

**METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME AMENDMENT 1186/41 —
WANDI TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT PRECINCT — DISALLOWANCE**

Motion

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

HON LYNN MacLAREN (South Metropolitan) [8.45 pm]: I wish to disallow the amendment for the Wandi transit-oriented development precinct. One could be forgiven for thinking that the Greens (WA) might support an amendment for a transit-oriented development. However, this amendment is not what it appears to be. The development is neither high density, nor transit oriented. The purpose of this amendment is to rezone 6.8 hectares of lot 683 Lyon Road, Wandi, from rural water protection zone to urban zone in the metropolitan region scheme. I have with me for the information of members a nice little picture of the area. It is located in this tiny section on the Jandakot water mound. That is one of the issues that I have with the development. It is also right on the freeway, which one would think could be a good opportunity for a transit-oriented design. I looked into this issue in quite some detail and was assisted by departmental officers. I also had a briefing from the Satterley Property Group, which has proposed the development. I have also met with other people who are concerned about bushland in our region. I can tell members that this amendment has been thoroughly researched by me and I would like the support of the house to disallow it.

One of the main reasons for disallowing this amendment is the development's location on the Jandakot water mound. Also, this habitat, which has not been cleared at the moment, is Carnaby's cockatoo habitat. I have six main reasons and I will quickly summarise those reasons, because, hopefully, members will be familiar with the principles of planning. My first reason for wanting to disallow the amendment is the lack of a clear commitment from the government about where it will put the railway station at Rowley Road, and I will go into that in detail later. The second reason is that the proposed density of this development is not high enough to qualify as a high-density transit-oriented development. The third reason is that the close proximity of the proposed development to Rowley Road is a concern because this is a major freight link to Latitude 32 and the southern ports. The fourth reason is the location of the proposed development on the Jandakot water mound, and I will go into the concerns I have about that in detail. The fifth reason is that there is insufficient detail in this proposal about the measures that will be in place to ensure that our groundwater source is protected from the contamination that is likely to occur from urban development. The final reason is the paucity of data relating to the conservation value of this site. So, very succinctly, I will cover those in detail.

Firstly, the government has not made a commitment to develop a rail station. We have been asking for the metropolitan master plan for public transport for some time. One of the reasons is to enable orderly urban development so that we know where we can build around rail stations. A number of recent reports, including the draft "outer metropolitan perth and peel sub-regional strategy", have put the location of that station near this development. However, early indications suggest that the government's 20-year public transport plan does not put the station near Rowley Road. Even in this metropolitan region scheme zonings and reservations map which was provided to me by the department and which I am holding in my hand, the proposed rail station was located north of Rowley Road, and now in the drawing it is conveniently located in close proximity to the land that we are considering. However, as it turns out, neither of these places appears on the master plan.

Point of Order

Hon PHIL EDMAN: Can we ask that that be tabled?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Michael Mischin): Does Hon Lynn MacLaren propose to table the plan?

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Absolutely. Would Hon Phil Edman like to see it? I can pass it to him now. I have pretty much memorised it. I seek leave to table the metropolitan region scheme zonings and reservations near amendment 1186/41, Wandi transit-oriented development precinct map.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: It has been pointed out to me that, upon the request of a member, the document is required to be identified, which the member has now done, and at the conclusion of the member's speech it will be automatically tabled.

Debate Resumed

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Thank you, Mr Deputy President. That, in a nutshell, is my concern about calling this a transit-oriented development, because if the station is not there, it does not really qualify.

I recently had the pleasure of visiting Harvest Lakes, which is one of those areas that was originally planned to be nicely developed to be a transit-oriented development. However, the station never eventuated. I believe that this is an issue that our planning authorities need to sort out so that we can finally start locking in these transit-oriented developments where the stations are.

I have mentioned that the proposed density of the development is not sufficiently high to merit its transit-oriented development tag because the two go hand in hand. Anyone who has seen the development of Leighton would know that we need high density at those rail station nodes. Therefore, this density is proposed to be for R40 to R60. That maybe cuts it on the minimum side, but it does not really achieve what we need to achieve with transit-oriented developments.

The developers argued that there would be no market for higher densities. However, there is, as we know, a major shortage of affordable housing in Perth, as documented by recent reports by Bankwest and Shelter WA. This is a case in which we could develop some affordable housing in a high-density development, and I would like to see that occur. However, at this stage of the process we have not facilitated that or even stipulated that that should occur. The Department of Planning argued that it was not really possible to dictate a higher density at this stage of the process. However, I still make the point that at some stage we need to take that major step. Because R40 and R60 are being talked about, R80 could at least be talked about. When do we actually start that process? I am saying that we should be starting it now.

The third reason was the concern about the close proximity of the proposed development to Rowley Road, which, as members for the South Metropolitan Region would well know, is a major freight link to ports and Latitude 32. My concerns relate to that issue of Roe Highway stage 8 and the Beeliar wetlands because, if members are familiar with that plan, they will know that quite a bit of land is required for the on-ramps and off-ramps, so it is more than just a ribbon of road. Sometimes these major intersections need quite a large triangle of land in which to get cars on and off the freeway. From my assessment of the maps, it appeared that that was not accounted for. We do not want to create a problem by allowing development too close to a major freight road. The planning authorities have since spoken to me and advised that Main Roads Western Australia does not have an issue with this. When I met with the Mayor of Kwinana and the planning authorities in Kwinana, they were concerned that perhaps there had not been sufficient leeway. Therefore, part of the reason for this disallowance is to be absolutely certain that enough land is reserved for the purpose of that major freight route. If we are going to put a lot of residents in that area, noise amelioration will be needed at some point, so we need to ensure that we have an adequate buffer for that. I do not want to create problems that we are already trying to deal with in built-up areas. The port authority was the only authority that objected in the 22 submissions on the metropolitan region scheme amendment. The port authority also was concerned about the integrity of the link and the transit lanes. Therefore, I think it is worthy for us to pay attention to its concerns.

Development is proposed on the Jandakot water mound, as I have said. This area is classified P2. P2 areas have been identified to ensure that there is no increased risk of pollution to the water source. Typically there is low-intensity development with lots that are quite spread out in these areas. The proposed development is high density. I know that developments occur in these areas that are fragile or vulnerable to groundwater pollution, but the way to do that is to be very clear about the drainage requirements and to have systems in place under which the drainage is very strictly controlled. This MRS amendment does not have those stipulations and I would like for us to be a bit more prescriptive in that. The policy for the protection of our groundwater supply is that further intensification of land use may result in the contamination of our public drinking water source; therefore, typically, urban development is not considered appropriate. That is the reason the original Jandakot structure plan, which I also have with me, did not include the little pocket of land next to the freeway. Satterley has already developed all the land to the south, but it did not include that pocket of land, which I am indicating on the map I am holding, because it is part of the Jandakot water mound. It could not be passed on the MRS amendment that went through first, so it has been held off and is subject to this special amendment just for this tiny pocket of land. That is an opportunity for us to ensure that the planning rules are strictly adhered to for the Jandakot water mound. I am not convinced that this amendment does that.

I am concerned about the potential contamination of bores. There are at least 10 production bores on Lyon Road. Production bore J210 near the corner of Rowley and Lyon Roads is under threat of contamination. At the point that this MRS amendment was tabled in this house, there was no consideration of how those bores would be protected. We need to ensure that that happens. That is why we have the special rules for the Jandakot water mound. The lobes of the water mound are protected drawdown cones with a 500-metre buffer around each wellhead, but this MRS amendment does not allow for those buffers. The Department of Water considered this amendment and its submission to the metropolitan region scheme amendment process is worthy of note. I would like to quote from it, if I may. The Department of Water's submission states —

The Department of Water ... has no objection to the amendment if it is determined that the unique location of the site adjacent to the Rowley Road (south) train station and its associated high density TOD would provide a greater community outcome. In this regard, the DoW have advised that should the site be zoned urban, then they would reclassify ... the area from priority 2 to priority 3 to facilitate urban development ...

The DoW has advised that while the proposed amendment is considered to be contrary to the water resource protection objectives of the DoW and SPP 2.3, the strategic location of this land and the commitment by government to the provision of sustainable TOD —

A sustainable transit-oriented development —

is recognised. The latter is considered by the DoW to provide sufficient justification to depart from the objectives of the SPP 2.3 in this locality.

However, as members will have figured out by now, I have a very real concern that this proposed development will be neither high density nor transit oriented. Therefore, the rationale that the Department of Water gave in its submission under good faith that this would be a transit-oriented development is now undermined. I suggest that the department may not give permission or see it as strategically important to permit urban development on this fragile piece of land if it knew that the pay-off was just further low-intensity development and not the transit-oriented development.

The fifth reason that I have listed today for this disallowance is that there was insufficient detail in this proposal about what measures would be in place to ensure that the contamination of water does not take place. The government argued that provisions would be included in the structure planning and subdivision process to restrict any contaminating activities. That is a worthy goal; we need to be absolutely sure, and I would like this chamber to express that absolute commitment that groundwater drainage requirements will be adhered to, because, frankly, the amendment we have before us does not guarantee that the groundwater will not be contaminated. I repeatedly asked for the drainage protection plan, and I was assured that the intention of the developers and the government was that this was to be a well-engineered development. However, there is nothing in writing, and I think that most of us would recognise that things like that are really needed in writing to ensure that something as important as our drinking water is kept free from contaminants.

The Department of Planning advised me that the provisions are likely to include the requirement for reticulated sewerage, a restriction on potentially contaminating activities, reduced irrigation and the use of fertilisers on public land and open space, and the application of water-sensitive design and subdivision design. I would like to see that on the record.

I am not necessarily opposed to all development on the Jandakot water mound, but it needs to be carefully controlled. A groundwater investigation to establish whether the run-off will infiltrate the groundwater and aquifers, as they are called, in the soil is needed. That has not been done at this stage. There should not be any commercial activities that would heighten the risk of groundwater contamination, and members can imagine what they are—petrol stations, dry cleaners and grey and black water recycling.

My final reason for this disallowance is the paucity of data relating to the conservation value of this site. This site is known to be the habitat of Carnaby's black cockatoos. Neither the government nor the developers were able to supply me with wildlife surveys taken at the site to assess its conservation value. In fact, a site visit determined that that area had already been traversed by cleared roads, which, as far as I know, are not allowed before this amendment goes through except for the purposes of survey work. In my consultation I learned that the Urban Bushland Council was opposed to the clearing of any more bush in the Perth metropolitan area. Its concern was that this area might be grand spider orchid country. We already know it is the habitat of the Carnaby's cockatoo. The Department of Environment and Conservation was unable to tell us whether the area had been surveyed and its wildlife value assessed. These are planning rules this state has put in place to ensure the protection of our environment. They are not in this metropolitan region scheme amendment, and we should disallow it. Offsets have been planned for this state; however, we have been unable to establish exactly where they will be.

In wrapping up, I want to make a few points about process issues. It appears that the proposed development is pretty much a done deal. We can see the constraints are many and we can see the developer is already quite advanced in his plans. I will show members these plans, which I will also seek leave to table. It is the "Wandi North Local Structure Plan".

Leave granted. [See papers 3463 and 3464.]

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: It shows the plan is already quite advanced for urbanisation along this side of the freeway. It would be quite nice and tidy to go all the way up to Rowley Road and complete that block of land. Members may recall that not long ago we considered an amendment for the other side of this freeway. That was the Mandogalup MRS amendment. This, too, has already been zoned urban and a structure plan is in place. Members can see why the pressure would be on this little area to go ahead and make it urban; however, that area, as members know, is that tiny section of the Jandakot water mound. That is why I believe it should not be developed.

As I said, I want to sum up. It looked like it was a done deal. The developers obviously did not think there would be any problem getting this development approved. I note, through my research, that they are significant donors to political parties in this house. I would hate to think that proper processes in this house will in any way be bypassed because of that. I would not expect that. However, it is notable, in my research, and that is what I had to share with members.

The Department of Planning stated that the Department of Water is also currently reviewing the Jandakot groundwater protection policy due to pressure from developers. According to the amendment report, a number of circumstances have changed so that the Western Australian Planning Commission supports a general review of the statement of planning policy. These circumstances include the construction of the Kwinana desalination plant and the increasing pressure from landowners within the Jandakot water protection area who are requesting greater urbanisation and a review of that policy. The development of the Jandakot water mound would risk contaminating our drinking water and would make us more reliant on expensive and energy-intensive desalinated water. I ask members to consider whether it is acceptable to commit our long-term future to that.

As I have already mentioned, the Greens (WA) are not necessarily opposed to any development on the Jandakot water mound. If the proposed development was a genuine transit-oriented, high-density development with a confirmed train station, we would probably support it, provided appropriate water management measures were implemented to minimise the risk of groundwater contamination and that the appropriate offsets were made to replace the Carnaby's cockatoo habitat. However, that is not what seems to be proposed for this area at all. What we have instead is a medium-density development on the Jandakot water mound, with no public transport provision. That will result in further clearing of the Carnaby's cockatoo habitat. I therefore move to disallow this amendment.

HON SALLY TALBOT (South West) [9.09 pm]: I have a great deal of sympathy with many of the points raised by Hon Lynn MacLaren in moving this motion. Like the honourable member, I have studied this proposal quite closely, and there has been a considerable amount of discussion on this side of the house about how we might proceed on this matter. Last week, in the context of the debate on urban bushland, I made the point quite clearly that we on this side of the house see enormous value in the preservation of urban bushland, not just for the sake of preserving it, but because properly preserved urban bushland adds to the quality of life in a metropolitan or urban area.

I note that Hon Lynn MacLaren framed her argument in six points. Let me take the final three points first, which are essentially about the conservation values and the protection of groundwater. The thing that disturbs me about the argument put forward by the Greens (WA) is that, were it a different sort of development—were it indeed a development that involved higher levels of density or had gone through a slightly different process—they might support it. Try as I might, I am unable to see a flaw in the planning process as it has evolved to this stage. I note particularly that both the Water Corporation and the Department of Water have done a full assessment of this site and both are happy for the development to proceed and are confident that the right measures can be put in place to ensure that there is no contamination of the groundwater.

I further note that the site has been subject to a formal environment protection and biodiversity conservation assessment. As honourable members in this place would know very well, the EPBC assessment is often a safety net. When we think the processes of the state might not be comprehensive or might be subject to considerations that we do not think should be brought to bear on a project, we often look to the EPBC act, which has a range of different considerations that can be brought into play. I notice that the EPBC act has been invoked here. The project has been assessed under the act, and those processes have also given this project the tick.

Those last three points have been well addressed. I noticed that Hon Lynn MacLaren was weaving through the issues a bit. It is probably not unfair to her to say that part of her argument is that the assessments might well have been done and they might well be adequate, but in the light of other concerns, the Greens have decided to move this disallowance. The reality is that one cannot actually walk both sides of the road at once. There has to come a point at which one makes a decision about whether one is fundamentally in favour of transport-oriented development. Transport-oriented development, people-oriented development, green-oriented development—they are not exactly interchangeable terms, but we on this side of the house pride ourselves on having done a lot of the pioneering work in making these terms part of the community's currency, part of the community's language, when it is talking about how to contain urban sprawl.

I share Hon Lynn MacLaren's concern about the densities at this site, but if that is our concern, it is our responsibility to hold the government accountable for delivering what it has promised to deliver. However, I am not sure whether the Greens (WA) make their point about ensuring that the densities are approved at the right levels in the strongest possible way by coming in here and moving a disallowance motion. I think other avenues are available for that.

One of the reasons that a lot of arguments the Greens are using resonate with me is that I look at developments such as Brighton, which is by the same developer, and things about Brighton make me very unhappy. Some of those things happened under the watch of my party, but the reality is that when we go to Brighton, we hear all the talk about medium and high density, affordability and sustainability. I and many honourable members in this place know how hard the developers had to work with agencies such as the Water Corporation to get some of those water-saving measures in that development. I can only hope that those processes become more streamlined in years to come. The reality is that the transport part of the development became out of sync with the building side of the development and almost every building in the Brighton subdivision has a double garage. There is no way that we can retrofit Brighton to make it a truly transport-oriented development and that saddens me enormously. We do not have to reinvent the wheel. To see how this works we simply have to go to other places in the world where transport-oriented developments have been built for decades. I can tell members that in all the best practice examples, they will not see double garages next to a train station.

I agree with the Greens that we absolutely must get this right. However, I do not agree that the best way to service those ends is to come in here and move a disallowance motion. As I said, the Greens cannot have it both ways. I concede that Hon Lynn MacLaren made the point that this is not a straightforward disallowance. I know that the Greens have a fundamental problem with excising any part of a Bush Forever site to allow for developments. I remember that within the last couple of years we have had the debate in here about the Jindalee subdivision in the northern suburbs. I argued on behalf of the Labor Party in favour of that amendment to the metropolitan region scheme because I genuinely believed that we would get better outcomes from what was being proposed than what we would have got from the kind of standard scorched earth sub-developments on the north coast. Fundamentally, we must look at what is at stake. The signs are that Wandri can be a best practice transit-oriented development and it is incumbent on us in this place to hold the government accountable to make sure that that is indeed the case.

I am a bit mystified about the arguments about the proximity to the freight link. Going through the briefings that we on this side of the house have had, Main Roads has looked at what is being proposed, and it seems to think there is a significant buffer zone. The reality is, as Bernard Salt has pointed out, if someone lives in an urban area, they should accept living with a certain amount of traffic noise. One of the most troubling situations in Perth is when we develop something such as the old brewery and people move into a development such as that and then complain that they get too much noise from the restaurants. When I am in the metropolitan area, I live in East Perth, and from my back veranda I can hear a lot of noise from the entertainment precinct around the Royal on the waterfront at Claisebrook Cove. I do not hear that sort of noise in my house in Denmark. I am very fortunate that I have the best of both worlds, but I do not move to a place such as East Perth and expect to have the same kind of environment that I have when I wake up in Denmark. People choose to live in a transport-oriented development for a number of different reasons. A lot of those that we on this side of the house want to see developed are to do with the affordability of living in a TOD in which families do not need to own two cars; they might not even need to own a car at all, given the way that the rail network is opening up different areas of the metropolitan area to ready and easily affordable access. I say again that I do not think the proximity to Rowley Road is reason enough to move this disallowance.

Although I think that we have to make sure that future densities are in line with best practice transport-oriented developments, I also believe that we have to be consistent in our argument and acknowledge that TODs are indeed what we want if we are determined to make Perth a thoroughly functional twenty-first century city.

As I went through the paperwork associated with this development, I noted the offset built in to the proposal—129 hectares in total, of which I understand 84 hectares has already been purchased. Offsets are one instrument we use, particularly for black cockatoos, to ensure the wildlife does not suffer a net disadvantage from a development such as this. However—I know that the Greens (WA) members will agree with me—they are not the ideal solution, particularly when we have a government that has failed to put in place a clear and transparent offsets register that enables us to see exactly what has happened, exactly what is planned, what has been achieved, what the effects of that achievement are and, most importantly, where the money is going. I notice that in the briefing documents this transaction was completed at some time in 2010, yet we do not seem to have been able to confirm that transaction; that is, we do not have any details about the location of the 84 hectares and how that is being managed for offsets for black cockatoos.

I referred in a previous debate today to some of the very troubling information that we elicited from the government during the estimates debate a couple of weeks ago. I asked how the offsets revenue is shown in the budget papers, and the answer was that it is not shown in the budget papers. That will make it very, very problematic for the government when the minister stands to defend the government stance on this disallowance by saying, “We have an offset policy in place”—I am quite sure that is what appears in the briefing notes of whichever minister is about to handle this disallowance—because the minister will then find he or she is unable to give the house any details. Again, my view is that that is not enough to support the moving of this

disallowance and therefore the Labor Party will not use that to vote in favour of this disallowance. Although the Labor Party will not be supporting the motion, I think it is time the government was put on notice. I know, and Hon Helen Morton knows, because she reads out the answers provided by the Minister for Environment every time I raise this matter, that there is a policy of development. However, this will become more and more of a pressing issue as we look at things like transport-oriented development. Once again, I make the point that have I made several times during previous debates in this place; namely, that offsets only work for certain species. They do not work for the small birds and the small animals and I would have liked to see something in this material to suggest that this concept of environmental permeability is being incorporated, if only in a transport-oriented development in which the densities are much higher than they might be in other developments.

Although we in the Labor Party have a lot of sympathy for the points made by the Greens (WA) in moving this disallowance, I think the better end is served by not disallowing this measure; the better measure is served by using the forums of the Parliament, and the forums that the community puts together for itself, to make the government accountable for delivering the best transport-oriented development in the state that it possibly can deliver at this time. That is why I indicate that the Labor Party will not support this motion.

HON HELEN MORTON (East Metropolitan — Minister for Mental Health) [9.25 pm]: Obviously, I have information that has been provided to me by the Minister for Planning on this motion, so some of the information that I will provide to the house is really from his papers. I noted from her comments, as did Hon Sally Talbot, that Hon Lynn MacLaren's concerns would not be so great if the development were to be of a higher density than what she perceives will be the case, and if there were to be some protections put in place around contamination issues. That came through fairly loud and clear in my mind. I also acknowledge the work that Hon Sally Talbot has put into providing an overview of the opposition's position.

I need to provide the minister's response to this motion, so I will run through it in a fairly routine kind of way. Before addressing the reasons behind the motion the member moved, I want to provide a brief background to the amendment.

In summary, metropolitan region scheme amendment 1186/41, the Wandi transit-oriented development precinct, is supported because it will facilitate development of 6.61 hectares of land for proposed medium and high-density residential development, providing a range of housing choice, in close proximity to the future train station. Initial concept plans indicate that approximately 200 residential lots will be created of a density between R40 and R60; however, the preferred density is not yet determined and will be subject to further detailed structure planning.

The amendment will contribute to a residential catchment to support the proposed Rowley Road railway station and an adjacent local centre. The station and local centre will provide a focus for community activity within the Wandi area. Over the last two years, the nearby Wandi and Mandogalup localities have been rezoned to urban or urban deferred in the MRS. This urbanisation in the south west corridor of the metropolitan region contributes to the efficient consolidation of land in close proximity to existing and proposed infrastructure, and ultimately the supply of urban land in the metropolitan region.

As the amendment area is located within the Jandakot underground water pollution control area, careful consideration has been given to its urbanisation by various state government agencies. The Western Australian Planning Commission concluded that the land was suitable for urban purposes, given the relatively small area of land—approximately 6.61 hectares; its location on the periphery of the Jandakot underground water pollution control area, with its limited resultant potential impact; local and state government agency support, including the Department of Water; the fact that the site is wholly contained within 600 metres of the proposed Rowley Road railway station; and that it completes, rather than extends, the urban zone in the Wandi locality, and contributes to the residential catchment of the proposed Rowley Road station.

However, the reasons for disallowing the amendment are not supported by the evidence and information available. Firstly, I would like to clarify the general purpose and intent of an MRS amendment, as it will assist in providing a context for the responses I give to the honourable member's reasons for this motion of disallowance. The intent of an MRS amendment is to consider broad regional aspects relating to long-term zoning of a site, and whether there are any fatal flaws that would prevent the future urban development of a site. An urban zoning in the MRS allows the next stage of the planning process to occur when detailed structured planning is undertaken and all issues are investigated and assessed or addressed. Most of the issues raised in the motion of disallowance relate to planning matters that are routinely addressed in the subsequent detailed structure planning stage, which will involve further consultation and referral to relevant agencies and public advertising.

Getting down to the specific reasons that were raised, the first reason I will talk about is the uncertainty about the width of Rowley Road to accommodate the major freight corridor. The importance of Rowley Road as a major freight corridor has been carefully considered in the assessment of the amendment. The future use of Rowley Road will not be prejudiced by the amendments as follows. Main Roads WA, in conjunction with the

Department of Planning, has been working to develop the ultimate planning design concept for Rowley Road east of Kwinana Freeway to protect the major freight corridor that will serve the Kwinana Quays project, James Point port, Kwinana industrial area and Latitude 32. As a result of this work it was identified that additional land is needed to accommodate the freight corridor. In accordance with Main Roads WA's submission on the matter, the amendment has been modified to exclude a northern portion of the amendment area from the urban zone. This will accommodate the future land requirement needs for Rowley Road to be upgraded as a primary regional road reserve to service heavy freight traffic into the future. In relation to issues regarding noise and loss of amenity of future residents from road infrastructure, these aspects are routinely addressed in the subsequent detailed structure planning stage, followed by stringent conditions of subdivision and development approval that typically require a combination of noise amelioration techniques, including noise walls, road pavement construction, quiet house design and notifications on titles.

The second point was about the lack of evidence for the location of a rail station. Planning for a station in Mandogalup–Wandi has occurred over the past decade and has been reflected in a series of strategic planning documents. The South West Metropolitan Rail Master Plan, 2000; the Perth Urban Railway Development Supplementary Master Plan, DPI 2002; and the Jandakot District Structure Plan 2007. In these documents, stations are shown in two locations: north of Rowley Road and to the south of the intersection of Anketell Road and the Kwinana Freeway.

A 2007 review of these sites by the Public Transport Authority, in conjunction with the then Department for Planning and Infrastructure, concluded that there would be adequate demand for stations near Russell and Rowley Roads. In January 2008, the WAPC endorsed the review's recommendation for a proposed station at Rowley Road south. This location has been subsequently identified as the Mandogalup proposed passenger railway station in the draft outer metropolitan Perth and Peel subregional strategy 2010 for the south west subregion 2010. The draft strategy forms an integral part of the endorsed vision in Directions 2031 and Beyond—Directions 2031—for increased densities in the metropolitan area. Directions 2031 also identifies an emerging district centre in the Wandi locality. A business case is needed prior to construction of the station. However, expected future passenger numbers in the catchment, which will include the immediate 800-metre walkable catchment and the wider Park 'n' Ride or Kiss 'n' Ride catchments, are anticipated to provide patronage for the station.

The agreed site for the station also provides flexibility to construct a station and associated facilities and achieve good integration between the station and the surrounding developments. The proposed station site will be kept under review and made a priority in subregional planning for the area. Development of the Wandi TOD land will assist in the case for further detailed planning and the ultimate construction of a station at Rowley Road south.

The third reason it was raised was concern about achieving the high residential density targets for the Wandi TOD land. Concern about achieving those high residential density targets for the Wandi TOD land is acknowledged, given that the reason for the amendment is to actually achieve transit-oriented development associated with the proposed Rowley Road south rail station. However, the allocation of residential density occurs at the local structure planning stage prior to subdivision. The structure planning process involves referral to relevant agencies, public consultation and the opportunity for submissions on planning issues, including the appropriate provision of residential densities. Although initial indications by the proponent suggest an R40 or R60 coding for the land, as part of the subsequent structure planning stage, the WAPC will carefully consider the appropriate residential density in evaluating land use and mix that will support a transit-oriented development outcome for the wider catchment area around the rail station. This catchment will take in not only a walkable catchment of around 800 metres in Mandogalup, Hammond Park and Wandi, but also a much wider catchment that will utilise Kiss 'n' Ride and Park 'n' Ride facilities. Minimum residential density targets rather than conventional maximum densities that will support government transport investment will be explored during structure planning to provide for appropriate densities that will support future construction of a rail station. The government is committed to achieving increased residential density in Perth, particularly when integrated with public transport in line with the WAPC's Directions 2031 vision for a more compact and sustainable city. The government will continue to work with the WAPC and the Town of Kwinana to ensure that appropriate density is achieved for the Wandi TOD.

The fourth reason related to the proximity to the Jandakot underground water pollution control area and whether water-sensitive design criteria are required, whether activities and irrigation are restricted and whether there is the potential for contamination of bores et cetera. The decision to support the amendment was not taken lightly, particularly given the location of the Wandi TOD land within the Jandakot underground water pollution control area. However, it was concluded that the land was suitable for urban purposes given the following: once again, a relatively small area of land—6.61 hectares; its location on the edge of the UWPCA, with limited potential for impact on the control area; local and state government agency support, including the Department of Water; the site is wholly contained within 600 metres of the proposed Rowley Road rail station; and it completes rather than

extends the urban zone in the Wandii locality and contributes to the residential catchment of the proposed Rowley Road station.

In answer to concerns about the lack of information relating to contamination of the UWPCA and land use and irrigation restrictions, I am advised that appropriate water management measures will be incorporated into the subsequent structure planning and subdivision process in consultation with the Department of Water. Provisions will likely include the requirement for reticulated sewerage, a restriction on potentially contaminating activities, reduced irrigation and use of fertilisers on public land and open space, and the application of water-sensitive drainage and subdivision design.

With regard to the Water Corporation's bore J210, which is located on the north east corner of the intersection of Rowley Road and Lyon Road, the Water Corporation has advised that incompatible land uses should be excluded from the wellhead protection zone. As described above, provision will be included in the structure planning and subdivision process to restrict any contamination activities. Also, as part of the structure planning and subdivision, district and local water management strategies and plans will be required in compliance with the WAPC's "Better Urban Water Management" for water-sensitive design, the principles of which are to maintain or improve predevelopment water discharge and also maintain surface and groundwater quality at predevelopment levels. Water-sensitive urban design will be required and implemented in subdivision and development. In light of the above, the Minister for Planning has indicated that he is confident that the structure plan process provides the appropriate mechanism to address the matters that have been raised.

Reason five relates to the lack of data relating to native vegetation and conservation values. I am advised that the proponent has conducted various environmental surveys on the subject land as part of an overall environmental study of the Wandii north local structure plan area. The study area includes the MRS amendment land. Environmental studies undertaken included flora, vegetation and fauna surveys at appropriate times of the year, wetland mapping, vegetation condition mapping and environmental assessment reports. No declared rare flora or flora species listed under the commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 were identified. Further consideration of any environmental issues raised in the environmental assessment reports will occur at the detailed structure planning stage, in consultation with the Department of Environment and Conservation and the Town of Kwinana's environmental section.

The amendment land was also included in a referral of the overall Wandii north residential development proposal by the landowner to the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. The DSEWPC approved the proposal subject to conditions for on-site retention of vegetation and off-site offset measures to ensure the protection of black cockatoo habitat. The DSEWPC's conditions are being complied with by the proponent as development of land to the south proceeds, as with the development of the Wandii transit-oriented development land.

In closing, it should be noted that disallowing the amendment could potentially impede the timely provision of urban land and result in a lost opportunity to secure a prime urban site to facilitate transit-oriented development, which in turn may prejudice the ultimate provision of a train station at Rowley Road south. It may also increase uncertainty and impede the coordination and timely provision of services and infrastructure in the Wandii area.

I trust that this reply will allay some of the concerns raised by Hon Lynn MacLaren. I formally request that the motion to disallow metropolitan region scheme amendment 1186/41 for the Wandii transit-oriented development precinct not be supported.

HON LYNN MacLAREN (South Metropolitan) [9.41 pm] — in reply: I want to very quickly express my appreciation to the minister representing the Minister for Planning for going into such detail about the environmental conditions that will be imposed on this development. That goes some way to addressing the concerns that I have raised, and I appreciate that. I would like to remind members that the conditions of the Department of Water have not been met. The department stipulated that it was on the condition that it would be a transit-oriented facility. We still are not convinced that the station will exist south of Rowley Road. I hope that within two weeks we see the master plan for public transport for the state and that we know whether there will be a station in that area. We will know soon enough whether that is true.

I appreciate the fact that the noise amelioration and groundwater protection controls will be measured and audited. I must note that the public open space and greenways in the concept plans that I saw for the development are impressive. I think that, should the developer deliver on the vision that he has set out to deliver, it will be a very stunning and nice development to live in. I hope that that comes to fruition. It is a major freight route; it is not a restaurant zone. Noise amelioration will be a key factor for the amenity in that area. I appreciate that the minister has made some comments about that.

Finally, I note that, at the recent ministerial lunch put on by the planning sector that I attended, the Minister for Planning was glowing in his assessment of the transit-oriented development that he visited in the United States. I

know that he knows. I know that he gets it. I know that he understands the importance and the joy that a transit-oriented development can deliver for citizens. I think he would agree with me that we want to see more of that in Perth. I just want him to be sure that that kind of development can be delivered. I am still not convinced that the Wandri transit-oriented development will deliver that. Therefore, I ask for support for the disallowance motion.

Question put and negatived.

The PRESIDENT: Members, noting the time, we will move to members' statements. I will give the call initially to Hon Giz Watson, because she tried to get the call right at the end of last week's session, and then I will work out the rest of the order and let members know.