

SUNSET RESERVE TRANSFORMATION BILL 2013

Second Reading

Resumed from 2 April.

HON KATE DOUST (South Metropolitan — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [12.50 pm]: I rise to comment on the Sunset Reserve Transformation Bill 2013. I must say I feel a bit of déjà vu because in 2006 I assisted the minister of the day who was dealing with the Labor government's Sunset bill. I feel as though the clock has stopped and that we have not moved forward terribly much.

Hon Ken Travers: You have got déjà vu. I think this is about the fourth Sunset bill I have seen.

Hon KATE DOUST: Hon Ken Travers is just so much older than I am!

Hon Helen Morton interjected.

Hon KATE DOUST: He is, actually, yes.

This bill obviously delivers on an election commitment made by the Premier leading up to the last election in 2013 to make this land available to the public and to transform it into an arts and cultural precinct for the community. There are some questions about how that will eventually occur, and I will come to that as I work my way through this bill.

On the surface of it, this legislation is quite technical. It deals with a range of changes to the Sunset Reserve and to some planning scheme arrangements put in place to deal with the area of land that the government seeks to excise from the Sunset Reserve and sell. There are some miscellaneous arrangements dealing with regulations or an account to be set up to deal with the proceeds of the sale and for the refurbishment of some of the properties on the site. On the surface of it, it is a fairly technical bill. We can work through the specific clauses of the bill and talk about how they impact on the site and the view of one particular community group in relation to the sale of that part of the site referred to in clause 7. Although the bill is technical and administrative on the surface, as my colleague Hon Ken Travers has alluded to, this is not the first piece of legislation dealing with this particular site. Who knows? It may not be the last one we have to deal with. In this legislation, there are some similarities to what was proposed in the previous bill in 2006, but obviously there was quite loud opposition in the community at that time to any change on that location, and that bill stayed on the notice paper without any progress and then fell off with the ensuing election. It is a shame, because we have had some interesting discussions in this place over time about Sunset, and a range of members from various parties have expressed some very interesting options for the use of that site. In 2006 I think I floated the idea of additional public housing à la Brownlie Towers. I thought it would be a fantastic location for low-income housing, but obviously that has not been on this government's radar. I remember that Hon Bruce Donaldson also floated a range of interesting options at the time, so the debate went on, and around the chamber a number of people provided options. Anyway, that was then and this is now; this is a different piece of legislation.

The Sunset site has a very long and colourful history in our state. It has been used for a range of purposes, albeit predominantly around health, with some variations. Its geographic location is quite interesting. When I was first a student at the University of Western Australia in the early 1980s, I recall there was quite a campaign at the time to save Sunset. What happens to that particular piece of land is an issue that continues to bubble to the surface and grab the community's attention. For those members who have not had the opportunity to visit Sunset, it is certainly interesting. I do not know whether the design of the buildings themselves, with the quad-type arrangements, was peculiar to the period in which they were designed and built and whether that was replicated in other places. I think Heathcote Hospital might have a similar type of arrangement. It is fascinating to walk around the site and to hear about its history and the changes that have occurred. Under the proposals in this bill, not all of those buildings will be retained. Some buildings, or parts of them, which are deemed to be unnecessary or which do not have a heritage listing will be demolished. To make the precinct more user-friendly or attractive for its future purpose, I think it has been decided that some of those buildings will be deleted from the site. Again, in past incarnations of this bill, those types of proposals were present as well.

I want to talk about some of the concerns of the community and issues in the future for local government. I do not know whether the connection to the Nedlands council and its ongoing involvement was really canvassed in the consultation process on this bill. I also want to raise questions about that council's ongoing financial commitment, if any, to what will happen at the Sunset site. I raise those questions only because the alternative site in my electorate in the South Metropolitan Region, the Heathcote site, has a fantastic set-up for families in the community. The Melville council has an ongoing financial commitment to the upkeep and maintenance of that site. It is an issue I think I need to come back to and find out from the government what money, if any, the Nedlands council will be contributing or required to contribute to the ongoing maintenance, upkeep or other

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

things associated with Sunset, given some changes are coming into the planning scheme arrangements. I know that the Nedlands council is supportive of the changes in part 3 of the bill dealing with planning scheme arrangements, but I understand it is not supportive of the clause that provides for that particular section of land to be sold. That is what I have been told, but the minister might want to clarify that. I will talk about why I understand that to be the case later.

The long title of the bill is fairly straightforward. It is —

An Act to provide for reserve and planning changes to expedite the transformation of the former Sunset Hospital site into an arts, cultural and community asset, and for related purposes.

I understand the first part of that, but regarding the last part of it, I am not too sure what else is to be done or what is envisioned by the words “and for related purposes”. I think it is fairly clear from the bill, the second reading speech and the explanatory memorandum what the government is hoping to do with the site to transform it into an arts, cultural and community asset, but it would be good to have some explanation about whether there are any other intended purposes in the future, given that this transformation, as it was explained to me, will not happen over a short time. The government is looking at quite a lengthy process of, I think, 10 to 15 years at least before this transformation will be completed. As we know, and hope, there could be a change of government in that period and who is to know what will happen with the “related purposes” in the long title of bill. I am curious to know whether the government is considering doing anything else with all or part of that land at some point in time.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 to 2.00 pm

Hon KATE DOUST: I am trying to remember what I was saying before we went to lunch—but I will not recap.

Hon Simon O'Brien: Go on!

Hon KATE DOUST: No, I will not.

Hon Helen Morton: You were talking about the house proposal and the Nedlands council.

Hon KATE DOUST: I thank the Minister for Mental Health.

Hon Helen Morton: And you congratulated us on how fantastic it is.

Hon KATE DOUST: No, I did not do that. Those words will never slip from these lips; do not worry about that. My memory is not that bad.

Hon Ken Travers: Can I assure you that when you are fantastic, we will congratulate you.

Hon KATE DOUST: Hon Ken Travers might.

Hon Ken Travers: If they ever are, I will.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Brian Ellis): Order! Hon Kate Doust has the call.

Hon KATE DOUST: With that assistance, I now recall that I was starting to go through some of the detail of what this bill will do.

As I said earlier in my first 10 minutes, there are some similarities in the bill to some of the proposed changes, two of which are in clauses 5 and 6, to tidy up those issues around the bore and pump and moving the cycleway. Those issues have been fairly consistent regardless who has been in government. They are not contentious issues at all and are fairly straightforward.

It would appear that clause 7 has created some rage at this point. Lot 302 was the area of contention last time. This time the government is seeking to amend the planning arrangements so that a parcel of land in the Sunset Hospital site will be excised. I also understand that the local town planning arrangements in Nedlands will have to be amended so that the land can become freehold and the government can ultimately sell this parcel of land, which, I understand, is just under 2 000 square metres—a substantial area, tucked away in the corner of the site that already has a property on it. Questions have been raised about the value of this land. I now refer to a letter that I assume most, if not all, members have received from the Sunset Heritage Association (Inc), which has had a long-term interest in this location because it is in its backyard. That association has expressed concerns specifically about clause 7. Although the association asks us to support the legislation overall, its letter refers to the problems associated with it. I want to put on the record that part of the association’s letter that refers to clause 7 in particular. The letter is signed by Ann Whyntie, the secretary of the Sunset Heritage Association, and states —

The proposal to sell off part of the site—initially said to be 1,500sqm, now 1993sqm ...

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

Would the minister explain whether there has been a change in the area that was to be partitioned and sold off or whether it was always going to be the 1 900 square metres? That might provide some clarification for this group. The letter goes on say —

... to raise approximately \$10 million for building maintenance. This would destroy the integrity of the site for little, if any, gain, as there is no funding commitment to full restoration and new use. The total cost of restoration and fit out of an arts and cultural complex is likely to be in the order of \$70 million to \$100 million. \$10 million is a very small part of the total funds required to complete all work and could well be wasted, as was the case at the East Perth Power Station when preliminary expenditure was not followed by further funding for full use. The Association considers it is far preferable to retain the subject land within the site, with the future option to lease, to provide an on-going source of income for the project.

That is the view of that particular group, and it raises some questions around the excision and future sale of the Sunset Hospital land, which includes that \$10 million figure. Given that we know that that part of Perth is very expensive—probably one of the most expensive suburbs in our state to purchase land—perhaps the minister could explain how that figure was arrived at, who did the valuation of the land and when was it done, and whether it is a current valuation of that parcel of land or whether the value is higher. There are also some questions about how many properties will be created once that land is sold. I imagine a very expensive house would be built on a property like that in that part of the world, because it is an expensive area and street in which to build. That issue has also been canvassed by the heritage association and raised by a number of other people.

A later part of the bill provides for a specific account to be set up to deal with the funds raised from that sale, which will go towards the cost of some of the refurbishment or renovation of the property—for example, for gutters, downpipes and a range of other things. As members know, renovating any property is expensive, let alone a heritage property. The minute we talk heritage, the price goes right up. It is a bit like a wedding as opposed to a normal dinner—the price goes right up. I do not know whether \$10 million, or the amount that is going to be allocated, will achieve what the government is hoping to achieve. The heritage association has made a valid point. If the government is legitimate about ensuring that this facility is at an appropriate standard for public access and use as a cultural and arts centre, \$10 million will certainly not achieve that outcome. I would be interested to know what sort of research or modelling the government has done to arrive at an estimation of the cost to bring that property up to standard. I have had the opportunity to walk through those buildings, as I am sure a number of my colleagues in the chamber have, and it is very run down both internally and externally. It would need to be cleaned up significantly in the first instance, and more than a lick of paint would be needed to bring it up to standard. The letter from the heritage association raises some valid questions about the costs associated with the renovation.

Apart from the \$10 million, why is the government not setting aside additional funds? The Sunset Hospital site is significant, so why is the government not allocating separate funding lines to facilitate the refurbishment in a much shorter time than that proposed in the discussions around this bill. It comes back to the debate in this house yesterday about Fremantle and funding priorities. It comes down to how the government treats heritage more broadly in the state. Yesterday, there was some discussion about the renovation and upkeep of the warders' cottages in Fremantle. Other members have talked about the Guildford Hotel and a range of other places around the city that are very important, and how we should, of course, maintain these buildings for the future. I think it comes down to what the government sees as its priority. I hark back to the issue I talk about a lot in this place; namely, if the government was not spending \$440 million on Elizabeth Quay it might have more money in the kitty to fix up the Sunset Hospital site and deliver the outcome it wants in a shorter time frame. But I imagine that is a matter we can deal with in a few weeks when we deal with the budget and see how that money is being spent. There are some serious issues around that. I hope the minister can provide some information about why money is not being provided through a heritage fund, some other line in the budget or a separate amount that could have assisted a swifter change for this project.

Clauses 4 to 9 deal with the changes in the land arrangements and who will have management of them. As I said, clause 7 is the most contentious issue because it covers the excision of the land. Clauses 10 to 13, in part 3, deal with the planning scheme arrangements and amend the metropolitan region scheme and the Nedlands town planning scheme to accommodate the excision of the land so that it can be sold. I think I mentioned earlier that, although the Nedlands City Council supports the overall change, I have been advised by, I think, the government advisers, that the council was not happy about the excision and sale of that land. The questions I raised earlier were in relation to what the council's ongoing connection to this site will be. Will it have any financial obligations to maintain any aspect of this land so that the community can use it? I referred also to Melville City Council and its engagement with Heathcote, which is a very popular location.

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

Part 4 deals with the excised land the government wants to sell. It refers to what the minister can and cannot do. Part 5 of the bill deals with two specific issues; one is about a special account that will be set up to hold any funds raised as a result of the sale of that land. The last clause deals with regulations. The advisers tell me there are no plans for any regulations to be drafted under this legislation, but they said that at some point there may be a need for regulations. We also discussed the fact that this bill does not provide a lot of detail; it is quite narrowly cast; there is not a lot of meat on the bones, if you like, to indicate how it will work. I was assured that, I think, the Minister for Finance would have oversight through the Department of Building Management and Works for this area. The minister might confirm that. I must admit when I heard “BMW” the alarm bells went off for me given past experiences. That causes some concern because this issue is raised fairly regularly when bills come to this place and do not contain a lot of detail and we have to rely on regulations or other instruments to find the detail for how the legislation will work in reality. It was quite interesting to be told during a briefing that the bill does not contain a lot of detail. My notes state, “Not a lot of detail, matters will be left to the minister and the department to provide admin for this project.” I thought that was pretty light on and fairly predictable in the way the government has managed these issues.

We note that some tenants are on the site. When I made a visit in 2006 ScreenWest had a presence in some of the buildings and was filming at the time. I think it might have been —

Hon Ken Travers: *Cloudstreet?*

Hon KATE DOUST: No, it was not *Cloudstreet*. It involved that Sims fellow and it was a movie to do with a train. I cannot remember what it was. I watched it being filmed but I certainly did not see the movie.

Hon Ken Travers: The Freo Train Ride.

An opposition member: *The Last Train to Freo*.

Hon KATE DOUST: That is the one; thank you for that.

Even though there has not been full occupancy, over time, various groups have made some use of this site. Currently, I think Minderoo, formally the Australian Children’s Trust has a two-year lease on building Q, which expires in June this year. I understand it will get a further extension and it pays a peppercorn rent. On reading the notes—please correct me if I have this wrong, minister—I understand the peppercorn rent is about \$1.10 a year, which I think is very low. The minister might explain to us how that figure was struck given that other people such as ScreenWest and Australian Doctors for Africa operate from this facility, and I understand the former matron’s house has tenants from time to time. Can the minister explain to the house how organisations become tenants? Are the properties put out to tender or is the tenancy by invitation? How is the rent or tariff struck for operating out of those buildings?

One hopes that when the opportunity arises to upgrade the facilities and bring about the changes proposed in the documents I have been provided, appropriate tenants can operate out of that Sunset Hospital site. The only concern I have is that they are not tenants that will exclude the general community from parts of the site. If the government is genuine about wanting to open this location for community access and use, it wants to ensure the tenants will facilitate that and not take over a building and put up a “No Entry Staff Only” sign there. That would be quite disappointing and would turn people away from the facility. I hope that is not the case.

I want to go through some of the more specific questions I have about this bill. I am pretty sure the minister will be able to provide answers to this in her reply. The first matter I have referred to a couple of times is the time frame the government has looked at for this project, which extends to about 15 years. I think, given the period and the number of attempts to provide other uses for this location; we have to ask: why could it not be done faster and why could the government not invest some of its own money? There is a view that perhaps a different model could have been provided. There has been a range of talk. We know the purpose of this land will be changed from retirement home-type use to I think, recreational—I will have to check.

Hon Helen Morton: Parks and culture or something.

Hon KATE DOUST: Thank you. Other questions people have raised with me are: could it have been perhaps another example of the Heathcote situation? As we know, Heathcote is a major drawcard in the south metropolitan area for families. That particular playground is always full of families throughout the week and the weekend. I used to take my children there when they were much younger. I thought it was a fantastic use of that site, which had its own tragic history. If the government wanted to do something like that and have that as a family-type playing area with restaurants, and retail and coffee shops, it would be a very attractive drawcard. It has a brilliant view over the river. The view over the river at that point in Dalkeith is just superb. The government is finding other ways to open that up.

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

I query why the government is not putting any of its money into the project but, rather, relying on the sale of some land. I also query the actual amount of money that will be raised and the amount needed to bring the buildings up to standard. Will tenants be required to pay for the renovations to the buildings they occupy? I have also asked the Minister for Mental Health about the valuation of lot 302. Who did the valuation, when did it occur, and what was the actual figure?

Another issue that was canvassed, which would be interesting to have an answer to, related to the steering committee that was set up, I think, in 2013 to look at this area, and the bill that arose from it. Although a number of government departments were represented on that committee, can the minister confirm that there was no representative from the local community or local government; and, if that is the case, why were they not involved in having a say?

Hon Helen Morton: What is it that you are referring to?

Hon KATE DOUST: I understand that a steering committee was established for Sunset. I have been advised that no representative from the local community or from local government was involved in that. Given that this has been such a controversial issue in the Nedlands area, why did the government not seek to involve members of the community or even members from the Sunset Heritage Association? I recall in 2006, the last time this legislation was before us, there was a hue and cry, and that was not just from the local Liberal member. The changes proposed in 2006 were for alternative means, with the creation of an area set aside for retirement homes. I went back through *Hansard* today. I recall Hon Ray Halligan, representing the Liberal opposition at the time, speaking on the Sunset Hospital Site Bill 2006. The Liberal opposition opposed the legislation. It opposed providing any change to Sunset at the time, which I think is quite interesting now that we have flipped the coin. Some things are fairly similar in this bill. This bill goes further than what was proposed then. The opposition of the day and the local member, Sue Walker, vehemently opposed this. She had been involved in setting up the local community group that opposed the changes. A very vocal and quite agitated group of people lobbied heavily to stop that legislation. Given that it stopped on a Thursday night in this chamber in mid-November 2006, one might say they were successful! Looking at that history, we have moved on.

I think that most people in Perth want to see something happen with this site. We cannot discuss forever what is going to happen but nothing ever does. I hope that the same thing does not happen to the minister today that happened to us—the debate just stopped. I hope that is not the case.

Hon Helen Morton: I do not think there is any chance.

Hon KATE DOUST: We all understand that timing and numbers works every time!

Another matter I raise with the Minister for Mental Health is: how does an organisation become a tenant? We hope that the processes will become a lot more transparent than what we understand them to be. We do not know how these organisations came to operate out of Sunset. I have no difficulty with the organisations that are there; I am just curious to know how they got to be there and how their rent is determined. I think that the use of the term “peppercorn rent” is quite an interesting one regarding capacity to pay to be in a place.

There is some perception—I am not sure that I share it—that any rejuvenation of Sunset to become a cultural and arts centre for that part of Perth would be seen as a playground for the western suburbs. I am not too sure whether that will be the case. I hope that if the government is genuine and makes this open and accessible, regardless of where people live in the state they will have an opportunity to visit Sunset. It is a shame in some ways that a proposal for an art gallery through the University of Western Australia did not proceed. That would have been a good use of the location, but that is all in the past. Now we have to wait and see what the government does with this project. It comes back to priority and dollars. If the government is really serious about wanting to deliver this change, we are of the view that it should take money from elsewhere—I use Elizabeth Quay as a good example—and put it into Sunset. The broader community would see a much swifter benefit if people were able to access Sunset for the purposes the government has outlined rather than waiting on the never-never of a project such as Elizabeth Quay.

With those few comments, the Labor Party will not oppose the bill. We all acknowledge it is time. We do not want to come back to deal with this issue every few years, with alternative proposals. As I have said, there are some similarities between the proposed changes in this legislation and those put forward in 2006. I hope the government is genuine in its desire to provide the appropriate upgrades and changes to this location. It is indeed a fabulous site. We hope the fences will come down and it will be fully accessible to every citizen of this state, because the Sunset site has a glorious vista. We hope that the government will provide the appropriate resources over and above whatever it gets from the sale of the land. People want to see this outcome sooner rather than later. I hope the Minister for Mental Health is able to provide responses to those questions. With a bit of luck, she might even get the bill through today.

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

HON LYNN MacLAREN (South Metropolitan) [2:28 pm]: The Greens (WA) are a bit torn about the Sunset Reserve Transformation Bill 2013. I listened carefully to the minister's second reading speech and to the Labor opposition's response to it. I can see what the government is trying to achieve from selling off this piece of land. As members will hear from my second reading contribution, it is a bit difficult for the Greens to support that. I acknowledge that the government has come a long way in an attempt to try to manage the Sunset site. I believe I have mentioned in this house before that I was a caretaker at Gallop House, which is a bit further along in Dalkeith. Not only is it a beautiful part of Perth but it also has a rich heritage. Gallop House, for example, was the original farm for the city. Sunset Hospital has managed to survive in a time of increasing population and lots of housing pressures in our city. It has the potential to be a beautiful heritage zone.

This is as far as any government has come towards recognising that potential, so I do not want to underestimate the tremendous effort the government has gone to and the steering committee has put in to this proposal. It goes a long way towards maintaining the social significance and conservation of this area. If we are to proceed down this path, it will retain both the natural environment and the building heritage. We have talked a lot about how we can retain our heritage. One way it has been successfully retained in similar cultures is through adaptive re-use. This proposal achieves that adaptive re-use. This is probably the most significant heritage proposal we have seen in this place. It is trying to go forward and retain the site instead of selling it off, carving it up or building Elizabeth Quay on top of it.

I want to touch on some of the points Hon Kate Doust mentioned. Like her, I want us all to be mindful of accountability in fulfilling our responsibilities towards heritage places and public ownership through existing legislation and policy. The National Trust of Australia (WA) was one of the constituents that I consulted. It stated —

It is essential that compatible reuse, supported by heritage agreements and planning decisions which ensure identified heritage values are maintained are developed for this significant site. It is essential that fully funded and implemented conservation and interpretations programs are included in any redevelopment of this site, and that there is active involvement of the community in determining the future of this place.

In the minister's response to the second reading debate I would dearly love to hear how the government intends to deal with that. How is the community going to be involved in the ongoing actions for this site? How do we know that the vision is fully funded so that we can deliver it? I have asked some questions in the chamber over the last few months about the amount of money the government intends to gain from the sale of a section of this A-class reserve. Does that amount of money equal the substantial amount of the money required for the renovation and ongoing management of this site? In other words, what are we getting for the sale of this public asset? We are carving a small piece of land out of it—it is on the edge of the reserve and there is an existing house structure on there—but what exactly are we getting out of that? I was kind of surprised that we were not given a business case that showed at least what income the government is aiming for or what is needed for expenditure. I have not yet heard that from the government, so perhaps the minister could talk a little about that. Like Hon Kate Doust, I received an estimation of what that might be from my constituents.

Hon Helen Morton: Have you seen the pictures of the future developments there?

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Yes. I want to touch on that in the next bit. I will briefly mention the history of the site. Right at the beginning I want to thank the members of the Sunset Heritage Association who spoke with me and gave me a copy of the book *The History of Sunset Hospital* written by Ann Whyntie. It is a fascinating history. The first page states that Sunset Hospital was opened to the public in 1979. That is interesting, because that is the year I came to Australia. It was not long after that that I was a caretaker at Gallop House. Sunset was originally known as the Claremont Old Men's Home—it was a poorhouse that replaced the original home in Kings Park opposite the Swan Brewery on Mounts Bay Road. It was constructed by the public works department in 1904 using the local limestone quarries from Point Resolution. Rumours of its closure surfaced during the 1980s. However, the ward blocks and the main office were modernised and the hospital continued to provide around 280 beds with the same number of staff. In December 1995, as part of an overall restructure of the state government nursing home sector, a decision was made to close Sunset Hospital. I noted in *The History of Sunset Hospital* that former member Hon Peter Foss was the health minister at the time who made the tough decision that Sunset could no longer function as a hospital.

I want to thank the Minister for Mental Health and the department for the briefing that I received. Anyone who received a briefing got these great pictures of the master plan, which identifies the long history of the place. It went from recreation in the 1890s to an old men's depot to Sunset Hospital, and then various adaptive re-use ideas were considered, which Hon Kate Doust touched on, starting in 1996 with not-for-profit aged care and then moving along to these very interesting proposals for a village concept. That is really what we are going through today. It looks as though 2005 was the last time we tried to do something with the site. That was some time ago.

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

I think people might have given up trying or decided that the money should go elsewhere. It is good that in 2014 we are now some way along. I want to acknowledge the work of the steering committee, which included really high-powered people who obviously want to get things done. When I had my briefing, I was struck by the brains trust that was gathered there. I do not know all their names—I know some of them—but they were the director general of the Department of Finance, the Government Architect of Western Australia, the executive director of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the chair of the Heritage Council of Western Australia, the director general of the Department of Planning and the project director of Building Management and Works. They all got together and probably produced the project vision in an afternoon. I have been in groups in which it has taken months to produce a project vision, but they are just so switched on that they came up with the following —

‘To transform Sunset over time into a unique Government owned asset for arts, culture and community use, which has a high level of heritage conservation, public access, amenity and engagement with the river.’

Who could not support that vision? It is a beautiful vision, and I want to go on the record as supporting it. A detailed vegetation study was undertaken, which we talked about in our briefing. The transformation strategy is laid out as far as which buildings will be repaired, restored and used first. It seems very practical and with well-planned in terms of the priorities. For instance, there will be a sculpture trail and an adventure playground; there are lots of different ideas. I can imagine families going down there. I am not concerned that it will be a playground for only people in Nedlands; I think that people from all over the city will love to come to this site. It will be a real A-class heritage development. The master plan then referred to the long-term vision of a full restoration of all heritage buildings. There are lots of pretty pictures of people of all ages having fun. It then comes down to the nitty-gritty, which is what we are trying to achieve in this bill. In the first instance, we are looking at A-class reserve 1667. The existing purpose is wrong. We are not using it for a retirement village, parks and recreation, community and ancillary commercial purposes, so we need to fix that. I fully support the rezoning under the metropolitan region scheme, which is the initial thing to do and which really acknowledges the use of that site. It will make it a contiguous area; it means that we will look at it as one picture and not try to carve it up into little bits and pieces.

There is also a boundary adjustment, which again is a reasonable and practical adjustment. So I would support the excision of lot 302 and the boundary adjustment.

I turn now to the rationale for the excision and sale of lot 302. I will not be the first person to mention that that is where the sticking point lies. Lot 302 comprises 2.4 per cent of the site. We have been advised that the purpose of the sale of lot 302 is to fund an initial phase of conservation as a first step. The Department of Finance states that this initial phase of work over two years includes demolishing insignificant structures, and some non-heritage buildings and walkways—these were provided when the site was a hospital, to make it more comfortable for the people who were there—in order to lessen the maintenance burden and enable the focus to be placed on the most important assets. We are told that the moneys that will be raised from the excision of that land will be used to preserve all the buildings from further deterioration of the fabric. We have talked this week about demolition by neglect. That is one of the concerns in this area. We need to prevent these buildings from falling into further disrepair, to the point at which their heritage value will be lost. We are told that this initial work will include repairs; replacement and repainting to roofs, downpipes and guttering; removal of asbestos; and repainting of timber fascia where necessary. The Department of Finance states also that this work will use like-for-repairs, and do as much as is necessary, while altering the historical fabric of the buildings as little as possible; new sewerage, water and electricity service infrastructure will be provided to the site; and there will also be landscaping works to the Padbury View and eastern part of the site, including a playground, barbecues and picnic areas.

However, there should be some indication of how much money we will get from the sale of lot 302 and how much those works will cost. As elected members, when we are talking about selling off an A-class reserve, we need to know that this will cover more than just the cost of sewerage works. We need to know that the money that will be raised from the sale of this land will be sufficient to cover the cost of all these works.

The Department of Finance also outlined a long-term vision for this site for the next 10 to 15 years. In order for the Sunset transformation study to proceed, the bill provides for the sale of lot 302 in Iris Avenue, amends the A-class reserve purpose, and amends the metropolitan region scheme and the City of Nedlands planning scheme.

Part 2 of the bill changes the purpose of A-class reserve 1667 to Sunset heritage precinct for arts, cultural, community and commercial purposes, such as a cafe. Lot 305 will be excised from the Sunset reserve as it contains a City of Nedlands bore and pump and will be placed under the management and control of the City of Nedlands. The same will take place for lot 304, which is a City of Nedlands cycle track. Lot 302 will be sold off, as it will be excised under the bill and the title transferred to the Minister for Works.

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

Part 3 of the bill provides for planning amendments. The Sunset site will be reserved for parks and recreation, instead of its current status as public purposes—hospital. That is obviously a tidy-up, because it has been a while since it has been used as a hospital. Lot 302 will be zoned urban, which will mean that the land that is sold will be residential. That is in keeping with the current zoning, because there is a residential house across the road from that site. If it was zoned commercial and a wedding venue was located there, for example, that might be different.

Hon Ken Travers: Except that Tawarri Lodge is just below it!

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Yes; that is handy.

The fact that it will be zoned urban is very important, because that means it will be a residential house for someone to live in. I think the existing house was used by the caretaker for a while. That house will be very close to this heritage precinct. Therefore, it is hard to imagine that we would want to make it a commercial venue. We should maintain the vibe in that area, if I can use that word, which is passive; therefore, a residential zoning is appropriate.

Hon Helen Morton: Are you saying you would support that?

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I am saying that is what the government is proposing. I can see why the government is proposing an urban zoning. However, I am torn, minister. I want to put on the record why I am torn. The policy of the Greens is that we support measures that encourage a viable future for heritage assets through the adaptive re-use of heritage places. We also encourage new uses for places if those new uses are compatible with the original use. The Greens also support the establishment of a heritage bank that will make funds publicly available for the restoration and maintenance of our heritage. Perhaps that is where the funds from the sale of this lot on the Sunset site should be placed. I have mentioned that the National Trust has said something similar, not particularly about this lot, but as a potential way forward. Our concern is that the government has not given us a business plan for how this money will be spent. If this A-class reserve in this heritage precinct is sold, will the money from that sale be put into a heritage fund, or will it be put into the sunset heritage precinct?

Hon Helen Morton: It will be put into a special purpose account, and it is very clear what that can be used for.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Great. I hope the minister will make that clear in her reply.

Hon Ken Travers: Will the Treasurer be able to take money out of the SPA when it suits the Treasurer?

Hon Helen Morton: Wait until you get up, and you can have your say.

Hon Ken Travers: I am trying to avoid having to do that, minister.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: As the bill stands, an account will be established and credited with the revenue from the sale of lots and other income generated from the site, as the minister has just pointed out in her interjection.

The National Trust program “Our Heritage at Risk” lists Sunset hospital as being at risk of disposal and inappropriate redevelopment. The trust describes it as follows —

... a unique example of the type of government sponsored housing for homeless and vagrant men in the early 20th century. The buildings display an unusual degree of homogeneity, and being united by the landscaped open spaces, collectively form an historic precinct that has become a much valued landmark recognised all over Perth.

The trust goes on to say that it is more than the buildings, though, because there has been a long association with the local residential area, and this, combined with its role in the development of social health and welfare of the aged for over a century, means that it has a strong social significance.

We have touched on the history of opposition to the sale of any part of this site and the reason why this proposal has taken so long. I need to put on the record the Greens’ longstanding opposition to the sale of any part of this site. In October 2000, my colleague Hon Giz Watson presented a petition opposing the sale of any part of A-class reserve 1667 for private development or trade. In May 2003, another petition was presented opposing the sale of irreplaceable community assets such as the Sunset A-class reserve. In October 2005, another petition was tabled opposing the sale and saying that selling off this permanent-listed state heritage land at Iris Ave, being part of the site known as Sunset at Dalkeith, is contrary to the intent and provisions of the Heritage of Western Australia Act.

There has been community backlash against the sale of this lot. I wanted to talk to these people and find out whether they are concerned about the current proposal. I have met with the mayor of City of Nedlands, Max Hipkins, and the Sunset Heritage Association representatives and have talked out some of the problems that they have with this proposal. The mayor, Max Hipkins, released an information paper, which is a very handy guide,

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

called “Sunset Hospital—past, present and future”. It details how we got to this stage. I will quote some paragraphs from that paper —

While the sale of 1,500sqm (less than two per cent of the site) for essential maintenance appears innocuous at first sight, it establishes the precedent of “selling off the farm” for maintenance purposes without any funding source being identified for restoration of the ultimate use. The UWA and City of Nedlands cannot be relied upon to take up any part of the site and contribute to maintenance.

After almost 20 years, the State Government has not been able to identify end uses and sources of funding to restore the heritage values at the Sunset Hospital site that are acceptable to the local community. It is time to get the site off the Government’s books, establish a Trust comprised of local stakeholders and give it the opportunity to realise the project.

On Tuesday, 28 August 2012, a motion before the City of Nedlands that was led on the integrity of the site passed unanimously. The document continues —

The whole of the site should be retained as an A Class Reserve in one lot in public ownership, with no subdivision permitted. This will not preclude some parts of the site being leased;

That is interesting, because there was no consideration of leasing it, so what we have considered is selling it. The mayor concluded that there was an expectation that the state government should expedite community consultation on its vision for the site. Hon Kate Doust asked some of the questions that I was going to ask; I look forward to receiving the answers. Although the government has been keen to refer to the conservation of the site being funded by the sale of lot 302, I want to see the detail of what conservation and interpretation plans are included in the transformation. I have included all the details that we have in my second reading contribution. I know there must be more. There must be a business case and a budget. There must be a reason why we are asking for this. We need to see those while we are having this debate.

The undefined long-term strategy begs the question: how long will interpretation plans take? We certainly do not want to hear later that the revenue from the sale of lot 302 was not sufficient to get beyond sewerage works and landscaping. How will the residential development that is likely for lot 302 play a role in the use and maintenance of the site? What steps are being taken to promote housing that complements the laneways, gardens, courtyards and parkland of the site?

I am nearly finished, minister. Most of the questions I wanted to ask were asked by Hon Kate Doust. However, the same questions were brought to me by my constituents. The Greens’ long history of representing the community in the City of Nedlands and the heritage groups has taught us that although this is a very commendable project—it is adaptive re-use and it will definitely be a beautiful park—we worry about how it will be paid for. I simply cannot support the sale of an A-class reserve—it feels wrong. If the people to whom I have referred, including those from the Sunset Heritage Association, said yes, because they love the place and because that is the only way they see it surviving, I would say, “Go for it!” However, they are not saying that. Rather, as documented in the association’s letter to me, it states —

The Association fully supports the proposed uses for the site foreshadowed by the Premier of WA in his press release of 10 January 2013, confirmed at the public meeting on 31 October 2013 with the release of the final plans and described in the Sunset Reserve Transformation Bill as a “Heritage Precinct for arts, cultural, community and ancillary commercial purposes.” However the Association has consistently not supported selling off any part of the site.

The proposal is to sell off part of the site—initially said to be 1,000sqm, now 1993sqm, to raise approximately \$10 million for building maintenance. This would destroy the integrity of the site for little, if any, gain, as there is no funding commitment to full restoration and new use. The total cost of restoration and fit out for an arts and cultural complex is likely to be in the order of \$70 million to \$100 million. \$10 million is a very small part of the total funds required to complete all work and could well be wasted, as was the case at the East Perth Power Station when preliminary expenditure was not followed by further funding for full use. The Association considers it is far preferable to retain the subject land within the site, with the future option to lease, to provide an on-going source of income for the project.

The Sunset Heritage Association has asked me—it may have written to the minister—to support the Sunset Reserve Transformation Bill, but only after the removal of the clauses that relate to the excising and disposal of part of the site. That is where I am. Specifically, I support the deletion of clause 3, which refers to the terms used, such as “excised land” and “Minister for Works”; clause 7, which refers to lot 302; clause 11, “Metropolitan Region Scheme amended”, which relates to that bit of excised land; clause 12, which seeks to amend the Nedlands planning scheme; clause 14, which is headed “Minister for Works may deal with excised

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

land"; and clause 15, which relates to delegation. The remaining clauses would be renumbered accordingly. The proposed legislation is still worthwhile—please, I am trying to be positive about heritage and adaptive re-use—with the abovementioned changes. It lays the groundwork and the parameters for the transformation of the Sunset Hospital precinct into an arts and cultural community centre while preserving the integrity of the site. Anne Whyntie, the secretary of the Sunset Heritage Association, asked me to support those changes. She says that they would demonstrate backing of an exciting project that would be world-class, while maintaining the faith of the local and wider community. At the end of the day, perhaps I am not in two minds. I represent the community; I stand up for its people and I voice their concerns in this house. Today, as much as I love the Sunset Reserve Transformation Bill, unless the government supports the amendments as proposed, I will oppose the bill.

HON SIMON O'BRIEN (South Metropolitan) [2.58 pm]: It is putting it very mildly indeed to say that the Sunset site has a long and chequered history, exaggeratedly so when one considers the number of times that those with responsibility for the site have proposed to do something about it. Every single time there have been proposals to deal with this most significant site, they seem to have been frustrated by some group or other that does not want any change, or some interested group of residents that does not want to see certain uses applied to the land in question. It is commendable that the Sunset Reserve Transformation Bill 2013 has been brought forward. It shows that the government is again rolling up its sleeves in an attempt to do something with this site.

The Claremont old men's home, as it is now remembered in history, dates back to about 1904. There was a tendency in those far off days to give terrible names to places. As a former disability minister, I remember the terrible names that some disability organisations had at the time. Nobody saw anything wrong with that, but one would shudder if acquainted with those names now.

Hon Ken Travers: Most of them had changed by the time you became the minister, though, hadn't they?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: They were long gone. I am talking about the 1950s or, indeed, the early part of the last century. I saw somewhere that the descriptor of this establishment was along the lines of "a residence for aged and alcoholic reprobates".

Hon Ken Travers: I heard it was for retired Liberal members!

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Possibly a few ended up there, I should think! At the rate we are going, if we do not get on with it, a few more might qualify for entry.

Hon Helen Morton: The old man's depot.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: There was a range of names. It struck me how crude the description of the day was. It was something like "a home for old alcoholic derelicts or reprobates". The opposition against good ideas for what we might do with this prime site has ebbed and flowed over the past 18 years or so. I was inclined to suggest to those who did not want things done here, there and everywhere to this heritage-listed site, because they objected to the amenity of their neighbourhood being disturbed—it would attract lots of members of the public and traffic and what have you—to put it back to its original purpose if they are so concerned about it. It could be returned to a home for hundreds of elderly gentlemen who are down on their luck, because that was its purpose. In 1996 the place was finally phased out as a retirement home or aged persons' accommodation run by the state, I understand, because of the changes in the aged-care sector from both the government and the non-government points of view.

This location is a historical oddity and there is a direct parallel to the Heathcote site in my electorate on the more civilised south side of the river. I hope members are familiar with the Heathcote site. It occupies a very prominent piece of land right on a headland of the Swan River, just to the west and indeed overlooking the South of Perth Yacht Club in what is now the seat of Alfred Cove. It is a magnificent site. It was put there many years ago as part of the mental health services of the day. It was then, I suspect, a much quieter and far removed locality as a site for a mental health hospital.

Hon Ken Travers: It was originally the Governor's place, was it not?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: The member is thinking of the Majestic Hotel site, which is a headland just down from the Heathcote site which was subsequently redeveloped during the 1980s for residential purposes. There are some very flash houses there now. I remember going there as a teenager, because there was a magnificent lawn outside the Majestic Hotel; I must have had a lemon squash there. It is a pity it was lost for public use. The Heathcote site has not been lost for public use. It has quite a few heritage-listed buildings; they are the fabric of the old mental health establishment, which, in its day, as with Sunset Hospital or Claremont Old Men's Home, had people there called inmates or patients. Anyway, in the 1990s the then government went to a lot of trouble to restore the buildings and to convert the whole site, parkland and all, for a range of public and other purposes.

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

There are some commercial setups there—the Bluewater Grill, for example—and a range of other concerns. There is a wonderful kids' playground there. It is the sort that when we go past and see the mock-up pirate ship and all the up-to-date play apparatus, we wish we were kids again so we could play on it. There is also a large building, which is the former nurses' quarters.

There is a lot of history about Heathcote and it is fair to say that there were tears before bedtime with that because it did not end happily, at least not in the first instance. Arrangements were made to transfer the ownership of it to the local government—the City of Melville, if I recall correctly. This might sound familiar given the bill we are talking about; it also became the focus for all sorts of political agitation by concerned locals and aspiring political candidates. It caused a lot of trouble for the local member and, along with some other things, probably helped him lose his seat in 2001. Nonetheless, it showed us what we could do with a site on the river, a magnificent piece of real estate with three or four sides with sweeping majestic river views, parkland, a good basis of buildings in which to create a number of further attractions and all the rest of it. I would suggest to members, given the views that have been represented by them in this place, that is the sort of outcome that we would like to get from such a site, not like the Majestic Hotel site which was sold off so only a few very well-heeled people could buy houses there. One or two of them are friends of mine so I am not begrudging that, but I think sites such as that, which have been in the public domain, should be reserved for public use.

Hon Ken Travers: There was a proposal to sell land at Heathcote, of course.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Yes, there was. That is the point I am coming to because it relates to the matters raised by Hon Lynn MacLaren and brings me back to the bill before us. This issue of Sunset Hospital has come before us so many times and nothing has happened to resolve it yet. That is why I think it is worth taking a moment to remind members what might happen and what perhaps should not happen. The refurbishment of Heathcote Hospital had to be paid for. Those old floorboards had to be polished; the tuck pointing had to be restored; and other facilities had to be provided. I think \$6 million was spent. It does not sound like a huge amount of money in the scheme of things these days, but it is a substantial sum of money and it had to come from somewhere. Where was it to come from? It was to come from the sale of land. Attached to the old Heathcote Hospital site on the eastern side was an area of reclaimed land that had, and still has, an old cricket pitch and a couple of fairly basic residences on it. The idea was that that land would be sold off to be redeveloped for residential housing and that would then pay for the refurbishment of Heathcote. It had an unhappy transition at that point because, if I recall correctly, the mayor of the day in the City of Melville reneged on the deal at the eleventh hour after the money had been spent on the refurbishment of Heathcote. I can relay that story to members on another occasion if they are interested.

That was an unfortunate aspect of it. How does this relate to Sunset? What we have is a roughly similar vintage heritage building site on the river with magnificent vistas; a very attractive piece of real estate in a very well-to-do suburb. One of the main differences between Sunset and Heathcote, however, is the size. I wonder how many members have been to Heathcote. My mum, who was in the nursing game from the 1940s through to the 1970s, had an expression, "Don't get worried about things, you'll end up in Heathcote". That was the saying mums had in those days. A number of members are familiar with Heathcote; are they also familiar with and have, perhaps, paced the ground at Sunset? If they do, one thing they will think of when they go to Sunset and have a look around—as I have, when I discovered to my distress that I owned the joint —

Hon Ken Travers: Did you move in?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I moved out. The thing that struck me is how big the place is.

Hon Ken Travers: You should have made it the Minister for Finance's residence.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Hindsight is a wonderful thing, Hon Ken Travers, but we would still be left with the problem of who is going to pay for it. Nonetheless, if the member's very worthy idea had had any potential for wings, I suspect it may have ended up as the official Premier's residence or something. It was on the wrong side of the river, in any case. It is a very big site; there are a lot of grounds and a lot of buildings, some of which are very extensive. There are a number of different precincts. We can look at a bit of dirt and think, "That is where the set for the film *Cloudstreet* was located"; there is a chapel on the other side and the old matron's residence down the hill a bit towards the river. There are a whole lot of parts to this very, very big site. The trouble with very big sites like this is how the heck we maintain them and what we do with them. Otherwise, people that tend to wring their hands about such things will have a lot to wring their hands about in terms of demolition by neglect. Believe me, if a site like this is not used, the neglect will result in its deterioration. If we are going to value the heritage fabric of it, we have to do something about it but we cannot do that at the expense of every other responsibility that government has. We have to get the money from somewhere. Whether it is a perfectly reasonable plan—as it was—to sell off the lower land at Heathcote, which, I might add, is still sitting there useless —

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

Hon Lynn MacLaren: It is a road, is it not?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: There are some other funny things that happened at Heathcote, but again, I can talk about that at another time if members are that interested. What are we going to do at Sunset? If we are going to do anything to preserve the fabric of this complex, then we have to find some ways of doing so. That leads us to the bill and the machinery in law that is necessary to excise part of the land and achieve the things that we want to achieve.

I remember, and I was just renewing acquaintance with, one of the very good state public servants who has had a bit to do with this site and others over the years. I was recounting a story that when I first asked for information about it from that officer, whom I will not embarrass by naming, and about the history of Sunset and proposals to sustain it, I received a big sigh as the immediate response. There have been so many proposals over the years, developed to quite a detailed level, to achieve the outcomes that we want: to pay for the preservation of heritage, to provide a series of assets for the ongoing benefit of the community, to do so in a way that does not upset the neighbours in their quiet enjoyment of the suburb, to provide access to some wonderful real estate with river views and all the rest—to do all of those things and more. It seems that none of those proposals have been substantially progressed. This one is the latest. It does have merit. In my view, the only thing wrong is it does not go far enough.

This bill reflects a proposal that is one step, or a number of steps, in the right direction. In my private view, it does not go as far as I would like to see it go, but that is the practical reality that is confronting the government. There is a limit to what it can be done but at least if this bill is supported, finally someone will have actually achieved something. With that in mind, I wish the government well in progressing this matter. I point out to those who may not want to support what is happening here that in the last almost 20 years of being awfully interested in these matters no-one has been able to come up with any way to take this matter —

Hon Ken Travers: Fair go! You lot blocked it when we were in government with a proposal that you just said you would have supported. Fair suck of the sausage!

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I think the expression, you old Ruddite, is “sauce bottle”.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Alanna Clohesy): Order! I invite the member to bring his comments back to the topic.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I think we should do that. Actually, the interjection reflects the reality of what has been a vexed political to and fro. I think the member actually makes a good point and now, for heaven's sake, we have to get on and let something happen with this site. As I said, I would prefer to see more than this happen but at least this is a step in the right direction. If those opposite do not want to at least support this, then they have to come up with some answers about how to address all the things that the bill is trying to achieve.

HON STEPHEN DAWSON (Mining and Pastoral) [3.19 pm]: I was not going to speak on the Sunset Reserve Transformation Bill 2013, but listening to all the speakers in this place I felt that I needed to, given where I grew up when we moved to Australia. Members may not know, but I do have an interest because my parents live on Birdwood Parade in Dalkeith, just up the road from the Sunset Hospital. We moved to Australia in 1989 and to Birdwood Parade in 1991. Many times as a teenager I not only walked through the place, but also went past on the bus to Claremont because the school bus went the other way. Over the years I, too, have watched the site lie idle and I have wondered what would become of it. I have always hoped it would be put to good use.

Members have already said in this debate that the bill the house is addressing today has been a long time coming. To understand the variety of reasons behind that one has only to look at the media statements and the website of the state government of Western Australia and go back through the history of the site and what successive governments have done or tried to do over the years. In 2002 ministers were concerned about unused buildings on the site; in 2004 the then minister Hon Nick Griffiths appointed Syme Marmion & Co—the company of Hon Bill Marmion in a previous role—to look after the site; there have been workshops and ministers calling for community input over the years; and when Hon Michelle Roberts was minister there were calls for public comment; yet nothing has happened on this site. I stand today to make some comments partly because I would be in trouble with my mother if she found out I had not taken the opportunity to stand up to speak on this bill.

Hon Ken Travers: I find the views of your mother are always a very good motivator for speeches in this place.

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: Absolutely. I have to say that my mother has a stronger view than I do on this site. She has thought for a long time that this site should be used not for community use per se or heritage or the like, but for government use in some regard. She has said to me on numerous occasions that this would be a perfect site for a disability justice centre, or the like, partly because over the years the community has known that this

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

site was used for a particular purpose. It was a hospital. The community was used to people visiting. They were used to buses stopping outside so that people could get off and go in to visit et cetera. She has said that the Sunset site would be a perfect site for that purpose.

I am not going to get into that debate and take us off course, but I have to say that I am happy to support this bill today. I do not support everything in it and everything that the government is trying to do, but I support the fact that this site will be transformed after many years of not being used to its full advantage. I support the move to look after the heritage of this site for the future. It is fair to say that out of fear of my mother I have stood up this afternoon to make those comments. It is good that this site is being used and that a government has finally brought a bill to this place to give certainty to this site into the future.

HON KEN TRAVERS (North Metropolitan) [3.23 pm]: As a member for North Metropolitan Region and as a member who has this site in his region, I have followed this matter for some considerable time. I must put on the record for the Sunset Reserve Transformation Bill 2013 a few extra points to those of my good friend and colleague Hon Simon O'Brien about the history of this initiative. I found it extraordinary to hear him suggest that this is not only the right thing to do but also we should be going further than the sale of the land. There is a very long history to this site that goes back to the Court government, which put forward a proposal that at the time was considered well and truly over the top and, quite rightly, it was made clear that this house at that stage would not support it. A more modest proposal was then brought forward during the period of the Gallop government, which is to this day probably one of the best options available for the Sunset Hospital site. That proposal suggested the sale of the land in similar locations to that being proposed in the Sunset Reserve Transformation Bill. It also suggested handing over the site to the University of Western Australia, with some limited capacity to find a stream of income generation—the sort that Hon Simon O'Brien was talking about—so that the site could be redeveloped to house the internationally renowned Berndt collection, which, for those who do not know, is a collection of anthropological items bequeathed to the University of WA, which people from all over the world travel to see. The University of WA made it very clear that it would then operate the site on an open campus basis, the same as the Nedlands campus. That proposal was given to this house to be supported and the Liberal Party sat in this place and made it clear that it would vote against that bill should it be put to a vote. We tried to negotiate with the Liberals. As a local member at the time I remember trying to find a resolution to that matter, yet we could not get that because there was an intransigent opposition that was only willing to play politics on the issue rather than do the right thing.

I am glad to hear Hon Simon O'Brien say the words he said today. What I regret is that he was not saying them back in the last decade when there was an opportunity to move something forward. The question still remains about this site: how long and when will all of the great master planning be completed? How will it be opened up to the public of Western Australia to access this fantastic site and to use the site for the benefit of all Western Australians? I always believed that if the people of that area had allowed that proposal to proceed at that time, there would have been a world famous museum, for want of a better term, or art gallery, probably with a high quality coffee shop to which they and people from across Western Australia would have been proud to take visitors. I look forward to—and I will wait to see—whether this modern proposal of this government goes anywhere near that proposal.

I needed to put that on the record so that anyone watching this debate is under no illusion about the history of this matter and the way in which certain parties in this place have supported this matter. On this occasion, the opposition will be doing the right thing, unlike the days when Hon Simon O'Brien sat on this side of the house.

HON LIZ BEHJAT (North Metropolitan) [3.27 pm]: I, too, as a member of the North Metropolitan Region rise to make my contribution to the debate on the Sunset Reserve Transformation Bill 2013. I am pleased to see it is called a “transformation” bill because that is exactly what needs to happen at that site. I have first-hand knowledge of that site when it was an old men's home. Very early in my career as a student of what was then called “chiropractic”, now called “podiatry”, one of our practicums was held at the Sunset site and we would treat people's feet there. I can tell you that some of the old blokes down there did not have very good feet and they needed to be treated by podiatrists, so I contributed to that and became quite familiar with the surroundings. At that time I thought it was a fantastic site.

My colleague from the North Metropolitan Region Hon Ken Travers questions how long it will take for anything to happen. To answer that question all we have to do is look at what the government has done since it came to power in the transformation—“transformation” being the operative word—of the city of Perth. There is Elizabeth Quay, the sinking of the railway and all the other projects that are now well underway and fast reaching their completion. I am certain that upon the passage of this legislation the work that needs to be done will ensure that Sunset becomes a very vibrant place.

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

It was either the Leader of the Opposition or the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who spoke about the Heathcote site. I am hopeful that the Sunset site will end up with something very similar, which is a wonderful open public space, with a fantastic restaurant, parks for children and which, when the weather is nice, people go to for barbecues and whatever. I do not want to delay the passage of this bill any further, except to say that Hon Ken Travers spoke about an opposition that did something a long time ago. The problem is, Hon Ken Travers, when we hang around for too long in this chamber, we get corporate history and corporate knowledge that perhaps only a very few people on our side have, because we go through a process of renewal and bringing in fresh blood and new and exciting people on our side of the chamber. Perhaps if there had been different people in those days, different things may have been supported.

Hon Ken Travers: Are you telling me I should go or Simon should go?

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Hon Ken Travers can draw his own conclusions on that. Far be it for me to say who should go and who should stay; I am certainly staying for the long haul, I can assure him of that.

Hon Nigel Hallett: You're an exciting lady, aren't you?

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: Thank you, Hon Nigel Hallett; I am an exciting lady.

I fully support the Sunset Reserve Transformation Bill and the plans for the future of this site. I very much look forward to perhaps one day going there with my colleague Hon Ken Travers and having an excellent cup of coffee down that way.

HON HELEN MORTON (East Metropolitan — Minister for Mental Health) [3.30 pm] — in reply: Given no other people are unexpectedly going to speak on the Sunset Reserve Transformation Bill 2013, I shall rise and make a few comments. I first thank the people who have given me a brilliant briefing on this bill. I have so much information here that I do not quite know where to start. It is very good information. I have a pictorial vision of everything I need to know, plus a lot of questions and answers, so I will be flicking backwards and forwards in my file.

Hon Ken Travers: Do you have a fly-through? Your government likes fly-throughs.

Hon HELEN MORTON: I have almost everything one can imagine here that will enable me to do this. I would like to thank everyone who has spoken on this bill because I believe—I will comment on the support that I think Hon Lynn MacLaren will give us—everyone will support this legislation, although I understand from the questions Hon Kate Doust asked that she wants some more information, and I have that with me. Hon Lynn MacLaren indicated that she supports the bill, but not the sale of lot 302. I believe I will be able ease her concerns where I think she is torn on this issue. I hope I can provide her with some information, especially from the Heritage Council of Western Australia, which supports the sale of that land. Hon Simon O'Brien is very supportive of the bill, but he believes that we are not going far enough. I think when some people say we are going too far and other people say we are not going far enough, we have probably got it about right. I hope Hon Stephen Dawson's mother will be happy with the outcome and that he makes sure she gets a copy of *Hansard* so that she knows that he spoke on this bill. I thank Hon Ken Travers for his support. I will go through a bit of the history, based on the history lesson given to me by the people involved in this process. I agree with Hon Liz Behjat about the transformation that will take place on this site.

Just before I get into the history, I will comment on the similarities people are drawing between this site and the Heathcote site. The Sunset Hospital site will be much bigger and could well be much better. That is not to say that I think the Heathcote site is not fantastic. I have been there many times and I adore the place. I worked there as a student when it was a mental health asylum and I went back there many years later as the director of the then South Metropolitan Health Authority. It was where my headquarters were after it had been partially renovated and redeveloped. I have the benefit of having worked at that site and, of course, I have been there many times for meals, weddings and other things. I know what a brilliant site it is.

I will not go through the entire history of the Sunset Hospital site—it is extensive—but I will put on the record some of the information I have about past proposals for the site. In 1996, the re-use of the Sunset site for not-for-profit aged care was proposed but not progressed due to the cost of upgrading the buildings. The scheme proposed at the time was for the sale of substantial areas of land, which would have provided limited public access and use of the grounds and heritage buildings. That proposal was not progressed for those reasons.

In 1999, the retirement village concept plan for Sunset to be developed as a private retirement village was released for public comment. This proposal involved the use of most of the heritage buildings for residential purposes, and provision for new accommodation on the western and eastern sides following demolition of the two-storey building. What a great shame that would have been. Around 60 per cent of the site was to be used for public open space and community use, and two proposed lots on the scarp, including the site occupied by the

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

former matron's house, were to be sold to fund the restoration of several buildings for community use by the City of Nedlands. Overall, the retirement village concept provided a viable option to open up the site and conserve the heritage buildings, although general public access was to be limited to only a few buildings. That progressed. The Western Australian Planning Commission approved an amendment to the metropolitan region scheme that would have supported the retirement village concept, although there was some opposition to the commercial and restrictive nature of the proposal. But it did not progress because Parliament was prorogued for the 2001 state election before the metropolitan region scheme amendment was approved. At this stage, having understood and read as much of this as I have over the last little while, I am really pleased that that did not go ahead.

Under the Labor government, a new process was initiated to resolve the future of Sunset Hospital. The objectives were to keep the heritage buildings, provide for community use of and access to most of the site, and secure \$15 million from the sale of land to reinvest in priority health areas. This process involved extensive community engagement and resulted in about 20 per cent of the site being identified for residential development. However, the plan did not resolve how the heritage buildings should be used. A subsequent business plan was undertaken and resulted in the public release of the Sunset community master plan. This led to the Sunset Hospital Site Bill 2006 being introduced into Parliament to provide for 91 per cent of the Sunset site to remain as an A-class reserve to be placed under the custodianship of the University of Western Australia, with 80 per cent of the site to be developed for the University of WA arts centre for community and cultural purposes, 11 per cent designated for a residential aged-care facility and nine per cent to be sold for the development of quality residential apartments. This proposal was not resolved in the Parliament before the 2008 state election. The idea of the University of WA being involved in Sunset was not supported because, although there was a clear commitment by UWA to establish the arts centre, there was no transparency of this use in the proposed legislation. Although the concept of a residential aged-care facility to provide an ongoing revenue stream for UWA to fund ongoing conservation of the heritage buildings had some validity, this would have taken up most of the significant open space on the eastern part of the site that should be accessible for the use and benefit of the broader community. The idea of residential apartments was flawed because the revenue of \$15 million was to be directed to the Department of Health for unspecified uses and not to the conservation and ongoing management of Sunset.

From all the material I have read, I think what I am seeing in front of me is the better of all those proposals that I have heard about. I am loath to now go back over any more of the history. People have talked about the hospital being vacant since it was closed in 1995. Both sides of government have struggled to find a viable and sustainable use for the site. As a result, the heritage buildings have been deteriorating over that time. I am really pleased that the Liberal-National government is delivering this election promise with a vision for this significant place with the Sunset transformation strategy. I agree with Hon Liz Behjat; it will be transformational. It will be a unique government-owned heritage precinct containing arts, cultural, community and ancillary commercial uses; a strategy that is supported by the Heritage Council of Western Australia. The strategy will be enabled by the Sunset Reserve Transformation Bill 2013.

I will say a few things about the bill before I get on to answer individual questions that members have asked. The bill is fairly small; it is very straightforward. It has only 17 clauses. As Hon Kate Doust mentioned, it deals with pretty much the technical aspects of the reserves and planning amendments that are necessary. It provides for five things to happen. The first is the "purpose" of A-class reserve 1667 being amended from "retirement village, parks and recreation, community and ancillary commercial purposes" to "Sunset heritage precinct for arts, cultural, community and ancillary commercial uses", and the second is the metropolitan region scheme planning reservation being amended so that the Sunset site becomes parks and recreation. Currently, two-thirds of the site is reserved "public purposes-hospital", which obviously is no longer relevant. Lot 302 will be zoned urban in the metropolitan region scheme and residential R12.5 in the local planning scheme. The third is the excision of residential lot 302, which contains the former matron's house and comprises 1 993 square metres; about 2.4 per cent of the site. Minor boundary adjustments will also be made to protect bore, pump and cycleway improvements that are owned by the City of Nedlands and encroach on the site. Finally, it provides for the establishment of a Sunset special purpose account to deal with the proceeds from the sale of lot 302. Moneys received or recovered from use of the land, appropriated by Parliament or from any other sources, will be applied in payment of costs and expenses incurred in the conservation and management of Sunset.

The bill does not intend, nor is it necessary, to deal with operational and management matters on the site such as lease holdings. In terms of its operation and implementation, the bill does not intend to deliver all of the minute requirements for this site. The bill amends what needs to be amended in a statutory sense to support the implementation of the Sunset transformation strategy only. The ongoing management of the Sunset heritage

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

precinct including leasing, future tenancy arrangements and heritage conservation will be undertaken by the Department of Finance under existing laws that do not need to be dealt with by this bill.

There has been quite a lot of discussion about lot 302 and its sale. It is a modest approach to provide a positive beginning—it is only a beginning—for the transformation of Sunset. Lot 302 contains the former matron's residence. It has no heritage value and sits below the main heritage complex. This of course has been confirmed by the Heritage Council of WA. This lot comprised a former closed road—Brown Road—and was never part of the original heritage core. Other than providing access from Iris Avenue, the land was never used for hospital purposes until the house was built for staff accommodation in the early 1970s. This strip of land only became part of the A-class reserve in 1977. The sale will enable all heritage buildings to be retained for future adaptive re-use for arts, cultural and community purposes.

The revenue from lot 302 will provide for the implementation of the first phase of work needed onsite. Broadly, that work includes the preservation of the heritage buildings to a secure and sustainable state; the provision of new sewerage, water and electricity infrastructure onto the site; the demolition of minor non-heritage buildings and walkways; and landscape works to the Padbury View and eastern part of the site to include the playground, barbeque and picnic areas that members have talked about. This will enable this modest but significant step to be implemented. The bill supports the Sunset transformation strategy, which is the framework within which more work can be undertaken by the Department of Finance, once Parliament approves the bill to set up the governance arrangements necessary to manage the place and achieve the vision over time.

I now get to some of the specific questions asked by members. A question was asked about the extent to which the City of Nedlands has been consulted and involved in this. Members have to forgive me for flicking backwards and forwards between these answers. The City of Nedlands has been consulted. There has been ongoing discussion with the City of Nedlands about the strategy. The City of Nedlands has provided in-principle support for the Sunset transformation strategy and some interest in exploring opportunities to relocate the Tresillian arts complex to Sunset. The City of Nedlands was briefed on the Sunset transformation strategy as part of the site inspection following the Premier's announcement to develop the strategy in January 2013. On 10 December 2013, the City of Nedlands noted the Sunset transformation strategy and supported the proposals for the long-term development of the site. However, consistent with its previous decisions, the council does not support the sale of any part of the site as a means of funding the transformation strategy.

Hon Kate Doust asked what “and for related purposes” means in the bill. The Sunset reserve account is the clearest example of related purposes. Although nothing about the special purpose account is in the long title, the bill makes provision for that to occur. That is an example of related purposes.

Most of the conversation from members related to lot 302. I want to talk a little more about that because I know that members have expressed some concerns. Originally, that amount of land was 1 500 square metres. At the time it was done, it was a desktop assessment. When the strategy was underway, that was reviewed to be 1 993 square metres. Once again, that is fully supported by the Heritage Council. Lot 302 contains the matron's house and has no heritage value. It sits below the main heritage complex. I have already mentioned that. It contains a former closed road, which was never part of the original heritage core. Other than providing access from Iris Avenue, it was never used for hospital purposes until the house was built. The strip of land only became part of the reserve in 1977. I have already mentioned that as well.

The Department of Finance will prepare design guidelines for lot 302 in consultation with the State Heritage Office, the Swan River Trust, the Department of Planning and the City of Nedlands to ensure that design and development is of a high standard, comparable to nearby residences, and has no detrimental impact on the heritage significance of the Sunset site.

Hon Lynn MacLaren asked a question about how it will be sold—will it go to the open market or to tender? It will be sold on the open market by a public process. A purchaser may choose to live in the existing house, redevelop as a single house or make application to the Western Australian Planning Commission to subdivide lot 302 into two single residential lots. That would be consistent with the design guidelines and the City of Nedlands' local planning scheme. The City of Nedlands will determine any development application on lot 302.

Some questions were asked about how the government knows that the value of the sale will be sufficient to cover the costs of the first stage of the transformation strategy. As I mentioned, I have seen the valuation or the costing of each item that is in the first stage. I am also aware what this land might be worth from the election commitment that was put out by the Premier at the time that this commitment was made. I can assure the member that the costs associated with those items are less than that cost, so we will be able to cover the full cost of those. It is difficult to release any valuation advice on this land before it goes out to tender, because that could reduce the benefit that could be achieved through the sale of that land. It is not possible to ascertain a figure with

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

confidence at this stage. The figure we are working on is an estimate—it could be higher or lower than that. Nevertheless, I am confident from the information I have seen that the items already earmarked for that funding will be covered in that process. I do not know whether the member feels comfortable with my assurances.

Hon Lynn MacLaren: What happens if it is not enough? What is plan B?

Hon HELEN MORTON: I will get to the process on how things will develop from there. Again, I assure the member that it will be covered. I have covered as much as I can on the valuation of the land.

Another question that came up was: Why not put government funding into it? Why do it this way rather than finding an allocation from consolidated revenue to go into it? There was a suggestion that we should take money out of the Elizabeth Quay development and put it into this. My answer is that we can have both. There is not an issue about not having one or the other. We are going to get the funding out of the sale of that land. Income will also come from the rent, which I will talk more about later. We already have maintenance funding going to the site from the Department of Finance, which is around \$200 000 a year. If Parliament were ever to appropriate some funding for this, it would go into the special purpose account. There is no need to take funding out of any other project to make this happen. This will all be achievable within the proposal and transformation strategy.

Hon Lynn MacLaren: Only from the sale of that land?

Hon HELEN MORTON: That is just the first part of it.

There was also a question about whether we need more regulations under this bill. We do not need any more regulations; any other regulations or processes can be managed within existing legislation. That is why it does not need to be any more detailed than at the moment. Existing legislation will enable everything that we need to do to be done. Regulations may be required under the Land Administration (Land Management) Regulations 2006, for example. Other legislation can be used to achieve whatever regulations we want.

There was a lot of talk about tendering for tenants and about the tenants that are currently there. This will cover some of the questions around how the project will be funded. The tenancy management strategy will be developed and overseen by a Sunset transformation committee. A requirement of leases will be that tenants restore the buildings to a heritage standard in return for a peppercorn lease. Once the buildings are restored, commercial lease terms and market rentals will apply. Future tenancies will be compatible with the arts, culture and community use. The Sunset transformation committee, to be chaired by the Department of Finance, will be established to oversee the transformation plan and approve future tenancy arrangements for the site. Key issues to be considered before entering into further leases include public access to heritage buildings, lease periods, car parking requirements and how to achieve a mix of activities that promote site activation and vibrancy. It was mentioned, for example, that the Minderoo Foundation, formerly the Australian Children's Trust, is a current lessee. It is on a short-term lease of building Q for office use. In return for a nominal \$1 per annum rent, Minderoo has upgraded the building to a tenable standard. I understand that it has put in in excess of \$1 million to do that. The government has supported ScreenWest film and television productions at Sunset since 1987, with more than 40 productions undertaken there. The Department of Culture and the Arts has a licence agreement to use building A. This enables the Australian Museum of Motion Picture and Television to store vintage cinema equipment in part of the building. Australian Doctors for Africa has a monthly tenancy arrangement to store medical equipment in the former Catholic chapel prior to its being sent to Africa. No rent is payable by that group. The former matron's house is a 1970s house in fair condition that has been subject to periodic lease since 2001. The rental is \$425 a week and subject to the Residential Tenancies Act. It can be terminated with a couple of months' notice if ever necessary. That amount of money is never going to be enough to meet the cost of maintaining that facility.

Hon Lynn MacLaren: Did you say \$420?

Hon HELEN MORTON: It is \$425 a week.

Hon Lynn MacLaren: For the three-by-one house?

Hon HELEN MORTON: I have never seen the house so I have no idea what it is like.

Hon Sue Ellery: Location, location, location.

Hon HELEN MORTON: I know; the location would be brilliant.

The original one-year lease to Minderoo for office use of building Q commenced on 22 June 2010 with a further one-year option, which was granted. A further two-year lease commenced on 22 June 2012 with a two-year option available from 23 June 2014, which the minister will not unreasonably withhold. What is being demonstrated here is that people are coming into those buildings with their eyes wide open about the requirement

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

to restore their heritage value. Once it is at that stage, a commercial rent will apply. A question was also asked about how other organisations will get into this site if possible. That will be determined as part of the tenancy management strategy to be prepared by the Department of Finance.

Taking this a little further, there was also a question about the steering committee and why it did not have local members on it. Hon Lynn MacLaren hit the nail on the head when she talked about the steering committee having a substantial —

Hon Lynn MacLaren: Brains trust.

Hon HELEN MORTON: That is right. I will quickly go over that again. The steering committee consisted of the director general of the Department of Finance, the Government Architect of WA, the executive director of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the chair of the Heritage Council of Western Australia, the director general of the Department of Planning and the project director of Building Management and Works. It was a government decision to look at this bigger picture, with full knowledge of the views from previous schemes. However, there will be an opportunity for local councils and other individuals to become involved in the next stage, which is the implementation steering committee—I cannot remember the proper name for that. The implementation process will also have committee involvement, so there will be opportunities for people to get involved in that.

Hon Lynn MacLaren: What about the Sunset Heritage Association? That is a key stakeholder.

Hon HELEN MORTON: I cannot say which individual organisations will be involved.

Hon Lynn MacLaren: That is the group that really looks after that entire area.

Hon HELEN MORTON: Given that it is about the implementation process, I think anybody who has a genuine interest in it could be involved—I should not say “anybody”, because I do not believe it needs a cast of thousands. There will be opportunities for that to be considered in the establishment of the next stage of that committee work. I am trying to look for the words in my notes.

Hon Lynn MacLaren: Thank you, minister. I will follow up on that.

Hon HELEN MORTON: The Sunset Transformation Committee will develop the tenancy management strategy and the Sunset management plan. So there will be a process for that.

With regard to the business case, I think I have covered that as much as I can, without giving the member the actual dollar values.

I know that Hon Ken Travers is interested in the special purpose account. Clause 16 of the bill states clearly what can be done through that special purpose account. Some people have suggested that the funds could be placed in a general purpose heritage fund rather than a special purpose account for maintaining the heritage at the Sunset site. I think it would be a great shame if that were to happen, because if the funds are in the special purpose account, and the purpose of that account is spelt out clearly in legislation and those funds cannot be used for any other purpose, that is the best and most secure way to ensure that those funds are used for that purpose and that purpose only.

Hon Ken Travers: However, under section 20 of the Financial Management Act, the Treasurer could declare those funds surplus to requirements and take it all.

Hon HELEN MORTON: But if the funds were to go to a general purpose heritage fund, I think we would have no chance of ensuring that those funds were directed back to the Sunset heritage maintenance and development. I believe that, despite the advice members have had to the contrary, this is a better, safer and more direct way of ensuring that these funds are applied specifically to the purpose for which they are intended.

The Heritage Council of Western Australia supports the strategy in full and does not agree that the sale of lot 302 will compromise the heritage value of this site. The income from the sale of lot 302 will not cover all the works that will need to be achieved on this site, but it will ensure that we get the necessary funds to put in place the basic requirements that will enable people to make full use of this facility.

I hope I have answered most of the questions that members have raised. With those comments, I move that the bill be read a second time.

Division

Question put and a division taken, the Acting President (Hon Alanna Clohesy) casting her vote with the ayes, with the following result —

Extract from *Hansard*
[COUNCIL — Thursday, 10 April 2014]
p2459b-2477a

Hon Kate Doust; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Liz Behjat; Hon Helen Morton

Ayes (27)

Hon Ken Baston
Hon Liz Behjat
Hon Jacqui Boydell
Hon Paul Brown
Hon Jim Chown
Hon Alanna Clohesy
Hon Stephen Dawson

Hon Sue Ellery
Hon Brian Ellis
Hon Donna Faragher
Hon Adele Farina
Hon Nick Goiran
Hon Dave Grills
Hon Nigel Hallett

Hon Alyssa Hayden
Hon Col Holt
Hon Peter Katsambanis
Hon Mark Lewis
Hon Rick Mazza
Hon Robyn McSweeney
Hon Helen Morton

Hon Simon O'Brien
Hon Ljiljana Ravlich
Hon Samantha Rowe
Hon Amber-Jade Sanderson
Hon Ken Travers
Hon Phil Edman (*Teller*)

Noes (2)

Hon Robin Chapple

Hon Lynn MacLaren (*Teller*)

Pairs

Hon Martin Aldridge
Hon Peter Collier
Hon Michael Mischin

Hon Sally Talbot
Hon Kate Doust
Hon Darren West

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to third reading.

Third Reading

HON HELEN MORTON (East Metropolitan — Minister for Mental Health) [4.09 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

HON LYNN MacLAREN (South Metropolitan) [4.10 pm]: The Greens continue to oppose the Sunset Reserve Transformation Bill 2013, and not because we oppose the adaptive reuse of land. We have made it clear that we support the plan put forward with just one little hitching point, which is the sale of an A-class reserve. It is a principle that we hold very dear: public land should remain in the public's hands. In this case, we do not believe that the sale of this land is necessary to fund the Sunset transformation. That is the reason we oppose this bill. We urge the government to consider other methods of funding heritage preservation.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Sitting suspended from 4.11 to 4.30 pm