

# CORRECTED VERSION

## SELECT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LAND DEVELOPMENT

Geelong — 18 March 2008

### Members

Mr D. Davis

Mr P. Hall

Mr P. Kavanagh

Mr E. O'Donohue

Ms S. Pennicuik

Mr B. Tee

Mr E. Thornley

Chair: Mr D. Davis

Deputy Chair: Mr B. Tee

### Staff

Secretary: Mr R. Willis

Research Officer: Mr A. Walsh

### Witnesses

Mr A. Garrett, project development planner,

Mr D. Frost, general manager, community infrastructure and recreation, and

Mr B. Renouf, sustainability officer, environment unit, City of Greater Geelong.

**The CHAIR** — I will ask you to make a short submission, and we will then ask a few questions.

**Mr GARRETT** — We have a verbal presentation which I will try to skip through quickly. We also have hard copies if you would like them. Initially we would like to thank the chair, David Davis, and members of the committee for giving us this opportunity to make a submission. We are aware that there are a number of concerns that are raised in the community from time to time, and this inquiry provides an opportunity for these issues to be canvassed and for some explanation to be given as to what circumstances provide for the sale or alienation of public land and open space.

An initial point that I would like to make from the outset is that the terms of reference focus on the loss of open space — I suppose the negative aspect of it, or what could be a negative aspect — and fails to really consider the additional supply of open space. To illustrate this point, the provisions of the planning scheme make it a requirement for private developers when subdividing land to provide a minimum of 5 per cent as open space. In fact the City of Greater Geelong requires a greater contribution than that. In all greenfield developments we get an increased supply of open space in accordance with structure plans, which I am sure we will talk about. In some cases developers cannot provide the space requirements and provide cash in lieu. That money is allocated to a reserve fund which is used for the purchase and upgrade of additional open space throughout the municipality. In addition there are a number of projects undertaken by state and local governments which produce public lands. In particular the Geelong ring-road, which is currently under construction by VicRoads, will produce considerable areas of public land that will be utilised, in particular, for recreational bicycle paths and for passive recreation.

Having said that, the committee's terms of reference are particularly focused around, as you know, the sale or alienation of public land for development; the sale or alienation of public open space; and also in regard to these issues of Melbourne 2030 and green wedges. We will concentrate on (a) and (b) in our submission, and not on (c).

In terms of the first section of the terms of reference, which is the sale or alienation of public land for development, without being too specific the sorts of examples of land in this category that the City of Greater Geelong has had some experience with generally involve the foreshore, seabed, roadways or air space over roadways. Apart from the fact that these transactions are done rarely, the underlying principle is that there needs to be established an overall public good to justify the alienation of public land. An example in Geelong is the foreshore and seabed. As all the seabed is, in fact, public land, it is difficult to imagine the establishment of port facilities, jetties, piers and navigational facilities without some alienation of public land for a specific purpose. It is not difficult to extend the argument further to include some recreational marine facilities such as boat ramps, marinas and the establishment of yacht clubs and other facilities.

The issue is that the alienation of some public land is sometimes necessary in order for the broader public to gain access to a much larger area of public land. In the case of marine infrastructure in particular, it enables the public — either for economic or leisure purposes — to obtain safe access to Port Phillip Bay. The City of Greater Geelong would argue that adequate processes and safeguards are in place via the statutory planning process and the consultation that council and other agencies undertake in the approval of such alienation to ensure that the public good is firmly established and that those people in the community who feel disenfranchised by such an alienation have an opportunity to be heard.

The other area I mentioned in the introduction was the sale of roadways. These are generally when the roadway is determined as being no longer required for public use or access. There are some statutory processes in place within the Local Government Act to ensure that the lack of public need is clearly established and that the roadway when closed can be offered to the market in a number of ways to ensure orderly and sensible disposal of unrequired road reservations.

I will now move on to the sale or alienation of public open space. In relation to the sale of public open space, this is a rare occurrence and one which the City of Greater Geelong undertakes on few occasions. Nevertheless it is necessary where an area of public open space is either underutilised or no longer required. A better outcome in terms of the locality, size or topography of public open space can be obtained by selling a parcel and purchasing an alternative area of space.

In relation to the alienation of public open space — that is, the exclusive use of an area of public open space as distinct from its general availability — this is indeed a common issue and is basically one of a question of equity. For example, it is well established that particular sports conducted on public open space will often require

purpose-built facilities such as bowling greens, tennis courts, netball courts and the provision of facilities for football and cricket and other field sports. In some instances to make these sports viable they need to be provided within a club environment, and clubs invariably require some membership criteria to ensure their ongoing viability.

To pick up on a point made in other submissions, in terms of ensuring that public open space is available to all of the public all of the time without any alienation of any buildings, et cetera, would actually cut across some fairly major principles and things that are important to Geelong. One example could be the Geelong Football Club. Yes, we have a stadium and the club has some degree of exclusive use, although it is a shared facility. If we took the point of no alienation of public open space we would have no football club, no football facilities, but we would have a nice open park. In some ways the greater good can be achieved through some degree of alienation. It is common for areas of public open space to be fenced or in other ways to provide housing for a particular activity, for which only a limited number of members of the public have access.

Another instance where public open space can be alienated to some extent is where facilities are placed within a public open space to enable a wider or more specific enjoyment of that public open space by a portion of the public. Typical examples of this field include restaurants and cafes, which may be complementary or ancillary to the public open space. An example would be the botanic gardens providing a tea room or kiosk to enable people enjoying the botanic gardens to spend a longer time and have a different experience within the gardens themselves.

The Geelong waterfront provides a prime example of this utilisation of public open space where a number of restaurants established along the waterfront, while alienating small portions of the public open space, actually provide facilities for concentrated enjoyment of the views over Corio Bay and a greater experience of the interface between the land and the ocean. In that degree some alienation can actually enhance and provide greater attraction and access through that for the general community.

There are some other instances where a particular resource can only be accessed through public open space, and that might be access to a stream, a topographical feature or a particular view. In the case of the City of Greater Geelong we have one such instance in Eastern Park where access to naturally occurring mineral water will require some minor alienation of public open space if improved access and utilisation of this mineral water is to be realised. The City of Greater Geelong, in conjunction with the state government's department of tourism and the Victorian Mineral Water Committee, has been examining the establishment of a spa facility at Eastern Beach which would, by its nature, require the alienation of a portion of the public open space but which on completion would provide much improved access for a much larger number of people to partake of the beneficial attributes of mineral water. In addition such activities along a desire route, whether it is a cycling or walking route, can actually attract people to go to such facilities and then to turn around and come back or potentially stay in that facility.

The absence of any of those facilities just means you have a straight, linear path with not necessarily any attractions along it. It may actually discourage or not encourage people to use such a facility. While local governments and state governments may establish or approve such developments, it often does fall to the private sector to operate the facilities or to partially fund their establishment. There obviously has to be some degree of profitability in such ventures for the private sector, but council believes the overall public benefit achieved from such arrangements justify the provision of the area of public open space allocated to that particular purpose.

In conclusion, just before the many questions I am sure we will get, the City of Greater Geelong, as a public land manager, believes the appropriate supply of public open space is very important for the health and wellbeing of the community. There are instances where a portion of the public open space can be justifiably alienated, generally in order to ensure that the greater number of members of the public are able to enjoy a particular aspect of that public open space. The City of Greater Geelong believes that providing adequate justifications are made and that a satisfactory process to enable approvals and consultation occurs the limited alienation that occurs can be justified into the future.

**The CHAIR** — I thank you both for your general submission. It has covered a number of broad topics. Can I ask you a couple of more specific questions? The first goes to the Stockland development, which is on your side of the border with the borough. It is private land but impacts arguably on public land and the surrounding area, in particular, Swan Bay. Does the council support a referral to the federal government with respect to the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act?

**Mr GARRETT** — I think regardless of whether council supported that referral or not, if it was a relevant situation to be referred, it would be referred regardless. Also there was an environment effects statement done, which would have picked up any relevant referral.

**The CHAIR** — So the council does or does not support referral to the federal minister?

**Mr GARRETT** — I do not know of any council objection to any referral.

**Mr TEE** — Has the council made a decision either way?

**Mr GARRETT** — Council has supported the development and the process to consider that development. Picking up on an earlier point, on any rezoning or change to the planning scheme, if there is one objection, council must refer that to the minister requesting a panel, under the Planning and Environment Act. It is not about council going, 'This is a bit hard' and handballing it. We have an obligation under the act to request a panel.

**The CHAIR** — The other development we heard something about this morning was the Barwon Heads development on the Macafee Investments land to the west of the current town boundary. What is council's position with respect to that development? Does the council support a change in the town boundary?

**Mr GARRETT** — Council's position is very clear that it does not support a change in the town boundary. My understanding is that the council officers recommended no change. It was considered by the relevant councillor that the issue should be able to be examined by all of the community.

**The CHAIR** — The relevant councillor being?

**Mr GARRETT** — It was Cr McMullin, who suggested that the plan, as a draft for community consultation, be changed to include the Macafee land, which certainly enabled and raised the number of different submissions to be made, which certainly helped clarify the community's view.

**The CHAIR** — That is the most generous description I have heard in a long while.

**Mr TEE** — And crystallised the issue for councillors.

**Mr GARRETT** — Yes, which made council very comfortable that it was aware of all the issues and was able to say, 'No, we do not support that proposal'.

**Mr TEE** — Thank you very much for your submission. As I understand it, we deal with a number of specific examples — and the Chair has just gone through two of those — and I can assure you that we have considered a large number of specific examples. Really the gist of your submission is a broader examination of the issues. Essentially what you are saying is that inevitably there is a balance of views in the community, but also there is a balance of competing uses that you can put community facilities to. And sometimes to enhance community access and facilities you do need to alienate part of the public land. The conclusion then seems to be that you do need to have a transparent process to ensure — to get it right, essentially — you encapsulate the community's views. Ultimately the outcome may well be that some parts of the community are not satisfied with that, and hopefully you as the council get the balance right and get the 'greater good' right and the long-term position right. Is that a summary? Have I got that right in terms of your position?

**Mr GARRETT** — Yes, and just additionally to that there is also a very important role for strategic plans as well. It is not just about saying, 'What about that site of public land? Okay, let's sell it, but let's talk to the community first'. Really it should be done in a strategic look of all of that. Along the waterfront, for example, we have an overall waterfront code looking at all the different opportunities, so when council goes to potentially sell or lease land on the waterfront — not that I am suggesting it; just as an example — that should be backed up by a strategic plan which has identified these opportunities and actually gone through consultation itself. Then that goes through to the process of going into the planning scheme, another form of consultation endorsed by the minister, and then, if there is any sale or lease of land, making sure that is public as well so the community can have their say as well. There are three main processes.

**Mr TEE** — Moving on from that, sitting behind all of that is a strategic plan which, you would hope, is statewide or at least follows the coast so that you have got a development of the structure plans for you to

determine your boundary and you do not have urban sprawl up and down the coastline, so is there is a broader state government structure in place within which those other structures fit in and collapse into.

**Mr GARRETT** — Exactly. Coastal spaces does that for us. In terms of the old structure plans being renewed, I cannot think of any structure plans that we have reviewed that would go against the objectives of coastal spaces. Yes, there is some expansion of some of the towns that have been designated for growth according to the urban growth strategy, but they are generally inland and not trying to join up the coastal towns, if you like. That is a clear objective of our MSS, so our policy is to avoid that, and that is consistent with coastal spaces.

**Mr TEE** — Thank you very much

**Ms PENNICUIK** — Mr Garrett — a good name — you mentioned many times the term ‘public good’.

**Mr GARRETT** — Yes.

**Ms PENNICUIK** — I just wondered how you define that.

**Mr GARRETT** — Probably not in one sentence. Council does have a number of open space strategies which try to inform whether there is an open space need, but also which provides some guidance about whether additional or loss of open space will provide public good. I would summarise that — and Dean might want to jump in too — about whether it is going to provide a community benefit, particularly in terms of accessing or improving a public open space. If a public open space is impossible to manage — for example, if it is on a steep hill and it is not actually being used — then you would have questions about whether the retention of that open space in lieu of potentially purchasing another open space would provide a public good. It probably would, if you have a flat bit of land, even if it is smaller compared to something on a hill. If it enhances the public open space access and also enhances the experience for the public then that can create a public good. But I will let Dean probably continue on this stream.

**Mr FROST** — I think what Aaron is saying is right. And as Mr Tee said in relation to getting a balance, it is about balancing the range of impacts. It is what is the space used for? How accessible is it? What does it cost us to maintain it? What are the benefits to the users? They are just a couple of examples of things that we would consider. Aaron mentioned before about being strategic. What is the longer-term benefit or vision for that area, that piece of space? It is not simply about what we do with it today but about what its benefits are into the future. There is a whole range of those sorts of factors.

**Ms PENNICUIK** — Can I just go back to your opening comments about the terms of reference. I suppose I would have to say that usually a committee gets set up when there seems to be a mood or examples of things that are not quite working as they should. That is why the committee is set up to look at it. So if everything is going along swimmingly, you really do not need a committee of inquiry. For example, you would have seen perhaps in the *Age* just recently the fact that the City of Melbourne has a deficit and is losing public open space. I am just wondering what the situation is in Geelong?

**Mr FROST** — I am certainly not aware that we are losing open space. We did a study of open space in 2000 and it highlighted that the city was well served in terms of open space and, as Aaron highlighted, when we have developments we have a policy of trying to obtain 10 per cent unencumbered land or cash in lieu. So I would not have thought that we are in deficit or going backwards.

**Ms PENNICUIK** — Perhaps that information could be provided to the committee.

**Mr GARRETT** — I would be surprised if it was not actually increasing significantly because of the greenfield developments that we do get. While we negotiate, generally we do get 10 per cent open space or thereabouts. Leopold is probably a good example of where we have not only got open space to meet the needs of the new community but we are actually negotiating to get a regional park for the whole township of Leopold. So it is actually providing additional open space for sometimes the whole township.

**Ms PENNICUIK** — I just wanted to go to open space on the foreshore and your description of improving it to improve access, et cetera. Would you not agree that sometimes the community is not in favour of too much improvement because they prefer it unimproved, so in some ways you can overimprove that land?

**Mr GARRETT** — I certainly think that is the case, but also we must recognise that different open spaces can be quite different. Some open spaces can just be about a linear trail. Open spaces can be about a nature reserve for kicking a footy. The open space, if you like, for the waterfront is quite different. It would probably not suit many of the uses I have just mentioned, but it does provide a balance of open space as well as some community and commercial facilities to enhance that. Obviously if you had a 2-mile line of restaurants, et cetera, that would not be a balance, that would not be providing a diversity of experiences and it would be counterproductive. What that balance is though is not always able to be clearly defined, but I suppose I would go back to my earlier comment — that as long as it is done on a strategic basis consistent with state government strategies and goes through a consultation process as well I think that generally helps find that balance.

**Ms PENNICUIK** — I am interested too in the 10 per cent, or cash in lieu. Firstly, if you are talking about a greenfield development which is open space, and you end up with 10 per cent of open space, you could make the argument that you have lost 90 per cent of your open space — that is one way of looking at it. The other is that if you are taking cash in lieu and you are going to try to find some open space somewhere else, you actually do not have the open space there for the people in that area. What people value is open space close to them as well as ‘iconic’ open space such as is on the foreshore or along a river or a creek or somewhere that I would call iconic because it is close to the water — —

**Mr GARRETT** — Iconic to — —

**Ms PENNICUIK** — So how do you justify taking the cash and not having the open space?

**Mr GARRETT** — There are certainly some circumstances where there is already adjacent open space, so you could have a large piece of open space next to a relatively small residential development and then you could go, ‘Yes, we do not really need it. According to our strategy there may be an oversupply in that area, ok we are going to make you provide more open space even if we do not want it’. Instead of doing that, we allow the taking of cash in lieu, with that then to be used where it is needed, where there are gaps. We have a strategy that has identified where the gaps are. It is just that, especially for greenfield developments, the vast majority would always be provided as open space, but particularly for some infill developments, there may not be a need there, and it is better for the money to be used where there is a need.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — Thank you for your submission. Can I ask you what alienations of public land have been controversial in the City of Greater Geelong?

**Mr GARRETT** — That is a good question. I am not sure if Dean is a little bit more equipped to know. Most of the controversial issues are about the development of private land and the extension of township boundaries, if that does occur, and for infill developments, the potential impact on the immediate community.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — You do not get people objecting to giving out leases on the foreshore or something like that for restaurants? It is not an issue?

**Mr GARRETT** — Not to a high degree, in my understanding, and generally they are all consistent with our overall strategy anyway, which has dealt with most of those issues. Most of the impacts relate to where people are going to be directly impacted or where it could change the character of their coastal township. They would be the most controversial issues.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — A lot of your submission was about the theoretical justification for alienating public land for public good.

**Mr GARRETT** — Yes.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — What about temporarily alienating public land for private good, for example in Yarra Street, which for a year has been blocked off most of the time and huge areas of parking wiped out for the shopping centre there? What is the principal justification for that?

**Mr GARRETT** — I think on a very basic level it would be that the overall benefit of the development, particularly through jobs, through supporting a regional city, would outweigh a couple of months of discontinuous roads. Yes, while there are some immediate and short-term impacts on businesses — and we are doing work to try

to help those businesses and still get people down that road — they are significantly outweighed by the longer term benefits.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — So you see it in terms of public good also?

**Mr GARRETT** — Yes.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — What is ‘open space’ in the city of Geelong?

**Mr GARRETT** — We do have a definition I think in our open space strategy. My view would be it would generally be public open space, obviously owned by council or the Crown, which has at least a general access by the public.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — So is a road or a footpath open space, down the street, a nature strip?

**Mr GARRETT** — It could be seen as so, yes. So it would contribute to access and those sorts of issues.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — Yesterday we were in the city of Moreland, and they told us that they have been working on schemes for communities to share, for example sportsgrounds, that are part of school properties. Has that been happening in the city of Greater Geelong? Have you been doing that?

**Mr GARRETT** — Yes.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — Okay. So how many schools would be affected?

**Mr FROST** — I would not be able to tell you off the top of my head but there is a number — one that comes to mind is a joint development of a facility on the Bellarine Peninsula, Bellarine College.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — Bellarine College?

**Mr FROST** — Yes, which was recently completed.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — And that has been designed so that the community uses the grounds as well as the school?

**Mr FROST** — Absolutely. There is a project we are doing at the moment at Flinders Peak Secondary College — that is another example that just comes to mind because we are working on it.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — And that happens outside school hours presumably — the public has a right to use it outside school hours?

**Mr FROST** — Yes. They are generally leased. The public can use them, they are generally used by sporting clubs and so forth, who base themselves there.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — But anyone can go onto the grounds outside school hours?

**Mr FROST** — Yes.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — The major objection to these sorts of schemes is that people say there is an increased risk of vandalism — for example, people burning down schools or something like that. How do you organise things to minimise those?

**Mr FROST** — I am not sure that it has been presented to us as an issue. I think what the schools see it as is bringing the community into the school, which they see as ultimately being a good thing, and being part of the community.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — But do you have to pay, for example, to build very good fences between the grounds and the school buildings or something like that?

**Mr FROST** — No, not particularly. I think the schools see the benefit of getting access to probably a higher quality facility than they would be able to fund themselves, and the council obviously sees it as a benefit in

that it is a shared-cost arrangement so we are getting access to a facility that we would typically have at a reduced maintenance or development cost.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — Has any thought every been given by Geelong city council to sharing libraries between schools?

**Mr FROST** — I believe so; yes.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — Has that happened?

**Mr FROST** — There is some work occurring at the moment in Vines Road, where we are doing quite a significant development with the school there. It includes a shared library and community facilities on site as well as the school facilities. There are a number of shared open space areas there as well.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — You said ‘shared facilities’. Which ones are shared?

**Mr FROST** — I said there is the library and there is the community facility that will be constructed.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — To be constructed?

**Mr FROST** — Yes, it is a current project.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — Used as a community hall outside school hours and as school when it is in school hours?

**Mr FROST** — Used as a community centre.

**Mr KAVANAGH** — What is the name of the school? You said Vines Road.

**Mr FROST** — It is in Vines Road; that is what we would call it, I think.

**Mr GARRET** — Maybe we could supply you with some information.

**Mr FROST** — We could certainly provide you with that.

**Mr HALL** — Thank you, gentlemen, for coming in and talking to us today. I just want to know whether council gets notified as a matter of routine if other levels of government or government departments are intending to dispose of publicly owned land — that is, whether the federal government, if they have got land to dispose of, or the state government or authorities like VicTrack or Barwon Water, if they are disposing of land — do they routinely tell council about that or do you read the real estate pages of the Addie to find out?

**Mr FROST** — I do not know whether it is routine, but I have been involved in a number of discussions with state government departments that have talked to us about whether or not we would have a use for a particular parcel of land that they no longer require. I do not know whether that is part of their routine procedures or whether that is just something that a particular person or a particular department has done.

**Mr HALL** — Given that council is probably better attuned to local needs than any other level of government, would you not think that it would be as a matter of course good politics to routinely notify council of any public land to be disposed of?

**Mr GARRETT** — It would be good practice, let alone good politics, I think.

**Mr HALL** — Do you get first option? Are there any instances where council has been given first option on public land that is being disposed of?

**Mr FROST** — I do not know of any details. I would not be able to tell you that.

**Mr GARRETT** — We would be able to speak to our property development department to confirm their usual practice, if you would like to have that information.

**Mr HALL** — Yes. I would not mind some information on that, because we are dealing with the transfer of public land between levels of government and government departments, so I would like to know whether you were routinely notified when things were becoming available.

**Mr GARRETT** — Yes.

**Mr HALL** — In relation to that, what about the Portarlington foreshore redevelopment that was mentioned by some people here today. They suggested that it seemed to be Parks Victoria that was driving that. What level of involvement has council got in that particular proposal?

**Mr GARRETT** — It is possible that Burke Renouf from our environment team might be able to assist in answering that question.

**Mr RENOUF** — I am Burke Renouf, sustainability officer. I work within the environment unit. I have had some dealings with this process. I am not fully au fait with everything that is going on with it, but I know that strategic planning are dealing with the overall planning of the harbour side of the development. Parks Victoria are the land managers of that area, so council is working closely with Parks Victoria and the consultants that are working on it.

**Mr HALL** — Did council actually initiate anything to do with the redevelopment or was it an initiative of Parks Victoria?

**Mr RENOUF** — I am unsure. I would guess that it was Parks Victoria and DSE. I am not totally sure.

**Mr HALL** — All right. Again, in our dealings in terms of public land use, it would be helpful for as a committee if we had some feedback from council as to who actually initiated that proposal.

**Mr GARRETT** — Yes.

**Mr HALL** — My last question is a question I gave you on the notice before, Aaron. That was in respect to the designation on the structure plan proposal for Barwon Heads where the designation on the Macafee land was 'protect for resource and scenic values'. Do you remember my asking that question? I said I would get back to you.

**Mr GARRETT** — Yes, I do remember that one. I would not interpret that 'resource' as a mineral resource. I would probably interpret it more that one of the zones in the planning scheme is a public conservation and resource zone. My understanding is that in that context where there is a natural habitat which provides a flora and fauna resource as well as a resource in terms of viewing to the community, that is what it means. You could replace it with 'asset' I suppose, as opposed to a mineral resource or any other sort of resource. I can understand the misinterpretation. It could be quite easily — —

**Mr HALL** — I just did not understand. You are describing it more as a habitat resource as opposed to an ecological and an environmental resource, which may not necessarily be habitat-related. That is fine, thank you.

**Ms PENNICUIK** — I was just going to ask about the Geelong Football Club. Is that on Crown land?

**Mr GARRETT** — Yes.

**Ms PENNICUIK** — It is interesting, because we have been looking at another parcel of land at Caulfield Racecourse which is also on Crown land. It is basically used as a racecourse, although it has other uses under its —

**The CHAIR** — Trust deed.

**Ms PENNICUIK** — Trust deed, thank you. Is there public access to the football ground?

**Mr GARRETT** — Yes, and not just every Saturday.

**Mr FROST** — It is a common misperception that Skilled Stadium has seven or eight football matches a year; it has in excess of 50 football matches. It is used by the local cricket club for training and by the local football umpires for training. We have had a number of school carnivals. We had a Walla rugby carnival there last week, so there are a number of activities on the ground.

**Ms PENNICUIK** — Can members of the public go and walk their dogs there?

**Mr GARRETT** — No. Within the context, though, Kardinia Park, or the oval itself, would take a minority of the public open space that it is on, so it is not as if you could say that the public is losing access to public open space and is disenfranchised just because we do happen to have a stadium within that context.

**Ms PENNICUIK** — Obviously you were not going to talk about Melbourne 2030, because you are not really Melbourne, but I just wondered what state strategic documents guide your strategic planning.

**Mr GARRETT** — There is obviously the state planning policy framework in every planning scheme. There are things such as coastal spaces and things like that. We still do have regard to Melbourne 2030. We have our increased housing diversity strategy, formerly known as our medium-density housing strategy, so it is not as if we are totally foreign to some of the strategies that are relevant to Melbourne.

**Ms PENNICUIK** — Like, for example, the Melbourne 2030 parklands code. Do you refer to that?

**Mr GARRETT** — I do not know, I am sorry. The ones that are specifically on Melbourne are I suppose more of a reference as opposed to something that we necessarily have to comply with.

**Ms PENNICUIK** — And what about the Victorian coastal strategy? Do you refer to that?

**Mr RENOUF** — Yes, regularly.

**The CHAIR** — Sorry?

**Mr RENOUF** — Regularly, yes.

**The CHAIR** — Can I thank the three of you for providing evidence today. There are issues to follow up, and we will certainly be in touch on those matters. Thank you.

**Committee adjourned.**