



## Mirvac Interpretation Strategy for Australian Technology Park -Draft Sept 2016 – Rail, Tram and Bus Union Retired Members Association Submission Background.

The Eveleigh Railway Workshops Precinct includes the Australian Technology Park site. The latter has been influenced by: Aboriginal heritage both past and present, industrial heritage both tangible and intangible<sup>1</sup> with the Eveleigh Locomotive Workshop and associated machinery collection listed as exceptional<sup>2</sup> by the NSW Heritage Council and internationally, and by the links between the Eveleigh Railway Workshops and the local community.

In October 2015 the NSW Government privatised the ATP site and sold it for \$265 million to property developer Mirvac. The sale forms part of a rapid transformation of the district which includes the Eveleigh-to-Central-Corridor project, the North Eveleigh property development, and the Waterloo Metro Station – public housing redevelopment. The Government indicated the sale proceeds would be used to improve local infrastructure though no further action has occurred. The sale was accompanied by a positive covenant in relation to heritage.<sup>3</sup>

Mirvac has filed a Development Application for commercial buildings. It does not apply to the Eveleigh Locomotive Workshops which will be the subject of a future DA. The centrepiece is a nine storey building for the Commonwealth Bank (with 10,000 relocated employees) forming one of the largest commercial leasing pre commitments in Australian history.

The DA is being processed by Urban Growth and then will be sent for a decision by the Planning and Environment Commission. The process has included forms of consultation and invitations for the public to make submissions about issues of concern to them, and a public response by the proponent noting the matters raised with some modifications to the proposal being made. As in all DAs, conditions may be attached to the DA.

② <sup>1</sup> Lucy Taksa: Issues pertaining to absence of attention to the intangible cultural heritage associated with the NSW Eveleigh Railway Workshops, October 2008. The article points to the adoption by UNESCO in 2003 of a Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, manifested in oral traditions, social practices and traditional craftsmanship. The article argues that successive owners and managers of the site have only paid lip service to its heritage and that the record of the lives of ordinary men and women has not been preserved in situ. Overarching concern for tangible industrial remains has been at the expense of their “intangible” social and cultural associations. 1.  
2.

<sup>2</sup> Australian Technology Park, Conservation Management Plan: Report prepared for ATP. Goddon, Mackay Logan Pty Ltd, Dec 2013. At p94 grades of significance for different components of the site take from the NSW Heritage Office publication. Exceptional, rare or outstanding element directly contributing to an item’s local and state significance. Applies to major elements within ATP Exceptional, Smithsonian Comments.

<sup>3</sup> The proprietor must comply with NSW Heritage Act and in particular all obligations under S170A as if the proprietor was a government instrumentality and comply with ATP heritage documents and Conservation Management Plan, Heritage Asset Management Strategy and Moveable Collection Management Plan.

The Interpretation strategy for ATP currently subject to comment is the third Heritage Assessment/ Interpretation Document produced by Mirvac in the last nine months.<sup>4</sup>

### **RTBU RMA Concerns about the Process and Timing of this current Exercise.**

The DA has yet to be endorsed by the Planning and Environment Commission (P&EC) yet important issues submitted by organisations to the previous two Heritage Impact Assessment Statements have yet to be adjudicated by Urban Growth and the P&EC. For example, the NSW Heritage Council in its submission argued that a new interpretation strategy should be endorsed by them. In another example the RTBU RMA noted that the second HIS included a 3 stage interpretation strategy with only the first stage including consultation with stakeholders, and its submission called for major revisions as the documents had failed to take into social and labour history including the role of former workers and their unions.

The \$64 question the RTBU RMA asks is: does the current Interpretation Strategy process reflect a new era for NSW heritage whereby a company writes a policy, the policy document asks for public comment and determines the outcomes, or is the public policy issue to be addressed in a transparent and accountable manner with oversight by the Government and the NSW Heritage Council?

**The RTBU RMA recommends the latter must prevail and threshold issues resolved before this process proceeds further. As has occurred in the past formal consultative structures for community consultation and engagement must be established.**

### **Interpretation Strategy for Eveleigh Railway Workshops**

As indicated in the public covenant there are 3 relevant site documents directly referred to. In addition, there is the Eveleigh Railway Workshops Interpretation Plan and Implementation Strategy, 2012<sup>5</sup>. All of these documents have been endorsed by the NSW Heritage Council. The Conservation Management Plan at the centrepiece of ATP heritage and conservation said, *“ it is vital the whole of the place’s story is told ... the story of the Eveleigh locomotive workshops is a great Australian story. It said this plan should be adopted as a whole. The ERWIP should be adopted as a whole”*<sup>6</sup>

The Draft IS Report at S2.5 sets out the Eight Key Principles for Interpretation at ATP. Two reference the Aboriginal community and the remainder are generalised. This contrasts with the Interpretation Plan Objectives set out in the Executive Summary of the 2012 ERWIP.

---

<sup>4</sup> See also Heritage Impact Statement ATP Redevelopment, December 2015, Addendum to Heritage Impact Statement ATP Redevelopment, April 2016.

<sup>5</sup> These various documents have taken many years to produce, been through consultative processes over nearly 30 years established by government authorities and have been endorsed by the NSW Heritage Council.

<sup>6</sup> CMP op cit p130 Policy objective 10 –Interpretation. 11 points are included with 5 actions. A comparison between what is set out in the CMP and the Interpretation provides a sharp contrast.

**The RTBU RMA recommends the key principles be refashioned to place the conservation, maintenance and interpretation of the heritage significance of the Eveleigh Locomotive Workshops, associated machinery collection and intangible heritage at the centre and as the first key principle. The role of social and cultural history of the site including workers and their unions should be included as a specific principle.**

### **Interpretation Zones**

The Draft IS identifies five key zones identified as suitable for the installation of interpretative products. This is an arbitrary decision based the nature of the current DA which is focussed on 3 commercial buildings and the public domain.

Interpretation for two of the buildings is minimal, as the major interpretation element is the former Alexandria Goods Yard whereas one of the buildings, because it is located on the former foundry site, has more potential and a greater range of ideas has been put forward.

The public domain zone with its proposed major focus on public art is given the greatest attention including expenditure of resources. The Loco Workshops Zone is further divided into 2 sub -zones Bays 1 and 2 in one, and Bays 3-15 in another sub zone. On the evidence presented in the Report some minor changes are proposed to Bays 1 and 2, the most notable being a bar or restaurant and what appears at this early stage on the evidence in this report (Bay 8, Relics showcase; the Archives and Research Centre and the large digital reproduction suggested for Bay 8 or Bay3.) to be the decoupling of heritage interpretation previously envisaged for Bays 3-15.

**The RTBU RMA recommends that interpretation for the Zone 1 Locomotive Workshops be excised due to a future DA and that the proposal for sub zones not be proceeded with.**

In the ERW 2012 IP five major interpretative zones were chosen to simplify navigation of the ERW and were based largely on the original operational divisions of the ERW.

The strategy makes the claims that the Locomotive Workshops including movable heritage collection are addressed in this report to *“ensure consistency to interpretative approaches across the whole of the ATP (within the context of wider Eveleigh Railway Workshops)”*<sup>7</sup>. It sets out to apply an interpretative framework that applies to both the current DA and the future DA for the Eveleigh Locomotive Workshops. This is a case of the heritage tail wagging the heritage dog.

The strategy acknowledges that the Workshops will be subject, at an as yet unspecified date, to a separate DA, which will require a further heritage impact statement, yet it seeks to establish a heritage framework which applies to both DAs.

**The RTBU RMA recommends the proposed framework should be rejected for the Eveleigh Locomotive Workshops as it circumscribes future interpretation strategies and**

---

<sup>7</sup> The Draft IP at p 16 notes that the HAMS and MCMP are in the process of review and provision. In other parts of this submission comments are made about the interaction been the ATP site and the wider ERW Precinct.

**significantly alters interpretation strategies for the ELW as set out in both the CMP and the ERWIP 2012.**

The Interpretation Strategy argues the NSW Heritage Council endorsed ERWIP “*was used as a basis for the initial framework for this strategy*”. A comparison of the two strategies suggests there are significant differences between them. Importantly the draft IP runs counter to the Conservation Management Plan.

Furthermore, it alters the interpretative concepts outlined in the EWRIP 2012 and narrows the elements of heritage interpretation utilised. No evidence is produced that this represents best practice interpretative methods. In our view it draws a long bow in arguing that, as the Technology Park focusing on innovation, digital technology should be the standard. There are a number of flaws in this argument. It will significantly reduce target audiences.

**The RTBU RMA recommends that the interpretative straightjacket adopted in the Draft IP be rejected as being too narrow, as it will limit a range of target audiences and themes and runs counter to both the Conservation Management Plan and the ERWIP 2012 and has been unilaterally determined without consultation or regard for the consequences.**

#### **Consultation and the proposed 3 stage Interpretative Strategy**

The interpretive strategy is proposed to be in three stages. The Heritage strategy submitted as part of the DA process provided consultation for some stakeholders only in stage one (limitation continued in this document e.g. in many areas a failure to include former employees and their representative associations, a consistent, continuing feature of the 3 heritage/assessment Interpretation documents produced so far. Stage 2 and Stage 3 interpretation in the public response document did not provide for stakeholder consultation, though this document at p13 indicates that “*consultation will continue to be undertaken as part of stage 2.*”<sup>8</sup>

**The RTBU recommends that the 3 stage interpretative strategy be altered to include the suggestions concerning consultation set out in the RTBU document: Response to Public Submissions.** (available from the UrbanGrowth web site.)

### **Heritage Interpretation**

#### **Previous Strategies**

The ERWIP, 2012 proposed 12 possible interpretative works across the ERW site, (3 applied to Carriageworks). It also included potential opportunities for works within the public domain, heritage demonstrations and events, as well as collections management and maintenance.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Draft Interpretation Strategy op cit p13.

<sup>9</sup> Op Cit p20

The Draft IP sets out what Mirvac proposes to do with these 12 interpretative elements.<sup>10</sup> For all intents and purposes, as set out in the analysis below, the 2012 ERW IP has been disembowelled.

**The RTBU RMA recommends that the draft IP proposal for the interpretation elements for the ELW be rejected and subject to independent analysis and report by the NSW Heritage Council.**

The Interpretation analysis in the draft IS identifies one gap with the 2012 plan as *“the pre and post contact Aboriginal heritage of the ATP site. The ERW and the Alexandria Goods Yard was a major employer of Aboriginal people”*. The RTBU RMA agrees that this is a welcome addition to the Interpretation Plan.

The RTBU RMA notes that consultations with aboriginal groups included a suggestion for an *“opportunity to create a central space to allow the interpretation of Aboriginal history, heritage and culture; and perhaps provide a keeping place also.”* The RTBU RMA suggests the possibility for this suggestion to be linked up with one of the interpretation elements of the ERWIP 2012 for and Archives and Research Centre.

---

<sup>10</sup> Op cit p40 Table 1: summary of proposed interpretative works for the ERW site (from 3D Projects 2012) from the previous IP 1. ERW Heritage Route. Not at this stage. If implemented would need to take place after the development of all precincts in the ERW. 2. Interpretation zones and signage clusters. This is part of 1 and as 2 zones are within ATP not possible at this stage. 3. Relics Showcase. Provides general visitor orientation, with 8 metre showcase that displays a general cross section of ERW and located near centre of bay 8. Argues not feasible, future of Bay 8 not known, (Bay 8 is the interface with new building 2 in Locomotive Street: our comment) at a much reduces scale consider the potential of a relics showcase for Bays 1 and 2. 4. Plan. A large format digital reproduction of an historic ERW plan in glazed aperture in Bay 8. Consider in areas outside of the Locomotive workshops through this interpretative plan DA. 5. Ghosts: a large scale floating artefact and audio-visual installation which explores the site through an array of personal stories and experiences of the place's past inhabitants. Response: rationalised concepts to be considered in conjunction with wider precinct... consider holographic projection. 6. Portraits. 25 glazed panel screen, Bay 1. Response could be considered outside workshops if part of this DA or if Loco workshops subject to future DA. 7. Bridge: two pedestrian / cycle bridges connecting North and South Eveleigh. Unable to address at this stage. (Refer to Urban Growth Report. Mirvac says “currently investigating available options with landowners and government agencies.” (Elements 8, 9, 10 not included or overlooked) 11. Workers Wall: a large scale interpretative artwork recording names of workers at ERW 1887-1989 or at least those that were killed or injured, location flexible. Could be considered during ATP interpretation in public domain areas. Though “not necessarily need to be on such a scale or incorporate into paving.” (latter should be opposed) Other potential opportunities, Signage: could be considered. Audio guides GhosTrain audio project (5-part sound sculpture). Response: are of self-guided tours and use of apps including Eveleigh Stories. May not necessarily be in the form of Ghost Train, potential to be considered as part of stage 2 interpretations. What does this mean and has the originator of GhosTrain been consulted?

Flyer, Webpage and Guidebook. Response: not proposed for this project arguing “outdated method of interpretation for this digital age”. Archive and Research Centre: proposal: all existing and future ERW related publications proposed to be collected and stored centrally, preferably on site at ERW, within an archive and research centre that could double as an ERW Visitor Information Centre. Response: ATP buildings are privately owned which is not commensurate with suggested use of the site of a public archive and research centre, not proposed for the project. Recycling, Site materials and artefacts: proposed recycling of structural elements and materials for future ERW landscaping and public artworks. Response: could be considered during ATP interpretation.

## Key historical themes and key stories for interpretation at ATP

The Draft IP references 36 NSW Heritage Council themes that are linked to 9 Australian National historical themes. The NSW historical themes relevant to ATP are set out in a table.<sup>11</sup> The RTBU RMA argues that a gap analysis of this table and its application into the Interpretative Plan reveals a number of areas for inclusion.

**The RTBU RMA recommends these gaps be remedied as set out below in this submission.<sup>12</sup>**

### Improving the commentary around the 9 key stories.

This submission suggests the commentary around the nine key stories could be improved. The stories around strikes, unionism and activism and safety first can be elaborated on considerably by former workers and their unions and this can occur during the interpretative consultation stage.

### Interpretative options

The Interpretation Plan considers a wide range of interpretative options and concepts that may be implemented as part of the final interpretation of the ATP site and the *“final interpretative products, including their detailed design, content preparation and implementation are then determined by the client in consultation with the key stakeholders.”*

**The RTBU RMA recommends that the final say on these issues should be made by the NSW Heritage Council.**

### Target audiences

As occurs in several other areas of the Interpretation Plan, a particular issue, in this case interpretative products, is referenced by the range of activities, offices, retail, public recreational, pedestrian thoroughfare, high traffic area where a wide range of products can be considered.

Throughout the paper reference is made to these matters and broad concepts such as target audience without any reference to surveys or estimates of the number of persons (other than the main office building with its 10,000 relocated employees) who may apply to these activities. Tourism is but briefly mentioned as part of the audience but no discussion is undertaken of the potential role of tourism not only for the ATP but the entire ERW precinct.

**The RTBU RMA recommends that surveys, working with appropriate Government Departments such as tourism and education, should be undertaken to give substance to the target audience numbers and preferences. In addition, the views of the incoming**

---

<sup>11</sup> Op cit p56 table 2 Historical themes Relevant to ATP.

**10,000 financial sector workers should be surveyed about interpretative plans, products and their concerns in relocating to the ATP site.**

### **Interpretative Products-Some Comments**

The Interpretative Plan outlines a summary of Interpretative products which are included under 9 headings. One is digital products and in this regard the Eveleigh Stories web site is referred to. As we understand the material for the site was prepared by ATP heritage, which has been disbanded, and that the site is being hosted by UrbanGrowth after the ownership change.

It is an unusual arrangement for such a site not to be operated by the owner of the site and this differs from other iconic heritage locations. This connection could be revisited and is another example of the increasing complexity of heritage interpretation for the ATP and wider Eveleigh precinct because of changing ownership patterns.

The effectiveness and potential of this site as a teaching, research and education resource, let alone the more basic question of who knows about this site, requires considerable attention to be paid to.

Other forms of interpretative products include **Artefact Displays**. The machinery collection is grouped under this heading. It notes that the overwhelming majority of items are housed in Bays 1 and 2 and the rest of the Bays and *"it presents a good opportunity for display when presented in a meaningful and conscious manner in more public locations to capture a wider audience."*<sup>13</sup>

**The RTBU RMA recognises this is a complex area and suggests a discussion paper which takes into account the 3 documents included in the positive public covenant, including experts in the machinery collection field, how assemblages are protected, the relationship between machine and operator/s and how this is conveyed; and the location of machines in situ needs to be produced.**

**Publications.** The interpretative plan argues that publications are antiquated and that alternative publications and phone applications that can assist with self-guided heritage tours and interpretations of the site's history will be investigated in stage 2 of the interpretation process.

This narrowing of the interpretative range runs counter to the CMP and the ERWIP 2012 and this is referred to below.<sup>14</sup> Concerning Landscaping a report has been prepared.<sup>15</sup> **Place naming:** the draft DA puts forward the possibility of a rebranding exercise across the site

---

<sup>13</sup> Op cit p 66.

<sup>14</sup> CMP op cit p131: the industrial history of the site would lend itself to the following interpretation methods: video installations, sound scapes, podcast, recreations of machinery assemblages and uses of an actual locomotive.

<sup>15</sup> Aspect Studios 2015, Australian Technology Park SSDA- Public Domain Design Report, prepared for Mirvac, December 2015.

which could recognise the site's heritage. This is in line with the suggestions of the ERWIP 2012 and is supported by this submission. .

**Volunteer Program /events.** Indicates that the *“efficiency, nature and involvement of the current volunteer program could be undertaken,”* with indications from the Plan that the volunteer program reports are outdated and the effectiveness of Heritage Open Days and Field Days should be considered. This submission indicates further discussions will be needed with volunteers with special attention being paid to marketing and promotion of these events and further engaging with the wider railway community. The RTBU RMA is concerned when efficiency is mentioned in this context as it is often associated with rationalisation

**Adaptive reuse.** Reference is made to Loco Bays 1 and 2 which house the majority of the machinery collection and the adaptive reuse to include a bar ,restaurant, brewery with the Cornerstone Bar and restaurant at Carriage Works referred to as an example. Given this submissions earlier comment about interpretative zones including sub zones and given a future DA needs to be made this decision needs to be deferred. However we do point out to: the fact that Bays 1 and 2 is one of the few remaining areas on the whole ERW site which has working industrial machinery and extensive machinery collections in situ; that the Carriageworks example does not have these features; and that the future of the buildings subject of the current DA is bars and restaurants; and as yet the numbers of target audience have not been provided.

Table 3 of the report outlines interpretative products, key requirements and recommendations for possible materials that could be considered for heritage interpretation at ATP. Given the preceding comments about digital products and place naming and the new interpretation zones at Buildings 1, 2 and 3 it is curious to find the statement that *“place naming and digital products have not been included in this table as they are considered to be already implemented and ATP and do not require further consideration at this time.”*<sup>16</sup> This statement would seem to be at odds with other comments in this IP, CMP and ERWIP and should be further explained.

Section 8 of the Draft IS concerns **Locomotive Workshops Interpretation**. Even though Heritage Interpretation will be considered as part of future DA it is considered in the report as part of the overarching interpretations strategy. This is opposed by the RTBU RMA. Compared to the centrality of Workshops in the 2012 ERWIP this plan, because of the future DA, has them at the periphery of the plan. A comparison of the actions taken by ATP in heritage conservation<sup>17</sup> and what is proposed in this plan shows that the changes proposed for the Loco Workshops are minimalist. This is without taking into account that Bays 1 and 2 and Bays 3-15, unlike the 2012 plan, has been divided into two sub zones for interpretation

---

<sup>16</sup> Op Cit p68.

<sup>17</sup> See ATP document “Public Statement on Heritage” 3 page document downloaded from ATP web site.



b) zone Bays 3-16 requiring a specific DA prior to stage 2 interpretation taking place. Thus the timelines for both zones will be considerably different to the other 4 zones of the ATP site, due to the separate DA processes. This will also mean a different timeline for stage 2 interpretation, and yet the plan proposes the same framework for the entire ATP should be adopted. There is a chicken-and-egg aspect to this discussion as the use of the Bays 3-16 in particular can't be determined until the future DA. The plan says it is possible that elements could be introduced that could help to encourage public use of the retail areas of the space. The heritage plans for Bays 3-15 were considerable in the 2012 plan and the severe dilution of the proposals as they affect Bays 3-15, coupled with the above comments, do paint a worrisome picture for heritage interpretation in these bays.

The report refers to site users, target audiences, relevant stories, comments about interpretation and its limitations, a number of which are productive comments. A section at 8.5 outlines heritage interpretation within the Locomotive Workshops. In Bays 1 and 2 there are some minor changes to existing movable heritage items, blacksmithing functions, major issue of mixed use, and updated signage, pump house projection, digital /interactive displays and artefact display cases. These proposals could be implemented in our view without a DA. For Bays 3-16, dependent on the future DA, display of movable heritage items may present the opportunity for static or rotating displays.

### **Brief comments on each interpretative zone**

**1. Building 1.** 9 storeys, office accommodation, 10,000 employees. The major gap is the Alexandria Goods Yard and this should be the major relevant story which includes the major themes of work, unionism and associated themes and operation of the goods terminal. As the goods terminal had a relatively significant number of Aboriginal workers, this should be a key relevant story.

These two opportunities for heritage interpretation would be in addition to the recommendations concerning public art, potential relocation of some moveable heritage items (which would be subject to existing policies) and naming of spaces and potential limited use of glazing for publicly accessible areas.

There is no provision for consultation of relevant stakeholders for building 1 interpretative zone and this should be remedied. Provision should be made to consult with future employees about the heritage interpretation to be applied to this building.

**2. Building 2.** 7 stories, commercial office building with ground level retail including supermarket, general shopping, cafes and restaurants. The Interpretative Plan notes that as this site is the former foundry a "*prime opportunity*" exists for the interpretation of this building. This submission supports this sentiment and is supported in principle.

The Draft IS argues, because of a wider audience compared to Building 1 (which has 10,000 employees each work day - our comments) Building 2 gives more opportunities for

interpretation. Stories from the 2012 ERWIP applicable to this site include: people, place, buildings, design technology, trades /skills, machines, production, multiculturalism, teamwork, closure of foundry and fate of workforce and demolished structures. The relevant stories as set out should include safety first. Once again the plan refers to “potential for some opportunities proposed through the 2012 IP to be implemented in this location” but no details are given. **These opportunities should be set out.**

The IP sets out a number of opportunities for heritage interpretation. This submission suggests presentation of the actual operation of the foundry with the sight/sounds/smells of the operating foundry would be a stunning display. A number of the stories from the 2012 IP are relevant to any proposed heritage interpretation. A number of recommendations are made including function and stories of the former foundry employees, if possible specific items from the movable heritage collection, naming of areas after heritage items, places, events, people and remnant fabric to be retained.

**3. Community Building:** is a 4 storey multi-purpose building including commercial office, community office, childcare, retail, gym and offices. The uses of the building appears not to have been settled but a general observation is that community space/functions will occupy an overwhelmingly minority position within the building. The heritage proposal for this building are limited with suggestions limited to public art and the incorporation of heritage items into a potential children’s playground should this proceed.

This submission suggests that as the site was occupied by the Alexandria Goods Yard recognition of this fact should be established and can be pursued by a number of relevant stories as referred to in our comments concerning Building 1.

The Draft IS notes there are some potential opportunities proposed through the 2012 IP to be implemented at this location. **The specifics of these should be set out in this IP.** The stage 2 reference should be amended to include reference to various stakeholders.

**4. Public domain.** *“Mirvac proposes significant public domain works.”* This interpretative plan devotes more attention to this zone than all the other interpretive zones combined. Public domains spaces are identified with 6 areas specified across the site are proposed for public art initiatives and installations. Suggested that for the purposes of these IP locations such as the Pump House should be considered as part of the public domain. Reference to previous heritage suggestions included ERW heritage route, interpretation zones /signage cluster, Workers Wall, pedestrian bridge and replacement of external pedestrian signage.

A number of these, as discussed previously, have been rejected in this Draft IS and *“will need to be addressed at a later date between Mirvac and future developers/ landowners, of the North Eveleigh precincts.”* This is commented on later in our submission.

Opportunities posed by the redevelopment for interpretation include landscape and public domain design and public art work. As mentioned a public art strategy has been prepared

for Mirvac. The report notes that artworks could potentially include such things as Aboriginal street art or sculpture, Workers Wall, paving inlays and moveable/heritage displays.

#### **Workers' Wall**

The concept of a Workers Wall is referred to in the draft IS and was one of the 12 interpretative elements outlined in the 2012 ERWS IP. It was suggested the artwork would need to be of a very large scale and might be incorporated into the site landscaping. Three themes have been suggested, the names of workers who were severely injured or killed; the names of the 65 trades performed at EWS and a full list as possible of those employed at the workshops. The RTBU RMA makes a number of comments.

#### **The RTBU RMA recommends all three components being included in a large scale interpretative artwork.**

The Eveleigh Stories touches but briefly on some OHS issues. A car builder recalls the death of a boilermaker due to the dreaded disease asbestosis and the exposure of that trade generally. Another recalls that basic items such as clothing were not provided to workers. This topic of course intersects with the history of the NSW Railways Ambulance Corps and the many struggles undertaken by workers, their shop committees and unions to improve both railway operational safety and OHS. The idea of recognising the occupations at EWS is strongly supported. However we suggest all occupations both trade and non-trade needs to be recognised as the majority of workers were non trades. For example the occupation of iron machinist had several classes, 1, 2 and 3. Class 1 was a tradesperson and 2 and 3 were non trade.

It is timely to reflect on the impact of a Workers Wall. The L.Taska Paper<sup>18</sup> refers to both the Swindon UK example and the Midland Railway Workshops in WA, Workers Wall. The latter is referred to in the extract below<sup>19</sup>.

Other subject matters that should be include in an Interpretation Strategy. This submission suggests these include the 1917 Great Strike, Migrant workers as Lucy Taksa has written

---

<sup>18</sup> L. Taksa op cit

<sup>19</sup> Ibid p3. In 2003 the framework for the wall was opened for public display. Seven thousand visitors came and descendants began to order bricks. Around 3,500 people attended the Dedication of the wall. In 2004 when stage 2 was opened due to desman, another 1200 attended. The second stage is now complete. In 2007 The MRAs CEO told me that the WA Heritage Council now deems the wall to be an important part of the sites heritage. This acclamation of the sites intangible cultural heritage is also supported by an oral history program. The Heritage Interpretation Centre provides a repository for the oral histories, films, and other memorabilia that have been donated by retired workers.

extensively about this subject and its relationship to Eveleigh. The 30 panel display, spearheaded and produced by railway workshop employees titled *Trains of Treasure* should be included as part of the public art work. It incorporates the overwhelming majority of stories set out in the 2012 ERW Plan and the 9 identified stories / historical themes set out in section 6 of this Draft IS.

This submission points to the process adopted by Carriage Works for the development of public art, the adoption of themes and significant artists to develop these themes with the project being assisted through a curatorial process, which includes the City of Sydney, NSW Transport, Heritage and Unions. **The RTBU RMA recommends this process be extended to the proposed Public Art strategy and representation expanded to include representatives of the Aboriginal community.**

In its conclusions to this section the IP argues *“Zone 5 public domain for the ATP is perhaps the key zone that is conducive to a range of heritage interpretation products, as it will be regularly utilised and traversed by all site users... interpretation within the public domain spaces embrace the concepts contained within the ERW IP”*.

This submission argues that whilst the public domain represents exciting possibilities, the key is the listed assets on the NSW Heritage Register with the centrepiece the Eveleigh Locomotive Workshop, associated machinery collection and intangible assets.

It is noted that that the IP provides that next stages of interpretation will involve a process of community consultation. Consultation issues have been canvassed earlier in this submission.

**The RTBU RMA submission rejects** the assertion that this report applies a consistent holistic approach to the entire ATP site and that the Locomotive Workshops should be covered by its framework and that it would form the basis of opportunities for this location.

**Funding the Implementation of this Interpretation Plan.** This submission suggests that the financial cost of the Interpretation Plan be detailed on a zone by zone basis together with the financial resources to be allocated to the Maintenance of the Locomotive Workshops in the period up to the future DA( In 2020?). The Association seeks confirmation that the Heritage Asset Managing Plan 2013 -18 will be implemented and information on a year by year basis of the expenditure proposed.

This RTBU RMA asks that information be provided on Mirvac’s request to Government to waive their Redfern- Waterloo Contributions Levy of over \$ 8 million because of their plans to spend \$19 million on the public domain.<sup>20</sup> The RTBU RMA opposed the proposed offset for a variety of reasons, first and foremost that the monies should be expended on public

---

<sup>20</sup> JBA ATP Response to Submissions and Amended Proposal, May 2016- 2.9 Development Contributions commencing at p52.

facilities in the wider Redfern- Waterloo area. We note that the City of Sydney Council opposed Mirvac's request for an offset as did members of the public.

### **Governance Issues.**

The sale of former public land in the ERWS Precinct combined with proposed developments in the view of this submission raises both small and large issues for consideration. At one end is the co-ordination of the future development of the Eveleigh Stories project. The original management and implementation was undertaken by ATP heritage. Our understanding is that this component of the ATP has ceased to exist and that in the change from public ownership the Eveleigh Stories web site was taken over by Urban Growth who is heavily involved in the development of North Eveleigh. The RTBU RMA asks what resources, project plan and responsibilities will be allocated to continue with ATP Eveleigh Stories?

A wider issue relates to precinct wide issues such as pedestrian/cycling bridge connections between the parts of the precinct. This has been a demand of the community and local institutions especially Sydney University students for many years. A number of the other elements of the 2012 ERWS IP are put on hold e.g. Heritage Walking Track, because of the lack of co-ordination, prioritisation and most likely legislative inertia/shortcomings due to changing land ownership in the ERW precinct.

The draft IP suggests that the wider view of the precinct will be addressed by a consultant's report commissioned by UrbanGrowth.<sup>21</sup> It refers to current and future landowners *"not only of their responsibilities for areas under their control and management, but of their broader responsibilities to retain and conserve the heritage values and the ERW as a whole, consistent with the Heritage Management Principles and Overview Conservation policies."* The draft IS sets out a number of the policies relevant to heritage interpretation. The RTBU RMA asks have the policies outlined in the Consultant's Report been adopted by UrbanGrowth Board and management and have they been adopted as policy by the NSW Government?

The draft IS refers to the current development of the ATP site and comments on the wider ERW in the terms quoted below.<sup>22</sup>

The RTBU notes there are a number of caveats to the Mirvac approach to the wider ERW project, that it is disconnected from the current DA and as the Urban Growth consultant's report related to non-enforceable policies.

---

<sup>21</sup> OCP Architects 2016, Eveleigh Railway Workshops, Overview Report, Revision D-17 June 2016, prepared for UrbanGrowth.

<sup>22</sup> Draft IP op cit at p39 *" while it is acknowledged that heritage interpretation a ATP should attempt to speak to wider interpretations across the wider ERW site , as the Locomotive Workshops are but one part of a wider holistic historic site , it is also noted that this must also be physically and financially feasible "*

**The RTBU RMA recommends that UrbanGrowth, the NSW Government, and land owners including Mirvac answer the questions: What processes are going to deliver ERW precinct heritage objectives to both the local community and the people of NSW in a timely manner and are these objectives covered by the Positive Covenant?**