

METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME AMENDMENT NO 1010/33, PORT CATHERINE

Motion for Disallowance

HON ALAN CADBY (North Metropolitan) [11.50 am]: I move -

That the metropolitan region scheme amendment No 1010/33 - Port Catherine published in the *Gazette* on 23 June 2004 and tabled in the Legislative Council on 24 June 2004 under the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act 1959, be and is hereby disallowed.

We all know that the Gallop Government came to power on the promise of open government. However, we know from experience that its openness has been quite selective. This disallowance motion will allow the Government to inform the House and, therefore, the public why it has made the decision about Coogee. The community can then decide for itself whether this Government is worthy of its support in the forthcoming state election.

I will listen with interest to the various parties in the House explain why they support or do not support the disallowance and then I will make a decision about which way I will vote.

HON JIM SCOTT (South Metropolitan) [1.52 pm]: When I stop puffing I will strongly support the disallowance motion. This coastal development is an absolute travesty of planning and process. I want members to think about this very carefully. It is the first time an area of ocean has been placed in the hands of private individuals. The urban zoning of this area of the ocean will allow a developer to sell the land for private purposes. It will be the first time that has ever happened. Nothing like this has happened in the past. This area has been described by the minister as similar to the Hillarys marina and all sorts of other places, but it is not. That is a blatant distortion of the truth. Places like Hillarys are not privately owned; they are leased areas. The areas built on the jetty are leased; they are not houses or dwellings as will be built in Coogee. That is a significant point to remember. This metropolitan region scheme amendment will create a precedent for the private ownership of parts of the coast of Western Australia. The Government is trying to disguise the proposal as a marina. Let me tell members that it is not a marina. Members should listen to what is said about marinas on the east coast of Australia. The authorities there have become sick of the canal estates and the environmental and other problems and expenses they are causing to both local and state governments. New South Wales has banned that type of development. The description of what is called a canal development fits the Government's description of the proposed Coogee marina.

I am rifling through my papers to find the document, which I got out of order when I ran up the stairs. The New South Wales Government has released the "State Environmental Planning Policy No 50 - Canal Estate Development", of which the explanatory notes state -

Canals estate developments have the potential to cause adverse environmental impacts. Submissions made to the Department in the course of drafting the SEPP have noted that the impacts in particular circumstances may include :

Loss of wetland habitats and other sensitive aquatic systems...

I will not continue with that quote because it refers to the inland canals. The Coogee proposal is not inland; it will involve filling in the ocean. The explanatory notes continue -

Inadequate hydraulic functioning which may reduce water quality through poor flushing, cause sedimentation or affect structural integrity.

Impacts caused by storm water and urban run-off, including erosion, sedimentation away from a canal estate development site.

Impacts associated with imported fill.

Problems caused by disturbing acid sulfate soils.

Pollution by wastes from vessels.

Ongoing impacts from maintenance, including maintenance dredging.

...

Clause 3:

Provides the definition of a canal estate development used in the SEPP.

The definition of canal state development in the SEPP 50 has three essential components, as set out in out fully in sub-clause 3(a), 3(b) and 3(c). These components are: a wholly or partly constructed canal or other waterway or waterbody; the construction of dwellings; and the use of fill.

Hon Alan Cadby; Hon Jim Scott; Deputy President; Hon Kate Doust; Hon Norman Moore; Hon Ken Travers;
Deputy President (hon George Cash)

That will be built at Coogee; it will be a canal estate in the ocean. It will not be a marina. It is an absolute nonsense to claim that it will be. The creation of a marina is a very convenient exercise by the minister. We must ask ourselves: if this is to be a marina, why is the zoning being changed to urban? Why is it not remaining under the zoning of parks and recreation. Marinas elsewhere are zoned parks and recreation; they are not zoned urban. The Coogee development will be an urban development on the ocean. It is an absolute disgrace that the Labor Party has proposed this development, which will set in motion the erosion of the Australian way of life; that is, one in which people want public access to their beaches, not private ownership of them. The Labor Party is supporting private ownership of the beach.

Over time, we have seen quite a reversion of the Labor Party's development policy. Previous Labor Governments had proposed that that area of coastline south of the river would be turned into parks and recreation areas. A plan was drawn up that provided for that. Successive changes have occurred, I believe, heavily promoted by some of the same people who are now working as lobbyists; for example, the Burke-Grill connection. In 1992 the Burke Government called for expressions of interest for the development of a private sector marina project in this area. That call for expressions of interest was a bit of a failure because only two were received. When the Court Government came to power it thought the development smacked a bit of WA Inc and did not propose to put this marina in as part of the development. I understand that Hendy Cowan was particularly vociferous in his objection to this development. The development was then pushed by Joe Rotondella. I received some plans of his original proposals - I still have them in my office - which show that he did not have the expertise for this proposal. He was proposing to dig into the coast so that the coastal road in that area would deviate around the development and the partly inland marina. Massive fingers of land would have gone out into the ocean in a chaotic manner aimed at maximising the number of houses that could be put into the sea. The Coogee master plan was the next stage, which recommended that the marina project not be endorsed at that time because of concerns about the financial viability of the project and also public and Environmental Protection Authority concerns about such a development. The developer had not addressed a lot of issues. It was at about that time in 1995 that Australand first became involved in the project and started to make it look a bit more professional than had previously been the case. That company proposed a vastly different marina from what had previously been proposed. What really got under the nose of the local community was the turgid, underhanded way in which the local voice was stifled in this debate. Members of the local community have attempted to put their points of view to the local council. Mayor Lee, who now seems to be one of the endorsed candidates for the Labor Party, has been pushing very hard for this development.

A government member interjected.

Hon JIM SCOTT: He seems to be number one in the South Metropolitan Region these days. He is being put on all sorts of government committees. Mayor Lee has gone out of his way to make it difficult for the community voice to be heard on this issue, to the point at which he has had council officers remove the banners of people opposing the development. He has made it very difficult for members of the local community to see him, while at the same time he has been quite happy to take on the largesse of the developer with trips around the country and high-level meetings.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: It sounds like corruption to me.

Hon JIM SCOTT: I am not talking about corruption but I am talking about representation of the local community. The mayor is doing his best to deny local voices to be heard on this issue.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Didn't you say he was enjoying the largesse of the developer?

Hon JIM SCOTT: That is true. He certainly did take trips to other developments on the east coast.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: I hope you reported these concerns to the CCC.

Hon JIM SCOTT: I do not know whether it was illegal for him to be taken on those trips - I have not investigated that - but what I am saying is that he seemed happy to meet with the developers but not with the people he represents. When the developer gets his money he will be gone, but the community will still be there.

Mayor Lee met with members of the local community opposing this development only once in two years. That is pretty appalling. It was not through their lack of trying. He has said that 90 per cent of the community supports this development. His photo has appeared on brochures promoting the development and he has been a key player in the push for this development to go ahead. It is interesting that he would do all of that but not link up with the local community. What happened when members of the local community wanted to have a rally? Apart from the mayor having all the banners pulled down, he also tried to revoke the permit they had been provided with, although he did not eventually prevent them from having a community meeting. The group

Hon Alan Cadby; Hon Jim Scott; Deputy President; Hon Kate Doust; Hon Norman Moore; Hon Ken Travers;
Deputy President (hon George Cash)

supporting the development comprised a very small minority compared with the very large group of 3 500-odd that turned up to oppose the development.

The other interesting thing about the group supporting the development is that from day one it appeared with beautiful, professionally made placards, all of the same type, highly expensive -

Hon Norman Moore: You have never used any of those yourself.

Hon JIM SCOTT: No. The people who opposed the development were writing and drawing their own placards. These placards started appearing about the same time that Julian Grill appeared as an ambassador for this project. This was when the dirty work really started. A community group was quickly pulled together with fantastic resources and was able to spend huge amounts on professional placards and advertising etc.

Hon Barbara Scott: Who paid for the glossy postcards on the other side?

Hon JIM SCOTT: The other side did not have anywhere near that level of expenditure. They raised all their own money.

Hon Barbara Scott: Who paid for those postcards?

Hon JIM SCOTT: I have no idea, but postcards are rather less expensive than some of the advertising that has been promoted by the other side. Some 3 500 people opposed this development and, even if each of them had put in \$10, that involves a bit of money, compared with the very small group that turned up at the rally supporting the marina.

It is a fallacy to think that the people who are against this proposal are against any development. That is not the case. The people who oppose this development want that area redeveloped, but state departments have undertaken ad hoc reactionary planning in this area. I had discussed that area with some of the leading lights in planning in Western Australia, people like Paul Frewer. I said that I felt that what was really needed for that area was a total redevelopment plan that integrated any new marinas or anything like that into the overall planning of the area, not something that is driven by a developer's wish to make some quick bucks, is totally unlinked to anything else in the area and totally disregards the needs of that area.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: What happened to the Coogee master plan?

Hon JIM SCOTT: The Coogee master plan was a total rehash of a lot of old plans.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The interjections of Hon Derrick Tomlinson cannot be accurately heard by Hansard. If Hon Jim Scott responds to disorderly interjections, Hansard must be able to hear them. The member should not encourage interjections.

Hon JIM SCOTT: It is interesting that at one stage the minister was showing some concern about houses on the sea but seemed to change her position as time went on. That seems to be around about the time that the minister was suffering backlash from certain union groups in this State. They were very unhappy, and were threatening to unseat her in the electorate of Armadale.

Hon Ken Travers: Stick to the issue.

Hon JIM SCOTT: That is the issue, and the member knows it. Suddenly, along came a white knight in the person of Kevin Reynolds.

Hon Graham Giffard: He has been described as many things.

Hon JIM SCOTT: Of course I use the words "white knight" ironically. Kevin came in to bat for the development, the minister seems suddenly not to be opposed to houses on the sea, and all union problems seem to disappear from view at that point. We have heard nothing more about the minister being unseated in Armadale. I am not sure what the connection is with her change of view.

This development certainly does not cater for the needs of the community. The needs that exist in that area, such as the need for a boat ramp, will not now be met. There will be no boat ramp for the community. This is, as I said, not an area to which people can go and enjoy themselves; it is an area with houses on the sea. It is not a marina to which people can go. What can people do when they go to this area and walk out onto the areas reclaimed from the sea? Will they be able to knock on someone's door and go and enjoy a nice cup of tea or coffee? I am sure that will not happen. It is not an area built for public purposes. Where will things like a boat ramp and lifesaving and rescue facilities be located? Because they can no longer be placed in the development, they will be pushed down into the conservation reserve at Woodman Point. Tarmac and surf clubs will be located in an area that is not suitable for them. The things that had previously been planned by the Government

Hon Alan Cadby; Hon Jim Scott; Deputy President; Hon Kate Doust; Hon Norman Moore; Hon Ken Travers;
Deputy President (hon George Cash)

to go into the development will now be placed in an area that was set aside for conservation and recreation. This will not provide any of the things we need.

Furthermore, we know that this development will be costly in many ways. Sand accretion will occur with the littoral drift of sand up and down the coast. The sand will build up on one side of the development in a massive way. The picture we had was of the coast in front of the old power station moving out some 500 metres. That would completely change that area. To refurbish the area south of the canal development sand will be pumped from one side to the other. Not only will the community lose the area of beach and ocean where this canal estate in the sea is to be built, but it will also experience significant periods when the other areas of beach are unusable because of the pumping of sand from one side of the development to the other. That must go on year after year, because every year the sand will build up on one side and disappear from the other. That is a real problem. Not only is that area being taken away from the community but also the areas either side will be unusable for parts of the year.

A new way of subverting the public consultation process was first acknowledged in relation to the Sealanes development in Fremantle, in which, in order to build up the numbers of genuine submissions in the consultation process, a large number of submissions were generated on computers that altered the typeface and size and moved around some words. Thousands of these were produced and sent in as if they were all individual submissions. This practice was discovered in the consultation process around the Sealanes development, and the council was rather annoyed. An admission was made that that was not the right thing to do. However, exactly the same thing has happened in relation to this development. Many of the submissions made in support of the canals were not actually written by the people who sent them in. They added their names and addresses to prepared statements written by experts. They were photocopied from legitimate submissions. Many different forms and layouts were used to make them look different, but they were in fact part of an organised process in an attempt to make out that all these nice individual people were writing individual letters when in fact it was all generated from the propaganda office of our friend Mr Grill.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: How many were there?

Hon JIM SCOTT: Let me see. I think there were 4 000, but -

Several members interjected.

Hon JIM SCOTT: What I am saying is that this was not organised by the community group. This was organised by our dear lobbying experts, who were employed to do it. This was an exercise in deceit.

Hon Ken Travers: But they were signed by a lot of people.

Hon JIM SCOTT: In the case of Sealanes, a lot of people wrote in and said that they had not in fact done that. That probably needs to be checked. I hope they will check those ones that are clearly part of this deceit, because it is a bit hard for the people who received these submissions to know whether they are genuine. The reality was that at Sealanes there was a very large kerfuffle about this process being used because it would appear that not everyone who was supposed to have sent in submissions actually had.

Hon Graham Giffard interjected.

Hon JIM SCOTT: I do not know. I would not be surprised. The other issue is why would we want to zone an area of the seabed as urban. I ask all members opposite to really think about that. Every other marina in this State is zoned parks and recreation. Hillarys marina is zoned parks and recreation. Why will this marina be zoned urban? The reason it will be zoned urban is that the land will be privately owned. The seabed will be owned by private individuals. That will set a precedent that, if members opposite agree to it, they will be pilloried for, and that the Government will be pilloried for, because people up and down the coast are getting very, very concerned about their alienation from the coast.

Hon Norman Moore: A few of them are getting pretty sick of you too, I can tell you.

Hon JIM SCOTT: Then I wonder why our numbers keep going up, Norman. The reality is that they are not getting sick of us, because we are working with the community and trying to protect people's rights. They are getting sick of people like you, Norman, because you are more prepared to look after your mates -

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon George Cash): Order! I was not going to enter the debate, but if the member wants to refer to other members he should refer to them by their correct title in this place. More than that, I remind members that this is a limited time debate. The longer members speak, the less opportunity other members will have to make a contribution to the debate.

Hon JIM SCOTT: This zoning is the opposite of what people expect. It will not be public space. It will be private space. This zoning will create private space - private ownership - and shut out the public. It is all very

Hon Alan Cadby; Hon Jim Scott; Deputy President; Hon Kate Doust; Hon Norman Moore; Hon Ken Travers;
Deputy President (hon George Cash)

well for the developers to say that they may build a hotel. The wording of these agreements actually has a let-out clause to enable the developers to get out of providing the public facilities. I will compare what we will be getting here with what we get at Hillarys. Where are the boat ramps? People know that if they go to Hillarys they will get a boat ramp. Hon Alan Cadby knows that if he goes to Hillarys he will get a boat ramp, and he can go out to sea in a little tin boat if he wishes. That will not be the case at Coogee. This is a lie. This is not a marina. The other thing is that two-thirds of the Hillarys area is water. However, two-thirds of the Coogee area is land. That is for a very good reason - so that the developer can build more houses on the land. The argument has been that it will be impossible for the developer to make a profit unless the houses are built over the sea. There is only one reason that the houses that will be built over the sea will be profitable - the Government is giving that land to the developer. Therefore, not only is an area of coast being taken away, but also the developer will not have to pay for it.

Hon Paddy Embry: Will the developer not be doing certain other things instead, such as providing public boat ramps and things like that?

Hon JIM SCOTT: No. The Government will be providing boat ramps along the coast. We are talking here about a zoning change that will enable an area of ocean and beach to become urban. That is what we need to understand. It will not be an area that the public can recreate in. It will not be a parks and recreation area. It will be zoned urban so that houses can be built over the sea. The plans show that houses will be built over the sea. How many boats can be tied up at Hillarys? Hillarys has a capacity for 1 000 boats. How many boats can be tied up here? Only 300.

Hon Ken Travers interjected.

Hon JIM SCOTT: As I understand it, those are the figures. If they are not correct, I am happy to hear what the correct figures are. If two-thirds of the area at Hillarys is water but at Coogee only one-third of the area will be water, and we are talking about a development on a similar scale, then obviously the water will be rather more crowded here if we try to put in 1 000 boats.

Several members interjected.

Hon JIM SCOTT: So it will be 360.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon George Cash): Order! One speaker at a time, please, otherwise Hansard will have no idea of the interjection, which will make the response nonsensical.

Hon JIM SCOTT: Because Hillarys marina is a public facility, the areas of beach within the marina have been kept open for public access. However, they will not be kept open in this development. Only one small area, which is not a natural beach, will be within the marina. Hillarys marina has 60 publicly-accessible commercial outlets, including 30 shops, 15 restaurants and cafes and three amusement outlets. At Port Coogee the commercial area will comprise just a fraction of the space. I understand that an attempt is being made to change some of the commercial areas to residential. I hope Hon Ken Travers will tell us whether it is correct that the developer wants to change some of the commercial areas to residential.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Do you think Hillarys is a good example for the development? Do you think we should replicate that?

Hon JIM SCOTT: It would depend upon a whole lot of other parameters. Before we even start, we should look at the integration of whatever the development is with the rest of the local community and develop a plan that will suit that area and the needs of that area.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: It was the same at Hillarys.

Hon JIM SCOTT: Hillarys is at least a public facility. People can go there and have access. This will not be a public facility. For members who are unaware, although most are aware, the south metropolitan area for this development is industrial land in varying states of readiness for redevelopment. A large part of the clean-up of the area has been paid for by the Government - taxpayers - rather than by the developers. Members must bear in mind that the Government has invested large sums of money in this development and will be unlikely to see a return of that money.

Six per cent of the existing foreshore is in private ownership; that is, not the ocean, as no part of the ocean belongs in private hands. However, with the urban zoning of the land, the Government will provide almost 45 hectares of ocean for private rather than public needs. It is interesting to note the Premier's express desire to enshrine the coastline in public ownership. However, what is happening here is exactly the opposite. The Premier makes iconic statements and does nothing to follow them through; in fact, he does exactly the opposite. I could refer to many other planning areas that point to why this metropolitan region scheme amendment is an extremely poor decision, but we must also consider other issues.

Hon Alan Cadby; Hon Jim Scott; Deputy President; Hon Kate Doust; Hon Norman Moore; Hon Ken Travers;
Deputy President (hon George Cash)

Some time back I asked some questions in the House about the allowance the development would make for the rise in sea level. The answer I was given at the time was 0.3 of a metre. I was informed in answer to another question in the House that the Western Australian Planning Commission has set a figure of 0.38 of a metre, which is higher than is proposed for this development. However, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change talks about a level of 0.6 of a metre being the most likely figure for the rise in sea level in the next 100 years. As members know, a wide range of predictions has been made about the coastal rise in sea level. Figures indicate that a constant rise in ocean levels is occurring in the Fremantle area. We can therefore see that this rise is already under way. The rise has been going on for centuries but there is also what is known as the enhanced greenhouse effect, which causes an additional rise above any rise that has occurred in the past. Other developed countries realise they should not take risks with their coastlines due to the rise in sea level, as they will lose not only the built-up areas close to the coast that may need to be enclosed by revetment walls, but also all the low-lying areas. Those low-lying areas, of course, are the sandy beaches that everyone so enjoys. If we are serious in this State about protecting the interests of the public and the public's access to beaches, we should be doing whatever we can in planning terms to protect those areas from private ownership. Furthermore we, like the United States and Europe, must prevent development from occurring in any area that is likely to be inundated by seawater in the next 100 years. We are not doing that in Western Australia. This MRS amendment is an absolutely crazy and stupid thing. What is most stupid is to build into the ocean a canal estate that in no way can be protected from a rise in sea level. How can a revetment wall be built around a canal estate? What will the developers do; build in a lock? Will people drive their boats into the lock and be lifted up and brought into the canal estate? That is not likely. What is most likely is in about 40 or 50 years houses will start to disappear into the ocean as the rise in sea level starts to kick in and weather patterns become more extreme. There are people who do not believe that we have global warming, such as George W. Bush who is sitting in Florida at the moment talking to people who have suffered their third hurricane in a row in a very short space of time. Sooner or later the penny will drop even for people like George W. Bush.

There is a problem in this State and we must deal with it in planning terms. We must do everything we can to protect our coastal areas and ensure that coastal access is public coastal access and not private coastal access. The precedent that this metropolitan region scheme amendment sets will be the beginning of the end for public ownership of the coast. I believe that any member who votes for this amendment must get himself or herself ready for an onslaught of complaints from the public. The Greens (WA) will certainly ask the public to knock on members' doors. I support the motion.

HON KATE DOUST (South Metropolitan) [12.36 pm]: I oppose this disallowance motion. When I became a member of this place this development was one of the first issues in my electorate about which I was approached. I recall as a school student from the age of 13 passing this area on a daily basis. I recall also as an older teenager spending some of my spare time partying on the beaches in that area, not that my parents knew about it at the time.

Hon Simon O'Brien: I went there recently and saw the bottles!

Hon KATE DOUST: Soft drink, Hon Simon O'Brien, soft drink.

I have a fairly good idea of the area. Even back in the 1970s it was an industrial area; it was a dump; it was neglected; it was difficult to access; and it did not have the potential for usage that it could have had. I know that the proposals for change in this area have been a long time in coming to this point and that the previous Government was involved in the process. As Hon Jim Scott said, it is an issue that has divided the community. I have been inundated with letters and e-mails from people; I have had meetings with numerous people who have different points of view on the issue; I have spoken to councillors and other members in the area about the issue; and I have tried to get my head around the right way to deal with it. However, one thing that I have constantly said to everybody I have spoken to is that I support development of the area.

Hon Jim Scott: So does everyone.

Hon KATE DOUST: However, nothing will change if we do not support this MRS amendment. The area will continue to be a dump and an area that people are unable to access as they should be able to access. I believe this development is a positive initiative. The Government has done everything it possibly can: it has worked with the community, the council and the developers. All sorts of changes were made to the developers' initial proposals. I attended a meeting of the council a few months ago when the council endorsed this development. The meeting went for about three hours and focused only on this issue. Everyone who wanted to speak on the issue has been given ample opportunity and a fair hearing.

Hon Jim Scott alluded to a number of allegations. I have picked up over the past few years that the member has a tendency to fling about allegations. I think Hon Jim Scott must be a great fan of Oliver Stone movies as he has

Hon Alan Cadby; Hon Jim Scott; Deputy President; Hon Kate Doust; Hon Norman Moore; Hon Ken Travers;
Deputy President (hon George Cash)

a lot of conspiracy theories. If people do not agree with Hon Jim Scott, they must be wrong or they must be corrupt or -

Hon Graham Giffard: They must be bad.

Hon KATE DOUST: That is right. The member has some issues. If he believes things are happening, he should provide concrete proof. Similar allegations have been made in some letters I have received recently. The people who say these things must have proof. A lot of misinformation has been pumped into the community about this issue. People from the coastal action group have said, "We're not opposed to development, but . . ." I thought that if the processes were worked through and the umpire were to say "Bang - here is the decision", they would accept it. That was not the case. Interestingly, some people involved in that group have written lately and said that they followed and supported that group, but they are now not happy because the group has been providing misinformation. One letter reads -

. . . when it comes to turning our local development issues into political footballs -

As Hon Jim Scott is doing -

the only losers are local ratepayers, who pay for the delays and conflict caused by an over-zealous few.

If Hon Jim Scott has his way, the local community will be the losers. These people want to see changes and they want people to be able to access the area. The campaign against these changes has been very well organised. In fact, it has extended to a how-to-oppose Port Catherine kit -

Hon Paddy Embry: What's that?

Hon KATE DOUST: It is this document, which I am happy to table. My office received a kit outlining how to go about opposing the proposal. It gives a detailed outline on what to put in letters to members of Parliament, what sort of allegations to make, how to apply pressure to people and what lines to use. Congratulations - good campaign.

Point of Order

Hon JIM SCOTT: Can I ask the member to identify the document?

Hon KATE DOUST: I am happy to do so.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon George Cash) Under standing orders, the member can be asked to identify a document.

Hon KATE DOUST: This document is called "Send in the Postcards...to Help Save Coogee". It has been sent out by the Coogee Coastal Action Coalition. It was received in my office.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The document is identified.

Debate Resumed

Hon KATE DOUST: One of the reasons the local community supports this development is that it will instigate a clean-up of the area. If any member has had the opportunity to visit the area, he or she would know that it is in great disrepair with industrial waste. It is difficult to navigate. A clean-up of the contaminated industrial site will improve the quality of water in Cockburn Sound. It will be of great environmental benefit. One constituent told me early in the piece that he had lived in the area all his life. He said that people say the development will wreck the environment, but he told me that he, a couple of his mates and a cousin went fishing in a boat the other night. They cast out the nets, and when they pulled them in, they found nothing there. He said there has been nothing there for years, and that he does not see that situation changing. He did not understand why people were opposing the development.

I firmly believe that the processes have been followed as they should have been. There has been extensive community consultation. The member alluded to the rally. Another comment made to me was that the local people who attended the rally in favour of the change walked home when it was all over, while those opposing the change got in their cars and drove home.

The extent of the consultation process has involved a parliamentary inquiry, one of the recommendations from which was to encourage the Government to support the change. The State Government through the minister has been working very hard to ensure that the best outcome possible can be reached for the community in the Cockburn area, but, in a broader sense, the wider community in Western Australia would like better access to that beach area.

Hon Alan Cadby; Hon Jim Scott; Deputy President; Hon Kate Doust; Hon Norman Moore; Hon Ken Travers;
Deputy President (hon George Cash)

Some positive changes negotiated are a resulting better area of beach, which will be a great family beach where children can swim safely. I would like to see that happen. There will be more than 7 000 square metres of public open space.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Hon Jim Scott has had a fair go and a chance to speak. This is Hon Kate Doust's go.

Hon KATE DOUST: Another 39 public boat pens will be provided, along with a promenade and boardwalks along the waterfront. At the moment people must walk among bricks, broken glass and other refuse. Boating, fishing, diving, sailing, snorkelling, swimming and canoeing opportunities will be improved. A disabled fishing platform will be provided on the groynes with public boat tie-ups and berths.

Other constituents from Cockburn told me that on the night of the council meeting that they were really pleased the development was to go ahead. Their child or mother is in a wheelchair. They would like to go to the area, but they can currently only pull into the small car park. Therefore, disabled people cannot get on the beach. For people with disabilities, this development will be an improvement. Additional public parking will be provided for people travelling to Port Coogee. Nine hectares of land in parks and public open space will be provided, along with better picnic facilities - I am not too sure whether they exist at the moment. An extensive network of pedestrian and cycling paths will weave through the estate, and children's playgrounds will be provided, which will be very attractive for families. There will be a permanent berthing area for the community tall sailing ship project.

The economic benefit to the community is that close to 500 direct jobs will be provided in the preparation and construction phase of the project, and about 560 indirect jobs will be created in the broader community. It involves the establishment of a tourism and recreation node. The member talked about whether a hotel would be involved. I understand that a proposed hotel-serviced apartments development is proposed, which is a great prospect for those people from out of the area - even those from country regions - who may want to stay close to the beach.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order, Hon Jim Scott!

Hon KATE DOUST: We cannot leave the area as it is for another 20 or 30 years. We must support some sort of change. There has been enough time and negotiation and sensible compromise reached to get to this point so that the local community at Coogee can benefit from the change; namely, better access and better facilities, as well as flow-on economic benefits to the local community. Also, the wider community of Western Australia will profit from this proposal. I think Hon Jim Scott is opposed to change in any way, shape or form. He has not said a single positive thing about change in this area, and neither have some of his colleagues. People have approached me of late with alternative suggestions, some of which are very attractive and well thought out. Something has to happen. Something has to change. I look forward to development in that area; I look forward to seeing constituents enjoying the change in the area; and I look forward to taking my family to the area. If we oppose the disallowance and support the metropolitan region scheme amendment, it will be a positive all the way for the Western Australian community.

HON NORMAN MOORE (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the Opposition) [12.49 am]: How I hate to see the coalition opposite falling out about such things - it is quite distressing.

The Opposition recognises that this is a contention issue. There are strong views on both sides of the question. We have sought to understand what the development means, what it contains, what its consequences will be for the environment and access to the beach, and all the other issues that have been raised by Hon Jim Scott today. We have discussed this within the coalition party room and have come to the conclusion that we should oppose the disallowance and support the development. We believe that it meets the Government's planning, environmental and engineering requirements. As Hon Kate Doust so eloquently said, it will be a very good development for that part of the south metropolitan coastline, which, as we all know, was a blighted industrial area. I listened with interest to Hon Jim Scott's arguments and to those put to me by others that this development will limit people's access to the coast. The coastline of Western Australia is, I think, 12 000 kilometres and this will take up about 500 metres of it. I keep wondering to myself why people who oppose these developments oppose anything happening anywhere near the beach and that the whole beach from Wyndham around to Eucla should be available for public access. It is nonsense. Vast areas of beachfront in Western Australia are available to the public and very little of it has been developed.

However, I find this Government's approach extraordinarily inconsistent. I listened with some amusement to Hon Kate Doust's speech in promoting this development. It reminded me of a speech I made on the Mauds Landing development. I said on behalf of the people of the north west that we would like something like that. I argued that the Mauds Landing development would be good for the people of my electorate just as, for all the

Hon Alan Cadby; Hon Jim Scott; Deputy President; Hon Kate Doust; Hon Norman Moore; Hon Ken Travers;
Deputy President (hon George Cash)

same reasons, she argued on behalf of the people of the South Metropolitan Region that the Coogee development is good for them. I find the Government's decision-making process extraordinarily inconsistent. I wrote down a comment made by Hon Kate Doust, who said, "A lot of misinformation has been pumped into the community over this issue". Hear, hear! Vast amounts of misinformation have been spread on both issues. Hon Jim Scott referred to the poor people who circulated all the stickers about Ningaloo Reef and who he said were up against massive international corporations that spend all their money on defeating them.

Hon John Fischer: I don't think he realises how they have been drilled.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: That is exactly right. They are part of a highly organised well-funded campaign involving people we do not know, although I know who provided some of the funds for the Ningaloo Reef campaign.

I will not prolong the debate other than to say to people who oppose the Coogee development and the Mauds Landing development - I suspect they comprise many of the same people - should see what the Government has in mind for Coral Bay. It proposes to double its size and to build an off-shore island to provide for boat-launching facilities in the nursery zone of Coral Bay. I wonder what on earth the people in the public gallery today and those who oppose the Mauds Landing development think about the proposed development at Coral Bay. Let us get some consistency into this debate and recognise that people like having access to the coast and that they find the development of marinas and residential developments on the coast desirable. It is interesting that the Government can see merit in the development of Coogee, as described by Hon Kate Doust, but could find no merit at all in the development of Mauds Landing, and intends to double the size of Coral Bay. I cannot understand this Government's approach to environmental issues. However, that is a debate I have been involved in for some time and will continue to argue because I would like to see some consistency from this Government.

I will send Hon Kate Doust's speech to members in my electorate saying, "This is the Government's approach to what the people in the metropolitan area should have. What a pity they don't have the same views about what people in the north west would like." On that note, the Opposition will not support the disallowance and we hope that the development proceeds as planned and that the people of the South Metropolitan Region and, indeed, the rest of the State benefit from what I think is a very good development.

HON KEN TRAVERS (North Metropolitan - Parliamentary Secretary) [12.54]: I also agree that this issue has created an enormous amount of heat in the local community. It is unfortunate that that heat has been generated, but issues of this nature are contentious. Therefore, people need to dissipate some of the heat and consider the basic facts. We must all appreciate that everyone has a right to their view on these matters but, ultimately, a decision must be made one way or the other. I think Hon Kate Doust adequately outlined many of the benefits of this development and the history of the land and how this MRS amendment will transform an historically industrial area into something that I think Western Australians will be proud of. The details of the issues leading up to this position have been examined by a committee in the other place. As Hon Kate Doust quite rightly said, it recommended that we continue with that process and the community will benefit.

Hon Jim Scott interjected.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I will happily go through those points raised by Hon Jim Scott. Although we can talk about whether it is urban or not, the issue is whether the public will be able to get greater access to the coastline than they do. The answer is yes, as a result of this MRS amendment, they will get better access because, in most cases, the land is privately owned. At present, people go through privately-owned land to access parts of the beach. This MRS amendment will create quite wide public thoroughfares. The public will have access to the groynes, and people understand the benefits of groynes. Cycleways will allow access up and down that coastline. There will be significant areas of public beach, one in the marina and one to the north of the marina, which will provide better access and facilities for people who want to recreate. The beach most loved by the people of the northern suburbs is the beach inside the Hillarys marina where they can take their young families. It is heavily utilised. Similar opportunities will be provided at Coogee. I will not have the time to go through the history of this development, but I urge members to examine the proposals from when the design concept started in 1994 to the position today. A lot more canal developments were originally proposed. I congratulate the minister and everyone involved in the work they have done in negotiating the current proposed structure plan, which has significantly reduced the urban component of it and increased the areas for public access, public boat pens and the like. The proposed number of boat pens has increased from 150 to more than 300. I say to Hon Jim Scott that 300 more boat pens could be catered for at Coogee in the same way they have been catered for at Hillarys but that would require an even bigger marina. I am sure he is not seeking that. Public access of 20 to 30 metres will be provided and access will be available to the south.

A public boat ramp will be provided within the surrounding area as a result of this development. The most suitable location for that is still to be determined. The beach areas will be enhanced, boat pens will be built and

Hon Alan Cadby; Hon Jim Scott; Deputy President; Hon Kate Doust; Hon Norman Moore; Hon Ken Travers;
Deputy President (hon George Cash)

urbanisation of the canal development will be significantly reduced to increase public benefits, public open space and the like.

Hon Jim Scott interjected.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I will not debate the issues of Coral Bay -

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon George Cash): Order! Hon Jim Scott's interjections are not being responded to. They are not being recorded by the Hansard reporter, so let us just listen to the parliamentary secretary.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The other issue is that the proposed Coogee development is significantly different from Mauds Landing but today is not the day to debate that issue. I am more than happy to go through the comparative environmental impacts and a range of other issues at another stage.

Community consultation, an underlying theme of Hon Jim Scott, has been exhaustive. The level of heat in this debate highlights that people have been informed and have had an opportunity to have a say on this matter. I have friends in the South Metropolitan Region and I know this debate regularly appears in their local community newspaper. The issues have been adequately addressed and I urge members to read the MRS report on submissions, which I think highlights carefully how coastal planning issues have been considered. There is a need for node developments; that is provided for under the coastal planning policy. This is one of those nodes that will provide a better facility for people of the South Metropolitan Region. I urge members to oppose the disallowance motion.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I heard only one no and, according to the standing orders, a division is not held when there is only one person in the negative.

Question put and negatived.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 to 2.00 pm