

T R A N S C R I P T

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL LEGAL AND SOCIAL ISSUES COMMITTEE

Inquiry into the Redevelopment of Melbourne's Public Housing Towers

Melbourne – Tuesday 5 August 2025

MEMBERS

Joe McCracken – Chair

Michael Galea – Deputy Chair

Ryan Batchelor

Anasina Gray-Barberio

Renee Heath

Ann-Marie Hermans

Rachel Payne

Lee Tarlamis

PARTICIPATING MEMBERS

Melina Bath

John Berger

Georgie Crozier

Jacinta Ermacora

David Ettershank

Sarah Mansfield

Tom McIntosh

Aiv Puglielli

Sonja Terpstra

Richard Welch

WITNESSES

Kerrie Byrne, and

Clare Hanson (*via videoconference*), Save Public Housing Collective.

The CHAIR: Welcome back to the next session of Legal and Social Issues Committee Inquiry into the Redevelopment of Melbourne's Public Housing Towers. I am Joe McCracken, the Chair, and we will go through the introduction of the committee members.

Anasina GRAY-BARBERIO: Good afternoon. Anasina Gray-Barberio, Member for Northern Metro.

Aiv PUGLIELLI: Hi. I am Aiv Puglielli, Member for North-Eastern Metro.

Rachel PAYNE: Hi there. I am Rachel Payne from South-Eastern Metropolitan Region.

Ryan BATCHELOR: Ryan Batchelor from the Southern Metropolitan Region.

The CHAIR: We have got two committee members online as well. I will go Michael and then Sonja.

Michael GALEA: Hi there. Michael Galea, Member for the South-Eastern Metropolitan Region.

Sonja TERPSTRA: Hi everyone. It is Sonja Terpstra. I am the state Member for the North-Eastern Metropolitan region.

The CHAIR: Thanks very much. All evidence taken is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the *Constitution Act 1975* and further subject to the provisions of the Legislative Council standing orders. Therefore the information that you provide during the hearing is protected by law. You are protected against any action for what you say during this hearing. But if you go elsewhere and repeat the same thing, those comments may not necessarily be protected. Any deliberately false evidence or misleading of the committee may be considered a contempt of Parliament.

All evidence is being recorded. You will be provided with a proof version of the transcript following the hearing. The transcript will ultimately be made public and posted on the committee's website.

Just for the Hansard record, Kerrie and Clare – I will go to Kerrie first – would you mind saying your name and the organisation that you are representing, please.

Kerrie BYRNE: Kerrie Byrne, the Save Public Housing Collective.

The CHAIR: Clare, we can see you on the screen now – beautiful. If you want to say your name and the organisation as well. Thanks.

Clare HANSON: Clare Hanson, also Save Public Housing Collective.

The CHAIR: Beautiful. Thank you very much for that, appreciate that. Now, Kerrie, I understand you are going to be doing an opening statement. Is that right?

Kerrie BYRNE: Yes, sure.

The CHAIR: I will hand it over to you, then we will go to questions after there, okay?

Kerrie BYRNE: Okay, sure.

The CHAIR: Off you go. Thank you.

Kerrie BYRNE: I would like to acknowledge we are meeting today on the unceded lands of the Wurundjeri Woi-Wurrung and Boonwurrung people and pay my respects to their elders, past and present.

I have been a long-time public tenant, and I have witnessed at fairly close quarters the relocation experiences of public housing residents at both the Barak Beacon, Port Melbourne, estate and the Flemington towers. Barak

Beacon was a lovely estate with ample grounds on which infill construction could have provided the required uplift in dwellings to 350 units at a saving of \$80 million compared to the government's demolition and high-density plan while still retaining open recreation areas. They then upped the number of units to 400, and I went up the other night to have a look. It is just boundary-to-boundary construction. I could not see any open space apart from the driveways where the trucks were going in.

I witnessed or was told by Barak Beacon residents about the impact on older and/or vulnerable residents, the impact of relocation from their long-established homes. Some residents were served eviction notices even if they were cooperative. Families with children were offered very tiny apartments with little living space and no outdoor area. Then the relocation officers responded as if the residents were the ones being unreasonable and served eviction notices to try and make them move. The common theme was that these residents were cooperating with the relocation team but they were either being offered unsuitable places or they accepted offers only to have them repeatedly withdrawn. Family members would take time off work to drive the residents to various properties but subsequent offers either failed to materialise or would be withdrawn. In the end many of them accepted places that were unsuitable just because of the stress. It was observable that different residents were treated differently. In the last months the remaining residents were all in the complex needs category but were not being offered suitable places. During the question period, I would like to give some brief case studies, if the committee is interested, including an ongoing one with a Flemington tenant who has been relocated.

Victoria purports to have an ageing-in-place philosophy that guides its approach to the welfare of older people. The Victorian Government website states:

Ageing in place is about staying independent in the familiar places where we live. It involves connections to local neighbourhoods and communities. Most people prefer to age in place.

That is from the ageing well action plan on the government website. Yet this practical and compassionate approach is denied to public tenants, who comprise some of the state's most vulnerable citizens. Relocation in itself is destabilising but, in addition, residents in their 70s and even older have been mucked around by the relocation team's disorganisation. Homes Victoria needs to engage support workers from reputable local services, such as Cohealth and/or Housing for the Aged Action Group or possibly the Tenancy Plus program at Launch Housing, to work with the residents in order to help cushion the blow of displacement from their long-established homes. As well as emotional support and advocacy with Homes Victoria, this could include practical aspects like packing and unpacking, assistance to connect energy providers in the new places or applying to Centrelink for CRA, which is required for community housing. Of course only some residents would require personalised support, but there is a need for a funded program like that, run independently and funded by Homes Victoria.

I am now moving on to managed decline. My own estate, a solidly constructed collection of townhouses on several streets built in the 1990s, has not been refurbished for 25 years. Tenants can self-advocate to occasionally receive refurbishments, such as painting, reflooring or even a new kitchen, but this can be a stressful experience. One of my neighbours has had an ongoing problem with termites for years. They never seem to be fully eradicated and the repairs they do to the skirting boards are never acceptable, but she is a very busy working woman with three kids and she just has to abandon this problem every so often and get on with her life. Previously – I guess we are going back 15, 20 years – there was a 12-year cycle of structural refurbishments. That way on each estate you would have a predictable pattern of wear and tear, and then the budget could be allocated accordingly by the department.

Getting back to my estate, inspections have been carried out, one in 2016 and in 2023, to document the dwellings' condition. We were told that refurbishments would proceed, but this has not eventuated. We are told there is no money, yet I found several examples of funding targeted specifically for structural maintenance in the past five years. It could be that there is just one or two packages of funding that are being repackaged with different names, but there was at least \$500 million that was allocated to structural maintenance. So where did it all go?

If public housing was overseen by an independent regulator, we would be able to get answers, but Homes Victoria is mired in an opaque bureaucracy, starved of accountability, transparency and lacking respect for its client base – us, the tenants. All we get told is there is no money. So why did they pay inspectors to do condition reports if there is no budget to undertake the works in the first place? Of course this could be an asset

assessment and they are just waiting for the places to deteriorate to justify demolition and high-density replacement blocks.

Another example of managed decline is the sewer stacks at the Carlton red brick towers which came up in the first hearing. At the community consultation last year we were told they had to be demolished as the sewer stacks were failing, yet this letter from DHHS in November 2019 clearly shows that the plumbing pipes at Nicholson Street were earmarked for replacement by DHHS. Obviously this never happened, but that was the intention before Homes Victoria was created.

Last year in Parliament the Member for Richmond Gabrielle de Vietri exposed the systemic neglect of the sewerage system across the Melbourne towers, the ensuing health hazards and the government's withdrawing of funds allocated to upgrade the sewer stacks across all the towers. She said:

This is clearly a deliberate act of neglect not just to save money but to make residents so uncomfortable, frustrated and even sick that they desperately want to move out. It is called eviction by neglect, and there is a well-documented history of governments doing this when they want to get rid of public housing.

This shambolic state of public housing raises questions about the decision-makers. Until the creation of Homes Victoria in 2020, public housing generally paid its way, though it has had heavy maintenance bills in the last five years or so due to neglect of the assets over time.

A couple of years ago I took snapshots of the profit from rental income (as reported in the Annual Reports of DFFH and previously DHHS) once the costs of council rates, maintenance and a couple of other categories are deducted from the gross rental income. For example, in 2001 there was a net profit from rental income of \$76 million; in 2006 it was \$81 million; in 2012 it was \$106 million – I think that is when the Liberals were in power. Then it declines down to \$32 million in 2020, and from then on it goes into the red, I think due to the heavy maintenance bills.

The *Herald Sun* has told us twice that Homes Victoria is on the brink of financial collapse. There was an article in October 2022 and one in April this year. If this is the case, it is clearly due to the reckless extent of estate redevelopments and the need to purchase or rent places on the private market for relocating tenants. I guess my point about the profit from rental income is that public housing pays its way. It is not due to the public housing system that Homes Victoria is on the brink of financial collapse.

The CHAIR: Kerrie, I do not mean to interrupt you, but are you happy if we explore some of these through questions as well because I do note the time, and I do not want to –

Kerrie BYRNE: Can I go for 2 more minutes?

The CHAIR: Two more minutes, but I am just conscious of time, that is all.

Kerrie BYRNE: Okay, thanks. If Homes Victoria is on the brink of financial collapse, it is clearly due to the reckless extent of estate redevelopments and the need to purchase or rent places on the private market for relocating tenants.

The other gigantic expense is the Ground Lease Model, which is sheer financial lunacy. The first seven GLM sites will cost around \$2 billion in capital grants and service payments, albeit across 40 years, but those costs or service payments are likely to rise due to wages and construction costs. These GLM redevelopments are revenue negative for the government, whereas the estates could have been redeveloped and managed as public housing, which would have been far more cost effective. At the GLM sites, none of the rents from the tenancies are passed back to government – that is not part of the arrangement.

Homes Victoria is being propped up by grants from DFFH, presumably in order to fund the redevelopments. But it means that the public housing system is being starved of funds, as I have shown with the example of my estate. Yet the Board of Homes Victoria is comprised of people with stellar financial and development expertise, but they cannot seem to rein in the spending. Their reckless decisions on mass redevelopments are socially harmful, as you have heard from so many residents in these hearings. Why weren't these extravagant redevelopments properly budgeted for in the first place? And just to quote from this Herald-Sun article in 2022, October:

Homes Victoria has warned Treasurer Tim Pallas that without a significant cash injection it won't have enough money to cover 'core business expenditure'.

Homes Victoria keeps getting very large grants from the department – of around \$500 million or \$800 million every year since then. Could it be that the intention is to bankrupt the public housing system in order to justify further transfers to the corporatised housing associations? I certainly hope not.

The sensible solution would be to abolish Homes Victoria and bring public housing operations back into government, severed from the external pressure which regards inner city estates as development opportunities. That way a tighter rein could be kept on spending and more socially constructive decision-making would hopefully occur. Ideally public housing should not be a housing of last resort. If it was being built in sufficient quantity to meet the demand for it, then down the track a few years 20 per cent of new construction could be allocated to people on moderate incomes, such as emergency service workers and the so-called working poor who struggle to find affordable private rentals near their place of work. This would be a far superior outcome to the so-called affordable housing platform, which charges near-market rents and has been beset with building faults post construction. Thank you.

The CHAIR: Very good. I am going to cede my time because we are running short, and I will hand over to Mr Galea straightaway.

Kerrie BYRNE: Sorry if I went on a bit.

The CHAIR: No, that is all right. We got a lot of information, so I appreciate that. But I will hand over to Mr Galea.

Michael GALEA: Thank you, Chair. Thank you very much, both. Just to begin with, would you support the idea of more people having the opportunity to live in social housing or indeed even housing more generally in these places where there is better access to services and other amenities?

Kerrie BYRNE: Sorry, I missed the first part of the question. Would I support –

Michael GALEA: More people having the option to live in these areas, such as is provided with the minimum 10 per cent uplift in social housing in the redevelopments.

Kerrie BYRNE: Well, that is a hypothetical question. What we are advocating for is public housing. Obviously a 10 per cent increase in social housing across those sites is minimal. You are not going to fix the waiting list with just 10 per cent. I think the program is more about finding investment opportunities for the superannuation funds. What we would support, I think, is that if it was public housing, as I said, and you were constructing the number of buildings required to meet the need of people on the waiting list, then you could open the eligibility criteria to people on higher incomes. But we just do not buy the affordable housing platform. I mean, come on – 10 per cent below market rent is not affordable.

Michael GALEA: That is the minimum; it is not necessarily the final outcome. But you would support more social housing in these areas –

Kerrie BYRNE: Obviously, yes. More social housing is needed.

Michael GALEA: or would you prefer it to be built in the outer suburbs or the regions?

Kerrie BYRNE: Yes, but that does not mean that people who are living in the inner city now in public housing should be relocated to the outer suburbs, where there are less –

Michael GALEA: Quite, and I just actually want to pick up on what you were commenting on before, with the importance of ageing in place. I agree with much of what you said. There is commitment that people will be able to come back to their homes in the new towers. Is that something that you support? Is there something that can be done to improve that for people?

Kerrie BYRNE: To improve what?

Michael GALEA: The guarantee that people will be able to come back to their homes.

The CHAIR: Mr Galea, time is up, I am afraid, but if you want to respond in the next 20 seconds or so, that is fine.

Kerrie BYRNE: My understanding on the ground is that some residents relocating from Flemington towers have requested that offer to return in writing, and they have not received it. So that is something that the government needs to work on – to actually committing to giving people a right of return.

The CHAIR: Ms Gray-Barberio.

Anasina GRAY-BARBERIO: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Kerrie and Clare, for being here. The committee today has heard a fair bit about Homes Victoria pressuring residents to move out. Can you tell us a bit about Barak Beacon and the experience of public housing residents there?

Kerrie BYRNE: Yes, sure. Can I just read you out a few of the case studies?

Anasina GRAY-BARBERIO: Sure.

Kerrie BYRNE: Does that answer your question – like how they were treated? Is that what you were interested in?

Anasina GRAY-BARBERIO: Yes, if you would not mind sharing that?

Kerrie BYRNE: Great. Okay. So, a man in his 90s accepted relocation offers five times, only to have the offers withdrawn. He then accepted an apartment that needed repairs, which was not ready by the time he had to move, so he was put in a temporary apartment and the repairs were never completed. He became completely unsettled, could not get any justice from Housing and then passed away after two years of very sad stress. One severely disabled woman was put in a private rental and was told accessibility modifications would be done, but after she moved the landlord refused to make the modifications or even do basic maintenance.

One older woman ended up in hospital following her relocation as she was so traumatised by having to sever the ties with her home of many years. I think she went looking for her cat and got disorientated, and they took her to hospital for an assessment. She has been in a nursing home ever since. She was someone who used to walk around the estate every day with her walker, and she was a much-loved resident. But since then she has been in a nursing home.

Another older woman died due to health complications, most likely brought on by the sudden announcement and then the relocation stress. She had a fear of lifts, which she clearly communicated to the relocation staff, but she was repeatedly offered upper storey apartments. She then accepted places only to have them withdrawn. She finally accepted a place that was not in Port Phillip but died very unexpectedly the day before she was to sign the lease. So there are real-world consequences to the decisions made by Homes Victoria and the Government.

Anasina GRAY-BARBERIO: Thanks, Kerrie. In your experience with previous relocation processes, what have residents been told will happen if they refuse two offers of relocation?

Kerrie BYRNE: They could be handed an eviction notice. But what we usually advise people to do is to hold your ground, because what we found with Barak Beacon was that people were eventually offered a decent place – the sort of place that they needed. So even if they are told they will have to be evicted, I think the tactic is to stand your ground.

Anasina GRAY-BARBERIO: Thank you.

The CHAIR: I will now pass over to Mr Batchelor.

Ryan BATCHELOR: Thanks, Chair. Kerrie, Clare, thanks so much for joining us today and also for the submission. It was very detailed, very comprehensive, and I think members of the committee particularly appreciated a lot of the historical context that was put into the submission.

Kerrie BYRNE: Of my submission?

Ryan BATCHELOR: Yes.

Kerrie BYRNE: Oh, thank you.

Ryan BATCHELOR: I think it was the one that was attached to the – yes, it was yours. The Save Public Housing Collective submission.

Kerrie BYRNE: Not the main one. I did a separate one for myself, but I did mention all the history in there.

Ryan BATCHELOR: Yes, and your one as well. I think it was really good, and helpful for us. Just to clarify, there were obviously some pretty distressing stories you read out from Barak Beacon. Were you suggesting that the process contributed to some of those outcomes? It is a bit of a significant claim to make.

Kerrie BYRNE: Of course it did, because these are people's long-established homes. If you read in my submission also the direct accounts from the Flemington Towers residents – I put those in my submission because we had a few residents' meetings; the Save Public Housing Collective organised several residents' meetings at Flemington – I do not know what else I can say about it. You know, if you are happy in your home and you have got your community there, and then you are suddenly told you have to move from there for probably at least three years – and as I said, they are not getting right-of-return put in writing at the moment at Flemington – of course it is going to be utterly traumatic.

Ryan BATCHELOR: I have just got limited time.

Kerrie BYRNE: Sorry.

Ryan BATCHELOR: That is okay. Do you think that means that we can never go through a process of moving people out to rebuild estates or to build more?

Kerrie BYRNE: Right. Okay. Well –

Ryan BATCHELOR: Is it forever? Does someone have a right to stay in that house forever, or can the government say, 'We need to renovate for the collective better good?'

Kerrie BYRNE: Firstly, you need to demonstrate that the redevelopments would be to make better housing, not for some other spurious reasons, like at Barak Beacon. There was no need for that estate to be redeveloped.

Ryan BATCHELOR: Not even if is going to have a 43 per cent increase in the amount of social housing on the site?

Kerrie BYRNE: Is it that much?

Ryan BATCHELOR: Yes.

Kerrie BYRNE: Well, it was originally 10 per cent.

Ryan BATCHELOR: It is 43 per cent.

Kerrie BYRNE: No, I think because they are done very insensitively – that is the point. You could have done infill. That is my whole point. You did not need to bundle everyone out. You could have done a sensitive refurbishment, as the OFFICE architects had proposed. That way it is also much more focused on people's wellbeing because you do one block at a time, and then you can usually move them into somewhere else on the estate. I assume that Simon Robinson would have talked about that this morning. My estate was a redevelopment, I think it was grungy walk-ups before, but it was rebuilt as 100 per cent public housing. That is the way that things used to be done. I think there is far too much focus on demolishing public housing at the moment. That is the only way I can answer the question.

The CHAIR: I am going to pass it over now to Ms Payne.

Rachel PAYNE: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Kerrie and Clare, for presenting for us today and your submission. I am just going to ask one question, just being mindful of time. In relation to your submission, you highlight that the tenants of the 44 towers have been promised the right to return if the property meets their

household needs. Previously we have seen rebuilt public housing has converted many three- and four-bedroom dwellings into one- and two-bedroom dwellings, so I would like to understand: is there a concern amongst the community that you are speaking to that the right to return may not be fit for purpose?

Kerrie BYRNE: Well, there is a need for bigger places for some of the larger families, so that needs to be taken into consideration.

Rachel PAYNE: Yes. Maybe I will rephrase my question just to be a bit more specific. Is there concern or worry that families will not be able to return to one of the 44 towers?

Kerrie BYRNE: That is right, because unless they are given a letter saying they have the right to return, then it is just something someone said at a meeting. Homes Victoria staff might – my understanding is in the beginning of the consultation process at Flemington, they said that people would be able to return. And of course the other problem for larger families is the very small size of the new community housing places at Victoria Street, Flemington, and Abbotsford Street, North Melbourne. People have moved there, but the bedrooms are very small. Those places have been described as ‘tofu cubes’ by one resident. So yes, we definitely need to be building places with, at least three large bedrooms. There need to be some places for larger families. But Homes Victoria would have all this in their data.

Rachel PAYNE: Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

The CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Payne. I will go now to Ms Terpstra, who is online.

Sonja TERPSTRA: Thank you, Chair, and I just want to say thank you to you, Kerrie and Clare, for coming along today. You do some really important work as genuine grassroots community advocates, so I want to thank you for the work that you do. I am at a disadvantage because I am online and I cannot see any clock, Chair, so I trust that I will get my right allocated time.

Firstly to you, Kerrie: I was listening very carefully to what you were saying, and although you were saying that Homes Victoria did tell tenants when there were meetings to discuss relocations that they would have a right to return, it sounds like there is a bit of a lack of trust there at the moment. You are saying there is nothing in writing, despite people being told that they would have a right to return. What do you think Homes Victoria or government could do to improve the trust there? Is it because people are getting conflicting information from external third parties, or is there not enough information coming from Homes Victoria or housing organisations? How could things be improved?

Kerrie BYRNE: Well, as far as the right to return goes, it has to be in writing, either in a letter or as part of a lease agreement. When they move into the new place, you make the right of return one of the lease conditions. Does that answer your question?

Sonja TERPSTRA: What do you think? Why do you think people do not trust what they are being told? Are other people undermining what they are being told? Is there conflicting information? Why do you think people –

Kerrie BYRNE: No, I do not think so. I think it is simply that Homes Victoria has refused to put in writing the right to return. I do not think it has got anything to do with external organisations giving conflicting information. They do not have a right to return at the moment – until it is put in writing.

Sonja TERPSTRA: Well, they do. They do have a right to return. But you are saying unless it is in writing, people are not confident about it.

Kerrie BYRNE: They are not convinced, because they have been through a lot with this relocation stuff. I do not want to speak anymore, because I think we need to give Clare a go. I wanted to give an example of a Flemington tenant and how they have been treated, but I will leave it for now.

Sonja TERPSTRA: Sure. Clare, did you want to add anything?

Clare HANSON: My little talk is more emotive than Kerrie’s. Kerrie came along with all the facts and figures. If I am allotted 5 minutes – am I allotted 5 minutes?

Sonja TERPSTRA: I do not know. Chair, what is on the clock?

The CHAIR: The clock is not looking so great at the moment. But do you know what, Clare, you have got a couple of minutes if you want to respond. That is fine. But I am also conscious that Mr Puglielli has got questions and it is already 2 minutes past our close time for this session.

Sonja TERPSTRA: Well, Clare, give us what you can as quickly as you can.

Clare HANSON: Okay. I will give you what I can. Where I live was one of the first estates bought by the Chifley government after the Second World War. The flat I live in was constructed in 1947. It is double brick. It has sprung wooden floors. It has been checked by surveyors, who have said these buildings could last another hundred years. The tower is the same. We have had surveyors in the one on Racecourse Road who have said the same. We were required to hand over our evidence to that at the class action recently; however, Homes Victoria were not required to hand over any information as to why they are no longer fit for purpose. I find that a little bit unfair.

On the right to return, they pulled down one street here in Dunlop Avenue, and it took six years to rebuild. Are you going to move house, with your children in a new school perhaps, and then move back again six years later? So with the right to return, even if it was on a piece of paper that is signed, people are not going to; they do not return. I do not know very many who have returned, because they have set up a life somewhere else. Would you want to move every six years? Also on the relocating of people, if Homes Victoria have stock to put these people in, why do we have a waiting list of nearly 100,000 homeless people?

Sonja TERPSTRA: Thanks, Clare.

The CHAIR: Thanks, Ms Terpstra. I am going to hand it over to Mr Puglielli now.

Aiv PUGLIELLI: Thank you, Chair. I will try and keep it to one question, just in the interests of time. But before I ask it, I just want to clarify an earlier point, Kerrie. With Barak Beacon specifically, are there any public homes set to go back to that estate when it is rebuilt?

Kerrie BYRNE: No. It is one of the Ground Lease Stage 2 developments.

Aiv PUGLIELLI: Okay. There are other types of housing but not public at that site?

Kerrie BYRNE: Pardon?

Aiv PUGLIELLI: There are no public homes for that particular estate?

Kerrie BYRNE: No. All the Ground Lease projects are through a consortium, and Community Housing Limited is the consortium leader.

Aiv PUGLIELLI: Right, okay. Sorry, I just wanted to clarify that from the earlier line of questioning. I will ask a question to both of you, and Clare, if you want to have a go at answering first, just to keep you included in the conversation, that would be great. You are a grassroots collective. You are working with and for the community at that level. Can I ask: have you engaged with government MPs or the government at any stage, and can you characterise what those experiences have been like? What have they told you? Clare, do you want to go first?

Kerrie BYRNE: Yes, I will let Clare answer that.

Clare HANSON: I have had quite a few meetings with politicians – Sam Ratnam was one, although she is no longer there, Gabrielle de Vietri, Bill Shorten when he was in office. As far as what Bill Shorten said, I do not know if I should swear – well, I will not – but he said that Dan Andrews' final parting, the 'We're pulling them all down,' was the 'most effing stupid thing' he had ever heard. There is no need for these buildings to come down, and none of them are being replaced with public housing. And I think we should remember that public housing belongs to us, not the government. Us – it is ours. It is a public asset. And we cannot get a meeting with Minister Shing. She will not talk to us at all.

Aiv PUGLIELLI: Okay. Thank you, Clare. Kerrie, did you want to add to that?

Kerrie BYRNE: No, I am good with that.

Aiv PUGLIELLI: You are all good? Okay. I think just in the interest of time I might stop there. But thank you both for your contributions, both in writing and in person. Thanks.

The CHAIR: Okay. Thanks very much for that. That ends this session. I want to thank both of you very much for your time and your evidence today, and you can rest assured that it is taken on board. You will get a copy of the proof version of the transcript when it is available to you, and you can make any minor corrections that you need to. But from there, we will finish up. Thanks very much. Appreciate it.

Witnesses withdrew.