

“DIRECTIONS 2031” PLANNING DOCUMENT AND DRAFT ACTIVITY CENTRES POLICY

Motion

MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham) [4.17 pm]: I move —

That this house calls on the Minister for Planning to reconsider key elements of the “Directions 2031” planning document, and the draft activity centres policy, with particular reference to —

- (a) the unreliable demographic data underpinning the plan;
- (b) the downgrading of the Armadale and Midland regional centres; and
- (c) the miscalculation of opportunities to implement growth strategies in the Peel.

This motion is essentially a criticism of the state’s “Directions 2031” planning document. I had hoped that the Minister for Planning would be present; I know he is aware it was coming on because he asked me and I spoke to him about it—I am pleased that he has now arrived.

The motion moved by the opposition is designed to point out some of the flaws in the recently released “Directions 2031” document. The principal speakers will be me, as shadow Minister for Planning, as well as the members for Armadale and Midland because of the impacts that document may well have on the communities they represent, and also because of both of those members’ extensive knowledge of planning and local government.

The Minister for Planning released this document earlier this year. It is what is called a spatial planning document; it builds upon the Network City plan that was released by the member for Armadale in 2004. It is, in effect, a continuation of planning documents that extend way back to the 1950s, with the Stephenson plan for the orderly growth and development of Perth and the Peel region.

Our criticisms of this document, whilst it contains some good points, are that it is based on some false and misleading assumptions. It is dangerous to have a document that is meant to plan for the future of Western Australia, our capital city and the Peel region for the next 22 years when the underlying assumptions upon which it is based are incorrect, because, of course, we cannot get it right again. It is not as though the planning can be done again once that period of time has expired, or whilst it is ongoing, if the underlying assumptions contained within the 2031 document are incorrect.

Our principal complaint about the document, which is echoed by a range of other organisations, such as the Urban Development Institute of Australia and the Committee for Perth, the City of Rockingham, the City of Mandurah, and indeed the Australian Bureau of Statistics, is that the growth figures planned for in this document are wrong.

The growth figures contained in this document are incorrect. When we plan for the development of our capital city, where there is 75 per cent of the population of our state, plus the Peel region—so it is more than that—and when we plan for long-term liveability, long-term infill urban development and long-term development on the fringes of our city, which are the places where people work, live, raise families and enjoy their lives, and where they are born and die, we must get it pretty right, so that our city can develop and grow in an orderly, sensible fashion that reflects the wishes and the desires of the people who live within that environment.

The document that the Minister for Planning presented, “Directions 2031: Draft Spatial Framework for Perth and Peel”, as I said, builds upon the document, “Network city: community planning strategy for Perth and Peel”, that was launched by the member for Armadale in 2004. That was a revolutionary document for planning in Western Australia. It removed some of the former ideas that the city could just go on and on. It put in place the idea that we need to put a real focus on urban infill, based around the employment and, in particular, the transport nodes that have opened up in the past few years, with the doubling in size of the Perth railway network, so that people are able to live in a society in which they do not spend the majority of their time in a motor vehicle. I think we could probably say that they were some of the major factors upon which that report was based. The report that the minister has launched builds upon that. However, it also uses exactly the same figures, which are now five or six years old, for growth in population for Perth and the Peel, and those figures are incorrect. Therefore, if the government is going to plan for the long-term future, it must have up-to-date, correct analyses of how our city will grow over the next 20 to 30 years.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics has released its latest growth figures. However, I will first tell the house the figures in the report that the minister proposes to use. The minister suggests in the report that the growth of Perth and the Peel region will be an additional 556 000 residents, and that by 2031 there will be a requirement for 328 000 more dwellings. The report is quite comprehensive on that point and has various analyses of different styles for the city of Perth—a compact city; a connected city with various nodes through it, which I think is the

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 14 October 2009]

p8062b-8084a

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Ms Adele Carles

minister's preferred option; and a linear city, which is longer along the coastline, as the name suggests. Each one of those scenarios suggests that the growth in population will be 556 000 people, requiring 328 000 dwellings, and that the land available to do that is 18 600 hectares. That is where the minister is out in his planning document. As I said, our research has shown that that analysis is wrong.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics suggests that Western Australia has recorded the nation's fastest population growth in the past year, at 3.1 per cent. We are outperforming Queensland, obviously, and Victoria and all the other states, with 3.1 per cent population growth. The bureau suggests that the fastest growing city in Australia is Mandurah. Its growth rate is much higher than that population growth of 3.1 per cent. Perth and the Peel have the highest growth rate of all the capital cities of Australia, and Mandurah is the fastest growing regional city anywhere in Australia, including those regional cities on the Queensland coast, which one would think might be growing faster. Nevertheless, Mandurah is outstripping them. However, the minister's document says that the figure it is predicated upon is a growth rate of 1.4 per cent for the next 22 years. Even the Property Council of Australia, in its analysis of what the minister has said, says that that is incorrect. It says that the minister's analysis of 1.4 per cent growth between 2009 and 2031 is incorrect, and that the document and the analysis, and everything they are based upon, should presume a population growth of 2.5 to three per cent. Considering that our population growth until recently has been 3.1 per cent, I think that the council has been conservative in its analysis of how we should plan for the future of Western Australia.

The Committee for Perth says —

There seems to be an underlying reliance within the document on research conducted as part of Network City. That research was wide-ranging and extensive but it is arguably the case that this research is now effectively out of date and may not be an appropriate basis on which to formulate new policy.

The Committee for Perth and the Property Council both suggest that the basis of the report is incorrect. The Property Council further says that many of the economic fundamentals that existed from 2003 to 2006 are likely to continue operating in WA, including very high population growth rates and a resilient state economy. Those two bodies, which are fairly significant bodies, and, as I said, the Australian Bureau of Statistics are all saying that the figures upon which the minister's report is based—the fundamentals, if one likes, contained within the first couple of paragraphs of the minister's executive summary letter at the front of the report—are incorrect for the long-term planning for Perth.

The City of Mandurah says in its report from the chief executive officer to council members that the minister's analyses are out by 27 000 people in the scale of population growth in the next 22 years. It says that there will be an additional 27 000 people living in the Peel region, Mandurah, Waroona and Pinjarra in the next 22 years, on top of what the minister is basing the planning arrangements for the Peel region on.

The City of Rockingham is also a very fast-growing region on the outer urban fringe, and one with which I am familiar. The City of Rockingham's town planner, Mr Peter Ricci—a man whom I know to be a very fine person—indicates that the minister's planning document is out by 32 000 people in Rockingham. All the analyses of the growth rates affecting the southern suburbs of Perth say that in the next 22 years the population will be 160 000 people, whereas the minister's estimate is that the population of Rockingham will be about 128 000 people. Again, the minister is out by 32 000 in his analysis of the area of Rockingham. That indicates that the analysis is significantly flawed and that the document needs to be changed to reflect not just that, but also some of the other recommendations that reflect that fact.

The Urban Development Institute of Australia analysed the minister's document, and it also indicates —

UDIA is of the opinion that the population projections presented in *Directions 2031* are underestimated and consequently the number of projected dwelling units falls short of what will actually be required. This has implications for the amount of urban zoned required to accommodate future development.

It says a number of other things that are critical of other parts of the document. If the foundations of the minister's document are incorrect, naturally other parts contained within it will be incorrect because they are built upon those foundations. The institute's submission continues —

A critical issue for UDIA is the underestimation of future urban land requirements proposed in *Directions 2031*. The methodology *Directions 2031* has used to calculate urban land is unacceptable and must be reviewed. The document requires a significantly finer level of analysis particularly in relation to informing sub-regional structure plans.

It is industry's view that at least 30 years' zoned land supply and a 50 year time horizon is required to preclude the possibility of another land supply crisis as occurred in 2006.

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Ms Adele Carles

It refers to the Gorgon project, and I will continue with the quote —

In June 2009, with the approval of Gorgon looming Perth has:

- 1,725 lots on the market (on the way down) from high point in May 2008 (2,212 lots on market)
- 3,065 lots under construction for release in next 12 months. This level of construction activity is significantly lower than previous years)
- 1,757 lots sold which is comparable to June 2006

I will quote further what the institute has to say —

It is UDIA's view that the 18,600ha of zoned land currently available to develop is inadequate and offers no buffer to the threat of a land supply crisis should demand increase suddenly,

As I indicated earlier, the obvious fact of the progression of the Gorgon project is one of those things that might provide that spur to the demand for housing in Perth and the Peel region. The institute has a number of other criticisms of the report, and I have outlined the case that when a report is based upon a fundamental mistake, naturally some of the other issues contained within the report are going to be wrong. I know that the report is a draft document calling for public comment, but generally these things are relatively close to their final state when they go out and the government would not want to have to start again. My advice to the Minister for Planning, based upon the facts that I have identified, which are pretty irrefutable, is that the people who have prepared the document have made a big mistake. It is a mistake that I do not think is very easily explainable. The minister said that the report is based on the assumptions contained in earlier documents produced five, six or seven years ago. That is not a good excuse for coming up with a document that contains the exact same assumptions six years later!

The people drafting this document should have known a major problem was looming. They needed to base their document around correct assumptions. Bearing in mind that the resources available to an opposition member are pretty restricted, and I could discover what the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the City of Mandurah and the City of Rockingham, the Property Council of Australia, the Committee for Perth, and the Urban Development Institute of Australia had to say about the future of our city and the Peel region for the next 22 years, I would have thought it would have been pretty easy for the Department of Planning to come up with that same analysis.

Mr J.H.D. Day: You are assuming that the Department of Planning is wrong and all of your advice is right. It may be a matter of different interpretation, and we can discuss that further.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I appreciate that is the minister's view. I do think the Department of Planning is wrong. I have met with some of the bodies that I have referred to, some of which have wide membership, and they are very concerned about the future planning for our city if it is to be based upon false assumptions. If the minister is saying that the Department of Planning is right and that the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the Property Council of Australia, Committee for Perth, the Mandurah council, the Rockingham council and the UDIA are all wrong, then I suspect that he will be proved wrong in the end. However, it may be a period of time before that becomes apparent. I would have thought it would be better to plan a document of this importance and magnitude for the future of our city and the Peel region based upon assumptions that are widely understood. Also, it could have worked out pretty easily, as it is pretty obvious that Perth and the Peel are going to grow significantly.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I agree, and 560 000 people over 20 years is a lot of people. That is what we estimate.

Mr M. McGOWAN: A growth rate system of 1.4 to 1.6 per cent is obviously not correct.

Mr J.H.D. Day: It is possible.

Mr M. McGOWAN: That is what the minister's document is based on. It is obviously not going to be correct, particularly because we have experienced growth rates in excess of three per cent. All I am saying is that the minister should perhaps have worked that out, and maybe, before he released that report, exercised due diligence.

This allows me to go into an issue that I raised in question time today. I heard the minister's answer, and the minister is correct that lots are available to be developed, if only the development industry would get on and develop them. I was also correct when I said that lots that had reached final approval in what was in effect in the minister's first year as minister were roughly half what was put in place by the former minister in 2006-07. The minister's line on this is that it is not his responsibility; it is the responsibility of the private development industry. Bearing in mind the nature of our Parliament and political system in which governments and ministers are held accountable for what happens within their broader portfolio area, that answer is a little unhelpful in view of what is going on in this state. We must have holistic government. We know there will be a whole range of developments in Western Australia. We know that the future growth path will be based upon what it has been.

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Ms Adele Carles

We know the capabilities of this state. We know how we suck in people from overseas and interstate. We know what our birth rate is. We know that we have become even more fecund.

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I am surprised the member for Armadale knew that word; the member surprises me, but she knew that one. I remember reading that word in Shakespeare in year 11, and I have never used the word since. I attempted to pronounce it in that year 11 English class and it got me into trouble! We have a very fecund population in Western Australia, but that is the smallest part of our population growth. The biggest part is overseas migration. The second biggest part is the breeding of our citizens; and the third biggest part is the number of people coming from interstate. A number of us in this chamber are in that category, including me. We know that all of this is going on. We know about the Gorgon project and about what will come as a result of that. It is not good enough for the minister responsible to say, "It is not my fault. It is someone else's fault; they will do something about it." It is up to the minister to make sure that more lots reach final approval than 12 179 compared with 20 916 just two years ago. It is not good enough for there to be a nearly halving in the rate of final lot approvals on the minister's watch. I know for a fact that the minister would certainly not have accepted that excuse had the Labor Party been in office when those figures came out. Labor governments had to confront a boom, huge demand for property, and we responded to that. As members can see, the figures prove that Labor governments made a huge effort in providing more lots to final approval, not only by the Minister for Planning and other ministers who have some responsibility in that area—former environment ministers also played a role in doing that—but also former Premiers. However, a number of the things that Labor governments put in place have now been removed.

This government has applied staffing caps on the Department of Planning. One area that we really had a problem with was ensuring there were enough planners to meet the demand to move more blocks through to final approval. Of course, planners were being taken by the private development industry and it was a battle to retain them. However, I have heard the complaints from industry that the government has restrictions on what can be done to meet that fundamental demand. The government removed the funding for the acid sulfate group that was secured in 2006; that group was designed to assess land ahead of development to ensure that all the necessary land that could be used or needed some remedial work could be prepared. A unit was put into the Department of Environment and Conservation to do that. The government has removed that funding. The government abandoned the approach put in place by the member for Armadale for an online subdivision approval system. The government keeps saying that it has not done so, but the money was taken out of the budget; therefore, if the money is not in the budget, where is it? The government can say that it will do something different, but money often speaks louder than words and this is a case in which money in the budget would have made a difference.

The government's performance has been very slow on public housing issues as indicated by all the people who are having difficulties finding somewhere to live. We have now identified that more than 50 000 people are waiting for housing, including a near doubling in the priority waiting list. There are underspends in public housing and fewer houses are being constructed than the government had committed to building. The abolition of the shared equity housing scheme—that scheme, of course, is the one thing that makes the biggest difference in getting people out of public housing and into their own homes —

Mr J.H.D. Day: Who said that has been abolished?

Mr M. McGOWAN: The shared equity scheme has, yes.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I think you're wrong. It is not my portfolio but I think —

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is not the member's portfolio but what the government has done is —

Mrs M.H. Roberts: First Start has been abolished. There are other equity schemes but they are very, very small schemes in comparison.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The money that was put in is of course still there; the people who owe the money to the state still live in their houses but there is no more money in the program. Therefore, the thousands of other people who applied for that scheme can no longer access it, and the government did not look at alternative options for how to continue the program in a less expensive way. The government then commissioned a social housing task force that came out with a report that was littered with references outlining that that kind of scheme is needed. If the government wants to solve the problem—I agree we need to resolve the issue through people owning their own homes, which I think is a desirable outcome—it needs to provide ways of getting people through the public housing system and into their own home. The shared equity scheme was the best way available to achieve that. The other means, which governments over time have both agreed with, is doing up public housing stock and then selling it to the people who live in it. The previous government did enormous amounts of that work throughout some Perth suburbs, such as the new north and Kwinana areas and so forth.

This reduced the incidence of public housing and increased rates of home ownership. Both of those schemes work, and we did both of them. I think that the current government is continuing with the latter to some degree, but the First Start shared equity scheme has been abandoned. Its retention would have made a significant difference.

Therefore, in effect, we are saying that the government has released this policy, but that the policy is built on soggy foundations; it needs to be repaired, not in terms of changing a few figures, but the whole way through. Otherwise, the government will plan for the future of Perth and the Peel region based on incorrect assumptions, analysis and policies that flow from that policy. The government needs to take heed because it is not simply the opposition coming up with something out of thin air; the view is based upon significant research and analysis. The opposition has raised this issue with the government in this forum because it allows some friendly, measured and reasoned debate to put these views forward. I urge the government to take note of what we have said so far, and to take note of what the member for Armadale and the member for Midland will have to say about their communities, and make some very significant changes to this planning document for the future of Perth.

MS A.J.G. MacTIERNAN (Armadale) [4.45 pm]: I certainly support the comments of my colleague the member for Rockingham. In my comments today I will focus mostly on the south east corridor and express my concern at the very significant downgrading of growth and activity in the south east corridor —

Mr P.T. Miles: That was your baby—the south east corridor!

Ms A.J.G. MacTIERNAN: I was very fecund as a minister and we had plenty of babies across the state! However, I have a special responsibility in my current role for the south east corridor.

I want to start off with a couple of general observations, one of which is how to some extent this “Directions 2031” document builds on the Network City model. All models to some extent build on those that have gone before them. We like to think that Network City took us in a significantly different direction; however, it built on the work that had been done before. Therefore, each of us build and make a contribution based on what has gone before and, obviously, we all try to do it better.

One of the significant proposals of the Network City model stressed the importance of trying to have a city that had more pockets of intensity spread throughout the city. Doing that could ensure that there was more activation and that people lived closer to where they worked, recreated and were being educated. To achieve these pockets of urbanity and intensity, we needed to change the ratios in which we were developing infill, compared with land on the fringe. The model was that we would have 60 per cent infill development and 40 per cent on the fringe. That was a challenging aspiration, I acknowledge that, but it was also very much in keeping with the demand of the younger demographic. Very interesting work is being done around Australia on the preferred patterns of living for younger people, in particular, and the big social problem in particular that is emerging from commute times. My good friend the member for Morley being a pseudo-Texan would particularly understand some of the real problems with commute times. It is actually becoming a major social issue. It certainly has become a major social issue in places such as Sydney. Throughout the United States the fact is that people are spending three, four or five hours in their vehicles, which is becoming a major social issue. It is actually contributing to family dysfunction and to crime levels because children are unsupervised for a long time and parents are heavily stressed. Therefore, these issues go very much to the fabric of how we live our lives. These issues are not just something that interests property developers; they are absolutely crucial to the sorts of tasks that we in this Parliament have to consider in how we help create societies that give value and where people can live decent, productive and fulfilling lives. Being in a car commuting in traffic for four hours a day is quite clearly for most people not part of that process. There are a few revheads around who would probably love that, but by and large people find commuting very stressful. This is an important factor. I concede that the 60-40 proportions—60 per cent infill and 40 per cent edge development—was a challenging task, and maybe it needed some revision. But I have to say that what is in this document is very much just business as usual. The development of new areas will now be 53 per cent rather than 40 per cent. This approach to planning reminds me of Les Stein, who was a lecturer of mine at university. He is reported to have had a gig in Benares in India, where he was asked to do its town plan. This has got to be an urban legend. It is said that he was given the job of developing the town plan, which he did, and that when he went back 10 years later, he asked how the town plan was going and was told, “It’s fantastic! It’s perfect! Every year we go out and see what has happened and we change the plan.” To some extent, the Minister for Planning today was admiring his own hands-off approach. It was a case of just let them do it. I put it to the minister that he is just recording business as usual. It is planning by recording and not by getting in there and driving it. It is hard to do. As I said, the 60 to 40 ratio was a bold aspiration. It would take enormous drive to get there. The modification of the increase ratio from 40 per cent to 53 per cent, I think, shows a lack of imagination.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 14 October 2009]

p8062b-8084a

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Ms Adele Carles

While my good friend the member for Rockingham is here, I will talk about population projections. This matter was a concern to me when I was the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure and we were trying to get a resolution on this matter. I am sure that the Minister for Planning has had discussions with the population projection personnel in the Department of Planning. It is true that there are population peaks and troughs. The departmental demographers are saying that there are peaks and troughs but that a line can be drawn through it to get the average rate of growth in Western Australia. I understand that. However, a phenomenon occurs in Western Australia whereby we experience periods of population leaps and plateaus. When we make the quantum jump, we have to readdress it. The demographers draw a line from around 1960. If the line were taken back from 1880 when there were about 36 000 people in the entire state, members would see that it was a much flatter line. Western Australia has had dramatic jumps in population because it is a resource-based economy. The first dramatic jump occurred in the 1890s. We had a mini-jump late in the Depression when there was a bit of a gold boom and the next one occurred in the 1960s. I put it to members that another one of those started in 2005-06. However, we are still drawing the line from 1960. We are not recognising that the population has jumped to a new plateau and therefore the line must be redrawn. Just as we would not draw the line from the 1880s, it is no longer adequate to draw the line from 1960. I have had this debate with people in the department. It is a serious problem and I urge the minister to look at the historical data and see how the trend works. I know what the demographers will be telling him. They will tell him about the peaks and troughs and say that they average out. It does average out, but we must take into account that from time to time we make a quantum leap in population and we must readjust the starting point of the line. I put it to the minister that that happened in 2005-06 because of the massive expansion of the iron ore industry in particular. We know that this will occur again because of the gas projects that will be coming on-stream over the next 10 to 15 years. They are some general observations.

One of the things that absolutely astounds me is how all this plays out in the south east metropolitan area. We have a policy of encouraging more development on the fringe. The "Network city: community planning strategy for Perth and Peel" plan showed what would occur in the south east corridor. The south east corridor is on the metropolitan fringe and includes Gosnells, Armadale and Serpentine-Jarrahdale. The Network City plan showed a projection of 92 000 new lots. However, under the Directions 2031 plan, there are only 35 000 new lots over the same period. It simply does not add up. This area of the outer suburbs is supposed to experience more growth. In the south east corridor we have a severe reduction in the number of lots compared with those that were projected in the Network City plan. I will not only compare Directions 2031 with Network City, but also consider the projections for the south east corridor. The current population of the south east corridor is 170 000. Under the Directions 2031 policy, it is expected to be 228 000. That is an increase of 58 000 people. However, that fails to take into account what is happening in that area. We are not talking about blue sky projections and land that is currently zoned rural land that could be rezoned urban land. These calculations, which were done by the various councils, are based on land that is already zoned urban, is subject to structure plans and is owned by developers who are in the process of developing it. Bear in mind that under this model the whole south east corridor is projected to increase by only 58 000 people according to Directions 2031, even though more urban development is expected to occur on the fringe. However, Armadale alone has a projected growth of 65 000 people over that time. As I said, that is not based on blue sky projections but on the current urban zone structured planned areas. Serpentine-Jarrahdale's population is expected to increase by 47 300. The member for Serpentine-Jarrahdale is not in the chamber. That area is experiencing tremendous growth. Every week a new structure plan is approved for yet another development. Again, that is not a blue sky projection. The population of Serpentine-Jarrahdale is projected to increase by 47 300. Gosnells is an inner suburb and so its growth potential is not as great, but its population is projected to grow by 30 000. The projected growth for that corridor totals 142 000 people, yet the "Directions 2031" document predicts that the population will increase by just 58 000. The document also predicts that there will be more growth on the fringe than we had before. It does not add up. How will we suppress the growth in that corridor, given that this land is already zoned and has structure plans over it, and that there are already developer intentions? It is very cheap land. Many parts of Byford are very beautiful and people will find lots for \$140 000 or \$150 000. That is some of the cheapest urban land in Perth and it is being snapped up like hotcakes because of that. We all know that there will be another spike in demand for housing as the jobs from Gorgon come through. These projections, as I said, are not blue sky. That is very well-priced land in the south east corridor.

The projections in this "Directions 2031" document are totally wrong. This must be seen in the context of what is happening with the hierarchy of centres. Under the existing regime Armadale is part of the second tier. There is the city centre, the big poached egg in the middle, and then a hierarchy of strategic regional centres. Midland was one, Joondalup was one and Rockingham was one. I am not quite sure it was appropriate, but a number of others were added in around 2000. Nevertheless, we had these centres. They performed a very important role, because there was a clear marker that these would be the anchors for growth, the service centres, the places that provided real jobs that would be centres for the government discharge of administration and basic service

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 14 October 2009]

p8062b-8084a

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Ms Adele Carles

centres. They should also be places that had the lions' share of retail development. We have seen a new system come in that has separated out Joondalup and Rockingham and said that they will be in the second strata, but all the others, including Midland and Armadale, will be downgraded. Mandurah was brought into the fold with Network City for the first time but it had not actually had a formal designation under the city centres policy. According to the Network City documentation, Mandurah was conceived as being at that same scale as Joondalup and Rockingham, but what we see now is that Mandurah is also reduced.

[Member's time extended.]

Ms A.J.G. MacTIERNAN: Mandurah has also been relegated, if we can say that, which is quite an extraordinary development given the actual size and functionality of Mandurah. It is interesting when one looks at these documents and asks what will be the difference between division 2 and division 3. Does it matter that a centre has been relegated so that it is no longer a tier 2 centre, which are now called primary centres, but it is now a strategic city centre? The document "Directions 2031" states —

Primary centres are functionally similar to strategic city centres, with the exception that they —

That is, Rockingham and Joondalup —

are the preferred location for investment in high-order public and employment generating infrastructure outside of the inner and middle sectors.

It is a flag, a marker and an indication of an instruction and advice to those in the private sector that if they want to invest, they should not be investing in Mandurah, Armadale or Midland because they are no longer as significant. They are no longer places where we will put high-order public investment. These have been downgraded.

My concern is that despite all this other rhetoric that we have got this connected city out of all these different models that were outlined and that we would have a connected-city approach, we look at this bizarre—it can only be described as bizarre—downgrading. It is not even taking into account growth. In the southeast corridor there will be a lot fewer people than the last planning document indicated. We are not even being realistic about what the growth will be; we are actually contracting it. We are shrinking the growth and saying to the developers just to note that we will not be putting high-order infrastructure there or employment-generating infrastructure in those areas and, therefore, they should not bother going out to Armadale or Byford, because that is not where the action is. This is precisely what happened in the 1990s. This is a story that really needs to be told about why we were going to get the Kenwick deviation for the railway. It was a great little deal done by Richard Lewis. The Kenwick deviation was always designed to bring the people of Mandurah to Westfield's Cannington shopping centre. I remember the day we announced that we would go via the direct route. The Mayor of the City of Canning said that we could not do that because Westfield had been promised that all those people from Mandurah would be coming up to the Cannington shopping centre, which is why Cannington was allowed to expand enormously. What happened when that was done? Gosnells and Armadale were sucked dry of private and public investment. Those communities were in a parlous state because of that planning decision. We see here a very clear signal that it will be back to that and that the south east corridor, and no doubt the north east corridor, will be deserted once again. I have not done an analysis for the north east corridor. I am sure the member for Midland has. When we look at all these things that are happening, the bizarre contraction and undervaluing of the growth compared with the land that is there ready for development and is being developed, the signal we are giving developers is not to bother to go into Armadale because we will give up on that and we will have a linear city. We will put it all along the coast. It will be Rockingham and Joondalup, and that is where we will be developing.

It is a very poor planning development. Of course, it is really bad for the people in Armadale and Byford et cetera of the south east corridor. Not only does it reduce the value of their land and their aspirations, but also the document becomes the tool the Department of Education and Training, the Department of Health and every other government department uses. Every government agency looks at this document. It is guiding where they will put services. They will say that there will be nobody there nothing much happening. They will say that they will not build or expand the hospital or do anything because they will be relying on this planning document that is deliberately driving us down. This has enormous consequences. I fear that it has the potential of becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy. It is not even a dog whistle; it is a direct statement. It says that we are not putting any high-order investments in infrastructure or in job creation into Armadale or Mandurah. We are not doing that, so developers might think about where they actually want to develop. We are saying to government agencies not to plan for hospitals or schools because there will not be any people. It makes the areas difficult and challenging, which is just what happened with Armadale in the 1990s. What happened to Armadale in the 1990s was disgraceful. We had to come in with the Armadale Redevelopment Authority to rescue that area and to make it

work again. We were getting success. Now this government has come in with this plan that will take away all that achievement that was worked on so hard. It will do a similar thing to Mandurah, but I think that Mandurah, being a coastal centre, probably has the ability to confound the attempts of this document. Certainly for the south east corridor it is a very bleak development. We will go back to the stage where we did not get private sector investment. Public sector investment will not be forthcoming and, once again, the area will move into the doldrums.

Also we have the issue of the lifting of caps on shopping centre size. I agree that the previous government was in the process of changing that. We indicated that we would change it because there was too much rigidity to floor space caps. What we have now in this document and the activity centre policy is an indication that it has been very much over-corrected. It has been over-corrected by lifting any significant controls on retail floor space limitations and there is a very real prospect that many dysfunctional centres will be developed. There will be a lot of failures, not only of property developers—the big companies—but all the small businesses that establish in those shopping centres.

The whole art of planning is about directing development; not being too restrictive. I agree that there needed to be a major revision of those floor space limitations, but not an abandonment of them. It will kill the capacity to deliver a connected city if we do that and it will become a Texan-Houston free-for-all. I know that the member for Riverton would love that, because he thinks that we should let it rip no matter how bad the consequences are. He talks all the time about housing affordability. He does not say anything about living costs affordability in his poster-boy city of Houston, which, whilst it has cheap land, has in fact one of the lowest living costs affordability rates. The transportation costs for people who live in that city are so enormous that it more than counterbalances any advantage of cheap housing.

These are really important consequences for the people of my electorate in their ability to get jobs in the future; their ability to feel proud of their area; and their ability to go into their town centre and enjoy the lifestyle opportunities that people have elsewhere. We were turning that around with the Armadale Redevelopment Authority. We were bringing government investment back and the private sector investment came in and followed that. We were seeing that community lifting extraordinarily. This 2031 document has the capacity, in reality, to turn that around and give a very clear signal to developers not to bother going there, because it is not the place to be and, as was the case in the 1990s, there is no interest in the south east corridor.

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland) [5.13 pm]: I will follow on from the member for Armadale's comments. Towards the conclusion of her remarks she said that very important consequences will flow from the "Directions 2031: Draft Spatial Framework for Perth and Peel" document, and indeed there are. I will focus my comments, as the member for Armadale suggested, on the north east corridor of the metropolitan area.

Before I get into the detail of that, I place on record that the "Directions 2031" document is available on the Department of Planning's website. I urge all Western Australians, particularly those who will be negatively affected by this type of planning, to look at it. A map on page 24 of the document essentially highlights what will be the primary centres and, under that, what will be the strategic city centres. The map indicates only three primary centres—Joondalup, Perth and Rockingham, which are in a row and fairly close to the coast. There is not a single primary centre to the east. To my way of thinking that is crazy. We cannot continue to have a city that largely expands just north and south; it must go east.

On page 18 of the document, I draw members' attention to what primary centres actually are and how they are described. It states —

Two primary centres have been identified — Joondalup to the north and Rockingham to the south. These centres have been selected due to their central location in the city's major growth catchments, and their access to high-order public transport infrastructure.

I will pause there. Sorry, have I missed something or does Midland have a much higher order public transport infrastructure than Rockingham? It always has. How can we justify Rockingham, on the one hand, having high-order public transport infrastructure and Midland not? It does not make sense. It is simply not true and the Minister for Planning knows that.

The report goes on and there is a real danger here, because at the end of the paragraph there is a positive phrase which states —

Other centres may be considered for elevation to primary centre status in the future.

I read that and thought that maybe there is still a chance for Midland. Even if this document is finalised and goes to print maybe there is still a chance for Midland, Armadale and other centres. But no, because the report then states —

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 14 October 2009]

p8062b-8084a

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Ms Adele Carles

Based on current population and employment projections it is anticipated that there will only be sufficient economic activity for the consolidation and growth of two such centres in the period to 2031.

Therefore, if Midland wants to be considered under this government's plan it has to wait until 2031 before it can be considered for primary centre status. That is the warning. The member for Armadale referred to important consequences. It is a pretty important consequence if centres such as Midland and Armadale are relegated to second-tier regions for a period of over 20 years. It is significant.

The next paragraph is the biggest lot of gobbledegook I have read in my life. Under the heading "Primary centres" it states —

To improve employment self-sufficiency in outer growth areas, primary centres must evolve from a population driven consumer goods and services profile by attracting knowledge intensive and producer service businesses.

Whatever they are. It continues —

To achieve this, primary centres must build on their existing assets and invest in the attributes that influence the locational decisions of these businesses, including accessibility, land availability, local amenity, communications and technology, and the availability of skilled labour.

That is it; it is crazy and it is nothing more than gobbledegook and weasel words.

Under "Strategic centres", still on page 18, the document states —

In their most common form, strategic centres are the main regional centres for consumer transactions, —

Therefore, I gather that Midland becomes a consumer transaction centre —

providing convenience and comparison retail, domestic community and health services, and professional and business services to a large catchment population. Directions 2031 has defined these as strategic city centres.

Therefore, Directions 2031 defines Midland in that category. Am I to accept on behalf of my constituents and the wider region that Midland should just be a centre for local consumer transactions and that it should just provide some convenient retail and comparison retail—whatever "comparison retail" is—and that it should cater only for the local domestic community in terms of its health services and professional and business services? I can tell members that Midland is well beyond that now. Midland has been an important city, regional centre and hub in this state since about 1831. It was one of the first towns to be established in the metropolitan area and it is in a key strategic location for not only public transport, but also all transport. One need only look at the road network to see its strategic location.

There is more detail on page 42 of the document about the north west subregion. I will briefly focus on the north west subregion because that is the comparison—Joondalup versus Midland. Why should one be a primary centre and the other not? Why should Joondalup be a primary centre and Midland not be a primary centre? The document states under the heading "Activity centres network" —

Joondalup town centre will be planned and progressively developed to become one of two primary activity centres in the metropolitan area. As outlined earlier, primary centres are functionally similar to strategic city centres with the exception that they are the preferred location for investment in high-order public and employment generating infrastructure outside of the inner and middle sectors (the central sub-region).

The member for Armadale highlighted this point, and she is a former planning minister, so she knows more than a little about this. As the member for Armadale has suggested, this is a significant government document that states where government infrastructure investment will go. These are the places that will get major infrastructure, major employment-generating activities and major state government investment. The document continues —

The state government, local government and private sector have invested heavily in Joondalup, and that investment must be given the opportunity to mature and generate dividends for the local community.

I also point out that, particularly over the past eight years, the government and the private sector have invested heavily in the Midland region. Why should that investment not be given the opportunity to mature and generate dividends for our local community? Of course it should. The document continues —

Transitioning Joondalup town centre to a primary activity centre —

Again, "transitioning" implies that it is not there yet —

that will be the major employment centre of the north-west sub-region is a significant undertaking and one that is unlikely to be completed by 2031. However, governments, planners, developers and investors must begin making decisions with the end goal in mind —

Making decisions, presumably, at the expense of a centre like Midland —

if Joondalup is to evolve from a population driven consumer goods and services centre, to a more intense and diverse centre that attracts knowledge based and producer service businesses.

Whatever “producer service businesses” are.

Midland has been a major employment centre for more than a hundred years. We have a long record of being an activity centre. Midland was not established as a little housing estate; it started as a town that was a major employment centre. The Midland Workshops, in their heyday, employed more than 5 000 people. We have within our region industrial areas like Hazelmere, Malaga and Midvale. A lot of infrastructure and government investment has already gone into Midland.

In advancing my comparison of the north west subregion with the north east subregion, I note that the strategic city centre for the north west subregion will be Yanchep. That is announced on page 43 of the document. I say good luck to Yanchep. The document states —

Strategic city centre: a new strategic city centre will be developed at Yanchep to support longer term urban growth in the north of the sub-region. This new centre will be planned to provide a full range of services, facilities and activities necessary to support its catchment, thereby reducing the requirement for travel outside of the area to meet the daily needs of residents. The centre will offer local employment opportunities, and will be well connected to public transport services.

The message for the people of the Midland region is that they will have the same city centre status as Yanchep. Not Joondalup—Yanchep! Midland has 100 years of history and an incredibly different function within the metropolitan area, and it has been downgraded to the same status as Yanchep. It is a joke. They fall under exactly the same heading in exactly the same category. That is the plan: to not advance Midland. This government’s plan is to bring Yanchep up to the same category as Midland. It is saying, “Let’s invest in Yanchep so Yanchep can have employment and rival Midland.” Of course, what has not been considered in this document is what already exists in the north east subregion. How can Yanchep be compared with a region like Midland, which already has, for example, the city’s major airport? Will Yanchep have a major regional hospital? Will Yanchep have major government infrastructure put in place? The document is contradictory because it is saying that that there can be only two primary centres, which have to be the key focus, and that there can be some strategic city centres under that because the population growth will not be such that eggs can be put into too many baskets; the focus has to be on key points. However, at the same time it is also saying that the government can afford to put a lot of infrastructure into Yanchep. That is crazy.

I turn to the north east subregion as defined by this document on page 46. It states —

The north-east sub-region encompasses the City of Swan and the shires of Kalamunda and Mundaring. The sub-region is bordered by the Shire of Chittering to the north and the shires of Northam and Toodyay to the north-east and east. The Town of Bassendean and the cities of Bayswater and Belmont define the southern and south-eastern boundary of the sub-region.

That is the region I am talking about. The document also acknowledges—again, this is contradictory—that —

Midland is a diversified centre that acts as a gateway to the Swan Valley and provides a range of services, facilities and employment opportunities to a large hinterland catchment. Midland has also benefited from State Government investment via the Midland Redevelopment Authority.

That is why Midland should be a primary centre. Midland services areas well beyond the boundaries defined in this document. Midland, as I alluded to earlier, is served by significant road infrastructure. The two major highways leading out of the metropolitan area go through Midland—Great Northern Highway, which goes to the mining areas in the north of our state, and Great Eastern Highway, which leads into our agricultural region, Kalgoorlie and, ultimately, the eastern states. That is the pivotal position that Midland is in. It is where Great Eastern Highway and Great Northern Highway have been joined since the last century. That is why there has been significant private and public investment in Midland for more than a century—because it is a natural regional centre. The comments in the “Directions 2031” document that Midland has benefited from state government investment via the Midland Redevelopment Authority are certainly true, and it has been a significant benefit. What is not highlighted in the document is that previous Labor governments have always identified Midland as a place for strategic government investment. Indeed, it was a former Labor government, under the portfolio of former minister Gavan Troy, which moved the then Department of Land Administration—now

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 14 October 2009]

p8062b-8084a

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Ms Adele Carles

known as Landgate—a government agency, to Midland. For many years there was government investment in the railway workshops.

[Member's time extended.]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: There was investment in Midland through the placement of Landgate, a major government department, into our city.

Investment has also been made in Midland by the police service, at least partly independent of the Midland Redevelopment Authority. I think that if we just talk about the Midland Redevelopment Authority, people regard that as the area of land on one side of the railway line that used to contain the workshops. MRA's boundaries are wider than that, but within those boundaries, several hundred million dollars of other government department money has been invested, particularly in the police communications centre, the police forensic centre and the police traffic operations centre.

There has been a significant commitment to Midland by the federal Labor government; it has recognised the strategic importance of Midland and is providing more than \$180 million towards the new Midland hospital. For a federal government to provide that order of money for a major hospital is a first. The former Labor state government included in its last budget an allocation of \$63 million for a new Governor Stirling senior high school, and we completely rebuilt three schools in my electorate of Midland, at Woodbridge, Clayton View and Midvale. The Eastern Horizons projects were evidence of yet more government investment in Midland in suburbs like Koongamia and Midvale.

Over the years an incredible amount of state government infrastructure has been put into Midland to service not only Midland, but also the wider hinterland, which the document alludes to but does not acknowledge when it considers what level Midland should be rated at. For example, people from the agricultural region—not just the closer towns like Northam, York and Toodyay, but also towns like Merredin, Cunderdin and beyond—come into Midland, and not just to do their shopping. That is where they see their doctors, their specialists, their accountants, their lawyers, if they need to see a lawyer, because Midland is a major regional centre and has usually enjoyed top order status after the central business district. No matter what the document has been, whether it has been “Network City” or some earlier iteration of a planning policy, Midland has always been in the second tier of strategic importance, immediately under Perth city itself. “Directions 2031” is the first document that downgrades Midland to the third tier. The main primary centre is Perth itself, the capital city, and the next category that is established is primary centres. Only two are proposed—Joondalup and Rockingham. Midland is ranked as a third-rate town, and we are accorded exactly the same status as Yanchep, despite the fact that Midland is a major regional centre, despite the fact that it caters not just for the boundaries indicated within the “Directions 2031” document—significant as they are—despite the fact that both the domestic and international airports are within those boundaries, and despite the fact that it is really more than just a place where people go for a bit of local shopping.

Midland is not a town that has been just created to service suburbs and it has traditionally been an employment hub. It is not a creation such as Joondalup; it is a natural place for industry, commerce and activity to occur. When I look at the definitions in the document and I read nonsense such as that public transport infrastructure is one of the two key factors in the choice of classification as a primary centre, and when I find out that Rockingham and Joondalup get chosen and Midland does not, I say that just does not compute. Yes, there is a train line from Joondalup to Mandurah that virtually runs through part of Rockingham, but how does that compare with the strategic position of Midland? It does not.

The Minister for Planning has an opportunity to go away and rethink this document. Page 47 of his own document states, under “Movement Network” —

The north-east sub-region is the eastern and northern gateway to the city and serves a catchment that extends beyond its boundaries.

That acknowledges exactly what I have been saying. The document goes on to state —

As a result, the area is serviced by a strong intra and inter-regional movement network.

Reference is also made to the passenger railway line extending to the north east and forming part of the Avon arc rail service. The document also states that in the future there will be extensions considered to cater for the urban growth areas at the foothills of the Darling escarpment. Freight rail services and the Great Eastern and Great Northern Highways are also referred to, as are the planned Perth-Darwin highway and the planned Perth-Adelaide highway, known as the “orange route”. A freight handling container offload facility is being planned at a cost of \$14.5 million for Forrestfield; this is a significant growth area. It makes no sense to classify Midland as a second-tier town, and Joondalup and Rockingham as the only primary centres. Midland, too, should be a first-

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Ms Adele Carles

tier town. There should be an indication in this document, as there are for the other towns, that Midland is a strategic place for both the government and the private sector to invest.

If I could just divert for a moment, a lot of government agencies are based in the CBD and I have long believed that many of those agencies do not need to be. They could just as easily be located in centres such as Midland, Armadale, Joondalup, Rockingham and so forth. Indeed, the opportunity to do that was taken by an earlier Labor government with the placement of DOLA, now Landgate. That move was resisted by the public servants who worked there at the time, but over time that employment situation has sorted itself out and it has actually worked very well. I had some discussions with the director general of Landgate a couple of years ago and asked him what the upshot had been, and, more than 10 years later, how did he think that move had worked out; he was full of praise for it. Over time, some of those public servants who worked at DOLA at the time did not find Midland to be a convenient location given their own residential location, and moved to other government agencies. At the same time, a range of other public servants saw DOLA being in Midland as an opportunity for them to transfer to that government agency. As I understand it, the balance of people who work at Landgate now is heavily skewed towards people who live in that north east region and people who want to live close to where they work. In this day and age, with computer technology and ease of access, that has worked out exceptionally well. It is certainly my belief, and the belief of a lot of other people, including Grahame Searle, who was the head of Landgate but is now the head of the Department of Housing, that that kind of move could work for other government agencies. It could have a whole range of benefits. One, of course, is the benefit to the towns to which the departments, or sections of departments, are relocated. It also reduces transport costs for the individual public servants, and it reduces greenhouse gases, because people need to use less fuel to travel to and from their place of work. It makes strategic sense. It also reduces the government's rental bill, because the cost of rents in the central business district is always going to be higher than that in outer metropolitan centres. Therefore, there is a significant cost saving for government also. This is something that needs to have more thought given to it. My concern, however, is that there is a clear direction in this document that if we are thinking about relocating government departments or looking at where more employment can be created, we should go to Rockingham or Joondalup. I think that is the wrong message to be giving. I believe that Midland has been treated very shabbily. I do not know why, for the first time in the history of our state, Midland has been downgraded from the tier of towns immediately under the CBD.

Mr J.E. McGrath: The minister lives in Midland.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Exactly. One would think he would know better.

Mr J.E. McGrath interjected.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That is the crying shame. I do not know why he has not examined this more closely and seen how illogical it is, given that he knows Midland so well. I was very pleased when the member for Kalamunda became the Minister for Planning and the minister responsible for the Midland Redevelopment Authority, because I thought, "Whacko. We have someone who actually knows our area, who understands our area and who appreciates the diverse region that it serves, and the potential that the eastern metropolitan region has." However, I have to say that in this document he has disappointed me.

MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Minister for Planning) [5.42 pm]: I welcome the opportunity to respond to the comments that have been made so far in this debate and to address some of the issues. I also welcome this debate. The motion raises issues that are very important to our state. We have very much a growing state, with an increasing population that is expected to continue increasing indefinitely. There have been major growth pressures over the past decade, or couple of decades, I guess, and we expect that those growth pressures will continue to exist, certainly over the next couple of decades at least. So there are certainly important issues that we need to face as a Parliament, as a government and as a community in Western Australia, and to that extent I welcome the opportunity for these issues to be raised in Parliament today.

However, I need to respond to some of the assertions that have been made by the three previous speakers and to correct what I think are some of the misconceptions that have been developed in the debate so far. The member for Rockingham suggested, amongst other things, that the figures on which the "Directions 2031" document is based are wrong. I gather he is relying on submissions that have been made by the Urban Development Institute of Australia, the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the Property Council of Australia, FuturePerth and other organisations. I have not seen those submissions. I could have if I had needed to, but I am very happy for them to go into the Department of Planning and to be assessed in a professional way, and to then examine them once a report is prepared based on the call for submissions in relation to what is currently a draft document that is out for public comment.

The member for Rockingham said, in particular, that there was a fundamental mistake in the preparation of the growth projections in the "Directions 2031" draft document. He said that they are based on a 1.4 per cent growth

rate over the next 20 years or so. I am not sure exactly where he gets that 1.4 per cent figure from. I do not think it is in the document. It seems that he has made that calculation himself. Based on the basic mathematics, perhaps he could come up with a figure of 1.4 per cent. However, I am advised that the projections are not in fact based on a particular percentage growth rate; they are based on best practice demographic modelling, which takes into account the particular cohorts in the population, assesses their growth according to migration, fertility and mortality figures, and then calculates the projected actual population growth based on those assumptions. As I understand it, that is more likely to arrive at an accurate projection than using a percentage population growth figure. I am also advised that the 1.4 per cent increase is not correct in any case. That deals with one of the main points raised by the member for Rockingham.

It is the case that we expect there will be substantial growth in the Perth metropolitan and Peel regions over the next two decades, whatever the figures may be that we are talking about. In the document, we predict that there will be a growth of about 556 000 people in those two regions, requiring approximately 328 000 new residences. That is a substantial increase—there is no question about that—and it is going to cause major challenges to be addressed over the next 20 years if we are going to be able to find homes for that number of people. One of the approaches that needs to be taken—I agree entirely with the member for Armadale—is to give greater attention to providing residential development in infill areas than has been the case in the past. There has been a substantial reliance in the growth of the Perth metropolitan area over the past century, I guess, on expanding the urban area and relying on growth in the peripheral parts of the urban area.

The “Network City” document that the former government put out as a strategic planning document, as the member for Armadale said, had the figures of 60 per cent of new residential growth coming from infill development and 40 per cent coming from peripheral greenfields development. The reality is that that aspirational target was never anywhere near being met by the previous government. As I recall, over the past few years the amount of infill residential development has worked out to be about 37 per cent of residential growth. That is a very long way from 60 per cent, which was the aspirational figure, but a really unrealistic figure, put in place by the previous government. So this “Directions 2031” document —

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: Minister, that is partly because getting the infill is a long process. We started that process of increasing the zoning of areas. With that sort of multistorey development et cetera, you were never going to get those figures going through in the first couple of years. So if you abandon your aspirational target, you are not going to achieve it at all, because it will take five to 10 years to reach that aspirational target as a result of time delays in getting that sort of development approved.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Obviously, it takes time to achieve these targets. Even going above 37 per cent is a significant challenge to be achieved. Therefore, in this document we have a figure of 47 per cent that we are aiming for in relation to residential growth in urban infill areas. Even that will not be easy to achieve over the next few years, and there is plenty of resistance to urban infill development when it is proposed. There are plenty of debates going on at the moment. The member for Nedlands has a few constituents whose argument I am familiar with in relation to urban growth in some areas in his electorate, Subiaco in particular. Some of those issues are being worked through at the moment. However, as the member for Armadale will recall, I am sure, they are not easy to deal with in placating the concerns of some residents in that part of the metropolitan area.

I will respond to one or two of the other points that the member for Rockingham raised. He said, in particular, that the online land approval system that had been proposed under the previous government has been abandoned by this government. That is not the case. It is the case that a sum of money in the order of \$15 million was in the previous government’s last budget. With the substantially changed financial circumstances that this government has had to face in the 12 months that it has been in office, it is correct that there is not currently \$15 million, or a figure of that order, in the current state budget. However, there is an amount—I am going on memory—of around \$3.5 million in the current state budget for further development of the electronic land development assessment system. That amount of money is available to more accurately determine the scope of what is required and the likely cost of providing a workable system. The advice that was provided by the Department of Planning—no doubt by the same people who were responsible to the former Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, the member for Armadale—was that having gone out to the market to seek the cost of providing a system, the tender amounts were excessive and there was far too much uncertainty as far as the risk to taxpayers of this state in putting in place the system that was being developed when the previous government was in office. This government is still committed to developing a system, but under much more precise parameters than was the case with the system being developed when the previous government was in office.

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: Is the minister saying that the departmental officers who put the electronic development assessment program to us have now said that that program is too risky?

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 14 October 2009]

p8062b-8084a

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Ms Adele Carles

Mr J.H.D. DAY: They have said that having gone out to the market and sought tenders on that project, they have major concerns, firstly, about the cost of the project that has come in through the tender prices, and, secondly, about the fact that there is far too much risk to the state in the proposals that are being put forward.

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: This was after the tender process?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I do not know if this was when the member for Armadale was in government or whether it was just after.

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: It would have been after. What has the minister done with the money that was in the budget?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I have just explained that. There is about \$3.5 million for further development of the program.

Mr M. McGowan: The minister said he had deleted \$15 million or so. Does the minister guarantee that that money will come back?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Once the scope of the project and the likely cost is better determined, I will need to make the case in the budget preparation process. The member for Rockingham, as a former minister, knows as well as I do how that works. I did make reference to the substantially changed financial circumstances this government has had to deal with since it has been in office. The case will need to be made in the budget process once we have more information about what is the likely cost of the system. It is not the case that the project has been abandoned at all.

The member for Rockingham raised issues about the provision of public housing. I will leave that to the Minister for Housing and Works as it is in his portfolio and he is more familiar with those issues.

The member for Armadale raised the issues of Network City and urban infill. I have addressed those aspects to a reasonable extent. The member also talked about the issue of average growth over a longer period of time versus the quantum leaps that occur during high growth periods. I agree; obviously that occurs. It may well occur over the next two or three years or so. It occurred over 2006-07. But even if the population projections in this document are out by 10 or even 20 per cent over a 20-year period that does not mean that the document does not have validity or that it will have any significant impact on the provision of housing over the next five years or so.

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: They are out by over 100 per cent in the southeast corridor!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I will get advice and get that looked at more closely. I would want more evidence than the member for Armadale is presenting.

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: Did the minister have an adviser here today to provide him with advice on this?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: He is still here, as the member knows.

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: Has he provided advice on this?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Not on that specific point, no. I refer to the issue of primary centres versus the designation of strategic city centres, which the member for Armadale and the member for Midland have understandably raised. Incidentally, I note that the member for Rockingham and the member for Joondalup have not been complaining about the fact that Rockingham and Joondalup have been suggested as primary activity centres.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: They are happy to share the love around.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: That is good to know, but I would like to hear that from the mouth of the member for Rockingham.

It is not the case that there has been any downgrading of the status of Midland or Armadale. It is the case that two primary activity centres have been designated in Joondalup and Rockingham, and they have been designated as areas, as described in the document, where some of the high order public and employment generating infrastructure might be located. That is largely based on what is regarded as the capacity for growth in those two areas.

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: This is where the flaws in this document are so profound. The document has underrated by a factor of over 100 per cent the growth in the southeast corridor and then used that as the basis for relegating the strategic town centre. We will have a very unbalanced city as a result of that. We will not have Armadale and Midland acting as anchors for growth. The minister will have the linear city that he is supposedly not having!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: The issue is whether we designate primary activity centres or not. It is unrealistic to indicate we will have four or more primary activity centres. I am sure that the member for Fremantle would have a view about Fremantle's importance in the overall provision of infrastructure services in the Perth metropolitan area.

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Ms Adele Carles

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: The whole balance of the city is going to be skewed by this decision.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I will answer the member's point in just a moment. In this document, the strategic city centres include Armadale and Midland, and also Cannington, Morley, Fremantle, Stirling, Mandurah and Yanchep. The member for Midland ridiculed the fact that Yanchep would be considered on a par with Midland.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: I do not see Midland and Yanchep in the same light.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Of course, if people looked at the current situation and the population in the Yanchep area now compared with the population in Midland, they would come to that conclusion if they were so stupid as to look at only the next 12 months or so. However, this document is about growth over the next 20 years. There is no doubt that there will be substantial growth in the Yanchep area; there is a lot of land zoned for urban development in that part of the world. Therefore, it is suggested that in the longer term Yanchep might be considered as a strategic city centre. Clearly, places like Fremantle, Mandurah, Morley, Cannington and Stirling are centres of major activity at the moment, together with Armadale and Midland of course.

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: I ask the minister to clarify one thing. Something that really concerns me is that when the minister talks about the functionality of Midland and Armadale being the same as that of Rockingham and Joondalup, but that they simply will not be identified for this high level of investment, the minister makes the distinction of the inner ring—that is, strategic city centres that are in the inner area, like Stirling or Cannington. Therefore, that says that those cities can still get that investment but the outer tier strategic city centres cannot. Morley and Cannington might be all right, but that just really highlights the downgrading for Armadale and Midland.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: As I said, there is no downgrading and indeed it is a matter of making decisions about what is appropriate for a particular issue. If we talk about the government locating particular government offices in a certain area, we will need to look at each case on its merits. Indeed, under both governments there has been a focus —

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: But you have got your figures wrong and your concept of the place is wrong. You have underestimated the growth there; you have underestimated the role that Armadale and Midland play in servicing a hinterland and of being an anchor for growth.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Now Mandurah services all of Peel.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I agree that Midland and Armadale have a very important role to play and I have a strong personal commitment to and interest in what happens in the Midland region, in particular, and also Armadale. Like the members for Armadale and Midland, I represent an eastern metropolitan electorate. I have also lived in the area for most of my life and I still live in the area, so I have a strong —

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: Well, you are not; you are abandoning it in terms of planning!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Hardly.

Therefore, if I am convinced that the proposals made in this document will have a negative effect on Midland and Armadale, I will certainly be very interested in reviewing what is proposed, because I certainly do not want any outcome that leads to a lessening of the focus on Midland and Armadale in particular. I agree that the eastern metropolitan area in many respects has perhaps not received the degree of attention that would have been desirable, particularly compared with the growth that has occurred in the northern metropolitan area, for understandable reasons, I guess, over the past three decades or so. There does need to be —

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: You'll find that in the last eight years it was better!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: The record of the previous coalition government on development in Midland in particular is in fact strong. The member for Midland did not actually tell the full story about the relocation of government services in Midland. She quite rightly referred to the relocation of the Department of Land Administration, as it used to be in the early 1990s, but she did not mention that in the late 1990s a significant decision was made to relocate major police facilities to Midland. I happened to be the police minister at the time and I conceived that idea and ensured there was government support for it to be followed through. I think it had a significant catalytic effect in ensuring further growth in Midland; and subsequently, in the time of the previous Liberal-National government, the decision was made to go ahead with the establishment of the Midland Redevelopment Authority, which has led to some very positive developments in the Midland area, particularly on the old Midland Government Railway Workshops site.

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: That's after you closed down the workshops and lost 1 000 jobs.

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 14 October 2009]

p8062b-8084a

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Ms Adele Carles

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Would the member have kept them open if she had been in government? If the workshops had not closed in the early 1990s, would they still be open now?

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: They could well have been.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I think not; that is absolutely fanciful!

What has actually happened is that there has been a very high standard urban redevelopment on the western part of the railway workshops site. I know it well because I live there. There have been other major improvements in streetscaping, remediation of contaminated soil in the area, and the relocation of major police facilities to the area. The decision was made to put the police communications centre in Midland in 1998 originally, but I think it opened in about 2001, if I recall correctly. Police forensics, and, more recently, the state traffic operations for Western Australia were located there. Hopefully, there are plans for further relocations in the future, although I am not quite so sure about that. However, that had a very positive effect. There is also a proposal for a university in Midland; the Raffles Education Corporation has expressed a strong interest in developing tertiary education facilities on the Midland railway workshops site. There are major heritage buildings on that workshops site that are very important historically for the state and are major engineering achievements in their own right as well, so it is important that they are not only preserved but also used in some meaningful way in the future. A lot of those actions have in fact resulted from the decisions of the previous coalition government, and I am pleased to say that those decisions were followed through by the Labor government in the seven and a half years that it was in office.

The member for Armadale also talked about other government agencies, such as health and education, not taking a serious interest in places like Midland and Armadale if they are not designated as primary centres. She said that they would not have an interest in building schools or providing health facilities there, and there would just be a few horses in paddocks and that sort of thing out there. That was just a laughable suggestion!

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: You actually misunderstood what I said. What I said is that those figures and those growth projections that you have written into that document will then become the thing that guides the education department, the health department, community services et cetera. It is not the fact that they are not a strategic centre but the fact there are these massively downgraded estimates of growth in those particular areas.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Whatever the case, we will have continued substantial growth in the north eastern and south eastern parts of the metropolitan area. There will be a need for new schools and other facilities provided by government agencies.

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: But if your figures are out by about 130 per cent, okay, you might have schools but you will have 130 per cent fewer schools than you actually need.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: We will be providing schools in response to the population that is growing in that area, whatever that population may be.

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: What is the point of planning if nobody is going to take any notice of the figures? What is the point of this document if the figures are not going to be guiding what people do? That's what you're saying, "Oh, we're going to provide it anyhow." What is the point —

Mr J.H.D. DAY: The member is assuming that everything she says is right and just about everything in that document is wrong. I would not make that assumption at all.

I will go through some of the other points that were raised; I think I have responded to most of what the members for Midland and Armadale raised in their contributions to the motion. Just to provide a bit more detailed information about the population projections, I am advised that the data is drawn directly from the "Western Australia Tomorrow: Population projections for planning regions 2004 to 2031 and local government areas 2004 to 2021" report. The projections are calculated from the estimated resident population base, which is produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and the setting of future trend assumptions relating to the components of growth, which, as I mentioned earlier, include migration from overseas, interstate and intrastate; fertility; and mortality statistics in Australia and other similar nations. In addition, local economic intelligence and multiplier effects on the resident populations from known development projects and information provided by state agencies and the contributions of local governments are used when these effects are proven to be above the trends that are otherwise predicted to adjust the underlying assumptions relating to the growth components in that area. The main purpose of the projections is to predict the long-term future over 20 to 30 years. The short-term volatility in population growth from year to year continues to be variations around the longer-term trend. In addition, a new projection series for all local government areas in the state is being prepared within the Department of Planning for release in a new addition of "WA Tomorrow" around the end of the current financial year and for use within the Directions 2031 program. Those figures are being looked at now. It is also anticipated

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Ms Adele Carles

that a new edition of “Are Our Projections on Target” will also be progressed to assess the accuracy of the current projections. The Department of Planning does not necessarily assume that the figures it is currently working on are set in stone or are completely accurate. Continual reassessment of the forecast is being undertaken.

I mentioned that the “Directions 2031: Draft Spatial Framework for Perth and Peel” has been out for public consultation. The deadline for submissions was extended to 6 October. More than 290 submissions have been received, and the comments in those submissions are being extensively analysed. It is likely that changes will be made to some elements of the strategy based on the submissions that are received. By definition, we are prepared to consider the comments that have been made in the various submissions before this document is finalised. That is why it has been out for public comment.

I will also make some comments about the third part of the motion, which has not received a lot of attention as yet, to respond to what the opposition says is the miscalculation of opportunities to implement growth strategies in Peel—I think it is the Peel “region”. It is important to realise that opportunities to implement growth strategies in the Peel region are based on population growth and land and dwelling demand as determined by the state’s demographer—that is, the research directorate in the Department of Planning. The projected demand for new dwellings in the southern metropolitan and Peel subregions through to 2031 is slightly under 55 000 dwellings. Quite apart from the department’s determination of the future demand for urban land and dwellings, the department’s urban growth management staff undertook the southern metropolitan Peel planning process through wide consultation, including with key state government agencies, service providers and local government stakeholders. In particular, the department’s staff collaborated closely with the Shire of Murray and the City of Mandurah planning staff in identifying land that may be suitable to meet future urban land requirements. The collaborative process has investigated the existing and conditionally approved residential lots, together with the potential supply and potential infill, and has determined that a potential supply totalling 106 000 dwellings exists within the area. This is expected to adequately meet the projected demand and equates to a provision of over 22 years of land supply based on a high-growth scenario and more than 30 years in a low-growth scenario.

It is important to also note that the potential supply of residential land from the proposed Keralup development has not been included in the figures I have just mentioned. The Department of Housing is continuing with its planning investigations of Keralup, and expects that a first phase of development can occur by 2015, although the area is potentially subject to severe constraints. It is quite low-lying land and significant issues of drainage in particular will need to be dealt with. Having said that, the development and the release of a large number of dwelling sites—potentially up to about 90 000 new dwellings—has not been included in the figures that were mentioned previously. It could be said that a reasonably conservative approach is being taken with the figures in this document. But there is a lot of potential for other housing development to be provided, in part, through the Keralup development.

In addition, large areas of land are located north east of the Pinjarra Road intersection with the new Forrest Highway—this is an area of major interest to the member for Murray-Wellington—and within the Shire of Murray. Those areas have also not been factored into the figures I previously mentioned, due to the high levels of uncertainty associated with the constraints in that area. Much of this land is potentially subject to severe developmental constraints and, in any event, is not likely to be required for urbanisation within the 22 to 30-year time horizon of this plan. Possibly some of the member for Murray-Wellington’s constituents who recently arranged to meet with me may have a different view about that particular aspect. However, we need to ensure that a sensible approach is taken to the rezoning of land and to the provision of further urban land in the Perth and Peel regions.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Is the member for Murray-Wellington’s area north east of —

Mr J.H.D. DAY: North east of Pinjarra Road and the new Forrest Highway.

Mr M.J. Cowper: Ravenswood, east Pinjarra.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Is that still north of the Riverlands Ramble area and all of those?

Mr M.J. Cowper: Paterson Road, Baker Road, the freeway, Pinjarra Road.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Most of that is currently zoned rural, isn’t it?

Mr M.J. Cowper: South of the Murray River.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Yes. Thank you.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I conclude by reiterating that, although the second part of the motion alleges that there has been a downgrading of the Armadale and Midland regional centres, that has not been the case. Those centres

have the same status as set out in the original corridor and metropolitan plans that were previously in existence. I understand the corridor plan used the title of “major regional centre” and the metro plan used the title of “strategic regional centre”. Directions 2031 is using the title “strategic city centre” to include Armadale and Midland. Strategic city centres are the multipurpose centres throughout the metropolitan region. They will need to provide a range of housing services, facilities and activities to support the communities within their catchments and, therefore, reduce the requirement for travel outside the catchment.

As I said earlier, I entirely agree with the views of the member for Armadale in particular. We need to have a greater focus on in-fill development so that we do not excessively rely on peripheral urban development, which leads to urban sprawl. There are major infrastructure costs in doing so for government and taxpayers and, potentially, quite substantial social issues that need to be addressed as a result of that approach.

Based on the current population and employment projections, it is anticipated that, if we are to have primary centres, there will be sufficient economic activity to justify the destination of only two of them. However, as I said, I will certainly want to be assured that there will not be any negative impact, particularly on the centres of Midland and Armadale through doing so. If that is likely to be the case, we will review what is proposed.

I welcome this debate. As I said, I think it has provided the opportunity to discuss some significant issues for the future of the Perth and Peel regions in particular, given that we are in the very fortunate situation whereby a lot of people will want to live in Western Australia over the next 20 years or so, partly through natural increase in population in this state and partly through migration from overseas and interstate. There will be major issues to address, many of which are raised in the “Directions 2031” document, and we will be reviewing the submissions that have been provided in response to the document before we finalise it and put it out as a more determinative document for the future.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah) [6.19 pm]: I am very keen to make a contribution to the motion moved during private members’ business this afternoon. In doing so, I note the comments and the contributions made by the members for Armadale, Midland and Rockingham. To ensure that I do not get into a bidding war, which is a risk I take, I will comment on the draft plan that has been released. I understand that the call for submissions was very strongly subscribed to. I will focus in particular on the Peel aspect of the document and refer to two of the five local government authorities in the Peel; namely, the Shire of Murray and the City of Mandurah. I listened to the Minister for Planning very carefully when he talked about the criteria and the philosophy of the determination of the two primary centres, which were identified as Joondalup and Rockingham. Although I do not want to get into a bidding war, I acknowledge the contribution of and the strong argument put by the member for Armadale about Armadale’s case for becoming a primary centre and I acknowledge also the member for Midland and the case she put for Midland becoming a primary centre.

An interesting thing about the development of Perth, and ultimately of Peel, is that our development has occurred on a fairly narrow coastal strip. Effectively, the almost unbroken urban sprawl of Perth and the Peel region stretches for approximately 160 kilometres. That includes Yanchep and Two Rocks in the north and the City of Mandurah some 80 kilometres to the south of the Perth general post office. Like many other cities around the world, Perth has grappled with the grave problem of ensuring that the city is liveable and that its residents enjoy a good quality of life. We grapple also with providing land for a mix of urban development living styles and appropriate and necessary industrial land. Alternative lifestyles must be provided, including for those who like to live on larger blocks of land, particularly in the south east of the metropolitan area and in the Peel region.

The Minister for Planning was just outlining the reasoning behind the identification of Joondalup and Rockingham as primary centres, and he highlighted a number of criteria. I will build a case for why Mandurah should be considered in this draft document, “Directions 2031: Draft Spatial Framework for Perth and Peel”, as a primary centre, which it is not currently considered to be. Like Armadale and Midland, Mandurah is not considered to be a primary centre in this draft document. In the flow diagram in the document, it is considered to be a strategic centre, or a city centre, which is the next level down from a primary centre. An important part of this planning document is that it gives the Peel region an opportunity to state its case for becoming a primary centre. In my view, the provision of overall infrastructure in the Peel region has been overlooked for a long time. However, that does not include either the later years of the Court government or the Labor years, when the Perth-Mandurah railway and the Perth-Bunbury highway were built. I acknowledge that both sides of politics have given recognition to the region. However, I do not believe that either side of politics has understood the real growth that is occurring to the south of Perth. One of the problems—I have mentioned this on a number of occasions—is that there is a view held by members on both sides of this house about the status of the City of Mandurah. I will not continue my ongoing crusade on behalf of the City of Mandurah tonight, which is that it is proudly a regional city and that it recognises itself, and wants to be recognised, as a key regional city. I will not go into that again, although I could spend the next half an hour talking about it. I say to members on this side and the other side of the chamber that it is important to recognise the aspirations of the people who live in Peel and

those who are either moving there or will move there in the future. Traditionally, the people who moved to Peel came from a rural background. Peel attracted people from a number of Western Australia's rural wheatbelt towns in particular as well as the goldfields. A large number of people from the goldfields have chosen to spend their retirement in Peel.

Mr J.J.M. Bowler: They are the ones that we don't want!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: They are some very good friends of the member for Kalgoorlie!

Traditionally, people from the rural parts of Western Australia have called Mandurah and Pinjarra home. More recently, particularly in the past 15 years, we have seen a major shift in population and in the number of people from not only Perth, but also interstate, to our region. An increasing number of migrants have moved to Peel also.

Mr M.J. Cowper: And a lot of South Africans.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: There are a lot of South Africans, member for Murray-Wellington, and English residents. If members doorknocked around the Seascapes area in the member for Dawesville's electorate—not that I have done that because it is not my seat; mind you, I sometimes think about shifting!—they would probably find that an English accent would greet them at the door. Despite the chiding from members on my own side and from members on the other side, identity is a very important issue for the people of Peel. I get quite angry when it is dismissed by members in this place. A point that is raised with me by members on both sides is that we have the train and the road. Of course, they are important infrastructure projects. I have told members before to look at some of the key regional cities just outside the main metropolitan cities in Australia. Look at the city of Geelong. It is 80 kilometres south west of Melbourne.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Yes, they do. The member for Warnbro is wrong.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It does not matter. I do not want to argue with my friend from Warnbro because he is way off the planet on this issue, but I will not go into that. The regional city of Geelong is wonderful. The member for Perth would be jumping up and down and claiming what a wonderful city it is because its team won the grand final. It has key regional infrastructure, including rail and road infrastructure. Although, I admit that its population is significantly greater than that of Mandurah, it is a large population living on a coastal node. No-one would ever accuse people who live in Geelong of being Melburnians because they would probably garrote anyone who made that accusation.

We had an internal debate in Mandurah about whether we wanted to market it as the Gold Coast of Western Australia. During the 1990s when I was on the council, we were reluctant to do that because high-rise development was a significant issue in the city. However, whether we like it or not, people who go to Mandurah now will see that high-rise buildings have become far more prevalent than we thought. The former Peninsula Hotel site now has three 12-storey plus apartment blocks. Five to eight-storey blocks are planned in Fraser's development in the Coodanup area. Five to eight-storey blocks are planned in the Seascapes area for the village. A high rise is being built just across the Dawesville Channel in the golf course precinct of the Dawesville Cut. Another 12-storey building is planned in the Erskine/Bridgewater development just across from the Estuary Bridge. We have also seen plans for five, 10 and 12-storey blocks coming before council for developments in the centre city precinct. Brighton Hotel, which is under construction and expected to be completed early next year, will be another 12-storey building. The City of Mandurah has changed within five years. The real face of the place has changed. However, the willingness and the eagerness of the growing population to maintain our regional city status is very strong.

Mandurah has been compared with cities such as the Gold Coast or the Gold Coast catchment, which is a similar distance from a major capital city. When we say we are going to the Gold Coast, we do not say we are going to Brisbane. We are not in Brisbane when we are on the Gold Coast. It is a clearly defined city in its own right. When we go to Geelong, we are not in the City of Melbourne. It has a clearly defined identity. When we go to Mandurah, we are not in the City of Perth. Whether people like it or not, the City of Mandurah is a clear city in its own right. It is a regional city. I have said this to the member for Bunbury on a number of occasions. When people ask what the biggest regional city outside of Perth is, a lot of people say it is Bunbury. No, it is not. The population of the City of Mandurah is 65 000. I will come to the population issue because I think that is an important element.

Mr J.J.M. Bowler: The last census said Kalgoorlie was the next largest after Mandurah.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: There we are! We have to explode some of these myths about identity issues that have been perpetrated on both sides of this house. It is absolutely abhorrent when people who do not know the place and do not understand the issues in the place label us. I do not care what side of politics they come from. I do not have the right to make judgements on Geraldton. I know a little bit about Geraldton. It is a nice city, and a very important city in the mid-west. It is the regional city in the mid-west. I do not have a right to say, "You're only just north of Perth" the same as I do not have the right to pass judgement on the City of Bunbury. The City of Bunbury has a unique place in Western Australia. Not only is it a wonderful historic place —

Dr G.G. Jacobs: It's got a wonderful member.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: That could be debated. He is a good man, and I acknowledge that.

The City of Bunbury has its own identity and it has its own mix of history, population and elements that drive the economy. I am not going to criticise Bunbury. I know I get animated sometimes but I ask members to please not make a value judgement about my city or the region that the member for Murray-Wellington, the member for Dawesville and I represent because we have some specific issues and some specific unique elements that are valid and important.

When we are talking about the Peel and we invite comment on the plan, it is important that those comments are looked at and considered very seriously. I am glad that the minister welcomes this debate because it is important to have these debates. We are talking about what sort of future we want to see for the City of Perth, for the regions that are located around the City of Perth and for the key regional cities, centres or areas that are important parts of the whole tapestry. I know that the minister will be briefed and will go through a number of the submissions. I will not go through this in great detail. I wish to refer to some of the issues that the City of Mandurah and the Shire of Murray identified in their draft submissions.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I will need this extra time to espouse my region. It is important to look at the submission from the City of Mandurah. I will go through a couple of key elements of that submission. The first element highlighted is the clarity that is needed about how the projected population has been arrived at for our area. Both the City of Mandurah and the Shire of Murray's submissions draw to the minister's attention and to the attention of the Planning Commission what they believe are discrepancies. Page 13 of the City of Mandurah's submission highlights the fact that there is a discrepancy. The member for Mandurah touched on this. The plan projects that the population of Mandurah will be around 27 000. The City of Mandurah and the Shire of Murray have done their population growth forecasts. The Shire of Murray predicts that its population will grow to 45 000 by 2031. I think the figure in this document is significantly smaller. In his response, the minister highlighted a couple of examples of where there is still some work to be done. I accept that. The worry I have—I am sure the member for Murray-Wellington has the same worry for the Shire of Murray—is that growth is happening so quickly, we will be in the situation that the City of Mandurah found itself in the past few years where we are trying to catch up. The Shire of Murray has very specific planning and environmental issues that are very significant to that area. When there is such a discrepancy in both submissions by the Shire of Murray and the City of Mandurah—both of them ask for greater clarity in how those figures have been arrived at—the relevant planning authorities need to go back and look at those figures. That is critical. If we are talking about the number of lots, both potential and real, in the Peel, that growth area—I call it the growth corridor—between Mandurah and Pinjarra will be very significant. When the minister is considering the submissions, I ask him to please zero in on that issue of population because it seems to me that it will culminate in a range of other decisions that will be made in the future. If those figures are wrong, we are putting ourselves in a very tenuous position.

Another aspect of the argument is that Joondalup and Rockingham will have the capacity to generate greater employment and, therefore, will be preferred as these primary centres. It comes back to the earlier part of my contribution about the way planners and members of Parliament have seen the Peel. We must understand that the growth that has occurred in the Shire of Murray is servicing not just the City of Mandurah and the town of Pinjarra. There is Dwellingup, Waroona and even Boddington because of the nature of the economy, the mining that is occurring at Boddington, the mining that is obviously occurring at Alcoa and the Iluka activity in the region. Most of their workers reside in the Peel. We need to include that in our planning as well. Traditionally, the city of Mandurah has been the hub of service delivery, but as the population grows in the Shire of Murray, I think it will have to change. I think that we will have to look at more servicing being delivered via the Shire of Murray, because that is where we will be seeing a significant number of people living in the future. Transport corridors and industrial land opportunities will all be impacted on by that.

Sitting to the north is the proposed Keralup development. The minister mentioned that Keralup's proposed figures are not included in some of this population process. I can understand why, because there is still a lot of planning and other things to do. I sound a warning about Keralup. I am not convinced at all about Keralup's viability or sustainability. The reason is that it is linked, in my view, to the direct health and wellbeing of Peel waterways and the catchment. I am very concerned that we might allow in the future a population of up to 60 000 being plonked on a piece of very degraded, waterlogged land. When I was the former Minister for the Environment, the Environmental Protection Authority put out a very strong report, highlighting a range of environmental issues and constraints that must be dealt with before 60 000 people can be plonked in an area like that. They include not only issues such as mosquito-borne disease, but also the issue of plonking those people on a river system, particularly the Serpentine, which is already probably the sickest river in Western Australia, and probably one of the sickest rivers in Australia. We have known this for a long time. The river system delivers straight into the Peel-Harvey catchment. Growth is already occurring along the northern corridor from north Mandurah, along Stakehill Road and all those places. All that catchment is influencing the Serpentine River's health.

The Murray River is also under stress. It is remarkable really how healthy the Murray River has been, given what has happened to it historically, but the Murray River also has some very clear environmental concerns. I remember very clearly the Peel Development Commission releasing a commonwealth report that had been jointly funded by the previous federal government and the previous state government, which talked about the growing influence of urban development on the health and wellbeing of water quality, particularly in the Peel. The report showed very clearly that urban development was now having a greater impact than what was historically blamed on the agricultural pursuits in the region. Now urban development is the big question mark.

Let us be very careful before we plonk 60 000 people at Keralup, impacting on a sick river and a waterway system that is already under pressure. Also, be very careful about developments such as Point Grey. Point Grey is one that will come before members in the next year or so. Already a lot of preliminary work is being done on Point Grey. I have some very grave concerns about them. I know it is in the member for Murray-Wellington's electorate. Again, I think we are talking about putting 2 000 people eventually, from the figures from the Shire of Murray, in the Point Grey area. The shire's submission said that by 2031 it is expected that there would be approximately 2 500 people there if that development was allowed to go ahead. Part of that development, if the marina proposal is approved, would involve major dredging from the proposed marina through to the Dawesville Channel because it is the narrowest point.

Mr M.J. Cowper: They have changed it in recent times.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It is still a proposal. These elements that are proposed in the Peel have a potential direct impact on the region's health and wellbeing, particularly the environmental health and wellbeing of the catchment and the Peel-Harvey waterways. What needs to happen? We need to be taking very clear notice of the input of particularly the two local government authorities most directly affected, the City of Mandurah and the Shire of Murray. I know that they are willing to work with the minister, and the minister has already mentioned in his contribution a working group or the cooperation that is already occurring, and that is fantastic. What I am trying to say to the minister is that from the City of Mandurah's point of view it wants to be seen as a clear southern city. They are excited about the potential of that. This document could assist in that process. I ask the minister to please look at their submissions.

Another matter is more of an environmental aspect. We must also address the underlying environmental issues and concerns that have been around, some of them for decades, to ensure that the whole region will be able to sustain a population of over 150 000 people within 20 years. If we want to see that growth in population, we must fix those indicators, particularly those environmental indicators, and address them because they ultimately underpin the health and wellbeing of that population as it grows into the future. Part of that is the commitment to the Peel regional park. I know it is an area that comes under the Minister for Environment's portfolio, but it is an important element in this issue. We need to secure the Peel regional park, which is all that land that has been identified as part of that park. It will be an important part of the planning process. I hope that the government will find money, and if the minister does find money for that, I will applaud him unreservedly. I will applaud him unreservedly if he finds the money to implement and proclaim the management of the regional park. We did not achieve it, and that is my greatest concern. I urge the minister to make it a priority in the overall strategic planning of population, infrastructure and economy of the region. My message simply is that this is an exciting region, which is attracting all sorts of people.

Mr R.F. Johnson: All sorts of people? Some undesirable.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 14 October 2009]

p8062b-8084a

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Ms Adele Carles

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Some undesirables who buy canal homes, motor down, spend a little at the weekend and then nick off back to Perth! They are an important part of the economy.

Mr R.F. Johnson: Your local mayor welcomed me with open arms.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Is the minister going to be the candidate for Mandurah at the next election?

Mr R.F. Johnson: No.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I was rather hopeful about that. It would be good and I would look forward to that contest. Please recognise the argument that the city of Mandurah puts, as a key regional city, and how that will assist the minister in the ultimate planning of greater Perth and how we can create something forward-thinking and unique into the future. I am willing to work with the minister and the government to achieve those ends, as I am sure are my other parliamentary colleagues who represent the region on both sides of Parliament, including the Green members from the south west. I am very willing to work with the minister, because it is too important to not seize this opportunity and recognise the potential of the Peel region.

MS A.S. CARLES (Fremantle) [6.49 pm]: The Greens (WA) have a different priority, I understand, after hearing the different contributions in this place. We regard the most significant environmental challenges for how we plan our city as being at the forefront of this debate. Of course I am talking about climate change and fossil-fuel dependency. We must therefore get our planning right in the context of these huge challenges, rather than ignoring them or putting them in the too-hard basket. Rising greenhouse gas emissions, excessive natural resource use, increasing population, increasing consumption, increasing waste, issues of water, and soil and air quality all have huge environmental social and economic consequences for the future. Our challenge is, therefore, to create sustainable communities. I just wanted to say that in the context of the big picture before I talk about the minister's planning document, and then specifically about Fremantle at the end of my speech.

We are concerned about the assumptions for growth that are contained in the planning document. We believe that they are not projected far enough into the future, nor do they take into account that we will have reached our ecological limits at the current rate of consumption; neither do the assumptions take into account the certainty of a low-carbon and eventually a zero-carbon future. We are also concerned at the lack of serious urban growth management.

The "Directions 2031" document predicts that the population of Perth and Peel will grow by just over half a million from the current level of 1.65 million to 2.2 million by 2031. In order to accommodate this growth, the document also estimates that we will need another 328 000 houses and 353 000 jobs. However, Professor Richard Weller, author of *Boomtown 2050: Scenarios for a Rapidly Growing City* predicts that the population of Perth will be 4.2 million by 2056. He strongly argues that the predictions in "Directions 2031" are extremely short-sighted in space and in time. If he is anywhere near right in his predictions, we do have serious problems with the 2031 document and the planning for the future of Perth. The "Directions 2031" document refers to 18 000 hectares of zoned or deferred land to provide the 328 000 houses that I referred to. If we lock that into this prediction, what land will there be left for generations beyond 2031? The Greens say that the growth scenarios and the density targets for 2031 need to be urgently re-evaluated in light of the recent future scenarios being reported, such as those by Professor Richard Weller.

With regard to the pattern of low-density development, the fact is that we have one of the most sprawling cities on the planet. Our density of 12 persons per hectare is the second-lowest density recorded for any city in the world. We come second only after Houston in America, which has six persons per hectare. The average suburban home in Perth requires an ecological footprint of 58 hectares to sustain it. Clearly we cannot keep going like this.

The urban growth management strategy in the document needs to be accompanied by an urban growth boundary. If we look to Melbourne, in 2002 Melbourne created an urban growth boundary as an interim boundary to protect Melbourne's highly valued farming, conservation and recreation areas. We can also look to the urban growth boundary in Portland, Oregon, which is renewed every five years to determine its 20-year supply of land for future generations. We recommend that the department further investigates the urban growth boundaries and other areas that I have just mentioned so that we can ensure that we get our urban boundary tailored in and we stop the sprawl that is currently so very damaging to Perth.

The 2031 plan also acknowledges a number of strategic issues and challenges for the future. We Greens say that they are not just strategic challenges, but also moral and ethical challenges. Specifically, we are talking about the need to ensure the integration of urban development with the provision of community services, the need to ensure mixed-use developments and the need to protect valuable biodiversity. We want to see genuine measures

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Ms Adele Carles

so that these are not simply put there and lip service paid to them. These are really big strategic and moral imperatives for us to get right.

Some of the recommendations that we put forward are as follows. In terms of ensuring urban development, we would recommend an end to the hidden subsidies for new developments on the urban fringes, which actually amount to \$85 000 with a free infrastructure for each lot. We would provide incentives for developers to provide genuine green and affordable housing, tax breaks and a moratorium on developments until the completion and adoption of the Public Transport Authority strategy, which is expected later this year. We would also like to see the findings of the federal Senate inquiry into public transport infrastructure incorporated into this plan and document.

For the need to ensure a mixed-use development with community facilities and services, we recommend that a social infrastructure needs analysis should be undertaken. It is simply not enough for developers to provide roads and pipes; they need to look at the human aspect of their developments. I can certainly say that a development close to where I live, South Beach Village, is not a village, it is more like —

A government member interjected.

Ms A.S. CARLES: Yes, but we want to see urban sustainable developments, not developments that turn into white elephants.

For the protection of biodiversity, this is absolutely critical for the Greens. We would recommend that DPI and DEC work to ensure that recommendations made by the Auditor General's report "Rich and Rare: Conservation of Threatened Species" are adopted. We would like to see a moratorium on all clearing until 100 per cent of species have funded recovery plans. We would also like to see the value of green carbon and the valuable role that our forests play in carbon storage and climate protection actually acknowledged in our planning documents so that we can stop logging our native forests. I want to refer to the coastal developments aspect of the plan and then I will get on to Fremantle.

We note that Perth seems to have fallen in love with marinas, coastal developments and high-rise developments along the coast. They are simply not sustainable into the future if we accept that global warming is here and that sea levels are rising. I see some government members shaking their heads, so I gather that there are some climate change sceptics on this side of the house.

Mr J.J.M. Bowler interjected.

Ms A.S. CARLES: I am not going to get into that debate about climate change and whether it is happening, because I think that we are way beyond that debate. I would be very surprised if we had to debate that issue in this house. I am going to assume that we accept certain science —

Mr J.J.M. Bowler: I just say I do not know. You know; do you?

Ms A.S. CARLES: Ninety-nine per cent of peer-reviewed scientists around the world agree on this.

Mr J.J.M. Bowler: That's absolutely wrong! That's not true.

Ms A.S. CARLES: All right. I am going to get back on to coastal development.

Mr J.J.M. Bowler: Don't assume that this house won't have that debate. If you want to have that debate, I'd love to have it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members!

[Member's time extended.]

Ms A.S. CARLES: Coastal developments must provide public access to beach and coastal waters. The coast line, the seabed, our rivers, the estuaries and offshore islands of Western Australia should remain in public ownership and statutory plans for all coastal areas, including height restrictions and adequate setbacks, must be put in place. We would like to see a prohibition on all future canal developments. Just look at Port Coogee; it is a complete disaster. The seabed was actually zoned urban for the first time. Please! I just hope we do not see that again. We must acknowledge the impact of rising sea levels and storm surges by at least a 100-metre setback. We say a lot more than 100 metres, but we need at least a 100-metre setback.

I want to turn now to talk about Fremantle. I do not want to get into a debate about who has the best electorate; however, it was a complete shock to people in Fremantle and planning experts when they realised that Fremantle had been significantly downgraded by this document. In fact Professor Newman, who heads up Curtin University of Technology's sustainability policy unit, says that —

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, in accordance with standing orders this business is adjourned.

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 14 October 2009]

p8062b-8084a

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Ms Adele Carles

Ms A.S. CARLES: I was just getting to the fun part!

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.