

**SCARBOROUGH PLANNING FRAMEWORK AND DESIGN GUIDELINES
METROPOLITAN REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY — DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL**

Petition

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.06 pm]: I have a petition that has been certified as conforming with the standing orders of the Assembly. It has 888 signatures and states —

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned residents of Western Australia note that the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority (MRA) has not adhered to the Scarborough Planning Framework and Design Guidelines which establishes the base height controls of 2–12 storeys for all buildings in the Scarborough Redevelopment Area.

The MRA has instead approved the Chinese owned 3 Oceans Property development proposal for two towers of 43 and 33 storeys at the corner of Scarborough Beach Rd and West Coast Hwy. This site is designated for 12 storeys under the Scarborough Planning Framework.

We the undersigned ask the Legislative Assembly to protect our coastal environment by:

- 1 Compelling the Minister for Planning to direct the MRA Board to adhere to the Scarborough Planning Framework which requires all developments within the Scarborough Redevelopment Area to be a maximum of 12 storeys.
- 2 Compelling the Minister to direct the MRA Board to reject the 3 Oceans proposal as it does not adhere to the aforesaid Scarborough Planning Framework, Design Guidelines and Height Controls agreed with the community following public consultation in 2016.

[See petition 116.]

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Point of Order

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I am just seeking clarification under the standing order on a conflict of interest. Under the standing order on the disclosure of a conflict of interest, resolution 3, if a member presents a petition when they have a potential or direct conflict of interest, are they discounted from presenting that petition? I am just asking.

The SPEAKER: I will consider the point of order and I will make a statement later in the day.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Mr Speaker, can I seek clarification from you? Exactly what is the nature of the member for Cannington's accusation with respect to a conflict of interest?

The SPEAKER: I do not have to explain that. He has made a comment and I will check with the Clerk to make sure whether it is right or it is wrong. I will clarify to find out the standing order.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Further to that point, Mr Speaker. There were two parts. First, he accused the member for Scarborough of having a conflict of interest or a potential conflict of interest.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, he did.

The SPEAKER: No, he did not. He just asked for clarification of standing order 80, was it?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Mr Speaker, I think he said that he sought your advice on whether or not a petition applies if the deliverer of the petition, in this case the member for Scarborough, has a conflict of interest or a potential conflict of interest with the development in question.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, he did.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Therefore, are you going to rule on whether she has a potential or real conflict of interest? I would like to know what is that conflict of interest and what is the accusation of the member.

The SPEAKER: As I said before, I will seek advice on this. I will make a decision and a statement later on in today's proceedings. That is all I can do.

[See page 8206.]