

# CORRECTED VERSION

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

### REFERENCES COMMITTEE

#### **Inquiry into environmental design and public health**

Melbourne — 23 August 2011

#### Members

Mr A. Elsbury

Mrs J. Kronberg

Mr C. Ondarchie

Mr S. Pennicuik

Mrs I. Peulich

Mr J. Scheffer

Mr B. Tee

Ms G. Tierney

#### Substituted members

Chair: Ms G. Tierney

Deputy Chair: Mrs I. Peulich

#### Staff

Secretary: Mr K. Delaney

#### Witnesses

Ms J. Wood, president, and

Ms D. Parnell, manager policy, Council on the Ageing Victoria.

**The CHAIR** — In the hearing this afternoon we are seeking a 5 to 10-minute presentation and then the opportunity to ask questions so that we can get some interaction going and tease out some possible recommendations or further ideas that we may need to pursue.

In this hearing you are covered by parliamentary privilege but comments made outside the hearing will not be afforded such privilege. In about a fortnight you will be provided with a copy of the transcript of these proceedings to check. You can liaise with Keir Delaney in that regard. Please state for the record your name, address and the organisation you are representing today. Then we will hear your presentation.

**Ms WOOD** — Janet Wood, 4th floor, Block Arcade, CBD. I am president of the Council on the Ageing Victoria.

**Ms PARNELL** — Debra Parnell, 4th floor, Block Arcade, Elizabeth Street, Melbourne. I am manager, policy unit, COTA. Apologies from Sue, who is unable to attend as intended.

**Ms WOOD** — Thank you for this opportunity. It does seem to be the year of reviews, and we believe that we are putting together coherent ideas that might be of use to you. I have just come from our annual conference of Living Longer Living Stronger, which has been one of the major programs for COTA over 10 years. The theme of that today was motivation to move.

I think that segues very neatly into appearing here today to speak to our submission on environmental design and public health, because the capacity to move and the motivation, particularly for older people, to move links very clearly with the environment outside the front door and even the environment inside. We are actually addressing today both the interior and exterior, if you like. If the interior is ill designed, ill fitting and inappropriate for an older person, they are far less likely to be able to make their way to the front door and get outside the front door where there is paving that is raised and all those sorts of issues such as no bus et cetera, then we have obviously got a problem about social participation or participation of any sort.

The statistics are pretty compelling. There are 860 000 Victorians currently who have some mobility issue. They are not all in wheelchairs, but they would have to think about how they actually access the great outdoors. There will be 72 000 more people added to that list this year, so it is a growing area. The good news is that the number of disability-free years that older people have actually increases along with life expectancy. The more we can delay the onset of any disabilities of any sort, then the longer people live and of course the happier they are. It is a really good win-win situation. Disablement for older people, when it happens, is not simply physical, and one of the reasons we have made a submission and want to address you today is that it has to do also with the sense that they are still wanted in the community, that the community and the built environment is still inviting enough and says, 'Yes, please participate'. That is crucial as we age.

We are looking at issues around the environment, community accessibility and opportunities for participation. We need to say that if we get these right in our state, then we get them right for everybody. It is not only getting them right for older people, but if we do get them right for older people, then we will probably all be living in paradise. It would be nice.

We hope to address — Debra will do that — some of the very practical things. My heart sank at the news that we, in Australia, now outstrip the US in the size of the houses that we are building. I live in Gisborne. I commute by train. I go past all those large mansions and even in my own street I see the very large houses. When we moved there 10 or 11 years ago nearly every house was occupied by four people. Everybody is different now — the offspring have disappeared and they are occupied by two people. That, in terms of flexibility of housing for our future and for the whole built environment, is obviously a problem.

We want to remind ourselves, as I am sure you need no reminding, that we now have two generations of older people in the sense that we have — whenever you want name yourself as an older person, which can be around 60-ish, I suppose — the 60s to 85s and then the over-85s, which is the fastest growing population relative in our community, and they have different needs as well. We are rural, urban and suburban, and those have different characteristics as well. We have different levels of income and different life experiences which bring us to a particular point when we can identify as being older. There has been over the last couple of decades I suppose a dramatic shift in our understanding of what constitutes a good life for an older person. It used to be a couple of years post retirement, which is why the pension was set at 65 because you could be pretty sure people would be

dead by 67. Now of course it has moved back. We probably have one-third of our lives ahead of us at 65. So it is dramatic, it is interesting and, yes, long may it last.

We are really very interested in the sorts of recommendations that you will make. What we are really looking at is a whole-of-government approach and one that is serious. The ageing portfolio has nearly always been dangled off something else. Often there is something else that has been the bigger part of the portfolio and then, 'Oh, yes, and ageing'. And in fact in many policies and programs we find 'and ageing' is dropped out almost entirely. So we at COTA are obviously arguing for that very large demographic to be thought about in everything that happens in government now. In fact we would argue that government cannot afford not to. Looking around the table, you are going to be around for a long time and this will be your community as well if we get it all right.

We are currently working on a submission for another inquiry on opportunities for participation of older people in Victoria. That is a huge one as well but they link quite nicely together. So we hope for a whole-of-government approach. We look for a strategic planning framework so there is a sense of why we would do this and how it would be done. We would push that it is actually a human rights issue. It is an issue about access and an issue therefore about participation. We would argue for an urgent need for all our communities to be age friendly, and in that we are very much helped by the development of the WHO age-friendly communities. We have worked with MAV and lots of councils on age-friendly environments and have seen the WHO standards applied there. I will reiterate that it is a whole-of-life approach. If we get it right for older people, we get it right for people pushing prams and footballers who break their legs and all sorts of things. If you get it right for one, you get it right for the lot.

In our submission we have gone to a few quite specific things, and Debra will speak to those.

**Ms PARNELL** — Yes, as Janet has identified, we see environmental planning obviously having significant impacts on older people, their health and wellbeing and their opportunities for participation. In our submission we highlighted a small number of areas that we see as integral to older people's wellbeing and health outcomes, in particular housing, transport and the impacts of climate change. These are things that should be considered within a planning and environmental design framework, and I think that this committee should take note of these.

We have talked about housing as a cornerstone for ageing well and ageing in place, and in particular we have talked about the need for universal access and design principles being designed applied to housing. One study that we have cited identified that appropriate and supported housing for older people can mean a delay of up to six years for them going into residential care. It also means that those people continue to participate in their communities and their local networks, which is better for them and better for their communities. Importantly not only does it mean that older people can stay in their homes but it has implications for a wide range of other groups — people with disabilities, people with young families — and there is also the capacity for communities to then come into those homes as well. So support services can come into those homes. It means that people can visit — people with disabilities or other older people with mobility issues can also access those premises. We see housing as a really important issue in terms of what is appropriate housing and how can people access that housing. It needs to be an integrated approach.

The second area was transport, and I am sure that this is something that the committee has considered. I am sure a lot of people have written about transport and the transport needs of our community going into the future. We see transport as again a fundamental issue for older people as so many older people rely on public transport for their mobility. We are concerned about the integration of public transport. We think there should be an ageing lens on transport to the extent that older people are not using transport the same way that people going to work or school children are using transport. They are wanting to go to different places. They have different timing and different access needs around transport. So certainly we are recommending that the government and this committee look at the integration of public transport and how it is going to meet the needs of our ageing population, not just public transport in terms of growth corridors or getting people to and from work but for those other parts of the community. As we have already said, there are growing numbers of people who are going to need transport and for whom it is a really fundamental issue.

The final area that I want to touch on is the impacts of climate change. We raise this because we know that older people are going to be the most vulnerable people in terms of the extreme weather events we have already

experienced and we are likely to continue experiencing into the future. In 2009 while there were a lot of people who died during the bushfires, over 300 older people died as a result of the heatwave. Those deaths were preventable. A lot of them were because people were not in environments that protected them from those conditions.

The other thing that we know is that older people are really very concerned about paying their electricity bills. They will go without food and medications to enable them to pay electricity bills. We know that those costs of living are going up as a result of a number of things but certainly climate impacts are part of that. So we are really concerned that along with accessibility housing protects those people that are most vulnerable. We are advocating for consideration of thermal efficiency of housing and finding ways for people to be supported to access incentive programs or subsidised programs to get energy-efficient appliances or be able to make their homes more thermal efficient. Of course a lot of low-income people, especially pensioners, are not in that situation, so how can they be supported to have their houses retrofitted or move to more suitable premises? The other thing is that a lot of older people we know are living in rental accommodation and that adds another level of complexity to the situation as to how they can be safeguarded.

As Janet has mentioned, we see the environmental planning and design area as having much broader areas for consideration than what people normally think of under the planning regime like buildings, roads, growth corridors. What does this mean for our community and how do we maintain a healthy community? We are saying that for an ageing population there are a number of significant issues that should be considered within the framework that you are going to be addressing. We are happy to take questions and talk about those things in more detail.

**Mr ELSBURY** — The only real question I had about your submission was in relation to climate change. I think you have basically answered what I was going to ask, which was that the emphasis should be on preparation for a changing climate rather than any arbitrary measures to try to stop it from happening. It could be allowing people to access housing that is appropriate, whether it has climate control or such to allow them to live safely. As you have said, a lot of the people were not in environments that could sustain it, so I just wanted to clarify that that is what you were actually saying.

**Ms PARNELL** — Yes.

**Ms WOOD** — We have little arguments — not arguments, but we think about whether we should say ‘climate change’ or whether we should say ‘weather events’, but frankly we all know what we are talking about. Things are getting bigger. So we are looking at what will make people feel more secure in their own locations, because dislocation is one of the ways of decreasing longevity. Dislocation is one of the factors that does not assist older people. We are looking at how older people can assist themselves as well in areas of climate. Some of you probably went up to Charlton et cetera after the floods and saw how resilient you have to be to cope, not only with the trauma of the floods but with what follows, how you put a life together when you realise that you have probably only got 5 to 10 years more to live, and how you recover and reshape. It is crucial to invite older people to be part of how it will work and what will work and not only part of the ‘Dear old things, we must be careful about them when there is an emergency’. It is about the building up to it.

**Mr ELSBURY** — On the discussion about older people in those regional communities that were impacted upon by a flood event like we experienced, the integration of community was very important, as was the fact that neighbours who had never spoken to one another were willing to help in any way, shape or form they could. So there needs to be an emphasis upon community working together in a disaster situation such as that. We are fortunate that in Australia we have got that strong culture, unlike in England, unfortunately, where, as we have seen, a small minority go off and cause the trouble, but then the community comes out and shows with a broomstick just how impenetrable the spirit of the community can be.

**Ms WOOD** — This segues very nicely though into the issues of pre the event, and that is about a community which is well functioning in good times as well. For older people that particularly includes volunteering. So the built environment, the spaces out there, and through volunteers, particularly older people, link very well with that, because it means that the people who are volunteers have confidence in their own skills to be useful, but they are practising being connected as well.

I live in the Macedon Ranges, and I am noticing how many of my peers and those older are now saying, understandably, 'I would never drive to Melbourne anymore. I don't drive to Melbourne; it's got scary'. I do not either. I hate it. But if your husband, or whomever, or your friend is in Epworth or wherever, who is doing the driving then? We have all these little interconnection things we want to get right, and as Melbourne grows its millions and millions, you have got rural and regional people less and less happy about coming here. So there are all sorts of ways in which the whole question about volunteering, older people et cetera and your big scope comes together.

**The CHAIR** — There has been a push for people to live in their own homes for longer. Probably 18 months to two years ago a project was auspiced — and it happened in Portarlington where Jenny Wills and Monica Hayes did some fantastic work — about the things that really need to be at the forefront of our minds regarding the internal structures of our houses, including wider hallways and door frames and every other such thing for wheelchair access and a number of other things. What are your recommendations directed at developers and architects about what needs to be put in place so that we can live at home longer?

**Ms PARNELL** — We have done a lot of work in this area and have been part of a quite large group of organisations that came together called the Victorian Universal Housing Alliance, and we have done a lot of work on this. That group put forward a number of recommendations, and the previous government did take up some of those recommendations, but they were not put in place.

The things that we particularly want to see in place around universal housing is a clear path from the street to a level entry for access to a house, wider doorways and passageways, as you have identified, and that they not be just minimal standards, because we are recognising that wheelchairs, for example, and scooters are becoming larger to accommodate and be more useful for people. So that really needs to be considered — not only how people can get in but how they can manoeuvre around the house. We want a toilet suitable for people with limited mobility and that that be on the entry level so that people visiting the house can also access a suitable toilet. We also want to see reinforced bathroom walls so that houses can be retrofitted at minimal cost later on when people decide they need to have rails or they need other facilities in the house.

At the moment we know that retrofitting houses when people develop mobility issues is so costly that it is prohibitive, which means that people either have to struggle with living in a house that is no longer appropriate or they need to leave that house, which has a whole lot of impacts on them socially and in terms of their health. The other issue, when that happens or when the house becomes no longer appropriate for them, is we know that is one of the reasons that people go into residential care. Because the house is not appropriate, people cannot come in to give them the appropriate services. Often it is not feasible for them to move to a new house because of the value of the asset, how much it costs to move and all those sorts of issues. The other thing that we would also ask for is that there be a provision of an entry-level shower.

A lot of work was done in relation to these issues. Under the previous government there was, we believe, bipartisan support for these things, and they were just very unfortunate circumstances that these regulations that were proposed were not passed and put into action. We feel it is something that could be done very easily at very minimal cost. I think for new houses it was brought down to be about \$500 per new dwelling to put these provisions in. We see this is something that would have a significant impact for a lot of people. It is a very small and easy thing to do but would really impact on thousands of people and their ability to stay in their home and stay connected to their communities.

We know at the commonwealth level there are moves and guidelines and voluntary measures being put in place to bring in these types of universal housing provisions, except that we see that that is going to take a very long time to happen, and voluntary guidelines often do not work, so at some point there needs to be a greater requirement for these provisions to be put in place. We believe that Victoria could be a leader in this area and really transform the community and accessibility within the community.

**Mr TEE** — Looking at the recommendations there, they seem obvious rather than onerous, and I know legislation has now gone through that provides for those sorts of wider doors and corridors in public and commercial buildings, so what you are saying is let us take us to the next logical step, and I know that VCOSS is a big supporter of those changes. I suppose the push-back is always the developers who say the sky is going to fall down. I am wondering whether there is any work you are aware of that you can provide to us with some assessment as to the cost — you have identified a \$500 costing, and I suppose that cost takes into account the

immediate up-front cost — including also the cost in terms of older people having to move out of their homes because their homes are not purpose built. I do not know whether you have the answer now, but I think that would be helpful.

**Ms PARNELL** — These regulations were put through a regulatory impact statement process. The department, which I assume was DPI — I cannot remember which department — —

**Mr TEE** — DPCD.

**Ms PARNELL** — Yes. The department did all the work behind that. It did all the costings. It did all the variations on what this would mean and what it would look like. It did a lot of consultation with people. That regulatory impact statement was in fact accepted or went through its process, and it was identified that these things were possible, that there were minimal costs and that the benefits really outweighed the small costs that were identified.

**Mr TEE** — It may be something we can ask the government for, if it has done the work.

**Ms PARNELL** — Yes, the work has basically been done. It is really a matter now of saying, ‘This is something that can be progressed to the next stage’.

**Mrs PEULICH** — Thank you for your submission. You mentioned the large homes you see as you travel in from your beautiful part of the world. I know that downsizing is an issue for older persons because of the costs involved. Obviously planning has seen a densification of middle and urban Melbourne with higher density housing closer to transport corridors. All of that is happening, often under local government, on the basis of substantial requirements for car-parking concessions based on the assumption that people will need fewer cars because they are closer to transport.

The result of that is that we see more cars parked not in garages, because living spaces are so small that people are often using garages for storage, but on roads and increased congestion of roads. I have had lots of people raise concerns about not just driver safety, as you have alluded to, but also pedestrian safety and movements. It is a much more intimidating environment. Also I have heard examples of where the local roads are so cluttered because of higher density development that emergency vehicles such as ambulances cannot actually get through roads. Are you able to comment on where you believe the happy medium might be?

**Ms WOOD** — I am glad you are the people who have to come up with the recommendations. I know all the problems. I live in Gisborne, and we are calling ourselves Gisbury now because we can see Sunbury coming up the road, and we are not all that cheerful about it. It is having those sorts of complications in terms of parking and those things. It is a village that had only one route in and one route out that now has to cater as though it is a semi-metropolis. I remember that you used to be the member for Bentleigh. I lived in Bentleigh, and one of the fascinating things there for some time — it probably still is — was how the little houses in Bentleigh had a driveway and a garage that was for a Ford Anglia. You are all too young! The changing use of space is not new, but if we have an opportunity to do it better, that will be excellent.

I am probably getting off the track of what you are talking about, but, for instance, housing developments are now often in courts and have roads into them that I think are about one and a half cars wide. They are quite small. You cannot get a bus in there. You can get a small bus, so maybe we have to re-tweak how we actually transport people and where we transport them to. You could have two stages: a small bus and a big bus.

**Mrs PEULICH** — Maybe we can design cars that can breathe in.

**Ms WOOD** — Well, yes, you do see a lot of little ones. As I said, I do not think COTA has any real answers to that, except that it is clearly important that we have a sense of how we will use space and that we do not take every bit of space and cover it over with something. In case I do not get a chance to mention it, I need to mention that for older people, as for any age group, I think aesthetics count. A sense that you have something around you other than concrete is really helpful to the human spirit, so just covering up and having more and more car parks and larger and larger things is really not the answer either.

**Mrs PEULICH** — They are vexed questions, aren't they?

**Ms WOOD** — Yes, they are.

**Ms PARNELL** — We do have some concerns that with a lot of transport issues the focus revolves around cars. Even when there is a focus on public transport, there is a sense that you need to cater for people to drive to stations, and that takes some pre-eminence over people being able to talk to stations or have amenity around those stations that encourages people to walk or use public transport. We are concerned that there is not more of a focus on walking. We know, for example, that there is not an advisory group that is around pedestrian issues. There is an advisory group around cycling and how we can integrate cycling into our communities, which is a fantastic thing, but there is not a group that then considers where pedestrians are within the bigger picture of how people get around so that we can encourage mobility and physical exercise. We recognise that one of the best things that older people can do is be physically active. It has enormous implications for their health if they are able to walk, take up exercise, get into their communities and be active in that way. We see those things as being very linked. We cannot look at one thing to the detriment of those other things.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — This is a question where you may want to just send us something later or point us to something. I am interested in the idea that we talk a lot about access to facilities and experience and so forth, and growing older, as with all the way through life, is also about letting go. You let go of your childhood, your youth, your children and your employment — that is letting go. For people in the group you talked about — say, between 65 and 90 — the last 10 years or so of that is also a time to let go. A lot of experiences in our community can be quite overwhelming — when thinking of going to a restaurant or when you want a quiet space. Sure, you can go to the park, but where are the colours, internal spaces, light and wind in the environment for people at the very old end of their experience, when they still want engagement but they want that to wind down? Do you know whether research has been done on how spaces can be designed to be more accommodating of that dimension of life?

**Ms WOOD** — No, but I am sure there is.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — Could you take it on notice?

**Ms PARNELL** — Yes. I think there are probably examples that we could look to that have a very inclusive approach. For example, there is certainly the work done overseas in Denmark. There is also a development in Sydney under the Benevolent Society called Apartments for Life. They are looking at integrating housing for older people, particularly low-income older people, to enable them to continue living at home, but they are seeing it as a whole-of-community approach. They are catering for different needs. There are models overseas where they are doing that — integrating people of different needs and abilities into a common space — and asking how to do that and how to cater for those different needs. They may provide some useful examples.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — If you have some connections, could you let us have them?

**Ms PARNELL** — Yes. People tell us that they want to be integrated into the community. They do not want to be away in their own little ghettos.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — That is the space I am talking about. I am talking about people wanting to go out into it, but they do not necessarily want to go to a rock concert.

**Ms WOOD** — Or the football or the cricket, which now turn into rock concerts.

**The CHAIR** — Or going to dinner and not being able to hear yourselves speak.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — That is right. It is that sense of design in the end that we do not seem to be looking at a lot. We are looking at big engagement, volunteering and all those things, but you also become the receiver of the volunteer service when you are at a certain point.

**Ms WOOD** — Yes, that is true.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — And you need to be able to do that.

**Ms WOOD** — Yes.

**Mr TEE** — I just wanted to touch on partly the letting go aspect. I think it comes back to the point you raised about older people living in the large home after the kids have moved on. Part of the debate in the submissions we have had is about increased density and making sure there are, I suppose, units that people can

move into in a suburb. They cannot necessarily afford to buy a house but there are higher density units. They can move out into the bigger house and then move back into a unit in their community when they are older. It is about the choice of housing, I suppose. I think it was the Committee for Melbourne that came out on the weekend and said, 'There is an issue with letting go with older people wanting to stay in their own homes because that is where they have been for the last 40 years'. I am wondering how you would make that transition easier.

**Ms WOOD** — This probably is for another time but the whole notion of letting go is worrying in that there is an assumption there that older people never take on — they are just redistributing whatever they have had. I think we need to address ageing now in a more positive way, in that, 'It is a time when you can take on as well, not only take off'. That is my little sermon on the side. One thing that has worried me for some years, and I said this at a parliamentary committee hearing many years ago, is the lack of flexibility in those big mansions. Can they be turned into apartments, and if not, why not? If you build something that has three bathrooms and you think back to all those lovely old Victorian mansions and so forth which were eventually turned into apartments for families, say — —

I do not know if there is anything in anybody's head about what you do with those vast spaces, which are an incredible footprint as well, and whether there is flexibility in the way they are designed so they could be available for other people and the people who own it can move into one part of it. There are so many regulations now that make it very difficult to do anything like that, but it would be my dream. There are building designs and materials available now to make that happen, like movable walls. You are not stuck. Most of our office buildings now are built so that you are not stuck with a wall in its one place and you can never move it; you can move them around. There are ways of design now that would address some of that but we are nowhere near it. The question is then: where do we put the smaller dwellings?

**Mr SCHEFFER** — Just in case there is a misunderstanding on that, when I used the expression 'letting go', it is important because you mentioned people in Macedon saying they no longer felt they wanted to drive to Melbourne. That is the kind of thing I am talking about.

**Ms WOOD** — Yes.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — You are embracing something but you no longer are engaged in that particular way of doing something. Behind every 93-year old person there is a goodtime person who liked going to rages when they were young but those things have been put in the past. What are the things we do in our urban design that create an engagement which is free of the things that very old people no longer feel capable or able to negotiate? I am thinking of things like in soundscapes, in visual scapes, in colours, in the way nature interacts; that is also social but not a pressed social environment. It is that kind of space I am interested in.

**Ms PARNELL** — Raising the issue around housing, it is about offering a range of options and choices that means that it is not one size fits all, that there are different places that different people can go to and they can access and enjoy.

**Mr TEE** — At different times of their lives.

**Ms PARNELL** — That is right, exactly. I think housing is a significant issue: how we come up with those alternative models for housing that older people are able to access, that as they age their suburbs have a range of housing options so that people are not living in one area and they have to move out to the outer suburbs or they have to pay an absolute fortune and come into an apartment lifestyle. How are we facilitating that range of options? It is interesting that the Productivity Commission report *Caring for Older Australians* talks about housing options and the need to encourage and facilitate a range of accommodation options to meet people's needs as they age. I think that is something that needs to be addressed. How it is to be done I do not know.

**Mr TEE** — I have not seen that reference to the Productivity Commission. Are you able to send that through to us?

**Ms WOOD** — Yes. And there is a very good Dutch-Canadian — —

**The CHAIR** — We are running way over time now. The last question is for Mrs Peulich.

**Mrs PEULICH** — Basically it is on a similar theme. We all know that there is an insufficient number of one and two-bedroom spaces — where do we place those? We have heard reference to large homes. In Europe they do it simply; they almost do them as self-contained apartments at different levels — Grandpa and nanna may live in the bottom level, and so on. I know about this, coming from a multicultural background. My mother is getting on, she is widowed and we are thinking of buying a larger home to be able to accommodate her. Obviously we need to do a bit more work on looking at how all sorts of accommodation needs to be provided on that particular theme.

In the positions you have advocated — and you have done a wonderful job for many years — to what extent do your policies and recommendations, not just in relation to this one but generally speaking, reflect the various other cultural views, differences of older persons generally? The extended family especially is something that — —

**Ms WOOD** — What we commit to is always engaging with the older community, listening and taking our cues from there. We are intent on making sure that we have as diverse a view as possible — sometimes specifically Greek, specifically Vietnamese or another group. We do a lot of work that way. Also we try to have people on our committees who are from different communities.

**Mrs PEULICH** — I know living in place is highly valued by in particular our Anglo-Saxon constituencies.

**Ms WOOD** — That is right.

**Mrs PEULICH** — But not so in our multicultural — —

**Ms WOOD** — Not so by everybody. Absolutely.

**The CHAIR** — That draws the committee to an end. Thank you very much, Janet and Debra. That was very good. I think it has given us a lot of food for thought that we will consider as a committee. I am sure you will see some aspects in our final report that go to some of your issues.

**Ms WOOD** — Fantastic. That is great. Thank you.

**Witnesses withdrew.**

