

GENERAL PURPOSE STANDING COMMITTEE No. 4

Wednesday 22 January 2006

Examination of proposed expenditure for the portfolio areas

PLANNING, and REDFERN WATERLOO

The Committee met at 10.00 a.m.

MEMBERS

The Hon. J. A. Gardiner (Chair)

The Hon. J. C. Burnswood
The Hon. D. Clarke
The Hon. G. J. Donnelly

The Hon. K. F. Griffin
Ms S. P. Hale
The Hon. D. Oldfield

PRESENT

Department of Planning

Mr S. Haddad, *Director General*

Ms G. Connolly, *Executive Director, Metropolitan Planning*

Mr C. Wilson, *A/Executive Director, Sustainable Development Assessments and Approvals*

Mr P. Lucas, *Chief Financial Officer*

NSW Heritage Office

Mr. R. McDougall, *Director*

Ms S. Macdonald, *Assistant Director*

Redfern Waterloo Authority

Mr R. Domm, *Chief Executive Officer*

CHAIR: I welcome you to this public hearing of General Purpose Standing Committee No.4. I welcome departmental officers from the Department of Planning. At this meeting the Committee will examine the proposed expenditure for the portfolio areas of Planning and Redfern Waterloo. Before questions commence, some procedural matters need to be dealt with. In accordance with the Legislative Council's guidelines for the broadcast of proceedings, which are available from the attendants and Clerks, only members of the Committee 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, you must take responsibility for what you publish or what interpretation is placed on anything that is said before the Committee. Members and their staff are advised that any messages should be delivered through the attendant on duty or the Committee clerks.

The Committee has agreed that the officers from the Department of Planning will be required to appear from 10.00 a.m. to 11.00 a.m. and then from 11.00 a.m. to 12.00 noon it will hear from the NSW Heritage Office and the Redfern Waterloo Authority, and that has been a matter of discussion with officers from the Department of Planning. I declare the proposed expenditure opened for examination. Are there any questions? Mr Haddad, do you have any brief opening statement?

Mr HADDAD: No. I will be pleased to answer questions. I have my colleagues with me here.

CHAIR: Could you advise in respect to the metropolitan strategy and the funding for land purchases, the current financial status of the Sydney Regional Development Fund?

Mr HADDAD: The Sydney Regional Development Fund—and I will ask Peter to help me—currently has a total contingent liability of approximately \$900 million-plus, comprising land that has been earmarked for acquisition for open space and corridor purposes over the years. The funds had been the subject of a broad review internally within the department to make sure that we have the money allocated and the assets located and efficiently managed. As I said, the contingent liability is \$900 million-plus and I am not sure about the details in terms of asset disposal program and the rest of it so Peter can say a bit more about that.

Mr LUCAS: There is an asset disposal program designed to realise what was originally acquired for planning purposes but is no longer required for that, and that money will be able to be used to extinguish some of the contingent liabilities that the director general has mentioned. There is a review of those contingent liabilities to determine if some of the planning instruments that create that contingent liability are still required.

CHAIR: Are you able to give the Committee an outline of the fund's financial projections for each of the next three to six years?

Mr LUCAS: I will take that question on notice. However, I will say that the Sydney Regional Development Fund is a separate entity and only draws from the Consolidated Fund to the amount of about \$5 million, and that is scheduled to go out through the next three financial years, as you have requested. The remaining amount is funded internally from asset sales and collections from councils which it is entitled to levy for operational costs.

CHAIR: Are you happy to provide that to the Committee on notice?

Mr HADDAD: That is correct.

CHAIR: The Committee has decided that it would appreciate answers within 14 days of the transcript being available so that we can complete our report.

Mr HADDAD: Yes, that is no problem.

CHAIR: In relation to the funding for rail corridors can you advise the Committee what the anticipated cost for the new rail corridors in the south-west and north-west of Sydney will be?

Mr HADDAD: Yes, the details of alignment designs are being undertaken now by the Transport Infrastructure Development Corporation [TIDC] that is looking after the implementation of the rail corridor. The estimated costs in terms of capital costs, and acquisition of lands that has been published previously, was in the order of \$460 million for the entire corridors. My understanding is that TIDC will be submitting formal applications for the development of the corridor shortly—I am not able to say exactly when—by way of planning approvals. We will be looking at amending the relevant State planning instruments to be able to reserve the corridor. My advice is that this should happen shortly.

CHAIR: Is there any relationship between the funding of the new rail corridors and the Sydney Regional Development Fund?

Mr HADDAD: Yes, there were actually announcements made—I would have to double check to be factual—that the funding would come from a variety of funding, including the Sydney Regional Development Funds and other funding mechanisms. That is the latest published information, which included a number of funding sources, including the Sydney Regional Development Fund. I must say that the funding is being worked out at this stage in terms of the sources of funding and the exact magnitude of the funding that is required, and the sequencing of that funding, in line with the development of the release areas through a business case that has been developed by the Growth Centres Commission. When it completes its business case it will be able to say the sequencing of infrastructure supports that are needed to support the development of the release areas. That will inform the precise funding magnitude and the sequencing and timing of funding that is required.

CHAIR: When do you expect that to be finalised?

Mr HADDAD: My understanding is within the next couple of months. I will have to double check with the Growth Centres Commission, if possible. I am happy to get back to you on that.

CHAIR: That would be appreciated.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: You said that a review was carried out on the financial status of the Sydney Regional Development Fund?

Mr HADDAD: Yes.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: Was there a written report?

Mr HADDAD: No, there was an internal report. The purpose of the review was basically I wanted to make sure that we have the up-to-date information on the status of the fund and that it is being used efficiently and appropriately.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: Is that information codified in a written document?

Mr HADDAD: Yes, there is a broad document in draft form—it is not a policy document, it is not the completed document but it is still a work-in-progress document.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: Will you provide the Committee with a copy of it?

Mr HADDAD: I would have to take advice on that to see what is the status of the document, if you do not mind. I am happy to support the verbal advice that I have given with further information. I just want to make sure that any documented information is factual and up-to-date. As I said, once it is up-to-date there is no problem in having all this information available.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: The review is actually still being carried out?

Mr HADDAD: The review is still being carried out and refined and there is still questioning happening. As I said, the main purpose of this review is to make sure that we have an efficient mechanism, appropriate at the time, and that is what we are doing now.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: For how long has the review been under way?

Mr HADDAD: A couple of months now. It is not very advanced and extensive but this is an ongoing thing. I am more than happy to make it available when it is completed and there is nothing in it that is inappropriate in terms of addressing the relevant issues.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: When was the last review before that one carried out?

Mr HADDAD: Peter, would you know exactly that? Would that be five, six years ago, maybe?

Mr LUCAS: I would have to take that on notice.

Mr HADDAD: I will have to take this on notice and come back, I am not sure.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: But you think about five or six years ago?

Mr HADDAD: I will have to take it on notice and come back. It is a scheme that has been going on for sometime and from time to time it is subjected to a look in.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: If it is five or six years, as you think it maybe, is that not a long time between reviews of the financial status of such a major fund?

Mr HADDAD: It is annually reported through the annual reporting mechanism, so there is an ongoing reporting mechanism, but the fundamental reviews, if I said five years, I will have to double check on that.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: Mr Lucas, you said there is a review either being conducted or has been conducted in regard to land asset disposals?

Mr LUCAS: That is correct.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: Is there a written report?

Mr LUCAS: It is the same report that the director general is referring to. The overall objective of the report, aside from the items that the director general has mentioned, is to assess that contingent liability, and to see whether there are ways that that can be reduced either by purchasing, and that is an asset purchase, disposal of properties that we currently hold that were formerly purchased for planning purposes and no longer required, and appreciating that those properties are fragments so that there is a lot of work needs to be taken to combine a number of fragments together to get to a particular thing, and then also look at whether there is land reserved under a planning instrument that is no longer required. I am not qualified as a planner to comment about that.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: Do you have a list of land holdings that you are proposing to dispose of or you have decided to dispose of?

Mr LUCAS: Within the report it goes through the land holdings and identifies broad groups of properties that may be able to be disposed of, yes.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: That part of the review is already in written form?

Mr HADDAD: Part of the review obviously is to identify those lands, as Peter said, where there is a potential to dispose of the land, or otherwise, and other lands where there is justification to acquire that lands. This is work in progress, as I said. It is going through that progress of identifying lands, of looking at the planning objectives, looking at whether we still require the land in terms of the applicability of those planning objectives or otherwise. When the final report comes out it will have to say something about the location and otherwise, but it will have to provide justification for what we are proposing to do. This is work in progress and in due course it will have to contain all the relevant information.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: It is work in progress but is what has already been produced publicly available?

Mr HADDAD: No, it is not publicly available because it is work still going on. The information is still being gathered and looked at.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: You have not made any final decision on any land disposals?

Mr HADDAD: No, we have not.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: Everything is still a work in progress in regard to those lands?

Mr HADDAD: That is correct, yes. That is correct with the exception that—and I will have to double-check—that the land management program is ongoing with annual plans to acquire and dispose of land, so that is an ongoing program irrespective of the review. Just to be factual in terms of the response, the review is looking beyond that, as applicable, but there will be still a program of disposal and/or acquisition as part of the ongoing program.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: You said that the cost of the new rail corridors south-west, north-west, was previously set at about \$460 million.

Mr HADDAD: Thereabouts, yes. That is the figure for acquisition, yes, that is correct.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: When did you come to that figure?

Mr HADDAD: I did not come up with it. That is the advice that we received as part of the strategy itself and that would have been about a year ago or so, and this figure is being verified and checked as a result of more detailed investigation into the alignments of the corridor and it has been published and that is the figure that has been quoted on the basis of very preliminary investigations.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: You say "preliminary investigations". Was it a detailed investigation?

Mr HADDAD: No. The alignment itself aligning the corridor is shown on maps and published. There was an estimate of the cost of the acquisition of the corridor and this cost is in the vicinity of the figure that I have quoted. The next step is to look into the detail: the corridor adjustments, the alignments, the exact nature of the lands, the engineering requirements and all the rest of it, and that is what is happening now. As to what would happen to the final cost estimates, I have not got this information yet.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: So it is just a general assessment made about a year ago?

Mr HADDAD: Yes.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: And it could vary either way to a reasonable extent?

Mr HADDAD: With any project it could vary either way, but at this stage I am not expecting it to vary substantially and significantly. But I am just saying that within the next few months there will be an update of this cost in light of the detailed alignment investigation.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: So you would be fairly confident that there is not going to be a significant blow out on that figure of \$460 million?

Mr HADDAD: To be honest, I am not the expert on this and I do not want to mislead the Committee, but to the best of my knowledge that is the figure that has been looked at. My advice is that that is the cost. The experts there are the TICD people; the transport corporation has been charged with looking into all these details. I am more than happy to come back with further clarification.

The Hon. DAVID CLARKE: Could you get some specific clarification on that and come back to us?

Mr HADDAD: Yes, sure, with pleasure.

CHAIR: Mr Haddad, with respect to the metropolitan plan, is it not correct that there is no longer any advisory panels advising the Government on that implementation of the plan?

Mr HADDAD: You mean the reference panel that was chaired by Professor Blakely?

CHAIR: Yes.

Mr HADDAD: That is correct, yes.

CHAIR: And is there any proposal to have any future advisory panel as the plan is being implemented?

Mr HADDAD: Yes, there is. We have moved into the implementation stage. I was reading in the media today the commentary about the panel and all that. The panel was very useful in advising us while the strategy was being formulated and we are now focusing on implementing the elements of the panel, and in the document itself that has been published we have highlighted the Government's arrangements that would have to implement it. We have a CEO group—the chief executive group—that will co-ordinate the various elements of implementation. Also, the Minister will be reporting to government on an annual basis and we will be working with local government, we will be working with industry and other stakeholders, including communities, through the preparation of our subregional plans. That is the focus of what we are trying to do during the implementation.

There will be a formal reporting mechanism, and as we said here, we will be seeking advice from experts inside and outside government by the metropolitan CEO group and outside. So we will be valuing expert advice from time to time, including from Professor Blakely and others, as applicable, during the implementation of the plan. But we are focusing now on just trying to do our best in implementing the plan and just delivering to the community generally the various elements of this plan; that is our main focus at the moment.

CHAIR: And how will that input from outside the bureaucracy happen?

Mr HADDAD: It will happen through both formal and informal processes. My colleague here, Gail, maybe can talk about the process of the subregional planning that we have started. For instance, today we are meeting with local government and representatives from other stakeholders and they are reporting into the subregional plannings in different processes in a practical way. When those plans are made they will be put out for public exhibition for public input, for community input, and then we will have a different evaluation forum of how we are travelling; we will try to have performance indicators. As I said, we will seek expert advice, as applicable, and then the Minister will be, on an annual basis, producing the report to governments in that regard. Gail, do you want to say anything more?

Ms CONNELLY: In addition to that, there are a range of other mechanisms provided for in the strategy, such as the establishment of an employment lands advisory group to advise the Minister independently, and the strategy provides for the Minister to convene that group and assist him in reporting annually on the strategy. So there are other mechanisms in addition to subregional planning.

CHAIR: Can you confirm that when the metropolitan plan was published the Premier promised to deliver a 10-year infrastructure plan that would be available in January and is that now pushed out to the middle of the year?

Mr HADDAD: I can confirm that there is and that there will be a State infrastructure plan. I am not able to advise the Committee on the exact timing of it. The State infrastructure plan is being co-ordinated and developed through the Minister for Infrastructure and through Treasury and other groups, and there is a plan and it is progressing, but I am not sure exactly when it will be available. That is what I can confirm. I cannot give a credible answer as to the exact timing to the Committee.

CHAIR: So the whole-of-government concept works only if the whole of the government knows what is happening, does it not?

Mr HADDAD: It is a whole-of-government process and there is input into it by various agencies. At the bureaucratic level in particular we have officers within the department working very closely with other officers who have been in different agencies, and my colleague here, Gail, has been extensively involved in this. I have been involved in a lot of discussions, the purpose of which is to make sure that any infrastructure plan is practical, can be funded, can be honestly funded and can be aligned as much as possible to the strategy that we have got there, and it is happening as a whole-of-government advice. My advice is that it will be available shortly. I am just not able to commit the Government in this case to a particular time.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: According to this morning's *Sydney Morning Herald*, the metropolitan strategy reference panel was dissolved in October, six months ago. Was any announcement made at the time that the panel was being dissolved?

Mr HADDAD: I am not sure. I will have to check. I am not sure whether an announcement has been made. I am happy to get back to you on this.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: It is interesting, that was two months before the metropolitan strategy was released for public comment and submission. Why was not the panel retained to assess those submissions?

Mr HADDAD: The metropolitan strategy was not released for public comment nor submissions, the Metropolitan strategy was released as a final document. The panel provided its advice up to the strategy being available. Now there is a time between the finalisation of all the different technical inputs and the compilation of information and so on and then the finalisation and the publication and the announcement of the strategy.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: According to the report in this morning's *Sydney Morning Herald*, the reference panel unanimously advised Mr Sartor to set up an independent advisory board similar to those in Los Angeles and Portland, Oregon, to make sure that the complex plans in the strategy were carried out. But according to Professor Blakely, that advice had been ignored. Is that the case?

Mr HADDAD: I am not sure that the advice has been ignored, the advice has been considered. I would have to go back and check whether it was a unanimous advice or otherwise, but yes, there was this advice that there is an option of an ongoing mechanism. It was considered and the decision was made that alternative mechanisms, such as the one that I have just described, are more appropriate, and that is what is happening.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Except that the crux of that advice seems to be that the board should be independent of the Government whereas the mechanisms you have suggested seem to me are all very much dependent upon the Government determining who is on the panel or who is giving the advice. That it is the very opposite to independent.

Mr HADDAD: There are obviously differing views and judgments to be made as to the needs and to the value adding of having added bodies at different stages of implementation. That is something that has been considered. The decision was made that we will get that advice on an ongoing basis in a different way and that there will be evidence or otherwise of the plan being implemented through different mechanisms.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: But do you acknowledge the wisdom behind the comment of Professor Blakely when he said that independence is important because governments are very much influenced by electoral cycles, whereas good planning requires good planning strategies, and they are not about election cycles, they are about 20 or 30 or 50-year cycles?

Mr HADDAD: I do not really want to comment too much on the electoral cycle and all this political stuff but, essentially, planning has been done. We have been paid to do planning as the Department of Planning and we are supposed to be advising government and the community and be judged on the outcome of what we are saying. That is the main, I suppose, test for us. Now how much

independent testing you put around that is something that others would have to determine. But, as I said, in this particular case the emphasis, the resources, is being put in trying to do our best in implementing the strategy. We will be seeking advice, including expert advice. We may or may not, because of community pressures, because of other instances being raised as we are travelling, have to put the implementation through other mechanisms, I do not know. But I think there was a decision made that an ongoing independent mechanism may not be the appropriate way of going, and that has been evaluated also by others and all the rest of it.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: On 20 February, two days ago, the Minister released a media release about a new panel to streamline local planning processes. In that media release he says that every year the New South Wales Government's Parliamentary Counsel prepares 5,500 pages of draft local environment plans but only 20 per cent of this work ever becomes law because so many draft LEPs do not comply with State or regional planning objectives. That suggests that 80 per cent of LEPs that are submitted to the department fail the test. Is that figure correct?

Mr HADDAD: I am not sure whether that is referring to the LEPs referred to the department or to the Parliamentary Counsel. Certainly a lot of LEPs travel directly to the Parliamentary Counsel early on and there is work being done on it and they end up with the Minister or with the department and a recommendation is made not to adopt them. The reason for all this, essentially, is that we have a lot of LEPs in the system, quite a lot, particularly in relation to spot rezonings, which are not consistent, they do not make sense, if I can be blunt with you. So, basically, they can travel through the system either via the department or from councils under delegation directly to the Minister.

The Minister, rightly so, will examine those documents and he will say, "Well, they do not make sense to me." And he will not make them because they do not comply with an analytical reasoning of why they have to be made or, in particular, they do not comply with established policy. There is no point in us working hard on policies and then having hazard rezoning happening, particularly in relation to spot rezones. We are trying, basically, to bring all these LEPs, particularly the spot rezoning and others, very early on. We are telling councils to bring them in and we will put them to an independent—in this case a panel—within the department that will involve local governments and, as applicable, other experts. They will say that it is consistent or not consistent and we will give an upfront, early advice to councils and everybody as to our views in progressing this LEP. We cannot legally stop the LEP from progressing the, but at least we will be advising early on as to whether this LEP is consistent or otherwise.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: I am sorry to interrupt, but my understanding is that most councils engaging in a lot of informal communication with the department precisely because they do not wish their LEPs to be contrary to any legal requirements.

Mr HADDAD: Yes.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Has the suggestion that 80 per cent of them do not conform been analysed in any way? Could you provide the Committee with the supporting documentation, the breakdown, that enabled the Minister to make such a statement?

Mr HADDAD: Yes, I can. Well, I just want to go back and confirm the applicability of the 80 per cent, as I have said—as to whether they apply to LEPs that went to the Parliamentary Counsel and not me. I will provide you with the statistics that we have.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: The story in the *Sydney Morning Herald* referred to 80 per cent that went to the Parliamentary Counsel.

Mr HADDAD: Yes, to Parliamentary Counsel. That is why I am saying that I need to go back and check. I can provide the information to back up all this. The fact is that there is a jamming in the system that we are trying to address. I think that will improve the system operationally.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: The Minister's media release also said that the panel that will assess these LEPs will include representatives from the department and from local government.

Mr HADDAD: Yes.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Will they be permanent local government representatives, or will they be representatives from the Council that is submitting the LEP?

Mr HADDAD: No. There will be independence. I have met with the President of the Local Government and Shires Associations. They are going to nominate four people from across State and we will be using one of them on each panel on a rotating basis. I am not sure but I expect that if it is within their own localities they may not want to be involved, so that we can have a fresh view. We will be doing that within our own department. I will be getting people from different regions to look at different localities.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: When you say that councils will be advised whether they should proceed to exhibition within a targeted response time of 15 days, does that mean that it will take 15 days for the panel to assess the LEP's compliance?

Mr HADDAD: It will take 15 days—that is our benchmark targeting figure—from the time we receive what we call the section 54 notification to the time we advise the council as to the views of the department, of the panel.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: It says it will examine proposed land zoning and key development controls for consistency with State environmental planning policy criteria, including regional strategies and compatibility with nearby land. Will those criteria be spelled out publicly?

Mr HADDAD: Yes, they have been sent to all councils and I am more than happy to make them available to the Committee. The criteria have been made available to, I think, five or six different categories of zoning and for each one we have set criteria and they have to do the evaluation against those criteria.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: The department will, in effect, be giving the nod to an LEP prior to any public submissions on the desirability or otherwise of that LEP.

Mr HADDAD: When you say, "giving the nod," we cannot legally give a nod or otherwise. We will be advising the council that this particular LEP or whatever is consistent with policy and is likely to be supported, subject to the public participation process. More particularly, we will want to tell councils that it is highly unlikely that the department would support this particular LEP—so it will be particularly the ones that we would be highly unlikely to support that we want to send a message to.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Where, as a response to the public participation and submissions, there is intense opposition to an LEP that the department has said conforms, how will the department respond?

Mr HADDAD: We have taken all delegations from councils and, where we believe that particular LEP proposals will generate public interest, we will tell the council we want all this to come back to the department and the department will be giving due weight to the public submissions and may, as a result of those submissions and the public interest, advise the Minister contrary to the first advice. Basically there is this process. As I said it is particularly the ones where we have a concern of inconsistency with State and regional policy that we want to flag very early in the process.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: When will we standard LEP template be released?

Mr HADDAD: We are trying to release it in March. This is the target date that we are working on.

CHAIR: With respect to the emissions from the M5 tunnel, can advise the Committee what actions have been taken to stop the proposal to allow tunnel air to be released from entrances on the M5?

Mr HADDAD: That is in terms of the audit report that we have released. As you know, we have released the audit report and it is on our web site. We have made the observations that we will

need to finalise special protocols and agreements, including procedural and operational measures by the Roads and Traffic Authority [RTA], to be able to specify more clearly the circumstances where tunnel emissions may or may not be emitted from portals. That is the most immediate action without taking in relation to the outcome of our audit report.

CHAIR: Has any action being taken to stop the proposal to allow tunnel air to be released?

Mr HADDAD: Yes. Under the current conditions there are specific conditions where portal emissions are allowed. That is what the conditions specified—in emergency situations, and that is specified under the conditions.

CHAIR: Will you tell the Committee how many times to date emissions have been vented from the entry and exit portals of the M5 tunnel?

Mr HADDAD: I do not have the figures with me. May we take that question on notice and get back to the Committee? We have published some misinformation in our audit report, which is on the web site, but I will double check and get back to the Committee.

CHAIR: Can you tell the Committee if any departmental staff have had meetings with concerned residents about the venting of emissions from the tunnel portals? Have you had any meetings to date?

Mr HADDAD: Yes, we had a number of meetings. Our compliance staff met with them.

Mr WILSON: The department gave its submission to the community group, the liaison group, set up under the M5 East approval on 6 February. It gave an outline of the findings of its audit report at the same time as the report was released. My understanding is that we are due to go back and meet with them again and to listen to the concerns a response of the community in the next week or two. It is also my understanding that at the same time, the RTA is coming back with the response to the results of the investigations and findings of that audit report.

CHAIR: With respect to the Metropolitan Water Plan and drinking water supplies, the Government has indicated that it has a comprehensive plan to increase water recycling in the Sydney metropolitan area. Can you provide the Committee with any detail about those plans and, in particular, how the Government proposes to pay for the recycling program?

Mr HADDAD: That particular program is now being run by a separate team. It is not run by the Department of Planning but by a separate team. I think the team sits within the Cabinet Office and I think it would be more appropriate for that office to respond. We can make an approach to them, but certainly it is not within our departmental any longer.

CHAIR: Should the Committee approach the Premier for that information?

Mr HADDAD: The Cabinet Office.

CHAIR: With respect to the Shaping the Central Coast strategy, can you give the Committee and update on what the department has done to progress the implementation of that strategy?

Mr HADDAD: We are working on a strategy. We are formulating a strategy. As you know, we have published a strategy for the lower Hunter region. We are preparing strategies for 4 or 5 regional areas, and the Central Coast is one of them. We are targeting June as the time when we are going to have it on public exhibition in draft form. That is basically what we are doing. We have a team there on the Central Coast. We have put more resources there and they are working on the strategy and liaising with local councils and communities in the area. There are a number of mechanisms in place and we will be, as I said, coming out with the draft strategy around June or by June. I am not sure whether Gail wants to comment further on that. Is that correct?

Ms CONNELLY: That is correct.

CHAIR: The document, "Shaping the Central Coast" was released sometime ago. Has there been any review of the proposed strategy in the meantime?

Mr HADDAD: Yes. Basically, we are now formulating a new strategy, taking into account any previous strategies that have been made and taking into account any local strategies. As I said we are preparing a fresh strategy for the Central Coast that will integrate various elements. That will hopefully be made available for public discussion and comment by June.

CHAIR: What other main elements of the fresh strategy?

Mr HADDAD: The main elements basically will be to try to manage growth in a way that is sustainable. We will be looking at where further developments could occur at where further areas could be protected, including along the coast centres, subregional planning in different areas, employment plans. These are the various elements of it.

CHAIR: In relation to the Transport Action Plan in the same area, the Central Coast, what has happened to progress at particular action plan?

Mr HADDAD: We have not progressed any implementation of this action plan. I would like, if you do not mind, to take this question on notice. What we are doing is looking at integrating the transport elements of that plan into the strategy that I have just mentioned. We have not really in practice, other than existing actions that have been ongoing through existing committees, gone beyond that for the time being, pending completion of the strategy.

CHAIR: How can you have a Shaping the Central Coast strategy that does not integrate a transport plan?

Mr HADDAD: The shaping transport strategy was actually a strategy that was done before. I am not very familiar with it. What we are doing now we are basically growing a fresh strategy, which will integrate a number of elements in it. That will be the planning strategy that we will be relying upon.

CHAIR: So there is no action on the master plan for transport?

Mr HADDAD: The transport plan, the action we are doing, we are taking the elements of it into consideration in drawing the new strategy.

CHAIR: With respect to the Warnervale train station development, are you aware of any delay to get that development under way?

Mr HADDAD: No, I am not aware of any delay. I am aware that it is under active consideration. I visited the site and the surroundings recently, and we are talking with the council about what we can do to further progress it.

CHAIR: How recently were you there?

Mr HADDAD: I was there, I think, about four or five weeks ago.

CHAIR: I understand that there has been a discovery of an endangered species growing around the proposed station site—

Mr HADDAD: There is, yes.

CHAIR: —and therefore it is being delayed.

Mr HADDAD: That is why I specifically went there, because obviously there are issues between the development and conservation issues. That is why we were there trying to look in terms of how we can accommodate both, if any, or what are the issues involved in terms of the threatened species areas that are there. So the work is progressing. We have been calling for more validating

studies. But you are correct, there is a threatened species there which we have to respect and we are trying to deal with the issues now.

CHAIR: And apparently it is a daisy.

Mr HADDAD: It is a daisy, yes, and there are other things, as I am saying, that are being looked at at the moment.

CHAIR: Can you advise the Committee what amount of hydraulic work will be needed to mitigate any existing flood problems from upstream developments in relation to that particular train station development site?

Mr HADDAD: I can come back to the Committee with the details but I am not up to date with all the studies. As I said, the main planning issue of interest was the threatened species. I am more than happy to come back with other issues.

CHAIR: Can you confirm that basically it is about a \$19 million project?

Mr HADDAD: May I just take that on notice as well? I think it is in that range but I just have to get back if possible.

CHAIR: In the same Central Coast area, specifically the CityLink project for Gosford—

Mr HADDAD: Yes.

CHAIR: —can you provide the Committee with information as to the current status of that project?

Mr HADDAD: The current status, to the best of my recollection, is that preliminary planning work is being done in terms of master planning development action on it with, I think, Landcom and councils. Again, this has not yet come to the department, and I am not sure whether it will come. Essentially, we are trying to understand that project and if possible to facilitate it. It is something that Landcom is progressing with the council directly.

CHAIR: Do you know what the total cost of the project is expected to be?

Mr HADDAD: No, I am not sure about the total cost. I can come back with that figure.

CHAIR: You will take that on notice?

Mr HADDAD: Yes, sure.

CHAIR: What sort of community involvement is there in terms of information to local residents?

Mr HADDAD: I will update the Committee on that when I go back and get more information from Landcom, but I know as a minimum any master planning will be the subject of public exhibition and comments. I am aware that a community group has been submitting information directly to the proponents in this case and to the councils. I am also aware that there have been a number of council meetings where people were making submissions or voicing their interest in it.

CHAIR: In relation to the operations of the department itself—

Mr HADDAD: Yes.

CHAIR: —and reviews of its organisation, the department's 2004 annual report states that it spent nearly \$600,000 on four separate consultancies for organisational reviews. Can you tell the Committee what services were provided by the consultancies?

Mr HADDAD: That is in relation to the Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources.

Mr LUCAS: I do not have the details with me. As the Director General said, that is the former Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources. We would need to have a look at the detail that has been published in the annual reports.

CHAIR: Can you provide us with information as to what services were provided by those consultancies?

Mr HADDAD: Yes.

Mr LUCAS: Yes, take that on notice.

CHAIR: And the costs for the consultancies that did those reviews before and after the merging of the two departments. Can you tell us also what costs were involved with separating the two departments last year?

Mr LUCAS: Take that on notice, yes.

CHAIR: You will probably need to take this on notice as well. Can you provide the Committee with the costs of the media and the advertising buying before and after the merger of the two departments?

Mr HADDAD: Yes.

CHAIR: Naturally we would be interested to know the costs associated with putting the two departments together and then separating them again. I shall ask some questions in relation to regional planning issues. Firstly, in relation to Bundeena, some of our electors in Bundeena as well as some members of Parliament from both sides of Parliament, as I understand it, have written to the Minister asking for information about the Bundeena area. This was done prior to the current Land and Environment Court case being heard in relation to Bundeena. Apparently there has been no meaningful response from the Minister or the department, and it has been several months since the Minister and the department received this correspondence. Can you advise the Committee when it is expected that the Minister or yourselves will respond to the people of Bundeena with information about the case currently before the Land and Environment Court about their home area?

Mr HADDAD: Yes, sure.

Ms CONNELLY: I have seen that correspondence, and I have some draft responses prepared, but essentially it relates to development under the existing Sutherland LEP 2000. The community is waiting for the draft Sutherland LEP 2004 because they believe that those controls will provide greater protection in the court. The Minister has asked the department to expedite the finalisation of that LEP, and we are anticipating that that will happen before the end of March.

CHAIR: So when you say you have draft responses, are they waiting for that March event or will they get some answers in the meantime?

Ms CONNELLY: No, they are in the process of being finalised, according to the Director General.

Mr HADDAD: We will make sure that we get the answers as quickly as possible.

CHAIR: Can you tell us the current status of the proposed development on the site of the Royal Rehabilitation Centre at Ryde?

Mr HADDAD: The status of the development is that, as the Committee may be aware, it is a concept plan application that we have been looking at. There is a study and an assessment report that have been on public exhibition. We are now going through the assessment process of the submissions that we have received. That is the status of it .

Ms SYLVIA HALE: In 2004 DIPNR provided funding to the Local Government and Shires Association to establish a sex services premises planning advisory group.

Mr HADDAD: Yes.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: I understand that that group produced guidelines in December 2004.

Mr HADDAD: Yes.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: When will those guidelines be made public?

Mr HADDAD: My understanding is that they are not public so we will look at them and see whether we can make them available through at least our library so that people can access them.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Presumably this is a matter of considerable interest to workers in the industry as well as to councils. It is now 18 months since those guidelines were prepared.

Mr HADDAD: Yes. As I said, if you do not mind I will take it on notice, update where it is exactly and then come back to the Committee.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Thank you. I have a brief question about Bungonia. You may be aware that a number of residents living near a property called Ardmore Park on Oallen Ford Road, Bungonia, have had their properties placed partially or a wholly within a buffer zone for a proposed hard rock and sand quarry. As a result of those properties being placed within the buffer zone, the values of those properties have dropped significantly so they are negative equity for some owners. Will the Government consider purchasing those properties at the market value that pertained prior to the rezoning and imposition of the buffer zone?

Mr HADDAD: These properties are in a buffer zone because of what? Is it because of the condition that was imposed?

Mr WILSON: The Minister for Planning refused the application for a quarry at the Ardmore property last year. There is no proposal on foot at this stage before the department. I am unaware of any formal buffer zones that have been imposed by any instrument. I can take that on notice.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: If you would.

Mr WILSON: As far as I am aware, no buffer zones have been imposed by any statutory instrument.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Earlier the Chair was asking about the M5 East. Unfortunately I did not hear some of those questions or the answers. I understand that the Minister for Planning has said that the Government is considering changing the conditions for approval for the M5 East tunnel to allow the operators to blow emissions out of the portals. Can you give me any more information about that?

Mr HADDAD: The only information I can give is that if you look in our published audit reports we are making comments about the operation of the entire ventilation system. The RTA advises that it is looking at how to optimise the whole ventilation system. If the RTA wants, as part of this, to increase the number of times where under certain conditions emissions are allowed from the portals, it would have to come with a formal notification to the approved development, which would have to go through a public process, including, as the Minister said, an independent evaluation so that the conditions upon which any increase in emissions from the portals can or cannot occur.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: But you would agree that the problem with emissions is that the ventilation in the tunnel was designed to handle fewer than 110,000 vehicles a day, yet the tunnel is currently handling in excess of that.

Mr HADDAD: Yes.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: So any waving of the requirement that there be no emissions from the portals, except in very limited circumstances, would enable the tunnel to continue to operate without filtration equipment being installed.

Mr HADDAD: I am not sure about the relationship between filtration and emissions from the portals because filtration relates to particulate matter and portals relate to gauging emissions. As I said, that will be subject to a very detailed examination if there is a proposal to do this. As I said, I am confirming that it will have to go through a formal notification to the previous approval, which will involve a public process, and documentation will be put publicly. There will most probably be—and certainly this will be our advice to government—an independent evaluation of all that to happen so that there is a clear understanding as to whether it should or should not happen.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: I now turn to affordable housing. It is now common practice in global cities around the world to have ambitious targets for affordable housing. For example, in parts of Paris the target is 25 per cent and the target in London is 50 per cent. Given that housing costs in Sydney are consistently some of the highest in the world, is the Government contemplating imposing a levy to fund the provision of affordable housing in all high cost local government areas in the State?

Mr HADDAD: I am not aware of such considerations. All the initiatives that relate to affordable housing are contained in the Metropolitan Strategy. Further than that the Premier announced publicly that it is a major issue for government. A committee is being formed specifically to look into that. Obviously, they will look at all options. To what extent the planning can or cannot help in all of this is part of the committee's investigations. I really am not able to answer in terms of government policy in that regard.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Will the committee examine the operation of SEPP 70, which allows an affordable housing levy to be imposed?

Mr HADDAD: I am not sure whether they will look specifically at the provisions of the SEPP, but certainly they will look at the underlying fundamentals of the SEPP itself.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: How many councils have approached the Government seeking permission to levy developers for affordable housing, either via inclusion in SEPP 70 or through some other mechanism?

Mr HADDAD: Can I take it on notice, unless Ms Connelly knows?

Ms CONNELLY: My understanding is that at this point in time it is only two, but I would have to take that on notice to see if that is still the current situation.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Which councils are they?

Ms CONNELLY: I think it is Willoughby and Woollahra, but, once again, I would have to take it on notice, but it is very few.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: It is my understanding that Parramatta council requested in writing that the Parramatta LGA be included in SEPP 70. Did the department respond to that request and, if so, will the department make available to the Committee a copy of its response?

Mr HADDAD: We will take this on notice and come back to the Committee on it.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Recently the Minister announced a 3 per cent designated affordable housing target for a development of 673 units at Sydney Olympic Park in Homebush Bay, which represents 21 units out of a development worth \$190 million. What is the justification for setting the target for affordable housing so low?

Mr HADDAD: Can I get back to you when I look at the details of it?

Ms SYLVIA HALE: What statistics and figures did the Government use to decide upon a 3 per cent target? Were income profiles and average wage rates part of that equation? Was the percentage of income spent on housing included in the calculation? Was social hardship in different LGAs considered, or was the 3 per cent figure simply negotiated with the development industry as something they said that they could live with?

Mr HADDAD: Whatever figure was set would have been on the basis of the merit assessment of the case. We publish all our assessment reports and justification on our web site, but nevertheless I will go back and check the justification in this particular case. I am not sure that there are uniform targets across the board, but there are differences. There must be a merit assessment and full justification. It is not simply just by negotiations.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: In relation to the Carlton and United Brewery site in Chippendale, which is going to be one of the biggest residential developments in the inner-city area for many years, given the chronic shortage of affordable housing in the inner-city area will the Government impose a requirement of more than 3 per cent on this development? If not, will it explain why it will not?

Mr HADDAD: I am sure that when and if there is a development application submitted for the Government to consider that there will be proper provisions in that regard.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Why has Landcom not increased its target for affordable housing provision?

Mr HADDAD: That is a question for Landcom, I suppose. I cannot answer for them. As I say, the provisions are set on a case-by-case basis on the merits of the case.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: I now turn to marinas. What is the status of new marina developments in Sydney Harbour? Did the release of the Sydney Harbour Regional Environment Plan lift the moratorium, or will the moratorium not be lifted until Waterways release the landowner's manual, which was exhibited in April 2004, but has not yet been released in final form?

Mr HADDAD: I am not sure whether I can answer that in terms of the moratorium, but the situation is that where there are proposals for marinas they are considered on their merits. The Waterways owner's manual really is, in a sense, a separate exercise that they go through themselves as to whether they can give landowner consent equivalents for the process to start or not. On top of that there is an assessment process. Our interest really is for efficiency purposes and certainty to make sure that it is the same mechanism. That is what we are looking at.

The Hon. DAVID OLDFIELD: Do you require the provision of a percentage of affordable berths in these marinas?

Mr HADDAD: No.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Could you tell me the status of a development application by Dennis O'Neill for a new marina at Rose Bay?

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: We set one hour for Planning.

CHAIR: This will be the last question.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Could you tell me the status of the development application by Dennis O'Neill for a new marina at Rose Bay?

Mr HADDAD: We have no development applications. If you are referring to the one at Rose Bay we have no application before us or before the Minister in relation to this particular case.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: It would have to come before the department?

Mr HADDAD: I did not say that. I am not sure whether it would have to go to the council or to the Minister. I have not seen the details. If it is to the Minister then there would need to be justification why it fits a State significance development.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: That would be a designated development, would it not?

Mr HADDAD: Or State significance development, yes. I think it would have to be State significance.

(The witnesses withdrew)

CHAIR: We will now proceed to that part of the budget estimates supplementary hearing that relates to heritage and the Redfern-Waterloo Authority. Mr McDougall, in relation to government assets does the department have any plans to sell the heritage-listed Lands building in Bridge Street in the city, which currently is occupied by Planning and Natural Resources?

Mr McDOUGALL: I am not aware of it, but as you can appreciate those sorts of decisions would be made by the occupier or the owner. As far as I am aware we have not had any approaches to the Heritage Office because, obviously, the building has heritage value. But I am sure that either the Treasury, government assets area, or the Department of Planning might be able to confirm. We certainly are not aware of anything.

CHAIR: Are you aware of any other New South Wales Government-owned and heritage-listed buildings that the Government intends to sell off?

Mr McDOUGALL: No major ones. The Quarantine Station is one that is going through some leasing arrangements, but with all major heritage assets any government agency that is going to sell them, they are required to notify us and enter into consultation. At this stage my understanding is that none are on the agenda, but I am happy to take that on notice and get back to you.

CHAIR: You said there are no major ones, but perhaps there might be some smaller ones.

Mr McDOUGALL: Perhaps there could be, but I certainly am not aware of those. I am happy to chase that one up for you.

CHAIR: That would be appreciated. Could you tell the Committee how many heritage-listed properties the government currently owns?

Mr McDOUGALL: I will come back to you with an exact figure. There are more than 1,500 items on the State Heritage Register and approximately half of those are owned by the Government, but I will come back with an accurate figure for you.

CHAIR: Do you know the latest valuation of those properties all up?

Mr McDOUGALL: No, I do not know that. Again, that probably is something that the property group may have a figure on, but certainly it is something that we would not be aware of.

CHAIR: Can you advise the Committee whether the Government has any long-term strategy for heritage properties, how to manage them and so on throughout the State?

Mr McDOUGALL: About 12 months ago we brought in some heritage assets guidelines under section 170 of the Act to assist government agencies in the management of the heritage assets. One of the products we requested through those guidelines is that each government agency prepares a heritage asset management strategy, which will address how they will manage those assets. Those strategies are due to come in in the first half of this year.

CHAIR: In relation to the Eveleigh rail yards, are there any plans to sell the rail yards or are there any alternative plans to allow private developers to utilise that site?

Mr McDOUGALL: Probably my colleague would be in the best position to answer that. We get involved only once plans are brought to our attention and, as I said, government agencies are required to consult with us. We do not have any consultation on the agenda currently, but plans for the government and ownership of the site would come up within the authority of the Redfern-Waterloo Authority. Perhaps that is something you could ask Mr Domm.

CHAIR: Are there any heritage implications, from your point of view, of the Government's plans in relation to the built environment plan, which includes the rail yards, the former police station, the courthouse, the old Rachel Foster Hospital and the Eveleigh Street precinct? Is there any concern on your part that there will be a loss of heritage as these plans by the authority move forward?

Mr McDOUGALL: There are number of items in the area covered by the plan and the Redfern-Waterloo Act. Some of those are on the State heritage register and there is provision, both in the Act and in our legislation, for the Heritage Council to be consulted when there are any proposals that affect those. We will certainly be consulting the Heritage Council and they will be making their comments on that in due course. We have not done that as yet.

CHAIR: In relation to the rail yards, is there a long-term strategy in place for the future utilisation of that space?

Mr McDOUGALL: Again, we have not sighted that and RailCorp maybe able to answer that, given that they are looking at the heritage assets generally, but my understanding is that nothing of that nature has come into the office for comment.

CHAIR: Mr Domm, do you have any comment to make in relation to the Eveleigh heritage issues we have just been talking about?

Mr DOMM: I think the important point to make is that the built environment plan that you referred to is a draft plan and it only proposes new zonings and new planning controls for the sites; it does not specify any actual development applications that may occur in the future, which will, of course, be subject to a completely separate statutory process and community consultation process. So, in proposing new land use concepts and planning controls for those sites it does not automatically follow that the development will happen. That is essentially up to the market to respond to those new zonings, if and when they are made.

In specific answer to your question about north Eveleigh, you have to see the rail yards as north Eveleigh and south Eveleigh, and south Eveleigh includes the Australian Technology Park, so including the rail yards encompasses those three components. I think the Government has spent an enormous amount of money and effort in preserving the heritage on those sites. The Australian Technology Park is an outstanding example of preservation of rail heritage and that is recognised right across-the-board to be the case.

The Government is currently spending \$40 million refurbishing the old carriage works at north Eveleigh to turn them into a contemporary performing arts space and once again that is an adaptive reuse that sees what was formerly a heritage asset that was decaying being restored and into active use. The Redfern-Waterloo Authority [RWA] is actively engaged at the moment in looking at ways in which other buildings on the north Eveleigh site, like the former chief mechanical engineer's building and the blacksmith's workshop, can be restored and adaptively reused.

So I think that the real challenge for those rail yards is to find creative ways to allow the urban renewal process to drive the heritage restoration and adaptive reuse. We cannot allow, however, those sorts of issues to stop the urban renewal process from occurring because that is the saviour for these facilities, in our estimation. We have set out in that built environment plan a broad strategic approach and when it comes to any specific investment that may occur on those sites or development applications, the challenge for us is to ensure that the essential heritage of those sites is preserved.

CHAIR: With respect to the operations of the authority, can you advise the Committee of the number of times Minister Sartor has consulted with the Aboriginal Housing Company [AHC] during the last 12 months and, in particular, how often has he met with the Aboriginal Housing Company since his rather controversial comments about the chief executive officer [CEO] of that company?

Mr DOMM: The Redfern-Waterloo Authority Act requires the Minister or his nominee to consult with the Aboriginal Housing Company and the broader Aboriginal community on matters pertaining to redevelopment of the Block. The Minister wrote to the Aboriginal Housing Company in November last year advising that the CEO, myself, as is his nominee to consult with the Aboriginal Housing Company on the Block. I will answer your question in two parts, if that is okay.

In terms of the Minister's involvement, he has met numerous times with the Aboriginal Housing Company from the time he was made Minister. I was appointed CEO officially on 17 January and the Minister and I met with the board of the Aboriginal Housing Company, I think on 9 February, about two or three weeks after the RWA had been established. Unfortunately from that

point on the Aboriginal Housing Company chose, of its own volition, to boycott further discussions with the Minister and the RWA for a period of time. However, a number of informal discussions did occur between the Minister and Mick Mundine and ourselves during that period.

I formally met with the Aboriginal Housing Company again on 31 August and presented a detailed proposal to them to set up a negotiating framework to resolve issues pertaining to the Block. They never responded to that proposal. As I said, the Minister wrote to the Aboriginal Housing Company in November nominating myself as his nominee. In recent times I have met with the Aboriginal Housing Company twice in the past three weeks and there were very productive meetings, but there have been a range of discussions, formal and informal, that have occurred over the past 12 months but not as much as we would have liked simply because the Aboriginal Housing Company itself formally boycotted discussions with the Government.

CHAIR: Has the Minister met with the company since last November?

Mr DOMM: Yes, I understand that he met with Mick Mundine fairly recently in private discussion.

CHAIR: How would you characterise the current relationship between the authority and the company?

Mr DOMM: I think it is very good. I think it is as good as it has ever been. I do not think there has ever been any real animosity between ourselves and the Aboriginal Housing Company. I think that the AHC has engaged in a public process designed to enhance its negotiating position but privately the relationship has always been very good.

CHAIR: Can you advise the Committee when construction is expected to begin on the new Redfern developments?

Mr DOMM: Which one in particular?

CHAIR: The ones that have been currently flagged?

Mr DOMM: As I have indicated, the built environmental plan merely sets out a proposed planning regime but there is a development due to start—the Australian Technology Park—within weeks that the Redfern-Waterloo Authority is doing itself. It is a new building to house National ICT Australia and the Defence, Science and Technology organisation. We are borrowing up to \$45 million from NSW Treasury to build that building ourselves. It will house about 600 employees and it is about 11,000 square metres of employment space. We are kickstarting the process, through doing it ourselves, of urban renewal through getting something happening at the ATP—there have been no buildings built there for more than five years—and I think it is really important to get some cranes on the skyline, some activity happening and some new employment into the area.

We will be actively engaged in the process of marketing the ATP because we see that as a key employment zone. In respect of the other sites, we still have a public process to get through of getting the plan approved and the new zonings made and then that we can start actively marketing those sites. With the exception of the ATP and the redevelopment of the Redfern railway station, we expect the private sector will drive the redevelopment of Redfern-Waterloo.

CHAIR: What is the expected cost of the building that is going ahead, the ATP?

Mr DOMM: The actual building cost is about \$38.5 million and a few million dollars extra for fit outs and things like that, which will eventually be reimbursed through the leasing arrangements we have negotiated.

CHAIR: You mentioned the private sector. Does the Government have plans to allow developers involved in the rebuilding of that area to receive stamp duty and section 94 exemptions so as to increase housing affordability?

Mr DOMM: The Redfern-Waterloo Authority does not have any plans, as you have indicated, but we are conscious of the fact that in the 12 months of our existence there has been next to no investor interest in Redfern whatsoever. In 12 months I have not had one major developer or investor walk into my office saying they want to invest in Redfern-Waterloo; despite what some people think, that there are all these developers out there willing to knock everything down, the exact opposite is the case and our job is to try to turn that around and get some interest in the place. Therefore, levies, which act as a significant disincentive to investment, are things we have to be very careful about in an area where people just do not want to invest.

Having said that, the development industry just cannot get out of it scot-free. It has to make its contribution, so we have to try to strike the right balance when it comes to developing these levies and contributions and we are working on that at the moment. It is foreshadowed in the built environment plan that it is a body of work we have to do that flows from this, including that work.

CHAIR: Has the authority reached out to the development industry, so to speak, to try to encourage investment?

Mr DOMM: Yes.

CHAIR: But this has basically brought no significant interest at all.

Mr DOMM: I think people have been waiting to see this plan and to see what it all means, bearing in mind that most of the sites of the plan are State government-owned sites; they are surplus sites and they are not zoned for development at the moment. They are either zoned railway land or for school uses or hospital and, therefore, rezoning is necessary to allow residential and commercial development to occur.

They have been waiting for this plan. We have been trying to market the ATP. We took over the ATP on 1 April last year, which is only nine or 10 months ago, and we had to go through a fairly significant process of restructuring that company, getting it into profit and getting it healthy. There has been a pick up of investor interest at the ATP, but overall Redfern suffers from an image problem, a perception that it is not a good place. It is our job to turn that around, to try to say that the perception does not match the reality because the ATP, for example, is a very good environment for business to invest.

That is the challenge for us. This plan, once it is finished, will provide a very useful vehicle to encourage a new level of investor interest, but we have to get out there and actively market it. In recent times we have made representations to the Property Council and to the urban task force. We will be working with those organisations once this plan is finalised, to get out to their membership to try to spread the message that Redfern is a good place to invest.

CHAIR: In relation to transport infrastructure that will need to be part and parcel of the new development, can you advise what is the anticipated cost of providing that basic transport infrastructure?

Mr DOMM: Are you referring to the redeveloped railway station or the broader question?

CHAIR: Broader and including the railway station?

Mr DOMM: It is a bit difficult to say at the moment. In respect to the railway station, our estimation is that we will need about \$30 million to \$40 million but it depends a bit on the nature of the development that occurs alongside the railway station on the lands adjacent to Gibbons Street. That is our rough estimation. We are working with RailCorp at the moment. We have just established a joint project control group with RailCorp, the RWA and the Transport Infrastructure Development Corporation. In the next six months there will be options developed for redevelopment. It is only when we have those options that we will have to put some costing to it. It is a rough estimate of \$30 million to \$40 million. In respect to the broader transport issues, that is part of the body of work that we have to continue doing as we go through with the consequential actions from this plan but, obviously, that is an issue that involves the RTA.

CHAIR: With respect to the \$30 million that you mentioned, how would those costs be generated? How will they be paid for?

Mr DOMM: We expect that they will be generated through a range of measures, through sale or disposal or redevelopment of surplus government lands through developer levies and also through RailCorp funds.

CHAIR: In relation to plans for commercial development of Redfern, can you tell the Committee how many new car parking spaces would be created as part of that plan?

Mr DOMM: Around Redfern itself? I can answer in respect to the ATP. Under the current master plan of the ATP, there is provision up to 1,600 car parking spaces. This proposed new zoning for the ATP does not impact on that, so that figure remains the same.

In respect of the other areas, it is a bit premature to talk about what the car parking will be when we do not know at this stage what the nature of any developments will be. But obviously that is an issue. It is important to bear in mind that the development around the railway station is premised on a public transport solution not a car solution. That is why it has been done this way—so that the ATP, North Eveleigh and South Eveleigh and the new commercial precinct around Regent Street and Gibbons Street would feed into an enhanced public transport network. We are not really focusing on vehicular transport; we are focusing on public transport to try to make this work.

CHAIR: At this stage are there any plans for privately operated parking stations?

Mr DOMM: No, there are no plans whatsoever at this stage.

CHAIR: In terms of DAs, can you give us an indication of the expected turnaround time for development approvals that hopefully will be lodged with the authority?

Mr DOMM: The authority itself only has delegation for development applications of less than \$5 million. For anything above \$5 million the Minister for Planning is the consent authority. Therefore, we only have delegated consent functions. We are not the consent authority; we have delegated consent functions for developments with less than a \$5 million total capital development cost. So we get the small stuff that we do and we turn it around in a time that is comparable to the City of Sydney. We have to follow a statutory framework and that takes time but we are geared towards efficiency in the way that we deal with these matters.

CHAIR: Is there any provision for compensation to be passed on to prospective home buyers, for example, if the time frames run over time?

Mr DOMM: I will try to answer that question but I am not quite clear what you mean. The developments we are proposing are, by and large, developments that will not in our view create major residential conflicts. They are not right next to residential areas. The ATP is a discrete centre. Yes, the hospital site is surrounded by residential. The school and police station are not: they abut Redfern Street, which is a retail street. Large parts of the Eveleigh Street precinct, which includes the Aboriginal Housing Company lands, are already commercial. They go right down to Cleveland Street so there is a minimal residential impact on that part. With a number of these precincts we believe the development will not create major residential conflicts.

Where there will be issues will be places like North Eveleigh, where there is currently limited access to the site because it is significantly below the level of Wilson Street, where the current residential exists. That is a problem we have to fix. We have to find new ways of accessing that site. But, apart from that, because there are no actual development proposals there at the moment it is a little premature to be commenting in detail about those sorts of issues. But moving forward, whoever is doing these developments—bearing in mind that it will not be us; it will not be the Redfern-Waterloo Authority—will have to deal with residential conflicts and issues in the same way as anywhere else—if it was occurring under the jurisdiction of the City of Sydney, for example. We intend to adhere to the same standards.

CHAIR: With respect to building new homes, are there any plans in place for a rehousing program? If any residents are dislocated how will they be looked after?

Mr DOMM: Are you referring to public housing or housing generally?

CHAIR: Public housing and housing generally—any housing.

Mr DOMM: We do not anticipate that any non-public housing will be dislocated in the way that you have indicated. I do not have a crystal ball but at this stage we do not anticipate that. Obviously we have foreshadowed in this plan as part of its proposed stage 2 that we want to look at ways in which we can revitalise the public housing stock and create some opportunities for affordable housing. But that is in the context of certain very firm guarantees that the Government has given that people will not be disadvantaged, their tenancies will be secure and so on. It may well be—in fact, it will almost certainly be the case—that if there is going to be any redevelopment on those sites to revitalise the public housing stock it would have to be done in a staged way. Therefore, you can try to manipulate vacancies or whatever to try to minimise any dislocation but we have made it very clear that people will not be relocated outside that area. As currently happens—I think the Department of Housing is currently converting some bed-sit apartments into one-bedroom apartments; I think there are about 28 of them in Waterloo—they have to temporarily relocate those tenants while they do that. They give those tenants the first right of refusal to go back into the new enhanced units when they are finished. Sometimes you have to go through a relocation process to get a better outcome for those tenants.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Mr Domm, in 2005 RPR Consulting prepared an evaluation of the Redfern-Waterloo street team. What were the major failings revealed in that report that led to the winding up of the Redfern-Waterloo Partnership Project's landmark youth services program?

Mr DOMM: The report that you referred to has been the subject of a freedom of information application—which the RWA determined just yesterday, in fact. It denied the application on the grounds that the documents are Cabinet in confidence.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Did the evaluation find that the management of this government program was inadequate and that government funds had not been spent appropriately?

Mr DOMM: As I have indicated, that report is Cabinet in confidence, on the advice that I have.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: What did the authority learn from this experience that will change the way in which government and non-government youth services are provided in the Redfern-Waterloo area in the future?

Mr DOMM: I think the important thing is that we must reform human services in the area so that you get the best possible outcomes for the money that is being invested. Large amounts of money are being invested in Redfern-Waterloo—I think \$30 million to \$40 million a year is invested in human services, of which a significant proportion goes to non-government organisations but a lot of it is government. Yet you have a welfare-dependent society with a significant degree of social disadvantage. We are attacking the problem in three different directions: firstly, with the built environment proposals to try to generate investment, jobs and enterprise, and therefore economic activity and opportunities for people; employment and enterprise, which flow from that; and reform of the human services area. So what we have done with the money that was previously allocated for the street teams is we have said to the community that we are going to consult with that community on the best ways in which those funds can be reallocated to achieve the best results for youth services.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: So the \$800,000 that we are presumably talking about that was allocated to the street team you expect to be redirected to youth services or will it now be used to fund other human services in the area?

Mr DOMM: We intend to consult with the community and NGOs on the best ways in which—it is more \$800,000; I think it is a total of about \$2 million—

Ms SYLVIA HALE: I assume there was \$800,000 left over.

Mr DOMM: No, it is more than that. We will consult on the best ways in which that money can be reallocated. Whether that much can be spent on youth services or whether some of it should be spent in other ways remains to be seen. But the intention is to get a much better outcome for the use of those funds.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Now that the authority has released the draft built environment plan will it also release the Cox Richardson report on the RED strategy consultation on which the plan draws?

Mr DOMM: The plan does not draw on that. It looked at all the preceding work that was done, which, once again, I must unfortunately say is Cabinet in confidence. But all those documents formed part of the Cabinet's decision that established the Redfern-Waterloo Authority.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: So you are saying that that document is Cabinet in confidence as well—even though it is referred to in the built environment plan—and will not be released.

Mr DOMM: We have not been asked to release it formally but to the best of my knowledge it formed an attachment to the Cabinet decision.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Will you provide to the Committee a copy of the Cox Richardson report?

Mr DOMM: If it is Cabinet in confidence I am not sure that I can.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Thank you.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: Point of order: As Chair of the social issues committee, which did an inquiry into Redfern, I know about some of these things. I am not sure whether Ms Hale has many more of these questions but it does not seem to me that they are appropriately addressed to the authority. The matters she is raising go back some considerable time and were not handled by the Redfern-Waterloo Authority. They predate its existence.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: To the point of order: The authority has taken over the activities of the partnership project so I believe it is specious to suggest that the authority does not have access to these documents and is not in a position to provide them to the Committee.

The Hon. JAN BURNSWOODS: But the things you are asking about were not done by the project.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: It is not a point of order, Madam Chair.

CHAIR: There is no point of order.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Mr Domm, could you explain why under the built environment plan the authority reduced the residential floor space ratio [FSR] on the Block when on the Government's own land at the eastern end of North Eveleigh, with the same proposed zoning and a similar distance from Redfern railway station, it has proposed a 1:1 FSR and for the commercial core it has not yet indicated any residential FSR?

Mr DOMM: Can you refer me to the particular page?

Ms SYLVIA HALE: It is page 33. If you look at the existing FSR, it is down the bottom: table 4.1.

Mr DOMM: If you are talking about North Eveleigh, you also need to look at the actual part of the plan that talks about the specific site because that site is broken up into three sections. If you go to pages 40 to 41 that indicates what I just said. You will see that the eastern end, as I think you described it, is seen as mixed business and residential use. The western end—if I can call it that—is

seen as predominantly residential and the middle section is predominantly cultural and artistic, and that is where the contemporary performing arts space is being built. If you look at page 41 you will see that the proposed floor space ratios when it comes to residential are different for each of those three sections. In the western section, for example, the proposed maximum residential floor space ratio is 2:1, which is equivalent to the proposed maximum FSR. In the eastern section that you referred to the proposed maximum residential FSR is 1:1 but the proposed maximum FSR is 2:1.

In the eastern section the difference between the maximum residential FSR and the maximum FSR is entirely consistent with what we are doing with the Block because it is designed to encourage commercial development over residential development. This plan is essentially about job creation. Therefore, there is consistency between what you have described at the eastern section of North Eveleigh and what we are proposing to do on the Block.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Are you suggesting that the construction of the Pemulwuy project, for example, would not be a job-creating activity?

Mr DOMM: If 62 dwellings are built, as proposed by the Aboriginal Housing Company, on the 6,000 square metres that constitute the Block it would not allow for any commercial outcomes.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: But their plan, as I understand it, involves a cultural centre, a museum and a commercial building.

Mr DOMM: Where is their plan?

Ms SYLVIA HALE: I have seen a model of it at the Block and I am sure there have been inspections by many people. The University of Sydney architecture department has spent a long time developing the plans.

Mr DOMM: It proposes development of other people's land to achieve those sorts of outcomes. What I am saying is that the size of the Block is defined by those four streets—Eveleigh, Louis, Caroline and Hugo—which is about 6,200 square metres. So if you put 62 dwellings and assume an average of 100 square metres for each there is no room for anything else.

So there has been a lot of talk coming out of the housing company but for 12 months I have been asking for detailed plans and I still have not seen them. It is one thing to look at a model in their office and another thing to come up with a real proposal that has the land owner's consent to allow these things to happen. Essentially what has occurred over the past 12 months is as a response to the position that the Government has taken saying that it opposes a concentration of high dependency housing, the Aboriginal Housing Company has made a lot of statements about other types of development there but no detailed proposal has been put forward. It has even met with the Department of Planning recently in respect to a concept plan and it still has not presented any detailed proposal.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: You would agree that the proposed FSR of 0.5:1 in fact stymies the Pemulwuy project entirely? There is no point if this floor space ratio persists with them proceeding with the plan which they consider would not now be viable?

Mr DOMM: The Government has been very consistent: it has never supported that concentration of housing on The Block and all of this draft built environment plan does is maintain that consistent approach. Can I ask you to look at it this way, because I do not think the position of the Redfern Waterloo Authority has ever been fairly presented? What we have always said is that the Government will commit to the construction or the provision of 62 dwellings for the Aboriginal Housing Company which is consistent with what it says it wants. If under this planning regime only, say, for the sake of this discussion, 32 could be built it means we will have to find another 30 near The Block. On our estimation that could be done within a radius of 400 to 500 metres.

Under this proposal, if this zoning goes through, we will have increased the value of the Aboriginal Housing Company's land on The Block quite considerably—the development potential increases by 50 per cent. The zoning goes from 1:1 to 1.5:1 maximum FSR. This is a big opportunity for the Aboriginal Housing Company to get 62 houses and create commercial development that provides a non-housing type income, and jobs for Aboriginal people. The value of its land under this

proposal increases and it still gets all the housing it asks for. The only thing it does not get is the right to concentrate it all on those 6,000 square metres, which we just do not agree with, and we have been very consistent about.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Why was it not feasible on The Block to maintain the 1:1 residential FSR and increase the overall FSR to provide commercial incentives for development in the area. Is that what the Government requires?

Mr DOMM: Because we do not support a concentration of housing and what you are suggesting would have allowed a concentration of housing.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Where a reduction in floor space ratio is proposed in an existing residential area, if one of the existing houses burns down and needs to be rebuilt, does that mean it will only be able to be rebuilt at half the current size or will it be able to be rebuilt as it is currently?

Mr DOMM: You are probably aware of the notion of existing use rights?

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Yes.

Mr DOMM: I do not want to be quoted because I am not efficient with the law on this as maybe I should be, but my understanding is those existing use rights exist for a period of time after a dwelling may have been demolished or whatever but they do not exist indefinitely. The fact of the matter is that the Aboriginal Housing Company itself has demolished most of the dwellings on that site over a period of time.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Do the terms of sale being considered of the former Redfern Public School site require the Indigenous Land Council to maintain any open space on the site? If so, why is that not reflected in the draft built environment plan?

Mr DOMM: Just before I answer that Ms Hale can I just add to my previous answer and say that you will see an article by Mr Sartor in today's paper where he makes it clear that even under the existing planning controls the Aboriginal Housing Company's Penulwuy project could not be built. In respect to your question about the school, the Indigenous Land Council has offered to purchase that facility to create a national centre for Aboriginal excellence—sporting, cultural and social excellence. The sale has not yet occurred. It is going through negotiation and is currently at valuation stage, valuing what the site will be. It is our expectation that the sale will go ahead but that depends on a range of factors that come out of the negotiation.

What the Redfern Waterloo Authority sought, and what it agreed to, was that the existing buildings and sporting oval would remain. It has been pointed out to us since we released this plan that the way we have put the maps for the school site in this plan creates an incorrect impression that that sporting oval could be built over, for example, so we intend to take those comments on board when we finalise this plan and clarify it.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Presumably you would adjust the plan for the proposed zoning for four to seven storey buildings on the site?

Mr DOMM: I think we need to make clear what we mean by that in the context of the agreement with the Indigenous Land Council that the existing sporting field remain.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: What mechanisms has the authority put in place in the agreement with the Indigenous Land Council to ensure that the former school area remains used for community education and recreation?

Mr DOMM: Well, that is the zoning we are proposing for that site. The actual specific title of the zoning is special purpose zoned community, which is community education and recreation.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Is there any provision in the sale agreement for the Government to repurchase the site should either the Indigenous Land Council [ILC] no longer wish to operate

educational and recreational programs on the site or should the Government require it for future educational and recreational uses, as the Redfern Waterloo area grows?

Mr DOMM: There are two issues there. Firstly, the zoning would not allow anything other than what we have just said and it is beyond the capacity of the ILC to change that zoning—the Government will have to do that and has no current intention to do that. Secondly, as I have indicated the negotiation for the sale has not yet concluded. So it is an issue that we have put out there that we want some guarantees in respect to this. I think someone who is purchasing the land, and spending a lot of money to purchase it—bear in mind that the land will be valued on the basis of best use residential and it will be paying that even though they will not be using it for that purpose but for a community and educational purposes—the land owner has got some rights in respect to the land and its future uses but consistent with the basis upon which the Government has agreed to sell them the land.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: Given the skewed income demographics for the area, that is, twin peaks with higher-than-average and lower-than-average incomes, what percentage of new housing in the area will be designated affordable housing in order to create socio-economic balance in Redfern Waterloo?

Mr DOMM: Under this plan, this is stage 1 of the built environment plan, and as I have indicated the primary thrust is for commercial development, there are only 2,000 dwellings proposed which probably equates to about 4,000 residents. But we are only looking at that area arching out from the station and then the old Eveleigh railway yards and whatever—there is a much bigger area primarily in Waterloo which we have not yet looked at. As I indicated earlier, and as the plan foreshadows, public housing estates may provide an opportunity for affordable housing to be generated. One of the things we hope to come out of this plan is to develop an affordable housing strategy and the whole issues of levies and targets that I have spoken about.

We regard affordable housing as very important. There is not much point creating a whole lot of new jobs if people cannot live anywhere near them, and that is the whole point of having affordable housing that goes with this development so it reduces the impacts of vehicles. I think we need to use public transport, cycle or walk to work and that is what the whole plan revolves around.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: When do you anticipate that strategy will be released?

Mr DOMM: We are going to start work on it this year, as the plan foreshadows, and there will obviously have to be a lot of community consultation because the Government is very clear that current residents will not be disadvantaged. I will be setting up a unit within the RWA sometime this year to begin detailed research work. A lot of this sort of thing has gone on before in other places and other countries and we need to look at those best practices within Australia and overseas and see how they can be adapted to the Redfern Waterloo context. But I think there is a real opportunity for a significant degree of affordable housing to be created.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: In relation to employment the Minister has stated that the aim of the employment and enterprise plan is to create 18,000 jobs and assist people to reduce what he describes as welfare dependency. Is the authority, or the Minister, aware that taking on a job may cost a public housing resident not only part of their Centrelink income and concession card but will result in an increase in rent and possibly the loss of their public housing tenancy, due to the interaction of the proposed employment plan with the reshaping public housing policy? Has the authority or the Minister spoken to the Minister for Housing about that because the two policies seem to be in direct conflict?

Mr DOMM: We have three ministerial advisory committees on which relevant government departments are all represented, and this issue has been discussed within that context. But my advice from the Department of Housing is that if someone who is in public housing gets a job or a new job with income increase it does not kick them out it just increases their rent. I could be wrong on that.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: That is wrong.

Mr DOMM: That is what I am told.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: It is my understanding that any new tenants who come into the area will be subject to very stringent eligibility criteria which could mean that if they take a job then they will be forced to leave.

Mr DOMM: I cannot comment on that because I am not familiar with it. What I am saying is that we are very strong on the issue of affordable housing.

Ms SYLVIA HALE: You will consult with the Department of Housing about potential conflicts between the policies?

Mr DOMM: Absolutely.

The Hon. DAVID OLDFIELD: Given the line of questioning to which you have just been subjected from Ms Hale would you comment on the considerable conflict? Ms Hale is suggesting a requirement for you to create affordable housing and you suggest that this affordable housing is particularly important and necessary because there is no point creating jobs if there is not a place for these people to live close to work, transport issues and so and so. Then the new issue arises that if these people have got jobs they are not going to be allowed to live in this affordable housing. Do you have a comment on that conflict?

Ms SYLVIA HALE: I think Ms Hale is referring to public housing, which is quite different from affordable housing.

The Hon. DAVID OLDFIELD: Are we not talking about affordable housing that would be essentially another form of public housing? It is certainly operated by government or government-related agencies or local councils at very low rent.

Mr DOMM: I think we are seeing it as a broader issue than that. I think we want to see, and this plan indicates that we want to look at, equity ownership models and things like that rather than just rented models. Part of the strategy to create wealth is to give people some sort of equity and potential for capital gain.

The Hon. DAVID OLDFIELD: How would you do that?

Mr DOMM: We have not started the work on this yet.

The Hon. DAVID OLDFIELD: Just in principle generally now it sounds as though you are suggesting you would be selling certain types of housing below market?

Mr DOMM: No. What I am suggesting is that you have to have a range of strategies to tackle complex problems: there is no one-size-fits-all approach. We need to look at Australian and overseas experience in these issues and part equity ownership models have been successfully used elsewhere. We have not started working on this yet but we intend to develop a multi-faceted strategy which would include a range of options for affordable housing.

The Hon. DAVID OLDFIELD: Along what sort of line? For example, are you talking about government sponsored low interest loans?

Mr DOMM: Not necessarily.

The Hon. DAVID OLDFIELD: Can you give me some sort of example?

Mr DOMM: No, I have not started work on it yet. I am not going to get into the detail when I have not started work.

The Hon. DAVID OLDFIELD: You have no idea at this stage then?

Mr DOMM: No, I just have not started work on it. It is foreshadowed in this plan as a future stage 2. I will be establishing a unit within the RWA later this year to commence detailed work.

The Hon. DAVID OLDFIELD: I understand you say it is broad-ranging but, quite frankly, there are only certain ways that this could be done and it is not as broad-ranging as you suggest. If you are talking about a person having some equity then you must be talking about there being some sort of loan structure. If you are talking about it being affordable for low income people then those loan structures must in some way be Government sponsored and at low interest rates—there are only so many ways it can be done—or run by community housing groups and the rent is low. But there are only so many ways and it is not quite as broad-ranging as you are suggesting.

Mr DOMM: I think there are more options than you have indicated.

Mr DOMM: There is the role of the private sector, for example.

The Hon. DAVID OLDFIELD: What would be in it for the private sector to be involved and how would they do that?

Mr DOMM: That is a body of work that we need to do.

The Hon. DAVID OLDFIELD: These are all sort of cliché terms: "body of work", "broad ranging". Can you be a bit more specific? Just give me one solid example.

Mr DOMM: Well, the question was asked earlier of, I think, Mr Haddad, about the CUB site and affordable housing, and we are in discussions with CUB at the moment about this issue and they have said to us, "We can either pay you a levy or we could build affordable housing and give it to you, which you can then use in whichever way you wish". So there are ways in which affordable housing can be built at no cost to government on that basis. I am not being vague or general, I am simply saying that I have not commenced work on this project, but what we want to do is to seriously tackle the issue and see what the range of options are there. But I do not want to be saying yes, government is going to be selling public housing, I am not saying that at all. I am simply saying we need to sit down, look at the problem, look at what we are trying to achieve here, look at international and Australian experience, what other people have done; we do not need to reinvent the wheel.

There have been a lot of creative solutions applied to these problems in places like England and Scotland, for example, and in terms of equity ownership in places like Ontario in Canada. We are going to sit down and research this issue and consult with the relevant communities in conjunction with the Department of Housing, who actually owns these sites, not us. So there is a body of work we need to do before we can comment in detail on this, it is just the reality of where we are at the moment.

The Hon. DAVID OLDFIELD: The issue of my concern, which might clarify my line of questioning, is in regard to your own response earlier and that is the creation of jobs and then not having a place for people to be. My concern, of course, is the creation of so-called affordable housing and then having it occupied by people who do not work.

Mr DOMM: We estimate that 18,000 jobs could be created in the next decade or so in Redfern. Bearing in mind that Redfern railway station is a key transport junction; every railway line in the Sydney metropolitan network, with the exception of the airport line, runs through Redfern. So it is possible for people to live anywhere and work in Redfern, but we all know that the public transport system is under stress as well. There are solutions there outside of people living in the area, but our preference is to try and create as much dwellings as we can in the area. And we think we can, but it is a long-term project.

There are no quick solutions to the problems of Redfern Waterloo. We were set up as a 10-year project; I think it is about a 25-year project, in fact, but if we can get the right settings that encourage investment and the right vision and the right strategies in place—bearing in mind we have only been going for 12 months—an affordable housing, public housing strategy is a huge project in its own right and will take 20-odd years, I suspect, to implement.

CHAIR: Mr Domm, just in conclusion, do you think that in the timeline that you have been given of 10 years, you can go a substantial way towards reaching the goals that are set and then the

disbandment of the authority and natural forces, so to speak, just take over and finish the job or do you see that perhaps the timeline that you have been given for the authority to exist is perhaps overly optimistic?

Mr DOMM: No, I think it is plenty long enough. As I said, if we get all the settings right and get our strategies and visions in place and promote the key infrastructure investment that is necessary to make all these pieces fall into place, I think 10 years is more than enough. Our model is one in which we have a very small organisation that is non-bureaucratic, it is very outcomes-focused and it is there to do a job and it is there to disappear at the end of its time. Whether it is 10 years or eight years or seven years remains to be seen, but I think 10 years is more than enough.

CHAIR: Thank you all for your assistance here today. In relation to answers to questions on notice, the Committee has resolved that we would appreciate it if we could get them within 14 days of your receiving the transcript with the questions on it.

(The witnesses withdrew)

(The Committee adjourned at 12.05 p.m.)