

**METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME AMENDMENT NO. 1114/33 —
JANDAKOT STRUCTURE PLAN, CELL 1 — MANDOGALUP — DISALLOWANCE**

Withdrawal of Motion — Leave Sought

HON LYNN MacLAREN (South Metropolitan) [4.54 pm]: I seek leave to withdraw this disallowance motion, but I would like to explain the reasons for doing so in seeking that leave.

The PRESIDENT: Carry on.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I want to thank very much the Minister for Planning for providing me with further information that addressed some of the concerns I had about this metropolitan region scheme amendment, which, as we know, will result in 181 hectares of land just to the east of the Alcoa area down in Kwinana, and just to west of the Kwinana Freeway and north of the Spectacles wetlands, being developed. My concerns were around the impact that would have on that area. The Minister for Planning was very kind and provided me with a briefing that gave me some additional information.

A particular concern I had was that the development did not specify a high-density area near the railway where the WA Planning Commission had decided to locate, just south of Rowley Road, a railway station. We know that in Perth it is very important to take advantage of those opportunities and build-up that area with a high-density zone. I was surprised, in reviewing the amendment, that high density was not specified in that area. I discussed with the planning officers that it would be opportune for these high-density zones to be introduced at the MRS amendment level. Typically, as I was told by the minister's advisers, it is done later, at the local planning scheme amendment stage. I will, of course, be following that process to see that that is done. My concerns around that issue were addressed in that way.

I also had concerns about groundwater and drainage issues because of its location near the Spectacles wetlands. I have been advised that a plan will be prepared, and I am sure members who have been in this place for a while realise that sometimes these plans do not deliver to the high standards that we would call for in this house. Therefore, it would be useful if that kind of detail could be provided in MRS amendments at this level, because it is very important for the long-term sustainability of these developments that they have a high-quality standard of drainage plan. It should not be something that we should wait for the town planning scheme or the local planning scheme to insert.

I had similar concerns about whether there was an adequate buffer zone surrounding Alcoa. I have been given a direction that the Minister for Child Protection representing the Minister for Planning pointed to when she tabled the amendment, which actually states that the buffer zone for Alcoa will be looked at in detail, and that this house will get an opportunity to review that. That is very important, because we do not want to create problems for the future in these areas where we have the opportunity to develop a greenfields site and potentially have a lot of people living there. We do not want to create problems for industry that exists nearby, and it is very important that we have adequate buffer zones. I felt it was necessary to review the MRS amendment to make sure that that buffer zone was there, and we will get a chance to do that after the buffer zone has been suggested by the industry.

I listed 10 reasons for disallowing this MRS amendment, and each of them were addressed by the minister's advisers. Those reasons were also noted by the Environmental Protection Authority in its response to the amendment, but I felt that the amendment did not have sufficient detail for me to be confident, on behalf of my constituents, that if there was any rare flora or endangered fauna in the remnant bushland, it would be protected. I hope to see future MRS amendments with that kind of detail, because at this stage all they told us was that a study would be done; I still only have a promise, really, that that will be done at the next stage. In Western Australia we are at a point at which these are the crunch zones. We have a huge population that we have to cater for, and we need to be able to protect, from urbanisation, our bushland and protect those rare habitats that still exist.

At what level of planning do we do that? This is the time as members that we can review these plans at this level and say, "Okay; that is important and we should protect it." We heard two weeks ago during the debate for a disallowance motion on a similar amendment that even Bush Forever sites are not adequately protected. Therefore, for sites such as this that are not identified as Bush Forever that may indeed have rare flora or fauna but have no protections on them, I feel that it is our duty to review these plans and make our values evident in the metropolitan region scheme at this level. We know that as the MRS amendment goes down the planning chain to the town planning scheme and local scheme level, additional pressures come from local residents, councils and people who want to grow food in the area or use the area for industry. However, we can take the bigger picture view.

We support, in many key ways, delivering the Directions 2031 policy that the Minister for Planning would like to see implemented in the city. I think that is where we need to make more decisions at that level of the MRS amendment to protect that vision the planning minister wants to deliver for the people of Western Australia. Therefore, I do not think it is fair enough to leave it for the people at the local planning scheme level to try to follow that vision. It is up to us to inject that vision into planning. I wanted to disallow this MRS amendment earlier because I did not see that vision evident in the amendment.

This amendment has been in the planning process for four years, so I know that the current Minister for Planning is not responsible in that regard for much of the work that has been done to date. However, at some point we in Western Australia need to deliver zones where we can have higher density and this is the perfect opportunity for that. I felt that we missed that opportunity at this level and that we should rethink that. However, as I said, the Minister for Planning has taken that on board and advised me in his letter that —

The concept of transport orientated development is something I strongly support and I thank you for raising this important issue.

Therefore, I feel that we are going in the right direction but we need to ensure that the detail is included at this MRS level, and I look forward to doing that over the coming years. The minister advised me that a complex range of issues have been addressed and a balanced approach to conservation, planning and development provided for. I just think that there is not enough detail. The next time that we have an MRS amendment to the Jandakot structure plan—several amendments are coming—I would like to see that level of detail, and to see that bushland protected and high-density areas actually identified. It is not good enough to simply say, “R20 is an okay thing.” Therefore, we must start making those tough decisions. At this stage I am satisfied with the minister’s response to my concerns and I seek leave to withdraw my disallowance motion.

The PRESIDENT: For motions like that it is appropriate for members to explain their reason for seeking the withdrawal of the motion, but it is not a debatable motion from that point on.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.