



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, TRAINING AND
YOUTH AFFAIRS**

(Reference: [Future use of the Fitters Workshop, Kingston](#))

Members:

**MS A BRESNAN (The Chair)
MR J HANSON (The Deputy Chair)
MS M PORTER**

TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE

CANBERRA

TUESDAY, 13 MARCH 2012

**Secretary to the committee:
Mr A Snedden (Ph: 6205 0199)**

By authority of the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory

Submissions, answers to questions on notice and other documents, including requests for clarification of the transcript of evidence, relevant to this inquiry that have been authorised for publication by the committee may be obtained from the Legislative Assembly website.

WITNESSES

BARR, MR ANDREW , Deputy Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development, and Minister for Tourism Sport and Recreation.....	156
CANTAMESSA, MS CINDY , Acting Project Director, Economic Development Directorate.....	156
McNULTY, MR HAMISH , Executive Director, Infrastructure and Capital Works, Economic Development Directorate	156
REYNOLDS, MR CHRIS , Executive Director, Land Development, Economic Development Directorate	156

Privilege statement

The Committee has authorised the recording, broadcasting and re-broadcasting of these proceedings.

All witnesses making submissions or giving evidence to committees of the Legislative Assembly for the ACT are protected by parliamentary privilege.

“Parliamentary privilege” means the special rights and immunities which belong to the Assembly, its committees and its members. These rights and immunities enable committees to operate effectively, and enable those involved in committee processes to do so without obstruction, or fear of prosecution.

Witnesses must tell the truth: giving false or misleading evidence will be treated as a serious matter, and may be considered a contempt of the Assembly.

While the Committee prefers to hear all evidence in public, it may take evidence in-camera if requested. Confidential evidence will be recorded and kept securely. It is within the power of the committee at a later date to publish or present all or part of that evidence to the Assembly; but any decision to publish or present in-camera evidence will not be taken without consulting with the person who gave the evidence.

Amended 9 August 2011

The committee met at 9.00 am.

BARR, MR ANDREW, Deputy Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development, and Minister for Tourism Sport and Recreation

REYNOLDS, MR CHRIS, Executive Director, Land Development, Economic Development Directorate

CANTAMESSA, MS CINDY, Acting Project Director, Economic Development Directorate

McNULTY, MR HAMISH, Executive Director, Infrastructure and Capital Works, Economic Development Directorate

THE CHAIR: Thank you, minister, for appearing today before the education, training and youth affairs committee's inquiry into the future uses of the Fitters Workshop at Kingston. I draw your attention to the privilege card, which is on the table in front of you, so you are aware of the implications of that. Everyone is aware of that? Yes, excellent. Before we go to questions, minister, would you like to make an opening statement?

Mr Barr: No.

THE CHAIR: No?

Mr Barr: "Why am I here?" would probably be my opening statement.

THE CHAIR: I can probably give you some information on that. Obviously we have had a number of hearings into the Fitters Workshop and issues around the LDA's involvement with the Fitters Workshop, and various plans that have been developed for it have come up. All committee members agreed it would be useful to have the LDA appear. As I said, there are a number of questions about the LDA's involvement in the conservation management plan and the various master plans that have been developed over time. So that is the background as to why. And the LDA is mentioned quite a number of times in quite a lot of the information about the Fitters Workshop. Is that useful at all?

Mr Barr: Yes, to the extent that I have made a statement to the Assembly in relation to the nature of this agency's involvement now.

THE CHAIR: Sure.

Mr Barr: I hope the committee is aware that I no longer have responsibility for the capital works project. The Economic Development Directorate was created in May of last year, and there was a small window, I think, of a few weeks where we did have carriage of the project, but it has been transferred to Community Services Directorate.

THE CHAIR: We are aware of that.

Mr Barr: As to the overall master plan, I indicated in the statement to the Assembly that I was waiting on the outcome of this committee before finalising that.

THE CHAIR: Yes.

Mr Barr: So, as far as my involvement in the matter is concerned, that is where it lies.

THE CHAIR: We are aware of that. But because we have a number of plans—the conservation management plan plus the work Colin Stewart originally did on the precinct—

Mr Barr: Sure. Certainly officials who were around at that time will be able to, hopefully, provide some information for you.

THE CHAIR: Excellent. There have been a number of questions around the history and the time line that have also been relevant in terms of what we have been looking at as a committee. I might go to my first question, then.

I understand, as you said, minister, that the capital works has been handed over, but, in terms of developing the works to be done on the Fitters Workshop and the annexe and the time frame for that, we have not been able to get clear information. Representatives from the bus depot markets appeared last week, and they said they had been told by the LDA that it would be around about 18 months for construction for the work to be done on the Fitters Workshop and the annexe. That was the first time we had heard this time frame. That time line has been indicated to other stakeholders as well. Can we get some idea of when that 18 months would have actually started from?

Mr Reynolds: The 18 months time line does, in my opinion, seem reasonable for construction. However, there is a precursor prior to that, which is dealing with the latent environmental conditions on site by way of the past use of the former area. It is probably no surprise that there is a range of contamination and remediation exercises that need to be undertaken. So I guess there is a bit of a rider to that statement—that is, normally 12 to 18 months to actually build the proposed works and the annexe is certainly reasonable, but any major contamination and remediation that may need to be undertaken would add to that time frame.

THE CHAIR: When was that time frame set? When was there a time frame in terms of when that construction period would start?

Mr Reynolds: When the works would commence?

THE CHAIR: Yes.

Mr Reynolds: I guess it is important to understand where we are in the process as well, and the minister just mentioned that we are still waiting for the outcomes of this standing committee prior to finalising the draft master plan that the LDA has prepared. That involved extensive consultation, and that might be where the question was raised.

The master plan the LDA commissioned with Purdon Associates involved a range of workshops and community consultations actually at the markets. As I say, we worked with Purdon Associates. We had a range of workshops with a range of stakeholders attending those. It was very hands-on and informative. It has concluded now to a draft proposed master plan for section 49, as it is called, which includes the cultural and the

arts hub in there. It is pending finalisation, as I say, until the outcome of this standing committee's inquiry.

THE CHAIR: So you are saying that, basically, the 18 months was a time frame that was mentioned through that consultation process? Would that be correct?

Mr Reynolds: I specifically cannot recall saying 18 months, but it does not sound unreasonable. Having a look at the design, 18 months seems a reasonable time frame. However, if there was the requirement to have the site remediated and independently validated and signed off by the EPA, our experience on remediation and contamination issues is that they can take longer, and that would have to have occurred before that 18 or 12 months construction period would commence.

THE CHAIR: Like you said, it could be two years, it could be a bit longer, would you say?

Mr Reynolds: It could be, depending on the nature of those latent conditions.

THE CHAIR: Would it be expected that there would be some of those conditions, as you said, on that particular site?

Mr Reynolds: Well, certainly with Kingston we take nothing for granted when it comes to that. I guess the short answer to your question is that there is a likelihood that it would occur.

THE CHAIR: And was it likely that the construction would have started in 2012 or later than that? I know we have this inquiry process now, but was there a plan for when the construction would actually start?

Mr Reynolds: I think the original budget had construction funding commencing in 2011-12, so, yes, some construction in 2012.

THE CHAIR: But it is likely they may not have been to that site until the end of 2013, potentially, or longer?

Mr Reynolds: Sorry, is that a question?

THE CHAIR: Yes, that is right. Is it likely then?

Mr Reynolds: Is it likely?

THE CHAIR: Yes.

Mr Reynolds: That it might have been delayed?

THE CHAIR: No, what I am saying is that, because you had that construction time frame, in terms of Megalo going into the site, it may not have been until the end of 2013.

Mr Reynolds: I see what you mean; just extrapolating out those time frames?

THE CHAIR: Yes.

Mr Reynolds: Yes, that adds up.

THE CHAIR: Okay.

MRS DUNNE: I am a little confused, as is Ms Bresnan. In debate about whether or not we should have this inquiry, the Minister for the Arts was telling the Assembly that it was expected that Megalo would move into new refurbished premises at Kingston this calendar year, that their lease was expiring in Watson in June and that there would be some carryover, but the expectation would be that they would move into the Fitters with its extension this year. I am just concerned and a bit confused about how we could get such contradictory time lines and who might have advised the Minister for the Arts that that was the time line for her to say that in the Assembly, whereas the LDA and the planning authority were working on a different time line.

Mr Reynolds: In terms of the refurbishment and the proposed new works, that was never an LDA project. That was being done through budget-funded capital works, which was formerly through Land and Property Services and now transferred.

MRS DUNNE: Yes.

Mr Reynolds: As we go with any of our projects, there are always forecast programs for construction activities. What has come to light is that, yes, you could physically build it in 12 to 18 months—let us say 12 months—and, subject to there not being any major contamination issues, that would physically be achievable. It would be a stretch, but possibly achievable.

MRS DUNNE: What I would like to get to is: who advised the Minister for the Arts that Megalo would be in a position to move in August-September this calendar year? What was the source of that advice?

Mr Reynolds: I am not aware of the LDA or LAPS providing that advice.

Ms Cantamessa: I think that question would be more appropriately directed to Community Services Directorate, which has the project time line for the Fitters Workshop extension.

MRS DUNNE: Okay.

THE CHAIR: We actually had some difficulty getting that information from the minister and Community Services on that. When the bus depot markets appeared and actually mentioned that time frame, that was the first time we were able to get some sort of indication of that. As Mrs Dunne said, there has also been a lot said in various submissions about Megalo having to cancel works and all this sort of thing because of this committee process, but it seems that the time line was probably beyond what they expected or what potentially they had been told, that they would not be in—

Mr Barr: Certainly, but even longer now, yes.

THE CHAIR: Sure, but no construction work had actually started on the site. So I think that is the point.

MR HANSON: It seems to have been exaggerated—the time frames in terms of when they would move in. It did seem like they were going to be moving in very shortly. That seems to have been exaggerated to some extent. Regardless of this inquiry, there is a delay. What that delay exactly is—whether it is contamination or how long the construction takes, but certainly it is not happening any time soon, I suppose, is the—

Mr Barr: Certainly not at this point, no, because in response to the Assembly motion in October last year and then the establishment of—

MR HANSON: The Purdon Associates master plan, when that was conducted, did the terms of reference given include Megalo moving into the Fitters Workshop?

Mr Reynolds: Absolutely.

MR HANSON: Okay.

Mr Reynolds: There was a range of fixed not negotiables. Government had made a decision on that. We went to a great extent to be very clear to all participants that we had to work within the boundaries of some not negotiables. That was something that we saw as an opportunity or a constraint that needed to be accommodated.

MR HANSON: Sure. Given that constraint, this committee is yet to work out what it is going to recommend. But one of the options that we are looking at and that has been put to us is that Megalo would move to another location on that site and have a purpose-built facility and that the Fitters Workshop would remain a community space available for a variety of uses, including musical and gallery uses and so on. The Purdons work, if it were to be recast in that light—I assume that a lot of work would not need changing. I mean, that would be a change of a constraint. It might be difficult to give this answer now, but if that were to be the committee's recommendation—

Mr Barr: Hypothetically speaking.

MR HANSON: It might be. It has been put to us, but we all understand the implications if we were to recommend that.

Mr Barr: Sure, yes.

MR HANSON: Obviously, the master plan to be recast in that light. Do you have a view of how long that might take, how feasible it would be to just get that done in the short term? Obviously, whichever decision we make out of this committee, we want to get on with this.

Mr Barr: I can give you an answer as Treasurer. I would want to know how much it would cost.

MR HANSON: Certainly.

Mr Barr: So I would need that scoped. If there were additional costs on top of the existing appropriation, I would have significant concerns.

MR HANSON: Yes.

Mr Barr: I would need to go through a budget process—

MR HANSON: That is understood, yes.

Mr Barr: and priorities.

MR HANSON: But in terms of the actual master plan, if you went back to Purdons, I assume that much of what they have done would remain the same. It is that one constraint that would then change around.

Mr Barr: Presumably—I mean, it would depend, I suppose, on the nature of consultation with other affected parties, if there were some, and to what extent you would reopen the entire question—

MR HANSON: Yes.

Mr Barr: and the entire master planning process. Some people would probably argue that you would have to start from scratch. I would not necessarily share that view, but in this city if you change anything, everyone wants a say. That is a fairly common thing. It would depend on what you mob wanted to do too in terms of motions in the Assembly. Would you want us to start the whole process again—

MR HANSON: How long did the Purdon Associates master planning process take?

Mr Reynolds: The process took about—we commenced that in July 2011, and basically took the six months—

MR HANSON: It was about a six-month process. So if we were to say—you know, this is speculation; we are trying to work out implications—

Mr Barr: I love dealing with hypotheticals.

MR HANSON: Sure, we are trying to work out the implications of decisions that we make in recommendations.

Mr Barr: Absolutely.

MR HANSON: So if we were to say that we want a new master plan or were to recommend a new master plan that made those changes, we are talking about a six-month period at the extremities, because that is from—if you start again, it is six months and that is probably the consequence of that?

Mr Barr: Yes, but then your question would be that you would miss this year's budget cycle if it cost any more. So it would be—

MR HANSON: We understand that.

Mr Barr: And there would be a new development application process. You would have to go through that.

MR HANSON: Okay.

Mr Barr: So my concerns would be delay and cost. I would have those concerns as Treasurer to everyone's projects.

MR HANSON: Sure. Look, we are not naive to the implications of any decision we make here.

Mr Barr: Yes.

MR HANSON: There are costs for delay. But then there are the longer-term implications of what is the result that we want that is the right result to last over the decades. So there is a balance—

Mr Barr: As with everything, Jeremy, there is a balance.

MR HANSON: Indeed.

Mr Barr: Yes.

THE CHAIR: We will go to Ms Porter first and then to Mrs Dunne.

MS PORTER: I am fine.

MRS DUNNE: Could I follow on from where Mr Hanson left off and the comments that you make, Mr Barr, about any costs in delay. Has the government considered the costs of implementing the master plan, the wider master plan, beyond the moneys that have been allocated to the redevelopment of the Fitters?

Mr Barr: Obviously the master plan is not finished. That is only in its draft stage.

MRS DUNNE: Yes.

Mr Barr: So it is certainly an open-ended question in that sense. Yes, there will be costs associated with redeveloping the precinct, but also some opportunities in terms of land sales revenue associated with that. Then it becomes a question of time frame and budget management over a period of time. Of course, with any given fiscal year, there are competing priorities for limited capital resources. So it is difficult to answer that question at this point, given that we have a draft master plan awaiting a recommendation from this committee before being finalised as a draft and then going through further processes.

MRS DUNNE: But it is envisaged at some stage in the budget process that there would need to be more funds—

Mr Barr: I am certain that the Minister for the Arts would bring forward some further budget bids over time.

MRS DUNNE: Right, thanks.

THE CHAIR: Anything further on that?

MRS DUNNE: Not on that.

THE CHAIR: Did you want to go to another question?

MRS DUNNE: I wanted to go back to the issue that Mr Reynolds raised about remediation. You said that with Kingston you have to expect everything. What sort of things might you expect to find in and around the Fitters Workshop that might need remediation?

Mr Reynolds: We are aware from going through historical records that, I think in the vicinity to the east, there were some old storage tanks that have been disused for some time. The records are a bit sketchy about exactly what was in them but, again, being precautionary, we would assume that some testing would need to be done. It might be that there is no issue there and that the tanks could be pulled out and taken away.

MRS DUNNE: So the tanks are still there?

Mr Reynolds: My understanding is that they are still under the ground. Is that correct, Cindy?

Ms Cantamessa: Yes.

Mr Reynolds: Yes.

MRS DUNNE: But we do not know what was held in them? It could be fuel, it could be water, it could be—

Ms Cantamessa: They are previous underground storage tanks; so there would need to be additional validation testing around the fill material to see whether they have leaked, but they will need to be extracted and then they will have to do more testing to ensure that the soil is okay. So it is a process to verify the soil.

MRS DUNNE: Even if there was no actual remediation needed, is that extraction of the tanks and the soil testing and verification part of the building time line, or is that in addition to the building time line?

Mr Reynolds: As I was saying earlier, that would be outside of the building time; so that would be—

MRS DUNNE: So even if you are just extracting tanks that previously held water?

Mr Reynolds: You would have to take those out before you commenced building, yes.

MRS DUNNE: I just want to clarify that that is not part of the building process.

Mr Reynolds: Yes, but the variable there is if it is not contaminated—you would do your tests to start with before you touched anything. If they showed it is healthy, there is no leakage, you would pull the tanks out, compact some clean material back in the spot and then build on top of them. That is a very short process. However, until we actually get there—again, just being precautionary here—we would do the testing and obviously then see the results.

If it is contaminated then there is several months of process there—of independent sign-offs and checking of what is there, what are the results and what needs to be done. There are always three layers there: an expert consultant, an independent auditor and then the EPA. What we have typically found is that with those three levels the process works very well but it is not a quick process. It does take several months, depending on what has been found.

THE CHAIR: And that work has not started in any form?

Mr Reynolds: Not on the particular site to the east of the Fitters Workshop, no. As I say, we have done what is called a desktop analysis, due diligence, to find out what is there. Since the LDA has had carriage of Kingston for some time, we have got a lot of those records. Yes, we have not started the physical testing around those pits or any of that process yet. As the minister said earlier, we do not have carriage of delivering those works.

THE CHAIR: No.

MRS DUNNE: With the best case scenario, how long does it take to extract the tanks and compact the area again?

Mr Reynolds: The actual physical works would probably be the quickest. It is hard to say, but to physically get the machinery in there, take a tank out and fill it with a few truckloads of clean fill is not a very lengthy process. The time will be taken in the checking, the sign-offs and the approval of what needs to be done, if it is contaminated.

MR HANSON: What is your estimate on that time frame?

Mr Reynolds: I have been caught out estimating those things before.

MR HANSON: We promise not to hold you to it.

Mr Reynolds: If I was programming it, I would say you would be stretched to get all of that done in four to five months, and then with the works I would allow three to four weeks. I will draw on my colleague's experience there.

Ms Cantamessa: Six months.

MRS DUNNE: That is the best-case scenario?

Ms Cantamessa: No, that is a ballpark figure. It really depends on whether you find additional contamination and you have to chase the contamination. It is a lengthy process to try to get the approvals once you have had the soil validated.

MRS DUNNE: I have a techie question. Does the fact that you have to disturb all the soil to take out tanks and then recompact it change how you do your foundations and footings?

Mr Reynolds: No. You would compact it to meet the requirements for the building's footings. For example, you would not put in material that required extra footings. You would just put in the right material where the tanks were and compact it to the right standard to minimise your costs for any future building, given that you knew a building was going on it. It is a good cost saving approach to compact it right to start with.

MS PORTER: With respect to this process that you might or might not have to do, but certainly you need to remove the tanks, what impact does it have on other users of the site—for instance, the Kingston markets? They are quite close, aren't they, to that area? One side of the Kingston markets is quite close to that. What impact will it have on their being able to use that particular area for loading, unloading and all the activities that they have to do each weekend?

Mr Reynolds: I cannot give you a definitive answer to that, because, as I said earlier, we will not have carriage of those works. But it would be reasonable, if we could have another hypothetical, to assume that most of the activity would certainly be occurring outside the time that the markets might be operating, so during the week. On the weekend, with respect to the area where the immediate disturbance was occurring, a fence would be put around it to restrict site access. In terms of what impact it would have, without doing a detailed review of it, I am sure it could be managed.

THE CHAIR: I want to ask a question about the conservation management plan that was developed, the 2011 one.

Mr Reynolds: By Duncan Marshall?

THE CHAIR: Yes, by Duncan Marshall. I know you do not have the document here but it lists the various stakeholders that would have an interest in the Fitters Workshop. Obviously Megalo is there, the ACT Heritage Council, the National Trust, the Australian Institute of Architects, Actew and Pro Musica. What involvement did Pro Musica have in the conservation management plan? I have read through it and it lists all the various issues, but what was their involvement that you are aware of in the conservation management plan, given that they are listed as a stakeholder?

Mr Reynolds: I might ask Hamish to answer that one, if he is able to.

Mr McNulty: Clearly, they were one of the stakeholders consulted during the preparation of the conservation management plan. As to the exact nature of those consultations, I cannot answer that. I would have to seek further information on that.

THE CHAIR: So were they included because they had expressed an interest in the Fitters, or were they actually consulted—

Mr McNulty: I presume so. I am not sure.

THE CHAIR: Would it be possible to get some information on that?

Mr McNulty: Absolutely.

THE CHAIR: In one of the sections it talks about the implications of the significance of the building itself. It mentions issues like the size of the building, which has obviously been mentioned by a lot of people, in that it is unique, and the feeling with having the large windows. Again, this might be something that you cannot answer: what implications were discussed in terms of the sort of development that would go into Fitters Workshop that would be best to maintain those unique characteristics of the building that are listed in the conservation management plan?

Mr Reynolds: Again, I was not intimately involved with the preparation of this conservation management plan, but with the ones that I have been involved with previously, they do not normally explore a range of uses and pick a winner, so to speak. They will look at the asset, its heritage value, and identify what aspects of that need to be preserved and maintained as opposed to trying to identify what uses would be complementary to it. They tend to just focus on that built form and its values and what the important bits are that cannot be tampered with or adversely affected.

Mr McNulty: It is worth adding, though, that the background to the report does say that the report was prepared following the government's decision to relocate Megalo there. So that was the context within which this conservation management plan was prepared.

THE CHAIR: When the original plan included a mezzanine level and those sorts of things that would impact on it, was that considered prior to doing the conservation management plan or was it a matter of saying, "They were the plans, they're not going to fit in with the actual site of the building and we'll have to do something different"?

Mr McNulty: I think the design of the fit-out was done to meet the requirements of the conservation management plan.

MRS DUNNE: I am going through the FOI documents. Minister Barr, as the Minister for Economic Development, at various times in the latter half of 2009 you wrote letters to various people who had written seeking—

Mr Barr: Sorry, in 2009?

MRS DUNNE: 2009, yes.

Mr Barr: I was not Minister for Economic Development in 2009, so I could not have written those letters.

MRS DUNNE: Well, you were responsible for the LDA.

Mr Barr: No, I was not.

MRS DUNNE: You were not?

Mr Barr: No. I have been responsible for the LDA since May of last year.

MRS DUNNE: You did in 2009 write letters to various people who had made representations that Fitters be retained for music, and in those letters you say that the government decided in July 2009 that the Fitters Workshop should be occupied by Megalo print studio. Was that decision made in cabinet? Where was that decision made?

Mr Barr: I will have to go back and check the records. I presume that would be in the context of a budget allocation; it would have been a budget cabinet decision. I will need to check the record in relation to that. Clearly, the Minister for the Arts at the time would have made a recommendation and it would probably be a matter of that being progressed through a budget cabinet process. But I will check that. I would have been the planning minister in 2009. I presume that would have been the context in which I would have written letters.

MRS DUNNE: It would be useful to know when that decision was made and whether it was made in cabinet or outside cabinet. If you could check the record, that would be useful.

THE CHAIR: Okay, that will be taken on notice. Going back to the draft master plan, do you know who was consulted in the development of that? Who were the stakeholders that were included in that?

Ms Cantamessa: We consulted all the key government agencies, the developers who were on site at Kingston foreshore, the bus depot operators, the glassworks. We did public consultations as well. So we ensured that we went out to a large group of people. We conducted the public consultations at the bus depot markets on Sundays and we also did two workshops. We invited people to attend if they wished, so we tried to broaden the scope. As well, we did some workshops where we used a marketing firm to actually canvass people who wished to attend. So we tried to do a broad community consultation where we not only had people and involvement from the inner south but we tried to extend it into the greater community of Canberra.

THE CHAIR: So the people involved with the conservation management plan, the stakeholders listed there, were they also specifically included in the development of the master plan—the National Trust, Pro Musica?

Ms Cantamessa: Yes. We consulted the National Trust. We consulted key architects, Duncan Marshall, who had been involved with the CMP for the Fitters Workshop.

THE CHAIR: Were Pro Musica included in that?

Ms Cantamessa: If Pro Musica were consulted, they would have come as members of Pro Musica to the public consultations.

THE CHAIR: So they were not actually included in the stakeholders—

Ms Cantamessa: Not as a key stakeholder.

THE CHAIR: Okay. You mentioned the bus depot. One of the issues they raised when they came in to see us was about the actual annexe that is proposed to be constructed. That has a significant impact on their delivery area—actually, a major impact. It sort of blocks that area. Also, they said that obviously when the markets are operating, that is a space that is used significantly by the markets themselves. They mentioned that they did raise those issues during the master planning process. How has that been considered in terms of developing the master plan and actually looking at the overall uses on the site, given that that annexe will have a significant impact on the bus depot?

Ms Cantamessa: In the master plan it is recognised that the operators actually need the capacity to unload at the markets.

THE CHAIR: Yes.

Ms Cantamessa: So we have ensured that they could actually drive through the markets and unload in the morning. Many of the operators actually do that already. They physically drive into the building, unload and then drive out and park their cars. So what we did was to identify the need to actually have that capacity for the operators to be able to come close to the markets, stop, unload and then find a park somewhere.

THE CHAIR: Is that area identified in the front area of the markets or behind where the annexe would be?

Ms Cantamessa: In the master plan we have identified that they could have access through the front and drive into the building. Also, at the side as well there is capacity for people to actually drive in to park and unload.

THE CHAIR: Okay. It was interesting that they saw it was actually going to have a significant impact, particularly driving into the front area of the markets. It will have a big impact on how the markets are run on the particular days. There is also the fact that market stalls are often set up there at times. So that is seen as being sufficient, is it? They would be parking at the front there or they would be unloading at the front.

I guess what I am trying to get a sense of, too, is the overall use of that site. They are saying it is also going to have an impact on the activities of the actual markets when they are running. I am just trying to get a sense of how that has been incorporated into the annexe and the overall use of the site. I guess that goes to the overall master planning process too. They are indicating that this is going to have an impact on their activities and asking why that is not being considered in the overall process.

Ms Cantamessa: From our observations and our consultation with the operators, it came out that it was extremely important that they actually have the capacity to drive up, park, unload in the morning, have close access to where they can unload or

actually even get access into the building, but then they were happy that the stallholders could take their vehicles somewhere else to park them. So where the current annexe is, if they lost parking in that area, the operators indicated to us that that was okay if there was sufficient parking provided for the stallholders at another location. But they stressed the importance of actually being able to come close to the building and unload.

THE CHAIR: Okay. It just seems to be different from what they told us.

Mr Reynolds: Just to add to that, too, as I said earlier, when we went into the consultation, the decision had been made about the Fitters Workshop and the annexe. So the master planning process that the LDA, through Purdons, had carriage of was really about identifying—that is a given opportunity or constraint, but it is a given. So what can our master planning process do with regards to a range of things, including the market operators, to address some of the concerns that that might have affected them?

THE CHAIR: That probably goes to another issue for me. There is that master plan and then you are going to do an overall master planning process. It seems that the two things have been done somewhat in isolation, I guess. Things have been planned that are going to impact on other activities. They have just got to actually deal with it, basically, is what they are being told.

Mr Reynolds: I think one was a high level strategy—the arts hub that was announced. That was a high level strategy. Then our master plan added—you go down in layers of clarity as you go through these processes. So the work that the LDA has done through its master plan is the next layer of fine-grain detail.

It is not inconsistent with the arts strategy. It actually builds on that and was able to address some of the issues such as the market operators and their concern about having the access to unload. Although they may not be able to park in the same spot that they park now, the convenience of being able to unload in close proximity is there and, as Cindy said, they were happy to park in a different spot.

THE CHAIR: I guess what I am saying is that when they appeared they did not seem to be happy at all with what was being proposed and that it would have a big impact on their activities. I guess they felt that in that overall planning process that had not really been considered adequately in what was happening.

Mr Reynolds: I think it has through direct consultation with some of the actual operators. We were aware of what their concerns were, and it was about obviously not having to carry all their goods a long way—so the convenience of being right in close proximity to unload during set-up. They were happy to park their vehicles in a different location, not necessarily where the proposed annexe is.

THE CHAIR: Mr Hanson?

MR HANSON: No.

THE CHAIR: Ms Porter?

MS PORTER: No.

THE CHAIR: Mrs Dunne.

MRS DUNNE: I am fine, thanks.

THE CHAIR: I want to ask one final question. Colin Stewart appeared before the committee and talked about the work he had done. I appreciate it is quite some time ago—1997 was when he first did the work. But he did say that he obviously had significant involvement and that had actually been a part of developing the site. What we were not able to get a sense of when Ms Burch appeared was when those plans that he developed ceased to actually be a part of the actual overall planning of the site. In his plans he envisaged, I guess, a multi-arts precinct and that there would be sort of private-public partnerships going on there. What has actually happened with those plans that he developed?

Mr Reynolds: The plans still affect a large part of Kingston. It is important—there was a significant event that occurred in 2010. That was the Heritage Council’s listing of where the bus depot markets are held but also the former transport depot. The heritage listing of that required a response through a revision in part of that area to respond to that new constraint that at the time of Colin Stewart’s original master planning was not heritage listed.

THE CHAIR: Yes.

Mr Reynolds: So, yes, with the listing there were elements of Mr Stewart’s original master plan that now could not be delivered. We needed to respond to that, which was the first prompt for us to commence the process of reviewing that section 49 arts-cultural precinct.

THE CHAIR: Sure, and I recognise that. But what about some of the other facets of what he had actually developed—that area being a multi-arts precinct and that there would be public-private partnerships? Are they still things that are on the cards, or is that something that has been washed away now that these other processes have started?

Mr Reynolds: Many aspects of them were also elements during the consultation that stakeholders and the broader community still saw value in. In responding to that and his original master plan, we have carried many of them through, although they might be in slightly different locations. There are elements in the draft master plan, such as the ongoing floor space for arts and cultural activities. There is some commercial land proposed in there, and there are your commercial partnership-type outcomes. So it is still consistent, although being approached from a slightly different way because of the heritage listing of the former transport depot.

THE CHAIR: As to his idea of it being a multi-arts precinct, are you aware of the time when it became to be seen as a visual arts precinct, when that became the focus rather than another of—

Mr Reynolds: I think when Minister Burch launched the arts hub precinct strategy in 2011.

THE CHAIR: So it was an arts decision rather than an LDA decision that it become a visual arts precinct?

Mr Reynolds: Correct.

THE CHAIR: So did the LDA have any involvement in that decision, given the work that the LDA had done in the past?

Mr Reynolds: The decision is effectively responding to a broader community need for the arts, and Arts has carriage for that. We certainly did not have any say or felt that it was in our area of expertise to comment on whether it was visual arts or arts more broadly. Our comments and our input have been focused towards the logistics in responding to site constraints and opportunities as well as planning requirements under the territory plan—car parking, those sorts of things.

THE CHAIR: Even though there had been all that work in the past, as far as you are aware that did not figure into that decision?

Mr Reynolds: That would be a question for Arts to respond—

THE CHAIR: I tried to ask them that and could not get that answer, so—

Mr Reynolds: Well, the documents were there. I can only assume that they were aware of that and considered that. I cannot really comment on—

THE CHAIR: No, I appreciate that.

MS PORTER: Mr Reynolds, you just said something about constraint of the site with regard to the heritage listing of the bus depot. Is that constraint just within the bus depot itself or does it have a parameter around which you cannot do anything? I do not know how far a heritage listing goes. Is it just to the wall or does it mean to that—

MRS DUNNE: “Curtilage”, I think, is the term.

MS PORTER: Curtilage, thank you very much. Is there any of that?

Mr Reynolds: I might ask Cindy. As far as I am aware, it is just the building.

Ms Cantamessa: It is just the building.

MS PORTER: It is just the building itself.

Mr Reynolds: And not all of it. There is a 1970s annexe, Cindy, that was not—

Ms Cantamessa: Yes. If you read the CMP, you will see there are some elements of the building that have higher significance from a heritage perspective than other elements. They have been assessed and there is potential, for instance, that an annexe

at the back of the building could be removed, which is currently where the antiques are at the moment.

MS PORTER: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Any further questions?

MRS DUNNE: No, I am good.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, minister, for appearing.

MR HANSON: Can I just add my thanks? I believe this has happened at short notice, and it is very good of you to respond. It has helped us in formulating our opinions.

THE CHAIR: It has indeed, thank you. Thank you, minister, and thank you, officials, for appearing today.

The committee adjourned at 9.41 am.