

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES AND  
FINANCIAL OPERATIONS**

**2015–16 ANNUAL REPORT HEARINGS**

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE  
TAKEN AT PERTH  
TUESDAY, 25 OCTOBER 2016**

**SESSION FOUR  
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING  
WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Members**

**Hon Rick Mazza (Chair)  
Hon Peter Katsambanis (Deputy Chair)  
Hon Alanna Clohesy  
Hon Helen Morton  
Hon Sally Talbot**

---

**Hearing commenced at 1.45 pm**

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER**  
**Minister for Planning, examined:**

**Ms GAIL McGOWAN**  
**Director General, examined:**

**Mr GLEN FINN**  
**Director, Urban Design and Development, examined:**

**Mr TIMOTHY HILLYARD**  
**Chief Property Officer, examined:**

**Mr JOHN DEERY**  
**Chief Financial Officer, examined:**

**Mr ERIC LUMSDEN**  
**Chairman, Western Australian Planning Commission, examined:**

**The CHAIR:** On behalf of the Legislative Council Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations, I welcome you to today's hearing. Can the witnesses confirm that they have read, understood and signed a document headed "Information for Witnesses"?

**The Witnesses:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** It is essential that all your testimony before the committee is complete and truthful to the best of your knowledge. This hearing is being recorded by Hansard and a transcript of your evidence will be provided to you. It is also being broadcast live on the Parliament website. The hearing is being held in public, although there is discretion available to the committee to hear evidence in private. If for some reason you wish to make a confidential statement during today's proceedings, you should request that the evidence be taken in closed session before answering the question. Agencies and departments have an important role and duty in assisting the Parliament to review agency outcomes and the committee values your assistance in this.

Do you have an opening statement?

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** No, I do not believe so.

**The CHAIR:** I was going to say that if you do, we do not have time, so we were going to put it in the Hansard.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** Okay; there we are. That answers that question, does it not?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** The department and the commission are here at the same time, so I will start with the commission, if that is okay.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** That is what I was going to ask you—if we were going to go from one to the other and which one we would go to first. I am relaxed.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** That is important to me, minister, so we will start. With respect to the commission's annual report, I want to ask some questions about Bush Forever. Page 32 of the report refers to the purchasers in respect of Bush Forever. My questions are: How many sites are left to be acquired? What is the estimated value of sites that are still to be acquired? I doubt that you will have this with you, so you might like to take it as supplementary information, but can you provide the committee with a list of the sites that are required to be acquired?

---

[1.50 pm]

**Mr Lumsden:** The short answer is: a few to go. We have had quite an aggressive acquisition program over the last 12 months, but in terms of the specifics, I will ask Mr Hillyard if he can assist you in that regard.

**Mr Hillyard:** It needs to be clarified that the report that is done as part of the Bush Forever purchases relates to those additional properties that are reserved in the metropolitan region scheme for the Bush Forever policy, and there remain 19 properties still to be purchased. One of those is owned by the commonwealth, one is owned by the Department of Housing and 17 remain as private properties. There is no particular value that has been ascribed to them. As part of the work that is being done for the strategic assessment for Perth and Peel region, valuations are being undertaken for all properties that are still to be purchased, so that involves sites that were reserved for, let us say, the Yellagonga Regional Park, which is a Bush Forever site. Any outstanding private properties within those regional parks, we have them all identified, but they are not part of that \$100 million program. They are purchased, as the chairman of the Planning Commission said, on an annual program.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Thank you. You do know a lot of things off the top of your head—I remember thinking that last time—but, if you cannot do it now, are you able to give us a list of the 19 sites?

**Mr Hillyard:** Certainly, but we would have to provide that as supplementary information.

[*Supplementary Information No D1.*]

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** On to the infrastructure coordinating committee. The reference is on page 23 of the annual report. I have a couple of questions about that. In respect of the actual ICC, are you able to tell me how many times it met in 2015–16? Who are the members, and what are the major projects or plans that they discussed? The paragraph below that refers to the steering group, and I am interested in the membership of that as well.

**Mr Lumsden:** The membership of the ICC includes a number of public servants, who are directors general. That has met, I think from memory, about four times, but due to the process of refining the ICC, and it becoming more focused, we have set up, through the cooperation of directors general, a senior officers' group. That meets at least every two months, or as required. They have been working through assessing all the infrastructure required for the Perth and Peel, as part of the development of the Perth and Peel frameworks. The ICC also assessed—through the senior officers' group, but also through the ICC itself—the regional infrastructure planning strategy we developed over the last two years, in terms of assessing priorities. The ICC is far more focused and involved in determining all the infrastructure, but its main task at the moment has been focusing on, other than resolving disputes between agencies and that is in terms of priorities or issues—that is being done through the senior officers' group. But overall the focus has been getting a full understanding of the suite of infrastructure required to implement Perth and Peel@3.5 million. I can give you the detail of the membership as supplementary information.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** And the membership of the steering group?

**Mr Lumsden:** I can do that as well.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** And the membership of the senior officers' group.

**Mr Lumsden:** Yes.

[*Supplementary Information No D2.*]

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Just so that I make sure that I understand it, you are saying the major focus has been about Peel.

---

**Mr Lumsden:** Perth and Peel—yes, that is correct, because the infrastructure priorities have already been identified as part of the other regions, so the remaining regions to be identified are Perth and Peel, where, as you can appreciate, there is a lot of planning work going on.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Thank you for that. I will keep going until you stop me, chair.

**The CHAIR:** I will let you go a little longer, and then we will give another member a go.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** All right, thanks. I do have questions about the department as well, but I will stay on the commission for the moment. Page 23 refers to the Perth convention precinct master plan, and I wanted to ask you: What stage is the master plan at? When will something be ready to go formally to the government for consideration?

**Mr Lumsden:** In answer to the last part of your question, shortly. The master plan has been prepared and is being reviewed by the Central Perth Planning Committee, but for the detail I will hand over to Mr Finn, who has been the project manager for the area.

**Mr Finn:** The convention precinct master plan in its draft form has been presented to the central Perth planning committee. We are currently in the process of finalising an accompanying business case, and we expect that that will be submitted through the commission and up to government by the end of the year.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** I will stick with the plan, and ask you some WAPC questions first. Can I just ask you, first of all, a quick question about the Perth–Peel green growth plan? There is a reference on page 22 to, and I quote —

... significant upfront avoidance of over 16 000 hectares of impacts to native vegetation ...

Can you tell us a bit more about that? How has that impact been avoided?

**Mr Lumsden:** Yes, certainly. In answering your question, I will need to give you some background. The commission has been working closely, through the Department of Planning, with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, which is leading the development of the green growth plan. As part of the process, we have—by “we” I mean the commission—resolved to integrate the outcomes from the green growth plan into our Perth and Peel regional frameworks. The approach of the commission has been that where significant areas of vegetation or other environmental issues have been identified as part of the green growth plan, we would take an avoidance approach to any proposal for urban, industrial or rural residential land. In other words, we are putting a high weighting on the environmental attributes that have been identified by the green growth plan, in addition to those high-value attributes that have also been identified through the office of the EPA. What we are intending to do is to recognise—as part of the program for Perth and Peel, but also in the requirements of our legislation—to put a high value on what I will call major areas of environmental significance at either the commonwealth or the state level, so that we do not promote future development in any area that would have those values compromised.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** So they are for preservation, not land swaps —

**Mr Lumsden:** When you say “land swaps”, the only aspect I think you could be referring to is —

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** I am sorry—offsets; land swaps and offsets.

**Mr Lumsden:** Offsets have been occurring in the past, mainly through commonwealth negotiations, and they were giving the state some concern in terms of what I will call a somewhat ad hoc approach, not only where offsets were being negotiated, but also where the offsets may be being used to acquire land. We have taken the view—when I say “we”, I am speaking on behalf of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet as well—to try to ensure that, if there are offsets agreed to, that they are identified to be of value in terms of the land concerned, and also taking an approach that where offsets are to be negotiated, we are actually adding value to the conservation estate, not simply doing a straight trade. The green growth plan, as you are probably aware, honourable

member, is still being developed and worked through, but from the commission's point of view, I am satisfied that when we—that is, the commission—make final recommendations to the government, any proposals of the commission will be in strong alignment with the proposals of the green growth plan and not contradictory to it.

[2.00 pm]

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** Okay. Thank you. Can I take you now to page 33, where it says that nine lots were transferred to Main Roads for \$2.2 million for the Perth Freight Link. First of all, can you give us details of the nine lots?

**Mr Lumsden:** Yes. They are basically a refinement in terms of those links in terms of reservations. For the detail, I will ask my memory bank on my left to answer that question. Thank you, Tim.

**Mr Hillyard:** Thank you. I think we would have to provide you with the details of that—some of the properties have been included in the list of materials that were provided to the preliminary questions, I think.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** I think they were the questions asked by Hon Sue Ellery.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** Right. So have we got the dates purchased and the prices and when they were transferred to the MRD?

**Mr Hillyard:** I do not think they are covered in that.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** I will just give you that. If it has already been asked, you can cross-reference it. I am looking for what were the nine lots; when were they purchased by WAPC; for what price; and what was the date of the transfer to the MRD?

**Mr Hillyard:** That would be a matter that we would provide that information as supplementary.

[*Supplementary Information No D3.*]

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** One page on, the Whiteman Park draft strategy. When is that draft going to be finalised?

**Mr Lumsden:** As you would be aware, honourable member, that has been out for public comment. That comment has concluded as I believe, or close to being concluded. Then we would anticipate, I would hope, that being finalised by the end of this year.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** What is the close-off date for submissions on that? Has that not passed yet?

**Mr Lumsden:** Last week.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** Okay. Do you know how many submissions you received?

**Mr Lumsden:** No. We would have to check that.

[*Supplementary Information No D4.*]

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** It only closed last week, so we will just clarify the exact number.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** Specifically, are you aware of concerns that have been raised about the location of the cemetery on Marshall Road?

**Mr Lumsden:** Yes.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** What is the nature of those concerns?

**Mr Lumsden:** The nature of the concerns that I am aware of, subject to receiving the reports on the submissions, has been, one, is the site appropriate for a cemetery. But also there are other users, such as the rifle club. Their representatives have made some comment about not being an appropriate adjacent land use. I will stop there, I think.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** Okay. Are you going to publish the submissions?

---

**Mr Lumsden:** We normally do it as part of an overall report. There will be a report on the submissions. So that will be part of the public document.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** So that will be made available when the final report —

**Mr Lumsden:** Correct.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** I see.

**Mr Lumsden:** What happens is that the report goes to the commission, complete with submissions. The department gives comment on the submissions as to their validity or various aspects for consideration. The commission then considers those submissions as part of the overall report from the department prior to making a decision.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** There is a fantastic table on page 12 and 13. Can I ask you in relation to the categories “major”, “minor” and “other”, what is the process for attributing the status “major”, “minor” and “other” to these projects? What criteria are taken into account in making that assessment?

**Mr Lumsden:** It is an assessment made by Department of Planning staff on the potential impacts of the amendment. For instance, is it a refinement of a current reservation or zoning? Are there major impacts from the proposal, such as, a major road corridor would be considered a major amendment? A refinement to a reservation made under something else that was of concern would be considered a minor. So it goes through a process within the department to assess what are the implications of the amendment and whether it has major or minor impacts.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** You can see that Roe 8 is three from the bottom on page 13. How does that get categorised? What exactly is that heading “other”? It is the far right-hand column on page 13.

**Mr Lumsden:** Some of them are obviously planning control areas, and others may be just some refinements. Do you want to add to that, Tim?

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** How is Roe 8 considered in the category of a planning control area and not a normal MRS amendment?

**Mr Lumsden:** Okay. I will partly answer and I will ask Mr Hillyard also to add if he wishes to. As I said before, in terms of when we are looking at refinements to reservations, it may be required, whilst we are refining or coming to a conclusion as to what those refinements would be, to put in a planning control area to protect the options available to the commission prior to initiating an amendment. A planning control area normally puts aside an area of land for further examination, because any refinements to the existing reservation may be of a number of options. It also allows us to ensure that the process and the people who may be impacted upon are advised at the most earliest possible opportunity rather than waiting for an amendment to go through the system. Tim, do you want to add to that?

**Mr Hillyard:** If I could provide some additional information, and I will answer the other component of the other list that is there. In terms of Roe Highway, that is a slightly unusual circumstance because the reservation that was in the metropolitan region scheme many years ago was not assessed environmentally. When Main Roads was proposing their current development for Roe stage 8, the project would need to be assessed. So it was proposed that the refinement of the road that they would construct would be assessed by the EPA as a project and then the metropolitan region scheme would be amended after the event. As it occurred there, the road was deviated to north and goes outside of the current metropolitan region scheme reservation. As a result of that detailed work that was done by the project that was assessed by the EPA, the planning commission put a planning control area over the additional land that went outside of the current primary regional road reservation in the metropolitan region scheme, including land where there was a refinement of

the road to go through the corner of Murdoch University. So in that case it is a question of the project being assessed rather than the metropolitan region scheme amendment.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** So in fact an MRS amendment was not an option that was available to you?

**Mr Hillyard:** It would have been possible, but the work on the final alignment of the project in response to further environmental work today versus what occurred in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s required that the project itself be completely reconsidered, and also the connections through to the Murdoch activity corridor or centre area given the decision to build Fiona Stanley where it is now and the requirements for road connections et cetera. Going back to the chart on page 12, the other items that are there which are not major or minor amendments are the items which have a 27 after them—1305 and 1307. They are what is called a clause 27 of the scheme text, and it involves land transferring from the urban deferred zone to the urban zone once the issues that had it under the deferred zone are resolved. They are issues such as servicing capacity et cetera. The planning control areas are a planning instrument and they require the commission to proceed with either consideration of the initiation of an MRS amendment or the planning control area expires after five years. Finally, in terms of the major or minor process, there is a development control policy, which is a public document produced by the WAPC, which sets out the issues and considerations that are required. That followed a Supreme Court case many years ago known as the Helena Valley case where the commission's decision to rezone land under a minor amendment was challenged, and that has clarified the issues.

[2.10 pm]

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** Okay; thank you.

**Mr Lumsden:** Through you, Mr Chairman, I just might add that planning control being put over an area of land prior to any amendment to the MRS is a common approach —

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** It is a common approach.

**Mr Lumsden:** — and common practice of the commission.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** Hon Peter Katsambanis, did you have a question on this subject?

**Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS:** Not on this subject. I do have questions generally, but, more importantly, I said in the previous hearing that we had about people listening in—people are listening in but are finding it very, very hard to hear, so could we either adjust the sound volume or could witnesses speak louder and into the microphone? That would be really helpful.

**The CHAIR:** Noted. Just on page 25, before we move on to the next member, I have some questions on the bushfire reforms. I asked a couple of questions of DFES this morning, but they have handballed it to you.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** Did they?

**The CHAIR:** Yes, they did!

Just in relation to the bushfire attack level assessors, how many of those do we have at level 1 at this stage?

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** I think the director general might be able to assist on that.

**Ms McGowan:** Yes. We currently have 42 accredited level 1 assessors, seven level 2 and three level 3 bushfire planning practitioners accredited.

**The CHAIR:** Who actually undertakes the training of those assessors?

**Ms McGowan:** The Fire Protection Association Australia; they were the successful tenderers for that.

---

**The CHAIR:** Okay; right. Actually, I think that might have been mentioned this morning. How many did you say there were at level 3?

**Ms McGowan:** There are three level 3, so there is not a lot, but we are in the process of training more at the moment.

**The CHAIR:** Okay. Three is not very many, because, obviously, there are quite a lot of bushfire-prone areas. With the different levels of the BAL assessments up to FZ, I think, which is the flame zone, it has been suggested to me that there are some developed blocks that people have maybe held for 10 or 15 years that now effectively they cannot build on. Is that a misconception by people, or is there actually some truth behind that?

**Ms McGowan:** There are a number of implementation issues that we are working through—some quite legitimate concerns where someone feels as though they have been caught out by the changes. I met with the DFES commissioner and the Building Commissioner a couple of weeks ago and there are probably two associated issues. One is that there has probably been a fairly stringent, for want of a better word, application of the policy guidelines, and the discretions available under the policy framework probably have not been utilised. We make no apologies for putting a premium on saving lives and recognising the risk of bushfires across the state, but we also want to make sure there is a practical approach taken. The commission has recently revised its planning bulletin and is working through the guidelines at the moment. Equally, the WAPC chairman as well as the fire commissioner and the Building Commissioner and I have written to local governments to remind them of those issues where there is some need to be practical in terms of approach. We are looking at each of those issues as they come to us and just working to make sure the intent of the regulations is actually being implemented.

**The CHAIR:** Where there is a little bit of not misunderstanding, but they are not quite sure—one of the planning departments in one of the shires is not quite sure of the application of some of these BALs—they then refer to you guys.

**Ms McGowan:** It depends on the situation, but normally the person that would issue the building licence—because if a lot is under 1 100 square metres, it does not need planning approval, but they will still need their building permit. It would ordinarily be someone like the building surveyor who would issue that permit, so if it is a question about them applying it or local government applying it, the question would ordinarily go to the Building Commissioner, but we are finding that a number of questions come to us as the Department of Planning because people just assume it sits with us. We work collaboratively with the other agencies to make sure there is a response given.

**The CHAIR:** Just so I have this clear, if it is under 1 100 square metres, it does not need planning approval if someone puts a building application in to the shire. If it does not need planning approval, do they still need to get a BAL assessment if it is in a fire-prone area?

**Ms McGowan:** Yes, if it is in a fire zone area, they must still comply with the Building Code of Australia, which requires a BAL assessment in those situations. That is the difference. Just because it does not need a planning approval, it may still need a building approval.

**The CHAIR:** Some of the concerns that these people have where they effectively say they cannot build on the block because maybe it is in an FZ category, how are you working with them to try to overcome the loss of them being able to build on that block or the substantial imposts in costs to comply?

**Ms McGowan:** We would be encouraging anyone—if it is in a high-risk or an extreme level anyway, obviously the intent is to try to limit the amount of construction there, but for those people who have existing blocks et cetera, if their assessment level is BAL 29 or above, there is a requirement to comply with the Building Code of Australia, which means they must have those additional protections in place for residences. Outbuildings, additions, extensions or anything that was in place prior to the regulations coming in are not covered.

---

**The CHAIR:** So there is no retrospective refit —

**Ms McGowan:** There is no retrospectivity on it.

**The CHAIR:** Okay. Thank you for that. We might move on to Hon Peter Katsambanis.

**Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS:** Thank you. I want to refer to the coastal zone management that is referred to on page 26 of the annual report. It talks about a new high-resolution bathymetric LiDAR survey from Hillarys to Horrocks, including the Abrolhos Islands et cetera, and how that survey will enable better modelling of storm surge, sea level rise impacts, coastal vulnerability and the like. When is that survey, or the results of the survey, likely to be made public?

**Ms McGowan:** I will have to get the specific details there, but certainly data collected in the LiDAR survey from Two Rocks to Geraldton will support the application of our coastal zone policy, but I would have to get confirmation of when it is likely to be made publicly available and when it will be completed. The department made a contribution of \$700 000 towards that survey work through the commission, because it was determined that that area of the coastline is particularly vulnerable and it would benefit from having a greater understanding of the bathymetry in the area.

**Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS:** Can we have that on notice?

*[Supplementary Information No D5.]*

**Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS:** Has that work been made available to any local government authorities?

**Ms McGowan:** I know we have worked quite closely with the areas around Jurien and Seabird et cetera, so I am assuming the answer would be yes, but I cannot confirm; I know we have assisted them with a lot of the work.

**Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS:** My specific focus was a little bit south of that. The City of Joondalup has undertaken a coastal hazard assessment recently that has caused significant consternation. Do you have any knowledge or optics around that coastal hazard assessment undertaken by the City of Joondalup?

**Ms McGowan:** Certainly, we know that the city has been engaging with potentially affected property owners and stakeholders and that they are developing a local coastal planning policy, and we understand that that is due to be advertised for community comment in late 2016. I am not sure whether it has been advertised at this point in time, but basically the requirements of the state coastal planning policy or the state coastal planning requires these coastal hazard risk assessment processes to be undertaken. Certainly, some of the risk areas that have been identified under mainly the Department of Transport's coastal modelling suggest that there is a vulnerability on that coast. I am very aware that the work has been undertaken; I am not sure if anyone has any further information.

[2.20 pm]

**Mr Lumsden:** No. I am aware that work has been undertaken but one of the objectives is to have a consistent approach for the coast. By having said a consistent approach, it needs that type of information so that we have integrated information for the whole coast because the coastline varies. Also, the hazards involving that area of coast going from Geraldton south also varies in terms of intensity and in terms of climate change. If a local government is doing a study in its own right, we need to have some, I will use the expression “benchmark”, or some base data to assess their proposal.

**Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS:** I am glad, Mr Lumsden, that you used the word “consistency” because, from the feedback I have had so far, a lot of the concern is around consistency. I would imagine that as a starting point to that consistency, you would want to have consistency in

methodology across the coast. I seek from you whether there is any consistent methodology that has been applied by individual local government authorities or even whether local government authorities themselves are best placed to undertake this work given the need to have a consistent approach, certainty in methodology and as much certainty as we can possibly have—in what is an area of a bit of guesswork—around the science of that methodology.

**Mr Lumsden:** I cannot specifically answer that question because I have not seen the data, but certainly the commission would like to see some consistency of approach in terms of the methodology, and also the ability of the information to be assessed would depend on who the local governments use from a consultancy perspective. Obviously, in terms of some areas, there are differing abilities of councils to fund—bearing in mind, you do have varying degrees of financial capability of local governments up and down the coast—adequately that type of information. We recognise as a commission that coastal zone management is important. It is becoming even more critical because of climate change and other sea events. It is also necessary to have that information to, as I indicated earlier, have some ability to give an objective assessment of what is being proposed. Does it have a high degree of validity or are there perhaps a number of assumptions that need to be further examined?

**Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS:** I am not questioning —

**Mr Lumsden:** Sorry, I cannot answer any more than that.

**Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS:** No, I understand that, but I think this is an important area. I am not questioning this particular council's financial capacity to undertake the work—it is a good, solid, financially stable council. I am also not questioning their goodwill. I agree with exactly what you said; it is something that we need to look at urgently. Perhaps the only thing we can fault them on—which is not a fault at all—is that they are actually undertaking the work earlier than some other councils. I do not think that we should fault them or punish them for that. It is just that when landowners receive documentation as a result of this work, their first fear is, “How will this impact on the value of my property?” We are talking about significant value of coastal property. They are worried—very concerned—that this will become some sort of registrable instrument upon title and I would like a bit of clarity around that. Is any of this coastal hazard assessment going to be registered on individual titles of individual properties?

**Mr Lumsden:** I cannot answer that question at this stage. It is a possibility but I would not say that it is a certainty.

**Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS:** Who would make the decision to turn that possibility into a certainty? Could it be done at local government level or would it have to be done legislatively?

**Ms McGowan:** Through you, Chair: certainly we now have a state coastal erosion inundation strategy or an advisory group that is jointly coordinated through the Department of Planning and the Department of Transport. That is actually then supported through the coastal zone management program—the assistance program—which provides grants to local governments to actually help them support policies. Clearly, there is a question of the extent to which it is possible. Clearly, we cannot stop coastal inundation and the strategies to manage it are obviously mixed across a range of areas. The idea of supporting and providing advice and assistance to local governments to develop those strategies, and also to actually look to try to avoid future greenfield development where there is erosion or inundation risk areas, will be a significant one. That is where possibly, in the future, if there is greenfield development on any of those areas where you may be looking at notifications on title, for the question of existing residences, there has been no talk of putting notifications on existing titles, certainly at state government level. Whether any local governments have gone down that track, I am not aware. Our Coastwest grants program provides funds to partnerships of local governments and Aboriginal land councils and community groups. There is \$330 000 per annum in 2016–17, and to do the coastal management plan assistance there is a pool of \$277 000 available in 2016–17. What we have done, through bringing together the Department of Transport, the

Department of Planning and, to some degree, the Department of Lands in this advisory group, is combine the available funds to get best effect and best assistance and that consistency that you are talking about.

**Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS:** Okay, but I still want a little bit of clarity, if you can provide it, whether now or on notice. If a particular local government authority—I am not suggesting that this is something that the City of Joondalup is contemplating; it is just a potential fear raised by residents—was minded to make a notification on title about the findings of their coastal hazard assessment, is that currently permitted under the existing legislative and regulatory framework?

**Mr Lumsden:** From my understanding of what you are saying, honourable member, that would be difficult. Where this would come into effect, to give you a more direct answer, is that if the commission had before it an application to rezone land or to subdivide land, which requires the approval of the commission, it would take into account whether a reservation was proposed and whether the reservation was adequate in terms of coastal erosion. It takes into account whether the information indicates that perhaps certain lot designs need to be changed. The commission would take that information into account in its decision-making role for either the approval of a rezoning or a structure panel or a subdivision. In terms of a subdivision, if it felt it was warranted—but I am not saying this is the case—for instance, there have been other, I call it impediments on properties where the commission may have felt it was appropriate to indicate a notice or a memorial on the title so that people cannot say, “We weren’t aware of this impact.” I have used that in a general context, not just on coastal erosion.

**Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS:** I understand that, which leads to a broader question, and again, it is not a question I am making up; it is a question that the people who are vitally interested in this particular coastal hazard assessment have raised with me continually. If there is any risk to their property in the future, prior to their property suffering any damage, there will be significant damage to existing, well-established, extraordinarily expensive, critical public infrastructure. I guess the flippant question that comes out of that, but very important question is: what are we doing about that?

**Mr Lumsden:** Through the state planning policy but also the investigations we are carrying out, obviously if we see—Seabird is a good example, I suppose, in hindsight—there is likely to be a major impact on infrastructure or private property or public facilities such as the surf club or something like that —

**Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS:** Surf club, road, underground services, overground services —

**Mr Lumsden:** — we would identify that because it means that we are identifying the risk and you need to then look at what are the planning solutions to mitigate that risk.

**Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS:** Yes; obviously, there are a range of them.

**Mr Lumsden:** For instance, I am very familiar with the coastline in Rockingham, which changes. Often the erosion, particularly from winter storms, can erode the Palm Beach–Rockingham Beach area and often it affects not only the beach, but also the road reserve and that needs to be re-established. We need to look at that incidence—what is the likelihood of it occurring and how it can be militated against. This is why we are, through the commission and through the cooperation of other agencies, putting on a lot more attention to coastal zone management so that we can become aware of where these issues are likely to occur ahead of the time when perhaps mitigation is urgently required. We are looking at it from an asset management perspective.

[2.30 pm]

**Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS:** Thank you. I could ask questions around this for a long time, but I will not. I think it is a topic that we might explore again in the future.

**The CHAIR:** We will move on.

---

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** With the south Bullsbrook intermodal terminal, first of all, something quite simple is the website address. I know that the planning process in part was completed last year. In the annual report, the website address is not in that table of MRS amendments on that; nor can I find it, by the way, which is going to be my next question.

**Mr Lumsden:** I will ask Mr Hillyard to answer that.

**Mr Hillyard:** The Bullsbrook intermodal facility is actually protected by one of these planning control areas. The work is currently being undertaken by the Department of Transport and their consultants, GHD, refining the actual requirements for that intermodal facility, and that will then lead to the initiation of a metropolitan region scheme amendment to define the area that would be affected by it.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** So that is different from MRS 1219/41.

**Mr Hillyard:** Yes.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** In what way is that different?

**Mr Hillyard:** That is the industrial area itself. The intermodal facility is basically just to the south west of the Pearce air base.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** So bordered by Warbrook Road and Railway Parade?

**Mr Hillyard:** It is just north of Stock Road. Yes, west of Railway Parade I think it is. There was a generalised area that was identified for the intermodal facility and, as I say, as a result of the work that is being done now, it is including all of the transport linkages in there and also the requirements for drainage et cetera.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Do the transport linkages in there include the northern gateway?

**Mr Hillyard:** It does to the extent of the connections to Stock Road, which goes to northern gateway.

**Mr Lumsden:** East–west links.

**Mr Hillyard:** Yes.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** East–west?

**Mr Lumsden:** East–west links.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** So where is that at in planning terms?

**Mr Hillyard:** The NorthLink?

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** The northern gateway.

**Mr Hillyard:** That is in the metropolitan region scheme already. That was completed.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** So that is in MRS 12 —

**Mr Hillyard:** Yes. Where it goes to the boundary of the MRS, there is a small section that goes outside.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** So that amendment report was completed, like, five years ago or something?

**Mr Hillyard:** It was a bit closer than that.

**Mr Lumsden:** Not that long ago.

**Mr Hillyard:** No, two to three years perhaps.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** We can come back to you.

**Mr Hillyard:** We can get you the details of when it became effective.

---

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** And the proponent for that?

**Mr Hillyard:** That was Main Roads.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** I can no longer find the detail of that either on the website. If you could put all of that together in a package, that would be useful.

**Mr Lumsden:** Certainly.

*[Supplementary Information No D6.]*

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** Can I just clarify just so we get you the right information? You are obviously referring perhaps to two different elements.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** I started about RS 1 and then moved to the second one.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** You are asking for information on both. We will incorporate an answer encompassing both; is that what you would like?

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Thank you, because they are obviously directly related to each other.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** That is fine. I just wanted to make sure we have got the right information.

**The CHAIR:** Just before we move to Hon Sue Ellery, just following on from what Hon Peter Katsambanis said about notifications on the coastal titles, and just getting back to the fire-prone areas, as I understand it, when you put in a building application or you get a planning application that is approved, it is usually conditional, and one of those conditions is that you register at your cost a section 70A notice to say that the property is in a fire-prone area. My concern, though, is that people could be buying those properties, particularly vacant land, that have not had a building or a planning approval on them not knowing that they actually are in a fire-prone area. What safeguards are there in place for people when they buy land to know that it is actually a fire prone–area block?

**Ms McGowan:** One of the reasons that the DFES commissioner, in issuing the map of fire-prone areas, has kept it very simple as a very simple binary map is that that information is readily available in the sense that it is quite easy to look up to see whether you are or are not in a fire-prone area and then make inquiries. It would be part of the normal due diligence on anyone seeking to buy a block of land, and it is certainly part of the approach we would be wanting to encourage—everyone to be aware that many areas of the state are in fire-prone areas. It does not mean that they necessarily have to do a whole lot of additional work, because it depends on the zone. But it would be part of that normal due diligence. In some of the conversations, we looked at whether those maps issued by the commissioner should be more granular in detail, and decided to keep it simple. The maps are updated at least once a year. I think new maps were issued in May of this year. I understand that DFES or the Office of Bushfire Risk Management is just about to go out to local governments again to actually seek their input into the next iteration of the maps to make sure that they are kept as current as they possibly can be.

**The CHAIR:** So what actually prompts buyers or mortgagees to look at that information? Are real estate agents and settlement agents made aware that they need to check as part of their due diligence?

**Mr Lumsden:** That is common practice. Whether it is a settlement agent or a solicitor, they have a standard practice of referring the property sale to the local government. The standard form ranges from, obviously, zoning of the land, the rateable value of the land et cetera, and they also ask for any other issues affecting the land. It could be drainage issues; it could be soil types, as well as bushfire. So we would expect that a buyer would use their own due diligence, but also that, through the relevant settlement agents, they would follow current practice to identify those bushfire areas.

---

**The CHAIR:** My concern is that if someone develops or in some way gets planning approval, that section 70A notice goes on the title, so anybody in the future dealing on that title knows. The worry I have is that by the time it gets to a settlement agent, people have made plans. You have got an unconditional deal, they have got finance, and they have maybe got a whole host of other conditions that they have spent money satisfying. The settlement agent or solicitor then does a local government search and it comes up as a fire-prone area, and then suddenly it might be an F40 or BAL-FZ—a very high category of the BAL—and they want to withdraw from that contract. That can cause people some pretty serious and very chronic ag—an unconditional contract—because they suddenly find out that it is in a bushfire-prone area. Has there been any consideration or, more to the point, budgeting done on what it would cost to put a section 70A notice on all titles in fire-prone areas.

**Mr Lumsden:** I think the answer is no.

**Ms McGowan:** I think, equally, the answer is no. It would probably be a matter that is more appropriately referred to the Building Commissioner than it is to us, but certainly I am not aware of any moves to require compulsory notifications.

**The CHAIR:** It is something I might pursue a little later.

**Mr Hillyard:** Mr Chairman, if I could just add that in terms of property purchases and sales, it is incumbent upon a vendor of land to make sure that anything that they know about that property that a purchaser should be made aware of is passed to the real estate agent first of all.

**The CHAIR:** That is if they know it is in a fire-prone area.

**Mr Hillyard:** The other point is that through Landgate—the old area of the titles office—they now produce detailed information about every property, which you can inquire on and you can find out all issues relating to a property. So that would be a layer of data that agencies such as the Planning Commission and the department provide, as does DFES, to Landgate, and they can produce information about any property and you can then go into their web page on their maps and pull up all of that sort of information.

**The CHAIR:** People have to have a presence of mind to do that. What is worrying me—there is a whole host of these little trends that are coming up—is that in the past, a search of the certificate of title identified all the encumbrances that were on that particular block before you bought it. It was one of the main features of a Torrens titles system.

[2.40 pm]

We seem to be adding on all these other little things along the way like fire-prone areas or coastal areas, which people really have to fish around and look for. As I say, if it gets to the point of the settlement agent, it can cause some people some really big problems.

**Mr Hillyard:** If I could answer that as well, though, one thing people generally know when they are buying a block of land is, “I am buying this property and it can be developed into four units or whatever.” They know all that other information but that is not on the title either. There is no zoning. Reservations are not shown on title. It is an interest in the land only. Matters that people should be aware of such as notifications that are imposed for buffers to poultry farms or something when a subdivision occurs—I think we need to look at educating people more about the information that is available because it is always a very important investment.

**The CHAIR:** If you are going to build four units, I can understand that. If you buy an en globo block of land that you want to subdivide into four units, I completely understand your diligence on that. That is a commercial decision —zoning issues—the whole lot. You usually get professionals involved. But if you are just going to go and buy yourself a residential block of land or a five-acre block, for that matter, people are not really apprised about why they have got to go and do all this background research. It is a concern.

---

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Thank you. If I can go to the Department of Planning's annual report, page 20 refers to the Swan Valley draft development plan. I wanted to ask: when is it anticipated that the plan will be in final form and made public?

**Ms McGowan:** Through the chair, I will hand over to Mr Finn in just a moment because he has far more knowledge. We are currently, as I understand it, working with the City of Swan on their local scheme amendment. The two things sit in tandem. If I could ask Mr Finn to elaborate.

**Mr Finn:** Thank you, through you, chair. The "Swan Valley Development Plan", as you are probably aware, was released for public comment late last year through to early this year. We have reviewed all of the submissions and are in the process of preparing a report on those submissions. That report and recommendations will be made through to the Western Australian Planning Commission, but that will not occur until the Swan Valley Protection Bill passes through Parliament and becomes effective as the Swan Valley protection act. There is, through the protection bill, a process that needs to be followed and that process requires that the WAPC will make a recommendation only once the Swan Valley protection act is in place. Of course, the Swan Valley protection act gives the head of power to the Swan Valley development plan.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Are you able to tell us how many submissions you received?

**Mr Finn:** We received 110 submissions.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Have they been made public, or will they be made public?

**Mr Finn:** They have not been made public. That will be a matter for the planning commission. Typically, reports on submissions are made public but not the individual submissions themselves.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** I might ask if the commissioner has anything he can add to that about making those public.

**Mr Lumsden:** We would follow the normal process, as I have answered before. We do not normally identify people who make submissions. We certainly make public the nature of the submission and also the response of the department to that submission.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Great. Okay. Still in the department's annual report, page 60, which is part of your performance indicators, shows median land price as a percentage of median residential house prices. Are you able to—I do not anticipate you have got this with you now—provide that percentage year-by-year from 2008?

**Ms McGowan:** We should be able to provide that, but I would have to do it by way of supplementary.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Great. Thank you.

*[Supplementary Information No D7.]*

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Page 17 of the department's annual report refers to the bushfire policy framework. There has been some conversation already about bushfire. What I wanted to ask was: is the application of that framework being reconsidered or reviewed in any way?

**Ms McGowan:** As I think I mentioned—through you, chair—the commission has just finalised a review of a planning bulletin in relation to that. Equally, the guidelines are now being updated again. We have always envisaged, as it is a joint approach by agencies, that we will, in this early stage, have to review it fairly regularly. The guidelines are under development again. As I said, the FES Commissioner is currently updating the maps and the Building Commissioner is looking at their component as well. We have got a stakeholder reference group that is actually looking at those guidelines at the moment with a view to making recommendations to the commission.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Thank you. You might have mentioned this before, and perhaps I zoned out, but do you have a time line for the current review?

**Ms McGowan:** I think we are anticipating finishing that work fairly quickly, but I do not have a finite time frame. It is a matter of making sure we get the right stakeholder engagement on that.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Page 66 of the report, again on your key performance indicators, talks about town planning scheme amendments for final approval processed within time frames and lists some percentages. Are you able to tell me, first off, numerically, how many town planning scheme amendments were finalised in 2015–16?

**Ms McGowan:** I would have to get that information for you. I am sure it is in one of my notes somewhere.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Perhaps if I give you all of the questions about this and you can tell me what you can tell me now and, if not, you can put it all together. The number—how many? Are you able to provide a list of what they are? How many amendments are outstanding and a list of the outstanding amendments? If you are able to, can you also provide the length of time that those amendments have been considered?

**Ms McGowan:** I will be able to get most of that information as supplementary, maybe not all.

*[Supplementary Information No D8.]*

**Ms McGowan:** I have got the numbers. Are you talking purely about local planning scheme amendments?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Yes, local town planning scheme amendments. If I may, chair, I have one more question on the department's annual report. I refer to Perth and Peel@3.5 million. When is it intended that the draft strategic land use planning frameworks will be finalised? We had some discussion about this and green growth earlier on. How do the finalisation of the Perth and Peel draft strategic land use planning frameworks relate to the work being done on green growth? I think we touched on this very early on. To the extent that there is conflict at all—I think the commissioner made some comments about this—can you just reiterate how those conflicts would be determined?

**Ms McGowan:** Through you, chair. There are three obviously very key strategic pieces of work that have been undertaken: the sub-regional land use planning frameworks for Perth and Peel@3.5 million, the strategic environmental assessment of Perth and Peel and the transport plan. They all use the same footprint, which is the footprint determined by the commission. The Department of Planning has been doing the underpinning work required to advise the commission. In terms of the land use planning framework, the commission is getting close to its completion. We have had over a thousand submissions, over a hundred meetings with stakeholders, numerous deputations to the commission and a number of site visits by commission members. There is a further meeting in the middle of next month for the purpose of trying to finalise. In fact, I think the commission is close to settling on a great many of the issues.

[2.50 pm]

The chairman, he may choose to add as well. We have been working quite closely with the Office of the Environmental Protection Authority, so when you actually look at the mapping, for instance, that has been done for the subregional planning frameworks and the mapping that has been published in terms of the conservation or the proposed conservation areas for the SAPPR, they are the same maps and they have been prepared by the Department of Planning. Equally, the transport plan uses those maps. We would expect the land use plans to be finalised. During the process, we have worked on any what we would call hotspots that have been identified in common across the processes and actually unpacked the issues with those. For instance, the areas that the commission has worked hard to avoid—and I think the chairman touched on this before—are very much those areas where we are aware through those mapping exercises that there is high conservation value et cetera.

---

The absolute strength of this process to date has been the extent of across agency alignment on all of these processes. So, we would expect the subregional planning framework to be finalised, the strategic environmental assessment proposals to be put to the commonwealth minister and the transport plan comment to the finalised. The commission is very cognisant of the fact it will then have to do at least five-yearly reviews of the planning frameworks but probably will have to do at least one alignment review to make sure any little bits of tidy up are done, but it has all been predicated on the same information.

**Mr Lumsden:** I would reiterate that. I would anticipate the commission finalising its deliberations by the end of this year.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Thank you for that.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** Mine follows along the same tack, so I am looking at page 21 of the WAPC report, which is about the subject raised by Hon Sue Ellery and particularly the final paragraph on that page where you talk about the second round of targeted consultations, which included 33 local governments. Was that all local governments in the area?

**Ms McGowan:** All local governments were invited to have input. I think the majority did. I could not say absolutely whether every single one of those took up the offers, and some of those briefings were in clusters of local governments—for instance, the growth councils or the local governments around the Peel area et cetera. More often than not, they have met both with the staff from the department working on the proposals for the commission, or on behalf of the commission, but in a number of instances they have also made deputations to the commission itself as part of its deliberations.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** Have some of those local government authorities expressed major reservations about the draft as it exists currently?

**Ms McGowan:** There are differing views from broad acceptance to some who question it. And certainly there are some and I would expect if you have not been directly advised, you would have seen media around some of the councils around the Mandurah–Peel area —

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** That is obviously my area of interest as member for South West Region.

**Ms McGowan:** As I say, there have been a number of meetings with those councils. The commission has—and in the deliberations, and the chair may choose to add, obviously, anything that has been raised with both the department and the commission has been taken seriously and examined. In fact, in many instances when there has been information that appears to conflict or be quite contested, we have engaged some independent advice in some instances—so, for instance, environmental assessments et cetera just to peer review the information we have had against the criteria established for the strategic assessment and for the planning frameworks in terms of our overall objects. But the chair may wish to add some more.

**Mr Lumsden:** Thank you for the question. Yes, I am well aware of the issues down in that area with the alliance. First of all, let me make the point and I have made it to a number of people, not just local governments: the frameworks that we published were drafts. “Drafts” mean they were draft. They were not in concrete; otherwise, why would you call for submissions?

We have had some extensive submissions and in terms of the Ravenswood–Mandurah area, which you referred to, they not only made submissions objecting to certain elements of the draft, which I can understand why, but also I need to say that some of their submissions are also contrary to good planning. A lot of the areas that the alliance councils were promoting for development was going to promote development in, for instance, the Alcoa buffer zone; were involving significant removal of natural vegetation in the Furnissdale as well as the Badgerup area; and also there were a number of issues in other proposals in terms of the development being proposed because of the amount of fill required. Some of these issues were common with the issues within our draft frameworks, but the alternative promoted by the alliance, which has been examined very carefully, ranging from the

designation of Ravenswood as the subregional centre in lieu of Pinjarra to other development issues, all had similar issues associated with our draft. So I think what will happen through this process is that there will be a modified final plan which takes into account the alliance's views but at the same time does not agree with all the alliance's views because there are some common issues—environmental issues, for instance.

I also think that some of the proposals of the alliance, whilst in good intent, did not have enough research behind it. For instance, some of the alliance's submissions were in alignment with, say, the Peel–Harvey Catchment Council; in other areas they were not. There were significant transport issues, which we have to take into account, and, as the director general mentioned, the commission has required further modelling to be carried out. Added to this, I would say the area concerned of all the submissions, of which there have been over 1 000, is the most complex but also controversial. It involves an area that not only has its own individual environmental constraints from drainage to vegetation management to nutrient management to filling of flood plains to Ramsar wetlands—you name it, it is there—it is also right smack in the centre of the Peel–Harvey catchment area, which is of concern to the commission in terms of broader catchment issues, which need to be investigated thoroughly. That would also require an appropriate amendment in due course, but this is part of the process of the state planning policy for the Peel–Harvey catchment.

I can assure the honourable member that the issues raised by everybody in that area are being very carefully looked at. We have had at least two site inspections in detail by commissioners. I have actually carried out 18 single inspections, at the last count, of areas to make sure that I am fully acquainted with all the issues. There have been further requirements of modelling done by Main Roads WA through to the Department of Transport to test the number of assumptions. At the end of the process of the commission, it will be the most thoroughly investigated area of any in Perth and Peel, so I hope that will rest your concerns.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** Just by way of winding up, you talked about some of the concerns about the environmental issues. Have you singled that out because you regard that as the most important point of contention or are there others which you are also addressing?

**Mr Lumsden:** There are others, depending on the area concerned. I would say whilst the overall area has myriad issues, some issues have more intensity of concern depending where they are within that general area. So, you might have a precinct within the general area, compared with other precincts, which has major transport issues. Other areas may have more environmental issues; others may have broader issues, such as the amount of fill to bring the land to a developable state. That is why I said it is the most complex area I have ever experienced in my 50 years of town planning.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Can I ask about Stirling Highway? This is in the WAPC annual report and the MRS amendments to the rationalisation of Stirling Highway. It is amendment 1210/41. What is the basis of that Stirling Highway reserve being rationalised? What is the expected impact on land values for those properties where the reserve has been lifted or reduced?

[3.00 pm]

**Mr Lumsden:** I will answer most of your question and then I will ask Mr Hillyard to supplement my answer. First of all, it needs to be understood that the Stirling Highway reservation was one of a number of reservations that was put into the metropolitan region scheme in 1963. As an ongoing process of review, not only of Stirling Highway but of other major regional roads, we have worked closely with the Department of Transport—particularly Main Roads WA but the Department of Transport as a total entity—to reassess the impact of the reservation because it has been there for a long time. For the majority of the area, the reservation will be reduced. It is also ironic to me that many people who have made submissions did not even know about the reservation, even though it has been in place since 1963. By and large, the intent was that with a very close examination of the reservation and further refinement of the engineering requirements of today compared with

yesteryear, I think about 80 to 85 per cent of the reservation is reduced. There are some areas, particularly in the East Fremantle–Stirling Bridge area, that were problematic for two specific reasons: one, the number of heritage buildings, particularly heritage buildings that may not have been listed on the state register but on the local government register, which was of concern, particularly when they were associated close to intersections of roads on the highway because of requirements for traffic turning movements and also providing provision for further transit lanes. They have been worked through as much as possible but that was the major area of contention. I will ask Mr Hillyard to comment on that area because he is very familiar with the specific detail.

**Mr Hillyard:** In terms of your question about values up and down, the issue is that the reservation has been excessive for so many years and the market did actually absorb that knowledge. People have been buying and selling properties along Stirling Highway, as they have along Canning Highway, which was similarly a very wide reservation. The commission put in place a policy a number of years ago—probably about 25 years ago—in which they would essentially work on the basis of a five-metre setback from the dedicated road. Although the reservation was still excessive and is being revised now, a lot of development has been occurring even within the reservation by specific approval from the commission et cetera. It is unlikely that there will be any major spike in values up or down as a result of the change to the reservation because it has mostly been factored into the marketplace.

**The CHAIR:** If there are no further questions, we will leave it there. On behalf of the committee, I thank you for your attendance today. The committee will forward the transcript of evidence, which highlights the questions taken on notice, together with any additional questions, in writing after Monday, 31 October 2016. Responses to these questions will be requested within 10 working days of receipt of the questions. Should you be unable to meet this due date, please advise the committee in writing as soon as possible beforehand. The advice is to include specific reasons about why the due date cannot be met. If members have any unasked questions, I ask them to submit these to the committee clerk at the close of the hearing. Once again, thank you for your attendance today.

**Hearing concluded at 3.03 pm**

---