

TRANSCRIPT

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Inquiry into Environmental Infrastructure for Growing Populations

Melbourne—Wednesday, 21 April 2021

(via videoconference)

MEMBERS

Ms Sarah Connolly—Chair

Mr David Morris—Deputy Chair

Mr Will Fowles

Ms Danielle Green

Mr Paul Hamer

Mr Tim McCurdy

Mr Tim Smith

WITNESSES

Ms Natalie Robertson, Director, Development and Growth,

Ms Bridget Wetherall, Director, Infrastructure and Environment,

Mr Steve Van Orsouw, Executive Manager, Operations, in the Infrastructure and Environment Directorate, and

Ms Joanna Cuscaden, Executive Manager, Development Facilitation, in the Development and Growth Directorate, Ballarat City Council.

The CHAIR: Welcome. Thank you so much for taking the time to join us today as part of the public hearing for the Inquiry into Environmental Infrastructure for Growing Populations.

On behalf of the committee I acknowledge the traditional Aboriginal owners of the land. We pay our respects to them, their culture, their elders past, present and future and elders from other communities who may be with us here today.

This is one of several public hearings that the Environment and Planning Committee are conducting to inform itself about the issues relevant to the inquiry. Before we come to introductions and kick off, there are just a couple of things I need to point out to the group. All evidence taken today will be recorded by Hansard and is protected by parliamentary privilege. What this means is that you can speak freely without fear of legal action in relation to the evidence that you give, but it is really important to remember that parliamentary privilege does not apply to comments that you make outside the hearing, even if you are just simply restating what you said here today.

You will receive a draft transcript of your evidence in the next week or so to check and approve. Corrected transcripts are published on the committee's website and they may be quoted from in our final report.

Thanks to you all for joining us and taking the time to speak to us this morning. I know we have got 40 minutes together before some of us need to head off to other things. The committee will quickly go around and introduce themselves and then if we can get some introductions from the City of Ballarat. If you have a 5-minute presentation or statement you would like to make, that would be great, but I know that members have some great questions they would like to jump into and have a deeper discussion on some of the things you have raised in your submission. My name is Sarah Connolly. I am the Chair of this committee and the Member for Tarneit.

Mr MORRIS: I am David Morris. I am the Deputy Chair of the committee, the Member for Mornington and the Shadow Minister for Local Government, Shadow Minister for Housing and Shadow Minister for Ageing.

Mr FOWLES: I am Will Fowles. I am the Member for Burwood in the middle eastern suburbs of Melbourne.

Ms GREEN: I am Danielle Green. I am the Member for Yan Yean, the Parliamentary Secretary for Sport and the Parliamentary Secretary for Regional Victoria.

Mr HAMER: And just in time, I am Paul Hamer. I am the Member for Box Hill.

The CHAIR: Thanks, Paul. I am going to throw over to Ballarat City Council. I am not sure who is leading the discussion, but I will hand it over to you.

Ms WETHERALL: We will just go around the table. I am Bridget Wetherall, Director, Infrastructure and Environment.

Ms ROBERTSON: Natalie Robertson, Director, Development and Growth.

Ms CUSCADEN: My name is Joanna Cuscaden and I am the Executive Manager of Development Facilitation.

Mr Van ORSOUW: Steve Van Orsouw, City of Ballarat Executive Manager of Operations.

Ms WETHERALL: Steve and Joanna are direct reports to Nat and me and have some great context to add, so we thought that it was worthwhile bringing them into this meeting as well.

The CHAIR: Did you have a statement or anything you want to start off with? It is completely fine if you do not. We can just jump straight into questions if that is okay.

Ms WETHERALL: We will see what questions come at us and go from there.

The CHAIR: Okay. All right. Great. I love it. I will start. I can see the City of Ballarat's urban forest action plan, which was adopted by council in 2019, has a target of 40 per cent tree cover for the area by 2040. Now, as your most recent annual report noted, the benefits will include mitigating temperature increases through shading, increased carbon sequestration, reduced run-off, increased groundwater recharge and improved amenity for living and working—a very ambitious plan. Can you talk about what the current percentage of tree cover in the area is and if council is actually on track to achieve that goal? And does the urban forest action plan envisage the provision of additional parks and open space, or is it actually anticipating that the goal of 40 per cent tree canopy will be met through planting on existing public land?

Ms ROBERTSON: There were a lot of questions in one there. I will answer some, and then there will be other parts of the team that have capacity to answer that as well. The tree canopy strategy is primarily to do with council-owned land, so road reserve planting. It does not rule out additional open space, but we believe primarily it is our road reserves and scheduled planting with that. I believe we are on track, but the 'on track' is a result of having to look at our budget and upscale that to be on track. So being short of the budget being announced or firmed up by our councillors, I can tell you that it is a priority of theirs and it is very likely that we will receive support in funding to ramp up our tree planting schedule. I have lost track of all the other questions in there; I apologise.

The CHAIR: So just to be clear, are you on track to achieve your goal of 40 per cent? Are you where you should be?

Ms ROBERTSON: I think in terms of advising it, we can say that we are, but we will not know if we are on track until we receive our budget in June, because that budget will contribute to the cost of tree planting—that will keep us on track. We have represented council in asking for a budget that is commensurate with us achieving being on track. When I say that, it is because it is scheduled planting that will bring us to the requirement, so that scheduled planting has to be supported by a budget process. So I would say we are on track, because we are seeking a budget that is commensurate with delivering what needs to be to keep us on track.

The CHAIR: Okay. And is there something in particular around that—so obviously, as the Member for Tarneit, out in Melbourne's outer western suburbs, we have not got a lot of tree canopy and shade cover. Are there comments you want to make to the committee that you want to see state government get involved in this? You have got a 40 per cent target by 2040. What do you see as a role of state government in that? Is there anything you want to see us do or change or improve upon?

Ms ROBERTSON: The only thing that can help us stay on track obviously is financial assistance, or it is stronger policies within planning schemes that would support at the state level. If your planning scheme is stronger on these types of initiatives, then we can enforce that with developers as well so that there would be a set criteria to measure to allow us to achieve those in newly developing areas.

Ms WETHERALL: The other thing to consider is that we can plant the trees but then there are the ongoing maintenance costs. We have arborists that are employed, and their job is to manage risks posed by some of our trees. We have lots of variety of age and type. Providing the money up-front to do the planting is fantastic, and I would strongly advocate a position from the state government to help support that, but then it is the ongoing costs, because all of our parks, gardens and trails in the open space, including trees and tree canopy and managing trees, require ongoing funding, and as our asset base grows right across our city, because we are a growing municipality, we are not able to keep up with the level of service that the community is expecting or that we would like to see to make sure that we are managing risk when it comes to the safety of tree management or with parks or with other facilities that we are offering to the community. So yes, once off is great, but it is the ongoing that we struggle with more so.

Ms ROBERTSON: And to be conscious of the fact that we have—we are probably not the same as some but—in our growth areas an 18-month maintenance period. Once that period is over, obviously the maintenance returns to council, but generally you will find that the quality of the planting is not sustainable enough or not looked after enough in that 18-month period. That is why from my point of view it would be looking for support within strategies and schemes that allow us to enforce that or ask for better outcomes.

The CHAIR: I have just received a message here from Hansard. For Hansard's sake, could you go around the table again and just very loudly say your name and position? It just has not been recorded quite correctly.

Ms WETHERALL: Yes, sure. Bridget Wetherall, Director, Infrastructure and Environment.

Ms ROBERTSON: Natalie Robertson, Director, Development and Growth.

Ms CUSCADEN: Joanna Cuscaden, Executive Manager of Development Facilitation.

Mr Van ORSOUW: Steve Van Orsouw, Executive Manager of Operations.

The CHAIR: I am going to throw to David Morris for a question.

Mr MORRIS: Thanks, Sarah. Just a quick follow-up first on the 40 per cent, which the committee heard about I think—our first public hearing was in Ballarat back in 2019. Can I just clarify on the 40 per cent tree cover: given that it is restricted to road reserves and council land, is that 40 per cent of the municipality or is that 40 per cent of council land and road reserves?

Ms CUSCADEN: I can answer that twofold. Whilst our strategy primarily focuses on council-owned land and infrastructure, we do try to reinforce that through our planning work as well. It is not entirely prescribed for council; it is also prescribed for the individual landowner, but it is a harder mechanism to control it that way. So yes, our commitment is for our own land to be able to achieve that percentage.

Mr MORRIS: Okay. But without putting words in your mouth, the intent of the policy is 40 per cent across the municipality?

Ms CUSCADEN: Agreed.

Mr MORRIS: Can I come back: I guess Bridget's comment a few minutes ago raised this question in my mind. Over the last decade or so you have had pretty solid population growth. Obviously we have had the pandemic over the last 18 months, but just looking at the projections that were provided to us—basically another 39 000 people between 2018 and 2036, which is pretty solid. Given that population growth to date, has there been an impact on parks and open space in the municipality yet or is it still to come? And in terms of what is still to come, how does that play out in terms of the planning and provision of open space?

Ms WETHERALL: I will probably pass to Steve in a second, but I guess we have had a lot more people that are out and about writing to us about the condition of some of our assets. So they are picking up areas where we can improve the facility, whether it is weed spraying or gravel path maintenance or connecting various assets. We are probably having a lot more feedback. The other thing I will just note is that we are very lucky in regard to the amount of state government owned land that also surrounds Ballarat in terms of state forests and so forth, so we have got a great opportunity for the people that live in the City of Ballarat to enjoy both state government land and local government land. Steve, it might be a question for you.

Mr Van ORSOUW: Can you just frame that a little bit? My area is specifically on maintenance. So is that more around the maintenance side of the effects on my staff?

Mr MORRIS: I am just interested in basically what pressure, I guess, first of all, population growth puts on it. What is the impact? Because I am acutely aware that 1.8 per cent does not sound much, but when it is 1.8 per cent year on year on year on year, it does not take long to compound. But I guess also I am interested in the impact of COVID and whether that has changed the demand patterns or whether it is just that the population growth has paused and that has taken the pressure off or how it has affected you.

Ms ROBERTSON: I can probably answer that one, having both areas in our team. For want of a better way to phrase it, we were not impacted by COVID in terms of development. In fact through the height of the pandemic period we actually issued a planning permit for 1100 lots, and the feedback was that they were

selling very fast off the plan. That is indicative of Ballarat's growth area. It has continued to develop at a rate of knots. I will put it to you this way: with COVID and that increasing impact of the development, we are seeing a demand and we are seeing far more people using our open spaces. That is coming across very clearly to us through our engagement processes in terms of developing our council plan—that the community's priority is a focus on our unstructured recreation, so obviously our parks, our trails, our bigger parks, if you like. So we are having to focus in that direction.

How we can control it in the growth areas—we do have great parks. We have a great central park in our growth area, and that has been developed to establish a tree canopy commensurate with what our requirements are. We are trying very hard also to deliver in our newly developing areas good green streetscapes. At the moment they do not necessarily look like that, but in terms of that that is what we are focusing on. But yes, we are seeing an impact on our open space through both development and COVID because we have attracted a lot of people here in that time as well.

Mr MORRIS: Can I follow up? Bridget, you made a comment earlier, and the note I made, which may not be a literal note, was a comment along the lines of 'we're not able to keep up because of the growth'. Can you expand on that a little bit? I think I know what is driving that comment. If you talk to people in the community, they say, 'Well, they've got more development, more houses, more rates. What's the problem?'. I guess that is the aspect I am interested in.

Ms WETHERALL: With that more development, more growth and more people, there are more assets. I think Steve had some great statistics over the past five years—you might be able to talk to that in a minute—about the ongoing increase in all of our open space assets, whether it is linear metres of trails, whether it is wetlands or whether it is stormwater pits to maintain or just ovals and parks. We have been limited through council budget planning, which is overseen by councillors, in the resources we have had to manage those increases in assets, because there are great priorities elsewhere.

We are expected to deliver a certain level of service on those assets, and it is a real pull of having the right amount of resources for all of those assets but to, as well, deliver on the very many other expectations and priorities of council. And as Nat was indicating just before, we are still in the process of public consultation on our new council plan. At the top of the list of a lot of the feedback is environmental sustainability and the want of community for us to focus more on natural resource management and natural resource stewardship as well. So that is something we need to focus more on, which will take more resources, which will take more strategic planning. So we are hearing that, and I would hazard a guess that that is certainly related to COVID and people being at home more. But, Steve, you might want to also add on information about our assets and how they have grown.

Mr Van ORSOUW: Obviously our asset base has increased, so additional trees, parks, open space. The west side and south side of Ballarat continue to grow as these assets are gifted to council after an 18-month period. That requires my staff to then maintain these to the existing levels of services that are identified in the *Ballarat Open Space Strategy*, and that puts more pressure on my staff to be able to stretch themselves with the current assets that we have got, like lawnmowers and staff, which are not increasing over the period of time, which need to increase with what is handed to us. And I guess that was probably contributed to by last year council making that decision not to increase rates for the last financial year. So that means our resources do not increase. Then, in turn, last year was a good year for rainfall, so the grass grew and our customer expectations are still high that we need to maintain these assets. But, yes, we just cannot keep up with seasonal changes and the levels of service. If we are not growing, then the levels of services drop and the customer requests build. And instead of mowing grass, say, up to Christmas, we are still doing that through Christmas into the new year. So customers' expectations do not change.

Mr MORRIS: No. Exactly. I thought I heard someone say you had a list there that might indicate the pressure that is on your budget. Did I hear that correctly?

Mr Van ORSOUW: I have a five-year resource plan for operations—that is, road maintenance and parks and gardens maintenance. That looks back at the last five years, where our operational budgets have not increased but it has identified the number of open space areas that have been handed to us, and that may be tree numbers, lineal metres of grass et cetera, and that is forwarded to the leadership team as part of the budget consideration with the budget bids that we put forward.

Mr MORRIS: Okay. I was going to say: could you make that available to the committee? Obviously I would say from your comments there that is an internal document. Could you make it available to the committee on the basis that it is not published, that it is not made public?

Ms WETHERALL: There is nothing in it the community would not be privy to if they asked for it anyway. It is a good summary document of the growth that we have experienced in the past five years in terms of those assets—those green sort of infrastructure assets—and there is significant resourcing required, whether it is internally or through contractors or a combination of both. Yes, it is a good summary, so we can certainly provide that.

Mr MORRIS: I think it would be very helpful to the committee if you could.

Ms WETHERALL: Yes.

Mr MORRIS: Thanks, Sarah.

The CHAIR: Thanks, David. I am going to throw to Will.

Mr FOWLES: Thank you, Chair. We are sort of flying, I guess, a little bit blind here. Normally in these hearings we have a submission from the parties or an opening statement about what it is that you would seek to have changed. But the role of this committee ultimately is to make recommendations to the government and to the Parliament about this particular topic. So if I can just throw it to you, I guess, as an open question: what would you have the government or the Parliament do in relation to environmental infrastructure, given the growth you are experiencing?

Ms ROBERTSON: Well, I can only do it from a perspective legislatively that would be enforceable or able to control through a means or strategy or legislation or anything like that, and for me that is a strong planning scheme, so that when we are in our growth areas and developing our growth areas we have something to support that. Even with our DCP contributions it talks heavily about infrastructure where it relates to drainage and that type of infrastructure but neglects the opportunities for us to seek contributions that do relate to environmentally sustainable things, such as greater tree canopies and parklands and things like that. So in that respect when I am looking for direction I go to policy or strategy or legislation. So that has to be stronger and in a means that is enforceable as an officer.

Mr FOWLES: So having stronger things is kind of a lovely aspiration, but specifically are you saying that the planning scheme needs to explicitly reference things like tree canopy and a few of the other environmental-type matters and it does not at the moment?

Ms ROBERTSON: Correct. When we say ‘explicitly’, that is correct. There is a ‘should’ not a ‘must’ in the framing of a lot of things, and it is very difficult to enforce something or require something where it is not legislated as being mandatory.

Mr FOWLES: But changes to planning schemes are typically originated by municipalities, are they not?

Ms ROBERTSON: Well, in our local policies we can do as much as we can, but also there are state policies, and the provisions in the planning scheme are state provisions, so—

Mr FOWLES: But they are state provisions that are regulations. Is it not that in the ordinary course of business you would put up to the minister amendments to a scheme that might include those amendments you just foreshadowed?

Ms ROBERTSON: So we can at a local level and we can seek that through our own local scheme. We cannot ask for a change of a state policy. It would have to be supported across the state. The only—

Mr FOWLES: Sorry, no, I appreciate that. But are the rules you are referring to—like tree canopy; let us just use that example—contained in state policy or is it in your local planning scheme?

Ms ROBERTSON: Well, our local planning scheme does try to capture it through environmental significance overlays and any adopted or recognised strategies within it. We have local ability to control it, but at state level it is not very strong. So you can have competing, I suppose, provisions, and our environmental

significance overlay is one of them. So state policy needs to support your local policy. That is how I would frame it, and state policy is not as strong in areas that it should be.

Mr FOWLES: So specifically you are asking us to recommend that the state change its policy in relation to a few of these matters, including tree canopy, in order that you can toughen up your rules locally?

Ms ROBERTSON: No. You asked me means and ways that I thought it could occur.

Mr FOWLES: Right.

Ms ROBERTSON: You speculated on some opportunities at a state level. I think our local policies try to capture that as best they can, but where it would come down to, if we are looking at a state level, overlays, zoning as a provision for them are the responsibility of a state level. So if I were to be assessing a multilot subdivision in a growth area, doing the assessment for that would have to be the same across the board, across the state, because it is a state-introduced provision that we are guided by. Our local policies can be as strong as we need them to be, but if it is competing against a very weak state policy it is not always easy to achieve it.

Mr FOWLES: But the framework is provided by the state. The rules—like an environmental overlay, for example—the specific rules in an environmental overlay would be drafted by you, would they not?

Ms ROBERTSON: The schedules to it, yes, you are correct.

Mr FOWLES: So is it not possible to ask the government to change those schedules, to adopt them into law to reflect those things that you have outlined?

Ms ROBERTSON: Yes. It is very expensive, very costly, but yes, there is an ability for us to do that, and I think we already do that reasonably well. But, as I said, our local policies compete with state policies, so if perhaps the state policies are in line with the local policies or the local policies can be given stronger weight, that would be a good outcome. Go, Jo.

Ms CUSCADEN: An example I might give you—and obviously this is not what we are here to talk about, but if you want to talk about environmental sustainability in building and that kind of thing—although councils have tried very hard to put in stronger controls around environmental sustainability around buildings themselves, without that strong support from the state government and the policy from above, the state government at the end of the day is the body who approves the planning scheme amendments and quite often the councils are sent back the amendments for being too ambitious from the state's perspective, because they have obviously got to look at a whole state in itself and all the councils that work within that. So we can be as ambitious as we like, but that is with our licences and schedules and zones or local policies and that kind of thing, but then unless the state government is able to support those ambitious planning policies, we spend a lot of money going through a panel or going through a process of community consultation, we raise expectations within the community through those processes, and then often council gets to the planning panel and then it gets sent back because it is not in line with the standard.

Mr FOWLES: And have you had ambitious things like that actually knocked back by Vic gov?

Ms CUSCADEN: We have not personally, but I do know that there is a lot in metro Melbourne—the City of Yarra and Moreland—

Mr FOWLES: We are speaking to all the other councils, so let us just confine the discussion if we can to the City of Ballarat. What would the City of Ballarat have us do differently in relation to environmental infrastructure?

Ms GREEN: For Ballarat.

Ms ROBERTSON: In the context of this hearing here and feeling like we do a magnificent job trying to achieve what we do and not liking the course we are heading down in the way of questioning, we have said we think that state policy can be better, we think that strategies can be better.

Mr FOWLES: How?

Ms ROBERTSON: We think that we can do things better and are trying to achieve that, but at a state level, anything the state can do to assist us to overarchingly give a stronger strategy provision or legislation, we would welcome it.

Ms GREEN: Chair, can I dip my oar in?

The CHAIR: Sure.

Ms GREEN: We have just heard from the City of Greater Shepparton and Campaspe in the previous hearing, and I made the offer there. My electorate covers the City of Whittlesea and the Shire of Mitchell and also Nillumbik, but for the purposes of growth I would really draw to your attention the vegetation protections and the environmental overlays that are present in the City of Whittlesea. I was sort of reluctant to be a bit prickly here, but I have doorknocked in Lucas. I drive through the west of Ballarat all the time. Ballarat is a beautiful city, but Lucas is just really setting the side down. I reckon, come and have a look at what is happening and at the environmentally sensitive design that has received UN awards in Whittlesea, which is a growth council, and see whether you can replicate some of those controls in Lucas, because I just think it looks like a wasteland. I just really worry for the kids that are growing up there. You have got that aspiration of tree canopy, but I kind of feel like you need to be asking your developers to do more—whether it is planning controls or whatever it is. I am not sure what it is, but I would open the invitation for you to come and visit with me in the City of Whittlesea and have a look at what they are doing, particularly in Mernda Villages.

Ms ROBERTSON: I appreciate that. I am not sure what part of Lucas you are driving through, but they have a central park in Lucas that is absolutely spectacular and a requirement for tree planting, so it is a very young and immature area. I think it is doing quite well, particularly if you go to that community hub area. I know the developers will be disappointed to hear that, who are very entrenched in Ballarat and very proud of the product—

Ms GREEN: Who is the developer, just by way of interest?

Ms ROBERTSON: Integra.

Ms GREEN: No, I do not know them. I am just saying comparatively, because I get around a lot of growth areas, and maybe it is just early days yet.

Ms ROBERTSON: Well, yes, it is a very new area. So from our point of view we are supportive of the ESD, and there is currently work that is being done. We had submitted to MAV to say that we are very supportive of looking at ESD provisions being reinforced within the planning scheme. That gave us great confidence, actually, that it is very seriously being looked at in support of bolstering the planning scheme, and we have made submissions to that effect. We have environmental significance overlays. We have vegetation protection overlays. And as I tried to say, some of the state policy or state provisions overarch those, because you have got bushfire management for us as well and areas where other things trump it essentially, so it is not strong enough.

Ms GREEN: The City of Whittlesea has those BMOs as well, as does Mitchell. Most of the outer urban areas do, and a lot of Sarah's area would as well. So it is very similar.

Ms ROBERTSON: I am not sure of the intent of the panel. I am not sure if it is to tell us we are not doing very well.

Ms GREEN: Oh, no.

Mr FOWLES: The purpose of this—

Ms GREEN: We were flying blind because we did not get a submission or an opening statement, so we are just trying to draw some stuff out.

Ms ROBERTSON: And I think that falls on us because we were unsure of where the panel was leading or what the expectation of this panel was.

Ms WETHERALL: There was a one-sentence terms of reference, so we had very little to go on. So we pulled some information together, but we were challenged to find more information about what the terms of the inquiry were.

Ms ROBERTSON: So if I could say anything, the work that has been done for ESD through the state for our planning scheme, I thoroughly support that. Our councillors are supportive of that being entrenched into our planning scheme a little bit better, because at this point in time it is not. Whether we argue that through local or state, I can tell you now state is not as strong on it is local, so to reinforce that within our planning scheme statewide would be wholeheartedly embraced. What else can the state do for us: funding to help us achieve our aspirations of the 40 per cent tree canopy. I suppose there are a number of initiatives that we could look at in terms of what does the ongoing look like as well. At this point in time I am not sure what we will achieve out of this meeting, but it has certainly made me think that we will just stick to our own local strategies and policies and try to firm them up a bit stronger and work hard to achieve what we need to.

The CHAIR: I am going to jump in here. I am just mindful of time because I know that the team from the City of Ballarat, you guys had other meetings and commitments to go to. I just want to reassure you that the purpose of these types of hearings, and all government committee hearings, is really to get around and talk to people that want to talk to us, and our job is to listen. It is really about, I guess, you guys putting forward things that you want to see state government improve upon, and I think you have touched on some of them today, which has been really great, thank you. You can take this as a question on notice, which will enable you to be able to provide a letter or some more content to the committee should you wish to do so, but if there are other things that you think would be really helpful that state government could change to better facilitate environmental infrastructure for the growing population in the City of Ballarat, please feel free to do so. But that really is the purpose of the committee; it is not to pass judgment on what you are doing and what you are not doing. We just need to be very clear about what you would like to see us do and the areas that we can improve. So if you think of any more that you wanted to provide to the committee, I will just say outright you can take it as a question on notice and come back to me.

Ms ROBERTSON: I think just a written submission, because I do not feel that really in any respect we achieved anything today, except for me to try and justify that I did not think our state policy was strong enough and then to be challenged on it. As I said, you asked us the question and I think I provided it. Yes, so we are prepared to just give you a written statement on some of the things that we had identified that would be welcomed in support of what we are trying to achieve.

The CHAIR: Okay. All right. Well, on behalf of the committee I would like to say thank you for taking the time to come and talk to us this morning, and if there is anything else that you want to draw our attention to, we would be more than happy to accept it from you. Thanks so much.

Ms ROBERTSON: Thank you.

Witnesses withdrew.