

PERTH WATERFRONT PROJECT

Motion

MR J.N. HYDE (Perth) [4.00 pm]: I seek leave to move the motion on the notice paper in an amended form.

Leave granted.

Mr J.N. HYDE: I move —

That in relation to the Perth Waterfront project, this house calls on the Barnett government to —

- (1) fully and transparently answer all concerns raised by its own departments and agencies as detailed in the metropolitan region scheme report submissions;
- (2) fully and transparently answer all concerns raised by independent experts and stakeholders as detailed in the MRS report submissions; and
- (3) fully and transparently answer all outstanding concerns regarding the \$440 million budget and time line for this project.

The opposition is so concerned with the minister's handling of the very important waterfront project that we have allocated a large amount of time in our debating period to give him the opportunity to deliver on what he promised in February this year. When he produced the amended report on the waterfront project, he stated that the process allows for extensive community consultation and discussion in Parliament before a final decision is made. He has not afforded us any time in Parliament for discussion of the waterfront project.

Mr J.H.D. Day: We're doing it right now

Mr J.N. HYDE: He has not delivered. It has again fallen on the loyal opposition to carry through the work of government. Let us be clear; the opposition is in favour of a waterfront project. What we want to do today is to raise our serious concerns about the minister's stewardship of this project and exactly what he is spending \$440 million of taxpayers' money on. It is \$440 million at a time when escalating utility prices are being inflicted on the taxpayers of Western Australia by the Barnett government. The minister really does need to be accountable for every dollar spent.

Let us be clear. On 22 May the minister put out a press release stating that the waterfront project will require just \$270 million in government funding—May 22, a press release, his name, after the budget. Of course, we have now discovered that the real cost of this very troubled project has ballooned out to \$440 million. I thank the minister for the briefing by his department officials late last week. I was able to glean from that official briefing that the minister was deliberately waiting until after the March 2013 election before closing Riverside Drive. The most contentious issue in this project, the one issue that in all the submissions and all the reports sticks out as being the real bugbear of his waterfront project, is his decision to close Riverside Drive. He will not undertake this most contentious capital works on the project until mid-2013. More alarming, having had the technical briefing, is that he really cannot do a lot of the important capital works on this project, such as the perimeter piling of the new inlet, until Riverside Drive has been dug up and moved. He cannot complete the piling needed to get the inlet correctly aligned and ready for operation until that happens. The Barnett government is now talking up getting the G20 meeting to Perth in 2014, and it will be going in with a bid when 10 hectares of prime riverside land will be a building site. This is what the government will be offering compared with Sydney Harbour, Melbourne and even Darwin. Because of its sloth as a government, it will deliberately stall this project until after the election, so that motorists and others will not be inconvenienced—because the minister knows that it will mean inconvenience under his stewardship of this project—and then it will start on the nasty bits.

There has not been transparency. The minister promised open discussion in Parliament before a decision would be made. Please, minister, give us the exact figures of where this \$440 million in public works will be spent. Even after his own stated intention of \$440 million being spent, all we are really getting is a hole in the ground, because he is not delivering on what should be the prime piece of public infrastructure in this development, which is the Indigenous cultural centre. Not one cent in that \$440 million allocation from the Barnett government is for the Indigenous cultural centre. As well, the minister has been putting out glossy plans and photographs showing the wonderful cable car that will come down from Kings Park. There is not a brass razoo in the \$440 million budget for it. The minister needs to transparently and openly tell the Parliament and the people of Western Australia what the \$440 million will be spent on.

Although the minister and others in his government have had thought bubbles about how they will get away with moving the state heritage-listed Florence Hummerston house across the road to the Supreme Court Gardens, I have discovered that the minister has ditched that plan. It will not be moved to the Supreme Court Gardens; it

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

will be taken down, brick by brick, floorboard by floorboard, tile by tile, and each heritage brick, each heritage tile and each heritage floorboard will be individually numbered and put into storage. Although the minister is not the Minister for Heritage, I think he understands not only how important but also how expensive proper heritage preservation and storage is. The budget has a set allocation for the cost of dismantling, storing, moving and re-erecting Florence Hummerston house somewhere else. The minister needs to be up-front with the people of Western Australia and tell us exactly how much of the \$440 million is needed to do that job properly and professionally. More importantly, he needs to tell us what his plan is for Florence Hummerston house. It is an important piece of heritage. We now know that the City of Perth has added to the weight of disapproval about moving Florence Hummerston house to the Supreme Court Gardens, so the government has ditched that idea. Where is the government going to put it? What is the use of pulling down a very expensive and extensive piece of heritage, brick by brick, floorboard by floorboard, tile by tile, if there is no planned use for it later on? The Minister for Planning knows from the public submissions on the metropolitan region scheme amendment that heritage expert after heritage expert has reminded the minister about the Burra charter and its principles on removing heritage buildings. We need to know from the Minister for Planning and the Minister for Heritage whether it is the heritage policy of the Barnett government to ditch the Burra charter and to now remove inconvenient heritage buildings. Let us be open with the developers and say to them that state heritage will no longer be an impediment if a developer wants to build a cheap and nasty tilt-up or a magnificent edifice because the heritage buildings can just be removed now that that is the new policy of the Barnett government. The minister needs to give a transparent response.

Let us consider other questions about the Perth Waterfront project. The City of Perth is demanding to have a seat on the project committee. When we debated the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority Bill 2011, the Minister for Planning quite openly said that one of the reasons the legislation had to be passed was so that the authority would be operating by 1 January and could take over control of the Perth Waterfront project. We have now discovered that although the MRA may legally have control of an area, until it actually publishes its planning scheme it is not able to operate as the governing authority. All those wonderful provisions in the bill that we debated late into the night to ensure that local authorities and stakeholders would be consulted will not be needed because the project will be developed under the Western Australian Planning Commission, which, of course, has an exemption under section 8 of the act and will not be legally bound by the consultation provisions that are enshrined in the MRA act. Although the MRA act is in place, we may not have a scheme that enables the MRA to legally operate in this district for a year or possibly more. A lot of the work will be done without transparent public scrutiny because it will not be transparent under the operation of the MRA.

The government needs to be up-front about whether the bid to host the G20 meeting in 2014 is dinkum or is just another thought bubble. What is the role of the waterfront in that? The government made a lot of play during the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting about the sign of Perth that was beautifully angled so that it included the wonderful Council House building that was lit up, showcasing the wonderful work that the City of Perth is doing. However, it will not be able to be seen from the same position at the time of the G20 meeting because 10 hectares of the city will be a building site. The Minister for Planning needs to be up-front about that.

The City of Perth is putting up its hand to be compensated for Allan Green Conservatory and Florence Hummerston building. Neither of those buildings can continue to be leased out for commercial purposes during the construction of the Perth Waterfront project. The Minister for Planning is quoted in today's paper as saying that he is happy to consider the council's requests for compensation. That is very jolly of the minister. Can he tell Parliament how happy he is and what is the cost impost of being happy to consider that proposal? How much compensation will he hand over to the City of Perth? How much within the budget of \$440 million is he budgeting for compensation for the City of Perth and for other existing operations? What are the figures in the budget to compensate private sector tourism operators who will be disrupted when Riverside Drive is being dug up and traffic is being redirected? What are the budget allocations for those things? Everything comes back to money in government, unfortunately. Members can be great visionaries like the Minister for Planning and me, but in the end the Treasury types clip our wings. We need to know how much of the minister's wings have been clipped and exactly what percentage of the \$440 million will be spent on the heritage works and the piling works for the inlet. I understand that although some government members do not see the intrinsic beauty and wonder of Perth Arena that perhaps the member for South Perth and I will enjoy when we see wonderful events there —

Mr J.E. McGrath: I hope I live long enough!

Mr J.N. HYDE: The member will certainly see something in that venue before he sees anything on the waterfront, unless he wears snorkels!

The people behind the development of Perth Arena are the same people the minister has awarded the tender for the Perth Waterfront project. The visionary Perth Arena, of course, is a wonderful tribute to the previous Labor

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

government. As the local member for Perth, I remember the complaints I got from local residents and businesses during its construction when the piles were being driven in around the building's perimeter. The minister's experts have told me in a briefing that the same type of piling work will be done all the way around the inlet when the waterfront project is developed. The very important piling will be expensive, noisy and time consuming, and it cannot be properly completed until the work on Riverside Drive is done. The minister needs to be up-front with the people living in Lawson apartments and my other constituents who live nearby. If the government is extending this project until after the election, will the residents have to put up with metal piling work being done around that extensive inlet for two years? Will the sand that will be gradually taken out in trucks and be subject to the vagaries of the Fremantle doctor and other natural phenomena lie in piles for two, three or four years? What is the cost for all these activities?

The minister has announced a budget of \$440 million for the project. He must be transparent to this Parliament, including about the day—excuse the pun—when the government will get a return on some of its investment of that \$440 million. The minister stated that there would be upward of a 30 per cent increase in the amount of office space in central Perth because of the new office buildings that will be built by the private sector on the Perth waterfront site. Let us be transparent about the income side of the project. Exactly what date and which decade does the minister expect that he will start to get money from a land sale and a building development? Some members of Parliament might like the idea that someone will want to build an underwater bar in the inlet just like in Dubai. Maybe that is the type of attraction that a regional member, such as the member for Geraldton, might like to see developed in Geraldton harbour. If the government has plans for one of the commercial operations to be a very expensive underwater bar in the inlet, we need to know more details about it. We have glossy visions of a wonderful cable car coming down from Kings Park but there is not a brass razoo for its funding. The Indigenous cultural museum does not have a cent in funding. We need all of these details so that the people of Western Australia can be confident that the minister knows what he is doing with this project and this investment.

There are some really well thought out responses in the submissions received on the metropolitan region scheme amendment. Many of them come from the government's own departments such as the Department of Sport and Recreation, which says it is concerned about the loss of open space in this project. We do not really have a government or ministerial response to that concern. What is the minister's response to the issue of losing open space? The Department of Indigenous Affairs advised that the consultation with the South West Aboriginal Land and Sea Council did not constitute appropriate consultation.

As the local member of Parliament for the area, I have a few views on transport access, and I will leave it to our excellent shadow Minister for Transport, at another time and another place, to try to seek the government's exact position on the excellent submissions regarding the transport problems and the submissions from many of my constituents regarding those problems. In the briefing from the minister's planning people, I was told that the rest of Riverside Drive, from the waterfront project, would become two-way, that Mounts Bay Road would become two-way, and that they were not quite sure which route buses would take, be it on the Mounts Bay Road or the Riverside Drive two-way road. Therefore the minister needs to discuss and be transparent about a whole lot of transport issues that are integral to proper planning. The Minister for Transport today threw the issue back onto Perth Airport saying that Perth Airport in its planning will have to build a beautiful underground terminus for a railway line in the future. If the building of the new terminus is commenced at the international airport next year, a very expensive concrete cavern will be built ready for a train to get in. We need to know what provisions the minister has made, not only for transport, but for everything else underground. Does the minister know what is underground? Our shadow Minister for Water will have some questions about that, because not only has an archaeology report been made for the area, but also a few pipes bring liquids in and take liquids and solids out. The minister needs to give us full information on those issues. I turn to the archaeology report. I asked a question on notice to the minister, and he provided a detailed answer indicating all the archaeology work that had been undertaken by experts from the University of Western Australia and elsewhere. We need to know the costings of that work, what was involved and what the minister will do with that work.

Let us look at the submission from the National Trust. Its submission is dated 24 May, and was included in the government's official submissions. It was written by deputy chief executive officer Enzo Sirna, who is a good friend of a number of people on the government's side of the house and also on Labor's side of the house through his excellent work with the National Trust. He again comments on the Burra charter quoting from article 9.1, which states —

The physical location of a *place* is part of its *cultural significance*. A building, work or other component of a place should remain in its historical location.

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

Mr Sirna commented on article 9.3 stating that the objectives of the master plan do not necessarily require the relocation of the Florence Hummerston building and therefore retention should be considered.

The government's master plan contains what looks like a triangle sail jobby from Bunnings or something—some sort of pavilion. Therefore, it is quite conceivable that, whatever the proposal, a heritage building could be incorporated.

What is more important in the submissions is the topic of the heritage contribution of Lawson Flats, which provide a very important part of Perth's heritage—probably the most important part of what is left in the CBD of our residential heritage. As members know, the Lawson building is an 11-storey building on the corner of Sherwood Court and The Esplanade. It was constructed in 1937, and built as a companion piece to the now-destroyed CML building that was built in 1936 and demolished in 1980; we all remember who was Premier then. In its context, the building is an important part of the heritage of WA, and its heritage is embellished by the position of The Esplanade that allows us to appreciate that very important 11-storey 1937 building. The government proposals will block it out, cage it in and destroy a lot of its cultural significance. When we consider how much of the heritage in that district has gone, we really need to pay attention to what the Perth Waterfront project will do. The minister has not answered these very important submissions; he has not given a government response to the submissions. We have important contributions from a number of planning experts in Western Australia on problems with the government's waterfront project. We have submissions from the History Council of Western Australia, and tomorrow night or next Thursday night it will conduct a public seminar regarding the Perth Waterfront project. A number of other people have commented, not only heritage experts, but also other people who are concerned about the history of the WA and that site in the parades of the RSL. A very different type of activity has been happening in that public space compared with further along the riverfront at Langley Park. Again, its preservation as open space for heritage was an issue brought on by the opposition, and in response to which the minister acted. Therefore, it was good enough for constituents and heritage lovers at one end of the river, but the same consideration has not been given to The Esplanade.

The City of Perth's position, from its meeting last night, has been quite strong in terms of the questions it wants answered by the government. Again, we keep going back to the \$440 million, and the government being transparent about what the money will be used for. I hark back to the Minister for Planning's media statement of 22 May, which states —

“Work will start on the Waterfront project as soon as the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting ... is over, with major public works expected to be completed by the end of 2014. The total cost to Government is estimated at \$270 million.”

The cost on 22 May was \$270 million, and we now know, as confirmed by the minister's own planning people, that the current figure is \$440 million.

Mr J.H.D. Day: One figure is net cost and the other is gross cost.

Mr J.N. HYDE: Again, that goes back to my earlier points: Does the minister truly think that the net cost, including that of any land sold and any interest paid back on the borrowing costs and the other costs of running the MRA and other projects associated with this can be kept at \$270 million? Is a net cost of \$270 million an accurate and correct figure? The government has given no indication about the land to be sold or for what price it will be sold, or when construction will be complete. A very simple question has been asked: when will people be able to sit down at the inlet in this government's waterfront project and drink a cup of coffee? I think that is a very simple question to ask. If the government has done the work—certainly, the planning people indicate that a lot of work has happened in the budget—there is no reason the minister cannot transparently provide the information.

I will finish soon and hand over to my colleague and other shadow minister the member for Cockburn. However, I again hark back to the Perth Waterfront project amendment report by the government of Western Australia, dated February 2011, in which the minister stated that the process allows for extensive community consultation and discussion in Parliament before a final decision is made.

All the discussion has been one-way as a result of the opposition asking valid questions. All the public discussion has been one-way in the number of excellent submissions raising concerns about the project. All we have had back from the minister is a glossy diagram, plans and a picture or two on corflute, but we have not been given the exact figures in a budget so that the public of Western Australia can be confident that the Barnett government will spend \$440 million wisely and that we will not be left with a massive hole in the ground.

MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn) [4.31 pm]: I join my colleague the member for Perth in seeking from the Minister for Planning an explanation about the Perth Waterfront project, which is slated to cost \$440 million in today's terms. I put to the minister that that amount is very much at the bottom end of the total cost of this

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

project to the state of Western Australia. I ask the minister whether he honestly thinks that \$440 million is a realistic sum of money for the completion of this project. I am not talking about completion with the construction of the buildings, but the completion of the land development to be completed by the state. I asked the minister to confirm whether the \$440 million will cover the entire cost of bringing the Perth Waterfront project to the construction phase—that is the construction of the buildings on the waterfront area—because of recent building and earthworks experience on sites in the Perth CBD similar to but perhaps easier to develop than the Perth waterfront area. The example I give is one the member for Vasse, being the former minister responsible for the project, loves to cite; namely, the Perth Arena. The member for Vasse was quite correct when earlier today he referred once again to the Perth Arena project as one that initially was to be constructed without an underground car park. When, as the then minister, I announced the project at a cost of \$168 million, it did not make provision for an underground car park. That was a later addition promoted, by the way, by the Department of Treasury after its modelling indicated that it was a far better return on the operational costs of the project to include an underground car park. I argued strongly against it, because the number of car parks already available in Perth made it unnecessary. Nevertheless, it was endorsed and successive ministers picked up the new concept of building a Perth Arena with an underground car park. One of the reasons that I as the minister strongly objected to the inclusion of an underground car park is that water is located only a few metres below the surface—former lakes and wetlands existed before they were filled in for the railway and the link between Northbridge and the Perth CBD area. It was obvious that if we were to start digging on that site, we would hit water, and once we had hit water, the reinforcing and pumping of concrete to the site to stop the intrusion of water would be an absolute nightmare. As minister I did not want to go anywhere near it because I knew there was going to be a problem.

Mr J.H.D. Day: But for this project, we want water in it.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Yes, we do, but in the first instance, we did not. It is one step after another. There will be water in it eventually, but before we have water, we need to ensure that the water is controlled and does not leach into other areas, particularly in the CBD, surrounding the Perth Waterfront project. Hence, there will be a time in the construction process during which water will not be wanted in order to allow the waterfront walls to be reinforced. That will not be done underwater. That will be done without any water around and will require reinforcing of the walls and massive amounts of earthworks. The Perth Arena project is probably the latest example of a massive cost blowout because of an underground car park and the amount of work required to pull it off. I put it strongly to the minister that it will be exactly the same for the Perth Waterfront project; in fact, it will be worse because the riverbank has been laid down over tens of thousands of years. I do not know what the geotechnical reports say about the riverbank in the area, and it will be interesting for the general public and particularly this house if the minister were to inform the house about the geotechnical work done so far, and if it has not been done, when it is done, and to table that geotechnical work. I believe that the geotechnical work will show that it will be necessary to go down a long way to get to the solid rock in which to anchor the reinforcing and the pile-driving required for the Perth Waterfront project. That is where the costs will start to come to the fore. The costs are not tens of thousands of dollars; they are not even hundreds of thousands of dollars, but tens of millions of dollars—in some cases hundreds of millions of dollars—to ensure a project of that scale, which is much, much bigger than the land area of the Perth Arena, is done to a quality and a standard that will ensure not only the safety of the buildings to be constructed around it, but also the environmental protection of the river.

We can look at similar earthworks projects on a much smaller scale. If we look at the cost blow-out for that Perth Arena project, because of the amount of earthworks and reinforcements that was needed to ensure the stability and safety of the underground car park, and if we transpose those costs onto a much, much bigger project such as the Perth Waterfront project and then look at a far more difficult situation where rock bolting and pile driving needs to be done, I would strongly suggest that the costs will be far more significant than they were for the Perth Arena project. If that is the case, the \$440 million that has been allocated to the project will be the starting amount of money that will be needed to conclude that project. It will not be the final amount of money by any stretch of the imagination. That will just be in ensuring the stability of the Perth waterfront walls and the geotechnical quality of the Perth Waterfront project.

The other issue on which I would like to get some information from the minister is the Perth central sewerage station, which is located underground in the Perth Waterfront project area. The Water Corporation has indicated that moving the associated pipe work—it will have to be moved—is very complex from an engineering point of view. As a result of its complexity from an engineering perspective, it will be very expensive. The Perth central sewerage station will have to be relocated from its current site and its piping will consequently have to be relocated from its current site to somewhere else, I presume, along the Perth waterfront area, possibly further up on the other side of the Supreme Court in Langley Park. I am not sure where it will go, because it certainly cannot go back towards the conference facilities. I would presume that a project of that size could only go towards Langley Park. If that is the case, how much will it cost to relocate that sewerage facility? It is not a

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

situation in which the sewerage facility can just be forgotten about; it is the sewerage facility for the entire CBD of Perth. It is large and complex, and it will have to be relocated. It will probably be relocated at least a kilometre away from its current site. That means big bucks. There will be a huge bill from Water Corporation to the Western Australian Planning Commission or whoever will be running the Perth Waterfront project. Once again, it comes back to the total amount of \$440 million that has been allocated to this project.

I put it to the minister that if we look at just those two elements of the entire project—the central sewerage station and the geotechnical work, from rock bolting to pile driving, needed to stabilise the project—\$440 million will not even cover those costs. What will be the end cost of the Perth Waterfront project to Western Australia and to the government of Western Australia? I put it strongly to the minister that that figure of \$440 million is nowhere near enough to cover even part of that project, never mind the completion of the entire project. Those are my questions to the minister. I am particularly interested in the one that relates to the Perth central sewerage station. The minister's own project team has identified that as an issue for the Perth Waterfront project. I think it is appropriate that people in Western Australia know exactly how complex the project is to move the Perth central sewerage station and how much it will cost the taxpayers of Western Australia.

MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Minister for Planning) [4.44 pm]: I am very happy to have the opportunity to make some comments on the Perth Waterfront project, because it is a major project for Perth and Western Australia. It has been talked about for 30 years or so in one form or another, but until this point, nothing has ever happened in reality on the ground. A lot of planning has been done and a lot of concepts have been prepared. There has been a lot of discussion and, generally speaking, agreement that there should be much better activation of the bank of the Swan River close to the Perth CBD and that a much better connection should be established between the Perth CBD and the wonderful Swan River, but until this point none of that has occurred. The reality is that under the Liberal–National government the project is a reality. The funds have been allocated, and a lot of the preparatory work is underway now, as it has been for the last year or 18 months. The project is very much becoming a reality.

Contributions from the opposition raised some valid issues, but I get the feeling that, although the member for Perth indicates the opposition supports a waterfront project, in reality the opposition is doing all it can to undermine this project and really does not want it to occur.

Mr M. McGowan: Apart from starting it, you mean. You need to go back to history and look at what happened.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I just said that a lot of designs have been done. A big one was put out in early to mid-2008, known as “Dubai on Swan”. There were other concept plans in the previous 20 or 30 years. Did anything actually happen on the ground?

Mr M. McGowan: You've been in office for three years.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Did it happen? Has it happened yet?

Mr M. McGowan: We allocated the money and commenced the project in early 2008, six months or so before the election. You're saying that we should have commenced it in the six months, yet you've had three years since then.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: You were in office for seven and a half years. The point I am making is that this project has been talked about for decades. Until this point, the funding has not actually been allocated to enable the project to happen in reality. Funds might have been allocated for planning, but I do not think the previous Labor government allocated any substantial amount of funds for the project to actually be constructed.

Just so that everybody knows what we are talking about, I have a copy of the concept plan, which was made public towards the end of last year. That has been refined in detail to some extent.

Mr P. Papalia: Three years to produce that?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: No, no; the member does not understand the process.

This is a plan in a greater amount of detail. In three or four years we will see that this project is actually a reality on the ground. Just in case people are still sceptical about whether it is happening, I can assure them that it is. The only sort of project that I think the opposition is committed to, because it seems there has been quite a bit of backtracking, for example —

Mr J.N. Hyde: The debate is about how you are funding this.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I will come to the funding. I am questioning, first of all, whether the opposition really supports this project or not.

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

Mr J.N. Hyde: You're the government!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: We are doing it, but it would be good to know —

Mr J.N. Hyde: Tell us how you are doing it.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I have another 57 minutes, so just wait. If the member does not understand it yet, he will by the end—maybe.

It was interesting to hear the member for Joondalup on radio this morning. He was interviewed by Geoff Hutchison and said —

The waterfront development ... do we need that right now ... ? Can't we actually postpone some of those things so that we can actually help our people who are hurting here at the moment.

That question was raised by the member for Joondalup, a backbencher. It is not necessarily the view of the opposition as a whole, but I know that only a couple of months ago the Leader of the Opposition made a suggestion that the waterfront project should be deferred. I do not know whether that position was maintained. Can the member for Perth, as shadow Minister for Planning, indicate whether the opposition actually wants this project to be completed?

Mr J.N. Hyde: We are in support of the waterfront project. We want you to get it right. You have to detail to us how you are spending the \$440 million.

Mr F.M. Logan: It is our job to hold you to account.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: That is process of opposition, but it is good to know whether the alternative government of this state—albeit, hopefully, a long way in the future—is supportive of this project occurring or not.

Mr F.M. Logan: If it blows out, of course, like any opposition, we will have major problems with the project.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: In relation to the cost of the project, the member for Perth queried the different figures of \$270 million and \$440 million. The estimated net cost of the project of constructing all of the public works, the inlet, the boardwalks, the island and so on is \$270 million, and the estimated gross cost of doing that is \$440 million, or to be more precise \$438.5 million. The difference is obviously what is estimated to be achieved through land sale, which may vary, of course. Hopefully, the amount achieved through land sales will be higher than the difference between those two figures. That remains to be seen through the sale of land process.

Mr J.N. Hyde: You need to detail it. At the moment you are giving us a back-of-envelope figure. What is it exactly?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Most people would understand that it is impossible to predict with absolute certainty what price will be achieved for a particular piece of land over the next year or two. Detailed estimates of the value of the land have been prepared by qualified valuers and professional advisers to government, but until we actually put something out there in the marketplace it is impossible to be absolutely precise.

Mr J.N. Hyde: Will you table that advice, minister?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I do not intend to provide any more information at this stage on what may be of value to people in the private sector who actually want to buy land here. We want to achieve the best possible outcome for the state and I will follow the process that will achieve that. At the end of the project, or at some appropriate time, all the information will be revealed about what is actually achieved and what are the final costs.

On the points that the member for Cockburn raised, firstly, in relation to the pilings that he described to construct the edge of the project, the retaining walls and so on, I am indebted to the member for Nedlands, an engineer who has had some experience with these sorts of matters. It will not be necessary to drive pilings down to bedrock for the construction of the retaining walls around the inlet. It will be necessary to do that for the construction of the major buildings—the commercial, residential and other buildings—that will eventually be constructed around the inlet on the land that is going to be made available to the private sector. However, that will not be necessary for the construction of the retaining wall.

Mr J.N. Hyde: Your own planning people said that there will be piling around the entire inlet. It may not be down to bedrock, but you will need piling all the way around the inlet.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Of course, some of that will be necessary. I do not pretend to be a technical expert on exactly how all of this will be constructed. I am happy to provide further briefings on those aspects, if that is really necessary. I know that there been a lot of thought and a lot of professional advice sought and received on the

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

construction of this project; and, obviously, we will rely on the advice of professional engineers and others to come up with —

Mr J.N. Hyde: Can you table the costings?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I am not going to table all of the detailed advice that has been received at the moment. This has been a completely professional process by the Department of Planning and the public service of Western Australia. There is no political influence to try to come up with a particular figure. The government has made it clear that it wants this project to be undertaken. We have gone through the process of getting the best estimates on the estimated cost of the project, using appropriate professional advisers, and the government has made the decision to allocate the funding in the budget—it is in the forward estimates—to ensure the project can be undertaken. That is a reality.

The member for Cockburn mentioned a sewerage station. If it is necessary for that to be moved, I have no doubt the cost of doing so is incorporated into the overall budget for the project that has been provided in the total amount of \$438.5 million.

Mr J.N. Hyde: You have got to know exactly! Why won't you tell us?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: As I said, the budget for this project has been determined on the basis of professional advice of engineers, architects, project managers and all of the others involved, including the office of the Department of Planning, and the figure that has then been arrived at is a sum of all of the different components, no doubt with a contingency factor built in. So any relocation of the sewerage station will certainly be built into the overall cost of the equation.

I will go through some of the other points that were raised by the member for Perth, in particular, some of the points that he had made in a media statement that he put out last week and which he also referred to in this place. I need to make the point that there has been some very selective extraction of information from the submissions made through the metropolitan region scheme amendment process, and comments around those submissions. There has been very selective extraction of bits of information on the part of the member for Perth to give quite a misleading impression to people. Let us look initially at the Department of Sport and Recreation's submission, which the member for Perth said was concerned about loss of open space. That is true to an extent; however, when we look at the first comment of the Department of Sport and Recreation, it reads —

- The Department of Sport and Recreation ... is broadly supportive of the proposed Metropolitan Region Scheme ... amendment, however, are conscious that the concept design requires the removal of a significant piece of green Public Open Space ... between Barrack and William Streets.

The department indicates that it is “broadly supportive” of the scheme. Was that mentioned by the member for Perth? I do not think so.

Mr J.N. Hyde: That “however”, is a pretty big however!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: In relation to the substance of the issue, obviously the use of the area that is currently a green open space, grassed area which is used to some extent will change substantially. Will it be a better space overall? Will it be much more active? Will it enable Perth, as the capital of Western Australia, to be more interesting and invigorated and attractive to local people and visitors to our state? Absolutely! Change does involve a trade-off to some extent, but the benefits overall out of this project will be absolutely substantial.

I will provide the response of the WA Planning Commission to the comments of the Department of Sport and Recreation on the issue of the loss of public open space. The Western Australian Planning Commission's “Report on Submissions” reads —

It is acknowledged that the Esplanade Reserve currently performs a number of functions as a recreational and event space and that the loss of the parkland will result in these activities having to relocate elsewhere. It also noted that the parkland contributes to Perth's sense of place and provides open vistas to the Swan River.

Unfortunately, the vastness of the open space creates a sterile space that contributes to the segregation of the city from the river. While acknowledging that in the past the parkland has on occasions provided the Western Australian community with a useful gathering space, unfortunately for large portions of time the land now remains underutilised.

The Perth Waterfront development now provides an opportunity for the Esplanade Reserve to once again become an important community space. A large part of the reserve, which was reclaimed by the

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

early settlers, will now be returned to the Swan River. The land that remains will continue to serve a public function, albeit in a different manner.

It is important to remember that this area was originally part of the river and it was reclaimed.

Mr W.J. Johnston: How come this was the site chosen for the barbeque that the Queen went to?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: It is because it was there and it was available. It was a good use of the site for that particular event, as it is a good use of the site for the West Australian Symphony Orchestra outdoor concert each December, the final one of which in that location will occur next month, obviously. It is better than not using the space at all. Do we think the space can be better used more continuously? Absolutely; and that is exactly what is happening.

Mr J.N. Hyde: So, for the G20 it'll be bring your flippers for an underwater dive!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I thought this was a serious analysis of a major project for Perth. I will go on with the response from the Western Australian Planning Commission —

The design of the Perth Waterfront includes a range of new open space opportunities in the form of promenades, the landing, parks and the unique landscaped island. For major events, the new road along the northern arm of the inlet can be closed to provide an integrated gathering space with the promenade. Upgrades to the Supreme Court Gardens as part of the Perth Waterfront public works will also improve its capacity to accommodate events.

Therefore, if the barbeque for the Queen a couple of weeks ago had not been able to be held at the Perth waterfront, it could have been held at the Supreme Court Gardens, for example. The response continues —

These public spaces will host performances and recreational activities; and offer an alternative community gathering space to the vast areas of green open space to the east of the project area.

That issue, therefore, is clearly being addressed. The second point made by the member for Perth is —

The Water Corporation strongly opposed development over the Perth Central Sewerage Pumping Station and identified a number of costly and complex engineering issues;

Mr J.N. Hyde: You still haven't told us how costly.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Whatever is necessary to be changed is built into the overall cost of the project.

Mr J.N. Hyde: Minister, you are a better minister than this. You would've gone over it with a fine toothcomb. Surely you've asked these very same questions that I'm asking you. I'd be staggered if you didn't.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I asked plenty of questions about the project and what I know is that it is well planned and well designed and is underway at the moment; so that issue is being dealt with.

Mr J.N. Hyde: But you just won't tell us.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: The member for Perth also stated —

The Public Transport Authority revealed it had not undertaken an investigation into the public transport impact on bus or rail services ...

Et cetera, and it goes on. Let us look at what the Public Transport Authority states —

The Public Transport Authority ... is supportive of the Amendment to reclassify the land for the Perth Waterfront project to public purpose special use reserve.

That tells a quite different story. Then the PTA goes on to mention some points that need to be addressed. Are they being addressed? Obviously they are. One aspect that is important to remember about this project is that it is a major transit-oriented development. In fact, it will probably be the premier example of a transit-oriented development in Western Australia, given its proximity to the rail network, the Esplanade rail station and the Esplanade bus station, and given that ferries will be able to come into the inlet and there will be a ferry terminus within the Perth waterfront area. Also, of course, a very active pedestrian space will be available and the cycleway along the river will continue as a dual-use path over the bridge and the island that will be constructed. So, that is the reality about public transport.

Mr J.N. Hyde: Minister, is the ferry terminus costed?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: That is included in the \$438.5 million.

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

Mr J.N. Hyde: The other one, the possible future station development—if you look to the left on your confluence—has that been costed, or isn't it because it's in the future? It is in the grey or beige part.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: No. Is the member referring to this one I am pointing to?

Mr J.N. Hyde: Yes.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: No, a possible future station would not be included.

Mr J.N. Hyde: The possible Perth entertainment centre extension, has that been costed?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: No. That is not part of this project. The entertainment centre is privately operated, as the member knows.

Mr J.N. Hyde: But government had to pay for it.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: That is another issue. Without the government contribution made by the Court government, the project would not have happened. Is the member talking about the entertainment centre or the Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre?

Mr J.N. Hyde: Yes.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: The Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre. Obviously that will be a completely separate project.

I will go on with some of the other comments the member for Perth made about the Swan River Trust, which in its submission states —

The Trust has recently provided advice regarding the District Water Management Strategy. Provided the Trust's comments are adequately addressed in the revised DWMS, the Trust has no objection to the proposed amendment.

This story has therefore been built up by the member for Perth and by the opposition that all these state agencies have major concerns about the project and that it therefore perhaps should not happen. I think the opposition really does not want it to happen because there is a degree of envy about the fact that this project will be completed under this government.

Mr W.J. Johnston: No, it's not.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: It is going to be completed as a result of decisions by this government. If we get re-elected, we will certainly be —

Mr W.J. Johnston: In 11 years' time; in 2020.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: If the government is going to undertake major engineering works, they do actually take some time to plan and then to construct and complete.

Mr J.N. Hyde: But conveniently not until just after the state election will you close off Riverside Drive. That's quite calculating.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I will come back to that.

Mr J.N. Hyde: What about the heritage ones—the Florence Hummerston building? Come on! The National Trust; you can't verbal them.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I will provide the comments from the report on submissions. On the Public Transport Authority, the Planning Commission states —

It is noted that work has not been undertaken to plan for increases to PTA services as a result of the Perth Waterfront development. Considerable liaison has occurred to date with the Department of Transport, City of Perth and Public Transport Authority to ensure bus priority and access measures are incorporated into the movement network improvements attributed to the Perth Waterfront project.

Those issues, therefore, are being dealt with.

Mr J.N. Hyde: People going to the state election in March 2013 need to know—if they re-elect you—where the buses will be going and where the cars will be going when you dig up Riverside Drive the next month. They need to know that.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: And what will happen to this project if they happen to elect a Labor government?

Mr J.N. Hyde: You're the government.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: No, no. The member for Perth is talking about after the next election.

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

Mr J.N. Hyde: No. Come on!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: We are talking about after the next election.

Mr J.N. Hyde: That's right. You're the ones who are digging up Riverside Drive.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: If the people of Western Australia happen to elect a Labor government, what will happen with this project?

Mr J.N. Hyde: You've got two narratives. One is you're saying you're starting work this week. The other one is you're saying you're not going to tell people going to the election what you're doing with Riverside Drive, yet you've allegedly costed it.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I will come back to that. I want to continue analysing the very selective comments made partly today and also last week by the member for Perth. The response from the Planning Commission to the comments from the Swan River Trust states —

The majority of comments raised by the Trust relate to the Environmental Assessment Report. A specific response on these matters has been included in Part 5 of the Perth Waterfront Environmental Assessment Report – Report on Submissions.

The EAR ranks the key environmental impacts against standard criteria, with the intent to identify the impacts that require more detailed investigation and/or assessment. Both medium and high ranked unmanaged issues will be required to undertake further studies ...

I will not outline them all but obviously —

Mr J.N. Hyde: More detailed investigation.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Of course. This is a major project on which a great deal of work has been done, and more work is being undertaken at the moment. The member for Perth highlighted the Department of Transport's comments that the MRS boundaries are not consistent and logical with the proposed layout of the road network and that it identified problems with the proposed reclassification of the area and also identified traffic as a significant issue.

Mr J.N. Hyde: A direct quote.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Okay. The Department of Transport did raise some concerns about the precise detail of the boundaries of the MRS amendment.

The member for Perth does not seem to understand that the whole planning process is open and transparent. Proposals to change the use of land and zonings are put out for public comment by interested parties—state agencies, members of the public, local governments or whatever—to identify issues that need to be addressed before a planning scheme amendment is finalised. That is the process; that is what often happens. There is a proposal and it is either implemented as advertised or modifications are made before it is completed. In some cases, amendments are not proceeded with because they should not be.

The concerns of the Department of Transport have been very much taken into account. The amendment to the metropolitan region scheme, which I tabled in Parliament, has been adjusted to take into account those concerns. Does the member for Perth point all that out? No, of course not.

I quote from the "Report on Submissions" where it refers to the Department Transport's comments —

Further discussion has occurred with the Department of Transport to determine the appropriate alignment of the western boundary of the proposed MRS amendment.

I will not read out all the following detail, but to conclude —

Given the above considerations, the Committee recommends that the western boundary of the amendment should be modified to a position immediately east of the proposed Bus Port intersection and west of the future indicative development site (south of the Esplanade Train Station). The Committee considers that the modification to the amendment represents only a minor change and will enable both the city planning and regional transport planning requirements to be better coordinated.

That issue has been addressed. Again, I make the point that the member for Perth is seeking to develop a narrative that tries to convince people that there are major problems with this project—that state agencies have major concerns and that therefore the whole thing should be deferred or should not occur at all. I think that is the sentiment coming from the opposition. When we look at the full picture, we get a very different story indeed.

Mr J.N. Hyde: You have listened to only one of the 70 submissions, then.

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

Mr J.H.D. DAY: All the submissions were listened to.

Mr J.N. Hyde: You acted on only one, which was the slight adjustment of the western MRS boundary. That is a sum total of one.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: All the submissions have been considered. If we look through the “Report on Submissions”, we can see that there is a response to each submission. In some cases it is simply a matter of noting comments. In other cases it may involve some change. That has occurred with the Department of Transport’s comments. In other situations it might be a matter of not accepting the comments made.

Mr J.N. Hyde: There is the heritage one with Florence Hummerston.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: As I understand it, an application is before the Heritage Council of Western Australia. I think that is the case. Obviously, a decision needs to be made by the Heritage Council. I think the member for Perth is saying that he essentially does not support relocation of the Hummerston pavilion. If the pavilion is not relocated, it would be a major impediment to this project. Either you support this project happening or you do not.

Mr J.N. Hyde: The National Trust thinks that you can build without it being an impediment. What is the government’s response?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: If the National Trust of Australia has that view, we do not share that view because retention would be a major constraint on what can be constructed around the site and would compromise the integrity and the outcome of the whole project.

Mr J.N. Hyde: What about compensation for the City of Perth? Will you address that issue?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Compensation for the City of Perth?

Mr J.N. Hyde: Yes, which you said you were happy about in the paper this morning.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I do not know that the City of Perth is even asking for compensation. Compensation for what?

Mr J.N. Hyde: For the lease regarding Florence Hummerston and the value of the glass triangle.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Is the glass triangle, as the member calls it, the conservatory or whatever, in use at the moment? Is it doing anything useful? I do not think so. In relation to the lease held by the operators of the Chinese restaurant, negotiations will be held, if they have not started already, with a view to ensuring that there can be agreement for the operators to move out of the building at the appropriate time.

Mr J.N. Hyde: Where will you rebuild it then?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: That has not been determined at this stage. Indeed, there is a question of whether a building still has the same heritage value once it is demolished and moved from its original location. That has not been determined at this stage.

I should respond to a few other points. The member for Perth raised the issue of the Indigenous cultural centre and the cable car. We have always made it clear that although they will be allowed for and sites will be provided, they are not included in this phase of the project. Obviously, not everything can be done at once. The Indigenous cultural centre will certainly be a very valuable and important addition to the whole precinct, but that will probably be several hundred million dollars on its own. In my view, if that is to occur, it should be a joint project between the state and the commonwealth. Hopefully, there will be the opportunity for that to occur in the not-too-distant future. We have always made it clear that the centre is not funded as part of this stage of the project—likewise with the cable car.

I will respond to some of the other comments. The member for Perth queried where the \$438.5 million will go. Obviously, there is a breakdown of that, but I do not intend to table that because we need to seek tenders from the private sector for construction of various parts of the project; therefore, it would not be appropriate to provide all that information at this stage. I can say that the estimated cost of the major part of the public works, for which we are seeking expressions of interest from qualified managing contractors, is about \$200 million. As I said, we have called for expressions of interest. That occurred last week. That aspect is underway, and over the next few weeks we will call for tenders for other specialist marine and civil works contracts. They have an estimated value of about \$55 million.

Nine sites will be made available to the private sector for a range of office, residential, retail and hotel developments. This will be made available in a different way from the Perth City Link project in which all the

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

public-owned land will be made available to the private sector as one parcel. In this case, it will be a number of different sites, and therefore there will be a number of different bidders.

Mr J.N. Hyde: Minister, if you are quoting from an official document, please table it.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: These are notes that were prepared for my use in this debate. Is there anything else that the member wants to know about in particular that I have not addressed?

Mr J.N. Hyde: You have not really told us anything.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Maybe I have not have told the member anything that he did not otherwise know. I have told members that this project is happening.

Mr F.M. Logan interjected.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I mentioned that while the member was out of the chamber. If there is a need to relocate the sewerage station, it would be incorporated into the cost. The construction of the inlet will not require piling down to the bedrock. It will require some piling presumably and construction, but we are not talking about holding up major buildings. Multistorey buildings will need piling down to the bedrock and that will be undertaken as part of the construction of the buildings, whereas the retaining wall around the edge of the inlet will obviously not be as complex a construction.

Mr W.J. Johnston: If engineering works need to be done by the people who purchase the blocks, that will reduce the value of the blocks; that is true, isn't it?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: They have to incorporate that into the cost of their project.

Mr W.J. Johnston: That is the way they price these things because there is more works. There is plenty of vacant land in the Perth CBD. What risk is there that you will not be able to sell the blocks within the next 11 years as you have planned?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I think the member needs to remember that this is probably prime real estate in the Perth CBD. It is right on the Swan River and we expect there to be quite a high degree of interest in the land that will be available.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Sure, but there is a vacant lot immediately across the road that has been vacant for at least as long as I have lived in Western Australia. For 22 years there has been a vacant block right there and nobody has done any development there. Why will you be able to get developers to develop this land when other commercial developers have not been able to achieve the same thing just across the road?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: By just across the road, do you mean at the bottom of Spring Street?

Mr W.J. Johnston: No; I am talking about the site next to the BHP building, owned jointly by the Irish bloke in Multiplex.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: It is not quite as close to the river.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Okay, but for 22 years nobody has been able to get a project to fly there. What planning has the government done to ensure the waterfront project will get up when these others have not?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: This will be a very active location with a high level of public amenity that will make it very attractive for people who may want to work in the area, live in the area or stay in a hotel there.

Mr W.J. Johnston: I have no problem with the apartment blocks. I am talking about 156 000 square metres of office space, which is an 11 per cent increase in the amount of office space in the CBD. That is an incredible amount of extra office space.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: As the member knows, the economy in Western Australia is strong. The expected level of investment and population growth in economic activity is relatively high in the state and vacancy rates in the commercial sector are relatively low at the moment.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Okay; three new office buildings are about to be completed in Perth. What is the next office building to start construction in the CBD?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: On this site?

Mr W.J. Johnston: Anywhere in the CBD.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Oh, well, wait and see.

Mr W.J. Johnston: There isn't one. There is not a single planned office tower in the CBD at the moment.

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Maybe that indicates there is a need for more space and there will be a high demand for it.

Mr W.J. Johnston: There are dozens of sites owned by private enterprise already. None has current plans to build an office tower. How will you get 156 000 square metres of office built?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Wait and see what the interest is.

Mr J.N. Hyde: That is why we have asked the minister to justify that the net cost will be only \$270 million.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: As I said, that is based on the advised —

Mr J.N. Hyde: But you will not give us the advice.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: — expected return from the sale of land overall. That may vary to some extent. The net cost of this project may vary to some extent naturally. It always does.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Minister, I asked how much per square metre the government expects to achieve from the land sales and the minister would not tell me.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Why would I? The member should consult with the property sector if he wants to know that.

Mr W.J. Johnston: I have; they say this is not the way to do the project.

Mr J.N. Hyde: We have, and they say it will not fly. You're trying to sell similar land on the Northbridge Link for massive development there. You haven't; you've tried in two forms to flog that and it hasn't worked. We've got the west end development and other developments in that area ahead of this one and you haven't got tenants for office accommodation for them yet, let alone for the waterfront project.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: This one is a little further down the track, then, from what the member for Perth just said. There is a pretty high demand for office accommodation in Perth at the moment; we expect that to continue. What is the member for Perth saying, in essence—that he thinks this project should be deferred?

Mr J.N. Hyde: We want to know: what is your expert advice? Table the expert advice so we can be confident that \$440 million is being well spent.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: If the member does not believe the figures I have given him, he does not believe the figures that have been provided by the professional public service of this state to the government, which have been assessed by Treasury and so on. No figure has been pulled out of the air by us as a government.

Mr J.N. Hyde: All you are giving us is the back-of-the-envelope figure.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: It is not a back-of-the-envelope figure; it is the total figure rather than a breakdown. It is certainly not just a figure done on the back of an envelope, I can assure the member of that.

Mr J.N. Hyde: Moving on from the issue of the sewerage works and, obviously, the electricity transmission costs, if you look at your design—I referred earlier to the future possible station development, future possible Perth entertainment centre —

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Do you mean the Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre?

Mr J.N. Hyde: Yes. And the future possible Supreme Court extension. All those future possibles, as well as all this work, will involve huge sewerage and electricity works. We need some sort of confidence that that is being planned for and is all incorporated within the budget.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: It has been planned for, but I cannot recall the amounts—this may in fact cover the sewerage station; I will need to check it—but there was approval for both Western Power and the Water Corporation to undertake expenditure for the construction of those aspects to enable this project to proceed. I will need to check what sewerage stations are included within that, but approval was given for both Western Power and the Water Corporation to undertake expenditure—in other words, incur borrowings, if necessary—to allow those aspects to occur.

In relation to the timing of the project, the major construction works will commence in the first half of 2012. I expect that to be April next year. Some early preliminary work will get underway before the end of this year. Commencement of the major construction works, of course, will be determined by the need to do the detailed planning and design work and to go through the approvals process in relation to environmental aspects, Indigenous affairs, heritage aspects and all the other aspects. A lot of progress has been made in that respect, although, obviously, all that has taken some time. The tender process needs to be undertaken and the contractors appointed so the major works can get underway.

I expect the closure of Riverside Drive to be around the middle of 2013, as I understand it. The timing of that was determined by the appropriate sequence of the construction of the project. The member for Perth has raised

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

the conspiracy that the closure of Riverside Drive is being deliberately delayed until after the election. Other works are necessary and logical to undertake, such as excavation and so on, prior to the need to close the road, so it makes sense to leave it open for as long as possible. It is also important to realise that people's ability to drive from east of the project to west of the project or vice versa will not cease completely. Traffic will be diverted up Barrack Street, down The Esplanade, along Mounts Bay Road and down William Street to rejoin Riverside Drive and go around the Narrows Bridge. It may take a little longer through being diverted to some extent, but traffic will still be able to move in either direction. Is that a major problem? I do not think so, because of the benefits this project will mean to the people of Perth and Western Australia.

Mr J.N. Hyde: Why did the Premier raise this issue? Why was he not in favour of blocking Riverside Drive?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: He is in favour of this project as it is being delivered. I can assure the member for Perth that he has taken a very strong interest in this project and continues to do so. He is ensuring that it will happen. I can assure the member that without the support of the Premier of the state, the net amount of \$270 million would not have been allocated. The Premier supports the project as it is being delivered. Obviously, we have discussed the options such as building a bridge over the inlet for traffic, but that would be counterproductive to re-establishing the connection between the Perth CBD and the river. It could be done technically, of course, if it were lifted high enough, but aesthetically it would have a very detrimental effect on the overall project. A tunnel would probably cost another \$300 million or \$400 million to construct. That will still be possible in the future if a future government decides it is necessary and a future generation of Western Australians wants to do it. It will be possible to construct a tunnel to connect with the east and west sections of Riverside Drive if they want to do that. We have not done that as part of the project because we do not think it is necessary and we believe that we can use the funds in a better way.

Mr F.M. Logan: We don't want you to leave us with a massive bill in 2013.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: It is interesting that the member for Cockburn raises the issue of being left with a massive bill when there is a change of government. The members for Cockburn and Perth raised the Perth Arena project, and that is exactly what happened when we came to government as a result of that project.

Mr F.M. Logan: Let that be a lesson to you!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: One of the major —

Mr F.M. Logan: Don't do the same as us!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: It is confession time, finally! The Perth Arena project was never properly planned nor the scope of the project determined before a decision was made to go ahead with it.

Mr J.N. Hyde: Let us talk about the waterfront project. Your track record on the waterfront project is the belltower, which left a \$450 000 deficit. Your track record in this precinct is not too red hot. In the spirit of mea culpa, that is happening on this side of the house —

Mr J.H.D. DAY: One project cost \$5 million and the other is costing \$520 million, or thereabouts. It is a different scale.

Mr J.N. Hyde: The percentage loss is going to be gigantic.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: The belltower, although members opposite are always having a go at it, serves a useful function.

Mr F.M. Logan: Which is?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: It is a musical instrument and is part of the cultural heritage of Perth.

Mr F.M. Logan: The minister is still justifying it. You're a brave man!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: It will be made more use of once the area is activated by the Perth Waterfront development. The belltower is in the arts portfolio, for whatever reason. I have inquired whether any other minister would like to include it in their portfolio but I have not been successful!

Mr F.M. Logan: Put a bar in there, minister. That's the only thing that will make it work.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: There will be plenty of bars around the waterfront project as well as cafes and restaurants. I think I have covered most of the issues that have been raised.

Amendment to Motion

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I move —

To delete all words after "house —", and insert —

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

- (1) supports the completion of the project, as determined by the Liberal–National government;
- (2) notes that funding to complete the project has been allocated by the Liberal–National government; and
- (3) notes that issues raised in submissions during the metropolitan region scheme amendment process are being addressed during the planning and implementation of the project.

MR J.E. McGRATH (South Perth — Parliamentary Secretary) [5.33 pm]: I thought that the minister had cut me off at the pass by moving an amendment to the motion, but I am happy to speak to the motion. Ever since I have been a member of Parliament I have been very supportive of the Perth Waterfront development and have always said that we need to make a stronger and closer connection between the Swan River and the city. I am basically very supportive of what our government is doing. However, I stand to speak on behalf of the people in the electorate of South Perth who have some concerns about the consequences of the waterfront development. The opposition has talked about the \$440 million that the government has allocated for the development and for cutting into the land at the bottom of Sherwood Court down to William Street. I believe that we should seriously consider putting a tunnel underneath the water when the inlet is developed. I have made that suggestion before and have spoken to the Premier about it because the residents of South Perth and I honestly believe that the traffic consequences as a result of closing Riverside Drive will be quite serious in my electorate. The City of South Perth is concerned about those consequences and I am concerned that the City of South Perth was not consulted at any stage of this process. The City of South Perth is very closely linked to the City of Perth. In fact, it would not surprise me if one day the City of Perth and the City of South Perth became one municipality. They are divided only by the Swan River and there have always been close links between the City of South Perth and the City of Perth.

I have some reservations about the consequences of this project. I have raised my concerns in Parliament previously and they have been raised by other members. Every day, 30 000 cars travel on Riverside Drive. Many of those cars travel to West Perth, Subiaco and Nedlands. I would not think that many of them go into the city. When the foreshore is developed, some of those cars will travel along Orrong Road and the Polly Farmer freeway through the tunnel, but I believe that they will be mostly people from the eastern suburbs. People in Victoria Park and parts of my electorate south to Bentley in the south eastern corridor will be disadvantaged if they cannot use the Causeway and Riverside Drive. I wrote to the Minister for Planning on 8 April because the matter was raised with me by a number of my constituents. This is an enormous project and the amount of traffic and the population of Perth will only increase. We are talking about 30 000 cars using Riverside Drive today. In 15 or 20 years double the number of cars could be travelling through that area, even though I understand that the transport nodes will change.

Mr J.H.D. Day: But you like the project overall, don't you?

Mr J.E. McGrath: I have said that, minister. I love the project and am a big supporter of it.

Obviously I am not a member of cabinet and do not have a say on this and nor am I an engineer, but it is my view that when we dig out the soil to let the river reclaim the land, surely it would be easier to build a tunnel then rather than later. Eventually—the minister has conceded this in his speech—one day we might need a tunnel.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I did not quite say that. I said that people could do that in the future. You can probably manage traffic in another way.

Mr J.E. McGrath: Getting back to my electorate, I would be derelict in my duty as the member for South Perth if I did not raise this matter when the opportunity arose. As I have said to the Premier and the minister, I support the project. I think it is a great project. I want to see more ferries used on the Swan River. I have been campaigning for the use of ferries for a long time. It is good to see the Minister for Transport, my very good friend, back in the chamber. I have been campaigning for more ferries since I was in opposition and I campaigned for the previous Minister for Planning and Infrastructure to bring back the Coode Street ferry service. I think a lot more ferries should use the Swan River. Under the new Perth Waterfront development, those ferries will come in a lot closer to the city so that people will not get off the ferry at Barrack Street but will be closer to the Esplanade train station. That is fantastic and it will be an opportunity for us to develop an excellent ferry network in Perth. I am very supportive of that.

I perceive that there will be problems with the number of vehicles that will be forced to come through my electorate and believe that we need to do an impact study. I know the Minister for Transport will speak on this issue, but we need to have an impact study that will put the minds of the residents of my electorate at ease that roads such as Mill Point Road, Labouchere Road, Douglas Avenue and the links onto the freeway at Judd Street

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

will not become so congested that my electorate will become like a car park in the morning and afternoon. I am happy to be convinced that that will not happen and I know that the Minister for Transport will make a few points on this matter, but I have to raise it because it is continually raised with me by my constituents. That is why, in a conversation with the Premier the other day, I asked whether there was any chance of having another look at this project and maybe look at a tunnel. The Premier—I am sure he will not mind me saying this—did not rule it out in the future. He said it was something that we might look at putting in if the demand is there; I think there will eventually be a demand. The other alternative is a bridge, if a tunnel is too costly. The minister said it could cost \$300 million to \$400 million to build a tunnel. We are a very wealthy state; we are driving the economy of Australia and I am told by economists wherever I go, and by the Committee for Perth, that one day Perth will be a bigger city than Melbourne. I am not convinced about that, but people out there say that eventually Perth will be the second-biggest capital city in Australia and it will be driven by the mining boom. If we are going to put these new amenities into our city, we might also have to factor in the fact that one day we will be a much bigger city than we are now.

Getting back to the City of South Perth, it responded and made a submission to the public consultation process on metropolitan region scheme amendment 1203/41 on the Perth waterfront. I quote some of the things that the City of South Perth raised in the submission. It basically said that it supports in principle metropolitan region scheme amendment 1203/41 on the Perth waterfront, dated February 2011 with the following exceptions, and I paraphrase: the city is extremely concerned about the proposed changes to Riverside Drive, which will reduce traffic volumes from about 30 000 vehicles a day to about 15 000 vehicles with the resultant traffic being forced to utilise other local and regional roads of Perth. The City of South Perth went on to say that the roads in South Perth would be affected because the traffic would be redistributed to Canning Highway, Mill Point Road, Labouchere Road and Judd Street respectively, thereby resulting in increased traffic volumes and congestion, a reduction in road and pedestrian safety and residential amenity during the morning and afternoon peak travel times. I also make the point that one of those roads, Labouchere Road, is the entrance point for Perth Zoo. More than 600 000 people a year visit Perth Zoo and a lot of those people are families and school children. These are things in my electorate that I want our government to take account of. In its submission, the City of South Perth also requested —

... detailed traffic modelling and reporting be undertaken as a matter of urgency to determine the likely increase to traffic volumes and congestion on Canning Highway, Mill Point Road, Labouchere Road and Judd Street resulting from the Perth Waterfront development and changes to Riverside Drive ...

The city's submission then stated that where it is identified in the detailed traffic modelling and reporting that those streets in South Perth would be adversely impacted upon by increased traffic volumes and congestion, improvements should be undertaken to the road network and intersections to alleviate the identified negative impacts. The city is saying that if there are going to be some impacts on traffic flows, maybe the Department of Transport or Main Roads could come up with some other solutions. The submission also stated that the city —

requests to be consulted on any future traffic and transport studies or initiatives undertaken by the City of Perth and/or the WA State Government where changes to the road and transport network in Perth is likely to result in adverse impacts within the City of South Perth.

In closing, my view is that we should look at a tunnel or a bridge. I know that the minister said the traffic would be able to divert and go up Barrack Street, down The Esplanade and down William Street.

Mr J.N. Hyde: Half an hour.

Mr J.E. McGrath: In peak hours it would be a difficult journey. If I was making that journey as usual and I was working in West Perth—a lot of people work in West Perth—I would not drive down The Esplanade. I think people going to the city will use that route, but others will either go along the Polly Farmer freeway through the tunnel or they will take the South Perth option, and that is the big concern to me as the member for South Perth. It is a big concern for my community and a big concern for the City of South Perth. I support the project. I think it is a project that has been a long time coming. I think it will add a lot of vibrancy to that part of the city; it might take part of the vibrancy away from Northbridge and bring people into another part of Perth. Therefore, there will be two areas where people will be able to recreate and where there will be business and residential development. We will have the development above where the train line is sunk, we will have Northbridge and we will have a brand-new area. I think the high-rise buildings will be developed in that area. I would be interested to hear what the Minister for Transport has to say about those concerns I have raised and what he thinks about the suggestion that —

Mr T.R. Buswell: I reckon it's a joke!

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

Mr J.E. McGRATH: Minister, there are tunnels all round the world. I was in Sydney recently and I believe I went through a tunnel that went under the Sydney Harbour; that would be a fair-sized tunnel. This would be a very, very small tunnel compared with the one in Sydney. There is a tunnel underneath the English Channel; we are talking about a very small tunnel here. But my main concern is for the residents in my electorate of South Perth.

MR A.P. JACOB (Ocean Reef) [5.48 pm]: Madam Acting Speaker —

An opposition member: Have you got a tunnel?

Mr A.P. JACOB: I will get to it, members. I want the Perth Waterfront project and I have to say that it is fantastic to have an opportunity to speak about my second-favourite waterfront renewal project in this state and in this city. I must also very briefly acknowledge Jenny Gregory, as I did not have an awful lot of notice that this motion was coming on today. One of her papers on this project has proved particularly useful in preparing for this debate. Like most members of this place, I often host guests here in Parliament; I then invite them for lunch or for a range of different things and I often give them tours. Some of my favourite things to point out to people are the very insightful photographs that are scattered around this place, and I often use them to bring to people's attention the history of this very issue, as I think the waterfront is a particularly topical issue and one that strongly pervades the Western Australian psyche. There is one particular photo on the wall right out the front of the Premier's office that I often point out to people as they come through, which shows some of the original river shoreline almost all the way back to The Esplanade. That makes for an interesting argument when we get into some of the environmental and heritage debates, because we are really talking about bringing back the waterfront to the river's original shoreline. Some of the history of how the Perth foreshore and Riverside Drive came about makes for a very interesting examination of this topic.

It is almost impossible to address this project without first having a brief look at the Stephenson–Hepburn plan for the metropolitan area, Perth and Fremantle, which was published in 1955 and predominantly implemented during the years 1954 to 1973, and which played such a big part in determining the past 50 years of Perth's foreshore history. In fact, I think that it would be fair to say that of all the foreshore schemes promoted in Western Australia over the past 50 or so years, the Narrows scheme is probably the only one that has really flown and come to fruition.

In the Stephenson–Hepburn report, there is, above all else, a preference for the car in the planning process. George Seddon concluded that the “plan had the virtues and defects of the planning ideology of the day, which was to give absolute primacy to the private automobile”. Nowhere is this more plainly seen than in the impact of the Stephenson and Hepburn plans for a freeway system on Perth's Swan River waterfront. They recommended an inner ring-road surrounding the central area of the city, with Riverside Drive a part of that legacy as the southern part of the ring-road freeway.

It is interesting to look at historical attitudes and the swings and roundabouts over time. In their initial assessment of the foreshore area, Stephenson and Hepburn described Mounts Bay as merely an expanse of shallow water which is more or less stagnant for a great part of the year and Mounts Bay would soon be sacrificed to the needs of the motorist. It was most interesting to read that it was “sacrificed to the needs of the motorist”. Forty-three acres of Mounts Bay were then reclaimed for the city approach to the bridge, which meant filling in most of the bay with soil dredged from other parts of the river and imported sand. For nearly a decade, most of the area looked like a desert while its natural compression and stabilisation took place. This was all long before —

Point of Order

Mr J.N. HYDE: Madam Acting Speaker, I reluctantly raise a point of order. We are addressing an amendment, and I appreciate that the member for Ocean Reef does not get that many opportunities to speak, but the amendment is specific. Although the history of the area is very important, I would be more interested to hear what Jenny Gregory said to the member about her view of the waterfront project proposed by the member's government, and which is the substance of this amendment.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms L.L. Baker): Thank you, member. I am sure that the member for Ocean Reef will take that on board.

Debate Resumed

Mr A.P. JACOB: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. I have just a few brief notes to give a bit of historical context because a lot of the debate about this project comes back to Riverside Drive. I think an understanding of the historical context and how that came about will help. We have heard the debate from the other side of the fence. I am simply trying to lay down some of that context as I address the motion before us.

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

Mr J.N. Hyde: It is an amendment, member!

Mr A.P. JACOB: Sorry—the amendment that is before us. I thank the member for Perth.

Some interesting photos of that period hang at the northern side of the main entrance to Parliament House that show the sand going out into the river. This was of course all before my lifetime.

It is interesting to note—this goes quite well to the amendment—that once work began and people became aware of the extent of the proposed changes, they became extremely worried. At the time, some believed the works were too ambitious, particularly as costs increased, but most simply grieved over the loss of Mounts Bay, and saw its then reclamation as sheer vandalism. Now we face accusations that undoing these works and bringing the river back to the city is, again, too ambitious, particularly given fears that the costs will increase, and people grieve over the loss of an oval and some roadway and see its restitution as sheer vandalism. The historical context is indeed interesting.

Planning for the Narrows interchange in 1961 to facilitate Stephenson and Hepburn's inner ring-road system pushed our transport artery system even further into the sphere of the Californian-style of freeway, which was, I think, the prevailing idea of the time. This meant that in early 1964 details of the Narrows interchange project were announced. Yet again, this was done in the face of vigorous protests, possibly even by the member for Perth's predecessor, although I did not manage to find whether he was a part —

Mr J.N. Hyde: She. I am having dinner with her tonight.

Mr A.P. JACOB: Thank you, member for Perth.

Mr F.M. Logan: You know, member, that there is the by-product of that interchange right out the front of this building, which is probably the most hideous gash on our city that we are still living with.

Mr A.P. JACOB: Yes, I do not want to be called to a point of order, but sometimes I think of us as the castle on the hill and the freeway as the moat that keeps us back from the great masses out there.

Mr F.M. Logan: This is why you have to be careful with big projects like that.

Mr A.P. JACOB: That is right—but I do not want to be called to order again.

As I was saying, the Narrows interchange project was also undertaken in the face of vigorous protest, and work proceeded on reclaiming a further 19 acres of the Swan River, which began with the dumping of some 80 000 cubic metres of sand to form part of the future shoreline between Union Jack Square at the foot of Barrack Street and the Narrows.

Please excuse me, Madam Acting Speaker; I have a cold.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I remind the member that it is the amendment that we are addressing.

Mr A.P. JACOB: Yes, Madam Acting Speaker.

I speak to the points the member for Perth raised, particularly concerning Riverside Drive, which is, I think, one of the more —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr A.P. JACOB: In 1967, when Main Roads released a further stage of the De Leuw Cather plan—somewhat of a successor to the Stephenson–Hepburn plan, but very much in the same theme—it became apparent that Riverside Drive had actually been designed as a six-lane freeway across the foreshore, which would have well and truly separated the city from the Swan River foreshore.

As well as being severed from the river, Perth city at this time was looking to lose Supreme Court Gardens and the playing fields of Langley Park. The city council of the day went into battle to try to stop the proposed freeway, with architects, planners and the Chamber of Commerce also taking a stand. It would be interesting to see whether some of those same people would be now cheering the government's proposal to restore some of the original shoreline. I really wanted to outline the long and turbulent history of this issue.

Interestingly, many comments have focussed on the indicative costings, and the member for Perth raised the matter of the Perth Arena. It is amazing, when we look at the industry, what we get in terms of the different prices. I will briefly refer to another waterfront project; namely, Southbank in Melbourne where a particularly good public space has been created. The member for Perth might be familiar with the Eureka Tower, which is a 91-storey residential tower. When it was completed in June 2006, it was the world's tallest residential tower. It is quite literally a gold-plated luxury residential tower. The 91 storeys were completed for \$415 million in 2006, a

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

mere eight months before we started construction on the Perth Arena, which is approaching \$520 million. On the one hand, we have the Perth Arena costing \$100 million more than the second-tallest building in Australia—a luxury gold-plated apartment building. Costs fluctuate greatly.

Mr J.N. Hyde interjected.

Mr A.P. JACOB: Again, I was just addressing the member for Perth's comments about the Perth Arena; it was an interesting comparison on how public projects sometimes go.

Earlier this year, in the interests of furthering my own education, I undertook a quick unit with the Urban Design Centre in which weekly discussions were facilitated with final year urban design and architectural postgraduate students. One of the first questions we asked of ourselves was: where is the centre of Perth city? It is actually a very difficult question to answer because there is a technical centre, but —

Mr T.R. Buswell: The old Treasury building.

Mr A.P. JACOB: Yes—point zero is right on the corner of the old Treasury building. I suppose the better question is: Where is the heart of Perth city? Where do members envisage the centre of the city to be?

Mr T.R. Buswell: Subiaco Oval.

Mr A.P. JACOB: There would be a range of different views, but it is a very difficult question to answer, thereby highlighting the importance and the potential of this project and how our treatment of our city riverfront has featured so highly in the narrative of who we are as a city and as Western Australians. This project is absolutely vital if we are to have a location that can help us to identify a sense of place and a location that identifies a heart for Perth city.

I strongly congratulate the Minister for Planning for his advocacy and work on this project to date to ensure that it continues to go forward and has the strongest possible chance of coming to fruition. His work must be recognised. I must also acknowledge the Premier, who has taken a very firm stand on this particular project to ensure that it is progressed. Having worked on a similar sized project for my entire tenure as an elected member, I know exactly how hard it is to try to get things such as this up and running. The Premier has done an amazing job in helping to push forward and to keep momentum for the first Perth Waterfront project. I believe these urban renewal projects will be the best urban legacy we can leave future generations.

As I said at the beginning, this is only my second favourite waterfront project. It would be remiss of me in speaking on waterfront projects in Perth if I did not use the opportunity to briefly mention my Ocean Reef marina. It is another urban waterfront renewal project. I look forward to the day when I can have lunch down at the Perth Waterfront, catch a boat with a friend—hopefully a friend's boat; I do not think I will ever own a boat—and we can travel down the river, up the coast, and enjoy dinner at Ocean Reef marina. I truly hope that this waterfront project in Perth is only one small step in seeing a range of waterfront opportunities up and down the coast.

Mr I.C. Blayney interjected.

Mr A.P. JACOB: That is right. It is absolutely one of my ambitions to see that come to pass. If any of my constituents happen to read *Hansard*, plan 7.2 for Ocean Reef marina came out in yesterday's *Joondalup Times*. The project is progressing very well. I am excited about the Perth Waterfront project and think it is very important for the future of our city; it is something that we have discussed for decades. I think it needs a strong decision to go forward, and that is what the minister and the Premier are presenting, and well done for that. However, I must also put in a plug for the Ocean Reef marina. I think the two projects, hand in hand, would complete the fantastic coastal waterfront lifestyle we enjoy in Perth city.

MR T.R. BUSWELL (Vasse — Minister for Transport) [6.01 pm]: I apologise for not being here for the majority of this debate. I had the pleasure of attending, along with the Premier and the Deputy Premier, a meeting of senior officials from China Southern Airlines, which, as the Deputy Premier announced in question time today, made its first inaugural flight to Perth today.

A member interjected.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: Yes; first and inaugural, funnily enough. That airline will visit Perth three times a week, which is fantastic. One of the things we talked about was how Perth is transforming and becoming an international city. When we look at what is happening in Perth, we see that the most significant projects that are driving that transformation are around the City Link project—the sinking of the railway line, the sinking of the bus station, the demolition of the entertainment centre and ultimately the developments that will happen over that site. In actual fact, the railway line will run underground from the train station pretty much to the edge of the entertainment centre. That will be a great precinct when it is done.

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

Mr J.N. Hyde: Half of it is done already.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: I do not think so, member.

Mr J.N. Hyde: Yes, it is. Have you taken the train to Fremantle?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: Member, I have taken the train to a lot of places. I have reason to catch the train up and down a lot of lines, but I can tell the member that that work is not half done by a country mile. I was down there only two weeks ago with the federal member for Perth, Hon Stephen Smith, and the federal Minister for Transport, Hon Anthony Albanese—"Albo" to his mates. I looked over the site, and I have to tell members that the planning is great, the work has started, but there is no way that it is nearly completed; there is a massive amount of work to go there. The point I was trying to make was that this government is delivering the transformational projects to this city to help attract airlines such as China Southern and ultimately the people who will travel on it. The second transformational project —

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: They will not come to see the member for Warnbro. I can give the member that tip right now. Perhaps at the world conference for village idiots we might attract a few. Given that the member is on three calls, it is tough.

The second transformational project is the one for which the plan sits to the left of my colleague the Minister for Planning—that is, the foreshore development. I did not hear the debate earlier. I asked the Minister for Planning whether the opposition was going to support this transformational project. It promised the other one forever. It showed lots of pictures of this one and never turned a sod of soil —

Several members interjected.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: The member said that about the City Link project as well. He said for a long time that it was not happening. The member has now said it is nearly finished, so I am not sure how we got from "it has not happened" to "it is nearly finished" in about a month, but I am pleased that the member has suddenly opened his eyes as he travels around his electorate. Perhaps it has something to do with travelling when the sun is up.

Anyhow, returning to this particular project, this will be the second part of the transformation of the city. The point I was trying to make was that I did not understand when the Minister for Planning said that the member for Perth was a bit evasive in stating whether the opposition supports this project. I assume the member is not going to tell me whether he does or he does not now. I would suspect he would oppose it. He opposes other things we are trying —

Mr J.N. Hyde: You're verballing. You've missed the debate on two occasions.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: The member opposes other things we are trying to do to increase vitality in the city, such as seven-day trading, although I notice that the member has it in his electorate.

Mr J.N. Hyde: Address the amendment. Is the member for South Perth right or wrong? We think he's right.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: He is wrong.

Ms J.M. Freeman: Have you got the amendment?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: I have it right in front of me. I support the amendment, because I support the completion of the project. I note the funding to complete the project has been allocated. I think that is fantastic. I note that the issues raised in the submission process are being addressed. I think that is a perfectly legitimate amendment to support. I quickly want to talk about the transport aspects of it, and in particular roads. Clearly this will have an impact on the 24 000 vehicles a day that use Riverside Drive. Not every single one of those vehicles will be displaced. Our traffic modelling shows—if the member had read the submission, he would have seen it highlighted in the submission from the Department of Transport—that there will be a significant displacement of road usage from Riverside Drive to the Graham Farmer Freeway and through the tunnel. We have to make some investments to deal with that. If members read the Department of Transport's submission, they would see that it clearly says that we need to take the tunnel from two lanes to three.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: Despite the member for Girrawheen's rapid exhalation of air, which I am assuming was shock and not deflation —

Mr J.N. Hyde: The tunnel was always going to be three lanes; you know that.

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: Correct. That is the point I was going to make. The tunnel, as the former Governor and former Commissioner of Main Roads, Ken Michael, reminded me, was always designed to go to three lanes. Basically the emergency stopping lane is removed —

Mr J.N. Hyde: So the member for South Perth is right, then? There is going to be extra traffic in South Perth.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: No, I am not saying that at all. What I am saying is that the traffic modelling is showing that the vast majority of traffic displaced from Riverside Drive will relocate through the tunnel, so we have to make some investments to cater for that. Those investments are quite complex. The first one is to put a third lane in. To put in a third lane, the emergency stopping lane is removed and a modest adjustment to the width of the existing lanes is made. My memory is a bit hazy, but I think it goes from 3.6 metres to 3.5 metres, or 3.5 metres to 3.4 metres, so it is about a 10-centimetre —

Mr J.N. Hyde: The Minister for Planning says they are going to do the half-hour horseshoe around this little alcove. So he's wrong, too.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: As I said, the majority of traffic will be redirected by driver choice into the tunnel. There needs to be a bigger investment than just putting an extra lane in the tunnel.

The other thing we need to do—the Department of Transport's submission clearly points this out—is to invest in how people exit the tunnel, in particular at the western end. That involves the current intersections of Loftus and Cambridge Streets. It involves the current method of transferring out of the tunnel westbound onto freeway south, and also out of the tunnel westbound onto freeway north. That is a big job. We are currently working on delivering those outcomes. Those outcomes will ensure that traffic in and around the city is not negatively impacted upon by this development.

The other thing that the member opposite assumes is that nothing else changes in life. The government has announced some planning, which is now well advanced—again opposed by the opposition—on the light rail link that will run from Mirrabooka into the city, with the terminus probably being in the vicinity of Balga TAFE. That is a fantastic mass transit solution. That will mean that a lot of traffic that currently moves into the city will not come into the city; I acknowledge that is from a different direction. The impact of congestion is on the totality of vehicles, not just on vehicles moving in one direction. I expect that type of mass transit investment will continue over the years ahead. That will reduce people's dependence on the motor vehicle to get into the CBD area.

It is not mentioned in the Department of Transport's submission, but we are also looking at significant investments to upgrade Orrong Road as part of the work around road links to the airport. The government is working in partnership with the commonwealth to deliver the first phase of the Gateway project. The Gateway project will effectively upgrade the intersections of some big roads out there, such as the Tonkin and Leach Highways, and Tonkin Highway and Horrie Miller Drive. The Leach Highway—Abernethy Road intersection will be the first job of work. It is significant. The second job of work will be upgrades to Orrong Road so that traffic can effectively come off the Graham Farmer Freeway and travel to the airport without going through traffic lights. That is an engineering and design challenge that Main Roads is currently working through.

Mr J.N. Hyde: What about the waterfront project? There will be thousands more office workers because of this project, the link and everything—how will they get in?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: All these measures will help take pressure off the movement of traffic through the CBD. I will describe to the member for Perth in quite simple terms how we will fix Orrong Road. We will either go out, up or down.

Mr J.N. Hyde: That has nothing to do with this amendment. Come on; focus!

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: It has something to do with this amendment, because it all impacts on traffic flows. It all impacts on the quality of this development. It all impacts on South Perth, member for South Perth.

Mr J.E. McGrath: Thank you. Tell me how!

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: It will impact on South Perth more than the failure to upgrade the Canning Bridge train station and the Manning Road off-ramp—two other pet projects I know the member is pursuing very vigorously! But of course we are onto that as well for the member.

Mr J.H.D. Day: All the property values will go up because of their proximity to such a world-class and attractive development.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: But the point I want to make is that a lot of work has gone in to understanding how this will impact on traffic. There are some investments required to deal with that. One thing the member for Perth is right about—I am not sure that he actually said it, but he would have thought it!—is that the tunnel is pretty

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

much at capacity at the moment in peak times. It carries about 100 000 vehicles a day. That is a bit under what comes down the freeway north, and up the freeway south. Clearly, investments have to be made to cater for the displacement of traffic.

Mr M.P. Whitely: Your investment is just putting a new line on a road, is it not? It is not much more complex than that.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: It might be, in the member for Bassendean's mind —

Mr M.P. Whitely: You are turning it into three lanes, aren't you?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: That is right.

Mr M.P. Whitely: What does that involve except for painting a few lines on a road? You are not actually widening the tunnel.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: The member for Bassendean's scientific approach is rocking me back on my heels! What is the point you are trying to make in your normal L. Ron Hubbard-esque style?

Mr M.P. Whitely: I am asking what else you are doing other than painting a few lines on a road to put in a third lane?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: As I just explained, if the member was not off in the ether, there needs to be a significant complementary investment, particularly at the western end of the tunnel. That significant complementary investment deals with traffic coming out of the tunnel to the freeway north. An extra lane will have to be put in on the freeway north, probably stretching as far north as Scarborough Beach Road. It will involve significant modifications to the capacity to come off at Loftus Street, in particular at the intersection of Loftus and Cambridge Streets.

Mr M.P. Whitely: So you are widening the freeway —

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: A whole lot of work has to be done.

Mr A.P. Jacob interjected.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: We are doing some more work up there; calm down!

I will try to create a simple analogy for the member for Bassendean. It is like a funnel—they are those things with a big bit at the top and a little bit at the bottom. If we make the big bit at the top a bit bigger, which is what we are going to do by the extra lane—about a third bigger—and we do not make the little bit at the bottom wider, it does not matter how much water we pour into the top, it will not get out the bottom quicker! We have to make the top bigger—it will be a third bigger with the extra lane—and we have to make the bottom wider. That is the bit that comes out the end. It is a broad road investment program. I have great confidence that we will deal with the impact of this transformational project —

Mr J.N. Hyde: On the top left-hand corner of that excellent corflute sign there, it says “possible future station development”. You are the Minister for Transport: what sort of possible future station have you got planned—light rail, bus or train?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: That is actually on top of the existing station. The member would have to ask the Minister for Planning, but there is already a station there.

Mr J.N. Hyde: No; it says “possible future station”. We built the one underground, do not worry about that; what are you building on top?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: It may well be development on top of the existing station.

Mr J.N. Hyde: What is it?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: It will be future station development!

Mr J.N. Hyde: Tell us.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: I don't know, but there is already a station there.

Mr J.N. Hyde: You don't know and you're the minister! You are trying to tell us all the traffic is going in the tunnel —

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: Let me explain something that might not be blindingly obvious: when there is an underground railway, there is generally a station underground. If the member is advocating building a railway station on top of the ground when the railway line is under it, go for it, but we are not doing that!

Mr J.N. Hyde: It is your corflute sign; your plan says “future station”!

Mr John Hyde; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Day; Mr John McGrath; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Mr Troy Buswell

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: Yes; right.

Mr J.N. Hyde: So you don't know.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: Moving on, Mr Acting Speaker. I think we have pretty much covered the core issue. The core issue is to make sure that the impact of this wonderful transformational project, not supported by the Labor Party but to be delivered by the Liberal–National government, on traffic movements through the CBD will be dealt with by additional investment in road and ongoing investment in our fantastic public transport system—although that investment in light rail is opposed by the Labor Party and, quite bizarrely, the member for Girrawheen, since it goes out near her electorate. We will have a discussion about that another time.

MR J.N. HYDE (Perth) [6.16 pm]: In closing, this amendment is an effort by the Liberal Party to close down debate on this issue and the very important points that have been raised. We applaud the member for South Perth for speaking up for his electorate and for understanding the real impact of this project. Within its own submission is the article in which the Premier was discovered writing on a cabinet detail, “No”, to the issue of Riverside Drive as the key element of the waterfront plan. It was very clear that there was a proposal early on that Riverside Drive should be kept open. The amendment has been moved; let us put the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Motion, as Amended

Question put and passed.