

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES AND
FINANCIAL OPERATIONS**

2014–15 ANNUAL REPORT HEARINGS

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE
TAKEN AT PERTH
WEDNESDAY, 9 DECEMBER 2015**

**SESSION TWO
WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PLANNING COMMISSION**

Members

**Hon Ken Travers (Chair)
Hon Peter Katsambanis (Deputy Chair)
Hon Liz Behjat
Hon Alanna Clohesy
Hon Rick Mazza**

Hearing commenced at 11.15 am

Mr ERIC LUMSDEN

Chairman, examined:

Ms GAIL McGOWAN

Director General, Department of Planning, examined:

Ms SUSAN BURROWS

Assistant Director General, Perth and Peel Planning, Department of Planning, examined:

Mr JOHN DEERY

Chief Financial Officer, Department of Planning, examined:

Mr TIM HILLYARD

Chief Property Officer, Department of Planning, examined:

The CHAIR: I will reopen the hearing. I think we will just acknowledge that we swore you in for the earlier session, so we will just treat it as a continuation. We are now formally dealing with the WAPC, but I think we will just continue if there are crossovers, as there may be.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Page 17 refers to the second airport study. Can I ask what locations are currently being examined for that?

Mr Lumsden: Thank you, honourable member. The current locations are very generic at the moment in terms of Perth and Peel. We are in an early stage of the process where we actually have gathered all the information necessary which would affect site selection. We are now in the process of taking that down further through a steering committee, which I chair. So it is early days. Those sites will be identified early next year. But, obviously, there is a process to go through which is a multi-criteria analysis of all the issues. At this stage, it is too early to give specifics.

Hon SUE ELLERY: What is the minimum total footprint that you would need?

Mr Lumsden: I would have to take that on notice exactly, because we are looking at two types of sites. The first is the general aviation site, similar to Jandakot; and the other one would be a potential international site. Whether we recommend one or the other yet is still to be determined because of site constraints and other issues that I have touched on—criteria we need to assess.

Hon SUE ELLERY: If I go to page 15, there are two things on page 15 that I want to ask you about. One is Ranford Road, which is the bane of my life. My electorate office is in Willetton, and I spend a lot of time driving up and down Ranford Road; so, apart from my personal interest, I am interested on behalf of my electorate, obviously, about where that work is at now on Ranford Road.

Mr Lumsden: First of all, can I say at the outset that the commission is not a construction agency?

Hon SUE ELLERY: Indeed.

Mr Lumsden: Certainly, the reservation is facilitated to allow the widening of Ranford Road, which is proceeding in stages. I drove down that road probably three months ago, and I understand that road construction is being carried out by private contractors through either the City of—I am sorry; it was one of the cities or Main Roads. I would ask Mr Hillyard to just add to that, please.

Mr Hillyard: Yes. The first stage of the upgrade was done by the City of Armadale, where they dualled it in consultation with the department and the WAPC, because there were some land offsets for that work to go ahead. I understand a current part of this further planning is for an additional future reservation requirement to widen the current MRS reservation.

Hon SUE ELLERY: So what the annual report is saying is that the review study was for the purpose of kind of looking at the future role and function of Ranford Road. So can you talk to me a little bit about even the scope of that?

Mr Lumsden: The scope was basically to ascertain whether the current reservation was adequate in terms of the future east-west major road, and that study was undertaken and I think there were some refinements done, by memory, to allow for an appropriate dual-lane carriageway to be constructed as is now the case.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Is the actual report itself of the review a public document or going to be a public document? What is its status?

Mr Lumsden: I do not think there is any issue with the report, is there?

Mr Hillyard: No, I have not seen that report, but there will be a metropolitan region scheme amendment that needs to be initiated, so it will be related to that.

Mr Lumsden: Yes, so it would be available through that process.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Okay, but not before we see the amendment?

Mr Lumsden: That is my understanding, yes.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Can I ask you about Henley Brook Avenue on the same page and how many properties are still to be purchased?

Mr Lumsden: I will refer that to Mr Hillyard. I do not know off the top of my head. I think there are a few.

Mr Hillyard: Most of the properties have now been purchased or are committed through the urban development areas. One property was purchased, I think, last year. There would be probably no more than about 10 whole or part properties to be completed.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Perhaps you could take it on notice so that I could get the actual answer.

Mr Hillyard: Yes, certainly.

[Supplementary Information No B1.]

Hon SUE ELLERY: I have a couple of questions on page 10 as well. The first one is about how many MRS amendments are currently in progress.

Mr Lumsden: That are currently in progress, right now?

Hon SUE ELLERY: Yes.

Mr Lumsden: I will take that on notice.

[Supplementary Information No B2.]

Hon SUE ELLERY: There are 19 listed in the annual report, so how many of those that we have in front of us are you able to tell us—you might need to take this on notice as well—have actually been finalised?

Mr Lumsden: Yes, I would have to take that on notice because they all might be in various stages—finalised or close to being finalised.

Hon SUE ELLERY: If you are taking that on notice, can you provide for me or specify the amendment title that goes with each one of those as well?

Mr Lumsden: Yes.

The CHAIR: We will make all that part of B2.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Still on page 10 dealing with MRS amendments, when will the MRS amendments for Roe 8 be initiated?

Mr Lumsden: Amendments for Roe 8? That would be some time next year on my understanding.

Mr Hillyard: Mr Chairman, maybe I could answer that.

The CHAIR: Yes.

Mr Hillyard: In the early stages of planning for Roe 8, there was a determination made that the project itself would be assessed rather than the MRS amendment being initiated and being assessed, if you like, because there was the chance to interact on the design et cetera through Main Roads through the environmental assessment process. So what is intended is that an MRS amendment will be initiated post-construction so that it meets the final as-constructed requirement.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Where was that decision made early on? In which agency or where did that decision get made?

Mr Hillyard: I think it was just a technical working group meeting between Main Roads and the Department of Planning as to what was the more appropriate mechanism.

Ms McGowan: I think it is important to note that probably about 95 per cent of the land required for Roe 8 has actually been part of the reservation for quite some time; so it is only, I think, the areas around Murdoch Drive and a couple of other areas that sit outside that.

Hon SUE ELLERY: That is an area that is part of my electorate, so I am very familiar with some of the history of it; let us just put it that way. For how long has the department—this is really the Department of Planning, I guess, rather than the PC—been aware that you did not in fact have the total construction envelope that you needed?

Ms McGowan: I think it is not uncommon, and I will certainly defer to Mr Hillyard and the chairman for this, but in any of these major projects and I think in Roe 8 it was identified around 1963 in the MRS that there would frequently be areas that just sit outside an area which you cannot predict with that much certainty so many years out. I think the extent to which, you know, as the final concept plans have been drawn up—I am not sure when you might have had discussions or if you have had discussions.

Mr Hillyard: Yes. The issue of the actual reservation versus ownership is a slightly different one, because where the road would go outside of the current MRS reservation for Roe Highway is still within mostly land owned by the Planning Commission, which is parks and recreation land. Obviously the intention was that as the road moves, then there is a backfill with the parks and recreation. The only private land that I was aware of that was not reserved within the particular project area was the corner of Murdoch University, which came out of the Murdoch activity centre. So, that road requirement was identified some years ago by Main Roads, the council et cetera and the Planning Commission as part of the planning for Fiona Stanley Hospital; so it was always going to be required for that. Once again in terms of the reservation, it is a public purpose—special use reservation, the university. So the university is considered to be public in that sense.

Ms McGowan: And I think just, as I am aware, bunding ramps and drainage were the only areas that sat outside of the MRS reservation.

Hon SUE ELLERY: In respect to the planning control areas applied on the Roe 8 project, what was the basis of those planning control areas?

Ms McGowan: Basically it is just to make sure that that land is protected that sits outside until the MRS amendment is undertaken, and that is just, you know, a normal part of the planning process.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Because you are going to do the MRS amendment after construction?

Ms McGowan: Yes.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: In Gidgegannup, moving from urban deferred to urban zoning, who was the proponent of that amendment?

Mr Lumsden: It was the Rowe Group planning consultants on behalf of a landowner; I think it might have been Mr Coleman.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: When was the request for changing the zoning made by the proponent?

Mr Lumsden: I have not got the date before me but I think it was some time ago. It has been going through an assessment process with the department.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: What I am looking for is the length of time taken for the assessment process.

Mr Lumsden: Okay.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: Can you take that on notice?

Mr Lumsden: Yes. Can I just add to taking that on notice, through you, Mr Chairman?

The CHAIR: Yes.

Mr Lumsden: The Gidgegannup proposal for being urban deferred and then lifting has been around for some time. There have been a number of issues in terms of —

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: The proposal to rezone it to urban deferred has been around for some time?

Mr Lumsden: Yes, and also in fact probably around 10 years, because there have been ongoing discussions and community consultation on that extension of the town site.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: To urban deferred, but not from urban deferred to urban?

Mr Lumsden: That is right, but the urban deferred request has been in for some time because there were still a number of issues to be resolved through the department before the commission would be satisfied to lift the urban deferring.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: So who was consulted in the assessment to shift to an urban zoning?

Mr Lumsden: It would have been normal government agencies and local government was my understanding.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: So the City of Swan was consulted?

Mr Lumsden: Yes.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: How were they consulted?

Mr Lumsden: By a formal request for their input.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: Were they asked by letter?

Mr Lumsden: By letter through the department for their comments.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: So, “This proposal is before us; what do you think?”

Mr Lumsden: Yes, for comment.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: When was that done?

Ms McGowan: We would have to take that on notice through the Chair.

Mr Lumsden: It was some time ago.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: And when was it responded to?

The CHAIR: I will make all of those earlier requests all part of B3.

[*Supplementary Information No B3.*]

[11.30 am]

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: Who else was consulted in relation to the changing of the zoning from urban deferred to urban?

Mr Lumsden: We would have to give that information in response to the other question.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: Okay, so if you make that: who else was consulted and when, and their response?

The CHAIR: We will add that to B3.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: In the move to urban zoning, what requirements, which WAPC had noted in the move from zoning rural to urban deferred, have been met? For example, there were issues to do with sewerage treatment, with water, electricity, public transport and roads. All of those requirements in the initial change of zoning from rural to urban deferred were expressed by the WAPC, so which of those were met changing from urban deferred to urban?

Mr Lumsden: My understanding, but we will take it on notice, is that literally all of those requirements were met, including bushfire control, environmental issues et cetera as well.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: How was the wastewater requirement met—the sewerage requirement?

Mr Lumsden: The wastewater requirement is being met by a private provider who will have to meet requirements of the economic regulator to provide that facility for the development to proceed.

Ms Burrows: The commission's decision was around that it was satisfied that it could be achieved through a private provider. Those details will have to be firmed up before any further planning work takes place, and that includes major structural planning before development. So, by the structure planning stages, they will have to have firmed up the providers of those services, that the land can be adequately serviced for those stages of development.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: So the proponent will have to firm that?

Mr Lumsden: Correct, to the satisfaction of the commission and other relevant agencies.

The CHAIR: There was something there earlier that was going to be taken on notice that we need to add.

[*Supplementary Information No B4.*]

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: All of the requirements that have been placed on the proponent, is that information public, rather than me going through each one with you now?

Ms Burrows: I believe it is at this point in time, yes, but we will take that on notice and provide that if it is public information.

Mr Lumsden: I do not see any reason that we cannot provide it.

The CHAIR: We will make that part of B4.

Your minutes used to always be put up on the website, but I do not know that that always happens regularly now, does it? It still occurs?

Mr Lumsden: They are, with one exception, which has been a longstanding practice of the commission, that the minutes of a meeting which makes recommendations to the minister remain confidential.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: So the minutes in relation to this decision —

Mr Lumsden: Should be on their website; we will check that out. These ones will not, but we can still make them available to you.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: If you could include the minutes, it would be useful.

I have a couple of other questions. The Shenton Park redevelopment—there are two: one is 1293/57 and one is 1299/27. For 1299/27, there is no website address for the Shenton Park hospital site amendment. I am happy to take it on notice in the interest of time, but could you provide the details of what that amendment is and the key requirements in that.

Mr Lumsden: Yes, we will provide that.

[Supplementary Information No B5.]

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: I think that is it for MRS amendments.

Hon RICK MAZZA: Just on page 13, there is the review of commission decisions that have gone to the SAT—some 80 applications. What were the sorts of reasons why applications were being referred?

Mr Lumsden: There are two aspects to that. There may be decisions that have been excised through the Department of Planning's delegated authority, which applicants feel aggrieved with; there might be a decision itself or a condition or conditions thereof. The other one could be, which is probably rarer, appeals against commission decisions that the commission has made itself to the SAT. Overall, I think the majority of appeals have been upheld in the commission's favour, unless Ms Burrows wants to add to that.

Ms Burrows: That is correct.

Ms McGowan: It is actually over 99 per cent.

Hon RICK MAZZA: They were 90 per cent, were they? So the 57 applicants that were finalised, how were they finalised? Were they finalised by adjusting their application?

Mr Lumsden: It would be through the tribunal process, which is a staged process. First of all, they go through a mediation process with the relevant agencies involved; obviously, the Department of Planning represents the commission. There may be then new arguments put forward by the applicant, which is often the case, that were not available at the time, allowing the agreement between the parties to modify a condition. That is normally the case. Alternatively, on rare occasions it goes to a full hearing of the tribunal, which makes its own decisions.

Hon RICK MAZZA: You said it was 90-something per cent?

Ms McGowan: It is 99 per cent—it is in the key performance indicators, I think. I will confirm that for you, though.

Mr Lumsden: It is up in the high 90s.

Ms McGowan: That does not mean that there may not have been a mediated outcome as part of that process; it is when the decision is actually overturned.

Hon RICK MAZZA: In the middle of page 17 it talks about the state planning policy for bushfires with bushfire-prone areas, which seems to quite a large part, if not all, of the state. Has there been any work done on how much that will increase building costs by?

Mr Lumsden: In general terms yes, and I will ask Ms Burrows to add to that. The point I would make is that the honourable member would be aware that the commission was mentioned in the Keelty report in terms of carrying out certain actions. We have been doing that process, facilitated through the Department of Planning in conjunction with the Department of Fire and Emergency Services and other agencies. Notwithstanding the Keelty report, the commission has become more concerned at bushfire incidence due to the drying climate and also, unfortunately, due to more people lighting fires. Also, the fire behaviour has changed quite significantly and the commission itself has taken on board the fires in Margaret River and Prevelly, as well as more recent fires such as the one in Armadale. This is part of the planning process to address this issue.

In terms of the larger aspects of the bushfire policy, Ms McGowan or Ms Burrows might wish to answer.

Ms McGowan: Broadly speaking, it depends on what level of protection is needed at the lower end of the spectrum. If something is obviously in a low bushfire-prone zone, no extra requirements apply.

Hon RICK MAZZA: Sorry to interrupt, it has got gradings, has it?

Ms McGowan: It has got gradings, so BAL-12, I think it is. If it then goes into the next categorisation, which I think is BAL-29, it would involve things like embers screens and covers over air conditioners, and the cost could be around \$2 000 to \$5 000. At the very extreme end—this is where the chairman was speaking where we would discourage or the commission would not approve future builds in those sorts of areas—for new builds that have been approved under previous decisions, the cost could be in excess of \$50 000, \$60 000 or \$70 000 because you would actually have to have certain buildings with quite significant protection. All of those are specified under the Australian Standard, which has been adopted, obviously, across jurisdictions, and that is a function of the Building Commission and the building licence process.

Basically, from a planning perspective in terms of how it would work, if your lot is less than 1 100 square metres or R10, you will not need separate planning approval. If the proposed building is more than 50 kilometres from a gazetted town site, you can do a self-assessment. We actually have an online form on our website now that allows someone to step through what they need. Broadly speaking, the Keelty work was around recommending protections for areas within 100 metres of vegetation. In metropolitan areas what that will mean in practical terms from the planning point of view is that most lots are under 1 100 square metres, so you will not need to have a separate BAL assessment; you will not need separate planning approval. However, when the building surveyor or whoever is the authorised person comes to issue the building permit, a lot of those people will be accredited as BAL assessors and they can determine the requirement. Also, when you have got subdivisions either in a metropolitan area or a large regional or urban centre where you have what is called BAL contour mapping that has been done as part of the subdivision, so the whole area has been assessed, the individual landowner will not need to do something in addition; that will be relied upon. The cost of actually having the assessment done will probably be around about the \$500 to \$700 mark, but the level of mitigation you need will start at the lower end at about \$2 000.

Hon RICK MAZZA: So it could be quite a financial impact for people building new homes.

Ms McGowan: Yes, for any new home it can potentially be, but, of course, the reality is that the Keelty review was very strong on those recommendations. I think the evidence of the fires we have had both in Ellenbrook recently and in Esperance, and other fires in the past, is that it is something that was determined to be required.

Hon RICK MAZZA: It will be interesting see the insurance impacts on those properties that comply and do not comply.

Mr Lumsden: I think the commission was obviously aware of the impost on the consumer; however, in my view, this is no different to people building on difficult sites where you have to have a geological assessment done, you have to change footings—there might be clay soils, there might be rocky soils—particularly in the Perth Hills where I have lived. I see this as no different. The other point I want to make is that governments across Australia have been severely criticised by coroners' reports on not doing adequate bushfire planning, and one of the issues with this type of thing is that where people own property, you cannot stop the building, but coroners' reports have still said that that building—similarly, where you are building on clay soil, you have to have different footings and that type of thing—needs to be reflective of the issue that you are addressing. In this case, it is not only property, but in many cases a life. So, I think the government and the

commission have responded to this issue, which has been an ongoing issue, regardless of the persuasion of the government of the day, to address it appropriately. Unfortunately, in my career I have seen bushfire behaviour change dramatically in terms of intensity and the way bushfires happen. They are far more intense and they have a tendency to be more difficult to control. There is a number of areas now where the evidence I have had presented to me by both local governments and by FESA themselves is that there are areas we have got to manage appropriately through what has been prescribed by the director general to ensure that if a property is being built or extended, it is done in a certain way, because some fires in some areas will be very difficult to contain. We have a responsibility to the individual, as well as the wider community, to address these issues. Unfortunately, part of the outcome of this is some increased costs.

Hon RICK MAZZA: I understand that. Just on the point you made there about extended property, you are saying that if someone renovates or extends their house, they have to comply with bushfire code —

Mr Lumsden: Depending on what the BAL is.

Hon RICK MAZZA: Yes, but at what percentage do they have to do up the entire house and not just the extensions?

Ms McGowan: They cannot make the existing house worse. The new area has to comply, but they cannot render the existing part more prone to bushfires, but there is no obligation to do anything on the new part. I was going to just add, in terms of your comment in terms of insurance premiums, it is probably important to note that there was a multiagency response in terms of the Keelty review and the Department of Fire and Emergency Services, the Building Commission and the Department of Planning worked quite closely together. In all of the discussions with the insurance industry, there was certainly the commentary that they were well aware of bushfire-prone areas. A number of the most significantly impacted councils, so Mundaring and in the south west around the Busselton area et cetera, already have very comprehensive bushfire maps that identify bushfire-prone areas and require a lot of these measures in place already through their local requirements. This is simply picking up on the Keelty view that the state could not rely on each local government acting individually; it had to have an overarching framework.

[11.45 am]

Hon RICK MAZZA: That would follow that those new homes that are built will comply, then insurance premiums should go down. It would be interesting to see that.

Ms McGowan: Well, in the same way as your deadlocks do.

Hon RICK MAZZA: Moving on to page 24, “Parks and Recreation (regional open space)”, 15 properties have been bought for some \$15 million and compensation paid. What areas were they bought in?

Mr Lumsden: I will ask Mr Hillyard, but they have been basically, first of all, bought in areas which have already been reserved or reserved for some time. The commission has been in the process of finalising—when I say finalising, most of the properties which have been reserved in the Perth region scheme, for instance, have been acquired and there are some remaining ones, but Mr Hillyard can be more specific on that for you.

Mr Hillyard: Certainly. If you go to the section in the report on regional parks, there are eight formal regional parks in the metropolitan area and there were three major purchases that were completed during the last financial year. The large area at Canning Vale of 63-odd hectares, which is just to the west of Jandakot Airport, was a large, central part of Jandakot Regional Park. There was one large property within Yellagonga Regional Park up at Woodvale, which nearly completes that park. Then there were a number of sundry properties down in the Peel region, which are part of Peel Regional Park. As it stands, most of the metropolitan regional parks are now

fairly close to finality. We are probably talking less than half a dozen properties per park to complete them.

The CHAIR: What was the land at Woodvale that you have purchased?

Mr Hillyard: It was the historic Duffy property.

Hon RICK MAZZA: With the residential infill programs that you have in some suburbs, sometimes you can actually increase the number of people living in a particular suburb dramatically. What purchases or work is the commission doing with regard to providing extra public open space and parks for those areas? Obviously, a lot of people like to go for a walk in the morning, or whatever, and if you have got a big increase in that area, it could put a lot of pressure on the existing parks.

Mr Lumsden: The first response I will give on that one is, to put things in perspective, a number of these areas in the past have had higher populations per household than they have now. In other words, generally speaking, household occupancy has dropped. When I started my planning profession, it was around about 3.6 people per household. Now it is around 2.1 to 2.2 people and a lot of suburbs have aged or generations have changed. So in a number of areas, there have been adequate parks. Notwithstanding that, we are trying to locate infill in conjunction with the government to ensure those properties are close to amenities—whether it is shopping centres, public parks et cetera—for infill. It is part of the site selection that we go through, albeit local government does a lot of that themselves. If anyone wants to add to that, feel free.

Ms McGowan: The only thing I would add in that regard is, through the planning frameworks that we are obviously finalising now, there has certainly been consideration given to public open space needs. It is always part of the approvals process. Equally, with the strategic assessment for Perth and Peel that we are working on in concert with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet areas, there has particularly been a need recognised for quite significant areas of what we would call “active” open space—sporting fields and that—in some of the outer growth areas. That is work that the commission has been actively looking at. Just as a general example—Tim will correct me if I am wrong—if you look at the Perth metropolitan area now, we actually have 42 per cent or thereabouts of it as green space in either state forest or recreational public open space. A great bulk of that has been through the planning processes of the commission.

Mr Lumsden: That is right.

Mr Hillyard: That is correct. The other point that I would add is, through the subdivision process, there is a general requirement for 10 per cent, that everyone quite understands that the developer provides. That is not included in the calculations for the overall regional open space that is identified through the planning frameworks or past structure plans, and is reserved in the region scheme and acquired by the Planning Commission. So you have got regional open space together with public open space. Public open space is the local parks et cetera and they are more passive. Regional open spaces comprise land that is generally of a larger area and they provide both scenic, active recreation and conservation. They are potential multiple-use areas. As the director general has pointed out, there is the acquisition through that process of the larger areas that are required for active recreation. The department and the Planning Commission work with the Department of Sport and Recreation on the forecast for land-use needs. Those areas get reserved and they get acquired by the Planning Commission on behalf of local governments or the state sporting facilities plans. The most recent one that has been acquired, of course, was finalising the acquisition of the Murray–Mandurah site down at the corner of Fiegert Road and Pinjarra Road where there is a very large site there for multiple-use recreation needs. The Planning Commission also finalised, a couple of years ago, the site with the City of Rockingham for Lark Hill for active sporting facilities. They were all put together and funded through the Planning Commission.

The CHAIR: On that issue, I know it is an issue for the City of Wanneroo in terms of purchasing active recreational regional playing areas. Where are we up to with the purchase of the land in the north west corridor? When can we expect to see you purchasing it?

Mr Lumsden: Shortly.

Ms McGowan: We would hope imminently.

The CHAIR: What is imminently?

Ms McGowan: Well, over the next several months, I think, at maximum, because we have been working with both the City of Wanneroo and Sport and Recreation, as Mr Hillyard said, and looking at the most effective way to acquire some fairly significant land.

The CHAIR: Will that be the Yanchep site or will it be the one further south—I think it is Alkimos; I am not sure what it is called these days, but the one further south.

Mr Hillyard: There is one site that has already been provided by the developer and is under construction —

The CHAIR: At Yanchep?

Mr Hillyard: — at Yanchep. We are dealing with Alkimos in the first instance, and in the longer term Two Rocks.

The CHAIR: So the Alkimos one is the one that you see is imminent?

Ms McGowan: We would see it, and certainly in our planning frameworks, we have identified that area.

Mr Lumsden: My understanding is that it is the priority for the City of Wanneroo as well.

The CHAIR: Yes—only because they have managed to get a solution at Yanchep, but it is probably not the —

Ms McGowan: But we are very much aware of the pressure in that north west corridor.

The CHAIR: What is the hold-up in terms of buying that land, because you have plenty of money sitting in the metropolitan regional improvement fund, have you not?

Mr Lumsden: Yes, Mr Chairman, but, as you would be aware, there is government policy that restricts expenditure from that fund at the moment.

The CHAIR: Is that the reason then? Is it the government policy rather than any other outcomes?

Mr Lumsden: We are constrained by expenditure limits.

Mr Hillyard: There is one other—the site at Two Rocks. Whilst the commission has approved the structure plan, it is actually not yet reserved in the metropolitan region scheme. That is intended to occur, but that is a longer term requirement in any event.

The CHAIR: So you do not purchase it until it is in the scheme?

Mr Hillyard: That is correct.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Are you able to tell us how much money is currently sitting in the fund?

Mr Lumsden: Yes; what is the latest?

Mr Deery: There is \$263 million in the fund as of the end of November 2015.

The CHAIR: As Arthur Daley would say, “That’s a nice little earner”!

Hon SUE ELLERY: The question is: is it earning? Clearly not. I appreciate what you have said in respect to government policy. I have a series of questions about what is the expected expenditure in the fund in the forward years; you may or may not be able to answer that. That question is basically

what is the expected expenditure from the fund in 2015–16, 2016–17, 2017–18 and 2018–19. Let us see if I can get an answer to that.

Mr Lumsden: The detailed response will be given by Mr Hillyard, but I will make two points. Any financial expenditure in the out years is obviously controlled by government policy through Treasury et cetera. There is one exception to what has been said: if there was an urgent need to acquire land for a number of reasons, particularly if it is causing hardship to an individual who has had the land reserved, the commission, through the Department of Planning, can seek approval for Treasury to get a specific approval for the acquisition of that property. But I will hand over to Tim to —

Hon SUE ELLERY: Just before you hand over, in respect to those exceptions, what is the process for granting an exception?

Mr Lumsden: First of all, the Department of Planning would obviously assist the commission in determining the urgency. Then, subject to the commission agreeing with that, a formal request would be made through the Department of Treasury for that expenditure to be granted. Then that would be granted through the Economic and Expenditure Reform Committee.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Are there any applications for exception before the commission now?

Mr Hillyard: There are two hardship cases but they will be accommodated within the existing program.

Mr Lumsden: So we do not have to reapply for that exemption.

Mr Hillyard: There is one further exception, and that is where there is a claim for compensation that comes in and it is regarded as litigation to us. That is deemed to be a statutory responsibility of the commission in any event, so those funds have to be paid no matter what the limit.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Thank you. Are you able to tell me anything about expected expenditure in those years that I mentioned?

Mr Hillyard: Only from the current forward estimates: 34.4 for 2015–16; 34.18 for 2016–17; 31.83 for 2017–18 and 74.3 for 2018–19.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Thank you very much.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: The current years' funding, is that sufficient to purchase the land for the City of Wanneroo—the Alkimos land?

Mr Lumsden: Yes.

Ms McGowan: It should be.

The CHAIR: Whilst you have got that cap place, how do you prioritise what you purchase?

Mr Lumsden: Obviously, the first one is need; where there is clearly a need to purchase it from a local government perspective, such as the City of Wanneroo. The other one is obviously from the point of view of hardship resolution. The third one is, I suppose—Mr Hillyard can expand—where we are trying to consolidate existing reservations we have acquired, as Mr Hillyard has previously mentioned, to finalise the acquisition of that reservation.

The CHAIR: On page 24 of the report, you talk about transferring to Main Roads \$15.6 million of land for the Mitchell Freeway, Great Eastern Highway, Perth–Darwin highway and two properties sold to the PTA. How does that work in terms of if it has been purchased with the money from the metropolitan regional improvement fund, why would you then be selling it to those agencies rather than transferring it free of charge?

Mr Hillyard: It is a bit of a historic issue that came from the very early days of the metropolitan region scheme being implemented. It effectively creates a revolving fund. The Planning Commission would receive some money, which is on a formula of historic costs plus 2.5 per cent.

That money gets paid to the commission on the transfer of that land to Main Roads, PTA et cetera and those funds go back to the MRIF and are then reinvested in the scheme, mostly on forward purchases for parks and recreation and also transport infrastructure.

[12 noon]

The CHAIR: So the money does go back into the regional improvement fund?

Mr Hillyard: Yes.

The CHAIR: Who gets the interest on the regional improvement fund?

Mr Hillyard: The WAPC.

The CHAIR: So you do collect interest on it? At what rate?

Mr Deery: I think it was about \$4 million last year; I am not sure what the rate is.

The CHAIR: So, \$4 million on \$200-odd million would suggest around two per cent.

Mr Lumsden: As I understand it, the normal government rates through the Department of Treasury.

The CHAIR: When they are private sales, if it has been purchased by the regional improvement fund, it goes back, when you dispose of it, into the fund?

Mr Hillyard: All revenue goes back into the fund.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Sorry; I was not here earlier and this may have been covered off. The City of Joondalup local housing strategy scheme amendment 73, as I understand it, went up to WAPC in April. Where are we at with that? How far away is that from being signed off?

Mr Lumsden: It would have gone to the commission, but through the Department of Planning. I am not aware of the current status of that within the department. Ms Burrows?

Ms Burrows: No, I am not sure. I will take that on notice. I know there has been some dialogue with respect to that, but we will take it on notice and provide exactly the status.

[*Supplementary Information No B6.*]

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: When you say “dialogue”, what do you mean? Can you expand on that?

Ms McGowan: What would normally happen with many of the scheme amendments, and it is something that we are continually working on, is that there will often be information that we require or there may be clarification required on certain things. One of the things we brought in with the local planning scheme amendments is an ability to stop the clock, because one of the issues we were finding as an agency working on behalf of the commission is that we would have a scheme amendment lodged and it may then go back for further information and sit with a local government, for instance, for seven or eight months before we get the information back, so we are actually now dealing with that. I am not saying that that is the case in Joondalup, because they could be quite simple things, but we do now, with the planning scheme amendments that came into effect on about 19 October —

Ms Burrows: We ask for extension of time.

Ms McGowan: That is right. We ask for an extension of time if we are not going to be able to complete within a set time frame, and we have to be able to justify that to the minister.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: All right. Are you able, then, in your B6 response, to expand on the reasons why—I will not use the word “delay”—we still do not have an outcome? I understand these things can take a while.

Mr Lumsden: I have to say, in defence of the department and therefore the commission, that I am a bit concerned at times when local governments develop very, I will use the word “complex”,

housing strategies and they do not consult enough upfront with either the commission or the department. Those strategies have to be prepared, obviously, in line with state planning policies and other frameworks, and I think some delay in terms of assessing them was, firstly, because often the documents are quite significant and complex; they are not simply what I would call a five-pager. Secondly, they may have assumptions in there that do not stack up to scrutiny. Thirdly, they may have proposals that are not in line with government policies. I think a lot of delay—the delay is not necessarily with the commission, it is with the process that the department has to go through—would be removed quite a lot if there had been far more dialogue in the preparation at various stages and prior to lodgement of those strategies by local government, and we have that example in a number of cases where the commission is cited as holding things up. The commission itself does not hold things up; very rarely does any decision of the commission go beyond one meeting. It is the process of the person, whether it is a private individual or a local government, lodging a proposal, whatever it may be, such as a local planning strategy or a local housing strategy, and the detail it has to go through. So I think the process that has to be improved in terms of timelines rests just as much with the local government and its officers and dialogue, and often that requires dialogue with other agencies, not just the Department of Planning, as well as the department itself; it can only do when it has the relevant information there.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: I understand that, and I am not casting blame. It is good that you have put it on the record. You have foreshadowed my questions, because I accept that perhaps there had not been consultation with the WAPC throughout the period. But from a local perspective—I am asking questions not on behalf of the City of Joondalup; I am asking on behalf of my constituents, who badger me about this about as much as any other planning matter I have had in my time in the north metro region —

The CHAIR: Real estate agents have been selling land on the basis of that plan for the last two years, I think.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: I think I would describe the consultation process that has been undertaken with local residents as “beyond exhaustive”—I think “exhausted” is probably a better word—and as a result, there is significant local buy-in to this. Having that process and then hearing exactly what you have just said, chairman, which I do not dispute in any way, is there a better way? Can we have a one-stop shop so that the consultation process can be more integrated and more seamless than it seems to be at the moment in its current silos? And what are we doing to create a more inclusive process where all parties that need to be consulted are brought in at the front end rather than have something spat out at the end and then given to the commission and the clock almost starts ticking again?

Mr Lumsden: Certainly I would encourage that. But as I said, from my local government experience, when I was in local government I made sure we did all the consultation upfront with agencies, and if there were any issues we had them resolved before we lodged it with the commission. That does not unfortunately happen in all cases, but I am open to any suggestions for improvement.

Ms Burrows: We are addressing this through the phase 2 planning reform process to make a lot of this a bit more simple, including for the mums and dads out there and the community at large that needs input into these documents up-front. I suppose one of the issues—we are also working with our local government colleagues about understanding, so we understand why they propose something; sometimes it is not quite clear, yet there may be community expectations, and it is about outlining them. If I can give you an example, in the case of Joondalup’s housing strategy, which I am talking about, I became involved in it some time ago; my measure of time differs because it goes so quickly. They had densities around the railway station precinct that did not comply with state planning policy—did not come near that—and we then had to have a dialogue and discussion

with the City of Joondalup to understand why. There were reasons behind that with respect to community expectations, but what we are trying to do —

The CHAIR: So leave it as it is, would be my solution to that.

Ms Burrows: Well —

The CHAIR: It is criminal to actually change it to an R20–40 or even R60. If the community does not accept it, leave it as it is, and do not change it at all, because you actually damage the long-term future.

Ms Burrows: That may be the case, but in this case, what was proposed was in my view actually damaging the long-term view, and I said we needed to go back and revisit that. There has been further dialogue with the officers with Joondalup, but we will provide a status on what is outstanding and the likely finalisation time lines.

The CHAIR: In terms of the public consultation, my colleague talked about it being exhausted. I am not sure at what point the public feel —

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: I said that people feel exhausted.

The CHAIR: Yes, but one of the things I am interested in—I am trying to remember which was the last public consultation as opposed to those issues that people like myself and Peter have been involved in. If what you ultimately want is significantly different to what was originally proposed as part of the city's consultation, will that now go out to a further public consultation, or how will that be resolved?

Mr Lumsden: Good question. I think the answer to that would depend on what modifications are required, because if there are substantial modifications, to take that as an example, then the community would expect to be consulted, I would imagine. If they are what I call refinements or minor modifications which meet within the spirit of the commission's policies, then we would use discretion—sorry to use that word—to allow them to move ahead.

The CHAIR: But in that sense, on this issue, in terms of the last lot of public consultation, if you are going to uplift the zoning around train stations, I think the last public consultation did not involve that, so is that something that would fall within discretion or —

Ms Burrows: It was not about that. It was having that understanding as to why they had done something that was contrary to state planning policy.

The CHAIR: But ultimately the commission has three options—either to knock it back and say, “We’re not approving it”; or say, “Go back for further public consultation”; or say, “We’re going to change it and the zoning around train stations is now X”.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Or four—accept it as is.

The CHAIR: Or leave it as it is, yes, around train stations. In terms of the process—and I am happy if you take it on notice, to tell us where it is up to and what will be—will the uplift require further public consultation? If you were to change the zoning around train stations, at what point will you consider it is beyond discretionary and requires further public consultation?

[Supplementary Information No B7.]

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: I am vitally interested in the Joondalup scheme amendment, obviously. I do not have any commercial or financial interests at all, I point that out —

The CHAIR: Well, we both own properties in the City of Joondalup.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: I own property in the City of Joondalup but well outside any of the proposed change areas; completely not affected. But I am just as interested in how we can do this better in the future because we have to do this; we all know that. We have to bring the community with us. I agree with Hon Ken Travers—if the public are not happy with it, do not

fiddle, just leave it as it is and come back later and give it another try and do it right, rather than get half pregnant. So, what can we do better? There is the phase 2 process, so who is involved in that? Who is involved in the consultation process that will lead to the changes that will happen in phase 2?

Ms McGowan: Two things, in a general sense. The phase 1 and phase 2 planning reforms were widely canvassed with public submission periods et cetera. I would agree that one of the objectives that both the chairman and I very much agree on is this need to continue to streamline the process and the system, because I think the layers, while they may be simple to those that live with the system every day, are not so easy for those outside it to understand. What has happened is that some of those reforms that government announced and introduced as a result particularly of the phase 2 planning means that we have actually truncated some processes and made things concurrent rather than one after the other, which is about streamlining. The other is the reverse of—it is the balancing act of where you say, “The community don’t want it; leave it”. Sometimes where there are general policy settings, there is a need for some form of consistency across local government—it might not be down to that granular level—where we do now have deeming provisions and the minister can implement provisions in local schemes and things to get some of those higher order things settled. So I think there is a lot of work going on to simplify and streamline, but absolutely right in terms of bringing the community along.

Ms Burrows: I think it is about, where the process has been improved, it is where it is needed to be, in other words making more simple where it is needed, with that higher order strategic planning, if it is all agreed, and then make those processes after that simpler because you have something agreed right up-front. As I said, part of the problem is not if it complies with policy or not, and we want you to change your policies; it is understanding the position as to why that was reached, so we report to the commission, it is understood, and it may be that there are good community arguments not to do it then; it is into the future.

Ms McGowan: And we are certainly looking at good planning outcomes, not the process.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: So if I were the City of Joondalup or the City of Wanneroo or any other city across the metropolitan area that wanted to embark on one of these strategies today, how could we engage the commission at the outset? Is there a process whereby the commission can be involved right from the outset in a formal sense?

Mr Lumsden: Yes, both formal and informal—first of all, general discussion, and then if the local government has some issues or outlines its approach, very simply, writes to the commission, we would probably then, depending on that approach, have further discussions and get a formal response.

[12.15 pm]

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Would you also be able to get involved in the public consultation process, so that there is a combined “City of ABC” and WAPC, a combined public consultation process?

Mr Lumsden: My answer to that is if necessary.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: How would that be triggered? Would that be on a request of the local government?

Mr Lumsden: From the discussions with the relevant local government. If they wanted us involved in that, we are most happy. I am happy to go to any public meeting.

Ms Burrows: I will give an example that we were talking about before with the Forrestfield project. The department officers represent the commission. At that point with the local government and the other government agencies, PTA, Main Roads all attended those sessions to answer questions and to make presentations to those communities on the future planning for the area and to hear the

communities views on that. We have done that in the past with local government, but we work well with our colleagues in local government and we try to have up-front discussions to manage a process through so that it is smooth.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Could a proponent who is not the local government get you involved in a scheme amendment right from the outset?

Mr Lumsden: Certainly from a commission point of view we can discuss it. I am very cautious about involvement in the sense of too involved, bearing in mind the commission has to make the final decision in its own right. Certainly they can have consultation with Department of Planning officers and other agencies, and that often occurs.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: I do not have any other questions on that area, but I do have one other question.

The CHAIR: All right, if it is quick, and then we will move on.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: It is quick. Page 5 of your annual report is the snapshot page and it covers \$650 000 in grants for Coastwest grants and Coastal Management Plan Assistance programs. Can you break that amount down—I do not expect you to have it there but if you do that is great—either by local government area or by region or however?

Mr Lumsden: Yes. We can break it down by local government area and the specific proposals. In fact, we have just signed off on some of those the other day, so we can take it on notice and give you the details.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: I would appreciate that.

[Supplementary Information No B8.]

Hon SUE ELLERY: Page 9 refers to one of your general functions as asset management and includes obviously acquiring land. Are you able to tell us what the key projects are that you are actively purchasing land for currently?

Mr Lumsden: Yes, in terms it is an extension to what we have previously said. It is actually acquiring land for land that has been reserved; and as mentioned in areas of reports those three areas were a priority. And there are other issues; we are acquiring land either to facilitate reservations for transport corridors or currently parks and recreation. Do you want to add to that, Tim?

Mr Hillyard: Just to the extent that the parks and recreation areas have been an ongoing priority, predominantly to finalise Bush Forever purchases, even though that program as an official program was closed in terms of acquisitions—still some residual properties to be acquired, so they are a priority. Acquisitions of land for the extension of the railway to Yanchep continue to be a priority. There is a program put to the commission at the beginning of the financial year once we know what our budget allocation is. With a program, often there is a few hardship cases et cetera that might also come forward, and unmet compensation claims. But the priorities, as the Chairman has pointed out, are predominantly regional open space, which comprises regional parks, Bush Forever, et cetera, major infrastructure corridors, predominantly the railway and along Stirling and Canning Highways.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Thanks. Are you able to give us a copy of the program that you did develop after this year's budget and are working on now?

Mr Hillyard: That is normally a confidential matter provided to the commission.

Mr Lumsden: I do not see any reason why we should not, subject to commission resolution, unless there is something that I am not aware of.

Mr Hillyard: The only issue is that it is a formal program and it does have the names of people and anticipated costs.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Can I get you to take on notice: is there a way to give us some information around that where you protect identifying information et cetera?

Mr Hillyard: Yes.

The CHAIR: What I will ask for in B9 is for the document to be tabled, but if there is additional information that you want to have deleted, ask for that to be deleted and maybe then provide us with the document and say, “Keep that private but here is a redacted version that we would be happy to be released publicly”.

[Supplementary Information No B9.]

The CHAIR: On the Stirling Highway activity corridor study, which I assume also includes redesigning the reservation for Stirling Highway, where is that up to and when can we expect to see some outcome of it?

Mr Lumsden: My understanding is either at the last commission meeting or early next year that will be finalised.

Ms McGowan: In terms of the reservation.

Mr Lumsden: In terms of the reservation, yes.

Ms McGowan: In terms of the activity corridor work, we probably are a bit behind on that but certainly the consideration of the submissions and the report on submissions and all of that work, we would expect that to be finalised over the next couple of months. That is in terms of the existing reservation and whether that can be reduced or whether it needs to be increased in some areas. But overall the general sense is that there will be a reduction in the area of reservation.

The CHAIR: Although I think there are some contentious areas along it, so it was all sort of put on hold.

Mr Lumsden: There are some contentious areas because of heritage buildings and also intersection treatment to facilitate public transport movements et cetera. It is close to being finalised, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIR: Will that include the issue around where Queen Victoria Street and Stirling Highway meet, and the connection to Curtin Avenue?

Mr Lumsden: Certainly where Stirling Highway meets High road, if that is the correct road—High Street?

The CHAIR: No, Stirling Highway. High Street is on the south side of the river. I am talking about Queen Victoria Street and Stirling Highway in North Fremantle.

Ms McGowan: It deals with the buildings on either side of Stirling Highway. It does not go into the Curtin Avenue side, as my understanding is.

Mr Hillyard: No, that is correct. That is the recent planning control area that is being declared to enable that further study to be undertaken for the Curtin Avenue extension, if you like; the decision whether that would link into the Stirling Highway existing reservation at North Fremantle.

The CHAIR: What is now the process for that planning control area and when can we expect decisions around that planning control area for the Curtin Avenue–Stirling Highway linkage?

Mr Lumsden: It would be the normal process, obviously liaising with Main Roads and other agencies, working that through in terms of the design, coming up with a reservation, but I would imagine it would be some time next year. I have not got a specific date in mind.

Mr Hillyard: That project is primarily—the planning of it—is a Department of Transport and Main Roads project, not a Department of Planning or WAPC one at this stage.

The CHAIR: Depending on who you ask, it becomes everyone else's problem! In terms of those decisions from a planning point of view, or Main Roads, are they all predicated on the Stephenson highway reservation remaining in place?

Mr Lumsden: There is no plan that I am aware of at the moment to remove the Stephenson highway reservation.

The CHAIR: Right. We are basically continuing to plan on the assumption that eventually we will have from North Fremantle through to Innaloo a major regional road connecting those two areas, with a small section being a local road through the Stirling activity centre.

Mr Lumsden: That is certainly the long-term planning objective at this stage. There has been no change to that.

Mr Hillyard: I think the issue for that connection across at the moment is in part a response to the introduction of the railway into the port, because the existing MRS reservation comes down along the current passenger rail line and T-intersections at Tydeman Road. Because you have got the height issues of the railway to get underneath it for —

The CHAIR: Getting under the extension of the rail loop, yes.

Mr Hillyard: And the Planning Commission owns nearly all of the land that is the subject of that planning control area, I might add, because it is only the latest of the planning control areas to accommodate that potential use. It is an idea that has been there for a number of years.

The CHAIR: What also strikes me is it is the only efficient way of getting the Perth Freight Link into the port.

Mr Lumsden: Correct.

The CHAIR: The employment targets that you talk about for the north west corridor, you are talking about 229 089 jobs. You talk about reaching 62 per cent self-sufficiency by 2050. What were the assumptions that you used to arrive at those figures, particularly with respect to the timing and provision of things like the extension of the rail line to Yanchep?

Mr Lumsden: The work was done by private consultants and the name escapes me who they were, but we did that for all the major centres, such as Joondalup. They have made some analysis in terms of not only what the employment capacity would be but also the nature of that employment, whether it is health service industries et cetera. My understanding is that those projections—and that is what they are in terms of the best information we can get through to consultants in their dialogue—are considered to be underestimated in terms of potential by local governments in that area. But that is part of the review process through the submission period to the frameworks. Sue might want to add to that?

Ms McGowan: I might add and then see if Sue has anything additional. Certainly, as with any study, you will get variances in terms of the view about the assumptions used. We also have work going on between our Department of Planning staff and Department of Transport, including Main Roads and PTA staff, looking at some of the modelling and testing of some of those numbers as well, as part of the transport route planning that is complementary to the other work we are doing.

The CHAIR: But as I understand it, one of the key outcomes is to get the sort of employment self-sufficiency, the work that has been done in the past identifies that you need to get the railway line into Yanchep early. You need to get it in early to allow that development at Yanchep to meet its potential for a job creator. Is that still an assumption that you support, or do you have a different view as the WAPC?

Mr Lumsden: No, the commission has supported that.

Ms Burrows: I think it is also a bit wider than that, it is about protecting employment land within that corridor and maintaining employment land and creating it for the future so that it does not become residential, if I could just use that.

The CHAIR: Which is always a challenge. If you go to the Joondalup city centre you see what happens if you do not get in quick—it all becomes strata title housing.

Ms McGowan: Also, some of the linkages that we have identified in the frameworks for that area about having better linkages east to west, so in fact being able to protect that employment generation and link those two areas together.

The CHAIR: What role do you have in the freight network review, the development of a freight network for the metropolitan area? What role is the commission playing in that?

Mr Lumsden: We are involved in giving advice to see that freight network, and as well as obviously ensuring relevant reservations occur in conjunction with the Department of Transport.

The CHAIR: One of the things you talk about is Rowley Road and Anketell Road in your report.

Mr Lumsden: Yes.

The CHAIR: That is obviously an important linkage right through to the northern corridor, in terms of if there is an outer harbour built. How are you doing that, when I notice on your website the only mention of locations for the outer harbour is a 2004 options paper? Have we worked out where the outer harbour is going to be? If not, when are we going to work it out? And then the linkages all the way through to the northern corridor, when are they going to occur?

Mr Lumsden: The outer harbour options have been in the process of refinement, but the Anketell and Rowley Road reservations—they have been refined as well—facilitate to my understanding all the options for the outer harbour, so that is not an issue. And obviously the future freight links, we are working with the Department of Transport to ensure that if there are any amendments to reservations that they can be facilitated through the commission at the appropriate time. A good example is that with the Gateway project we had to refine some of the existing reservations that have been around for some time for the interchanges which are now being constructed.

Ms McGowan: And just in terms of—we will update the website—the south metropolitan planning framework, south metro and Peel planning framework, does notionally identify a port installation and the need to protect freight corridors in that area, because that is just part of good long-term planning. All of the work we have done in terms of latitude 32 and, you know, any work, it is not so much exactly where or when; it is a matter of just being able to say, “We need to make sure we keep options open for corridors.”

[12.30 pm]

The CHAIR: What role have you had in developing the concept of Perth Freight Link from a planning point of view?

Mr Lumsden: We have basically been liaising with them in the freight link process through the Department of Transport.

The CHAIR: Are you having any input into prioritising whether the freight link or Rowley Road or Anketell Road are the priority areas?

Mr Lumsden: No, not at this stage.

The CHAIR: When would you expect to have an input into that?

Mr Lumsden: From my point of view, the sooner the better.

The CHAIR: It has been reported that there is some friction between what Planning wants to happen in terms of planning of that freight for Perth and Main Roads. Is there friction there?

Mr Lumsden: I would not say there is friction. At times we have some robust discussions. My personal view is that these issues should be resolved as much as possible in parallel to the planning system for a range of reasons. That is my personal view; I think it would be shared by the majority of commissioners around the table. We have had improved dialogue over the last 18 months with the Department of Transport on these issues.

The CHAIR: Noting the time, I think we will need to conclude it there. The committee will email the transcript of evidence, which includes the questions you have taken on notice highlighted on the transcript, to you in the next couple of days. The corrected transcript will be requested to be returned within five working days of receipt. The answers to the questions taken on notice will be requested by 11 January 2016. Any additional questions the committee has for you will be forwarded to you via the minister next week and will also be requested by 11 January 2016. I should just highlight that we have shortened the period for transcripts to get back so they can be finalised after five working days. That is just your transcript. We have extended the normal period for the answers because of the Christmas–new year period. Should you be unable to meet the due date, please advise the committee in writing as soon as possible before the due date. The advice is to include specific reasons why the due date cannot be met. In the event that you are unable to meet the due date for some of your questions, could you please provide the questions that you are able to provide by the due date. If members have any unasked questions, I ask them to email them to the committee by midday on Monday, 14 December. On behalf of the committee, thank you for your attendance.

Hearing concluded at 12.32 pm
