

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

HOUSING — LAND SUPPLY

Motion

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan) [4.06 pm]: I move —

That this house condemns the Barnett government on its failure to provide adequate land supply and land approvals in Western Australia to meet increasing housing demand.

I want to start my contribution today to reflect on some of the comments made by the Minister for Planning yesterday in the house when a dorothy dixer was asked by the member for Belmont. The question was whether the member for West Swan was correct when she said that the number of land approvals was down compared with the number under the previous Labor government, and I think the answer was yes. The minister therefore actually acknowledged yesterday that land approvals were down.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I said your analysis was completely wrong.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, I think the minister said I was correct.

Mr J.H.D. Day: Your analysis was wrong.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think the minister said I was correct. Very rarely do dorothy dixers get asked about whether a member opposite was correct and the minister has to stand and say, yes, she was! Land approval numbers are down under this government, and I will go through this issue in a little detail.

Another question asked by the member for Belmont was whether the Office of Land and Housing Supply had any staff. The question could have been a bit misleading, as I have commented that the Office of Land and Housing Supply has no permanent staff. The answer to the question from the member for Belmont was provided by the Minister for Planning, or by his representative in the upper house. In answer to the question on how many permanent staff were employed in the Office of Land and Housing Supply, the government announced that there was none. In my commentary the other day I was reflecting purely on the fact that the government had confirmed that there were no permanent staff in the Office of Land and Housing Supply. Therefore, although the Minister for Planning had a dorothy dixer question asked of him yesterday that attacked me, in fact he stood up and confirmed that my points were correct and that the number of land approvals is lower under the Barnett government than it was under the previous Labor government.

I want to point that out because I remember very clearly what was happening when there were attacks from the then opposition on our ability to put land online. There were attacks day in, day out saying that there was not enough land on the market, yet now fewer land approvals have been granted under this government than were granted under the previous Labor government. That is an important point to make. This area is like many areas of this government. It has no clear direction and no clear plan. As a result, the housing stock in WA is not sufficient to meet the growing demand. I sit in the chamber quite a bit and I have heard, both on our side and on the government's side, story after story about there being not enough housing for Western Australians. I think it was the member for Belmont who raised this issue yesterday in her contribution to the debate on the Supply Bill. She said she had dealt with, and I am sure will continue to deal with, families and mothers coming in wanting housing, possibly after being kicked out of private rentals. There is also the Department of Housing issue, but the issue of housing supply is the key issue for Western Australians at the moment. There is simply not enough housing stock to meet the significant demand in the market and in recognition of the significant population growth over recent years.

As I said, in my office we are getting more and more complaints and calls for help. I know the Minister for Housing is here and I think the minister needs a better system to assist the public on these sorts of issues because we are not getting a lot of assistance from the Minister for Housing's office. I know it is a hard portfolio and it is hard for the individuals involved, but we need to be a bit better at dealing with these issues that arise in our electorate offices.

I want to go through some of the more recent reports that show the significance of the housing crisis. I refer to a release from Anglicare on 29 April 2013, which states —

Anglicare WA's Annual Affordability Snapshot Shows that the rental market in Western Australia has become completely inaccessible for low income earners.

...

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

“This is our third year running the snapshot and the issue is not only unresolved, it is clearly getting worse. The results of last year’s snapshot were already staggeringly low, and the market has become even less accessible this year. This is a genuine crisis,” said CEO Ian Carter.

There was a marked decrease in affordable properties for working families. In last year’s snapshot couples working on the minimum wage with children were able to afford 7.8% of rentals on the market. This year, they could only afford 2.6% of rentals—a drastic drop. The median price of a rental property in Perth was up from \$450 per week in 2012, to \$520 per week in 2013—a 16% increase.

I go to comments made by advocacy groups representing seniors. This was as reported in *The Sunday Times* in March this year —

ADVOCACY groups say Western Australia’s seniors are suffering the worst of the rental crisis.

With our ageing population and a population influx, they say more affordable housing is needed now.

...

National Seniors’ WA spokeswoman June MacDonald said the lack of affordable housing was a “major problem”, which had been exacerbated by the resources boom.

I want to quote another group. The website of the Urban Development Institute of Australia states —

With further evidence emerging of a healthy recovery in the urban development sector in 2013, the ability to adequately meet the expected demand for new housing in WA needs to be managed better.

...

The ‘heat’ in the rental market has been building since early 2010. Whilst there has been a gradual upward trend in median weekly rent costs, the vacancy rate has plummeted from nearly five per cent in 2010 to below two per cent. Should this trend continue, the median rent will inevitably rise at a much greater rate, resulting in people looking at alternate housing options.

...

However, frustrating the delivery of vacant land are the time and cost implications of bureaucratic processes being imposed on the whole industry (being land developers, builders, consultants and contractors). Also, often conditions attached to funding create inefficiencies and has a flow-on cost effect to the end consumer by virtue of pre-sale conditions.

As I said, over recent years there has been a build-up of this problem and the issue of there not being enough stock in the market. This issue will clearly get worse as the population grows and stock is not delivered to the market at the rate that we need. I refer this time to the March 2013 urban development index of residential land activity —

Without a further significant lift in the number of lots brought onto the market in Perth, current sales volumes will not be maintained. Analysis of the number of lots available on the market, the number of lots committed to be brought onto the market and current sales rates reveals that there is a notional shortfall of 700 lots in Perth and Peel over the next six months.

It makes an analysis of the stock in particular corridors. It states —

*City of Swan has
lowest stock levels
in Perth*

The City of Swan is part of my electorate —

At current sales rates, there was only enough stock on the market at March 31 to cover less than four weeks of sales. This was the lowest level of all growth councils in Perth and Peel.

As I said, this is a significant problem that appears to be getting worse and there does not seem to be enough urgency or enough happening within government to address this problem and the housing shortage.

I want to go through some of the land approvals that I raised the other day. I refer to final land approvals. From 2008–09 to 2011–12, 38 221 residential lots were granted final approval in the Perth metropolitan area and the Peel area. In the previous four years, 59 961 lots were granted final approval. I refer to conditional land approvals. From 2008–09 to 2011–12, 73 171 lots received conditional approval. In the previous four years, 81 086 received conditional approval. Fewer approvals were given. The other key point is the massive population growth. From approximately 2007 to 2011, 197 000 people moved to WA. While there were fewer

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

approvals, there was a greater population coming in. As I said, I wanted to go through some of the history to make sure I was well briefed on this issue. I checked some of the commentary that was made by, I think it was, the then Minister for Housing, who talked about the fact that we ran out of land in Western Australia under the previous government. Again, I refer to the Department of Planning and the Western Australian Planning Commission's publication titled, "Urban Development Program: Perth and Peel Development Outlook 2011–12". This analysis monitors what is happening in population growth and housing stock and housing developments to see whether we have a surplus of stock, have a deficiency of stock or are at equilibrium. It is quite interesting to analyse why there is a housing crisis. Why can people not find homes? I want to go through the analysis and the outcomes of the analysis —

Based on expert advice from the property industry, Perth was in dwelling equilibrium around 2000. On this basis the cumulative effect of the overbuilding up to June 2006 meant that a dwelling surplus built up over time peaking at over 12,000 dwellings during 2005/06. The under-building since mid-2006 has meant that this stock was gradually depleted, reaching equilibrium by early 2009 and then a dwelling shortage of about 4,000 dwellings by June 2011.

There was a dwelling shortage by June 2011. What are the implications of that? There are fewer houses on the market, less rental accommodation and more pressure on people trying to put a roof over their head; and, of course, we are hearing the stories of rents being increased by \$100, \$200 and \$300. We are hearing it all the time. The problem is that there is just not enough housing in the market out there to cater for our significant population.

I want to go on to the commentary from the Western Australian Planning Commission and the Department of Planning. This document was produced under the current government. It states —

This analysis challenges a view that rising house prices in mid 2000s were caused by a shortage of housing as a result of a perceived demand–supply imbalance ... Figure 23 —

Which I can provide to Hansard —

shows that there was a substantial oversupply of housing through most of the decade until the end of 2008 when a massive post-GFC population boom helped to absorb the surplus housing stock ...

The conclusion from the analysis shown in Figure 23 is that as at June 2011, the Perth metropolitan region had a housing shortage of around 4,000 dwellings and that this shortage was getting worse by around 550 dwellings per quarter (the under-building trend line).

I think this analysis is quite useful. As I said, I think it demonstrates that there is a structural problem out there, which this government has failed to address.

I will go through some of the noise and list some of the statements this government has made getting a handle on the housing situation. In May 2010 a key part of the budget for that year was the Office of Land and Housing Supply. It was there to fix supply problems and, as I said, it was a key feature of the 2010 budget. It was welcomed by industry; there is no doubt about that. I refer to the Urban Development Institute of Australia's comments, which state —

"It is critical that the Office of Land and Housing Supply sit within Premier and Cabinet and is given a mandate to work across government departments at the highest level," ...

That obviously did not happen. Although the office was welcomed by industry, I think industry and everyone at the time thought it would be a bit bigger than it eventually ended up. I refer to a question put forward by the then shadow Minister for Planning, Hon Sally Talbot, in the upper house. In October 2010 she asked the question that follows —

I refer the minister to the recently established office of land and housing supply.

(1) How many staff are employed in the new office?

The answer from the government, and I did not make this up, was —

(1) The office of land and housing supply does not employ any permanent staff; ...

A key feature of this budget was to create this Office of Land and Housing Supply, which sounded like a pretty good idea in theory.

Mr J.H.D. Day: Whether they were permanent staff or contract is not really material. There are staff in that office who are employed in that role.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The minister answered that question and said there were no permanent staff.

Mr J.H.D. Day: There are contract staff. Yes, they are not permanent staff, they are contract staff. What's the point?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There are no permanent staff; the minister answered that question.

Mr W.R. Marmion: That doesn't mean there are no staff.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Okay!

This is the question: how many staff are employed in the office? That was a question asked by Hon Sally Talbot and the minister said —

The office of land and housing supply does not employ any permanent staff; ...

That is what the minister said.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I can tell you there are two contract staff there now.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The reality is that it was a nice idea that was not followed through and I think everyone acknowledges that. Good idea; the government was going to create this Office of Land and Housing Supply that would work with agencies to ensure that we get land onto the market and that there is enough land available to meet increases in demand due to the surging population. The concept was great, but like all things, and I know this happens, the implementation was poor, and so there are no permanent staff. As I understand it, although the agency does a bit of negotiating with other areas of government, one of the key things it does is produce documents that show that there is not enough land. A lot of these documents we read are basically in response to what the Office of Land and Housing Supply is doing. We had the creation of the Office of Land and Housing Supply with no permanent staff and in May 2010 the new Minister for Housing said the government market would be flooded—it would get land out, increase housing and flood the market. I am sorry the Premier has just left the chamber.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Obviously the member for Girrawheen has scared him off again!

In May 2011, the Premier contributed, as he sometimes does, to the housing affordability debate. His contribution to the fact that there was not enough housing in WA to meet the demand of WA families was outlined in an article, which states —

West Australian Premier Colin Barnett has dished out some tough-love to aspiring young home buyers, telling them to “have a job and save some money” and lower their expectations if they ever want to realise their dream of owning a property.

That was the contribution in 2011 by the Premier. It was not about how we will get serious about making sure that we have enough housing to meet the demand of Western Australian families; it was for them to lower their expectations. The real issue here is not about expectations; there is just not enough housing out there. Regardless of people's expectations, there is simply not enough housing. Of course, in 2011 we had the “Affordable Housing Strategy 2010–2020” and again I wish the Minister for Transport was here, because, remember, he loves that affordable housing strategy document. He has talked about it time and time again. I do not think in the history of WA that we have ever been in the situation in which we have had such a housing crisis in the community. The government produced the affordable housing strategy and I must say that some of the social housing build in particular has mainly been driven by the commonwealth stimulus package over three or four years. The affordable housing strategy document talked a bit about social housing, primarily funded and driven by the commonwealth; and for the rest, the outcomes are there for all of us to experience—not enough housing. Therefore, the government has a strategy and I know that the Minister for Transport, the former Minister for Housing, loves that strategy, but it is not actually delivering the outcome we need. In April 2013 the current Minister for Housing got the portfolio back, as I recall—it is hard to recall all the change in portfolios—and he said he wanted to flood the market again. In 2010 the then Minister for Housing and Works wanted to flood the market; in 2010 there was going to be the new Office of Land and Housing Supply; and in 2011 the Premier said, “Lower your expectations. Let's release this affordable housing strategy”. Where are we today? We have the most serious housing crisis that people in WA have ever experienced. There are not enough rental properties and there are not enough homes to house Western Australian families.

As I said, since taking this shadow planning portfolio I have spoken to a number of people in the industry and around the place. There are some serious delays happening with the Western Australian Planning Commission, there is no doubt about it. The Minister for Planning would have seen a letter from the Town of Victoria Park

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

talking about a local planning scheme—I do not have that letter in front of me. That planning scheme has been with the WAPC for up to three years. There are issues in the City of Swan that I know about with, for example, the development contribution plans. I think people are aware of development contribution plans. They are quite significant because basically they estimate the contribution that the landowners need to make when they are developing a property once it has gone through the structure plan process. As I understand it, this DCP has been with the WAPC for probably over two years. What does that mean? It means huge uncertainty in the market. It means huge uncertainty for the developers because they are not quite sure where to price their blocks. There has not been a final DCP and so they are not sure exactly how much for a block they will have to pay to DCP. There is huge uncertainty for homeowners and for land buyers in the area. They may be buying an overinflated or under-priced block, not knowing what the final DCP will be. Significant delays have been experienced with the WAPC. When I talk to councils and local governments around the place, they tell me everything takes a lot longer currently through the Department of Planning and WAPC, and I think the member for Mandurah will probably contribute to this point later in the debate.

Mr J.H.D. Day: Those figures yesterday demonstrate otherwise.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is what local governments are telling us and people have been so energised they are contacting us to let us know that things are taking longer under the government's WAPC.

Mr B.J. Grylls interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Do not keep talking like that. There is no permanent chair of the WAPC. When the minister rises to his feet, hopefully today, he can let us know what the progress is for actually appointing a permanent chair of the WAPC.

I want to talk again about developer contribution plans, because there is a lot of concern about them out there; they have a huge impact on the price of land and also on the timing of when land becomes available. The two key issues with DCPs are what they contain and what they will be priced at. I understand that the government does not have real capability within the Department of Planning to make sure these processes occur in a timely manner. I will talk briefly about jobs in the Department of Planning. I will raise a number of key points. Firstly, the department needs expertise to process the DCPs and to make decisions in a timely manner so there is certainty in the marketplace; and, secondly, which is an outcome of the chaotic and bungled mismanagement of the state budget, departmental heads have no idea what their budgets will be; and that in evidence from the director general of the Department of Planning in the budget estimates process last year, it was estimated that the department had 70 positions fewer than there should be, and there will be still more staff cut to meet the government's efficiency dividend. This will mean further delays in processing applications at that level. Councils have a role to play, of course, and every council is a bit different; but the state government has a role too. Although people point the finger at local government, the state government has to make sure its house is in order. I have heard from not just one council, but a number of councils about the significant delays they have experienced with the Department of Planning.

Another key point relates to infrastructure coordination, which is a very tough issue. We do not have enough coordination on public transport between the Western Australian Planning Commission and Main Roads, the Department of Education and other service and infrastructure delivery agencies to ensure that we have the infrastructure to enable development to continue. Another key criticism we hear is that progress is being held up by government trading enterprises like Western Power and the Water Corporation and that the government does not have the infrastructure in place.

A key factor, of course, is the delivery of infrastructure to allow land to become available. Members should think about how the Perth–Mandurah rail line stimulated housing growth, with lots that were close to good public transport systems coming onto the market.

This government has given us a number of disconnected ideas and plans. We had the “Public Transport for Perth in 2031” document, which does not really marry with the planning document “Directions 2031”, and now we have this range of election commitments, which are moving all over the place. We have no better example of this than what happened today with the Perth–Darwin highway. The whole point of the Swan Valley bypass, otherwise known as the Perth–Darwin highway, is to bypass the Swan Valley. That is why it is called the Swan Valley bypass! The interesting outcome of the Premier's change in position is that the highway will not bypass the Swan Valley at all. People will have to go through the Swan Valley to get onto the Swan Valley bypass. I will say that again for government members: people will have to go through the Swan Valley to get onto the Swan Valley bypass road.

Several government members interjected.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Government members will find that their road will start in an area that is outside the area defined in the Swan Valley Planning Act. The road starts at the northern border of the Swan Valley planning area, so the road is not in the Swan Valley planning area. To get onto this new Swan Valley bypass, trucks and cars will have to get onto West Swan Road—even though the whole point of the Swan Valley bypass was to take traffic off West Swan Road. They will have to get onto the Reid Highway, which is a single-lane road in some parts. They will have to get onto Lord Street, which is also a single-lane road. They will have to keep going on Alexander Drive and then turn onto Gngangara Drive, which is currently a single-lane road. That was the whole point of the Swan Valley bypass!

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Please! The Premier does not understand just how ridiculous what has happened over the past few days is! I know the member for Swan Hills is secretly agreeing with me—for the first time! I do not think any member opposite can contemplate or understand 100 per cent what has been announced. The whole point of the Swan Valley bypass was to take the trucks off West Swan Road, Great Northern Highway, Gngangara Road, Lord Street, Beechboro Road and Alexander Drive. That was the whole point of the Swan Valley bypass—basically, so that the tourist amenity and the massive housing demand and growth occurring in Ellenbrook, along the Lord Street growth corridor with Brabham, Dayton and Brookleigh Estate were not affected. The government will bring more traffic into the Swan Valley and onto the roads leading to Ellenbrook, because the Swan Valley bypass will now start in the Swan Valley. It will start on Gngangara Road. It will attract more traffic into the area and onto a number of single-lane roads that were primarily built for rural purposes, and which have not been upgraded since then. It is the worst transport planning decision I have ever seen in this place.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You can go out and oppose it; that will be great. Your constituents will appreciate that. You have shown no support for investment in your electorate.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I can tell the Premier about my constituents.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Do they support it or not?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I can tell the Premier that I do not support a major highway starting on Gngangara Road and bringing more trucks into the Swan Valley and its roads.

Mr C.J. Barnett: So you don't support the project that will take a number of years to construct!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I support the 37-kilometre bypass.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You didn't say that at the election campaign; you were missing in action!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, I did. I support it.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You were missing in action. Did you commit to it as a party? Did you commit to it?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What did the Premier say? He said he would build the Swan Valley bypass. That is what the Premier said. You constantly lie to the people; and you constantly redefine!

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The member referred to the Premier in an unparliamentary manner.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): You did use a term, member for West Swan, and I ask you to withdraw.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I withdraw.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What did the Premier do? He went out and told people that he would build 37 kilometres of road. The Premier asked the commonwealth for \$420 million. I think the Premier thought the federal government was not going to give it to him, but it did! The federal government gave the Premier \$420 million. The Premier said, "Hang on! We didn't really want that \$420 million; we were just going to build that little bit at the northern part!" That will bring more traffic into the Swan Valley and will make the conditions leading up to Ellenbrook and the Swan Valley worse. No one out there will disagree with me that starting the Swan Valley bypass on Gngangara Road will make the traffic worse in the Swan Valley and on the roads leading up to Ellenbrook. The Premier went out there, and in all the reports, the Premier said that he would build that bypass. He asked the commonwealth for \$420 million, and the commonwealth gave the Premier \$420 million. The federal government has brought forward \$420 million of funding. There it is! For four and a half years we heard from the member

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

for Swan Hills and from people in the Liberal Party out there that the Swan Valley bypass and the Perth–Darwin highway was their number one priority. They said, “Don’t worry about the train line. We don’t want that. The Swan Valley bypass, the Perth–Darwin highway, is our number one priority.” We heard it week in and week out. They said that the federal government was not coming to the party and it would proceed if only the federal government came up with the money. Here it is; the federal government has come up with the money! The federal government has put \$420 million on the table. What do we hear from the state government? We hear that it is not a priority!

Point of Order

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I think the member is straying from the motion. I think it is about land and not about roads.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Yes; member for West Swan, could you come back to the motion?

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What I am trying to demonstrate is the need for better infrastructure coordination to ensure that we get timely land approvals, and land releases that are both close to amenity and affordable for families. The provision of infrastructure is a key part of that. One of the key issues that I have been campaigning on, both in this place and outside this place, is the need for better infrastructure. The timely provision of infrastructure enables developers to get land onto the market, and it provides people who move into the suburb with amenity and the ability to get into and out of the suburb in a timely manner.

As I have said, the commonwealth came up with \$420 million, and now the government is saying it does not want it—that it was never really committed to it. It is just beyond belief. If the people of Ellenbrook and the Swan Valley could not be insulted more, they have been insulted today and yesterday—absolutely. The government has been saying for the last four and a half years that it needs \$420 million to build the Swan Valley bypass. That is the number one issue in the Swan Valley. The people of the Swan Valley have said to me that we can go and build the train line. But their number one issue is the Swan Valley bypass. Okay. So the commonwealth came up with \$420 million. There it is. First of all, the state went to the commonwealth and said, “Can we have \$420 million?”, and the commonwealth said, “Sure; we will give you \$420 million to build it.” The government then said, “No, no. We are not going to build that Swan Valley bypass. We are going to build a bit of the road —

Point of Order

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Mr Acting Speaker, I think the member is still straying from the actual motion.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Yes, member, I think you are still drifting off the topic a bit.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sure. I will bring it back to the key point, which is the need to have infrastructure to help facilitate land developments in the suburbs. We need this road to ensure that we have more land approvals and more land releases so that we can somehow address this massive housing shortage in Western Australia.

Mr J. Norberger: How is a bypass going to help you? It will just go past people’s houses. How is that going to help make more land available?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The whole point is that we open up more land, both north and south. But there has to be amenity. It is a legitimate question. Basically what we are doing is taking a lot of traffic off the local roads. If we take more cars off the local roads, that will allow more housing developments to be undertaken, because there will be more access to those housing developments. If the roads are too congested, that will limit the ability to access those housing estates. That is why this road is very important, because it will take a lot of cars off the local roads, and that will improve the ability to build those housing developments.

As I have said, this decision to build a bypass that will not bypass the Swan Valley is the most ridiculous planning decision and transport decision I have ever seen. It is akin to building a bridge that goes only halfway across the river. It is just ridiculous. No-one would do it. The idea is that all the trucks will come along the beautiful new gateway of Tonkin Highway, funded primarily by the federal government, with three lanes either side, and with massive interchanges at Collier, Morley and Benara Roads, funded 50 per cent by the federal government. Those trucks will come along the beautifully improved Tonkin Highway, and they will get to the intersection of Tonkin Highway and Reid Highway, and then they will stop, because that bypass has not been built. It is interesting that the government is planning to build this road north–south and not link it to Tonkin Highway.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

Mr C.J. Barnett: Who said that?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Premier did.

Mr C.J. Barnett: No; never.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Premier did —100 times in the past couple of days.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Never.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Whatever.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You need to tell the truth in this place.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Premier needs to tell the truth. The Premier stood out there before the election and said, “We are building the Swan Valley bypass.” Every report was that the government was going to build the 37-kilometre bypass. The Premier never said it would be built in two stages.

Mr C.J. Barnett: We have to build it in a couple of sections.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Every report—*The West Australian*, the local papers—said 37 kilometres. I support the 37-kilometre proper bypass. I do not support —

Mr C.J. Barnett: You did not promise it in the election campaign.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What did the Premier promise?

Mr C.J. Barnett: We promised to build the Perth–Darwin highway.

Point of Order

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Mr Acting Speaker, we are very happy to have a debate about the Swan Valley bypass and road transport issues. But the opposition has to move a motion to that effect. This motion is about land supply. I think there are a number of members on both sides who want to speak. So I do ask that the member concentrate on that issue.

Mr R.H. COOK: Further to that point of order, the speaker on her feet was responding to interjections from the Premier. If the minister would like the member to stick to the point, perhaps he should control his Premier much better to make sure that the member is heard in silence.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Thank you, members. Member for West Swan, we are talking about land supply.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sure. I will wrap it up soon, Mr Acting Speaker, so thank you for that.

As I said, infrastructure coordination is a key, and this is where the government is completely failing. That does impact on the ability to get land onto the market. I say again that the misleading and deceptive behaviour by the Liberal Party before the election, with flashing signs saying 24/7 police stations, and saying that it is going to build the Swan Valley bypass, is beyond belief.

This government is failing to get land onto the market. There is a significant housing crisis, and there are families in Western Australia that are struggling to get a roof over their heads. That is all because of the failure of this government.

DR A.D. BUTI (Armadale) [4.45 pm]: I also rise to support the motion in relation to land sales and land supply. When we talk about land, we are really talking about land as a conduit to housing and accommodation. I do not think anyone from either side of the house would deny that we have an accommodation crisis, not only in the metropolitan area, but in the whole of Western Australia. I sit next to the member for Kimberley. I was just reading a report in *The West Australian* that states that the Kimberley region has some of the highest homelessness figures in Australia. The data showed that in the Kimberley, 5.39 per cent of the population, or 1 877 people, are homeless. The Kimberley is one of the top 20 areas in Australia for homelessness. So if we think we have problems in the metropolitan area, just spare a thought for people who are seeking housing in the Kimberley region, and I am sure also in other areas, maybe even parts of the electorate of the Acting Speaker (Mr I.C. Blayney). Of course, in the Pilbara region there are also major problems with housing.

A lot of the problems that have come about in the regions north of Perth are due to the mining boom. Although we always support booms, they always have unavoidable or negative consequences. One of the problems with the resource boom is that it has pushed up the price of housing in the metro area. It has also increased or

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

exacerbated the housing crisis, because as we are told week in, week out, over 1 000 people are coming to Western Australia on a weekly basis. So the problem is enormous, and I do not want to minimise the challenge that the government faces. But it is a challenge that the government has to try to address.

The issue that I would like to raise in my brief contribution to this debate is: where is the comprehensive plan that the government has to alleviate this problem? The government is now in its fifth year in office—I think it has been going for five years; it is since 2008—and I have not seen a comprehensive plan or strategy to address the housing crisis. The government has admitted that there is a housing crisis. There has to be a housing crisis when the median rental price in Perth is about \$450 a week. Just to show members how expensive that is, an academic friend of mine recently came back from living in Manhattan for about four months. He was able to rent a large studio in Manhattan on a short-term lease—therefore the rental was higher than it would be if he was on a long-term lease—for \$500 a week. Yet the median rental price in the Perth metro area is around \$450 a week. That shows us that there is a crisis.

June MacDonald, who is the Western Australian spokesperson for National Seniors, and who is also a councillor at the City of Armadale, and a constituent of mine, has been reported numerous times in the media, and as recently as 18 March in *The West Australian*, talking about the housing crisis for seniors in Western Australia. She makes the valid point that people in Perth who are seeking to live on the pension and also seeking to rent have a real problem. The median rent in Perth is \$450 a week. Not only is it expensive to rent in Perth, but also the rental vacancy rate, which is 1.9 per cent according to the Real Estate Institute of Western Australia, is probably an even greater problem. A senior on a fixed income or a pension will have problems because the pension provides around only \$250 a week. If the median rental price is \$450 a week, some major challenges will be faced. If a person is on a disability or an aged pension, it is also incredibly difficult. In the debate about whether WA should sign up to the National Disability Insurance Scheme and have good quality services, one of the issues that has been forgotten by all sides is that of accommodation for people with disabilities. The housing crisis is enormous for the general populace, but it is even greater for those on fixed incomes or receiving various welfare payments.

The question that this motion is getting to is: what is the government's strategy? I am interested in the minister's response. I would have to say that over the years, he has been one of the more competent ministers on the other side, although I am not so sure about VenuesWest being the management organisation of Champion Lakes Regatta Centre, but that is a matter we can deal with another time. I am interested in the long-term strategy or plan this minister and this government has to overcome the crisis. I do not think the minister will deny that there is a crisis. Obviously, there must be a crisis when the rental vacancy rate is only 1.9 per cent. The problem is that there is a shortage of land, which increases the price of land and therefore the price of housing; that is obvious. This makes it difficult for people to buy houses and also for people who are trying to rent, which is why we have a high rate of homeless people in the Kimberley area.

About a month ago, a constituent who lives under a bridge came into our office. I will not say exactly where in my electorate she lives because there are a few bridges. Within 200 to 300 metres of that bridge where she sleeps a female person was murdered, which shows how dangerous the issue of a housing crisis can be. The consequences of not having a roof over a person's head are enormous. If a person does not have a roof over their head, they find it very difficult to get a job, to ensure a proper family situation and to educate children. A number of families in my electorate—I am sure this occurs in other electorates—live in cars because they cannot afford to rent. I am not blaming the government for this, but I want it to have a plan that addresses this issue. The land issue itself is not the only factor as to why people cannot afford housing, but it is a major factor as to why people are homeless.

The government needs to lay out its planning strategy to create more affordable land and to ensure that people can enter the housing market. For young people today, trying to buy a home is incredibly difficult. A young person can have what is considered a well-paid job but cannot afford to buy a home. The great Australian dream of having our own home is actually becoming a fast-fading Australian dream. The importance of housing and accommodation is not only sacrosanct in Australian culture, but also recognised internationally. It is so important that the United Nations considers it a right. Article 11 of the United Nations International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights provides that housing is a human right, and I do not think anyone here would disagree. It is obviously a right that everyone, especially in a developed society, should be able to achieve. If we cannot house our citizens in an appropriate manner, it is very difficult to ensure that we have a functioning society. Last week in this place we debated policing. Many issues that arise with regard to criminal and antisocial behaviour and revolve around the need for extra police come about because people do not live in a stable housing situation. In my electorate, and I am sure in other electorates, we can find three or four families living in the one house to be able to afford the rent. I am not talking about public housing; I am talking about

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

private rentals that people, on their income, cannot afford. What strategy or plan does this minister have to ensure that we have an adequate or improved supply of land? Of course, this has to be done in a clear and controlled strategic manner, because if we flood the market with land, as the Minister for Housing mentioned, while that superficially is very attractive, I am sure his contacts in the 500 Club will come back to inform him that that may not be the appropriate way to go.

Mr W.R. Marmion: It is supported by the developers.

Dr A.D. BUTI: That is interesting; it is supported by the developers. Which developers?

Mr W.R. Marmion: I am not going to name them.

Dr A.D. BUTI: So the minister is just saying it is “all” developers and he will not name them.

Mr W.R. Marmion: It is the ones I have spoken to.

Dr A.D. BUTI: It is interesting that the developers want vacant land to be flooded onto the market.

Mr W.R. Marmion: They want more.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Obviously they want more. We all agree that we want more. I hope the minister will agree that if more land sales are opened up, it must be done in a controlled manner. The developers I spoke to when I was on the board of the Armadale Redevelopment Authority would not have been arguing for an open scorched-earth policy for putting vacant land onto the market. They wanted it to be done in a controlled manner to ensure that they received value for their investments. The problem at the moment is that, beside the minister’s announcement, we have not seen any detailed policy on how the government will facilitate the increase in land supply. The member for West Swan talked about local government. Some of the problem lies with that level of government, as I am sure the Minister for Local Government would be fully aware. However, there is anecdotal evidence that the changes this house made to the building regulations in the last Parliament have delayed the process of ensuring sufficient housing on the market. That contributes to Western Australia’s incredibly scarce rental vacancy rate.

I have one other thing. It actually does not come under the planning portfolio; it relates to accommodation, so it falls under the housing portfolio. I do not want to get into the social housing situation today. The Minister for Housing should communicate with his department about its views on social housing. Constituents in my electorate who live in social housing—not Homeswest housing; I am talking about Access Housing—are appalled by the behaviour of people managing their complexes. Some residents have complained about antisocial behaviour. The response from Access Housing was, “What do you expect when you have medium-density social housing? That’s the way people behave.” If it is the way that people behave, the government has to reconsider how it plans social housing and whether medium or high-density social housing is appropriate. I personally think it is needed, but appropriate controls have to be put in place, as well as educating tenants about their responsibilities in those complexes.

I do not really want to add more to the debate. It is a challenging issue. I do not want to try to water down the complexities and challenges the minister and his government face, but there is no doubt that we have a major accommodation crisis in Western Australia. It is not necessarily up to the government to solve it in one suite of policies, but it should put in place a set of policies that start with planning to ensure we improve the present situation, which is diabolical. It really is quite ironic and sad that we have the strongest economy in Australia, we are the boom city in the boom state, but as each day goes on there are more and more people who cannot afford to have a roof over their head at night-time and cannot afford to ensure their family lives in a stable environment. As a result of not being able to live in a stable environment, their children’s education is put at risk and they often move from school to school. The problems in Perth are bad enough, but they are even greater in the Kimberley and other regional areas.

MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn) [5.03 pm]: When talking about land supply and land releases, I want to take the collective memory of the house back to the time of the Gallop and Carpenter Labor governments. I particularly refer to the Minister for Planning, who was in the house during those periods of government. He was fairly vocal on this issue. The then Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, Hon Alannah MacTiernan, was the Minister for Planning’s nemesis.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I did not have responsibility for planning, but transport and education.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: No; I understand that. Hon Alannah MacTiernan was one of the minister’s nemeses, along with many other of the minister’s colleagues. Members who were in the house during the period 2001 to 2007 and a little later will remember there was constant carping by the then opposition about the release of land for housing. There was constant criticism over the behaviour of the then Minister for Planning and Infrastructure,

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

Alannah MacTiernan. The current Minister for Planning, even though he did not have the shadow portfolio, was one of the people involved in the attacks on the then minister for planning—he would remember this.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I think it might have been the Premier who referred to the honourable minister as a fishwife. The current Premier, when he was a member of the opposition, was ruthless in his attack on the then minister for planning over her handling of the planning portfolio, and specifically over land releases. The member for Mandurah remembers that. The opposition constantly criticised her failure to release land onto the market and to sign off on developments. They criticised her by saying that she was always sitting on her hands, that she was micromanaging her department and micromanaging the land releases, and that she was deliberately taking too long in the whole procedure of planning approvals and land release approvals. That was a constant criticism by the opposition of the then minister for planning. The Minister for Planning knows that is true. We can go back and drag out the *Hansards* and look at the comments that were made about the former Minister for Planning and Infrastructure.

It is worthwhile looking at the statistics for lot releases during the former minister for planning's period of office, the former member for Armadale, Hon Alannah MacTiernan. They are quite informative and fly in the face of the criticisms that continued in this house. This information comes from the minister's own department. It is entitled "Land Supply and Housing Activity" for the September to December quarter of 2012. The number of final approvals granted for residential lots in 2007–08 in Western Australia was 18 115. That has dropped to 11 339 for the year 2011–12, which is the last financial year. It has dropped from 18 115 to 11 339.

Landgate statistics are available month by month to Western Australians. I am looking at the number of new freehold and strata lots created during the period that Hon Alannah MacTiernan was being criticised by the then opposition in this house. In 2006–07, that number was 35 639, and in 2007–08, it was 33 863. If we compare those figures with the current statistics from Landgate for the number of new freehold and strata lots created in 2011–12, it dropped to 21 561. Over the past decade, the peak activity for the release of land supply in Western Australia was during the Gallop–Carpenter governments, presided over by the former minister for planning, Hon Alannah MacTiernan. That was the peak of activity in terms of land supply in this state, yet during that period, when the minister went out of her way to bring as many lots to market as she possibly could, she was constantly criticised by members in this house, who were then Liberal–National members of the opposition, for not doing enough—for sitting on her hands and micromanaging! The Minister for Planning and Infrastructure was criticised for slowing the process down. I clearly remember the Premier, then a backbencher in the opposition, claiming that documents were piling up in her office and that she was not getting on and signing off on those final approvals for land supply. I remember that clearly, yet statistically we can see that that was just not true. That criticism was not warranted; it was not true. In fact, the peak of activity for land supply release and the release of freehold and strata lots was during that very time of her office.

That brings me to the obvious questions: If that was the peak of activity and the poor minister at the time was being criticised, what is happening now? Why have we seen such a significant drop-off in the release of land to the market by the final approval of residential freehold and strata lots? Why has that figure dropped off from its peak in 2006–07 and 2007–08 to the figures we have today? What is going on in either the Department of Planning, the minister's own office or in the Department of Housing? What is going on? If it was fair enough at the time to criticise the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, Hon Alannah MacTiernan, for sitting on her hands and not releasing land for supply to the market when that was the peak of land supply here in Western Australia over the last two to three decades, then it is quite appropriate for the opposition to more than criticise the Minister for Planning and his department for the sluggishness and the slowdown in the land supply release and the statistics I have quoted to Parliament today. The minister owes a duty to the house and to the people of Western Australia, and particularly to the building and construction industry and to the housing industry, to explain why there has been such a drop-off and why there is such a sluggishness in the release of land supply to the industry in Western Australia.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I did in question time yesterday and I'll do it again today.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Good! We will be waiting with bated breath. We will be waiting to listen to the Minister for Planning with bated ears, I would imagine, not bated breath.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I will tell you the same as I did yesterday. It hasn't changed.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: And we will continue to criticise the Minister for Planning in the same way that the government criticised our minister.

Mr J.H.D. Day: You have to have some substantive evidence.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

Mr F.M. LOGAN: We realise now, from the statistics, that that criticism was just not warranted. We can honestly say to the house that our criticism is warranted because the statistics show that the criticism is warranted.

Mr J.H.D. Day: The difference is that the approval times now are substantially improved.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Then there has to be some other reason. If it is the case that the approval time has been reduced —

Mr J.H.D. Day: Yes.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: — the minister then has to take the house through why those statistics are as they are.

Mr J.H.D. Day: Two words: less demand.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Less demand! I am glad the Minister for Planning has come to the issue of less demand, because —

Mr J.H.D. Day: There has been over the last four years. It is picking up now, but there was less demand.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I am glad the minister has raised the issue of less demand because that, again, is also not borne out by statistics. I do grant you and I accept that, because of the sluggishness by the Reserve Bank of Australia in reducing interest rates following the 2008 global financial crisis, there was a downturn in demand for house sales. But, as the minister knows, a lot of activity and demand for lots continued on past the GFC, because of first home owners.

Mr J.H.D. Day: Not at the same rate as it was pre-GFC.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: It still continued on and did not drop off as dramatically. It dropped off later, but the demand was still there. It did drop off. I accept that it did drop off because of the interest rate issue. But, as the minister knows, the median house price has now jumped back up from under \$500 000 to about \$540 000, and demand is continuing to grow.

The demand has always been there. I accept that it dropped off, but it did not drop off to the point at which it can be justified by those statistics. There was a significant drop-off in the availability of land supply. Because the median house price has gone up, we expect that more land will be provided to the market. It is not the whole story and I think the minister owes it to the industry and to the people of Western Australia to explain the whole story.

I go now to what the Minister for Housing told the house on a couple of occasions when he referred to the affordable housing strategy that was released by the previous Minister for Housing. Only yesterday the minister talked about the highlights of the implementation of the affordable housing strategy. He ran through a series of successful outcomes of the affordable housing strategy. One outcome was 7 600 new affordable homes against the target of 20 000 by 2020, which is the key objective of the affordable housing strategy. As of June 2012, under the affordable land aspect of the affordable housing strategy, the department is claiming that 4 909 lots were produced by the Housing Authority and its joint venture partners for sale to the market, as well as for government housing programs. I would like to know whether those lots produced had final approval. Landgate statistics for that same period indicate that the final approvals figure for residential lots for the whole state was 11 339, and we have the Department of Housing claiming that it produced virtually half of them. I do not think that is true, Minister for Housing. I think some licence is being taken in that affordable housing strategy as to what “4 909 produced by the Housing Authority and its joint venture partners for sale to market” means. “For sale to market” means that final approval has been given and the lot is for sale. Is the Minister for Housing suggesting that of all the lots that were finalised last year—the claim being made in the Department of Housing press release that the minister referred to yesterday—half of the lots that were finally approved were all done by the Department of Housing?

Mr W.R. Marmion: Joint ventures.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Whether or not there were joint ventures, is the minister saying that half the lots in the whole of Western Australia were done by the Department of Housing and JVs? I do not think so, and I think the minister knows that is not quite true. The Minister for Housing owes it to the house as well to explain a little more about that claim that is made in the press release by the Department of Housing that the minister stood proudly and referred to yesterday in the house. Of those 4 909 lots, how many have been finally approved, when were they done and over what period were they finally approved? Have they been finally approved? Are they simply, as we speak, underway for sale ultimately? Are the 4 909 lots being worked on for sale but have not reached final approval? The Minister for Housing owes an explanation of that to the house, because it seems to not line up with the statistics that are provided by government departments.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

As the member for Armadale pointed out, regardless of the issue of land supply, regardless of the statistics I have just referred to, the end result is that if not enough land is supplied to the market at a time when demand is coming back, as the Minister for Planning and I recognise is occurring now, then prices will rise. Rising prices will mean that the affordable housing strategy the Minister for Housing is working on will be undermined by upward movement in the housing and land market. It will also mean that those people struggling on low incomes will be further ostracised because they will not be able to access the housing market. It means that it will become more difficult for organisations that work with the Department of Housing, such as Homeswest and community housing associations, to purchase homes and land to provide housing for the very unfortunate in our society—that is, the unemployed, very low income earners and the disabled. The Minister for Planning knows it will have a knock-on effect all the way through the chain of the housing industry and will hit those at the bottom of society's food chain. That is why it is critical that the demand for housing is met by the constant, thorough and timely release of land for freehold lot activity, social housing lot activity and, ultimately, strata lot activity.

Under the Liberal–National government, the statistics show a continual decline in the approval of state government and private land supply and the availability of land for subdivision. That has continually decreased from September 2008, when the Liberal–National government took office, to today. The month-to-month statistics show that will not turn around, and it will continue to decline even though, as the Minister for Planning and I recognise, demand in the market is returning.

I have raised a number of issues that the Minister for Planning and the Minister for Housing need to explain to the house, the housing industry and the people of Western Australia.

MR P.T. MILES (Wanneroo — Parliamentary Secretary) [5.22 pm]: I would like to speak on this matter because it is important that some facts are put on the table. The matter was raised by the member for West Swan, but I note that she is not in the chamber at present.

The continued lack of land supply in the north coast region is an issue that affects my electorate of Wanneroo. I want to take issue with some of the figures the member for Cockburn referred to, especially the figures from 2006–07 and 2008. If 35 000 lots were put on the market in that annualised year, why were people camping out for three or four weeks to purchase land? It was unprecedented that people had to camp overnight to purchase land. In fact, in Yanchep young people were being paid to camp outside the sales office for a week and a half to two weeks before that land came on stream.

Mr F.M. Logan: It happened in my electorate, but it doesn't dismiss the fact that land was made available.

Mr P.T. MILES: The member for Cockburn was saying that—

Mr F.M. Logan: The statistics are there.

Mr P.T. MILES: The member for Cockburn stated that there was plenty of land on stream, but there was not. The former Labor government did not provide enough land and, therefore, housing became unaffordable.

Mr F.M. Logan: Do your research and state the facts.

Mr P.T. MILES: That is the fact. In 2002 blocks of land in Kinross sold for \$78 000. Three years later, under a Labor government, those blocks of land were selling for \$140 000, and that is because the government of the day failed to make enough land available to the market on time. The member for Cockburn knows only too well that that is a fact. He may worship the ground that the former Minister for Planning and Infrastructure Alannah MacTiernan walks on, but at that time she well and truly buggered up land use.

Dr A.D. Buti: Rubbish! Rubbish! How dare you say that!

Mr P.T. MILES: The member for Armadale should have listened to what I just said. People stood outside a sales office for three or four weeks to buy a block of land, not just for them, but in some cases for their kids.

Dr A.D. Buti: Don't make a sweeping statement about someone you would not be able to hold one minute with.

Mr P.T. MILES: I don't know whether the member for Armadale was here at the time, but that is what was happening.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms L.L. Baker): Member!

Mr P.T. MILES: Sorry, Madam Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER: That is quite all right. I am not surprised the member for Wanneroo did not see me on my feet with all this yelling going on. Would members please take the yelling out of the chamber. The member for Wanneroo is on his feet, and although you might not want to hear what he says, he will have his time uninterrupted.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

Mr P.T. MILES: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker, for that protection from the member for Armadale.

Dr A.D. Buti: Just remember the member for Armadale.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member!

Mr P.T. MILES: The former member, of course.

That was the issue back in 2006 and 2007.

All members know what happened in late 2008. The global financial crisis occurred and the market plummeted. I know of some developers in my area, because I was on council before I came into this house, who sent the bulldozers away literally overnight. They just packed up. They knew they would not sell any more land and they packed up for a good 12 to 18 months. They ran through any land and stock they had available.

That has been the situation ever since this government was elected. There have not been queues outside sales offices. People have not had to camp overnight or for a week to buy land. People have been able to go into a sales office during regular trading hours, purchase a lot of land and build in the normal building process. For the past four years, the Minister for Planning, Hon John Day, and the government have done an excellent job providing land at affordable rates.

Banksia Grove, which before redistribution was in my electorate but is now in the electorate of Butler, is a low-income, first home buyers' area. Cottage-sized lots of 380 square metres are being sold in a very clear fashion for between \$140 000 and \$160 000. House and land deals are able to be purchased for about \$340 000, which is a great starter for future Western Australian homebuyers. Are there stresses and pressures? Of course there are. I acknowledge some of the earlier words stated by the current member for Armadale, but they need to be stated in a different style of debate from the one being held today. I acknowledge that the Department of Housing has to deliver on its quest to deliver a couple of thousand homes every year to have 20 000 new homes in its stock. But that can be done in other ways, such as with higher density housing.

Currently, the electorate of Wanneroo has large areas of land owned by various government agencies and they should be brought on stream for higher density living because they are in the town site. The Department of Environment and Conservation should get out of the town site because D9 bulldozers, and equipment like that, should not be stored in the town site for firefighting. That is not appropriate anymore, and the minister should do something to resolve that.

The land that is coming on stream has been selling calmly. I live in Yanchep and I see a lot of land sales offices when I drive to and from this place every day. When there are land sales, they do very well and land is selling at a fairly good rate. Developers these days are smart. They market well when bringing land on stream. Most importantly, land costs have not gone up the way they did under the previous Labor Government.

I wanted to put that on the record because it is important that there is balanced reporting in this house. It is not all doom and gloom, as the member for West Swan would have us believe. I found her contribution to this debate very woeful indeed.

Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker, for your protection from the member for Armadale. I offer up those few words so a balanced view is expressed on the record in this chamber.

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.30 pm]: I thank the member for Carine and the member for Mandurah for managing the chamber so I could ultimately get the call for a change; it is refreshing. I thank the member for Wanneroo for that paid political advertising. No wonder the member for Wanneroo needs protection from the member for Armadale. It was absolutely shameless!

Sometimes we rise in this place to talk with great in-depth knowledge and insight on a particular portfolio or policy area. I certainly do not claim to do so on this occasion. Planning is an area that is of emerging knowledge for me and, in some respects, I sit in this debate as much to learn from the Minister for Planning and hear about how we are resolving some of those issues as I am to support the motion moved by the member for West Swan and to protest. I want to discuss the issues as they confront my electorate of Kwinana and seek the minister's explanation on why we are confronting so many bottlenecks in the Baldvis area.

Baldvis enjoys the highest rate of first home owner take-up in any area of Western Australia. It is an area that is witnessing extraordinary demand; indeed, we are seeing some development in that area to meet that demand. But it is true to say that amongst the property developers, there is also a range of frustrations around Baldvis that point to the complexity of land release and management in the planning process. In particular, in Baldvis we confront some of the issues around infrastructure development. One of the major constraints that have impacted on the area has been the lack of capacity in wastewater management. That has been a constraint upon the

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

redevelopment of the area. For members who are not aware, the Water Corporation is developing a new wastewater treatment plant near Office Road in Kwinana to cater for the ongoing development in the area. It is one of these funny situations in which one part of my electorate is clamouring for a development and another part is protesting against it. The residents of Hillman were up in arms over the development of the wastewater treatment plant because they were concerned about the impact the odour would have on their community. Residents and property developers in Baldivis were up in arms because the government was not developing the wastewater treatment plant quickly enough. Since then, the government has announced its plan to scale back the capacity of that wastewater treatment plant, much to the delight of my constituents in Hillman—who have sadly left my electorate through redistribution to the Leader of the Opposition’s electorate of Rockingham—but to the ongoing frustration of property developers trying to make land available in Baldivis. Obviously, although that wastewater treatment plant will cater for the land development in the foreseeable future, it represents a constraint on land development over the horizon unless there is an ongoing process to continue to increase the capacity of that wastewater treatment plant.

The development of that wastewater treatment plant is also impacted by the extension of Mundijong Road. That continues to frustrate both the developers of Mundijong Road infrastructure and the East Rockingham wastewater treatment plant. These things all conspire over time to constrain the development of land in the Baldivis area. In announcing the purchase of land in both Baldivis Road and Mundijong Road, Cedar Woods last year reported that it expects a delay of between four and five years in developing that land simply because of these infrastructure issues and the fact that this government has not got its ducks in a row to make sure that this sort of infrastructure is brought on in a timely fashion.

These issues do not impact only on large developers such as Cedar Woods. I was recently approached by a couple, John and Betty Davies, who own land at 256 Baldivis Road. The piece of land is bordered by Kerosene Lane and Baldivis Road. This is not a big development compared with other developments there, but lot 256 represents the future for John and Betty Davies. They want to see their land, which is zoned as urban deferred, changed to urban. They are constantly frustrated by the planning process and by the Western Australian Planning Commission’s sluggish work. They have reported to me that it was supposed to be before the WAPC in March this year, but they continue to be frustrated in the process of getting their land rezoned. This land is bordered on one side by an established residential development, The Chase, in Baldivis. It is bordered on the other side by another piece of land that has already been zoned urban. There is no reason why the land in question should not proceed in an orderly fashion that will not only allow the Davies to continue to develop this land, but also provide opportunities for people to secure their first home, as so many people in the Baldivis area are trying to do. That is important because, as the member for Armadale said so well earlier in this debate, we in Western Australia are confronting an extraordinary level of demand for housing, whether that be rental properties or social housing or land for people to buy to develop their first home.

In my office, 90 per cent of the issues that come through our door concern housing. An important part of the availability of housing is to have a good supply of land being brought on to the market so that that part of the marketplace that is ready to purchase land and build homes could come out of the rental market. Then people who rely upon the rental market could move into the vacancies that therefore occur in the rental market and, hopefully, those people who cannot afford the rental market would have a public housing situation that is not so stressed and they could have the safety net of a strong public housing regime. The property developers in the Baldivis area continue to be frustrated by a lack of infrastructure and a lack of properties being brought on to the market, and that is having an impact upon housing right across the metropolitan area.

As the member for Cockburn said, when the government was in opposition, it spoke often of the lack of performance of the previous Labor government in releasing land to bring to market. As the member for Cockburn has observed, and as we have demonstrated, the previous Labor government outperformed this government significantly, yet the minister stoically defends a record that, in the face of what he describes as low demand, has produced this housing crisis in Western Australia. The minister says that it is rubbish and he assures us that there is a lack of demand. We see property developers frustrated by a lack of land for them to develop and we see people frustrated by a lack of housing stock in the community, yet the minister continues to say that there is a lack of demand. Clearly that is not the case.

Mr J.H.D. Day: There was a reduced demand over the last four years compared with the previous three years. That is why there have been fewer lots created. It is related to a range of issues, but there is the global financial crisis and more difficult access to finance for developers and homeowners, and all that has combined to mean that there has been reduced demand and, hence, less production by development companies. It is now increasing—I accept that—but that has been historical fact for the last few years.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

Mr R.H. COOK: Therefore, we seem to be in this boom–bust cycle whereby when demand pops up, the system is not able to cater for that increase in demand and then we have a lag or a depressed market when we see fluctuations in demand. The language the minister uses sits in stark contrast to the language that, for instance, the Premier has used over the last four years, which is that the economy is going great guns, we have an influx of workers into Western Australia and things are going really well. Yet the minister tells us that the market for land has been depressed. That does not concur with any of the anecdotal evidence we are confronted with in our daily lives as we speak to property developers, tenants and first home buyers.

Mr J.H.D. Day: You're referring to demands for rentals and the demand for rentals has increased substantially, but that is different from the demand for new lots.

Mr R.H. COOK: Would it not also be true to say that it is all part of the same process?

Mr J.H.D. Day: It all relates to the availability of housing. I think you are talking about the availability of new land subdivisions.

Mr R.H. COOK: The argument I make is that as more new land is made available, people who are ready to be first home owners can vacate the rental market, which builds the vacancy and the capacity in the rental market to cater for the demand, which, as the minister has observed, is peaking significantly.

Despite the urgings of the opposition Whip at the beginning of this debate for me to stay on my feet for as long as possible, looking around the room, I now understand that there are a number of people who want to contribute to the debate, so I conclude my remarks by saying that any day now a letter about John and Betty Davies will land on the minister's desk seeking resolution to their issues at 256 Baldivis Road. The letter will also seek a briefing from the minister's office on what the bottlenecks in Baldivis are, why we continue to see property developers frustrated and making public commentary about the constraints they see with land supply and why the minister believes that those property developers are comprehensively wrong.

MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells) [5.43 pm]: I rise to support this motion by the member for West Swan. I want to add to it by saying that it is of course a matter of a lack of sufficient land supply, but it is also a problem of adequate, suitable land supply, which is a very important issue. I understand, and the minister will be able to confirm this, there is a strategic assessment between the state and federal governments. A referral was made for a strategic assessment of the Perth and Peel regions for future urban development in the Perth area. I think it was agreed on 2 April this year that we would have that strategic assessment.

Mr J.H.D. Day: It was agreed last year. The process was started last year.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: Is the process still underway?

Mr J.H.D. Day: Yes, it is, but it was agreed between the state and the commonwealth last year, I think it was.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: That is under the federal Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act and it is an important approach because it means that, once we have the final strategy in place, we can signal to developers where the no-go areas and the viable areas are. Therefore, straightaway we do some constraint mapping, basically; we tell developers where they can look and where they cannot look. Then there are some other constraints we have to factor in, and the biggest one to me is the necessity to locate future developments close to other urban centres; that is, we develop our city in such a way that it becomes a well-connected city. I think the connected-cities policy is a key term, which is the advancement from the Network City policy that the Gallop and Carpenter governments developed—making sure that Perth is a well-connected city. It is absolutely vital that we develop things that way. There is no point at all in having urban sprawl by which we condemn people to live a costly lifestyle, a lifestyle that involves a huge impost on their hip pocket for petrol or public transport even, or that causes people to spend time away from their families as they commute to work, to see family or to social occasions.

We have to make sure that our city is planned in a well-connected manner. Therefore, I am nervous when I hear the minister talk about the rate of approvals and the time that is taken for approvals, as though that is the only key performance indicator that the minister looks at when assessing how well his agency performs. There are some other very important KPIs that have to be used and the most important one—I look to the minister for some reassurance—is that the urban planning policies in place are being met; that should be the KPI. Yes, the time taken to do something is important, but we also have to make sure that those policies that form our planning framework are consistent. That is about ensuring that those approved areas are located next to transport infrastructure and work centres and are close to other areas of urban habitation. We have to make sure that that level of planning goes on and that we use that policy framework that I know the WA Planning Commission has set up, which are the statements of planning policy that form the planning framework. Ensuring adherence to that policy should be the number one KPI. The actual time taken is secondary to adherence to those important

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

policies. When the referral was made to the commonwealth for the strategic assessment, my understanding, and the minister can confirm or deny this, is that there was an attempt to rule out areas such as the Amarillo–Keralup area from that assessment. There was also an attempt to rule out the northern corridor from that strategic assessment. I have been hunting around for some information on that, but I would be keen for the minister to let me know what the final wash-up on that is.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I can tell you that in the northern corridor, the north east metropolitan area, the initial assessment has been undertaken and the draft report completed, and it has been sent to the commonwealth for its comment.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: Is that separate to the strategic assessment of the Perth and Peel regions?

Mr J.H.D. Day: No; it is part of the overall assessment, but for the north east metropolitan area the first stage has been completed in advance of the rest of the metropolitan area, and so for that geographical area it is more advanced.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: Was the Keralup area excised from the strategic assessment?

Mr J.H.D. Day: I am not sure about that.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: I want to touch on the Keralup area a bit because there could potentially be 90 000 to 100 000 people living there if it is developed. I really question how suitable that land is for development. There is much fear, and the member for Mandurah talked about the problem of mosquitoes that we already have.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: All swampy lands across the state are vulnerable to mosquito infestation if there are changes, and it seems that with urbanisation we get increased mosquito problems. That is not just a nuisance; it is a very serious problem for its impact on human health. Advice from the Department of Health on this is very serious and it is extremely concerned. We all know about the cases of Ross River fever, and there are Murray Valley encephalitis and other illnesses. These cases are on the rise all the time.

We cannot escape the fact that Keralup is a long way from other places and from good transport networks. There is a hope that there will be a train station somewhere or a terminus for people. However, that is currently being proposed or talked about as being in a Bush Forever site. That is another piece of our constraint mapping that we should be using. I acknowledge that the identification of areas as Bush Forever sites was a Court government initiative, and when Hon Graham Kierath was a member of this place, he drove the whole Bush Forever process and had that implemented. That was honoured by Alannah MacTiernan when she was Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, and I know that the current minister respects this as well. But that should not then be ignored. If we have settled on the importance of Bush Forever sites, we should respect them, and they should be precluded from urban development. That is an important part of the constraint mapping that we have to use and be mindful of when we are looking at potential for urban development.

Mr J.H.D. Day: The policy certainly is respected, and we did finish off the MRS amendment in the last term of government, so we do give it a lot of priority.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: So why am I hearing things about the station for Keralup being in a Bush Forever site?

Mr J.H.D. Day: There may be some modification around the edges, or details that need to be worked through, and in some cases probably a broad policy.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: I think the problem, and the fear that I hear expressed by people who are knowledgeable in this area, is that we can often end up with death by a thousand cuts, whereby there is this constant whittling away of sites that have been deemed significant enough to be included in Bush Forever.

Now that I have said all that, people may say, “If we cannot have endless urban sprawl, what are the alternatives?” There are alternatives. I know that the minister has an interest in densification, and also in urban infill. They are not necessarily the same thing—densification and urban infill. We have to make sure that both of those things are happening. I hear from industry and from the Urban Development Institute of Australia that they are worried by the additional costs they face for brownfields developments. Why is that? What can government do to give developers an easier and less expensive run in developing brownfields sites? That is the sort of thing that we should focus on. Then, of course, we have to accept that modifications will be needed. If we have infill housing, do we need to design parking bays in the same way? Does an area that is dominated by townhouses need to be based on the idea that each townhouse will need two parking bays? What incentives can we provide to landholders and property developers to ensure that there is flexibility and there are options so that people who

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

live in more densely-built areas can choose to be a one-car family? We need to incorporate into our overall planning strategy a diversity of choices. That is how we can increase land supply and housing supply.

If we just continue to follow the old idea of urban sprawl, we will not be able to provide affordable housing. The issue of a dwelling being affordable on the day we purchase it cannot be divorced from the ongoing running costs that are associated with living in that dwelling. If we do not factor in the transport costs that a family might face over its, let us say, 20-year lifetime in a particular region, we are not doing an honest job of assessing the affordability of a particular dwelling type. We need to provide a mixture of housing options and settings for people so that we can accommodate the different needs that people might have at different stages of their lifecycle. Younger people might prefer to live in an inner-city arrangement for a while. They might then move from a townhouse to a more suburban setting as their children grow up. They might then, as they get older, want to downsize. We need to be able to accommodate that mixture of needs. We need to make sure that we provide the open space that must go along with more densified settings. We also need to make sure that we provide people with access to transport infrastructure. That is absolutely vital, as other members have also indicated.

I know that the minister has available to him tools such as the urban growth monitor, which provides an indication of how much land is available, how readily available that land is, and how much of that land is in the urban-deferred category. In my area, there is potential for the development of some reserves. Initially, people might say, “Gosh! What is this? We are talking about development on land that has been designated as public open space.” But in the City of Gosnells, there are extensive areas of land that are presently zoned public open space or reserve, but are almost sterile. The land is unused. So the idea is that the City of Gosnells could sell off some land around the edges of the reserve, thereby densifying the urban area of Gosnells. Those developments would look in on the park, and that would create a passive surveillance that would lead to the park being used in a more meaningful way. It would also provide revenue for the local government, which would be the body responsible for selling off that land. However, as much as I know that the City of Gosnells is keen to do this, I do not get the sense that it is being given the assistance that it needs from the state government to achieve the transition from public open space to making the land available for urbanisation and development around the edges of these parks.

There are a few examples in my area. One example that comes to mind that I can give to the minister is Robinson Park on Corfield Street. That is a huge park. It is occasionally used for gymkhanas. That is about the best value for that land. It is certainly suitable for that purpose. But we do not have many gymkhanas there these days, unfortunately. The park is used a bit for dog training. But it is a huge expanse of under-used land. It is a community asset that is not being properly used. If we were to allow some selling off of blocks in that park, perhaps 500-square metre or 800-square metre plots, that would enable us to have a mixture of townhouses and ordinary dwellings—R20 or R40-type dwellings—around the edges of that park. Those houses would look in on the park. That would be essential. At the moment, only back fences face the park, so people do not look in on the park at all, and there is a reluctance on the part of the community to go into these spaces and use them, because people do not feel safe there. We need to turn that around.

Mr J.H.D. Day: Is the City of Gosnells preparing a proposal for the development of that site?

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: Yes, it has been. There is Robinson Park, and there are a number of others. Another one that comes to mind is Sutherlands Park in Huntingdale, which is no longer in my electorate. The City of Gosnells is keen to do this. It has been talking about this for a while. It just needs a push from the minister’s agencies to make it happen.

That is an exciting opportunity. That is the sort of thing that will give us an increase in land supply, while avoiding those pitfalls that come with urban sprawl. I know that the minister’s land document for the future—the 2030 document —

Mr J.H.D. Day: It is Directions 2031—a very good document.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: That document talks about land supply being a mix of infill and urban sprawl-type development. I think the minister’s ratios in that document are nowhere near ambitious enough. The minister has brought back the targets from the ones that the previous minister had. Minister MacTiernan had a much more ambitious target when it came to infill. I think the minister should be looking at that target at least and using options such as the one that I have outlined for Robinson Park. There are no doubt many other examples across the Perth metropolitan area. The member for Cannington has some examples like this as well.

There are some exciting opportunities for the minister. But until the minister seizes those opportunities, he has to be condemned in the way that this motion presents itself to the house. I will terminate my remarks there.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Minister for Planning) [5.59 pm]: It is, I think, timely for me to make a few comments on the motion that has been moved by the member for West Swan. Not surprisingly, the government does not support the motion, primarily because what is expressed is not borne out by the facts. I accept that this is a valuable debate, and there are issues that have been raised by members of the opposition that in some cases need to be further considered or that are general in nature and are certainly relevant. But as to the particular criticism of government for, as the motion says, failing to provide adequate land supply and land approvals to meet increasing housing demand, as I indicated clearly in question time yesterday, I believe, the statistics do not bear that out. It is correct, as the member for West Swan said, that in the last four years there has been a reduction in the number of lots created, but that is not because of action, or lack of action, by the state government, by the Department of Planning or by the Western Australian Planning Commission, as part of the Western Australian government. The story is told by the fact, for example, that in 2006–07 there were 6 255 applications to create new lots in Western Australia, compared with 2011–12 when there were 2 942 applications to create the number of lots that were created. So, there was a reduction in the number of —

Ms R. Saffioti: Can you say those numbers again, minister? The first one?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: The first one was 6 255 —

Ms R. Saffioti: I don't think so.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: — based on the information I have been given, compared with 2 942 in 2011–12. So, there was a reduction in the number of applications for approval. Those applications do not come from government; they come from, generally, the private sector or LandCorp, and the Department of Housing also has a role to play in the provision of land. But the reduction in numbers of applications is a direct reflection of the fact that there has been reduced demand, for a range of reasons, over the last four years compared with the previous three or four years. That reduced demand has resulted from, in part, the global financial crisis, when there has been a substantial tightening in the availability of finance to land developers to bring on land for subdivision. That applies, in particular, to smaller and mid-level developers compared with some of the larger ones that were not impacted so much, and it also relates to the tighter availability of finance for individual homebuyers or home builders to build new homes. There has been an increase in demand for rental availability in Western Australia, and that has been reflected in the increase in the median level of rental costs in the state, but that has not translated to an increased demand or a commensurate demand for the number of new lots until recently. I accept that things are changing, as the evidence indicates, at the moment, but that was not the case until probably six or eight months ago.

I also pointed out yesterday that the performance of the Department of Planning and the WA Planning Commission in approving subdivision applications has improved substantially over the last four years. In 2008–09, 56 per cent of subdivision applications were processed within the target 90-day period, and that increased to 79 per cent in 2011–12. In 2011–12, 99 per cent of applications for final subdivision clearance were determined within the required 30 days.

Mr C.J. Tallentire: Is that the only KPI?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: No, it is not the only key performance indicator for the performance of the planning system. I agree with the member that a whole range of other issues need to be considered, but this motion is really about the timeliness of approvals and the availability of land supply for new housing lots. There are certainly many other aspects within the planning portfolio which we need to deal with and which need to be addressed regarding land development and urban development in Western Australia. I entirely agree, as the member for Gosnells stated, that we need to have a greater focus on urban consolidation, urban infill developments. That is reflected in Directions 2031, in which we have the aim of 47 per cent of new housing units being provided through urban consolidation and 53 per cent through greenfields developments. It is correct that that is a lower proportion coming from urban infill projects than in the previous government's Network city document, but the previous target of, I think, 60 per cent coming from urban infill projects was never anywhere near being met. We are not at the 47 per cent level at the moment, in fact. It is increasing, and I think that the proportion coming from urban infill projects is something like 30 per cent or maybe in the mid-30s at the moment, but the 60 per cent level was never anywhere near being met under the previous government, and is really very unlikely to be achieved in anything like the foreseeable future in the Perth metropolitan area or the Peel region.

Mr C.J. Tallentire: Have you asked your advisers, your experts, why those targets are so seemingly difficult?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: We do not have to go very far to realise that there is, firstly, quite a bit of resistance in some areas to increasing density. That is particularly the case in the western suburbs, but it is not only there. Also, it is one thing to say that we want to have increased density and increased urban consolidation, urban infill projects—

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

I am very keen to facilitate more of that happening, as I am indicating—but it is a lot easier said than done. In many cases the infrastructure that is currently in those locations is not adequate for a substantial increase in new developments. New infrastructure needs to be provided. Also, undertaking apartment developments, which is generally associated—not always, but in many cases—with urban consolidation, is more expensive in most cases than a lot of stand-alone homes. That is a challenge in Western Australia. So, all those sorts of factors make it more difficult. Nevertheless, that is certainly a priority of this government—as I said, amidst some resistance in some parts of the metropolitan area, but that is something that we are seeking to overcome.

We put in place a quite substantial reform to the planning system in the last four years of government. Members who were here would recall the significant amendments to the Planning and Development Act, a couple of major aspects of which were the introduction of the section 76 process, under which local governments can now be required to initiate planning scheme amendments. That was, at best, debatable previously. That power has now been used, or at least it is in process, on 10 or 12 occasions. We have also established development assessment panels. That has also been amidst some resistance in some parts of the metropolitan area. Quite a number of local governments do not particularly like the existence of development assessment panels, because it takes the decision-making role from local governments themselves and also the WA Planning Commission, when it was also involved, and gives that responsibility to a panel, which has two local government representatives and three professional representatives on it. As I said, that has been with some resistance, but I think, broadly, the establishment of development assessment panels has been pretty widely welcomed and supported.

I expect that we will have further reform to the planning system. At the moment, a discussion paper is close to finalisation within the Department of Planning, and that will come to me, I hope, within the next week or so. That will put forward further proposals for reform of the planning system to further streamline the approvals process. It may suggest modifications to the advertising of the public consultation time for scheme amendments, for example. I expect that it will also consider the role of development assessment panels and whether the role of the panels should be modified or extended in some areas. There will be a range of other ideas as well. Once that paper is completed, I will be keen to discuss the ideas with the development industry as well as the wider community so that we can ensure that we are doing everything we can to have a planning approvals system in Western Australia that is contemporary and responds to the sort of issues raised in this debate, and those that we face in Western Australia with our substantially growing population and changing demographics, in particular an ageing population.

I will not go on at great length because I know quite a number of other members want to speak, but I will again place on record that we have a substantial amount of land zoned and approved for urban development at the moment. At the end of the 2005–06 financial year, approximately 62 500 lots across Western Australia were approved for development—had conditional approval. In the past four years that stock has been at least at that figure, and in fact generally around 72 000 lots had conditional approval for subdivision. That does not mean to say they will all be created—there will be some obstacles or lack of will on the part of landowners to go ahead in some places—but it does make the point that a substantial stock of land is available to be developed at the moment, but generally it needs the private sector to actually get on and bring land to the market and make it available. That is happening at a greater rate now. I think, unfortunately, it is probably inevitable that there will always be some lag because it takes time to actually do the subdivisions, do the construction works and actually make the land available once developers access the finance or, for whatever reason, have the motivation to actually undertake the subdivision, but there is a substantial area of land available.

That is also borne out by the fact, for example, that at the current rates of historically relatively low density across the metropolitan area, there is enough land in the Perth and Peel region for the next 26 years that is zoned urban, and if we increase the average density of development there is enough land for approximately 50 years of supply to accommodate a population of 3.6 million people. In relation to density, it is important for people to understand that we are not suggesting that density across the Perth metropolitan area be increased, but it is certainly the intention of the government that average densities will be increased so that in some specific areas, through urban infill projects or greenfield developments in appropriate areas, a higher average density will be provided. But a diversity of choice still needs to be available for people; there needs to be larger lots, with semirural lots in parts of the metropolitan area, as there are in a significant part of my electorate of Kalamunda, for example. That choice needs to be available to people, but we need to make better use of land and respond to the changing circumstances that we have by having higher density developments in appropriate areas, whether it be through infill projects or greenfield developments.

I will end my comments at that stage. We oppose the motion. It is not supported by the facts, albeit this debate raises important issues.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

MS L.L. BAKER (Maylands) [6.13 pm]: Thanks for that, minister; there was some very interesting information. My contribution to this debate covers not only the release of land, but also the very closely allied issue of housing affordability in this state. The minister would be well familiar with the combination of the two issues, how they interplay, the ramifications if sufficient land is not released and the impact on the market and affordability. I wish to draw on a few current reports, the first of which is the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute report by the investigative panel that completed its work this year. The comment at the beginning of the report states that —

Current investment in rental housing is primarily from so-called ‘mum and dad’ investors owning one or two dwellings, but this has failed to increase the supply that is affordable and available to lower income households. At the same time, Government investment in social housing has been well below that required to meet the needs of even those on the lowest incomes.

I know the minister is familiar with the situation. It appears that institutional investment has been limited, and the minister referred to some of the market pressures that have come into play and are causing the problems we are experiencing at the moment. According to AHURI, the institutional investment limitations include market uncertainties such as the need to achieve higher rental yields than those typically applying in the rental investment market, there being not much of a track record in institutional investors investing in residential property, limited data on the performance of rental assets, and an uneven knowledge in the market about the operational cash flows of affordable rental housing among fund managers as well as investors.

Having begun my comments with those fairly bleak words, I move to talk about a group that the government set up in, I think, 2008—the Housing Industry Forecasting Group. The minister would be familiar with its April 2013 figures on housing industry drivers and the economic overview for the state on public attitudes to the property market. The figures as of last month show a downward trajectory in the market and that perceptions about affordability have hit a record low.

I will talk now about land on the market. According to the Housing Industry Forecasting Group, Perth land listings fell from a high point of 3 200 lots in July 2011, to 1 455 lots in March this year—a 50 per cent fall from March 2012. I will cite the figures for listings over the year through to March 2013 because it is worth putting them on the record in light of some of the minister’s earlier comments. The Peel region was down 25 per cent; Greater Bunbury fell three per cent; Geraldton–Greenough was 18 per cent down; Albany was up 24 per cent; and Busselton was down 23 per cent. Clearly, there is a problem—the minister alluded to it—with regional land availability. The pressures on affordability of regional land have meant that low-income earners living out of the city face an even more difficult job in purchasing a block, buying a house, building a house or even finding rental accommodation.

I just remind the minister—not much comment has been made about it—of the debacle in this state when the government brought the Building Act in a year or so ago; the minister has acknowledged there were some hiccups in the process because of that. The ability of local governments to meet new statutory deadlines under the act, I think, is still in doubt, according to the minister’s own industry forecasting group. It was a complete disaster. Now lots are coming on the market much faster, but demand now far exceeds supply in Perth. The minister said several times in his earlier contribution—I have probably missed my chance to ask the minister to respond—that demand and supply were far closer than the report from his own industry group indicates. I might be confusing the terminology, but my reading of it is that the group is reporting that now we are through the worst of the disasters that resulted from the Building Act, lots are coming onto the market much faster but that demand far exceeds supply in Perth. The index tracking the number of lots expected to be available for sale over the next six months increased by only 1.8 per cent over the 2013 March quarter. To me, that indicates some issues in land availability. There has been a small decline in first home owner grants paid in the first quarter of 2013, but the proportion of first home buyers has fallen to 26 per cent in that same quarter. There is clearly a slowing in that part of the market.

Going back a few months: in the 2012 December quarter, a Perth household on the estimated median income of \$82 300 allocating 30 per cent of their gross income to loan repayments with a 10 per cent deposit could afford a property valued at \$360 000. In the March 2013 quartile—just three months later—the median house price was \$515 000. The number of available properties for a family on a median income is very small. I will talk more about the Anglicare statistics around that in a minute. Members will see that there is a big gap. It is easy to see why households on low or moderate incomes continue to face unaffordable home ownership.

The overall picture of housing affordability in Perth at the moment, as the minister would be well aware, is one of crisis, with individuals and families basically being forced to spend large amounts of their income on housing. That leaves very little money for other necessities such as food, paying utility bills, transport and medical bills.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

We all know, as a result of government announcements made yesterday, that those necessities have all gone up again. Saving money to buy a house becomes difficult, if not impossible. The dream of owning one's own home or escaping a rent trap becomes less achievable for many Western Australians. As the economy in our state grew over the past decade, the crisis started to hit hard on people on benefits such as the age and disability pensions, Newstart, youth allowance and single parenting payments.

In 2013 it is clear that the impacts have caught up with us. Minimum-wage earners and qualified workers in low-paying industries are not only unable to buy homes but also are unable to enter the private rental market. Perth's median rent stands at \$470 a week, which is up by 12 per cent on last year. A household needs a gross income of \$1 567 a week, which is just about the median income, if they want to allocate no more than 30 per cent of their income to rent. Members of this house will be familiar with the fact that the indicator for housing stress is if a person has to pay more than 30 per cent of their income towards a mortgage or rent. Households on lower incomes are struggling to afford higher rents, which increased by 11.9 per cent over the year. This has been one factor behind the continued high waiting list for public housing, which, at the end of March 2013, totalled 21 333 households.

The national rental affordability scheme continues to add to the supply of affordable rental houses in Western Australia at the rate of 1 286 dwellings completed by the end of March 2013. In return for indexed financial incentives for 10 years—currently worth \$9 981 per dwelling per year—dwellings will be available to eligible applicants for 20 per cent below the local market rent. I understand that round 5 was recently announced by the commonwealth. That is expected to lead to an extra 400 dwellings in Western Australia by June 2014 and another 1 000 in 2015–16. I mention those figures because it is very clear that our federal colleagues have made quite an investment in housing, which, in some cases, might have made the state's investment look a whole lot better than it is, should one unpick it carefully.

I mentioned that I wanted to take a closer look at Anglicare's 2013 rental affordability snapshot. It talks about rental stress reaching far into our community. Anglicare's research examined more than 3 600 private rentals in Perth and calculated the affordability for low-income individuals and families. As a result of this research, it found that less than one per cent of the market was affordable for people on benefits, and less than five per cent for families earning two minimum wages. Affordability in this study was calculated by spending no more than 30 per cent, as I mentioned earlier, of the net household income on housing costs. A preschool teacher, who can afford to pay \$210 a week in rent, looking for one-bedroom rental accommodation, can only access 0.1 per cent of the Perth market. That equates to three properties. A cleaner, who can afford to pay \$173 a week, cannot access the market at all. Taking a room in a share house or unit provides more options. With these options included, a preschool teacher can now access 1.4 per cent of the market—that is 51 properties—and a cleaner 0.5 per cent; which goes up to a massive 19 properties. The list goes on for other people who are on low incomes struggling to find appropriate housing. The link to land availability is clear. I will mention some possible solutions that have been put to me.

For single people on Newstart or the youth allowance, there were no affordable rental properties available in Perth. Only two properties were affordable for singles on an age pension or a disability support allowance, with both being rooms in share properties. There was only one affordable property for age pension couples and there were no properties available for families on benefits.

The average rental in Perth at the time this survey was taken was not \$470; it was \$609 a week, inclusive of share accommodation. That was up eight per cent from 2011, when Anglicare last surveyed it. The median rental price, by Anglicare's measure, had risen 16 per cent between the two years' calculations.

Before I finish, I want to mention some solutions that I have picked out of the literature and the research, and from talking to my colleagues in the housing market. The obvious issue is to fast-track development approvals where possible. The minister mentioned development assessment panels. Quite rightly in my view the minister mentioned that they cause a great deal of grief to local government authorities and even more grief to local community members. Members would be aware of my involvement last year in stopping the Coles liquor store development. Maylands people displayed antipathy when they found out that the decision to let that store go ahead would be made by a group of people of whom only two lived in the electorate. Although the group tried to bring some fairness and balance into the process, from their position, three people, who were completely outside anything to do with the amenity of local government, were making decisions on whether a 1 200 square metre discount alcohol barn could be constructed in the middle of their city. That was the subject of great concern to them. It will be interesting to see how that development assessment panel progresses. If it has the capacity to fast-track development approvals, if it has any way of doing that, it should do that being mindful of the community and the amenity of the area.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

I now refer to an investment in overcoming development bottlenecks, both in the processes and in the financial investment, to ensure bottlenecks are taken out of the system. I know the government is in favour of density bonuses; it is a good strategy to pursue. Despite its problems, I do think density bonuses have a lot to offer. I am not aware that we have set minimum targets for annual affordable housing builds in the state. If that is not the case, I would think it would be a matter of some security for investment opportunities if people knew that the government was committing to releasing this much land and building this much affordable housing over a 12-month period. The need for an ongoing pipeline of development projects for registered community housing organisations that have the capacity to do these kinds of developments is something I wanted to mention as well.

In conclusion, the link between land availability and affordable housing in Western Australia is critical. Affordable housing in our state is critically low at the moment, and multiple interventions are required. I have pointed out some of them; indeed, some of them need the state to work with the federal government to pull them off. Priorities must be made to increase the level of benefits, income supplements and to accelerate social housing programs.

The Western Australian affordable housing strategy is good, but it requires more resources to make an impact over the next five years. Before I sit down, I emphasise the need for not only affordable land, but also affordable housing in Western Australia. There is an urgent need for the government to work with the community housing providers and the social housing providers to make sure that we have a decent supply of community and social housing in the state.

MR W.R. MARMION (Nedlands — Minister for Housing) [6.31 pm]: The government has a number of speakers, and I rise to make a few comments before we close tonight. Firstly, I commend the last speaker, the member for Maylands, for actually offering solutions because I think it is really —

Several members interjected.

Mr W.R. MARMION: We often get criticism, but it is very good when the government gets both criticisms and also solutions. I was also pleased to note that the member said that the strategy the government has in place is a good strategy. I will make just a few comments. The strategy was developed in 2009, and it had some data that goes back from August 1999 to August 2010. There were some very good indicators that we were heading for a bit of a crisis way back in August 2004. It is highlighted in the document. The member for Maylands acknowledges that.

From the first five years of the previous decade, there was a gap of only \$30 between the median rental and what was called the affordable rental. It then started to separate in August 2004 to get closer to \$50 in August 2005. There was an indicator way back in 2004–05 that we needed a strategy to address the possible differential between affordable and median rents. Everyone should look at the graph noted as figure 4 on page 13 of the strategy. The other indicator that is on the graph is the vacancy rate, which was dropping. In fact, in around August 2002, the vacancy rate was way up at 4.5 per cent. When the separation amount of \$30 started to go to \$50 in August 2005, the vacancy rate had dropped to 2 per cent. I understand that it is around 1.9 per cent now. But the vacancy rate fell below one per cent between August 2006 and August 2007. There was a crisis then, which backs up the comments of the member for Wanneroo who said that people were camping out to get land.

Another interesting aspect of the report is the average size of houses in Australia compared to those in the United States, France and Britain. The average square metreage of houses in Australia is 215; in the United States, 202; France, 113 and Britain, 76. I put on the record that we are comparing rather large houses when looking at the averages.

The document was released as a government strategy to address affordable housing. I know the motion is about land supply, but land supply, which I will get to in a minute in terms of my responsibility, is about affordability because at the end of the day, as the member has raised, the issue is that if we do not have enough land supply, housing will not be affordable. When the report was released by the Department of Housing, the actions being undertaken were the fast-tracking of housing lots in Henley Brook, Hammond Park and Golden Bay. That is mentioned in the strategy. It is a really good strategy; I am not going to go through it.

Ms R. Saffioti: When was that?

Mr W.R. MARMION: It was 2009 when the report was done; its release was in 2011.

I will not go through all of the strategies because a lot of members on the government side, and more opposition members, wish to speak. However, I want to highlight some of the land supply that the government has done. I also recognise the point that people are finding it difficult to find rentals. I have close friends in that situation who have had trouble getting rentals, but have rentals now. Also, although housing prices are stabilising, they are

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

affecting a lot of people. We have strategies in our document to assist those people who cannot afford bank loans with access to Keystart loans. The department is building a different scale of houses that are affordable, and it is also working closely with joint venture developers. I will mention a couple of the government's projects, such as that at Golden Bay. The government initiated the Golden Bay development, which is providing 1 750 lots with house-and-land packages starting at less than \$300 000.

Mr P. Papalia: No police stations, no public transport—it's a disgrace!

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member!

Mr P. Papalia: You are a disgrace!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Warnbro.

Mr W.R. MARMION: The member for Cockburn also questioned the provision of 4 909 lots that the joint venture partners have produced to date on the market. I pull up my data and mention that we have nine active joint venture developments.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, Members!

Mr W.R. MARMION: At Brighton, it is in partnership with Butler Land Company; Dalyellup, it is Satterley; Banksia Grove is with the Walker Group; Wellard is with Peet; Harrisdale is with Cedar Woods; Ellenbrook is with Morella Pty Ltd; Oyster Bay is with Heath Development; Sienna Woods is with Stockland and Seacrest with Springdale Holdings.

I will read out the number of lots associated with these developments. I am happy to table this information if I can get a printout. I notice that a lot of people in the house are using iPads, but mine is a smaller version. The Brighton development has produced approximately 4 650 lots to date, and there are another 1 900 lots remaining. Dalyellup has produced —

Mr M. McGowan: What was it called again?

Mr W.R. MARMION: That was Brighton.

Mr M. McGowan: I mean the one after that?

Mr W.R. MARMION: Dalyellup, just south of Bunbury, produced 2 650 lots, and there are another —

Mr M. McGowan: Where?

Mr W.R. MARMION: It is south of Bunbury, just near Gelorup.

At Banksia Grove, there are 1 295 lots and another 2 050 lots remaining from the subdivision. At Wellard, there are 1 200 lots with another 1 430 lots remaining, and at Harrisdale, there are only 130 lots to date, but 120 lots remain. A total of 7 000 lots have been produced in Ellenbrook, a suburb that is close to the member's heart, while 3 300 lots remain. Members opposite are not interested in the data. In Oyster Harbour, 600 lots have been produced, with another 1 800 lots remaining. In Sienna Wood, 180 lots have been produced, with another 2 750 lots remaining. These are all joint venture developments, so they are not recognised by the general community and members opposite as being Department of Housing developments. In Seacrest, another 1 070 lots have been produced, with 80 remaining. The Department of Housing, through its innovative joint venture projects, is producing quite a lot of lots ready for development. Some of those lots are in built form and are being sent out to the market at affordable rates.

The government should be commended for having a very detailed plan with a lot of innovation and for addressing affordability in Western Australia.

MS J.M. FREEMAN (Mirrabooka) [6.41 pm]: I, too, wish to speak on the motion, which states —

This house condemns the Barnett government on its failure to provide adequate land supply and land approvals in Western Australia to meet increasing housing demand.

It will come as no surprise to either minister that I want to add that the government has failed to develop and release lots 60 and 61 on Milldale Way. The Minister for Housing is leaving the chamber, which is unfortunate. He stood and showed us a document and said that the government is following a great plan. He said that the crisis began back in 2004. I said to my colleague the member for Bassendean that if it was a crisis then, what is it now? We both agreed that it must be Armageddon. Out in the community it does not feel like what it would have felt like in 2004. Even the member for Southern River said in his speech the other day that for the first time ever people are coming to his office seeking housing and becoming homeless. As I have said in this place, I worked

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

in housing some 15 or 20-odd years ago, and we thought it was a disgrace then when it took three weeks—21 days—to get someone priority housing. We thought that was a disgrace, and we brought that figure down. The fact that it is difficult to get private rentals, that the median rental rate is at the level it is and that it takes three years for someone on the priority housing list to get a house, is very serious. It has a major impact on the welfare and wellbeing of our communities. It does not affect us because we go home at night to our nice warm houses and we have somewhere to stay but it affects a lot of people and their families and their children. We bang on about all of this stuff in this place.

Housing is a human right, and it has been undermined by this government's failure to act. I have a perfect example of this government's failure to act. I refer to lots 60 and 61 on Milldale Way, Mirrabooka. Lot 60 is 5.8 hectares, while lot 61 is 1.2 hectares. That is seven hectares of Department of Housing land. I understand that 2.5 hectares of that land may have finally gone across to the Department of Health, although I am never clear whether the titles have gone. That means that 4.5 hectares is available for housing. I raised this in my inaugural speech. As the Minister for Health and the Minister for Housing know, I raise this constantly. The ministers should hang their heads in shame that that land has not been developed. I say to the Minister for Health that I was not a member of Parliament at that time. He has to admit that I have consistently prosecuted the claims that he needs to develop this land and he needs to address the problems in this area. The Minister for Housing and the Minister for Health need to stop sitting on that land and put it on their budget bottom line. They need to do something.

I need the assistance of the Minister for Housing. If a hectare is around 10 000 square metres and an average block is about 450 square metres, does this mean that we are missing out on about 100 houses that could be and should have been delivered? I am just talking about single dwellings. This is 100 houses in a desperately needed housing market. Where there is infrastructure, there will soon be light rail, which the government will hopefully soon deliver, as promised. If we had won the election, we would have built a heavy rail line across Reid Highway. The perfect bit of land is available and nothing has happened in all that time.

I will outline the history of this issue. The subject of the motion we are debating relates to the inadequacy of government action. The member for Willagee summarised it very well when he said that this government is an "in-tray" government. If it is not in the in-tray, the government will not do anything about it. I try to keep this issue in the in-tray. Do members know how hard that is? It is a constant battle. We have to remind the ministers and we have to write the questions. When the member for Warren–Blackwood was the housing minister, I wrote him two letters that he never responded to.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Have a look in the in-tray.

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: It is in the in-tray.

Mr D.T. Redman: I make a conscious point of getting the turnaround time in my office down as quickly as possible.

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: I must admit I followed it up towards the end of that period. I will take the minister's point.

Mr D.T. Redman: In fact, I think there are issues that you personally raised with me.

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: I have crossed the floor and personally raised it with every Minister for Housing. The government has failed to show why we should not develop this land that is available, which is really important for the social and economic wellbeing of this area. It is also really important for delivering housing.

I want to outline some of the history. In May 2010 the current Minister for Housing may have been the Minister for Housing then. He said in a letter to me that the government will be doing something very quickly. He said that the government would build 60 social housing units by December 2010. The problem was that the minister had the wrong site. He had a site that was a bit down the road. It was a site under the national rental affordability scheme and was sold off to private renters. Under NRAS, the government has to keep a percentage under market rental. Because our rental is so high in Western Australia at the moment, it is not an affordable rental option.

In April 2010, in response to my calls and after raising it in this house, an article appeared in the *Eastern Reporter*. In that article a departmental spokeswoman stated that the land could not have houses built on it until a district centre development plan was approved by the City of Stirling. Further, the article stated that the land was zoned and once the development plan was approved, it confirmed that work could take place on this site. So it was handballed to the City of Stirling. I organised a meeting with officers from the City of Stirling and the Department of Housing and said, "You keep blaming one another. Can you work it out? Can you stop this bureaucratic ping-pong that is going on here and get on and develop this land?" There was a great commitment after that meeting that they were going to get on with it. The Department of Housing just needed to provide some

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

details. That was on 6 April 2010. Subsequent to that, nothing happened. I asked questions during budget estimates. In August 2011, after asking questions in estimates through the shadow Minister for Housing, now the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the minister undertook to give me a briefing so I knew what was going on with this land. In August 2010 I headed off to a briefing in town to see the general manager of commercial and business operations. I was told that a subdivision plan was being submitted at that time to excise the 2.5 hectares and it that would only be a short time before that land was developed. We are now looking at August 2011. Prior to March 2011, Minister Buswell's office said that they had lodged the application with the Department of Planning, but clearly they had not because in August I was told something else. On 2 May 2012, I received another letter about the development of that particular lot, which reads —

“Further to your email to the Department of Housing concerning progress on Lot 60 Milldale Way Mirrabooka, I provide the following.

The Dept has received subdivision approval to excise the Health site and action is underway to meet the conditions of approval, which will involve subdivision works, It is anticipated that titles to the new lots will issue around mid 2012.

When, subsequently, during the budget estimates process I asked whether the titles had been transferred to the Department of Health, I was told they had not been.

The saga continues. Finally, early September 2012, we see earthworks. Any bit of bush and any trees have been taken away and this 5.5 hectare area of land next to Reid Highway has been flattened. One day MAX will get to this point, so I am sure members will all visit. Up to that point, I am sure it has not been on the radar of many people apart perhaps from that of the member for Morley. Earthworks began and we all got excited and asked: What is happening? Let us find out. When will it happen? Will it be earthworks, a road or a really nice paved sidewalk? But we heard nothing—no information, no details, no transfer. Nothing is happening on that land. If that is not a sign of an inadequate availability of land for this community, I do not know what is.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah) [6.51 pm]: I would like to make a final contribution, and I realise I have only 10 minutes. I appreciate the comments made by a number of members this evening on this very important matter of land availability. It relates directly to the provision of housing and the issues surrounding the housing crisis that I believe we are experiencing in Western Australia at the moment, with many people unable to secure accommodation for themselves and their families. This is something I mentioned last night during my contribution to a previous debate.

I want to highlight, as an example, the frustration of a developer, Mr Mike O'Brien, in Mandurah. Mr O'Brien is a very patient man; he owns a large lot, lot 100 or 2–16 Nairn Road. For probably 15 years he has been attempting to have an appropriate outline development plan approved for lot 100, which, of course, would provide him with not only a secure retirement future but also subdividable land for development. It is a long story but it has reached the stage at which the City of Mandurah in its latest deliberation early this year, in a report to council, approved his outline development plan for lot 100. It was approved for advertisement unanimously by council at both its planning committee and full council meetings on 22 and 29 January this year. Then suddenly, in February this year, the city asked for a whole new climate change risk–assessment report. It is a pity the Minister for Planning is not here because this is an issue I will write to him about. Draft state planning policy 2.6, dated February 2012, is a draft state planning policy relating to setbacks. The council is scared of future climate change risk and this property backs onto the Serpentine River. After a long saga that has gone on for many years, the council is now opposing Mr O'Brien's ODP, citing the draft state planning policy 2.6. I am pleased the minister is in the chamber at the moment. Of course, this is another impediment that is causing Mr O'Brien total frustration. Whilst I understand the city has concerns about future climate change effects, particularly sea level rise, the fact is, after many years, council has suddenly placed in front of him, at the last hurdle, an impediment, citing a draft state planning policy. I do not know how long it will take for the minister to finalise that state planning policy but —

Mr J.H.D. Day: What is the title of the planning policy?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It is draft state planning policy 2.6. I am not 100 per cent sure of the name of it, but it relates to proposals for, I understand, mitigation against setbacks and future climate change.

Mr J.H.D. Day interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: That is great, but after saying in January this year that there were no problems with his proposal, the City of Mandurah has now cited a draft planning policy. I do not know whether councils can do

Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Vincent Catania; Mr John Day; Mr Roger Cook; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Bill Marmion; Deputy Speaker; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman

that. I am interested in the minister's feedback on whether the local government can cite a draft as a reason to not approve a subdivision. Does the minister have any comment on that?

Mr J.H.D. Day: If draft policies are regarded as seriously entertained, they can be significant factors in making planning decisions.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I wanted to use that example. Mr O'Brien is a very reasonable bloke; I have known him for a long time. He now faces a huge process. He will probably take it to the State Administrative Tribunal, and he believes he will be successful. It is an example of a mismatch, if you like, of council objectives and their use of draft proposals through the state planning policy. I will write to the minister about it because I think it is important, particularly since, quite frankly, the City of Mandurah is now spooked about climate change and is very concerned about future litigation from homeowners or, indeed, other stakeholders who may be impacted.

In the brief time before I am told by the Deputy Speaker to sit down I want to also highlight the matter of Keralup, which the member for Gosnells mentioned earlier. I have had grave concerns about the environmental implications of placing a large population on degraded land in Keralup, and, as the Minister for Health will know, the latest statistics regarding mosquito-borne diseases are continuing to increase at an alarming rate. I know the Department of Health has concerns as part of the whole Keralup approval process. It has highlighted on a number of occasions concerns about future control of mosquitoes, despite, during the election campaign, the Minister for Health promising to eradicate mosquitoes.

Dr K.D. Hames: I didn't say I would eradicate them.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Yes, he did. He will be held to account for that. I went to the polling booth in Greenfields and Riverside Gardens and there were signs "Eradicate mosquitoes—vote Liberal" and the relevant press releases in the lead-up and wrap-around of the *Mandurah Mail* in the last week of the election. He cannot backtrack again and come in here, as did the Treasurer this morning, and backtrack on another promise, because he will be held to account for it. He knows it is a big issue down there. He thought it might win him some votes. He said he would eradicate mosquitoes, but he will not be able to. The government has allocated only about a million bucks, some of which the Minister for Environment said was going to be spent in Maylands. The Minister for Health wants to check that because he was found wanting. He should not worry; he will be held accountable for that. Every single complaint people make about mozzies will be sheeted home to the Minister for Health because he will fail —

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I am having difficulty finding the relevance of mosquitoes to land supply, so can you return to the motion please?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The mosquitoes are an official issue relating to land supply, quite frankly, because we in the Peel region will be asked to provide land that is affected by potential mosquito-borne disease. In fact, on land titles in the City of Mandurah and other local authorities in the Peel region a clause warns any person purchasing land in the Peel region that they are living in a mosquito-borne area.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.