HOPE VALLEY-WATTLEUP REDEVELOPMENT BILL 2000

Third Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR THOMAS (Cockburn) [3.57 pm]: When the debate was adjourned before question time, I had referred to the fact that adequate compensation is not being offered to the residents of Wattleup under this Bill. Prior to my presenting that argument, my colleague the member for Peel made a similar argument about the residents of Hope Valley, who are in his constituency. I then talked about the need for a Hope Valley-Wattleup redevelopment authority. The project that will be undertaken, whatever the outcome, will involve substantial rezoning and redevelopment of the Wattleup area. It will be the biggest redevelopment project in Australia. It will be much bigger than the East Perth, Subiaco and Midland redevelopments by a factor of 10:1. It will take place over an extended period, because the timeline will be determined by the take-up rate for industrial land, as opposed to that for the land in Subiaco and East Perth, which happened as fast as physically possible.

LandCorp and its antecedents have been through a number of incarnations in the time I have been in Parliament. No doubt members would find many more if they looked back 30 years. In these circumstances, in which a redevelopment is taking place and many stakeholders are involved, if the Government has its way and people do not continue to reside in the area, residents of adjoining areas will also be involved. People at large, the industries involved and their umbrella organisations and spokespersons would also have an interest in the environmental implications. They want to be able to deal with a continuing organisation. There can be no confidence that LandCorp will be a continuing organisation. It has already been through a number of incarnations and I suspect that over the next 30 years it will go through more - as it should, as people come up with better ideas on how to manage the organisation of the public sector. However, it is desirable to have continuity of structure and identity. It is also desirable to have an organisation whose sole priority is ensuring that the redevelopment of Wattleup and Hope Valley goes well and is at world’s best standard - the Opposition wants nothing less than that.

It is likely that an organisation that has a large portfolio will from time to time have different priorities. One year it might have a more urgent project and staff resources would be assigned to that rather than to the Wattleup-Hope Valley redevelopment. The Opposition wants an organisation whose sole priority and sole task is to make sure that this is done the right way. We want an organisation that has an office based in the district with which people are able to identify and develop a sense of ownership over. The extensive amendment that was moved, which I drafted to create a separate authority to undertake the redevelopment of Hope Valley and Wattleup, is worthy and has substantial merit. I cannot see why the Government is not prepared to at least give some ground on it.

Leave granted for speech to be continued at a later stage.

Debate thus adjourned.