



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PLANNING, PUBLIC WORKS AND
TERRITORY AND MUNICIPAL SERVICES**

(Reference: [Annual and financial reports 2010-2011](#))

Members:

MS M PORTER (The Chair)
MS C LE COUTEUR (The Deputy Chair)
MR A COE

TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE

CANBERRA

TUESDAY, 29 NOVEMBER 2011

Secretary to the committee:
Ms V Strkalj (Ph: 6205 0435)

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.

APPEARANCES

Economic Development Directorate.....	148
--	------------

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 9.32 am.

Appearances:

Barr, Mr Andrew, Deputy Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development and Minister for Tourism, Sport and Recreation

Economic Development Directorate

Dawes, Mr David, Director-General

Hudson, Ms Cathy, Deputy Director-General, Economic Development, Policy and Governance Division

Guthrie, Mr Neale, Group General Manager, Territory Venues and Events

Jeffrey, Mr David, Manager, Facility Projects and Planning

Judd, Ms Elisabeth, Senior Manager, Land and Affordable Housing

McKay, Mr Ross, Director, Sustainable Land Strategy

McNulty, Mr Hamish, Executive Director, Infrastructure and Capital Works

O'Leary, Mr Shane, Executive Director, Tourism, Events and Sport Division

Priest, Ms Jenny, Acting Director, Sport and Recreation Services

Reynolds, Mr Chris, General Manager, Land Development Agency

Thomson, Mr Ian, Acting Executive Director, Land Strategy and Finance Division

THE CHAIR: Welcome to the second public hearing of the Standing Committee on Planning, Public Works and Territory and Municipal Services inquiry into annual reports for the year 2010-11. Good morning, minister, Mr Dawes, Mr O'Leary and all the officials. You are all familiar with the privileges card and you are happy with that? Could you just acknowledge that verbally.

Mr Barr: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. Minister, we are going to start with sport and recreation and territory venues and events. We will go through until morning tea. We did have that down for 10.40 but it has been changed to 11.15. Are you able to cope until 11.15?

Mr Barr: I am happy to go with the flow.

THE CHAIR: All right. Let us see how we go. We might break a bit earlier than 11.15. I think Mr Coe has to leave at 11, so that might be a time for us to take a break. After morning tea, we will go to land development and infrastructure and capital works. Were you aware that that is on the agenda for today?

Mr Barr: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Minister, do you want to make any opening remarks in the area of sport and recreation?

Mr Barr: No, thank you, Madam Chair; I am happy to go straight into questions.

THE CHAIR: That is good. On page 39 of the report, it talks about visitor satisfaction for the standard of management of our sportsgrounds. Could you

elaborate on the cost of sporting grounds to sporting groups and users, and is this the most significant cost that users face to play sport?

Mr Barr: In a minute I will get Mr O’Leary to talk a little on the detail, but yes, the annual report refers to a very high level of satisfaction in relation to sportsgrounds. We have been undertaking a process of rejuvenation of our sports fields. There has been an extensive program of conversion to more drought-tolerant grasses, and we have also been engaged in a program of restoring ovals that had to be switched off from potable water as a result of water restrictions in the last decade. Pleasingly, that program has been progressing well. There are a number of ovals that have been brought back on line across the city, Gungahlin and Woden. And a project is continuing at the moment—it is almost at completion; we can probably get an update—in relation to Charnwood and Isabella Plains. It has been an important process across the territory to update irrigation systems and resow ovals with more drought-tolerant grass as well as restoring facilities. I might get Mr O’Leary to talk a little about that program.

THE CHAIR: Before Mr O’Leary starts, could you explain to me what type of grass you are talking about?

Mr Barr: It is usually couch; it uses less water. It goes dormant in the winter months, and so is less thirsty.

Mr O’Leary: That is right.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

Mr O’Leary: As the minister was mentioning, there are probably two parts to the question that you asked. In relation to sportsground hire fees, which I believe you asked a question about, sportsground hire fees, I would suggest, are not the main cost pressure on people participating in sports. It should be remembered that a lot of sport is conducted at indoor facilities that are subject to user-pays arrangements.

In terms of the formula which is arrived at by which user fees are charged in the ACT, since 1996 this has been a combination of either CPI or wage price index increases annually, which are relatively modest in the grand scheme of things. There are a number of other considerations that go into the formula by which charges are arrived at. This includes the size of the playing field that a particular sport uses. For example, touch football uses a relatively small rectangular field whilst AFL uses almost two hectares. Athletics can have line marking that amounts to kilometres in distance. Touch football, on the other hand, is merely a few lines on a relatively modest-sized oval. There are other considerations, like the cost recovery of electricity charges where ovals are lit. There is infrastructure associated with some sports that is more elaborate than others—for example, goalposts, nets and so on and so forth.

User charges, as I mentioned, have been linked to the WPI and CPI. They are also subject to review and approval by Treasury under the normal standard fees and services approvals for government services in the ACT. There has been some comment in the past about a 135 per cent increase in user charges for our playing fields. This can be misleading, in the sense that those fees have seen an hourly rate

over the last three years for junior sport—junior rugby league at a particular oval—
increase from \$1.60 to \$4.

So in summary to the question that you asked about the major cost pressure, it would
not be sportsground hire fees. There are a number of issues that impose upon the costs
for people to participate in sport.

In terms of the restoration of ovals and the bringing back on line of our sportsgrounds,
when the drought came into having its effect in 2002, the ACT government, sport and
recreation services, worked very closely with all sporting organisations in the ACT. It
has worked collaboratively with them over that period. Many initiatives have been put
in place that have seen sports change the way that they go about programming their
sport. That has resulted in a rationalisation of the need for sporting grounds in the
ACT. This has been a very collaborative effort—again I emphasise the point—
between government and the ACT sports community. It has been brokered and had
the strong and heavy involvement of ACTSport.

When the drought broke 12 months ago or so, of course the question arose of grounds
coming back on line. The minister made mention of Charnwood and Isabella ovals.
There has been a great deal of progress made in bringing those ovals back on line. I
think they are both subject for completion early in the new year. What has also
happened, though, is that many of our sports have learned, through the drought, to
adapt their needs. Whilst the inevitable question of grounds coming back on line
arises, the need for all those 40-odd ovals that were switched off as a consequence of
the drought—it is simply not necessary at this stage.

THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. Ms Le Couteur.

MS LE COUTEUR: Last night I was at the Downer Community Association, and the
principal item of discussion was the proposed new floodlights. That is not what I am
going to ask about, but a major concern of people there was the amount of litter which
was generated by sporting events. What policies and practices do you have over the
ACT to deal with the litter generated by sporting events?

Mr O’Leary: We deal with that by providing what we would consider to be adequate
bins and the like at our facilities across the ACT. We have requirements for people
that hire our ovals to maintain them and use them in a responsible manner. We have
sportsground maintenance teams, and we work closely with our colleagues at TAMS,
the parks and gardens team, in seeking to keep playing fields in a respectable state.

As a number one line in seeking to address that, we depend on people to do the right
thing. If there are any particular issues at any time that require highlighting to us, the
sportsground booking team would be happy to receive information so that we can
potentially address any concerns with users who might not be doing the right thing or
might be abusing the terms and conditions under which we hire sportsgrounds.

MS LE COUTEUR: One of the issues seemed to be that bins were brought out when
it was hired and then put away, but put away basically as soon as the hiring period
finished. The people who were there probably were in the facilities a bit longer, and
their takeaway food containers were left because that was all there was.

Mr O’Leary: We promote and, I would expect, actively provide a flexible and responsive service when it comes to the hiring of sportsgrounds. If there is any whiff or hint of inflexibility in terms of how we go about our business, if that is what is being suggested, I would be happy to look into that and ensure that we are working with sportsground hirers to ensure that bins are in place at all times during and for a reasonable time after the hiring of grounds.

MS LE COUTEUR: That is all I have.

THE CHAIR: Mr Coe.

MR COE: Firstly, I have a question about the placement of sport and rec in the Economic Development Directorate. Are you happy that that is the best place for it to sit?

Mr Barr: Yes.

MR COE: What is the rationale for it being in Economic Development, other than that you are the minister and presumably you wanted to keep it?

Mr Barr: Sport and recreation make a significant economic contribution to the territory economy—in the most recent analysis, well over \$250 million a year, employing nearly 3,000 Canberrans. That is just the direct impact. Access Economics, in their assessment, said that, in addition to that, there was significant indirect impact across a number of industries within the territory that were linked to the sport and recreation sector. In future economic impact analysis we look to seek to better capture that value.

But it is a significant economic driver within the territory. Some of our major national league sporting teams are some of the largest private contributors in the ACT economy. The amount of activity that is generated by the Raiders and Brumbies, for example, is significant for Canberra stadium. The sort of revenue that is generated and the economic activity that is generated through Canberra stadium in any given year are, as I understand it, approaching \$45 million. So it makes a significant contribution to the territory economy—obviously not as large as the tourism sector, but nonetheless an important contributor.

MR COE: Could you not make the same case for parts of education, like universities? I am sure that makes a huge economic contribution. If you are simply going to measure something on economic contribution, surely just about everything would come into that space.

Mr Barr: Indeed. That said, the education directorate comprises a quarter of the territory budget and the number of employees is approximately a quarter of—

MR COE: But the university sector is a subset of education. Surely that is very similar to sport and rec being a subset of TAMS or Economic Development?

Mr Barr: No. In the first instance, in relation to the university sector, it does have an

important economic development role and is a key part of my work as Minister for Economic Development.

MR COE: It seems to me to be not the most harmonious fit in Economic Development, but of course it is there. With that in mind, how do you deal with TAMS on a daily basis? Surely your directorate is liaising with TAMS regularly—

Mr Barr: You might have observed from the recommendations of the Hawke review that there is now a single ACT public service.

MR COE: That is right, but there is not a single building—not yet. And to that end, there is going to be a lot of communication that goes back and forth. How does that happen on a daily basis, especially with things like fees and charges for ovals and the maintenance of ovals?

MS LE COUTEUR: Surely there was always a single ACT public service? We did not have 10 ACT public services.

Mr Barr: But in terms of the importance of the Hawke recommendations and the establishment of directorates rather than departments, that cultural change is an important reflection of how the ACT government works.

MR COE: Whereabouts is the sport and rec team located?

Mr Barr: Physically at the moment—

Mr Dawes: Actually, currently it is still in Macarthur House. We have gone to quite some detail in bringing the directorate together, Mr Coe. We have actually established three divisions within the Economic Development Directorate. We have in one division what we are talking about here—sport and recreation, tourism, territory venues and events, and oversight of EPIC. That has brought together all of those entities as well. We can look at a number of sporting events that are a little outside the realm of sport and recreation—and I am talking about dragon boat races and also the marathon—where there is involvement but where we believe, because they are important economic drivers, that by actually linking them all with tourism there will be greater leverage in attracting additional people and having hotel nights extended. So we believe it is a very good fit.

What we have actually done with the directorate as well is that we are in the process of doing a rejig. We are moving sport and recreation and part of venues and events and tourism into 220 Northbourne Avenue, which is the old John Overall office, so they will all be co-located in that one area. The land division, in which we do all the strategic planning for land supply and land release, is located at TransACT House, and then business and industry development and policy for the department are at Telstra. So we are in that one precinct, which will give us greater synergies.

MR COE: Whereabouts is PCL in TAMS?

Mr Dawes: That is a matter for TAMS.

Mr Barr: They are different responsibilities.

MR COE: I know, but you must be dealing with them on a regular basis, so whereabouts are they?

Mr Dawes: Shane can fill you in on a little detail. Sport and rec came holus-bolus to the Economic Development Directorate, so we do our own maintenance of grounds, if that is what you are alluding to. We do have quite a bit of interface with TAMS on a number of different levels—

MR COE: That is right, yes.

Mr Dawes: and a number of different directorates as well. There are a number of different forums. But we actually manage all the sportsground maintenance and hiring within sport and recreation, if that is your question.

MR COE: But surely you must be working with PCL with regard to other maintenance projects and also in terms of ground hire and things like that?

Mr O’Leary: Just extending what the minister said, we certainly take the approach through sport and recreation, the Division of Tourism, Events and Sport, the Directorate of Economic Development, of playing our part as a single service. In direct response to your question, Mr Coe, regarding the physical location of PCL, currently sport and recreation are on the same floor of Macarthur House as PCL. The move that Mr Dawes mentioned early next year will see us effectively move across the road.

We enjoy close working relationships—sport and recreation—with all areas of government as needed. I would be quite prepared to submit that we have worked very hard on those relationships. We have worked particularly hard on them since coming into the Economic Development Directorate. We have extended those relationships into areas such as education, who, by necessity, we work very closely with in identifying those grounds that are prioritised for recommendation to be restored.

The notion of sport and recreation somehow having a diminished capacity to communicate or have influence on relationships or seek services from other areas of government is simply not true.

THE CHAIR: Minister, I might go to page 37 of the report—

MR DOSZPOT: Excuse me, I have a supplementary.

THE CHAIR: This is a supplementary, Mr Doszpot. It mentions that 42 major events were hosted across our major sporting venues, which is obviously what you are referring to with regard to the economic drivers. I note on page 47 of last year’s report, which was in a different area at that particular time, it mentions that there were only 28 major events. So that obviously is—

MR COE: This is a supplementary to the placement of the directorate?

THE CHAIR: No; it is a supplementary to this question of how the departments work together to conduct these events and drive the economic development, as you were going to, Mr Coe.

MR COE: Sure.

THE CHAIR: With the new arrangements, how will that be built on and continue and what are the drivers that would get us to this point?

Mr Barr: There are a number of issues that we have considered in the context of the alignment within the new directorate of these functions and responsibilities. I think there is an interesting debate, as is always the case within the ACT government context, about the split between municipal and territory-level service provision. Sport and recreation perhaps encapsulates this challenge better than most agencies, given the size of our government and the question of the balance between territory-wide policy, the major sporting teams and their economic contribution. The need to provide community-level sport has always been an important policy priority.

The issue in relation to your question, though, Madam Chair, is how we can utilise this change in administrative arrangements to forge even stronger working relationships with those areas that sport and recreation is now more closely aligned with and look to build on that. Mr Guthrie is perhaps charged with the delivery of most of those major events, so he can talk in a moment about the forward projections for those events and how we intend to work across the directorate to further capitalise on those opportunities.

It is undoubtedly the case that, when we look at what the economic drivers for the ACT will be, particularly as we approach our centenary year and the legacies that we wish to build on from that significant investment in that year, sport and recreation events are a key part of that, in terms of those major elite events that people would watch and, importantly, participate in. There are a number of events that we host through our major venues that are actually large community participation events. I might get Mr Guthrie to talk a little about the forward projections for events within his group.

Mr Guthrie: Looking forward over the next couple of years, as recently as yesterday afternoon, the Australian Rugby Union announced that the Brumbies will host a game against the British and Irish Lions in June 2013 as part of the Lions tour to Australia in 2013, which is, after the Rugby World Cup, the most attended event in the Rugby calendar in the world. Canberra is very lucky to host an event like that, and it will certainly add to the celebrations in 2013.

Stromlo forest park continues to grow. We saw growth over the last two financial years. In the financial year that has just finished, 12 major events were held at Stromlo forest park. In the previous financial year we had six. There were a range of events. There was a business event around Trek, the world's largest manufacturer of bikes, which is now hosting its Southern Hemisphere world release of its new brands of bikes. That is held in conjunction with the convention centre, which holds an indoor display of those bikes and then there is an outdoor demonstration day that goes with that. It is well attended by many hundreds of people. Certainly identities in the world

of mountain biking and road cycling attend that event. It has been a great success.

Also Trek Australia have based the headquarters for their company here in Australia and they have chosen Canberra. They chose Canberra because of the cycling infrastructure that is here and also Stromlo forest park which supports them. That was without any prompting from anyone from government, including me. But it is great to see them based here, and we just have to work on the other bike manufacturers now.

With respect to other events looking forward, we had a very successful world solo 24-hour mountain bike event staged at Stromlo forest park last year in October. That was the first time that such an event had been held outside North America. It was the 12th time that event was held, and that event had 411 entrants, which was twice as large as in any previous world solo championship event in the previous 11 and was four times as large as the event that was held in the previous year.

Interestingly enough, with the world solo championship, Cork were looking to bid for that event again for 2013. It appears that the event promoter is getting out of the business. There was no event held this year for the world solo 24-hour championships. Cork announced a couple of months ago that they are now partnering with event promoters in Italy and Scotland to host a world solo championship each year to provide a venue for elite riders in that sport. So next year, in 2012, the first of those events will be held in Italy, and in 2013 there will be a world solo championship event held at Stromlo forest park as part of the Scott 24-hour event, which will be the 10-year anniversary of the 2003 bushfires, and it will also be the year of the centenary. So it is another centenary event that we will look to gear into the program. I know that one of Robyn Archer's programs for the centenary will see that event as part of it. She is looking at a concept called "Spin", which is broader than just bikes. It is anything that spins.

That is just a snapshot. I could occupy the committee's time for much longer, minister, but I will finish there.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. That was very interesting. Mr Doszpot.

MR DOSZPOT: Coming back to Mr Coe's original question regarding the placement of sport and rec within your new directorate responsibility, I must say that I do share some concerns about the directions. I heard you talk about the major sporting teams and elite sports, and that is all very important; I agree with that. But it seems that we are losing track of the grassroots involvement and the needs of the grassroots sporting activities the further we go up into economic development type activities. Do you see any conflict between the requirements of community sport as opposed to the economic development that you are driving?

Mr Barr: This is probably the age-old debate in sport and recreation—what is the appropriate balance between community and elite sport.

MR DOSZPOT: We think it has moved the wrong way.

Mr Barr: That is debatable. Certainly you are welcome to that view. I think the data released today on grassroots participation in sport shows again that the ACT is the

most active community in Australia. So the data is in, yet again, confirming—

MR DOSZPOT: I am not disputing the data at all.

Mr Barr: No, so—

MR DOSZPOT: We are reinforcing it.

Mr Barr: Yes. So there would appear to be little evidence to support your assertion that community sport is suffering. In fact, if anything, this data is confirming the ACT's national leadership again.

As I was alluding to in my response to Ms Porter's question, there is always a tension within ACT government around what is municipal and what is territorial. In larger jurisdictions, clearly, councils have some responsibilities around sport and recreation, but at a state level sport and recreation agencies take that leadership role. I think it is important within a jurisdiction of our size to be accommodating the entirety of the sport and recreation industry and seeking to ensure that their needs are met. In terms of grassroots participation, the overwhelming majority of the ACT sport and recreation budget and staff time and ministerial time is devoted to community sport, overwhelmingly. You see that in the budget allocations every year. You see that in the sorts of projects that are supported.

MR COE: In which case, why is it in Economic Development with tourism if it is community sport and that is what, in effect, TAMS is there to deliver—community infrastructure?

Mr Barr: Because we are looking to build on that economic development opportunity through sport and recreation as a participatory issue as well. In terms of sport and recreation drivers and tourism, it is not just those who come to watch an event that are your tourism drivers; it is those who come to participate. So a particularly important element is working with ACT sporting organisations around their capacity to host national and international championships. Just yesterday I met with the veterans athletics association, who are looking to host the Australian championships in 2013. That will be a fantastic event for veterans athletics, a fantastic event for that sporting group within the ACT community, and it has the potential not only to make an economic contribution to the city but to increase participation because of the profile of hosting those sorts of events.

I think that Canberra as the home of national sporting activity is a powerful tourism message, a powerful economic message and a powerful message about this community being the most active in Australia. And I do not think that the two are in competition with each other. I think there is tremendous opportunity to leverage off that and to recognise the power of sport and recreation in terms of its community benefits in health, education and other social outcomes as well as its economic contribution. We are able to achieve that with the current arrangements.

MR COE: It just seems to me that there are greater synergies with sport and rec being in TAMS rather than in Economic Development. The only reason it is there is that you want to be the minister for it.

Mr Barr: TAMS is a municipal services provider. There is more to sport and recreation than municipal services. Given the way the administrative arrangements are, as a discrete unit coming across to a single port of call, so that there is no confusion about who you approach—it is sport and recreation—they are able to assist sporting organisations and the community to participate in sport as well as playing that policy role that is territorial and working with tourism events.

MR COE: Do you accept that there would be considerable confusion about who you would contact about a ground issue—

Mr Barr: No. You go to sport and recreation, as you always have.

MR COE: Okay, so—

THE CHAIR: Mr Coe—

Mr Barr: It is only in your mind that there appears to be confusion, Mr Coe.

MR COE: I do not think so.

THE CHAIR: Mr Coe—

MR COE: I think you will find that a lot of community groups are struggling with this as well.

THE CHAIR: Mr Coe, Mr Doszpot has not quite finished his line of questioning. Can we go back to Mr Doszpot, please.

MR DOSZPOT: Minister, my line of questioning is actually quite similar to Mr Coe's in that—

Mr Barr: Amaze me!

MR COE: Unlike Mary Porter's.

MR DOSZPOT: Quite true. I guess what we are getting at is that there is a conflict. You have got an economic development which is aimed at revenue generation. That is one of the major areas with the national team sports and the major sports, and again it is commendable, but the information we have been getting back from the grass roots up until now is that they are finding it very difficult to get the attention to the grounds that they need because they do not generate revenue. They are an impost, if you like, on the department from the point of view of having to continually invest. That is our concern. The conflict is between revenue generation and investment in infrastructure for the junior sports, which do not really bring a monetary return but do bring a great return to the community.

Mr Barr: You cannot have successful elite sport, Mr Doszpot, without a strong grassroots base.

MR DOSZPOT: Correct. That is exactly the point we are getting at.

Mr Barr: I think that if you look at sport and recreation industry development within the territory you will see a very strong focus for each of the sports in the territory in grassroots development. There is a lot of the media attention, and obviously the line that you are trying to push is that this is all about elite sport. I would ask you to look a little deeper. Let us take the AFL as an example. There is a lot of focus on the matches that are played at Manuka oval, but the government's involvement and the partnership with the Giants are much more than that. It is about grassroots development.

MR DOSZPOT: Minister Barr, that is exactly what I am trying to focus on. Looking at the condition of the grounds that junior AFL is played on, particularly in Tuggeranong, I have got to tell you that there is a lot of investment that is required to get those grounds up to standard.

Mr Barr: As I indicated—

MR DOSZPOT: And I do not see any of those developments being undertaken.

Mr Barr: You are obviously not looking—

MR DOSZPOT: I am looking very closely—obviously closer than you are.

Mr Barr: You are not looking at the level of investment that has been provided.

MR DOSZPOT: I am looking at the reality of what is out there.

Mr Barr: The upgrades, in terms of community infrastructure, are significant across the territory—new lighting, new fields, resowing of surfaces, replacement of irrigation systems, upgrading of pavilions. There is an annual program. I am happy to table for the committee, going back over the last decade, all of the community infrastructure upgrades that have been funded by this government. It is an incredibly strong record. There has never been a level of investment in community sporting infrastructure that parallels the last decade from this government. I am happy to stand on that record, Mr Doszpot. It is a significant investment.

MR DOSZPOT: Including 43 grounds taken off and out of action.

Mr Barr: In the middle of a drought as a result of imposed water restrictions.

MR DOSZPOT: The drought has been over a few years now.

Mr Barr: We have been undertaking a program of restoration. I can go through the list of all of the ovals that have been restored, Mr Doszpot. I am happy to go on that basis as well.

MR DOSZPOT: There is a bit of a synergy—all the schools and all the grounds.

Mr Barr: Indeed, we have invested significantly, particularly in drought proofing

sport and recreation facilities across the territory. It is a level of investment that dwarfs anything that the Carnell government was able to do in its six years.

THE CHAIR: Mr Rattenbury.

MR RATTENBURY: You were asked earlier about the cost of ground hire as part of the impact on sporting clubs. Do you have a general sense of where that fits in, compared with other costs, such as insurance? Do you have an analysis of what cost pressures clubs are facing?

Mr Barr: We can certainly provide that. It would depend. It varies sport by sport—whether they are using indoor facilities, hard surfaces or ovals. It depends, obviously, on the number of participants in a sport. For any of the football codes, for example, the hourly training fee for a junior player is going to be between 8c and 10c an hour for hire of sports facilities. Obviously for some of the individual sports that require the hire of a court surface, where there might only be two participants, the cost per participant will be higher, as you would expect, depending on the nature of the sport. I am certainly happy to provide some analysis across a range of sports. I think it is reasonable to capture some team and individual sports and some indoor and outdoor sports and to look at that. The insurance issues will vary as well.

Another question that is clearly an issue will be the structure of the sport in terms of its parent bodies—either a state-level sport or a national-level sport—and to what extent junior membership fees and participation fees are pushed back up the line to national bodies to fund a range of activities. In the context of Australian sport, that varies, largely depending on the success of the premier or the peak league in each of the sports.

Those that have very generous national broadcasting deals are pushing money back down into the grassroots. There are a number of sports where, in fact, it would appear the money gets pushed back up, so possibly the largest cost driver is the grassroots supporting elite teams going the other way. Sport and recreation is an interesting industry in that context because, depending on the profile of the sport, whether it has Olympic funding or Commonwealth Games funding or whether it has a federated structure or a national structure, the cost drivers for the participant at the grassroots level can vary significantly.

MR RATTENBURY: In a similar vein, I am interested to explore—and I could not really find anything in the annual report—what mechanisms are in place from the government at the moment to support participation by low income families with some of those cost pressures that are around.

Mr Barr: The annual sport and recreation grants round has subsets of programs that over the years have been used to assist participation from youth at risk, people with a disability, and older and disengaged Canberrans. We have been able to target particular grants rounds each year based on seeking to increase participation from some sectors of the community who have not been able to participate. There are, I suppose, questions that are largely devolved to individual sports around their annual or triannual operating assistance and the extent to which some of that money is used to provide concessional access to different sports. Again, it will vary. It will vary from

sport to sport.

There is also a question of the interrelationship with school sport and the capacity for participation to be assisted or subsidised significantly through involvement in school-level sport. We have recently announced, working with School Sport ACT, a restructure of that organisation and increased funding—you would have noticed it in the most recent budget—aimed at, again, improving the administration of school sport and increasing participation opportunities. I have been passed some information in relation to our inclusive participation funding program and the list of organisations that have received funding. I am happy to provide that to the committee as well.

MR RATTENBURY: If you could, that would be interesting. Thank you. Just on the previous question, can we confirm that you are happy to provide us with some sense of what the department knows about the cost pressures that are facing some of the sports?

Mr Barr: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Minister, can I just clarify? Are you taking that on notice or are you going to table it today?

Mr Barr: I think it is probably best if we put together a package of information. I imagine the requests will come over course of this hearing to add to that.

THE CHAIR: Yes. So you will take that on notice?

Mr Barr: Yes, happily.

THE CHAIR: That will be taken on notice.

MR RATTENBURY: The other thing I wanted to ask about—and we have touched on it already—is the demand for indoor facilities. My understanding is there is quite some pressure on in the ACT for indoor facilities. What analysis does the directorate have of that pressure and what steps are you taking to address it?

Mr Barr: There certainly has been, although there has been some alleviation of that with access to the school facilities. The national BER program has facilitated the development of a number of new facilities. Just yesterday morning I was at the Emmaus school in Dickson looking at their new school hall. It is a gymnasium largely, that they utilise as a hall. It was funded under the BER program. The principal was indicating it has significant community usage for everything from the Ainslie footy club to dance groups. They are regularly utilising that facility. I think there has been a boost, if you like, on the supply side in terms of—

MR RATTENBURY: Those facilities have been designed to allow that out-of-hours access?

Mr Barr: Absolutely. That was a criterion as part of that program. Nonetheless, those facilities tend to suit smaller community groups or single sports. They are often either single or double gymnasiums, so the need for larger and co-located indoor facilities is

certainly acknowledged—hence the work in the Lyneham precinct, for example, with Tennis ACT, netball and then the projects with Basketball ACT. They are all aimed at increasing the available space for indoor facilities. In fact, the business models for those projects rely on multiple users. In the case of netball, for example, in addition to their programs, they also hire out their facilities for futsal. I think all of the sports are cognisant of the need to make their facilities available for multiple uses, for multiple sports. It aids their bottom line and is part of their business planning.

MR RATTENBURY: Page 104 of the annual report, under “New works”, talks about the design of the Throsby multisport complex. Can we get an update on what work the directorate has done to progress through the commonwealth assessment process for EPBC and the like?

Mr O’Leary: We actually have a meeting tomorrow with AECOM, who are the consultants managing the environmental impact study, and some of the community groups that have raised some issue with habitat in that particular area where that development is proposed. A great deal of progress is being made, but it is all being made in accordance with our regulatory and statutory requirements. In terms of the EIS, there is a meeting scheduled for tomorrow that will be a turning point in that process.

MR RATTENBURY: The estimated completion date for the design work is November; it is now, basically.

Mr O’Leary: Yes.

MR RATTENBURY: When did you start engaging the commonwealth on the EPBC process?

Mr O’Leary: If I could ask you, Jenny?

Ms Priest: Sure. We are taking the environmental clearances through a bilateral process, which is a process that is facilitated through the Environment and Sustainable Development Directorate. We have prepared, in accordance with the scoping documentation prepared by that agency, a draft EIS, which Shane was referring to before. We have been working with our stakeholder groups to ensure that we address the concerns, or any environmental concerns, that are being raised in the context of that facility in that site.

We have had an initial review undertaken of that draft EIS documentation and we are having a meeting tomorrow that will look to refine the document so that we can lodge it and get it into the system, which the Environment and Sustainable Development Directorate—previously ACTPLA—will take through the bilateral process. We would be expecting some time next year, early next year, to be getting a decision in that process.

MR RATTENBURY: Has the project been delayed by the EPBC referral?

Ms Priest: There is no doubt that environmental clearance processes do take their toll on time frames for development, and this has been no exception to that. We are

working through the process as rapidly as we can, but making sure that in that process we are taking proper account of the environmental issues.

MR RATTENBURY: Was the EPBC process calculated in your original time line?

Ms Priest: I would have to say that there would always have been consideration that environmental triggers would come into play, particularly in the Gungahlin area, where we know there are sensitivities. I guess it is difficult to always understand what that time frame will be.

Mr Dawes: Can I add to that that one of the things that we have done is that we have commissioned quite a bit of work and we have incorporated a whole lot of issues around EPBC. We have had Dr Paul Rutherford do a complete review of Gungahlin. That has been reviewed by Paul Cowper as well. So there has been quite a lot of work. There has been some very good work across the directorates, inter-government. We have a high-level committee that is working through these issues as well because obviously it is not only the playing fields that we are working through—we are obviously talking to the Catholic school there as well—but also in the broader context of doing some other development in those suburbs, in Moncrieff and parts of Throsby.

I will have Paul Lewis here a little later and he can go into greater detail on those discussions. There have been quite a lot of discussions with the commonwealth, but it does take time and we are now obviously factoring a number of those things into our land release programs.

The work that we are doing at the present time with both Paul Rutherford and Paul Cowper is to ensure that all of that up-front work is done so that we can actually have it referred and peer reviewed so that we can get on with it. Obviously when you look at what has been preserved in the territory, especially over the last 10 years, it is quite significant as well.

We are looking at putting two additional areas in Throsby into the parklands there as well. So we will not be developing all of Throsby. We realise that there are some very sensitive issues around grasslands, woodlands and superb parrots. So we will be preserving those, and that is part of the work.

MR DOSZPOT: Can I ask how many grounds are actually under consideration for that Throsby complex, how many ovals?

Mr O'Leary: It is only draft and proposed, but there are four synthetic fields.

MR DOSZPOT: Four synthetic fields?

Mr O'Leary: Yes.

MR DOSZPOT: And that is to cater for how many sports?

Mr O'Leary: If I can refer to some notes that I have here, certainly soccer fields, eight tennis courts, eight netball courts, an essential building providing six squash courts, but I qualify that by saying there has been no detailed design work.

MR DOSZPOT: No AFL? No cricket?

Mr O’Leary: It is very much a concept plan.

THE CHAIR: We are going to Mr Coe now.

MR COE: I will give way to Mr Smyth.

THE CHAIR: Mr Smyth.

MR SMYTH: I do apologise. I have to get away to go to a funeral. Minister, is this the area where we look at the funding for Australia Forum? Is this under infrastructure?

Mr Barr: It will be later in this hearing, yes.

MR SMYTH: So it is not—

Mr Barr: We are doing sport and rec now.

MR SMYTH: When is that likely to come on?

Mr Barr: It is a matter for the committee. We were debating whether it would be at 10.40 or 11.15, depending on the flow of the hearings this morning.

THE CHAIR: Unfortunately, Mr Smyth, we do need to finish off sport and rec before we go on to the next one.

MR SMYTH: That is okay. I will come back at 11.15 then.

THE CHAIR: Mr Coe, do you have any questions?

MR COE: Minister, as to the sport and rec grants published in the TAMS annual report, have all those been shifted across to management by Economic Development now?

Mr Barr: Sorry, I missed the first part of that.

MR COE: The sport and rec grants as published in the TAMS annual report.

Mr Barr: The annual grants program, yes.

MR COE: Have they been shifted across into Economic Development?

Mr Barr: Yes.

MR COE: They have in full?

Mr Barr: Yes.

MR COE: And as of what date?

Mr Barr: 17 May, when the administrative orders changed.

MR COE: Why are all these grants published in the Economic Development annual report?

Mr Barr: Because the grants are given in January, January-February, of each calendar year. So they have been reported at that time, when it was within TAMS. I recognise—and this has come up in a couple of other hearings—when an area of government has moved from one directorate to another, there has been a question whether that information should appear in duplicate in both the departing agency and the receiving agency. Certainly it is important that it appears in at least one of those annual reports, and that has certainly been the case. In future, in the 2012 sport and recreation grants round you will see it in the 2011-12 annual report for Economic Development. Of course, the information is available on the sport and recreation website.

MR COE: How do you decide what information is reported in your annual report and what information is reported in TAMS? You had more than 10 months of activity happening in TAMS as opposed to Economic Development. So if you only reported on those last six weeks there would not have been much to report at all.

Mr Barr: There are annual report directions. The directorate was only established on 17 May, so I cannot report—

MR COE: How have you got all this stuff in here? Surely that was just about all administered by TAMS, in which case—

Mr Barr: Because there are other elements of the directorate. The old Land and Property Services is part of the Economic Development Directorate now. It was a department before, and it forms the largest part of the new Economic Development Directorate.

MR COE: What I am saying is: why isn't all the sport and rec stuff done before May in the TAMS annual report?

THE CHAIR: I think the minister has answered the question.

MR COE: No, he has not.

THE CHAIR: Mr Coe, I believe he has.

MR COE: He has not.

Mr Barr: From an accounting perspective—

THE CHAIR: Do not argue with me, Mr Coe.

Mr Thomson: The annual report guidelines require us to report those items that were finished in the organisation. So items that were finished before 17 May, or the financial process or delivery, got reported in the agency, in this case, TAMS. They actually had responsibility for that activity until that stage. The activities that were reported in the Economic Development Directorate really relate to activities that had either not been completed or were ongoing so far as the financial position is concerned.

As a consequence, I suppose the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services and the relevant chief executive had responsibility for the delivery of those sports grants at the time and that therefore was reported in the Territory and Municipal Services annual report, as finishing before 17 May.

MR COE: In terms of the actual staff that administered those grants, have they all gone across?

Mr Barr: Yes.

MR COE: Or were there synergies before in TAMS with the provision of other grants whereby you had some people who were in effect grants experts that centralised—

Mr Barr: It has always been handled discretely within sport and recreation as a business unit.

THE CHAIR: Minister, I notice that page 39 of the annual report—and Mr Doszpot was raising community involvement—refers to the active 2020 strategic plan. I am aware that part of that plan is cooperation between community sporting groups and schools in both the public and private sectors. I was wondering whether you could talk a little more about how that plan nurtures and promotes active recreation.

Mr Barr: In the context of the long-term strategic vision for sport and recreation, this process, the development of the active 2020 plan, I think is the most significant collaborative effort across the sport and recreation industry in the history of self-government. It is a strategy that has had buy-in from all stakeholders across the sport and recreation industry, from the widest possible range of interested parties. It is great testament to the level of commitment there is within the sport and recreation sector to work collaboratively not just with government but with the education sector and the business community to continue to enhance sport and recreation in the territory.

A key element there—and I certainly note your leadership and passion in particular around education institutions working more closely with sport and recreation organisations—has been clearly manifested in, as I alluded to earlier, effectively unlocking the school gates for use of a considerable asset base in terms of community sport and recreation facilities that is held within the education sector. This is a project that has come to national attention. We are one of the leading lights across the country in terms of being able to deliver community access to that significant education-sport endowment, effectively, that governments and organisations in the non-government sector have invested in over many decades.

I was really pleased that one of the key criteria around the building the education

revolution program in terms of the sport and recreation facilities that were delivered as part of that program was a requirement for community access. And you see in the design of facilities, certainly in the case of new schools and new infrastructure, they are able to be accessed by community organisations outside of hours without having to traipse all the way through the school itself. There have been some very practical and common-sense measures put in place there to ensure that that access is there and at a reasonable and fair price. It obviously returns a small income to the schools to go to cover their costs in terms of making the facilities available.

I think it is a really important project for grassroots sport and recreation and a fantastic thing that the education sector is partnering with so many different sport and recreation organisations. Whilst there has been a big focus on sport, I think it is also important to acknowledge the level of recreation access to some of these facilities. It is not just organised sport; it is a variety of other recreation purposes that are assisted by access to these facilities.

MR DOSZPOT: Madam Chair, I have a supplementary on that.

THE CHAIR: Yes, Mr Doszpot.

MR DOSZPOT: Thank you for raising it. The active 2020 plan talks about multisports usage and in fact it was in estimates that we talked about a particular concern that people raised with me regarding Banks oval, which was utilised solely by athletics, and that is now several months down the track. Can you give us a progress report on what is happening, whether football has been accommodated on that as well as the athletics usage?

Mr O'Leary: Certainly we took on your concerns and looked into that very closely. As I recall updating you in a private briefing, one of the challenges was the fact that the layout of the actual athletics track cut clean across the proposed two football pitches that would go there. And as a consequence of that we worked very closely with the soccer club to provide some options to them in terms of alternative venues. I am not certain but I do think that those options have actually been taken up. Mr Jeffrey, could you update us, please?

Mr Jeffrey: Yes. Basically the correspondence with the Lanyon valley football club was, as Mr O'Leary stated, that other options were tabled in relation to the nearby Conder neighbourhood oval that has capacity and infrastructure in place to support some of their training requirements, which also, with respect to the Banks neighbourhood oval, does not currently have lights that would be required to support them through the winter period. So those offers still stand. In that sense, Lanyon valley could make use of that and it could work with our office to make bookings at that venue, which is in the same jurisdiction and area.

THE CHAIR: Ms Le Couteur.

MS LE COUTEUR: I believe we have the figures for adult participation in sport at about 85 per cent, and that is from measuring our participation, but what do we know about kids' participation?

Mr O’Leary: Certainly across the board in the ACT our jurisdiction has the highest rates of participation in active sport and active recreation. In terms of definitive figures for junior participation, I would need to take that on notice. I would be happy provide you that information at the earliest opportunity.

MS LE COUTEUR: That is taken on notice.

Mr Barr: I can observe that on one of those measures the children’s Physical Activity Foundation have been actively promoting the active kids challenge. This year’s minister’s challenge had a record number of schools participating and, I understand, although I will get some final figures from the foundation, a record number of students participating. The foundation has grown into one of the nation-leading participation organisations. I am really pleased it has received a level of corporate support, including being headquartered at Rock Development Group’s facilities in Belconnen. That is a really pleasing level of business involvement in assisting the organisation.

I know the board are working very hard on a range of programs to continue to drive participation in the ACT. It is a model and an example of an initially government supported organisation that has gone from strength to strength over the last five or six years. It is a really good example of how if you have the right policy focus and the right partnerships you can achieve a significant outcome for a jurisdiction. By any benchmark, what has been achieved with the children’s Physical Activity Foundation and the considerable involvement of high-profile Canberrans in that foundation is a really worthy outcome for children’s participation in sport and recreation.

THE CHAIR: So you will take the rest of that detail on notice?

Mr Barr: Sure.

MS LE COUTEUR: What about the other end of life? I know we have got figures for adults in general, but what about over-60s and, possibly even more particularly, over-70s, with possibly more active recreation rather than some of the sports that are not going to be well participated in?

Mr Barr: The level of detail by age cohort is certainly available. We can provide that for the committee and perhaps have a look at the long-run experience. Our actively ageing programs have made a big impact on the level of participation in the ACT if you look back over the last decade. I am certainly happy to provide the committee, if you like, with a medium-run snapshot of the impact that those programs have had.

THE CHAIR: That is taken on notice.

MS LE COUTEUR: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Mr Coe.

MR COE: Can we get an update on where things are at with the Lyneham precinct in terms of the work there?

Mr Barr: Sure.

Mr O’Leary: The Lyneham precinct is a wonderful initiative, valued at around \$14 million. It is being delivered in three separate stages. Stage 1 was mostly completed earlier this year. There were some very minor delays as a consequence of the rain over last summer, but that first wave of works resulted in stormwater works being completed. It also saw some car parking realignment around the hockey and tennis precincts and some significant tree removals—all done, I might add, in accordance with all the normal requirements.

Stages 2 and 3 will see the archery facility upgraded. It will see the sporting fields, the district playing fields, realigned, resurfaced, re-irrigated and brought up to top-notch standard. There will be some additional car parking improvements on the Northbourne Avenue side, some fencing and ultimately in the future it is planned for club rooms and a pavilion to be installed. It is proposed at this stage to provide some barbecue and shade areas for many of the school groups that visit from other areas around the country. So it is quite an exciting project, mostly due for completion next year. However, there have been some recent developments at Lyneham that have put that completion date on hold at the moment.

MR COE: What is the cost blow-out as a result of the asbestos?

Mr O’Leary: There is no cost blow-out, because that is presently being managed through contingency funding associated with that project.

MR COE: How much of the contingency has been used?

Mr O’Leary: I have not got that information to hand.

MR DOSZPOT: Was the federal government going to cover part of that asbestos related expense?

Mr O’Leary: I think that might be part of a wider issue that the ACT is making representation to the federal government in relation to.

MR DOSZPOT: And what was the outcome?

Mr Barr: It is ongoing. Obviously it relates to a number of sites. Prior to self-government, when the commonwealth had responsibility for the territory, there was either a lack of appropriate record keeping around where waste was disposed of or a question of whether the commonwealth even knew in some instances. It would appear that in earlier development phases of the city, when perhaps we as a community were not as across the issues in relation to the danger associated with asbestos as we are now, these matters were not treated with the level of seriousness that they are now. We certainly have put a case to the commonwealth. There are at least three sites where clearly appropriate records were not kept: in and around Weston Creek, in East Lake and this site in Lyneham.

MR DOSZPOT: Just sticking with Lyneham for the moment, has all the asbestos been cleared or is it still being cleared at the moment?

Mr O’Leary: It is actually being investigated by an independent contractor. Being the large area that it is, and our desire to keep the project moving, the contractor in consultation with EPA and WorkSafe zoned the whole precinct and commenced looking at what initially were considered the most low-risk areas in coordination with the contractor so that works could continue as particular areas were declared safe or free of asbestos. So progress is being made there. It is not the appropriate time, because the investigations continue, to declare that the site is free of asbestos.

MR DOSZPOT: My concern would be, obviously—it is a serious issue—if we are pushing ahead with making sure the project is completed on time, whatever, that the safety considerations should really be looked at fairly quickly.

Mr Barr: Absolutely paramount, yes.

Mr O’Leary: Without compromise.

Mr Barr: Hence the process to enable clearance of those areas where work can continue. If you are a regular visitor to the precinct—as it is not far from where I live, I am—over on the eastern side—

MR DOSZPOT: It will be interesting to see how many bookings you make there to play.

Mr Barr: Every Monday night in the precinct, yes. We lost last night, though—smashed.

MR DOSZPOT: You should have come and played soccer. We did beat the feds at soccer with our children.

Mr Barr: They probably do not need my soccer skills.

MR DOSZPOT: No. We would welcome you.

Mr Barr: Thank you. On the eastern side of the precinct, nearest the netball centre, the car park reconfiguration has certainly been able to progress. The issues where there has perhaps been the greatest concern have been around that archery precinct and the area just adjacent to that where the former stormwater drain and whatnot was located.

MR DOSZPOT: Okay.

Mr O’Leary: Can I just add to that as well. Obviously with asbestos right around Canberra and as we look at a number of other future developments, we have actively engaged with the Master Builders Association. The Master Builders Association on Thursday is hosting a roundtable. We have helped to facilitate that. We have all of the stakeholders across government at that particular meeting, including the WorkSafe commissioner there. We have one of the pre-eminent experts from CRC attending that workshop on Thursday as well to look at some of the experiences that are happening nationally.

Obviously we need to be able to handle this far more quickly, sensitively and safely than we are and it has been a major issue. So that is something that we are taking quite seriously and, as I said, hopefully the outcome of that will be that we will learn from what is happening in other jurisdictions but also try to put some other processes in place so that we can deal with it more quickly and so forth.

MR DOSZPOT: Will the three other sites that were mentioned be following on after Lyneham, or are they being looked at at the same time?

Mr O’Leary: Obviously we are working proactively to do all of that work up-front.

MR DOSZPOT: We asked about the cost of the asbestos removal. I would appreciate it if that could be taken on notice so that we can find out about that.

THE CHAIR: We will take that on notice.

Ms Priest: I just want to add that we had clearance yesterday. Both the EPA and WorkSafe signed off on the zone that is known as the archery site. So work will recommence there. We are also expecting clearance of the further zone within days, so we are progressing and advancing with some positive results in terms of clearance. The final report for the site we should have in January.

THE CHAIR: Minister, page 37 mentions that territory venues and events manage both Manuka oval and Canberra stadium. While we are talking about redevelopment, what are the priorities for those areas for 2011-12?

Mr Barr: In relation to Manuka, it is the procurement of additional seating of a mobile nature that can be shared between major event venues. We are currently in the process of consideration of the work that Mr Guthrie and his team have been undertaking around the Manuka redevelopment options. Neale, do you want to talk a little about those two?

Mr Guthrie: There is allocation of \$200,000 for a precinct planning study and \$750,000 for preliminary design for Manuka Oval redevelopment. Both of those projects have been run together as there are obvious synergies. The planning study will focus on the thin strip of land, the precinct that surrounds Manuka oval but enclosed by the road Manuka Circle, which incorporates the pool site, the arts facility, Manuka oval land and also the Canberra Services Club site. Other than the Canberra Services Club site, the other parcels of land are all owned by the ACT government. We have retained a town planner to progress the planning study and we are still finalising the procurement process for the design team. Once the design team starts, both of those projects can start getting a bit of traction.

There has been some preliminary consultation with ACT government areas around the planning constraints within the precinct planning study. We are all aware of the recent heritage listing process that has commenced for Manuka oval and other areas within the precinct. We have accommodated those requirements and we see the heritage listing and the direction that we were taking regardless, with Manuka oval development, co-existing quite comfortably together, as we see the heritage value of

the site as one of the attractions for the site for development going forward. They are the main focuses, as the minister said—the temporary seating and those plans for Manuka oval. There is another small allocation for ongoing maintenance issues at the venue through the capital upgrades program.

For Stromlo forest park upgrades, \$800,000 was allocated in this financial year and a further \$2 million in 2012-13 that was approved in this year's budget. The priority for that is infrastructure works planning around setting the venue up for growth in the future; that is basic sewer, power, water and road infrastructure. We have been spending a lot of time coordinating with the Molonglo development, which is on our boundary on Uriarra Road. The new access road that comes off John Gorton Drive is currently being designed and we need to incorporate that into the access into the park.

In addition, the stage 2 Molonglo development along Uriarra Road has been brought forward. There are a lot of residential zones there and a lot of entry roads coming along Uriarra Road, so there is infrastructure being looked at to run inside Stromlo forest park, which includes bike trails and a main water line. Actew are looking to house the main water storage facility, or one of the main storage facilities, for Molonglo Valley inside Stromlo forest park. All of those are being coordinated as part of this infrastructure services project.

We have received an allocation of \$2.2 million over two years—\$1 million this year and \$1.2 million next year—for the Canberra stadium. That funding was allocated to produce some preliminary sketch designs of improvement for Canberra stadium. However, internal work has identified that the recommended approach that we were putting through inside government was not necessarily supported by many, and we are just stopping at the moment and relooking at the broader approach, which will also look at the future locations for Canberra stadium going forward.

THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.

MR RATTENBURY: Can I ask about territory venues and events, while we are on the topic?

THE CHAIR: Yes.

MR RATTENBURY: First of all—perhaps this one is best taken on notice—we were talking about the world mountain bike championships earlier and you talked about the number of competitors. I would be interested to know if you have any data on the economic impact while they were here and a sense of how much they spent or how long they stayed.

Mr Guthrie: I will not take it on notice; I actually prepared it because I noted you asked that question in relation to tourism a couple of weeks ago, Mr Rattenbury.

MR RATTENBURY: I did ask the other day, so I am glad we have got the chance to come back to it.

Mr Guthrie: First of all, it was the world solo mountain bike championships held in October 2010.

MR RATTENBURY: Yes.

Mr Guthrie: The event was solely promoted by Canberra Off-Road Cyclists. There was no ACT government funding and they did hire Stromlo forest park so that they could conduct their event. Whilst there was no economic analysis done by the promoter of the event, there were 411 entrants. Eighty-nine of those were international competitors that came from 16 countries. It is estimated that those competitors arrived on site seven to 14 days prior and that they brought a support group from overseas averaging 3.5 persons. The majority of those stayed in the host hotel, which was the Crowne Plaza, a four-star hotel.

Mr Barr: It is 4.5, I think. They might get upset if you call them a four-star.

Mr Guthrie: Sorry: a 4.5-star hotel.

MR RATTENBURY: I am just thinking I should have gone into mountain biking.

Mr Guthrie: Given that there is no economic analysis, I am trying to give an indication of the sort of costs they would be paying.

MR RATTENBURY: Yes, thank you. It is very helpful.

Mr Guthrie: The average stay is about 15 days in Australia. That is for the 89 international plus their 3.5 persons. In addition to that, the bulk of the remaining 411 entrants—so 300-plus—came from interstate to participate. I do not have the statistics on those people but I would assume that, whilst they probably did not follow the same trend as the international group, they would have been here three or four days prior to the event in preparation. The attendance at that event is estimated at 10,500 for each of the days, 8 and 9 October. And, as I said, that event was double the size of any previous event held in North America and four times the size of the event held the previous year. That event will return to Stromlo forest park in 2013.

MR RATTENBURY: Thank you very much for that. On page 38 of the annual report under “Territory venues and events”, it says:

A total of 83 functions ... were held at Canberra Stadium during the year.

But it goes on to say:

This was a reduction on the previous year and was the result of staff shortages.

Can you tell us a bit more about the background to those staff shortages and whether the situation has been rectified?

Mr Guthrie: Sure. The staff shortage effectively was that our function coordinator resigned. Whilst we were in the period of her absence, we basically were running that function business on a shoestring. We have subsequently filled that position moving forward. I will emphasise that the functions revenue is a small part of Canberra stadium’s own-source revenue. It sits between \$100,000 and \$200,000 per annum—

noting that our own-source revenue for Canberra stadium sits above \$6 million each year.

MR RATTENBURY: It says \$3.6 million in the annual report.

Mr Guthrie: Sorry.

MR RATTENBURY: I just happen to have the page open.

Mr Guthrie: I am talking turnover, but yes, you are correct.

MR RATTENBURY: Sure. On that topic, is there any progress on a naming rights sponsor for the stadium? I saw some recent media reports, but—

Mr Guthrie: Yes. We are currently in the process of trying to secure a naming rights sponsor. The first phase of that process was effectively an open process where we sought proposals from the market. We took this advice from Procurement Solutions. Whilst they said it did not necessarily have to follow the procurement guidelines, they suggested that we followed a process that mirrored it; therefore we had an open process.

We received 11 expressions of interest, of which I would say two were realistic. As the financial situation started to unfold in Europe, one dropped off pretty fast. The other company are an emerging Australian company. They are not timed to release their product into the market for another 12 months so they declined the offer based on it being too early for them given that we are still keen to proceed as soon as possible.

That advice was received about six weeks ago. Subsequent to that, we are now burning shoe leather, as I say—knocking on doors to try and rouse any interest. We have not been successful to date. In the new year, when I come back after Christmas leave, I will be going to Procurement Solutions and going through a process to secure an independent agent. There are sales companies out there that shop these sorts of things around. We will secure an independent agent and go with that task, which is the normal commercial way of selling a naming rights sponsorship.

MR RATTENBURY: I am not sure whether it is with the ministry itself, Mr Guthrie, but with the world cup bid on there was some significant discussion about the future of Canberra stadium—whether a new one would be developed and those sorts of things. With the failure of the bid, I am wondering if you could give us an update on the strategic thinking there.

Mr Barr: Sure. As Mr Guthrie indicated, I think, in an earlier answer, we are considering those options. The short-term priority is Manuka, so the issue of one or two stadia has been resolved. It is just not cost effective to try and have one that will accommodate every user group. The movable seating and all the rest mean that in the end that does not end up being a cost-effective model for the size of stadium that we are talking about.

In an ideal circumstance a new development associated with a redeveloped

convention facility, along the lines of the model that the city of Dunedin pursued as part of their redevelopment where a lot of the back of house is aligned between the stadium and convention facility, is certainly worth exploring. In large part, those back-of-house functions are about catering—the quick delivery of a lot of meals to a lot of people. The capacity to share those facilities is attractive when you look at the costs associated with this sort of infrastructure—somewhere between \$150 million and \$300 million for convention facilities and a similar cost for a stadium. If you are able to share some of those costs it makes projects of that scale more achievable.

The question then is one of available land and siting. Across the world the experience appears to be that the best value is from co-locating facilities within urban renewal projects closer to CBDs. Australian examples are Docklands and the Queensland government's work around what I will refer to as Lang park—it has various other titles, depending on the naming rights sponsor from year to year. So we are having a look at some of those possibilities.

As I think I have indicated publicly before, the Dunedin model is certainly worth exploring. I did not get the opportunity during the Rugby World Cup to hop across the ditch, but in the near future we will be taking the opportunity to go and look at that facility. When business next takes me to New Zealand, I will take the trip to the south island to have a look at that.

That is certainly one option. The other is a staged progressive rebuild of Canberra stadium—through the next decade, effectively. I think the infrastructure will see us through this current decade, with some attention to some areas, particularly the Meninga stand, which is the oldest of the infrastructure at the existing Canberra stadium. They are the two models that I think are the most viable—either a progressive rebuild of Canberra stadium throughout the 2020s, which you would need to do one stand at a time, effectively—the disadvantage there is obviously that there is disruption on site during that period—or moving to a new piece of infrastructure that is co-located with a convention facility.

The West Basin precinct work that is underway gives the potential to locate something there. I am not sure that there are many other CBD sites that would work. I asked for an examination of the existing Olympic pool site opposite the current convention centre, but the advice is that that is not quite large enough—that the footprint is not large enough. I think the only other—

MR DOSZPOT: Minister, I am just wondering whether you can add a bit more to your preamble on this. What about the Canberra stadium? We talked about possible ownership issues as against lease.

Mr Barr: Yes.

MR DOSZPOT: Is that being considered at the moment?

Mr Barr: Yes. Neale can give you an update on that. Largely, the issue is really about a long-term licence versus ownership.

MR DOSZPOT: Sure.

Mr Barr: I think that is largely settled, but obviously it is a matter for the commonwealth to execute ultimately. If we were to redevelop on the existing site we would need long-term security over that site.

MR DOSZPOT: Sure.

Mr Barr: I want to give the West Basin precinct study the opportunity to examine this issue. As I say, there is attractiveness around sharing certain back-of-house facilities. When I was in the US recently we took the opportunity to visit the city of Baltimore, which has undertaken an urban renewal project where its sporting facilities, convention centre and major public transport hub are all located close by; they are in a harbour urban renewal project. I think it is a pretty reasonable example of some adaptive re-use within a Baltimore precinct that perhaps did not necessarily have the greatest reputation—with apologies to the tourism folk there. The work in this area has turned that city around.

It was a pretty useful opportunity. I met with the stadium management. They have both a baseball facility and an American football facility within that precinct. As you come into the city of Baltimore, they are a pretty key part of the DNA of the city now. In that precinct the combination of the convention facilities and the public transport hub has made a difference to that city. It is another model that we are exploring. Neale, do you want to add any more?

Mr Guthrie: Sure. The ownership issue with Canberra stadium is an ongoing one with the Australian Sports Commission. We are still in the same position we were in the last time I was at a committee hearing: I am still awaiting a proposal from the Australian Sports Commission. I have spoken with my opposite number in the Sports Commission, who apologised for it. He has had a delay with a staff shortage over there, and you are probably also aware that there has been a new chief executive officer and some changes to the board. I am assured that their position is unchanged with those changes and that I will soon receive a proposal from them to progress this issue of ownership.

But the commitment is from both sides. I believe it is good faith on the Sports Commission's side that they are looking for a long-term lease over our site for the ACT government. That gives us surety for any development we may wish to progress on that site.

MR DOSZPOT: Do we have any idea of the actual value of the stadium at the moment? We were asking about this last time; there was no valuation at that point.

Mr Guthrie: I know that the Sports Commission have conducted an evaluation and their proposal would be based on that evaluation. We are waiting for that as a starting point for the discussion.

MR DOSZPOT: I would be interested to see that as well if you could take that on notice.

Mr Guthrie: Sure.

THE CHAIR: If it is possible; I will leave you to contemplate that, minister.

Mr Barr: The Sports Commission will have to convey that to us; once we have it I am happy to—

THE CHAIR: I would have thought so. Thank you, minister; we will deal with that on notice. We will now go to a morning tea break and then go on to LDA and infrastructure and capital works. Thank you.

Meeting adjourned from 11.04 to 11.21 am

THE CHAIR: We will now start the second half of this hearing. We will be looking at the Land Development Agency and infrastructure and capital works. Ms Le Couteur.

MS LE COUTEUR: Thank you. Last night, as I mentioned, I went to the Downer Community Association meeting, being a Downer resident, and a major topic of conversation was what was going to be happening to the Downer central area. The DCA had been expecting a presentation from Economic Development on the subject, but were told that Economic Development was not quite ready to do that. I understand that will be in two weeks time. Just as a comment, I would hope that Economic Development will be doing the letter boxing for that, given DCA did the last one. It might be a bit much to expect the volunteers to do two lots.

The question that seemed to be occupying people's minds the most was: what is the situation with CHC? They have been told that CHC has the site. What status does this have and what is the deal—or is there a deal and, if so, what is it?

Mr Dawes: There is a memorandum of understanding between Community Housing Canberra and the LDA whereby we have to provide a certain number of sites for them each year. It is a mix of infill sites as well as sites in greenfields. The Downer site had been recognised as a potential opportunity for them, because they have been working with a number of different groups as well to provide some older-age women's accommodation. A particular requirement coming from the community in that inner north area is to provide some affordable accommodation for older women. So there have been some of those sorts of discussions going on between Community Housing Canberra and those particular groups.

I will ask Ross to go into some of the finer detail. Obviously we are ready, so Ross might have an explanation as to why we were not there last night. But can I say to you from a directorate perspective that we will be doing the letterbox drops and so forth. I would not expect the community to do so. I think that is actually one community that we have worked very well with and it is wanting us to get on with the development. So that has been a very encouraging sign. I was there earlier in the year, or a few months ago now, and the concern was about the delay in getting some activity on the site.

Mr McKay: We have not reached an agreement with Community Housing Canberra—CHC Affordable Housing—as yet. But we do intend to work with them, to

work with the community, to get to a design response stage where there will be a level of concept design which will show the approximate form and character of the development, the number of dwellings and the space—the commercial space and the community space. From that, CHC can decide whether or not they are interested, we can decide whether or not we are interested and the community will know that there is a design form that suits their understanding of what should be there.

MS LE COUTEUR: So at this stage the project is still being run by your directorate, not by CHC?

Mr McKay: It will continue to be run by our directorate. CHC is doing the design work.

MS LE COUTEUR: So they are doing the design work but you still control the site?

Mr McKay: Correct, yes.

MS LE COUTEUR: Is it the expectation that CHC would have the whole site or part of the site?

Mr Dawes: That has not been determined as yet. What we are actually looking at is part of the design response, because there are a number of other issues that we need to do, and we are conscious of what the Downer residents are requiring with respect to the old Downer shops and the heritage issues, as well as how we can actually reacquire a site that belongs to a developer that is not proceeding. So there are a number of sensitivities around that, and we are looking at how that can then be integrated into a community facility for that part of the inner north.

With the exact numbers, we are just waiting for the final discussion with Community Housing Canberra. But it is quite a large site, and it does lend itself to providing opportunities for other people as well to provide accommodation. What is going to be very important, and one of the things that I have learnt in going out and doing community consultation, is that you need to get the first stage right to set the scene, to make sure we have the right built form outcome, and the quality as well. That is part and parcel of my discussion with the community groups. It is not only the density issue but quite often it goes back to the quality of design and the quality of the built form. So we are spending a little bit of extra time in ensuring that that is right.

MS LE COUTEUR: Would there be likely to be a variation of ownership? Even if CHC has it all, would it all be social housing? Aged housing, given it is in Downer, is probably something that could well be incorporated in some of it.

Mr Dawes: I think it is very important for us to ensure that we provide for all of the community as well. If you look at the community housing model, it has provided rental accommodation and they do sell their properties as well. They have a particular market and they have an agreement with the ACT government, as part of the affordable housing action plan, to provide X number of dwellings at price points, and rental accommodation as well. That is part and parcel of it. So there will be a mix of ownership there. I think it is important to create a mix of community there as well. So it will not be all dominated by one group over another.

MS LE COUTEUR: And a mix of price points?

Mr Dawes: Yes, correct. I think that is important. Obviously we will be mandating that, and that will be built in accordance with our affordable housing pricing policy.

Mr McKay: CHC has about 400 NRAS funding units. They will be retaining a number of units within the development and not selling them at all and renting them out at an affordable rent point. When we talk about social housing, it is more about housing for a policeman, a bartender or a hairdresser, as well as aged accommodation—accommodation for older people and specific accommodation for, say, older women.

MS LE COUTEUR: The other issue which you alluded to earlier, Mr Dawes, which is exercising the minds of Downer residents is the Downer shops; to be precise, the Downer “unshop”, which, I believe, has just been provisionally heritage listed. As you would be aware, there is strong support from the Downer community for the concept of the government buying that site back and turning it back into community use. What is happening with that proposal?

Mr Dawes: We have not had any discussion with that developer for some time. We are going through doing that bit of work on what is going to happen on the site and how that can be incorporated back into a community centre. We are getting to the point where it is a matter of whether we buy it back or that becomes part and parcel of the development conditions of developing the precinct, and that will be incorporated. We are taking further advice from GSO and a number of other areas as well to ensure that that can be done. There has been discussion with the developer, as I said earlier. Because of the complexities, the heritage site and all of that, I think he would prefer to walk away from the site.

MS LE COUTEUR: How will you determine whether there is a commercial component of the site? That is one of the things that people have been debating for the last 10 years. No-one would like to see a shop there going bust but everyone would like to see a shop. How will you determine it?

Mr Dawes: That is part and parcel of some of the exercise that we are doing. We have engaged a retail consultant in that area. I have not been involved in the discussion; Mr McKay may be able to provide a little more information. But in some of the earlier discussions I have had with Community Housing Canberra, they were quite keen to have some facility there that was a shop, and also potentially a coffee shop arrangement, because, as we increase the density in and around that site, that will provide an important meeting place for that community as well.

Mr McKay: We have always had the opinion that it is appropriate to have a level of commercial development there, and it would be low scale, as Mr Dawes said. It will be a coffee shop, corner shop type thing, but if somebody wishes to come forward with a proposal for more extensive development, I am sure that could be accommodated. But on the ground floor it is most likely that it will be community facilities and commercial as one of the primary uses. The position of the shop in the first place is one of the biggest issues. We still have not made any decision on whether

it should stay where it is with better access or move on to, say, the corner of Banfield and Melba and use the parking that is already there.

MS LE COUTEUR: This is my last question about this site: the school has tenants in it. It has been a business incubator. The other part of Economic Development, I guess, would answer this, but do you know what your plans for decanting the tenants are?

Mr Dawes: That particular facility is being managed at the moment by TAMS Property Group, which was part of the old Land and Property Services. But we are working quite closely with them. That is the reason why the development will be staged—to give the people that are occupying those spaces time to relocate. We will be working with them to assist them with relocating over time. With the first stage, we do not need to decant them immediately.

THE CHAIR: Minister, on page 9 of the annual report it mentions that one of the objectives of the directorate will be maximising the economic, social and environmental return from land release. What policies have been or will be implemented to achieve this goal? Also, while we are on that subject, I notice that on page 7 it says that a greater number of dwelling sites than anticipated were released in the land release program. It is not a substantial amount but it certainly means we are achieving a slightly higher amount of blocks to market. So could you address both of those questions?

Mr Barr: I think that central to the government's housing affordability strategy a key economic and social outcome for the territory is a supply side solution that is most effective in putting downward pressure on the growth in house prices and rents through enhancing the supply of housing across a variety of different pricing points. When you look at the work that that has been undertaken in the housing affordability strategy, the particular targets around affordable housing on greenfield estates and our desire to work with organisations like Community Housing Canberra, you see a suite of policies combining to not only enhance the supply of housing but do so across a number of different pricing points in the housing market.

We have also been very successful in innovating. A more recent example of a success story in the housing affordability strategy has been the land rent program. More than 1,000 Canberra households have been assisted. The recent announcement of bankmecu as an additional financial institution participating in the scheme I think will allow that program to continue to grow. That is certainly very encouraging in terms of the suite of housing affordability policies that we have put forward.

We also recognise of course in the context of the territory budget that our land program is a significant contributor to the territory's bottom line and does facilitate significant capital investment that clearly has a flow-on effect in terms of a number of important sectors for the territory economy. As we have seen a level of population growth in the territory exceeding the national average for the first time in a while and very strong employment growth in the territory, there is clearly demand for new housing and that is fuelling a very strong performance within the construction sector. All of the data has shown, perhaps outside of Western Australia, that the territory economy is the strongest performing in the country and there are a number of key indicators that go to reinforce that point.

That economic prosperity is important for the territory, but sharing that throughout the community both in terms of access to affordable housing and, critically, access to employment and employment opportunities outside of the public sector is also a key focus. What we are seeing, effectively, is a virtual circle here where we are seeking to address some of those policy challenges so that we facilitate good outcomes in terms of social equity and also a strong engagement from the education and training sector and some fantastic opportunities for very worthwhile careers for young Canberrans as they make their way through our education and training system.

THE CHAIR: What about the area of sustainability? Obviously this has got to be at the forefront of our mind going forward because of the challenges with our climate.

Mr Barr: That is certainly the case. You see those sustainability principles incorporated into the planning of new estates and their delivery on the ground. Obviously there has been a pretty significant focus on the broader planning strategy for the territory and where new development will occur—what is the appropriate balance between a new greenfield development and an urban infill. Through the Economic Development Directorate and the LDA we obviously are involved in projects in both areas. In planned development there are significant new estates coming on in greenfields areas but also a number of really important and innovative urban infill projects.

I had the opportunity to attend the LDA board meeting earlier in the week. The issues that the LDA are grappling with, particularly around those urban infill projects in Campbell and Yarralumla, I think are exciting opportunities to get an enhanced public amenity but also achieve the government's sustainability targets and deliver some important opportunities for significant urban renewal.

Mr Dawes: If I can just add to that, some of the initiatives that are being used in the greenfield sites around sustainability have been well received by the community. I look at Molonglo in particular. There have been a number of proactive measures there where we are working with the community. We have employed someone within the LDA to provide advice to people that are purchasing homes or blocks of land in Molonglo on maximising the solar access. Chris, you might want to allude to the UDIA standing on the principles of Molonglo.

Mr Reynolds: Certainly. I think over the last few years the LDA have been able to self-challenge with our projects and our commitment to sustainability, both in community consultation and on-the-ground results through our estates. One of the achievements that we invested in in Molonglo was to get independent certification by the UDIA. That certification process involves a range of independent academics and scientists who customise and benchmark targets for the ACT. Obviously our different climate and our location are somewhat specialist to the rest of Australia. At the time, and I think even today, that is the only independent accreditation scheme available for states within Australia.

We achieved the accreditation under four categories at that time—four out of six. Molonglo is the largest estate in the nation to have achieved that certification. I can also add that that is an annual certification, so it is not just a matter of getting a pass

mark and then using that accreditation forever. Two weeks ago we received recertification. The whole project was reviewed, the performance targets were identified and we exceeded them and got reaccredited.

As to a lot of the other commitments, we are optimistic that we will also get a fifth category. That relates to water efficiency. Whilst we have provided the opportunity to receive the accreditation for the fifth criterion—that being low water use—it is dependent on individuals' behaviour within their occupancies as they are living in their houses.

Our approach has been to provide the estate infrastructure and the contractual incentives through our sales documents and our awareness campaign—as Mr Dawes identified—through our home sustainability adviser, who is working with the purchasers and their architects and is certainly passing on that information and that awareness about what occupants can do to use less water, right from landscaping to water efficient fittings within the house. We may yet get that fifth leaf and we would certainly like to see that.

A lot of the other commitments within Molonglo were also put in place by the LDA as an internal challenge to ourselves. They came in place prior to amendments to the territory plan that now require a lot of solar orientation and site design aspects. We self-elected to do that within our contract documentation before the regulatory regime came in to back that up.

I can go on about our community development programs and our mingle programs. The view within the LDA and from the board is that sustainability is not just about the bricks, the energy, the water and the asphalt. It certainly goes a lot further than that from our point of view. It goes to the social and the community building—right from our predevelopment applications where we consult with the community on how our design responds to site constraints and the planning requirements and then, as the occupants move into their houses, we have what we call community-building events. These are opportunities for the new residents all moving into their estates to rub shoulders, get to meet and mingle—hence the name “mingle”—and we are certainly getting positive feedback from that. We believe that is important for the social fabric in new estates that are greater than 500 residents; they are large, new communities.

Mr Dawes: Just to add to that, we look at where society is today compared to what it might have been, say, 20 years ago. When I moved into my first home we all tended to jump in and help one another put the lawns in. You tended to meet your neighbours. I think this has been a very important initiative that the LDA has undertaken because these days you just tend to walk into the home; it is turnkey and it is landscaped. People just drive into their garages and they are self-contained. It is very important to encourage them to mingle. The feedback that we are getting as well is that residents and communities want that maintained, so we intend to continue doing that.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Dawes. Mr Seselja.

MR SESELJA: How many of the land rent blocks are concessional and how many of those are paid at the higher four per cent rate?

Mr Dawes: I would have to take part of that on notice. If I look at the numbers of land rent blocks that are currently coming through the system—I will just get those numbers—we have had 1,061 contracts exchanged. Of those, 314 have settled and 747 have exchanged. As to the exact break-up I would have to get back to you.

Mr Thomson: I will have to get those numbers from Treasury because they administer the land rent payments. People would provide their income details to Treasury, who collect the land rent.

MR SESELJA: So the LDA does not know? You have listed it as a housing affordability initiative so obviously you would know that you would need to be helping a lot of low income people. You do not know those numbers?

Ms Judd: I understand that around 30 per cent of those contracts that have been exchanged have actually gone to people that are on the concessional rate, the two per cent land rent rate.

MR SESELJA: So around 70 per cent are going to those not getting the concessional rate. How many are going to builders versus purchasers or owners?

Ms Judd: We would have to take that on notice.

Mr Dawes: At the present time we restrict the builders to a maximum of five blocks. One of the key things with the land rent—

MR SESELJA: Is that five blocks at a time or five blocks for one builder?

Mr Dawes: In a ballot. What we have got to remember is that it is important to get the land rent blocks into the marketplace through a number of different channels. It provides opportunities for the builders to sell those particular blocks. They would pay four per cent, naturally, but if, for example, they sell to one of the concessional buyers, when the concessional buyer buys that particular house and land package on land rent they would then be able to go back to the two per cent concessional rate. We are in the process of running a number of seminars with the industry associations to inform and train them on the land rent scheme.

I think it is worth noting as well that the land rent scheme appears to be being looked at by the South Australian and Western Australian governments. One of the key things is that the CPS community credit union have a strong presence both in South Australia and Western Australia. The Western Australian government, in particular, has been looking at the process here because it is a way of providing affordable accommodation but also other opportunities for people to get into home ownership.

MR SESELJA: How many land rent blocks have been handed back, so people take them and then do not build on them?

Mr Dawes: Obviously a number are handed back, and we have those numbers as well. There have been 149 contracts entered into and rescinded prior to settlement. So when you look at the scheme and the number of blocks that have been sold that is a fairly low percentage.

MR SESELJA: That is 149 out of a total of how many?

Mr Reynolds: That was at 30 June 2011.

Mr Dawes: Out of 1,306.

MR SESELJA: In Molonglo, more broadly in terms of blocks, how many blocks have sold in Molonglo and how many of those, separate from land rent or as a combined total, have been handed back or not settled on?

Mr Dawes: There are not that many that have been handed back. We have got the numbers. Have you got those there, Ian?

Mr Barr: We will get those.

Mr Dawes: We will get them exactly.

MR SESELJA: On the revenue, you have listed—

Mr Dawes: Could I add to that as well? They are not due for settlement. I think that is an important point.

MR SESELJA: In terms of the Molonglo blocks?

Mr Dawes: Yes.

MR SESELJA: When are the first of the Molonglo blocks due for settlement?

Mr Reynolds: The first blocks in Molonglo are due for settlement December-January. So we will be issuing notices to complete over the coming weeks.

MR SESELJA: Page 22 talks about a decrease in revenue from your forecast, \$100 million lower than the 2009-10 actual, and it lists a bunch of things that were delayed. It lists the Ngunnawal 2C site being delayed, adverse weather and some other things. Given that, what is the expectation for this year? Are we expecting that, given a lot of things were delayed in the last financial year, there will be an increase in the land revenue this year? What is the forecast at the moment?

Mr Thomson: We still have some challenges to get through on our environmental clearances at Molonglo for Molonglo 2. Our revenues this year will be over \$400 million. So we will be up on last year.

MR SESELJA: If I could clarify, it will be over \$400 million for this financial year?

Mr Thomson: This financial year.

MR SESELJA: Remind me what your forecast is for this financial year.

Mr Thomson: It was initially in the budget closer to about \$680 million.

MR SESELJA: It will be in the vicinity of the low 400s? Is that the expectation?

Mr Thomson: Mid 400s.

MR SESELJA: Again, that will be less. How will that affect the dividend? Are you expecting to provide less of a dividend to government? If so, how much?

Mr Thomson: I have not done the actual calculations on the dividend based on our forecast. The dividend will be 100 per cent dividend as it is. The dividend will be probably on a pro rata—I can provide that detail.

THE CHAIR: We will take that on notice.

MR SESELJA: You have had two years in a row where it has been significantly less than forecast. Maybe you could expand on that a little. The rationale in the annual report is that things got pushed back. Presumably those have gone ahead now. Was that factored in when these forecasts for this financial year were put together? What are the other things that have offset and obviously more than offset that additional stuff that has been pushed back from last financial year?

Mr Dawes: We might do a tag team here. I think what we need to remember is that part and parcel of the delay last year was due to wet weather. I think we had an inordinate amount of wet weather. And I think we need to remember that just because it stops raining the day after, it is some weeks before you can get equipment back into the field. So there have been some delays in that area as well.

We also have been delayed with commonwealth EPBC clearances. And I think in a number of other forums I have mentioned the work that is going on. And we have a dedicated person actually running those processes. But that has an impact on time. If you look at when the ACT embarked on developing Molonglo, we separated and we had Wright and Coombs, but the rest of the clearances are going through that commonwealth process.

We have only just received, for example, notification from the commonwealth last month—and there was an announcement by the commonwealth minister and the ACT minister—about the plan being signed off. We are still waiting for the commonwealth as well, and we are being very proactive, to find out what the conditions are attached to that approval.

That will delay settlements, and it is important that we have some englobo sales going out to the market in the third quarter of this financial year, to the private sector. We have actually delayed those, and they will flow over into very early the following financial year. Obviously, we need to ensure that when we actually take those to the market, they are de-risked, there is certainty as well. We are re-profiling some of our capital works as well, because they also need those commonwealth clearances. So there is a lot of work across the agency as well to refine and get those clearances.

But this is the world we live in. As I said, we have a special team now across government to attack those particular issues so that we can actually get ahead of the

program.

MR SESELJA: If I can clarify Mr Thomson's answer, you will provide us with an updated estimate of the dividend.

Mr Thomson: The expectation or the forecast for this year has been delayed significantly by Molonglo being cleared by the commonwealth four or five months after our expectation.

MR SESELJA: You will provide those numbers?

Mr Barr: Certainly the government will provide an update through the midyear economic statement.

MR SESELJA: I have asked Mr Thomson—

Mr Barr: I am responding. I am the minister. I am allowed to.

MR SESELJA: In response to this question—

Mr Barr: I am telling you—

MR SESELJA: you are not going to provide that information that I have asked for then?

Mr Barr: we will—

MR SESELJA: Mr Thomson just indicated that he was prepared to.

Mr Barr: If you would let me answer your question rather than just going on another verbal spew at an official, if you would let me answer your question—

MR SESELJA: I am actually going at you.

Mr Barr: Okay. What I am saying is that the government will update the budget position in relation to the midyear statement, as we do every year. This is clearly an input into that process and when we provide that update, I will be able to provide all of that information to the committee.

MR SESELJA: The question I have asked Mr Thomson, which he said he was going to answer, you are now saying will not be answered. You will answer it in your own good time when you do the midyear update?

Mr Barr: The question has been taken on notice, and I will provide that information. I am also indicating to you that, of course, it is an input into—

MR SESELJA: It is taken on notice.

Mr Barr: the midyear economic statement.

MR SESELJA: It is good we can clarify that. So that has been taken on notice, I think, is the upshot. Is the LDA owed any money on any of the recent land sales? In terms of the recent large land sales that it has undertaken, is there any money outstanding, or has that all been paid? If there is, how much is outstanding?

Mr Dawes: Ngunnawal 2C is now settled, to the best of my knowledge. To the best of my knowledge, all the settlements are in. Obviously, the economic climate that we are in has delayed it, but Ngunnawal 2C is now settled.

MR SESELJA: Are there any others where there are outstanding payments?

Mr Dawes: No, not at all.

THE CHAIR: Minister, when is that midterm review likely to be tabled?

Mr Barr: The tradition is in February.

THE CHAIR: February, just for completion of that.

Mr Barr: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Ms Le Couteur.

MS LE COUTEUR: Still on land, I will go back to Economic Development. On page 9, you are building an inventory of urban renewable opportunities. How are you doing that? In conjunction with ACTPLA? Tell me more.

Mr Barr: Yes, we are. I commissioned some work as planning minister in relation to identifying some sites. A number of them are fairly well known and are the subject of varying processes, depending on the nature of those sites. Some are more progressed than others. Some have been the subject of considerable community engagement—the old Canberra brickworks site, the site in Campbell on Constitution Avenue, for example, Greenway, with the Tuggeranong Community Council on that Greenway precinct.

So there are a number of opportunities that are at different stages of development, and we will continue that policy process and that policy work in conjunction with ACTPLA, ESDD, noting, of course, that some of this has overlap with the overall planning strategy. The government also has land holdings and assets in some of our priority development zones—within the CBD, along the Northbourne Avenue transit corridor, in Woden—and there are areas that will be the subject of further examination as we move forward.

MS LE COUTEUR: Are you only looking at land that is currently owned by the government in this?

Mr Barr: That is certainly a principal focus for us, but you would not be surprised to learn that there are private developers who have land holdings who are also pursuing development opportunities.

MS LE COUTEUR: And do you have any coordination with them, any facilitation role or anything along those lines?

Mr Barr: It depends a little on the nature and the scale of projects. Often there will be a project for direct sale of contiguous land to assist in redevelopment processes. Off the top of my head, I can think of an example in Jamison where that has been the case, but there are other examples. It really does depend on the scale of the development.

MR SESELJA: On that, does the LDA own the site for the proposed supermarket in Crace? I know there is a development application on that site. Does the LDA own that at the moment?

Mr Dawes: That is a joint venture with CIC Australia.

MR SESELJA: Who owns—

Mr Dawes: It is owned by the joint venture.

MR SESELJA: And is there a proposal to sell that land to a supermarket operator at the moment?

Mr Dawes: That is subject to a number of discussions with that particular joint venture board. They are looking at getting the site approved and then taking it out to the market. Again, it comes back to a point I made earlier about the built form and the quality. The joint venture is very focused on delivering quality outcomes. They want to ensure that the plan is approved and they are not dumbed down, if I can use that term, as well. They are getting that approved and they will take that to the market.

MR SESELJA: To clarify, you said the application is going through and then there would be a process. The application goes through. Who puts in the application?

Mr Dawes: The joint venture actually lodges that particular design with ESDD for approval.

MR SESELJA: So the joint venture has lodged an application for a 1,500-metre supermarket in Crace; is that right?

Mr Dawes: Correct.

MR SESELJA: And if that were to be approved by ACTPLA, they would then have some sort of process for a—

Mr Dawes: That is to be determined. My understanding is the joint venture board has not reached an agreement there—whether that would go out with an expression of interest or whether it would go straight to auction.

THE CHAIR: Minister, page 9 of the Economic Development annual report, to which Ms Le Couteur was drawing your attention, mentions the continuing development of the National Arboretum in Canberra, which has now come into your area, I believe. I attended a very successful event at the arboretum a few weekends

ago. I think it was called Voices in the Forest, although someone rudely said “voices in the bushes,” referring to the fact that the trees are very little at the moment.

MS LE COUTEUR: “Songs in the saplings”.

THE CHAIR: “Songs in the saplings” is another suggestion. But it was a very successful event. There were a lot of people there. I think that it bodes well for the future. I was wondering whether you could talk us through what development is going on at the moment and future plans.

Mr Barr: Sure. The arboretum had a brief sojourn with the Economic Development Directorate. Under the changes to the administrative arrangements that the Chief Minister announced last week, she has taken carriage of the arboretum through the Territory and Municipal Services portfolio.

THE CHAIR: Okay. So it is no longer here; it has moved already?

Mr Barr: It has moved, yes. That is a decision the Chief Minister took as part of the new ministry arrangements with Dr Bourke entering the ministry. The origins of the arboretum are that it was supported through the former Land and Property Services department, continuing on with that area through the creation of the Economic Development Directorate, but now under the Chief Minister’s wing in Territory and Municipal Services.

THE CHAIR: It is good to know that the Chief Minister has carriage of that area, of course, but I am sure that the—

Mr Barr: We can certainly provide some information on the work that has been undertaken to date.

THE CHAIR: Yes, that would be really good.

Mr Barr: I will get Mr Dawes to assist you with that.

Mr Dawes: When you look at what has been achieved at the arboretum, it is certainly going to be an iconic project in the future. As well, there has been significant work. We have seen the announcement of \$20 million from the commonwealth. Officers within EDD and the commonwealth are finetuning exactly where and how that money will be spent, but it is obviously going to go into infrastructure. We have already seen our first donation there by the private sector, and that money being allocated to the visitors centre. We believe some of that commonwealth money will go to the fit-out of the visitors information centre, and there is some dialogue with some other benefactors at the present time. So it has actually now captured the hearts of the business community and also the broader community. Looking at the roads that are being completed, Mr McNulty will go into some of that finer detail.

Mr McNulty: The main projects going on at the arboretum at the moment are the ongoing tree plantings. At the end of June this year there were 71 forests. By the end of this year, we anticipate having 83 forests planted of the 100. A 1.6 megalitre water tank has been completed on the site, up near Dairy Farmers Hill. The visitors centre is

now well advanced and we anticipate that will be completed in August-September next year, and that will be a wonderful building, a really good addition to the site. We are also working at the moment on the central valley, the zigzag path down the central valley, and we are shortly going to start work on the events terrace. As Mr Dawes mentioned, we are very close to finalising an agreement with the commonwealth about the use of the \$20 million and how that will be recognised on the site.

THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. We will watch that space with great interest. I would encourage anyone that has not already been up there to take a visit, because it is a fantastic facility and will be into the future, obviously. Ms Le Couteur, it is your turn. I am losing track of whose turn it is.

MS LE COUTEUR: Yes. I would like to continue talking about urban renewal opportunities. How does that relate to your inventory of serviced land? Is it a published list that you produce of the urban renewable opportunities or is it only part of a private inventory?

Mr Dawes: No, we do produce a four-year indicative land release program. That does identify sites as well. Part and parcel of what we are wanting to do is that we are actually enhancing that as we go further. With respect to one of the key things that I think we identified some years ago, we do not have to mention the particular community that were up in arms about a for sale sign being put on a car park. I might add that I attended my 21st reference group meeting last night, so we are just about there with the master plan on Hawker, which I think is encouraging.

THE CHAIR: A sort of coming of age, Mr Dawes.

Mr Dawes: One of the lessons learned out of that was to produce an indicative land release, putting those sites out in the marketplace, and we would go out and do the community consultation. When you look at how that has worked, if you look at the Greenway site that was on the list, that has been very well embraced by the Tuggeranong community. We have had some workshops on Campbell.

In finetuning that, and with the closer relationship between the Economic Development Directorate and the LDA, one of the key functions and some of the work that we are doing now is to do that work even further up front. That means when the indicative land release is printed and produced, all of the consultation around the number of units that are going to go on, say, the Campbell site, is all done up front. So when that program is printed, that is the deliverable for the LDA to take to the market. But that is actually being refined and enhanced as we go through that sort of process. So we are building up that inventory. We look at the constraints and opportunities on the sites to ensure that, again, when we go out—because, in some cases, the numbers of dwellings that may go on a site have been undefined—and consult with the community, they know exactly what is going to be in place.

With respect to some of the things that I have learned in going out and doing this community consultation, it comes back to the quality, and also people changing what has been agreed to. Take, for example, where you might agree to four to six-storey heights and then an application comes out of left field for a 20-storey tower. So we are looking at ensuring how we do that. We get EDPs approved, and that provides

certainty back to the community. So that is some of the additional work that we are doing now.

MS LE COUTEUR: One of the reasons I asked this—I may have missed it in my skimming—is that Downer, which we spoke about earlier, is not on the program. But I know we started consultations on that in 2001. I would have thought it would be a big enough site to warrant it. So I am assuming you have another list. These are the ones that are pretty certain that—

Mr Dawes: The ones that we try and put out are the ones that are certain. Obviously sites will come up during the year or during that process and we will then go out and independently consult. That site has only been with us for the last year—that we have had a focus on the Downer site. So we have actually progressed. I know it has been around for a long period of time. We are trying to compress those times and do that up-front work. Ideally, all the design work that we are doing now would have been done some years ago, to provide that certainty to the community.

MS LE COUTEUR: What is the government doing to move towards being carbon neutral in the land release program?

Mr Dawes: There are a number of different levels. There are a number of different initiatives. It goes back to what Mr Reynolds talked about earlier regarding Molonglo. As we are now going into the phase of building, we are looking at setting up some examples whereby things can be recycled, there are bins and all of that.

There has been a very good example, and it can be controlled even better, if, for example, you have one developer doing some estates. If you look at some of the work that the Village Building Company did out in west Macgregor, they were able to recycle a lot of the materials because they could have the central bins. There is quite a bit of work that we need to do with industry, and we are having those discussions with both the HIA and the MBA as to how we can implement some of the recycling and try and mitigate waste that is going to the dump, so that it can be recycled on site. That is part and parcel of some of what we are trying to achieve in Molonglo which will set a benchmark for future estates that we undertake.

Mr Reynolds: The LDA board last year adopted a sustainability framework for the agency. That framework identifies a number of stretch targets across social—and I made reference earlier to our mingle program, our community consultation processes—and also energy, water and a range of other measures, such as passive design and solar orientation.

With that framework having been adopted by the board last year, we have business plans for each of our projects. We treat very prudently our large projects in terms of having a business plan, identifying risks and financial parameters. Equally, we go through in a very measured way and identify sustainability targets and outputs and we cost them, which we believe is important in achieving the outcomes.

Right from now, with our broad organisational sustainability framework, down through the business plans and monitoring outputs and performance through our project evaluations, we believe we have a robust framework in place that will see real

results on the ground, some of which we are already seeing through the Molonglo demonstration project enviro certification.

With the specific reference that you made to what we are doing for carbon neutrality, through the innovative Crace joint venture that the LDA established, there is also a commitment there through a partnership—I believe it is with Greening Australia—that the estate works will be carbon neutral, and that is being monitored by the joint venture. It was one of the sustainability elements when the LDA reviewed its competitive joint venture establishment process. It was one of the key measures that was certainly very attractive and scored highly as part of that process.

Through Crace, we are observing very closely to see how successful its initiative is, and, as we do with all our projects, we will go through what we call a lessons learnt process, and any positive elements from that are certainly replicable through our broader projects.

What you find within the LDA is that we have the broad framework, and with each of our different projects we are testing the edge and pushing the parameters in terms of leadership on sustainability. Molonglo is slightly different from Bonner, and Moncrieff will be slightly different from both of them, and Crace itself is pushing at another edge. We believe that by having that approach we can implement better performance more quickly by observing on a number of different fronts what has worked and what has not. We consolidate that and then inform ourselves for the next project.

MS LE COUTEUR: Is one of your stretch goals your fair share of the contribution to the 40 per cent greenhouse gas reduction? And how have you worked out what that will be?

Mr Reynolds: I would have to take that question on notice to answer specifically about the 47 per cent stretch target.

MS LE COUTEUR: Only 40 per cent is okay.

Mr Reynolds: Okay; I am already a few years ahead, sorry.

MR SESELJA: The Canberra Seniors Centre have been seeking a new block of land and some new premises. I understand they have had dealings with the LDA over a period of time. I am told that there was a process which was being looked at which they were involved with, which apparently fell over some months ago. They were told on 1 March, I understand, this year, in an email they received from LAPS, that the whole proposal had been abandoned and that a whole new, different process would have to be commenced. Could you give us an update as to where that new process is up to and why the Canberra Seniors Centre have not heard anything since March 2011?

Mr McKay: We have been in a long conversation with the city seniors, with a view to putting them onto a block in Dickson. The fundamental issue was that, as the funding agency for the seniors is CSD, therefore, we went to CSD and said: “We’re likely to get this block. We hope to get this block. If you support the seniors, there’s an

opportunity for them there.” They met with CSD and, in the end, we could not pick up the block. So it was left with CSD—

MR SESELJA: Why not? Why couldn't you pick up the block?

Mr McKay: We could not reach agreement to purchase the block with the owner.

MR SESELJA: So it was the owner of the land rather than the department that caused that to fall over. Who owns that block?

Mr McKay: The block is owned by the Tradies.

MR SESELJA: So you could not reach agreement; that is why that fell over?

Mr McKay: Correct, yes.

MR SESELJA: Okay. You said that if they could get support from CSD—

Mr McKay: CSD would have to fund the construction or the move, because they are the funding agency for seniors clubs.

MR SESELJA: So that one fell over, and they have not heard anything since March, when they were told suddenly that it had all fallen over. What has happened since then? Are you seeking an alternative block for them?

Mr McKay: I do not believe that we told them it had all fallen over. We said that we had got to a stage where they needed to talk to CSD.

MR SESELJA: Okay. They have been struggling to hear from CSD. So CSD has not come back to you and engaged you in looking for an alternative site for the seniors centre?

Mr McKay: Not at this stage.

MR SESELJA: They had out-of-pocket expenses of around \$8,000 which they were told by the government to undertake because they needed to undertake it as part of that process. They were told they would be reimbursed and they have not. Is there a reason for that?

Mr McKay: I understand CSD said they would need to meet their own expenses on that particular issue. That is my understanding.

MR SESELJA: So CSD has told them that they will not be compensated?

Mr McKay: That they would not reimburse them for that, yes.

MR SESELJA: I understand they were told they would be compensated, and they have not been compensated. So from your perspective, you have not heard from CSD on this issue since the Tradies site did not eventuate?

Mr McKay: We have not discussed it with CSD for some time, but we have identified another block that there is a possibility that they could be relocated on, that would be suitable for them. But it is still in the early stages.

MR SESELJA: Which is that?

Mr McKay: There is a block adjacent to the Tradies block.

MR SESELJA: What work has been done on progressing that?

Mr McKay: We are in discussions. That is owned by the Salvation Army. We are in discussions with them. They want to relocate in Tuggeranong, to have one of their main focuses for their pastoral care in Tuggeranong. So we have been in discussions with them. They said that they would be happy to have that as part of the consideration for a new block.

MR SESELJA: Mr Dawes, is the former head of the LDA, John Robertson, still with the organisation in any capacity or has he moved on?

Mr Dawes: Mr Robertson has moved on. Mr Robertson was offered alternative employment. I think this question came up last week with the head of the service. He was offered an alternative position at level; he chose to move on.

MR SESELJA: Sorry, I do not remember that discussion. I remember it in relation to Mr Savery.

Mr Dawes: I think you referred to both.

MR SESELJA: I did not ask about that. Was Mr Robertson paid out for his contract? What was the arrangement?

Mr Dawes: Mr Robertson received all the entitlements that he was due under the terms of his employment with the ACT public service.

MR SESELJA: How long did he have remaining on his contract when it was terminated?

Mr Dawes: It does not come back to a contract.

MR SESELJA: So he was not on a contract?

Mr Dawes: He was on a contract, but you do not pay out a contract. That was changed some years ago. If you look at them, I think you will find that most directors-general or former chief executives are on a 60-day rolling contract. It is a five-year contract. But as I said, he chose not to take his appointment. He had around 15 months to go on his contract, if that is the question.

MR SESELJA: All right. I think Ms Hudson may have something to add. Is that what I can take from that?

Mr Dawes: Being a former commissioner, she can probably provide some additional advice.

Ms Hudson: Specifically, to add to what Mr Dawes has mentioned, in response to the Hawke review, the government indicated its preference to have LDA and EDD more closely aligned, and indicated that preference to the governing board. The governing board then agreed with that proposal. That meant that the director-general and the chief executive officer are a combined role. The LDA, endorsing that board, determined to restructure the LDA. As a result of the restructure, the role of the CEO fundamentally changed, and the former CEO's contract was terminated. In terms of how that arrangement comes into being, it is considered like an operational change, and that contract then gets terminated.

MR SESELJA: In those circumstances, what is the nature of the payout and what is the size of the payout?

Ms Hudson: He was a statutory officer, so it is slightly different, but he received all his statutory entitlements at the end of September 2011.

MR SESELJA: Which is what?

Ms Hudson: Given the privacy, I do not think I should—

MR SESELJA: It is a statutory office and these contracts are public, so I am not really sure where the privacy issues arise.

Ms Hudson: The amount. It varies depending—

MR SESELJA: The amounts of these contracts are public too.

Ms Hudson: The amount of the payout.

MR SESELJA: I am not sure where the privacy issue arises given that these are public contracts.

Mr Dawes: His contract was not paid out, Mr Seselja.

Ms Hudson: We received advice from the Government Solicitor that we should respect the privacy of the former CEO and not disclose that amount.

MR SESELJA: So we can know how much someone is paid in these positions but not how much they are paid out?

Mr Barr: The issue here is a question of length of service, so that would vary from officer to officer.

MR SESELJA: Sorry; I missed that.

Mr Barr: It is a question of length of service. The officer in question will have a different set of entitlements from another officer in a similar circumstance because of

length of service. The point Mr Dawes and Ms Hudson are making is that there are circumstances unique to the former CEO that mean that there are privacy considerations in relation to his personal circumstances.

MR SESELJA: So is it now the government's position that payouts for executive contracts are a matter of privacy?

Mr Barr: It is not a payout for an executive contract. That is the point.

MR SESELJA: What is the amount of the payout for the executive contract?

Mr Barr: We can take that on notice and provide that information.

THE CHAIR: We will take that on notice.

MR SESELJA: You will not give us the total payout, but you will give us—

Mr Barr: That will be different from his personal circumstances. That is the distinction that you are obviously not getting in this line of questioning.

MR SESELJA: No; I am quite clear.

Mr Barr: Do you believe that his personal circumstances should be shared with everyone? Is that your intention here?

MR SESELJA: What kind of personal circumstances are you talking about, Mr Barr?

Mr Barr: His payout.

MR SESELJA: We are talking about a payout of a contract for a senior office bearer—

Mr Barr: No, we are not. We are talking about a different thing.

MR SESELJA: What is the payout for then?

Mr Barr: He has entitlements because, prior to taking on this role, he had other roles with the ACT government. That is the point that Ms Hudson is making.

MR SESELJA: What part of the previous service draws the Privacy Act compared to the latter service?

THE CHAIR: I think we need to move on. Obviously this is advice that you have got from the Government Solicitor. We need to move on, Mr Seselja.

Mr Barr: I am happy, in responding to the question and taking it on notice, to provide information that we can. I am not seeking to hide anything. But I am equally conscious of our need to respect the privacy of an individual, and I would hope that the Leader of the Opposition shares that concern.

THE CHAIR: One would hope so. Ms Le Couteur.

MS LE COUTEUR: Some 306 multi-unit buildings have been released on Flemington Road, and I am sure there are many more to come. What innovative arrangements are you doing in terms of parking and transport arrangements given that they are on key transport corridors? Have you got something in the sales agreement which recognises this?

Mr Reynolds: Yes, correct, insofar as the 306 multi-unit sales that you are referring to are along an important transit corridor between Gungahlin and the CBD. Those multi-unit sites naturally have a higher density in recognition of their accessibility to public transport. With regard to the parking requirements and access to public transport, the approach that we have taken is to comply with the letter of the law with regard to the planning policies that dictate over that area, through the territory plan. The densities that have been calculated that go with those site sale documents are all based on being compliant and consistent with the planning policy that affects those sites.

We have not sought, through any additional contractual layers, any dispensation or other requirements with regard to parking. The approach has been to comply with the planning policy. Given the site's access and close proximity to that transit corridor, we believe that the convenience of having that service literally at the doorstep will influence behaviours with regard to patronage of public transport.

MS LE COUTEUR: So you have not tried to get any changes because it is such a good site? Given that you have not looked at that area, in other areas have you looked at the way that developers can reduce pressure on the government's infrastructure costs? For instance, rather than providing half a car park in the 1½ car park range, maybe developers could contribute to public transport infrastructure or even shared parking structures that could be better utilised over a 24-hour, seven-day period?

Mr Dawes: Ms Le Couteur, that is part and parcel of the broader transport strategy discussion. That is already out in the marketplace in some guises. That is something that needs to be fed into it. There is nothing mandated at all at this point in time, if that is your question.

MS LE COUTEUR: And you have not been discussing it at all with ACTPLA?

Mr Barr: There have been discussions, yes.

Mr Dawes: It has been discussed, yes. We are looking at what we can do to enhance it.

Mr Barr: Yes, absolutely. Some of the concepts that you have just raised in your question have been discussed. There are a variety of different methods the government could adopt to seek to achieve those outcomes. In terms of parking provision, for example, we have got to be conscious of the balance between private and publicly provided parking. My observation would be that, in terms of the Greens' position, that of the government and that of the Liberal Party, as is normally the case in territory politics, you two are off occupying either extreme of the argument and we

are looking to steer a sensible middle path through these issues. I am regularly put in this position where the Greens are seeking punitive behavioural change, the Liberal Party do not seem to care at all about responding to the policy challenges and the government seeks a sensible middle ground. This is a familiar concept.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, minister. We will bring this part of the hearing to a close. Members have five days to put questions on notice; then there will be a three-week period for you to respond to questions on notice. Obviously it is running into Christmas.

Mr Barr: Our understanding from other committees in the annual reports process is that there was a mid-January or late January—

THE CHAIR: Because of the Christmas break, there will be more time.

Mr Barr: Certainly at the hearing a couple of weeks ago that was the case.

THE CHAIR: That is right. We are going to allow more time because of the Christmas break. Thank you very much, minister. Thank you, Mr Dawes and officials.

The committee adjourned at 12.30 pm.