

TRANSCRIPT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON LEGAL AND SOCIAL ISSUES

Inquiry into the public housing renewal program

Melbourne — 5 December 2017

Members

Ms Margaret Fitzherbert — Chair

Ms Nina Springle — Deputy Chair

Mr Joshua Morris

Mr Daniel Mulino

Ms Fiona Patten

Mrs Inga Peulich

Mr Adem Somyurek

Ms Jaclyn Symes

Participating Members

Mr Greg Barber

Ms Georgie Crozier

Mr Nazih Elasmar

Ms Colleen Hartland

Mr Gordon Rich-Phillips

Witnesses

Mr Salvatore Furfaro and

Mr Nick Legge.

The CHAIR — Welcome to both of you. Thank you for coming along to give evidence. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege, therefore you are protected against any action for what you say here today, but if you go outside and repeat the same things, those comments may not be protected by this privilege. Proceedings today are being recorded. We have asked people if they wish to give an introductory statement of 5 or 10 minutes, but I see that you have brought along a presentation, so perhaps you might want to just walk us through that, and then we might have some questions.

Visual presentation.

Mr FURFARO — Thank you for the opportunity. Just a couple of words about me: I studied and graduated and worked in Italy for a number of years before coming to Australia in 1985. The work I did when I was practising in Italy was about designing public housing for cooperatives and town planning. Architects at that time in Italy could do both. Here in Australia I have been working mainly on designing public healthcare projects, but I have an interest in the issues of public housing, social justice and fairness and sustainability, of course.

My presentation is about trying to present to you a picture as I see it of the issue with the supply of and need for public housing and of the issue of homelessness, and then I have a few comments about the current program of the Victorian government for the renewal of the public housing estates and some examples and recommendations.

I do not want to go into the detail of figures and dates, but those two diagrams illustrate how in the last 30 years the situation of public housing has developed. It is a dire picture because it started at a certain level and it is declining for a number of reasons — one is the chronic lack of funding for the construction of public housing. The fact is that those who need public housing are increasing in number, and there has been a change of policy in providing public housing that is not very fair. By the way, those diagrams have some lines at the top right-hand side that coincide with the Rudd government's stimulus package at a certain point. The diagram on the right shows that after that basically the trend is going to resume as it was, trending downwards.

The Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute has done an analysis of what the supply of public housing has been in the last 30 years and what the emerging need is. It is a dire picture, again, because over the years the percentage of public housing compared to the total housing has fallen, and apart from 1996, where it went up a little bit, it has fallen again. In the 2016 census it was at 4.2 per cent. The housing and urban research institute is saying that in comparable European countries the proportion is around 15 per cent — so 4.2 per cent against 15 per cent. This is different where you are showing those figures and why the percentage has gone down again. The highest point was in the 1990s, when the percentage was around 7.2 per cent and it has been trending downwards apart from that episode.

This is a comparison of the states' situation. Victoria is in the worst situation compared to all the other states, because its percentage of public housing is at 3.4 per cent and that data is related to the 2011 census. Now it is even less than that. Again the trend for Melbourne is that it is the lowest amongst all the other states.

This diagram is showing in 2011 which suburbs had a variation from the previous census. The patches in grey had an increase of 10 to 19 per cent, and there is a lot of white — that is where there is less than 10 per cent. I put that diagram there because I wanted to compare it to the next one, which shows the variation between 2001 and 2011. The dark patches are where there has been a loss of over 20 dwellings. The grey areas are where there has been a little gain. These two pictures to me say that there is a trend of public dwellings being expelled to the outer suburbs, which is not desirable, I think.

This diagram shows what is understood to be rental stress. Again the trend is rising because of the increasing cost for housing in general and the fact that public housing is not available to allow some relief to those people feeling housing stress. The estimated need that the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute has carried out is explained in this table for type of family. Basically, apart from couples with three and four kids and singles with two and three kids, there has been an increase in need. There are two figures: people having to pay more than 30 per cent of their income and people having to pay 50 per cent of their income. The total of the households — this is the Australian data — needing public housing, including those people who have to pay more than 30 per cent, is 465 000. The figures for the people on the waiting list for housing is much, much less, and there are reasons for that.

The situation for the homeless is as dire, because from 2001 to 2011 the number has gone up. There are percentages there of the reason for being homeless. One of the big components there is fleeing family violence, and then mental health and addiction situations, but overcrowding is also an important component. In Victoria the census data elaboration shows that the percentage of homeless has grown from 2001 to 2011 from 38.9 to 42.6 per cent. This means that there is not enough being done to solve the issue.

The specialist homeless services have provided information about 105 000 people who presented to them requiring assistance. Of those 105 000, 40 000 — or 38 per cent — were homeless. That means they were sleeping rough, couch surfing, living in very crowded situations and having financial difficulties for which they had been evicted et cetera. An average of 100 requests went unmet each day. That is one quarter. Again the diagram illustrates reasons for being homeless, where the bigger component is domestic and family violence. Then, going clockwise, financial difficulties, housing crisis, inappropriate or inadequate dwellings et cetera. The number of people presenting to the specialist homeless services with issues of mental health again is increasing. From 2011–12 it was 20.1 per 10 000. In 2015–16 it was 30.4 per 10 000. The same picture is for people presenting with issues about detention from 2.3 to 3.3, and increasing.

This is an illustration of what the cost of being homeless is to the state. On average, for health, justice and children placed in out-of-home services it is \$25 343 per person, whereas the comparable cost if these people are in supported accommodation is \$4890 on average. That tells me that if these homeless people had a house to go to, the state would save a lot of money. The diagram on the bottom-right is explaining the reduction in cost for women and for men.

Here is the current program for the renewal of the public housing estates that the Victorian government is pursuing, as explained by the Victorian government. I am sorry; I did not put the source of that information there, but it is about the program and the Walker Street redevelopment. The program data I show excludes the current tenants, who presumably will have to be rehoused in new accommodation. It is about creating 3650 new apartments, of which 110 will come from redeveloping 1100 properties across nine sites. Then there are homes delivered on vacant land and households delivered by private and philanthropic sectors; rehousing of rough sleepers, 40. The program allows for rehousing of only 40 homeless or rough sleepers. There are 9000 out there. Dwellings in Preston and Flemington: 900. So the 3650 new apartments, if we take into account the current estimated need of 105 000, is just 3.47 per cent. If we take into account the number of homeless people, it is only 38.2 per cent. So instead of trying to satisfy the needs of the 100 per cent of people who are in need, we are just scratching the surface.

The Carlton housing estate redevelopment to me is an example of how things should not be done in the sense that, apart from selling almost 80 per cent of the estate for private development, it started with planning provisions requiring salt-and-pepper distribution of public housing amongst the private development. The development plans were approved on that basis, but during the development pressure from the private developers ended up with the idea being accepted that there should be separation within the private and the public. Also, before the redevelopment there were on the estate 510 residents in 192 units. After the redevelopment the number of units went up to 246 — so more than the 10 per cent that was required — but the number of residents has reduced to 349. Not only has 80 per cent of that public land gone away; also the number of people living there has reduced. The principle of social integration has failed.

This diagram shows programs established by the various states to try to solve the issue of public housing need. As you see there, Victoria is together with New South Wales. Those are the two states which only have the National Rental Affordability Scheme and transfer program, but they do not have any of the other provisions that the states are implementing.

Inclusionary zoning can happen. This is an example from New York. This is next to Hyde Park, and in that project there is a rate of 20 per cent affordable apartments dispersed amongst the other 80 per cent sold at market rates. There is no excuse for caving in to developers requirements not to have a mixed arrangement. It can happen there and it can happen here too. Another example — this is a project at this stage, again in New York, where the idea is that there is a blank facade of a building which is currently not used by anybody. This project is about establishing a scaffold on the outside where these pods can be appended to. These are meant to be 3D printed, and the design of the single pods can vary of course. There can be various solutions that also depend on the size of the unit to be accommodated there.

Ms PATTEN — Is this still just conceptual?

Mr FURFARO — Yes, this is still conceptual, but it is going to be built.

Ms PATTEN — It is a beehive, isn't it?

Mr FURFARO — Another example — and I put this image here because it tells me that it is possible to have public housing not just in the city but also in the countryside. This is just a series of prefabricated units which can be stuck one on top of the other up to three storeys. They are built and sold at very affordable cost. This is just an example.

Finally, some recommendations. The question is, if we want to, how do we bridge the gap between 4.2 per cent and 15 per cent? In my mind this is an emergency and it needs to be dealt with as an emergency. There needs to be state and probably national provisions and planning that facilitate a program to recover the initiative in delivering public housing. In my mind inclusionary zoning is just one of the things that can be legislated and implemented in the town planning schemes. Another one is a requirement for initially a program that requires, I am saying, 50 per cent, and the business sector to start at 50 per cent, but if there is a realistic view of solving this problem and really making a dent in the numbers of people homeless and on the waiting list, then there has to be some exceptional measures. That program can then be monitored according to progress and a change in the situation.

The developer contribution levies in my opinion are not at the moment adequate. For instance, the contribution for public land is currently at 5 per cent of the land, and it is not based on the number of actual people who will go to live in the development. I found this when I was looking at the paper mill redevelopment in Alphington, where, under pressure from the community, the developer has been asked to provide 7000 square metres of land for public parkland. Those 7000 square metres compared to the 5000 people who will go and live there is cramped. In Italy there is a provision in the planning scheme that says that there should be 24 square metres of land provided for infrastructure, half of which would be for parkland and half of which would be for other infrastructure. That is 24 square metres per person, not 5 per cent of the area.

Ms PATTEN — Is that per person or per dwelling?

Mr FURFARO — Per person—the number of bedrooms, actually.

The CHAIR — Thank you. I understand Mr Legge has to leave at about 3 o'clock, I have been made aware, so I think what we might do is let him speak and perhaps ask questions of him, and then we will have some more in relation to the presentation if that is okay.

Mr LEGGE — That is very kind of you, Madam Chair.

The CHAIR — No, that is fine.

Mr LEGGE — Thank you. I am Nick Legge. I am part of a group that is strongly opposed to the redevelopment of the Walker Street estate. By way of my own background, I used to be a budget manager in Treasury who for a while had the office of housing budget within my grasp, although the budget was always very opaque and mostly came from its own capital. I have lived until very recently, and my family still do, directly opposite the estate, in High Street, and we have loved it all the time. Selling public housing that was compulsorily acquired, as this land was and as many of these estates are, for public housing is a betrayal of public trust, not to mention a betrayal of people waiting for housing.

The CHAIR — Forgive my ignorance, but when was it acquired?

Mr LEGGE — Between 1954 and 1955 most of it was acquired, and it was built in 1958, so it was opened in 1958. The then housing commission had a very socially valid remit for slum-clearance activities, which ended in the 60s or the early 70s with the issues about Brookes Crescent in Fitzroy North, and many of the estates, some of the estates, were in fact slum-clearance estates, but neither Walker Street nor, I am sure, Bills Street, Hawthorn, nor, I am sure, the Brighton estate were slum-clearance estates. They were compulsorily acquired by the housing commission because it deemed, potentially in consultation with the local governments, that we needed public housing in the area. So the first point — acquired compulsorily for public housing. There were some beautiful old houses there.

The next point I am going to make is the fact that the department's proposals, as I know other witnesses have said, actually shrink the available public housing — increased dwellings, fewer bedrooms. Low-income people seeking public housing deserve inner-suburban accommodation as much as average-income people seeking private housing, for whom there are already ample apartments available. We have a glut of apartments at the moment in the inner parts of Melbourne.

Moreover, the idea that all these estates should be considered as disconnected enclaves where welfare dependence and criminal behaviour thrive, regardless of the particular circumstance of a specific location, is appalling. We understand that there are some public housing areas in the state which are potentially problems: Corio, formerly some parts of Broadmeadows; I am not sure which, but certainly not the Walker Street estate. It is a small estate surrounded by private housing. Tenants are welcomed. There might be the odd junkie there; there are junkies everywhere. The idea that selling it to private developers is a way of polishing up the poor people who need public housing and of course turning most of the new apartments over to private developers is a sick joke.

Richard Holt at the committee's previous hearing pointed out the idea that to pretend that the 10 unrelated development projects being aggregated are all part of a giant, statewide project, therefore warranting the planning minister's intervention is a twisting of the intention of the law, and I have to commend the Council for overturning the planning rules in relation to the Ashburton estate. I think that point has been clearly made.

Moreover, coming back to the point about the mix of private and public, if there is a strong desire — we have to ask the tenants this, but of course they will not have been asked — that a particular area that is occupied by public housing tenants should be utterly invisible and mixed up with private market rental tenants, then that does not necessarily mean you have to sell the land to a private developer.

I heard you asking Mr Spence previously about the idea that it be leased. I have also in my submission presented that idea. It is a slightly different idea. My view is that the director of housing has the authority over the Housing Act to develop land himself or herself. It is quite conceivable that the land could be developed by the director using borrowed funds, and if it is determined that some return on the funds needs to be, then a proportion — certainly not half — could be leased on the private market, and they would then be able to return to public tenancies at some point in the future when the need became even more overwhelming and pressing than it is now.

So it is again not true to say we must sell it to a private developer to do this. It should be retained in public ownership, and this is a way. If we are really keen on mixing up private renters, then they can be mixed up as renters, which puts them on the same footing as the public renters.

Like the provisions of schools and housing, decent, affordable shelter for all people is something that should be regarded as a core government obligation, not another outsourcing opportunity. If all the buildings in the estate are indeed beyond refurbishment — and the committee will have no evidence of this because I believe the Walker Street estate has some shortcomings such as no air conditioning and lack of internal wardrobes and storage space — then refurbishment should be a first option. But again the committee is asked to take as an article of faith that there is no way all of these places are going to be refurbished. It is again an evidence-free world here.

Moreover, as recent reports have shown, and I have sent this to your inquiry director and hope that you find this yourself in the *Age*, another reason for the government's program is to increase the supply of private housing to depress, to try and keep the lid on, prices — 'House prices based on undersupply myth'. The ANU has done some work and established that there is an oversupply of private apartments in the inner cities, in most of the inner suburbs of Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane — certainly Melbourne. So the argument that this is going to keep the lid on house prices is again a furphy.

You have got my submission, I believe, where I point out that the proposal is both contrary, as it stands — I think — to the Housing Act, which in fact specifically tasks the director of housing to expand and develop the role of public housing, and certainly inconsistent with the principles of the Planning and Environment Act, as I have made clear in a separate submission to the planning standing advisory committee that is looking into this.

Thank you for your patience. Especially because you may have seen several versions of my first submission, I maintain that shrinking housing is the pits and it does not shed good light on an otherwise — in many other respects — decent Labor government.

Ms CROZIER — Thank you both very much for your evidence provided to the committee. Could I just go back to a point you made, Mr Legge. You were using the Walker Street development as an example that it should be refurbished rather than demolished.

Mr LEGGE — I am saying that the proper investigation for a refurbishment opportunity—

Ms CROZIER — Has not been done.

Mr LEGGE — Has not been done, to the best of my knowledge.

Ms CROZIER — That is the point I wanted to get to. You are saying that DHHS, the Department of Health and Human Services, have not gone in to look at whether that could be refurbished over a knockdown and rebuild.

Mr LEGGE — Certainly, I am not aware of it. Again, it is very hard to get information out of the Department of Health and Human Services.

Ms CROZIER — Yes, I know.

Mr LEGGE — I am sure you found out. Look, I will give you an example of something that may be a little bit relevant. The Noone Street estate, which is on the list —

Ms CROZIER — Which is Noone Street?

Mr LEGGE — Noone Street is in Clifton Hill. Noone Street is one of the 10. Ten years or so ago the tenants were moved out, and there was some refurbishment —

Ms SPRINGLE — How long ago?

Mr LEGGE — I think about 10 years ago. This is second-hand, but it is from a person who was a tenant, so this is fact. The refurbishment took place, and when they moved back in it had been half done, it had been botched and it was — I don't know. That is from the tenants telling me the story. Certainly at Noone Street some attempt was made, but it was clearly inadequate.

Ms CROZIER — Clearly inadequate. So they botched it.

Mr LEGGE — I do not know the story. You would have to in fact get the data from somebody who knew, but it seems like that.

Ms SPRINGLE — Are you saying that that was a similar kind of estate to what we are talking about at Walker Street?

Mr LEGGE — There is a slight difference. It probably was a slum clearance originally because it is in the lowlands, the old Riley Street, which is now Alexandra Parade, which used to be called Riley Street. That would have flooded and been a miserable place to live, swampy and horrible. In that sense it is dissimilar. It would not have been nice houses on the border of the Merri Creek that were demolished to create that estate. Otherwise, it is a four-storey walk-up, and it is about the same size.

Ms SPRINGLE — Sorry to cut in on your questioning, but are you saying, using that as an illustration, that they have actually assessed for refurbishments before; is that what you mean?

Mr LEGGE — Yes, it would appear to be so. It would appear that at least Noone Street was attempted.

Mr MULINO — Thanks for your evidence, both of you. Mr Legge, I am actually going to ask you a question based on one of the graphs from Mr Furfaro's evidence, which is that we are facing a long-term decline in commonwealth investment in this area. I think we can discuss what the appropriate level would be,

and I suspect most people in this room would like to see it turned around, but there are obviously all sorts of budget constraints, which you would know about.

I was interested in your idea of having different rental streams which the director of housing might be able to use to repay loans. In a sense that is building on the idea that the previous witness gave that we should lease it potentially, but not sell it. Is it fair to say that in general terms you would accept that the state government is in a position, given fiscal constraints, where it does have to start thinking about new ways of funding and that that is probably going to involve new income streams somehow?

Mr LEGGE — I certainly recognise the fiscal position the government is in. I do not accept the policy that borrowing is such a dirty word that we must do as little as possible when it is borrowing for long-term infrastructure, but I understand the desire to sell any asset that you can possibly sell to make the budget picture look good. My issue is that that is gone forever. We see the situation in South Melbourne where you would close schools and suddenly realise the population has grown and we have got to buy new land to open them again.

With the closure of the Ford factory in Broadmeadows and Corio, the jobs that might once have been there for the people who were public tenants, where did they go? This is in the centre of the city. It is within a whole range of jobs that are close in, including where public transport is accessible. So the sale of land in this area is the most objectionable thing. If you were selling half a Broadmeadows where there is abundant public housing and it is already quite a long way out — I kind of guess there is some difference there — but this is in an area which is highly desirable, schools are good and all the tenants there send their children to local schools — although there are not a great many children at the moment at the local public schools. That does not really answer your question, but —

Mr MULINO — Look, I actually agree with you that in a low-interest-rate environment, when you are talking about infrastructure, borrowing should be one of the tools.

Mr LEGGE — Higher up there, yes.

Mr MULINO — In this context, though — and your idea is an interesting one. If you do borrow, you have got to pay it back, but I do think that it might be that other funding sources could be used to support that borrowing. Obviously, AAA is also important if you can maintain it.

The CHAIR — I will take that as a statement.

Ms PATTEN — There is another new public housing development that has just started on Bell Street.

Mr LEGGE — Yes, that is right, just off Bell Street. I do not believe it is starting, because my latest information is that the land is being used for the Level Crossing Removal Authority. It is my understanding that it has been deferred, but the local member, who I note is here, may well have some better information than me.

Ms PATTEN — That is fine. The last that I heard was that it was going ahead, that it would be built in two years and that it made a lot of sense, if you were going to redo Walker Street, to move it to that development holus-bolus.

Mr LEGGE — Absolutely, it would make sense. I just want to make one more point about the density of development, which is of course another element. At the moment it is one of the nicest structural estates in the business. The Kennett government, to its credit, knocked down one of the internal buildings in the 1990s because it was regarded as being overly dense at 107 apartments. One block in the middle was knocked down to create a really nice open space in the area; the argument was that it was too dense. Now we are going to triple the amount of building and the entire site will virtually be covered by structures.

Ms CROZIER — Thank you very much, Mr Legge. If you do need to go, I do appreciate your time. But just to follow on from you, I think in your documentation that you have provided to us, Mr Furfaro, you actually cite that it was in the 1990s when the numbers were going up, if I am correct, and the numbers since then have declined. But if I could go to your page 20, you speak of the established state level affordable housing delivery schemes. You note that South Australia and Tasmania have low deposit home loans and share equity schemes. Could you just explain a little bit about those two aspects to the committee?

Mr FURFARO — I am not a financial expert, and this chart is there just to advocate for initiative on the part of most of the states. I would prefer not to go into detail about those schemes because I am not familiar with them.

Ms CROZIER — That is quite all right. I thought you may have been because you have put it into this, but I appreciate you not having that expertise. Thank you.

The CHAIR — I did have a query about one of your slides, the one that Ms Patten was asking about, the pods on the side of the building. Ms Patten asked the question that I was thinking of, which is, is that conceptual or is that actually happening? But you are saying it is happening.

Mr FURFARO — I found that in one of the architectural magazines I received at the end of last week. The information is that it is conceptual at this stage, although it has been thought to be applied to a number of sites in New York.

Ms PATTEN — Just to follow on from that, we have been looking at this sort of temporary housing on the land banks that we have, similar to the Western Australian example that you put up. We had an intern look at the cost and development of temporary housing that would be on land for 10 or 15 years that eventually would need to be used for something else. The report that the intern came back with was that it was not actually terribly financial, that it was not good value for money and that the UK had trialled this as well and found that it was expensive. Have you come across much research in that area?

Mr FURFARO — Yes, but I have not got them with me, and it is difficult to mention figures. An example which most of us would be aware of is the Nightingale projects. The Commons started the model. It was about building apartments at low cost for people who wanted to live differently and not use an individual car but use common services. Those apartments were designed with materials that were without embellishments, like copper taps and pipes — expose the pipes and services — in order to reduce the cost. Instead of each apartment having a laundry, there were common laundries and a common roof gardens for the use of the housing community. That is an example of how affordable housing can be delivered. I believe that for each of those subgroups that are classified as homeless there are particular solutions that can be applied to how you can solve the situation. I do not think that the building of public housing generally will solve the situation, but certainly there is an issue of supply that is not being addressed.

Ms SPRINGLE — I do have a couple of questions, and thank you for your presentation. It is very interesting. There are some maps over pages 7 and 8, but on page 8 there are some areas that are talking about the loss and gain of overall dwellings. There is one down here that is a gain of 20 dwellings. Are you able to tell me which municipality that is, because it is a little bit meaningless without knowing the context, I suppose?

Mr FURFARO — No, I am sorry.

Ms SPRINGLE — Would you be able to send us that information?

Mr FURFARO — I could find out and confirm it.

Ms SPRINGLE — That would be wonderful, thank you. My second question relates to this sort of conceptual page 23 around property of housing projects in rural areas or regional areas. I suppose I would like to get your perspective on development of that kind in areas where there is not a lot of infrastructure, because often that is the drawback of developing extensively in sort of removed settings because there is no infrastructure for the people that are living there.

Mr FURFARO — One of the reasons which I put that picture there is that I have been told that roughly half of the homeless people who arrive in Melbourne are from countryside Victoria, so there is a need for cities in the countryside to look after these people. They end up in Melbourne because they do not have anywhere else to go. They sleep rough. They are treated abysmally. If I may say, one policy that I mention in my submission — and I have not talked about it here today — is the policy of Housing First that started in the United States, has been applied in number of countries in Europe and has proved to be very successful in solving a good proportion of homeless situations.

Finland is the country that has been most successful in implementing that policy. It is based on the principle that you provide housing for these people. Instead of requesting them to undergo a series of rehabilitation programs

and apply to agencies for services, you give them a house. That starts making them feel respected. They gain self-respect. They are not obliged to undergo rehabilitation; if they do it, they do it of their own volition. That, in Finland, has reduced by 30 per cent the number of homeless people in three years. That, together with the money governments have saved in providing less services, makes it very worthwhile, I think.

The CHAIR — You have made me think of one last question with your perspective from working in this field overseas. When I think about the public housing stock that I knew as a kid, it was generally freestanding houses, and we now of course have many three-bedroom dwellings and we are having a discussion about a need for smaller ones. Do we look at public housing with a particularly Australian perspective on how much land should be around and how much size should be there? Do we need to rethink how we look at this in line with how communities in other places have dealt with it given that we have, particularly in cities, where the services are, less land, which is not a problem we have, I think, historically had in terms of providing public housing?

Mr FURFARO — I think that there should be standards to be complied with in terms of land available per number of inhabitants. I think that most of the urban consolidation or density increase that is happening at the moment is relying on existing infrastructure and it is not contributing to much improvement around it, parkland particularly. The area available for individuals is not increasing because we just build, build, build. Some of the developments do not have green spaces for the local inhabitants to go and be a community.

The CHAIR — That is certainly evidence that we have had.

Mr FURFARO — When I worked in Italy I designed both public housing in the city and in the countryside, and in the countryside the situation is a bit different, but certainly there is the need for public transport and infrastructure connection. You cannot just put them in the middle of nowhere.

The CHAIR — Exactly. I thank you for that very detailed submission you made that I suspect has saved our researchers a huge amount of work, so on their behalf I say thank you, and I also thank you for coming here today to speak to it. You will be provided with a transcript of today's proceedings within a few weeks for you to review. We will now close the proceedings.

Mr FURFARO — Thanks for the opportunity.

Committee adjourned.