

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

**PERTH AND PEEL GREEN GROWTH PLAN FOR 3.5 MILLION**

*Motion*

**MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells)** [4.01 pm]: I move —

That this house condemns the Liberal–National government for failing to provide adequate detail in relation to the “Perth and Peel Green Growth Plan for 3.5 million”, also known as the “Strategic Assessment of the Perth and Peel Regions”, including not providing legible, clearly demarcated maps or the impact on at-risk species such as Carnaby’s white-tailed black-cockatoo.

I note that the Minister for Environment has left the chamber and perhaps I am to assume that the Minister for Planning is going to take carriage of this motion condemning the government. Let me begin by refreshing members’ memories on an exchange between the Minister for Environment and me last week, through interjection at question time, during the minister’s answer to a question that the member for Joondalup had put to him about what the Barnett government was doing with the strategic assessment of the Perth–Peel region. The dorothy dix–style question began with a slightly rambling answer from the Minister for Environment in which he talked about all of the agency effort in producing the green growth plan. The minister said —

Much of that investment has focused on regional areas, as we would expect. Western Australia is a large state.

He was talking there generally about environmental works across the state and making certain claims. He then said —

However, for the past five years this government has been working in the background on the Perth and Peel strategic assessment. That assessment has now been released. What this assessment seeks —

I interjected on him there and said —

No, it hasn’t; there are no maps.

It has not been properly released because there are no legible maps that would help anyone make sense of this strategic assessment. I am sure that the minister will come into this place, perhaps in unison with the Minister for Planning, and make an announcement that very good quality maps and spatial analysis information will be presented to the public so that they can make a sensible submission based on good knowledge, and that there will be an extension of the public comment period. The intent was to have the plan out for public comment, I think, for four months. I would say that formal public comment period should begin when the legible maps come out, because we are talking about a huge spatial analysis exercise. This is what it is about. I have said already today that this is a debating chamber, but in contemporary society we need the best information to make sensible comments about decisions that affect the future shape of the Perth metropolitan and Peel region. We have to have the best of information out there. We have to have good mapping. This information is not new. It is not as though the technology is still coming around and we are still trying to get that technological capacity to enable members of the public to do the analysis that they might require. I worked in the public service, in the Department of Environment Regulation, in the late 1990s. We had amazing geographical information systems. It was amazing stuff that enabled people to see all sorts of things and to overlay vegetation, cadastral boundaries, infrastructure corridors and zonings for planning. All that information was readily available in the 1990s. Why has the government failed, with the presentation of the so-called green growth plan, to provide the public with that information in 2016? It is absolutely impossible to comprehend. It is inexcusable. The government is treating the people of Western Australia like idiots. They have every right to get that information. The government agencies have got it. Why cannot the people have that information? Is it that the Minister for Environment does not want the people of Western Australia to have that information and to be able to make an intelligent comment? The Minister for Environment tried to have a go at me the other day, suggesting that I had not made much comment on this. It is pretty impossible to do that without the quality of information that is required. When I did go along to a briefing session, which was not offered to me by the Department of Environment Regulation or the Minister for Planning’s agency —

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** Did you request one?

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** I went along to a briefing conducted by Simon Taylor, who I believe works for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. In fact, we have three government agencies involved here. I do not know how community consultation is facilitated when three different agencies are involved—the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the Department of Planning and the Department of Environment Regulation. The lead agency is, apparently, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. I was at the briefing by Simon Taylor, who did his best. He is a bureaucrat trying to explaining a very complex thing without the benefit of information —

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

**Mr J.H.D. Day** interjected.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** I will take the minister's interjection in a moment. All Simon Taylor could provide us with was a massive document that does not really tell us anything. At that meeting, which was convened by the Urban Bushland Council WA, Simon Taylor said that he would get us some better maps, because all he could point to in the documentation was an A4 page on which was represented the whole of the Perth–Peel region. It was absolutely impossible to understand. I was quite pleased when I heard that at long last the conservation sector would be given a decent map. What were we provided with? That exact same A4 sheet blown up to A0 size! This A0-size map is the best the conservation sector has to work off at the moment. It is absolutely impossible to know where the Minister for Environment's claimed additional 170 000 hectares to the conservation estate is. It is impossible to know where that is from this map. It is impossible for somebody who might live in the member for Scarborough's electorate to be able to say, "Oh, that little bit of Trigg bushland is safe, but that other bit over the road is not safe." It is impossible for people to make that level of analysis. Why is the minister hiding that level of information from the people? There is no response from the minister. The best the minister can do is to provide this totally inadequate map that is blown up to A0 size. That is treating people like absolute mugs.

**Mr A.P. Jacob:** You can see Trigg on that anyway!

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** Does the Minister for Environment reckon he can understand what are roads and cadastral boundaries on this map?

**Mr A.P. Jacob:** I will respond soon.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** I can guarantee that the Friends of Trigg Bushland know exactly where all the native bushland is. They know where all the Bush Forever sites are and they absolutely know what is happening with this bill.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** I am glad the Minister for Police has interjected, because I want to show members what was done back in the year 2000 when mapping was presented to the public around the Bush Forever sites. There was limited technology and people did not always have access to computers, so they had to produce hard copy maps. For Bush Forever, we were able to produce maps that did show decent cadastral boundaries. The resolution is not that exceptional, but it gave people an idea of where the Bush Forever sites were. What we have with the green growth plan is a map that is absolutely impossible to understand. If the Minister for Planning thinks that is the standard that people should accept in this day and age, he is completely wrong.

I hope that at the end of this debate, the Ministers for Planning and Environment announce that they will make this information accessible to the public online, and that the public will be able to use some sort of geographic information system online to do the spatial analysis that will enable them to do the kind of submission that they would want to put forward. They would be able to use it to bring forward their technical knowledge, bearing in mind that this whole process is about getting a tick off from the commonwealth government under the federal Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. This is called a strategic assessment. This is so we make the environmental decisions; the decisions about where planning and urban development can and cannot go, locking in things for decisions for the next 50 years. It is a mega decision; it is enormous. Why we are not providing people with something better than an A4 sheet blown up to A0 size is completely beyond me and it is totally unreasonable of the government to even try to get away with a stunt like that.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** It is not a stunt; you just need to be a little patient.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** I welcome the Minister for Planning's interjection and I think the conservation sector is an incredibly patient sector. The minister has the sector under the gun. The minister shot the starting gun when he said that this document was out for public comment. The public comment period is set to end on 8 April. With totally inadequate mapping, people are to prepare submissions over the course of the Easter weekend; they still do not have decent maps. I do not know when they are going to get time to read it, digest it and break it down. Some people will have knowledge of particular areas, but others will be interested in ensuring that the habitat of a particular species is covered elsewhere. There is a whole exercise that goes on here, bearing in mind as well that this is all about volunteer effort; this is done in people's spare time because they are passionate about the environment. They are not getting paid for this at all. The Minister for Environment gave the game away when he said that this has been five years in the making. People in the agencies who are well paid, professional and to be respected have been working away on this for five years and we are expecting the general public to suddenly come up with a comment on this. It is very important that we get that community comment because so often the knowledge the community has surpasses the knowledge that is in the agencies, environmental consultancies and the developer companies. People in the community often have longer memories and they have access to information about decision-making on planning and perhaps why urban development was not allowed in a particular area. They have views on what sort of risks would be involved because of drainage problems and

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

knowledge of the history of what happens when there is a flood event in a particular area. We would like to think that all that knowledge resides in the agencies, but so often it is knowledge that is best understood, best kept and most accessible through the community sector. Therefore, we must empower the community sector to make that comment.

I hope that the side conversation that is going on between the Minister for Planning and the Minister for Environment is about announcing when this information will be made available to the public, and that there will be a substantial extension on the public comment time. It is in the ministers' best interest to ensure that that happens, because if this does not come up to scratch, if this falls over in some way or it does not meet the standards, there is a very real risk that the commonwealth government will say, "Look, that strategic assessment that Western Australia has tried to conduct, it does not meet the mark. It has not engaged the community, it is missing information, there are lots of knowledge gaps, there are serious contradictions in it, and it is something that should not be accepted." That is a very real possibility.

I go back to the presentation from Simon Taylor of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. One area where it was supposedly possible to use some spatial analysis online involved the downloading of Microsoft Silverlight. I had to go to the Department of Mines and Petroleum's website, normally a website that I find very useful and very smooth running. I had a particular interest in looking at where basic raw materials were to be extracted from under the implementation of the green growth plan. Using the Department of Mines and Petroleum website, I tried to follow the links through to this thing that involved me downloading Silverlight and I must say that I found it impossible to use. If the Ministers for Planning and Environment go down the route of providing this information online, please ensure that the online GIS works. Different local governments have those systems, and they work reasonably well, although sometimes they are a little bit clunky. There needs to be something that is contemporary and the technology of 2016, so that people can do that spatial analysis, build up the layers and find out where there are recognised areas that are important to endangered species.

I come to the issue of some of the information that has come out around endangered species that are to be impacted by this green growth plan. I note that one of the primary triggers for the commonwealth assessment of the whole Perth and Peel strategic assessment was the impact of urban development on black cockatoos, particularly the Carnaby's black-cockatoo. The release of a population viability assessment was actually a leaked document; somehow it leaked out. This is a document that was internal to government. I think it is part of its Carnaby's cockatoo recovery plan. With the leaking of that document, we found that it stated that if the plan was to go ahead in its present form—bearing in mind that the people who are writing this document have the benefit of all that information that is actually in government and they are not being left to just the bare minimum information that I was talking about earlier—with the more detailed information, they were able to see the implementation of the strategic assessment for the Perth–Peel region, in its current form, would lead to a 50 per cent decline in the population of Carnaby's black-cockatoo. That is just one of the threatened species that we have somehow nominated as being an icon species, a keystone species perhaps—one that we have captured the public's imagination around. It is a good way of testing whether or not we are achieving things. There are many other threatened species in the Perth–Peel region and they do not have that same level of scrutiny. It is a great worry that a leaked document enabled us to find out that the implementation of the plan would lead to the demise of that species, because their numbers are so low that if it drops by 50 per cent, we are talking about the demise of that species in the Perth–Peel region. What a tragedy. What sort of a message does that send? What is the legacy that we will leave if we implement an urban growth plan called by this government a "green growth plan" and it ends up leading to the demise of an iconic species like the Carnaby's cockatoo? It would be an absolute disgrace. It would be such an embarrassment and a tragedy all at once; a real tragedy.

On the subject of Carnaby's cockatoos, this leaked information was very interesting because it gave us an opportunity to learn a little bit about some of the so-called offset work that the government proposed when it comes to the implementation of the green growth plan. There is, unavoidably it seems, a large area of land that will be converted to urban development; that means much native habitat will be destroyed. I will come back to the issue of actual hectares and how we get our facts and figures together on the number of hectares that are going down. Sticking with this point of the Carnaby's cockatoo and knowing that many developments have gone ahead already that have involved the destruction of Carnaby's cockatoo habitat, the proponents, the property developers, through assessment processes have been told, "Right, you can have this subdivision here. Yes, you are destroying several hundred hectares of land that is valuable feeding ground habitat, whatever. You can do that, but you must offset the loss elsewhere."

However, what has emerged is that many of the areas that are currently nominated as offsets for projects that have already gone ahead are now being re-proposed as offsets for future developments. This is a classic example of double counting on offsets. That will corrupt the whole offsets system. There is already a high degree of scepticism in the community about environmental offsets, and justifiably so. People find it confusing. They are

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

concerned about the monetisation of environmental assets. They are concerned when the minister commits to things like the Pilbara conservation fund but it does not happen. That fund should have \$30 million, \$40 million or \$50 million in it from various Pilbara projects; however, there is not one cent in that fund because the minister has not managed to create that fund yet. Offsets in general are a concern for the public. I think that at times the public would say that there is such a demand for urban development, what else can we do? However, that scepticism will turn to absolute outrage when people find that there has been double counting for these offsets. That is what we are seeing, and that is the information that has been provided to me. I have a map that came to me via people who are involved in the Carnaby's black-cockatoo recovery program. They have been able to overlay the proposed offsets and the existing offsets. It shows that at times this is a scam. I have said in the media that this is not a green growth plan. This is verging on a green growth scam. When we look at examples such as this, we can understand why that charge is well justified.

The minister has claimed that in time, 170 000 hectares of land will be added to the conservation estate. However, let us look at the wording around that 170 000 hectares. Action plan H in the green growth plan states that 170 000 hectares of environmental significance will be added to the conservation estate over the life of the plan. I have a couple of things to say about that. That opens itself up to all sorts of vagaries. One issue is the location of those 170 000 hectares. Some of those plots of land are hundreds of kilometres from the native vegetation areas that are being destroyed; therefore, that does not make much sense. It is not a like for like comparison. There is no analysis of vegetation type or Heddle classification, which seems to be the standard native vegetation mapping unit descriptor used in the Perth metropolitan area, whether it is Karrakatta south or the Southern River complex—all the complexes that were described by Heddle, and by Libby Mattiske, who has gone on to become an environmental consultant of some note. That Heddle work is still very important to our assessment. However, those figures are not presented clearly in this assessment. The absence of spatial data makes it impossible for people to click on the geographic information system, bring up the particular Heddle complex that they are interested in, see how much of a particular complex remains, and then click another button that shows whether the implementation of the green growth plan will reduce that Heddle complex by whatever percentage. People need to be able to see that both spatially and in numerical form. People can then make the call about whether this is a legitimate plan. The Environmental Protection Authority requires that no vegetation complex be destroyed below 30 per cent of its original extent, and that a significant percentage of land—I think at least 20 per cent—be kept in some form of conservation reserve. The implementation of the Bush Forever plan provided the potential for some of those complexes to be given a degree of protection. That may or may not be acceptable, but we do not know. That information has not been presented to us, so it is impossible for us to say.

I have talked about the need for information to be presented spatially so that people can visualise it and ensure that the offsets are not a scam and are not a vegetation type that bears no resemblance to the vegetation that has been destroyed. I have pointed out also that many of these areas—in fact all of these areas, because the document says it—are environmentally significant. The whole 170 000 hectares is deemed to be environmentally significant. That means that with a good Minister for Environment in place, none of these areas will be destroyed. However, that means also that there will be no net increase in the conservation estate. All we will have is a transfer of land tenure. The 170 000 hectares is not an increase in habitat area for a species across the Perth metropolitan area. It is not an increase at all; it is simply a change in tenure. It is an absolute scam that the headline item from the Minister for Planning and the Minister for Environment was that the green growth plan will result in a 170 000 hectare increase in the conservation estate and that it will make a major difference to the conservation estate. All we will have is a change in tenure. It is environmentally significant land, and it will perhaps go from being state forest to being nature reserve or national park. However, that will not make any difference. There will not be a net increase; there will be a net loss. We need to drill into how much the net loss will be, and what other species will be lost or put beyond various thresholds. That information needs to be presented to us.

I trust that when the minister responds to this motion, he will announce that there will be at least a three-month extension to the submission period and that the information that people require, which has been in the agency since probably before the late 1990s, will be made available to the public, along with the capacity to do the intersections, as I think they are called. It has been a while since I operated ArcView, which is one of the GIS programs that we can use. Those programs are beautiful to use. They are very easy. People can learn a lot about their particular area. They can see where the watercourses are, how the soil types vary and where the vegetation is, and they can put on top of it what the intention is for urban development. They can see which areas are at risk, and they can provide some sensible advice. People can then say to the state government that if it pulled back a little this way and went that way, we would get a better environmental outcome. Why would the government not do that? Why would it not want to enrich this process with well-informed public comment?

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

I have not touched on the involvement of local governments. I have noticed that the Western Australian Local Government Association is as outraged as my friends in the conservation sector. I acknowledge the people in the public gallery, who represent various urban bushland groups and have come to hear this debate today. They are passionate about protecting the bushland in their area. They are worried that if this plan goes ahead in its current form, their bit of bush will be destroyed. They talk about it as their bush. It is not. They would be the first to say that this is a community asset that they are passionate about sharing. They have that sense of proprietary because they work on that land. They do the Clean Up Australia Days and they do the planting days. They are always looking at restoring land and improving it, creating public awareness and helping the general public realise that they have a mini Kings Parks on their doorstep. So I want to recognise the people in the public gallery and thank them for the conservation work that they do right across the metropolitan area. We have a few people here at relatively short notice—that is the way of private members' motions; they do not get a lot of advanced warning—but they are passionately interested in finding out what the future holds for bushland in their areas.

We heard a lot from Simon Taylor in his presentation to the Urban Bushland Council about how much would be lost in general terms. I must be honest and say that in the PowerPoint presentation it was impossible to keep up with the figures as we went through. I think it was delivered with the very best of intentions of conveying the figures, but it was very hard to keep up. There again we have an example of information not being fully provided. I think those figures were extracted from the report, which is some 3 000 pages long, and cut and diced in certain ways, so it was not particularly clear. That is why I will go back to my first request here; that is, that all this spatial data be provided so that people can do their own analysis and work out, for whichever of the vegetation types and soil types, how much will be left as natural area with the implementation of the plan. It is very important that we do that.

I know of some people's endeavours to carry out analysis. I think of the Wetland Conservation Society's assessment that we are set to lose about 70 000 hectares of native vegetation through the implementation of this plan. The minister's quick response was that the government will add 170 000 hectares to the conservation estate. But that is not the same thing; that is where the minister is kidding people, if he is trying to pretend that the addition of something to the conservation estate—the change in tenure, probably from state forest to something else—is a positive step forward for the environment. It is still about net loss. The minister must be very clear and very honest about the amount of net loss that this whole project would involve. He has to be clear about that.

I want to allow other members to speak on this motion. I have a letter from the Urban Bushland Council that has made it clear that it has requested that the mapping be provided. It has also suggested that printed copies should be provided in public libraries so that people can study them in that way, if that is their preferred way of analysing things. The message has been with the government for some time; it is not as though the minister can say that the member for Gosnells has suddenly come into the chamber and made this request. That is not it at all; this request has been around for some time. I think when people made the initial request and were given the ridiculous A4 sheet blown up to A0 size, what was really being requested then was perfectly well understood.

We also need to acknowledge the situation of the property developers around town. They are in an equally invidious position. They do not have the information they require either. This is not something that is essential for only local government and conservation groups to comment on; it is also to enable all the developers who have a big financial stake in this to be given the information they need so that they can comment, and look at where their landholdings might be. They might be areas that were purchased as rural, and then they have seen them rezoned to urban or urban deferred. They then have to work out how they can develop that land if it has already been designated or is found to have some sort of conservation significance. That is also a very serious part of this whole process. It has to be carefully looked at. We need their engagement.

In the middle of last year the Urban Development Institute of Australia sent me a very comprehensive submission it made on the Perth and Peel@3.5 million strategy. It is clearly a well-organised and well-funded organisation with a great capacity, and it probably has its own internal geographic information systems that enable it to do some degree of analysis. The institute provided a very interesting document. It discusses things that are often seen as the antidote to urban sprawl, such as some of the barriers to urban infill. It is a fascinating read, and there is some really useful information in it. The Urban Development Institute deserves to be given the same quality of information that other groups in the community are given. It does its analysis in its own way, focusing on various things such as employment trends and densities of habitation around Perth. This is very much the sort of thing that professionals in urban development would be expected to do. I am sure that they would appreciate the extension of time and the provision of decent quality mapping. That would make a huge difference to the quality of the institute's input into this process. Otherwise, people are just left in their standard positions, rather than being provided with good quality information. We do not want that. This is something that could have been avoided. We could have enabled people to have access to that information for the whole of the

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

summer. The minister is right—these documents were originally out before Christmas; I forget what date exactly, but they were released just before Christmas. We could have had the benefit of that whole holiday period to go through it, but instead we have to start again with the consultation period when all the information is properly out there. That is the only time to start it. It is a recurrent theme in the various submissions that I have received. People want the strategic conservation plan, adequate scale maps, electronic versions of maps, and GeoView—I think that is a rival of ArcView; another program that enables the viewing of spatial information. We need to get all of that out there.

If, as the minister suggested, this has been a government project for the past five years, we have to ask: what has been going on if this is as good as we have got after five years of work? I know it is a mammoth task to provide all this information to a standard that the commonwealth requires, but to say on the one hand that we need five years to produce something, and what we have produced is not that great, and on the other hand ask the general public to come up with submissions in a couple of months, is not reasonable at all. It suggests that there is a disregard for the potential useful comment that will come through from the public. I find that misplaced. It is very often the case that the very best advice can come from the public. It will be very specific, judging from the various submissions I have received from people discussing the need for particular Bush Forever sites to be secured, and areas that are currently in private ownership for land acquisition. I know that issue is often taken up with the Minister for Planning. We need that to be resolved, and to know how much money is being set aside, and how much is for the acquisition of land that is in private ownership. That all needs to be made clear.

When I went through the green growth plan I was particularly disappointed to see that there has been no proper reference to the impacts of climate change on the Perth–Peel region. I heard the member for Bassendean talk about the comments made by the chief executive officer of the Water Corporation, Sue Murphy, that this part of the world appears to be one of the areas most impacted by climate change; we will feel the consequences worse here than anywhere else in the world. That is the quote that I heard from the head of the Water Corporation. Clearly we have a problem, and yet our green growth plan does not take account of climate change. In what ways should a green growth plan be looking at the impacts of climate change?

There is the potential for the sea level to rise. I know that one of the Minister for Planning's statements of planning policy references this issue of climate change and sea level rise. But I do not see how that has been properly incorporated through the "Perth and Peel Green Growth Plan for 3.5 million". There are other issues as well. The drying climate and the abstraction of water for bores and other watering cause subsidence or lowering of the watertable. That then leads to instability in the geotechnical condition of urban developments and cracks start to appear in houses. I think the Gwelup region is known for this. Cracks appear in houses because the watertable has gone down very rapidly and as a result people have big expenses. People are finding that things as substantial as foundations and retaining walls are cracking. That is all part of anticipating how our green growth plan should go. How we do housing in a drying environment is at the core of urban development and is very important. I do not see any mention of that in the green growth plan. Clearly, that area has been overlooked. I am sure that when the commonwealth assessors receive the final product, they will also be concerned about that. They will wonder why the Western Australian government in its urban planning and strategic assessment work did not take account of all the information that shows how dramatically our area is being impacted on by climate change.

Of course, there is the impact of climate change on the natural environment. I know that people have varying views on how we should be restoring areas. How do we remove the pine plantation on the Gngangara mound, recognising that the Carnaby's cockatoo uses it as a food source? Interestingly, I am told that it is not a food source for Baudin's cockatoo or the forest red-tailed cockatoo. Those species have come up to Perth because, especially in the case of the red-tailed black cockatoo, they have lost habitat in the south west or there is not the same food there. They have come up to Perth and tried to feast on the introduced species that are around. We have to accommodate this huge change. If we do not accommodate it, we will go through a pattern of urban development that will cause, as I said before about the Carnaby's cockatoo, the sad demise of that species. Going back to that leaked document, that population viability analysis clearly showed that the implementation of the green growth plan in its current form will lead to the end of the Carnaby's cockatoo in the Perth area. That would be a tragedy and a great shame. We must do better.

I hope that the response from the government on this will be positive and the government will announce a date by which the geospatial information will be made available. I hope that information will be of a standard that enables people to make good-quality submissions and properly engage and perhaps, when necessary, get assistance in doing that layering and using the ArcView system or whichever one it is. I hope that it is available to people in public libraries and in hard copy, where possible. We can never quite achieve that same layering in the hard copies. We can print things out. It can be useful; it can assist. Of course, we have to do that because some people will recoil from the complexity of using a geographic information system. The information has to be made available and there has to be a substantial extension on the time for public comment. The deadline of

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

8 April does not work and we need the government to acknowledge that this is rude. Putting this sort of plan out on a blown-up A4 sheet is an absolute insult to Western Australian's Peel people and anyone in this region. To give the public a map such as that and expect people to make comment on it when the government has access to incredibly detailed information is really an insult to the people of Western Australia. I conclude my remarks there and I look forward to the comments of others.

**MR A.P. JACOB (Ocean Reef — Minister for Environment)** [4.45 pm]: I thank the member for Gosnells for his comments on the "Perth and Peel Green Growth Plan for 3.5 million" and I hope I have an opportunity to address a number of the issues that were raised along the way. Let me say at the outset, I will address the substantive issue, which is whether there will be an extension of the public comment period. Yes, there will be. We will extend the public comment period to 13 May. I indicated that in an interview I did with the ABC some two or three weeks ago.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** You did not tell me in Parliament.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** The member for Gosnells did not ask me the question. If he wants to get up and ask me a question in question time about it, I will happily answer it. The member's interjection in Parliament was in response to a response I was giving to another member, so it would not have been appropriate.

The second part of it is the release of the detailed maps. Those maps should be released tomorrow, if not early next week. That work is being done and has progressed all the way through. I will come back to those detailed maps in a bit. Essentially, yes, both those things will happen. We have been working on that and in briefings I have had with groups around the strategic assessment process I have indicated that we will most likely extend the public comment period, and we will do that.

The draft strategic assessment for the Perth and Peel region, to put it in focus, is the largest city-focused environmental assessment ever to be undertaken in Australia. This draft plan looks 30 years into the future and provides certainty regarding the protection of the Perth and Peel region's natural environment. It also has a balanced outcome in that it provides certainty in the development required to support our growth as a city from two million people to 3.5 million people. The draft plan proposes an unprecedented level of protection for bushland rivers and wetlands in the Perth and Peel region. It is the largest expansion and creation of a conservation estate in any city anywhere in the world.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire** interjected.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** It is the largest conservation network in any city anywhere in the world. The member for Gosnells can oppose that if he wishes to, but that is what is proposed in this plan, and with a balanced outcome that allows us as a city to grow to 3.5 million people. Nobody in government is pretending for a second that we can go from a population of two million people and expand our state's economy, particularly in the Perth and Peel region, to 3.5 million people without an impact. Of course, there will be an impact. If we look at the impact of the Perth and Peel region to this point, for us to grow from settlement to where we are now with roughly two million people in that region, we will see a net loss of 70 per cent of the Swan coastal plain's vegetation. We believe we can go from here with a 70 per cent increase in population—two million to 3.5 million—with a further loss of only three per cent of our bushland and, in the middle of that, create over the life span of this plan, over the next 30 years, a further 170 000 hectares of conservation estate in the Perth and Peel region. We will not only create a conservation estate but also provide fully funded management of that estate going forward.

The member for Gosnells in his earlier comment referred to certain claims I had made, and he was referring to the answer that I gave in this place last week. I made the claim that this Liberal–National government has been the single best government for environmental outcomes and results in Western Australia's history.

Several members interjected.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Challenge that. As the Premier said, challenge that. I refer to the Kimberley science and conservation strategy. That is the largest expansion of conservation estate that this state has ever seen. We have created five new marine parks, including what will be the second largest marine park in this country. That interconnected network of marine parks throughout the Kimberley is fully funded—not just provided. A member opposite made a disdainful comment about paper parks. We create these parks to a scale that the opposition and the Labor Party could not imagine. It could not land Roebuck Bay. Roebuck Bay is the smallest of the five marine parks that we have progressed the delivery of. Over this term of government we have also funded the marine park network to an amount in excess of \$80 million.

Several members interjected.

The interjections do not even come close to landing a blow, member for Gosnells. That is just one bioregion of this state.

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

**Ms R. Saffioti:** You're the most pompous man I've ever heard.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** That is the truth. I stand on this government's record.

**Ms R. Saffioti:** Yes, you are, making a statement like that. I'll get up in a minute, jeez!

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** The Labor Party has got nothing, and this proves it. I will come back to this one. It has nothing to compare with what this Liberal–National government has done for the environment.

I have just started on the Kimberley marine site. Let us look at the Kimberley terrestrial site. Last year Sam Walsh of Rio Tinto flew over it. Rio Tinto has given up its retention leases over the Mitchell Plateau, and a bill has progressed through this house to create the terrestrial site; if you like, the great Kimberley national park. That will be the single largest terrestrial national park ever created in Australia. That also has been done by this government. We can bring it right down through. We have seen under this government —

*Point of Order*

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** The member is not addressing the motion. The motion is clearly about the green growth plan. He is trying to make false claims about other activities that he has done in the environment area. The motion is clearly about the green growth plan. That is what we want answers to. He has made false claims also about the viability of the green growth plan.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz):** Member, I take your point. In terms of responding to the —

**Mrs L.M. Harvey** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Points of order are heard in silence, member for Scarborough.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** I apologise, Mr Acting Speaker,

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The focus is clearly on the Peel green growth plan. I accept that you can digress a little from that, but I encourage you to move back to the issue at stake.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I was simply responding to interjections and some scoffing that I heard when I made the claim that we have been the best government on environment —

**Ms R. Saffioti:** The best environment minister ever!

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** No; I said we have been the best government. I am the third person to be an environment minister in this government. I do not claim credit for all of those, but I certainly stand by our government's record. I am not claiming that for me personally, but I tell you what, this has been the best government for the environment ever.

Several members interjected.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** This has been the best government for the environment in this state's history.

**Ms R. Saffioti** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Members opposite can make their little inane interjections as much as they want. Pick a single bioregion of this state where we have not delivered over and above every single government that has gone before us.

**Ms R. Saffioti:** What about Gnangara?

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Thank you, member for West Swan; bring us into the Perth and Peel region, which is, indeed, the issue before us today. As much as we have been doing all that work through regional areas, she can see a plan from this government that deals with all the key environmental issues within the Perth and Peel region in one large strategic assessment—the largest strategic assessment ever undertaken in Australia. It will create the largest conservation reserve in a metropolitan area ever seen in the world. Members opposite scoff when I claim that we have been the best government for the environment this state has ever seen. I think I could take that claim further; I could take it a lot further. Members opposite should look at everything we have done as a government. I have heard members opposite scoff. What is Labor's strategic position? Members opposite have absolutely nothing to offer. They nitpick about the tiniest little bits around the margins of this. It does not matter that we are —

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** If you want a general debate on the environment, we will give that to you.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Listen, member for Gosnells; don't whisper in her ear.

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members, let us just settle down a little. Please allow the minister to address the motion. Thank you.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** I am specifically addressing the motion.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** No, you're not.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** I think it is a very salient point.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Let us listen to the minister.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** This is exactly the motion the member for Gosnells has written. What is his party's alternative plan? Although I can stand and say we have spent five years working around this plan, we are putting to the people of Western Australia a plan that will deliver and fund the management of the largest metropolitan conservation estate seen anywhere in the world, and I stand by that record.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** The only problem is that after five years, you can't show it to us.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Gosnells!

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Those interjections are not even worth it because what I am stating the black and white facts of the matter.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Gosnells!

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** All sorts of people will always come out and say they would like more in area X, Y or Z.

**Ms S.F. McGurk** interjected.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Okay, what is the Labor Party's alternative plan? Yes, we have put forward something that will have an impact; we have not shied away from that. When members opposite look at the green credentials of our strategic assessment —

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** When we can see it.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** — they will see that it stacks up globally by any measure. A significant amount of detail has already been released, member for Gosnells. I suspect he has not had an opportunity to read all the way through it because a lot of work has gone into this process. If we take the alternative —

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** A lot of work and we can't see it.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** What is the opposition's plan? The member for Gosnells mentioned the impact on the Carnaby's cockatoo, for example. A population viability survey found that over the life of this plan—not the species as a whole; the localised population within the Perth and Peel region—it could have around a 50 per cent impact within the Perth and Peel region. That is a figure I am also very up-front about. This brings us back to the key point: that species is in far more significant decline right now than a 50 per cent decline over the next 30 years within the Perth and Peel region only.

Several members interjected.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** I have not finished. What is the opposition's alternative? Is it saying it will completely ring-fence growth and refuse to allow the Perth and Peel region to grow beyond two million people? Is it saying that it will not allow any access to future basic raw materials, limestone or sand, because they inevitably impact directly on the habitat and that it will not allow any industrial development? Of course we will pursue infill largely for urban growth. The Minister for Planning has long been a champion of that and has done excellent work in that area, but I tell you what: it is pretty hard to infill industrial development. If our population is to increase from two million to 3.5 million, that is one thing we will need to address. If I want to see three key outcomes from this for my children, firstly, I want to see an opportunity for affordable housing—we will really need this plan in that case—and secondly, an opportunity for a job and therefore a state that has some economic growth. Thirdly, I would like them to grow up in a city that has the largest conservation estate within it in the world. The government has been doing that work over five years to deliver, and we stand by that. Members opposite can harp on and criticise little bits and play to their fans maybe in the gallery, but they have not yet put forward a single alternative.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** Don't insult people who have come here to watch this debate.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Gosnells!

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** In gaining members up there, the member for Gosnells has not yet put forward a single alternative. What is his alternative? Will he cap —

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** We don't have the public service capacity you've got, do we?

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** He can carp on, but will his government cap growth? Is it the opposition's plan to cap all urban growth for the Perth and Peel region?

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members, settle down!

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Is it to go beyond our plan and have a greater impact? As I said, a large number of maps were released for public comment with the draft green growth plan. Later this week, we will release more detailed mapping. That will include, member for Gosnells, an online map viewer, which will be posted on the Department of Planning's website and will also be available through the Department of the Premier and Cabinet's website, which already contains an extensive amount of information around this green growth plan. That recognises that stakeholders will need more time to review this additional information. The maps build on the information that we have already provided. We have been doing the work to make sure they are informative and provide as much of the information as possible both on where we need to go with future growth as well as where conservation opportunities are in the middle of them. We will also extend the public comment period through to the middle of May this year. The dataset will allow those maps to be viewed on a 1:10 000 scale, which should be more than adequate for what we are talking about. It will allow close examination of the conservation commitments and proposed new conservation reserves.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** When will you officially announce the extension?

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Today or tomorrow, member for Mandurah.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Will you send the information out to various stakeholders?

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** We will announce that formally via the website, as I indicated three weeks ago. This process has been five years in the making to get to here. It is the largest strategic assessment ever attempted anywhere.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire** interjected.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Stop with the carping for a second. This is what responsible government is about, member for Gosnells. This is why a Labor government could never get a Biodiversity Conservation Bill in. Successive Labor governments could never do it. It is so process focused that it could never achieve an outcome. This is why I can legitimately stand here and say, when it comes to environmental outcomes, this Liberal-National government is along way ahead of any of our predecessors. We have not been afraid to take the big decisions and tackle the large projects such as the strategic assessments —

**Mr C.J. Tallentire** interjected.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** That is an absurd statement.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz):** Member for Gosnells! I do not want to have to call you. Minister, please continue.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** That is an absolutely absurd statement. In the member for Gosnells' earlier comments he answered some of the claims that he is making against us. He made the point that when he went to the briefing, it was run by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and an outstanding individual. An officer within that department whom I hold in very high regard and who has done a lot of work on this along the way made those presentations. The Minister for Planning has had a lead role within the development of this process as have I, as the Minister for Environment. The Minister for Mines and Petroleum and the Minister for Transport have had various feed-ins as well, as one would imagine. This is a really good example of breaking down the silos within government. The member saw that as a criticism. If nothing else, this has been a fantastic effort in government to break down those silos. The level of cooperation between these agencies is the only reason we have been able to pull together so many disparate views.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Churchlands and member for Gosnells!

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** If I piled the A4 sheets of information that we have released, it would probably sit this high already, member for Gosnells. The interjections and the debate up until this point show why, as well intentioned as members opposite may be, they continually fail to deliver significant environmental outcomes. Due process is important and that is why we are making sure that we take the time to get the maps right before we release them.

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

Yes, due process is important. However, if we are so process-bound that a decision cannot be made until all consulted parties from the entire Perth and Peel region have agreed, we will never get 100 per cent agreement across all parties, which is why government exists. Government exists to take a stand, to make a decision and to stand by that decision, and that is why we as a government have been so successful within the environment portfolio.

We will compensate for the loss of habitat of not only Carnaby's black cockatoo, but also other species because Carnaby's cockatoo is by no means the only impacted species of flora or fauna that sits within the Perth and Peel region. The Perth and Peel region, as we have discussed many times, sits within a biodiversity hot spot. It is the only city in the world that sits within one of those 34 or 35 globally recognised biodiversity hot spots. Although Carnaby's cockatoo has a lot of consideration within this plan, it is by no means the only affected or most endangered of the species that sit within this area. One cannot do good environmental, ecosystem or biodiversity conservation planning management if it is considered through the lens of only one species. However, we recognise the impact on Carnaby's cockatoo and this is why one of the proposals in the plan is for the replanting of 5 000 hectares of pines in the Yanchep area that will be set aside primarily for Carnaby's cockatoo habitat. We will have 5 000 hectares of dedicated pine plantation for that one species to make sure that it has a viable food source within the Perth and Peel region.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Gosnells!

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** There are other measures right across this plan because there is also that 170 000-hectare conservation estate, which will give them more than enough landing pads throughout that area.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Just hold it a minute, minister. How many times has the member for Gosnells been called? Zero. Okay, he has been called once now.

**Mr P. Abetz:** I was very lenient on the member for Gosnells.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Well done, member for Gosnells—I am surprised.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, minister.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** The member for Gosnells mentioned a drying climate. Anyone who has been the Minister for Environment or anyone who has an interest in environmental issues generally would know that the single biggest issue we face in the south west of Western Australia is our drying climate, hands down, and that extends beyond the Perth and Peel region. If I could have any wish, it would be to bring back our average rainfall, absolutely. Again, that is where we need to consider biodiversity conservation decisions within the scope of the entire ecosystem and not just one species, and where retention of the existing Gnangara and Pinjar pine plantation will have significant impact because of not only the draw down that they have on the shallow aquifer currently and the impact that that has through the shallow wetland chain in the northern suburbs, but also, by their nature, the extent to which they prevent aquifer recharge. In many ways the solution, if you like, is also one of the environmental problems.

I will go back to that 170 000 hectares of conservation estate, which provides at least 116 000 hectares of Carnaby's cockatoo habitat and, as I said, is also funded for its management going forward. Much of that will be state land but some of it will be acquired and that acquisition will have to form part of this program. The elegance of this approach of pursuing it through a strategic assessment through federal and state environmental approval is that in order to achieve that approval, the acquisitions have to follow through. A complaint that I often receive or some of the frustrations that people have had around Bush Forever as a policy is that it has progressed to a certain point. It is still progressing and a lot of good work is happening, but by bringing in the strategic assessment process into this proposal, we bring it to its ultimate conclusion more quickly and it provides for that long-term management through the state government as well.

As I said, I am looking for three things here. One is affordable housing for my children going forward. It is not about just basic raw material access, although that directly impacts on housing affordability, nor is it industrial land and transport corridors or dealing with the provision of pine softwood plantations into the future building industry. All of those have a direct impact on affordable housing. My concern is the accumulative impacts on the Swan coastal plain in an environmental sense, and those accumulative impacts have a ceiling that we are getting very close to right now. We have already cleared some 70 per cent of the Swan coastal plain and to go any further without this strategic assessment process simply kicks the can down the road. If this generation or this government does not do the hard work—five years of incredibly hard work has already gone into this—of sorting out that strategic assessment approach at a state and federal level now, the cost impost on our children and grandchildren will be incredibly huge, and that is why we are taking the opportunity now to address this

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

matter. Trying to address those environmental issues in isolation on an ad hoc basis—the business-as-usual approach—has failed environmentally and led to a far greater decline of the species in question, and as it goes on, it will lead to significant constraints, if you like, on the growth of the Perth and Peel region as a city and direct constraints on affordable housing. We are taking this decision now to ensure that the great Western Australian or Australian dream is something that can still be pursued into the future. The other reason we have pursued this strategic assessment approach is to ensure that we can continue to grow economically. I want to ensure that my kids have what I and my generation growing up in Western Australia have enjoyed, which is a place where any child who wishes to apply themselves can pretty well go and do whatever they wish. That is certainly the future that I wish to see. In order for that future to continue in Western Australia, we need to continue to grow. Growth from two million to 3.5 million over the next 30 years will accommodate that future. The third element of this plan, which I am excited to see, is that we will have in future years for perpetuity the largest, completely managed conservation estate in a city anywhere in the world. When we look at everything that we have done as a government in regional areas, if we, as a government, land this strategic assessment for the Perth and Peel region, it will sit as the ultimate feather in our cap as an environmental outcome for future generations of Western Australia. It is a process that I have been incredibly proud to have been a part of.

**MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan)** [5.10 pm]: Very rarely in this place do we hear a minister say, “I am the best minister in the state’s history.” That is what appeared to happen today. The Minister for Environment said that he was the best minister for the environment in the state’s history—I think he might have said the world. I have never seen a more pompous contribution by a minister who said, “We have the best environmental policy.” He implicitly said, “I am the best environmental minister ever seen in this state.” It is absolutely ludicrous.

**Mr F.A. Alban** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Do you know that you are on three calls? Now you do. Tread softly.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** It is absolutely ludicrous. Again, it is a sign of absolute arrogance to try to talk down to the person in this place who knows more about environmental policy than anyone. It is arrogant to try to dismiss the concerns of the member for Gosnells, who knows more about environmental policy than anyone in this house. The member has legitimate concerns, as does the community. Not only have people raised with him in his capacity as shadow Minister for Environment real concerns about some of the contents of this plan and the consultation process, but also, as shadow Minister for Planning, I have had representation after representation about the lack of consultation and the lack of detail. Landowners are somehow supposed to work out on a map that their zoning will be changed, but they have not been directly informed that it will be. Councils that have been working on these issues for decades have not been involved. The minister has said that he has been working on it for five years, so why has he not talked to someone about it? Why has he not done some basic consultation? It has been five years and he could not ring a council! That is absolutely ludicrous. There has been no consultation in five years, yet he claims that it is breaking down the silo approach.

The key criticism I hear about this issue is “My goodness, we have this plan that does not reflect anything that is happening in the transport portfolio.” It is completely disjointed. The minister talked about environmental credentials, even though the government bulldozed old-growth forests and wanted to destroy the Ningaloo Marine Park. Let us go to the dysfunctional Environmental Protection Authority, which has been discredited under the guardianship of this minister, yet he claims to be the best Minister for Environment ever. He dismissed legitimate concerns. Yes, he should be worried about water, because the extractions from the Gngangara mound are having a significant impact in that area. He talked about marine parks but he did not talk about the sanctuary zones. He abolished the Swan River Trust, yet he tries to belittle anyone who wants to pose a question. He says that there has been an extension to the closing date. Why did he not tell someone about it? The government is going to tell people tomorrow, but that is because the shadow Minister for Environment put this motion forward today.

**Mr P.T. Miles** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Wanneroo!

**Mr J.H.D. Day** interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The self-proclaimed greatest Minister for Environment has been working on this for five years.

**Mr J.H.D. Day** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, if you say that he did not say it and you want to make a speech, make a speech. I want to hear from the member for West Swan.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The minister has been working on it for five years. Today I met a group of four councils that said that they were not consulted at all.

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** Which ones?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I will tell the minister. It is basically every council I speak to, and I speak to a lot of councils.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** Which were the four today?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I will tell the minister in a minute.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister for Planning, I call you to order for the first time.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Every council I speak to, and I speak to a lot of councils, tells me that they have not been involved and they do not know the details. Landowners say to me that they do not know the detail. Honestly, the government's approach to the Swan Valley development plan is that it has basically changed the nature of landholdings and has not consulted the landowners. It is a constant criticism.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** It's been out for consultation.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** No, minister. My view is that if the zoning is proposed to be changed in a document, the government should let landowners know, because as soon as it is changed, it changes the value of their land upwards or downwards.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** That's why you have consultation.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I am going to say this: when a government produces a document that changes the potential use of their land, particularly if it means their houses will be demolished in some cases—this is in relation to the Herne Hill town site in the Swan Valley development plan—of course they get concerned, because an official document states that the use of their land has been changed. The government has to be very careful. It has to consult with people. It has to send them letters at the very least, but it does not even do that.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** That's why it's been out for consultation.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** It has been out for consultation! As I say, the government's process of consultation reminds me of the first episode of *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy*. Just because the government puts something on a website, it does not mean that the landowners involved know about it. When the government is directly affecting people's livelihoods, it has a responsibility to inform them of that.

The other point is: is it funded and costed? The minister has made the claim that this will be the biggest conservation change in the state's history. Again, it is obviously a term he has borrowed from the Premier. Everything they do is the best and biggest in the state's history and nothing existed until this government came to power. However, is it costed and funded? Has the biggest conservation estate in the world been costed and funded? How will the government deliver it? I hope the minister addresses this when he stands. Again, if the government wants to purchase land here and there and change the ownership, how will it fund it? Otherwise, it will not happen.

I am upset that the Minister for Environment is not in the chamber. I could say something quite nasty. Obviously, he has things to do.

Several members interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** He took all his things. He does not normally take all his things.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The member is right; maybe he is looking at himself in the mirror in the toilets.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. Through the Chair, member for West Swan.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** He asked what our plan is. I do not know, but it is an interesting concept to coordinate public transport with land use planning. It is a crazy idea to coordinate infrastructure delivery with land use planning! This government has had an ad hoc, chaotic approach for seven and a half years whereby it builds suburbs without public transport. It creates enormous uncertainty for the development industry, landowners and home owners. Our plan is to integrate infrastructure delivery with land use planning. I am going to make this point again and again: when we build infrastructure, we want to maximise the outcome. We want to make sure that we get the density and the planning right. With Metronet, we are planning on not only building new lines, but also getting more out of the existing infrastructure. Taxpayers have laid out hundreds of millions of dollars for infrastructure. From a sustainable growth point of view, we want to maximise the outcome of the money that has already been spent. That is what we are doing. The government is so proud of its planning, even though its density targets were 47 per cent but density has reached only 27 per cent. Without the coordinated delivery of infrastructure and land use planning, the government will not get there.

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

I will go through the transport priorities in a minute, because people will just laugh. What are the big three and what is missing? I will go through them, but, firstly, I want to go through some of the key points that have been raised with me about the level of detail and the level of understanding. I refer to Wanneroo, particularly the south Gnangara region. I have seen report after report; I think the latest report is the 2011 “East Wanneroo Structure Plan”. This report completely contradicts that plan.

**Mr J.H.D. Day** interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** It does in the south Gnangara region, minister. Again, processes were underway that tried to take into account the numerous factors that impact on planning, but the government came out with a report that contradicted that plan. The previous Labor government worked on it and the current government tried to continue it in its ad hoc way, but it is now contradicting that plan.

People have raised the area of Ravenswood with me. The shires around there believe the government should do some more investment in Mandurah and Pinjarra and build up those areas as key centres and then work from there, instead of trying to create a new centre, which does not make good planning sense. People from the Swan Valley have come to me about the water pipeline that will be carved right through the Swan Valley. Again, the government has had no consultation with those people. Landowners find it very difficult to identify exactly where that proposed water infrastructure will go because they do not have the detailed maps. Those are three quick examples of people who have approached me. As I said, I did not write to everyone inviting comments, because that is what the government should have done.

I refer to east Wanneroo. This plan completely contradicts other plans that have been worked on for decades. This is causing landowners serious concerns. The plan shows developments further down Mandurah–Pinjarra way, and the councils there are worried. In my view, most councils—there may be a different view in the western suburbs as I tend not to hang round there very much—are very keen to work with the government to get smart development. Most councils want to activate activity centres and to have infrastructure in place and smart density, but the government is ignoring that. The councils that approached me today were very concerned about what would happen to Pinjarra and Mandurah under the government’s plan because, basically, it will create massive infrastructure bottlenecks and it is not giving Mandurah and Pinjarra the capacity to grow.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** Caused by what?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Caused through the government’s plan.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** How are they being prevented from growing?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The minister should go and talk to them. Seriously, if the Minister for Planning has not heard their concerns —

**The SPEAKER:** Through the Chair, please.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** If the Minister for Planning has not heard these concerns in the seven and a half years he has been minister, I am seriously worried. The minister should be talking to people—that is his job!

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** I do a lot of that.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yes, I am sure—in a sparkling capacity! I refer to the Swan Valley off again, on again water infrastructure project. It now appears there will be a massive new pipeline through the area. Again, there has been no consultation with the community on that.

One of the key issues I want to talk about in relation to detailed maps relates to infrastructure. Again, this is where the minister lets himself down. No-one is trying to argue against a strategic plan for growth, but surely it has to bear some resemblance to what the government is doing in transport—surely, they have to work together. I want to go through some of the points in this plan. This plan tries to present priorities for infrastructure, but those priorities do not seem to correlate with what the government is doing. Frankly, if this plan is to take Perth’s population to 3.5 million, we might as well all go home. The extent of planning for heavy rail is the extension of the Joondalup line from Butler to Yanchep. Remember, this project was identified in 2011 as a priority in the “Public Transport for Perth in 2031” plan, but it has now disappeared. Every time government members stand up, they try to rubbish Metronet; they do not say it, but they try to rubbish it somehow, yet this plan is a part of Metronet and shows, once again, that the rail extension to Yanchep is needed, but this government has no commitment to it and has not provided funding.

The plan proposes to extend the rail line from Thornlie to Cockburn Central. Again, that proposal is on again, off again. As I see it, it really depends on how worried the government is about the member for Southern River retaining his seat at the next election. The member for Southern River goes out to his electorate and on one day tries to claim that he is delivering the project, but on another day says that his electorate does not need better

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

public transport, because it has an excellent public transport system! That is complete hypocrisy. We see the government backflip on its proposal for that route from day to day. Again, it is part of Metronet.

The only other project that is identified in this plan is the construction of the new east Wanneroo rail link. That is predicated on bulldozing most of east Wanneroo and building a massive housing development, which the government is nowhere near doing. That is a very long-term plan, if that ever happens! Members will be interested to know that Metro Area Express light rail appears in this plan. Remember, the government committed to build the MAX light rail to Mirrabooka; it then said that it was not best value for money and it would have MAX on wheels. Now, of course, the government's plan has turned into a tunnel to Morley. But in this strategic assessment framework, MAX light rail is shown as something that will happen. Honestly, the plan is all over the place! I am looking for new busways in the plan. I do not know, even the member for Swan Hills' bus rapid transit system seems to have been diminished in all of this! I can find no mention of busways. The minister said that the government has been working on a detailed plan for five years, but it proposes only four projects for the future of Perth. The entire mass transit policy that will cater for another 1.5 million people comprises an extension of the Joondalup rail line to Yanchep, an extension of the rail line from Thornlie to Cockburn Central, which I think may be 18 kilometres of track, and the east Wanneroo bypass.

[Member's time extended.]

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Let us face it, that east Wanneroo bypass is a long way off, because the Yanchep to Whiteman highway is nowhere near commencing and is only in the very early planning stage. That is all the government has proposed in this plan—and MAX light rail. But the government has said that it does not need MAX light rail. It is very confusing. Does the government understand why people think the plan is ad hoc and chaotic? Today the Minister for Environment said that in WA we do not have a silo approach to government. As I see it, we do not have a government! Can I get a clarification from the Minister for Planning on which part of cabinet owns this plan? Is it the Liberal Party or the National Party part of cabinet? Did everyone sign off on this plan? I have a legitimate concern, because we seem to have two governments. We have two cabinets and two governments. Is this a government plan or a Liberal Party plan?

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** I think you know the answer to that.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I do not, actually. I have never seen anything like this. I have never seen a cabinet that does not take collective responsibility for decisions. It has never happened in this state.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** You know the set-up of this government. It is exactly the same set-up that you and your former leader, the then Premier, were discussing with the National Party after the 2008 election.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** No, it is not. And maybe that is why —

**The SPEAKER:** Through the Chair, please, member for West Swan.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Warnbro!

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister for Planning, that is enough!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Honestly, did the National Party sign off on this? I just want to know who I am talking to about this.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** You are talking to me; I am Minister for Planning.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Were National Party ministers in the cabinet room when you signed off on it?

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Swan, Hansard has to try to follow this. Through the Chair; thank you.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** It is a legitimate question, because now, with every bit of government policy and legislation, we have to understand who was in the cabinet room, because the entire Westminster system of collective cabinet responsibility does not exist under this government. Are we going to have two budgets at the next budget time? Will Premier Barnett stand up and present his budget, and then will the Minister for Regional Development stand up and present his? Is that how it will work?

**Mr I.C. Blayney** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. I have just said that Hansard has to try to follow what is going on—through the Chair.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Sometimes I think I have a tough position, but I think it would be tougher to be a Liberal Party regional member. That is a tougher gig—honestly! It is tough being in opposition, but imagine

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

being a regional Liberal Party member, having to cop all those decisions and watching their National Party counterparts driving around in their big white cars, flying over them in jets, and then saying, “Look, I was not part of that cabinet decision.” As tough as we have it sometimes, colleagues, at least we are not a Liberal Party regional member! That is the toughest gig going around!

The government is planning to increase the population of Perth and Peel from two million to 3.5 million. It is planning to extend the Joondalup rail line from Butler to Yanchep; to extend the Thornlie rail line to Cockburn Central, which is Metronet; and to have a new rail line, the east Wanneroo rail link, which is the first part of Metronet.

I also looked at some of the maps, just to make sure I have not missed anything in relation to projects.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Maps?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** There are some maps. I have looked at the proposed infrastructure for the north east region. I have looked at Ellenbrook. There is nothing. There is no busway, and there is no railway. The government is planning to increase the population to 3.5 million, which is enormous growth, but it has not planned for anything in the north east corridor. Sorry; there is an existing green line. It is for railway passenger freight. It is good that the government has noted that. However, there is nothing new all the way to Ellenbrook. There is no busway. There is no bus rapid transit. There is nothing. That is despite the fact that the government’s 2011 draft public transport report said that BRT was a priority. I have also looked at the proposed infrastructure for the central subregion. I think this is the Metro Area Express. The MAX project—which, remember, the government killed off and said was not happening—now appears in this well-thought-out document that the government has been working on for five years. Let us go through that document. The rail line will be extended to Yanchep. In the central subregion, there will be a tunnel. I think it is a tunnel to Morley. That is it. The government is going to reduce congestion in Morley by building an end-of-line station in Morley. Everyone will have to go to that station and park at that station. This is the government’s way of solving the problem of congestion in Morley.

I have also looked at the plan for roads. We have seen from the government’s transport documents for the next 15 to 20 years that there will be three rail lines, and a light rail—MAX—but no new busways. One of my favourites is the road that will lead to the port. I am trying to work out from the maps what will happen to the Perth Freight Link. That is not mentioned in this document. I cannot see the words “Perth Freight Link” in that document. I am not saying that I have read that document word for word, but I have looked at the maps, and at the appendix, which refers to transport proposals, and I cannot find the words “Perth Freight Link”. What I have found in that document is that Rowley Road, which extends from Kwinana Freeway to Tonkin Highway and is currently a local road under local government control, will in future be the principal freight access route to the proposed new container port facilities in Kwinana.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Oh!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** That is interesting.

**Mr P. Papalia:** On what page is that?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** That is on page 16 of the infrastructure report. I have heard the Treasurer say that we will never need a new container port. The government’s new plan is all about live sheep exports. I know where that came from. That came from the Premier, who is trying to put the argument that there is a crisis today in live animal exports. The main criterion for determining port policy is live animal exports. This crisis was not there last week. It has appeared only in the past couple of days. That is because the government is trying to justify its actions.

As I have said, I have been looking for the roads. I have been trying to find Roe 8. On one of these maps, Roe 8 just finishes. It does not connect to anything. It just stops. Talk about a road to nowhere! This map describes a road to nowhere. The map refers to the roads that need to be built for the second port. That is what it does.

To be honest, I wish the Minister for Environment was here to interject on me. He is very, very good. Oh, he has come back! I was talking about the fact that the entire mass transit plan for a population of 3.5 million people is the extension of the rail line to Yanchep, the Thornlie to Cockburn rail line, the MAX light rail and the east Wanneroo link. That is to justify a population of 3.5 million. That is it.

I have gone through the transport proposals and all the roads that need to be upgraded. Fair enough. No specific detail is available about busways. I thought the Minister for Transport likes buses. I thought he said that buses are just as good as light rail. However, in this entire document, there is no information about busways. As I have said, I cannot see the words “Perth Freight Link” anywhere in this document. I may have missed it. However, I do see commentary about upgrading Rowley Road to connect to the new container port in Kwinana.

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

The objective of this plan is fine. The objective is to identify areas that we need to grow into and areas that we need to conserve. That objective is sound. However, it is incredible that after so many years, a public transport plan is not attached to that objective. The government has not communicated directly with landowners about the plan. Councils believe they have been completely ignored. The government's idea that it has broken down the silo approach is nothing less than absurd. Frankly, I would have thought better of the best Minister for Environment in history. I thought he would have overcome those obstacles, that he would have had some consultation with councils, that landowners would be involved with this plan, and that funding would be attached to this plan. I do not know how the government intends to fund this plan. Minister for Environment, how is the government going to fund the biggest conservation estate in the history of this state? The minister is not going to say. He is not even going to look.

**The SPEAKER:** Through the Chair, please.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The minister has no idea how to fund it. How much will it cost?

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Warnbro!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The government has said that it has an infrastructure plan. I have gone through that plan. It is very weak.

Our plan is very simple. Our plan is to coordinate land use planning with infrastructure planning. Our plan is also to be very aggressive on transport-oriented development. It is not to just let some of Alannah MacTiernan's projects roll on, which is the Minister for Planning's approach, have LandCorp to do a bit of work here and there, and focus on the CBD, because we really need to spend \$500 million on that project. That was a real priority for the government.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** I think you are showing your ignorance of what has been done in planning in the last seven and a half years.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I am continually looking and looking. Members opposite keep pointing to Cockburn. That all started under Alannah.

**Mr J.H.D. Day** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The best transport-oriented development is one40William, which the then opposition opposed. The then member for Vasse called that a corrupt deal. Every time we see a picture of the new Esplanade train station and one40William, we remember that those are projects that members opposite opposed. They opposed the two new central stations. Those new stations give life to the city. They opposed those stations, because they voted against the new section of the rail line. So, minister, do not talk to me about being ignorant. Members opposite opposed the undergrounding of that rail line through the centre of the city. That has created two new underground stations that have given life to areas that were absolutely neglected. That has also created the one40William zone, and Esplanade train station, which the government has renamed. That is what we did. We want to have proper TODs and proper density, not the ad hoc and chaotic things that are happening under this government, which has seen the community resent infill, because the government has just sat back and let infill happen where it should not happen.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** Such as where?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** There are a lot of examples.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, through the Chair, please, or you will be called a second time.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I am talking about Maylands.

**MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Minister for Planning)** [5.40 pm]: That last contribution did not have much to do with the motion, which is actually about the strategic assessment of the Perth and Peel regions, which is actually an enormous project. When it is completed it will be a very substantial achievement for all those who have been involved. Its commencement and, hopefully, completion have been a major priority for this government, as the Minister for Environment indicated. A large amount of work has been involved—a lot of steps to be taken and a lot of detail—to get to the point we are at now.

The comments of the members for Gosnells and West Swan implicitly criticised the public servants, the officers of government, who have been involved. Comments were made that virtually nothing has been done over five years, or that we do not have much to show for the effort that has been put in over five years. That is essentially what was said, in part. I can assure members that a very large amount of work has been put in by some very dedicated officers of the public service. One name was mentioned—Simon Taylor, in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet—but there are many others in the Department of Planning, from the director general down;

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

the Western Australian Planning Commission; the Environmental Protection Authority; the Department of Parks and Wildlife; and the Department of Environment Regulation. All those agencies have been involved. DPC has been coordinating, and the Department of Planning has, to a large extent, been the lead agency, but it has been a very collaborative effort across government, and it has not been completed yet. A lot of work has been put in by many people, as I have said.

A substantial amount of funding has been allocated by the government to enable the project to be undertaken, including increased allocations in the last financial year. In the order of \$6 million was allocated in the budget to continue the project. Consultants have also been engaged from the private sector as part of this very large project. As the Minister for Environment said, it is the largest strategic assessment to be undertaken anywhere in Australia. It is being undertaken in the context of the relevant commonwealth legislation, which enables these strategic assessments and agreements between the commonwealth and other jurisdictions to be put in place. A large amount of work is necessary, particularly for a project of this scale.

The strategic assessment of the Perth and Peel regions, when it is completed, will deliver three critical outcomes. Firstly, there will be an unprecedented level of protection of our bushland, rivers, wildlife and wetlands through the implementation of a comprehensive plan to protect the environment, including the provision of an additional 170 000 hectares of new land for conservation reservations—a very substantial commitment by this government. Secondly, there will be the reduction of red tape by ensuring that up-front commonwealth environmental approvals are obtained, and also the streamlining of state environmental approvals processes for the development required to support the growth of the Perth metropolitan region and the adjacent Peel region to a population of 3.5 million people. Third, increased certainty will be provided for private landowners, and a more efficient approval process for development. As I said, this is the largest city-focused environmental assessment undertaken in Australia, and it is being prepared in tandem with the government's draft planning strategy, "Perth and Peel@3.5million" and the associated draft subregional planning frameworks. The integration of land use planning and environmental protection will ensure that the Perth and Peel regions will grow in a manner that protects important environmental attributes.

The Labor Party likes to make out that it is the great saviour of the environment, and that the Liberal Party and Liberal governments, when we are in office, really do not care much about those issues, but the record actually demonstrates otherwise. The opposition Labor Party is very good at making noise, and making announcements about how committed it is to the environment. There is plenty of grandstanding involved. There is some real achievement, sometimes, when Labor is in government; I acknowledge that, but Liberal–National governments not only talk about these things but also follow through and ensure that the necessary work is done to create new national parks, add new areas to the conservation estate, and put in place and fund real protective measures. We do not only announce them; we do not only talk about them; and we do not only grandstand—in fact, we do not grandstand at all—but we actually do the work necessary and commit the necessary funds to ensure that real changes are made on the ground.

The strategic assessment will allow for an expected population increase of more than one million people, while further restricting the loss of Swan coastal plain vegetation to just three per cent. A lot has been lost to this point. I think the Minister for Environment quoted the figure of 70 per cent as having been cleared since European settlement, and one of the main outcomes of this process is that only an additional three per cent is expected to be cleared. That will, of course, involve higher density developments in appropriate areas—not that this debate has been specifically about that aspect, but that has been a major focus of the planning portfolio in all the time we have been in government.

In relation to the comments about the lack of consultation that we heard from the opposition, the draft documents were released for public consultation on 17 December 2015, with the consultation period initially intended to close on 8 April, as the member for Gosnells said. In response to feedback from stakeholders and the community, the consultation period is being extended to 13 May this year. We do not want to extend it indefinitely because we want to get to a conclusion of the process, with the amount of work that has been put in. There will be an extension of the public consultation period so that people are able to look at the detail of the additional maps that are being put out later this week. The reason that this has not been done to this point is that a huge amount of technical work has been involved to get to the point at which we are able to put the maps out for public comment with a good level of confidence about the level of detail that has been provided.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** Why did you put it all out when you did not have all the information ready?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** Because there is a lot of information in the draft plan that was put out in December. From memory, I think there were thousands of pages. There are a number of appendices, and there is a lot of detail in what was put out in December. Rather than waiting for a much longer time, it was considered appropriate to put out in December the information that was available then, given the strong public interest, particularly from the

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

development industry and from conservation groups. We have been completely up-front with people, and wanted to provide as much information as we can, and to be as communicative and collaborative as we can in this process. Now that the additional information is available in the more detailed maps that, as I said, will be put out very soon, we are extending the consultation period to 13 May.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, we are digressing. Through the Chair, if you please.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I make the point that the maps being put out, if not tomorrow then early next week, and the consultation period being extended, has absolutely no relationship to the fact that this debate is occurring now. Do members opposite really think that we would have got that organised in the past 24 hours? No, it has actually been on our agenda. It was discussed by the government earlier this week and has been discussed over the past few weeks. From the government's point of view, the fact that this debate is occurring now is completely coincidental. Perhaps the opposition became aware that we would take this action. Therefore, it wanted to have the debate today to take credit for the action the government was always intending to take.

In relation to the consultation, a stakeholder reference group was established comprising representatives from the development industry, local governments, conservation groups and also professional bodies. Although I am not aware right at the moment of all the detail of the consultation that has occurred with local governments, a large amount of consultation has been undertaken in the development of this plan.

I note the comments from the member for West Swan. She said she met with four unnamed local governments today that are complaining that they have not been involved in consultation. I would be very surprised if they are substantially affected by this plan and have not had any communication or consultation over the last few months or couple of years. If the member for West Swan would like to give us the names of the local governments involved, we are very happy to check out the details of the consultation with those local governments. The member does not want to name the local governments.

**Ms R. Saffioti:** I did, but you missed it. You have to pay attention, John.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I did listen.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, through the Chair.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I missed them because the member did not and does not want to say who they are. Either they do not want to front up or the member for West Swan does not have confidence in what she is saying, or she is not telling the whole story—one of those.

I advise that the Department of the Premier and Cabinet briefed a large number of stakeholders in the lead-up to the release of the draft strategic assessment documents in December. Since the release there have been briefings, workshops and site visits with more than 30 stakeholder groups, and this will continue over the forthcoming months during the finalisation of the plan.

In relation to the mapping, a large number of maps were released with the draft plan when it was put out for public comment. As we have indicated there will be more detailed maps put out, we certainly hope, tomorrow. They will be available through an online map viewer hosted on the Department of Planning's website. A link to these maps will also be made available through the Department of the Premier and Cabinet website, which will contain an extensive amount of information regarding the draft plan. The mapping will include spatially related conservation commitments and also proposed new conservation reserves. The data that has been prepared will allow the maps to be viewed at 1:10 000 scale and enable close examination of the conservation commitments and the proposed new conservation reserves.

As I have indicated, it has always been the government's intention to put out more detailed mapping as soon as reasonably practicable to do so. That is what is occurring. We welcome the fact that the opposition has raised this debate today, as it gives us an opportunity to talk at much greater length than we would be able to during question time about the actions that the government has taken. But, as I said, it is entirely coincidental that this debate is occurring today and more information is being put out this week.

In relation to Carnaby's cockatoo, the Minister for Environment really has primary responsibility for the protection of threatened species and has made comments. I will not repeat all that but I will reiterate that part of this plan involves providing additional protection for Carnaby's cockatoos through replanting 5 000 hectares of pines in the Yanchep area, primarily for foraging habitat. The conservation reserve system will be expanded, as we have said, by 170 000 hectares. That will include improvements to the protection and management of at least 116 000 hectares of Carnaby's cockatoo habitat. Rehabilitation and revegetation will focus on improving habitat quality for Carnaby's cockatoo and other species and establishing or improving habitat connectivity and

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

ecological linkages across the landscape. Further research and monitoring will be done to increase knowledge about the species and inform conservation measures and adaptive measurement. The additional information being released this week will include the draft report, which has been prepared as part of the strategic assessment process on the impacts of alternative land use scenarios on the population viability of Carnaby's black cockatoos. But it is important to note that this paper is a draft and is undergoing peer review for publication in a scientific journal.

I think between me and the Minister for Environment, we have provided quite a significant amount of information on the actions that the government is undertaking. We are keen to have further public consultation and response to the areas that have been indicated for conservation protection. A large amount of work has been put in, as I said, by many people. When the strategic assessment is finalised within the state government and, hopefully, agreed to and supported by the commonwealth government, it will be a great credit to the efforts of many people in the Western Australian government who have been involved. We therefore most certainly do not support this motion moved by the member for Gosnells.

**MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro)** [5.59 pm]: I happily rise to join in condemning the Liberal–National government for failing to provide adequate detail in relation to the “Perth and Peel Green Growth Plan for 3.5 million”, also known as the “Strategic Assessment of the Perth and Peel Regions”, including not providing legible, clearly demarcated maps or the impact on at-risk species such as Carnaby's white-tailed black cockatoo. The member for Gosnells raised the matter of the lack of detail the moment this plan was released. It is not as though this motion is the first time the opposition has come into the Parliament and raised the matter. It is not as though this is the first time that the minister has had the lack of detail in his maps brought to his attention by the member for Gosnells.

**Mr A.P. Jacob:** Yes, it is.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** Rubbish! I am not the one who holds this portfolio and I have heard the member for Gosnells speak about and raise the issue across the chamber. It has been interesting watching two failed ministers, two abject failures in their portfolios, clear the decks prior to the reshuffle of the deckchairs next week. They are still on board the *Titanic*, unfortunately for the government. Watching them in action today has been illuminating. We have heard from the Minister for Environment, the man who oversaw the disastrous Roe 8 Perth Freight Link fiasco, which was an attack, an assault, on protected vital wetlands by the government and which has fallen into disarray under his oversight. He came in here and presented this plan and suggested that somehow he is the best environmental minister the state has ever witnessed.

*Point of Order*

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** That is not something I ever said.

**Mr P. Papalia:** What is the point of order?

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** The member is ascribing to me comments and claims I did not make. I am very happy to clear up what I said —

**Mr P. Papalia:** I will correct them if you sit down.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I will deal with the point of order, thank you.

**Mr P. Papalia:** He is taking my time.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** I said, Madam Deputy Speaker —

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** I know the complaint. The point was that it was the most condescending and arrogant contribution we have had the misfortune to witness in quite some time. The suggestion by the minister that he has any degree of knowledge superior to the member for Gosnells is laughable. The member for Gosnells is easily the most experienced and knowledgeable advocate for the environment presently in this place and probably ever in this place. It is ridiculous that the minister should even talk in the fashion that he did earlier.

The performance of the Minister for Planning, for the week or so that he has remaining, in integrating portfolios and breaking down silos is laughable. Just because in this process a number of different agencies were involved provides no evidence at all that the minister has managed to break down silos. In fact, it confirms the fact. The minister had difficulty even talking to the Minister for Transport. The minister cut him out and left him hanging in the breeze whenever he embarrassed himself. I understand the minister doing that because he is a bit more

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

experienced than the Minister for Transport. The Minister for Planning and the Premier often left him going down the path of selling a particular line that had been agreed upon and once they realise he is incapable of selling anything, they abandon him and leave him to embarrass himself on his own. To suggest that somehow the minister has overcome the failure to communicate across portfolios through this process is just silly.

I want to pick up on the observation the Minister for Planning made about the amount of money allocated to this task. Last year he suggested it was \$6 million additional funding.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** That's from my memory.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** That is what he said—to the best of his memory. It cost \$6 million to produce an A4-size multicoloured map covering 170 000 hectares of land that people are supposed to interpret. I am getting old and am in denial about my age and the necessity for me to have assistance with my eyesight but, fortunately for me, the member for Gosnells exploded the size of the map to provide me with something I can almost see. I guarantee that lots of constituents who are in the same boat as me are having a great deal of difficulty trying to discern exactly where the various areas lie. A significant number of the phase 1 and 2 expansions are in my electorate. They are small as a proportion of the overall number, but a significant number is in my current electorate lying particularly between the salt lakes, west of Baldivis and the land to the east of that point and towards the freeway. There are a lot of questionable areas in there and it has a long history. Landowners have been impacted for many years over a number of iterations of designations of Bush Forever sites and land zoning and whether it is rural or future urban. They all significantly impact landowners, many of whom have a great deal of concern for the environment and, of their own volition, have acted positively for conservation and aggressively pursued preservation of bushland and habitat, particularly for things like the Carnaby's cockatoo. People were interested and I got correspondence from some of those people, one lady in particular, who has been there for decades and lived through a lot of these changes. Quite understandably, when the last lot of consultations was undertaken, the maps were not much better than this, I have to tell the minister. They were done in the same fashion; they were small. I am trying to remember the correct terminology. I think it is actually large-scale—no small-scale, with large amounts of land on a small map. I am trying to remember cartography and what is large and what is small. Hopefully, Hansard might help us later. We had physically small maps covering extensive amounts of geography, with nothing more than a few different colour tones to discern between proposed changes to land use. That, understandably, raised the anxiety levels of landowners.

I acknowledge the member for Gosnells. The minister was derisive when I suggested that the member for Gosnells had earlier raised in Parliament the issue of these maps. I am sure he did. I remember him doing it because they were of interest to me because my constituents had been concerned.

**Mr A.P. Jacob:** It was an interjection to a question last week.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** No; I am talking about earlier than that. I will accept the assertion that the minister was planning to release more maps, more detail and more information soon and will be doing that next week before he hands over the portfolio and changes. I can understand that this is kind of like the barnacle clearing, but not so much before the election; before the reshuffle. It will happen before then, otherwise he will go, and will leave something for someone else to do. I am sure that would have been planned but the minister must admit that the process by which he released a document that contains inadequate information adds to people's anxiety levels. It raises many questions on behalf of the people affected about whether consultation is legitimate, whether the minister will assess any feedback or whether it will be something that is handed down in the absence of listening to any commentary from the people most impacted. That is a reasonable observation because it is being done in two stages. Did the minister notify people that that would be the case before now?

**Mr A.P. Jacob:** It's a huge task.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** Yes, I can see that.

**Mr A.P. Jacob:** You have to balance that with the ability to release the information you have ready at any given time. You don't want to hold things back any longer than necessary either. We had a wealth of, I guess, high-level information that we were able to release last December and we did. This drills down to that next level and we are getting that to the point where we can release it. We have always said that we are happy to take longer if we need to.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** I think it will take longer to make sure that people are comfortable with where these lines lie, what land is impacted and what it means. Even if this map were massively bigger than it is for me, it would not really define some of these areas. I know where those roads are and the land we are talking about. The types of properties that could be impacted, in some cases, differ quite significantly. There is urban land right next to land

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

that is being used for market gardens right next to other land that is semi-rural retirement-type places next to other land designated as Bush Forever. It is quite complicated, and that is only in that little plot.

**Mr A.P. Jacob:** Add to that the complexity of various MRS amendments, various planning scheme approvals and various environmental approvals all mixed into it. There are a lot of datasets to pull in.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** Yes, and we can lay across that what the City of Rockingham is doing with its town planning schemes and the like. Even they have been altered. This is not the minister's problem but other people have raised with me that when they bought land, one town planning scheme had a significant major road in a location to the north of them and now it has been changed to be south, and that will change their lives. That sort of thing is overlaying the minister coming out with this plan. This plan is necessary. It is essential that we have planning to preserve the environment, particularly in trying to preserve some of our threatened species. It is a complex history that must be accounted for. The minister might not have been engaged with it all that time but a lot of people down there have been the whole time, some of whom are ageing. In many respects, these changes can impose on them a lot of unnecessary stress; for example—the minister will be familiar with this—some people had assumed that their landholding is almost like a superannuation package or a source of funds for their retirement and that may be threatened. It may not be, but their concerns are elevated as a consequence of the lack of information.

**Mr A.P. Jacob:** I completely agree. That is where this exercise by its very nature will bring that to finality. What needs to be acquired has to be funded for acquisition for the approvals to be in place and what is not required may be unencumbered. There is a mix in that and that is why bringing it altogether across Planning, Environment, Premier and Cabinet and others was the approach we took.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** I will watch with anticipation to see the completion of the delivery of information and engagement with the community.

I will finish by commending the member for Gosnells. I have no doubt that the member for Gosnells has brought to this place a renewed vigour and enthusiasm for defending the environment and focusing on governance of the environment, which can only benefit the state and the entire population and, into the future, hopefully, will ensure that we have better standards and we preserve the environmental estate for future generations. I urge the member for Gosnells to continue with his enthusiasm and the rigour with which he assesses all matters environmental on our behalf and drives the Western Australian Labor Party towards continuing a proud history in protecting the environment and I thank him for that. As I say, I look forward to the release of further information and further engagement with the community, particularly with those people who will be impacted by this.

**MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah)** [6.10 pm]: I am very keen to make a contribution to this motion that is before the house this evening. I note my good friend the member for South Perth is in the chamber and I am gunning for him to be the next Minister for Environment.

**Mr J.E. McGrath:** You were a former environment minister.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** I know, and I think you have the credentials.

**Mr J.E. McGrath:** You weren't bad at it.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** Thank you. I would never claim to be the world's greatest environment minister unlike the current minister who loves blowing his own bags as much as he has today. Normally I am a little bit less conciliatory, but I will be a bit more conciliatory because this draft Perth and Peel Green Growth Plan for 3.5 million, the strategic assessment process and also the Perth and Peel@3.5 million strategic plan are all very critical plans for the people who call the Peel region home. As members may be aware, I have lived in the Peel region now for over half my life. I have a connection to it from when I was a boy when my family, like many families in country Western Australia and metropolitan Perth, chose Mandurah as essentially their initial holiday destination. For many of us who live in the Peel now and call it home, our connections to the region can be traced to the attraction of the natural assets that make up that region. I have spoken in this place on many occasions about the health and wellbeing of the Peel waterways and the catchment, the importance of the Peel Yalgorup National Park and the thrombolites that exist in the southern parts of the City of Mandurah, the significance of the Ramsar conventions, the fact that the Peel–Yalgorup system is an important and crucial Ramsar site, and of course the ongoing importance of looking after in an absolutely sustainable way those assets that have, in many respects, attracted generations of Western Australians, Australians and international visitors to the region to enjoy and experience the assets that make our region a very unique part of Western Australia.

As we know, the green growth plan was released last December for consultation. It was an important milestone. It is a process or a plan that has been developed, as the minister said, through input from the Department of the

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

Premier and Cabinet, and underpinned by the strategic assessment process. Included in all of this is also the Perth–Peel planning strategy, which talks about the future population growth and how we will accommodate that into the future. All of these plans are very important and there is no argument from me about that. To be totally honest with members, I am not interested in arguing about who thought of it first and all the chest beating. I want to get on with it and make sure that whatever decisions are made and put in place in the future are evidence based or soundly based upon the science and that it takes into account—this is a point that I think the member for Gosnells makes very well—the fact that the Peel region is internationally recognised as being a biodiversity hot spot. It has a number of unique elements to its asset from an environment perspective that requires us to not only tread carefully when planning for the population growth that we have and will experience into the future, but also preserve those natural fauna and flora elements that make it unique. It is true to say in terms of biodiversity that it is one of those rare places in the world where the quality and number of species is quite remarkable. It always astounds me that it is very much an area of Western Australia that is still in need of more research and understanding. For example, tiny little birds from areas in Siberia travel literally thousands of kilometres every year along the Asian flyways to the Peel–Yalgorup system to feed and replenish their energy supplies et cetera. They then make their way back again along that same flyway. They have been doing this, it seems, for thousands of years before settlement or the colonisation of the Peel region by Thomas Peel over 100-odd years ago during the times when the Noongar and Pinjarup people lived and traversed that unique part of Western Australia. We are in a unique situation, so we have an obligation to not only the existing population, but also the future population to tread carefully when we talk about what is a population that is sustainable for the region and what measures need to be put in place now and in the future to ensure that the unique qualities of the region's natural assets are preserved.

Numerous studies, many of them recent, indicate ongoing concerns about the health and wellbeing of the catchment and the waterway. Yes, we have some very good entities and tremendous volunteers working on the ground and very good work being done by government and non-government departments. We now have a natural resource management entity in its own right for the region, a wonderful achievement, through the Peel–Harvey Catchment Council. I have publicly paid tribute to the work of the late Don Randall who, as the federal Member for Canning, advocated to the federal Minister for the Environment to make that election commitment at the last federal election, and delivered on it. I acknowledge the significance of that. However, in any existing and future planning structures we need to make sure we get it right. I believe very firmly that there are a number of concerning indicators, and I mentioned that a number of recent studies continue to show grave cause for concern. I will not have a go at my parliamentary colleague the member for Dawesville, but I remember in our debate about the Peel waterways bill, which was brought to this place by the member for Gosnells, focussing on an element of governance with regard to the Peel waterway system. The throwaway line of the member for Dawesville was something like this: “There is no problem with water quality. I can throw a few nets into the water at the back of my holiday house in the canals and catch crabs and the water is clear.” I was astounded by that comment.

I am not going to criticise him and have a go at him about it.

Several members interjected.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** That is what he said; it is in *Hansard*. It demonstrates to me a very shallow understanding of exactly what is happening in that system. I can point to a number of reports in recent years, including one that was highlighted in a study by the University of Queensland about the ongoing concerns of water quality in the system. A number of indicators show cause for concern and I do not think we can ignore them.

I listened to the minister's comments about the loss of 70 per cent of vegetation over the last number of decades or hundred-plus years and his claim that the Perth and Peel Green Growth Plan for 3.5 million will see only a three per cent decline in vegetation coverage, even though there is projected growth in the population and in residential plan development. One of the things that I want to revisit as part of the green growth plan is the plan for Point Grey on the eastern foreshore area of the Peel–Harvey waterway. I will not go into the history of Point Grey in great detail, but I sincerely believe that Point Grey is one of the areas in this plan that need to be revisited. Point Grey has a history of conjecture over science and a history of development proposals, but Point Grey is also a lightning rod for one of the concerns about the potential future growth, particularly the residential growth, on the eastern side of the estuary system. The maps are indecipherable, but we will get more detail tomorrow and in the coming week. I remember the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure in the previous Labor government, Alannah MacTiernan, specifically highlighting, particularly to speculative developers who were looking at purchasing, and who have since purchased, land along the eastern corridor of the estuary, the view that that area should not be developed for residential purposes to great intensity in the long term.

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

The reason I want to talk about Point Grey is that there are some interesting situations. Basically, under the state and federal processes, which I know will change, Point Grey was approved for a marina that would incorporate a major dredging channel effectively from the Dawesville Channel through to the proposed marina, which would be excavated from the estuary foreshore at Point Grey. There was very strong community concern and, indeed, agitation and protests and a massive number of submissions; in fact, I understand that the number of Point Grey submissions either equalled or exceeded those for James Price Point, so it attracted a great deal of community concern. I believe that the community concern specifically referenced the proposal for a marina and the excavation. It attracted concern from recreational fishers and, indeed, commercial fishers that operate in the estuary. I assume that the minister will be aware that the number of estuarine fishers has declined markedly; I think there are fewer than six licences now, and that is down from a high of more than two dozen in the 1980s and 1990s. One of the concerns about the proposal to join the excavated channel with the proposed marina at Point Grey was the impact on not just fishing, but also the habitat for the blue manna species and other fish species in the estuary system. There were concerns about the proposal for dealing with spoil and the ongoing need to dredge that channel once it had been created and who would ultimately be responsible for that in the out years. During that process, we looked at other examples in which dredging and/or design and supported proposals had not been effective for the health and wellbeing of waterways. We looked at the Port Geographe experience in Busselton. A significant amount of money has been spent to retrofit the marina.

[Member's time extended.]

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** We know that the design issues associated with that marina proposal meant that there was an ongoing build-up of seaweed et cetera, and that caused quite a concern for the community at Port Geographe. We also looked at a more recent example of the issues in the Jurien Bay marina, where there are some major concerns about water quality, flushing et cetera. One of the concerns that have been raised in the Peel–Harvey area is the issue of acid sulfate soils. As the minister knows, acid sulfate soils are not effectively activated until they come in contact with oxygen and are disturbed, so that is an ongoing concern.

The Point Grey proposal has reached an interesting stage. The minister may not be aware of this but I think it is relevant. The development company has been having financial difficulties for some time now. It has a development approval for those elements of the marina and the related excavation for the channel and, of course, the proposed residential development, but the company has been in a serious financial situation for a number of years now. The proposal to effectively establish an urban centre at Point Grey runs completely counter to one of the major goals of the green growth conservation plan of restoring and improving habitat and connectivity across the landscape. I believe, as do a number of other people, that this is counter to that aim or objective. I believe that the proposal at Point Grey needs serious reconsideration and I think that can be done as part of this proposed green growth plan. This is not popular with the Shire of Murray; the Shire of Murray supports Point Grey's development, and I differ from the Shire of Murray in my point of view on that. I get on very well with the Shire of Murray, but I have a different point of view. Collectively, the Point Grey area is an ideal location, both currently and into the future, for a whole range of passive and recreational activities that would enhance the human interface with the natural fauna and flora of the area. I also believe it would create an important southern element to the green growth plan as it is proposed.

I am not going to go into greater detail in terms of the natural assets of Point Grey, but it is a very strategic peninsula, if you like, in the Peel–Yalgorup system. There are many who believe it is a short-sighted plan to allow it to be developed into an area that will effectively have more than 3 000 urban lots, a potential population of more than 7 000 residents and a marina that is fed by an excavated channel that will need dredging into the future. We have an opportunity to revisit that.

The Premier will be coming to Mandurah on 4 April; I am not sure when he is making his decision about the cabinet reshuffle and whether that affects things, but he is coming to Mandurah and he will be welcomed to Mandurah.

**Mr C.J. Barnett:** Coming to Mandurah and looking forward to your hospitality!

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** Yes, and I respectfully look forward to that, too. I know the Premier will have heard this before during previous visits, but there is a real sense that the health and wellbeing of the ultimate population in Mandurah–Peel is underpinned by the health and wellbeing of that magnificent asset. The Premier will hear that; I will not be the one who tells him, but he will hear it from many, many stakeholders when he is there on 4 April. I just hope that, as part of the Perth–Peel green growth plan, there is some potential for the government to look again at this element of it, which is the future of Point Grey. I would hate to see that opportunity missed.

I am aware that the ongoing funding of this will be subsequent to the plan for the future, but I think we still have to deal with the governance issues. I know there has been consideration of the Department of the Premier and

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

Cabinet's stewardship of a number of the negotiations. That has been raised previously. I think the governance issue is an important one to be considered. The other issue is that this plan proposes the establishment of the Peel regional park. There is no denying that the Peel regional park element of this plan and of any strategic approach to the future of the Peel–Harvey estuary and the catchment is crucial. The Peel regional park proposal, which is an element of this plan, will essentially do three things. It will bring under the Peel regional park the land-based reserves, which have jurisdiction under the Conservation and Land Management Act, so all the terrestrial elements, the existing conservation elements and the existing regional park elements will be combined under the proposal for a Peel regional park gazettal. We will see the regional open space elements and the Peel regional plans that are part of the overall planning strategy for Perth–Peel, but for the Peel aspect of Perth–Peel, come under the regional park proposal. I think it is crucial and I support strongly the inclusion of the Peel–Harvey estuary and its tributaries under a single marine management area. I applaud that; I support it absolutely. One of the problems in the history of the management of the Peel–Harvey system over literally decades is that the model has changed. There was a Peel Inlet Management Authority at one stage. Prior to that there were a range of measures employed whereby the overall management of the system was usually by one lead agency. Post the Peel Inlet Management Authority, it came under the jurisdiction of agencies like the Department of Water. Of course, we know that the system has, in all of its management challenges, a finger in many pies. We know that the Department of Water has responsibilities, the Department of Transport has responsibilities, the Department of Fisheries has responsibilities and the Department of Parks and Wildlife has responsibilities. Then, of course, there are the responsibilities and the stewardship or custodianship, if you like, of the five local governments that have a direct and ongoing interest.

I am glad the Premier is here. I suppose what I am keen to see is, as this process continues—and as we have seen, the maps will be available so we will now get greater clarity for local government to make informed submissions—the input and submissions by all stakeholders, whether it be the Peel–Harvey Catchment Council or whether it be the local government entities, to be genuinely listened to and acknowledged. We need to come at this with an understanding, particularly from local government, that for many local governments in the Peel, it has been a change with regard to the understanding over time of the importance of the Peel–Harvey system and the health and wellbeing of that system essentially to our existence into the future. I say all the time that the viability and sustainability of every small business in the Peel is ultimately linked to the health and wellbeing of that system, as is my family's existence and the future of the thousands of families that call Peel home—their investments in housing and business are all essentially linked to the health and wellbeing of that system.

If the Perth–Peel green growth plan is to succeed, it needs buy-in by all those stakeholders, many of whom I have already mentioned in this contribution. As a local member, I will not stand in the way of a plan that I think is going to work and deliver benefit to the community, but I want to make sure that everyone is heard and not simply dismissed. There are so many who have a vested interest in the success of a viable, sustainable environment there, and in some cases there are examples where that has occurred in the past.

With that, I support the motion that has been brought to Parliament by the member for Gosnells because it is a rap on the knuckles to the minister for not, in the preparation of this plan—we are now in the late stages of it—providing information that was vital and should have been provided at the beginning. I look forward to what I think will be good quality submissions made to this process, which now has an extended submission period to 13 May and will now also have legible maps.

**MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells)** [6.40 pm] — in reply: I am pleased to speak again on this motion and to acknowledge the capitulation by the government on this issue. In my latest media release on this issue, on 3 March, I asked why the Liberals are not allowing the community to see the detailed maps. On 23 March, we now have a commitment from the government to release the detailed mapping. I hope my optimism about the quality of that mapping is not misplaced. I hope those maps will be as accessible as has been indicated by the Minister for Environment and the Minister for Planning. I hope they will provide the level of detail that will enable people to have all the information at their fingertips and get the detail together, and thereby improve the quality of the overall submissions and assessment of this green growth plan.

The motion that I have moved is that this house condemns the Liberal–National government for failing to provide adequate detail on the Perth–Peel green growth plan. That stands. We continue to condemn the government for its failure to provide the detail on that plan. In the course of debate, it is emerged that the government is prepared to release that detail. We have given the government other opportunities to provide that information to the Parliament, such as through my media comments of 20 days ago, and before that time. We know that conservation groups have also been pushing for that information to be released. Thanks to this motion coming to the Parliament, the government has now made a commitment that it will release these maps, and that it will provide additional information about the impact on at-risk species such as Carnaby's white-tailed black-cockatoo.

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

I am very pleased that this has been the result of this motion. It is essential that the house now votes to support the motion and locks it in so that the government cannot move away or conveniently forget the commitment that it made in the course of this debate. We need to have that commitment locked in. I hope that all members will see the good sense of this motion and support me and all those on the Labor side of the house and vote for this motion to condemn the government for its failure to provide detailed mapping and to provide information about Carnaby's black-cockatoo.

Some very interesting points were raised in the course of this debate. We need to remind ourselves about the biodiversity significance of the part of the world in which we live. I refer members to a paper that was co-authored by Dr Margaret Byrne, a senior bureaucrat in the Department of Parks and Wildlife; Dr David Coates; Félix Forest; Stephen Hopper; Siegfried Krauss; Kale Sniderman; and Kevin Thiele. These people are eminent in their field, mostly in the botanical area, I believe. The paper is titled "A Diverse Flora—Species and Genetic Relationship". They begin their paper by recalling how Myers and Mittermeier identified this part of the world as a global biodiversity hotspot. We think of those hotspots as being confined to Fitzgerald National Park, the Stirling Ranges and Lesueur National Park. However, in the Perth metropolitan area and in Peel, there is an exceptional level of floristic diversity. Therefore, it is critical that we ensure that the urban development in this area is respectful of those environmental values. In the course of debate I was heartened to realise that across the chamber there is some awareness about that, but further questions arose as the matter was discussed.

Further issues came up, particularly around how the green growth plan will be funded. It is all very well for the Ministers for Environment and Planning to talk about this 170 000 hectares of land that is going to be transferred from one form of protection to another. It has already been identified as environmentally significant land, so it is not at risk of a bulldozer at the moment because it is environmentally significant land. That land will be transferred to another form of tenure and that is a form of offset. In the course of debate I think the minister said that of the 170 000 hectares, about 160 000 hectares did not require an actual land acquisition, but some 10 000 hectares would require some form of land acquisition. Where is the money coming from to pay for an acquisition? The minister also talked about the money that would be available for land management, and I recognise that whenever there is an addition to the conservation estate, it comes with a responsibility to manage that land and that takes money as well. I have looked through the green growth plan, especially draft action plan H. We did say that this represents five years of work and draft action plan H is not that long. People were talking about thousands of pages, and overall the green growth plan is a very big document, but the actual conservation section is relatively brief. Of course, that is one of the reasons for this motion coming before the house today—that we have this paucity of information; we do not have the maps. During the course of the debate the government committed to releasing those maps in the next day or two. I think the minister is even committing to release those maps tomorrow—that very detailed information that has much in the way of data underpinning it. They are very substantial datasets that are then formed into things that I believe are called shapefiles, which are then used in the geographic information system analysis. They will enable people, community members, to go online via the various departmental websites and interrogate those maps of the Perth–Peel region to see the environmental values. They will be able to do that layering and see that there is a particular vegetation complex in their area that coincides with a particular landform or watercourse, and to see as well that there is potentially some urban development proposed for that area, and they will be able to write sensible submissions on that basis.

The draft action plan H, the conservation program, refers to the offsets package, and this is the one that concerns me. We have had commitments from the government today that it will release the maps and provide an extension to 13 May, and that is good news. I really think the opposition deserves a lot of credit for this, because if the government is trying to say that it was about to do this, why would the government not have done it when I previously commented publicly on the lack of detailed maps? Why would it not have said it would provide an extension when my last media release was issued on 3 March? The government has waited 20 days and now it has come good and said that there will be much more information available and there will be an extension. That is to be welcomed, but there are many other aspects of this green growth plan that need to be interrogated. There is this issue of the nature of the offsets. Earlier on I talked about the concerns I had that the offsets plan would very quickly turn into something that the public could become very cynical of, because there is all sorts of potential for misleading the public. I have pointed out that we have already noted that some of the Carnaby's black-cockatoo areas that have been designated as habitat for previous developments, developments approved over the last 10 years or so, are now being proposed as new offset areas. This very tricky and dishonest double counting of offset areas is a real problem that the government has to resolve. Again, this is something to which I think the attention of the government can be drawn through this comment period, if the government is genuine in its commitment to provide people with information and give them an extended time to make comments. Then we can have useful and meaningful comment on the overall plan.

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

The Minister for Planning made a suggestion at one point that I was being a little harsh on some of the public servants, suggesting that they had not done much in five years. That is not the case at all. I am sure that they have been working exceptionally hard, but after all, the government of the day, in this case particularly the Minister for Planning and the Minister for Environment, are the gatekeepers who make the decisions on when the information is to be available to the public. So far, they have prevented that information getting out to the public. But now we have a commitment that that information will come forward and will eventually be made available. However, there are many questions, particularly on the issue of the funding.

The public is sceptical. People have been hearing for years about the commitment to full implementation of Bush Forever—all those Bush Forever sites. In fact, I see that some of the areas proposed as offsets, included in the 170 000 hectares being talked about, are already Bush Forever sites. There is real reason for scepticism in the community about the offset package. Another reason for that scepticism is that the Environmental Protection Authority had position statement 9 in place, about offsets. It had been in place for many years and then, towards the end of last year, it was revoked along with whole lot of other documents. In fact, I managed to count about 50 EPA documents revoked by the government—position statements, guidance statements, policy statements, environmental reports and bulletins. The government said it did not like those, so it revoked them. That is what it did with the EPA's position statement 9 on offsets. It was an excellent document, put together at the time when Dr Wally Cox was the chairman of the EPA, and it had a degree of clarity about it, setting out how an offset system should work. It certainly made it clear that we should not have this double counting that we have already seen occur with the draft of the green growth plan. The draft of the green growth plan mentions offset areas that are already offsets to something else. That double counting will just undermine people's sense of the quality and the trustworthiness of this exercise.

Some of the other areas that have been identified as part of the initial package of sites—phase 1—for the offsets make me wonder how many are really substantial areas of protection, when we realise they are already protection areas. We need additional areas. The government is going to allow the destruction of about three per cent of the whole of the Swan coastal plain, and I believe there would be potential to offset that by some sort of environmental restoration. We cannot play God. We have talked about how the Minister for Environment wants to play God with extinctions, but he cannot be God and re-create something that has been destroyed. However, we can go some way towards carrying out ecological restoration. We can acquire degraded land and try to rehabilitate it. The rehabilitation of land is a very important component of a good offset package. That was made clear in Dr Cox's position statement 9, the previous EPA position statement that was revoked by the current minister. Ecological restoration work should form a part of the offsets package. I had a meeting with the previous chair of the EPA, Dr Paul Vogel, just months before his retirement. It was an official meeting, so he was not telling me anything that could be said to be out of school.

He was saying that ecological restoration had to be a major part of the green growth plan. I do not see that in this document that is before us at the moment. The minister did not speak about it earlier. That is an area of concern.

The community is very interested in the green growth plan. Thanks to the WA Labor team bringing that issue to Parliament today in private members' time, we have been able to ensure that the government commits to releasing all the information that people will need to make submissions. Of course, it remains to be seen what the government will do with that information once it is provided. I trust that the motion that I moved will be supported by all members of this house.

*Division*

Question put and a division taken, the Deputy Speaker (Ms W.M. Duncan) casting her vote with the noes, with the following result —

Ayes (17)

Ms L.L. Baker  
Dr A.D. Buti  
Mr R.H. Cook  
Ms J. Farrer  
Ms J.M. Freeman

Mr D.J. Kelly  
Mr F.M. Logan  
Mr M. McGowan  
Mr M.P. Murray  
Mr P. Papalia

Mr J.R. Quigley  
Ms M.M. Quirk  
Ms R. Saffioti  
Mr C.J. Tallentire  
Mr P.B. Watson

Mr B.S. Wyatt  
Mr D.A. Templeman (*Teller*)

**Extract from *Hansard***  
[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 23 March 2016]  
p1751b-1777a

Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Albert Jacob; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia; Deputy Speaker; Mr David Templeman

---

Noes (32)

Mr P. Abetz  
Mr F.A. Alban  
Mr C.J. Barnett  
Mr I.C. Blayney  
Mr I.M. Britza  
Mr G.M. Castrilli  
Mr V.A. Catania  
Mr M.J. Cowper

Ms M.J. Davies  
Mr J.H.D. Day  
Ms W.M. Duncan  
Mr J.M. Francis  
Mrs G.J. Godfrey  
Mr B.J. Grylls  
Dr K.D. Hames  
Mr C.D. Hatton

Mr A.P. Jacob  
Dr G.G. Jacobs  
Mr S.K. L'Estrange  
Mr J.E. McGrath  
Ms L. Mettam  
Mr P.T. Miles  
Ms A.R. Mitchell  
Mr N.W. Morton

Dr M.D. Nahan  
Mr D.C. Nalder  
Mr J. Norberger  
Mr D.T. Redman  
Mr A.J. Simpson  
Mr M.H. Taylor  
Mr T.K. Waldron  
Mr A. Krsticevic (*Teller*)

---

Pairs

Mr P.C. Tinley  
Mrs M.H. Roberts  
Mr W.J. Johnston  
Ms S.F. McGurk

Mr W.R. Marmion  
Mr R.S. Love  
Mrs L.M. Harvey  
Mr R.F. Johnson

Question thus negatived.

*House adjourned at 6.59 pm*

---