

Division 30: Western Australian Planning Commission, \$111 275 000 —

Ms L. Baker, Chairman.

Mr J.H.D. Day, Minister for Planning.

Ms G. McGowan, Director General.

Mr J. Deery, Chief Financial Officer.

Mr E. Lumsden, Chairperson, Western Australian Planning Commission.

Mr T.M. Hillyard, Secretary, Western Australian Planning Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: Minister, can you confirm that the advisers are the same as they were for the Department of Planning?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: They are.

The CHAIRMAN: They look the same. I am just checking—you might have done something when I was not looking!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: It has been a seamless transition.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: My first question is about the metropolitan regional improvement tax. I refer to “Statement of Cashflows” on page 339. What is the expected MRIT collection for 2015–16?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: In total?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. And how much is forecast to be spent?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: The amount expected to be collected is indicated on page 331. In 2015–16, the amount is \$98.112 million, expected to be raised through the MRIT. I am advised that the amount has increased by about \$5 million compared with, I think, what was predicted in 2014–15. I will ask John Deery to provide the amount expected to be spent out of the fund in 2015–16.

Mr J. Deery: In 2015–16, it will be \$98.1 million of revenue. The total capital and recurrent expenditure will be \$69 million. Not all the money that is received will be spent.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Can I have the figures for the three out years?

Mr J. Deery: In 2016–17 the MRIT income will be \$105.7 million, plus \$6.4 million income for the Peel and greater Bunbury regions, giving a total of \$112.1 million. The next year, 2017–18, it will be \$113.9 million plus \$6.9 million for the Peel and greater Bunbury regions, giving a total of \$120.8 million. For 2018-19, net to income is \$122.8 million. The Peel and greater Bunbury income is \$7.4 million, making a total of \$130.2 million.

[4.50 pm]

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What was the forecast expenditure for those years?

Mr J. Deery: The total expenditure then for 2015–16, as I said, is \$69 million; for 2016-17, it is \$61.9 million; for 2017-18, it is \$60.1 million; and then in 2018-19 it jumps to \$103 million.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Excellent.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: These are estimates of course; they are forward estimates so they can always change and probably will.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, Premier—oh, I am sorry, minister!

What is the expected balance as at 30 June for the metropolitan region improvement fund account?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: If I remember rightly, it is all listed in the budget papers. It is on page 338.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, \$237 million. Is that right? Yes. As at 30 June 2015, the expected balance is \$237 million. That is a lot of money. I have had information provided before by way of supplementary, I suspect: can I have a breakdown of the expenditure for 2014-15 for the MRIF?

Mr J. Deery: Yes, as supplementary information.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Yes, we can provide the expenditure, although the year is not quite over. But as far as possible, we will provide a breakdown of the expenditure from the MRIF for 2014-15.

[*Supplementary Information No B63.*]

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In respect to the MRIF, was it a direction from Treasury not to spend the entire collection to help reduce some of the net debt issues?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: As with all government expenditure, it does go through the budget process, essentially, and therefore approval does need to be given through the budget process, and forecasting is done as part of that. The Western Australian Planning Commission is subject to the overall budget decisions made by government as to how much is able to be spent. What is actually spent can vary. If, for example, a court judgement is issued that requires a certain amount to be paid and if that is going to result in the commission spending more than expected, one way or another approval needs to be given for that. So there can be variations for that sort of reason.

The CHAIRMAN: I am conscious of the time. I am happy to give another question to the government, but does the opposition have anything? Right, member for Perth, rock and roll!

Ms E. EVANGEL: If I could refer the minister to page 35, under the heading of “Asset Investment Program”, with particular regard to the new Museum. I am keen to —

The CHAIRMAN: Is it page 335?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Wrong division.

Ms E. EVANGEL: Sorry, my apologies; it is page 355.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: That is after 5.00 pm.

Ms E. EVANGEL: I am jumping the gun, sorry, but I am very keen to ask it though.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: My question relates to some of the movements for smaller block sizes, in particular I understand there is a move—I think WAPC is considering it currently—in relation to some very, very, very small blocks of around 100 square metres. I was just wondering whether that is something before government currently and what the government’s inclination is?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I am not aware of anything around 100 square metres—200 maybe?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, I think it is about 100. I cannot remember whether it is green title or other title, but is it something before WAPC currently?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Does the member have a particular locality?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes; Ellenbrook.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I will ask Eric to comment generally.

Mr E. Lumsden: The short answer is no. That does not mean something will not be presented to us by industry, but certainly there have been discussions in terms of, in appropriate locations, lot sizes down to 250 square metres, which are cottage lots. But as to 100 square metres, my initial reaction to that is that is very aspirational, if not impractical.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This question is in relation to developers and school locations. There is a problem in my electorate currently of the government having committed to a school that it has now pulled out of—Caversham south—but the developers continue to advertise the fact that a school is coming. Is that something the Department of Planning takes an interest in or gives direction to; and what role and what interaction does the Department of Education have? For example, the Department of Education cancelled the school and probably never even told the Department of Planning or WAPC it was doing so, and now developers continue to advertise that the school is coming in 2017 when it will not be. What role does the department or WAPC have in that?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Probably not a lot, in short. If false advertising is being knowingly undertaken, the Consumer Protection Division of the Department of Commerce may well want to take some interest. I will just ask Eric to comment.

Mr E. Lumsden: In my view, all that can be said from a developer’s point of view is that it has a school site, which is normally indicated on the structure plan or appropriate subdivision plan. We obviously develop those structure plans and liaise with the Department of Education, but if the developer is actually proposing that a school will be coming in a certain period and if it does not have a commitment through, particularly, the Department of Education—obviously, it has to be in the forward works of government—I believe, as the minister said, that is totally false advertising and it is deceiving the community and increasing an expectation that will not necessarily be delivered.

The appropriation was recommended.

[5.00 pm]