



**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

PROOF TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE

CANBERRA

TUESDAY, 18 NOVEMBER 2025

This is a **PROOF TRANSCRIPT** that is subject to suggested corrections by members and witnesses. The **FINAL TRANSCRIPT** will replace this transcript within 20 working days from the hearing date, subject to the receipt of corrections from members and witnesses.

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

Office of the Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment.....	123
--	-----

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 4.15 pm.

Appearances:

Office of the Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment

Cooper, Dr Maxine, Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment

Gardner, Mrs Miranda, Director, Complaints and Investigations

Grimes, Mr Sean, Director, Sustainability, Environmental Assessments and Reporting

THE CHAIR: Good afternoon and 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 Office of the Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment. Thank you for joining us.

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 watching from home.

We are recording and transcribing in Hansard and we will be publishing proceedings. We are also broadcasting and webstreaming live. If you take a question on notice, please say, "I will take that on notice." This helps the secretariat track down the answers.

Welcome to the Office of the Commissioner for Sustainability and Environment. As witnesses you are protected by parliamentary privilege and you will be 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 do not need you to state that you agree with that anymore, that just covers you. We are not doing opening statements. I hope that is okay as we have a short session. We will proceed directly to questions.

Dr Cooper, I have the first one. We are a bit concerned. Is it your understanding that the government response to the *Close to the edge* report is now overdue? We think that that statutory response has already fallen due.

Dr Cooper: I do not particularly know. But I do not think—I do not know. I would have to go back and look. Because again, sorry, I have not been keeping my eye on the timing. I defer to either of my colleagues. Do we know?

Mrs Gardner: There may not be a statutory response to that investigation.

Dr Cooper: They have to table it, I think.

Mrs Gardner: It has been tabled but I do not know whether that one required a statutory response.

THE CHAIR: The government has tabled its response?

Mrs Gardner: No. I do not know if they are required to respond—

Dr Cooper: No, tabled the report.

THE CHAIR: Yes. I do not think we have seen the government response. Are you telling me the government is not responding?

Dr Cooper: We do not know.

Mrs Gardner: Yes, I believe that they—for this type of report, it was a commissioner-initiated report, not a ministerially directed one.

THE CHAIR: Yes.

Mrs Gardner: And the legislation is a bit—I do not know—

THE CHAIR: Loose.

Mrs Gardner: Yes, it is a bit loose.

THE CHAIR: Yes, okay.

Mrs Gardner: But we think that there is potentially no requirement to respond to that report.

THE CHAIR: Have you asked them if they are planning on responding?

Dr Cooper: No.

THE CHAIR: Would you—are you intending to ask them if they are going to respond?

Dr Cooper: I think that is a matter for government because I understand they do not have to respond. So it is a matter for government. One of the things about looking at the office, the last review of the office was in 2007, that would certainly be an issue that will come up in the conversations around what should be the government's arrangement for the office.

Mrs Gardner: I think the best way to explain it is that, for the other types of reports, it stipulates in the legislation that a response is required within a particular timeframe.

THE CHAIR: Yes.

Mrs Gardner: For commissioner-initiated investigations, it is silent on the matter.

THE CHAIR: Okay. So we have got a reference here that the investigation into the effects of urban expansion on the environment in the ACT was tabled in the Assembly on 15 May 2025. It said in that that the ACT government will provide a formal response within six months of this date.

Dr Cooper: Then that is a verbal commitment from the government. So we would leave

it with the government.

THE CHAIR: Yes. Okay. That is all right. So it might be up to somebody like me to track down that response.

Dr Cooper: Can I just, if I may, Madam Chair?

THE CHAIR: Yes.

Dr Cooper: Can I just say, I am reasonably sort of new in this role, on a return-recycle.

THE CHAIR: Sure.

Dr Cooper: But I would just also like to acknowledge and thank Dr Sophie Lewis, because this annual report really reflects her main period of being commissioner, plus the report that you have just talked about. So I just give respect to Sophie Lewis.

THE CHAIR: Yes. Thank you. We might track down at our end that business of whether government will or will not respond and whether or not they believe they are required to. There were some pretty significant findings in that final report.

Dr Cooper: There were. There were many significant findings and there were ideas about how to address some of the big challenges we have got. It was a retrospective report. So the recommendations certainly reflect a pathway that you can take, but there probably are other pathways. So it is, for us, engendering a lot of conversation about, we do not go over those recommendations that Sophie made, but what can we do? How do we shape it? And some of our current work certainly builds on what was presented in that report.

THE CHAIR: Sure. Are you having conversations with some of those recommendations about urban growth boundary, ACT offsets policy, some of these things that have been agreed by ACT government, but have not actually progressed yet?

Dr Cooper: We are part of the general conversation about trying to forge better pathways for the environment. So when those kinds of things come up—but I have not taken those recommendations and said, “Let’s have a conversation specifically around what you are doing?” One of the things we do do is report in the annual report on what the agency says they are doing on recommendations. Well, we have not even got to that part of the process yet.

THE CHAIR: Until they respond?

Dr Cooper: Until they respond.

THE CHAIR: If in fact they will.

Dr Cooper: If in fact they will, yes.

THE CHAIR: Right. So quite a lot hinges on whether or not they respond.

Dr Cooper: Well it is part of a process.

THE CHAIR: Yes, okay. The offsets recommendation—we actually asked the minister for the environment about offsets earlier in the week, I think it was this week. It could have been last week. Time is moving in strange ways during hearings. We asked her about the progress on that and the answer sort of came back, “We are still waiting on the federal reforms.”

Now this *Close to the edge* report was pretty clear. It said the ACT could have stronger offsets policies and laws than the federal. It was written in a different time. But actually we have almost moved—I do not know if we have moved ahead or backwards, it probably depends on where you are. We still do not have federal reforms in place. We do not know if we will. We also do not know if they will be particularly environmentally strong offsets policies.

Have you put any view to government about whether the ACT should be forming its own offsets policy and actually implementing that? Given the degradation we have seen and the decisions that are being made.

Dr Cooper: No. What we normally do, before we put something to government, is do an investigation. So we are a small team.

THE CHAIR: Yes.

Dr Cooper: And last week we informed the minister and the agency that we are going to be doing an investigation into the Northern Road, the dragon and the grasslands. So that allows us, if you like, to canvas all the issues and to talk with the agencies. So issues around protection, be it offsets or whatever, certainly if they come up, we would be talking to the agency about them, and the government, and making recommendations. But at this stage, there is nothing set as to what we are actually going to focus on in a particular solution.

THE CHAIR: Yes. Sure. I am interested about the dragons. I knew that was—there had been a complaint lodged. You have now—

Dr Cooper: We have turned the complaint into what is called a statutory investigation, which *Close to the edge* was, initiated by the commissioner. And what we are doing in that is really simple, although, it is incredibly complex, because it involves ACT and commonwealth legislation.

We will give a bit of the background because a lot has happened in this space for the Canberra Grassland Earless Dragon and how to protect it. We are going to be looking at the Northern Road. We will review and look at the approval conditions, the variations, the processes, the transparency and the decision making that went on. We will particularly be looking at the Northern Road Operation Strategy 2020. And we are going to be asking questions like, are the conditions achievable? How are they being achieved? And are they being ones that actually will ultimately protect the dragon?

We are also going to look more broadly at the Canberra earless dragon habitat across the ACT and look at who manages it and how is it all being managed. And then we are

going to try and do some future looking. Already the agency, give them credit, has done future looking with their action plan. So we will be building on their knowledge base, but looking at the Aboriginal perspective if we can. That has not come through on anything we have looked at so far.

Also too, we have listened previously as an office, not me but the previous commissioner and my colleagues here—to children's perspectives. So the future generation. We will be bringing out some of the features of the ACT action plan. We will also be looking at the national recovery plan because that is a draft. Putting all the pieces of this jigsaw puzzle together to hopefully add our bit as to how to help things go forward in a positive way.

THE CHAIR: That sounds like an excellent investigation. I am about to hand over because we have a very short hearing. Do you have a timeline for that investigation?

Dr Cooper: We are hoping to have it done by the first half of next year.

THE CHAIR: Fantastic. Is it looking at funding as well?

Dr Cooper: I would focus on what needs to be done. And then that would be clear—what needs to be done. Then the agency can come up with the funding. But one of the things that I will say on funding, for something as critical as the dragon, we have actually got to get something very long term. It is like somebody being in intensive care. You are going to need to actually do some on the ground activities for its habitat. You are going to actually need to do some breeding activities. And yes, we can worry about the next five, 10, 15, 20 years, but we have really got to look long term for something as critically important as this and as endangered.

MS CARRICK: My question is about future proofing Yarralumla Creek and restoring it back to nature. So have you had a look at Yarralumla Creek and the imposition, or the housing through both—well, basically the southern gateway project and the tram is going to densify the corridor and it does not leave much room for naturalisation of the creek. So have you had a look at that?

Dr Cooper: Ms Carrick, we have not had a complaint in. We have to respond to complaints or requests. We have not had one in on that issue. But we would—

MS CARRICK: Well, you are getting one. It is on its way.

Dr Cooper: Thank you very much. We would actually—something like that is more at the operational departmental integration area. So I would hope the agency would do the planning and look at that, rather than us. That is sort of quite operational. But what we are going to do, which my colleague on my right can talk to, is we are updating the state of the lakes and waterways work that we have done, which will give a focus to not only that waterway, but all waterways in terms of health. Sean, do you want to add to what we are looking at?

Mr Grimes: Yes. So you will be aware in 2022, we did a *State of the lakes and waterways in the ACT* report. We are revisiting that. It is not a minister directed update. It is from the commissioner. So it will repeat the work that was done previously.

Unfortunately Yarralumla Creek is not part of that in terms of data because there is no sampling data for it that was available at enough, I guess, quality to put that in the report.

So at the moment we are limited to Tuggeranong Creek, Ginninderra Creek, Sullivans Creek and Molonglo River as our urban waterways, as well as the lakes, of course. But it is an area we could potentially look into as part of the report because we are identifying future and current issues. So we are aware that there is talk—not just in Australia, but elsewhere, of re-naturalising some waterways. So we can have a look at that, and we will be looking at that. In terms of the quality of the water going down Yarralumla Creek, we do not have that as such.

MS CARRICK: Okay. Thank you. So we will send in a complaint about the lack of planning. Would that be appropriate? The lack of planning to ensure that it is able to be a creek.

Dr Cooper: Anyone can—yes, if it has an environmental outcome or a sustainability outcome, we will certainly consider it. Just so you know the process, we will go to the agency and we will ask them what they are doing in that space. So it will involve conversation and collecting information. We may not progress to an investigation.

We have recently had a—somebody raised a complaint about the Stromlo Treatment Plant, whereby working with Icon Water, the issues were resolved. We said some of the things that they raised would go into a broader investigation. So without any promises, we, of course, embrace people contacting us.

MS CARRICK: Okay. Thank you. I have done a motion on it, yes—

Mr Grimes: Sorry, I should just also add, that when we look at those re-naturalisations, it will not specifically be for Yarralumla, it will be across the ACT because a lot of the urban waterways are concrete and that comes with a lot of water quality issues.

MS CARRICK: Yes. It would be just good to have it included in the work that you do, given that it is at risk from densification because it is along the corridor, the transport corridor.

Dr Cooper: Thanks, yes.

MS CARRICK: I just want to ask one question about mode, about climate change and emissions, because talking about the transport corridor, do you seek assurance from the transport directorate that the network that they are going to implement will attract mode change to get people out of their cars?

Dr Cooper: That is a great question. I think you have government policies that are in place and some of the literature tells us that some of the things we are putting in place should be magnets for getting people out of their cars. But one of the interesting pieces of work that we are doing right at this moment is that we have engaged Sydney University to do a survey across the ACT, a representative one, to look at the values around travel and what would it take to actually shift peoples values, so that they actually may move out of their car and into more sustainable transport modes.

Because, from our perspective, it is an environment where you have got to have government policies, yes, but then, where is the willingness of the community? And is there anything in the community that they are willing to shift that might then be able to be translated into policies. It is that fine line.

MS CARRICK: I think it sort of also comes down to the network and the services that are offered because the longer the journey time, the less people are willing to use public transport, and the more times they have to change—

Dr Cooper: Yes.

MS CARRICK: It just puts people off.

Dr Cooper: Yes. It is all of that, the convenience and the ability of people to get those quick connections. I heard recently, if I may, that up in Queensland—in fact, my colleague on the left, Miranda, experienced this—that their fares are all 50 cents now. But, if you get off and you forget to tag off, is this right, it is a \$10 cost for your fare.

MS CARRICK: Because they want the data.

Dr Cooper: Yes, they want the data, and they are obviously much more denser. But apparently, that 50-cent fare has really shifted people. They were very successful in getting the community to shift, because they could say to the community, “We are not going to have to spend your money building the next big freeway,” because if you shift—I was with someone at the weekend who comes from there and was involved in it. So that was an interesting sort of policy position, and then the practice of how much does it cost?

MS CARRICK: They do have very good busways and they do have heavy rail connections. They did, at one stage I knew that they had a policy that you should not stand for more than 20 minutes on your public transport journey. I do not think that we are getting those sort of—those outcomes, of consideration of the people’s ride, their trip.

Dr Cooper: I think they have got, I do not know, I would have to ask our transport colleagues, but they have probably got more congestion.

MS CARRICK: Yes.

Dr Cooper: Which is also an incentive when you have got the 50-cent fare.

MS TOUGH: Dr Cooper, I am interested in your time in this role this time, and then drawing on your previous experience, what are the biggest opportunities and challenges for the management of the environment? Does the new super agency of the City and Environment Directorate begin to address some of these challenges by bringing everyone together?

Dr Cooper: I think the biggest challenge from being the recycled commissioner, the biggest challenge is, it is really harder now to make the environmental gains. You have

got, you know, the urban expansion. Things are really difficult. Back in the time, I hate to say that, but back in the time, just on the grassland issue, there were perspectives then that, oh well, we will just save the grassland that is intact and connectivity. Now, it is about, we have got to save the landscape, but we have also now got to look at the patches, where previously the patches were, more or less, let go.

Also, it is becoming much more difficult because our whole environmental system does not respond to plans being made at a particular time and not changing. So you will get bird species, once development occurs in one area, maybe they will move into another. And the pressures for nature shift. And yet we expect nature—like we will go to a site, and it may then have new values a year or two later, when the development approval for that site has been given, but nature did not sort of go, “I better check before I land there.” So I think it really is a tough environment.

I also think, not just physically, but people are actually expecting more environmental protection, plus also wanting more development, and in a way that maybe is not that compatible. On the other hand, we are getting some innovative solutions. So the missing middle, we should be I would hope, asking for nature positive outcomes and environmental outcomes in that, as much as any of the economic. Anything we do, I think we have gone beyond the time of saying, minimise the environmental consequences, to now saying, how do we regenerate? How do we actually gain that again? I hope that is where we are heading.

MS TOUGH: Can you just expand a bit on what you mean by “nature positive outcomes for the missing middle?” Like, how would you see that?

Dr Cooper: So for instance, the type of vegetation you plant. You know, it can be as simple as that. It could also be as simple as thinking about connectivity. Even sort of if you have got connectivity between blocks. Let us not lose it by having it completely for the whole development. My colleagues may have some other ideas.

Mrs Gardner: I think this has actually come up in an inquiry hearing before, but with regard to that, just the thought about how if you are doing a development, which involves multiple blocks, there is more opportunities for meaningful vegetation than if you have the same blocks but each is being developed separately. So that sort of more bigger picture planning that allows things like big trees to be put back in which you would not necessarily have on a block with a townhouse complex on.

MS TOUGH: Yes or preserving some existing trees on some of the blocks by being able to use the footprint better.

Mrs Gardner: Yes, exactly. I get what you are saying.

MS TOUGH: Just a last one on that, have you made any recommendations to city and environment about things like nature positive outcomes and missing middle or any other—

Dr Cooper: Yes, we have.

MS TOUGH: Wonderful, perfect.

Dr Cooper: Yes, we do all that. Also too for the committee's benefit, the agency invites us to various workshops. We will attend to be another supportive voice for the environment. So we certainly do that. We have been part of the latest climate change consultations. I think you have been at various workshops, yes, because we learn from the agencies too, and it is those questions of, can we do it, how do we do it.

Mr Grimes: I was just going to add with the nature positive, water sensitive urban design is very important too. So for the protection of your aquatic systems and that, again, with the missing middle the way you can plant trees and design that is probably—or revegetation—it is probably easier for that for the missing middle and that sort of development rather than a big expansive suburb.

Dr Cooper: And also, of course, let us go to energy efficiency, and it would be great if we can have passive energy. That is more likely to occur than the other two attributes that we have talked about.

MR BRADDOCK: The office of the commissioner has previously recommended that wood heaters be phased out, and the government agreed in principle to this by 2045. Do you think the government's existing education and wood heater replacement programs will be sufficient to fully phase out wood heaters by that date?

Dr Cooper: I think you have got to have carrots and sticks, but that is just a general commissioner view. So one interesting nexus here will be with the Human Rights legislation and the right to a healthy environment. It will be interesting to see if action can be taken under that if you live next door to someone who has a particularly polluting wood heater. So I think the dynamics of time with those two pieces of legislation are going to shape many things, including that.

MR BRADDOCK: Those programs in themselves—sorry, please forgive me if I am paraphrasing you incorrectly here, I want to make sure I understand clearly—you are saying that those programs in themselves will not be sufficient to achieve a full phase-out and it is going to potentially require other programs or the legislation as you mentioned to achieve that?

Dr Cooper: I have not done the analysis of the programs myself. I am totally aware that the office has done that, so I could go back and read the report in terms of—I forget the recommendations that were made. I have got it here somewhere. Here we go, can Canberra burn. I think through the agreement in principle that was made that the government is continuing to progress many of the recommendations our former commissioner made. So whether it reaches its target or not, I am not sure, but all I can say is the evidence I have is that there is action in that direction, and I think the two pieces of, sorry, the commitment to 2045 and the Human Rights legislation, provide another interesting environment within which a catalyst for change for this seems to exist.

MR BRADDOCK: Has there been any engagement between you and your office and the City and Environment Directorate or the minister's office as to what the next steps could look like in terms of phasing out wood heaters?

Dr Cooper: I have certainly spoken with the EPA. I think—I would have to go back and get their notes. I would hate to misrepresent them, but they are certainly right at this moment, and next year—a regulatory impact statement—if the EPA is listening, I hope I have got that correct. So we have certainly been briefed. We have certainly asked them what they are doing, and by what I can see, they are taking action.

MR BRADDOCK: Have you given any thought to steps like banning new installations of woodfire heaters?

Dr Cooper: Well, that is not what I am—sorry, I have not given any thought to that in detail other than to ask to make sure that my predecessor's work and the work that they are currently doing was progressing. So I have not revisited it.

Mrs Gardner: Yes, that is a recommendation from the previous report, to ban new wood heaters, and it was agreed in principle by the government, so—but there has not been any sort of concrete progress on that. They are still considering the path forward.

Dr Cooper: Yes, so in our reporting which the agency provides the information for, we have five categories—you know, early planning, resourcing phase. Yes, they are in that. Program and activities have commenced, yes, and that is what I was mentioning from the briefing with the EPA. Are they well-advanced? Not yet. Are they complete? No, not yet. So that is where our work in the annual report comes in because we connected with them and they have been very frank and it is put there as it is.

MR BRADDOCK: Thank you.

Dr Cooper: You are welcome.

THE CHAIR: The ACT has just missed its first legislated climate target. We have not got the inventory yet. That has not been published. It will presumably be published before Christmas, but the minister has said that we have missed that target. Is that concerning to you?

Dr Cooper: Missing anything on climate change has to be a concern to everyone, I think. I am not sure why they have missed it, but I think, the minister has also said that we are having problems even hitting our target—getting near our target to the degree we had anticipated we could. So yes, of course it is.

THE CHAIR: No, we have not got details yet. The minister has essentially said details will come when she publishes the report, so we are all a bit mystified as to why we have failed that target having met it for the past eight years. We have noticed that the current climate strategy finishes in 2025. The minister has only just started consulting on the next one, so there is no sort of funded action plan for climate. Does that sound like the right pace of climate action from a government that is missing its climate targets?

Dr Cooper: Well, it depends I think on what they are about to do. So not having seen what they are about to do, I know we are being consulted on the current one, so what is it that is going to happen I think is the big issue.

THE CHAIR: Are you able to tell me what sort of feedback—it is great that you have

been consulted, and I know others have been consulted—what was your feedback to government on what their climate action plan should look like?

Dr Cooper: Well, we mainly listen, but certainly to be as assertive in terms of targets as we possibly can. Also to, Scope 3, how do we—you know, some of those really difficult issues, we have talked around that. We have talked around transport. We have talked—what will you two add? We have talked biodiversity, what does it—I mean, we are—I think, as I said at the beginning, I think now is a really difficult time for the environment.

THE CHAIR: Yes, we are in tough time. I am super glad you mentioned Scope 3. There was a 2021 commissioner report into Scope 3 that made a lot of recommendations and government did respond to that one. We have not actually got any kind of action on that, and my read of the consultation paper was quite narrow. It looked as if the government was just going to look at Scope 3 for government operations. It did not say that it was going to look at Scope 3 for all of the ACT. That report certainly says we should be looking at Scope 3 for all of the ACT. That is your view as the new Commissioner?

Dr Cooper: I think we should try because it is not just the government, it is the collective, how do we do it? And it is tough. So in my conversations with those folk undertaking the consultation for the strategy—in fact, we will go back after this and just reinforce—they are open to those ideas so, yes.

THE CHAIR: Yes, that is good. Since that 2021 report came out, I know Australian businesses are now subject to Scope 3 reporting and reductions. I know EU and Californian businesses are doing Scope 3. Some of the EU is moving into Scope 4 actually, so I feel like in the five years that have gone past, Scope 3 has moved along. Is that the way you are looking at it too?

Dr Cooper: Well, I think the recommendations previously provided good direction and they are pretty clear.

THE CHAIR: Have you got any sense of timeline of how long governments should take to sort of—

Dr Cooper: No, I have not, sorry.

THE CHAIR: That is entirely fair. That is okay.

MS CARRICK: I am interested in the town centres and the amount of concrete in them and the view that we can put green gardens on the top of 26 storeys and that is your green space. Does that work?

Dr Cooper: It works in Melbourne in some areas, and in other areas it does not. Melbourne is actually—I cannot remember it. I did some research on this, but Melbourne has a green policy, and they actually calculate all the green that is in a development, and you can have it on your roof, down the walls of the building, or wherever. So my response to that would be I think we could go to Melbourne—not physically, but we could look at Melbourne, Melbourne City, and see what has been

done there, and see what we can learn because they are in the vanguard on some of that.

MS CARRICK: I mean, they have tried it at the Nishi Building, and a lot of the towers in Woden have all had green gardens, but I am not—I do not know that—like there has not been any work to see—

Dr Cooper: The evaluation.

MS CARRICK: Yes. There has been no evaluation. Are those gardens still there? Did they ever go in? Are they still there?

Dr Cooper: Yes, I cannot answer that and I do not know whether my colleagues can.

Mrs Gardner: No.

Dr Cooper: No.

Mrs Gardner: I mean, obviously the climate is a challenge in Canberra that some other cities that are known for their green buildings do not face. Again, I think the city of Gold Coast has a target to have a vegetation cover of 51 per cent, as the sort of recent thing they are working towards, but they have very different conditions from what we have here. But yes, there are examples of cities in Australia starting to look more ambitiously at greening those urban spaces, including ones with lots of high rise and quite dense buildings, so there might be some research coming up that we can draw on in the future.

MS CARRICK: I think, could we do—maybe we put it into a review—we have a complaint about that—because it is not going in at ground level, so you will lose it at ground level because it is going up there, and if it is not going up there, you have lost it completely.

Dr Cooper: You have lost it. Also, too, one of the key things when you put it up there is to make sure, engineering-wise, it is structurally located to take it, and you can get water up, and you know, it is not just simply taking soil up and putting it there.

THE CHAIR: Thank you for indulging us team. We have run a little bit over. On behalf of the committee, thank you so much for your attendance today. I do not think we had any questions on notice—well done—and we thank broadcasting and Hansard. Anyone who wants to lodge a question on notice, lodge it within five working days. We are now adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 4.48 pm.