

GENERAL PURPOSE STANDING COMMITTEE No. 4

Friday 10 November 2006

Examination of proposed expenditure for the portfolio areas

PLANNING, REDFERN WATERLOO

The Committee met at 2.00 p.m.

MEMBERS

The Hon. J. A. Gardiner (Chair)

The Hon. J. C. Burnswoods
The Hon. Dr A. Chesterfield-Evans
The Hon. G. J. Donnelly

The Hon. K. F. Griffin
The Hon. G. S. Pearce

PRESENT

Department of Planning
Mr S. Haddad, *Director General*

Department of Natural Resources
Mr P. Lucas, *Chief Financial Officer, Corporate Shared Services*

Redfern-Waterloo Authority
Mr. R. Domm, *Chief Executive Officer*

ROBERT DOMM, Chief Executive Officer, Redfern-Waterloo Authority, on former oath:

CHAIR: I declare the hearing open to the public and welcome Mr Domm as a witness to this hearing at which the Committee will examine the proposed expenditure for the portfolios of Planning and Redfern and Waterloo, starting with Redfern and Waterloo. Before we commence I will make some comments about procedural matters. As to the broadcasting of proceedings, in accordance with the Legislative Council's guidelines for the broadcast of proceedings, only Committee members and witnesses may be filmed or recorded. People in the public gallery should not be the primary focus of any filming or photographs. In reporting the proceedings of this Committee, the media must take responsibility for what they publish or for what interpretation they place on anything that is said before the Committee. The guidelines for the broadcast of proceedings are available on the table by the door. The delivery of messages is as per usual. I ask everyone please to turn off their mobile telephones.

As to the return date for questions on notice, I advise Mr Domm that the Committee has resolved to request that answers to questions on notice be provided by five o'clock on 22 November. This short time frame is necessary due to the Committee's reporting deadline of 23 November. Given this short time frame, I request that you answer as many questions as possible during the hearing rather than taking them on notice. Do you think that will be a problem, Mr Domm?

Mr DOMM: No.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Except for the fact that he does not know what the questions might be and 22 November is very close.

CHAIR: Yes. Mr Domm, I remind you that you are giving evidence under a former oath or affirmation. I declare the proposed expenditure for the portfolios of Planning and Redfern and Waterloo open for examination. I note that the Committee has resolved to examine the Redfern and Waterloo portfolio until three o'clock and then we will examine the Planning portfolio until five o'clock. Mr Domm, would you like to make a brief opening statement?

Mr DOMM: No.

CHAIR: Mr Domm, can you advise the Committee whether the Redfern-Waterloo Authority [RWA] is currently self-funding?

Mr DOMM: No, it is not.

CHAIR: Can you advise the Committee why the level of grants and contributions to the authority increased from \$3.18 million to a revised figure of \$7.18 million?

Mr DOMM: The Redfern-Waterloo Authority's funding is comprised of basically two parts: \$4 million plus \$3.18 million. The \$4 million was originally characterised as a non-repayable loan until the auditors queried the status of that sort of arrangement and it was changed to a grant. So the \$4 million then became a grant. The \$3.18 million is recurrent funding, which was formerly funding for the Redfern-Waterloo Partnership Project. So the total funding of the Redfern-Waterloo Authority is in the order of \$7.18 million but is comprised of those two parts: first, a grant, which is obviously a non-repayable grant; and, secondly, recurrent funding as a result of the incorporation of the Redfern-Waterloo Partnership Project into the RWA on 1 July last year.

CHAIR: I think the budget gives a figure for "other revenue", which is \$1.072 million. Can you advise the Committee of the source of that other revenue?

Mr DOMM: I suspect that that is interest. You need to appreciate that these figures are combined for the Australian Technology Park and the Redfern-Waterloo Authority. The Australian Technology Park is a company—ATP Precinct Management Limited—and the RWA is a statutory authority. But for the purposes of the budget papers they combine the figures. I believe the figure you refer to would be interest payments on moneys that the ATP has invested for future infrastructure works and remediation.

CHAIR: There was no "other revenue" in last year's budget. Does that mean that the ATP gained some new source of interest-bearing—

Mr DOMM: No. The ATP's primary revenue comes from property management. That is the primary source of its revenue. About \$9 million or more of its revenue comes from that, and the other \$2 million plus comes from conferencing and events. So the ATP's revenue is up in that order. I think the figure in the 2006-07 budget is \$11.345 million, which is consistent with what I have just said. The RWA's only income at the moment is a limited amount of income from development applications and interest on moneys invested.

CHAIR: Would you mind taking that question on notice and checking the actual source or the nature of the other revenue of \$1.072 million?

Mr DOMM: Yes, I will confirm my belief that that is interest income.

CHAIR: That would be appreciated. I think the authority acquired \$5.5 million in property, plant and equipment in 2005-06. Can you explain the figure of \$62.5 million, being an increase in property, plant and equipment?

Mr DOMM: Is that figure on page 15-39?

CHAIR: I think so, yes. It may be a revaluation of assets or some such.

Mr DOMM: Are you referring to the \$5.038 million?

CHAIR: Yes.

Mr DOMM: We are required every year to value our properties and what tends to happen is that the basis for valuation sometimes changes. In fact, that was the case in the financial year just ended. In terms of your specific question, plant and equipment reflects revaluation of ATP properties. So that would account for that figure.

CHAIR: Can you advise as to the basis for that revaluation?

Mr DOMM: We get it done by professional valuers. I will have to take that question on notice and give you a technical answer. But it happens every year.

CHAIR: Sure. But it is a pretty big change in a single year, is it not?

Mr DOMM: As I said, we rely upon professional valuers and sometimes the bases upon which they value things change. Even accounting procedures change, as you know. There has been a dramatic change in the last couple of years.

CHAIR: Okay, if you could take that question on notice. Similarly, in the budget papers there is a figure for land and buildings, which was \$92 million in the previous budget papers and is now \$154 million—an increase of \$62 million. We have just talked about that, so I ask you please to provide an answer on notice. In relation to the authority's arrangements with its creditors, can you tell the Committee what the current terms are? Is it a requirement that you pay your creditors in 30 days? What are the current terms that the authority has with any creditors? Do they have 30 days to pay?

Mr DOMM: The RWA does not have too many of those. It is more likely to occur at the ATP, where we are running a business. We just operate on standard terms. I could not give you what the days are, but we regularly monitor outstanding debts—we have a monthly review—and we take action if anything is more than 90 days old.

CHAIR: You will probably need to take this question on notice. Can you provide a list of the number of creditors who were at 30 June 2006 outstanding beyond 90 days?

Mr DOMM: Yes.

CHAIR: That would be appreciated.

Mr DOMM: It is a small list, I can assure you. There are no more than four or five, but I will give you the details.

CHAIR: Redfern railway station, have you got a figure for its value? Do you have a value for the air space above the tracks?

Mr DOMM: No. In saying that, we have no intention to develop over the tracks other than maybe the building of a concourse for pedestrian movements. I know, there has been examination in the past of developing over the railway lines, that is not the way we proceeded. Of course, it is extremely difficult and expensive and it takes much more time to build across railway lines. The Redfern station is one of the busiest parts of the rail network. Nearly every railway line, except the airport line, runs through Redfern station. Very early in the piece, no, we have not discounted it entirely, but our thinking has always been premised on redeveloping the station with commercial development in the land alongside the station. The concept design study is currently under way. I put that caveat on my comments. That process will not be finished until the end of this year.

There would need to be a concourse that runs south of Lawson Street to stream people into the Australian Technology Park [ATP] into the commercial district of Regent and Redfern streets and also to divert a large number of students from Lawson Street, up through North Eveleigh Street into Wilson Street. For that reason, a concourse south of Lawson Street is probably needed. That study is currently underway and there are a number of options being considered.

CHAIR: Would that concourse simply be, at this stage, a means of people moving about, would there be any commercial development attached to it?

Mr DOMM: It may be possible to have some small retail outlets there, but that has not been decided yet.

CHAIR: In relation to the Rachel Forster Hospital site, how much is expected to flow to New South Wales Health from the sale of that site?

Mr DOMM: At the moment we are engaging in a process of preparing a concept plan for that site with the aim of taking it to the market next year. The net sale proceeds of that sale would be directed towards building a new community health centre at the former courthouse and police station in Redfern Street. At this stage the market will tell us what that site will bring, once it has been concept planned and sold for residential development—obviously we have expectations in the order of \$8 million at this stage.

CHAIR: When is that sale expected to occur?

Mr DOMM: Hopefully in the first half of next year, because we are keen to get going and have the new health centre built. This is the funding basis for it.

CHAIR: Can you advise how much the Government expects to receive in developer contributions from developments carried out in accordance with the Redfern Waterloo Authority Act over the next decade?

Mr DOMM: We have a public domain contributions plan currently on public exhibition. That allows for a levy of 2 per cent of development costs. We have estimated, based on the development potential under the built environment plan that was released a couple of months ago, that that would raise in the order of \$36 million over the next 10 years. In addition, we are currently finalising an affordable housing contributions plan, but that is not yet finalised. It has to go to the Minister and then has to be placed on public exhibition. It is anticipated that the amount of contributions that will be raised will be \$36 million plus the amount raised by the affordable housing levy.

CHAIR: Do you have a timetable for the completion of the affordable housing plan? When will that go to the Minister?

Mr DOMM: We are hoping to get it on public exhibition before the end of the year. We are aiming to get it to the Minister before then. It is pretty much finalised now, we have to get it to him because it is his plan, and therefore he has to make the decisions on the amount of the levies and so on. Obviously we will make recommendations to him.

CHAIR: Is it correct to say that \$15 million has already been committed to Aboriginal housing over the next decade as part of that plan?

Mr DOMM: We committed \$16 million to affordable housing for Aboriginal people. Of that \$1 million has already been allocated from existing funding. The residual \$15 million you referred to will be primarily funded from the affordable housing contributions derived from the development of the former Carlton and United Brewery [CUB] site. That is a separate voluntary plan in agreement that is also on public exhibition at the moment, and that is in addition to the affordable housing contributions plan that I have mentioned. That is derived from development outside our operational area. The levies obtained will be applied to affordable housing within our operational area. The \$15 million will be earmarked for Aboriginal affordable housing, primarily to be derived under that arrangement. We expect that that agreement, the voluntary planning agreement for the CUB site, could raise—it is hard to say because the Minister has not yet determined the concept plan on the amount of levies to be contingent upon the development potential resulting from the Minister's final approval. We expect that levy will raise more than \$20 million.

CHAIR: Do you have a plan for how that will be allocated, whatever that figure turns out to be? What will it be expended on?

Mr DOMM: As I indicated, the \$15 million we have identified so far for affordable housing for Aboriginal people will come out of that. The residual will be applied to promote and provide affordable housing for the broader community. We have not got down to the detail of exactly how that will be done to two reasons: first, we do not have the money yet, which is a pretty good reason; and, secondly, in terms of the Aboriginal affordable housing there needs to be a lot of community consultation with that community as to how that money should be spent, what is the appropriate way to provide affordable housing for Aboriginal people. We do not want to predetermine how that money would be spent until that process has been gone through. We expect that will take quite some time given the divergence of views within the community on these issues.

CHAIR: Which is fair enough. By a "substantial amount of time" do you mean six months or a year?

Mr DOMM: We expect to have made a lot of progress by the end of next year. It is a 10-year program to provide that \$16 million. Proceeds from the CUB site will not flow through next year, in our judgment. It is expected that the CUB site will be sold next year, but development will not start that quickly. We have plenty of time to engage in the process of consultation.

CHAIR: The authority does quite a bit of promotion of its work through newsletters and the like around the area. How much has the authority expended on graphic artists over the past year?

Mr DOMM: For newsletters?

CHAIR: For any authority publications that are distributed to the public.

Mr DOMM: We print about 16,000 copies of each newsletter and home deliver them. We also home deliver the newsletter to areas just outside our operational area because people have asked for that to happen. People just outside our operational area expressed a view that they have an interest in what happens close to where they live. So we distribute about 16,000 issues, home delivered, and the cost of printing each issue is between \$4,000 and \$4,500. In the course of this calendar year we have done about five newsletters and we intend to do one more before the end of this year. Last year we did four, possibly five, issues of newsletters. There is a distribution cost as well. We employ locals to do that. It is a few hundred dollars. They walk around and deliver them.

In terms of other publications, we printed a large number of copies of the built environment plan for the community consultation process. That was quite an expensive document to produce because it had a lot of maps and photographs and so on. We distributed about 2,000 copies during the community consultation and printed another 1,000 copies, from memory, when we produced the final plan. Most of those were sent out to people who made submissions and so on. The unit cost of each one of those was in excess of \$10, from memory. That was quite an expensive publication, but it was necessary to make it available to everyone. It was quite a big document and you could not expect people to be able to download all of that from the Internet because they needed to have a colour version of the maps in order to differentiate the elements of particular development sites.

The only other major publication was the annual report. The costs of those are set out in the report. In the first financial year 2004-05 it was in the order of \$30,000. That is for copyrighting photography and printing. The two annual reports we have finalised forward ATP and RWA for the past financial year were about that too. What we do put out a lot of material, I do not think we are excessive in what we spend.

CHAIR: Could you add up all of that and provide the total cost to the Committee?

Mr DOMM: Sure.

CHAIR: Do you have in-house graphic artists, or do you get that part of the task outsourced?

Mr DOMM: We are a very small organisation, we have only 20 staff. We do not have an IT department or a graphic art department or a public relations department. We tend to outsource those things because that is the most cost effective way of doing it, as opposed to employing people directly. We do outsource all of that stuff.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: With regard to the draft human services plan, is it the case that the recommendations on dementia were contrasted with problems facing the sole dementia provider in the area and that provider has inadequate resources?

Mr DOMM: Can you refer me to the specific part of the plan you are talking about?

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: No, I am sorry, I do not have that. It is a question of whether the dementia provider is able to provide for needs in relation to dementia in the area?

Mr DOMM: I assume you are talking about priority one of the draft of phase two of the human services plan, which is about improving access to dementia support. I think it is important to state that the fundamental premise of the reform of human services is that there will be no more funding applied to the area than there currently is, and the funding is quite considerable—it is up to \$40 million a year the State Government spends on human services in total, including funding provided to non-government agencies. So the object of the human services reform process is to find better ways to spend that money to achieve more effective outcomes. So, if there are ways to create efficiencies and so on that allow for greater funding to apply to the areas that need them that is a good thing, and that is what the object of the exercise is.

I do not know the particular organisation you are referring to so I cannot really speak about that. I think it is a fair statement to say that if you ask just about every non-government organisation in Redfern Waterloo do they need more resources they all say yes. But the State Government provides \$40 million and it is not intending to provide any more. Our task is to try and reform that system so that the community gets better outcomes on the basis of that funding.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: But you do acknowledge there is an ageing demographic there and also a big non-English-speaking background demographic that might have specific problems if you were to get dementia in that area, would it not?

Mr DOMM: There is a substantial aged population, that is true, which is why one of the key objectives of phase two of the plan is directed towards that sector of the community.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: To simply say that the gate is shut on the amount of money and work smarter, if you have got particular areas of need what can you do about that?

Mr DOMM: As I indicated, if we can find ways to better utilise the money that has been allocated. The global amount does not change, but within that frame work it is possible for funding to be reallocated in other directions. That is, in fact, what we have been doing. But the global funding will not be increased.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: So you are saying the best you can do is pinch from Peter to pay Paul?

Mr DOMM: No, I think it is fair to say that there is always scope for reform and improvements in service delivery and I do not think anyone could sit here and hold their hand on their heart and say the way money gets spent is perfect. I think we are engaging with that sector of the community to try and find ways to do things better. For example, with youth services you have a number of non-government organisations providing similar services. A key part of the reform objective of phase one of the human services plan was to co-locate those services in the one-stop shops, so you spend less money on administration and less money on property and reallocate that money to youth services for the community. I do not think that is robbing Peter to pay Paul, it is just a smarter way of spending money.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: If that geographical difference does not matter and if the demographics are compatible as well.

Mr DOMM: The bottom line is you do not want to see an outcome that leads to a diminution of services.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: In the deed between the Redfern Waterloo Authority and Carlton United Brewery [CUB] relating to affordable housing contributions of up to 3.5 per cent, the deed says, "The Redfern Waterloo Authority is to hold the affordable housing contribution made by the landowner under this agreement for the purpose for which it was made and apply it towards the provision of affordable housing within the operational area". Why was there no requirement that at least some of the affordable housing would be on the Carlton United Brewery site itself as well as just cash contributions to be spent elsewhere in the authority's area of operations?

Mr DOMM: I think the Redfern Waterloo Authority Act, which provided that affordable housing contributions could be levied on that development, which was outside of our operational area, was premised on the fact, on my understanding, that the monies would be applied to our operational area. Secondly, I think the developer would have preferred to provide housing in lieu of a levy because it is cheaper for them. Our view was we wanted to have control over the money in order to ensure we got the best outcomes for people within our operational area.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: You were happy for it not to be within the CUB site area because if it were outside it you would get to apply that money?

Mr DOMM: No, I said I think in principle we would prefer to get the money rather than be provided with housing. But, secondly, I think the Act is premised on the money being derived from the development but applied in our operational area because that is what our charter is—to create affordable housing in our operational area, not outside our operational area.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Why was a decision made to change the floor space ratio of the Aboriginal Housing Company from 1:1 to 0.75:1.00 for residential?

Mr DOMM: I think the important thing to note in respect to the Eveleigh Street precinct is that the Aboriginal Housing Company owns a fair amount of land in that precinct, and it is not just the Block. The media tends to focus on the Block, which is about 6,000 square metres of land bounded by Eveleigh, Louis, Vine and Caroline streets, but the Aboriginal Housing Company owns quite a significant amount of land in that precinct outside of that area called the Block. What the Built

Environment Plan did was break that Eveleigh Street precinct up into three zones. The Aboriginal Housing Company owns land in each of those three zones. By virtue of rezoning each of those three zones the development potential of Aboriginal Housing Company land has nearly doubled. You will not read that in the press because no-one wants to write that, but that is the fact.

The development potential for Aboriginal Housing Company lands in that precinct compared to what it was under the former City of Sydney's control, was 7,752 square metres. Under the Built Environment Plan, under the rezoning that you refer to, that has increased to 14,467 square metres. It is true that in the area of land known as the Block we have reduced the residential floor space ratio from 1:1 to 0.75:1, but we have also increased the development potential and the maximum floor space ratio above 1.1. So we have rezoned it mixed use and we have increased the development potential. We have increased the height and the floor space ratio, but there has been a tweaking down of the residential floor space ratio. But, overall, it is quite a significant increase. We have also rezoned land that they owned that was formerly zoned open space; we have now rezoned that mixed use. The corridor of land between Eveleigh Street and the railway corridor, which was open space and therefore worthless land to them—worthless from the development point of view—we have now rezoned that mixed use, with quite a significant development potential in height at five storeys: the development potential goes up quite significantly.

So, I think the objective in that zone was to create a genuine mixed-use zone. The difficulty with the weakness with a mixed-use zone is that it allows for residential and commercial development but it cannot compel it, so, therefore, to try and achieve the objectives of that zone, which, by the way, is supported by the Aboriginal Housing Company—they have asked us to do a lot of the things we have done; they submitted to us that that area be rezoned mixed use; the project application they have before the Department of Planning at the moment is for a mixed-use development, and they asked for the open space that we have rezoned to be rezoned to mixed use—we have done a lot of those things, we just have not given them quite the level of development that they asked for because we believed, in a residential sense, that was overdevelopment. As I said before, the development potential of their land has nearly doubled under the rezoning that we have brought in.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: This is the lowest floor space ratio of anywhere in that area, is it not?

Mr DOMM: No, it is not.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: I have got a particular interest arising from some of the things that came up when the social issues committee held an inquiry into Redfern Waterloo regarding the employment opportunities in the area, and particularly employment opportunities for indigenous people, which was a big issue raised with us then. Could you give us any information about steps you have been able to take to improve employment opportunities?

Mr DOMM: I think we identified earlier in the piece that employment generation was one of the most critical things to turning Redfern Waterloo around, that when you analyse that part of Sydney you can see that over the last few decades—in fact, from the Second World War until today—the residential and the working population has declined, which is quite extraordinary when you consider how Sydney has grown: that an area that is only three kilometres from the central business district has gone backwards quite considerably during that period. I think, from memory, in the 1981 census there was something like 15,000 jobs in Redfern Waterloo and in 2001 it had reduced to about 12,500. So in those 20 years it went backwards quite considerably from a fairly low base.

When you consider the high levels of social disadvantage in that area, the amount of people on welfare and the amount of people living below the poverty line or living on what could be considered an income level that denies them real opportunities in life, then clearly job creation and support for business enterprise is critical to turning that around. Human services reform can achieve so much but you really have to tackle the root cause of the problem, and that is you have got to find people jobs, education and training in jobs to give them real life opportunities. The most socially disadvantaged section of that community is the Aboriginal population, without question. Therefore, our early priorities have been directed towards job creation for them, for obvious reasons.

Clearly, as the pace of development and urban renewal increases, the opportunities will grow. But, to date, we have managed to create, using the construction industry as a starting point, something in the order of 124 jobs for Aboriginal people. Most of those are apprenticeships or traineeships and whatever, so it is leading to life opportunities—moving forwards. The nature of the construction industry is such these days that often people are not employees, they are, in effect, independent contractors because they work for subcontractors—they are tradespeople and so on—so therefore they need to also have an understanding of running a small business because, in fact, that is what they are. It is not enough just to be an electrician anymore you also have to know how to file a business statement for GST and whatever. So, we have also commenced training, through our offices, in small business and the requirements of setting up and running a small business.

I have already mentioned that figure for the numbers of jobs that have been created, and of course it is only early days, but 21 jobs have been created at the North Eveleigh Carriage Works project and 26 jobs have been created with the RWA on construction of a new building at the ATP, which is currently under way for the National ICT Australia and the Science and Technology organisation. In the agreement we negotiated with Sydney Broadcast Property for the Channel 7 development at the ATP, which will commence, hopefully, in January next year, we have negotiated 60 jobs for Aboriginal people. We have created four jobs under the new roads project we have currently got underway at the ATP. In a very pleasing sense we are also now starting to apply our indigenous employment model to projects that are being undertaken by other government agencies.

The City of Sydney, for example, is currently undertaking its Redfern Street upgrade and we have managed to create eight jobs under the City of Sydney's program for Aboriginal people there; and we have created five jobs as part of the Transport Development Infrastructure Corporation's Macdonaldtown station stabling project. The Indigenous Land Corporation, which has bought the former Redfern School, has now got a project application with the Department of Planning for the development of that site to create a national indigenous development centre. They also will employ our indigenous employment model to that project, and that is about a \$30-odd million construction project. So you can start to see what is happening: As the pace of development quickens, we are not only managing to acquire construction projects on government-owned land to employ this model but other people are starting to pick it up.

That is very encouraging because it means it is starting to take root and people are starting to see the benefit of this program. Some may say that 124 jobs is not that many, well it is not, but when you consider that there are only 800 Aboriginal people living in Redfern-Waterloo and put it in that context, that is quite a significant step in a very short space of time.

One of the things that we are particularly proud of—and it only started about three weeks ago—is that we spent about \$760,000 on developing a new training centre at the former North Eveleigh rail yards. That opened recently with the first course in hospitality training. It is called Yaama Dhinawan, which means welcome. That training centre started about three weeks ago and we started off with 19 single Aboriginal parents undertaking an eight-week hospitality training course. They are three weeks into that course. That operation also includes setting up of a commercial enterprise to feed into the training school and create opportunities and work opportunities for people.

The Yaama café will open in mid-November and probably become fully functional early in the New Year as a fully fledged, seven-day a week café. That centre also has a construction training school and we just received confirmation of funding from the Department of Employment, Education and Training to do a number of training courses in hospitality and construction starting next year. We have also been successful in getting some Commonwealth Government funding as well. We took a bit of a risk, I guess, and went ahead and set up that school, with funding for training not having been approved on the assumption that it would be, and that has now been confirmed and this is one of the key strategies for getting people into work, providing training and real employment because training without employment is not enough. Training with employment is, and of course, the Yaama Dhinawan will feed into our operations at the Australian Technology Park.

For example, this week we employed a number of students from the Yaama Dhinawan school at the Melbourne Cup function at the Australian Technology Park, so already they are starting to get work opportunities. These are single parents who have been out of the work force for a long time some of them; some are very young. This is the first time some of them have had an opportunity to do

something like this and it is inspiring to see them getting involved. It is run by Aboriginal people; it is run by the RWA, but we have got a very experienced Aboriginal elder and chef, Aunty Beryl Van-Oploo, running it and she is very highly respected in the Aboriginal community in Redfern and Waterloo. We have just engaged an Aboriginal chef as well and we are expecting big things from that facility as we move forward. The model we are trying to develop is one in which it becomes self-sustaining through its commercial operations. With government funding for training and its commercial returns, it will sustain in the future even after the RWA has gone.

They are some of the things we have been doing. I mentioned the enterprise hub that we have set up in conjunction with the SRD but we also provide a lot of business support to Aboriginal enterprise. There are an emerging number of Aboriginal small businesses in the area. There is an Aboriginal accountancy firm that has just set up in Regent Street and is run by Australia's only qualified CPA and there is an Aboriginal physiotherapist who has set up in Regent Street also. We have already managed to provide support to allow two small Aboriginal enterprises to set up in the construction industry. We are starting to see the elements of it all coming together, but there is a long way to go yet, of course.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: I referred before to the inquiry undertaken by the Standing Committee on Social Issues, so it is pleasing to hear how far things have moved. Although it is perhaps not your responsibility, one of the striking points made during that inquiry was that of all the shops, small businesses, service stations in the Redfern-Waterloo area not one had an Aboriginal face as a worker, so in terms of employment opportunities and human impact on the Aboriginal people of the area, there was nowhere they could go to see a worker so it is good to hear about the chartered accountant and the physiotherapist. Is there a change of attitude taking place in the businesses and retail outlets?

Mr DOMM: We have representatives of the chamber of commerce on our ministerial advisory committee on employment and enterprise and they are very supportive. We are undertaking at the moment a business needs survey and I have written to every small business in the area asking them to fill out the survey and on whether they want to grow their business through taking on traineeships and that we will provide the support.

These things will not happen as quickly as you would like of their own volition. They have to be driven a bit. Our indigenous employment model is premised on making it easy for employers to take on Aboriginal people because they are actually employed by a trainee company and they are supplied to the employer job ready. The trainee company undertakes all the human resources side of things and they just invoice the contractor or the subcontractor for the cost of that person's wages. You try and make it easy for people because small employers have less capacity to take on people than larger employers obviously.

We put that support mechanism around, but we also provide mentoring. I have employed an Aboriginal project manager in my office to go around the building sites and other workplaces and provide mentoring and support to Aboriginal people because there are real cultural issues working outside of their comfort zones in some cases. We are undertaking a business needs survey at the moment with the intention of trying to engage more with small business in the area to take on more Aboriginal people. We are doing it ourselves. The RWA has 20 staff but as of next week will have four Aboriginal employees, including a trainee who starts next week. I have created an Aboriginal traineeship down at the Australian Technology Park as well. We are trying to encourage more of that.

One of the issues we face is getting people who are job ready and to that extent you have to be ahead of the game. I said before that we put a lot of effort in the early days into construction jobs because that is where the jobs are being created. Take, for example, the Channel 7 development. That will create 600 construction jobs of which 60 have been earmarked for Aboriginal employment. That will be finished in two years time. It will start early next year and be finished by the end of 2008. Then there will be 2,000 permanent employees operating out of that development, not just with Channel 7 but with specific magazines and the other media outlets that will eventually go there.

We have a two-year window to get people job ready to go into those permanent jobs. Of course, it is relocation, but we have already spoken to Channel 7 about employment of Aboriginal people in that industry and they are quite supportive. The jobs at the Australian Technology Park are

very specialised. To work in that area you generally need university qualifications in information technology. There are very few Aboriginal people currently with those qualifications. So we have to be looking ahead and see where the jobs are being created, what sort of jobs are being created and try and get training systems in place to ensure that people can take advantage of those opportunities, otherwise the opportunities will be hollow; the jobs will be there, but people will not be ready to go into them. That is what our strategy is based around.

The Hon. GREG DONNELLY: You spoke about the importance of linkage between training and employment opportunities. Can you comment on the linkage between education in general of young Aboriginal people attending school and how that links through to training and then on to the employment opportunities that you are trying to create?

Mr DOMM: That has been a focus of phase one of our human services plan. It is important to get to people when they are young to try to get them going down the right path. We have been working very closely with the Department of Education and Training on the human services plan and their role has been excellent in terms of what they have been doing. The overall aim is to improve student literacy, numeracy, school attendance and retention rates. That involves prior to school and transition school programs.

A 2006-2008 school plan has been completed setting literacy, numeracy and school attendance targets for local schools. A new supported return-to-school program has been implemented at the Green Square school. A school transport task force has been set up to deliver improved school transport services by 2007. Improved student mentoring and training systems have started in semester two this year and Alexandria Park Public School is trialling a school-to-work experience program for younger students.

These are some of the things that have been going on under our human services framework, but, you are right, it is extremely important to work with, particularly the secondary school system to ensure that there is smooth transition into what other opportunities are being created. The Redfern Public School program, the National Indigenous Development Centre, when it is finished—and they will start work on it early next year—will cater for 5,000 Aboriginal students a year. That is a national program but there will be a lot of local Aboriginal children involved in that. That is designed to be a centre of sporting, cultural, social and educational excellence.

Reverend Bill Crews of the Exodus Foundation will be setting up there the special school program that it currently runs at Ashfield to deal with problem students who fall between the cracks in the school system. That is a very successful program that he has been running in Ashfield and he will be running that directly in Redfern. I think when you put all those actions together they provide more hope and more opportunity for those young kids coming through the school system.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: I want to go back to Redfern railway station. Are there any existing leases or agreements for the airspace above Redfern railway station?

Mr DOMM: I am not aware of that. You could direct that question to RailCorp. I am not aware of any.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: RailCorp still owns that airspace. The Redfern-Waterloo Authority does not own it?

Mr DOMM: The only land the Redfern-Waterloo Authority owns is the Australian Technology Park. The Redfern railway station and any airspace rights would be owned by RailCorp.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: So your role would simply be in terms of approval?

Mr DOMM: Facilitator.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Do you have any control over the land that has been earmarked for the storage of trains so that they can come into the city and be stored there so that they do not have to come out of the city for the afternoon peaks?

Mr DOMM: Are you referring to the Macdonaldtown station stabling project?

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Yes?

Mr DOMM: No. Once again, that is a RailCorp project. It is being undertaken by the Transport Infrastructure Development Corporation. It sits within our operational area. Our role in that has been to provide comment on the proposal when it was put on exhibition and every now and again we get complaints from residents about noise, which we take up with the appropriate people.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Coming back to the zoning of the Block, the Minister said in estimates on 8 September 2006, "If the Aboriginal Housing Corporation ever gets its act together it can lodge an application and it will be considered on its merits." Did the AHC not submit a project description in March 2006?

Mr DOMM: They submitted some documentation to the department then but it was not in the requisite form and they were asked to submit it. They then at some point shortly after that asked the department, in their words, to stop the clock on their application because they wanted to go away and revise their plan. The clock was stopped, so to speak, for quite some time. I have not got the time lines because they were dealing directly with the Department of Planning not with us.

When they did ask the department to restart the clock things moved quickly after that. But the department did not, to my understanding, receive a proper application from the Aboriginal Housing Company until 11 September this year.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: It is now received?

Mr DOMM: It is received and it has been processed.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Does it have a project number or is it listed on the major projects web site?

Mr DOMM: You would have to ask the department.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: That is not your area; it is in the Department of Planning?

Mr DOMM: The Redfern Waterloo Authority [RWA] only has delegated consent functions for developments worth \$5 million or less. This is worth much more than that. The Minister for Planning will be, always is the consent authority. There is no delegation to us on that.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: That is why you cannot answer that question?

Mr DOMM: It is better answered by the department.

CHAIR: Can you advise whether any of the employees of the Redfern Waterloo Authority undertake Aboriginal cultural awareness training, in particular, during the period 2005-06?

Mr DOMM: Yes. We all sat through a four-week, once-a-week session with Aboriginal people where we were shown videos and had discussions about some of the issues that have led to the current situation of Aboriginal people in Australia. All of my staff, including myself, attended those sessions. It was run by Aboriginal people under the banner of cultural awareness training.

CHAIR: Has the Minister ever attended any of those cultural awareness training days?

Mr DOMM: No, it was just for staff.

CHAIR: Has it ever been suggested that it might be a good idea if he did?

Mr DOMM: You might want to suggest it to him next time he appears before this Committee. Can I say this about the Minister, on all the major issues that I have been talking about today, whether it is Aboriginal employment, the Yaama Dhinamana facility, the national indigenous centre at Redfern school, including the rezoning of the Aboriginal Housing Company lands—by the way, we met privately with the Aboriginal Housing Company on 1 November and they were quite appreciative of the rezoning—in all those things the Minister has been very supportive of what we have been trying to do. I do not believe we would have been able to make those achievements without his support.

CHAIR: In relation to the human services plan, 100 child-care places were to be set aside. Is that correct? If so, do you know where they will be located and when they will be put in place?

Mr DOMM: As I recall, the 100 child-care places were contingent upon the establishment of the Redfern Waterloo Trust, which is currently in process. The trust was meant to raise money which would enable low-income families to pay the differential between what it costs them for child care and whatever Government subsidies were available to them. The trust is currently in the process of being set up. The RWA board has allocated some money, some seeding funds, to set it up. We had to go through a process of getting advice from the Crown Solicitor's Office that it was all okay. We have got a legal mechanism to do it. We are just awaiting approval from Treasury to go ahead with that. The trust is designed to create a mechanism for private sector donations or programs within Redfern Waterloo. One of those programs is intended to create that subsidy to erase the gap between the cost of child care and whatever State support is available. We were never intending to create child care centres, although there is a child care centre envisaged, as I recall, in our contributions plan. But the 100 child-care places you talk about is making childcare available to people who currently cannot access it.

CHAIR: Do you have a timetable for the finalisation of the setting up of the trust?

Mr DOMM: It is with Treasury at the moment. We are just waiting for them. We have done everything we can do. We are ready to set it up. It is just a matter of getting approval.

CHAIR: The Committee concludes its budget estimates inquiry on the Redfern Waterloo Authority. Thank you for your assistance, Mr Domm, in our inquiry. We appreciate you giving us your time.

(The Witness withdrew)

(Short adjournment)

SAM HADDAD, Director-General, Department of Planning, 23 Bridge Street, Sydney, and

PETER LUCAS, Chief Financial Officer, Corporate Shared Services, Department of Natural Resources, 23 Bridge Street, Sydney, on former oath in:

CHAIR: The Committee will now proceed to its inquiry on budget estimates for Planning. Welcome, Mr Haddad and Mr Lucas. The Committee has resolved to request that answers to questions on notice asked at today's hearing be provided by 5.00 p.m. on 22 November 2006. It is a short time frame because the Committee's reporting deadline is 23 November. I hope that will not pose too many difficulties for you. I declare the proposed expenditure for the portfolio of Planning open for examination.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Mr Haddad, I had hoped to ask you questions about the long-awaited State plan, which the Premier had promised by the end of October. Do I take it that the Premier was put off knowing you would be here today and we would question you about the State plan? Is that why we have not seen it?

Mr HADDAD: I really cannot comment on that.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: What role has your department taken in finalising the State plan?

Mr HADDAD: Basically the State plan was prepared by a group of chief executive officers who got together. As you probably know, we spent three days working on the State plan, the first draft of the State plan, which went on public exhibition. It was an extensive program of public consultation throughout. I have participated on behalf of the department both in the preparation of the relevant sections of the draft State plan and in the relevant public participation sessions. I must say, it was a very good opportunity during those public participation sessions to get some of the feedback on the ground from a variety of stakeholders. We then reconvened for one day, took into account all the submissions that we had and prepared further input into the plan.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: When did the chief executive officers reconvene?

Mr HADDAD: It would be about three weeks. It is an ongoing process. I cannot recall the exact dates, I am sorry.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: About three weeks ago?

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Point of order: Can I clarify which portfolio the preparation of the State plan comes under? I know it involves every agency of government, but it was not my understanding that it is being prepared under the aegis of Planning.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: No-one suggested that.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Perhaps these questions should be directed to the Premier's Department.

CHAIR: I think the questions by the Hon. Greg Pearce refer to the role of Mr Haddad and the Department of Planning in relation to the State plan.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: That is right.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: The Hon. Greg Pearce could have asked the same questions of the Redfern Waterloo Authority or the Department of Local Government this morning.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Are you canvassing the Chair's ruling? I am asking Mr Haddad what he has been doing for the past six weeks.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: I do not believe the Chair has yet given a ruling. It is an important point. This is the fifth agency that has appeared before the Committee. In fact, there have been many more because we had many different ones in Transport last Monday. In no other area of the budget estimates inquiry have any questions related to the State plan. It seems to me you are asking the questions of the wrong agency. I seek guidance from the Chair as to whether these questions are appropriate.

CHAIR: I rule that they are appropriate for obvious reasons.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Can I ask what the obvious reasons are?

CHAIR: Because we are here to talk about the Department of Planning. The State Plan must have something to do with the Department of Planning. If it does not, there probably needs to be another plan.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Perhaps your knowledge of the intricacies of the English language is not as good as it might be, but that does seem to be a very simplistic answer.

CHAIR: It is a very simple question.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Since the area is related to education, for instance—

CHAIR: The Hon. Greg Pearce has the call.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: What has been your role since that last meeting—you personally as the head of the department—in finalising the draft for the plan?

Mr HADDAD: I have participated on behalf of the department in the relevant sections of the planning input into the State Plan. The State Plan is much broader than planning, as you would appreciate. It deals with health, transport, a multitude in which other government agencies are involved, but I was involved in providing the planning input into the State Plan.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: When did you finish that work?

Mr HADDAD: That has been an ongoing exercise, taking into account the preparation of the draft section and then after that input as a result of the consultation process. It has been ongoing until very recently, but to give you a correct answer I have to just go back—it has been going on in terms of making sure that the input of planning and of other agencies is factored into the overall plan. Obviously I cannot speak for my colleagues, for the other CEOs, but in terms of the planning input that is what happened.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: To pick up the Hon. Jan Burnswoods' comments, the secretariat for the State Plan is in the Premier's Department. Who is running the process of convening all of these heads, including yourself?

Mr HADDAD: It may be better just to—I am not sure about the exact mechanics of who is doing it but it is in the Premier's Department.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Who do you talk to?

Mr HADDAD: In the Premier's Department, that is where we fit in and they co-ordinate input from various agencies.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Who did you feed into?

Mr HADDAD: I fed into the Premier's Department.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Who in the Premier's Department?

Mr HADDAD: Col Gelatly and specifically Elizabeth Coomb.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: It is no big secret.

Mr HADDAD: No, it is not a secret.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: The department has been busy with quite a bit of reform work with a number of different actions at the moment. I just want to ask you first about the new infrastructure State environmental planning policy [SEPP], which I think is still on exhibition.

Mr HADDAD: Yes.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: What is the thinking behind that, and how does it impact on the various other SEPPs which have been abolished?

Mr HADDAD: One main purpose of this policy is to try to in a sense simplify the relevant provisions that relate to infrastructure in the planning system. They are spread historically over since the model provisions or since the beginning of the planning system. Before that we had various model provisions and all sorts of other areas. Then we came in and we have put all this stuff in State environmental planning policies and I think we had almost between 18 and 20 State environmental planning policies with various provisions on a sectorial basis. People had to go all over the place to find all the relevant stuff. So the main purpose was basically to rationalise the relevant provisions and put them into the one policy.

More importantly, however, the policy intent behind that was to recognise that in some cases we need to expedite the approval system for relatively minor infrastructure provisions, the map of a classroom or fences in schools in some cases, which all needed planning approval. The idea here is to exempt them or to make them the subject of part five of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, still the subject of an environmental test but also work on guidelines, exempt them, have them subject to guidelines that can proceed. If they have a high level of significance put them into part five in some areas.

These are some of the fundamentals in the policy. We are trying also to address surplus government lands and surplus government assets in terms of rezoning and in terms of how we are dealing with that. Again in many cases we are struggling with the rezoning process without paying too much attention to the merit of the development application itself and that is causing a bit of jamming in the system. We are trying to bring back merit assessments, which will still be subject to development application and the rest of it, a bit more upfront as the core of the decision-making process. That is the main reasoning behind this State infrastructure policy.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: You mentioned that it was combining between 18 and 20 previous plans. So that is 19, is it?

Mr HADDAD: We have them listed somewhere.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: It is interesting because the Minister's press release stated 18 but in fact in the SEPP it is 19. I thought your between 18 and 20 was a good way to explain it.

Mr HADDAD: The reason for that is probably two things. The reasoning for that is that it is probably 18. It is combining the 18 but also it is taking elements of another may be one or two policies that are not entirely infrastructure. It is just taking the relevant ones.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: There is a lot of certainty when we can get down to the exact number.

Mr HADDAD: It is basically trying just to put all the relevant, as much as possible the relevant provisions that relate to infrastructure into the one place. We may not have captured every single one but that is what we are trying to do.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Did the initiative for this come from your department or from the infrastructure implementation group?

Mr HADDAD: It came from our department as part of our thinking to simplify, reform the system, try to make it a bit more relevant without necessarily affecting the credibility of the outcome. We are trying very hard to ease a bit the processes that we have and focus a bit more on the outcomes. It is a bit of a challenge but we are trying to push a bit more without necessarily diluting the merit assessment, as I said, but trying to simplify the processes. We have a lot of processes in our planning system and that is not the only place. There are lot of other areas.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Where are you up to in terms of the review of the seniors living SEPP?

Mr HADDAD: The seniors living SEPP, just to put it into context, we had an amendment earlier this year. This amendment addressed one part of the SEPP which related to the rural one. I think it was an appropriate one. It was basically making all these developments permissible. We had a couple of issues and we said, "Let's have a good look at it". It is not stopping the industry. They can still go through a zoning process and work through that if necessary. We have set about doing it. There are a lot of difficult issues when we looked at SEPP 5, and after SEPP 5 what we have done with this, affordability issues and all the rest of it. The first report that I had, I did not think it responded to what I thought we can deliver. I now have something, and we will be making recommendations to the Minister shortly.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: So you would expect it to be finished before the end of this year?

Mr HADDAD: I am hoping but obviously it will be up to the Minister to make a judgement as to whether it is an appropriate mechanism. We still need to ensure that we have the right outcome. As I said, it is not an easy one. Sometimes we need to question some of the fundamentals and maybe we wanted to do too much right now. But just let me say one thing. I think the best solution to all of that is to go back and make sure that when we do our comprehensive plans strategically we take into account these type of facilities as an integral part of the strategic planning. Hence we will not eventually need SEPPs for all these mechanisms if we do it at the strategic planning. Then eventually that is what we will have to do. So we just have to work harder, probably give local government much more guidance, be a bit more clever in terms of setting strategic purposes, strategic framework, work a bit more to take a bit longer but eventually I think—but again it is up to the Minister to decide—that a strategic framework will probably be the most appropriate outcome, rather than the SEPP, but for the time being we will see the SEPP.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: You are going back to a lot more assessment in your department, particularly a lot more part 5 work.

Mr HADDAD: No. Not necessarily. Not more part 5 work. What I am trying to say is that we do comprehensive local environmental plans [LEPs] or we do LEPs, I think that is where it is better to settle all these issues. That is my view. Hence, we still need to go through development applications [DAs] and all the rest of it, but instead of having another layer by way of the State environmental planning policy [SEPP] or whatever, we can integrate these types of developments often as a housing choice in a sense.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Is your department doing any work on a proposal to extend the Bickham Coalmine in the Hunter?

Mr HADDAD: Yes. We have done some work. We have done a cumulative water study. I visited the site, I think almost 1½ years ago, may be more, and spoke to the community there. I have expressed concern about it. We could have dealt with it by way of the DA but my advice was not to go that way. We did a study and the recommendation of the study was essentially that before any DA could be considered we need a water management assessment study. We gave the company the requirements. I think the study is almost finished and it will be subject to an independent assessment. I have not seen it but we have signalled very strongly that it will have to pass a very strict test. Just to be clear, legally—and I have said this before I think—we cannot stop anybody from submitting a development application but I think it is much more honest to let them know up front that this is our position. And that is where we are now.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: In that process, given that there is no current development application, will that water study be made public?

Mr HADDAD: Yes. My expectation is to make this water study public, put it on public exhibition.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: It will go on public exhibition?

Mr HADDAD: It will go on public exhibition and it will be subject to an independent expert assessment as well. After that we will probably have to make judgments on it. That is one issue, the water, but there may be other geological issues and all the rest of it. But that is the status of it today. To the best of my recollection we are still awaiting this water study from the company. Once it has been submitted, it is going to go on public exhibition and it is going to be the subject of an independent review.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: And public submissions.

Mr HADDAD: Public submissions and an assessment by us—not in the context of the development application but in the context of the 3 A kind of thing, as you have said, and see where we go from there.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Does that water study include groundwater issues around the Pages River and that sort of thing?

Mr HADDAD: Yes, it does. It does include that, particularly the interfacing between groundwater and geology, and the proximity of the mining to the river and to the aquifers.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Has your list of requirements been made public?

Mr HADDAD: I do not think we have issued any requirements yet.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: No, sorry—which formed the basis for the study?

Mr HADDAD: For the study, yes. We have produced the report and it is publicly available.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Just in similar vein, the parliamentary web site has been inundated with comments from people concerned about the Anvil Hill coalmine. Can you tell us what the position is there?

Mr HADDAD: We issued requirements for an environmental impact study. An environmental assessment report was prepared and went on public exhibition. We have received a lot of submissions, 2,000-plus submissions.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Mine included.

Mr HADDAD: We receive your submission, yes. There are many issues with greenhouse featuring very high in the submissions, but water, flora and fauna, and noise. I have written to the company saying that they need to do much more work on water in particular, and noise and flora and fauna. We had a panel and that panel has heard submissions. We are awaiting the report. But in practical terms what will have to happen is that the company will have to respond by way of its preferred activity report or by way of submissions and we will make that available as well as soon as we get it. How they will address those issues I am not sure. Of course, you have the court case and the issue there is greenhouse and whether the director general's requirements, whether my requirements, should have specifically referred to considerations of greenhouse emissions from the burning of coal. My requirements deal with the greenhouse emissions from the activities on site—as we do with most other projects—as is seen from downstream activities. That was heard this week for a couple of days and we are awaiting the outcome. That is where we are.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: And that would have an impact generally on your requirements, in terms of future projects.

Mr HADDAD: The outcome of this court would have an impact, yes. The Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, to the best of my knowledge, did not intend to go that far. That does not mean that greenhouse issues are not very serious matters. They are very important and very high on the agenda, but we have to be mindful of the assessment boundaries and particularly how much a Minister or consent authority can have control and impose certain conditions, how to enforce conditions, how far to go, what do we do with this information. There are a lot of issues now, of course, that could not apply only to downstream but to upstream as well and to life cycle stuff and whatever. So it is not an easy issue. As I said, it is not because greenhouse is not important and the burning of coal not an important issue; it is the boundaries of the assessment process. There are practical issues as well in terms of double accounting. Where do you allocate the final emissions, and the burning, what regulatory mechanism you apply to that and all rest of it. There are technical legal issues, which I will not refer to. They were all argued before the Land and Environment Court. That is where we are with this and we will see how we go.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: How much did Landcom pay for the Beacon Hill High School site?

Mr HADDAD: I am sorry but I cannot answer that.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Was the site independently valued prior to the sale to Landcom?

Mr HADDAD: I cannot answer. I am sorry. I do not have this information. Our involvement was in relation to the merit assessment of the subdivision itself.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: I will put these questions on notice, presumably?

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: You would have to put them on notice to Landcom. You cannot do that today.

Mr HADDAD: I have not got access. It may be better to get it from them.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Is this not checked by the department?

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: You would need to put on notice in Parliament, not here.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: It goes to the Minister either way, does it not? And then it goes to the department either way, does it not?

Mr HADDAD: I will take the question on notice.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Is the department considering a proposal to sell Seaforth technical college site?

Mr HADDAD: No. No. Not to my knowledge.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Not to your knowledge or no?

Mr HADDAD: No. I am not aware that the department is considering doing that.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: The Minister has given approval for the bulldozing of Beacon Hill High School site, though. Is that not correct?

Mr HADDAD: The Minister gave approval for the relevant development application, yes.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: When will that happen?

Mr HADDAD: I think the approval was announced yesterday.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Yes, it was, so it is likely to happen fairly soon.

Mr HADDAD: It is up to Landcom how they will operate in response to the approval. The approval was given to Landcom and it is up to them to do whatever it is.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Is the New South Wales Government considering a putrescible waste landfill in Minchinbury after 20 years of not such a development because of its proximity to homes, sporting grounds, public schools and child care centres?

Mr HADDAD: I think that we have a request for the director general's requirements, or we may have issued those, but certainly we do not have an application before us.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: So that you do not have an application for that?

Mr HADDAD: No. We do not have an application.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: There is a quarry there zoned for landfill, is that correct?

Mr HADDAD: I think so, yes.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Has there been any specification of what type of landfill it is zoned for?

Mr HADDAD: No. Just to make it clear, we do not have the application before us for a landfill there. We do not have a natural development application for a landfill there.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Will residents be involved in any environmental assessment process for a landfill at Eastern Creek and Minchinbury?

Mr HADDAD: If we do have a development application then the procedures will apply. The procedures will be contained in this departmental documentation, placed on public exhibition, and subject to submissions and notifications in accordance with the requirements of the legislation.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: With regard to the regularisation and expansion of Berowra Waters marina, why were the objectors to that development application not advised of the approval until February 2006, which is nearly a year after the Minister Assisting the Minister for Infrastructure and Planning, Diane Beamer, had approved the development on 21 March 2005?

Mr HADDAD: I will take that question on notice. I am not sure about the details. I will have to go back and check when the notifications occurred and whether there were other factors. It may well be that there were other discussions or other approvals needed from councils or others. I will have to take that question on notice.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Did the former Assistant Minister approve this development under delegation from the Minister?

Mr HADDAD: If you do not mind I will have to go back and check the facts on this. I cannot recall.

CHAIR: Will you take that question on notice as well?

Mr HADDAD: Yes. I will have to refresh my memory as to the details of this application. It has been some time. I am happy to take the question on notice and give you a consolidated answer.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Under what section of the Act was the Assistant Minister authorised to act as the consent authority?

Mr HADDAD: I think it was part four of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act but I will include that in my answer.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Why has the Minister withdrawn and stopped the leasing and other arrangements for drug and alcohol rehabilitation services by We Help Ourselves [WHOs] at Callan Park?

Mr HADDAD: Will you please repeat that question?

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: I understand the Minister has withdrawn and stopped leasing for the drug and alcohol rehabilitation services.

Mr HADDAD: I am not sure. The Minister for Planning? I know that the Minister administers the Acts, but I will have to clarify that because I am not sure.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: Will you take that question on notice?

Mr HADDAD: Yes.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: What are the plans of the Minister and the department for future maintenance and protection of the heritage gardens and buildings at Callan Park?

Mr HADDAD: There are provisions for an overall management plan for the park. I think at the moment the Department of Health is mostly responsible for the maintenance of the buildings there, including heritage buildings. The Department of Health is a looking after them under the current arrangements.

The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS: The Department of Planning does not have anything to do with them at the moment, is that the situation?

Mr HADDAD: That is correct, yes.

The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN: Mr Haddad, in relation to section 94 contributions and the fact that plans had to be initiated by councils about section 94, when did that occur initially? When did councils have to organise those plans?

Mr HADDAD: There were always provisions in the Act for section 94 plans. Do you mean section 94A or section 94? There were amendments last year to the legislation.

The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN: I think I am referring to the amendments.

Mr HADDAD: That occurred last year.

The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN: In relation to section 94 plans that were deemed under the changes last year, what is the department's involvement in those? When councils makes a section 94 plan and the department looks at it, what provisions are there in terms of how the department decides whether council decisions are appropriate? What changes can the department make if it has concerns about a council's decision on 94 plans?

Mr HADDAD: The Minister now has under those amendments the ability to direct councils to amend or to modify section 94 plans. The rationale for that is to avoid double dipping between local infrastructure provisions, State infrastructure provisions and other provisions so that the total quantum

is known and the application of all those contributions is also known. So the Minister has the ability to do that. We have recently written to councils asking them to send us the relevant plans and we are looking at some of them. We are going to be focusing by order of priority on the ones that we think are growth areas and other areas. But we have not intervened in that context because we did not need to do so.

The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN: In terms of whether the department has to intervene if it is reviewing section 94 plans that a council has made, what are the rules or regulations regarding intervention? Perhaps the department looks at a plan and decides that some council decisions might be inappropriate in relation to section 94.

Mr HADDAD: It is a direction from the Minister to amend plans, to change them or to adjust them accordingly, whether because the basis of the contribution is not appropriate or, for that matter, that the application of those contributions is not appropriate.

The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN: Is there a cyclic review process in relation to section 94 plans?

Mr HADDAD: We have not formalised a cyclic review process but, as I have said, we have written to councils and we are starting to look at them in the context of priorities, growth areas, to make sure that, where applicable, we have reasonable contribution plans. Of particular interest to us is the issue of total quantum: What would happen under 94 and under 94A? Where State infrastructure provisions apply, we want to ensure that the total quantum is reasonable and there is not a plan that will make provisions to levy on the same piece of infrastructure, local or State.

The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN: Without talking about the new areas that are opening up in terms of residential, commercial and industrial use, the policy is meant to support medium density and urban consolidation. What happens with the 94 plans in older areas, for instance the middle ring suburbs of Sydney?

Mr HADDAD: The same provisions apply. Basically, we look at them and see, particularly in terms of subregional planning, whether it ought to change or whether the same should apply—what is more appropriate.

The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN: How does this tie in with the metropolitan strategy?

Mr HADDAD: What we are doing now with the metropolitan strategy is we are moving into what we call subregional plans—that is one level—whereby we are looking at the various subregions and going at the second level of planning. But, more particularly, we are looking at how we can redevelop some of the centres. The applicability of all that would be, for example, mixed-use and up-zoning provisions in some areas. That would attract contributions to upgrade infrastructure and other provisions. Some of it will be local and others will be State. Section 94 may have to be reviewed to reflect the additional requirements for local infrastructure as a result of this. For example, if we look at what has happened in Wollongong—the Minister announced today the Gosford city plan, for instance—that is one of the city centres. I know it is not directly related to the metropolitan strategy but, if you look at the plan, there are provisions for upgrading section 94 provisions because of local infrastructure.

The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN: If there is an issue with an individual council—for example, the council adopts a section 94 contribution plan and, in review, the department is not happy with that proposal—what is the process?

Mr HADDAD: The immediate process is of course to work with council, to talk with council, to analyse, to try to understand, find out and come to an agreed outcome. If it does not work, as I said, the Minister has a statutory capability to do that.

The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN: What is the appeals process? For example, if a council adopts a section 94 plan and someone appeals against it, what is the process?

Mr HADDAD: I am not sure that there are merit appeal provisions. There are always procedural appeal provisions but I am not sure that there are in this case merit appeal provisions. Procedural appeals provisions may attract arguments about the reasonableness of the Minister taking certain action and, from my experience, that will form part of the procedural appeal process. So there are appeal mechanisms. They are not necessarily on the merit of it but on the process itself.

The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN: On the process that the council adopts?

Mr HADDAD: Yes, and the reasonableness of the council and others—including the Minister, by the way. There may be an appeal where somebody says, "Minister, you have said this and you are not reasonable in saying it, or the council". But the process that we will adopt will be, in the main, a negotiated outcome. In some cases we will probably go to an independent review—to a panel review. We will get experts in the field and negotiate an outcome and try to avoid as much as possible a legal situation.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Director General, can you give us an outline of the strategies and work being done under the cities and centres program?

Mr HADDAD: The cities and centres program was announced by the Premier as part of his economic and financial statement. Essentially, the intent there is to try to focus on six city centres—Newcastle, Gosford, Wollongong, Parramatta, Liverpool and Penrith—and revitalise those centres by basically doing a number of things, such as making sure that we have a clear vision so that everybody knows where we are heading with the centres. Then we have got a statutory instrument by way of the local environment plan [LEP]. We have public domain and design control plans and infrastructure plans. That is the broad picture. Essentially, the idea was to try to go into those centres and give them an economic as well as an amenity and residential focus, to try to provide certainty to the community and certainty to investors so that we can have an on-the-ground revitalised centre and city in many of those areas.

So far it has been a very successful program. We have completed work in Wollongong. It has been very well received. In most of these cases, by the way, the outcome is substantial or important up-zoning of both commercial and residential areas. We combine this with proper urban design and urban assessment criteria, and the rest of it. So there is quite a lot of work that goes into that. I think what is different with this program relative to others is that we do that very much in partnership with local government. The process that I have established in the department is that we have a specialised team. Chris Johnson is heading that team and we have got people from consultants, architects, designers, statutory planners and strategic planners. We also have people planners and professionals from the relevant local council working with them. It has been a very successful partnership experience. They work together and come up with a plan. We have established a number of reference groups whereby they can involve the community, involve industry and involve other stakeholders.

As I said, the Wollongong plan has been a successful one. It went through council, I think, last week and it has been adopted in final form. The Minister today announced the Gosford city centre plan. We have a program to try to achieve all the others by the end of this year. We may not do them all by the end of this year, but that is the target. As I said, the outcome is practical, including a statutory instrument but also support information that can help the community, investors and everybody else in moving and, hopefully, changing many of these areas. If you look at the Gosford plan, for instance, Gosford is a fantastic centre but it has not taken a lot of advantage of its natural setting. We are trying to give it that. The Gosford plan went on public exhibition so that we can get some of these things.

I am also told that the Wollongong plan got merit awards. We have got some merit awards from the Planning Institute as well. That is the program in essence. When we do the six of them we may be able to look at other centres in the second tier and see whether we can do something else. The idea behind all this is that in the past when we came to development applications we always struggled without a context. We are trying to build that context so at least if you put in a development application within that context the regulators should be accountable in delivering the approval, or whatever it is, efficiently and quickly. If you are not, you will have to go back and it will take time. That is the thinking behind that program and many others.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: When you referred to the fact that Wollongong council has adopted the plan, does that mean that it now serves as a guide for the council in terms of how it handles DAs and so on?

Mr HADDAD: That is correct.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: It is an overall guide for them.

Mr HADDAD: It is. But it is also a statutory instrument. It is an LEP. It went through the stages and towards the end, after the exhibition, there is a process—section 65 and whatever—and they take the comments and refer them to the department. I am informed that the council adopted the final stage, taking into account all those submissions. The next step will be for us to proceed to meet the plan.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: If in the future the Wollongong plan and any others require amendment or updating as the centres grow, what will be the process?

Mr HADDAD: The process will be an amendment to those LEPs through a public process. They have to come formally, and the council will have to resolve an amendment under the relevant provisions and then we will take all that into account. It will have to be done following similar steps to the making of an LEP following an amendment. Of course, that all depends on how significant those amendments are. That will be done. We are hoping that behind the statutory instrument there will be enough in a sense of accessibility, and big picture issues, to accommodate some of those changes. One of the main intents behind all this, and as has been expressed elsewhere, is that we are trying very hard to provide opportunities for people to work near where they live.

We are trying to push the boundaries of that a bit more. We cannot always make sure all the jobs will happen; planning does not create jobs. We cannot force people to work where they live, people will still travel. At least we are trying to provide opportunities for that. If we do that we believe there will be much broader benefits to the environment, with the amenities of transport infrastructure and all the rest of it. That is the thinking behind some of those centres as well, and elsewhere.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: I have seen the Wollongong one, it is very impressive and certainly provides that context. I assume the forthcoming ones will be similar?

Mr HADDAD: We will try to monitor how we perform in this business, where people live and work. We need to monitor it and make sure it is happening or why it is not happening and all the rest of it. That is the next step in our thinking that we are trying to drive.

The Hon. GREG DONNELLY: What is the progress of the BASIX initiative?

Mr HADDAD: The BASIX initiative is progressing well. It started applying in October, from memory, to alterations and additions. The cut-off point is \$100,000 for additions and for swimming pools of 400,000 litres. The new standards came into effect then. With BASIX we are trying to move into the implementation and monitor how it is happening. We had changed it a bit, after discussions about the targets for high-rise buildings. Some people wanted us to cut energy to 40 per cent, but we could not. We have 20 per cent and that is more realistic, recognising the technology. Overall, the outcome is not bad. We are working hard and we are entering into a trial of \$300,000 or thereabouts with co-generation facilities, we are trying to find out whether the technologies can work in high-rise buildings, whether there are other methods of doing it.

We announced in 2008 that we would report back. We are trying to address those high-rise buildings. Essentially, we have done as much as we can to set the parameters. We want to move much more into the implementation. We have asked everyone to have certification and we are accumulating those. We will make them available. That is where we are heading with BASIX. In terms of the broader issues of energy and water and all the rest of it, we are trying to go back and see how the planning system can complement what we have done to buildings. We are trying to see how we can do it in terms of planning. How can we contribute to energy and water savings—but energy in particular through better planning processes.

The Hon. GREG DONNELLY: Would you agree that there appears to be increasing community support for government initiatives along the line of BASIX? In other words, the public support seems to be increasing in expectation of the Government going forward with policies and introducing those types of initiatives.

Mr HADDAD: Yes, I think there is community support and developer support. The Property council is supportive of the initiatives and I have asked them constantly to give me feedback. To the best of my knowledge no-one is queuing outside and saying it is costing them so much. There are indications that we will have annual savings, some people are saying \$650 and \$700 a year, or whatever. Probably, we need to monitor that a bit more. Certainly there is broad support well beyond the statutory regulatory requirement. It is more of a cultural instance of these things. In my submission, inevitably that will increase. That is what is happening, and I think that is good.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Mr Haddad, my questions relate to East Darling Harbour. Currently you have on exhibition lot of documentation. What is your thinking of how the rezoning of that area will proceed? What process are you looking at and what timeframe?

Mr HADDAD: We currently have on exhibition applications for what we call a concept plan. It is not in relation to the architecture or any decision, just the concept of it. As you have correctly stated, it is on public exhibition in Bridge Street. We are getting submissions. I think it is on exhibition until the third week of November or thereabouts. We are getting submissions. When we get all those submissions, we will examine them. We normally give them back to the proponent, to the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority, and they would have to examine them and give us comments. Usually we make all those comments publicly available. It depends on whether there will be adjustments to the scheme or not, and that is also publicly available. The Minister will make the decision and prepare an assessment report with conditions, or whatever. We will make it available to the Minister and he will make the decision. In terms of timing, we are trying hard to do that before the end of the year, roughly, if we can.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: The end of this year?

Mr HADDAD: Yes, if we can. We may not be able to, but that is what we are working towards. It all depends on the issues that are raised, or whether we need more debate or not, and all sorts of other stuff. It may happen, it may not. That is what we are working towards.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: That is the plan, for the Minister to approve the concept plan?

Mr HADDAD: Yes. The Minister's approval of the concept plan, the form of the approval, will vary. I will have to think a bit more about what will happen, and I am more than happy to provide separate advice on this, as to whether we will be very specific in the case of densities or whether we will put some height limits and broad envelopes and the rest of it. Our assessment will depend on how far we go. Certainly I expect that as a minimum we will have to assess the various users and the broad users of the commercial buildings and that sort of stuff, and the mixes. We may go as far as FSRs and all the rest of it probably. How far specifically, we will certainly push the boundary in requiring very careful architectural and urban design requirements. I am sure that that will be a major issue. We will look at all those factors as part of the assessments. How far we go down will depend on the assessments.

Subsequent to that there will be a mechanism for development applications over time. If they are consistent with the concept plan, and they have to be by law, they will proceed accordingly. If they are not, there will be a notification, that is the broad scheme.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: The effect of it, once the Minister makes that concept plan, you effectively rezone the site?

Mr HADDAD: That is correct.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Then development applications can proceed?

Mr HADDAD: That is correct. The Minister made the decision that it is potentially a State significant site. Once we do that, we put it in schedule 3 of the SEP with the contours and the rezonings. That is how we do it.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: In relation to some of the documentation on exhibition, I note there is conjecture in the documents that the site will accommodate in the vicinity of 600 to 900 dwelling units. How do you look at that in terms of dwelling units to be approved in the concept plan?

Mr HADDAD: That will be part of the assessment itself. I think the parameters for the development of the sites, from what I have here, has been the foreshore park of 11 hectares and the public foreshore and all the rest of it and the 390,000 square metres, with 25 percent, and the rest of it. I would assume that will be part of the assessment process itself in terms of distribution. I would be very surprised if that is already fixed. It may be fixed by way of a proposal.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: It is in part 21.

Mr HADDAD: It is part of the application.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Yes.

Mr HADDAD: Probably we will have to look at it and see part of the assessment, whether it is more or less than specified. I am sorry, I cannot be more precise in terms of the exact outcome. It is part of the assessment process that it will have to go through.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: In terms of infrastructure for the site, the infrastructure report on exhibition as part of it, generally the infrastructure service in the site is either at full capacity and/or unsuitable for the proposed land uses to take place on the East Darling Harbour site. What work have you done in relation to that?

Mr HADDAD: In terms of the assessment, look at the infrastructure and what it would generate over time in terms of additional infrastructure, including transport and traffic implications and the rest of it. We would have to look at that. I am sure that the team is looking at all of that now for the assessments.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: If you get to the stage of a concept plan, effectively you could have the proponent putting in development applications for individual buildings?

Mr HADDAD: Yes.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: How would you handle that if that is the overall limitation on the infrastructure for the whole site?

Mr HADDAD: The approval of the concept plan will have to recognise the total infrastructure implications and will have to make provisions for it as part of the approval itself. There will be specific conditions. How far we go, whether there will be specifics in some cases, we have voluntary planning agreements as conditions, either specifically or totally and other stuff that we have to put in as part of the total developments.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: In terms of funding that infrastructure, the report says that the infrastructure will ultimately be financed through developer contributions. Has that decision been made?

Mr HADDAD: That is one mechanism that is available. We will look at that. There will have to be a contribution. I presume that will depend on whether it is through this mechanism. The development contribution may be exercised through a number of factors; whether it will be a percentage of the development costs, whether it is something else or whether it is a combination of this plus in-kind contribution for various things; how far do we want to go in locking in the gross contributions upfront. Last year we were talking about Wollongong; in that case infrastructure contribution was a percentage—3 per cent, 2 per cent—in other cases we just put DAs in and then we say we will renegotiate them what we are doing elsewhere.

As I said, these are the proposals that are there. I have not got any specific advice as to where we are with this year in terms of the assessment process. We are really wanting people to engage in it. We are trying to get people to be interested. It is a major development; it is a big development; it is a development that will have a major impact on our city, so it has to be done with care and we are very careful and committed to be able to do that. We are trying very hard to encourage people to come to give us comments, to advertise it. I know that the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority's people are also trying through various forums to have a bit of a debate about it and we will see how we go with all those submissions. I know that we have a lot of people coming through our exhibition, so we will see how we go.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: What is the process for amending the concept plan?

Mr HADDAD: The concept plan has to be amended by way of an application by the applicants similar to what we have to do to NCA in a sense, because the concept approval is a bankable approval. So, in that context people will do certain things on that basis and we cannot change the rule on them, they will have to come back if they are wanting to change that, but there are other ways. It may well be that in terms of implementation there is a logic in changing and people then will want to come and change it, but that is the broader process.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: I wanted to ask you a few questions in relation to answers to questions on notice that you have provided, or the Minister provided, following the earlier hearings. Maybe Mr Lucas might have to help you on some of these. Question 1 was a question in a fair bit of detail and had gone to quite a bit of trouble in relation to motor vehicles operated by the department. The answer told us how many vehicles the State had and told us a little bit about the policies but it did not actually answer how many vehicles were leased by the department from a government finance entity or, in fact, any of the other questions which were very detailed in relation to the numbers of cars operated by the department. Is there some reason you do not know that?

Mr LUCAS: No, there is no reason why we should not know that. I do not know it here and now. I will have to take that on notice.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: You have already taken it on notice once in writing. That is part of the reason we are back here today, because you could not answer it. You gave us this generalised stuff but no answers in relation to the department.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: That is not why we are back here today. We are back here today because of a specific motion moved a couple of weeks ago at a meeting you were not at.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: I am trying to get to the bottom of why the Minister and the department could not answer some very specific questions that were taken on notice in writing.

Mr HADDAD: I do not know why. There is no reason why. I will look into it and make sure we put that in. There may be a broad reason beyond the department, but there is no reason why we cannot give you the number of cars. It is there, but if there is a broader policy issue I will have to let you know that. I will look into it myself.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: That was Question No. 1. There were two pages of very detailed questions. Question No. 2 related to the department's annual report on outcomes achieved for clients from multicultural and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Again, it was a detailed question and the answer had some generalised stuff in it, including you actually told us agencies are required to prepare BAPs and review them on an annual basis but you were not able to answer the questions.

Mr LUCAS: I believe that the information will be in the annual report. The annual report is required to be tabled by the Minister in the Parliament and I anticipate that will happen within this month.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: You did not tell us that, but that is at least an answer now. Question No. 6 asked in relation to the community language allowance scheme did any departmental staff members receive an allowance under the scheme in various years. Again, you gave us some

generalised sort of answers but did not actually tell us whether anyone in the department did receive those allowances. Again, is there any reason you could not tell us that? You do not have that information?

Mr HADDAD: I do not think there is a reason, but I am told that the answer to this is two staff.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Why could you not have put it in a written answer that came back to the Committee? What was the reason?

Mr HADDAD: I am not sure what is the reason. I cannot comprehend that. But I am happy to explain it in a broad answer on notice. I am told by my colleague here that it is two staff.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: We also put together a fairly detailed question to your Minister and your department in relation to print advertising and we asked how much was budgeted for and how much was expended in various years on ethnic printing and various other printing and media outlets. Again, you gave us a bit of a general answer and you were able to give us detailed answers in relation to how much the Federal Government spent on advertising but you could not answer for your own department. What is the reason for that?

Mr HADDAD: It will be in our annual report anyhow.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: You could have told us that in your answer. You did tell us that in various other sections. I am just bemused that you were able to give us details of Federal Government spending but you could not give us the details of your own spending.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: He probably thought you could find these in the annual report but you might have trouble finding details of the Federal Government.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Why do you not let the witnesses answer for themselves?

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Because you seem to have run out of questions and you seem to be devoting an enormous amount of time going over what was done last time.

CHAIR: Which was not done last time.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: We do not have an answer for that question either, as to why you could not tell us what your advertising budget was?

Mr HADDAD: We do have the answers. It will be in our annual report. We will make sure that it is in there.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: That is in relation to advertising. What about in relation to expenditure on intermediary service providers? Can you tell us your expenditure there? Is that going to be in the annual report too?

Mr LUCAS: It would be a part of the annual report—whether it is described exactly as intermediary service providers.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Do you have that information, not necessarily here with you? Do you maintain that information?

Mr LUCAS: The general ledger system would provide that information, yes.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: So when we asked you a question for that specific information why was it that you did not draw it down from your general ledger system and actually give us the answer?

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: I thought it was in the budget papers.

Mr HADDAD: This information was done in our shared service, but that is not an excuse. I will look into it myself and put it all as soon as possible back to the Committee.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: It makes it a little difficult to run these estimates committees if we go to the trouble of giving you these detailed questions and you have the information and then you do not actually provide it when you are given three weeks, or whatever it was, to prepare it. What about contractors? Do you have information on the number of contractors the department engages and the amount of money you pay them?

Mr LUCAS: We would expect to have that information, yes.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: You would expect to?

Mr LUCAS: Yes.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Do you or do you not?

Mr HADDAD: That would be tabled in the annual report as well.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: That would be in the annual report?

Mr HADDAD: It is in the annual report.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: It would have been useful if you had told us that was your answer instead of telling us that you have internal audit procedures that deal with it, but you could not tell us the figures. Is there some reason you could not give those figures when we asked for them as an estimates committee and you specifically took them on notice and had three weeks to prepare the answers?

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Some of them were put on notice afterwards, of course. They were not asked at the time. The Hon. Greg Pearce is quite wrong. These are probably Lee Rhiannon's questions, I forget, but they were not asked at the hearing.

CHAIR: They were detailed questions put on notice.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Not at the hearing. The Hon. Greg Pearce is quite wrong in saying that. He was not present then.

CHAIR: Order! You do not have the call.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: I just thought it might be useful to correct the misstatements. They were not put on notice at the hearing.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: The questions are put on notice after the hearing, as you would know.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: But that was not what you said.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Do we have an answer? I could go on and on and on with these. There are well over 100 questions. We could sit here until five o'clock to keep the Hon. Jan Burnswoods happy and go through each one. I do not think the witnesses have got an answer to any of it.

The Hon. GREG DONNELLY: Point of order: I understand time has expired for the Opposition questioning. It is now the Government's turn to ask questions.

CHAIR: Mr Haddad, were you answering that question?

Mr HADDAD: I am happy to look at the answers and come back to the Committee. I will look into that.

The Hon. GREG DONNELLY: Mr Haddad, for the benefit of the Committee could you take us through what are the current essential major priorities for the department?

Mr HADDAD: I think at the last hearing I was asked about the corporate plan, which basically articulated the priorities that we have. Essentially, what we are trying to focus on now is, as I was saying, trying to complete our strategies. We are moving into implementing the various components of the Metropolitan Strategy and the regional strategies. That is what we are focusing on. I think that will enable us, hopefully, to have a bit of a clearer idea about managing growth, where it should happen and how it should happen and where conservation and protection should happen and the various mechanisms, and then that will ease the decision-making for individual decisions later on.

So, we are sort of putting quite a bit of resources into trying to come with those strategies and to deliver them. That is one of our highest priorities. We are certainly trying to put a much more focused attention on our development assessments process, the decisionmaking for development approvals and infrastructure development projects and the like. We have been doing a number of operational reforms in this area. We are trying to be a bit better in differentiating between complex projects, be it large or small, but ones that have the attention of the community and others and the ones that can have more of a mechanical impact and whether we can address that in a more readily fashion. That is basically what we are looking at, but it is a very high priority for us in terms of delivering efficient, timely and credible outcomes.

We have done a lot of work in terms of our LEP process and we are trying to give very early signals to developers and to councils about the work and that is the major area of work. The other priority that we have is trying to make all the planning reform that we have done work in practice. It does not matter which area it is, we are moving now from a draft or formulating planning reforms into the doing. That is where most of our resources are. Broadly speaking that is where we are heading.

The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN: We had the Director General of the Department of Local Government at our estimates hearing this morning. Obviously, one of the reporting processes is the turnaround times for development applications being accessed by individual councils. Do you have any comment about the turnaround time in light of the fact that many individual councils may not be able to fill all their positions for town planners because of a difficulty in having sufficient professional people to fill those positions at the local government level and does the department face the same problem? First, is there an issue and, if there is, what is the department's policy in trying to ensure that there are enough town planners who fit the criteria to fill council positions and positions in the department and other areas in the public sector as opposed to the private sector?

Mr HADDAD: There is a submission that there is a shortage of planning professionals generally. I cannot say by how much or where but certainly in terms of the numbers and the quality there is a submission that it is an issue. Earlier this year the Minister convened a forum with universities, the industry, local government and the State Government and we put together a task force. We have a report coming in terms of a number of things we should do to be able to address this issue. We need to broaden the definition of who is a planner. Planning is completely different to what it used to be. It is not statutory planning only. There are strategic issues. It is much more of a multidisciplinary type of function and we need to transit all that and to broaden the range of people involved in this. That is the most immediate solution that we are looking at.

There is a bit of thinking in terms of doing that and it is correct to say that in many councils, particularly rural and regional councils, there is a shortage of people who can undertake those functions. One of the main challenges for us in terms of addressing that is to think a bit more about the system as well. In many cases we tend to have systems that require approvals for a lot of things that may not necessarily need all the effort or we can do it differently and I think inevitably we will have to do that. We will have to be able to differentiate between the stuff that matters because it is important to communities or to the environment or to industry, from other stuff. I think particularly in local government we have a system where the development approval process applies to all sorts of things, sometimes too many. I know in some cases even the development application forms are quite extensive and in others it is not and I am wondering why. That is one of the critical issues that we need to examine.

We have been promoting exempt and complying development. That is one mechanism but I can fully understand that some councils cannot do that because they need to work more on their strategies and rules and this is another direction that we want to push for. All of these things will hopefully reduce the time that is taken. In my submission the time for determining development applications is an issue that needs to be looked at very carefully. This time will vary from development to development. There will be a number of categories of developments because of the complexity of the issues. It will take time for proponents as well to provide answers and to be able to provide credible outcomes at the end and others where the whole process will be much shorter because the issues are known and we should move on it.

I think the main accountability should really be in terms of making sure that where there are no issues or there are known issues, that our views are known very early, up-front, and that it does not take a lot of processes to come to the outcome and where the issues matter, that is where we focus our attention. I want to also add in that regard that we have started a performance reporting system with local government. The Department of Local Government used to keep records of all councils' development applications, the time it has taken and the whole statistics. Earlier this year we started a much more comprehensive system which will apply to all local councils in this State. We distributed that and we are getting the responses and working with them. We will have a much better handle on the timing, not only just to say that it has taken 100 years or one year, but it will enable us to understand much better what are the contributors to those factors.

We ask questions: How many planners do you have versus how many a year do you handle? What type of DA? Is it coming because at the State level the bureaucratic processes are jammed with people wanting too much information or is it because of something else? Hopefully we will have a better handle on those sorts of issues.

The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN: This question was asked this morning of the Director General of Local Government in terms of training for elected members. I understand there will be further training after the 2008 election and specifically the questions this morning related to financial issues, but given the complexity of issues that local councils face, and also the metropolitan strategy, do new councillors in particular, need a better understanding of policies and environmental plans that relate to their duties as elected members?

Mr HADDAD: I cannot make a comment universally on all our elected councillors, but obviously it would greatly assist decision-makers if they have an understanding of all those processes. It certainly strengthens and improves the quality of the decision-making. It is useful to have at least some understanding and provide mechanisms for them to understand the complexity and other facets of planning processes. Having said that, the role decision-makers, whilst they have a good appreciation of the systems, at the end of the day is also to accept and take advice and make much broader judgments of their decision. It is on that advice and what the community would say or from other factors, and you just have to respect that, as long as the advice that is coming to them is as credible as possible.

The Hon. GREG DONNELLY: On the issue of flagging up-front issues—I think you mentioned that a couple of times this afternoon as being important—to help facilitate the whole process of consideration of matters, could you explain to the Committee whether there is more work to be done and how that work can be advanced to keep the process going forward and improve the process of the flagging to potential developers of issues?

Mr HADDAD: There is a bit of a balance but in general I think it is much better if there are critical issues associated with a policy or with developments that there is an honest exchange of those views very early on. We need, of course, to make sure that we do not have, at the early stage, bureaucrats making those judgments in isolation and then selecting this and that. There ought to be a careful, transparent process in doing that and opportunities for people to say, "Why not?" and all the rest of it. Generally it is much better to have a structured process whereby the views are known early in the process. There is no doubt about that.

We have been going through this LEP panel that we have done, whereby very early on we have what we call a section 54, which means that if there is a resolution by council to do a rezoning, they used progress with their system of rezoning and put it on public exhibition, get to the end of the

process and ask for more studies, and get communities debating and spending money on more studies. It would then end up on my desk or the Minister's desk after two years and \$100 million or \$100,000 and then there was a decision to be made and sometimes the decision was "How can we do it", type of thing. It is very difficult when you get that.

What we tend to do now is to go back and say to this panel, which is formed now of professional people including representatives from a local government—section 54, we go through them and we say, "Yes, we support this" and I sign the letter myself, or "No, I am not going to recommend it". There are different views. When we say, "No, that is the end of the road", they can appeal or they can go to the Minister and say this is a crazy decision and they can still progress the rezoning. There is legally nothing stopping that process from happening. All I am saying is that generally it is better to do that. There is, of course, as I said earlier on, a bit of a balance in doing that. We need to make sure that we are not leaving it as a value judgment for people to do certain things early because they are important things generally. That is our charge.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: I think I am correct in saying that the Opposition placed 98 questions on notice after the last hearing and that many, if not most of them, were not really specific to your department. They were in fact identical to the questions that were asked after the event in relation to most agencies of government. Finally, they were questions that in almost all cases the information could have been found in budget papers and annual reports of this year or of previous years. It was very interesting at the estimates committee on Monday morning when Vince Graham from RailCorp gave us a few statistics on the amount of public servants' time and the amount of papers and so on that were used with some of these more ludicrous sort of questions. Given the kind of innuendo we were hearing before, could you confirm that there were 98 questions, that they were after the event and that they were identical to questions asked of many of the government agencies?

Mr HADDAD: I would have to confirm that. I cannot remember the number of questions exactly. I do not have them. You could ask Peter about some of those more generic questions.

Mr LUCAS: I would agree with the supposition put. Whether there were 98 or not, I cannot remember the exact number. There were a large number and they appeared to be fairly generic questions which were put to us and they involved us in a fair amount of time in getting information.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: You did not answer them. So how much time could it have taken?

Mr LUCAS: They involved a fair amount of time in getting the information together—

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Where are the answers if you have put the information together?

Mr LUCAS: —and submitting them through a process.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Where are the answers if you have put the information together? If you spent all this time getting the information, where are the answers?

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Perhaps the witness could continue his answer. They appeared to be generic questions. The part that the Hon. Greg Pearce is carefully ignoring is that in almost all cases the information is available in this year's and previous year's budget papers and annual reports. In other words, it is a time-wasting, revenue-wasting and resource-wasting fishing expedition on the part of the Opposition.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Goodness gracious, the Opposition is asking questions. How extraordinary!

CHAIR: This is a budget estimates inquiry.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: That is the purpose of the inquiry.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Mr Lucas is still trying to finish his answer.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: He is trying to adopt your answer.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Perhaps you could give him a chance to finish answering the question.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: He has at least another 15 minutes to answer the question.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Madam Chair, perhaps you could ask the Hon. Greg Pearce to give Mr Lucas a chance to answer the question.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: If you had not taken up so much time with your carry-on earlier he could have had a lot more time to answer questions.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: You do not like anyone checking on what you have done.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: You do not like anyone checking on what accountability there is.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Madam Chair, are you going to let Mr Lucas answer the question or are you going to let the Hon. Greg Pearce continue to try to justify himself?

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: You are a joke.

Mr LUCAS: As I was saying, there were a large number of questions, which did generate a fair amount of work for us. They were put through a process and the answers that were generated back to the Committee were deemed to be appropriate answers at that time.

Mr HADDAD: As I said, I will clarify the situation. I am told there were 93 questions. Whether or not all of them, some of them or part of them were a whole-of-government process, I will find out all these details.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: To pick up the suggestion by the Hon. Jan Burnswoods, can you identify which of them are in the annual report?

Mr HADDAD: Sure.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Is the Hon. Greg Pearce in the Opposition question time or the Government question time?

CHAIR: The Government time for questions has expired.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Mr Haddad is still trying to answer my question. It should be my question, not a question by the Hon. Greg Pearce.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Your time is up.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: I know my time is up.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Your time is up. In fact, whatever happens at the next election your time is up.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: As we all know, because this point has been made over and over again, when the bell rings that finishes the time for questions. But Mr Haddad is able—

CHAIR: You do not have any more time.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: I am trying to seek whether Mr Haddad had finished his answer before he was so rudely interrupted.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: You should have listened.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: I was listening carefully but you interrupted.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: He clearly had finished his answer.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: I am still anxious to find out, as a matter of courtesy, whether Mr Haddad has finished his answer.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: You do not know how to spell "courtesy".

CHAIR: Mr Haddad, had you finished your answer?

Mr HADDAD: My answer was that my understanding is that there were 93 questions and some of them or all of them, I will have to get back to the Committee, were part of a whole-of-government process for a number of reasons. Others may be in annual reports. I will check the answers myself and I will clarify back to the Committee. If they were in the annual report or are going to be in the annual report or were part of the whole-of-government process, I will advise the Committee accordingly.

CHAIR: Some of the answers we have received were that the information was going to be in the annual report. So they were going to be done through your process anyway.

Mr HADDAD: Yes.

CHAIR: So there is no extra workload.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Why is the Hon. Greg Pearce complaining? If you say it is fine for the information to be in the annual report, what is the problem?

CHAIR: How do we know when the annual report will be tabled?

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: The pathetic thing is that you have run out of questions to ask. So all you can do is comb through 98 generic questions to fill in time so that you are not embarrassed when we get to 5.00 p.m. and you have run out of questions to ask. It is a very sad state of affairs we have in the New South Wales Opposition.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: You are a seriously sad state of affairs.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: The Opposition does not have enough questions because the crossbench is not here.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: We are waiting to get started again when the rabbit over there keeps her mouth shut for a moment.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: You really are desperate for questions. The bell rang about five minutes ago. So far all you can do is indulge in tic tac across the table. You have clearly run out of questions to ask.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Mr Haddad, I want to ask you about the new local environment plan [LEP] template. As at the last stage, no council had submitted an LEP under the new LEP template. I think the Wollongong one is in now.

Mr HADDAD: Yes, mostly. I do not think it is 100 per cent but the Wollongong one is, yes.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: That would be the first one?

Mr HADDAD: It is the first one. I think we have another one somewhere, but I cannot recall exactly. I would say the Wollongong one would be the first one.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: The standard instrument was gazetted in March. It is now November and we have only had one LEP using the standard. Why has it taken so long for councils to adopt the new LEP standard?

Mr HADDAD: We have been encouraging councils to do that. The aim is to have the comprehensive LEPs move into this in its entirety. Definitely the ones that are comprehensive, that is an area we will have to follow to the best of our ability. Where we have substantive, large areas we are trying also to do that. I think we have had additional ones, which I am happy to get back to you and document a bit more. The whole purpose was to have it as part of the comprehensive LEPs, which are coming online. That is what we are working on, that is what we are doing. We will have before the comprehensive ones some of the centres and also some that are less than centres.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Do you mean the identified growth centres?

Mr HADDAD: Yes, but also the cities, centres and other ones. For example, we may have one for Chatswood or Burwood. These will be in accordance with the standard ahead of the comprehensive one.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Do you know what the status is with the Ku-ring-gai LEP?

Mr HADDAD: To my advice, I think it is all moving on time. I met with the mayor, the deputy mayor and the planners this morning and they reported that they are progressing with their various LEPs and are on time.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: You met with them this morning. What has their process still to go through?

Mr HADDAD: I met with them this morning on the subject and they have reported progress. We have already certified one or two and they have another two or three to go through.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Is the one already certified the town centre?

Mr HADDAD: Yes, the town centre. That is going and they have another three. They are working on them and they are aiming at having them ready. Whether they have all gone on public exhibition before Christmas or shortly after, I know they are progressing them.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: My next question relates to the Port Botany expansion and the M5 East air filter. Have your views changed in relation to emissions from diesel locomotives for the freight expansion of Port Botany as a result of reconsidering the whole emissions issue?

Mr HADDAD: My apology, what was that?

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Earlier you advised that air emissions from freight trains associated with the expansion of Port Botany were assessed and determined to be within acceptable environmental and human health limits.

Mr HADDAD: That is from the trains?

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: Yes. Is that still your view? Is there any further work being done on that?

Mr HADDAD: There were air emissions from freight trains with the expansion of the port. They were assessed and determined within the limits. The advice I have got is that there are no plans to electrify the stage three freight network in the future on the basis that part of the assessment, and I remember very clearly, was referring to comparative data of emissions for towns or freight. I have not got the figures here. They indicate they were much less than relative. We got them from the Energy Information Administration of the United States Department of Energy, which basically came up with predicted figures. I am happy to make them available to answer more specifically the quantification of it. The advice was that they were relatively a lower contribution in terms of the numbers that would come up as a result of the expansion.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: What work is your department doing at the moment in relation to the Port Botany freight expansion? Are you doing anything?

Mr HADDAD: The port has been approved. We are working on and participating in the freight strategy.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: There is no specific work on the rail links for freight coming out of Port Botany?

Mr HADDAD: There may be, but certainly we are not doing anything ourselves in that context. It does not mean that there is not work being done by the Department of Transport or others or for that matter by the port authority. I know that we are still looking at meeting the target of 40 per cent that was published before as much as possible. In that context we are looking at the configuration of intermodal facilities throughout the State. This work is led by the Infrastructure Implementation Group of the Premier's Department, and we are contributing to that work.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: I take you back to the Breakfast Point development. How was the decision made that that development was State significant?

Mr HADDAD: It was made on the basis of a submission to the Minister, an examination of that submission by the department and a recommendation from the department to the Minister on the basis that the site is of significance.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: What are the elements of that significance, briefly?

Mr HADDAD: It is an urban renewal project. The area is historically a contaminated site, having all the gas activities of AGL there. It was on the basis that it was significant regionally and in terms of accommodating urban renewal objectives.

The Hon. GREG PEARCE: That is about the last of those groundfill sites?

Mr HADDAD: No, we have got opportunities. There are a number of areas that may come, but that was a major one.

The Hon. GREG DONNELLY: I asked a question earlier about the current progress on the BASIX initiative. I was interested in your response to my question about the community embracing an understanding that we need to go forward with these sorts of initiatives and that is something that will probably grow further into the future, that is, the acceptance that we need to have these sorts of things. If I recall correctly, you said even developers are apprehending this and are coming on board. Could you elaborate on that observation that developers through the building councils and other peak organisations are showing support for those sorts of initiatives?

Mr HADDAD: From my experience, even when we had BASIX, and that is the practical answer, we used to have a lot of arguments whether they come under I think SEPP 65, which dealt with all the energy issues or whether they put in a development application after or before BASIX. I am not really encountering any of this now. It is coming as part of the development. There is an acceptance and understanding. I am certainly not getting any outcry from the Property Council or any other organisations, even the developers, on this issue or associated with broader issues on interest rates, affordability or the rest of it.

People will still argue with us about contribution and levying and all the rest of it, but it is not a major issue high on the agenda of people. In fact, they actively go in there and see what other measures they can do almost naturally, so they come with it. That is my experience; that is our experience generally, and that is all what we can gauge from. Developers and others are very upfront when they come with things that they do not like or what the regulators want to argue, and this is certainly not high on our agenda in that regard.

The Hon. GREG DONNELLY: I suppose that some people would perceive that as having a green credential in putting that forward in terms of a competitive advantage, vis-à-vis they are competitors in the marketplace.

Mr HADDAD: Yes, it is. It is certainly something. As I was trying to say, it is something that inevitably will grow, whether we will need the level of intervention in the future. It is not going to be an area for the regulators to get very involved in. I think it will be an advantage to developers to do this sort of thing generally.

(The witnesses withdrew)

The Committee proceeded to deliberate.
