, thank you. I might ask Graham to comment, but I'd just like to say to you that the proposal that the Government has put up is what would be happening if we weren't doing this work with you.

Transcript

So this is our opportunity to try, particularly in a pre-election period, to get to the Government that there is a different way of doing this.

I think what our planners have tried to do is to look at how you could provide for density, a neater railway station, that could work for people and create a more liveable amenity. There is a great argument about whether or not we should have any more density in the area and that's a whole discussion that we can have as a community, but the fact of the matter is the Government has a department, they have done this proposal, this could be just what happens if we don't do anything.

Now, it could happen anyway, but we're going to put up a really good fight to get a much, much better outcome than the one that they've put up because we think the one they've put up is terrible. It's an overdevelopment and it's really trashing the area and we don't want that to happen. So what we're trying to do - so the planners tried to be really reasonable and say, "Well, we can reduce the density down. We'll still have a dense development, but it's going to be much, much better."

Now, if the community comes out and a person says "we don't want density", well, that's an argument being said around metropolitan Sydney because we're not the only area where the Government has gone in and said state-significant development and you're getting all this development. A lot of people all across the metropolitan area are really angry about this and that's what's happening.

What we're doing is saying this is another way of doing dense development. We know in this period of global warming and population increase that we can't continue to live in far-flung suburbs in suburbia where everyone has room to play cricket after school. We know we have to be able to live in a more consolidated area and we need to know we've got to make it good so people want to live there.

So that's what we're trying to do and that's what we've tried to do at Green Square. We inherited Green Square and that density and we have spent many years now trying to create good design, good amenity, good facilities so people want to live there, and people are moving in there and want to be there. But we still know we need the transport and we need the education.

So what we're trying to do is what is responsible in terms of where we are and how we cope with population and global warming, but at the same time create environments where people want to live. So that's how we're operating at the City. Graham, do you want to comment on the other questions?

GRAHAM JAHN: I think Clover covered it. I said at the outset we wanted to set ourselves a challenge and that was 'what is the maximum density that's defensible and produces a good place'. It's not the only alternative approach,

Transcript

but it needed to be done - what is the alternative approach for the maximum density.

Now, we can't get to where the state has got to and we've got to a different yield and there will be other views about what that yield should be. But it's just we put it out there, this is what we believe can be defended as a good place.

The second thing is the metro block. So it was disconnected but we have shown, as you can see on the left of the park, what we believe the metro block should be, but that's a different process because it's going through a tender and the developers are giving their own proposition about the land use mix. That's what we think it should be.

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Can you describe and then say why?

GRAHAM JAHN: Well, currently it's residential on top of some commercial and retail - 29, 27 and 25 storey circular towers. That's in the concept plan. We think that Botany Road will continue to become a logistics-driven, heavy, classified road from the port to the CBD. As other roads are calmed, it will become increasingly an infrastructure route, including the carriage of dangerous goods, of every truck weight, and it's inappropriate to put residential overlooking that corridor if you have a choice. And the choice is to put commercial on to the road and create a barrier in effect so that the residential can overlook the park and be barriered from the corridor.

Now, workplace is appropriate because on a station you've got people coming and going and it's also within the ATP mix of workplace. It's an area that is growing in terms of jobs.

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: How many thousands of people will be working on those new sites?

GRAHAM JAHN: In the Commonwealth Bank - I'm not sure.

SPEAKER: 20,000.

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: We have thousands of people who will be coming to the area to work on those sites.

GRAHAM JAHN: So it's a separate proposition, but it is taken into account in this modelling.

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Graham is talking about a commercial barrier on the metro site that will protect the housing development on the site that we're talking about.

Transcript

KAREN: And the Aboriginal input, GRAHAM JAHN: So we've worked on this for 8 or so weeks, 10 weeks. I totally agree with you.

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: One of our drivers is to ensure that there is going to be Aboriginal housing as part of this project and we certainly would like to see Aboriginal architects and planners involved as well if that's possible. We have someone over here.

KERRY: My name is Kerry and I'm wanting to talk about the actual private ownership of people who own privately owned property. I understand that there's a large section of publicly owned land, but there is about 5% of privately owned land which is not being considered in either plan satisfactorily I don't think. In the master plan it had all towers - all the higher density was placed on the publicly owned land and any privately owned land had the minimum amount of potential rise. In this plan there's been a more equitable distribution as far as height, but that doesn't negate the problem that the private landowners have of, one, their investment and also to be displaced - in our particular block there's 41 owners and for them to be bought out, the acquisition costs are going to be considerably larger and we need a higher density in order to be able to renew our building.

So we're going to be left isolated. There's been no consultation with us from the master plan people who have prepared it, from either FACS or from UrbanGrowth. We've been asked to engage a private planner, which we did and then they were ignored, and we've spent money on a strata plan trying to organise that and facilitate that. I believe that we really do need to look at private ownership as being part of this plan as well. We do own 5% of the land, we've invested heavily, and nobody is really considering our asset and our asset investment and also the fact that equity is not just the height of a building but it's also the ability to be able to redevelop or to move if we want to and to be able to be paid out on a reasonable basis for that. I'd just like to see if you are going to actually consider that more in your plan, please.

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Okay. Thanks, Kerry.

ANDREW: I'm a 30-year resident and I'm a stakeholder, a local private owner. I moved here in the early 90s with the best aspirations for Redfern. It's pretty evident in the more recent consultation about traffic and the like where there have been plans put forward to open certain streets that have been closed to stop rat runs from McEvoy and to essentially dilute some of the large amount of traffic that travels on Botany Road and other roads from the city to the port.

But having said that, the overriding state imposition that is being put upon us as local residents is pretty obviously a pretty ghastly one. It's going to isolate and alienate more and more people, which is essentially what has

Transcript

happened and has been a grave error of building and mis-planning in the more recent 50 years in this neck of the woods.

Redfern is an important part of the Aboriginal community and it is imperative that they not only are major stakeholders but that they are involved in decisions.

I appreciate Clover and the City's challenges. But I believe that if we can't to the smallest degree at least align the State Government with our major concerns by saying, "No, you cannot open that street", "No, you cannot open this street", "We are the local traffic command, we are the people that look after these residents who are our ratepayers". This is the way to elevate, not just the issue, but to elevate the different political parties to get up, to make statements, to stick to their promises and to make sure that in future we are consulted and we do not have a horrible Dickensian crisis..

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Thank you.

NED CUTCHER: Hi, Ned Cutcher. I'm with Shelter NSW. I guess I wanted to thank the City of Sydney for this contribution. It's an important contribution to the discussion around Waterloo Estate, or potentially turns it into a discussion which perhaps it wasn't so much of one before.

I'm particularly impressed and interested to hear more from you about the move away from the 70:30 split and perhaps you could just repeat the social, affordable and private housing breakdown that you mentioned earlier in the night, because the numbers you've given here are different to what I read in the papers that I believe went to council on Monday, so I'm presuming that there has been some decision made there.

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: The Government's current proposal is for 5% affordable. Our proposal is for 20% affordable, including Aboriginal housing particularly. The Government's proposal is for 30% social - that's the existing social housing on the estate now plus 28. Ours is for 50% social, so that's a 20% increase there. The Government is proposing 65% private and we're proposing 30%.

So we just believe that that is fair and reasonable because it's on public land and we have this real crisis in housing. We also believe it's reasonable because we know UrbanGrowth has \$43 million in the kitty that came from the central park development to be spent on affordable housing in Redfern/Waterloo and we also know the Government has made \$590 million out of selling off public housing in Millers Point, and they have plenty of money for the stadium, as you know. So we just believe that that is a responsible position to take in terms of mix there and it should be able to be achieved. (Applause).

RICHARD WEEKS: My name is Richard Weeks. I'm with the Waterloo Public Housing Action Group and the Future Planning Centre. Unfortunately the

Transcript

Future Planning Centre doesn't exist anymore thanks to the State Government, they shut us down. We were the first evictions of Waterloo. I'm working out of the community centre now and out of my own home and we're still going and we're just as strong. In fact we're stronger than when we started.

Firstly I'd like, Clover, to thank you and all the councillors and Linda Scott has been down here tirelessly working with us as well, the Deputy Lord Mayor of Sydney, and all the councillors for all the marvellous work you've done for us over the last three years. I can remember back in 2016 when they tried to stop you from knocking on the doors when they allowed the Liberal Party, you wouldn't do it. And you were standing on the street and I read the riot act to Brad Hazzard and they came down here and sent senior management down to give you an escort to the estate. I'll never forget that day. We showed people power then.

We still have people power. I have 800 people, supporters on my books who can come out on the street any time we want to. They said, "We won't do that, we will do this and we'll negotiate." We've done that for three years. And we couldn't have done it without the City of Sydney, with the planners and all of the executive staff at City of Sydney have given us great help and supported us.
(Applause)

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Thanks, Richard, and for all the work you and the community have been doing.

KRISTEN: My name is Kristen. I'm a local resident. Is there any precedent for the State Government reversing this classification of the property being of state significance? And also in response to the first question that was asked about what people can do, is the council providing pro forma documents or some templates that can be forwarded on to Gladys and to other people to actually provide a way that residents can easily communicate this information on a broader scale?

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: So the question is can we put together - perhaps Graham might be able to answer that.

GRAHAM JAHN: I believe the status of the Waterloo Estate at the moment is that it's nominated for state-significant development status. It actually hasn't happened yet. But in 2012 it was removed from our LEP.

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: Local environmental plan.

GRAHAM JAHN: From our local environmental plan, yes. So the actual status of state-significant listing I imagine will happen with the application of the concept plan and the precinct rezoning through the department, but interestingly it's not fully consummated.

Transcript

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: But the thing is they were going to put highways through Paddington and Glebe in the past and they were going to put towers all over Woolloomooloo and The Rocks. People campaigned and stopped those. I think the world has got tougher actually and I think there's more to fight now. It's perhaps not so easy to bring a whole lot of people together in the way they did in previous times, but I think if enough people are feeling angry enough and making enough noise and the City is getting support for what we're doing, there's a real chance of hope.

I really think we've all got to work very hard at this because the result will be what you're seeing if we don't win this and that's a real worry. (Applause).

KRISTEN: The question about pro forma documents --

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: We could do that. We can pull out key points in our concerns about the state proposal and key points about our proposal and we can send that to people who have given us an email. I'm sure we can do that, yes.

We're nearing the end of public question time and we have our planning staff here who will - can our planning staff just indicate who you are? Yes. So you can have one-to-one talks with them at the end of the meeting. So we'll just have another couple of questions.

RESIDENT: It's just a quick one. I was wondering if anybody from Labor was here so that if and when the Liberals are voted out, maybe they could elaborate on what their housing policy is and what Waterloo is in for if they're in power. (Applause)

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: So I did invite Ron Hoenig tonight, your local member, and Jenny Leong, who's here, is near - who's a Green, her electorate goes from Newtown across to Redfern and includes part of this development. So Jenny, would you like to have a quick word?

JENNY LEONG: Thank you so much, Clover. I won't take time from the questions, but I did want to say a couple of things. One of the things that is really significant about the development area that we're talking about is it actually goes across two electorate boundaries. So the boundary actually runs between the middle of what is this proposed development and we've worked very closely with the residents in Waterloo and have come together around trying to push this.

The key thing I think here and I would say is really, really important at this point is that we need to push and I would like to acknowledge and thank the City for putting this alternative plan because while there might be serious concerns still about the density and the size and there are lots of people that just want to stay in their homes and have the maintenance that actually they

Transcript

need to have, the reality is that we need to have alternatives because otherwise what we have is something from the State Government which is outrageous and arrogant. I've been with you for years and seen the false consultation that has occurred and it has been nothing short of appalling. So I wanted to say thank you to the City for doing in a sense what the State Government should have been doing when it came to this plan.

But what I would like to say, and it's absolutely my position of what we need to see, is the great planning that has happened from the City here to open the conversation should be where we are taking this forward. So I think that what we should all be pushing for is to say that we want it taken back out of this idea of this false concept of state-significant infrastructure and put back into local community control and local community hands and then we can have the discussions about the balconies and the other things with the City, who we know do good consultation on these things. We don't trust the State Government to do those things well because we know that they are actually just wanting to deliver private development and private profits. And in actual fact let's get that as the primary ask so that we can continue these consultations and conversations hopefully with a new government when it comes to the end of March. (Applause).

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: We're hoping that Michael Daley will come out and say that he will respond to our proposal. And Linda is here, Linda is a member of the Labor Party, and I'm hoping that's what she's going to be able to say. But we are lobbying Michael Daley and what I'm asking you to do is to lobby Michael Daley and to lobby Gladys Berejiklian, the two leaders of the major parties, so that we do have a say in the planning of this area and we get an outcome that will create a place where you will all want to live. Okay, Linda. (Applause).

LINDA SCOTT: Thanks, Lord Mayor. Thanks all for coming out tonight. So yes, as the Lord Mayor said, I'm the Deputy Lord Mayor but I'm a Labor Councillor on the City of Sydney. Obviously I know many of you have spoken to Tania Mihailuk, who's the Shadow Planning Minister, as well as the local member, Ron Hoenig, across the border from Jenny Leong and I've also spoken personally to Michael Daley about it. I ran into him in the middle of the road today and went, "We've got to do something better about Waterloo" and he agreed. Tania Mihailuk, just so you know, has given this comment to the Herald:

Labor has always been vocal about the haphazard way this Government approaches planning issues across Sydney. We've outlined our alternative approach. The Government must stop running roughshod over councils and communities and allowing unplanned and ad hoc development to spring up across the city. We've already made the announcement that we will direct the Greater Sydney Commission to get back to work fixing the planning

Transcript

mess created by sitting down with councils and working out a fair plan for growth across the city. Having an adversarial planning system is causing unnecessary division, ad hoc and unplanned growth within the CBD. There needs to be a better system in place where the Greater Sydney Commission and the Department of Planning actually works with the City of Sydney for a more strategic and shared vision for our CBD and for Waterloo. There is excellent planning expertise at the City of Sydney and that should be tapped into, not sidelined by the Government.

I strongly endorse those comments. I know that the City staff have briefed Ron Hoenig on this proposal and he's deeply concerned about it, as are we all. He's very concerned about a range of factors. I think he was an apology tonight, as is Norma Ingram, Labor's candidate in Newtown, because they had pre-existing commitments, but both of them have told me of their deep concern and I think at the very least Labor has said they're very happy to work with the City, listen to the community and hear their feedback, but that the Government's proposal, I think we've all made very loud and clear noises, is unacceptable to proceed with in its current form. (Applause).

LORD MAYOR CLOVER MOORE: So thanks for that, Linda. I guess what we really want from Michael Daley before the election is that the current proposal will not go ahead. I think that's what we really want. (Applause).

So I'd like to thank you all for coming. Please make sure that you leave your details with us so that we can send you the City's report and the presentation from tonight and we will also send you suggestions for submissions that you can make to both the Government and the Opposition. And you've got to work really hard over the next three weeks. Thanks very much, everyone. Thank you to Peter and Richard (applause).

THE PUBLIC MEETING CONCLUDED AT 7.35PM