

Chairman; Mr John Hyde; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Miles; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Frank Alban; Mr Chris Tallentire;  
Mr Albert Jacob

---

**Division 48: Planning, \$47 631 000 —**

Mr P.B. Watson, Chairman.

Mr J.H.D. Day, Minister for Planning.

Mr E.W. Lumsden, Director General.

Mr G. Prattley, Chairman, Western Australian Planning Commission.

Mr A.R. Evans, General Manager/Secretary, Western Australian Planning Commission.

Mr G. Finn, Director, Perth Waterfront.

Mr S.M. Henriques, Director, Operations, East Perth Redevelopment Authority.

Mr R.H. Wilson, Acting Chief Finance Officer.

**The CHAIRMAN:** This estimates committee will be reported by Hansard staff. The daily proof *Hansard* will be published at 9.00 am tomorrow.

The estimates committee's consideration of the estimates will be restricted to discussion of those items for which a vote of money is proposed in the consolidated account. This is the prime focus of the committee. Although there is scope for members to examine many matters, questions need to be clearly related to a page number, item, program, or amount within the volumes. For example, members are free to pursue performance indicators that are included in the *Budget Statements* while there remains a clear link between the questions and the estimates.

It is the intention of the Chair to ensure that as many questions as possible are asked and answered and that both questions and answers are short and to the point.

The minister may agree to provide supplementary information to the committee rather than asking that the question be put on notice for the next sitting week. I ask the minister to clearly indicate what supplementary information he agrees to provide and I will then allocate a reference number. If supplementary information is to be provided, I seek the minister's cooperation in ensuring that it is delivered to the committee clerk by Friday, 10 June 2011, so that members may read it before the report and third reading stages. If the supplementary information cannot be provided within that time, written advice is required of the day by which the information will be made available. Details in relation to supplementary information have been provided to both members and advisers, and accordingly I ask the minister to cooperate with those requirements. I caution members that if a minister asks that a matter be put on notice, it is up to the member to lodge the question on notice with the Clerk's office. Only supplementary information that the minister agrees to provide will be sought by Friday, 10 June 2011.

It will greatly assist Hansard if, when referring to the program statements volumes or the consolidated account estimates, members give the page number, items, program and amount in preface to their question.

I now ask the minister to introduce his advisers to the committee.

[Witnesses introduced.]

**The CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, minister. Members, do we have any questions?

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** On page 556 of the *Budget Statements*, the first dot point under "Land Accessibility Planning and Policy Development" refers to the need to ensure "sufficient land is available". Why has the government not fully committed to and funded the electronic land development program? What is the current estimate of its cost? What has the minister been officially advised are the benefits of ELDP in WA? I refer to page 558 and the heading "Completed Works", at which the cost of completing the ELDP program was estimated in 2010-11 to be \$3.946 million. Yet in answer to question on notice 4955, the minister stated that it had not been budgeted for and would cost \$20 million. Is the minister's allegedly completed ELDP a land-lite version?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** It is correct that the first stage of the electronic land development program has been completed and that involved a much more thorough investigation of the options in preparation of the business case. From memory, the estimated cost for the major part of the project is in the order of \$20 million to \$25 million. It is desirable to complete that. It is always the case that it is never possible to do everything straightaway. Choices need to be made, and this is a project that will need further funding in the future. It is by no means the only factor in land supply; the major issue for the number of lots available at the moment is in fact not related to any activity or lack of activity by government, but to the reduced market demand resulting from a lack of confidence in people's preparedness to borrow money or lenders' preparedness to provide finance either to developers or, in some cases, to potential home builders.

Chairman; Mr John Hyde; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Miles; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Frank Alban; Mr Chris Tallentire;  
Mr Albert Jacob

---

**Mr P.T. MILES:** I refer to page 554 and the fifth dot point at “Significant Issues Impacting the Agency”. Will the minister please outline the role that the Department of Planning and the Western Australian Planning Commission are playing in the Perth Waterfront project? Will the minister advise on the status of that project?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** One of the government’s main priorities is to ensure that the Waterfront project is not only planned for, but undertaken and completed; and indeed that is what is happening. In terms of the Department of Planning and the WA Planning Commission responsibilities, that area of land is under the control of the WA Planning Commission. It has put in place an improvement plan, which gives it greater authority to undertake some aspects of the project. The Department of Planning is responsible for providing professional services to the Planning Commission and at the moment Mr Finn is the principal officer managing the project for the Planning Commission. A lot of work is underway. A lot has been achieved so far. And a lot will continue to be achieved between now and the end of the year, with the major construction works commencing in the early part of next year. Once legislation is in place—which we hope will be the case before the end of this year—to essentially amalgamate the existing redevelopment authorities and to establish a new metropolitan redevelopment authority, that new agency will take over responsibility for the management and delivery of the project. Hopefully that will happen from 1 January or at least in the early part of next year. At the moment, the East Perth Redevelopment Authority is providing some assistance and advice about the delivery of this project; however, the Planning Commission and the Department of Planning have primary responsibility. I will ask Mr Prattley to add his comments about the Planning Commission and this project.

[7.10 pm]

**Mr G. Prattley:** We are on target for the current work. We are currently commencing phase 3 of the work, which includes a detailed design, contract, documentation and statutory approvals. We anticipate that the initial sites will go to market for expressions of interest around September or October this year. It is all progressing according to the program at this stage.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I have a query. Are we dealing with divisions 48 and 49 concurrently? I thought we were only on division 48. We are on division 48 as I understand it, and the member for Wanneroo referred to the fifth dot point on page 554 of the *Budget Statements*, but as far as I am concerned, I do not mind dealing with both.

**The CHAIRMAN:** We are still on division 48.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** But division 48 does not address the Perth Waterfront project!

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** The Perth Waterfront project comes under division 49.

I refer to page 554 of the *Budget Statements* and the total cost of services in the service summary. How much funding has been allocated to the review of residential design codes? How much has been spent already? Which consultants have been awarded work on the review? How much is being done in-house? When will this review begin and finish?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** The member is correct to say that a review of the R-codes is underway. It has been much wanted by many members of the building industry, and quite a number of members of the public, for quite some time. I am not sure about the amount of funding allocated to that review. I am not sure whether a specific amount has been allocated. I will ask the Director General of the Department of Planning to comment in a moment. I know the consulting firm GHD has been appointed. I will ask the director general to also comment about the completion of the project.

**Mr E.W. Lumsden:** The R-codes review has commenced. The majority of work will be done in-house; I will have to check how that breakdown occurs. As the minister has outlined, a consulting firm—GHD—has been employed to assist in the process. The majority of the work is to be carried out by the policy division of the department through an acting director. It is intended that the review will continue throughout the rest of this year, for an early completion, subject to public consultation mechanisms, early in the 2012 calendar year.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** On 16 September last year, the minister put out a massive press release trumpeting this review, yet people who have contacted GHD were told that GHD knew nothing about the review and that perhaps its Philippines office might be dealing with it. There is not yet the ability to put in a submission to this review online, despite the minister’s big announcement last September.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** Does the member seriously suggest that GHD’s Philippines office might be dealing with the review?

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** That is what one constituent was told.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** By someone in GHD?

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** By someone in GHD.

Chairman; Mr John Hyde; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Miles; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Frank Alban; Mr Chris Tallentire;  
Mr Albert Jacob

---

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** We will check that out, because I would say off the top of my head that it sounds pretty unlikely and pretty stupid if anybody did say that.

In relation to the public consultation, Mr Prattley has just informed me that he signed a briefing note today seeking approval to proceed with formal consultation; therefore, that is about to occur. I will ask him to comment about the timing of that.

**Mr G. Prattley:** The process has been through extensive consultation with industry and with all the major stakeholders. It has been endorsed by the Western Australian Planning Commission, and, as I just advised the minister, late this afternoon I signed a briefing note forwarding all those recommendations to the minister for approval to proceed with formal advertising of amendments to this policy document and to put that in effect, which will then go through a formal full public consultation process.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Can the minister not accept that it is somewhat deceptive that he announced in September last year that everybody has been greatly anticipating this review, particularly key stakeholders such as local precinct groups, local councils, advisory councils and others who are interested? They tell me that they have been unable to put in submissions or locate information on how to do so. The minister has indicated that he has signed the briefing note about the public consultation.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** No, I do not think that there has been anything deceptive; I certainly cannot agree with that. Quite a lot of preparatory work needs to go into undertaking this review and I am sure that that has been occurring over the last few months or so. I do not recall anybody contacting me or writing to me, and I do not recall seeing anything indicating that people are dissatisfied with the process at this point. If somebody can show me otherwise, I am happy to accept that. There will be a public consultation process. A lot of work has gone on behind the scenes in relation to a lot of the detail that needs to be understood and prepared—this is quite a complex issue. I ask Mr Lumsden to comment further on the process and the work that would have been going on over the last six months or so.

**Mr E.W. Lumsden:** The review of the R-codes was on the annual planning program for the department on behalf of the commission. Before we went out to public consultation, a process of internal review was undertaken to identify all the issues that I thought it would be appropriate to address prior to the employment of any consultant. I am quite strong on that process; rather than putting in an open brief, to a consultant, I prefer to have a more defined approach. I have to say in my defence that I insisted on that process. We also decided to advance the multi-unit housing code prior to the review of the R-codes, bearing in mind that we still have to project manage these projects. Following an internal review process was an input to develop a brief for consultant registration, which went through, and, finally, the appointment of the consultant. Therefore, we are now at a stage at which we have a defined brief going out for public consultation, as the minister and the Chairman of the Planning Commission, Mr Prattley, said. It is an important strategic document and my view is that we need to do the right and proper thing. I was concerned to have a brief that met the issues that we needed to address effectively, regardless of perhaps a slightly longer time frame.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Can the minister provide, by way of supplementary information, the cost of the consultancy for the review? Given that Mr Lumsden said that at some time in 2012 we should have the final report or result, when does the minister anticipate being able to enact regulations or any legislative changes that might come from the review?

**Mr E.W. Lumsden:** We can certainly give the member that information; I want to emphasise that it is a review of the R-codes and therefore it will be a review of the current provisions of the R-codes. It will not be a total revamp—I hope that that is not necessary—but there will be amendments to the R-codes that will, subject to the minister's consent and obviously going through the Western Australian Planning Commission process, which Mr Prattley has outlined, be through by the end of the 2011–12 financial year. We will have to take the question on the exact day on notice, but we can give the breakdown.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Can the minister let us know about the supplementary information?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** We agree to provide information about the value of the contract awarded to GHD for its role in this review of the R-codes.

[*Supplementary Information No A13.*]

**Mr F.A. ALBAN:** I refer to page 567 of the *Budget Statements* under “Asset Investment Program” and the reference to the Perth City Link project. Can the minister please outline the next major steps in this project and relevant funding allocations?

[7.20 pm]

Chairman; Mr John Hyde; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Miles; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Frank Alban; Mr Chris Tallentire;  
Mr Albert Jacob

---

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** The Perth City Link project is another major project that the government regards as high priority. Sinking the rail line and the Wellington Street bus station has been talked about for many years. The project is now fully funded and is underway. As I think I mentioned at question time last week, some of the above-ground works have commenced with some of the changes needed to be made at the Perth railway station. Later this year, the major undergrounding works will commence, which will be undertaken under the auspices primarily of the Public Transport Authority. The East Perth Redevelopment Authority has overall responsibility for the project and in particular what is happening above ground. I will ask Mr Henriques to add a bit more information about the expected timing of the works.

**Mr S.M. Henriques:** Within the forward estimates, \$57 million is allocated for EPRA, of which \$31 million relates to the delivery of City Square for the Perth City Link project. The next significant stage of works is the stage 1 works around Milligan Street and the creation of two development sites just next to the Perth Arena—in between the Arena and the Channel 7 site.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I have a further question on that matter. What is the expected total cost of the Perth City Link project—that is, the two components with the old Northbridge Link plus the new bus station?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** The expected total cost is \$737 million. That is made up of \$609 million, which has been allocated to the Public Transport Authority for undergrounding the rail lines. It is also to upgrade the platform arrangements at Perth station and to underground the Wellington Street bus station. An allocation of \$128 million has been made to the East Perth Redevelopment Authority for expenditure in the above-ground works.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** What was the original estimate that was put to the commonwealth government back in October 2008, I think?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** From memory—I know one of the member's colleagues asked the Premier about this earlier today—it was twice \$263 million; I think it was of the order of \$530 million or so. I think I am also right in saying that undergrounding the bus station has increased the scope of the project somewhat. I will ask Mr Henriques to comment.

**Mr S.M. Henriques:** I can comment on the EPRA element. I do not have the figures in front of me for the \$609 million equivalent—the PTA element of the cost.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I refer to the total cost sent, as I understand, to the federal government in late 2008.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I would have to check that. My recollection —

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Could the minister provide that as supplementary information?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I think it is probably already on the record somewhere.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** But the minister does not know it.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** It is not particularly relevant. The point is that the project —

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** It is relevant because —

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** The point is that the project is going ahead. I think most people in Western Australia actually want this project to go ahead. My understanding was that the opposition supported the project as well. Obviously, there is a cost in doing so. There will be some recouping of the cost through land sales before the conclusion of the whole project, which will reduce the final cost. The final cost, therefore, once land has been sold, would be less than \$737 million. I am right in saying I do not have the final cost after land sales, but the expected cost of all the public works as a gross amount is \$737 million, subject to land being sold to reduce that amount.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Can the minister provide by way of supplementary information the original cost of the project?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** There was never an original cost of the project. Until the details —

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** There was, because the minister sent it to the federal government. There was an original cost.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I am happy to provide by way of supplementary information the figure that was being talked about and specifically what it related to back in 2008 or 2009, because it probably did not relate to exactly the same thing we are talking about now.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** It did, because there were two components: there was City Link plus the undergrounding of the bus station. It is the same project; it was just that it was the more expensive option.

Chairman; Mr John Hyde; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Miles; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Frank Alban; Mr Chris Tallentire;  
Mr Albert Jacob

---

**The CHAIRMAN:** Members, your own member is talking. Could the minister let us know what the supplementary information was?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I will provide by way of supplementary information what was made publicly available in relation to expected cost of works that were being contemplated in 2008 in relation to this project.

[*Supplementary Information No A14.*]

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** I refer to the reference to the state planning strategy on page 554 of the *Budget Statements* and the third dot point under “Significant Issues Impacting the Agency”. I ask whether during the current review ongoing problems faced by local residents from the operation of the Hanson concrete batching plant in Edward Street, East Perth are being addressed. As the batching plant’s licence expires in 2012, will the minister guarantee that to preserve the proper planning of the inner city mixed-use locality, the Barnett government will not support renewal of the licence or such industrial activities on that site?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I think this has a very tenuous link to the state planning strategy, but I am happy to answer the question nevertheless. The answer is: no, I will not guarantee that there will be a cessation of concrete batching plant activities in East Perth. The issues will be considered on their merits. The concerns and views of local residents will certainly be taken into account in any further consideration of the activities on that site. Also taken into account will be the economic cost—transport costs, fuel costs and greenhouse gas production aspects—of forcing the concrete batching plant activities somewhere into the outer metropolitan area. That would have a significant effect in relation to road congestion, greenhouse gas production, exhaust emissions and costs of building in the Perth city centre, given that a large amount of building activity will be underway in Perth with the City Link project and the Perth Waterfront project. A lot of building activity is underway at the moment. All those factors will need to be weighed up, including, as I said, the views of local residents.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Using that as a reason, the minister would be setting one up on the Esplanade to cut greenhouse gases and to ease traffic if that was the minister’s motivation for having such plant in the inner city.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** No; that is a fairly ridiculous comment. A plant is currently constructed in East Perth. To relocate it, for some artificial reason that the member just suggested, is fairly stupid. It is not the first stupid comment to be made tonight.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** EPRA put the original condition until 2012, so EPRA expected it to be gone by 2012. That is all that residents and others who have bought into the area are asking. The original agreement with EPRA, when it was under EPRA’s control, was that the lease would expire in 2012.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I do not know about any “agreement” that the lease would have expired then. I am not taking sides on this issue. I am simply saying that all the factors need to be weighed up. As in a lot of planning decisions, points are made on both sides of the argument. The essential point is that a statutory planning process needs to be followed, and it will be followed.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** My question relates to development assessment panels and the dot point at the top of page 555 of the *Budget Statements*. I am interested to know whether the figure of \$700 000 for DAPs listed on page 141 of Budget Paper No 3 excludes cost recovery? Is it a net figure? Does it include an amount charged to councils? Will councils be charged? Are appellants to be charged as well? What level of fees will be charged? Also, what sitting fees will be received by the development assessment panel members and what other costs are included in operating DAPs?

[7.30 pm]

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** The establishment of development assessment panels will take effect from 1 July. I made a statement in this chamber last week that the independent and non-local government members of the panels have now been appointed. The \$700 000 figure is the estimated cost of operations that is expected to be covered by the slightly higher application fees that proponents will pay when a development assessment panel is involved. It is therefore expected to be a cost-neutral exercise. The \$700 000 has to be shown in the papers, as I understand it, as expenditure, but that is expected to be covered by fees received. In relation to the fees payable to —

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** To councils?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** — to the members of the panels, from memory, is \$500 per session for chairs and \$400 for members. For sitting fees and amounts payable to councils themselves, applicants will still pay an application fee for a project, as they do at the moment when they submit an application through the local government authority. Off the cuff, I cannot remember what they are, but they are contained in the regulations under the Planning and Development Act. It is about \$5 000 for a mid-size project of between \$4 million and \$5 million—I am going completely on memory here. The additional fee payable when a development assessment panel is involved is in

Chairman; Mr John Hyde; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Miles; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Frank Alban; Mr Chris Tallentire;  
Mr Albert Jacob

---

the order of another \$1 500 to \$2 000 or so. But the information is all contained in the regulations that have been published.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** Has the minister any idea or is it possible to estimate how many sessions of the various DAPs will be convened?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** It would obviously vary a lot across the state. We do not expect many at all in remote or smaller regional towns of Western Australia. At the other end of the scale are those in the City of Perth, although the threshold is higher: \$15 million is the threshold when a DAP needs to be used on a mandatory basis, compared with \$7 million in other parts of the state. Certainly, given the size of the projects in the City of Perth, or those within a 20-kilometre radius of the Perth CBD, the frequency would obviously be greater. An estimate was done of the number of projects that would need to be considered, and I think it is expected to be in the order of 130 on an annual basis.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** I take the minister back to the third dot point on page 554 of the *Budget Statements* that was mentioned earlier relating to the “State Planning Strategy”. Could the minister outline in a broader sense the progress of the state planning strategy?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** The “State Planning Strategy” is being reviewed at the moment. It is the first time it has been reviewed since the current one was adopted about 15 years ago in 1996–97. It is clearly therefore overdue for review. Its purpose is to be the master planning document for the whole state and to cover all the state government agencies and local government authorities that have a role in planning for growth in the state. Some of the key factors will be sustainable use and development of land, particularly taking into account some of the community, economic, environment, infrastructure, regional development and governance requirements. We expect that a draft will be released for public comment in October this year. I will ask Mr Prattley to add a bit more information, given that the Planning Commission is essentially overseeing this review.

**Mr G. Prattley:** It has been an extensive review and, I guess, a quite different approach to the “State Planning Strategy”. We want it to be a document that represents the whole-of-government view about the future of the state. Therefore, it will necessarily be a high-level document that addresses all the key issues. We have been through an extensive process of consultations with other government agencies and most recently with the directors general of different agencies. We are now finalising that document and trying to compress it into a readable document, given that it is dealing with such a broad scope. We want it to be a document that is useful across government in terms of where this state sits on a range of issues. It is the overarching framework for all the planning work that we do, but it will necessarily be high level. There will be a lot of issues in it that cabinet will need to address before we get to the public consultation stage, but our target at this stage is to be through those processes and out in the public arena by October.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** I refer to page 553 of the *Budget Statements* and appropriations note (a) referring to the service level agreement for corporate services with the Department of Transport. What exact functions and services of the Department of Planning have been transferred back to the Department of Transport and what are the individual budget amounts for those services?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I do not know whether we can provide the individual budget amounts, but I will ask Mr Lumsden to comment on the functions that have been transferred.

**Mr E.W. Lumsden:** I want to outline to the member first of all that the transfer of functions in the corporate services area is not just to the Department of Transport; it is also in part to the Department of Regional Development and Lands. This is done by a service agreement covering functions such as IT and some areas of procurement. Other areas in legal services were transferred due to the nature of the split in the priorities and functions. I will, however, ask Mr Richard Wilson to go into some detail on this matter, because he has been overseeing this service level agreement on agencies’ behalf and he can give a more definitive answer.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Mr Wilson, through the minister.

**Mr R.H. Wilson:** The split of the former Department for Planning and Infrastructure was done at the beginning of 2009. The functions that were corporate-related stayed with the Department of Planning, providing services to both Transport and Regional Development and Lands. As a consequence of the need to separate the functions between the three departments, we have managed to now separate out all the functions so that there are separate finance, human resources, record-keeping, legal services, ministerial services and so forth that support each department. The only thing shared between the departments is IT infrastructure. So, the network services and other things that are done as a consequence of running that department are done through the Department of Transport.

Chairman; Mr John Hyde; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Miles; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Frank Alban; Mr Chris Tallentire;  
Mr Albert Jacob

---

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Further to that, a pretty big amount of money is being transferred back to the Department of Transport. Also, some of it is being transferred to the Department of Regional Development and Lands. I am after those figures. What is being spent?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** What is the global figure?

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** What is the global figure?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** No, what is it the member is referring to?

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Page 553 states that the “Corporate Services function was transferred to the Department of Transport”.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** Is that the \$31.766 million figure?

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** That is what it says there as the global figure, and that is nearly half of the total budget being outsourced.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** Mr Wilson has that information.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Through the minister.

**Mr R.H. Wilson:** That amount is the amount for the total corporate function that was transferred from the former Department for Planning and Infrastructure, which approximated \$50 million. Therefore, approximately \$32 million has gone to the Department of Transport and a further \$3 million has gone to the Department of Regional Development and Lands. The residual amount remains in planning to provide planning’s corporate services functions. Those moneys are transferred from the old department and from planning now into those two departments, but they are no longer in are our budget.

[7.40 pm]

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** This is going on again till 2014–15 and so on.

**Mr R.H. Wilson:** They are negative figures.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** That is right. However, in other areas of government a change in ministry means a one-off change in services. For the next century will there be this almost heritage line item of how things used to be under the Department for Planning and Infrastructure?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I will ask Mr Wilson whether he can explain why the amount of \$31.766 million continues across the forward estimates. This is listed under “Major Spending Changes”, of course, so it is obviously a continuing fad, but maybe Mr Wilson can explain.

**Mr R.H. Wilson:** These are negative figures. They are reductions to our previous budget. There would have been a positive figure in the published budget last year. These figures are now adjusting those out to get rid of them from the planning budget.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** This figure refers to a change compared with last year’s published figures. Therefore, as Mr Wilson said, \$31.766 million needs to be taken out for each of the years compared with last year’s budget papers. If the member gets last year’s budget papers and opens them up and takes off \$31.766 million from each year, he will arrive at what is now the expected expenditure by the Department of Planning.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** When we get to the budget for the Department of Culture and Arts, the minister will see that that has not happened. We have the cut-off date. It seems to be a different system.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** The Department of Culture and the Arts has not been split into two or three different departments. The Department of Planning was separated out from Transport from the old Department for Planning and Infrastructure. I presume that is the difference.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Did the government make a mistake in splitting up DPI into silos such as planning if it still has to make budget adjustments and re-amalgamate some services back into transport and sharing services?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** The answer is no, we did not make a mistake. I think it was done for very good reason. As I have discussed in this chamber in the last couple of weeks, the performance of the Department of Planning in dealing with planning scheme amendments, subdivision applications and structure plans and so on, in a more timely way, has improved quite substantially over the past couple of years or so. The fact that this department is able to focus much more on those planning activities as opposed to all the other functions in the old DPI, including vehicle licensing and marine safety and so on, explains a lot of it. The answer is no, I do not think that we have made a mistake. This is an accounting change that I think the people from Treasury could explain very effectively to the member if I have not been able to.

Chairman; Mr John Hyde; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Miles; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Frank Alban; Mr Chris Tallentire;  
Mr Albert Jacob

---

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** My question relates to page 558 and information and communications technology infrastructure expenditure under “Works in Progress”. The estimated total cost of that infrastructure is listed as \$88.9 million, yet it seems that around only \$44 million has been spent and will be spent over the budget year and forward estimates.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** Can I ask what project the member is referring to?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Information and communications technology infrastructure, under “Works in Progress” on page 558. What projects included in that \$88.9 million are not expected to be funded or completed over those five years?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** The estimated total cost, as the member said, is \$88.9 million over a number of years. The allocation in 2011–12 is \$5.24 million of that. The project provides for the ongoing upgrading of storage networks, servers and monitoring tools. The estimated total cost also covers a number of related projects, including capacity management, data archiving, version currency—someone can explain what that means in a moment—business continuity and disaster recovery planning. The long-term benefits include allowing the department to meet the statutory and compliance requirements in the protection of corporate data assets, and providing some of the basic infrastructure necessary to allow the department to participate in mainstream electronic service delivery and keep pace with work volume increases.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I asked what projects will not be funded. The minister just gave me the projects that will be funded.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** Is the member asking which projects will not be funded?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yes, the total cost of the program is \$88.9 million and that will not be spent over those five years, so what projects will not be funded over that time?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** Anything not included in what I just read out.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Could the minister provide by supplementary information those projects that will not be delivered?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** It is a bit hard to provide information on something that is not going to happen.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Why does the minister have \$88.9 million in the estimated total cost?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** In the out years the expenditure is expected to be \$68.58 million; obviously, there is ongoing expenditure, as there is across all of government, on ICT projects.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** It is not a difficult question. Simply stated, in the government’s budget papers, the minister has said that the estimated total cost of this project is \$88.9 million. The minister must have derived that figure by some method. We are asking what items will not be funded over those five years.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** Of that \$88.9 million, \$15.142 million is the estimated expenditure to the end of June of this year. As I said, after 2011–12 a balance is left of \$68.58 million. Information technology and computing requirements are never-ending and completely ongoing. I imagine a lot of the estimated total costs relate to further aspects of what I have mentioned.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Is the minister willing to provide the answer by supplementary information?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I think we should clear it up here.

**Mr E.W. Lumsden:** This is basically an operational expenditure to keep our IT assets constantly upgraded and renewed, for example, through the renewal of licences. We look at the necessary underpinning of the department’s operations, which would be normal business practice, to ensure that we have the necessary funds to maintain those systems. It is not a matter of not including projects. This is more fundamental; it covers the basic day-to-day operations of the department and the IT support. I will hand over to Mr Wilson to give a more precise answer.

**Mr R.H. Wilson:** The other thing that is missing from these papers is that the capital works program is a 10-year program. A further five years on top of this is calculated in the Treasury data, which adds to that total estimated cost. There is another five years of IT support for the department to be able to meet its obligations. All capital is funded that way for long-term commitments.

**Mr P.T. MILES:** My question relates to page 567 and the East Perth Redevelopment Authority. Under “Asset Investment Program” it says that \$5.6 million will be spent on the revitalisation of the Perth Cultural Centre in Northbridge. Can the minister outline the government’s progress on this particular centre and what is planned for the next year?

Chairman; Mr John Hyde; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Miles; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Frank Alban; Mr Chris Tallentire;  
Mr Albert Jacob

---

[7.50 pm]

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** The revitalisation of the Perth Cultural Centre is another of the government's key priorities. I am pleased to say that a lot has been achieved in the past two years to make it a place that is much more attractive for both local residents and visitors to the state to visit and use. The Perth Cultural Centre has also been made a lot safer. That has been achieved by putting in much better lighting, improving the security camera network, the seating and landscaping, and adding a couple of cafe outlets and also wi-fi facilities for people using the internet. There will be \$5.6 million expended over the next 12 months on works that will include installing a children's playground, a large LED screen for people to watch a range of events, some new signage that will go in, and some other improvements as well. I will just ask Mr Henriques to explain it as it is an area that is very important and is being used a lot more actively and successfully than was the case previously.

**Mr S.M. Henriques:** The additional elements not covered there include increased shade and closed-circuit television. That is again growing that whole feeling of comfort and security in the area to increase the visitation in that space and moving on to consider the longer term strategy and place planning aspects of the space.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Where will the playground be located? Will the CCTV be monitored? Is there a service agreement with police for the monitoring of the CCTV cameras, and how many cameras will there be in the Perth Cultural Centre?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I think I am right in saying that the CCTVs are currently monitored as part of the City of Perth security camera network. The children's playground will be located near the south west corner of the museum, so the southern side of Hackett Hall.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** So it is not with the central area transit buses, but on the other side, with the stairwell going down to the car park?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** It is not where vehicles go at the moment, obviously.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** As part of that reactivation and revitalisation of the cultural centre, there is also the vegetable garden. Could the minister outline the ongoing costs of running that garden, including security?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I doubt there is any specific security costs related to the garden, but there is certainly additional security provided in the whole cultural centre. The urban orchard and the wetlands adjacent to the Art Gallery of Western Australia building have been successful in improving the amenity, the interest and activation of the area. It is a place now where one can go at lunchtime or on any day, other than when it is raining, and there are a lot of people there. It is a very well used space and it has been a very successful and effective project. I am not sure what the ongoing costs are, but whatever they are, they are worth it.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Could we have that as supplementary information?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I am not sure there is any substantial additional cost of operating and maintaining the vegetable garden; it is part of the overall cost of maintaining the whole centre. Does the member for West Swan have a problem with it?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** This is the estimates committee and we are trying to establish the cost of what the government does.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I am asking whether the member has a problem with it.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** No.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** It is contracted out and we should be able to get the cost.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The minister seems to think that during the estimates committee hearings we cannot ask how much things cost. That is the basis of estimates committees—we ask the minister for information about the cost of items.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I understand that.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Will the minister provide that as supplementary information?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I am trying to find out whether the member is supportive of the orchard that has been established.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** This is not a debate about policy matters.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Members, can we get back to the point. Is the member asking the minister a supplementary question?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I am asking for supplementary information about the ongoing costs.

Chairman; Mr John Hyde; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Miles; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Frank Alban; Mr Chris Tallentire;  
Mr Albert Jacob

---

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** Yes, I will provide what the member for West Swan just asked for; that is, the ongoing operating cost of the urban orchard, as far as it is possible to extract that information.

[*Supplementary Information No A15.*]

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Since the minister is in such a generous mood, could he also provide the power costs paid by the East Perth Redevelopment Authority for the cultural centre's public spaces?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** Is the member suggesting that we turn off the lights at night?

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Not at all, but local councils are turning off their lights because of price increases by the Barnett government, so we would like to know how much EPRA has to pay. Is the minister charging EPRA for the power?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I am not sure what the cost of the lighting is, but the member knows the price per unit of electricity.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Does the minister want us to work it out per light pole?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Is the minister going to provide that information?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** No; it is a waste of time.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** How can the minister say that estimates are a waste of time? The minister is sensitive to power costs. I refer to the East Perth redevelopment works listed under "Works in progress" on page 567 of the budget papers. What has happened to the proposal for a bridge to connect the East Perth power station site with Summers Street above the East Perth railway lines? Does EPRA retain planning control over that precinct, since the master plan and the plans were put out for consultation? It may have been through the WA Planning Commission, but I thought it was under EPRA's watch when it had the Claisebrook precinct. Is the nearby Cheriton House at 34 Cheriton Street, the former stationmaster's house, still being sold by the government?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** The East Perth power station site is under EPRA's responsibility. I do not know whether the footbridge is still being considered.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** It was for public transport—originally the CAT buses—pedestrians and bicycles.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** It might have been in the past, but I am not aware of any proposal for that at the moment.

**Mr S.M. Henriques:** The planning aspects of the East Perth power station site are in place. As a project area at the moment, we have put it on hold to the extent of not pursuing it with a view to putting it out to market in the near future.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** In order to go out to market, a key point for people who might be thinking of doing something on the site is how they would get people in and out to the service. Certainly, before being put on hold, the original plan was for a reconnection from that site into Summers Street going over the railway lines.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** Nothing has been put before me in that respect that I can recall at all, and certainly not in recent times.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Is the minister expecting that people will be driving through Joel Terrace and the wonderful streets in the electorate of Mount Lawley to access the power station site?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** All these are details that would need to be worked out when there is a clear proposal put forward for what the old power station may be used for and for other developments on the site. These are not things that have been decided at all—certainly not to my knowledge.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** My question is also on the topic of the East Perth power station. Based on discussions, it is clear the government has no vision for development of that site at this stage. I am concerned there is no vision and no plan to underground the powerlines or conduct any major works there at the moment. In view of that, what are the ongoing preservation and maintenance costs for this prime heritage land?

[8.00 pm]

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** It is certainly correct that the development of that site has been put on the backburner somewhat, given only so much can be done at once. We are focussing on the Perth City Link project, the Perth Waterfront project and, under the East Perth Redevelopment Authority, the Riverside project near the Causeway. Only so much public funding is available at one time. The opposition has been debating issues about state debt levels in this chamber quite a bit. The East Perth Redevelopment Authority's projects have an impact on state debt. We cannot undertake everything at once, albeit a lot is being done at the moment.

Chairman; Mr John Hyde; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Miles; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Frank Alban; Mr Chris Tallentire;  
Mr Albert Jacob

---

In relation to any proposals for underground power in the area, that may be considered but it is not something I am familiar with right at the moment. The member for Gosnells asked for information about ongoing maintenance on or preservation costs of the East Perth power station.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** Can I have the ongoing costs as supplementary information, please?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I am happy to provide that as far as we have the information available.

*[Supplementary Information No A16.]*

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** The minister may not want to engage in major projects in the East Perth power station area, but can he at least outline a vision for that site at this stage? It would not necessarily cost anything, but it might perhaps inspire the commercial sector to be involved.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** We prefer to have visions about projects that are likely to happen. That is why we have been focussing on the ones I mentioned. The riverside project EPRA is undertaking near the Causeway should not be overlooked. It is probably not as highly recognised as the City Link and Perth Waterfront projects; it is nevertheless a very important and significant one that will be happening at the eastern end of the city. Possible future uses have not been determined; that is on hold at the moment. Obviously the power station is being maintained as a heritage building. I understand that quite a bit of money has been spent on preserving it over the past decade or so, but no decisions have been made. It is something for the future.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Moving back—and forward—to division 49 regarding the Perth Waterfront project, I refer to the third dot point on page 572, and to page 187 of budget paper No 3.

**The CHAIRMAN:** We are still on division 48.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Apparently the minister took questions on 49 originally. If you would like us to close division 48, we are at your beck and call, Mr Chairman.

**The appropriation was recommended.**