

**Division 72: Western Australian Planning Commission, \$109 998 000 —**

Mr I.M. Britza, Chairman.

Mr J. Norberger, Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Planning.

Ms G. McGowan, Director General.

Mr J. Deery, Chief Finance Officer.

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

Mr T. Hillyard, Chief Property Officer, Western Australian Planning Commission.

Mrs E. Thunder, Principal Policy Adviser, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

[Witnesses introduced.]

**The CHAIRMAN:** I give the call to the member for West Swan.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I want to ask about some of the confusion that has been caused in the East Wanneroo area about the metropolitan region scheme amendment, or the East Wanneroo urbanisation. This issue has been around for many decades. Given that the MRS amendment is different from what was outlined in the Perth and Peel Green Growth Plan, what is the expectation for land that is currently outside the proposed MRS amendment? Is there any chance that land that does not fall within the proposed urbanisation area will go to urban in the next 10, 20 or 30 years?

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** Is the member referring to the metropolitan region scheme in East Wanneroo?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yes.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** I will hand over to Mr Lumsden shortly. In relation to the metropolitan region scheme and the strategic assessment, it is worth noting that the current policies and processes for land use planning approvals continue to apply while the strategic assessment is draft and subject to consultation. The Western Australian Planning Commission continues to fulfil its statutory land use planning role, as is the case with the proposed East Wanneroo metropolitan region scheme amendment. Future urban development in East Wanneroo has been foreshadowed for many years, as the member indicated. The current scheme amendment proposal has been building on, and informed by, a number of pre-existing strategic planning publications, including the “East Wanneroo Structure Plan”, which was published by the WAPC in 2011. However, I just wanted to provide that as an overarching statement. Obviously, the strategic assessment covers that area as well and is at a draft stage. It is not finalised yet, and until that is the case obviously the current planning approvals will continue. Perhaps Mr Lumsden can elaborate further.

**Mr E. Lumsden:** Yes, there has been some confusion; that is a fair call. Notwithstanding that the East Wanneroo area has been highlighted in a number of previous strategic planning documents as potential urban—I underline the words “potential urban”—there have been a number of ongoing complexities, which, quite frankly, took some time to be resolved. Firstly, some initial assumptions were made that servicing would be very difficult, particularly water and sewerage, let alone power supplies. Added to that, it became quite a difficult situation to determine where the urban front would be, and by that I mean where it would start. At one stage, the commission, on advice from the Department of Planning, thought it would start from the bottom up—that is, Gnangara Road up. We then found out from the Water Corporation, after some, shall I say, indirect assistance from the member for Wanneroo, that that was not feasible; it would have to come from the north down. Added to that, we came across other complexities with the power supplies for development. That meant that we did not have a consistent flow of infrastructure going from one area to the next; it was disjointed. Added to that were some significant land fragmentation issues. At some stage, the City of Wanneroo, as well as landowners, had different views at different times on what should and could happen, and also on who should be the proponent from the environmental perspective of the initiation of the reclassification of land from rural to urban.

As part of this process, there were other considerations—other than the infrastructure issues—in determining what could occur. For instance, we were advised that some areas could be serviced more readily by the Water Corporation; or the Water Corporation would advise that certainly there was capacity for a limited amount of land to be rezoned, but that capacity would be taken from existing urban-zoned land in the north-west corridor. So we had to work through that to see what was the actual case in point. Other aspects involved environmental issues. We knew that there were some significant issues there regardless of the strategic environmental assessment. However, as I indicated earlier to the member for Gosnells, the environmental assessment raised issues that required us to look more closely at the potential.

Therefore, when the commission decided, on the advice of the Department of Planning, to initiate a change of zoning from rural to urban deferred, we did not believe, because of the information before us, that it would be prudent to include that for some of the areas that we had thought previously should go to urban deferred. Therefore, we have taken action to at least get the process moving so that we can go into more detailed planning from the urban deferred. Also, if people feel that an area of land that has been left rural should go to urban deferred, they can make a submission through the process, which is the normal thing, and we will reconsider that submission in light of further examination of their points of view. We are heading down that process and moving ahead, after taking a long time to try to clarify the various issues that on a number of occasions were conflicting. A number of landowners in that area still object to being rezoned from rural to urban. It fluctuates over time, but we are trying to move this process so that we can get some certainty in the system for the future.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** We have spoken about some of the concerns that landowners may have. They still have the opportunity to make a submission during the comment period under the MRS, which is open up until July; I do not have the exact date. There is still an opportunity for them to make sure that they have their views registered and heard.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I know that the MRA takes precedence over the green growth plan. The green growth plan highlights the entire area as potential urban or for urban consideration or whatever the word is. Obviously, there is an environmental issue with the land that is outside this MRS proposal, but it is an infrastructure issue and what was then, I suppose, identified as a community issue. Is that the best way to describe it?

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** The member is right. The strategic assessment has a predominantly environmental focus. However, it is still in a draft state. As I said earlier, it has to go to the commonwealth as well. Therefore, hypothetically, even if it passed government at the state level and we believed that there was no environmental issue, there is no guarantee that that may not be potentially challenged at a commonwealth level. Until it has actually gone through that process, I do not think it would be fair to say that we can guarantee that there are no environmental issues, and that is why it is at a draft stage. Mr Lumsden or Ms McGowan may want to add to that comment.

**Ms G. McGowan:** Is the member referring specifically to the Ranch Road area or the Gngangara catchment?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Gngangara, the southern part primarily, and also the eastern part.

**Ms G. McGowan:** I think that is where Mr Lumsden was saying that some landowners have either been included as being in a potential urban area, or are voicing quite strong opposition to that, and that is part of the consideration equally and why I mentioned Ranch Road. There is a concern that that area has not been included in the urban deferred area because, broadly speaking, there is a contiguous piece of land with fairly high vegetation, as I understand it, but that is one of the considerations. It is a mix of each. From what I have been told, some people in the Gngangara region do not wish to be considered urban, and others in that same cluster want it. The department has been working through those particular issues to come to an overall determination about what might be appropriate in the subregional planning framework. I understand that in the Gngangara area the proposed sequencing of any development, if it were to remain urban, is still quite some way off. One piece of work the department has been doing in the subregional planning framework is trying to look at the scoping and sequencing of work. That helps us with infrastructure planning more generally.

[9.20 pm]

**Mr E. Lumsden:** People need to understand that when the commission initiates an amendment such as urban deferred, the cadastral boundary is not finite at that stage. People can make submissions and that may result in their property coming out of the urban deferred area or going in. In making that decision, the commission looks not only at their arguments but also looks at the other elements and impacts. For instance, if people just say that they do not want to subdivide, the commission would have to make a judgement on that, all things being equal, and ask whether it has a major implication on servicing the remaining part of the area; the economies of scale. Equally, if it is to come out, what is the rationale behind that? Is it on environmental grounds or do we have to look at some other issues? I am often disappointed when people think that the commission has made a decision and there is no process of review. There is a process of review. All submissions are considered thoroughly by the Department of Planning as well as the input from other agencies. The commission needs to make a decision about whether this is the best outcome, considering all the various aspects relating to all the relevant parcels of land. People in the middle of an area may not want to go urban, which could result in a whole proposal falling over because it cannot work. That is the process we are now going through. As the parliamentary secretary said, there is still a submission period. After the submission period through the Department of Planning, the commission will examine those issues even more thoroughly because I can assure the member that east Wanneroo is complex.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** That is my reading of it. It is very complex and it has a long history.

I also look after that urban growth corridor of Brabham, Dayton and Henley Brook. Sometimes an urban front impacts on rural living. Park Street in Henley Brook is an example where there has been a push and I think it has been primarily accepted for urbanisation consideration. One issue is that significant urban zoning will create a no-man's-land in a sense because landowners do not get the benefit of rural living as they get the issues to do with congestion and the impact of a lot of people living around them. But they are missing out on urban redevelopment. That seems to be an issue when rural living has been left in the middle of an urban front. Is that something that the WAPC accepts in some of its considerations?

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** That is a good question—especially how that transition is handled between urban and rural. It is a very valid question. I might get Mr Lumsden to provide some insight.

**Mr E. Lumsden:** That is a consideration. The commission faces that issue in a number of areas. I find it a bit ironic, particularly in the area the member referred to, because I know that area very well from a past life. People wanted rural living and then, over time, through relevant personal circumstances, they wanted urban. Brabham is a good case in point. A lot of those areas were two to four hectares, including Henley Brook. People have changed their minds. This also relates to the previous question the member raised about east Wanneroo, one never really—perhaps I should say “rarely”—gets 100 per cent consensus. Some people will want to go, some want to go now, some might want to go in 10 years and some might never want to go. We have to ask, firstly, whether there is a need for urban development. If there is and it is fragmented, can it be serviced and what are the implications? Also, what are the implications for the phasing in? Can we avoid “ringlocking” people? These are considerations. In some cases we might not be able to, but we might be able to phase in the development. It is up to the individual when they want to subdivide and how that process will move forward. But it is difficult when there is an interface, especially people who had rural land or rural residential land and they changed their mind over time. It is one of those difficult ones that we try to accommodate, but there will always be some winners and losers unfortunately. We cannot make everybody a winner all the time. We try to go around the issue in some way, if it is feasible. That is another consideration that my office gives, as well as the commission, when considering those areas. We are not immune to their points of view. It is getting the balance of not only their personal point of view but also the wider community good.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Another issue is communicating effectively with a number of landowners. My parents are older Italians; they do not check the web about what is happening in their area. Another issue when looking at these types of areas is how the commission gets a good understanding of what the community is feeling. Sometimes people are not aware of what is happening and there is no communication simply because of the way they live and where they are at. I think that is a major issue too.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** The commission takes that as a valid statement.

**Mr P.T. MILES:** Further to the question that the member for West Swan raised, a major driving force in east Wanneroo over the last 10 years is the fact that the Department of Water has taken quite a few licences away from people. The land has become non-viable in a rural sense. There might be a horse on the land or something like that and in some cases it has become an albatross around their necks because of the taxes they have to pay. That needs to have a higher level of weighting when the commission makes its determinations on areas, especially as previously stated, around the Gnangara area.

The other part of my question I would like an answer to is this: there was a very good proposal to build a retirement village near the golf course in Gnangara. All of the greywater would be used on the golf course itself—so there was no impact on local amenities—but that was also knocked back by the commission. I also found that very strange. It was suggested that they did not want growth to go ahead in east Wanneroo. I do not know whether the parliamentary secretary wants to comment on those two items.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** I will see whether Mr Lumsden is able to comment on that. Was it the retirement village?  
[9.30 pm]

**Mr P.T. MILES:** Correct, yes.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** The member will obviously be aware that the Department of Water has senior representation on the Western Australian Planning Commission. I think water is one of the considerations taken on board. The member's specific question was about the weighting given to it, especially in an instance —

**Mr P.T. MILES:** There should be a higher weighting in consideration.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** The member's question is about whether a change made by the Department of Water—obviously separate to the WAPC—about how much water can be used can be an input into a WAPC decision with that land going forward. I will ask Mr Lumsden to clarify that.

**Mr E. Lumsden:** Underground water and water availability is becoming an increasingly emerging issue for not only rural lands, but equally the development of Perth and its environmental systems that depend on the water

systems. East Wanneroo had quite a lot of market gardens there that—this is a common problem—either had a water supply or a licensed underground water supply that was perhaps being wound back because of the limited amount of water available and the relevant demand thereon. That is certainly an issue in terms of rural land that we would consider. I would also say that a lot of those existing properties that may be market gardens were also smallholdings that were not very large, so it could perhaps be argued that there were other rural land uses there. Having said that, they were the issues we were looking at. I think that is a fundamental issue we have to address, because the member is right on the one hand; on the other hand, if there is a diminishing water supply to rural land, whether it is market gardens, horse agistment or horticulture, it does not then automatically follow that because there is less water supply we should automatically rezone the land to urban because it just would not be feasible. That argument could be applied right across the state in various areas. I think that is looking at a balanced approach. Then it also looks at whether land that is not used for market gardens still has a rural residential purpose, not only urban. That is the type of process we have to go through. But I agree with the member that this issue of water supply availability is an increasing issue and we have to plan better for water reuse—recycling, as the member mentioned—in the future, in both our urban and rural environments. But in the member’s specific example, I think there is more to that issue of retirement housing than just water. I would have to research that, because I am not confident to respond here and now and give the member a totally accurate answer.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** I refer to page 835 of the *Budget Statements* and the table under “Metropolitan Region Improvement Special Purpose Account”. May I have a breakdown of the expenditure for this financial year? I note that the closing balance of the account at the end of the last financial year was some \$262 million. It appears that in the 2015–16 financial year we are heading towards a closing balance of \$290 million. That allows an expenditure of \$69 million. May I please have a breakdown of the expenditure of that \$69 million?

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** I have the page number. The first figure the member started with was \$262 000 185— is that right?—which was the 2014–15 actual.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** The closing balance actual; that is right, yes.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** Then the \$290 million the member referred to was in the 2015–16 budget. We are estimating it will finish off at \$285 million. Does the member want the breakdown of the \$354 million that has been budgeted, or the anticipated finishing amount of \$285 million in the 2015–16 year?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I have a further question. I think a breakdown of the payments line, because that is the key.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** The payments?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yes.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** My apologies.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** So, I would like to know the breakdown for the \$69 million for 2015–16, the \$119 million estimated for 2015–16, the \$64.4 million for 2016–17 and what is budgeted in the forward estimates beyond that—basically, the expenditure for the metropolitan region improvement fund by program and item.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** I will pass to Mr Deery shortly, and he may be able to provide the detail now; if not, we will see whether we can provide it. There is obviously, if you like, a bit of a significant anomaly between the 2015–16 budget and actual. We budgeted \$69 million, and we are anticipating \$119 million. Then for the 2016–17 budget we are returning to a more, if you like, long-term trend of \$64 million. The difference between the \$69 million and \$119 million, notwithstanding the other information the member wants, came about due to a one-off payment to LandCorp for land acquisition in Alkimos. That explains that. Maybe I can pass on to Mr Deery and find out whether he has that information.

**Mr J. Deery:** Yes, that is correct; the answer is that \$87 million is an increase, and \$50 million of that was the Alkimos acquisition. As to the other question the member asked about a breakdown of that expenditure: the answer can probably be provided in more detail at a later date as supplementary information, if that is what the member requires.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** Does Mr Deery feel comfortable to be able to provide the information by 2 June?

**Mr J. Deery:** I think we can, yes. It can be listed out.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** We will provide, by way of supplementary information, a breakdown of the make-up of the payments under the metropolitan region improvement special purpose account for the 2015–16 actual.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yes; and what is forecast.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** And forecasts.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yes. For 2016–17, 2017–18 and 2018–19, what is the budgeted forecast expenditure for those years? I know the parliamentary secretary is not going to identify the projects because that happens later, but what is the total expenditure being budgeted for those out years?

[*Supplementary Information No A33.*]

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** Can I just get some clarification? Is one of the purposes of the MRI special purpose account the acquisition of privately owned Bush Forever sites?

**Mr E. Lumsden:** Yes.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** Yes.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** I guess we will see in the information that will be provided just how much was expended in the current financial year and how much the department is anticipating it will expend in the next financial year.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** Yes. Obviously, I cannot tell the member what that breakdown will tell him. I would imagine, given that we are giving the member a breakdown, it will be what it will be. But given that we know that that fund can and does get used for that purpose, it may well. I suppose because we do not have that detail here now, until we provide that breakdown for the member he will have to wait for that information.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** I will switch to what I think is a Bush Forever site—the Lowlands project referred to on page 832. Was that a Bush Forever land acquisition of \$9.8 million on page 832?

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** Was that Lowlands?

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** Yes, it is marked as the Lowlands project on page 832.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** I will pass over to Mr Hillyard to provide some detail on that.

**Mr T. Hillyard:** The Lowlands property is in Mardella, and was purchased by Main Roads Western Australia as part of the Gateway project. It had some 118 hectares of land to mitigate for the Gateway project, and so it provided the funds to acquire Lowlands. The intention was that the Planning Commission would put up the balance of the funds, at \$9.6 million, to acquire the rest of the land, and it was to then be made an A-class reserve. What actually occurred in that process was that the land was transferred back to the state promptly and it created an A-class reserve, and so Main Roads was left with a bill, if you like. It was seeking someone to repay those funds, and it had already passed the land on. The Planning Commission transferred some land of an equivalent value to Main Roads for the Mitchell Freeway project. As a result, the metropolitan region improvement fund effectively provided \$9.6 million towards that project acquisition.

[9.40 pm]

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** What was the total value of the property?

**Mr T. Hillyard:** Just over \$10 million—about \$10.1 million. It was about 1 000 hectares.

**Mrs G.J. GODFREY:** The future of the Ascot kiln site has been of great interest to the local community in Belmont over the years. I understand that the Western Australia Planning Commission recently took responsibility for the site. How will this assist in ensuring timely and appropriate redevelopment of this area?

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** The member is quite right. The WAPC actually purchased the kiln site in 1985, so it dates back a fair bit. That was actually part of a broader redevelopment initiative under an improvement plan. Subsequently the commission entered into a commercial arrangement with Ascot Fields Nominees Pty Ltd for redevelopment of the land, now known as the Ascot Waters estate. Development of Ascot Waters is virtually complete, apart from the 1.6-hectare kiln site. Ascot Fields Nominees relinquished its development options over the kiln site in 2015, due to the complexity of achieving a feasible development. As result, the WAPC has now resumed sole responsibility for the kiln site, and the Department of Planning is undertaking planning and technical studies to facilitate delivery of the site by the private sector, the intent being to de-risk the site and get it to a position of being planning ready. The Department of Planning will do site investigations, a local development plan and urban design concepts for the kiln complex, and a project business case, outlining delivery strategy and funding requirements, and will ensure all relevant planning frameworks, structure planning and zonings are in place to encourage private sector investment in the restoration of the kilns and adjoining land for the benefit of the local and wider community. I think the member will agree that, done properly, it will be a fantastic development for the Belmont area. It is good in that sense that the WAPC has taken it back over. It is a complex site but, with the commission's expertise, very similar to what we have seen in the Mundijong area, we are hoping to see a great outcome.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** My question again relates to the metropolitan region improvement fund, and land purchases. In relation to the bus rapid transit lane to Ellenbrook from Marshall Road, I understand that three properties are

required to be purchased. Has any communication been received by the WAPC from Main Roads about the purchase of those properties, and what is the time frame?

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** Can I just confirm that that question refers to page 835, the metropolitan region improvement account?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yes.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** I might get Mr Hillyard to provide the answer.

**Mr T. Hillyard:** Because this is an announced project, the Planning Commission, under its normal policies, will not be undertaking any further land acquisitions. That is left to the constructing authority. However, the Ellenbrook railway and transit corridor—this is both reservations in the scheme—had something like 44 properties that were affected, and there are only nine to complete land acquisitions for both the announced bus project and also for the railway.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** So is that just nine properties that are required to be purchased?

**Mr T. Hillyard:** Yes, but because of the decision for NorthLink to go back to the earlier alignment, there is a very wide reservation in the metropolitan region scheme at the moment.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Is it 80 metres wide?

**Mr T. Hillyard:** Yes, it is in that order. The design that is being prepared by Main Roads at this stage for the bus rapid transit is actually swinging back on part of the old—now old—Perth–Darwin highway, and part within the transit corridor. Therefore, they have reduced the number of properties that would be initially affected. I understand that three properties would be required by Main Roads on behalf of the Public Transport Authority.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** To clarify the process, it is an announced project, so its implementing agency is required to undertake the purchasing, and the source of funds is not the MRIF; it is the budget for the project.

**Mr T. Hillyard:** That is correct.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** Yes, it is an announced project, but it also has to be within two years of construction and completion. If a project was announced and construction was not intended to commence until 10 years down the track, planning would still have an involvement but, given that this has been announced and falls within that period, it comes under a different agency.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** In relation to the Metro Area Express light rail, has the WAPC purchased any properties in the past two to three years in anticipation, or under the direction of government, in relation to the proposed MAX light rail project?

**Mr T. Hillyard:** There has been no definition of the actual MAX into the scheme, whether it be a planning control area or otherwise, but one property has been purchased in Thomas Street in West Perth that would accommodate MAX, as well as the widening of Thomas Street. Some other areas of land within the Princess Margaret Hospital car park have been identified for a potential power station if MAX goes ahead. Those areas are not being purchased by the Planning Commission, because they are already within the Department of Health properties. Regard is being had to the light rail potential in all planning decisions that are being taken and the asset disposal program.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** In relation to another amendment to the metropolitan region scheme for the reservation along Stirling Highway, which was recently announced —

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** Which page number is the member referring to?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I refer to page 829, asset management. I understand that 200 properties in the reservation are affected. Can I just confirm that that reservation dates from 1963, and what would be the anticipated impact on the house prices with that reservation? Secondly, has the Department of Transport completely ruled out requiring that reservation for any potential public transport route in the future?

**Mr E. Lumsden:** As the member indicated, the commission carried out a major study reviewing the reservation, which was made in 1963. In the majority of cases the reservation has been reduced, which was not understood. A lot of people unfortunately did not know that there was a reservation on their property until we advertised the amendment. In some instances, in some strategic corners around Claremont, for turning movements and to facilitate bus movements, there was some slight widening, but overall the majority of the reservation has been reduced. The reduction of the reservation was not done in an ad hoc manner. It was done after detailed planning by Main Roads for future transport routes, including bus movements, down that corridor, as well as making adjustments to avoid, where possible, significant heritage buildings. I think we had something like 800-odd submissions on that development. In many cases, the land values have been improved, because the land take has

been reduced, except in some minor cases, but I will ask Mr Hillyard if he wants to add anything to what I have said.

[9.50 pm]

**Mr T. Hillyard:** Yes, a number of properties along there are in the reservation. That reservation has been in place for so long and something in the order of about 90 metres was originally proposed. Some 20-odd years ago the commission established a setback policy of five metres either side of the existing road reservation—the actual dedicated road. Therefore, a lot of development has occurred along Stirling Highway, as we can see today, on the basis that the reservation was, to a certain extent, ignored. There has been plenty of investment along there. I do not think the reservation has caused any uplift or even any blight along the way because it has been in place for so long and properties have been bought and sold over the last 50 to 60 years. Occasionally, a hardship case will come along in which a person who has owned the property for many, many years—probably 50 years—was not aware of the reservation, but when they want to sell it, they find that the whole of their property is affected by the road widening. In that case, there is a mechanism through the Planning and Development Act to compensate people or for the property to be purchased.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** I think Mr Hillyard made a fairly salient point. From a state government perspective—I know the member is talking about property uplift for individual property owners—we believe the easement of that reserve will reduce the state's liability by approximately half a billion dollars because of the reduction in the number of dwellings that will be affected by it. To give an example, the previous reservation would have affected 675 dwellings out of the 1 400 dwellings that about Stirling Highway, so 48 per cent would have been affected. The proposed reservation will affect 76 dwellings, or five per cent of the total.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** So the parliamentary secretary is saying that that will help our balance sheet. Is it a contingent liability? How is it written?

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** My understanding is that it would be a contingent liability.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Did the parliamentary secretary say that it was to the value of \$400 million?

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** It is \$500 million.

**Ms S.F. McGURK:** I refer to the Perth convention precinct master plan outlined on page 826 of the *Budget Statements*. Can the parliamentary secretary give us a bit more detail about the precinct plan and when we can expect to see something?

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** That is a good point. The Perth convention precinct plays an important role; we realise that it is a focus for international conventions. The preliminary master plan for the Perth convention precinct was done in 2014, and it concluded that although the infrastructure, tenure and site conditions have some considerable restraints, some significant benefits could be generated from complementary development, and that is being looked at. The member's specific question was: when is the planning due to be completed? Obviously, consultation is underway at the moment. We would be aiming for completion by the end of the year or maybe early next year.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Who has liability for that car park? I know that the council runs it and gets all the revenue—it is a terrible deal—but I understand that Wyllie Group Pty Ltd has a 20-year lease. Who has liability for the condition of that car park? Is it the group that has the lease or is it the government, which owns the property?

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** We do not have that information on the liability at hand.

**Ms G. McGowan:** As the member has said, obviously the City of Perth gets the income from the car park. As part of this work we are doing, we have accessed funds in the Perth parking fund to look at the transport arrangements there. Equally, in terms of the tenure arrangements across that whole site, there are leases in favour of the Wyllie Group for the Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre and Brookfield for the EY building, and the Adina apartments have a head lease. As I said, the City of Perth has the car park, so I assume that it would carry the liability, but I could not be absolute. There are also management orders to the Water Corporation and the Public Transport Authority. Part of the work we are doing involves looking at those governance and tenure arrangements, because any development would potentially require new leases. The work we have been doing on the master plan involves trying to get that framework to guide the evaluation of development proposals, because there are a couple of other development proposals; Brookfield and others have started to make some approaches. Equally, the Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre now ranks fourth in exhibition floor space, so we are looking at ways of maximising or increasing the floor space, but, more importantly, we are looking at whether something can be done with the interface with Elizabeth Quay and the outlook to the river. The thinking is that it would be done in a staged development. At the moment, we have a project team that includes urban design, transport, geotechnical, civil and structural engineering, commercial advisory, convention centre capacity and community engagement specialists. We are trying to do something quite comprehensive so that we can have an

overall vision for the site rather than an ad hoc development. Of course, the commission also has made some funds available for that master planning work at this stage.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** I refer to the asset management service outlined on page 829 of the *Budget Statements*, and specifically the disposal of properties. I have a question about Kiara College—formerly Lockridge Senior High School. I understand that the school wants to acquire land from the Western Australian Planning Commission but there have been a few hiccups along the way. Could we get some information on how things are proceeding with the acquisition of some land? I think it is in the order of 20 hectares of land.

**Mr J. NORBERGER:** I appreciate the question. I might get Mr Hillyard to address that.

**Mr T. Hillyard:** The Lockridge land is 20 hectares and it is the area east of the high school. An agreement has been reached for the school to continue to operate the farm school on eight hectares of that site, not 20 hectares. It used to lease the whole area from the Planning Commission. Planning is occurring around its requirement for the farm school. The rest of the site is proposed to be developed for urban purposes into the future and has a strategic assessment of the Perth and Peel regions offset area at the moment. The land is subject to rezoning to urban deferred at the moment.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** The school was practising agriculture on 27 hectares, so it is being asked to reduce that to 20 hectares; is that right?

**Mr T. Hillyard:** No. The total area that it originally leased from the WA Planning Commission was in the order of 20 hectares. By agreement, it will now occupy eight hectares. It had intensive agriculture on 3.6 hectares of the site, so it will keep that, plus an additional area. The WA Planning Commission also has made a number of offers to the school to operate its broader farming activities at Whiteman Park and also on another site that was purchased in the Avon Valley, which was a sheep station and could also be utilised. We have had some discussions with the school council and the Department of Education, but the school has determined that it wants to remain solely at the site and use that intensively. It will not be running large animals and the land is not suitable for that.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Will there be a transfer of ownership or will the WAPC continue to own that eight hectares and it will continue to be a lease arrangement?

**Mr T. Hillyard:** It will be a leasehold from the commission at this time.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Who will manage the development of the remaining 12 hectares? Will it be the Department of Housing or LandCorp?

**Mr T. Hillyard:** The land is going to be developed by the Housing Authority.

**The appropriation was recommended.**

*Committee adjourned at 10.00 pm*