

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS**

INQUIRY INTO COCKBURN CEMENT LIMITED, MUNSTER

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE
TAKEN AT PERTH
MONDAY, 11 APRIL 2011**

SESSION FOUR

Members

**Hon Brian Ellis (Chairman)
Hon Kate Doust (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Phil Edman
Hon Colin Holt
Hon Lynn MacLaren**

Hearing commenced at 1.30 pm

SAUNDERS, MR DAVID

Acting Director General, Department of Planning, sworn and examined:

FOX, MR NEIL

Senior Strategic Planner, Department of Planning, sworn and examined:

[Witnesses took the oath.]

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, gentlemen, for coming in. I welcome you to today's hearing. You will have signed a document entitled "Information for Witnesses". Have you read and understood the document?

Mr Saunders: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: These recordings are being recorded by Hansard. A transcript of your evidence will be provided to you. To assist the committee and Hansard, please quote the full title of any document you refer to during the course of this hearing for the record. Please be aware of the microphones and try to speak into them, and ensure that you do not cover them with papers or make noises near them.

I remind you that your transcript will become a matter for public record. If for some reason you wish to make a confidential statement during today's proceedings, you should request that the evidence be taken in close session. If the committee grants your request, any public and media in attendance will be excluded from the hearing. Please note that until such time as the transcript of your public evidence is finalised, it should not be made public, but I advise you that publication or disclosure of the uncorrected transcript of evidence may constitute a contempt of Parliament and may mean that the material published or disclosed is not subject to parliamentary privilege.

Before I ask you for an opening statement, I will just introduce the committee to you. We have Hon Phil Edman, Hon Lynn MacLaren, myself as Chair, Hon Kate Doust as Deputy Chair, and Hon Colin Holt.

I will just invite you to make an opening statement to the committee in regard to this hearing.

Mr Saunders: If I may, Mr Chair, the committee would have received the submission from the Department of Planning. Rather than reiterate what is in here, we are comfortable with the submission as it stood back in November of late last year. So, we are happy to take questions on the submission.

The CHAIRMAN: My first question relates to the department's submission, number 88. Your submission advised that much of the land surrounding CCL, Munster, within the Kwinana air quality buffer zone, is zoned rural and that, accordingly, the owners of that land are legally permitted to construct a single dwelling on a lot. What are the characteristics of a rural zone? How long has that land been zoned rural? What was the zoning of that land when CCL commenced its Munster operations in 1951? Also, were emissions from CCL ever a concern when considering the zoning of that area, especially considering the potential for the construction of a single dwelling on each lot? A final part of that question—so that you can make the note—is: has any of this land ever been subdivided; if so, why was the subdivision allowed?

Mr Saunders: Mr Chairman, I will attempt to answer them in turn. I might ask you to repeat them if I forget them.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. It was a long question.

Mr Saunders: I understand the first one was about, “What are the characteristics of a rural zone?” The rural zone exists under the metropolitan region scheme. As such, there are a range of activities that are permitted in a rural zone. The second part of the question, I think, was how long has it been a rural zone.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. How long it has been zoned rural?

Mr Saunders: I will have to take that question on notice. I do not know how long it has been a rural zone. The third question was: since 1951—

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: What was the zoning of the land at the time when CCL commenced their Munster operations —

Mr Saunders: Again, I would have to take that on notice. I do not know the answer to that question.

The CHAIRMAN: If you can get back to the ones that you have not got the answer to.

Mr Saunders: Yes. “Were there any submissions from CCL when it was a rural zone?”, I think was the fourth question.

The CHAIRMAN: It was, yes. It was: were emissions from CCL ever a concern when considering the zoning of that area, especially considering the potential for construction of a single dwelling on each lot?

Mr Saunders: Sorry; I misunderstood. That is emissions, not submissions.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Yes, emissions.

Mr Saunders: Again, Mr Chairman, I do not know the answer to that question. I will take that on notice.

The CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Mr Saunders: The last one was on subdivisions. Has any of the land been subdivided, and, if so, why? Again, I would have to take out a notice and check our records as to the subdivision history of that area.

The CHAIRMAN: Okay; if you can get back to us with those answers.

Hon PHIL EDMAN: While we are on the subject of divisions—you might want to take this on notice as well—I just want to ask a question about 74 Howe Street in Beeliar. Given the lot’s close proximity to Cockburn Cement and the Kwinana air quality buffer, did the Western Australia Planning Commission seek advice on the amounts of pollution or dust being emitted before approving that lot subdivision?

Mr Saunders: I would have to take that question on notice and get back to you.

Hon PHIL EDMAN: Okay. The last one, just while we are talking about subdivisions: on lots 21–25 Lorimer Road and lots 1–6 Henderson Road in Munster, I want to know why the Western Australia Planning Commission approved the development of a large bushland block owned by the Water Corp, despite half of the bush being inside the Kwinana air quality buffer, in relation to some protection for Cockburn Cement?

Mr Saunders: The specifics of that question I would have to take notice and get back to you.

Hon PHIL EDMAN: That is fine; thanks.

Hon COL HOLT: Perhaps I can ask a question. I guess the concerns of the committee—and maybe I should just speak for myself —

Hon KATE DOUST: It is all right, Colin; you can speak for us.

Hon COL HOLT: I have got an industry based in metropolitan Perth, if you like, that has some issues with dust emissions or emissions, and yet there is a fair bit of pressure around that site for more and more housing. I guess I would like to know the Department of Planning's attitude towards that. How do you marry both of them together? Is there any applications to subdivide those areas, or is there any pressure to increase some of those areas closer to the plant, inside the buffer, to have more people live in there, knowing that we have an industry there that has problems with emissions?

Mr Saunders: In response to that question, there is always pressure for further residential development across the Swan coastal plain, and that area, the Swan coastal plain, is no different. The commission would make a distinction between what is inside the air quality buffer and what is outside the air quality buffer, firstly—and secondly, we would make a distinction about the zoning of the land. The zoning of the land outside of the quality buffer is zoned either urban deferred and/or urban. The zoning of the land inside the buffer remains zoned rural. The zoning is one part of the answer, but also the effect of the air quality buffer would need to be considered in that.

The Kwinana buffer review committee has responsibility for review of the air quality buffer, and they will take all of those things into account in recommending to the commission whether the zoning of the land should change inside the buffer or not.

Hon COL HOLT: When did that review committee start? When was it established?

Mr Saunders: The Kwinana air quality review committee's date of commencement, I do not know, but it has been going for some years now. In my substantive role as the executive director of regional planning and strategy, I chair the buffer review committee.

Hon COL HOLT: How many meetings do you have a year?

Mr Saunders: They are as required. Certainly last year, it was meeting every month on occasions and every two months throughout the rest of the year.

Hon KATE DOUST: This morning we had the Department of Health come in and give us evidence about this matter. We were talking about the issue of encroachment upon the buffer area by new housing developments. They put to us that they thought that perhaps health should be taken into account as a consideration for when planning decisions are made that, over a period of time, allow for that type of change to occur. Is that something that is actually taken into account—the potential health implications of allowing people to build in or even close by to where a large industrial site is?

Mr Saunders: Health implications would be taken into account.

Hon KATE DOUST: But is it a standard thing, an automatic thing, that is taken into account, or only if there are issues in that area at the time?

Mr Saunders: In that specific vicinity, given the nature of industrial activity that is occurring, particularly in that particular site, that would be a consideration on each and every occasion. If the commission needs more specific advice, I can request that advice from the Department of Health.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: The Kwinana air quality buffer is currently under review—yes?

Mr Saunders: Correct.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: And that review has been going on since 2008?

Mr Saunders: Correct.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: When do you plan to finish that review? Are you anticipating a new buffer proximity to be established, or why is it under review?

Mr Saunders: I might just go back a step. The 2008 position paper of the Western Australian Planning Commission on the Kwinana air quality buffer identified the existing buffer but also

identified a number of portions of the buffer that needed to be resolved on receipt of the technical information to justify where it should sit. The Kwinana buffer review committee's role is to consider that information and try to resolve those outstanding areas. There are a number of those in this document. If you do not have a copy of this, we have brought copies of these for you.

The CHAIRMAN: Could you just state the title of the document so it is tabled for Hansard?

Mr Saunders: "Review of the Kwinana Air Quality Buffer—position paper", October 2008, Western Australia Planning Commission, is the document I am referring to. In relation to your question on when does the buffer expect to be finalised, we would anticipate by the end of this year, but that is subject to a range of technical studies to be completed and provided to the buffer review committee for consideration. The buffer review committee meets, as required, to consider information as it becomes finalised. For example, in the northern end of the Kwinana air quality buffer, there is the Water Corporation's wastewater treatment plant. That was one of the areas that was yet to be resolved in terms of where the final buffer should sit. That was subject to monitoring and modelling being completed for that area so that that information could be provided to the buffer review committee to justify where the buffer may sit.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Why has it taken four years? Was there some lack of resources, or did all of the technical studies require four years to complete?

Mr Saunders: Not all of them. Certainly in that example I just quoted, the wastewater treatment plant, the requirement, as I understand it, is to undertake monitoring over two consecutive summer periods to justify a valid set of results. That takes some time. There is also the modelling that needs to be undertaken following that monitoring exercise. They do take some years to complete, and we anticipate they will be completed this year.

[1.45 pm]

Hon PHIL EDMAN: You have just said this will be finished some time at the end of this year. Are there any councils or property developers wanting to develop close or inside that Kwinana air quality buffer, that have put in a submission?

Mr Saunders: They have not put in submissions per se to the review. They are invited, depending on where the location is, to make submissions to the buffer review committee as it is considering each of those portions of the buffer.

Hon PHIL EDMAN: Have any councils or property developers done that yet?

Mr Saunders: There has been.

Hon PHIL EDMAN: Are you able to name them?

Mr Saunders: The Town of Kwinana and the City of Rockingham have certainly made representations to the buffer review committee. They have been afforded the opportunity to present their case. Similarly, Alcoa has presented their case. Also jointly, the Satterley Property Group and one other developer—whose name escapes me, but it will come to me—have also provided representations to the committee.

Hon PHIL EDMAN: You can take that on notice if you like.

Mr Saunders: Sure.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: What are the implications of the review? What exactly are the statutory rules associated with the air quality buffer? Is it merely an advisory document, or are there certain planning rules that have to apply within the buffer?

Mr Saunders: It is not a statutory instrument; it is a planning overlay. The metropolitan region scheme would be considered a statutory instrument. It is a planning overlay that needs to be taken into account in any rezoning.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: And only a rezoning part? There are land uses permitted within the buffer?

Mr Saunders: Some land uses occur within the buffer —

Hon PHIL EDMAN: That would only be IP 14 land, though, would it, within the buffer?

Mr Saunders: Which area is that—sorry?

Hon PHIL EDMAN: Within the buffer, the zoning of the land, is it IP 14, or is it R40 and R80 as well?

Mr Saunders: There is rural zone in the buffer. There is some bushland within the buffer. Within those rural zones, as I understand it, there is a range of dwellings and activities. There would not be, as I understand it, sensitive land uses within the buffer. The commission would be keen to ensure that none did occur in the buffer.

The CHAIRMAN: There are a couple of prepared questions we have here. I have had a quick look at them. They would be similar to the first question. I think we will send those questions to you; it might be easier for you to get back to us. There may be others towards the end that we may not get to. I will move on.

Hon KATE DOUST: Can we just confirm: is there any urban zoning within that buffer, according to your —

Hon PHIL EDMAN: That is why I am asking for R80, R20 or R40.

Mr Saunders: There is some urban-zoned land within the buffer. Referring to the position paper 2008, there is a portion of urban-zoned land to the west of Rockingham Road on the northern extremity of the buffer.

Hon COL HOLT: That is the Kwinana air quality buffer?

Mr Saunders: Yes.

Hon PHIL EDMAN: So there are residents actually living in the Kwinana air quality buffer?

Mr Saunders: That is right. That is zoned urban.

Hon KATE DOUST: Which zone is that?

Mr Saunders: On the map, it is defined by Rockingham Road that runs north–south, and Russell Road that runs east–west. It is in the north west sector of that between the Cockburn Cement part of the buffer and the wastewater treatment plant buffer.

Hon KATE DOUST: That would be zoned urban because those properties have been there for an extended period of time?

Mr Saunders: Presumably. I would need to check when that zoning occurred. In the very south west extremity of the air quality buffer, there is a portion of land between Patterson Road and the ocean which is within the buffer, which is also zoned urban.

Hon PHIL EDMAN: You are talking about near the grain mill?

Mr Saunders: Yes, down that southern south west portion.

The CHAIRMAN: In light of that, in DEC's submission they advised that the EPA had stated that the buffer zone surrounding CCL Munster should not be used for residential development. How do the department and the WA Planning Commission reconcile this EPA position with the fact that there are residential buildings within the buffer zone surrounding CCL Munster? How do you reconcile the fact there are residential developments there and DEC's advice that the EPA stated that there should not be?

Mr Saunders: I would need to understand what DEC's advice was and the EPA's position, but as I understand it, it is no future urban zoning and therefore residential within the buffer.

Hon PHIL EDMAN: If one of the councils wanted to lobby you about putting another residential development inside the buffer at this point, I would presume it would be looked at unfavourably now by the Western Australian Planning Commission?

Mr Saunders: Yes. The Department of Planning's advice to the WA Planning Commission would be along those lines.

The CHAIRMAN: How many houses close to CCL Munster are less than one kilometre away from the plant, which is less than the EPA's recommended buffer distance of 1 000 to 2 000 metres?

Mr Saunders: Mr Chairman, I do not have that specific information. I am happy to take that on notice.

The CHAIRMAN: If you can. There will be some follow-up questions we will attach to those other questions so that you can get back to us.

The department's submission number 88 advised that the draft "Outer Metropolitan Perth and Peel Sub-Regional Strategy" identifies land in close proximity to CCL Munster and currently zoned rural as a possible area for future urban expansion. What set of performance indicators will be used to assess the suitability of these areas for future urban expansion, and how likely is it that this land will be approved for this purpose?

Mr Saunders: I might defer to my colleague Neil Fox to provide the performance criteria. There are some qualifications in that draft, which is out for public comment. They are an important factor to take into account. I would go back to my previous response in relation to land zoned rural within the air quality buffer and the likelihood of that zoning changing. Neil, if you could describe the performance criteria.

Mr Fox: Mr Chairman, I have the document entitled "Outer Metropolitan Perth and Peel Sub-Regional Strategy" which you are possibly all familiar with. We could make copies available now, if you like.

The CHAIRMAN: You can table that for us.

Mr Fox: While those documents are being distributed, I will make reference to page 93 in that document. If you would like to turn to page 93, figure 56, which shows these areas you have just referred to, Mr Chairman. The performance indicators, which you also made reference to, appear on page 36 of the document. Essentially, areas have been indicated on this map as possible urban expansion areas. They come with qualifications. On page 95 of the document it is stated under the subsection dealing with Munster—which refers to the urban expansion area in the draft expansion plan—"its development potential will be subject to the successful resolution of air quality concerns as a result of the review of the Kwinana Air Quality Buffer". The performance indicators are essentially detailed on page 36. Any application for development on that map, as we have described, would have to be carefully evaluated against those performance indicators before it could move forward.

The CHAIRMAN: So it would have to meet those performance indicators on page 36?

Mr Fox: Yes. I should of course mention that the document has been subject to a public submission period, as I think you would know. Submissions have been received within the south west subregion, also covering this area in particular.

Hon PHIL EDMAN: Just going back to this first paper you have given us, reviewing the buffer. You have just illustrated to us where there is urban within the buffer. Obviously the government of the day, or a couple of governments, have moved a lot of people out of Hope Valley to move them out of the Kwinana air quality buffer as well. Would that be something that you would be looking at as well, with those other two little areas where people are still living in the buffer? Would you be doing the same thing and move them out of the area like the people in Hope Valley?

Mr Saunders: I am not aware of any current proposal to undertake that sort of action.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: The Department of Health's submission recommended that every phase of the planning process should include a potential health impact assessment, and that the Department of Health should be involved at the earliest opportunity. What are your views about that recommendation?

Mr Saunders: That sounds a sensible suggestion.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Is it not currently done that way? How do you take into account health impacts?

Mr Saunders: I think it is on an "as required" basis at the moment. For this particular area that we are talking about, I would think that would be part of the commission's role to consider a submission from the Department of Health. As an example, in the Kwinana air quality buffer review committee, in considering a revised buffer in and around the Alcoa residue disposal area, we formally sought advice from the Department of Health and the Department of Environment and Conservation on where a buffer should sit. That information, when received, was considered by the review committee and provided to the commission for its consideration.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: We are concerned in this inquiry about the impact of emissions from the Cockburn Cement plant. Do you have any comments on the planning rules surrounding that area? Are they sufficient at the moment or are you reviewing the planning rules around Cockburn Cement?

Mr Saunders: Not as far as I am aware, no; and the buffer review committee has not been asked to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether you can comment on this: based on the reviews so far, do you think that the buffer around CCL Munster should be widened?

Mr Saunders: I do not have the information from the review, but certainly the findings of this committee will be taken into account by the buffer review committee. What I would say is it is not likely that the buffer in the vicinity of Cockburn Cement will be reduced in its extent. That has been the example and practice with the area that the buffer review committee has reviewed in the vicinity of Alcoa—rather than it being reduced, it has actually been expanded.

Hon COL HOLT: My question was along those lines. Looking at this document, the area around Cockburn Cement looks like it is urban expansion. I take on board what you talked about on page 95 where it actually says it will take into account the air quality buffer. What we have found out here is there has been a fair change in the emissions coming out of Cockburn Cement in the past couple of years, or an increase in complaints coming from those surrounding areas, including those ones to the north and east, downwind from the prevailing sea breezes. I raise with you guys that those sorts of issues should be taken into account with any review of the buffer zone in Kwinana. I assume you are aware of it and have been speaking to the Department of Health and DEC.

[2.00 pm]

Mr Saunders: At the appropriate juncture, we will be. As I said earlier, the buffer review committee will be taking into account the findings of this inquiry. In relation to the buffer around CCL, that will need to be taken into account.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I am interested because now we have the Hope Valley–Wattleup redevelopment area, which also includes the Cockburn Cement plant. Could you explain to me the master plan that is under development? Does it take planning control for the area, including Cockburn Cement, from the City of Cockburn?

Mr Saunders: I will defer to you, Neil.

Mr Fox: Thank you for that.

Essentially, the Hope Valley–Wattleup Redevelopment Act and subsidiary to that is the master plan. The WAPC is the decision-making authority in terms of that act. Therefore, any decisions about any application for development within the confines of that legislation—which applies to this Cockburn Cement site—rest with the WAPC. The City of Cockburn is not the decision maker.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: A bill before us at the moment relates to the Hope Valley–Wattleup Redevelopment Act. What is the current status of the master plan? Is it a planning instrument now or will that happen in the future? Do you know?

Mr Fox: My understanding is that it is a current instrument that is used to —

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Currently, planning decisions for Cockburn Cement, since passage of that act, are the —

Mr Fox: That is my understanding; management would refer to that —

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: They are the responsibility of the WAPC.

Mr Fox: I should also mention—I qualify this by saying that I do not have all of the information with me—that these decisions are handled by means of giving effect to them in terms of the delegations that exist. There is a delegation that is going to transfer decision-making authority to the City of Cockburn. But that comes with various qualifications. We are, more or less, in a transitional period with that, right now. But any application that has been lodged to date has been the responsibility of the commission in recent years.

The CHAIRMAN: If the department is the relevant regulator for the expansion of existing operations with CCL’s plant, has it ever received a development application relating the increase of the design capacity of the plant? If so, please provide details of these applications—including the factors which were taken into consideration when determining the application and any conditions placed on CCL if and when the applications were granted.

Mr Fox: Chairman, I think that we would need to request to come back with a full response to that.

The CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Mr Fox: I can say that the submission before you does give an indication of the nature of the applications that had been received at the time the submission was prepared. I have subsequently, in the last week or so, gone into our system to try to see whether we have any further or more current information so that I could bring the full information to your attention. I can mention that we have an application with us, at the moment, which relates to kiln 6. There is an application that is being processed right now.

The CHAIRMAN: So it is in the process; it has not been approved.

Mr Fox: Yes; it is in the process of being approved.

Hon KATE DOUST: How long does that normally take to work through the system?

Mr Fox: I have spoken to the people who are processing that application and there is every intention from the department’s side to have the matter finalised as soon as possible. I would like to say by the end of April—if all goes according to plan.

The CHAIRMAN: What does that application involve? I ask that because I have a question to ask about some of the approvals that you have already made for kiln 6. I may be asking the same question, but in your submission you advise that the CCL application to install a coal mill facility for kiln 6 was approved unconditionally on 16 February 2007. I was wondering what factors the department considered before granting that application? Did they include the likely impacts of coal milling on the surrounding community and the environment? I realise it made two separate applications but I was wondering if the new application was for continuing to use coal.

Mr Fox: Looking at the current application before us—an application received on 23 February of this year—the proposal is to develop two baghouses. In essence this will result in reduced dust emissions from kiln 6. I would hesitate to start trying to discuss with you the technicalities around that, but my understanding is that the installing of these baghouses to reduce emissions will mean a significant investment by CCL.

The CHAIRMAN: It occurred to me that it may be an application to carry on using coal.

Mr Fox: No; I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN: Does DEC consult your department or the Western Australia Planning Commission before it issues licences for prescribed premises? Did it do so for CCL's amended licence?

Mr Saunders: I am not aware of the detail that. We are happy to take that one on notice and get back to you.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you any views on the amended licence? Have you formed a view that it is a better licence than the previous one? Or have you any views at all about the conditions of the new licence?

Mr Saunders: I do not and I am not in a position to make that view known because I have not reviewed that specific material. Again, we will take that on notice and get back to you.

The CHAIRMAN: The amended licence also requires CCL to install, commission and operate, by 29 February 2012, pollution control equipment for kiln 6 designed to achieve a TSP—commission concentration of 30 milligrams per cubic metre or less. Can you explain whether you are satisfied with this new requirement?

Mr Saunders: I am not in a position to answer that question; that is a level of technical detail that we would need to research and get back to you with. As I understand, that would be a condition imposed by the office of the EPA or by DEC.

The CHAIRMAN: I will add that question to the others that we are going to be sending you.

Therefore, I presume you do not have a view on the 13 new environmental requirements—improvements—in the amended licence either.

Mr Saunders: No specific view on that, but we would be happy to take that on notice.

The CHAIRMAN: We will send that question on to you as well.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: The amended licence requires CCL to minimise dust emissions through the implementation of appropriate dust management control measures; ensure that odours and dust emitted from its Munster plant do not unreasonably interfere with the health, welfare, convenience, comfort or amenity of any person who is not on the premises; and ensure that no visible fugitive dust is discharged beyond the boundary of the premises. What are your views of these new requirements?

Mr Saunders: They sound eminently reasonable.

Hon COL HOLT: There you go; you got an answer! We do not have to do that one on notice.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Do you want to have a go?

The CHAIRMAN: One other question is whether your department has had any representatives on the environmental improvement plan group, which is now known as the partnerships in action group? If so, what are their experiences on this group? First, can you answer whether you have any representatives on this group?

Mr Saunders: No; we are not aware of that. We would have to take that on notice and get back to you.

The CHAIRMAN: If you do not have any representatives, are you planning to put on or make available representatives to this consultancy group?

Mr Saunders: If required and requested, the Department of Planning could do so.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Does the Department of Planning have any comment about Cockburn Cement operations and the implications for planning in the region?

Mr Saunders: No specific comment other than the generic comment that applies to any industry operating in the vicinity of residential areas; that is, they should take all best endeavours to limit the impacts of their activities to their site. The use of buffers to mitigate what is sometimes the inevitable emissions that occur outside of a site, is a planning mechanism to separate residential use from industry. In this case it has been used appropriately across the whole Kwinana air-quality buffer area.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, thank you for coming in. We will be sending you a number of questions and if you could, please get back to us with those answers.

Mr Saunders: Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Hearing concluded at 2.10 pm
