

Waterloo South People and Place Plan Submission

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| REDWatch was established to monitor such sites and plans | 2 |
| REDWatch's main concerns | 2 |
| Homes NSW needs to incorporate an Estate Management Plan into this People and Place Plan..... | 2 |
| No Current, Development Impact or Post Development Human Service Plan..... | 4 |
| No Reference to Waterloo Renewal Principles | 5 |
| Use of ABS statistics..... | 5 |
| Lack of clarity about the “who” in the People and Place Plan | 6 |
| Homes NSW Distinctions | 7 |
| Community Housing Providers | 7 |
| Tenants and their participation mechanisms | 7 |
| Agencies, Service Providers – Government and Non-Government..... | 8 |
| Issues with the PnP Plan Context (Pages 1-15) | 8 |
| The People and Place Actions..... | 9 |
| Working Together..... | 10 |
| Working with social housing residents..... | 10 |
| Working with the Aboriginal community..... | 12 |
| Supporting health and wellbeing | 12 |
| Accessing quality education, learning and jobs | 14 |
| Feeling Safe and Welcome | 14 |
| Being green and clean..... | 16 |
| Conclusion..... | 17 |

REDWatch was established to monitor such sites and plans

This submission is made on behalf of REDWatch Incorporated (REDWatch). REDWatch was set up in 2004 and has the following objects in its constitution:

REDWatch is a group of community residents and friends from Redfern, Waterloo, Eveleigh and Darlington who support the existing diversity in these areas and wish to promote sustainable, responsible economic and social development.

REDWatch recognises the importance of the Aboriginal community to the area.

REDWatch has been formed to:

1. Monitor the activities of the Government (local, state and federal), the Redfern Waterloo Authority, and any other government instrumentality with responsibility for the Redfern, Waterloo, Darlington and Eveleigh area, to ensure that:

(a) The strategy benefits a diverse community

(b) Communication and consultation is comprehensive and responsive

(c) Pressure is maintained on authorities

2. Provide a mechanism for discussion and action on community issues.

3. Enhance communication between community groups and encourage broad community participation.

This may involve: Holding regular meetings; Holding community forums and other events; Establishing a website; Communicating with the community through other means; Meeting with government representatives and authorities; Cooperating with other community organisations; And any other means the association deems appropriate.

To broaden understanding of the People and Place (PnP) Plan REDWatch invited Homes NSW Housing Portfolio Commercial Division to its meeting on 4 April 2024 to talk about the PnP and again after its release on 2nd May 2024 REDWatch facilitated a meeting where Homes NSW could talk to PnP and listen to feedback from attendees. These are the [Focus Group Questions for Draft Waterloo South People and Place Plan](#) used for that meeting.

REDWatch provided this feedback also to Counterpoint and Groundswell Redfern Waterloo and participated in a Groundswell agency workshop. This material fed into the report by Counterpoint on a keep, change, add basis.

To air some of the issues and encourage people to make feedback, REDWatch has also made public comments through its email update on PnP and these can be read at [REDWatch Initial comments on the People and Place Plan](#) and [Some further REDWatch comments on the People and Place Plan](#). REDWatch also contributed to the South Sydney Herald story [Can the Waterloo South People and Place Plan deliver](#).

REDWatch undertook these activities and makes this submission on the Waterloo People and Place Plan (PnP Plan) in line with our objects.

REDWatch's main concerns

REDWatch welcomes Homes NSW Housing Portfolio Commercial Division preparing a People and Place Plan. This is a welcome and essential initiative to try to cover people and place issues for the Waterloo South development. With the recent creation of Homes NSW, which merges Housing Portfolio with Housing Services and the Aboriginal Housing Office, there now exists the opportunity to broaden this plan into a plan that covers the people and place of the wider estate and not just the people of Waterloo South.

Homes NSW needs to incorporate an Estate Management Plan into this People and Place Plan

REDWatch cannot support the PnP Plan in its current form. It needs either to be accompanied by a Homes NSW Estate Management Plan for the entire estate that also deals with the redevelopment impacts on the wider estate or the PnP needs to be reworked significantly to become a PnP that covers the whole of the estate and not just Waterloo South.

REDWatch welcomes the recognition by the Homes NSW CEO, Rebecca Pinkstone, in her address to Shelter NSW members on 29 May 2024 that Estate Management and Estate Renewal are areas that are currently gaps in the newly formed Homes NSW and that Homes NSW has a strong focus on

addressing that gap. It seems to REDWatch that this PnP Plan falls into the gap that the Homes NSW CEO has identified.

REDWatch notes however that the Waterloo Estate, as defined by the Waterloo Redevelopment Plan, excludes public housing in the Waterloo conservation area. Some of the conservation area also borders the area to be redeveloped and will also be impacted by the redevelopment. In 2011 the conservation area included 188 apartments and 336 terrace cottages used for public housing. It is insulting that the current Draft PnP makes no reference to public housing in the conservation area when talking "About the Waterloo community".

Of all the public housing in Waterloo 20% is in the conservation area, 30% is in Waterloo South and 50% is in the 6 high-rises in Central and North. These three areas provide a range of housing types to suit different allocations. The Waterloo Neighbourhood Advisory Board (NAB) represents precincts across all three areas and all three areas are managed by the Waterloo Homes NSW Housing Services office. All three areas should be covered in a Waterloo Estate Management Plan and / or be covered by a combined PnP Plan.

The narrow focus of the current PnP Plan raises concerns about the People and Place issues the redevelopment brings for the surrounding community, the interaction between the public housing and Community Housing Provider tenants, and how supports for public housing tenants in Waterloo can be offered in an equitable way.

REDWatch is of the view that there needs to be a PnP Plan that covers the entire Waterloo public housing community as defined above be they in Waterloo South or adjoining it in both the high-rises and the conservation area. Parts of both these non-Waterloo South groupings will at various times be living next to construction or be impacted by light and sound impacts. We have seen this impact with some people living in the high-rises impacted as a result of the Metro Station constructions even though they are some distance away.

But it is not just construction impacts that this Plan needs to recognise and take action over. People who will be relocated or who are stressed by the development have relationships across the full Waterloo public housing community and so what happens to some people in Waterloo South will impact back on others in the broader Waterloo public housing community. Based on other renewals and relocations it is likely that those seeking support from local services will also increase putting additional pressure on existing services.

The redevelopment model for Waterloo South creates two different tenant cohorts - the existing public housing cohort and a new CHP cohort. The supports tenants can access will in large part be determined by who their landlord is. CHPs will be expected to run their own tenant participation program and this is usually not independent to the landlord. Support for public housing tenant participation is provided independently of Homes NSW by Mission Australia for the public housing Neighbourhood Advisory Board. CHPs will also be expected to provide wrap around support for its tenants while public housing tenants continue in the current fractured system the Collaborative is trying to address.

Many issues, including Health and Wellbeing and Community safety, do not totally depend on who your landlord is. The People and Place Plan needs to commit to minimising the difference in supports available between these two cohorts of people, as well as between social housing and private renters and owners. Equity in supports and access must be central to a people and place plan for the entirety of Waterloo social housing, rather than a two tier system depending on the landlord.

The plan also needs to commit to mechanisms for social housing tenants to meet and work together on non-tenancy issues of common concern. The Waterloo Safety Action Group and the Waterloo Redevelopment Group are examples of existing tenant groups, currently under the NAB that deal with tenant issues unrelated to who their landlord is.

While the work for this PnP Plan has been done by Homes NSW Housing Portfolio Commercial Division (the project team), it is imperative, now that LAHC is part of Homes NSW, that Homes NSW brings a wider lens to the people and place elements of this plan so it deals with the entirety of the Waterloo public housing community that will be impacted by the project.

REDWatch notes that the Council submission calls for Ministerial endorsement of the PnP Plan. REDWatch would support that recommendation but only for a PnP Plan that incorporates the entire estate and / or a separate full Estate Management Plan dealing with the redevelopment impacts on the surrounding areas by the Waterloo South redevelopment.

No Current, Development Impact or Post Development Human Service Plan

While the Human Services Action Plan, prepared by the Waterloo Human Services Collaborative, is referenced on page 8 of the draft PnP as feeding into the Plan, it is plain that how the Waterloo South People and Place Plan interacts with the Collaborative's Human Services Action Plan has not been considered.

While there have been earlier studies around community facilities and social sustainability, there has been no social impact assessment which clearly sets out the development impacts that need to be assessed and mitigated. Some aspects have been picked up in the PnP Plan but they are mainly related to the built environment rather than the people impacts and how they will be addressed in a human services plan that addresses the impacts from the redevelopment other than relocations. This should have been covered in this PnP Plan along with a clear human services plan for how CHPs will handled human service issues post redevelopment. These are major omissions.

Clearly the challenges facing tenants' access to human services do not go away because of the redevelopment; they are only likely to be exacerbated. So the People and Place Plan needs to cover how the Waterloo South Plan will interact with the Collaborative's plan to help address the areas current human service challenges and any changes resulting from the redevelopment.

The PNP Plan should commit the CHPs and development partners to participate in the implementing the Waterloo Action Plan and helping address the issues it identifies. It should also commit to a process for work to marry up, at a detailed level, the Collaborative Action Plan and relevant aspects of the Waterloo South People and Place Plan, as well as a coordination mechanisms between the two plans.

The People and Place Plan needs to deal with, and resource, the additional human service needs that come from the disruption and anxiety caused by the redevelopment. In many places it is assumed that unspecified "service providers" will help with the delivery of the Waterloo South People and Place Plan, but there is no indication of how already stretched services will be funded to undertake additional work created by the redevelopment.

The current Waterloo Human Services Action Plan has been through extensive discussions between agencies, endeavouring to respond to the current issues tenants have articulated. There has been much debate about the issues and possible solutions arising from that plan. The currently circulated version had lots of sub-points that were dropped from the summary version. It is the responsibility of the Coordination Groups to ensure those earlier sub-points and earlier discussions do not get lost in the implementation of the plan.

While Homes NSW Commercial Division has had workshops with Collaborative Services participants, many participants have not seen the issues they have raised reflected back in reports and there has been little opportunity to debate and test the actions presented.

Prior to the Collaborative, LAHC tried to lead its own version of a human service plan for Waterloo, nominally with the Groundswell agencies. What emerged from that process was a top down plan that was not supported by NGOs. That approach was ditched and the current participatory process was established and is delivering outcomes. The processes leading to the current draft plan were similar to those used by LAHC in the initial Human Service Plan, and like that earlier plan, the current PnP Plan does not have buy in. It misses areas raised in workshops, needs testing and shows a lack of understanding by the Homes NSW Commercial Division of human service issues and their potential impact on the people impacted by the redevelopment.

The issues being worked on by the Waterloo Human Service Collaborative are ongoing – they are based on changing business as usual without additional resources. Change is hence slow and many of the problems will persist into the foreseeable future. Any new service coming into the area as part of the consortium should become an active part of the Collaborative, sharing their insights and resources as are other existing organisations. As soon as a CHP has relocated tenants into the social housing above the Waterloo Metro they are part of the Waterloo service system.

REDWatch is of the view that, the PnP Plan should have at least addressed the actions in the Waterloo Human Services Action Plan. This is especially so given LAHC has been a member of the Human Service Collaborative and for the last 3 - 4 years has funded the Secretariat.

Now it may be argued that it is not necessary for CHPs to be involved because the CHP is expected to provide wrap around services, but just because a CHP is referring someone to a service rather than say Homes NSW or an NGO, it does not mean that the referral system works well or that there is a service with room to deliver the service being sort from the Government agency or an NGO. These are shared problems in which the CHP should have an active interest.

The Collaborative is only looking at current human service issues. This PnP and the human service plan that was expected to accompany the PnP were to deal with all new issues that would become evident as a result of the relocations and the redevelopment, as well as what might be expected after the transfer to CHPs and how that interacts with services to continuing public housing tenants.

As indicated earlier, even when the entire “estate redevelopment” is completed, 20% of the existing public housing community will remain public housing tenants unless a stock transfer happens to a CHP.

REDWatch is of the view that there cannot be a PnP Plan without the inclusion of the human service plan dealing with the redevelopment and its impacts. These impacts have been present since the original announcement in 2015 and will ratchet up further when relocations start. A human service plan to deal with these impacts cannot be left any later and must be included now in an Estate Management Plan and or a modified PnP Plan.

No Reference to Waterloo Renewal Principles

Another major REDWatch Concern with the Draft PnP Plan is that it does not reference the renewal principles that have been the subject of discussions between Shelter NSW and The Tenants Union NSW.

LAHC has agreed to [Waterloo Renewal Principles February 2023](#) with local services and the Waterloo Redevelopment Group. These were based on earlier work by The Tenants Union NSW and Shelter NSW over a state wide compact, in which Minister Jackson has shown interest. Back in 2016 LAHC agreed to a [Waterloo Stakeholder and Engagement Framework](#) but were unable to deliver on it.

The People and Place plan must include undertakings that Homes NSW, its Commercial Division and its consortium partners will operate within the Waterloo Renewal Principles and any state level compact that might be developed. How Homes NSW deals with the people in a place needs to be a central part of a PnP Plan and this is what the Compact sets out.

Use of ABS statistics

REDWatch is concerned about the statistics used in the PnP Plan as the public housing is located within a wider gentrified population. Using suburban level ABS statistics masks the complexity of the public housing make up that needs to be considered when describing the key facts about Health and Wellbeing for a public housing redevelopment.

REDWatch has undertaken its own statistical analysis of ABS statistics covering public housing in Waterloo and has provided this to Homes NSW with the recommendation that PnP should use Statistical Area One (SA1) ABS data for the SA1s overlapping the Waterloo South area in place of, or in addition to, the Waterloo suburban data currently used.

By overlaying Statistical areas in the 2021 census over a 2021 Public Housing ownership map, it is possible to get much better ABS indicators for the make-up of public housing than at suburban level data.

REDWatch examined SA1 data for all SA1s that contained public housing, SA1 data that excluded two SA1s that had minimal public housing, SA1s that covered the Waterloo estate, SA1s that covered Waterloo South and SA1 data that only covered public housing. With the exception of the latter, all data samples contain some non-public housing returns which impacts the overall representation of public housing.

There are some issues within the Waterloo public housing only data as these areas cover some of the high rises which have different allocations to other public housing in the area. On an inner city level using SA1s that only cover public housing in Waterloo, Redfern and Surry Hills may provide a more indicative picture of inner city public housing.

REDWatch concluded from this work that the PnP report was best to use the SA1s covering the Waterloo South Redevelopment area – these are SA1s 11703164718, 11703164709, 11703164702 and 11703164710. In part this recommendation was based on allocation differences, such as the significant Aboriginal population in Waterloo South.

Below we have compared the ABS Waterloo suburban data (used in the draft report) with the ABS Waterloo South SA1 data to illustrate the extent to which the suburban data hides the specific public housing profile. Here we have used four indicators from the “what are the key facts table” for supporting health and wellbeing on page 26. We are unable to provide a full alternative table as REDWatch did not have access to the full ABS data only that selection available through the City of Sydney website.

| | Waterloo suburb | Waterloo South SA1s |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Arthritis | 5% | 10.23% |
| Asthma | 7% | 11.82% |
| Diabetes | 3% | 7.19% |
| Mental Health | 9% | 18.59% |

We have further pointed out that there are a number of reasons why even this SA1 data is likely to be diluted by some private residents in the SA1s but is also impacted by lower return rates in public housing and the potential for under reporting in case the landlord finds out.

The [Waterloo Public Housing Tenants Survey](#), already quoted in the PnP for safety, may also provide more indicative figures on health and wellbeing. In that recent survey of 320 Waterloo tenants 35.5% reported a mental health condition (cf 9% ABS for Waterloo) and it also reported that 21% of respondents had “no physical condition, mental health condition or disability” (cf ABS Waterloo No long term health condition 65%).

The changes in allocation policy for public housing, from worker housing to housing of last resort, means that the makeup of public housing is very different from the gentrified private communities that surround it. It is essential in a PnP plan that the people element is properly understood, as this impacts all planning. It is the reason why when the light rail was being built past Northcott, workers were trained to interact with people experiencing mental health and drug and alcohol issues. It is also the reason that the Waterloo Metro developers have needed to pay police to attend so that workers are prepared to work on that site as they ran into problems with those living in adjacent public housing and people who publically consume alcohol.

The statistical dilution by including large numbers of private owners and renters across the rest of Waterloo substantially distorts the demographics of the public housing tenants who live in the area to be redeveloped.

The argument that current suburban data will likely reflect the post development demographic papers over the fact that, unless there are significant changes in social housing allocation policies, the social housing tenants in the new community will have at least a similar profile to the current public housing community. In fact as the older working class public housing tenants die and are replaced by people on the priority allocation list it is more probable that the health and wellbeing gap between social housing tenants and their private neighbours are likely to further widen despite the suburban level picture looking similar to the rest of the Sydney LGA.

An accurate picture of the needs of people must be factored in to the people and place plan. Survey and Homes NSW data should be used if available. If ABS figures are to be used they should include data for statistical areas that overlap Waterloo South. The limitations of any data set should be recognised.

Lack of clarity about the “who” in the People and Place Plan

The PnP Plan contains details on who it expects to lead and support the delivery of actions, however the terms of the actors are so wide that it leads to ambiguity and lack of clarity as to who will actually be involved. In some cases this ambiguity also applies to the target / beneficiary of the action.

One of the concerns REDWatch has with this plan is the lack of delineation between different parts of Homes NSW leading to interpretation differences and ambiguity. However this lack of clarity is not just confined to HNSW references but also applies to the use of labels such as “tenants” “agencies” “service providers” etc. Below we have tried to unpack some of the distinctions that are important to provide clarity about who will be involved or support or be the focus of any of the actions.

PnP on page 4 has a list of acronyms and Page 18 provides a partial list of the “who” without the abbreviations actually used in the report. As the acronyms don’t get used until after page 18 REDWatch suggests that the acronyms and “the who” explanation on page 18 be combined and expanded to include missing actors. In the case of a large organisation like Homes NSW, the plan needs to distinguish which part(s) of Homes NSW will be involved as this lack of clarity leads to ambiguity and potential misinterpretation.

As an example, someone might think that a reference to Homes NSW working with tenants might be about Homes NSW Housing Services working with public housing tenants outside Waterloo South when it actually refers to Home NSW Housing Portfolio Commercial Division working with CHP tenants in Waterloo South. Two very different things.

Homes NSW Distinctions

While we appreciate that Homes NSW is a new body bringing together previously separate organisations and that hence there is a desire at senior levels in Homes NSW to present a new united front, this approach can, as illustrated above, lead to the PnP not being clear about actions proposed in the plan.

Rather than just using a universal HNSW for everything Homes NSW, REDWatch would like distinctions drawn in the plan between the different parts of HNSW involved. Below we have suggested some possible abbreviations that could be used to bring greater clarity on the 'who', based on how we understand the Homes NSW players in the PNP Plan. The Homes component names make this difficult to either spell out in full or to summarise by acronym so some new descriptors / abbreviations should be considered to deliver clarity.

HNSW - Homes New South Wales – the newly created entity from Land and Housing Corporation DCJ Housing, Aboriginal Housing Office etc.

HNSW-HS – HNSW Housing Services – previously DCJ Housing – responsible for public housing tenancy management

HNSW-HS-R – The dedicated relocations team within HNSW-HS - Lead tenant relocations and returns

HNSW-HP – HNSW Housing Portfolio – previously Land and Housing Corporation (LAHC) – the owner of public housing stock, public housing community and open spaces and the underlying owner of the new social housing lots in the redevelopment managed by a Community Housing Provider.

HNSW-HP-CD – HNSW Housing Portfolio - Commercial Division – This is the part of HNSWP responsible for managing disposals and acquisitions including estate renewal overseeing project delivery, including submission of development applications etc.

HNSW-HP-PM – HNSW Housing Portfolio - Portfolio Management – Responsible for public housing maintenance

Community Housing Providers

On one level Community Housing Providers look straight forward, but we don't yet know which consortium gets the redevelopment and one consortium includes 3 CHPs so distinguishing which CHP might also be useful. The plan does currently use A/CHP but this seems to be wider than Aboriginal CHP.

CHP – Community Housing Provider(s) are federally registered managers of social and often affordable housing (not yet clear for Waterloo as consortiums have been asked to propose how they will deliver affordable housing and for how long). Prior to the redevelopment they may support tenant relocations where relocated public housing tenants move to social housing run by a CHP. After the redevelopment CHPs will be required to be responsible for tenancy management, tenant participation, maintenance and wrap around supports. Of the two remaining Waterloo consortium one lists one CHP partner and the other consortium lists separate CHPs for social housing, Aboriginal Housing and for Affordable Housing.

Tenants and their participation mechanisms

The PnP makes references to tenants and their participation without clarifying which tenants or mechanisms are being referred to. An example is Action 6.11 where it is proposed to "renumerate a tenant group to help welcome new residents", which tenants and which group are not clear – it could be the public housing NAB, a CHP Tenant Advisory Group (TAG) –or a group formed with representation from both.

Tenants – references to tenants may refer to some or all of public housing tenants, community housing tenants, affordable housing tenants, Aboriginal affordable or social housing tenants and / or private renters in privately owned rental housing. Tenants may also be considered in relation to particular precincts. For example precinct tenants could be those within Waterloo South, the Waterloo estate or all the public housing currently covered by the NAB. Precinct tenants could also be a particular type of tenant in a precinct.

As can be seen from this the general use of tenants in the document can be read many ways.

TPCE – Tenant Participation and Community Engagement program is an independent, HNSW – HS, funded organisation to facilitate public housing participation and engagement and supports the public housing tenants' Neighbourhood Advisory Board (NAB) and its activities. Mission Australia (MA) currently provides this role. This program is only funded to work with public housing tenants.

NAB – Neighbourhood Advisory Board – the overarching tenant representative body for public housing
REDWatch submission on Draft Waterloo South People and Place Plan

tenants in defined precincts across Waterloo South, Central and North as well as public housing tenants in the Waterloo Conservation area. While it covers Housing Standards, which deals with issues related to its landlord, it also includes working groups that are precinct wide such as the Waterloo Wellness and Safety Action Group (WWSAG) and the Waterloo Redevelopment Group (WRG). Currently it is the single representative voice for social housing tenants in Waterloo, but its representation will shrink as tenants are moved to CHPs.

TAG – Tenant Advisory Group – This is a term used by some CHPs to refer to their in-house tenant participation mechanism. We will use it here generically, recognising that Link-Wentworth has TAGs and St George have Local Tenant Groups (LTG). As part of the redevelopment, tenants in CHPs will become part of that CHPs' TAG either locally or across their properties and these tenants will cease being a member of NAB. If there are three CHPs in the successful tender we would expect a separate TAG for each. Given the potential conflict between the CHP as landlord and the CHP as encourager of tenant participation, the arm's length TPCE model used for the NAB is considered better practice than the CHP running their own TAG. As a result tenants' experience of TAG quality varies greatly from CHP to CHP.

Agencies, Service Providers – Government and Non-Government

The PnP does not define what it means by terms relating to service providers and agencies that are not key government agencies.

Service Providers – This term is not defined in PnP and is often used alongside the term Agencies or abbreviations for other organisations referenced in the PnP plan "who" column such as: CoS, RP, HNSW, SLHD, DCJ, DoE, DPHI or A/CHPs in the 'who' section. This seems to indicate that service providers only refer to unspecified NGOs.

Agencies – This term is used a number of times but is not defined in the document and it is not clear if this is just used for government agencies, for non-Government agencies or both and how this differs from the use of Service Providers and or NGOs.

These descriptors are so vague that it is not possible to know what the plan proposes and how to evaluate if the relevant parties have fulfilled their responsibilities.

The experience from the Waterloo Human Service Collaborative has been that it has been very difficult to get organisations, both government and NGO to lead actions within existing resources. There seems an assumption in PnP that organisation will just pick up extra work with no extra resources.

For both government and NGOs, any additional work to their business as usual will need to be funded within the project by Homes NSW, the renewal partner, levees or by other parts of government. There is no commitment in PnP to provide any funding to support the plan's implementation nor any indication of how additional work by agencies will happen without support.

Government initiative such as Redlink historically assumed that it would provide a place and that NGOs within their existing funding arrangements would provide the services they normally provide at an additional location. Additional activities required additional funds. This is especially the case where government tightens restrictions on services like TEI to focus more on children and families and make it harder for services to support others in public housing. Services like TPCE are only funded to support public housing tenants and are not to support social housing tenants in CHPs.

In summary if a plan is to be implemented or monitored then people need to know who is expected to implement or be covered by the plan. The PnP plan does not do this. The problems detailed above in the "who" of PnP often make it unclear as to both who benefits and who will lead or support the plan's delivery. A revision of this aspect of the plan needs to clearly define the "who".

Issues with the PnP Plan Context (Pages 1-15)

Page 4 – Acronyms – As mentioned earlier consider moving this to Section 3 and combine with the table on page 18 as this is the section in which these are used. In line with this submission look at broadening the Acronyms / descriptors to ensure clarity in the 'who' of the actions.

Page 7 – About the Plan - Reference is made to a vision which is not stated in the document. Include and label a vision. Also clarify that this plan deals with the health and wellbeing of all residents and will sensitively manage the impacts on all residents both within and around Waterloo South

The Plan does not currently provide the "clarity about the services, programs and infrastructure which will support the Waterloo community" that is claimed on page 7. The qualification that more detailed engagement and planning will be needed is in conflict with the initial claim. The Plan should provide clarity about the services, programs and infrastructure which will support the Waterloo Community.

Where more work may be needed this should be indicated to provide clarity.

Page 8 – Background to the Plan - the diagram in this section indicates that the Action Plan prepared by the Human Services Collaborative feeds into the PnP Plan but there is no evidence of this. In the presentation to the Collaborative, Homes NSW said that linking the Collaborative Plan and the PnP had not yet been done.

The second para of the description of the Collaborative Groups' work needs to be reworked for clarity – REDWatch suggests: *The Collaborative Group has worked together to prepare a Human Services Action Plan for Waterloo and is working together to implement the Action Plan and monitor progress and outcomes. The action plan focuses on addressing human service issues currently facing tenants and not additional issues that may result from the redevelopment which are to be covered in this plan.*

It is not possible to know if the PnP plan adequately deals with issues thrown up by relocations when this material is still to be released.

Page 10 – A Special place on Gadigal Country – while the pre-colonial section on Gadigal Country is great, Connecting to Country also needs to cover the post-colonial importance of Redfern Waterloo. It is the black heart of Sydney and a meeting place for mob coming to Sydney from across NSW and Australia.

It is important that the area is recognised as the birth place for Aboriginal Controlled Organisations that have spread across the nation. It is also important, especially given the PnP Plan's later reference to working with the Aboriginal community. It is also important it recognises that the community has been badly impacted by the gentrification of the area and that there has been a significant increase in the number of Aboriginal people who associate with the area but cannot afford to live in the area. This is the context for the communities call for Aboriginal Affordable Housing, which aims to provide housing and restore a more balanced Aboriginal community to the area. Redfern has an ancient and a modern Aboriginal connection to Country. The latter is missing.

Pages 11 & 12 – Waterloo development and High Rise Housing – slum clearance is mentioned but not the Green bans that stopped it. Also not mentioned are the 500+ properties the Housing Commission had in the conservation area where they had to stop acquisitions as a result of the Green bans when it was building the high-rises. A more balanced account especially given the "history project" is required. Also missing from the public housing construction history is the adding of balconies to the walk-ups in the early 2000s and the expansion of unit sizes in one of the towers.

Page 14 – About the Waterloo community – Again there is no mention of about 20% of the Waterloo public housing community in the conservation area as being part of the community! There is only mention of the Estate and Waterloo South, the rest of the public housing tenants who are part of the NAB and handled by the Waterloo Housing office are not even recognised as part of the "Waterloo Community"!

The People and Place Actions

In the first section of this submission we detailed a number of concerns with the PnP. In our view by not dealing with the impact of the redevelopment across the whole of the Waterloo public housing community the plan is inadequate. There are also issues with the "who" of the plan that makes it unclear as to who the plan benefits and who is responsible.

With so much missing it is not possible to provide a useful critique, especially as to what should be added to this plan, other than to state that:

- any reference to tenants should refer to all tenants both public and CHP
- any reference to Homes NSW should refer to both Homes NSW Housing Services dealing with public housing tenants as well as Homes NSW Portfolio Management Commercial Division dealing with CHP tenants.

REDWatch also has some concerns also about the "when" structure of delivery and operation. With such a large staged project there will simultaneously be areas that are in 'delivery' and in 'operation'. As soon as tenants move into the social housing above the Metro station it and the CHP is in 'operation'. So while 'delivery' may go on for 10 -15years, 'operation' will start almost immediately. How the delivery and the operation mesh is hence also an important consideration.

For example Action 1.4 about developing a precinct governance structure to lead long term management sounds like there is plenty of time to do this, however this will be need to be developed during construction so it is in place for when the first Waterloo South block is delivered.

Working Together

As already stated the acronyms and who section (page 18) should be reworked. We also understand that CHPs may not own affordable housing if it is not in perpetuity and on page 18 “may” should be added before “own affordable housing”.

Using pillar 1 as an example of the lack of clarity of this plan we note the following:

Action 1.1 Is the community governance arrangement for the entire estate or just for Waterloo South or just the bit of Waterloo South that has been delivered? Who are the stakeholders is this - just the various strata bodies and CHPs? CHPs and A/CHPs should both be in this and we are unsure who the agencies and service providers might be. The plan seems more about project governance rather than community governance.

Action 1.2 What tenants are to be meaningfully engaged (public and CHP?) as well as community members (read private owners and renters?). CoS will look for input from everyone, but do we have a similar undertaking from the RP and HNSW’s Commercial Division? One of the major issues is not just the design of spaces but also their functioning, so this should read “design and functioning” and be an ongoing action. Again unsure who the Agencies and Service Providers are for this action.

Action 1.3 Who are the tenants that get the well-resourced tenant participation structures and programs? Given the lead is an A/CHP we assume CHP tenants get this while those still in public housing have to live with the existing less than optimal and historically reduced model. There needs to be an equity approach for all tenants.

Action 1.4 A governance structure needs to also include HNSW Housing Services and HNSW Portfolio Management as there will be a need for dealing during the build with management and maintenance across the entire estate. We assume that “Precinct tenants” includes social and affordable housing tenants and not just the private strata. As mentioned earlier this is needed during delivery as well as operation.

Action 1.5 For there to be realistic reporting back there needs to be greater clarity about the plan and who is responsible for delivering it.

Working with social housing residents

REDWatch welcomes the provision of the key facts about the Waterloo South population. It would be helpful if similar information regarding other indicators could also be provided, such as the details of people on disability pensions, NDIS packages and My Aged Care packages etc.

This section of the plan primarily deals with relocations (2.3 to 2.7) and development or planning controls (2.8-2.11). The people part of working with tenants other than on relocations needs strengthening.

Action 2.1 Co-design of communications and support for all the tenants should be a part of an estate management plan. It is not clear that this action relates to public housing tenants in relation to Housing Services. Is the lead HNSW Commercial Division or does it include Housing Services? We have already seen delays in the Waterloo Human Services Action Plan area 3 actions which have seen regular communications delayed because LAHC was not in a position to say something. This action is worded “across Waterloo” but this cannot be just letting the rest of the estate know about the redevelopment, it has to be about public housing issues as well as CHPs and the redevelopment. It needs to integrated communications across the estate and needs to commit to working with the Collaborative in implementing Action Plan area 3 of the Collaborative Plan. This action appears to be the only action that applies to the broader public housing community outside Waterloo South or those not yet relocated.

Action 2.2 Waterloo Connect – this is a welcome initiative at this point, but with the creation of Homes NSW this office needs to also take on a wider role than just being about the redevelopment. It needs to be part of a wider estate management plan that also deals with existing estate issues, including the redevelopment. There will need to be a transition towards Action 2.13 about an ongoing on-site office for social and affordable housing. It should be noted that Action 2.13 will need to be wider than just the CHPs as currently there is no plan to transfer public housing in the conservation area to a CHP.

As the current Homes NSW Housing Services Office sits within the Waterloo South redevelopment area, it will be necessary for a new office to be provided for those in HNSW servicing the ongoing public housing.

Action 2.12 regarding a local allocation strategy for social and affordable housing seems directed at allocations into housing post the redevelopment. This needs to include allocation strategies for

Waterloo public housing and not just CHPs. Again this needs to be part of a wider Estate strategy that is linked to the redevelopment. Minister Jackson has said that there are people being allocated into public housing who should be provided other housing options. This needs to be factored into the Waterloo wide public housing approach to allocations.

Hopefully a local allocations policy will give priority to people who have historical association with the area or who work in the area, as applies in the City of Sydney LGA for affordable housing. This will be very important for the Aboriginal community, where gentrification has pushed people who associate with the area out of the area. This should not just apply to housing built as part of the redevelopment, but should also cover public housing in an estate management plan.

A local allocation policy also needs to consider if government wants to encourage allocations to families with children rather than the singles who are currently a major allocation demographic. If this is the case then there has to be planning for children in the social housing and provision made to have suitable housing for families to support such an allocation strategy.

Action 2.14 long term wrap around support. This is clearly only intended for CHP tenants in this plan and will start with those moving into the Metro site within the year. It has been recognised by both the Minister and the Homes NSW CEO that this also needs to become a feature of the public housing system, but it will take time due to resource constraints. Again this plan needs to mesh with an Estate management plan that sets this aspiration and works towards its delivery for all social housing tenants including those continuing in public housing. There is an equity issue that potentially becomes stark on a large estate development between the social housing have and have nots. An estate management plan needs to address this and try and minimise the support differences between public and CHP social housing tenants. Actions like 2.14 need to apply to public housing as well as those transferred to CHPs.

There is another aspect to wrap around support which involves making sure that the rest of the service system has the resources to handle the supports tenants need. Currently many services are funded through TEI and they are not funded to deal with most of the public housing cohort. Many services are at capacity, have waiting lists or manage on funding that has not increased to meet increased need. To deliver this wrap around support, in areas such as mental health support, there needs to be services allocated to service public housing communities where government policy concentrates people who need those supports. This problem is not solved by CHPs and is a major focus of the Collaborative's human service plan that has been ignored in this plan and as it relates to this action.

2.15 Maintain social and affordable housing as tenure blind. This again intersects with what needs to happen in the public housing space. Can Homes NSW Housing Portfolio Management make the undeveloped public housing and public spaces look tenure blind for the next 30 years, while they are waiting for the redevelopment? Or is this plan saying that only the new build will be tenure blind while the existing stock and public spaces will continue to look unmaintained and sub-standard. Again this is where there needs to be an estate management plan that interacts with this Commercial Division plan.

Regarding the relocations and development recommendations to provide a right of return (2.7), the redevelopment needs to ensure that there is appropriate stock to allow for return. There should be an undertaking, that no one wanting to return should be excluded because there is insufficient stock for larger families as an example. It should also be recognised that some people returning may now require a different sized unit to the one they left because either they have new families to bring back or that their family may have left the family home. Everybody should be able to return.

A number of areas are missing from this section. Some of the areas missing are:

- working with the existing public housing tenants on how they will be involved in working with Homes NSW Commercial Division regarding redevelopment decisions for example about ongoing mechanisms like the Waterloo Redevelopment Group.
- An overarching social housing tenant mechanism that will cover the common interest of public and social housing tenants like WWSAG.
- No reference to the development principles including sharing information already agreed with LAHC and any other state wide compact that might be agreed by the Minister.
- Agreement to working together with tenants to improve the delivery of human services, in particular responding to the Collaborative's action plan that was in response to tenant issues.
- No undertaking of working together to minimise and address the impacts of the redevelopment on the existing public housing community that are not related to relocations. This is mentioned in passing on page 20, but only the relocation impact is covered by actions.
- No action to help people deal with social dislocation resulting from relocations so they can maintain connections to Waterloo, local services and friends and activities on the estate.
- While diversity of housing types is mentioned it is not clear if this is aimed at social and

affordable housing diversity or at private housing diversity. Ideally there should be diversity in social, affordable and private housing.

As mentioned previously many of these issues could be addressed in a complimentary Estate Management Plan or in a revamped PnP Plan that covers the entire estate including the redevelopment. Currently this is only a plan for Waterloo South residents. Residents in the rest of the estate and the conservation area that will adjoin some development blocks, are not adequately covered in this part of the plan. It is not surprising then, that in our discussion with tenants there was scepticism about the plan with people saying that it was just spin.

REDWatch does welcome the implied undertaking that 20% affordable housing will be ensured during operation given earlier indications that the affordable housing may not be in perpetuity.

Working with the Aboriginal community

REDWatch is concerned again about the way ABS statistics have been used. In this case Redfern and Waterloo have been combined. Surely it is easy enough to show each separately. If we use the Homes NSW figures for the number of Aboriginal people in Waterloo South and the Waterloo ABS figures it appears as if 45% of Aboriginal people in Waterloo live in Waterloo South. As these are different data sets, the figures will not correlate but it does indicate that Aboriginal people have a significant interest in and will be significantly impacted by the Waterloo South redevelopment.

The description on page 23 makes mention of recent history, but does not unpack this and it should. Not recognised here are:

- The contemporary importance of the area to the community as a meeting place and working place.
- The Central role of the area for the creation of Aboriginal Controlled Organisations.
- That until relatively recently there was a large Aboriginal presence in the area that has been pushed out of the area as a result of its gentrification.
- That there are many Aboriginal people who while they still identify with the area, can no longer live here.
- The importance to the broader Aboriginal community for there to be an ongoing Aboriginal presence in Redfern Waterloo.
- The call from Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal communities for Aboriginal Affordable Housing in the area to be included the development of all Government controlled land.

REDWatch is generally supportive of the PnP actions provided that they extend across the entirety of the Aboriginal public housing community and are not just confined to the redeveloped areas.

Many of the general issues raised in the section above relating to social housing tenants are also relevant for working with the Aboriginal Community. It should also be recognised that many Aboriginal people also use non-Aboriginal Controlled Organisations for services and this should also be factored in to planning.

Supporting health and wellbeing

As mentioned earlier in this submission, REDWatch has major problems with the table on page 26 and has requested percentages also be included for SA1s covering Waterloo South as well as the inclusion of figures, where available, from the recent Waterloo Tenants Survey run for the Human Services Collaborative. Homes NSW may also have access to other relevant data such as those on disability pensions, NDIS and my Aged care packages.

Our major concern is that social housing allocation policies congregate people in need of health and wellbeing support in social housing and many of these tenants need to access supports to enjoy a successful tenancy, but many of these supports are not readily accessible for a range of reasons. This need for service access is common across social housing irrespective of the landlord / property manager.

The Waterloo Collaborative's Action Plan Section 2 has a number of actions identified to deliver improved health and wellbeing. Section 5 of that plan covers a number of areas to improve service integration and service accessibility for all service users, which also is related to supporting health and wellbeing. The Collaborative Human Service Plan is not referenced in the PnP and the issues in it have largely been ignored.

Some Actions in this section relate to delivering on the planning controls or built environment elements (4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.8 and 4.9. These aspects should be well within the ability of the development

consortium and Homes NSW Commercial Division.

REDWatch is more concerned about the activity and supports part of these actions (4.3 - 4.10) and how they will be delivered on an ongoing basis across the entire Waterloo social housing community. Ideally these elements could be part of an estate management plan or a wider Collaborative plan where agencies receive committed additional funds to those currently deployed.

We get an idea of the problem in 4.3 where the undertaking is for an ongoing program of activities and events ... including pop up activities and event at night and on weekends. Some of these activities already happen between the NAB, community centres and SLHD, but they all happen during the day in large part because the cost of after-hours activities are high. This action would be great if it could be delivered, however with existing programs in the wellbeing space like the community choir or Peer Educators looking precarious due to reluctance for anyone to fund them after an initial trial, REDWatch has to ask where the money is going to come from for such activities and activations.

Action 4.3 is important because as new people move in and the old inhabitants are relocated out, building a new mixed community becomes crucial. Waterloo public housing, despite its issues, has well developed social cohesion. This gets lost with a new development when lots of new people move in. The challenge not adequately covered in this plan is how building the new community cohesion that underlies the redevelopment rationale of building mixed integrated communities will be delivered. As with Green Square this is a major challenge that requires a more detailed plan and significant resources to build community connection and social capital. Action 4.3 will be crucial to that and there needs to be visibility that there will be resources in the redevelopment to rebuild community as quickly as possible. With turnover with social and private rental housing it is expected that this will need to be ongoing and consideration should be given to a program funded by all landowners as part of site wide management and governance arrangements.

Looking at the “who” in terms of leads or supports in this section of the plan, we see all bar two actions expect service providers to lead or support. One of the remaining two is about ensuring service providers have access to spaces to deliver high quality services. There seems to be an assumption that service providers will provide the ongoing services and all that the redevelopment needs to do is to provide space. While such facilities are necessary for service delivery they are not sufficient and someone in government or the redevelopment needs to fund the services that are not currently being provided to existing tenants and that will be needed by the significantly increased population.

A Homes NSW Housing Services doing basic wellbeing checks will go some way to addressing some of the health and wellbeing issues in public housing, but again the Housing Services bit of the puzzle is missing. This needs to be covered in an estate management plan with Housing Services providing improved supports to its public housing tenants. Presumably there will be an expectation that CHPs will do this for its tenants, but there should not be differences in this between the public and CHP sector. Remember even if CHPs could deliver the best possible outcome for their tenants, they will still live for a long time next to public housing and be impacted by that if it too does not change.

One priority identified in the Waterloo tenants survey that is not covered in the Collaborative's Action plan is the high level of social isolation. Actions to help design and deliver supports to address social isolation need to be incorporated in the PnP Plan. In a new estate this is likely to be a greater problem, hence the need for programs and activities that build social connection and cohesion.

There has been interest from SLHD in having health facilities near or on the estate. Initially the thought was for a federal Health One approach and this might be different under changes by the Labor Government. The idea is still the same, if you have a concentration of people in public housing needing a range of service from the LHD, what can be done to better service that need? Action 2.6 in the Collaborative's Human Service Plan is to “Consider the implications of the development of a Health One in Waterloo (being led by SLHD and is dependent on further funding) and where appropriate, contribute to the development of the facility”. It is disappointing that this was not referenced directly in the PnP plan. It might be covered under 4.4 or 4.5, but as these are not specific this cannot be guaranteed and hence held to account when plan delivery is assessed.

Action 4.4 on affordable health services seems more aligned to the provision of bulk billing GPs than SLHD services and is probably the responsibility of the Public Health Network. Having said that, a new Federal program may help deliver health care in Waterloo and Waterloo's contribution to Casualty presentations should be explored to see if a case can be made for a centre in Waterloo.

REDWatch notes that in terms of accessibility criteria for buildings (4.2) that accessibility standards should also be required for a proportion of private housing and not just for social and affordable.

REDWatch also notes that Action 4.7 on supports for families and young people to stay safe and connected and to participate in community life is especially important for the Aboriginal community that is connected to Redfern Waterloo.

In summary supporting health and wellbeing should be delivered by an estate management plan or a modified PnP covering the whole of the estate as well as the redevelopment. Similarly the relevant sections of the Waterloo Human Services Action Plan should be incorporated into these plans and it should be made clear as to how improved service delivery by agencies is going to be resourced. A special focus is also needed on accelerating the building of social cohesion in the new mixed tenure community.

Accessing quality education, learning and jobs

REDWatch welcomes the PnP Plan looking at employment creation opportunities from the redevelopment. This should go hand in hand with not just construction jobs, but for retail, government and service jobs.

It is important however to understand that many of those in social housing are outside the labour market. In addition there are a range of systemic disincentives in the welfare and housing system for employment. It is not uncommon for tenants who have employment prospects to throw employment away when faced with the prospect of losing their home and instead trying to find housing in the a very expensive private housing market where their job income will not guarantee stable housing.

REDWatch has argued that one solution to this problem is to allow tenants in social housing to move tenures (preferably without physically moving) into affordable housing so that their housing is secure and linked to their income, this also allows for people who may have a reoccurrence, relapse or retire to seamlessly fall back into social housing. This is especially a problem for those on timed tenure where there is not an option of paying market rent when a tenant comes up to a timed lease renewal. There is no indication that this part of the housing / employment issue has been considered.

Local employment plans have also proved difficult to implement in the past in Redfern Waterloo, as the location means access to employment is not a significant barrier to employment. Programs like Job Ready, Hospitality training and programs by developers like Mirvac and John Holland have needed to open their programs up city wide to get trainee participants.

All of this means that Actions like 5.1 skills training for tenants and residents need to be across a wide range of job possibilities, as recognised in Action 5.2, and are likely to deliver few people into the workforce. Given the number of tenants caring for other people, one training area to look at might be in personal care and might have a social as well as possible employment benefit.

REDWatch welcomes Actions 5.7 and 5.8 and has argued the need for wireless access points as an interim measure on the estate until low cost internet can be delivered to all tenants. This should be taken up in an estate management plan and aspects are covered in the Collaborative Action Plan area 3 especially 3.3 to reduce the digital divide.

REDWatch is not confident that low cost internet can be delivered by existing utility providers. Homes NSW must protect social housing tenants from new build internet connection fees (a problem for tenants going into Rachel Forster social housing) and from utilities being locked in by the developer resulting in tenants not being able to access lower cost options.

The Australian Communications Consumer Action Network (ACCAN) has a campaign for [No Australian Left Offline](#). Homes NSW should carefully consider what role it can play to ensure all social housing tenants have access to low cost broadband, not just from redevelopments, but also for existing public housing tenants. One option might be for Homes NSW to establish a unit that can negotiate low cost broadband from the NBN and either through an existing service provider or directly become a provider specialising in low cost internet. Without a dedicated intermediary to the NBN it is difficult to see how a low cost service might be delivered. Homes NSW should explore with the NBN and ACCAN what it can do to assist tenants with low cost internet.

Unnamed service providers again feature strongly in this section of the PnP and REDWatch is concerned that the lack of names and how things will be funded is a weakness in the plan. If the expectations that someone else will deliver does not eventuate and there is not funding built into the plan, then an action is unlikely to be delivered.

Feeling Safe and Welcome

It is difficult to see how country of birth statistics help explain the differences in Waterloo that might make people feel unsafe. Born overseas figures from the Census for Waterloo South SA1 show 37.72% where 30% speak a language other than English. These figures are lower in Waterloo South than those for all other SA1 variations mentioned earlier, in part because of a significant Aboriginal population in Waterloo South. While some people may not feel safe where people are talking a

language they don't understand, many people don't feel safe around Aboriginal people drinking in public spaces, while others have no such fears. People with mental health issues or who are antisocial are often cited as an area of concern for fear or crime and potential abuse.

This section of the PNP references some aspects of the Waterloo Tenants Survey including that only 41% of respondents felt safe walking around their neighbourhood at night. In addition 45% say that they have been insulted or harassed in public. There are clearly issues about feeling safe and welcome in Waterloo public housing that need addressing and that are unlikely to be dealt with by new buildings.

The question to ask the tenants who said they felt unsafe in the tenants survey, about this section of PnP, is if the actions in this part of the Plan were all done would they feel safer. We suspect the answer would be no.

Safety is an issue that has been picked up in the Collaborative's Human Service Plan both in section 1 on improved safety but also in Action 5.7 around identifying issues and developing responses to persistent anti-social behaviour. Other sections of the plan work on other parts of the service system which are thought, if they were improved, would mean that tenants received the supports they need more quickly and hence would not be as disruptive to other tenants who have a right to the quite enjoyment of their tenancy.

The work underway within the Collaborative's Action Plan as well as actions in the Homes NSW addendum should be reflected in a PnP Plan for the entire estate and for Waterloo South when addressing issues of people feeling safe and welcoming.

REDWatch is concerned that having identified Safety as a problem, the PnP Plan then focuses primarily on built environment solutions that are unlikely to impact the people problem identified.

Of course CPTED principles (6.9), proposals for community art on buildings (6.1), naming buildings and public spaces to reflect local stories (6.2), incorporating interpretative elements in existing buildings (6.3), well designed parks and community facilities (6.4), use of inclusive language on signs (6.6), maximising accessibility (6.7), use of lighting, artwork on hoardings (6.8) and public toilets (6.10) all have a place, but they do not address the people issues facing Waterloo public housing tenants who come in part for allocation issues, lack of mental health, drug and alcohol services and support, slack parole releases and a host of other well identified issues.

As with previous sections, management actions that will require funding are in the plan without any specifics about how they will be funded. As an example action 6.5 in the PnP proposes to "create a programmed mix of complementary uses in the community centre, parks and shops during the day and at night." This action is to be run by the redevelopment partner and the City of Sydney with the support of Service Providers. This could be an important part of helping build community cohesion but it would need to be ongoing and it needs to be funded in some way. We can't see the Council taking it on so funding will need to come from the development partner. Service Providers would need to be compensated in some form to put staff out for evening and weekend activities as it increases their staff costs and takes away from other work. Such proposals need to have enough detail to look like they might work.

Ironically the normal way in the City of Sydney for activating spaces are bars and hotels and on street dining, but these are only likely to exacerbate divisions in the community between the community who can afford to pay boutique prices for drinks and meals, and social housing tenants. This is especially so when some of the conflicts that exist around Waterloo Green, Waterloo shops and the Waterloo Metro relate to public drinking of alcohol by people who for various reasons do not use the sanctioned forms of street drinking.

It is surprising that conflicts between drinkers and John Holland that has led to them having to pay Police to be on site so building workers continue to work does not have an action in this PnP plan. REDWatch has raised the question of where will the street drinkers go in this new plan and it has been ignored. As John Holland has found out, drinkers will not go away just because there is a new development.

Under the antisocial behaviour part of the Collaborative's Plan (5.7) work led by Council around public drinking of alcohol is being explored. One question is how we can find somewhere safe for those involved in public drinking where the drinkers are safe and the impact on others is minimised. This is a CPTED issue, but it appears too complex for this Plan or for Homes NSW.

Welcome packs for new tenants have existed in Waterloo for many years. A new one has been prepared by Counterpoint as part of the Collaborative's work, but it depends on Homes NSW Housing Services staff to actually distribute it to new tenants, which has been an ongoing problem.

REDWatch is intrigued by Action 6.11 which proposes to “establish, resource and remunerate a tenant group to help welcome new residents and introduce the Waterloo community.” Is this going to be part of Homes NSW’s approach to all new tenants in Waterloo – if so it could be very useful, or will this be another inequity between public housing tenants and CHP tenants? Is this going to be a joint public housing – CHP tenant group or will only CHP tenants be paid?

There are many people areas left unaddressed in this part of the PnP. Again it needs to be accompanied by an Estate Management Plan or the PnP needs to be widened out to incorporate responses to human service issues and the public housing community as well as those in CHPs and in the new Waterloo South.

Being green and clean

This section of PnP is primarily about the built environment place part with the people part linked to enjoying the parks (7.1, 7.2), rooftop gardens (7.3), trees (7.4), shade (7.5) and sustainable materials (7.6), energy and water efficient homes(7.7), and cool and economical to heat homes and community centres (7.8).

Apart from improved energy and power efficiency (7.7 and 7.8), and hopefully better sound insulation, there is nothing about the underlying green outcomes in terms of green star ratings on buildings, solar power where possible, the electricity grid not being tied to a preferred provider etc.

There might also be a bit of green washing going on. Action 7.5 says “design and build streets, pedestrian routes and parks to be shaded and pleasant to use.” What might be pleasant in summer can be very inhospitable in winter, so it will be interesting to see how “pleasant to use” is done year round. Most tenants expect the pedestrian routes to be surrounded by tall buildings and that the challenge will be access to sunlight and not access to shade.

At the present moment recycling is not available in Waterloo because of problems of intermingling between the garbage and recycling streams. Homes NSW and Council continue to try and find solutions to this problem. It is not clear what will emerge from proposed Action 7.10 to address this well-known problem of waste and recycling management within social housing buildings (7.10). “Consider the diverse needs of tenants and residents, including older people, people with disability and the CALD community, when designing and delivering waste and recycling systems” certainly identifies a PnP problem that needs to be addressed. There are certainly problems in existing inner city high rises with garbage chutes that should be designed better in a new build.

But there is also a people problems that may only in part be addressed by the sustainability education proposed in action 7.11. There will be a vested interest by building managers to address the garbage part of the problem, but it is not clear how broader “sustainability education programs to support social, economic, cultural and environmental health” will be delivered where it is not uncommon for items to be thrown from high-rise social housing buildings. The current Homes NSW clean-up certainly help address this problem but this needs to be ongoing to properly deal with the issues and that needs funding from somewhere on an ongoing basis.

With parks and streets dedicated to Council, it will take responsibility to maintain them, other areas will need to be maintained by the site occupants either directly in the case of a CHP, or by strata arrangements. This is covered in action 7.9. Until all the site is redeveloped however Homes NSW has that responsibility.

The existing parks in Waterloo that are owned and managed by Homes NSW are not well maintained when compared to Council managed spaces. Making these spaces meet a similar aspiration as that held for new parks would contribute greatly to people’s appreciation of the area and to the spaces looking tenure blind. This should be part of an estate management plan.

With the focus on the new build this section is primarily about Waterloo South, but there is also a need to look at green and clean issues across the estate. It applies for example if Homes NSW decide to re-block / refurbish or knock down the high-rises in Waterloo Central and South to preserve or not embedded carbon. Many of the existing buildings have not been built with climate change in mind and are likely to need climate related work prior to their inclusion in the redevelopment.

Some of these clean and green aspects should be included in a whole of public housing estate management plan as well as the redevelopment. This is necessary to try and minimise the gap between the social housing have and have nots and to deliver the best possible environmental outcomes for both the people and the place over the next 15 to 30 years.

Conclusion

REDWatch has argued in this submission that there are a number of deficiencies in the PnP Plan that need to be addressed. Central to our concern is that the PnP Plan is primarily a project plan for Waterloo South and not a PnP plan for the entire Waterloo public housing community. REDWatch wants to see Homes NSW prepare a Waterloo Estate Management Plan to compliment this Waterloo South Plan or alternatively see this plan reworked as a People and Place plan for the entire public and social housing Waterloo community.

REDWatch has also argued that the PnP Plan also has to address the ongoing human services issues raised by the human services Collaborative as well as deal with the increased human service issues and opportunities that the redevelopment brings. Where government policy creates a concentration of people with high and complex needs, it is incumbent on government to provide the services to support that community. Homes NSW has a vested interest in the human services system, as addressing these people issues is likely to result in tenants having more successful tenancies and having quite enjoyment of their homes.

REDWatch has also pointed out that there is a high level of ambiguity in the plan over terms like Homes NSW and tenants that results in multiple ways of reading who are the beneficiaries of actions and the players who will lead and support. REDWatch has proposed that there be clarity in the Plan as to which parts of Homes NSW and which tenants are being referred to.

REDWatch continues to be concerned about the non-specific reference to agencies and service providers throughout the plan without any indication as to who these are or how these bodies will be funded to lead or support the actions proposed in the plan.

REDWatch has also raised concerns about a range of background information and description as well making comments on specific sections and actions within the plan.

Given the lack of integration with a wider Waterloo Estate Management Plan and the existing human services plan, we have not tried to cover everything that we think should be in a modified PnP Plan or a complimentary Estate Management Plan. That is a larger piece of work, to which REDWatch is happy to contribute, but is beyond the scope of this submission.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this plan.

Yours Faithfully

Geoffrey Turnbull
Spokesperson
On behalf of REDWatch Inc
C/- Counterpoint Community Services
67 Raglan Street
Waterloo NSW 2017
Ph. Wk.: (02) 9318 0824
Email: mail@redwatch.org.au
Web: www.redwatch.org.au

REDWatch is a residents and friends group covering Redfern Eveleigh Darlington and Waterloo (the same area originally covered by the Redfern Waterloo Authority). REDWatch monitors government activities in the area and seeks to ensure community involvement in all decisions made about the area. More details can be found at www.redwatch.org.au.