

GENERAL PURPOSE STANDING COMMITTEE NO. 1

Monday 24 October 2011

Examination of proposed expenditure for the portfolio area

PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee met at 3.45 p.m.

MEMBERS

The Hon. M. J. Pavey (Chair)

The Hon. J. A. Gardiner
The Hon. T. Khan
The Hon. P. Sharpe

Mr D. Shoebridge
The Hon. L. Voltz

PRESENT

The Hon Brad Hazzard, *Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, and Minister Assisting the Premier on Infrastructure NSW*

Department of Planning and Infrastructure
Mr Richard Pearson, *Acting Director General*

Hunter Development Corporation
Mr Bob Hawes, *General Manager*

Landcom
Mr Sean O'Toole, *Managing Director*

Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority
Mr Roy Wakelin-King, *Chief Executive Officer*

Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority
Mrs Egle Garrick, *General Manager*

Central Coast Regional Development Corporation
Mr Brett Phillips, *General Manager*

CORRECTIONS TO TRANSCRIPT OF COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

Corrections should be marked on a photocopy of the proof and forwarded to:

**Budget Estimates secretariat
Room 812
Parliament House
Macquarie Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000**

CHAIR: I declare open budget estimates inquiry 2011-12 into Planning and Infrastructure and welcome those in attendance. I particularly welcome Minister Hazzard and accompanying officials to this hearing. Today the Committee will examine the proposed expenditure for the portfolio of Planning and Infrastructure. Before we commence I will make some comments about procedural matters. In accordance with the Legislative Council 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, media representatives must take responsibility for what they publish or 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.

Any messages from attendees in the public gallery should be delivered through the Chamber and support staff or Committee clerks. I remind officers accompanying the Minister that they are free to pass notes and refer directly to their advisers while at the table. Transcripts of this hearing will be available on the web from tomorrow morning. The House has resolved that answers to questions on notice must be provided within 21 days. I remind everyone to turn off their mobile phones. All witnesses from departments, statutory bodies or corporate bodies will be sworn prior to giving evidence. Minister, I remind you that you do not need to be sworn as you have already sworn an oath to your office as a member of Parliament.

SEAN O'TOOLE, Managing Director, Landcom,

EGLE GARRICK, General Manager, Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority,

ROY WAKELIN-KING, Chief Executive Officer, Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority and Chief Executive Officer of Redfern-Waterloo Authority, and

BRETT PHILLIPS, General Manager, Central Coast Regional Development Corporation, sworn and examined, and

RICHARD PEARSON, Acting Director General, Department of Planning and Infrastructure, and

BOB HAWES, General Manager, Hunter Development Corporation, affirmed and examined:

CHAIR: I propose to commence with Opposition questions. The Government will forego its questions at this time to bring forward the finishing time of the budget estimates on a pro rata basis.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Do you have full confidence in the Director General of Planning?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I have complete confidence in the Director General of Planning. I think the first seven months of Government by the Liberal-Nationals parties have seen some major steps forward. The director general has been instrumental in ensuring that the policy initiatives, which guaranteed transparency and openness, a new way of doing business in the State in the planning regime, have been put into effect. He has ensured that his senior staff members have been actively involved in and have an understanding of the Government's agenda around transparency and integrity in the planning system and restoring community confidence in the planning system. Whilst I understand that under the former Government there was a high level of concern about planning outcomes and some of those—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Thank you, Minister; you have answered that part of the question in which I was interested.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I would like to finish, if you do not mind. I can finish, I think.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: We have a lot of questions and not a lot of time.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I have a lot of things to say when you ask a question.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I have asked a question and you have given me the answer that I require.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: Point of order: The Minister is entitled to answer the question as he chooses. Clearly he is being generally relevant and, whilst the Hon. Penny Sharpe might want to hustle along, he is entitled to answer his question in a reasonable and considered manner.

CHAIR: I think the Minister is entitled to answer the question as fulsomely as he would like, even though that may contradict what the Hon. Penny Sharpe would like in relation to quickness, but I encourage the Minister to finish his answer.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: As I was indicating, I think the agenda for the Government has been very well implemented and I think that Sam Haddad has shown the professionalism that would have been expected of any of our senior public servants in New South Wales. I also have to say that staff members, through the Department of Planning, have been equally effective in ensuring that the new Government's policies have been delivered. I think there was a general commitment right across the Department of Planning to engage more with the community than has ever been done before and to ensure that the sense of transparency, openness and integrity that the Government committed to bring into government is in fact delivered.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Your title states that you are the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure and also the Minister Assisting the Premier on Infrastructure. Can you outline to the Committee—

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: It is not just a title; I was sworn in under the Constitution.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I am pleased that that was the case. Can you outline what your responsibilities are versus those of the Premier in relation to infrastructure?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Yes. The issue of infrastructure across New South Wales was obviously largely ignored by the former Government. It would not matter what aspect of infrastructure we talk about—whether it is the delivery of substantial sectoral infrastructure or the sort of infrastructure that supports housing—as the former Government failed to address those issues. The Premier and I share equally certain duties in regard to infrastructure, although his primary role is such—as is always the case in any Westminster system—that the Premier can make final decisions in regard to all infrastructure matters. He and I have worked closely on a number of infrastructure initiatives, and I anticipate that that will continue. Certainly the delivery of infrastructure support, which is what the Government sees as being one of its major priorities in the delivery of housing to New South Wales, is critical.

Both the Premier and I are working on ensuring that infrastructure is broadly delivered across the board. You would be well aware in regard to the establishment of Infrastructure NSW that both the Premier and I were involved in that. Infrastructure NSW is probably the single biggest difference as to what has been done in the past in major infrastructure and what will be done in the future. Infrastructure NSW was designed around models that I saw operating in British Columbia, Ontario and the United Kingdom: Partnerships BC in British Columbia, Infrastructure Ontario in Ontario, and Partnerships UK in the United Kingdom. Of course, closer to home, as you may well be aware, I saw Partnerships Victoria. The infrastructure model is a hybrid of what I observed over the four years that I was in opposition.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Are you able to explain what you sign off on and what the Premier signs off on, or does the Premier sign off on everything?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: The Premier or I could possibly be signing off; it would depend on the issue.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That is what I am trying to ascertain. What aspects would you sign off on as opposed to the Premier?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: The issue of signing off is one that can be determined from time to time through Cabinet. Most major decisions are determined through Cabinet. Those are the issues that would be determined depending on the issue.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: How many policy advisers do you have in your office?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I have an enormous number of policy advisers compared with the former Government.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: How many?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I have one.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Does he or she do planning and infrastructure?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I have one most magnificent policy adviser who does everything, and he works very hard. I was tempted to get the same number that had worked under the former Government when it came to planning and a number of other portfolios, but in the end I determined that at this stage one was appropriate.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You announced last week that you have determined 124 projects since coming to office. There were over 300 left over through part 3A. Can you tell the community how you are dealing with the backlog of those with your one policy adviser?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: It was a very big challenge as to how we would deal with the leftovers, if you like, from the former Government's regime that had been in place for approximately six years. When we came into office I asked the Department of Planning to set out just how many there were—it was not clear from the public record how many there were. When the Department of Planning reported to me, it advised that there were

approximately 530 part 3A applications in the backlog. I must say I was a little surprised by that. Although I knew from the Opposition that there clearly were some proposals that did not seem to see the light of day—and I was hearing that they were part 3A applications—I was particularly surprised about some of them, for example, a development at Rhodes and another one at Coogee Bay Hotel. A number of developments had been signed off by the former Minister in effect incognito and there was no public disclosure of that.

Having asked the department to do that, the department went about doing exactly what the new Government had asked for—and it did it very well, astutely and fulsomely. The department gave us the list of 530. I looked at that list. I then asked the department for advice as to how we could fairly and reasonably deal with, if you like, the tail to which you have referred and how we could equitably and fairly implement and return a number of those to local government but without necessarily having an undue element of retrospectivity. What I was advised was that if we looked at breaking the total 530 effectively into two categories, that is, those that had had director general requirements issued and those that had failed to respond to the director general requirements through the implementation of the environmental assessment, that would be an appropriate division. When that was looked at from memory—that is seven months ago and an awful lot of work ago—I think there were 60 or 70 that were not progressed. Interestingly, some of them were quite recent but some were up to four years old that had not had any response from the proponent.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Would you be able to give the Committee a breakdown of those?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: They are publicly available.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: All of them?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: All of them. If that is not correct I would be surprised because I understood they all went onto the public record. Everything we have been doing has been going onto the public record, which is quite different from what happened before. About 60 or 70 applications went back to local government. However, when I say that they went back to local government they might not have.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That is what I am asking you.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I am sorry?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That is what I am getting at.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: If I could just explain it to you. Having reached that stage, what do we do with them? We could not tell them to go back to local government but what we could say to them was, "We are not going to process your application because we are drawing a line under yours." Those particular applications had the choice of going back to local government. At the time I indicated to the director general that the fair, equitable and open thing to do would be to say to each of those people that we would refund their application fees, and to my knowledge that was done. I am not sure how far we have got, but I can find that out for you, if you are particularly interested.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Thank you.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I think that is an important aspect and one that would interest me too. I want a chance to look at that. If those people wanted to make an application for their refund they would have got their refund. Then their choice was to go back to local government. The other remaining applications—about 460 roughly—are proceeding through the part 3A process but I indicate that there is one huge difference. One of the problems I had as the shadow Minister—I think the Opposition and the community generally had the same problem—was the fact that so many decisions were apparently made behind closed doors under the former Government and by the Minister. So I instructed the department to ensure that all those applications are now dealt with through the Planning Assessment Commission, which deals with the process at arms length. Therefore, the decision making is no longer behind closed doors.

One other thing I have done is to ensure that there is full transparency. Under the former Labor Government, the Department of Planning had a practice that I did not think was acceptable—I am sure most people would not think it was acceptable—that is, the planning report went to the Planning Assessment Commission for each application but would not be released until the Planning Assessment Commission made its decision. One of the other things I did, with full Cabinet approval and the rest of my colleagues on the

backbench, was to ensure that that transparency was absolute. Now, once the reports are completed by the Department of Planning, they go on the website. So if you are interested in any of those applications, you or the media can go onto the website and see from the moment they are done. From my recollection, that went live in the first week of August. It was certainly about that time.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Have you spoken to Nick Greiner and Paul Broad about the development of a 20-year infrastructure plan?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I have met with Paul Broad and Nick Greiner on a number of occasions. In fact, I attended the first board meeting, which was very impressive. They were in temporary premises at that stage. The boardroom was not very large; nevertheless the issues that were discussed with them were ranging across all aspects of what Infrastructure NSW should be doing, particularly in relation to the planning for infrastructure delivery. You would be aware that under the former Government an infrastructure plan was developed but the transport infrastructure plan was not developed as part and parcel of it. The net result was that when it came time to obtain funds from Infrastructure Australia, Infrastructure Australia and Sir Rod rejected the former Government's application.

It became obvious to the Coalition, the Liberal-Nationals in Opposition—certainly I am applying the same principles in government—that we should ensure there is an absolute focus on getting the infrastructure, but integrated with transport plans, ready. We have set that as one task for Infrastructure NSW. Certainly, it has 20-year plans and five-year specific infrastructure plans, and it is looking at some of those major issues. But making sure that the chief executive and the board, through the chairman of the board, are focused on that issue has certainly been a topic of discussion between me and them.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: There are assumptions for infrastructure that you have been involved in with Nick Greiner and Paul Broad in relation to implementation and funding. Is that based on the wholesale privatisation of electricity, including poles and wires?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I have had absolutely no discussions whatsoever—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: So there were no discussions about how infrastructure will be funded in New South Wales?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Their task is to plan for what New South Wales needs in all aspects of infrastructure. I have emphasised—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: They have been on the public record talking about privatisation.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: Point of order: The Minister is entitled to answer his question without being interrupted.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: He is handling himself.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: The Hon. Trevor Khan does not need to protect him. He is all right.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I thank The Greens and the Labor Party for their vote of confidence in the Minister. I appreciate that. One of the most important things about infrastructure in New South Wales, which was emphasised to me through my meetings—which, I might add, were all self-funded, in case you want to ask me about that, too—in Canada and the United Kingdom was to make sure that the bodies that pursue these activities are independent. When they make their decisions occasionally they will get it wrong, but they have to be fearless in making those decisions. One of the issues for us as a government will be that if and when they get the right decisions we will loudly acclaim them and if and when they get the odd wrong decision I would hope that we understand that such bodies do make mistakes from time to time.

I hope that the Opposition, The Greens and others in the community will understand that this is a principled approach, an effective approach to getting infrastructure plans and delivery of infrastructure but not one that is without possible fault or that will necessarily be perfect. There will be mistakes from time to time but having Paul Broad and Nick Greiner is an absolute plus. They are both very independent, strong-minded people and I think that is evidenced by some of the comments that have appeared in the press. There is certainly no

desire by the current Government to contain them. It is a case of, "Go away and do what you think you need to do and come back and tell us, and see how we can move the State forward as quickly as possible."

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: So you are telling the Committee that you have had no discussions with them about electricity privatisation and what could be used from the funds as a result of that?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I can tell you genuinely that I have had no discussions with either one of them about electricity privatisation. Why would I?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I have a question about the North West Rail Link. Will all the land acquisition for the North West Rail link be undertaken by the State Office of Strategic Lands?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Sorry, can you say that again?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Is Strategic Lands doing all the rest of the land acquisition for the North West Rail Link?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Yes. What about it?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: It is?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Yes.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Is it doing all of it? There are no other pieces?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I will just check. My initial reaction is that the Office of Strategic Lands is obviously pivotally involved in providing the necessary support and going through the negotiations. Recently I had some dealings with one of your Federal Labor colleagues, Gary Gray, who is a very good man.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: A south-west boy.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Yes. He was excellent and pivotal in getting the land that was former defence land down there in the south-west area—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: But in relation to the North West Rail Link, Strategic Lands will be dealing with all the land acquisition for that?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: It would be principally involved. I cannot think—I am happy to take that question on notice and let you know whether there is anybody else—but my understanding is that that would be principally the way in which it would be dealt with.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: If it is doing that are you able to provide the Committee with a list of the land to be acquired? Recently it was announced that 70 per cent of the land has yet to be acquired for the North West Rail Link. Are you able to provide us with a list of that land?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I can take that question on notice. The issue is that you would have to refer this to the Minister for Transport—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: She refers it back to the Office of Strategic Lands, so I am asking you.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: You have spoken to her already?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Yes.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: What did she say?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: She referred the issue of land acquisition back to the Office of Strategic Lands, which comes under your portfolio.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I will take that question on notice and try to get an answer for you.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Are you able to tell us which parcels of land were previously in public ownership prior to their acquisition?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I cannot tell you that now but I am happy to take that question on notice.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Can you indicate on that list of the land to be acquired which lands, if any, are still in public ownership?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I will try to find out exactly what you are asking and get some details for you. The detail of individual parcels, except when it becomes a problem, like the one that was occurring in the south-west, was not something with which I would normally deal. The office would be dealing with that at arms length.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I want to ask about the difference, under your new planning arrangements, between the way in which strategic State developments are being dealt with as opposed to strategic State infrastructure and the arms-length approach under development but the closer relationship with the Minister under infrastructure. How will those two different systems operate?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Sure. I do not mind answering that. It was an issue for us because we went from a system that, as I said, was part 3A, behind closed doors, lack of confidence, and the community felt that it was not being heard. The challenge for us was how to deal with that in the broad perspective but also to recognise that we had come to office with a philosophical position that we would try to ensure there was transparency and an arms-length process around as much development as possible.

We looked at a whole range of opportunities. The issue for us was the State significant developments, the substantial private development as opposed to government development, as opposed to the infrastructures necessary to support the State, logically could be dealt with through an arm's-length process involving the Planning Assessment Commission. That is effectively what we have done; I have delegated my authority to the Planning Assessment Commission for all State significant development. It is pretty cutting edge because most western democracies reserve a lot more power for planning Ministers to deal with these things, but the problem for us was that coming off the back of the last 16 years of the former Labor Government there was a stench if you like, there was a taint, around the planning processes. So in my wisdom—and I hope it is right—I decided we had to go that extra step and make sure it was even further at arm's-length on State significant development and I delegated to the Planning Assessment Commission.

I do have some reserve powers but I can only, under the current legislative arrangements, effectively exercise those if the Planning Assessment Commission recommends publicly that I do. I will not postulate because I am not quite sure where that might become necessary. Looking at the other side, the State significant infrastructure, if I can just put this as simply as possible, there is some infrastructure—railways, since we were talking about railways a minute ago—that requires for the taxpayer's good, the Minister to have the capacity to make some serious decisions about approval and moving forward as quickly as possible. A road that has to go through a number of different properties is critical to the economy of the State. Most western democracies reserve the power for the Minister to deal with that. So that is the only area that I could foresee that I would be actively involved.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Rail projects?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: No, the examples I gave—rail, road, and what have you.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Minister, how many State significant infrastructure developments are currently awaiting your determination at the moment?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: None have come to me yet for my approval under the new system, unless they are under one of my piles of correspondence or briefings. You are very lucky—you are in the best position—do not be a Minister because it is every day.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: No immediate danger.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: No immediate danger, that is probably right. I have just been handed a piece of paper which tells me—but I do not think I have seen any of them so I will double check that with the secretary—approximately 310 projects which are currently under assessment will be dealt with as transitional part 3A or transitional State significant infrastructure projects. I have asked my esteemed acting director general to clarify it for you, so you get the good oil.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: This is from the 460 or so in the tail, so there is a proportion of those. Are the infrastructure ones of those going to be determined by the Minister or by the Planning Assessment Commission?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: If they are under the old system they will be dealt with by the Planning Assessment Commission. I am talking about the new proposals for State significant infrastructure under the new legislation. Only new applications for State significant infrastructure will be dealt with by me—that is for roads and rail and so on—but I still have the option to take advice from the Planning Assessment Commission, if I think that is necessary as well.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Mr Pearson, is that your understanding, that all of those ones in the tail will be determined by the Planning Assessment Commission?

Mr PEARSON: Well, in the tail includes both infrastructure projects and private sector development projects and, as the Minister has outlined and I think the question reflected, the vast majority of development projects will be determined by the Planning Assessment Commission, but the infrastructure projects, the North West Rail Link and those kinds of things, will be determined by the Minister.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Can you tell us which ones are going to be dealt with by the Minister?

Mr PEARSON: We will have to give you a list.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: We will take that on notice and I will get a list for you.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: So there will be some from that tail that will come to the Minister?

Mr PEARSON: Of the infrastructure projects?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: The infrastructure projects.

Mr PEARSON: Of government infrastructure projects; not private sector infrastructure projects.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: We will take it on board and we will give you a list.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: So of the part 3A tail, the 550-odd projects that were in the pipeline before the election, approximately 85 per cent to 90 per cent are continuing through the part 3A process?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Except for the 60 or 70 that were taken out. They may or may not proceed. I do not know what they are going to do.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Are there any applications that reached the cut off and had no director general requirements issued and which are still being retained by the department for the purpose of looking effectively at the rezoning or land use elements of a part 3A application?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I am sorry, I do not understand your question.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: There are some initial determinations under the part 3A, and I will give one example of a Landcom development at Forster-Tuncurry which I was advised that, although no director general requirements were issued, it was being retained by the department for an initial determination as to land use. Is that true or have they all been referred?

r

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: My understanding—but I will take that on notice too—is that they have all been referred to the Planning Assessment Commission. Even if it involves a rezoning it will still go to the Planning Assessment Commission for advice on the rezoning aspect as well.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Is that the understanding of Mr O'Toole?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Mr O'Toole is not involved in this particular project. Sorry are you saying the Landcom project?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: The Landcom project.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: He would not necessarily know that because that is an issue for the planning department as opposed to Landcom.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: I just might ask him—it is his application—it is the department's application.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I have a note here which is the one you are asking about.. I am happy to read it to you because it is the detail: The notes states:

On 28 February 2011 the former Minister agreed to consider North Tuncurry as a potential State significant site and the potential for it to be rezoned for environmental conservation, residential, commercial or recreational use. The site is identified for urban development in the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031 and its development is important in meeting the region's housing targets. Great Lakes Council has indicated they are supportive of appropriate urban development within this site and for the department to be involved in this process. Landcom is currently preparing studies to address the proposal. Once this material has been submitted to the department it will be reviewed before any decision is made to exhibit a draft plan for the site.

Does that help?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: That is an example, as I understand it—correct me if I am wrong—of matters where no director general requirements have been issued but it is still being retained by the department for the purposes of determining change in land use.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: My understanding—and if I am wrong I will ask one of the senior officers here to tell me—is this is one that I do not recollect seeing in the part 3A list. I assume if you are asking that question, you have probably looked at the part 3A list but I do not think it is on the part 3A list. I think it is a local government issue being dealt with through the normal rezoning processes with Landcom working with the council.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Perhaps Minister, if it is not clear from that—

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Can I indicate there is another note here that says:

The former Minister had formed the opinion that the proposal—

Which I think is the issue you are looking for—

is a development to which Part 3A of the EP and A Act applies and endorsed the submission of the concept plan. In accordance with the repeal of Part 3A the Minister's opinion in this regard has been revoked.

So it has gone back to local government, in other words.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: For abundant clarity, can you confirm on notice that that is no longer being assessed by the department?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: There are a million and one issues in planning and they are all over the State. I could be wrong but I do not think I am. I will ask the acting director general to clarify what his understanding is.

Mr PEARSON: I will just clarify, it is not a part 3A project. That was revoked, as the Minister indicated. But it is being considered in the State's significant site rezoning category as a rezoning, not as a development application, and in consultation with the Great Lakes Council. So it is not a development application; it is a rezoning process that we are working through with the council.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Thank you for that clarity, Mr Pearson. How many applications that were previously under the part 3A system have been retained by the Department for the State significant site rezoning determination? You could answer that now, or on notice.

Mr PEARSON: We will have to take it on notice, yes.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Are you aware of any others?

Mr PEARSON: I would not think that there are many, but we will take that on notice.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Given the large increase in volumes—

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Can I say to you, David, if there are any questions like that you have at any stage, you do not need an estimates committee to ask them. Just write to me or the department. I am happy to give you all that information. One of the issues for us is that we are—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: I did.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I am sorry?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: I did.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Where did you write to?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: I sought to have a meeting, through your office, with Landcom about these and other matters.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: When did you do that?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: A couple of months ago and I did not have any success.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: You would have had one of my office staff talk to you about that.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Yes. I do not have the correspondence here, but I did.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: There was a staff response from my office?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: My correspondence was noted. You received my correspondence.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I would hope it was more than that because can I tell you that one of the issues for me—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: But I am grateful to hear that that is the case.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Just let me explain this to you. One of the issues for me is that my staff know, and some of them are sitting behind me here, there is a clear direction from me that if there is any request from any member of Parliament—for that matter, any member of Parliament irrespective of political background—you will have fulsome answers. So I am a bit surprised if you did not get the answers you needed.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: That is okay. Perhaps I recommend that you get another adviser, Minister.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: No, no. He is excellent, thank you very much. Probably you were rung by Lee Dixon, who is even more excellent.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: That is right.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: But she is in liaison.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Given the large increase in matters that are going to the Planning Assessment Commission, what is the additional resourcing that you have provided for the commission?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: That is a good question. You are probably aware that the Planning Assessment Commission has been operating on a part-time basis with a number of commissioners that were there under the former Labor Government. Those people have continued in those positions, but I have also added a number of others to assist. I am told I have met—and you are welcome to meet her, by the way; I am happy to facilitate any time you want to have a discussion—the chairperson, Gabrielle Kibble. We have added resources to the Planning Assessment Commission through capacity to employ additional part-time commission members. I am looking at the moment at whether it would be sensible to embark on having at least a couple of full-time members. There are budgetary issues around that, but I anticipate that that may make some sense as the number of matters proceeds or increases and it becomes more and more the avenue through which they are being dealt with—through the Planning Assessment Commission.

In fact, there was a modest increase—I will get you the figure because I cannot remember the amount—in the budget to allow for the Planning Assessment Commission to increase its resources. We have actually done quite well in that sense. I will add that I can answer you specifically. The Planning Assessment Commission base costs were \$2.92 million anticipated, and the additional figures that have come through under the new Government to shore up the activities of the Planning Assessment Commission are another \$2.53 million, so it is quite substantial in the operational sense because it is almost double.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: In terms of the tenure of those appointees, what is the length of the term of appointments that have been made?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I am trying to remember. The new ones I think have been made for a couple of years but the older ones, some of the ones who were there under the Labor Government, I think are coming up in the next month or two.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Is the remuneration for Planning Assessment Commission members based upon the time they use in assessing matters, or is it a flat remuneration per annum?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Again, this is all publicly available information, but the figure for the chairperson is a fixed amount. That is what was operating under the former Labor Government, and nothing has changed on that front. The other figures are sitting, for when they are actually focused on the task.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Who determines the allocation of Planning Assessment Commission members to particular applications?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: It is all done through the chairperson, Gabrielle Kibble. I might add that there is absolutely no discussion. I suspect—no, I will not suspect what happened under the former Government. There is absolutely nothing, no involvement by me or by anybody else, in terms of that process. It is all done, as one would expect, at arm's length. She makes those decisions.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: There is no communication at all between your office and any member of the Planning Assessment Commission?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Zilch.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Or the chair about the allocation?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Zilch—absolutely zilch. Let me tell you as a lawyer—I think you are a lawyer as well—I understand the need for arm's length process; absolutely transparent, honest, and open arm's length process. While I do not mean the system, the Planning Assessment Commission, to replicate all aspects of the Land and Environment Court—and that certainly, I am sure, was not Frank Sartor's intention either when he put it in place in 2008—there are critical aspects to it that would give the community certainty, and some of those are around being at arm's length from the Minister, positively.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Are there criteria that the chairperson uses in the allocation of membership of the Planning Assessment Commission that you are aware of?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: There has been no direction from me but she did on one occasion indicate to me that she tries to make sure that people with appropriate expertise are appointed to appropriate hearings.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Moving to another track, what are the current targets that your Government has adopted for greenfield and infill residential development in Sydney?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Absolute figures?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Both absolute figures and proportional figures in terms of new residential lots.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: The targets in terms of greenfields rezoned lots is that we are aiming to make sure that at any one time there is a minimum of 50,000 lots available. I think at the moment it is more like about 70,000 or 80,000, but that is the target we have set ourselves, and that is certainly important. I think there has been a bit of preoccupation among some—I am sure it would not be you, David, but among some—about precise percentages. But in reality I was out at Rouse Hill on the weekend and I launched area 20 as a rezoning proposal. That is another 2,500 blocks. The Premier and I did Marsden Park and Catherine Field in June or July, and that was another 10,000 in one and approximately 3,000 in the other. We are aiming to try to bring on quite a number of new rezoned blocks.

It is interesting because some people challenged whether you should have those in a greenfield area. You may or may not have that view. But the reality is that people have voted with their feet. Sydney's growth over the past 10 years has been around 12.4 per cent, but in the north-west it has been approximately 14.2 per cent. So people are voting with their feet. When land becomes available out there, people want to live out there. They are moving out there because it is actually a fantastic and exciting place to be. I do not know how often you get out there, but if you get out there you will see that there is a real vibe in the north-west of Sydney and people want to live there. The issue then becomes how much formally should there be in terms of precise percentages. I think those figures are figures that we should not get too preoccupied with. The reality is that there will be obviously an ongoing need for what we know as infill development and also greenfield development. As long as we as a Government, hopefully supported by Parliament broadly, are bringing greenfield land to the market in Sydney, we will find the demand is there. Of course you would have seen the recent reports that have come out indicating a massive demand in Sydney.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: My question was a little preoccupied with percentages. What is the percentage?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: We did not actually mention it.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: That is why I asked: What is the percentage?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I was purely supposing or hoping you would not.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: That does not—

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Such cynicism.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: It is appropriate now. What are the current targets though, percentage-wise, for greenfield and infill development in Sydney?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: You would know that the Metro Strategy formerly talked about a 70:30 strategy. As the Minister for Planning, I am not so preoccupied with that. I think we need, as the Premier has said on a number of occasions, to look at encouraging more developments into the greenfield areas of Sydney because that is where the market is. As I said, it is 14.2 per cent versus 12.4 per cent growth for Sydney. At this point, the strategy is to encourage development more broadly. I can add for you that the former Government—and I am sure your colleagues to your right will remember this—had a precinct acceleration in protocol that the former Labor Government introduced whereby they were opposing substantially more development in the north-west and the south-west growth sectors.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Minister, it is a fairly simple question that I have asked.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I thought I was answering it pretty well, actually.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: You have answered what the previous Metro Strategy was at 70:30. I am asking what your current Government's percentages are.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: As I said, I do not think you should become so preoccupied with that.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: But I am, and I would like the answer. What are the current percentages?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I do not think that is something that we need to engage as much.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: With all due respect, it is a question I have put to you—

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: As a lawyer I know, with all due respect, that you do not mean that though.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: With respect, I do. What are the current percentages for that? It is a fairly simple question with a simple answer.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: No, it is quite a complex issue, and one that reflects on the policy that the Government is developing in ensuring that there is adequate release of greenfield land. We are working towards that. You are aware that the Premier has asked Landcom to ensure that an extra 10,000 blocks come onto the market. That is obviously going to be in greenfield sites. We are looking to engage with the marketplace in terms of the total percentages. But I can indicate that I do not think the old 70:30 was necessarily the right mix. There has to be a much more energetic focus on where people want to live, which is the greenfield area as well. Some people want to live in the inner city, some in the eastern suburbs—I think where you live, David, but I guess you might be closer to that mark. I think a lot of people want to live in the greenfield areas, and as a Government we are going to make sure that there are plenty of opportunities for them. Do you have some opposition to people being able to live in the greenfields, do you?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: I do know where I live. The question was very simple: What are the current percentages and the proportions for your Government, of which you are the planning Minister, about infill and greenfill development.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I have indicated to you that we are a little more flexible. We are not going to become preoccupied with that. Even if The Greens and the Labor Party want to play those games, we are not preoccupied with that. We are preoccupied with making sure that there is adequate housing supply in Sydney, and indeed more broadly in the regions. Because there are a lot more folks who want to look at alternative opportunities and we are trying to engage with them to make sure that there are housing opportunities in our regional areas as well.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Will you be developing policy that looks at the appropriate split between greenfield and infill development?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: You really are a bit preoccupied with having a precise percentage, are you not?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: No, I am interested in getting a responsive answer about the Government's policy position on a key planning development for Sydney—the Government's view on the appropriate mix between greenfield and infill development.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I think you heard the Premier, and he is on the record as saying prior to the election, that it should be substantially more in terms of the greenfield.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Fifty:fifty.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I think that is right. I would add that the former Government got very preoccupied with formulas. It also got very preoccupied with the north-west and south-west growth centres. It put lines on maps and determined that they should be the areas where development would occur, even if in places like north Kellyville or Leppington there was fragmented land ownership and it really was not going to

happen. I have indicated to the community more broadly and to the department that Sydney needs land. We need rezoned land as quickly as possible and if there is anybody who has more than 100 hectares of land, within a reasonable cooee of trunk infrastructure—roads, sewerage, water and so on—then they should be talking to the Government about the possibility, even it is outside the lines on maps that were drawn by the Labor Party. I think that indicates to you pretty clearly that the new Government is absolutely committed to ensuring there are more opportunities for growth and greenfield sites, and that is the direction we are heading in. I would say that if somebody wants to appropriately have infill development, we are supportive of them too—as long as it fits within probity and guidelines, come and talk to us.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Do you endorse the Premier's call before the election for a 50:50 allocation between greenfield and infill development?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: As you probably observed, the Premier is always right. I am working towards making sure—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Do you endorse it or has the Government moved away from that?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I endorse everything the Premier says, but I am saying to you, at a practical level, as at today we are busy trying to encourage as many people as possible to bring their land to market in greenfield areas provided it is—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: There is no overall strategy; it is just anywhere?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: No, you missed what I said.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Anywhere with 100 hectares or more?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Was that the only criterion?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Is it just anywhere with 100 hectares?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Did you miss what I said? I will repeat it. If it is more than 100 hectares and it is within reasonable distance—in other words, it is going to be minimal expense to taxpayers because it is already close to the trunk infrastructure, such as water, sewerage, roads—we are very interested in talking to people. Although, as I have said, I have asked the Department of Planning to develop—in concert with the Independent Commission Against Corruption, as we do most with of these things—the appropriate probity guidelines to make sure that such proposals are dealt with appropriately.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: Minister, are you resolving from the policy that your Government took to the election of 50:50 for infill and greenfill?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Resolving or resiling?

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: Resiling.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I was trying to resolve the issue with Mr David Shoebridge but I have indicated what I have indicated and I do not think I need to pursue that any further.

The Hon. JENNIFER GARDINER: That is resolved then.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I think it is resolved.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Do not resile from it.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: So you are not committing to 50:50, which was the policy that your Government took to the election?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: No, I have indicated that I support the Premier's position but that your preoccupation, and that of your colleague from The Greens, with precise figures is really not particularly helpful.

The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ: So if it turned out to be 70:30 you would have no problem with that?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Let me say to you that the preoccupation of your political party that ruled this State for 16 years resulted in the lowest housing starts for 50 years. Excuse me for not getting on board with any of your particular planning proposals or ideological positions. I am going to make sure that practically we deliver the housing that people want.

The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ: What is the current figure for housing approvals?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: It is the lowest it has been in 50 years.

The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ: At the moment it is the lowest it has been in 50 years?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Actually, the good news is that under the new Government the August figures saw an improvement, as it is the highest it has been for years. One can only think that is because of the new Government, of course.

The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ: Where were those sites?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Take all the credit but none of the blame.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: It is a bit hard to take the blame when I was not in Government for 16 years.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Minister, you talked about probity in your responses today.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I would like to answer your question fulsomely. I do not mind if you want to move on. If you do not want to hear the answer I am happy too—whatever you want.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Will you provide the answer to us on notice?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I am happy to do that. I will take it on notice and give it to you—whatever you want. We are here to help.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I appreciate that. Minister, you talked a lot about probity in relation to planning. As planning Minister, what advice have you taken or sought in relation to managing conflicts of interest in the whole planning system?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: At the outset, that was probably one of my biggest concerns. I sat down with my new staff in my ministerial office and said to them that I wanted to make sure that our office was nothing like any of the offices of the former Labor Ministers and that probity, transparency and integrity were critical to everything we did. I put in place immediately some interim steps in that regard. But we also then worked with the Department of Planning. In fact, at that time all my staff, with the exception of maybe one or two new ones who have come on board since, went to the Department of Planning and had guidance from an officer from the Audit Office, as I recollect, who had at her fingertips the details of what was recommended by the Independent Commission Against Corruption and the Audit Office.

I then made some decisions, one of which was that absolutely everybody who contacts our office and asks for a meeting to discuss any issue is told that they have to put it in writing and they do put it in writing. They have to indicate whether there is a registered lobbyist coming to the meeting, or the person who has rung and purports to be a lobbyist has to declare that they are or are not a lobbyist. They also have to provide on that sheet a skeletal outline, a summary, of the issues that they wish to discuss. All meetings then take place in the presence of one of my staff and departmental staff. We have ensured that we have done more than I think any government has ever done—or will ever need to do in the future—because it is the highest possible platform of integrity and openness that you could ever have. The department has been doing similar things. The Department of Planning has recently been acknowledged as a role model in terms of being able to deal with these things with integrity and for the processes that it has adopted. All in all, the Hon. Penny Sharpe can be assured things have changed since 26 March and it is very good now.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: It is good to see the department winning awards for work that I am sure it was doing long before March 2011.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: The Registered Lobbyist Contact Protocol won an award for innovation in enterprise risk management from the Public Risk Management Association in September 2011. I am sure you hang out every day waiting to hear from that association. I assure the member that the departmental staff, who are extremely professional and capable, are very proud of having achieved that. I do not think too much of that came from the former Government.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Thank you, Minister. Please pass on my congratulations.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I would hope so.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: How then do you justify writing to a local planning panel asking it to reject a proposal for 72 units?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I have only done that once. Do you know which one you are talking about?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Is there more than one? I am aware of only one.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Do you know which one it is?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Yes.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Do you know it is in my electorate?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Yes.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: As the local member of Parliament—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Do you think that as Minister for Planning, even though you put it on a different letterhead, it is reasonable for you to write to a local planning panel and urge it to reject a development?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Again, I exercised all the deductive thought processes that I hope you are hearing I apply to these issues. I did not do it lightly or without considered advice. I did it with departmental advice in the sense that it was appropriate for me as the local member of Parliament to make my residents' concerns known. I do have those concerns because I think that this development came off one of those other wonderful legacies—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: It is extraordinary that you do not have a handle—

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: It is interesting that the member uses the word "extraordinary". She should talk about what the former Government did with the affordable housing State environment planning policy. The application was lodged under that State environment planning policy before this Government made changes to implement a local character test. At the moment there are two houses and one old shed on the site. The development application was for 79 residences, but I think the latest figure is 72.

Residents were entirely justified in expressing their concern. The proposed development is 200 metres from Forestville Public School and children walk up and down the street. The traffic volume would increase dramatically as a result of this intensive development, which was afforded to this particular developer in the infinite wisdom of the former Labor Government. I took advice and it was that I am not in fact the consent authority and will not be the consent authority because it goes to the independent joint regional planning panel. Therefore, there is no conflict of interest whatsoever in my expressing my view on that issue.

Having said that, if there were an avenue of appeal, as a lawyer I would take the view that I could not say anything; it would have been problematic. However, there is no appeal to me; it does not come to me. I am sure the honourable member knows that the appeal goes to the Land and Environment Court, not me. I strongly support the residents and if the honourable member does not that does not surprise me. The Labor Party set these people up for a fall by implementing the affordable housing State environment planning policy but then

did not back the residents. It is not prepared to give those parents the assurance that their children will be safe by guaranteeing appropriate development on that site. I am bitterly disappointed that the Labor Party would take that view.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: How many full-time officers are employed in your office?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I have 10 officers.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: Are any of them departmental officers?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Three and a half.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: Are they included in the 10?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I think so. In other words, we are running the ministerial office with about seven or eight staff.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: And three and a half are from the department?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Yes.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: How many liaison officers do you have in the department?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: None.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: How many development applications are in the system awaiting processing after the announcement about the six-month lag in the transitional arrangements?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: They would not be held up because they would not have been lodged. Are you talking about—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I am talking about the transitional arrangements. How many development applications—

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Are you talking about the old part 3As?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: The transitional part 3As.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Yes.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Not the new system?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Yes.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: According to the department, 310.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: In dollar terms, how much does that represent?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I have no idea.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Can you take that question on notice?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Yes. There should be some; there would have to be because there would be a figure on the application lodged under the former Government, to which you were a most wonderful contributor. They had to have a certain figure before they got into the part 3A system. I think I can probably work that out. I am glad you are interested, because many of them were there for up to four years under your Government. We have had only about seven months in government—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I look forward to getting the information.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: If you want to highlight just how bad your Government was I am very happy to assist.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: How will State-significant infrastructure projects that may or may not involve public-private partnerships be dealt with? Will they be dealt with by the Planning Assessment Commission or by you?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: If it is a private development—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: No, combined. I am talking about public-private partnerships for any public infrastructure. How will the planning and development be managed?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: That is part of what we talked about earlier in terms of the difference between State-significant development and State-significant infrastructure. Where it is a combined public-private partnership it is likely that it will still be dealt with under the State-significant development process. However, it will go to the Planning Assessment Commission in any case.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: And the commission will refer it to you.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: It will make a recommendation.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Are you guaranteeing that all of them will go to the commission?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: If it is principally a private development, it will go to the—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: No. Many of your colleagues are talking about the delivery of infrastructure being based on public-private partnerships. I want to understand how they will be assessed under the two-track system.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I will provide a written answer so that you understand what is happening.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That would be great. Will health infrastructure be dealt with by Infrastructure NSW or will NSW Health bypass you and the Premier?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Health infrastructure could be dealt with separately.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: In what situation would it be dealt with separately?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I do not want to postulate about that at this point because we are breaking new ground. It is an interesting issue. One of the concepts underpinning Infrastructure NSW—which, as I said earlier, has worked amazingly well in Partnerships BC in British Columbia, Infrastructure Ontario in Ontario, the former Partnerships UK and certainly Partnerships Victoria—is that if you have a major infrastructure project in, for example, the health area, the teams that traditionally work in that department can, depending on the arrangements with the infrastructure body, continue to operate by themselves. On the other hand, the infrastructure team could operate for one, two or three years within Infrastructure NSW. In effect, they are working inside Infrastructure NSW.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Is that likely to happen with Health?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: None of that has been resolved at this stage. It would be on a project-by-project basis. That is how it has worked overseas. There is fantastic value in it, as I understand it. One of the big problems in Government, as you would be well aware having been in government, is the silo mentality of some agencies—good people individually, but not necessarily all about working with other agencies—and in infrastructure delivery it is critical that there be a cross-agency delivery. What was put to me in each of my close looks at these issues overseas was that you can start to break down that silo mentality and get very good expertise that sits within an individual department to work through the vehicle of an organisation such as Infrastructure New South Wales. The expertise is accumulated within the infrastructure body and the reciprocity between the two means that the individuals who have come out of a particular agency will at some stage go back into their own agency, but they will have a different view on life. They will see themselves as part of a broader delivery of government role and they can apply what they have learned in the infrastructure body to their own

agency. Equally, the expertise they brought to the infrastructure body can then be transferred to the next project. If you are delivering a hospital it is a little different from delivering a train line or a road but there are some critical commonalities. What I am hoping to see as the infrastructure Minister is that those levels of expertise will come out of the structure, but I cannot give you any indication at this point specifically on an individual project.

The project in Western Australia, which you are probably familiar with—the delivery of a new hospital over there—has been an absolute case study in very effective delivery of infrastructure, but that is around some changes within the subsets of the public private partnerships and how they deliver. All those things—procurement models and so on—have to be developed within an organisation like Infrastructure NSW. We are doing well. Within the first seven months of government we had the organisation up and running and starting to work, and making public statements about the priorities for the State. To get to that level that you are referring to I think is a little bit pre-emptive.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That leads to my next question. We have existing part 3As, state-significant infrastructure and state-significant development, and we now have other infrastructure from agencies such as Health. How are you going to resolve that with Infrastructure NSW plans and which will take priority? Could those that are in train end up at the back of the queue?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: What I was just saying was that I expect far more integration across the board. One of the problems that we saw, again observing your Government, and which Infrastructure Australia highlighted in its refusal to give us any money for any infrastructure when the Labor Party was in government, was the lack of an integrated plan structure, so we are very cognisant of that.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I take it that when the Infrastructure NSW plan comes out it will be the plan that you stick to in relation to any of those side issues? They may or may not be included on the way through and, once the plan is out, it is going to be fully integrated and that will be the plan that we are working from?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Infrastructure NSW will work with the Department of Planning and Infrastructure, the Department of Transport and other agencies to make sure that there is full integration.

The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ: Are any of your agencies undergoing restructure?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Yes.

The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ: Can you elucidate on that?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Sure. I do not know if it has come to the upper House yet, but it is in the public arena because it has gone through the lower House—the Redfern-Waterloo Authority is about to be disbanded. The activities of the Redfern-Waterloo Authority will be rolled into those of the Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority [SMDA]. Whether it is social welfare or social programs, or whether it is infrastructure-related matters, they will be dealt with through the Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority and, to my recollection, the legislation passed through the Legislative Assembly last week. Has it passed through the upper House?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: No.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: You will be dealing with it in the next parliamentary sitting.

The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ: And that is the only agency undergoing restructure?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: The only one that I am aware of, unless there is something else happening that I do not know about. Has anything happened that I do not know about?

Mr PEARSON: Not unless I do not know about it.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: What steps has your Government taken to amend BASIX to pick up the Council of Australian Governments [COAG] agreement to ensure that there is six-star energy efficiency for buildings as measured under the Nationwide Home Energy Rating Scheme [NatHERS]?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I am aware of the COAG recommendation.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Which was to be implemented prior to now.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I am aware of that, and the BASIX implementation I think has been broadly a plus for the environment and for conservation generally. There have been some arguments about the effectiveness of some aspects of it. The Council of Australian Governments at some time in the last 12 or 18 months made the recommendation that we move to six stars effectively. I think the issue there is that the former Labor Government made no efforts on that front. The reason is possibly the cost-benefit issues and I am looking at those issues at the moment. We have done an awful lot, as you probably appreciate, in the first seven months, but I have not had time to move fulsomely and quickly on the BASIX issues—but I am aware of them.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Do you commit to living up to that Council of Australian Governments agreement to get the six-star energy efficiency through BASIX?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I think it is like most things that involve the critical environmental matters that we are all working towards. It has to be done in a realistic context. It has to be done in the context of the sorts of issues that one would expect.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Western Australia has managed to implement it with no change in their approval or impact upon residential development. I am just asking if this Government will commit to the key environmental outcome of having six stars?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: One of the critical issues for us is to make sure there is a far more integrated approach on all of the planning issues with the Federal people. They have taken much more of an interest in recent years, particularly in our cities in terms of planning and development, and there is nothing that I would do that would discourage that interest. I would certainly be working with them to try—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: This was a COAG agreement, not just Federal. It was a Federal and State unanimous agreement to implement it. Are you going to commit to that agreement?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I am certainly happy to work with them to try to achieve those outcomes. I see no reason why we would not try to achieve it. In fact, I am keen to achieve it, but I am also keen to get the time to look at some of the details, which in the first seven months I have not had a chance to do.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Minister, or perhaps Mr Hawes, in relation to the Newcastle railway line and Hunter Development Corporation's attitude towards the redevelopment of the Newcastle railway line—

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I can answer that.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Well—

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: My job is Minister and I get to choose. The Hunter Development Corporation has put its views out in a publicly available document and it has some views on a range of issues, including the railway. I assume you were talking about the line running right into the heart of Newcastle?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Correct, through Civic and into Newcastle.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Yes. I did not make this point at the outset, but I am sure you would appreciate—or actually you might not because you have only been here since September, but perhaps the Labor Party people might. Under the former Government each of the agencies here was not sworn in. I have done that to have them here if it is absolutely critical but—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: And I was asking Mr Hawes the question.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Let me finish, thank you. My job as Minister is still to answer the questions. If I need to I can make reference to them, but I say to you that the fact they are here is entirely different from the situation with the former Government.

The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ: That is not true at all.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: The Hunter Development Corporation made it clear that they had a particular position in terms of the—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Resumption of the railway?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: In terms of the resumption?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: The termination of the railway line at Wickham.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: That is a different issue from resumption. Please do not confuse it. They had a particular position. The Government—and the Premier has made this point on a number of occasions—is keen to ensure that the local community has an input on these decisions. I had people come to see me at various stages when in opposition who indicated that they felt the city of Newcastle was being effectively divided by that railway line. The southern side of the railway line is obviously very problematic—not a lot of development has gone on there in recent years—but the northern side, particularly through the magnificent work that has been done around the riverfront, is excellent. The Hunter Development Corporation has, through its reports, made a recommendation as to what it thinks. The Government's view, and my view, is that at this point in time we have a lot more consulting to do and there are a lot more discussions to be had with the local community as to what they have to say about it.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: So you do not endorse the Hunter Development Corporation's model for the railway line?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I just said we have a lot more consultation to do.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: What is the process or structure that you will put in place to consult with the people of New South Wales about that key issue for the future of the city of Newcastle?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: The issue is certainly on my mind in terms of the processes—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: But how will the people of Newcastle have a chance to change your mind or persuade you in relation to that key issue for the future of the city?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Consultation has been taking place through local members of Parliament and local community members, and when I was in opposition I had people come and see me about that issue. But right now it is in the hands of the local community to make some clear recommendations to the Government. If you have any further discussions I think you should direct them to the Minister for Transport. When is the estimates hearing for the Minister for Transport?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Tomorrow.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I think that is a more appropriate avenue for you.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Are you aware of any plans to change the prioritisation of coal freight trains and passenger trains on the Newcastle suburban network, which deal with development approvals that are done through your department?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: There has to be some delineation here, and I think that is a matter for you to talk to Gladys Berejiklian about.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Given the widespread concerns about the development of the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy—which I think you shared at the time—what is your proposal for the review of the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy and when will it be completed?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: As you would be aware, the priority for the Government, initially anyway, was to get the State Plan updated. There were also the various regional strategies, including the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy, which does need, and is undergoing, a review. There have also been some major issues just in the past few weeks that you would be very aware of. Obviously, the court decisions around Huntley-

Sweetwater have potentially had a major impact on that. I know that the planning department is working on the review but I do not know the timeframe on it. I am happy to take that question on notice and come back to you as to what the timeframe might be. I will talk to the various officers involved and come back to you.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Will you abide by the determinations of the courts if the courts determine to set aside the Huntley-Sweetwater development applications and not make a legislative intervention or regulatory intervention?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: My natural instinct is to abide by the court proceedings but I would like to look at each individual issue on its merits and consider it. But I think there are some serious issues around the Huntley issue, which you and I are probably in heated agreement on. I was a little confused when in opposition, and I remain confused in government, as to how the former Government managed to bring it up from about No. 90 something on the list—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: No. 99.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: —to the top of the list. It is an issue that I think you and I would be in blinding agreement on, but at the moment I have not received any official advice nor have I had a chance to go through and look at the subregional strategy. It is a matter for proper review of the subregional strategy.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: What is the process for review of that Lower Hunter Regional Strategy that you are aware of?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: The process for all subregional strategies will be consultation with local communities and local government, looking at precisely what has gone on. The only difference I can think of in the Huntley-Sweetwater issue is that they now have a commitment and commencement of the new freeway up there. I am not convinced that that is necessarily going to make a huge change but I will look at it in due course.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Will you commit to public consultation of a draft of these regional strategies?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Absolutely.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: And a period then for public submissions for a draft strategy?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Every step I have taken so far on anything we have done has been very much around transparency and public consultation in trying to give back a lot more authority to local communities, so absolutely.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Your Government has publicly stated on a number of occasions—also through your Parliamentary Secretary—that the Hunter should adopt a substantially larger number of dwellings moving forward.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: What should?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: The Hunter region should have a substantial increase.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Larger than what?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Than the plans under the former Government. What are your plans, in terms of dwelling numbers, for the Hunter?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I do not have any particular view as the new Minister on precise numbers. It is a bit like you exploring precise percentages. I am at the phase of wanting maximum consultation with the community in trying to see what is realistic for the various areas, not just the Hunter. It worries me a bit that some councils across the State—including my own of Warringah—because of the change in government have taken the opportunity to try to duck responsibility for developing responsible housing strategies. I think if you said in most cases the figures that were put forward as part of the various strategies—the subregional and regional strategies in the State Plan—were not too far from the mark in terms of what was anticipated for growth in individual areas, but I still think that the review needs to be a substantive one of those various strategies in the

normal course. That should not be an excuse for councils to say, "Hey, we are not going to do any serious planning for our local areas in coming up with housing strategies."

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Is your department involved in the review of strategic land-use plans?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Absolutely. In fact we are one of the pivotal agencies in that. As you may or may not be aware, very early on in this Government we set about trying to determine how we could go about developing strategic management plans with maximum consultation. I think there are 13 separate stakeholders in the various meetings occurring at the moment.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: What is the timeframe for the delivery of those?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Obviously we are working towards an outcome as soon as possible but—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Is there a timeframe in the department for the delivery of those?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Just as soon as practicable, really.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: What is your estimated delivery time?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Of strategic land management?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Correct.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: The first two are the upper Hunter and, what is it called?

Mr PEARSON: New England North West.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: And then we are going to do the Southern Highlands. I would hope they would be available in 2012. One of the big issues is that we have 13 different stakeholders. I think we added in the Aboriginal land councils. We have one of the major unions involved. There are farmers and thoroughbred industry people. There are people representing the mining industry, the minerals industry—gas exploration and some of the ones that people are concerned about at the moment. Trying to get all of them to agree is a challenge. When you think about the fact that to try to come up with a strategic land management plan for an area has never been done in the 200-odd years that we have had European settlement in Australia anywhere, you start to get a sense of the challenge. I know that farmers have expressed concerns to me—they met with me a week or two ago and said they felt they were not being listened to—and I have had others indicate that they feel they are not being listened to. At this point it has been genuinely at arm's length through the stakeholder process. I am hoping as long as we keep giving support to the stakeholders and keep telling them that we really are genuine about getting these strategic land management issues resolved, then perhaps the stakeholders will go away and realise that it cannot be a winner-takes-all issue; it is a process we need to adopt.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Minister, my question was about timeframe. I know it is complicated, and I appreciate the broad-ranging consultation, but what is the estimated timeframe?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: On those first two, we are hoping to get the first one up and running by 2012—which is only a couple months away—as soon as possible in 2012. I take the opportunity again to encourage the stakeholders to be realistic about their expectations and to try and work together. In the end governments can—as the former Government regularly did—lay down the law and say, "This is the way it is going to be." Or you can try to have—as The Greens often remind us—consultation, but sometimes that consultation creates a whole lot of tensions. At the moment those tensions are operating but I am hopeful they will be resolved.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Given the support in the Legislative Council for the re-establishment of the Royal Society in Science House, has your Government made any contact with the Royal Society and have you made any contact with the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority regarding arrangements for that?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I am aware that there has been some stress and pressure from various people about wanting to use Science House—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: From the Royal Society.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: —and the Royal Society is one of them. The Royal Society obviously would like to see itself back in Science House.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: And the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority is going through a process of renting out various elements of it. Will you approach the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority about giving priority to Science House, given the resolution of the upper House in support of that just last week?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I am conscious of its concern about it, and I have certainly indicated to the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority that I want to be fully briefed on what is going on in terms of the leasing. I have not given any direction to the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority on what should happen. I have just been given a briefing note and I will quickly go through some of this by way of background. Science House was resumed by the Sydney Cove Redevelopment Authority in 1971. The property consists of a six-level commercial office building listed as a heritage item on the Heritage Register. The building has since been leased to both private and public sector tenants, with the most recent tenant, the Australian Centre for Languages, vacating the building in 2007.

In February 2008 the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority called for expressions of interest for the leasing of Science House. Two applications were received, including one from the Royal Society of New South Wales. Both applications were unsuccessful as they did not address any of the criteria in the expressions of interest. In September 2008 the Royal Society sought support from the former Government to assist with its proposal to lease Science House. The authority advised the Royal Society that a business case would be required before any consideration could be given to a lease offer.

In July 2009 the Royal Society met with the authority and advised that it had still not prepared a business case. The chief executive officer reminded the Royal Society that the authority required a detailed outline of its proposals, including funding models and a business plan, before the society's interest could be progressed. It was told it would need to justify why the authority should allow the Royal Society rent-free use of a property with a rental market value of \$860,000 per annum—keeping in mind that that is taxpayers' money otherwise. In April 2010 the authority met with the Royal Society and representatives of the scientific community to again discuss the potential lease of Science House by the Royal Society. Again, no clear business proposal was presented. In the meantime the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority has made considerable efforts to find commercial tenants for this building. This task has been difficult due to dust and noise from a building site next door.

The building also has a number of heritage constraints that have deterred prospective tenants. Despite these challenges, the authority has recently negotiated lease terms for a five-year lease over the upper floors of the building. Part of level four and the whole of levels five and six have been leased to Baseline Constructions Pty Ltd for a five-year term, which commenced on 17 October this year. The New South Wales Government is also well advanced in negotiations to lease the remaining floors of Science House, so there is no capacity to accommodate the Royal Society in Science House if those negotiations were to proceed. I spoke with the Royal Society when I was in Opposition and I was aware of its interest. I was not aware, because it did not tell me at the time, about some of the discussions it was having with the Government, except that the former Labor Government was not being particularly helpful.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Nor has this Government been helpful, given the tenancy of the house in October and the advanced negotiations with a new tenant while you have been the Minister.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: This Government has been pretty reasonable because, coming off the back of advice to me, I understand that there is still no business plan. I am happy to look at it again for you and see what is going on with it. In a personal sense, my first degree was in science, so I was very sympathetic to the view that the Royal Society should have an occupation in Science House. However, the issue is that it must be balanced as to what it can afford to pay, if anything, and whether it is right that taxpayers should not get a reasonable return, which is nearly \$1 million a year.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Is that a matter that you will undertake to look at in the very near future, given the advanced levels of negotiations?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Sure.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: If Science House is not available will you undertake to have a constructive engagement with the Royal Society about alternative accommodation?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Yes, sure.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: What, if any, requirements does your department impose on Landcom to advise—

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Just so I do not get the society incredibly excited about the Minister's interest, I also have to make sure—you do not necessarily have to do this but I do now that I am the Minister—that I balance the taxpayer's interest in what money could come from a particular facility. That is a constant issue because I have had a number of people say to me over the past few months, "But, Minister, we have a particular right to occupy premises". That has happened through a number of my agencies. So while I am happy to explore it, happy to meet with the Royal Society, happy to talk to it and happy to hear your concerns, I cannot give any absolute undertaking. That would be improper, with all due probity and all due consideration of the taxpayers' entitlements.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: I was not getting you to sign the document.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: As long as you understand that. They might have misunderstood what I just answered so I just wanted to make sure they understand that.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Does your department impose any requirements on Landcom, or does Landcom impose any requirements on itself, to advise purchasers of residential lots released by Landcom or through your department about the proximity or the presence of coal seam gas infrastructure?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: This issue has come into stark contrast down in Camden, with the Camden ADL proposal. Generally, Landcom—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: But it also has a potential impact on those other land release areas that you were speaking about with the Premier, given they are all the subject of exploration licences.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Yes. While I understand the concerns, Landcom has been very responsible in making sure that there is some distance—I think it is about 300 metres away from the nearest well head. You would know, as a lawyer, that when you buy a property, generally you search the title upon which you are buying. You do not find out—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: I had the great pleasure of never doing conveyancing.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I do not share that pleasure. I actually did do conveyancing. You do not generally do a search on adjacent properties.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Correct, and nor does a 149 certificate bring up the presence of coal seam gas.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: A 149 certificate does not show the adjacent areas—that is the whole point.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Correct, which is why the obligation should lie with Landcom to advise landowners, which is what I am asking about.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: There are some issues around whether a government should have a higher duty of disclosure in some of these issues, particularly when it is a community concern. I have indicated to Landcom and I think Landcom is happy to do it, but we are looking at the legal aspects of it. I will let you know. I will take it as a question on notice and I will let you know in the next few weeks.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: I appreciate that.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: You have outlined how you will deal with public-private partnerships if they are for road and rail but not for hospitals. How will you progress the building of the hospitals announced in the budget at Tamworth, Wagga Wagga, Dubbo and Bega over the next four years?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I do not know that I did outline what I was going to do with public-private partnerships. I think that might be a misunderstanding. I do not propose to outline now what falls within the health Minister's purview, but I indicate that the Department of Planning and Infrastructure will make itself available if there are any issues on which the health infrastructure group needs to consult the department. But more properly I think you should direct those questions to the health Minister.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: How much do you pay your chief of staff?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I will take that on notice and give you the details.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: You said that there were—

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I am assuming that that is normally publicly available. If it is not normally publicly available I will not make it available. If it is normally publicly available you are welcome to it. Whatever it is, it is not enough. She is worth much more.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: You also said that there were recent increases in housing approvals. Can you give us a breakdown of how many of those were for infill sites and how many of those were for greenfield sites?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Are you talking about the figures in August?

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: In August.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I do not know those figures off the top of my head. I will certainly take that on notice and happily give that to you.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You will be aware that there is some controversy in the community around Goulburn and some planning issues.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Around what, sorry?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: In Goulburn. Why is the planning panel, Tim Moore's process, holding its public consultation at 2.00 p.m. on Melbourne Cup day?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: What a question to finish on. What a beauty. I simply indicate that Tim Moore and Ron Dyer, one of your former Labor colleagues—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I know Ron.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: He is a wonderful man, as is Tim. They established the timetable for travelling around the State. I think when I spoke to them last—I think it was some time last week—they told me they had had 25 different locations and they had had a hundred consultation periods. I think they were a bit surprised. I do not think they even realised it was on Melbourne Cup day. I have to tell you though, part of me says, "Well, I am not quite sure it should be as big a deal as it was, because if folks want to come along on that day at that time to talk about planning and they do not actually want to stop and watch a horse race well they should be entitled to do it", but thank you for the direction. They possibly should not, but can I also say though that Tim Moore and Ron Dyer have been amazingly responsive to the row that was raised by a particular member of Parliament on this issue—not one of us, not Labor—not State anyway.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: The Federal colleagues I believe have very strong views on this matter.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: One of our Federal colleagues, who was energetic and enthusiastic in his raising of the issue. None of that should surprise any of us but Tim Moore and Ron Dyer have agreed now to do two meetings on that morning of the Melbourne Cup day. People who are not particularly interested in watching the horses run around will possibly still go to the meeting. They have also agreed to do another meeting the

following morning before they drive off to wherever they are going for the next consultation. So the good people of Goulburn are now benefiting from four meetings. I will be fascinated to see how many people show up. I encourage them all to come.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I am very glad to hear that.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: I hope they put their money on the horses before they come to the race but I think that was all a bit silly really. The whole thing was a bit silly.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: If I can just go to the Redfern-Waterloo Authority, does your Government propose to continue with the BEP2, the Built Environment Plan Stage 2, instead of planning controls for the redevelopment of public housing in Redfern and Waterloo? Are you considering returning responsibility for those planning issues back to the City of Sydney?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: At this stage the status quo applies, although as a broad principle I am certainly keen to see much more involvement with the City of Sydney on all planning issues—not necessarily in a formal sense as to give them back the authority. For example, with Barangaroo, I think there is a lot more logic in having the City of Sydney within its broader area—it has very effective planning staff—having a much greater input to a lot of these issues. So I am prepared to look at it but no change at the moment. I am happy to look and consider what might be necessary.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: And the BEP2 part of the question Minister, the Built Environment Plan, you are committed to the BEP2 reformation of public housing or planning controls for public housing?

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Seeing Mr Wakelin-King came, and he has enjoyed sitting here and all of these people have missed out on something very much, why do we not we finish with a short answer from him?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Just say no and that will be fine: we can move on.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: The Built Environment Plan Stage 2 will be an important part of the Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority's work going forward. As the Minister has outlined, that will be done in close consultation with the City of Sydney.

Mr BRAD HAZZARD: Can I seriously thank all of you, because I know planning is a bit of a difficult area, but thank you for your input. I give this assurance to all of you—Labor, Liberal, Nationals, Greens: We are serious about trying to make sure there is consultation. The only thing I am disappointed about today, David, is that you tell me you did not actually get a full response on your issue. I may not always agree with you but I am going to make sure there is a full response. I will find out why my magnificent most highly paid chief of staff has got staff who did not do it. I think it must have been an oversight, but I will find out about that and be back in touch with you.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: I will give you the material.

The Committee proceeded to deliberate.
