

## Draft Redfern-Waterloo Built Environment Plan Stage 2 (BEP2) Overview and Issues for Submissions

**The Draft Redfern-Waterloo Built Environment Plan Stage 2 is on exhibition until 28 February 2011**

### **Consultation Problems because of Short Exhibition Period**

REDWatch's initial focus is to try to ensure that the community has the opportunity to be involved in the decisions being made about the area they live in.

REDWatch welcomes the RWA placing BEP2 on exhibition prior to formulating the final planning controls. This provides for community input into the Plan prior to it being finalised and placed on formal exhibition by the Department of Planning.

REDWatch is very concerned that Government has been working on BEP2 behind closed doors for over 7 years and yet it is only being placed on exhibition for 4 weeks. Even if the Plan contained all the information required and the consultation process was flawless, this is not sufficient time for a diverse community to gain an understanding of what is proposed and to make a considered response.

The consultation has been far from flawless. The process chosen is highly dependent on internet access which is not available in most public housing households. REDWatch does not consider that the RWA's newsletter provided sufficient information for informed comment and the Housing NSW leaflet did little more than refer public tenants to the RWA website. Public information sessions have not involved a verbal presentation and have relied on people responding to display boards and asking questions of the experts. This is a long way from best consultation practice especially when dealing with a diverse public housing community. REDWatch has written to the RWA raising more detailed concerns about the consultation - [REDWatch Concerns Regarding BEP2 Consultation](http://www.redwatch.org.au/RWA/bep2/110215redw) (www.redwatch.org.au/RWA/bep2/110215redw).

REDWatch is very aware that in the short time available we have not been able to get all the clarifications and information required to produce these initial comments for community discussion to the standard we would like. This may lead to some errors and misunderstanding of some of the very complex details in the report. Given the short period for exhibition we have no other alternative than to "run with what we have got" and hope it encourages discussion and comments to the RWA.

### **The Government's Plan – The Big Picture**

While the exhibition is primarily about the planning controls that stem from its BEP2 it is also very important to provide feedback on the underlying plan. To do this we need first to try to explore the government thinking behind this plan.

Housing NSW needs to renew some of its housing stock; HNSW also needs to better match housing stock size with the size of units needed by its tenants. The NSW Government is looking for places where there is existing infrastructure to put increased housing density. Government also needs affordable housing so Key

Workers can afford to live in the inner city. The state and federal governments would like to end concentrations of public housing to get a “better” mix.

BEP2 aims to bring these together in a bundle the Government hopes will attract private developers to come on board to cover the bulk of the cost of achieving the Government’s goals. In other much smaller suburban public housing redevelopments the mix required to secure developer involvement has been 70% private to 30% public. In Redfern and Waterloo the RWA believe that the scarcity of inner city land can make a 60% private (including affordable) and 40% public split enough to attract developers. About 2184 high-rise units will be refurbished and new stock built to provide the 2800 public housing units to be retained in the area.

To fund this renovation and renewal Housing NSW will sell off public housing land to make way for 4,200 private and affordable units while 50,000 people sit on the public housing waiting list. They will also purchase or build 700 public housing units elsewhere in the City of Sydney so there is no loss of public housing units in the Sydney Local Government Area to replace units moved out of Redfern and Waterloo. To have substance Housing NSW need to ensure that there is no loss of public housing stock elsewhere in the Sydney LGA in the meantime.

Promoting “social mix” is given as one of the drivers of the redevelopment. In fact overall Redfern and Waterloo are very mixed. It is only the area of social housing that the RWA has drawn a line around that is not mixed. Worryingly there is the possibility, depending on how the redevelopment proceeds, that after the redevelopment it might be still possible to put a line around public housing and argue that it is still not mixed!

Housing Mix would require Housing NSW to renovate the retained high-rise to a standard suitable for private units and to ensure service delivery to its public tenants for a workable salt and pepper mix of public and private tenants. But with a mix in the same building or even the same block it will be difficult for developers to sell to private investors or home owners. For the developers and Treasury the best returns will be achieved by leaving public tenants in the high-rise and in the infill housing around them with private developments separated from public housing. To do otherwise is likely to increase the Governments costs.

One of the problems with BEP2 is that it seems to assume any private housing will bring a benefit to the area and to the public tenants. This may happen over time if the buyers are owner occupiers who move into the area and put down roots, but if there is concern among buyers about possible problems with their neighbours it is much more likely that the new units will be sold to investors who put the units onto the rental market with the probable result that private occupants on short leases turn over more quickly than public housing tenants. A more stable community may well result if the increased population was affordable housing rather than private but as this would require greater government expenditure to subsidise the affordable housing it is unlikely.

REDWatch has argued that the Government needs to urgently address issues with human service delivery to public housing tenants. As public housing concentrates tenants with higher and higher needs in its properties there has not been a commensurate increase in the delivery of human services to its tenants. This is needed to ensure tenants own sometimes multiple needs are appropriately met and also by those who live around them to ensure that their neighbour’s sometimes problematic behaviour does not impact on them and their community. These human service issues should be addressed now. Increasing the density and introducing private tenants into closer proximity to public housing makes it even more important that the management of human service deficiencies be addressed as early as possible.

REDWatch is concerned that BEP2 provides no detail about the Government's commitment to renovate retained buildings or to ensure that the redevelopment meets any targets for the renewal of public housing stock. The final outcome will be very much dependant on the level of funding committed by governments over the life of the plan.

BEP2 states that: "The renewal of the social housing sites and realisation of BEP2 objectives will require funding from both the private and government sector and is subject to government decisions about funding for renewal."

REDWatch is very concerned that in the absence of firm commitments of government funding to refurbish and renew public housing stock that the BEP2 Development Controls could result in the existing low-rise area being redeveloped for private and affordable housing while public tenants remaining in the existing un-renovated high-rise with only around 600 public housing units being created. Under the Controls this could happen as infill around the high-rise buildings.

REDWatch is also concerned that any renovation addresses the liveability of the high-rise and the needs of the tenants that live there. There is concern that renovation could primarily improve the external appearance of the high-rise thus making them more visually pleasing for their new private neighbours rather than addressing the issues of those that live within the buildings.

These for REDWatch would be the worst possible outcomes for public tenants – the challenge is to make sure that they do not happen and to lock in both the government and opposition commitments necessary to renovate and renew public housing stock to deliver a harmonious higher density community over an extended time frame.

Such issues need community consideration and not just the specifics of the proposed planning controls which are covered below.

## **BEP2 Analysis of the Redfern & Waterloo Public Housing Area**

Section 2 of BEP2 contains a **Character Analysis (pp13-29)** which provides an overview of the social, historical, economic and built environment of the Redfern-Waterloo area, with a focus on the Housing NSW sites. It also contains in Section 3 **Renewal Opportunities (pp31-63)** a detailed analysis of the renewal opportunities and potential through a detailed site analysis of each precinct, including individual block analysis. BEP2 uses this analysis for the development of a Desired Future Character Statement for each precinct, including desired building scale and density.

These sections provide the basis on which the RWA has formulated the proposed controls. Residents living in or bordering the development should check how the Report analyses their part of the estate and what it proposes for its future. If you have concerns regarding this aspect of the study these should be raised in your submission.

## **BEP2 – The Planning Framework - Details what can be built**

Section 4 of BEP2 details the proposed **Planning Frame Work (pp65-87)**. It is derived from the detailed site and urban design analysis outlined in Section 3.

This section sets out the Draft Planning Controls. Following their exhibition as a Planning Instrument, these will set the legal framework for the next stage of the delivery process and the eventual redevelopment that will take place. If the legal framework does not adequately capture BEP2's stated intent then that intent cannot be delivered.

Following the exhibition, Housing NSW will commence work on a Master Plan for the Redfern and Waterloo Public Housing Estates. The Redfern Waterloo Authority's successor the Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority (SMDA) will undertake further studies in the area before proposing formal planning controls for the BEP2 area.

BEP2 says the Master Plan is not expected to be ready until after the SMDA has completed its study. This means that the Planning Controls are not likely not to include findings from the Master Plan which involve the additional consultation on many important issues.

REDWatch is of the view that the Master Plan should be finalised before the SMDA exhibit its final Planning Controls. This is especially so since key areas such as the **Public Domain Strategy (Draft BEP2pp 74 – 75)** including proposed opening of road closures, the **Transport & Movement Strategy (Draft BEP2 pp 86 – 87)** and **Community Facilities (Draft BEP2 p 87)** have been left to be further examined as part of the Master Plan and the information contained in BEP2 documents is inadequate.

As the BEP2 timeline expects Planning Controls to be set before the finalisation of the HNSW MasterPlan it is very important that people understand and make comment on BEP2 Planning Framework. To put it another way if you don't like the proposals for up to 12 storey buildings, the proposed increase in density (thousands of extra people coming in) or you do not believe the stated intent of BEP2 is reflected in the planning controls then **now** is the time to make your comment not during the Housing NSW Master Plan discussions.

Below REDWatch has tried to highlight the main issues in the Planning Controls, Urban Design Guiding Principles, the preliminary Public Domain Strategy and the Design Excellence Strategy.

It may be helpful to download Section 4 of BEP2 which contains the [Planning Framework](#) (PDF 3 Mb). We have indicated in each section below the pages we are referring to and provide the link to the draft control map at the bottom of the section if you wish to bring up just a particular map. Section 4 can be found at [www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/bep2\\_section4.pdf](http://www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/bep2_section4.pdf)

## **Land Use – what you can do where? (Draft BEP2 pp 68-69)**

In the Redfern and Waterloo consolidated Housing NSW sections of BEP most of the area is designated Residential as it was by the City of Sydney. The City of Sydney study proposed a mixed use band in Cope St (East side) while BEP2 introduces the proposed new Business Zones – Mixed use:

- Elizabeth Street (East side) and Walker Street (West side)
- Cope Street (East side), Cooper St (West side), McEnvoy (North side) & John St (South side)

The BEP2 zones cover the whole of the block and hence not only face some existing businesses but also face residential developments. There is no indication in BEP2 of how the proposed new zones may impact on existing business zones in Redfern & Waterloo. No figures have been supplied on the expected commercial floor space or the employment that may be created.

Analysis of BEP2 housing figures indicates that only 9,775 square meters of space may be available for business however a provision is also included that indicates that floor space for certain types of activity including community business, may be in addition to the floor space specified.

In BEP2 there is no provision for any zoned Recreation Zones in Redfern Waterloo only at South Eveleigh.

You can download the draft [Figure 25: proposed land use zoning](http://www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/fig_25_proposed_land_use_zoning_01.jpg) map (jpg file size 0.99 Mb) from [www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/fig\\_25\\_proposed\\_land\\_use\\_zoning\\_01.jpg](http://www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/fig_25_proposed_land_use_zoning_01.jpg)

## **Floors Space – How dense will the development be? (Draft BEP2 pp 70-71)**

The Controls proposed allow for 60.4 hectares of floor space excluding items like open balconies, voids or required car parking that are not included as floor space. BEP2 has used an average size of 85 sq m /unit to calculate the space taken by its 7,000 units rather than different sizes related to a mix of bedsits and units of different numbers of bedrooms. The balance is left for business use.

REDWatch has used the RWA's 85 sq m / unit figure to do an analysis of the entire site and to show how this is distributed across each block. It gives a the capacity for 7108 such units across BEP2 Redfern and Waterloo HNSW sites. This is just a guide for each site. Some existing HNSW units such as in Purcell average under 85 sq m / unit at the moment and there may be a larger number of smaller units required for public housing than is required for the private market. This could result in the number of infill units around the high rise being larger than REDWatch's calculated estimates.

BEP2 proposes floor space of between 2.5 and 3 times the land area for all the sites except Purcell which is proposed to be set at twice land area. BEP2 proposes 15.7 hectares more floor space than proposed by the City of Sydney. This is an increase of 35% and increases the floor space ratio from an average of 2.03:1 for the City of Sydney Draft Controls to an average of 2.75:1 for the BEP2 draft controls.

BEP2 proposes that "where appropriate" the floor area for "local retail, community orientated commercial activities, and social infrastructure/services" be excluded from the floor space for a particular block. This means that the floor space for such activities may be in addition to floor space available on a site. The RWA has clarified that its intention is that "only community uses and social enterprises are intended to be excluded from the FSR controls". This needs to be reworded in the proposed controls to avoid any ambiguity that would expanded commercial floor space.

All the existing high rise towers fit within the floor space proposed with some floor space available to build extra units next to them. If all the high-rises are retained then there will be a need for around 620 units averaging 85 sq m of "infill" housing to be built on the high-rise blocks to meet the BEP2 housing unit targets. This figure may be greater where the existing high-rise units average less than 85 sq m /unit. The actual floor space on these sites was not available to us so we are unable to estimate exactly what infill can be created. You can see REDWatch analysis block by block at – [www.redwatch.org.au/RWA/bep2/110212redw/download](http://www.redwatch.org.au/RWA/bep2/110212redw/download)

You can download the draft [Figure 26: proposed floor space ratio](http://www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/fig_26_proposed_floor_space_ratio_01.jpg) map (jpg file size 1.13 Mb) from [www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/fig\\_26\\_proposed\\_floor\\_space\\_ratio\\_01.jpg](http://www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/fig_26_proposed_floor_space_ratio_01.jpg)

It should be noted that **BEP2 provides no population increase figures** – Population is normally linked to the floor space allowed and the number of people expected to live in the units provided. Using the information

in BEP2 REDWatch calculates an upper population figure of 11,000 new residents if the existing public and private occupancy levels were reflected in the redevelopment. Subsequent to BEP2 the RWA has indicated it expects a population increase of approx. 6,125. The rate used by the RWA of 1.75 seems low when compared to the Council's 2.02 people / unit used on multi-story dwellings which is based on the 2006 census. If there has been any increase in the number of people living in each unit since 2006 or if there is any increase in built density allowed by the time the units are built then the population impact will be even higher than current projections.

## **Height – how high can they stack the units? (Draft BEP2 pp 72 -73)**

In basic terms, floor space of 3 times the site area allows a three storey building over all the land, or a six storey building over half the land or a 12 storey building over a quarter of the land. Allowing tall buildings is one way of creating larger public spaces like Waterloo Green. Height and floor space interact to create the texture of a development across the site.

[Figure 29: artists impression of a possible application of the proposed planning controls](http://www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/fig_29_artists_impression_of_proposed_planning_controls_01.jpg) on page 78 of BEP2 ([www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/fig\\_29\\_artists\\_impression\\_of\\_proposed\\_planning\\_controls\\_01.jpg](http://www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/fig_29_artists_impression_of_proposed_planning_controls_01.jpg)) gives some idea of how the density proposed translates into height compared to surrounding building heights. This diagram is important as it was used in the RWA newsletter and is the only place in newsletter that gave any indication of the infill housing proposed by BEP2 around Waterloo Green.

It is not possible to make a direct comparison between heights in BEP2 and council plans because BEP2 uses "Predominant Heights" while, in line with Department of Planning requirements, City of Sydney Council uses "Maximum Heights".

BEP2 proposes 6 and 8 storey Predominant Heights for the bulk of the area with an interface of 4 storeys with some lower adjoining areas.

In BEP2 8 Storey Zones buildings of up to 12 storeys are allowed if the 12 storeys section does not cover more than 20% of the block. If you compare the Council's proposed heights with BEP2 heights in many cases the Council heights are taller even though the BEP2 density is greater.

REDWatch is of the view that BEP2 should present height controls as maximum heights in line with the Department of Planning's requirement for council LEPs.

While the floor space of the existing high-rise fit the BEP2 floor space controls the height of the existing high-rise are much taller than allowed if they were to be rebuilt in line with BEP2. This means that in 30 or so years, when the high-rise come to the end of its economic life, the replacement buildings can contain the same number of units but could be rebuilt within the new height requirements covering a larger land area.

You can download the draft [Figure 27: proposed building heights](http://www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/fig_27_proposed_building_heights_01.jpg) map (jpg file size 1.14 Mb) from [www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/fig\\_27\\_proposed\\_building\\_heights\\_01.jpg](http://www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/fig_27_proposed_building_heights_01.jpg)

## **Urban Design Guiding Principles (Draft BEP2 pp 66 – 67)**

BEP2 proposes to include in the Planning Controls – Urban Design Guiding Principles. Similar principles were not included in the BEP1 Planning Controls. The Draft Urban Design Guiding Principles cover the BEP2 Vision,

the community, the public domain and open space, extra land use provisions, urban street patterns, built form, design, environment and heritage.

While floor space, land use and height define only what is built some of the Design Principles deal with who will live in the area – such as the 40% social 60% private housing mix and even the sustainability of the community.

It is important that people comment on the Draft BEP2 Urban Design Guiding Principles. Particular thought should be given to what needs to be in the Design Principles to ensure that the spirit and detail of the RWA / HNSW proposal flow through into the Development Controls.

How for example do you ensure the Controls actually “create a sustainable community represented by a mix of social affordable and private housing”? Is there a way in these Design Guiding Principles to ensure that HNSW renovates the high-rise in line with the staging of the redevelopment?

### **Design Excellence Strategy (Draft BEP2 p 76)**

The Design Excellence provisions developed in BEP1 are applied in BEP2 and will be included in the Planning Controls. BEP2 suggests many of the matters raised should also be considered in the Master Plan.

There are some design aspects which REDWatch believes are critical for new public housing which are not included. At a minimum all buildings should be designed so that they can be easily adapted to meet the changing needs of their tenants. REDWatch argues that the controls should require universal design standards that incorporate flexibility from the outset.

REDWatch is also concerned that Design Excellence seems only to relate to the built form presentation, such as the expensive blue tiles on feature walls in the recent Moorehead Street development rather than health and liveability. In the development, which trumpeted natural ventilation as part of its green star design rating no fly screens were installed. The units are situated in an area prone to mosquitoes in part because of the high water table nearby.

Thought needs to be given to what Design Excellence means in public housing and how this can be incorporated into the controls.

### **The Issues needing further Work**

There are three issues - the public domain, community facilities and transport and movement that are covered in the Planning Framework that indicate more work will be undertaken. BEP2 makes some indications of what is proposed in these areas but fails to mention other areas that should be locked into the Planning Framework and not left only for the Master Plan.

#### **a) Open Space and The Preliminary Public Domain Strategy (pp74-75)**

BEP2 states “The delivery of an enhanced public domain is a key outcome of the social housing renewal which the draft BEP2 seeks to facilitate” and yet there is no commitment in BEP2 to any target for open space to ensure adequate open space is provided for the higher density population.

Depending on how you define the area, Redfern Waterloo has open space between 5.9 and 6.9 square metres / person compared to the City of Sydney Council area average of 11.8 sq m/person. Historically 2.83

hectares per 1,000 people (28.3 sq m / person) was in the Environmental Planning and Assessment (EPA) Act, but over time this has been removed. Green Square and other inner city developments set a target of 10 sq m / person.

While BEP2 talks about new parks and upgrading existing parks it also proposes decreasing some existing open space at Waterloo Green with infill housing around the high-rises.

The redevelopment must deliver at least 10 sq m open space/ person. While Redfern Park and Waterloo Park may be close it is imperative that this development must increase open space to cater for the increase in population. Any decrease in the per capita local open space of the Redfern and Waterloo area should be resisted strongly.

More details on Open Space issues and BEP2 can be found in [REDWatch BEP2 Issues : Open Space - PDF Leaflet](http://www.redwatch.org.au/RWA/bep2/110214redw) (www.redwatch.org.au/RWA/bep2/110214redw). REDWatch encourages residents to cover the need for a per capita open space target in the controls and for public parks to be protected by land use zoning.

The public domain strategy section of BEP2 also deals with the removal of street closures. This proposal has concerned many at Poet's Corner who were involved in the campaign for closures. Included in the proposed street closure removals is Kettle Street which was wrongly depicted as remaining a street closure with public open space in a sketch in the RWA's BEP2 newsletter. This section of BEP2 also deals with laneway upgrades and through site links.

#### **b) Preliminary Transport and Movement Strategy (p86)**

This one page in BEP2 refers to the [Parsons Brinckerhoff Transport and Traffic Study](http://www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/traffic_report.pdf) which can be downloaded from www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/bep2/traffic\_report.pdf . This study investigated the likely traffic generated by the proposed planning framework and concluded that "the proposed planning framework would result in only a modest impact on the traffic performance on the surrounding road network". Traffic issues proved a major concern in BEP1. When council undertook its own traffic study in Darlington many of the RWA North Eveleigh recommendations were not accepted.

BEP2 also proposes using a 60% non-car travel mode share target for travel to and from the BEP2 area. The study seems focused on travel to and from the city or via Redfern Station. Public local transport options especially east west transport links are noticeably missing. How people get to hospitals, shopping centres, regional open space and sports grounds for kids sport are totally missing. The Village to Village bus which is continually under funding threat gets acknowledged with a graphic on page 23 of BEP2 but there important service it is not mentioned at all in the Transport Strategy. To remove the need for cars the linkages people need for their day to day activities have to be provided.

BEP2 also proposes "promoting reduced car parking rates, generally in accordance with the controls outlined in the City of Sydney's draft LEP 2010". BEP2 does not mention the maximum number of car spaces per dwelling but the Appendix B report does. For the private tenants in the BEP2 Redfern and Waterloo areas they are as follows: 1 bed studio 0.2; 1 bed apartment 0.4; 2 bed apartment 0.8; 3 bed apartment or townhouse 1.1. The allowance for public tenants is proposed to be 60% of that for private tenants. This means for 1 bed apartments private tenants will have an allowance of 1 car space per 2.5 units while public tenant's in the same size unit will have 1 car space for every 4.16 units.

While BEP2 parking study found spare parking capacity REDWatch is aware of complaints being made in Waterloo about commuter parking creating problems for local residents. Such problems are set to increase



with increased density and as people in new developments lose any right to qualify for on street parking permits.

This area needs a lot more work if the problems being experienced in Alexandria as a result of the ATP Chanel 7 development are not to be repeated in this redevelopment.

### **c) Community Facilities (p87)**

The RWA and HNSW have commenced a detailed review of the provision and adequacy of community facilities in and within the vicinity of the Redfern Waterloo Operational Area. There is already a demonstrated need for new community facilities in the public housing estates so this needs careful consideration.

The Urban Design Principles on page 66-67 allow additional floor area for social infrastructure, local retail and community orientated commercial activity and for the conversion of underutilised spaces at ground floor level within existing towers to community uses, studios and workshops.

One area that REDWatch believes should be explored is the possibility of facilities like swimming pools and gyms being open to the entire community rather than just located in private developments. If the aim of BEP2 is to promote greater social mix then there have to be places for interaction. Shared facilities provide an opportunity for mixing and counter the trend of large private development to become gated communities.

## **What is not provided for in BEP2 - Developer & Government Contributions?**

### **a) Developer Contributions**

BEP2 makes no proposals for the application of a Developer Contributions Plan.

The entire redevelopment seems to be constructed around private development providing some funding for new Housing NSW housing and Affordable Housing in exchange for government land and favourable Development Controls. Details of the financial modelling showing expected Government and Developer Contributions towards stock renovation and renewal and the expected income from land sales should be made available.

How the 700 new public housing units to be removed from Redfern and Waterloo will be funded and where they will be located should also be made clear. It should also be disclosed if and how other Housing NSW properties in Redfern and Waterloo will be renovated or renewed and if this is funded by the BEP2 development.

### **b) How will Affordable Housing be funded and operate**

BEP2 aims to deliver 700 affordable homes but the RWA has still not delivered an Affordable Housing Plan (expected last December) or explained how the Affordable Housing is to be paid for or how it will operate.

Much has been said about Affordable Housing for Key Workers. Will BEP2 affordable housing also make provision for public tenants who may gain employment and as a result no longer qualify for public housing but not earn enough to rent privately in the area?

The current RWA Affordable Housing Contributions Plan only applies to the BEP1 area and is calculated at the cost of 1.25% of the Gross Floor Area. In BEP2 if the high-rises are all retained for public housing then affordable housing will be 14.53% of all new housing or 16.66% if HNSW properties are excluded.

REDWatch is of the view that the Affordable Housing under BEP2 must be in addition to the Affordable Housing already announced for North Eveleigh where “between 12% and 16% of residential dwellings on the site [will] be affordable housing – which breaks down to between 150 and 200 dwellings, depending on size,” (Minister Sartor release 26 April 2008). The Affordable Housing at North Eveleigh is to be primarily funded by the Affordable Housing Levy paid by Fraser’s from the former Carlton United Brewery site.

## **What Next – The Housing NSW Master Plan**

The Housing NSW Master Plan will provide the finer level detail for the proposed redevelopment of the Redfern and Waterloo public housing estates. As indicated BEP2 defers some important issues to this study. As a result it is important that those concerned about BEP2 redevelopment also provide input to the Master Plan. The Master Plan will however be formed within the framework provided by BEP2’s proposed controls.

The RWA’s successor the Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority (SMDA) will undertake a Urban Renewal Study of Redfern and Waterloo before finalising the draft BEP2 controls and placing them formally on exhibition. The preliminary Master Plan is not expected to be settled until after the Urban Renewal Study is released and the Development Controls become Planning Law.

## **Submission Deadline – Close of Business Monday 28 February 2011**

Written submissions should be sent to: Attention: Redfern-Waterloo BEP2 at Redfern-Waterloo Authority, PO Box 3332, Redfern NSW 2016 Or emailed to: [redfernwaterloo@rwa.nsw.gov.au](mailto:redfernwaterloo@rwa.nsw.gov.au)

Information on BEP2 can be found on line at [www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/bep2/index.php](http://www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/bep2/index.php) or physical copies are available for inspection at the Council’s Redfern Service Centre, The RWA Offices and Waterloo Library. If you need assistance finding information ring the RWA on 9202 9100.

This Information Sheet has been produced by REDWatch.

For Further Information contact:

Geoffrey Turnbull

REDWatch Spokesperson

c/- PO Box 1567

Strawberry Hills NSW 2012

Ph Wk: (02) 8004 1490

email: [mail@redwatch.org.au](mailto:mail@redwatch.org.au)

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

Version: 15 Feb 2010 b