

ARMADALE REDEVELOPMENT BILL 2001

Second Reading

Resumed from 8 November.

HON DERRICK TOMLINSON (East Metropolitan) [12.13 pm]: The Opposition supports this Bill. As lead speaker, I will now take my unlimited time to explain why. Before turning to the detail of the Armadale Redevelopment Bill, and the justification for that in the city of Armadale, I will examine or visit the history of development authorities in this State, certainly in the metropolitan region.

The first development authority was the Joondalup Development Corporation. Joondalup was a greenfield site, well beyond the frontier of the urban development at the time that development authority was established. The development authority was established with a specific purpose: to bring some coherence into the development process, to provide a development scheme and to allow for the progressive implementation of that scheme to the best advantage of urban development in that part of the metropolitan area. Members will agree that it has been admirably successful. I confess that I have very few reasons for visiting that part of the metropolitan area. I find myself exceedingly busy looking after the eastern third of the metropolitan area, between Bullsbrook and Keysbrook. Apart from occasional visits to West Perth, I find very little reason to go to south Geraldton. However, I did have reason to visit Joondalup earlier this year and I confess that I was very impressed with what I saw. In one way, I was also depressed with what I saw, because I could not help contrasting the opulence of public facilities available in Joondalup with the poverty of public facilities in regional centres in the East Metropolitan Region, notably Midland and Armadale. However, all of the virtues that one can see in Joondalup reflect the value of sound planning before starting urban development. Because it was a greenfield site, and because there was planned and controlled development, there was also planned and controlled development according to that which the market could sustain and to the best advantage of the market. The net result was that the Joondalup Development Corporation made a beneficial financial return to the State of Western Australia, some of which went into the excellent facilities that are available in the city of Joondalup.

The second of the development authorities, although it was more properly called a redevelopment authority, was the East Perth Redevelopment Authority. That redevelopment authority was initiated, I think, by the work of Terry Burke, the then member for Perth. East Perth, as members know, was a particularly run-down section of the eastern end of the city, with a mixture of commercial, residential, industrial and very inadequate parkland areas along the river. Historically, it was a very important site, with the Perth Girls School, the East Perth Cemetery and Clays Brook, which was nothing more than a stinking cesspool. I use the term "cesspool" advisedly, because the sewerage plant at Claisebrook remains. Much of the land in that run-down section of the city was public land. It was not a greenfield site as in the case of Joondalup, but it was land and property within the control of the public sector. Therefore, the amalgamation of that land, and placing the development of that land in the hands of the East Perth Redevelopment Authority, was a relatively simple proposition. The net result was that the amalgamation of those public properties produced a viable parcel of land which, like Joondalup, could be properly planned, properly developed and released according to maximum market opportunities and maximum town planning values.

East Perth has several advantages. One is its site on the Swan River near the Causeway. Even though Claisebrook was a stinking cesspool, its potential was great. The second advantage was the size of the parcel of land that could be developed by aggregating public land and putting development controls over private parcels within the East Perth Redevelopment Authority precinct. The third advantage was that before the development authority was established, a development proposal had already been prepared. I think Ratcliffe was the name of the fellow who did it. He either took it to Terry Burke or developed it in association with Terry Burke. A concept plan for good urban renewal was in place in East Perth even before the East Perth Redevelopment Authority was established. The last and most significant advantage of East Perth was that it attracted a \$40 million Better Cities grant. Therefore, all the infrastructure that converted that degraded part of the eastern portion of the city was made possible before redevelopment began properly, because of the injection of \$40 million of commonwealth funds. The \$40 million spent on that infrastructure, according to the Ratcliffe plan, produced the very attractive urban setting that is now East Perth.

The second redevelopment authority, but the third development authority, was of course the Subiaco Redevelopment Authority. Subiaco in some respects was similar to East Perth in that there was a viable parcel of public land that could be aggregated. It was much more problematic than East Perth because of the strange mixture of subdivisions and titles, such as strata titles and purple titles. I think every colour of the rainbow was represented in the titles in that part of Subiaco.

Hon George Cash: There was a lot of government leased land.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: Yes. Hon George Cash was the Minister for Lands at the time that the aggregation of land to the Subiaco Redevelopment Authority took place. Although it was a much more difficult proposition than the East Perth land aggregation and acquisition, Subiaco did have a viable parcel of land which could be developed and marketed to the maximum advantage of the market and good town planning principles. The area did not have the advantage of location in the same way that East Perth had the advantage of location. It had a different advantage of location in that it was on the railway line and it was at the western end of Subiaco commercial precinct. The Government of the day took advantage of its location on the railway line to solve some very serious transport problems along that corridor. Therefore, by good planning, we had not only the development of an excellent Subiaco precinct but also the resolution of some urban transit problems to the advantage of all. It too, like East Perth, returned valuable financial benefits to the State.

The third was the Midland Redevelopment Authority. Midland is quite different. It does not have the advantage of location. When it was suggested that the Department of Land Administration relocate from its central city block to Midland, the most common objection was that people did not want to be “way out there”. It is 16 kilometres from the central business district. It is closer than Joondalup, but the perception is that it is “way out there”. The second disadvantage of Midland’s location is that it sits at the foothills of the Darling escarpment. Beyond the Darling escarpment, of course, there is very little opportunity for urban growth.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am sure the minister does not want to present his behind to the whole Chamber.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: I thank the President for protecting me, but I was enjoying the outline of his posterior.

Several members interjected.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: I do not think I could start at a better place for redevelopment than that which I was observing. Before that I was in Midland, I was in the foothills, I was at the Darling escarpment and beyond talking of serious challenges for urban development and the provision of infrastructure in what is loosely called the Darling Range. The second constraint on Midland is that, of course, beyond the Great Eastern Highway much of the land that has not been released to private ownership is state forest and surface water collection areas for Mundaring Weir and the Helena pipe-head dam. Another physical constraint is that to the north is the Swan Valley development area, which has serious statutory controls on its future development. It will remain, according to statute, predominantly an agricultural or horticultural region. The opportunity for urban development that would maximise the commercial advantage of the redevelopment of Midland is constrained by the location of the Swan Valley. The nearest major urban development is Ellenbrook. Although Ellenbrook will ultimately be a city at least as large as Bunbury, and certainly as large as the City of Melville, and, therefore, have a rate base as large as the City of Melville, Ellenbrook is too far removed from Midland to make Midland viable as a commercial centre. In fact, it is easier for the residents of Ellenbrook to go to the commercial centre of Morley than to go to Midland. For those reasons, Midland is quite different from Subiaco and East Perth in its potential to realise a quick and valuable financial return to government.

The third major problem is that the parcel of land in Midland that is available for urban renewal has negative value. That parcel of land is larger than was available at East Perth and Subiaco, with 74 hectares in the old railway workshops site alone. Therefore, there is no need to aggregate parcels of land, as was the case in East Perth and Subiaco. There is also none of the difficulty that is associated with aggregating different parcels of government land, as was the case in Subiaco, because that one parcel of land is owned by one government authority, the former Western Australian Government Railways. However, because of some of the historical practices of waste disposal on that Western Australian Government Railways workshops site, there are some contaminated spots in the Midland Redevelopment Authority site. It is difficult to identify some of those contaminated spots, and it is even more difficult to identify what may be contained in those contaminated spots, and that adds to the cost of redevelopment of the Midland site.

The Midland site has some valuable heritage buildings. Workshops Nos 1, 2 and 3, which were designed by C.Y. O’Connor for Western Australian Government Railways in the 1890s, are unequalled in Australia as industrial heritage buildings. I had the privilege of travelling with a party led by the then Minister for Planning, Hon Graham Kierath, to visit similar former railways workshops sites in Sydney and Newcastle.

Hon Tom Stephens: I thought you were going say you were travelling with C.Y. O’Connor.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: C.Y. and I go back a long way. I can remember walking the whole of the pipeline route with C.Y. I was very aggrieved when the *Sunday Times* attacked him when it did. However, I have grown old enough to accept that the editor of the *Sunday Times* had a position -

The PRESIDENT: Order! I assume that in due course the member will get somewhere near Armadale in his travels.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: Mr President, you are on track. We started at Joondalup, and we went to East Perth and Subiaco. We are now in the East Metropolitan Region and are moving towards Armadale.

Hon John Fischer: In the company of C. Yelverton O'Connor!

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: Of course! I am being distracted. I drew attention to the valuable heritage buildings and have said that I think workshops buildings Nos 1, 2 and 3 are the best examples of industrial buildings of their size and kind anywhere in Australia. A serious challenge exists in redeveloping those buildings, because they are roofed entirely with blue asbestos. Those saw-toothed roofs will have to be removed, and that will be quite a task. The former Railways Institute buildings are now being used by both the redevelopment authority and the Swan education precinct, which comprises Edith Cowan University and the Midland College of TAFE. The site also contains the power plant, which still has all of the original machinery.

The most significant challenge to the development of that site is that it has negative value. The second significant challenge is its location. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that the Midland site will give the Government a financial return similar to that for East Perth and Subiaco. Until now, there has been no investment of public funds in that site, as there was in East Perth. The \$40 million Better Cities funding for East Perth was important to the success of that project, because the infrastructure could be put in place before the redevelopment began. There is a pressing need for infrastructure on that 74 hectare site, and for infrastructure to tie that 74 hectare site to the old town of Midland. However, the investment of public capital is not available for Midland as it was for East Perth.

At long last we now arrive at Armadale. Armadale, like Midland, has the disadvantage of location. It too is a transit route. Just as Midland began as the junction of the Midland and WAGR routes to Geraldton and Kalgoorlie respectively, Armadale exists because it is at the junction of the South Western Highway, Albany Highway and Brookton Highway. Its origin is as a staging post for coaches. It exists simply because it is at the junction of those three major transit routes. Armadale is located in the foothills of the Darling escarpment. Beyond the hinterland of the city of Armadale, just as in the hinterland of the town of Midland, is either state forest or water catchment area. That area is protected and is very important for the quality of Perth's water and air, and for passive and active recreation for the Perth metropolitan area. However, that means that it provides no opportunity for urban development. Therefore, the catchment area of Armadale, as is the case with the catchment area of Midland, is severely constrained. In the foreseeable future, it will probably not become a commercial centre in the way that Subiaco, Morley, Cannington, Booragoon and Joondalup have become commercial centres. Therefore, it will not be possible to maximise the market opportunities as market opportunities were maximised at Joondalup, East Perth and Subiaco.

The second major constraint upon Armadale is that there is not the same opportunity to aggregate a parcel of publicly owned land to impose a structure plan to allow optimum urban development to expose itself to optimum market opportunities. I draw the attention of the House to pages 48 and 49 of the Bill - we are making progress. If members refer to those pages they will see the very real land constraints that the Armadale Redevelopment Authority will confront. Plan No 1 shows the boundaries of the redevelopment area around the town centre of Armadale. Most of that town centre is subdivided as commercial or residential. The portions of what appears to be open space along Armadale Road are in fact Minnawarra Park - a very attractive public recreation area. The City of Armadale is to be complimented for the way in which it has developed the park over the past decade.

The western side of plan No 1 - between Green and Commerce Avenues - shows the only parcel of public land that is available for redevelopment. That is Western Australian Government Railway land and the site of the Armadale railway station. I believe that the Government has allocated about \$6 million for the redevelopment of that site. Perhaps the parliamentary secretary could confirm that figure. The railway station will probably be relocated on the WAGR site at the end of Jull Street. It could become a very attractive focus for the town. The railway station is a destination rather than a transit point. It exists predominantly as the terminus of the Perth to Armadale route. It is intended that that route will be extended to Byford, in which case Armadale will no longer be the terminus. I anticipate that, in the very distant future, the railway will link Byford and Mandurah, and we will have a circuit railway. C.Y. and I will be well and truly gone before that happens.

Hon G.T. Giffard: Perhaps not C.Y.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: Who knows, I might live as long as Methuselah lived.

The PRESIDENT: I think the member is being distracted by interjections.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: I am being extracted!

It is also possible that the *Australind*, which now journeys from East Perth to Bunbury, will have its route extended past Bunbury. If the *Australind* terminus were at Armadale rather than East Perth, that railway station would be a significant transit point.

Apart from potential relocation and redevelopment, the only parcel of WAGR land available for other urban development to enhance the town centre of Armadale is relatively small; it does not compare with East Perth, Subiaco or Midland. It certainly does not compare with the greenfields site at Joondalup.

Page 49 of the Bill illustrates a disaggregation rather than an aggregation of government-owned land. Some of the parcels are as small as the Department of Conservation and Land Management site at the corner of Ecko Road and Albany Highway. The map on page 49 shows a tiny square on the eastern side of the redevelopment area. It was previously CALM's east metropolitan region operations centre. The Department of Agriculture also occupied the site when Armadale was more predominantly a horticultural centre. It is a small pocket of land surrounded by the new and very attractive Armadale-Kelmscott Memorial Hospital. Those members who have not visited it should do so. It meets the previous Government's commitment to provide a state-of-the-art hospital in that area. The market and urban development potential of that piece of land is somewhat constrained. It has no value as urban land because it is surrounded by the hospital site and it cannot be developed because of access problems at the hospital. The need for redevelopment to maximise patient access, particularly to the emergency department, will impose even further constraints on the development of that land.

To the south is the brickworks. The operators of that site have indicated that they will downsize their operations and release some of the land for redevelopment. Again, that site is somewhat removed from the town centre and it has very significant redevelopment constraints because of its previous industrial use. It is clay country, as one would expect given that it is used for brickworks, and it is located in the south Armadale industrial zone. That small parcel of industrial land has some value, but it does not offer returns comparable with those realised at East Perth and Subiaco. Alongside that site is the Armadale Senior High School. The school is problematic because of the size of its population. The previous Government closely examined it in its review of the secondary education system. Consideration was given to closing the school and focusing attention on the redevelopment of Cecil Andrews Senior High School. It could have become the senior college and Armadale Senior High School could have been downgraded to a middle school. The building itself is now 50 years old, and badly in need of rehabilitation, reconstruction and redevelopment - I suggest \$2 million would only start to meet the needs. The Government might reconsider the Armadale Senior High School site, particularly in its location alongside the brickworks site, which is in the redevelopment authority area, and consider the opportunities for building a new senior college in Armadale. One of the greatest needs of this part of the metropolitan area is education. The previous Government met the health needs with the Armadale-Kelmscott Memorial Hospital. There is no TAFE facility in Armadale; the nearest TAFE facility is at Thornlie.

I have just suggested that Armadale Senior High School, a very proud school, has facilities that are badly in need of redevelopment. Rather than commence redevelopment on that site along the South Western Highway, the Government might consider redeveloping Armadale Senior High School as a senior college, perhaps even collocated with a TAFE facility, to develop the south east corridor. The reason the previous Government did not progress very far in its consideration of whether Armadale Senior High School should be rationalised is that the potential demand for education in that south east corridor, as far south as Mundijong, will exacerbate the existing need for first-class educational facilities in the south east corridor. The opportunity exists to meet a community need in this redevelopment area. That would necessitate relocating the Armadale Senior High School site. I suggest there is already a site in the redevelopment area at the old Champion Lakes high school site. The Armadale Senior High School could be relocated there as the Armadale senior college; a TAFE facility could be collocated, and the Government would be doing a considerable service to the community of Armadale. At the same time, the existing site of the Armadale Senior High School, collocated alongside the brickworks site on Albany Highway could be amalgamated to make that a viable commercial business precinct. The Champion Lakes recreation area, in the north eastern corner of plan No 2, bounded by Lake Road and the future Tonkin Highway, is a recreation area. It will not generate a financial return to the redevelopment authority or to the State. In fact, it will be a very, very expensive development. That is the site for the proposed rowing course, which I think is admirable, and it should be encouraged and progressed by this Government and the future Barnett Government. I will certainly be agitating to make sure that is done.

Hon G.T. Giffard: You will be gone by then.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: No, I will not be gone by then; I have changed my mind. The member has persuaded me to seek re-endorsement.

The previous Government developed structure plans for this site, I think under the stewardship of the then Minister for Sport and Recreation, Hon Norman Moore, and I think the Minister for Lands, Hon Doug Shave. The site plans are in place. The cost estimates have been done, and they are great. It will be an excellent facility. Had we been a competitor for the 2006 Commonwealth Games, that would have been the site for the rowing competition. The rowing competition would have been shifted from the Canning River at Canning Bridge to that Champion Lakes site.

The point I make is that, although that parcel of land is one of the larger parcels for the redevelopment authority, it offers no capital gain to the redevelopment authority; it will be a very substantial investment cost. I believe that investment cost is justified but will be a considerable challenge to the redevelopment authority to achieve, because it will require the investment of public funds. I do not believe it will be a marketable site in the private sector. It will be a major public sporting recreation facility, built and maintained at cost to the public purse.

I refer finally to the redevelopment authority land at the Forrestdale industrial park. The Forrestdale industrial park has been one of the aspirations of the City of Armadale for as long as I have been a member for the East Metropolitan Region. The development of that industrial park is dependent upon two things: public transport or a major transport heavy haulage route, and the provision of appropriate infrastructure, particularly water and sewerage. The haulage route, of course, is the Tonkin Highway. When the Court Government came to power in 1993, the Tonkin Highway was a concept - nothing more than a line drawn on a map. When the Court Government was disgracefully removed from office, not only was the land already in reserve, but also the design for that highway was well and truly in place. In fact, the construction of a dual carriageway between Albany Highway, Kelmscott, and Mundijong Road, Mundijong, was to commence in 2002, to be completed by 2007. Unfortunately, the High Court case that took the petrol revenues away from Western Australia and gave them to the Commonwealth put an end to that. However, the previous Government had in place the financial structure for the Tonkin Highway. The previous Government persuaded the Commonwealth Government to assume funding for Roe Highway. At the end of 2000, the Commonwealth agreed to accept financial responsibility for Roe Highway between Welshpool Road and Canning Vale - \$76 million of public funding was to be provided by the Commonwealth for a state road. That released \$76 million for other projects. The \$76 million was to go towards the development of the Tonkin Highway, at least from Albany Highway to Armadale Road and possibly as far as Thomas Road. Regrettably, an election intervened and there was a change of government, but there was not a change of plan - the construction of Roe Highway between Welshpool Road and Canning Vale is well advanced, because the funding was provided by the Commonwealth Government to the previous Government. The election intervened and the new Government was able to say, "We are going to construct Roe Highway", and at the same time it released state funds for the Tonkin Highway - and I will take this up after lunch.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 to 2.00 pm

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: As a result of the previous Government's financial planning, funding for the extension of Tonkin Highway has been allocated. The construction of Tonkin Highway between Albany Highway, Kelmscott and Armadale Road is now included in the four-year program for the Department of Planning and Infrastructure. It will be completed as far as Armadale Road by 2004. That will mean that the Forrestdale industrial park within the redevelopment area will have heavy haulage access along Tonkin Highway to the Canning Vale industrial area and the Kewdale marshalling yards and the extent of Tonkin Highway to eventually the Great Northern and Great Eastern Highways. That strategic heavy haulage route will make that Forrestdale industrial park, as part of the redevelopment area, an integral part of the industrial lands of the Perth metropolitan region. It will also provide a great fillip to the employment opportunities for the city of Armadale.

Regrettably, in the foreseeable future Tonkin Highway will not progress beyond Armadale Road to its projected destination of Mundijong Road and through Mundijong Road to the proposed southern transit corridor connecting Brookton Highway, Albany Highway, South Western Highway and Tonkin Highway. The Forrestdale industrial park will be constrained from having direct heavy haulage access to the southern agricultural hinterland. However, it is an important part of the redevelopment area.

I hope that I have demonstrated that, unlike the previous redevelopment areas of Joondalup, East Perth and Subiaco, the land available to the development authority will not generate large amounts of capital. I project that the development of the Champion Lakes recreation reserve will consume any capital generated by the development of the other lands, and more; it will be a public funding sinkhole. The Forrestdale industrial park will have value as industrial land. The Department of Conservation and Land Management land alongside the Armadale-Kelmscott Memorial Hospital is such a small parcel of land that it too will generate a very small financial benefit to the development authority.

Historically, the Joondalup Development Corporation had the potential to be a public milch cow. It could do nothing but generate a substantial return to Western Australia. Similarly, East Perth Redevelopment Authority has proved to be a milch cow. I believe that federal Building Better Cities funding of \$40 million has been returned to the State with a profit. The initial capital investment has been not only recouped but also recouped with additional return.

Likewise, the Subiaco Redevelopment Authority has generated a financial return to the State. Each of those development authorities has been able to pay for itself and return financial benefits to the State. Midland is a different proposition. As a 13-year redevelopment project, it will probably have value as commercial industrial

land compared with the residential land development of its three predecessors. However, it will incur substantial redevelopment costs due to the nature of the land and facilities in the redevelopment area.

Armada offers the prospect of no financial return but the demand and the need for major public capital investment if its potential is to be realised. That is not to say that Armada will not reap a benefit - it will, but it will not be a financial benefit.

I believe this Government and future Governments should consider the policy implications of that. There are several regional centres or subcentres throughout the metropolitan region, particularly in the doughnut suburbs, that are in need of urban renewal. The communities that have the potential to generate a financial return have done so. The subsequent urban renewal projects will require public investment with the prospect of very limited, if any, financial return to the State. In other words, the urban renewal will require public investment. I believe Armada will succeed, only if this Government and the first Barnett Government of 2005 accept the reality that public financial investment must be put into urban renewal. An example is the Gosnells town centre. This Government has already honoured the commitment of the previous Government of \$16 million of capital infrastructure for the urban renewal of Gosnells. Although I wholeheartedly support the Armada Redevelopment Authority, I observe that it will succeed only if there is the political willingness and the political commitment to invest public capital. I will illustrate that further. I have already demonstrated that the disaggregated land in schedule 1 redevelopment area, plan No 2, on page 49 of the Bill, will, at best, be cost neutral, but I suspect that it will require public investment for no return, particularly with the Champion Lakes development.

The real challenge for the Armada Redevelopment Authority is the Armada town centre, plan No 1. I have already pointed out that the only public land available for the Armada town centre redevelopment is the railway land bounded by Green Avenue and Commerce Avenue. It will return very small capital gain in the short term. Apart from the \$6 million that has been allocated to the redevelopment of the Armada railway station, I believe that the best and most effective way to maximise the value of that land and its planning potential as a focus for the town centre of Armada is for the redevelopment authority, or its agent, LandCorp, to enter into an arrangement with a private developer to develop that as a commercial business precinct focused on the railway station. Therefore, it will be private capital investment, using the public land as the incentive for capital investment. If the redevelopment authority and LandCorp, its agent, are able to achieve that, there will be a realisation of both the aesthetic and financial potential of that parcel of land.

Apart from that, there is no land in the town centre part of the redevelopment that will generate capital for the redevelopment authority. Bounded by what looks like William Street, South Western Highway, Armada Road and, to all intents and purposes, the railway line, the bulk of the land is either town centre, public recreation, commercial, private commercial or private residential. It is a problematic site for redevelopment for a couple of reasons. The first is obvious when looking at the plan; that is, the issue of access. The South Western Highway now bypasses the Armada town centre because the highway that once passed through the town centre was relocated southwards. Likewise, the Albany Highway bypasses the Armada town centre. There is no advantage of passing traffic. Access to the town centre from South Western Highway, Albany Highway and, I suggest also, Armada Road, is problematic. There is a need for a structure plan and a redevelopment of the whole road network of the City of Armada. To do that would require the acquisition of land held in private title, which would be expensive. It would require major capital investment, and major public capital investment, for the redevelopment of roads and other infrastructure. The redevelopment authority will not generate funds to pay for its own works; it will require substantial public investment if the potential of Armada is to be realised, simply because of the historic infrastructure that must be restructured.

The second reason is the contour and topography of the town centre of Armada. It is located in the foothills of the escarpment. Those members who have ever visited the Armada shopping centre will recognise the problem that the developer had in taking maximum advantage of the site that he had. I always take the assessments of shopping centres from the person with whom I spend my life. She regards Armada shopping centre as one of the worst in the metropolitan area because of its difficulty of access. The whole town has a problem, not only because of its existing and historic infrastructure, but also because it is built on a sloping site that Western Australian architects and town planners do not have a great deal of imagination or competence in making use of. They are used to developing on flat, sandy soils. Armada has sloping, clay soils. It is a challenging development prospect, but one which, by virtue of its topography and contours, will be expensive. No capital is available from the redevelopment authority. It will require capital investment from the private sector or, alternatively, some incentives for the private sector to invest capital there.

I know that the owners of the shopping centre are keen to redevelop, and they have been keen to do so for some time. However, major commercial considerations have militated against it. Another of the major problems that the owner of the Armada shopping centre has had to confront is, of course, the historic jarrah tree. That jarrah

tree is reputed to be 300 years old, which is not bad for a jarrah tree. It is the methuselah of jarrah trees. It is reputed to be the oldest jarrah tree in that part of the metropolitan region.

Hon Ken Travers: Do you remember when they planted it?

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: As a matter of fact, it was one that Charles Yelverton O'Connor and I planted on our way to Kalgoorlie. I thank the member; he reminded me of that. I will tell the House too about the time I had to carry him back to Perth when he sprained his ankle! The owner is keen to develop, but the developer will require strong commercial or investment incentives to proceed.

Under the Bill, the redevelopment authority is charged with the responsibility of a development scheme. In fact, \$2 million over two years is established in this year's budget and in the forward estimates for the next financial year. In answer to a question in the Estimates Committee, it was stated that that \$2 million will be spent only on the development plan. There will be nothing for capital investment in realising the development plan. There is no need for a development plan on any of the areas on page 49 to which I have already referred.

The Champion Lakes redevelopment plan is already in place. It was developed under the stewardship of Hon Norman Moore as Minister for Sport and Recreation. The development plan for the Forrestdale industrial park already has been approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission. I think it was developed in conjunction with the former Western Australian Industrial Lands Development Authority, which ceased to exist about five years ago - certainly in the life of the previous Government. However, that structure plan is already in place. There is no need for a structure plan on any of the other sites, because they form part of the urban infrastructure of the City of Armadale town planning scheme. The only development plan that will be required is the development plan for the area that I have already talked about, when the need arises to redevelop the roads and infrastructure and to enhance the access to the commercial centre of Armadale from the major transit routes.

The last point I will make about that aspect of the Bill is that, like other redevelopment authorities, the Armadale Redevelopment Authority will have ceded to it the planning controls now available to the City of Armadale. The East Perth Redevelopment Authority assumed or was granted the planning controls of the City of Perth in that part of East Perth. The Subiaco Redevelopment Authority had ceded to it for the duration of the authority the planning controls and the planning authority of the City of Subiaco. It is the same with the Midland Redevelopment Authority. Using that model, the Armadale Redevelopment Authority will have the planning controls of the City of Armadale. It will have responsibility for not only the development plan of the town centre but also the planning controls of the town centre.

The difference between the Armadale Redevelopment Authority and the other redevelopment authorities is that each of the other redevelopment authorities has its own staff and is responsible for carrying out its own projects. Most of the projects are conducted by contract of one kind or another with a private developer. Control of the development is ultimately in the hands of the redevelopment authority. All commercial decisions are the responsibility of the planning authority. All contractual arrangements are entered into by the redevelopment authority. All liabilities and risks are the liabilities and risks of the redevelopment authority. Planning control rests with the redevelopment authority, but not in Armadale. In Armadale there will be a planning authority of six - a chairperson, a deputy chairperson, two people nominated by the minister and two people nominated by the City of Armadale. It is the same as the Subiaco and Midland Redevelopment Authorities. The local government authority, the City of Armadale - just like the City of Swan, the City of Subiaco and the City of Perth in the case of East Perth - is represented on the redevelopment authority and therefore has community input into planning and development decisions. Two nominees of the City of Armadale will be on the Armadale Redevelopment Authority, but there the control will end. There is no provision and no opportunity for the redevelopment authority to employ its own staff, to engage its own contractors or to carry out the development of the site. The contractor in this case will be LandCorp. The redevelopment authority will have responsibility and planning control for the development plan; however, LandCorp will be the developer. I anticipate that LandCorp will work closely with other authorities as well as with, I sincerely hope, the Western Australian Planning Commission, because the planning expertise that has been developed in the former Ministry for Planning by the previous Government is second to none in Australia. We have an outstanding group of town planners within the Department for Planning and Infrastructure. I hope that LandCorp will work with the Department for Planning and Infrastructure. However, it will not be the planning authority's responsibility; it will be LandCorp's responsibility as the agent of the Armadale Redevelopment Authority.

That is a sensible resolution, because I have previously demonstrated that the redevelopment authority will not generate its own capital; it will be a consumer of public capital investment. If it is a consumer of public capital investment, it should not be able to risk that public capital investment in private contractual arrangements. It is reasonable that LandCorp be the agent. However, I issue this caution: the redevelopment authority is empowered to delegate its authorities to other agencies, as listed in the Bill. We have the potential for those authorities, which by Western Australian law are the responsibility of the local government authority, to be

transferred from the local government authority to the Armadale Redevelopment Authority. The Armadale Redevelopment Authority will exercise the planning controls available to and exercised under local government legal provisions. Those authorities in turn can be delegated to other agencies. LandCorp will be the principal agent of the redevelopment authority. It would be a pity if the planning controls now available to the government authority by conduit through the redevelopment authority became the planning controls of LandCorp. I issue that caution because the deliberate intention of the redevelopment authority is to ensure that the local community has input into the development process, first, through having two local government representatives on the redevelopment authority and, secondly, through the requirement that there be public consultation in the development of the redevelopment proposal. It would be a pity if, by delegation, those authorities were simply transferred to a state authority.

The Armadale Redevelopment Authority is considerably different from its predecessors. The Bill looks remarkably similar to the Midland Redevelopment Act and the Subiaco Redevelopment Act; however, it is somewhat different from the East Perth Redevelopment Act. Ostensibly, it is a similar piece of legislation to the Midland and Subiaco Redevelopment Acts. The difference is that those authorities have absolute authority for the realisation of a development plan. The Armadale Redevelopment Authority exists largely as a conduit for the State's LandCorp. Apart from that caution I have about the Bill, and it is probably one I should not have, because I see no reason to have it -

Hon Ken Travers: When you sit on that side of the House you need at least one caution per speech.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: I do; I always try to encourage Governments. It is always the responsibility of the Opposition to look for the hooks in legislation. The potential is there. Apart from that caution, the Opposition has no hesitation in supporting the legislation. The City of Armadale needs the support of a redevelopment authority to meet the challenge of the redevelopment of its town centre. The opportunity for that is given in the Bill. For that reason I suggest that we go directly to the third reading.

HON J.A. SCOTT (South Metropolitan) [2.32 pm]: I hope Hon Derrick Tomlinson will allow me to interrupt the Bill's going straight to the third reading to make some small input. I agree with many of the comments Hon Derrick Tomlinson made. Armadale is similar to Midland in the way that it is an entry point to the city for a large section of the population of the rural hinterland and is at the crossroads of a number of major highways and railways.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: You should say that it is a most important entree point, because you are in the presence of the mayor.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Had I thought of it, I would have said that as well. I agree that Armadale seems to have reached a point in its history at which it is struggling for some cohesion in making a real centre. It is important that when regional centres around Perth are developed they have a real identity, centre and place with which people can associate as being their part of the city. Armadale already has infrastructure in place, but the cohesion of Armadale has been going backwards for a little while. The heritage precinct and Pioneer Village are not really operating very well. I believe that the Bill will pull things together and enable the city to be managed in a coherent way, which will enable it to succeed more easily.

The process of preparing the redevelopment Bill has been more inclusive than were others in the past. The redevelopment of East Perth and Joondalup was driven from some higher centre and did not have local input.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: That is why the planning control is vested in the planning authority, so that it can be a benevolent dictator.

Hon Ken Travers: Joondalup was a greenfields site.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Certainly, but East Perth had a population. I am pleased that there has been some local input, because our benevolent dictatorships tend to be more dictatorial than benevolent.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Democracy is a nuisance.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Yes. When a proper process is not put in place, people get very angry and tend to interrupt and get in the way. We saw that with the redevelopment in the Wattleup Valley area, which is still causing upset and anger.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Only amongst those who didn't get their way.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: That glosses over the very real aspirations of people who wanted to live in that area. Some chose to live there because of the lifestyle. It is very important to bring communities with us when we do these things, even if there is a centralised plan. A level of consensus means that the process works a heck of a lot better. Local knowledge is very important when putting together a plan that will really work for an area rather than simply having an expert at the top. Sometimes experts make big blunders. We have had quite a few big

blunders in Perth already. Anyone can look back at the blunders that happened in the centre of the city when the population was forced out of it. Now we are struggling to try to get people back into the city, and there is not really the ability to do that.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: There was also the question of lifestyle. People went from West Perth to Dalkeith because they thought Dalkeith was more attractive than West Perth.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: There is no doubt evolution occurs. People do not go through the whole of their lives wanting to maintain the same lifestyle. I dare say even Hon Derrick Tomlinson has changed during his lifetime.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Several times.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Local consultation has been very important in this Bill. I hope we will see plenty more of that in the future. I hope we adopt a consensus approach to such issues or at least try to get a large measure of agreement at local level.

As has already been mentioned, constraints are placed on the level of development in the Armadale area largely as a result of the topography, but also because of the uses for which the land is currently zoned. The topography to the east of Armadale makes the land difficult to build on, and it is very difficult and costly to provide proper infrastructure, such as sewerage systems. Therefore, it becomes even more imperative that that land use be well planned. One of the difficulties is that we cannot tell from the Bill what will be the population density in the development around the rail line -

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: The development of a plan will be an essential part of the development of this land.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Yes, but what makes it difficult for us in this place is that we get the plan later rather than sooner -

Hon G.T. Giffard: There should also be community consultation.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I understand from the second reading speech that there has already been local consultation.

Hon G.T. Giffard: Not in developing the plan.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: It is difficult for us to make a decision about this issue if we are given limited information about what is planned for this land. We need to decide whether this redevelopment is a good idea or a bad idea, but if we are given only half of the idea, it is not easy to make a decision. However, we assume that the right process will continue and the right planning will be put in place, and that more dense urbanisation will occur around the rail node, which we expect will reduce the need for people to use private transport and increase their ability to use the existing train service.

Another issue that was raised is the financial return of this project to the Government. I agree that although that may be a consideration, it should not be the overriding consideration, because when we improve an area, particularly when a body such as LandCorp is involved, at the end of the day there is usually a corresponding uplift in the value of all the other property in the region, and that returns a lot more money to the State's coffers.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: The aesthetic value will be greater than the financial value, but do you agree that the political willingness to invest public capital will be very important to the success of this project?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I certainly agree. This redevelopment will not be the same as the Subiaco and East Perth redevelopments, and in many ways the redevelopment plan will need to be more of a long-term plan.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: But with short-term capital investment.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Yes. I always appreciate long-term planning. This Bill is timely. It is necessary to coordinate the planning in the Armadale area to strengthen the regional development concept in outlying areas. I hope the Government will continue to build on that regional concept, because that will advantage the whole city. If we can ensure that people will enjoy the shopping and other amenities in that district, it will reduce the need for those people to travel to and use infrastructure in other parts of the city, and it will increase local employment. If we have more urban village-type development, rather than massive centres in which all roads lead to Rome, we will have a far more cohesive community and will also reduce the traffic and social problems that arise from that type of planning. I hope that in the future, the Government will take regional development even further and link Armadale with other regional areas, because we need to prevent the city of Perth from being seen as a mecca, although that is probably an unpopular word at the moment. We need to enhance regional centres. A number of recent planning changes will need to be addressed to build upon the development of regional centres. For instance, a concern in some areas in Fremantle is that the proposed rail link to the south will mean that people in the south will no longer use Fremantle as their regional centre. In the future we will also need to improve transport links between Armadale and regional centres south of the river, because currently I can travel from Fremantle to Armadale fairly quickly by car, but there is little public transport on that route.

HON G.T. GIFFARD (North Metropolitan - Parliamentary Secretary) [2.47 pm]: I thank all members who have indicated their support for the Bill; that is appreciated. I will make a few points about the matters raised by Hon Derrick Tomlinson. I do not take exception to any of the points that he raised, although I may not put the same emphasis on some of those points, particularly what may be characterised as his slightly pessimistic view of the return on the government land in that area. I am not sure I would take such a pessimistic view.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: I hope you are right.

Hon G.T. GIFFARD: I take the point, but I am not so at odds with Hon Derrick Tomlinson as to completely disagree with him.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: But you do accept that there will be a need for substantial state investment?

Hon G.T. GIFFARD: I do. We are probably talking about shades of grey. As I indicated by way of interjection, and as Hon Derrick Tomlinson has confirmed, the amount of \$60 million -

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: It is \$6 million, although I would like it to be \$60 million.

Hon G.T. GIFFARD: I am sure Hon Derrick Tomlinson would. I am told that planning has commenced, and, as Hon Derrick Tomlinson indicated, that money has been allocated. The purpose of the Armadale Redevelopment Authority is not simply to maximise the return on government land. It is important to have the correct emphasis. Clause 16 clearly indicates economic and social development considerations. It is appropriate to recognise that, although there is no resiling from the desire to maximise the return, part of the authority's charter will be to nurture social development.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: I agree wholeheartedly; that should be the primary focus. However, other redevelopment authorities, with the exception of the Midland Redevelopment Authority, will be able to meet the cost of the infrastructure required to enhance the social returns. In this instance, the cost of the infrastructure will have to be a public investment, because we will not realise the same return on the land available for redevelopment.

Hon G.T. GIFFARD: I understand what the member is saying. I thought it was worth pointing out the dual objectives.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: I agree.

Hon G.T. GIFFARD: I note the comments of Hon Jim Scott, but I do not believe I need to provide him with any further explanation. I thank members for their support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time, proceeded through remaining stages without debate, and passed.