

**STATE FORESTS 6, 22, 23, 28, 32, 33 AND 65**

*Partial Revocation of Dedication — Motion*

Resumed from 14 August on the following motion moved by Mr A.P. Jacob (Minister for Environment) —

That the proposal for the partial revocation of state forests 6, 22, 23, 28, 32, 33 and 65 laid on the table of the Legislative Assembly on Wednesday, 13 August 2014, by command of His Excellency the Governor, be carried out.

**MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells)** [5.10 pm]: I do not want to detain the house but I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate on the revocation of some areas of state forest. I also acknowledge the help of the Leader of the House to ensure that this debate was brought on today.

The revocations involve the excision of a number of areas in a number of state forests. I note on behalf of my friend and colleague the member for West Swan that a revocation to state forest 65 will assist with the construction and upgrade of part of Gngangara Road, which is indeed welcome from a road safety perspective. I also note that another part of state forest 65 will be revoked for road safety reasons to iron out a bend on Wesco Road. Road safety is clearly an issue there and, of course, has to prevail over any other concern.

The revocation of a number of state forests between Margaret River and Nannup affects a total area of 135 hectares and will enable an upgrade to make safer Mowen Road. No doubt officers from the Department of Parks and Wildlife will have cast their eye over any implications to ensure no dramatic loss of flora and ecosystems in that area. Of course, there is a degree of loss from the state forest of 130-odd hectares, but I have confidence in the officers of the agency to ensure that this will be done in the correct manner and that there is no loss, say, of a declared rare flora species or the like. Therefore, I have no concern with that either.

Similarly, state forest 22 involves a very small revocation and I do not think that is a great problem. It is a three-hectare site located in the heart of Jarrahdale that is not for a road upgrade but for town amenity purposes. I note from satellite imagery that the vegetation appears to be in relatively poor condition. There may be some people from that area who could tell me whether the trees are of some heritage or amenity value, but I trust that the local authorities have looked into that.

I do not want to detain the house unnecessarily; however, I wanted to mention briefly the revocation of an area of state forest 23, which involves an excision in the area of Helio Road in Teesdale of 3.07 hectares to enable access to lot 413, Austin Road. I raise this matter because we note that there are not many dwellings in the area. Indeed, I think there is only one major dwelling at lot 413 Austin Road on a fair-sized property held by a company known as Ivo Nominees Pty Ltd. The minister can help me by answering why this area of state forest is being revoked so that a road can be upgraded when it appears—I might have this wrong—that it will benefit only a single landholder. If that is the case, why are we setting ourselves up to upgrade roads for single landholders? Perhaps there is a good reason for that. My brief bit of research has revealed that Ivo Nominees Pty Ltd is an investment company with a postal address at 109 St Georges Terrace. It may all be perfectly reasonable that the affairs of state are conducted in this way, but I ask for some explanation for this revocation. The minister offered to provide a full briefing on these revocations, and I thank him for that, but on this occasion I am happy to take general advice and would welcome a response on my question about state forest 23.

The opposition welcomes these revocations where they improve road safety and enable a road to be enlarged and made safer. We accept that an important part of the work of government is to deal with things in this way. With that, I look forward to hearing the Minister for Environment's comments.

**MR A.P. JACOB (Ocean Reef — Minister for Environment)** [5.14 pm] — in reply: I will address the comments of the member for Gosnells, whom I thank for some advance notice of his questions on this matter. To quickly address any issues of clearing of vegetation, I believe the only one of these proposals that involves any clearing of vegetation is state forest 65, which involves mostly pine trees in the Gngangara pine plantation. Turning to state forest 23, lot 413 is effectively landlocked at this stage with no legal land access. Part of this revocation will provide for a new road into that lot and then an addition of almost one hectare back into the state forest portfolio as a bit of a trade-off. Helio Road also services at least another two, perhaps three, blocks; so at least three blocks in total are serviced by Helio Road.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** They have access on the other side, though.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** I know that the other two properties have access on the other side, but functionally at the moment their main access is on Helio Road and one of the properties is an operational bed and breakfast. That is where the community benefit lies. I believe the one in Jarrahdale is a playground and I do not believe that involves any clearing. There are certainly no impacts on any endangered or vulnerable flora or fauna.

Question put and passed.

