



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-956456

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH APPLICANT

RE: PEMULWUY PROJECT, REDFERN

PANEL: SOO-TEE CHEONG
ILONA MILLAR
PETER WILLIAMS

ASSISTING PANEL: MATTHEW TODD-JONES

APPLICANT: ALISI TUTUILA
ANDY LUDVIK
NICK TURNER
GREG COLBRAN
MICK MUNDINE
LANI TUITAVAKE
FOUAD DEIRI
STEPHEN COX
GEORGIA JEZEPH

LOCATION: IPC OFFICE
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES

DATE: 1.06 PM, TUESDAY, 13 NOVEMBER 2018

MR S. CHEONG: Good afternoon, everyone. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the land on which we meet and pay my respects to the Elders, past and present. Welcome to the meeting today on the proposal seeking approval for a section 75W modification application to the
5 Pemulwuy Concept Approval, a section 4.55(1A) modification application to the Pemulwuy Project approval, and State Significant Development consent for the construction of a three to 24-storey student accommodation building within Precinct 3 of the Pemulwuy Precinct.

10 My name is Soo-Tee Cheong. I'm the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me on the panel are my fellow Commissioners, Ilona Millar, on my right, and Dr Peter Williams. Planner, Matthew Todd-Jones from the IPC Secretariat is assisting the panel. We have quite a number of people for the applicant here, so I will get you to
15 introduce yourself in a little while. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.

This meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of
20 information upon which the Commission will base its decision. It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put on our website. We will now begin.
25 If I could ask you to introduce yourself. Perhaps - - -

MR G. COLBRAN: Greg Colbran from Deicorp. We are the project managers for the Aboriginal Housing Company.

30 MR S. COX: Stephen Cox from Turner. We're the architect for the development.

MR N. TURNER: Nick Turner from Turner.

35 MS A. TUTUILA: Alisi Tutuila, Chairperson, Aboriginal Housing Company.

MR A. LUDVIK: Andy Ludvik, Town Planner, Ludvik & Associates, assisting the AHC in this matter.

40 MR F. DEIRI: Fouad Deiri, Managing Director of Deicorp, and we're the builders for the project.

MS G. JEZEPH: Georgia Jezeph from Scott Carver, Landscape Architect.

45 MR M. MUNDINE: Mick Mundine, CEO of the Aboriginal Housing Company.

MS L. TUITAVAKE: I'm Lani Tuitavake, General Manager of Aboriginal Housing Company.

5 MR CHEONG: Thank you and welcome again. Now, perhaps you would like to provide us with an overview of the proposal and talk about the objectives of the project, the reasons for the modification, and your response to submissions, and how do you see the department meets with the State Government plans and strategies, and any other key points that you may wish to bring up. So - - -

10 MR COLBRAN: Thank you very much for the opportunity today to meet today. On behalf of our team here, our main thoughts today were that to – as our first speaker, we will have Alisi Tutuila, the chairperson of the Aboriginal Housing Company, basically to give you an insight in relation to the Aboriginal Housing Company and the project itself, and their 40-year journey in relation to getting to
15 where we are today. The second speaker will be Andy Ludvik, our town planner, who can work you through, obviously, the town planning issues.

The third speaker will be Nick Turner and Stephen Cox from Turner Associates in relation to the architectural content, urban planning of the project, myself, Greg
20 Colbran, as the project manager working for Deicorp. Deicorp have been involved with this project since its conception nine and a half years ago. So any questions in relation to where we sit as project managers for the AHC, more than happy to discuss. Also with us today is that we have Georgia Jezeph from SCAPE in relation to landscape, as you've already heard. If there are any questions, Georgia is more
25 than helpful to talk about those. Again, Mr Fouad Deiri, who is the director of Deicorp. And in other matters in relation to AHC, Mick Mundine and Lani Tuitavake. So I think Alisi, please, if you would like to start for us, thank you.

30 MS TUTUILA: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to meet, and I'm just going to apologise upfront because as a proud young – I still consider myself young – Aboriginal woman that actually has been associated to the AHC for the last 17 years, also lived on the block for most of my teen life and my early 20s, and now sitting in front of you as the Aboriginal Housing Company's chairperson 17 years
35 later, there could be a possibility I might get a bit emotional. So apologies in advance.

So basically the AHC was incorporated in 1973 in direct response to the widespread discrimination that our people were facing in the private rental market. So the late
40 Bobby Blair, at the time, who founded the company, proposed to the Government at the time for a grant to build the first houses. So the Whitlam Government, at that time, put its first grant out of \$500,000 to develop and obviously buy some of the properties on the block to start off that community.

45 What we've seen, then, from there, was an influx of Aboriginal families moving into that community because of the work opportunities, factories and in the railway, and it became a thriving community. It was a safe place. You know, it was a great space for our community, and when we say "community", they were from all walks of life.

In saying that, sadly and unfortunately, we also witnessed a dark era for our people on that land, and that's when the vicious cycle of crime, drugs and alcohol took place, and it was at that time that the board and the visionary Uncle Mick stood up and said, "This is not the way forward for our community", and considered redeveloping the block.

The first approval that we received was actually in 2012, and although it was a major milestone for our people, the reality was that there was no funding for affordable housing. It's an epidemic right across the country for all races, not just Aboriginal people, and when I say that the Aboriginal Housing Company knocked on every possible door, we knocked on every door to try and secure funding.

Also through that process, the AHC endured, as you would know, many battles just to keep the land owned by Aboriginal people. So there were several battles throughout the years and decades that the team and Uncle Mick had faced in regards to safekeeping that land, and through it all, I guess we're here today in 2018, still with that same fire that Uncle Mick had 45 years ago when he had this vision to redevelop the block.

So as I said, there was no funding available. The reality of it was, as we move forward is – and I'm sorry, I'm getting a bit nervous here, but the reality of it was there was no funding available, and we had to come up with a way, without relying on Government, to financially keep this model of affordable housing sustainable into the future, because we know today that there isn't really much affordable housing out there, and the AHC has been now – over the last 13 or 14 years, have stepped away from Government funding.

So we actually subsidise all our properties, our current stock, and that's obviously the hope for the new properties on the block, is that we will subsidise them ourselves. So we had to come up with a model that was financially viable and sustainable into the future. In saying that, we also wanted to ensure that as we're developing this piece of land, that we weren't handing over a debt for 100 years to the next generation, so that was a big thing for our board to ensure that we weren't handing over the debt to the next generation.

In saying this and what our people have endured to get to this point today, and this whole development and the whole concept of, you know, building this new community and having this, you know, breath of life into this thriving, healthy Aboriginal community and actually bringing families back into the city, because today, the reality is affordable housing aren't housing families any more. In the inner city, you're lucky to get a two-bedroom apartment, and that's, kind of, the limit. So we've got three, four-bedroom townhouses there, so it's actually bringing Aboriginal families back into the community, and it's actually a part of our healing, as well, as Aboriginal people.

The fact that we can sit here today, and I'm so proud to stand – sit here, sorry, as the chairperson, and say that we are actually not only doing our duty, as stewards of this

company, to actually progress out people forward, but actually contributing to the economic footprint, you know, and the growth in that area. So there's existing growth and developments in the pipeline that's already happening. We're playing our part. And to actually have the land we have been blessed with, and to utilise that
5 and unlock the potential of our own land, just as every other developer in the community are doing, to be able to do that as Aboriginal people and be the catalyst and set the benchmark for the rest of the nation is a massive thing for us.

And I'm confident, as I sit here, to say that we have overwhelming community
10 support, and it's not just about the Aboriginal people in Redfern, even though that's our priority. Uncle Mick, our visionary, has been really big on the whole reconciliation concept of coming together, people, human beings, and that's what we've created. That's the whole, you know, aspect of having the diversification of income. We've got the commercial retail. We've got the child care. We've got
15 different avenues that will help sustain this model. And in those avenues, it's going to be a multicultural, you know, footprint for our community. So we're really grateful. I'm sorry if I've just spoken 100 miles an hour, but we're super excited about where this is going to take our people, and, more importantly, setting these foundations for the next generation. That's what it's all about. Thank you.

20

MR CHEONG: Thank you. The next speaker?

MR LUDVIK: Yes. I would just like to quickly go over the strategic planning issues that are involved with this particular development. As Alisi said, that the
25 AHC has been going through a long and winding road to get to the point that it's at at the moment, and it wants to achieve that ultimate goal of providing affordable housing and community facilities for the local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community.

30 One would ask, "Well, what has changed since 2012 and the concept plan approval that we got back in 2012?", and when you set your mind to it, you see that it's been recognised that international education is a very significant part of the New South Wales economy, that the ABS did some figures where they indicated that the number of international students has risen by somewhere in the order of 22.4 per cent in the
35 two-year period between 2013 and 2015, and it's generated in excess of \$6.6 billion worth of economic activity as far as New South Wales development is concerned. So by providing a higher level of student accommodation, it very much reinforces that as a major economic driver to development in the state.

40 The other thing that occurred that in 2016, Knight Frank did a study on purpose-built student housing, and what it came up with was that there was a significant undersupply of purpose-built student housing in Sydney and throughout Australia, so that there was a demand for it and they recommended that the State Government and Local Government should look at different policies to attract that form of
45 development, which is exactly what we're planning to do on Precinct 3 and the Pemulwuy Project.

So that really sets the scene of virtually saying why we've changed, that there has been this impetus for a greater demand for student housing, and it can be satisfied in Pemulwuy. Pemulwuy is perfectly located, because it's right next to Redfern Railway Station. It's in very close proximity to a number of major educational institutions in the local area, and it's close to the Sydney CBD.

When we look at the strategic metropolitan planning context, it's changed quite significantly since 2012 as well. We had a plan for growing Sydney that was published in 2014, and some of the major issues that it – that it raised, and policies that it was promoting, was to increase housing choice around centres through urban renewal, creating stronger economic development in strategic centres and transport gateways, accelerating housing supply and urban renewal across Sydney and revitalising suburbs. So in 2014, the state government produced this new metro strategy where these were very much drivers what it saw as the future development of the area.

That was then followed by the Central to Eveleigh Urban Transformation Strategy, which was much more focussed on – on the local area. That was published in 2017 and the kind of notions it was putting forward was to – to reflect an enduring and important place for the Aboriginal community around that particular precinct of Central to Eveleigh. The renewal of Redfern Station and the – the creation of centres of activity around the station, the area becoming a renewed core and a place for Sydney's growing innovation and technology industries and a bustling, active hub for – of innovative businesses, shops, community service and new public places. It also advocated excellence in design quality and density well done principles.

These now have also found their way into the – the more recent publications in the Greater Sydney Region Plan and the Eastern City District Plan. So what's been proposed here very much fits in to the context that has been put forward in these more contemporary metropolitan strategies.

I'd just briefly like to touch on the design excellence process. Nick will talk a lot more about the architecture and how the building sits together on precinct 3, but the process involved a – a great deal of scrutiny. It had Kim Crestani, who has been an urban design advisor to Parramatta City Council, Tony Caro, who's an eminent Sydney architect, and Olivia Hyde, from the government architect's office. So it was – you know, quite an important group of people who were overseeing the – the design excellence process. In fact, the government architect's office were the record keepers of the – the goings on in the design view panel meetings. So you can rely quite heavily on the documentation that's been provided as to what occurred during the design development process.

I don't want to dwell too much on the statutory planning context. I – I – I've read the nearly 100 page report that's before you, prepared by the Department. I think it's a very comprehensive and robust report and I think it's one that the Commission could reasonably rely on to make a decision, as far as this development is concerned.

Just in closing, I – I really believe that this application is in the public interest and approval of it is – is warranted on the basis that the – the development facilitates the provision of the affordable housing and the community facilities for the local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community. That’s a very important goal of this particular development.

The other element is that it – it facilitates the economic development and use of the land. If this development isn’t approved, then the land is likely to stay vacant for the – the foreseeable future because there’s just no way of being able to fund it because of all the efforts that the Aboriginal Housing Company has made to try and do it in a different way. This is the only way that we see it going forward. So I finish on that. Happy to help answer any more detailed planning questions that the Commission might have but - - -

MR CHEONG: Thank you, Andy. Perhaps before the next speaker, if we can ask the question at this - - -

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

MR CHEONG: - - - point in time, with the – the urban planning issues and – yes, I’ll start with Ilona, would - - -

MS I. MILLAR: I guess, one – one question I had is in respect of the – the urban planning context. We’ve talked a lot about the increase in scale around the Redfern Station precinct, but to – is it the West Darlington – the – the – the planning context for the area which is currently more low-rise - - -

MR CHEONG: It’s on the north-east - - -

MR LUDVIK: To the west - - -

MS MILLAR: So north – sorry; north - - -

MR CHEONG: North-east. North and north-east.

MS MILLAR: - - - north, north-east.

MR LUDVIK: Going away from the railway.

MS MILLAR: Well – yes, basically going – going away from the railway station

MR LUDVIK: Towards the – the uni.

MS MILLAR: - - - towards – back towards, I guess, Surry Hills and - - -

MR LUDVIK: Yes.

MS MILLAR: The – what – the planning context for that area, is it to remain low-density, low-rise - - -

5 MR LUDVIK: It is. It's in a conservation area. What happens is that the development in precincts 1 and 2, which is where the Aboriginal Housing is to be provided, as well as the childcare centre and a small retail centre. That acts as a buffer between that lower scale terrace house development that you get in Caroline Street and other streets to the west. There was quite a bit of work done and we're asked to do views of what it looked like from those areas and we've provided those
10 views and I think there's one in your – your report, which shows that this development, whilst it's big, it is not overbearing, as far as the conversation area is concerned. There have been quite extensive heritage reports done which also come to that conclusion.

15 MR CHEONG: You mentioned the strategic plan, that's the urban transformation strategy of the Central and Eveleigh, can you tell us what the plan has recommended on that, in terms of density, height - - -

MR LUDVIK: It didn't go down to that level of detail.

20

MR CHEONG: Yes.

MR LUDVIK: You know, it – it's like a lot of strategic planning documents that indicate certain notions and they evolve. For instance, with the Central to Eveleigh strategy, at one stage there, and I think it's still afoot, that there was a proposal for a
25 – a one million square metre development - - -

MR TURNER: Correct.

30 MR LUDVIK: - - - over the Central Station area, which was going to provide hotels, this, that and the other. A lot of the strategy also looks at the social housing that's in Waterloo and I think it's – there – they talk about redevelopment of the station, without really giving us details of exactly what they intend to do there. I think they will evolve over time.

35

MR CHEONG: There are of course concerns with the – the height and bulk and scale of the – of the proposal, can you tell us a bit more how you respond to that and how to – how do you overcome that concern?

40 MR LUDVIK: Well, it's a big building. The – when you place it in its context, when you look at it in terms of the conservation area that's located to the – towards the university, you have a six storey building, virtually on the opposite side of Eveleigh Street to this particular proposal. Then you have the Redfern Community Centre, which provides an additional buffer before you get into the lower density
45 development. So there is a transition there. You know, it'd be naive to say that people won't see the building but what – what I would say is, that the building is really a city shaping building. It's a very iconic building and it's gone through this

design process to – to make it fit in with development that’s happening on the eastern side of the line or has happened on the eastern side of the line, and with – with anything that may be planned across the station and redevelopment of the station itself.

5

MR TURNER: I might – I might elaborate on that components of that and how that – how we deal with that, yes.

MR CHEONG: Peter, would you - - -

10

DR P. WILLIAMS: Just – yes, just one question. Thanks, Andy. The Aboriginal Housing in precincts 1 and 2 - - -

MR LUDVIK: In precinct 1.

15

DR WILLIAMS: One – in 1 only?

MR LUDVIK: Yes.

20

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR LUDVIK: Precinct 2 has got the childcare centre - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

25

MR LUDVIK: - - - and a small retail commercial centre - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Right.

30

MR LUDVIK: - - - where the AHC are going to have their offices, as well.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, thanks. That’s good. And – and all the student housing in precinct 3?

35

MR LUDVIK: In 3, yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MR LUDVIK: Thank you.

40

MR CHEONG: I want to - - -

MR DEIRI: Can I just add – can I add something, sorry? Because as a stakeholder, we’ve been invited to a couple of meetings by UrbanGrowth, when they were looking at the Central to Eveleigh and we’ve had some discussions with them and – and when the – when the UrbanGrowth strategy came out, they were looking at – and

45

I'm sure Nick touched on that, but they were looking at doing some 20 to 30 storey buildings down that corridor.

MR TURNER: Correct.

5

MR DEIRI: So whether that happens at all, we don't know about that, where a lot of general discussion came from them on that.

MR CHEONG: I've got another question about, you make a statement, I think, there's no – no car parking needs to be provided for student accommodation. How do you arrive at that?

MR LUDVIK: Well, when we did the first concept plan, we suggested some parking on the site, and the city council told us to go away. They didn't want it there, so – and in your reports, it turns around and says, "There's a number of student accommodation buildings in the immediate vicinity of this that provides no car parking", and I suppose it leads to that constant planning theory of saying, "Don't provide parking and that'll put people back onto public transport, it'll reduce congestion", and some of those kind of philosophies, so that's very much the city's philosophy. It's supported by other developments and being able to look at their characteristics and say, "Well, you know, you are looking at international students in the main being housed there, and students generally don't own cars."

MR CHEONG: You have provided a number of bike parking.

25

MR LUDVIK: We've got plenty of it.

MR TURNER: Yes.

MR LUDVIK: We've got plenty of bike parking, and one thing that we've done is a share bike scheme, you know, where not all students have a bike, but they sometimes would like to have access to a bike, so that was very much an initiative we thought of because the city council actually wanted a lot more bikes, and we would have ended up with a basement half-full of bikes that weren't being used, so we came up with this alternative of – I think it's 179 bike spaces as well as 20 which are there on a shared basis.

MR COLBRAN: And, sorry, the other point to that too, as we worked our way through the design axis, was basically looking at a drop-off zone for the students. Now, that drop-off zone has been allowed for in front of precinct number 1, where there are eight street parkings, so that was one of the main things that came out, as long we can have a drop-off zone for the students in a cab or what

MR TURNER: Yes, rather than dealing with commuting.

45

MR COLBRAN: Exactly.

MR TURNER: So – and I think the other part of that, the other dimension to that, is that it's in a walkable context, so we – public transport, the fact that the site's highly serviced, that aside, it's in a walkable context almost midway between University of Sydney and University of Technology.

5

MR CHEONG: So the drop-off there is in Caroline Street?

MR COLBRAN: Yes, indeed.

10 MR LUDVIK: Yes. Yes.

MR CHEONG: Okay.

15 MR DEIRI: And Nick got – and also further, the Igloo development that just finished this year, which is on Regent Street, 19-storey building, has no parking at all.

MR CHEONG: Right, okay.

20 MR DEIRI: And I don't even think – which they definitely haven't provided the amount of bicycle parking - - -

MR TURNER: There isn't. Correct.

25 MR DEIRI: - - - we've provided as well, and that's about 200 metres away from where this site is.

30 MR LUDVIK: There was some concern expressed about the ability for the footpaths to take the pedestrian traffic, so the department actually made us go back and do some studies of footpath capacities, which indicated that the footpaths in that area are capable of being – to accommodate the number of students that would be moving around that area, whether it be to Sydney University or whether it be to the University of Technology.

35 MR CHEONG: Right. Thanks. Perhaps we could move on to the next speaker.

40 MR TURNER: I think there are a couple of threads there for me to talk about. So just trying to best arrange this, I think before I head down the design integrity process, which was the process that it was termed within the, I guess, the frame of reference of the SEARs requirements that came through, the broader, I guess, strategic or contextual issues are that we're in a changing urban context, and we're – and it's been changing for a long time. It's been changing, really, since the demolition of the existing urban fabric that exists on the site, and it's been involving in not necessarily a conventional way, but it's been evolving.

45

That said, with the context of Waterloo and the work that UrbanGrowth, LAHC and Treasury are currently doing with Waterloo and the Waterloo Metro, together with

the changing urban context that you can visibly see, now, in Redfern, the future changing urban context in the form of, firstly, Central to Cleveland Street, Central to Redfern and then Central to Eveleigh, which is the broader context, you've got components along – along the route where change is already afoot. The overarching strategy are the various studies that have been undertaken to date that propose buildings of, as Fouad said, 30-plus storeys, depending on whether you're seeing work produced by the City of Sydney or UrbanGrowth.

That said, it's urban development both on the fringe of the rail corridor but, in part, over the rail corridor to optimise that – that airspace and, primarily, improve the connection from east and the Surrey Hills side west to Darlington and Redfern and Eveleigh, so procedurally I think it's important to talk about the design integrity process. It is a true statement to say that this scheme is not an arbitrary collection of architectural ideas. This scheme is the product of a really rigorous and intellectually satisfying and engaging design integrity process.

There were seven meetings that were held with Kim Crestani, Tony Caro and Olivia Hyde, and they went through a process that was initiated – really, and the initial meeting was an inception meeting with very little on the table, just to talk about the theory of urban design and architecture responding to this brief and the cultural significance of the context in which we were dealing with. As an aside, the SEARs actually had with it – it was accompanied by an illustrative solution for the site, and that was a building that was comprising a small three-storey component, eight, 11, 14 and 16 storeys, and it – it housed – it housed that GFA that's currently in the final scheme.

Now, that was a building form that was double-loaded in many respect and had a lot of rooms that were facing onto the railway line, in order to meet the objective of the number of rooms – sorry, the number of beds required for this particular facility, so with that in mind we sat down to look with the panel at how we best move forward and have a robust debate, and we moved not through the detail and the colouration of the building initially, but we moved through looking at form studies, and this – these models sat into a context model, but looked at the way in which we could come up with the best urban form that sat well within in its existing, previous and future contexts, which was a challenging thing to do in its own right, and I think we've got a solution that does that very, very well.

The next – and all of those various stages of evolution were documented, and that they were reflected in each of the sets of minutes from each of those design integrity meetings. Not only did we look at urban form, but we wanted to look at the nature of place, and we looked at the way in which materiality – and sorry to do this. If we had a projector it might be a bit different, but we looked at the nature of geology and the nature of flora and fauna on the site historically, what the site was, acknowledging that it was now a highly urbane context and environment, but how those key – the key geology, flora, fauna and colouration of those led to a concept story that paralleled the rigorous urban form studies that were going on that were

then abstracted, so once the – I'm sorry to do it this way, but I think it's graphically strong.

5 We look at the stratification of the geology, we look at, then, the abstracting of that into architectural language and architectural devices, and we did that for both the natural landscape that existed on the site and then abstracting that to start to give us some cues as to what and how the materiality might evolve, so the canopy and the pixelisation of that canopy and colouration, all the way through to the way in which the understorey can be represented in the form of texture repetition, rhythm and so on. All these architectural devices that come out of the natural environment.

15 And then, more importantly, the way in which each of these fantastic endemic – formerly endemic plants and shrubs that existed on the site with colour could then be abstracted to inform a stratification of materiality, but using those as tools and devices to deal with the issue of context and scale, transition and integration so that the way in which the building is ultimately conceived after the process that we've been through is it's not a building. It's a collection of buildings that make up a whole, and it's made up of a three-storey building component, and that relates very much to Eveleigh Street, and it's a form that's independent. It acknowledges the rhythm of the particular type of terraces that exist through there, the way in which the building interfaces with the street with active uses.

25 And then we have buildings – so that's a component of the – well, a part of the building – collection of buildings – a building within the collection of buildings that responds directly to the conservation context and the interface with that existing and future finer-grain context to the west. To the east, it's a building in the city, and it's more abstract because it's against the rail line. However, it's made up of three parts as you're heading north, and those parts are generally viewed at some form of speed, either on rail or in a car on Gibbons Street on the other side, and they're read and abstracted, in terms of the way you read those buildings and the impact of the buildings on the context, almost in a mural-like public art context as opposed to a conventional prosaic building, but they're fragmented so that you get that A-B-A rhythm, and the characterisation which you can see from the CGIs reflects that.

35 The building at the – of the three taller buildings of the city scale at the north, it's 17 – sorry, I will start again. At the north, its nine storeys, up to 24 storeys and down to 17, and that has arisen after hours and hours of debate with the Design Integrity Panel, ensuring that we didn't get a building that was overly bulky and a building that was dynamic in terms of not being a flat top building, but a building that varied as a collection of almost a microcosm of a city diversity that responds to its edge conditions, the harshness and the high-speed nature of the rail, the walkability, fine-grain nature of the conservation context to the west, two distinctly different contexts.

45 And then there's a third dimension to that, and that is the transition to the north where the building is read as an unusually thin building – unusually thin. Not as a slimline building in the context of, say, the apartment design guide, but a super slender building of, sort of, New York slenderness proportions. That is a stepping

down and transition to the north, which becomes – again, it’s a hard edge. It’s on the rail line, but has finer-grain context to the north of that. To the south, the building almost presents with a civic-like presence on the plaza and, again, that super thin edge, but it has real presence towards the station and the activation there, and part of the public domain strategy and the AHC strategy is that this is a meeting place, and it’s there to draw people in.

Then there are finer-grain layers and dimensions that build up both in a vertical and the horizontal dimension – well, actually, all three dimensions, because we’ve got public domain as a surface, which has been, I guess, really rigorously considered in terms of the way in which it deals with pedestrian traffic, conflict, gathering, drawing people, but also the ability to maintain and restore the artwork on the Lawson Street Bridge and returning down the wall against the rail line, so that that isn’t a forgotten piece of art work, or a relic, but it now comes to the foreground. It becomes very much part of this new meeting space, all harnessed by – all held together by this very lively three-storey high lobby space to the station end – the southern end of this building with a continuous public domain ground surface that goes into that lobby space.

So you’re effectively reading the transparency of that as being a living room within the public domain. And the soffit of that, through the – with the good help of Professor Michael Tawa, we’ve developed a public art strategy that encourages to restore and bring forward this art wall that exists, rather than just leaving it to deteriorate, and not have some primacy in the nature of the new public domain, and the other is then to start to use those surfaces within a lobby that are visible from everybody that walks past day and night to bring another layer of richness together with that that’s occurring within the public domain.

So seamless interface with the public domain, almost of a civic scale at the southern end as you approach from the station. The buildings of the city and speed and future transformation and future urban context of Eveleigh – Redfern to – sorry, I will start again. Central to Eveleigh and that context, and then the quieter, fine grain, walkable response to the conservation context in the form of our three-storey building with a whole series of active uses, and a terrace-like rhythm, I think, starts to break the building up to deal with its – what I think as a whole series of schizophrenic conditions. It’s not just about one or the other. It’s about the lot, and I think our building, through that really vigorous design integrity process, has led us down a path of crystallising the best of those ideas in the application that’s before you.

MR CHEONG: Thank you. Perhaps, I will start with Peter. Have you got any questions?

DR WILLIAMS: Well, not on those, but I will come back with some other questions, yes.

MR CHEONG: Ilona?

MS MILLAR: Could I ask a question about the public art and domain strategy and how, sort of, dynamic is that intended to be in terms of, you know, will the artworks be a fixed set for the duration, or will there be regular review update to – for example, the murals and paintings on the wall and any other, sort of, public art elements.

MR TURNER: Sure. Sure. I will touch on it, and if you would like to elaborate on it, but at the moment, there's a process of restoration. So re-energising those artworks that are currently there, and then the introduction of artwork in – there's a – within the volume of drawings – I can – actually, I - - -

MR COLBRAN: I can just show you here.

MR TURNER: Yes, there's another one.

MR COLBRAN: I will just pass those out, if I may. What you just - - -

MR TURNER: Yes.

MR COLBRAN: - - - see in – and just – sorry, Nick, if I can just add there, is that – and just that page that goes with it – basically in relation to the public art, and I think Lani, as well, because she has been working a great deal in relation to the public art in Lawson Street. What you just see on the front page there, again, is a – I think it's nearly 18 months, two years worth of public artwork through Sydney City Council and South Sydney Council to complete the artwork on Lawson Street. Then, as you move into your second page, we then start to talk about the public art that Nick is talking about, that will become a living canvass.

And, again, this was worked with Professor Tawa, but also the artist who actually worked on this wall, Danny Eastwood. Now, we have engaged Danny as well to stay with us. He is collaborating with Professor Tawa to look at – first of all was to renew the public art on that wall, but, secondly, to look at that as a living canvass, and as time works its way through, to sit with the Aboriginal Housing Company to say, “What can we do with this art wall?” Is it something, as it's created Danny, to say, “Would you like to change this?” and our last meeting that we had with Danny was that he said, “I would like to think about it”, because it is something that has been there for a long time. It has a great deal of history on the project, but notwithstanding that, it is something that maybe an agreement with the AHC could come into this living wall that every three to five years, that wall is put out to young Indigenous artists to come in and change that wall.

MS MILLAR: And is there a role for the council and their Public Art Department in any of this in your view, or is this something that should be, you know, in the hands of AHC and as a community to decide what

MR COLBRAN: The main point from that, as again, that we have had several meetings with City Council. Basically, the Aboriginal Housing Company have said

that, “This is our land. This is our wall. We have the artists that have been working on these walls for 30, 40 years, and in due respect to Sydney City, we would like to stay in total control of all the public art.”

5 MS MILLAR: Yes.

MS TUITAVAKE: but more importantly that we, from our – having lived and worked in the area, that we wanted to ensure that this living canvass, there was a plan in how we were going to look after this piece of art because from the other side,
10 Lawson Street has taken over decades to – despite the fact that it’s become like an iconic wall, and there was a wall that, you know, told, you know, history, it deteriorated over the years and whether we were, sort of, South Sydney Council and then we moved on to City of Sydney Council, it still took a process to actually get that wall restored, which only happened this year. So I think from – from our wall,
15 we – we learned that we needed to ensure that we did have – working with Michael and – and Georgia and the team, that, yes, we’re going to have a plan for the wall and looking into the future, to how we were going to maintain it and make sure that it never fell into disrepair.

20 But also that, you know, just talking with the team, the other side of the wall, at times, it did reflect what was happening on the other side because you had to come around the corner to actually see what was actually happening, you know, with families on the other side of the wall. The wall also fell into disrepair so, you know, there was – now it just seems like the wall’s got – you know, it’s been repaired now,
25 which has – it brought a lot of joy to lots of people. The railway entrance is getting restored and it – yes, sort of seemed like we’re all aligning but, you know, it – it does give that sense of, you know, it’s fresh, it’s – it’s vibrant and it just, it gives us, you know, that – yes, it’s – time is – hope of a – a better, you know, coming around to a lovely surprise on the other side, because you’ve got to come right – I don’t know
30 whether you’ve been to the site, but you walk right to the tip of Eveleigh Street and that railway, and then you stick your head around the corner and there we are, you know, our community.

MR COLBRAN: Right – go on.
35

MR TURNER: So I think the – the – I was just going to say, just to – to conclude that, the – sorry; can you just hold that – now, the other component that I was talking about was, as you – as you – so we have our very tall, slender end to the building here, 17 storeys, very narrow, to Redfern Station directly behind us. This
40 large, open lobby lounge space here that’s really transparent, with great surveillance over the new public domain, and then the soffit of the building here, which will be the canvass for another – another public art installation. And the third dimension, which I shouldn’t forget, Mick, is the – the family of turtles and the representation of the family of turtles, which will ultimately be up the south-west corner of the
45 building, on the eastern side. Sorry.

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry. Just to clarify, that's all in accordance with the – the plan prepared by Scott Carver, the – the - - -

MR LUDVIK: Yes.

5

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: And I think there's a condition to that effect, that I think we've seen some draft – a draft condition that it – the public art would be consistent with the – with the Scott Carver and - - -

10

MR LUDVIK: With the Scott – yes.

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

15

DR WILLIAMS: Michael Taylor - - -

MR LUDVIK: It's in the statement of commitment to do it, so - - -

MR COLBRAN: And further to that, is that I'm in the process now of reconvening with the design excellence panel to take the next step and work our way, so the – the – the DEP stay in tune with all designs, all public art, from start to finish.

20

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

25

MR CHEONG: All right. I notice comments from Council that – about the lack of private open space and they were recommended – recommending additional balconies to – to the building and I understand that you were – you think that it would have – destroy the integrity of the design, by putting balconies, which is fair enough, but - - -

30

MR TURNER: I don't think that's the sole – it's not the sole purpose for that, but – but – sorry, go on. Go on.

MR CHEONG: Yes. I also notice that you have actually provided a lot of communal space - - -

35

MR TURNER: Correct.

MR CHEONG: - - - within the building.

40

MR TURNER: Correct.

MR CHEONG: But then, there are quite a number of floors that you haven't provided with the – like a study or communal space. Would – would you think that it may be better to provide, on every floor, just to increase the standard of amenities to each floor?

45

MR TURNER: Sure. So the – the metrics, I don't have in my head but I remember at the time going through the justification and review process. We had – and there's – there was a differing view. When we did our own precedent study of facilities that are in existence, we are not providing less than other examples that are within the
5 city. More importantly, from a private open space perspective, the reason for distributing in an uneven way is not to be inequitable to all – to all – to all residents of the building, but to ensure that, in fact, you don't duplicate these facilities so you get floor isolation. And this is intended to be a living village of students and that there are different sorts of spaces throughout the building for them to gather and
10 meet socially.

The same with study spaces. Rather than creating small secondary study spaces, there are larger and actually occur on every – on every second floor as you track up through the building. So it's not about actually getting away with less. It's about
15 being deliberate about why we put it where we did. And that really is from a social engagement perspective, and still, I think, Andy, in terms of our numbers and our metrics, we're providing very healthy numbers of – square metres of indoor and outdoor amenity and communal open space that's in a very structured environment. We've worked through with the operator to ensure – because they have to be
20 competitive in the market, so they need to make sure that these spaces are not compromised because these are their selling points.

MR COLBRAN: And I think also, if – in relation to us working with the provider, is it is something that, from the way they actually run their operation, they did not
25 want balconies. They did not want young children - - -

MR TURNER: Correct.

MR COLBRAN: - - - out on balconies. That was one of the major points that they
30 advocate for.

MR CHEONG: Yes. My question is not so much putting the balcony on, but actually providing more communal space at various different levels. And I notice that you actually have it on upper ground level, 1, 2, 3 - - -
35

MR TURNER: Yes.

MR CHEONG: - - - and then 10, 18, 19, 20.

40 MR TURNER: Yes.

MR CHEONG: Would you be happy to look at providing in between that level 3 and 10 a few more of those open common area?

45 MR TURNER: I think we'd have to go back and look at the aggregate of – of - - -

MR CHEONG: Yes.

MR TURNER: - - - of the area that we're providing. Sorry, go on, Steve.

MR COX: We're – we're at the high end of – of allocation of common space in student housing. We're at – we're at the top end.

5

MR CHEONG: Yes.

MR COX: So if we did that, the danger would be we would reduce the amenity of the spaces we've got. So the idea is, by having them – having the space – fewer spaces, but scattered through the building, we get higher quality spaces. If we were to amortise them to a smaller space, on – on more floors, they'd be of a lower quality space, so - - -

10

MR TURNER: We are, at the moment - - -

15

MR COX: We're at 2.5 square metres - - -

MR TURNER: Yes.

MR COX: - - - per – per – per student.

20

MR TURNER: And Urbanest City Road is 1.9, Urbanest Darling Drive, Darling Harbour, which is the new – the new twin towers, down there is at 1.85.

MR CHEONG: I'm not asking or actually commenting on the – the size of it, but rather, you know, you have similar size of study on, say, level 3 and then, wouldn't be – would you be able to put, say, maybe in certain other levels, which are from level 4 to level 9 are without any communal space in that area.

25

MR COX: But it – it would be a matter of getting rid of another space to do that - - -

30

MR CHEONG: Yes.

MR COX: - - - is the issue and - - -

35

MR TURNER: Or – or relocating, perhaps. But I think the – at the moment, they're – it's really been worked through quite rigorously with – with – with the operator.

MS MILLAR: So the – the allocation of this sort of communal space is driven by a floor space area per student - - -

40

MR COX: That's right.

MS MILLAR: - - - for the number of - - -

45

MR TURNER: Into – into a pool, and then they look at where they distribute them to ensure that you get this – you don't get floor isolation, interactivity between groups within – within the building.

5 MR COLBRAN: And further to what Nick is saying, again, talking with the operator, is there was months of discussion with them in relation to how - - -

MR DEIRI: Probably 18 months. We spent 18 months working with the operators to get to where we are today, so any change could potentially have an impact which
10 would compromise the operator, which in turn could compromise the project.

MR COLBRAN: Which comes back in further to what Fouad is saying there, is in relation to how they run their operation and how the wellbeing of their students, which was first and foremost – and a lot of that came into the open areas where they
15 actually would like the young students to come together – how they would come together, the amount of students on one level to another level. And, again, as Fouad says, it was rigorous for – it took months and months and months for these guys to come back to where we were.

20 MR CHEONG: Sure. I understand that, but I just see that, for instance, you've got from level 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, you know, you've got quite a few floors without that communal area, and especially, as I pointed out, from level 4 to level 9, I think they are without any of those communal areas. Could you not have a look? You know, I'm not convinced that, you know, such a number of floors without it is going to
25 draw these people to the other common area.

MR TURNER: I personally couldn't commit to doing that because there are other forces at play in terms of the way in which the project is alive and has a life, so I think that'd have to be a – I'd have to defer that question.

30 MR CHEONG: Okay.

MR LUDVIK: I think the other thing is that the operator's requirements come from empirical evidence of them actually building these kind of developments and
35 operating these developments, so they believe, in the number of developments they've put together, that this is the best way of doing it, so it wasn't done by the Aboriginal Housing Company, it wasn't done by Turner's, wasn't done by Deicorp, wasn't suggested by myself, it came directly from the operator to say that this is the way that these buildings work, and it goes back to that thing of the purpose-built
40 student accommodation, and we do have to rely to some degree on the expertise that these operators have through, you know, the development and operation of quite a number of these facilities.

MR TURNER: Internationally.

45 MR LUDVIK: Yes.

MR TURNER: Yes.

MR CHEONG: So would you be able to supply us with that information that arrives at this metric?

5

MR LUDVIK: Yes.

MR COLBRAN: I'll go back to them, and I think a lot of it, too, is in our design excellence minutes, as we worked our way through, but sure, I can get information.

10

MR TURNER: It was – it was also the - - -

MR COLBRAN: It was, yes.

15 MS TUTUILA: Yes, it was in - - -

MR TURNER: - - - the subject of a lot of discussion as we - - -

MR COLBRAN: A lot of discussion.

20

MR TURNER: - - - as we looked at – both at the ground plane but also the – those incidental study spaces that occur between the primary open spaces as well.

25 MR LUDVIK: I think there was an additional study space put in at level 10, from memory, at one stage, and an amendment made to the building to satisfy the design

MR TURNER: And that was – that was during the assessment period - - -

30 MR LUDVIK: Yes, during the - - -

MR TURNER: - - - post design integrity process.

MR LUDVIK: Yes, yes.

35

MR TURNER: Yes.

40 MR DEIRI: I mean, from the operator's point of view, they've got to get it right, because if they don't get it right they end up with a building that has a big debt on it, so they've spent a lot of time with us to get this right, and, you know, I'm sure we can provide, but this is their request after months and months of vigorous design and documentation to achieve what they needed, and as Nick said, they've been doing these all over the world, not just here in Sydney.

45 MR TURNER: Yes, it was level 10 that the other one was added.

MR LUDVIK: Yes.

MR TURNER: Yes.

MR CHEONG: All right. We can move on to the next speaker.

5 MR COLBRAN: Basically, from Deicorp's point of view as the project managers, we're just here really to answer any questions that we can, so there's nothing further, unless – Fouad, is there something further that - - -

10 MR TURNER: You want to talk about – do you want to talk about the ownership of - - -

MR DEIRI: Yes.

15 MR TURNER: We were talking before talking about the ownership of the land.

MS TUTUILA: I think that's the important point is to understand that the land will always remain in the Aboriginal Housing Company's hands, and that was something that was non-negotiable for us, and you can imagine, that piece of land, we've had every developer, every – you know, kind of wanted to come and buy it off us, and
20 it's something we would never entertain is selling the land, because it's there for our people, and today we can sit here and confidently say, obviously, you know, with approval, that Aboriginal people will live on that site forever and a day, because we don't have a mortgage or a debt on it, and that's been something that's been very, I guess, fluid throughout our conversations, through all the decades of minutes, you
25 know, I've been getting myself up to date with the company around the number 1 thing is maintaining the ownership of that land, and we've been able to achieve that through this process and this deal.

30 MR DEIRI: So ultimately, the Aboriginal Housing Company will always own all three precincts.

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

35 MR DEIRI: And the intention of the developer with what we're doing now, even with the operator, is that the affordable housing that's been on precinct 1 and the commercial portion would be debt-free and unencumbered, and the Aboriginal Housing Company are doing this without any – I don't know any other development where we have 62 affordable housing going back to the community without any assistance from any government, purely, wholly and solely on their own back, so the
40 ownership of all the site will always remain in the Aboriginal Housing Company, and it's purely just done through a lease in order to achieve what we've achieved today.

45 MS MILLAR: Could I ask what the status is of the Aboriginal Housing Corporation becoming an affordable housing provider and registration on that basis? Has that been achieved that or is that - - -

MS TUTUILA: No.

MS MILLAR: - - - in process?

5 MS TUTUILA: Lani, do you want to - - -

MS TUITAVAKE: This is something that we're - - -

MS TUTUILA: Looking at.

10

MS TUITAVAKE: Progress that – a process that we will, you know, revisit, because one of the things that we really had to look at, and things that, you know, since the first approval, 2012 to now, it really – you know, you're talking about registration, community housing, but we were already a community, you know.

15 You're trying to build this concept into a community that's existing, and we were the first housing provider before Housing NSW was established, and, you know, to recognise that, that, you know, we have our own assets under the Housing Company, and it was important that we maintain as the board and sought legal advice to maintain our independence, our identity and how, you know, we were going to sign
20 up for a registration process that was – this is everything that we are.

We're coming to you with all our, you know, our – you know, some of our houses were run-down and, you know, great locations but needed a lot of work, and putting it into this pool but also undermining where our governance and where our future
25 direction, where the company wanted to take, you know, the vision to actually, you know, one day be, you know, self-determine and not be relying on constant, you know, funding grants, you know, that vision to be able to do that somehow, going through the registration, sort of – we were all wanting to do that but, at the same time, our hands were going to be tied and also that – and at one point there is the risk
30 of losing everything, and that – and for that, you know, the option to stay independent.

And, you know, we need to look at the – how we – you know, if we're going to go down that path, what is the best way to do that so that the Housing Company still
35 maintain their independence, because for us, you know, we talk about, you know, reconciliation on plans and that's great, you know, that's – but – and we talk about self-determination, and it's a policy. It's there, we can look at it, but we need to be able to say to the – you know, stand outside the entrance of Eveleigh Street with your grandchildren or child and say, "That's self-determination, that's what – you know, that's what we've been working for." Not to just be reading it, we want to be able to
40 see it. We want to be able to see it and touch and, you know, know that that's what it is, and that the next person from the other side of the country can come and say, "Actually, we want to do this too", you know, but we want to be able to write that page, you know, and be able to hand over that knowledge, not to just be told, you
45 know, "You fit into this policy", you know, "You can tick this." We're more than just a box, you know. It's a whole – and it – thank you.

MS TUTUILA: But it's - - -

MR COLBRAN: I think, further, also, if I could, in relation to what Lani and basically what we're saying here, and with us, you know, nine and a-half years we've
5 been working with the Aboriginal Housing Company, and to be sort of working shoulder-to-shoulder with them to – what Lani's alluding to is that this project is just more than bricks and mortar. It really is a lifestyle. It really is what the AHC have been striving to for the last 40 years, and basically, as we all worked our way through the projects and working with all the consultants and basically being led by the
10 Aboriginal Housing Company to say, "We are your project managers."

As Alisi alluded to, the main thing they said was that "we must maintain ownership at the end of the day", and what happens here, through this project and delivering, basically, what the Aboriginal Housing Company wanted was ownership, 100 per
15 cent, and affordable housing for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, so it's just not a matter of, as Nick has said, the way the building has evolved, but it's been a whole evolution of where we're at, and what the AHC do on a daily basis is just not only provide affordable housing, that's one minute little bit, it's basically like the general library where not only Indigenous people from the country and also, how
20 many times, all around the world that people come. They actually come to the AHC's office, "We are here in Sydney, where do we go, what do we do?" If you take a library out of a country area, that's the hub. The AHC are the library. That's what it is. So many different things they run, too.

MS TUTUILA: If I can just – sorry, Greg – elaborate on what Lani said, as well, around that national registered body, I think for us it was about being able to walk and activate that self-determination from what our understanding is, and I think we're doing a great job doing it. On top of that, it's not out of the question, because we're working with national registered suppliers now, and one of them is an
30 Aboriginal housing registered supplier, and we're in a very close partnership, and the succession for the AHC, one day, is to be able to achieve that status, because it just opens another, you know, portfolio for us to continue our core business and provide affordable housing, so it's definitely a part, but I think for us, in this particular instant, it was about walking and living out that self-determination.

MR DEIRI: This approval we're seeking is not just approval for student accommodation. This is approval for affordable housing for the Aboriginal people. That's what we're also seeking. Without the approval for the student
40 accommodation, we don't have an approval for the affordable housing.

DR WILLIAMS: I think what the department's looking at, through one of their conditions, I don't know whether you've seen it, is to ensure that the housing stays as affordable housing.

MS TUTUILA: Definitely.

MR DEIRI: One hundred per cent.

MS TUTUILA: Definitely.

DR WILLIAMS: And one of their conditions would be that you put a covenant on it to say it can only be used for affordable housing, so it's not - - -

5

MS TUTUILA: Yes, and we're fine to do that.

MR DEIRI: And they have no issues with that, and that's always been the intent.

10 MS TUTUILA: That's the whole purpose of that site, and to be honest, if we didn't do that, we're not worried about the department. We'd be crucified by our own people around the country, so at the end of the day, that is our main priority to ensure.

15 DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS TUITAVAKE: And that's in the deed that we, you know - - -

MS TUTUILA: It's in the deed.

20

MS TUITAVAKE: Sydney, you know, consolidating that Eveleigh – Eveleigh and Louis Street was the in the middle, and that was one of its – you know, that land has to be for - - -

25 MS TUTUILA: Used for housing.

MS TUITAVAKE: - - - for housing for Aboriginal people, and, you know, and that, for us, you know, it was important that, you know, as we look at, you know, future generations, that that's noted, it's gazetted, it's there so that we know it goes hand-in-hand in being able to say, "Aboriginal people will live here, you know, forever and a day", because we know that's purposefully for that reason and that there's, you know, then we have to look at the economics. There is no – you know, there's no debt on the site, because, you know, that's one of the things that, you know, that we think about, you know, that we're not handing – as Alisi talked about, handing over to the next generation. This is, you know, a debt where – this is a clean slate for us, you know. We're being able to rewrite that, you know, and be able to give them that platform for the next stewards and the next generation. There's a vehicle here to continue.

30
35
40 MR DEIRI: So just elaborating, when we're talking about debt, so the student accommodation is going to have debt on it. Student accommodation is what's creating the affordable housing, completely debt-free and unencumbered, and that's what we're referring to, so, you know, they go hand in hand, you know, and from the Aboriginal Housing Company's point of view, I mean, as Deicorp, you know, we are
45 builders, we're developers and we do this because what we try and do, and what the Aboriginal Housing Company are trying to do here, they're not doing it for Mick

Mundine or for Lani or for Alisi. They're not doing it for the company. They're not doing for the - - -

MR MUNDINE: The children. The children.

5

MR DEIRI: They're doing it for their children, and the next generation and the generation to follow after that, and that's what – that's what inspired us to work with them, because they're not doing it for themselves. They're doing it for the next generation, and I saw that, you know. I saluted them, and I admire them for what they're doing it, because they're not doing it for their own self needs, they're doing it purely for their community and the generations to follow after them. I - - -

10

MR MUNDINE: I think the most important thing – can I say something – that we're building a community in a community.

15

MR DEIRI: Yes.

MR MUNDINE: And when we're starting the respect flowing for one another. We're all human being, you know, I'm sick of this racism point of view. I mean, colour's only skin deep. I want to build a community in a community, start the respect flowing. We all work there, we all live there. So I think that's what the main – my own point of view, that if this could a, you know, in – the most important thing of all is for the next generation of children. That's so important, you know?

20

We get nothing out of it. We only steward, bloody workers and thanks to the – all the Koori men, they talk about reconciliation. Right. Right from the beginning, Aboriginal people might as well squat in it and, you know, squat the end three houses, right. But from them to where we are today, the multicultural input. Everybody had a hand in it. You know, that's the best. I think the government should start looking at – oh, look where they had to come down, even into the multicultural sort of input, they don't know where they are. That's reconciliation. Isn't that what we were – that's what we're trying achieve and we will achieve it. That's all I'll say. Thank you.

25

30

MS MILLAR: Yes. So – so, sorry, Soo-Tee. If I could just sort of follow up, in – in the – in this context, I guess one of the – the issues is that the conditions are – that have been provided by the Council, do have these sort of prescriptive requirements and I guess, if you've had the opportunity to look at these and whether there are amendments that you would propose to these to, you know, reflect the – the situation that – that you're in as the – the AHC, you know, obviously, take that on – on notice and, you know, if there are things that you would like to, you know, reflect differently in the – the draft conditions.

40

MR LUDVIK: I think the – the need to register as a community housing provider is more than likely a step too far in these kind of circumstances - - -

45

MS MILLAR: Yes.

MR LUDVIK: - - - where the Aboriginal Housing Company are going to own the land. They're going to manage it. They're going to do the whole thing. They're more than likely doing more than a – a registered provider would, and they're happy to put the 88B covenant on there to say - - -

5

MS MILLAR: Yes.

MR LUDVIK: - - - it's got to be used like that, you know, because that's their intention. They don't - - -

10

MS TUTUILA: Yes, definitely.

MR LUDVIK: - - - intend to do anything else.

15 MR CHEONG: So you would be quite happy that condition - - -

MR LUDVIK: If you knock - - -

MR CHEONG: - - - to supply only 110 beds, that you allocated to – for - - -

20

MS TUTUILA: For indigenous students, 100 beds.

MR CHEONG: - - - for affordable rental housing, yes.

25 MS TUTUILA: In the student accommodation - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

30

MR CHEONG: Yes.

MS TUTUILA: Yes. Definitely.

35 DR WILLIAMS: So that'll be the 62 - - -

MS TUTUILA: So that's the affordable housing.

MR COLBRAN: Two – two different things - - -

40

DR WILLIAMS: Sixty-two - - -

MS TUTUILA: That's two different things.

45 DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR COLBRAN: You have the student accommodation and you have the 62.

MS TUTUILA: And the 100 beds are for the students. So we want - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

5 MR LUDVIK: We have to make it available - - -

MR TURNER: They're priority – they're priority, that's – yes.

10 MS TUTUILA: So we made that a – a – I guess, a condition on the partnerships - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, yes. Sure.

15 MS TUTUILA: - - - that we couldn't have a state of the art student accommodation not have any black faces in there. So we made it – yes, it was part of our - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Just on that, if - - -

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

20 DR WILLIAMS: - - - at any one point in time, if there weren't 110 indigenous students there - - -

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

25 DR WILLIAMS: Just say there was 90 - - -

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

30 DR WILLIAMS: What happens with the other 20 - - -

MS TUTUILA: Well, so we have a timeframe - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

35 MS TUTUILA: - - - in the recruitment process of students, like any other operator does, and so if we don't fill them within that time then, obviously, that'll open back up to the market.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Sure.

40 MS TUTUILA: In saying that, if we go over 110, they're more – you know, they're more than happy to accommodate, because they want to see as much indigenous students - - -

45 DR WILLIAMS: Sure.

MS TUTUILA: - - - engaging in that as well.

DR WILLIAMS: We just asked that question to the Department - - -

MS TUTUILA: Yes, of course.

5 DR WILLIAMS: - - - and they weren't sure, so - - -

MS TUTUILA: No, that's fine.

10 DR WILLIAMS: No, that's good. That's absolutely - - -

MR DEIRI: Well, we – we have to make them made available, and that's what we've done.

15 MS TUTUILA: Yes.

MR TURNER: That's a priority. It's prioritisation - - -

MR DEIRI: And it's absolutely - - -

20 MR TURNER: - - - of that number of beds - - -

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

25 MR TURNER: - - - to be available.

MR DEIRI: And if there's more to - - -

MS TUTUILA: There's more that go - - -

30 MR DEIRI: Then we will sit down, like, I mean, like Nick said, this is about working, us all talking together, you know, whether it be Aboriginal people, whether it be Islander people, whether it be, you know, Australian people – whatever it is, it's about – this – this is a community – this is bringing the whole community together.

35 MS TUTUILA: That's right.

MR DEIRI: You know, and that's what this project is all about and - - -

40 MS TUTUILA: And that's subsidised.

MR DEIRI: - - - and from my behalf, I – I really, really applaud what they're doing and I take my hat off and that's why we've stood by and supported it.

45 MS MILLAR: And that would be across all – like, all accommodation types, depending on what the preference of the – the students would be?

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

MS MILLAR: So - - -

MS TUTUILA: Yes. So it's basically up to the AHC discretion how we distribute those, whether they're awards or scholarships, we're yet to determine that actual
5 model and finalise that but, yes.

MR DEIRI: And that's purely up to AHC.

MS TUTUILA: Yes.
10

MR DEIRI: And neither us or the – or the - - -

MS TUTUILA: Yes. Operator.

15 MR DEIRI: - - - operator will get involved in that. It's purely the AHC discretion.

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

MS TUITAVAKE: Can I just clarify – sorry, just happened so quickly. The ADA
20 - - -

MS TUTUILA: B.

MS TUITAVAKE: Is it?
25

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS TUITAVAKE: You're referring to the 62 houses?

30 MS TUTUILA: Yes.

MR DEIRI: Yes.

MS TUTUILA: The covenant.
35

MS TUITAVAKE: The 62 houses - - -

MR DEIRI: Yes, the – the 60 - - -

40 MS TUITAVAKE: - - - at that site is – for - - -

MR DEIRI: Affordable.

MS TUITAVAKE: - - - for affordable housing?
45

MR DEIRI: Affordable housing.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

MR COX: But that's already dealt with in – in the original DA.

5 MS MILLAR: That's dealt with in the original DA.

MR COX: Yes.

10 MS MILLAR: - - - but it does – the original DA does have the - - -

MS TUITAVAKE: I wasn't sure you were saying it was going through

MR LUDVIK: No, no. It's only the affordable housing component.

15 MS MILLAR: Yes, yes.

MR DEIRI: And there was a condition in precinct 3 we have to have available - - -

20 MS TUITAVAKE: Okay. Sorry, that's all. Sorry.

MR DEIRI: Yes, yes.

MS TUTUILA: And the other important point, I think, to mention around the
25 affordable is remembering, as we move forward, the market rises, everything – prices
go up, so it's our job to ensure that the commitment we've got to make those
affordable forever and a day, that we're subsidising those on top of – because you
can only imagine what the cost market for a three or four bedroom townhouse is.
Now, we can't be charging an Aboriginal family that, so keeping in mind that, again,
30 is on us, and through that diversification of income and that model, we'll be able to
achieve that.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Look, I think the department might be looking at a condition
for the 110 as well.

35 MS TUTUILA: Okay.

DR WILLIAMS: So that's what I want to clarify.

40 MS TUTUILA: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: I think they might also want it for the 110.

MS TUTUILA: Okay. Okay.

45 DR WILLIAMS: Which wouldn't be an issue if you didn't fill the 110 - - -

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - with Indigenous students, and could then be put it on the market.

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

5

DR WILLIAMS: You may not be able put it on the market at market rental. It might have to be at affordable.

MR LUDVIK: I think I would need to look at the condition again - - -

10

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

MR LUDVIK: - - - but I think it only applies to the - - -

15

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

MR LUDVIK: - - - affordable housing - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, I - - -

20

MR LUDVIK: - - - the way I read it, but I could be wrong.

DR WILLIAMS: Look, I think - - -

25

MS TUTUILA: discounted beds.

DR WILLIAMS: I think we need – yes, just to clarify that - - -

MS TUTUILA: Clarify that, yes.

30

DR WILLIAMS: - - - because - - -

MR CHEONG: There's 110 affordable rental houses.

35

MR LUDVIK: No, no, no, no, we're talking about talking about 62 affordable - - -

MR CHEONG: Yes, I know that's - - -

MR LUDVIK: - - - in Precinct 1 - - -

40

MR CHEONG: - - - Precinct 1, but there's - - -

MR LUDVIK: - - - but there's no section 88B on Precinct 3.

45

MR CHEONG: No, not section 88B, but - - -

MR LUDVIK: There's a - - -

MR CHEONG: - - - there's a condition that - - -

MR LUDVIK: There's a commitment from - - -

5 MR CHEONG: Commitment that you are providing 110 beds for - - -

MR LUDVIK: We will make available at a - - -

MS TUTUILA: Which we want to do.

10

MR TURNER: That are available on priority.

MR CHEONG: Yes.

15 MS MILLAR: Yes. This is a – condition A11, that, again - - -

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

MS MILLAR: - - - you know, with all of the conditions, your – you know, your
20 feedback on what has been proposed by the department is welcome.

MR LUDVIK: Yes.

MS TUTUILA: Yes. Yes.

25

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, could I ask – it's a very technical question.

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

30 DR WILLIAMS: Maybe for the architect, sorry, but it was something that was
raised by Sydney City Council, them meeting with us late this morning. Did this
require a BASIX certificate?

MR TURNER: It didn't. It didn't, no.

35

MR COX: I don't think it's – that's not housing.

MR TURNER: It's not that class of building. It's not a class 2 building.

40 DR WILLIAMS: Okay. It's just that we had this presented to us today, a decision
from the Land Environment Court for a boarding house in which - - -

MR COX: It's not a boarding house classification.

45 DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR CHEONG: It's not a boarding house. It's still residential. Yes.

MR COX: Different classification.

DR WILLIAMS: Are you definitely sure?

5 MR COLBRAN: It's different, yes.

MR TURNER: Yes.

10 MR COX: Yes, it's different classification than the NCC.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Okay.

MR COX: A boarding house is 1A or something.

15 MR TURNER: Yes, it is.

MR COX: And it's a different volume of the NCC.

20 DR WILLIAMS: Okay. As long as you're - - -

MR TURNER: Yes.

25 DR WILLIAMS: But it was raised, and the Chief Judge of the Land Environment Court did say that a BASIX certificate was required for his boarding house.

MR COX: Yes, I think - - -

MR TURNER: That would be – that would be correct, yes.

30 MR COX: Yes.

MR COLBRAN: For a boarding house.

35 MR COX: For a boarding house, because it's part of the – I think this needs a section

MR TURNER: It's a different classification of building, yes.

40 DR WILLIAMS: I mean, it's a procedural thing, but we just want to make sure that - - -

MS TUTUILA: Yes.

45 MR TURNER: Yes, I understand.

MS TUTUILA: No, that's fine.

MR LUDVIK: Peter, what's the reference to that

DR WILLIAMS: Just a look. If you want to get the copy - - -

5 MR LUDVIK: Thank you.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - Andy, yes. I just want to make sure that all the procedural requirements are covered, because - - -

10 MS TUTUILA: Yes. Yes.

MR TURNER: Of course. Of course.

MS TUTUILA: Of course.

15

MR CHEONG: Any other questions? Anything anyone wants to add?

MS TUITAVAKE: I just want to add one thing but, you know, like, about the registration, it started off with New South Wales registration – Community Housing registration. Now, that has become national registration. You know, so it's another thing that we also need to think about, because – for getting the framework. We also need to think whose country we're going into to be able to – if we become a national registration with that accreditation, we're then entering into another person's country to – let alone New South Wales, to be able to establish housing here.

25

So we need – you know, so our framework, we need to consider the Aboriginal concept of cultural boundaries, which is something that, you know, we sort of thought about, like, you know, not only are we going to New South Wales, we could understand that, but now there's a national body, so therefore, it could allow us to go to Melbourne and go and redevelop in Melbourne and put up, you know, same housing there also. We need to, sort of, think about, okay, are we going into another country – another Aboriginal group's area. So there's lots of things consider that registration and how we also marry that up with our cultural aspects of doing business, to not override that, you know. So they're just things that we have to consider, yes, but certainly the houses will be

35

MR CHEONG: Okay.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

40

MR CHEONG: There is no further discussion. I declare the meeting closed.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[2.24 pm]