LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

(Reference: Inquiry into Annual and Financial Reports 2024-25)

Members:

MS J CLAY (Chair)
MS F CARRICK (Deputy Chair)
MR P CAIN
MS C TOUGH

TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE

CANBERRA

MONDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2025

Secretary to the committee:
Mr J Bunce (Ph: 620 50199)

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

Privilege statement

The Assembly 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 20 May 2013

The committee met at 2.46 pm

Appearances:

City Renewal Authority
Gillman, Mr Craig, Chief Executive Officer
Wilson, Ms Lucy, Executive General Manager, Urbanisation and Renewal

Suburban Land Agency
Davey, Mr Adam, Chief Executive Officer
Lee, Mr Joey, Executive Group Manager, Place Delivery
Gordon, Mr Tom, Executive Group Manager
Holt, Mr Nicholas, Executive Group Manager, Thriving Communities Group

THE CHAIR: Good afternoon. Welcome to the public hearings of the Standing Committee on Environment and Planning for our inquiry into annual and financial reports 2024-25. This afternoon, we will hear from the Suburban Land Agency and the City Renewal Authority. Thank you for coming in.

The committee wishes to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands we are meeting on, the Ngunnawal people. We wish to acknowledge and respect their continuing culture and the contribution they make to the life of this city and this region. We would also like to acknowledge and welcome other Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who may be attending today's event or who may be watching from their land somewhere else.

We are recording and transcribing the hearing and it will be published. We are also broadcasting and web-streaming live. If you take a question on notice, please, use these words: "I will take that question on notice." That helps our secretariat track down the answers.

We welcome the Suburban Land Agency and City Renewal Authority. Please note that, as witnesses, you are protected by parliamentary privilege and you are bound by its obligations. You must tell the truth. Giving false or misleading evidence will be treated as a serious matter and may be considered contempt of the Assembly. We are not inviting opening statements; so we will proceed to questions.

I have a question about the release of affordable public and community housing. The annual report shows that, in 2024-25, you missed the targeted sales of affordable public and community housing by 157 dwellings. Our public housing wait list has increased this term. It has gone from around 3,000 to around 3,500. So it is quite significant to be falling short of our targets. The target of 608 dwellings was established through the budget process. At that time, detailed information would have been available about the constraints and the risks that might have led to a delay in the release of land. Given the housing crisis, can you explain what the reasons were for missing our land release public housing target by 26 per cent?

Mr Davey: I might ask a colleague who may have a bit more detail to come to the table To start, at a high level, there is a range of reasons why targets may be missed and why delivery of sites may be delayed. Sometimes those constraints are known in advance—

that there are risks that could delay the release of a site. But those risks are not necessarily realised until late in the financial year—and we, obviously, operate in financial years in terms of that reporting cycle. Sometimes we release a site that might not sell which might have targets attached to it, and we look to re-release that at a later date. I might ask my colleague Nicholas Holt to speak to some of the specifics.

Mr Holt: I have read and understood the privilege statement. Yes, we did have a target of 608 dwellings in the 2024-25 financial year notifiable instrument, comprising of 136 affordable, 40 public and 432 community dwellings. During the year, we released 451 dwellings that aligned to that notifiable instrument. There were two sites that did not get taken to market last financial year, being a site in Gungahlin for 52 affordable dwellings and one in Molonglo for 40 public housing dwellings and 65 community dwellings.

As Mr Davey said, there are reasons why some of these sites do not go to market in the year that they are intended to. Often there are planning delays or other things that might delay. While the site might be delayed from release, the targets still apply. But, when the site is released, those targets will apply.

THE CHAIR: Did we fail to release any of the land that we were planning on releasing for public housing in the year? Are those 40 the only 40 public homes that were due to be released?

Mr Holt: Correct.

THE CHAIR: What happens now? Does that get rolled into the next target and do we see a much bigger target for next year?

Mr Holt: Yes; those targets carry over. The site that those 40 were allocated to was Molonglo stage 1. When that Molonglo release comes to the market, those 40 public housing targets will still apply. So they will be released at that time.

THE CHAIR: What is the target for next year?

Mr Holt: Let me just double-check my figures. There is a notifiable instrument that came out a month or so ago that had the numbers.

Mr Davey: While he finds that, the Gungahlin site and the Molonglo town centre site releases were not so much planning delays as delays in our work getting the sites ready to release. There are always things we have to do in relation to planning, but it was not a system issue.

THE CHAIR: So, with the Molonglo site, it is suitable for public housing and it will be public housing and the SLA just did not get it up?

Mr Davey: We did not get that one out through our work not being ready in time. That is on this year's ILRP for release. So that will be released under the current project status in this financial year.

THE CHAIR: I am just trying to work out whether we have a much bigger target for next year because we will be rolling over these ones and we need more public housing.

Mr Holt: Like I said, the targets get applied. The way we report targets is in the year that they are set out in the notifiable instrument. If we do releases that have prior year targets, sent through prior year notifiable instruments, they will be applied in addition to new targets that will be set through a new notifiable instrument, which usually comes out every year.

Mr Davey: Maybe another way to explain it is that they are added on top of. So, whatever the targets are for this year, the ones we did not release last year are added to the top of that. So it would, in a sense, be a bigger target than it otherwise would have been had we have released them last year.

THE CHAIR: Right. Thank you. We might move to Ms Carrick.

MS CARRICK: My question is sort of a supp on your one, Chair. In the land release program, do you see the previous years, whether it be public housing or just any housing? If, on a previous land release program, you identified a block for sale and it does not go for sale, is it then shown again in subsequent land release programs or does it disappear off the program because it was on a past line?

Mr Davey: I think broadly, or routinely, it probably would, but it depends on the reason for that. I suppose, hypothetically, if a site that was on the land release was not released in the year because of a reason that was, I guess, large enough that you have to take it off the table, then it will not appear in the next year's ILRP. An example would be that first-stage release of 700 dwellings for the Molonglo town centre. That was scheduled in last year's ILRP. We were not able to get that out, and that is scheduled in this year's ILRP.

MS CARRICK: Given that there are no longer block and sections there like there were in previous years to identify what was being sold, is that—

Mr Davey: Is this the ILRP publication you are speaking about?

MS CARRICK: Yes. How do we tell if something that was not sold is still on the program? It just seems to be all grouped up now.

Mr Holt: When the ILRP is formulated, there is planning for which targets would apply to which sites. We do a lot of work with CED now around setting the housing targets and which sites are appropriate to have housing targets applied to them. So, while they may not be specifically referenced in the notifiable instrument—which formally sets the targets—in our planning, we do know which sites those targets will apply to.

How we report against them is through our annual report and we do report against notifiable instruments. Where we have had reporting against different notifiable instruments—for example, for a site that we might release this year—it may have been a re-release from previous years. But we clearly articulate in our annual report if the site is a re-release, which targets apply back against the original notifiable instrument and any additional notifiable instrument targets that might apply to that site. An example of that is Denman Prospect 3, which we released last year. It was a re-release of a site that we had previously released. It had two sets of targets that applied to that site, and we had accounted for those targets separately in our annual report.

MS CARRICK: I can see that, with Denman Prospect stage 3, there were 60 and 60 were released, but that was the 2021-22 release.

Mr Holt: Correct; yes. That sale process did not conclude for the sale and so we re-released that site. But the yield against that site increased and so there were additional targets that were applied. To try and make it as clear as possible from an accounting point of view of targets, we kept the reporting separate. So you should see reporting against the two notifiable instruments.

MS CARRICK: With the Molonglo town centre, there is a lot that can go into the town centre. There was 10,000 square metres of mixed-use development as well that has slipped. What is happening with the Molonglo town centre? When will it start to be developed? Will it be sold to the private sector or will there be public investment in it? How is it going to work?

Mr Davey: The first release of 700 dwellings, which forms part of the Molonglo town centre, is in this year's ILRP. Under current planning, that will be released this financial year. In terms of when the rest of the town centre will be released, given the size of that development, it is going to take several years to happen. In terms of the release methodology, we are still working through what might be the best overall outcome. It could even be that we choose to do a mix of different releases. That will obviously be public once we have made those decisions.

MS CARRICK: Does your website have a plan of the future town centre?

Mr Davey: In terms of where it is all up to, the master planning is currently underway. I would anticipate that that will be complete late this year or early in the new year. The intention will be to go out to the community, as we always do, and share that information. So probably in the first quarter of 2026 I would expect to see that out for public digestion.

MS CARRICK: Thank you.

MS TOUGH: The annual report says that the Turner Build-to-Rent had contracts exchanged in July last year. I am just wondering if there is any update on that project.

Mr Holt: Settlement of that site is contingent on some off-site works being done by the adjacent developer, including some water and sewage work to connect that site to those utilities. We are waiting on those works to be completed and approved by the relevant utility and then we will be able to settle on that site.

MS TOUGH: Do you have a rough indication of when that might be?

Mr Holt: I understand the sewer works are complete but the water connection is still to be done. I do not have the latest timing of when that would be complete.

MS TOUGH: What is the breakdown in that build of what is planned to be affordable rentals and what is just market rate rentals?

Mr Holt: I would have to confirm that; I have not seen their ultimate development proposal yet. But when we went to the market there was a minimum of 15 per cent to be affordable.

MS TOUGH: Thank you.

MS CASTLEY: I would like to ask about the SLA workforce, based on tables in section B14 of the annual report. I am looking at table 25. Am I correct in reading this to mean that the Land Supply and the Place Delivery branches are those which actually develop and release land for the SLA? Is that correct? Do I have that right?

Mr Davey: At one level. I think it is fair to say that all staff in the organisation play a role in the overall development, community consultation, release, community engagement and building. I guess you could say that the Place Delivery group are more like the project teams that look after specific sites in terms of doing the due diligence work and preparing the planning materials to progress those sites. The Land Supply group is a relatively new part of our business—it was formed about the middle of last year—and is focused on the earlier projects that have yet to hit the ILRP. They are things that are longer term in terms of when they might be released. So that group focuses on that sort of early works.

MS CASTLEY: Why is the Chief Operating Officer group so large? Can you talk about what they do?

Mr Davey: The Chief Operating Officer group, like any government unit or business, play a critical role in providing corporate services to the organisation and supporting our board. We obviously have pretty stringent governance requirements, above and beyond what a directorate might have, given our function, reporting to a board and looking after risk strategies. There is some HR support that we have. We also draw some corporate support from the portfolio agencies in which we sit. That is just a very broad-brush overview of what they do, but they do play a supporting and connecting role across the organisation.

MS CASTLEY: Do the Land Supply and Place Delivery branches report any workforce-based constraints on land release?

Mr Davey: Sorry; can you repeat the question?

MS CASTLEY: Do the Land Supply and the Place Delivery branches report on workforce-based constraints on land release? I have heard that it has not all come out. Is it a workforce issue? Is it that you need more staff to help get that land release going? I am just wondering how your targets are going—

Mr Davey: That is a fair question. You might have noticed that, in the financial year we are in now, we increased our FTE by 10. That was an organisational response to ensure that we are providing enough resources to deliver our work program. Obviously, we are quite mindful of where we have resources. We are continuously undertaking workforce planning to ensure that we have the right people with the right skills in the right places when we need them. I think it is reasonable to say that there will be workforce pressures with the large program we have. It is something in the order of 60 projects on the go at any one time. We are also quite mindful of the work health and safety and psychosocial risks, and we spend a lot of time making sure that we are thinking about those and managing them carefully.

In terms of how we prioritise our work, we have an internal prioritisation focus as well which helps us make sure that we are giving the right attention to the right work. But workforce pressures, I think, are always going to be evident in a delivery business.

MS CASTLEY: I would like to ask about some performance indicators. On the land sales revenue target—and I think we have probably touched a little bit on this—it seems, if I am reading it correctly, that the target was missed by 95.5 per cent. Do I have that right?

Mr Davey: The target was?

MS CASTLEY: The target was missed by 99.5 per cent. You have missed the target by that much. I do not have the document in front of me; my apologies.

Mr Gillman: Ms Castley, I think that might be our annual report, the City Renewal Authority's annual report. So I am happy to take that question.

Mr Davey: Well, that is a relief.

MS CASTLEY: I also have a question about how the two organisations work together with regard to land release.

Mr Gillman: The City Renewal Authority has low-volume but high-value land sales. So we have infrequent land sales of significant blocks. If we miss a settlement date, it can have a big impact on those numbers. I will hand over to Lucy in a second to provide a little bit of extra information, but that is our context. Because we are also very careful about the quality requirements that we put on land sales, typically a settlement will be dependent on a works approval that we have considered and approved and complies with our, in most cases, design guidance and we are getting the place outcomes we really want. So we hold onto settlement for an extended period, and any delay in that works approval process by the contractor, by the developer, can result in a big swing in our numbers.

You will see that again this year. With the block of land opposite the QT cloverleaf, its planning is going a little bit slower than everyone had hoped and so it will shift. But we have had another block come in earlier than we expected. So there is a bit of a shift and a swing and a roundabout for us.

Ms Wilson: I have read and understood the privilege statement. As Craig has discussed, our sales are contingent on criteria within the deed which relates to works approvals provided by the National Capital Authority. Therefore, those timeframes can change based on circumstances outside of our control.

Mr Gillman: That revenue is still contracted.

MS CASTLEY: Okay. Thank you.

MS CARRICK: In the City Renewal Authority, is there a finite amount of land that you can sell? Given that you have low-volume, high-value land, is there a point in time that you sort of run out of that low-volume land?

Mr Gillman: It is not imminent. For example, we have section 72 in Dickson that we need to master plan, and that is a significant part of Dickson. Then we have other sites around Dickson, such as the potential library car park in the future. That supply side is not imminent. But land is a limited resource—it is finite—and maybe the renewal piece that needs to happen is: what role does City Renewal play in actually building a dedicated renewal function? It might be surplus government assets and it might be private assets, but we have not thought that far out yet.

MS CARRICK: I was just wondering how you stay a public trading enterprise once you run out of land to sell.

Mr Gillman: If you do.

MR EMERSON: For the SLA, I wanted to ask about the Housing Australia Future Fund funding. Is there any coordination between the land release program and timing for HAFF rounds?

Mr Davey: That is a good question. We do engage with community housing providers and other stakeholders when we are contemplating the timing of releases and looking to how we might be able to align that. It is not always straightforward in terms of when those releases might happen. So we consider what mechanisms we may have available to help facilitate buying a bit of time for, say, a community housing provider to be able to consider a site and line it up with funding. It is something we definitely are alive to and, where we can align those to get the best outcome, that is what we strive to do, but it is not always possible.

MR EMERSON: Is round 3 open currently? Sorry; I have just been trying to find this information, and I thought you might have it.

Mr Davey: I cannot find that information, either. I think part of the challenge that we have at the moment is how you align with a program that is not open and you are not sure of the timeframes. That is part of our challenge as well.

MR EMERSON: Are you operating on an assumption of when that will open? I have seen reporting that it was supposed to open in the middle of this year, and then in the middle of this year it was late this year.

Mr Davey: The assumption that I am making on that is hopefully soon. I do not have anything more concrete.

MR EMERSON: Okay. If you are to try to get things into that round, does that mean bringing future releases forward? Is it more about trying to open up some of the land that was open and perhaps not developed or sold? What does that look like?

Mr Davey: The reality is that we cannot just bring things forward without all the appropriate preparations and planning documentation being done. In terms of our current programs, I think we will have an opportunity, once we know when the timing of a program might be, to consider aligning that release—which I think goes to your original question. We have implemented mechanisms like option deeds to give potential or prospective purchasers the opportunity to signal interest and then give them time for funding opportunities to materialise. That has had some success.

MR EMERSON: Do you have any for round 3 where you are going, "This is probably going to open soon. These are the sites that we are working with community housing providers to release in this window"?

Mr Davey: I think it is known that we are releasing block 54 in Belconnen to community housing providers. Certainly as we work through that release, one of the many things at the front of our mind is, "Is there an opportunity to align with that kind of timing?"

MR EMERSON: What is the extent of your engagement—and I do not know if this also might be for the CRA—with Housing Australia in terms of having regular conversations to ask, "How do we make the most out of this federal funding? How do we beat the other states and territories to get as much of your money as we can?"—those sorts of conversations. Is that how they typically go?

Mr Davey: We work very closely with Treasury on work in the housing policy space. I am not sure, Nicholas, if we have had direct meetings with Housing Australia recently.

Mr Holt: We have previously but, with the Housing Coordinator-General coming in, they are taking the lead on a lot of those commonwealth engagements. We are obviously contributing to those conversations. We do not directly have a relationship with Housing Australia, but we run it through the Housing Coordinator-General.

Mr Davey: So it is through Treasury and we are involved. The team meets probably weekly with Treasury, and there are different working groups and committees, and we are heavily involved. One channel for government rather than all the different parts of government coming to them would obviously be preferable.

MR EMERSON: And on the CRA front?

Mr Gillman: It is the same answer: the Housing Coordinator-General leads the consultation on behalf of the territory, and we work with them.

THE CHAIR: Mr Davey, you noted that it is difficult to get land ready for release, and we have noticed, from looking at the government reports, that it seems to take about five years before a site that is first on the government books has homes on it. Have you modelled the government's stated promise of 30,000 homes for Canberra against what the SLA is doing? Is your forward modelling showing that what you are doing right now will help government deliver what they say they are going to deliver?

Mr Davey: Yes. I think if you look at the ILRP and the total number of dwellings and, of those, what the Suburban Land Agency is responsible for, it is a significant way towards 30,000. Obviously, there is a contribution from the private sector in there as well, which would get there. Based on our current program—and we are heavily involved in the development the Indicative Land Release Program—I think that we are confident of what we have scheduled in there, albeit there are always high risks and things that do not happen as planned. We try to be as ambitious as we can but what we have in there is, I think, realistic.

THE CHAIR: And you have forward-modelled it for public housing and for community housing?

Mr Davey: It is not probably something that we have done directly. Again, I think that would be through the Housing Coordinator-General.

THE CHAIR: Noting that last year we had schedules to deliver public housing and none of those got delivered, I am just checking who in government is modelling our land releases for public housing to make sure we are on track. That is not SLA?

Mr Davey: We do not do that modelling. We are, I guess, the delivery arm for that modelling and that policy. As Mr Holt was saying earlier, we do keep very close track of those deliverables and what is in the notifiable instruments and make sure that we are delivering them. Even if sometimes we do not meet the year that it was intended, we will deliver it when we deliver that land.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

MS CARRICK: Following on from Tom's HAFF questions, at what point in the whole process does the commonwealth government provide the HAFF money? Is it when you identify the sites or when you build the housing? At what point do they hand the money over?

Mr Holt: Generally the way the HAFF rounds work is they work with either the territory or states for funding of social housing, which would be done through Housing ACT. For community housing, where we primarily have an interest through HAFF, the funding is through community housing providers. Community housing providers sign up with HAFF for 25-year arrangements for the provision of affordable housing or variants of that. So it is a relationship between the community housing provider and HAFF.

Our role in that process is to provide land to the community housing provider. As Mr Davey said previously, we are exploring mechanisms with community housing providers to give them certainty around the land, because they need to go to Housing Australia with control over the land. Often they do not have the funds to purchase the land outright, and so we have set up an arrangement where they can have a call option deed with us, which secures their rights to the land. They can take that to Housing Australia; they can negotiate an arrangement with Housing Australia for funding, which they can then come back to us with when they have secured their funding; and they can then purchase the land off us and complete the development.

MS CARRICK: Okay; so the funding happens before the house is actually built?

Mr Holt: Correct; but often it is around ongoing subsidies for the provision of affordable rental. It is up to the individual project and the arrangement that the community housing provider has with Housing Australia. It is not up to what SLA does; it is a relationship that is negotiated between the CHP and Housing Australia.

MS CARRICK: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: My question is about page 45 of the annual report. It says that the SLA progressed work to prioritise housing for people with a disability. What did you do? That sounds very exciting.

Mr Holt: We have been working with the CSD around how we can support people with disabilities moving into housing. One of the options that we have been exploring is giving people with disabilities the option to have longer settlements on land that they transact with us. A lot of them have to go to NDIS and get funding through NDIS to procure land; so we give them longer settlement periods. If their NDIS plan does not allow them to or they do not get funding through their arrangement, we give them an option to rescind without any costs on that land.

We also work with the industry body to identify appropriate blocks of land that have the right topology for people with disabilities—locations of driveways on the right side of the block, flat access to the front door, flat blocks, minimum costs et cetera. We do a bit of work around planning and identifying suitable sites. We then try to make them available to people with disability and provide them, I suppose, longer timeframes to sort out their funding to enable them to progress their purchase and their construction.

THE CHAIR: That all sounds excellent. In 2024-25 did SLA sell any sites for homes that could be constructed or adapted to liveable standards?

Mr Holt: We have constructed some homes through the North Wright Innovation Precinct that are all to liveable standard silver, I believe, or gold, which are more accessible dwellings as sort of showcase dwellings. We have not sold any to people with disabilities yet, because this is quite a new policy piece of work that we have been working on over the last 12 months. But we are hopeful, with some of the blocks that are coming through, that people will purchase them and go through that process and they will be able to provide dwellings that meet those requirements.

THE CHAIR: That is great. Who in government is doing the needs analysis for how many adaptable and gold-standard homes we need and how many we have? Who is doing that piece of work? Is that the SLA? Is that the Housing Coordinator-General?

Mr Holt: It is a policy piece of work. My answer is that it probably is not us who would do that. It is probably between CSD and the planning part of CED who would be looking at those need requirements.

THE CHAIR: On the land that you are working on at the moment, how much land will you have available in 2025-26?

Mr Holt: We have some inventory that is available over the counter now that people can come in and talk to our staff about. We have done a bit of a search through those and looked for blocks that would be suitable for those dwellings so that we can help people through those. I do not have the exact details on which blocks they would be.

THE CHAIR: I wonder if you could take on notice not the block and section numbers but the amount that you have available. Can you take that on notice?

Mr Holt: I could take it on notice. The one qualifier I would have is that there are levels of suitability for blocks depending on what the need is. It would probably work on the basis that, if someone comes in, we will work with them about what their specific needs are rather than—

THE CHAIR: You can take it on notice and answer it however you can answer it—if that makes sense.

Mr Davey: It could apply to any block. Obviously, there are blocks that are more suited, depending on your disability. Ultimately, the problem that we are trying to solve is not for a policy at the front end; it is the delivery at the back end—to make it easier so that people who have a disability and are reliant upon getting funding to be able to complete that purchase to have the choice and the flexibility.

THE CHAIR: I guess the information I am looking for is how much of this land is available and how people who need it find out about that. That might be something you take on notice, if that is—

Mr Davey: Sure; I am happy to do that.

THE CHAIR: Also, how you advertise it and how people become aware that this is something they can do.

Mr Davey: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

MS CARRICK: My question is about community centres, primarily in Molonglo. I understand that the Whitlam local centre, which had a community centre in it, went to tender and it did not get taken up by the private sector and so it will go to tender again. Will it have a community centre in it with the second tender?

Mr Davey: That is a good question. You are right: that site did go to market and it did not sell. As part of our approach to re-releasing that site, we have taken on board feedback from the market. We have a responsibility to balance government objectives, community aspirations and the commercial realities of making it something that can sell. In terms of the community centre, there are some community and sustainability requirements that are set out in a place brief and design framework that we put together in consultation with the community.

Mr Lee: We might take that on notice.

Mr Davey: Okay; we might take that on notice. But you are right: that was a requirement in the first release. We have not yet released this one. It goes to auction later this year. We will take that on notice in terms of the requirements for a community centre.

MS CARRICK: Thank you. Will the Molonglo town centre have a community centre in the planning?

Mr Davey: The Molonglo town centre does have quite a list of facilities that will be built into it. I am pretty sure the community centre is part of that.

Mr Lee: The Molonglo town centre master planning at the moment is being informed by the community needs assessment that has been undertaken for the Molonglo area. As we move through the master planning and subdivision design process, we will ensure that there are adequate community facilities. There are a range of facilities that have been committed to by government which we are also picking up. Noting that we are still in the master planning stage, we have not bedded down any specific community facilities into specific locations. That is a process that we will continue to work through as we work through design.

MS CARRICK: Is the community needs assessment publicly available?

Mr Lee: I might have to take that on notice. That is a needs assessment that has been developed by CED. But I am happy to take that on notice and provide that information.

MS CARRICK: And provide the community needs assessment, if possible?

THE CHAIR: So you have taken on notice if it is publicly available and to provide it and, if you cannot provide it, state the reason why you cannot provide it—what grounds of privilege you are claiming over it.

Mr Lee: It is something that that we are aware of. I am just unsure whether it is out in the public domain. So we will take that on notice and come back.

MS CARRICK: Thank you.

MS TOUGH: I have a question about the indicative land release. The annual report talks about some of the achievements across the year of the Land Supply group, and one of them is around progressing the due diligence in Tuggeranong and Mawson. I am just wondering what this work involved, what it is up to and what is next for those areas.

Mr Davey: That is a good question. I might ask Mr Gordon to speak to that.

Mr Gordon: In Tuggeranong and Mawson, there are obviously a number of existing car park spaces which are underutilised other than for car parking. At the moment, we are undertaking some due diligence related to traffic, trees and survey topographic information that will help support further studies in what is available for further development in that area.

MS TOUGH: Does that include potential Build-to-Rent future projects in and around Tuggeranong?

Mr Gordon: My area does not necessarily determine what the end development may be, but I would suggest that there are a broad range of facilities that could be available in those areas.

MS TOUGH: When it says "Tuggeranong", is that confined to the town centre area or is that a bit broader across the region?

Mr Gordon: We are looking at the town centre and Erindale. There are a number of car parking spaces in Erindale. One previously had a Territory Plan amendment done to it. We are looking at that and the other car parks around the Erindale area. There are also a number of car parks in Tuggeranong that we are looking at.

MS TOUGH: Thank you.

MS CARRICK: In Mawson, for example, there are car parks, but I would not say they are underutilised—they are very busy. Will you be doing a community needs assessment for that group centre, as it is an older group centre that has very little social infrastructure?

Mr Gordon: Yes, we will definitely be looking at the community needs of that area and how that feeds into the possible planning amendments that would need to occur to allow any future expansion or development within the group centre.

MS CARRICK: Will we get a document about the community needs—for example, a community centre?

Mr Gordon: Yes. It will go through a major planning amendment to change some of the zoning in that area. Obviously, that involves community consultation and there will be a planning report that comes out of that prior to any amendments that are proposed.

MS CARRICK: Okay; thank you.

MS CASTLEY: For CRA: I want to talk about non-financial accountability indicators. One of them is to award a contract; another is to submit a review package to TCCS; another is to promote 10 activations via social media; and there is another to have at least one engagement process. Who sets these indicators and what is the basis for them?

Mr Gillman: The accountability indicators are really about evidencing progress on our funded opportunities and land release. Having a works package agreed by TCCS means we are ready to go to market for that and get a construction contractor on board to build. The accountability indicators are agreed every year as part of the budget process through our Statement of Intent, which is submitted and becomes evidenced in the budget papers. We report on that annually through our Statement of Performance, which is an attachment to our annual report.

MS CASTLEY: Do you think the indicators are ambitious enough?

Mr Gillman: I think they are ambitious, because what they do is demonstrate progress on getting through our program of work, which is what we are accountable to do.

MS CASTLEY: Obviously, the indicators are to hold you accountable for your work and that $27 million a year. Do I have that figure right—$27 million a year? Is that what the agency gets? I am wondering about the 10 activations via social media, one review package to TCCS and one indicator to a water contractor. Can you just unpack for me what that body of work actually looks like?

Mr Gillman: It is probably worth setting out our broader framework. We have a 30-year program of work, which is really the City Precinct Renewal Program. That has real, outcome-based targets, such as population targets, employment targets, dwelling targets and those sorts of things. Then we have a five-year strategic plan with indicators around delivery of the strategic outcomes that we are trying to achieve. Because this is an annualised process and plan that is rolled up in the budget papers, it focuses on 12 months rather than the much broader indicators that are evidenced in either the 30-year City Precinct Renewal Program around population dwellings or our five-year strategic program. So there are layers.

THE CHAIR: Mr Emerson, do you have a quick question?

MR EMERSON: Yes; just quickly on the Acton Waterfront neighbourhood. It looks like there are a couple of to-be-confirmed buildings on top, essentially above Parkes Way. What needs to happen to confirm them?

Mr Gillman: The plan for the Acton Waterfront neighbourhood, which is out for public consultation at the moment, shows the site in essentially two sections: one north of Parkes Way and one south of Parkes Way. The majority of dwellings and neighbourhood will be on the south side but there will be some on the north. There is the potential to put a bigger bridge over Parkes Way and do oversight on Parkes Way. The fundamental reason it is not there at the moment is that those are always very difficult to make stack. We may get to a point where a development and partner can make them stack potentially, but there is a long history in development of people proposing over rail and over road developments, and they really have trouble stacking up. So we will wait and see where the feasibility ends up.

MR EMERSON: Okay. Was any consideration given to a larger portion of that, or would that make it just even harder to make it stack up?

Mr Gillman: At the moment, that makes it harder. If the world turns and construction costs go down, then maybe it is feasible. But you are just making the problem bigger at the moment.

MR EMERSON: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, team. On behalf of the committee, thank you very much for coming today and providing your evidence and your expertise. We have had a few questions taken on notice. If you can provide your answers to our committee secretariat within five business days of receiving the uncorrected proof *Hansard*, that would be great. I would like to thank every member who came along. Thank you, Broadcasting and Hansard, for your careful work, as always. If anyone wants to ask a question on notice, upload it to the portal as soon as you can but within five business days.

The committee adjourned at 3.31 pm.