

QTON No. 110

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Fiona Carrick MLA

Addressed to: Andrew Barr MLA

Redirected to: Chris Steel MLA

In relation to: Public versus Private ownership of community facilities

Hearing: 28 July 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 97

Transcript provided: 30/07/2025

Answer Due: 06/08/2025

Andrew Barr MLA took on notice the following question(s):

**MS CARRICK:** Okay. Thank you. I was then going to ask about public versus private ownership of community facilities. So for example, the pool in Woden, the proposed 25-metre pool will be a commercial tenancy in a mixed-use precinct, so how will you ensure it stays open?

**Mr Barr:** Yes. I will take that on notice for the relevant minister.

**MS CARRICK:** Okay.

**Chris Steel MLA - The answer to the Member's question is as follows:**

The Crown lease and Territory Plan are the mechanisms to ensure the Phillip pool facility is made available to the public. The ACT Government is able to take action when a lessee is in breach of their Crown lease.

The existing Crown lease for the Phillip Pool requires the premises to be used for the purpose of a public heated swimming pool and ice-skating rink. There is currently an additional provision in the lease that requires the lessee to ensure the swimming pool is open to the public during the hours and days as agreed with the Territory.

For the redevelopment of the site, the Territory Plan requires a publicly accessible indoor facility that includes all of the following, at a minimum:

- a 25m x 20m 8-lane swimming pool with water depths of 1.35m to 2.0m;
- a warm water program pool with the minimum dimensions of 20m x 10m;

- a toddlers/leisure pool, learn to swim pool and/or water play splash pad that is a minimum of 500m<sup>2</sup> in area;
- a transition to the outdoors (including to external gardens, decks and outdoor eating areas to support indoor/outdoor activities; and
- associated amenities to support the operation of the pool facilities.

Any future lease variation will require a development application (DA) which will need to be consistent with the Territory Plan. The future DAs will be assessed independently by the Territory Planning Authority who will ensure future provisions are consistent with these requirements.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Planning and Development, Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 142

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Mr Thomas Emerson MLA

Addressed to: Minister for City and Government Services

In relation to: Access Canberra and Comparative Data on Liquor Licensing Costs

Hearing: 31 July 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pages 82-84

Transcript provided: 5 August 2025

Answer Due: 12 August 2025

**Ms TARA CHEYNE MLA** took on notice the following question(s):

UPT pages 82-84

**MR EMERSON:** Another one, you mentioned the reviews. I am wondering if there has been any work done on looking at say licensing definitions– like licensing specifically, and costs compared to other jurisdictions, the different categories? Is that a piece of work that has happened? It might be in the last five years. It might be needed to be taken on notice, I am not sure.

**Ms Cheyne:** We have looked broadly, particularly as part of this reform work. And I think that the discounts that we have been offering have gone beyond what they are in New South Wales. However, I do note that New South Wales is looking to do a– what I think is a third tranche of reforms. But Dr Vaile and Ms Chesworth– Ms Chesworth in particular has been leading the policy development around the reforms. So she can tell.

**Ms Chesworth:** Fiona Chesworth, Senior Director of Better Regulation Team in the Strategy Data and Governance Branch in Access Canberra. As part of the reform work to introduce the liquor licensing nighttime economy reforms since 2024, we undertook a Nighttime Economy Review that is publicly available, that document. In that document it has a jurisdictional scan across all jurisdictions regarding their different sort of fees and the way they structure their fees, and the way they describe their different license categories. I do need to caveat it, because it was performed in February 2024. Jurisdictions do change fees and the way they structure their licenses. So it was correct at that time, but it does give quite a good indication, particularly in relation to the sorts of reforms that we were looking at what the arrangements are in other states and territories.

**Ms Vaile:** And the team have maintained those contacts, and they continue to get updates from the other jurisdictions over time as well. But obviously, that reform was a specific point in time.

**MR EMERSON:** Do you happen to have any recent updates internally? Are you able to provide that on notice? Obviously, I will go back and look at the review. And if you do not, that is okay.

**Ms Chesworth:** I mean, would you be looking at all sort of license categories, or particularly focusing on bars, nightclubs?

**MR EMERSON:** Well liquor license specific.

**Ms Chesworth:** Okay. Yes.

**MR EMERSON:** And the jurisdictional comparison. And the minister mentioned New South Wales, obviously we always get that comparison.

**Ms Chesworth:** Yes.

**Ms Cheyne:** If we have got anything recent, but I do not think it would be appropriate for us to create something.

**MR EMERSON:** Yes, that is fair enough.

**Ms Chesworth:** I mean, it is difficult sometimes to compare across because as Desire mentioned, the general license category, that is— based on my latest understanding, something like that is not available in New South Wales. So, it is actually quite difficult for businesses to set themselves up under that business model. Whereas the general license category allows them to both have onsite consumption, but also sell liquor for takeaway, and that is proved popular with a number of businesses that have popped up recently in Canberra in different areas. So, there is not always a clear parallel—

**MR EMERSON:** Okay. Thank you, Chair.

**Mr CHRIS STEEL MLA** on behalf of **Ms TARA CHEYNE MLA:** The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

An exploration of liquor licence types and fees is undertaken to support and inform policy development. The most recent publicly available comparison of liquor licence fees across jurisdictions prepared by the ACT public service is available in the [Night-time Economy Review](#) undertaken in February 2024 to support the NTE reforms introduced that year. This paper focused primarily on annual liquor fees, not application fees.

The most update to date information about liquor licence types and associated application fees and annual fees can be found by accessing each jurisdiction's web pages here:

- [New South Wales](#)
- [Victoria](#)
- [Queensland](#)
- [South Australia](#)
- [Western Australia](#)
- [Northern Territory](#)
- [Tasmania](#)

QTON No. 142



**Legislative Assembly** for the  
**Australian Capital Territory**

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for City and Government Services, Mr Chris Steel on behalf of Ms Tara Cheyne

QTON No. 143

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Ms Fiona Carrick MLA

Addressed to: Minister for City and Government Services

In relation to: Access Canberra and List of Access Canberra fees and charges and the impact on the 2025-2026 Budget

Hearing: 31 July 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 89-91

Transcript provided: 5 August 2025

Answer Due: 12 August 2025

**Ms TARA CHEYNE MLA** took on notice the following question(s):

UPT pp 89-91

**MS CARRICK:** Yes. I was just wondering if you could provide a list of all the fees, Access Canberra fees and charges and what they were? And then what their impact on the 25-26 budget was? What the increase or decrease in the budget was?

**Mr Rynehart:** Ms Carrick, you mean the difference in the fee from last year to this year?

**MS CARRICK:** Pretty much.

**Mr Rynehart:** The fee determinations largely indicate last year's fee and this year on the legislation register. That may be sufficient. Or are you talking about like the sort of the overall revenue impact as ...(indistinct)... [2.31.23]

**MS CARRICK:** Yes, well I mean— what I am interested in is all the different fees and charges and what their increase and the impact on the budget was? So you can see line by line.

**Mr Rynehart:** I think the fee determinations are set on the legislation register probably give that indication between last year and this year for each table.

**MS CARRICK:** Okay. So is that one document or is that a load of different documents?

**Ms Cheyne:** What I can tell you, Ms Carrick, and perhaps Mr Rynehart can read it with me at the same time, just in case I misinterpret, like I did yesterday. So there is income from taxes, license fees and fines.

**MS CARRICK:** Yes.

**Ms Cheyne:** And that is within the Access Canberra in the controlled budget statements in budget statement E. It is \$409,000 for this year.

**MS CARRICK:** Yes.

**Ms Cheyne:** So this year from last year. So it is an increase of \$409,000.

**MS CARRICK:** Yes. And so you do not have a break down of the fees and charges– the Access Canberra fees and charges and their movements?

**Ms Cheyne:** The Access Canberra fees and charges sit– they are all publicly available, but they sit against different acts. So I do think there is somewhere that consolidates them all. But they are disallowable instruments that are provided for under the primary legislation. So working with vulnerable people, for example, does not sit under an Access Canberra act. It sits under the working with vulnerable people act, or background checking act. And then there is the fee instrument there.

**MS CARRICK:** But Access Canberra would have collected the fee. Should it have gone forward, would they not?

**Mr Rynehart:** So fees are set by each piece of legislation. So the working with vulnerable people act sets its fee, the road transport legislation sets those fees, et cetera. And those– the setting of fees themselves are the responsibility of the policy area and the policy minister. So we collect, and we administer, and our website would indicate the fee per transaction– of each transaction. I do not know if there is a consolidated list of all fees that we collect, because we effectively collect across the entire ACT public service through our customer channels. But definitely the fees are determined according to each piece of legislation and then there is a disallowable instrument that is attached to each of those, which sets out the fee as– the legislative fee for the year.

**MS CARRICK:** Okay.

**THE CHAIR:** Mr Emerson.

**Ms Cheyne:** We do have it. Look at that. It does exist. I will send you the link.

**MS CARRICK:** Okay. Thank you.

**Mr CHRIS STEEL MLA on behalf of Ms TARA CHEYNE MLA:** The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

As the front door to Government, Access Canberra collects revenue for services it delivers and on behalf of other directorates for services it does not directly deliver. The controlled revenue in 2025-26 of \$409,000 listed against taxes, license fees and infringements for Access Canberra, on Table 83 of Budget Statement E, reflects the total revenue which is retained by Access Canberra for its services that was transferred from the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate to the City and Environment Directorate. This revenue is consistent with 2025-26 estimations in the 2024-25 Budget. However, most taxes, fees, and infringement revenue collected by Access Canberra is passed through to Territorial accounts (Table 89).

Access Canberra delivers services for a fee via approximately 50 fee instruments. The fee settings for services delivered by Access Canberra are made by the responsible policy Minister via a fee determination in accordance with the relevant Act. Fees are annually indexed in accordance with the *Fees and Charges Policy and Guidelines 2025-26*.

Overall, there are more than one thousand individual fee items. There is no consolidated source of information presenting all items with past and current financial year fees and would constitute an unreasonable diversion of resources to prepare.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for City and Government Services, Mr Chris Steel on behalf of Ms Tara Cheyne

QTON No. 144

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**

Select Committee on Estimates 2025–2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Mr Ed Cocks MLA

Addressed to: Minister for City and Government Services

In relation to: Yarralumla Nursery improvements delays

Hearing: 31 July 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: pp 109-110 & p 35 pp 109-110 + UPT 31 July 2025, p 135.

Transcript provided: 05 August 2025

Answer Due: 12 August 2025

**Tara Cheyne MLA took on notice the following question(s):**

**MR MILLIGAN:** Yes. Thank you, Chair. Yarralumla Nursery improvements, I think in the 2024-25 budget you had 208,000 for that, and then the budget for this financial year is 116,000. I just wanted to know what money is that going towards, and has any of these improvements been delayed?

**Ms Cheyne:** So what you are talking about is again the same project. So some of that money that was provisioned for 24-25 has been spent, but 116,000 has not been spent, so it has been re-profiled to this year. It is not additional funding. It is part of the same bucket, the one project. If I recall correctly, it is related to—

**Mr Childs:** Minister, I can probably answer that one for you.

**Ms Cheyne:** Thank you.

**Mr Childs:** That is the remaining re-profiled amount for the stormwater upgrades. Daniel Childs, Territory Business Services Executive Group Manager, and I have read and acknowledged the privileges statement.

**MR MILLIGAN:** Those stormwater improvements go everywhere, don't they?

**Ms Cheyne:** So Yarralumla Nursery has its own flooding problem, and so we committed a reasonably good bucket of money from the asset renewal program to support that.

**THE CHAIR:** Can I just clarify, what was the reason for the re-profile?

**Mr Childs:** I think it has just taken some time to work through the network issues there and have that managed. It is quite extensive, the area in there. There are a lot of trees and other bits and pieces, and I think looking at how that stormwater operates, and the proximity of the lake and other bits and pieces. I think it is just taking some time to work.

**THE CHAIR:** So there has been a bit of a delay in—

**Mr Childs:** Yes. I do not have the specific details, exactly why it is delayed, but I know that there was some complications in that space.

**THE CHAIR:** You can notice why it has been delayed and by how long?

**Mr Childs:** Sure. No problems.

---

**THE CHAIR:** So you have a few things you wanted to come back to the committee?

**Ms Cheyne:** Yes, if that is alright. I have been provided with an updated figure on Yarralumla Nursery. The actual figure of the recurrent funding is 1.491 million, including a CSO of \$321,000. So, not wildly off, but I just want to get that right. There is a total of 6,592 households, 4,162—I do not know what that acronym is. Standalone, single use. Thank you. And 2,430 multi-use dwellings, households, that are now part of the Fogo pilot. So, I will come back—I will take it on notice—or confirm, again, I will take it on notice the Yarralumla Nursery improvements, and I think I need to do some looking at the election commitments vis-à-vis active travel paths and funding. Finally, having now understood what Mr Milligan was asking with Florey, the question he asked about the toilet, that was simply a comment from treasury about a toilet may be necessary, and the funding does not reflect the cost of a toilet. So, I will take that as noted.

**Mr Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:**

In the 2024-25 Budget \$0.208m was allocated in the ARP to deliver feasibility and design of stormwater and town water supply improvements at Yarralumla Nursery.

The feasibility and design work has been delayed by two months.

The delay is due to the extensive and complex nature of the feasibility and design work required to determine the most appropriate stormwater management solution and improve town water supply. Key contributing factors include:

- Site complexities such as heritage considerations and established trees;
- Review of the ageing stormwater network;
- Integration of new designs with existing infrastructure to address flooding issues; and
- Stakeholder engagement, including asset owners, utility providers, heritage bodies, and urban tree management.

As a result, funds have been reprofiled to the 2025–26 financial year to support finalisation of the project.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the A/g Minister for City and Government Services, Mr Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 145

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Mr Andrew Braddock MLA

Addressed to: Minister for City and Government Services

In relation to: Active travel and Funding for Garden City Cycle Loop

Hearing: 31 July 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: 31 July 2025, p 113.

Transcript provided: 05 August 2025

Answer Due: 12 August 2025

**Tara Cheyne MLA:** took on notice the following question(s):

**MR BRADDOCK:** Next question is about the Garden City Cycleway Stage 2, where I can see the funding for each year. It is zero in '27-28 and I wanted to check why is that the case?

**Mr Fitzgerald:** I might have to take that on notice.

**Mr Chris Steel MLA:** The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

The funding profile is aligned to the project milestones as per the funding agreement with the Commonwealth Government. There are no milestones at this stage due for payment to the ACT Government in 2027-28. The timeframe from construction commencement to completion is anticipated to take more than one year at this stage (i.e. construction commencing in 2026-27 for milestone 2 and construction completion in 2028-29 for milestone 3).

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the A/g Minister for City and Government Services, Mr Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 147

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Mr Andrew Braddock MLA

Addressed to: Ms Tara Cheyne MLA, Minister for City and Government Services

In relation to: Active travel and Audit of cycle paths - what is funded in the 2025-2026 Budget?

Hearing: 31 July 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: p 114-115.

Transcript provided: 05 August 2025

Answer Due: 12 August 2025

**Ms Tara Cheyne, Minister for City and Government Services took on notice the following question(s):**

**MR BRADDOCK:** My next question is following the most recent audit of the cycle pathways what does this budget fund as a result of that audit?

**Mr Rampton:** So in the in the budget papers and particularly in the asset renewal program there is a number of regional sort of path funds in there for Belconnen, Woden Weston, Tuggeranong, the inner north, inner south et cetera. We are currently working up our program for what projects we will deliver through that, so it will be a combination of renewals, so sort of replacement of panels, repair of defects, construction of new infill or missing links, all as part of that program.

**MR BRADDOCK:** What has not been achieved through the budget that we ought to identify as an issue?

**Mr Rampton:** What has not been funded?

**MR BRADDOCK:** Yes.

**Ms Cheyne:** We will have to take on that on notice, Mr Braddock. Let us just double-check.

**Mr Chris Steel MLA:** The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

Roads ACT continually undertake path inspections (both planned and reactive), with a focus on community requests and high pedestrian activity areas. The last audit of the Territory's entire path network occurred in 2020-21.

From that audit a list of defects was identified, ranging from high risk through to very low risk items. Defects included horizontal displacements (such as cracked panels), vertical displacements (including

hazards between panels) and minor cracking (with no displacement and cosmetic damage only). Defects identified through the audit in combination with Fix My Street enquiries also included non-damage defects, such as debris on paths or encroachment from shrubs and vegetation.

Since the audit, the City and Environment Directorate (CED) has prioritised addressing the highest risk defects over defects that present little to no risk that were identified. This includes new high-risk defects that have emerged since 2021 and were not present during the audit (identified via regular inspections), particularly resulting from very high levels of rainfall from the La Nina weather pattern in 2022. Over recent years, CED resources and funding were directed to those new defects that were deemed a high or medium risk to the community, over the remaining low risk items previously identified in the audit.

The remaining low to very low risk defects from the 2021 audit, such as minor cracked panels, are mostly cosmetic in nature and present little to no safety risk to path users. These mostly require panel replacement works which are completed as packages methodically through the maintenance program.

The additional funding in the budget over the next four years will allow for additional maintenance activities to be undertaken by CED. This work will continue to be prioritised based on risks to the community, with high and medium risk defects being completed first. However, it is envisaged that the additional funding will allow for a number of the lower priority defects (e.g. minor panel cracking) to be addressed through the program of works.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the A/g Minister for City and Government Services, Mr Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 150

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Mr Thomas Emerson MLA

Addressed to: Ms Tara Cheyne MLA, Minister for City and Government Services

In relation to: FMS complaints about footpath closures

Hearing: 31 July 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: p 126.

Transcript provided: 05 August 2025

Answer Due: 12 August 2025

**Ms Tara Cheyne MLA, Minister for City and Government Services took on notice the following question(s):**

**MR EMERSON:** Okay. Might you be able to provide, perhaps on notice, for 2024–25 how many Fix My Street requests were related to path closures.

**Mr Fitzgerald:** Yes.

**Ms Cheyne:** Or it will be in the annual report.

**MR EMERSON:** Isn't that level of detail—I am happy to have a look.

**Mr Fitzgerald:** We, in our annual report, have the numbers of temporary traffic management plans, but that would include both roads and paths within it.

**MR EMERSON:** I am thinking about complaints more so than ...(indistinct)...[16.30.20]

**Mr Fitzgerald:** Yes, sure.

**MR EMERSON:** Because you might get some, then the detour works fine, and there is no complaint; right?

**Mr Fitzgerald:** Yes, that is right.

**Ms Cheyne:** We will try and get the breakdown as much as we can. Sorry, I was talking about the next year's annual report, 24-25, it is not out yet. But we will see what we have in terms of the

breakdown and the workflows in Fix My Street, and if it is not possible, it is just the system limitations. I have some other answers that I said I would try to do before 5.

**Mr Christ Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:**

Whilst there is not a subcategory for path closure complaints, data was obtained from Fix My Street with keywords (path, closure, closed). This data was manually filtered to show 21 requests were lodged through Fix My Street in relation to path closures during the 2024-2025 financial year.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the A/g Minister for City and Government Services, Mr Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 151

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Mr James Milligan MLA

Addressed to: Minister for City and Government Services

In relation to: Public space amenity and why was Florey chosen for a public playground upgrade?

Hearing: 31 July 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: UPT, 31 July 2025, p 127.

Transcript provided: 05 August 2025

Answer Due: 12 August 2025

**Tara Cheyne MLA took on notice the following question(s):**

**MR MILLIGAN:** Thank you, Chair. Another Labor election commitment, because I guess it is a bit of a theme.

**Ms Cheyne:** I am delighted to spend so much time doing it.

**MR MILLIGAN:** I would like to ensure that they are being delivered. One of them particularly is an all-purpose public ability public playground in Florey, for people with disability. I think the costings are at 924,000 over two financial years to build this facility, and it was noted by Treasury that there is no provisions to build toilets at this facility that is to be built in Florey. So pretty much, I would suspect that the community would also be calling for toilets to be built there. Will there be provisions to look at building toilets at this facility, and why did we pick Florey?

**Ms Cheyne:** I will take on notice why Florey, because I know Minister Berry was heavily involved in this election commitment. In terms of toilet funding or not, it could be one of two reasons. One, we do not have the location determined in Florey yet, and of course, from the election commitments in 2020 we have delivered a public toilet there recently. I am not saying that is definitely where the location will be, but we just need to scope the location, which I do not believe has occurred yet. In terms of overall funding and election commitments, and I guess this probably applies to any other questions you might have, Mr Milligan, a good portion of our election commitments on our regional plans are funded or appropriate through this budget, but election commitments are delivered over the course of a term.

**Mr Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:**

The play space at Florey was identified as an ACT Labor election commitment and also aligns with the policy direction identified through the ACT's Play Space Strategy. This includes a focus on

increasing the diversity of play experiences at district and central play spaces, in line with Action 1 within the strategy.

Investigations are currently underway to identify the location for the Florey playground upgrade. The consideration for toilet facilities will form part of the site identification process.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the A/g Minister for City and Government Services, Mr Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 165

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Leanne Castley MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water

In relation to: Water policy and Water abstraction charge

Hearing: 1 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 7

Transcript provided: 06 August 2025

Answer Due: 13/08/2025

Suzanne Orr MLA took on notice the following question(s):

**MS CASTLEY:** Minister, did you take advice from anyone other than Treasury before signing off on this year's charge?

**Ms Orr:** Ms Castley, I would need to, out of an abundance of caution, take that on notice to go back and check exactly what input was provided to any advice, given that advice, while it may come from one particular area, usually is consulted across government informing that advice.

**MS CASTLEY:** Great, so take it on notice.

**THE CHAIR:** Yes, just noting that was taken on notice. Mr Rattenbury

Suzanne Orr MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

The Water Abstraction Charge is made by the ACT Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water through a determination under Section 107 of the *Water Resources Act 2007*. The current Water Abstraction Charge is made in the *Water Resource (Fees) Determination 2025*.

The City and Environment Directorate (CED) prepares the proposed fee determination, in consultation with Treasury, for the Minister's consideration. CED areas that reviewed the proposed 2025 determination include the Finance and Legal teams; the Environment, Land and Technical Regulation Branch of Access Canberra; and policy areas with responsibility for environment and water.

In general, fee increases are made in line with the ACT Government's 'Fees and Charges Policy and Guidelines'.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Climate Change, Environment Energy and Water, Suzanne Orr MLA

QTON No. 166

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Fiona Carrick MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Climate Change, Environment Energy and Water In relation to: Climate change policy and List of programs and budget against them for this portfolio

Hearing: 1 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 14-15

Transcript provided: 06 August 2025

Answer Due: 13 August 202

Fiona Wright took on notice the following question(s):

**MS CARRICK:** You mentioned a list of programs that you had. Would you be able to provide us, for the portfolio, the list of programs and budget against them?

**Ms Cheyne:** Is the 83 actions that were referring to?

**Ms Wright:** Ms Carrick, are you talking about the 83 actions, or are you talking about

**MS CARRICK:** Not actions, just the programs that you manage. So you can assess the program and how it is working. I mean, there is a lot of initiatives in there, but how do they roll into programs? What are the programs that you manage?

**Ms Wright:** Minister, would you like us to talk some through programs?

**Ms Cheyne:** Yes, we could talk through some. As Ms Sendaba said, the actions and the programs that the actions would come under happen across all of government, so in the interests of time we might–

**MS CARRICK:** That is okay. For the sake of time I do not need you talk through them, but if you could just provide a list of the programs, even if they are cross-portfolio ones.

**Ms Cheyne:** So I am also going to refer you to the annual report that we publish on minister–

**MS CARRICK:** Does have a budget against each of the programs?

**Ms Cheyne:** Again, the budget provides the budget information.

**Ms Wright:** We can talk some large programs that are key budget line items.

**THE CHAIR:** I think that is not quite the question. I think Ms Carrick is looking for a straightforward list of programs that you are involved with, including whole of government, and cross-portfolio programs. Are you able to provide that on notice?

**Ms Wright:** We can provide that on notice, and I would also that we publish on our Everyday Climate Choices website, because programs are there for the community to utilise, they are publicly available on the websites. But we can provide that on notice.

Suzanne Orr MLA: The answer to the Member’s question is as follows:

Program	Budget 2025-26 (excl GST)
Sustainable Home Advice Program	\$400,000
Wood Heater Removal Program	\$40,000
Home Energy Efficiency Program	\$996,000
Access to Electric Program	\$2,350,000
Community Outreach for Household Energy Support	\$479,000
First Nations Home Energy Support Program	\$180,000
Commercial Landlord Electrification Pilot	\$200,000
Solar for Apartments Program*	\$1,800,000 (ACT Government contribution over 2023 – 2026)  *delivered by CED on behalf of Treasury who hold the budget
Sustainable Apartments Pilot	\$120,000 (ACT Government contribution 2024 – 2027)

Sustainable Household Scheme*	*delivered by CED on behalf of Treasury who hold the budget
Vulnerable Household Energy Support Scheme (publicly known as the Home Energy Support Scheme, HESP), comprising:  HESP: Public Housing upgrades - <i>delivered by CED in partnership with HCSD ~\$13.423m in 25-26.</i>  HESP: Community Housing upgrades  HESP: Rebates for homeowners  HESP: Rebates for rental providers (ACLTES)  HESP: Rebates for low income solar  Renter's Program	~\$2,533,000
Water Efficiency Program	\$1,979,000
EV charging for ACT Government fleet	\$1,650,000
DC charging hubs	\$100,000
Commercial vehicle demonstration	\$37,000
Sustainable Schools Program	\$175,000
Community Zero Emissions Grants	\$150,000
Community Garden Grants	\$40,000
Ebike Library Program	\$199,276 for two years. 2025-26 is year 2.
Sustainable Events Program	\$50,000
Sustainable Business Program	\$145,000
Business Rebates	\$400,000
Energy Innovation Fund Grants	\$17 million for 5-year grant program: 2024 – 2028

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Climate Change, Environment Energy and Water, Suzanne Orr MLA

QTON No. 167

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Jo Clay MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water

In relation to: Environment protection policy and Review of community environmental organisations

Hearing: 1 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 25-26

Transcript provided: 6 August 2025

Answer Due: 13 August 2025

Ros Malouf took on notice the following question(s):

**MS CLAY:** Thank you, Chair. Minister, on Community Day we heard from the environmental orgs and they told us that they have been given a one-year extension to their service funding agreements and they have been told that the next funding will be run under open tender and there is a review going on. They also said they had not been consulted on that review and this is causing some distress. Can you tell us where that review process is up to?

**Ms Orr:** Thank you, Ms Clay. I can hand to the directorate for more information. I have met with various groups. Not all of them, but specifically the catchment groups who were the ones in on Community Day and heard from them some of their concerns that they have raised. I think it is fair to say there is some miscommunication that has led to a number of these concerns. I do not know if they are necessarily all warranted.

The undertaking that I have made is to work through that and to get the directorate to work through that because I do not think we necessarily need to have misunderstandings where there is not need for them. That is probably looking a little bit more as to where we are up to and where we are going, but Ms Malouf can probably provide you more information on what has happened to date as that has mostly been with the directorate.

**Ms Malouf:** So the community orgs, we did a review, as we do with all programs to make sure it is fit for purpose and aligns with government priorities. That review has informed what a procurement process or a tender process would look like to go out to market to make sure that we capture any other—provide the opportunity for other community organisations to potentially tender for that process. We have had several conversations because those three organisations have regular meetings with our team. We have discussed this procurement for what this was going to look like and this review for approximately 12 months now.

There has been some change in staff in some of those community organisations, and referring to the minister's comment about some miscommunication, I am not sure the information was passed on. I was certainly clearly enough to meet the needs of the current understanding of those organisations. So we are having a look at that review and discussing it with the minister so that she can give us some direction on what that next step would look like to make sure that we are getting the great outcomes that community organisations provide us.

**MS CLAY:** So you speak about 'the review has been conducted'; that review is finished?

**Ms Malouf:** That review is finished.

**MS CLAY:** Can you table that review?

**Ms Malouf:** The review is actually—

**Ms Orr:** I think components of the review. The process is not finished. I think components that would count as a review have potentially finished. I think that is a better way to look at it.

**MS CLAY:** Can you table the components of the review that have been completed?

**Ms Malouf:** There are some probity challenges with going out to market to pre-empt what those would look like, so we will have a look at the procurement rules and make sure and table what we can table.

**MS CLAY:** Excellent, thank you.

Suzanne Orr MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

An internal desktop review was conducted in relation to Conservation Council, SEE Change and Canberra Environment Centre to:

- assess the value delivered through existing agreements;
- determine future government requirements for community-led environmental programs;
- redesign programs and agreements to align with current priorities; and
- inform evaluation criteria for any future procurement process.

The review findings cannot be shared due to probity concerns as it would unfairly advantage potential suppliers by revealing service specifications prematurely.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water, Suzanne Orr MLA

QTON No. 168

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Jo Clay MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water

In relation to: Service level agreements with environmental groups

Hearing: 1 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 26-29

Transcript provided: 06 August 2025

Answer Due: 13 August 2025

Ros Malouf took on notice the following question(s):

**MS CLAY:** Excellent and let us make sure we—I am interested in all of the public tender and review processes going on for all of our environment groups. The ones that have come, that have been raised with me are Conservation Council, SEE Change(?), Canberra Environment Centre, FrogWatch, Waterwatch and the catchment groups. So any reviews and any procurement changes that are going on with those groups is what my questioning is about.

**Mr Burkevics:** So the first three you referred to—and thank you, Ms Clay—Ms Malouf, was speaking to about the process and that is a matter that Climate Change and Energy colleagues have managed for some time, those groups. The latter three, the catchment groups, the review of the processes there and the grant arrangements, that is a matter that is being managed by Environment, Heritage and Parks, the group that I am with. So maybe if any questions on the first three, Ms Malouf can finish and I can certainly address catchment group matters.

**MS CLAY:** Excellent, so we were talking about the review in relation to Conservation Council, SEE Change and Canberra Environment Centre. That review is complete and if you have agreed to take on notice subject to probity requirements what elements of that review you can table? Is that what we are up to?

**Ms Malouf:** That is the three, yes.

**MS CLAY:** That is this point. Yes, okay and we will come back to this one. That is fine. So you talked about we were talking about open tender, but then you said the tender would be community groups only?

**Ms Malouf:** So we have not committed to any procurement pathway as yet. The review is for discussion. What we would do is make sure that we run an open process that is open to anyone who could deliver the services we are looking for.

**MS CLAY:** Sure, and I am assuming this process that you are going through—I will not call it 'the review' because the review is finished, but this process you are on at the moment, have you looked at the exemptions that were usually applied to government procurements? There are often exemptions where there is a supplier with specialist knowledge or where a new supplier would not be feasible because they would not be compatible with the existing services. We are talking about groups with lots of expert knowledge and lots of volunteers. Would those be reasonable exemptions to not go through an ordinary public tender?

**Ms Orr:** Ms Clay, from the three organisations Ms Malouf is overseeing this process for that reports to me, I think it is fair to say where we are up to is the groups have come in, they have raised concerns, we are having the discussions as to where the next steps go. The questions you are asking I think go to those next steps.

**MS CLAY:** The next step, sure.

**Ms Orr:** There is nothing that has been formally decided and considering that we have provided to better understand the concerns of the groups that have raised them, I think it would be a little bit premature to jump to the next steps without having that conversation.

**MS CLAY:** Yes, sure, and are the current service agreements public at the moment?

**Ms Malouf:** The service agreements would be on the register, the contracts register, correct.

**MS CLAY:** Okay, we could not find on the contracts register so we might circle back by email to get the links and make sure. That could be on us. In relation to the other groups which is FrogWatch, Waterwatch and the catchment groups, has there been a review into the way the funding is done?

**Mr Burkevics:** Correct. Ms Clay, there is a review that is underway and that has involved a survey of the three catchment groups and that is informing advice that the City Environment Directorate has provided to the minister, that is under deliberation, as the minister has said. I think what I certainly would like to acknowledge is the catchment groups have expressed that uncertainty is a worry to them and I acknowledge that. It is important recognising that the government invests around a million dollars a year in the three catchment groups and of course, whilst that is done under a grant type arrangement, the government procurement arrangements require anything over the \$25,000 to get quotes.

So I think that is factoring into some decision-making and advice to the minister. I think we are also aware that undertaking reviews is a very healthy thing. It encourages innovation and ensures that complacency does not set in. So I think the review is a very healthy process. I certainly acknowledge the catchment groups for their willingness and their engagement. Myself and colleagues met with the three catchment groups very, very early to explain the process. We have exchanged correspondence. I think there will be a benefit in talking further with them about the outcomes of the listening exercise that we have undertaken, what we have heard, and that will help then inform the final decision by the minister.

**MS CLAY:** Thank you. And can you table that review?

**Mr Burkevics:** Well, the review is an internal review. It is advice for the minister at this time and so it will be a minister's decision on what is tabled in due course, should that be the case.

**MS CLAY:** Okay, and you have talked about the procurement thresholds and the procurement and probity process. Has your review considered standard exemptions built into that procurement guideline where there is a supplier with specialist knowledge where a different supplier would not be feasible because they would not be compatible with the existing services such as the volunteer labour? Is that part of that?

**Mr Burkevics:** They are all provisions that a delegate may wish to consider in making a decision on a procurement approach. I think at the moment what we have done is have a look at a long-standing arrangement with three groups and considered what is the best course of action and provided that advice to the minister, noting that there may be others that may be interested in providing important environmental services.

**MS CLAY:** Sure, absolutely, and given that this review was an internal review, how were the existing organisations able to input into that?

**Mr Burkevics:** So the catchment groups in particular were invited to provide feedback for a survey mechanism and that has been considered and provided to the minister. I think, as Ms Malouf indicated, we are conscious that should future decisions mean we take a different procurement path, we need to be very, very careful that that is not jeopardised or giving anybody an unfair advantage. But of course, that is decisions for the future. At the moment, we have assembled some—we have done an internal review, we have got some advice for the minister and the minister will consider that in due course.

**MS CLAY:** Thank you. We have done a double-check on the contracts register and I would love this taken on notice. We cannot find the service agreements. Can someone take that on notice for us?

**Ms Malouf:** I can correct it now. I made a mistake there. Apologies, Ms Clay.

**MS CLAY:** No, that is fine.

**Ms Malouf:** That was done through not a full procurement process; that was done as a single select relating to the comments you made about expertise, so that they are not required under our procurement rules to go on the contracts register.

**MS CLAY:** Are they able to be provided on notice? Can you take on notice of whether they can be provided on notice for all of these service agreements?

**Ms Malouf:** Yes, I will take that one on notice. Yes, yes.

Suzanne Orr MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

These documents are now available on the notifiable contract register.

<https://www.tenders.act.gov.au/contract/view?id=225533>

<https://www.tenders.act.gov.au/contract/view?id=225536>

<https://www.tenders.act.gov.au/contract/view?id=225537>

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water, Suzanne Orr MLA

QTON No. 169

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Ed Cocks MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water

In relation to: Environment protection policy and List of grant programs for environmental purposes and funding arrangements

Hearing: 1 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 31-32

Transcript provided: 06 August 2025

Answer Due: 13 August 2025

Ros Malouf took on notice the following question(s):

**THE CHAIR:** Thank you. Going back to the other organisations that we have been discussing, it sounds like we still might have some that are on service contracts and some that are grant arrangements. Is that correct?

**Mr Burkevics:** Thanks, Mr Cocks. And just to further expand on Ms Malouf's answer, so the three catchment groups that are funded at the moment, that is from base funding. So you are correct in your remarks that, yes, decisions can be made; that is ongoing funding and it has been there for a long while. At the moment, the three catchment groups are funded through a deed of grant and an extension or a new deed of grant was given for a further year whilst this review process is being undertaken.

**THE CHAIR:** Okay, so there is no specific grants program; it is grants funded from base funding?

**Mr Burkevics:** Funded from base, although the catchment groups, of course, are not excluded and are actually encouraged to apply for the other grant programs that the government offers, the environmental grants and so on, and some of them have been successful for specific program funding through those mechanisms, as well as funding that is achieved under some Commonwealth programs, too.

**THE CHAIR:** Okay, so those dedicated grant programs, is that a single program or multiple programs? Are there many? Can you give us a list?

**Mr Burkevics:** There are multiple programs for grants each year. There is the Environmental Grant Program. Information is available online. That has just closed. It is always popular and successful. I know colleagues in climate, and Ms Malouf, feel

free to jump in with regard to many programs that you manage. **THE CHAIR:** And to be clear, I am talking about the funding that seems to be for community organisations rather than generic.

**Ms Malouf:** I think there are two different things. There is funding for the community organisations' operations to do a set level of activities the government wants. And then there is additional grants programs, which very often community organisations are well placed to deliver. Some of those examples are community gardens, community zero emission grants, and also a bike library that we run as well, that SEE Change happens to run as well because they are best placed to do that.

**THE CHAIR:** Just so that I do not waste everyone's time with a whole lot of questions, maybe could someone give me on notice a list of grant programs for environmental purposes and whether they are ongoing funding or terminating funding and if they are lapsing or terminating funding, on what date they cease?

**Ms Malouf:** Yes, we can do that.

**THE CHAIR:** Thank you very much.

Suzanne Orr MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

Name of Grant	Purpose	Funding amount in 25/26 (GST ex)	Program future
Community Garden Grants	This grant supports the establishment and maintenance of community gardens that empower Canberrans through greater social inclusion and access to food production that is resilient, sustainable and equitable.	\$40,000	Ongoing
Community Zero Emissions Grants redesign	Continuation of the CZEG program through a redesigned program to leverage the influence of social groups by funding projects that support the ACT community's transition to net zero emissions and increase community resilience to climate change impacts.	\$150,000	Funding to start in 2025-26 for two years
Nature in the City: Cooling your Suburb	This grant supported community groups and businesses to provide cooling, access to shade and reduce heat through nature-based means and improve rainwater run retention and penetration in the landscape to reduce storm water runoff and sustain vegetation. Projects funded under 2024-25 round will receive administrative support until completion in 2025-26.	Nil	Funding ceased.
ACT Environmental Grants Program	This grants program supports community groups address local environmental issues, Caring for Country initiatives and projects to connect more of the community to nature. It also supports building the capability and capacity of local environmental volunteer groups undertaking environmental stewardship activities on public land.	\$360,000	Ongoing base funding
Adopt a Park	The Adopt-a-Park grants program promotes long term landscape resilience that provides benefits for the Canberra community through successfully controlling or removing weeds and pest animals, strengthening volunteer group capacity and stewardship in urban open spaces, and building landscape resilience.	\$215,000	Initiative until 2027-2028 then ongoing base funding
Community Stewardship and Environmental Education Program	This grant provides funding for a community led program that supports local environmental groups and landholders involved in land stewardship across the ACT and community engagement and education activities to improve environmental literacy and enhance the adoption of environmentally responsible behaviours. The current recipients are the Ginninderra Catchment Group, the Molonglo Conservation	\$465,000 (\$155,000 per catchment group)	Ongoing base funding

Frogwatch Program	<p>Group and the Southern ACT Catchment Group.</p> <p>The grant provides funding for a community led program to support the implementation of a citizen science frog monitoring program in the ACT. It engages the community to monitor local frog population and to educate and raise awareness in schools and the community about frogs in our local waterways.</p> <p>The current grant recipient is the Ginninderra Catchment Group.</p>	\$96,820	Ongoing base funding
Support for ACT Wildlife Program	<p>The aim of this program is to support in providing care and rehabilitation for injured, sick and orphaned wildlife in ACT. This includes the funding for volunteer coordination; the resourcing a 24-hour public hotline for wildlife rescue and a drop-in wildlife centre; and for the purchase of equipment and materials to care for wildlife.</p> <p>The current grant recipient is ACT Wildlife.</p>	\$113,300	Ongoing base funding
Upper Murrumbidgee Waterwatch Program	<p>This grant provides funding for a community led program to supports the implementation of the Upper Murrumbidgee Waterwatch Program. It is a citizen science program that engages the community to monitor and care for the ACT waterways and to educate and raise awareness on issues of waterway health in schools and the community.</p> <p>The current grant recipients are the Ginninderra Catchment Group, the Molonglo Conservation Group and the Southern ACT Catchment Group.</p>	<p>\$332,598</p> <p>(\$110,866 per catchment group)</p>	Ongoing base funding

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water, Suzanne Orr MLA

QTON No. 170

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Leanne Castley MLA

Addressed to: Minister for City and Government Services

In relation to: Pest, weed and feral animal management policy and Tracking of livestock attacks by wild dogs

Hearing: 1 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 41

Transcript provided: 6 August 2025

Answer Due: 13 August 2025

Bren Burkevics took on notice the following question(s):

**MS CASTLEY:** Do we have any idea, do we track how many attacks on livestock by wild dogs were recorded?

**Mr Burkevics:** Ms Watts?

**MS CASTLEY:** So over the last three years, say?

**Ms Watts:** Yes so those attacks are reported by rural landholders to the ACT Parks and Conservation Service. Because it is led by rural landholders, there may be some anomalies in terms of the numbers that they are reporting. But we take that advice from the rural landholders to help us to design our wild dog and dingo control programs.

**MS CASTLEY:** What is the anomalies? Why would there be anomalies?

**Ms Watts:** Potential for over or under-reporting.

**MS CASTLEY:** So do you track how many attacks on livestock there has been over the last three years? Can we get a number?

**Mr Burkevics:** We can take that on notice. Where we are notified, we suspect that attacks on wildlife are underreported. The rural community are busy people. They are in sometimes areas where there is not phone reception. And whilst we have absolutely supported and encouraged the use of the app, often the conversations between the rural community and the rural lessee and the dog trapper onsite is probably the best form of communication in some instances. But certainly, yes, we can provide advice on data that we have received.

**MS CASTLEY:** Sure. And do we have an understanding on wild dog population?

**Tara Cheyne MLA:** The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

Since 1 July 2023, the ACT Government has received 76 reports of attacks on livestock.

For the same period and as shown in the following table, 88 wild dogs have been trapped in the designated wild dog control zone of the ACT.

	1 Jul 2023 - 30 Jun 2024	1 July 2024 - Present (7 Aug 2025)
<b>Dogs trapped</b>	48	40
<b>Confirmed attacks/losses</b>	49	27

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Acting Minister for City and Government Services, Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 171

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Jo Clay MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water

In relation to: Conservation and promotion of native flora and fauna and Funding for conservation of Grassland Earless Dragon

Hearing: 1 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 57 - 58

Transcript provided: 6 August 2025

Answer Due: 13 August 2025

Melissa Tetley took on notice the following question(s):

**MS CLAY:** Yes, okay. So, we would like to know how much funding is there for dragons in this budget?

**Ms Tetley:** Melissa Tetley, Chief Finance Officer of EPSDD, and I have read and agree with the privilege statement. So, with the funding for the earless dragons, there has been committed \$5 million in total.

But when you consider that there is some of it is offset, so there is approximately \$1 million of funding that was previous funding that was from the—so there was a earless dragon initiative from the previous year, so we have used some of that funding to offset this year is funding.

There was also some own source—or existing based resources that was used as an offset. So, whilst there is \$5 million being put forward for the dragons, only four million was given as new funding this year.

**MS CLAY:** Okay. Can we get on notice the detailed breakdown of what the funding is for, where the bits came from, is that possible to provide on notice?

**Ms Tetley:** I can tell you that right now, if you like?

**MS CLAY:** That would be great. Go ahead.

**Ms Tetley:** Yes, so we have \$2.7 million over four years to continue the five FTE positions. Now, that is partially offset through a budget—a previous budget initiative, and some of it has been offset by commonwealth funding, and there is a little bit more of an offset against existing resources.

There is \$1.998 million over four years to establish the colony at Melbourne Zoo. There is \$145,000 over four years to support the colony at Tidbinbilla, and \$96,000 over the—for '25/'26 only to continue field support and monitoring activities. That is fully offset from the commonwealth.

**MS CLAY:** Can you take on notice at the breakdown, including the commonwealth funding elements? But I do not need that detail right now. Thank you.

**Ms Tetley:** Yes, no problem.

Suzanne Orr MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

The funding comprises:

- a. \$2.779 million over four years from 2025-26 to continue five FTE positions, partially offset through \$178,000 from the 2024-25 budget initiative Supporting Environmental Volunteers and Emergency action to preserve the Canberra Grassland Earless Dragon, \$214,000 of Commonwealth funding and \$495,000 of existing EPSDD resources;
- b. \$1.998 million over four years from 2025-26 to establish a CGED colony at Melbourne Zoo with 200 individuals;
- c. \$145,000 over four years from 2025-26 to support the CGED colony Tidbinbilla Nature Reserve; and
- d. \$96,000 in 2025-26 only to continue field support monitoring activities, fully offset from Commonwealth funding.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water, Suzanne Orr MLA

QTON No. 174

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Laura Nuttall MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development

In relation to: **Thoroughbred Park development**

Hearing: 1 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: pp 69–71

Transcript provided: 6 August 2025

Answer Due: 8 August 2025

Ben Green took on notice the following question(s):

**MS CLAY:** Thank you.

Minister, I would love an update on where we are up to with the Thoroughbred Park Development. And we had a bit of a chat with another minister about this. But it has been in your ...(indistinct)... [1.22.14] that I believe.

The racing club submitted an application to vary their territory plan for Thoroughbred Park. And according to the documents we got on the FOI they were planning on briefing the incoming minister and once we have briefed, we will set up a time to progress.

Can you tell us, where this is up to?

**Mr Steel:** With the Territory Planning Authority. So I will hand over to Mr Green.

**Mr Green:** Yes, so I think that is accurate, Ms Clay. And whilst we have a statutory timeframe with respect to determining major plan amendments that are initiated by proponents, we took the view, given that the three major parties too different platforms to the election, that we would not make a decision in relation to that.

Our planning work has identified that there are other matters the government need to consider with respect to infrastructure. Whether that is social infrastructure needed, it might be derived and arising out of the proposal by Thoroughbred Park, and/or physical infrastructure. So we are still working through that. But I would anticipate that we would be in a position to be communicating with the proponent in the not-too-distant future around an outcome with respect to that.

**MS CLAY:** So the Chief Planner has not yet made a decision to progress the—

**Mr Green:** The Territory Planning Authority, no.

**MS CLAY:** No. Okay. So that is currently juts in—still in limbo, awaiting a decision?

**Mr Green:** At this point in time, yes.

**MS CLAY:** Okay. And last term we had a steering committee established. Is that steering committee still in existence?

**Mr Green:** That steering committee was established through economic development. And to the best of my knowledge, that steering committee is no longer.

**MS CLAY:** Is there any other government committee that is looking at this issue?

**Mr Green:** With respect to Thoroughbred Park's major plan amendment?

**MS CLAY:** Yes.

**Mr Green:** No.

**MS CLAY:** And with respect to any potential redevelopment of Thoroughbred Park?

**Mr Green:** There is no other committees involved looking at that.

**MS CLAY:** Yes, okay.

**Mr Steel:** So just to be clear about where—what stage this is up to. I would not describe it as being in limbo. The decision that the Territory Planning Authority, and I do not want to speak for them, but they can correct me if I am wrong, is that they have not yet made a decision as to whether to accept major plan amendment application. And that is the consideration that they are undertaking at the moment.

**MS CLAY:** Sure. And is there a timeline for how long these decisions usually take?

**Mr Green:** There is a statutory timeframe under the act. And I would—someone will correct me, I am sure, if I am incorrect on this. But I think it is usually three months that we are required to make a decision.

**MS CLAY:** Excellent. And when did that three-month timeframe start from on this particular one?

**Mr Green:** From the date of application. And I can take on notice the exact dates and provide that to you.

**MS CLAY:** That would be excellent. I understand there was an application made a couple of years ago. So, I do not know if there have been multiple applications. It would be good to get on notice what the current application is and what the starting was, and the statutory timeframes that are attached to that.

**Mr Green:** So I have just been advised, three months is correct. There have not been any former applications, other than the former one that has been put to us—

**MS CLAY:** Excellent.

**Mr Green:** —under the new planning system. And will probably be able to answer that next question at the end of this session today.

**MS CLAY:** The hearing. Yes, that is great. And minister, I am not sure how we will get on this next question, but I am going to have a crack at it. We had a chat with the Minister for Gaming Harm Reform, I believe is her title. And I apologise if I have got her title wrong. And she spoke a lot about diversification of the horse racing industry funding and how that was relevant to other decisions being made. And she spoke about this matter.

It is increasingly clear that it is difficult to get a steer from government on what is going on with this site until we know what is going on with this development. Are you inputting into that decision making of—are you across the diversification of this funding and how this relates?

**Mr Steel:** Well I am certainly, as the former minister, responsible for racing. Yes, have quite a bit of knowledge about the workings of the MOU. I think in that line of questioning you are asking her, was there a future MOU, if I recall. And it would certainly be too early to say as to what the government's position might be on a future MOU. But we certainly recognise the—that the proposal from the racing club is designed to diversify their revenues streams.

How quickly that might occur, really depends on how quickly the process goes through with the major plan amendment? If it is accepted and supported by the Assembly, there is obviously the statutory process that needs to be followed, and then how quickly they then move into the next stages of planning, in terms of subdivision development, if it was approved by the Assembly and how quickly they then work with a development partner, whoever that may be, to develop stages of the project.

**MS CLAY:** Sure. And so to recap, we have got a major plan amendment that is awaiting decision with a three-month statutory period. And then that would run—

**Mr Steel:** For acceptance of the MPA, I think is the key—

**MS CLAY:** For accept of MPA.

**Mr Green:** That is correct.

**Mr Steel:** Yes.

**MS CLAY:** And then what is—when you come back, perhaps on notice, Mr Green, can you back with the timeline of the next steps and whether public consultation would be in that?

**Mr Green:** I am happy to provide maybe a link that outlines what that process looks like.

**MS CLAY:** Sure.

**Mr Green:** That is on the assumption that a particular pathway.

**MS CLAY:** Yes.

**Mr Green:** So really there are three pathways when it comes to major planning. And this one is authority initiated. One is minister direct, and the third is a proponent initiated. And there are provisions within the act if, for example, a proponent-initiated application is not accepted, but the authority goes away to do something relevant to that site, or indeed if minister directs, there are different processes.

So I am happy to provide it generally, given that I have got a short timeframe to turn this around for this question. But not specific to Thoroughbred Park at this time.

Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

#### Thoroughbred Park application

Under Section 58 of the *Planning Act 2023* (the Act), the statutory timeframes for the Territory Planning Authority (the Authority) to decide an application for a proponent-initiated major plan amendment (MPA) is three months. This timeframe commences the day after an application is made and is not able to be extended, irrespective of whether further information is requested under Section 58 (3) of the Act.

In relation to the Thoroughbred Park site (Block 9 Section 69 Lyneham) Canberra Racing Club lodged an application for a major plan amendment (2024-01) on 1 May 2024. The proposal seeks to rezone part of the land to a mixture of residential and commercial zones.

On 1 August 2024, the Authority under Section 58 (3) of the Act, requested further information from the applicant. Over the months of August and September 2024, the proponent undertook to resolve matters raised in the further information request.

Following this, it was evident that further analysis and consideration was needed to understand the cumulative impacts from this proposal and a range of other current and future developments in the area. The Authority have undertaken this analysis and are currently considering the most appropriate planning approach, noting the extent of development within the area.

There has been no decision on the application currently.

#### Major Plan Amendment process

The three primary stages of the major plan amendment (MPA) process includes:

1. Pre-application and proponent application;
2. Draft plan amendment (DPA); and
3. MPA scrutiny, approval and tabling.

Overall, the process may take approximately 12-18 months to complete, depending on a number of variables, including whether the relevant standing committee seeks to inquire into the MPA. Details of each stage are provided below with more information also available on the [ACT Planning website](#).

The pre-application and proponent application stage may include:

- The Authority providing pre-application advice to a proponent to guide their preparation of a supporting report.
- The proponent submitting an application for a MPA.
- The Authority's consideration of the proponent's application. The statutory time for this assessment is 3 months.

The DPA stage includes:

- Public consultation – this occurs over a statutory period of 30 working days.
- Entity consultation – this occurs over a period of 15 working days.
- The Authority (there is no statutory timeframe to undertake these steps):
  - Publishes all consultation comments.
  - Considers consultation comments.
  - Considers whether withdrawing a MPA or revising the MPA.
  - If the DPA is revised, the DPA is referred to the Minister.
- The Minister refers a revised DPA to the Standing Committee – the Minister has 5 working days.

MPA scrutiny, approval and tabling involves:

- The Standing Committee deciding whether they will conduct an Inquiry – the Standing Committee has 15 working days.
- If the Standing Committee undertakes an Inquiry:
  - A report must be provided in six months.
  - The Government responds, including a Response being prepared and tabled in the Assembly – this generally takes 3 months.
- If the Standing Committee do not undertake an Inquiry, or after any Inquiry is finalised, the Minister may decide the MPA.
- If the MPA is approved by the Minister, the MPA and associated documents are prepared to present the to the Legislative Assembly.
- The MPA must be before the Assembly for 5 sitting days, where motions to reject the approved MPA may occur.
- If no motions to reject the approved MPA are moved, the MPA commences.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development, Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 175

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Laura Nuttall MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water

In relation to: Biodiversity financing

Hearing: 1 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 63

Transcript provided: 6 August 2025

Answer Due: 13 August 2025

Bren Burkevics took on notice the following question(s):

**MISS NUTTALL:** Okay. Beautiful. There is a tender for biodiversity financing mechanisms for the ACT from last year on the contracts register. Can you confirm whether that was an exploration of private stewardship payments and is it something that you would be able to table?

**Mr Burkevics:** I will take that on notice.

**MISS NUTTALL:** Thank you.

Suzanne Orr MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

In 2024 the ACT Government released a tender for a vendor to undertake a literature review and jurisdictional scan of mechanisms in place across Australia to facilitate biodiversity financing and support stewardship of nature. These mechanisms included rate concessions, biodiversity levies rate rebates, market schemes, covenants, related stewardship agreements and grants.

The report from this body of work has been used by the Government to help inform the development of the new ACT Nature Conservation Strategy and other policy considerations. The Government does not have any plans to table or publicly release this document noting it is for internal use only.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water, Suzanne Orr MLA

QTON No. 176

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Jo Clay MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development

In relation to: DA numbers lodged in the previous year

Hearing: 1 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: pp 81-82

Transcript provided: 6 August 2025

Answer Due: 13 August 2025

George Cilliers took on notice the following question(s):

**MS CASTLEY:** Thank you.

Can you talk to me just a little bit more about the significant application and what that timeframe is for approval?

**Mr Cilliers:** So significant applications are applications that they actually define legislation, so they are applications that include proposals that require consultation with the National Capital Design Review Panel. So those big-end developments that require that sort of greater scrutiny. Also proposals that require environmental impact assessment and sub-division design applications. So those three broad categories.

So the vast majority of DAs are non-standard or non-significant—are standard development applications or non-significant ones. Some examples of significant development applications I can think of is, for example, 220 Northbourne Avenue, that is an example. The approval that we gave in Lathlain Street in Belconnen, that is another example. Then of course, there are plenty of sub-division design applications that we do for future sub-divisions.

The timeframes for standard DAs are 30-45 working days. So, 30 working days if you do not receive a public representation. And then 45 working days for if you receive a public representation. And timeframe for significant DAs are 60 working days.

**MS CASTLEY:** And how do we track on those at the moment? How often do all of those meeting those timeframes?

**Mr Cilliers:** So for our standard DAs, we have met, the actual year to date result is 73 per cent of them are on time. For significant development applications, is 128 days is the medium that we achieve. So roughly 90 per cent we do on time. And they are a very small proportion, as I said. They are only—we only determined 18 out of 700 DAs, but they require that greater scrutiny.

**MS CASTLEY:** Yes. And has the number of applications lodged decreased in the last year or so?

**Mr Cilliers:** It has fluctuated. So there is a slight decrease in the total number of DAs. So we received 769. I do not have the previous financial years statistics in front of me, but it is slightly lower—

**MS CASTLEY:** Could you take that on notice? Is that—

**THE CHAIR:** Sorry, just to be clear, that was taken on notice?

**Mr Cilliers:** Pardon?

**THE CHAIR:** Was that taken on notice, sorry?

**MS CASTLEY:** The previous year.

**Mr Cilliers:** The previous year.

**MS CASTLEY:** Thank you.

Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

Development application (DA) summary statistics are publicly available at:  
<https://www.planning.act.gov.au/applications-and-assessments/development-applications/development-statistics/development-applications-da-statistics-2024-25>

The number of DAs lodged by financial year is summarised in the table below:

Financial Year	Planning and Development Act 2007			Planning Act 2023	TOTAL
	Merit track	Code Track	Impact Track	Significant & Standard	
24/25	9	0	1	760	770
23/24	537	10	13	251	811
22/23	1055	17	6	N/A	1078
21/22	1063	18	1	N/A	1082
20/21	919	24	9	N/A	952

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development, Chris Steel MLA



QTON No. 180

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Shane Rattenbury MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development

In relation to: Poker Machine Revenue

Hearing: 1 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 101–102

Transcript provided: 6 August 2025

Answer Due: 8 August 2025

Ben Green took on notice the following question(s):

**MR RATTENBURY:** Thanks.

I want to ask about the proposed major plan amendment for the Ainslie Football Club. Now if this was passed through the Assembly, will allow for the development of housing and a new club. I am wondering whether you have had any discussions with the football club about whether they intend to reduce their reliance on poker machine revenue?

Certainly I have had it raised with me, by a lot of constituents, about whether there will be a condition to any development approval or new crown lease that the number of poker machines will be reduced at the sight. Is that something the planning agency is considering as part of that process?

**Mr Steel:** I will hand over the Territory Planning Authority. Just where I guess—to provide an explanation of where this particular proponent initiated major plan amendment is up to. The draft got referred to the territory—the Assembly’s Planning Committee, and I think they refused to undertake an inquiry, or decided not to undertake an inquiry into that particular major plan amendment. So it is currently with the Territory Planning Authority before they then provide me with advice and the final territory plan amendment, to then make a decision.

But I have not yet received it. So I have not yet even started considering that matter, based on the final advice of the Territory Planning Authority. I would imagine that the Chief Planner and Mr Green, might have some further comments to make, but there are certainly requirements in the planning act that would go to the criteria around decision making of that major plan amendment. And so I would have to have regard to those matters in the planning act in making a decision.

Straying outside of those might be challenging or open up the ability for challenge. And so I would certainly need to give careful consideration to the requirements under the planning act in making a decision, which would also consider what the risks where of requiring certain conditions that may not be in alignment with the planning act provisions.

**Mr Green:** Minister, in terms of a reduction on poker machine revenue, I know there is reference to that in district strategies, in particular. The extent to which my team considered that as part of the MPA application, I would take on notice.

**MR RATTENBURY:** Okay.

**Mr Green:** I am also conscious of the decision-making process that we are in at the moment.

**MR RATTENBURY:** Of course. Anyway, I am trying to ask more on a policy level, I suppose—

**Mr Green:** Yes.

**MR RATTENBURY:** —than on the specifics of the decision. I think what I hear in the community feedback is people are open to the redevelopment, but they want to ensure that we do not stand up with the status quo. I think they are looking for other avenues for that change.

**Mr Green:** We better take that on notice.

Description of the extent to which a reduction in gaming machines is taken into account in relation to proponent-initiated major amendments to the Territory Plan

Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

Draft major plan amendment (MPA) 02 Ainslie Football Club (DPA-02) is a proponent-initiated MPA to the Territory Plan. When considering the proponent's application related to DPA-02, the Territory Planning Authority (the Authority), in accordance with the *Planning Act 2023* (the Act), considered the [ACT Planning Strategy 2018](#), the [Inner North and City District Strategy](#) and the Minister's [Statement of Planning Priorities](#).

The Inner North and City District Strategy states that the Government has made a series of commitments to reduce harm from gambling while supporting sustainable clubs. This includes allowing clubs to diversify their revenue base by encouraging development of available land for land supply purposes. This was considered by the Authority prior to accepting the proponent's application on 4 September 2024.

Once the necessary statutory processes under the Act are complete, the Authority will give DPA-02 to me, as the Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development, to make a decision. Under Section 75 of the Act, prior to approving DPA-02 I must consider, among other factors, the Inner North and City District Strategy.

However, it should be noted that the Territory Plan and MPA processes does not directly regulate the number of gaming machines in a venue or if a venue can or cannot have gaming facilities. With this, the extent of poker machines are not a direct consideration. This is regulated by the Gambling and Racing Commission, generally under the *Gaming Machine Act 2004*.

There have been a range of other initiatives outside the MPA process and planning system to reduce gaming revenue in the ACT. These are outlined in further detail on the [Gambling and Racing Commission's website](#).

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development, Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 181

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Ed Cocks MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development

In relation to: Strategic land use and Community needs assessment data

Hearing: 1 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 110

Transcript provided: 6 August 2025

Answer Due: 13 August 2025

Ben Green took on notice the following question(s):

**THE CHAIR:** There is a bit of interest on supplementaries on this one. I do have a couple on a couple of issues through this line of questioning. The first one, though, most recently—I always get a bit concerned when the word “need” is used rather than “demand” for community interest because in a lot of needs analysis processes, it ends up being the government saying, “Community, this is what you need”.

How much of this is an academic exercise and how much is trying to find out what people actually want for their suburb and their community?

**Mr Green:** I think just reflecting on the comments that I made around our first part of the process is really to understand the data. What is in the community? What is in government hands? What is in private sector hands? What is being delivered in a commercial multi-storey building that is actually a community function?

The other point that I made is that once we understand that data across a variety of different settings of that floor space, all well-regarded and informed industry benchmarks. Now, when it comes to planning of social infrastructure, benchmarks that are used in planning all of the time, it is then about testing that, and what might be reasonable and need in one community is not actually what is needed, going to your point, and that is why the qualitative assessment of that needs to occur.

There are plenty of discussions that are had through community in varying different forms. There is a significant discussion in the planning reform. Over the last three years, there has been recent discussions with Molonglo Community in particular around social and infrastructure needs there.

So it is picking up all of this information and where there are gaps, and where we need to improve that understanding, and there is priority to go there and look at it, then we will do that. I think that the key point is we were funded in the last budget to really improve what that data-holding looks like.

We will have not finalised that social infrastructure assessment. We have got a lot of data that is coming through that we can start working through, but that is really in the first—

**THE CHAIR:** Would you be able to provide, maybe on notice, what data you consider in the needs assessment process?

**Mr Green:** Yes, we can certainly talk to the categories of information and data

Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

In conducting a needs assessment for community zoned land in the ACT, the City and Environment Directorate (CED) considers a broad and detailed range of data sources to ensure land use aligns with both current and future community needs. This includes demographic data from ACT Treasury, the Canberra Strategic Transport Model (CSTM) and the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 2021 Census of Population and Housing. Analysis of this data includes characteristics, such as population growth, age distribution, household composition, gender profiles and cultural diversity.

Analysis also includes an audit of existing infrastructure through an ACT community facilities audit, which maps and assesses the location and type of community infrastructure across the Territory. This information is compared with employment lands floor space data, which provides insights into how commercial, retail, and institutional buildings are used for community functions such as health, education, and cultural services. Data on catchment, proximity, and accessibility data including transport links and walkability are also considered and incorporated to support comprehensive social infrastructure planning.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development, Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 183

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Jo Clay & Ed Cocks MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development

In relation to: Evaluation framework for new planning system

Hearing: 1 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 125-126

Transcript provided: 06 August 2025

Answer Due: 13 August 2025

Ben Green took on notice the following question(s):

**MS CLAY:** I might one sub, chair. Just to be absolutely clear, the government is about to set the baselines now. We do not already have the baseline data. This process will set the baseline data for the system that is already been operating for two years.

**Mr Green:** There is a baseline data in existence. The question comes and the consideration for us now is, are we capturing enough, given the directorate and machinery of government changes and the recommendations in the Edwards review, and do we just continue along this pathway with an existing framework that does not seek to capture more and miss the opportunities to broaden it out, when we are actually talking about delivering outcomes.

**MS CLAY:** Is that baseline data that is already in existence, is that public?

**Mr Green:** I will take that on notice.

**MS CLAY:** Thank you.

**THE CHAIR:** If it is not, can I ask that you provide it on notice?

**Mr Green:** I will take that on notice.

Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

Under the ACT Planning System Evaluation Framework 2024–29, the ACT Government has undertaken two baseline projects to date. The first is a baseline survey of planning system proponents and the second is a baseline development application design audit. These

studies are intended to inform future evaluations and continuous improvement of the planning system.

Consistent with ACT Government information privacy policies, the raw data collected through these baseline studies will not be released publicly. However, the insights derived from these studies will contribute to the design and implementation of future evaluations under the framework.

The City and Environment Directorate is currently considering the most appropriate scope and delivery method for the first major evaluation under the framework. As outlined in the framework, each major evaluation will be supported by a tailored evaluation plan, which will specify the data sources to be used and the analytical methods to be applied. This process is being informed by recommendations from the ACT Public Service 2025 Taskforce Report.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development, Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 184

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Ed Cocks MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development

In relation to: Planning pathways for Mr Fluffy blocks

Hearing: 1 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 138

Transcript provided: 6 August 2025

Answer Due: 13 August 2025

Ben Green took on notice the following question(s):

**THE CHAIR:** If someone pursues this particular pathway, the purchaser of last resort, does that block then qualify for the same provisions, in terms of planning, that those acquired under the buyback scheme fell into? I am afraid I cannot remember the exact—

**Mr Steel:** I think you are referring to the first right of refusal or—

**THE CHAIR:** No, sorry. I am referring to the planning constraints on the block. Under the buyback scheme, those blocks were then—

**Mr Green:** Permitted for dual-occupancy, yes.

**THE CHAIR:** –reclassified so that it was roughly equivalent to RZ2.

**Mr Green:** I would need to check that, unless George knows. Having said that, the missing middle reforms then what that was. Those missing middle reforms.

**Mr Steel:** But we can take that on notice anyway. We are talking about a small number of blocks, and it is post-buyback as well.

**THE CHAIR:** It is post-buyback.

**Mr Steel:** But we will check. The guidelines are available on the website for people to look at. Just to respond to your comment, I do not think there was a question, we have not ruled out compulsory acquisition, and I did mention that we would consider it on a case by case basis, but at this stage we are not considering it.

Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

Different planning/zoning conditions may apply depending on how the block was acquired:

- Properties which have been acquired by the Government under the Government Buyback Scheme are defined in the Territory Plan as 'surrendered residential blocks'. Some special provisions apply.
- Properties acquired as purchaser of last resort are not considered to be surrendered residential blocks. There are no special provisions that apply to these properties, so they are subject to the standard conditions of the current Territory Plan.

Under the Territory Plan, a 'surrendered residential block' means a block that has been included on the Affected Residential Property Register and that has been either surrendered to the ACT Government, or it is a dual occupancy unit-title block that has been acquired, fully or partially, by the ACT Government under the Loose Fill Asbestos Insulation Eradication Scheme Buyback Program. It does not include a surrendered residential block that is part of a registered heritage place or a provisionally registered heritage place under the *Heritage Act 2004*.

Under the Residential Zones Policy and Subdivision Policy of the Territory Plan 2023, in RZ1 zones, surrendered residential blocks are able to develop a maximum of 2 dwellings on blocks that are a minimum of 700m<sup>2</sup>. The dwellings may be any size.

In comparison, other RZ1 blocks are able to development a maximum of 2 dwellings on blocks that are at least 800m<sup>2</sup>. One of the dwellings is limit to a maximum of 120m<sup>2</sup>.

Through the missing middle housing reforms, the ACT Government are proposing to remove these maximum dwelling and minimum block size requirements. Rather, residential density is proposed to be controlled through other design outcomes and requirements, such as those relating to site coverage and living infrastructure.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development, Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 186

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Ms Leanne Castley MLA

Addressed to: Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport

In relation to: Public transport and updating the branding on Scania buses

Hearing: 4 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: p 5.

Transcript provided: 07 August 2025

Answer Due: 14 August 2025

**Chris Steel MLA: Minister for Transport took on notice the following question(s):**

**MS CASTLEY:** Just last question, Chair, if I can. In 2018, Transport Canberra created design guides for then-new corporate branding replacing the old action signage and corporate imagery. I understand that this included applying the new corporate livery to a number of Transport Canberra buses including Scania A36 OAU articulated fleet. It seems that these plans have been abandoned with a number of buses, including the Scania. I can give you the numbers if you want, the A and the B, and the steer-tag fleet, still with the old green-and-white action livery. Does TCCS have any plans to update the Scania fleet to bring it in line with the current Transport Canberra brand identity?

**Mr Steel:** We might need to take that on notice, I think.

**MS CASTLEY:** Thank you.

**Mr Steel:** The thing is, there are a number of buses that have been marked for retirement, and so it would not make sense to update those that are due to be retired in the short term.

**Mr Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:**

From the introduction of Transport Canberra's new livery in 2018, all buses that have been manufactured since this time have been supplied aligning to Transport Canberra's style guide. Transport Canberra previously assessed rebranding of the ageing fleet vehicles and determined that the cost does not provide value for money to the Canberra community. Both the newer Transport Canberra and the older ACTION branding are well recognised within the community.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

By the Minister for Transport, Mr Chris Steel MLA

Date:

QTON No. 187

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Mr Ed Cocks MLA

Addressed to: Mr Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport

In relation to: Public Transport and Cost of TCCS Image Guide 2018

Hearing: 4 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: p 5.

Transcript provided: 07 August 2025

Answer Due: 14 August 2025

**Chris Steel Minister for Transport took on notice the following question(s):**

**MS CASTLEY:** Sure. It is probably a while ago, but does anyone know what the image guide cost the government back in 2018?

**Mr Steel:** I am sure that that was probably a question that has already been asked. But I am happy to take it on notice.

**MS CASTLEY:** That is it. Thank you, Chair.

**Mr Chris Steel MLA:** The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

The Transport Canberra Style Guide was produced in 2017 at a cost of \$50,000.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

By the Minister for Transport, Mr Chris Steel MLA

Date:

QTON No. 188

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Mr Andrew Braddock MLA

Addressed to: Mr Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport

In relation to: Public Transport and spending to date on MyWay+

Hearing: 4 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: p 22-23.

Transcript provided: 07 August 2025

Answer Due: 14 August 2025

**MR Chris Steel MLA:** Minister for Transport took on notice the following question(s):

**MR BRADDOCK:** Thank you, Chair. I just want to ask some questions for some specific dollar figures. So firstly, in terms of what has been the budget overspend to date with MyWay+?

**Mr Steel:** I think that has been answered by Mr White.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Was there a dollar figure, sorry, in that answer?

**MS CASTLEY:** He did not give us a dollar figure, though.

**Mr White:** We have not exceeded the funding envelope, which as I say, includes both capital and operating, and at the conclusion of the project, we will obviously do the reconciling of those two items.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Okay, so can I please have the specific dollars on spend to date?

**Mr White:** We certainly can take that question on notice, Mr Braddock.

**Mr Smith:** Sorry, Mr Braddock, I think one of the important factors as well to consider—and we can certainly bring a spend to date figure through a question on notice. One of the important things as we work through the contractual arrangements with NEC, the territory does reserve rights to mitigate some payments as well, and some of those decisions are yet to be made, and so that will ultimately change final figures as we move through various milestones.

**Mr Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:**

The capital spend to date, as at 8 August 2025, for the MyWay+ Program is \$22,084,825.36. It should be noted that this includes additional capital costs associated with integrating NEC's solution into ACT Government systems and is not solely the contract payments to NEC.

Transport Canberra has not yet started to draw on the operational budget for the project.

Additionally, and as noted by the Directorate's officers, Transport Canberra has reserved legal rights for relief against the contract with NEC Australia with regard to liquidated damages for any delay in achieving certain milestones. This may have the effect of reducing the capital expenditure of the program.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

By the Minister for Transport, Mr Chris Steel MLA

Date:

QTON No. 189

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Mr Ed Cocks MLA

Addressed to: Mr Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport

In relation to: Public transport and Lost revenue from MyWay+

Hearing: 4 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: p 24.

Transcript provided: 07 August 2025

Answer Due: 14 August 2025

**Mr Chris Steel MLA:** Minister for Transport took on notice the following question(s):

**THE CHAIR:** I might just follow some of the details up on that line of questioning. Minister, have you received any briefings on modelling of the degree of revenue under-collect?

**Mr Steel:** I will take that on notice to check but we have provided—I have been briefed as part of answers to questions on notice where we have answered that question.

**THE CHAIR:** Okay, so you have received briefings on disaggregation.

**Mr Steel:** No, I have been provided information about what Transport Canberra could provide in answer to that question, which is as I have detailed.

**THE CHAIR:** Okay, so has Transport Canberra undertaken any modelling that would provide an indicative disaggregation?

**Mr Smith:** So in regards to have we undertaken specific modelling, no. At this point in time what we are doing is we are monitoring the ability for users to tap on, tap off, where we possibly can. Obviously, with fare evasion and stuff like that, you cannot monitor that, particularly if somebody just jumps on and jumps off, but yes, we are looking at the potential failure rate of MyWay+ to be able to capture a fare. We will then look at trends around that. They will then feed into stuff around where we will focus our revenue protection, et cetera. We will focus on maintenance within the MyWay system as well. I think going to the root of your question, are we specifically monitoring the gap in the budget between the forecast of revenue versus where we are at. Sorry, can I clarify, is that the question?

**THE CHAIR:** Yes, basically. What I am trying to find out is, and to an extent, whether the minister has been trying to track how much revenue is being lost here, and then whether Transport Canberra has been proactively trying to work out how much revenue is being lost. And then the next question to come, there was a comment about—I think it was that budget forecasts are simply higher than you can actually collect.

**Mr Chris Steel MLA:** The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

From information provided at fortnightly Minister's briefings and in responses provided to the Standing Committee on Environment, Planning, Transport and City Services Inquiry into the Procurement and Delivery of MyWay+, the following information is provided to best answer the question, that the Chair of the Select Committee confirmed. That is, what is the gap between the stated budget compared to forecast revenue from the Directorate.

Forecast revenue in 2025-26 is likely to be less than budget due to the following four factors:

1. Revenue budgets are predicated on a recovery of return to normal use of public transport patronage of at least pre-COVID levels (i.e. 2019/2020). Working conditions and locations have fundamentally changed since this time, thus impacting real patronage vs forecast patronage and therefore revenue. Indications from current trends show that we are returning to these levels, mostly due to improved service.
2. The Government's election commitment to Fare Free Friday has likely encouraged more patronage on this particular weekday, yet it is still unclear if this is influencing a similar uptick of patronage on fare-charging days. Additionally, until revenue protection measures are recommenced, Transport Canberra will be unable to fully monitor fare evasion.
3. There are still a small number of buses at peak times only, that are not equipped with MyWay+ equipment. These vehicles are scheduled for replacement before the end of the calendar year. MyWay+ equipment are tracking at a significantly higher availability rate than the previous system and as such fare collection is more successful from compliant passengers.
4. Fare evasion, whether opportunistic or deliberate, is considered by Transport Canberra to be around 10-15%. Since the introduction of MyWay+, the Government has taken the approach of educating customers on the many new ways to plan and pay for their journey. Now, that the MyWay+ system is significantly more stable and operating within specification, the Government is now taking steps to address this with an education-first approach through ticket inspection across the bus and light rail network.

Further discussion on the above factors is provided in response to QON 46 from the Inquiry into the procurement and delivery of MyWay+ published here:

[https://www.parliament.act.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0008/2883959/EPTCS-QON-46-Answer-Bus-Boardings.pdf](https://www.parliament.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/2883959/EPTCS-QON-46-Answer-Bus-Boardings.pdf)

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Transport, Mr Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 190

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Ms Leanne Castley MLA

Addressed to: Mr Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport

In relation to: Bus driver incidents

Hearing: 4 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: UPT 4 August 2025, p 28.

Transcript provided: 07 August 2025

Answer Due: 14 August 2025

**Mr Chris Steel MLA:** Minister for Transport took on notice the following question(s):

**MS CASTLEY:** Thank you, Chair. I would like to talk about bus driver safety. Obviously, we all know about the strike that occurred last year. They were talking about 40 assaults taking place each month for bus drivers. I am wondering if anyone has updated figures since November till now, month on month, how the assaults are tracking for our drivers.

**Mr Steel:** We have got the data on hand, otherwise we can take it on notice. But my understanding was that it had come down from the levels that we saw from last year. But we will provide some more certainty with the data.

**MS CASTLEY:** And obviously they are just—the data is going to capture the reported incidents.

**Mr Steel:** We can do month by month.

**MS CASTLEY:** Thank you

**Mr Chris Steel MLA:** The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

The number of Occupational Violence (OV) incidents, reported from Transport Canberra Incident Management System (IMS) data, per month is provided in the table below.

Month	Physical	Verbal	Other	Total number of OV incidents per month
Nov-24	2	31	46	79
Dec-24	1	37	40	78
Jan-25	1	27	30	58
Feb-25	2	23	18	43
Mar-25	4	35	20	59
Apr-25	1	25	14	40
May-25	2	30	13	45
June 25	1	21	5	27

Classification description:

- Physical – Any physical altercation that is directed at or toward TC staff. This includes spitting if contact is made with the TC staff member.
- Verbal – Any verbal abuse directed toward TC staff.
- Other - All other OV related incidents including smoking and vaping onboard, unruly behaviour (feet on seats, rowdy or boisterous behaviour), consumption of alcohol onboard etc. Other behaviour not directed at or towards TC staff, but staff may be exposed to.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Transport, Mr Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 191

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Mr Shane Rattenbury MLA

Addressed to: Mr Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport

In relation to: Public transport and Equipment to be carried by Transit Enforcement Officers

Hearing: 4 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: p 32.

Transcript provided: 07 August 2025

Answer Due: 14 August 2025

**Mr Chris Steel MLA: Minister for Transport took on notice the following question(s):**

**MR RATTENBURY:** Thank you. What accoutrement will the officers carry?

**Mr Smith:** Sorry?

**MR RATTENBURY:** What accoutrement, what kit will they have?

**Mr Smith:** I might need to take that one on notice, that will probably be determined. At the moment, we are looking at various things like, for example, body-worn cameras, so that they can monitor interactions with the public. Will they carry anything in regards—I am assuming you are heading towards, will they carry some sort of protection device or something like that? No, at this point, they will not be carrying that. One of the important things about de-escalation is not about escalating the situation either.

**MR RATTENBURY:** Of course.

**Mr Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:**

At this stage, the specific equipment for the Transit Enforcement Officers is still being determined and needs to be agreed with the Transport Workers Union (TWU) and Occupational Violence Working Group. However, current planning includes the following standard items:

- **Body-worn cameras** – to support transparency, accountability during interactions with the public, and deter anti-social behaviour as part of the trial.

- **High-visibility vests**– to ensure staff are easily identifiable and visible in operational environments.
- **Two-way radios**– to enable reliable communication between team members and with Communications Centre, with back to base duress system.

At this stage, no protective or defensive equipment will be issued. This decision reflects a strong emphasis on de-escalation strategies.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Transport, Mr Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 192

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Mr Ed Cocks MLA

Addressed to: Mr Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport

In relation to: Public transport and Proportion of dead running buses in Canberra bus network

Hearing: 4 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: p 36-37.

Transcript provided: 07 August 2025

Answer Due: 14 August 2025:

**Mr Chris Steel MLA:** Minister for Transport took on notice the following question(s):

**THE CHAIR:** A quick supplementary. I just wanted to confirm the numbers I heard before. I think you said 18 to 20 per cent?

**Mr McGlinn:** Yes.

**THE CHAIR:** That is the proportion of dead running?

**Mr McGlinn:** Just I will take that on notice and I will actually confirm the figure.

**THE CHAIR:** That would be really good.

**Mr McGlinn:** But industry-wide, it is anywhere from 15 to 20 per cent, or greater in some states and territories.

**THE CHAIR:** It would be useful to understand how that compares to other jurisdictions.

**Mr McGlinn:** Yes, whether they have released that. But anyway, any public documents we can compare to but—

**Mr Smith:** There is a balance point to that dead running as well and how we integrate that into the network, because if we were to have more bus depots for example, smaller satellite depots etcetera, that then requires more staff in those depots. And so there is an offset between the staffing and the fuel that we use for the dead running of the drivers et cetera as well.

**THE CHAIR:** And part of the reason I ask is, I mean, in our electorate, minister, in places like Weston Creek, I get this comment that keeps coming up that the most frequent service they see is “not in service”. So there is certainly a perception out there that there are more buses running around that are not in service than the ones that people are seeing actually picking up passengers. That is why I am interested in the comparison.

**Mr Smith:** Yes, and that would not be probably a wrong view because, if you think about the number of routes we have got, and I do not know the exact number, but if dead running is, say, 18 per cent, 18 per cent are not in service versus hundreds of routes, yes, you are more likely to see a not in service than a route 10 or a route 31 or a route 51 or something like that.

**Mr Steel:** And you are more likely to see them now that there is an operational bus depot in Woden because that is where those out of service buses are going to. They are going to Woden, so they are all going to come through Woden if they are going back to the Woden depot, or in Tuggeranong they are all going to go back to the—

**THE CHAIR:** Yes, the

**Mr Chris Steel MLA:** The answer to the Member’s question is as follows:

Transport Canberra statistic for dead running over the last 12 months is at 18.24%.

While there are no published public documents of other jurisdictions, based on industry conversations, Transport Canberra is able to confirm that across both metropolitan and regional operators they have recorded between 15 and 20% dead running as the norm.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Transport, Mr Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 193

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Mr Andrew Braddock MLA

Addressed to: Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport

In relation to: Public transport and traffic studies for the Belconnen Town Centre

Hearing: 4 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: UPT 4 August 2025, p 38.

Transcript provided: 07 August 2025

Answer Due: 14 August 2025

**Mr Chris Steel MLA: Minister for Transport took on notice the following question(s):**

**MR BRADDOCK:** Okay. Now coming to Belconnen Town Centre, I was just wondering if you have got any update on the traffic studies that have been undertaken for the Belconnen Town Centre?

**Ms Clement:** I do not have any updates on those ones. I might need to take that one on notice.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Please do so, particularly what has been undertaken in the past decade and the actions that are still outstanding from those.

**Mr Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:**

### **Belconnen Town Centre Master Plan**

The 2016 Belconnen Town Centre Master Plan provided recommendations for further consideration and implementation to improve transport amenity for all road users within the Belconnen Town Centre. The following list of studies and treatment measures have been undertaken in response to recommendations from the Master Plan:

- Expansion of 40 km/h zone for areas of high pedestrian activity and traffic complexity – this recommendation has been implemented.
- Road corridor traffic study to determine future requirements of road corridors in and around Belconnen, including Ginninderra Drive, Lathlain Street, and Luxton Street. Preliminary investigations have been undertaken through the ACT Movement and Place Framework and draft Multi-Modal Network Plan that will inform future Corridor Transport Plans.

- Public transport study, including consideration of the suitability of the Cohen Street bus station and potential for expanding the number of platforms at the Westfield bus station. To ensure sustainable growth and meeting the evolving needs of our communities, the consideration of public transport infrastructure and service delivery is embedded in all current and future planning activities. This integrated approach ensures that every project, regardless of scale or scope, supports accessible, efficient, and inclusive transport solutions.
- The Belconnen to City Transitway feasibility study is currently underway with a focus on the central sector along Haydon Drive which remains a key link needing prioritisation to improve journey times and reliability.
- Centre-wide parking management plan – a parking utilisation survey was recently conducted and will be used to inform future planning decisions to maximise efficiency of carparks and potentially assist to reduce congestion generated by queued vehicles.

As a matter of course, the recommendations made in the 2016 Master Plan will be re-evaluated through subsequent studies.

### **Belconnen Town Centre - Strategic Transport traffic modelling and assessment works**

In addition, the Belconnen Town Centre has been a part of the City and Environment Directorate's (CED) broader strategic transport and more detailed traffic modelling and assessment works.

- The Belconnen Town Centre is part of the Canberra Strategic Transport Model (CSTM) that the ACT Government use to forecast travel demand in response to future land use development and transport infrastructure intentions. The CSTM is recalibrated in line with the ABS census years and currently includes base model year 2023 and future model scenarios at five yearly intervals from 2026 until 2051.
- CED also commissioned the ACT and Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council Household Travel Surveys (HTS) in 2017 and 2022. While the survey outcomes were primarily used to recalibrate the CSTM's trip generation, distribution, mode choice and trip assignment models, the HTS provide travel pattern insights on why, where, how and when Canberrans including the Belconnen residents and visitors travel.
- CED regularly commissions parking survey of supply and utilisation of public car parking spaces (on and off-street) in the ACT's city centre, town centres and selected group centres. Recent parking utilisation survey data for Belconnen Town Centre is available for 2023, 2022, 2019 and 2016.
- In 2024, CED was gifted with the Bruce Precinct Traffic Model (BPTM) by Infrastructure Canberra. With base year 2024 and future base 2031 and 2041 model scenarios, the BPTM simulates detailed traffic impacts arising from proposed developments within the precinct including the Northern Hospital and helps inform assessment of associated transport infrastructure requirements. The model is currently bounded by Gungahlin Drive, Ginninderra Drive, Aikman Drive, Eastern Valley Way and Belconnen Way and is envisaged to be expanded to include the Belconnen Town Centre in the future. CED is currently updating the BPTM model with the latest CSTM travel demand forecasts as part of the Belconnen to City Transitway Project.

### **Preliminary Transport and Traffic Movement Study to support the Belconnen District Strategy**

CED is currently evaluating submissions received to undertake a Preliminary Transport and Traffic Movement Study for the Belconnen Town Centre and Surrounds, as part of a broader piece of work to support the implementation of the Belconnen District Strategy. This study will include a current Level of Service analysis for key intersections in the Belconnen Town Centre and will provide a high-level assessment of the likely transport network impacts from the anticipated future development of the identified Change Areas within the district strategy. This study is anticipated to be completed in early 2026. This study includes the requirement to review previous transport and traffic movement studies and policy positions.

There is a requirement for private developers to undertake site specific Traffic Impact Assessments as part of the development assessment (DA) process. In the past decade to 2015, six large scale developments were delivered in the Belconnen Town Centre; Nightfall, High Society, Republic and Wayfarer Geocon complex, Cirrus by Perse Development and the upgraded Belconnen Markets by IP Property. In addition, the Suburban Land Agency are undertaking a Traffic Impact Assessment as part of the DA process for the Lathlain Street Precinct.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Transport, Mr Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 194

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Mr Andrew Braddock MLA

Addressed to: Mr Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport

In relation to: Public transport and Disability accessible bus stops

Hearing: 4 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: p 42.

Transcript provided: 07 August 2025

Answer Due: 14 August 2025

**Mr Chris Steel Minister for Transport took on notice the following question(s):**

**MR BRADDOCK:** I will try to keep it quick. Just in terms of bus stops, I am trying to understand what the criteria is in terms of whether they have seating, shelter, wheelchair accessibility and so forth. Is there a criteria in place, or is it more we just live with whatever we have inherited from previous governments?

**Mr Smith:** Yes, I can briefly talk to that, Mr Braddock. So we do assess the bus stops on a regular basis. So we are working through ensuring that, as a first step, bus stops are accessible under disability standards. So the pathway to bus stops, whether a bus can pull up and it can use its hydraulics to be at level, et cetera. In regards to shelter, what we would do regularly there is review the bus stops, the utilisation of those bus stops, and where appropriate we may wish to invest in shelters. We do not have a standard budget item in the operating budget to do that. If we can and we know there is a shelter at a bus stop which is no longer utilised for a reason, we may look to try within the operational budget to relocate the bus stop, the shelter itself. But moving forward, we may look to, in future, discuss with government in regards to the appropriateness of budget bids for things like that as well. So we do look at it and think about what is there, how they operate, et cetera.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Yes. Talking about shelters, you utilised a term “where appropriate”. Well, how is that determined as to whether a shelter should be there or not?

**Mr Smith:** Yes, so I guess in a perfect world, utopia again, every bus stop would have a shelter. In saying that, there are a lot of bus stops around the city. Again, I cannot name exactly how many there are. The utilisation rate would be one of the most important factors in regards to where a shelter would go. So if we have a highly utilised bus stop then ideally that is where we would start

looking in regards to where a shelter could go. If we know we have one that might pick up one or two passengers a day, then obviously and unfortunately that would go further down the priority list.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Do you know what proportion of stops are accessible or, should I actually say, inaccessible for disabled users?

**Mr Smith:** I would have to take that on notice in regards to the exact number.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Okay, thank you.

**Mr Chris Steel MLA:** The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

There are currently 2,495 active bus stops across the Transport Canberra bus network. The ACT Government has made substantial progress in fully or partly upgrading 1,867 (or approximately 75%) of these stops to improve accessibility. These upgrades include Tactile Ground Surface Indicators (TGSi) for vision impaired users and, where possible, improvements to the boarding point and connection paths.

Of these bus stops, 409 are fully compliant with current *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* (DDA) requirements. Due to the topography and the gradients of many road corridors, achieving perfect compliance for bus stops is not always practical. However, upgrades are tested where required to ensure disability access is appropriate for transport users in these instances.

Additional funding has been provided through the 2025-2026 Asset Renewal Program initiative *Bus stop accessibility upgrades* to continue the upgrade work to improve accessibility across a number of active bus stops.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Transport, Mr Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 195

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Ed Cocks MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Heritage

In relation to: Heritage Council Meeting

Hearing: 4 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript 45

Transcript provided: 7 August 2025

Answer Due: 14 August 2025

Minister for Heritage took on notice the following question(s):

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Just very quickly as a supplementary, I think you mentioned that it has been referred back to the Heritage Council, is that correct?

Ms Swete Kelly: Well, I should say, not formally referred, but they are having a conversation in regards to the current discussion and advice that has gone up to the ministers, so Minister Cheyne and Minister Steel.

THE CHAIR: Okay and so that is an informal conversation, is that correct?

Ms Swete Kelly: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Is it to be considered at a meeting?

Ms Swete Kelly: Yes, it will be considered at the next Heritage Council meeting, so they have just had a discussion about the general context in which the current discussion is going on, and they are just going to talk about that in terms of their advice.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Sorry, just got to keep it quick. What date is that meeting scheduled for?

Ms Swete Kelly: I am not sure; they have just changed their date.

THE CHAIR: Okay, would you like to take it on notice?

Ms Swete Kelly: So you might be aware we have a new Heritage Council, and they are talking about new days and new times, but I should expect late August, early September.

THE CHAIR: I am happy for you to take the actual date on notice.

Ms Swete Kelly: Yes, sure.

THE CHAIR: Yes? Thank you

**Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:**

The next regular meeting of the ACT Heritage Council is scheduled for 24 September 2025.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

By the Minister for Heritage, Chris Steel MLA

Date:

QTON No. 197

**Legislative Assembly** for the  
**Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Fiona Carrick MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Heritage

In relation to: Callam Offices

Hearing: 4 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript 50-51

Transcript provided: 07 August 2025

Answer Due: 14 August 2025

Minister for Heritage took on notice the following question(s):

MS CARRICK: Thank you, Chair. My question is about the Callam Offices, the status of them. I heard they were up for sale. So what has happened?

Mr Steel: That is a matter for Infrastructure Canberra, and places and spaces, who have responsibility for Callam Offices. And they may be able to provide some guidance. It is heritage listed. But I do not know whether you want to provide any comments on the heritage listing.

Dr Swete Kelly: No. As you said, they are— it is a responsibility for the place manager to manage that and manage the sale or whatever use of that site might eventuate in the future. So the Heritage Council has made a decision on that some time ago and protected that as an entry on the Heritage Register. And not it is over to them to sort of look at the options for future use of that site.

MS CARRICK: So, what are the heritage requirements that have to be looked after? What did you say about the heritage register, that it is not— I mean, it is in the heritage register?

Dr Swete Kelly: Yes, it is.

Mr Steel: Yes.

MS CARRICK: Yes. And so what are the requirements, the heritage requirements for the site?

Dr Swete Kelly: I would have to take it on notice about the specific requirements for that site. But in general, the heritage register notes what the significance of the site is. And certainly I do know that from this point of view, it is the architectural elements of that place. But I am not quite sure what might be the limitations of those specific requirements on Callam Offices.

MS CARRICK: So would the Heritage Council be responsible for ensuring that it is looked after and maintained?

Dr Swete Kelly: The Heritage Council is responsible—

MS CARRICK: Or the heritage in the directorate, sorry? I know there is—

Dr Swete Kelly: No, it would be the Heritage Council as the decision maker. They have provisions to— basically they need to make sure that the significance of the site or the place is being maintained. And if that were not to happen, and I am not saying that is in this instance, they have capacity to make heritage directions or repair damage directions that basically direct the properties and land-owner managers to rectify that, to maintain that significance.

THE CHAIR: Just quickly, going back to your previous response. You said that you would have to take that on notice, but. Can I confirm that you have taken that on notice?

Dr Swete Kelly: For the specific requirements of Callam Offices, is that correct?

THE CHAIR: If that is what you were looking for, yes.

MS CARRICK: Yes. The specific requirements and whether they are being complied with.

Dr Swete Kelly: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Yes. Thank you.

**Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:**

The Callam Offices (sometimes known as Callum Offices) were added to the ACT Heritage Register in 2008.

The Callam Offices are one of two large government office commissions in Canberra designed in the 1970s by John Andrews. Callam Offices are designed and detailed in the Late Twentieth-Century Structuralist manner, and finely built in exposed off-form concrete, steel and glass.

The guiding conservation objective of the Register entry is that Callam Offices be conserved and appropriately managed in a manner respecting their heritage significance and the features intrinsic to that heritage significance, and consistent with a sympathetic and viable use or uses.

Features intrinsic to the heritage significance of the place which require conservation under the *Heritage Act 2004* include:

**1. Three-pod office complex**

- The original scale, form, and fabric of the complex, including specially designed finishes.
- Elevated walkways as shown in the original working drawings.
- Full-height and full-width glazing with the glazed stainless steel sun-shading façade system.
- Exposed waffle slab floors and prominently expressed reinforced concrete slab edge beams.
- Reinforced concrete walkways and connecting links.
- Cladding on circulation bridges and utility service zones.
- Circular lift and stairwell towers, including circular concrete stair towers.

- Original fittings and finishes in toilet areas and lifts.
- 2. Freestanding building configuration**
- The independent placement of the buildings, which allows their scale and form to be fully appreciated.
  - The open landscape setting, including the open undercroft, which contributes to the site's spatial character and visual openness.
  - The free-standing nature of the buildings which enables its scale and form to be appreciated including the open form of the landscape setting including the open undercroft.

As a registered place, provisions of the *Heritage Act 2004* require the building be conserved and responsibly managed by its owner, Infrastructure Canberra (ICBR).

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

By the Minister for Heritage, Chris Steel MLA

Date:

QTON No. 198

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: CLAY

Addressed to: Minister for Heritage

In relation to: First Nations Heritage

Hearing: 4 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript 48-49

Transcript provided: 7 August 2025

Answer Due: 14 August 2025

Minister for Heritage took on notice the following question(s):

MS CLAY: Thank you. I have just got some supplementaries on First Nations heritage in this work. Will First Nations heritage be part of the new database that you are procuring at the moment?

Mr Burkevics: Thanks, Ms Clay. Really significant focus across all areas of heritage. And as minister indicated, really pleased to see that there are two First Nations representatives on council for a long while, but absolutely a big focus.

MS CLAY: In the database– thank you, about reps on the heritage council. The database that you are procuring at the moment, will the new database be able to record and process First Nations cultural sites?

Mr Burkevics: As mentioned, cannot speak with any detail on a procurement or where matters are up to in terms of a databased. I think what we certainly know is the protection of the cultural data that is held by ACT Heritage already is a huge priority. And a lot of work has been done already to clean and make that data accessible.

MS CLAY: I am sorry, I am not looking for pre-announcements of things that cannot be announced, but if you do not scope something in a contract, you will not get it delivered. So I am just trying to check whether government has decided to put this into the procurement. Because if you do not ask for it, then it will not be there.

Mr Steel: You can answer that. If you want to take it on notice and then we can check.

MS CLAY: On notice, would be fine.

Dr Swete Kelly: Basically, so it is my understanding– yes, we are doing the body of work to enable the government’s arrangements and the conversation with First Nations about data accessibility in the First Nations space. But that sits alongside and parallel to the actual database procurement itself.

MS CLAY: Okay. I am not sure I am going to get any further on that.

Mr Steel: We might take that on notice and just see whether we can answer it in relation to the specific requirements for the database.

MS CLAY: Yes. Thank you, minister. Yes.

**Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member’s question is as follows:**

A new heritage database will include provision for the management of data relating to Traditional Custodians cultural values. This requirement directly fulfils Section 3(a)(iii) of the *Heritage Act 2004*, which mandates the establishment of a system for the recognition, registration, and conservation of Aboriginal places and objects.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Heritage, Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 213

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Ms Fiona Carrick MLA

Addressed to: Mr Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport

In relation to: Public transport and Transport options for Molonglo and Weston Creek residents -  
Light Rail Stage 2B

Hearing: 05 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: pp 22-24

Transcript provided: 08 August 2025

Answer Due: 16 August 2025

**Mr Chris Steel MLA: Minister for Transport took on notice the following question(s):**

**MS CARRICK:** Just a supp on the BCR stuff, I note that with the BCR, you know, you have got your transport benefits, your land use benefits and your WEBs, where you might put your agglomeration benefits and what have you. In Stage 1 the transport benefits were 0.49. The total was 1.2 with land use and WEBs. My experience in working in infrastructure is while a business case might set out those three types of benefits, the transport benefit for a transport project is what is publicly stated. And in this case it was not the transport benefit was ever really made a thing of. It was always the whole thing, the 1.2.

So anyway, I just made that point that, like, if we are moving beyond BCRs we need to look at the public transport. That is the fundamental thing of why we are putting these projects in. So you know, like when we are talking about Stage 2B, what work have you done to survey the people of Tuggeranong and Molonglo and Weston Creek to ensure that you will get mode shift onto public transport once the new network goes in?

**Mr Barr:** Certainly that is work that the transport area of government has undertaken, but also the planning area have also looked at that, plus obviously where future population growth would be catered for in the territory. And some of that obviously goes to address either population decline or stagnation in some parts of Canberra. So as a catalyst for new development and population increase, transport projects, I think, have proven to be very successful. I mean, ultimately, we have had four elections now on this matter.

**MS CARRICK:** No, I was just asking about what work you have done to survey the people about what their needs are for public transport, because I understand that from Molonglo and Weston Creek—and Minister Steel said from Tuggeranong—that the buses will still run through. But the whole thing

is about increasing levels of congestion as the population grows to 750,000 by 2060. So without a dedicated bus lane they will be stuck in traffic. And is that good public transport?

**Mr Barr:** Well, that is not a question. That is a statement.

**MS CARRICK:** Is that good public transport, to be stuck in congested traffic?

**Mr Barr:** Well, that is why you would have a dedicated new and extended form of public transport that does not leave you stuck in traffic.

**MS CARRICK:** Well, how do you know they will catch it if we do not know what the travel times are, how they will access it? We do not know how many changes.

**Mr Barr:** Well, we certainly—

**MS CARRICK:** When will you tell us how many changes, what the services are, and what the travel times will be?

**Mr Barr:** As we progress through the detailed design and procurement of the project those sorts of questions are answered. But I mean, these exact doomsday scenario questions were put in ahead of—

**MS CARRICK:** No, it is not doomsday. It is information. It is just being informed about the services and the travel times that we will get from a big investment.

**Mr Barr:** And these exact scare campaigns were run ahead of Stage—

**MS CARRICK:** It is not a scare campaign.

**THE CHAIR:** Mr Barr, I think what Ms Carrick—and please forgive me if I am off track, Ms Carrick. I think what she is trying to find out is what is the timeline in terms of actual dates rather than where—or I would be happy with a specific of where along the process we will find out that information.

**Mr Barr:** Yes, so all of these issues are, of course, addressed and resolved prior to the procurement of the project. There is still a process that needs to conclude, including the engagement with the National Capital Authority and the commonwealth parliament, before those questions can be finally answered. But ahead of procurement, they will be. And the point I was making is that these exact questions were asked and posed as a reason not to proceed with Stage 1 of the project. I was there. I remember it all. I am watching a poor sequel, really, of a debate; a movie that we have already seen. But nevertheless, Ms Geraghty can provide some further—

**MS CARRICK:** I think it is perfectly legitimate to ask for travel times.

**Mr Barr:** If we can answer the questions—of course it is. Of course it is, and I have answered the question, that we will provide that information once we have that final certainty. There is still a process to run through. Ms Geraghty will indeed endeavour to answer the questions that you have put.

**Ms Geraghty:** So currently, Stage 2B, the draft Environmental Impact Statement is out for consultation, and that is an ongoing process which talks about the design, talks about the

environmental factors, looks at—you know, it is really the initial process of the planning. Once we have got that finalised and we submit that as a final version next year and receive an approval for that, we will then be able to progress the business case. And part of the business case process will be looking at how it will be used, what will be the travel benefits, what will be the mode shifts, what will be, you know, the patronage. And all those sorts of things will be considered as part of that, and similar to what was done under Stage 1. So we are just not there yet in terms of the planning.

**MS CARRICK:** But you must be considering the people of Molonglo and Weston Creek. Like, how will Weston Creek—what is their service? Are they on the bus or are they on light rail? Surely we know this.

**Ms Geraghty:** Well, I think that is probably a question for Transport Canberra rather than us. We were working very closely with them during the business case process. They are responsible for transport planning and we will be working on the infrastructure to support their planning.

**MS CARRICK:** So, interestingly, we have no idea what the service for people from Weston Creek or Molonglo will be at this stage even though we have committed to this big investment.

**Ms Geraghty:** I am happy to take this question on notice and refer to the—

**Mr Chris Steel MLA:** The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

The ACT Government has consistently stated that there is still expected to be direct rapid buses from the Southside to the City once Light Rail Stage 2b operations commence, including from the Molonglo Valley.

There may also be opportunities, which were not available before, to provide connection points to light rail for passengers connecting from rapid buses from Molonglo and Weston Creek (which would continue to the City). For example, opportunities will be explored in the future for a bus stop near the Kent St light rail stop, which would provide options for passenger connections to light rail services to the major Commonwealth Public Service employment hub in Barton and Parkes as well as Woden Town Centre.

Consistent with the introduction of Light Rail Stage 1, Transport Canberra will oversee future network planning to optimise bus and light rail integration.

Preliminary work is underway, and considered in the Environmental Impact Statement, to explore how the existing bus fleet could be deployed to enhance network reach and frequency. As network demands and traffic movements change, transport planning studies will continue to be undertaken that will inform future public transport network adjustments and improvements, including the Molonglo Valley region.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

By the Minister for Transport, Mr Chris Steel MLA

Date:

QTON No. 221

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Fiona Carrick MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development

Redirected to: Chris Steel MLA

In relation to: Yarralumla Creek Holistic Planning

Hearing: 5 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp36

Transcript provided: 8 August 2025

Answer Due: 16 August 2025

Ms Geraghty took on notice the following question(s):

**MS CARRICK:** It is quick. Like so the northern section of Athllon Drive there is the duplication, there is the light rail. You talked about SLA land release. Will you do holistic planning that includes the creek, Yarralumla Creek, the naturalisation of the creek. We have been asking for sometime, years, that if you not plan it holistically, the people miss out.

**Mr Barr:** Yes, that is the work the SLA are undertaking. It has been referenced.

**MS CARRICK:** So is there some transparency for the community because we have been asking for years and it is like you get nothing.

**Ms Geraghty:** We are happy to take the question on notice and refer it. I can give you two questions' answers quickly. Raising London Circuit is a total budget of 134 million which is inclusive of—sorry 1.34 million. The next question was about the aquatic centre. It is 1.495. It is the operating subsidy inclusive of an additional 500,000 for additional repairs and maintenance funding. The 500,00 is yet to be determined. We are working with different operators about which facility to take to that would attract that.

**Chris Steel MLA The answer to the Member's question is as follows:**

Yarralumla Creek plays a vital role in Canberra's urban water system as a designated floodway, carrying significant flows during periods of heavy rainfall. Its function is particularly important in managing stormwater and mitigating flood risks across the Southern Gateway Corridor (the Corridor).

To better understand and plan for future conditions, the City and Environment Directorate (CED) is currently finalising a comprehensive flood study for Yarralumla Creek. This study will model the impacts of climate change and anticipated development in the Corridor, providing critical data to inform future land use and infrastructure planning.

The Woden District Strategy sets a clear direction to explore opportunities for integrating Yarralumla Creek into the blue-green network. This includes investigating the potential for wetlands and the application of water-sensitive urban design principles to enhance ecological value and urban resilience.

The outcomes of the flood study will be one element that informs the development of the Southern Gateway Planning and Design Framework.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Planning and Land Management, Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 238

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Mr Shane Rattenbury MLA

Addressed to: Minister for City and Government Services

In relation to: Parks and conservation and Funding for Capital Woodlands and Wetlands Trust

Hearing: 07 August 2025  
Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 3  
Transcript provided: 08 August 2025  
Answer Due: 15 August 2025

Suzanne Orr MLA took on notice the following question(s):

**MR RATTENBURY:** Thank you, Chair. Good morning. I wanted to ask about Mulligans Flat. I wanted to ask if there was any funding for the Capital Woodlands and Wetlands Trust in the budget because I could not identify any in there.

**Ms Orr:** Thank you, Mr Rattenbury. Suzanne Orr, Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water. I believe the Parks and Conservation Service is just making its way to the table and will be able to answer your question.

**Ms Watts:** Morning. My name is Michaela Watts. I am the executive branch manager of the ACT Parks and Conservation Service.

There was no initiative funding in the budget for Mulligans Flat or for Wildbark; however, ACT government continues to provide maintenance funding for the building facility at Wildbark, and that is written into a deed of grant for that particular facility.

**MR RATTENBURY:** Thank you. So are there any other ongoing funding agreements between the government and the Capital Woodlands and Wetlands Trust beyond that maintenance funding Ms Watts just described?

**Ms Orr:** Sorry. Just bear with us, Mr Rattenbury.

**MR RATTENBURY:** Sure.

**Ms Orr:** It is actually Minister Cheyne's part of the portfolio, so—

**MR RATTENBURY:** Okay.

**Ms Orr:** —we might take that on notice, if that is all right, just so we can actually—

**MR RATTENBURY:** I appreciate that.

**Ms Orr:** Yes.

**MR RATTENBURY:** I am sorry. I thought it was sat in this, but anyway, I will get it right for annual reports.

**Ms Orr:** Yes. That is fine. Yes.

**MR RATTENBURY:** Yes. No worries.

**Ms Orr:** Yes. So we will take that one on notice.

**Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:**

There are no other ongoing funding agreements with the Capital Wetlands and Woodlands Trust.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Acting Minister for City and Government Services, Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 239

**Legislative Assembly** for the  
**Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Ms Jo Clay MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water

In relation to: Conservation and promotion of native flora and fauna and Costings in the Sullivans Creek options paper

Hearing: 07 August 2025  
Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 8  
Transcript provided: 08 August 2025  
Answer Due: 15 August 2025

Suzanne Orr took on notice the following question(s):

**THE CHAIR:** All right. Ms Clay had a supplementary on this.

**MS CLAY:** Minister, I think I heard that the Sullivans Creek options paper had rough costings in it, but I have just checked, and there are not costings in there. Can we get the rough costings on the Sullivans Creek options on notice, perhaps.

**Mr Burkevics:** We do have some rough costings, minister, available.

**MS CLAY:** Yes. Could we get those on notice?

**Ms Orr:** We will take the question on notice and see what we can do. We will have to see how rough they are.

**Mr Burkevics:** There was general estimates before the proposed works, but certainly, minister, if you are comfortable, we can take that on notice.

**Ms Orr:** Yes. I can take it on notice. Yes.

**MS CLAY:** Thank you.

Suzanne Orr MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

The Sullivans Creek Re-naturalisation Plan is available online at <https://www.act.gov.au/environment/environment-projects/sullivans-creek-re-naturalisation-plan>.

Rough estimates to restore three areas along Sullivans Creek were provided separately to the plan. The total estimate was approximately \$300 million. A significant cost was the relocation of existing utilities and services.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water, Suzanne Orr

QTON No. 241

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Jo Clay MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water

In relation to: Conservation and promotion of native flora and fauna and Size of earless dragon release sites

Hearing: 07 August 2025  
Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 16  
Transcript provided: 08 August 2025  
Answer Due: 15 August 2025

Bren Burkevics: took on notice the following question(s):

**MS CLAY:** I might be a little more tangible then. If breeding in captivity is successful, where will ACT government be releasing the dragons?

**Ms Orr:** Yes, Ms Clay, we are not actually releasing the location of the sites or identifying them in public for the simple reason that we do not want to encourage people to try and go there to spot these critters because that will create biosecurity concerns.

**MS CLAY:** Sure. That is fine if it is not public. Do you have clear plans for where you will be releasing the dragons?

**Mr Burkevics:** There are absolute plans for where those dragons are proposed to be released and there are already some releases that have been approved by me as Conservator already in some of the existing sites.

**MS CLAY:** And are you able to tell me perhaps—I do not need to know the locations. Can you tell me the scale of the sites, the hectares, like any information? So a lot of people are quite concerned that we might be spending money on breeding in captivity and we are not—having seen a good area of habitat now being destroyed, people are quite concerned that they think we may end up with dragons in captivity alone and they do not know where the dragons will live in the wild.

**Ms Orr:** Ms Clay, we can certainly clarify that the breeding program is not breeding and staying there; it is a breeding and release program so the dragons that are bred will be released into the wild populations.

**MS CLAY:** Is it possible to get a hectare figure on notice?

**Mr Burkevics:** I think we can provide—if you are happy to take that on notice, minister, we will provide as much information as we can, noting that I suppose the existing Majura Valley is habitat to the Canberra Grassland Earless Dragon, so there are a number of existing reserves in other locations where the releases have occurred and future releases are planned, but certainly happy to provide as much information that we can that also protects the security of those release sites.

**MS CLAY:** Sure. Sure

Suzanne Orr MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

Two sites in the Jerrabomberra Valley of approximately 203.5ha (site 1) and 187ha (site 2) have been identified for initial releases of the Canberra Grassland Earless Dragon (CGED).

These two sites contain Native Temperate Grassland (NTG) of high quality, and Native Pasture (NP) of low-quality habitat. The available NTG and NP at these two sites fluctuates seasonally and across years.

The latest plant community type mapping shows that Site 1 has approximately 2.5ha of NTG and 160ha of NP. The remaining 41ha is exotic-dominated and is not suitable CGED habitat.

Site 2 has approximately 57ha of NTG and 104ha of NP. The remaining 26ha is exotic-dominated and not suitable CGED habitat.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water, Suzanne Orr

QTON No. 242

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Miss Laura Nuttall MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water

In relation to: Agriculture and Local food supply chain study

Hearing: 07 August 2025  
Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 20-22  
Transcript provided: 08 August 2025  
Answer Due: 15 August 2025

Bren Burkevics took on notice the following question(s):

**MISS NUTTALL:** Okay, that is helpful to understand. Thank you. With the Chair's indulgence, may I briefly ask about the Local Food Strategy?

**THE CHAIR:** Yes, I will let it go. Okay.

**MISS NUTTALL:** Thank you. That is extremely kind, thank you, Chair.

**THE CHAIR:** You can use a bit of my time because you just asked my question.

**MISS NUTTALL:** Well, that is very kind. I am so sorry. So on the Local Food Strategy, I am confirming that there were no initiatives funded in this budget to implement the strategy, is that correct?

**Mr Burkevics:** There is ongoing work to implement the strategy and a number of studies that have been progressed. So whilst there was not any specific funding in this budget to support the need, there are measures in previously that are supporting implementation of that local food strategy.

**Miss Nuttall:** Okay. Got you. So two actions that I am aware of from last budget that were initiated, which is a review of land management agreements and the local food supply change study, where are those both up to?

**Mr Burkevics:** Review of the LMAs, land management agreements, which are a statutory instrument signed by me as conservator. So a review was done several years ago as part of a response to an Auditor-General's report into land management agreement. That has helped inform quite a way forward and some improvements in our land management practices.

I think certainly my interest as conservator is any new land management agreement has to be signed by the rural lessee and myself. Very keen to ensure that there is robust ecological information in that. I think I would certainly like to make the LMAs more user friendly. I think feedback that I get from the other signatories to the LMA is it is a at times difficult document to read, and so one of the areas that we are looking into is how could we make it more user friendly to both parties.

But I am very confident. I know that when LMAs are being reviewed that we often will have teams on the ground looking at the existing ecological values, re-assessing those and ensuring that the most recent information is included in the LMAs for signature.

**Miss Nuttall:** Got you. That review that you mentioned then, is that publicly available?

**Mr Burkevics:** Yes. I think it is on the Auditor-General's website. It is several years old now.

**Miss Nuttall:** Got you.

**Mr Burkevics:** And there would be a government response to that.

**Miss Nuttall:** And sort of no necessarily new—because is that what the funding from the last budget was for in terms of a review of land management agreements, just to sort of track back? Because it was done a few years ago, I am wondering what—

**Mr Burkevics:** Yes. If could confirm the budget initiative that you are referring to about LMAs in the last budget. I am not—

**MR RATTENBURY:** If I might assist, I think Miss Nuttall is familiar with the review by the Auditor-General. But then under the local food strategy, there was a review initiated to look at the role of land management agreements and how they might operate differently in that context.

**Mr Burkevics:** Separately in relation to supporting—

**MR RATTENBURY:** No. I think that is the one Miss Nuttall is specifically asking about.

**Mr Burkevics:** The one in the strategy?

**MR RATTENBURY:** Yes.

**Mr Burkevics:** Okay. No. Thank you for that clarification, Mr Rattenbury. I think it is fair to say that at the moment, the priority for the team on the local food strategy is the food study, and so I am not aware of any forward progress on the LMA at the moment. That is a downstream priority, noting the work that has already occurred on the LMAs as a result of the Auditor-General's type work.

But I think it is fair to say we continue to have regular engagement with our rural communities about supporting their needs to remote agriculture in the ACT and look at farm diversification. I know our natural resource management team have done a considerable amount of work in

relation to that matter. So I think it is related and is feeding that action under the food strategy, but it is one of the priorities for later.

**Miss Nuttall:** Got you. And on that local food supply chain study, is that completed?

**Mr Burkevics:** That one is still underway, from memory.

**Miss Nuttall:** Is there a review to when it might be completed?

**Mr Burkevics:** Happy, if the minister is comfortable, we can get some further information on timeframes for that one.

**Miss Nuttall:** Beautiful. That would be awesome. Thank you.

Suzanne Orr MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

The ACT Food Hub Feasibility Study was commissioned in April 2025 as part of the implementation of the Canberra Region Local Food Strategy. The ACT Government received the final report from SGS Economics and Planning at the end of June 2025. The findings and recommendations are being considered to guide and inform next steps.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water, Suzanne Orr MLA

QTON No. 243

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Mr Ed Cocks MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water

In relation to: Water policy and Healthy Waterways Project funding

Hearing: 07 August 2025  
Uncorrected Proof Transcript pp 22-23  
Transcript provided: 08 August 2025  
Answer Due: 5 August 2025

Suzanne Orr took on notice the following question(s):

**THE CHAIR:** All right. So I am just going to jump back to the discussion around the Healthy Waterways briefly, because I do not think we quite got to a completely clear space. So page 156 of Budget Statement E, you have got the \$944,000. Now, that is an additional spend in 24-25, reducing the allocation for 25-26. That is right, is it not? Well, it is a positive number in 24-25 and a negative in 25-26. That would seem to indicate that it is money spent earlier than expected.

**Ms Orr:** Thank you. We might pass to Ms Tetley.

**Ms Tetley:** Melissa Tetley, Chief Finance Officer. Yes. What happened was that the spending in the prior year was accelerated, so to help with that, we have brought the funding forward and reduced the funding in the forward. It is all within the same amount of the program that we were allocated.

**THE CHAIR:** Okay. So that is a bring-forward of expenditure into—

**Ms Tetley:** Yes. That is right.

**THE CHAIR:** Okay. That is useful to know. So the page 107 of the budget outlook has \$127,000 to continue the Healthy Waterways Project under this measure, improving Lake Tuggeranong.

**Mr Burkevics:** Correct.

**Ms Tetley:** Correct.

**THE CHAIR:** Now, that has \$150,000 of offsets. Can you tell me what those are? That is separate to the reduction in spending.

**Ms Tetley:** Yes. That is correct. So that Lake Tuggeranong, which is a new initiative for this year, has—it was two resources. One of them was within existing resources, so the offset is an existing resource.

**THE CHAIR:** So when you say “two resources”, is that two FTE?

**Ms Tetley:** That is two FTE. Sorry. Yes, two FTE.

**THE CHAIR:** That is useful. So it is entirely FTE—one new, one existing—so that is clearly offset from something else. What was that resource previously allocated to that is not being done so that they can do this?

**Ms Tetley:** It was previously. So it is part of our Healthy Waterways FTE base funding, so one of our ongoing FTEs within the Healthy Waterways.

**Ms Wright:** So I might add, Mr Cocks, so Healthy Waterways has been like a long-running program, and as you could appreciate, have achieved several projects over the years. And now that the focus turns to Lake Tuggeranong, that is a resource that will be applied to the Lake Tuggeranong work.

**THE CHAIR:** Okay. So it is not really a \$327,000 measure. It is a \$177,000 measure because Healthy Waterways is going anyway. That resource was previously working on Healthy Waterways. Now they are going to be working on this part of Healthy Waterways.

**Ms Wright:** Yes. However, each initiative we seek funding for is time bound, so this provided—you know, that resource was ongoing at this period. So you are right, you know, in that that was already allocated for this period, that 150,000. That is why it is shown as an offset.

**THE CHAIR:** Okay. And you said each resource is time bound, so all funding under Healthy Waterways are non-ongoing measures?

**Ms Wright:** There is a mix, but yes, most is ongoing. Yes.

**THE CHAIR:** Could you provide me a breakdown, maybe on notice, of what is ongoing and what is non-ongoing and when they drop off for this program?

**Ms Orr:** Yes, Mr Cocks, we can take that on notice. The ongoing and non-ongoing nature is partly tied into the initiative, so is the certain projects that need delivery.

**THE CHAIR:** Yes, I understand that.

**Ms Orr:** And then the ongoing is to be continued. Yes.

**THE CHAIR:** If you like, I am happy for you to identify it, break it down by which initiative is going off and on and what time, if it is more useful

Suzanne Orr MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

The Healthy Waterways Program comprises two teams. One team is focused on urban programs such as the *Safeguarding the Territory's water resources – Improving Lake Tuggeranong* initiative. The other is focused on non-urban initiatives, including delivery of the *Restoring the Upper Murrumbidgee River* (RUMR) Program in partnership with the NSW and Commonwealth Governments.

There are 11 full time equivalent (FTE) staff working in the Healthy Waterways team in 2025-26.

There are 9 FTE funded by the ACT Government, as shown in the table below.

ACT Government Funded Positions - Healthy Waterways		
Level	FTE	Status
Senior Officer Grade B	1	Ongoing
Senior Professional Officer B	1	Ongoing
Senior Professional Officer C	1	Ongoing
Senior Officer Grade C	2	1 FTE non-ongoing (2025-26 ACT Budget initiative) 1 FTE ongoing
Infrastructure Officer 3	1	Ongoing
Administrative Services Officer 6	1	Fully absorbed by existing resources (2025-26 ACT Budget initiative)
Professional Officer 2	2	Ongoing
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9</b>	

A Senior Officer Grade C (1 FTE) is funded from the 2025-26 *Safeguarding the Territory's water resources – Improving Lake Tuggeranong* Budget initiative and the rest of the positions are ongoing. Of this 9 FTE, one SOG B (1 FTE) is leading the RUMR Program, and the rest are working on catchment plans for urban lakes and underpinning technical analyses, or supporting related Office of Water business.

The RUMR program has two additional FTE—a SOGC and an ASO6—funded by the Commonwealth, as shown in the table below.

Commonwealth Funded Positions - Healthy Waterways		
Level	FTE	Status
Senior Officer Grade C	1	Non-ongoing (Federation Funding Agreement - Restoring the Upper Murrumbidgee)
Administrative Services Officer 6	1	Non-ongoing (Federation Funding Agreement - Implementing Water Reform in the Murray-Darling Basin - 2024-25 to 2027-28)
<i>TOTAL</i>	2	

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Minister for Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water, Suzanne Orr

QTON No. 275

Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital TerritorySelect Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Ms Fiona Carrick MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Sport and Recreation

Redirected to: Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development

In relation to: Sport and Recreation and Risk mitigation for Philip Pool

Hearing: 06/08/2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript p21

Transcript provided: DD Month YYYY

Answer Due: 20/08/2025

Yvette Berry MLA took on notice the following question(s):

**MS CARRICK:** Okay, thank you. What policy work is being done to assess and mitigate the risk of Geocon Pool in Phillip not being financially viable as a public facility and closing to the public?

**Ms Kelley:** That would be a matter for City Environment Directorate.

**Ms Arthy:** Yes. So as we talked about previously in these hearings, anything to do with that particular pool is a matter for City and Environment Directorate because it is a privately-held pool with conditions put in it as part of the lease arrangements, and yes, we certainly are not doing any specific work in relation to the Geocon Pool, and any questions about it should be directed to the other directorate.

**MS CARRICK:** So should the Geocon Pool not be available to the public, as the Minister for Sport, how will you manage the shortfall of aquatic facilities in Woden?

**Ms Berry:** It will be available to the public.

**MS CARRICK:** Can you guarantee that?

**Ms Berry:** That might be a question again for another directorate but that is definitely the intention, that the pool would be available to the public. It would not be viable for Geocon or anyone managing the pool for it not to be available to the public. That would just be - yes.

**MS CARRICK:** We have seen private pools fail before—Phillip, Oasis, Big Splash. There is a history of privately-funded pools failing, so how can you guarantee that this is commercially viable?

**Ms Berry:** Look, I do not think it is a question I can answer, but I will take it on notice as far as what work has been done in that space.

**MS CARRICK:** Because as the Minister for Sport, we need to know how you are mitigating this issue and what the alternative is should it fail. Where is the Sports and Recreation Needs Analysis that determined that only a 25 metre pool and associated smaller pools would meet the need for the Woden, Weston Creek, Inner South catchment?

Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

The purpose clause in the lease currently states that the site is to be used only for the purposes of a public heated swimming pool and ice-skating rink. Amongst other things, there are also provisions in the lease that require the lessee to make the swimming pool publicly available.

Access Canberra is able to investigate and take action when a lessee is in breach provisions in the Crown lease or when a person is not conforming to the requirements of the *Planning Act 2023*.

The proposed redevelopment and development application (DA) is subject to both the Territory Plan and a Crown Lease. The Territory Plan currently contains specific provisions relating to a pool facility and ice-skating rink. In particular, the Woden District Policy requires a pool facility to a minimum standard and that the facility is publicly accessible.

On 13 November 2024, a significant development application (DA-202443325) was lodged for the existing Phillip Pool site, Block 2 Section 22 Phillip. The design report that was submitted with the application outlines that the redevelopment of the site is proposed in three stages. This includes:

- **Stage 1:**
  - o Demolition of toddler pool, landscape elements, roof canopy and building structure;
  - o Construction of Tower A and B along with new swimming pool complex and basement parking;
  - o Construction of laneway connecting Melrose Drive to Irving Street;
  - o Construction of substation S1 and S2;
  - o with the continued operations of existing 50m swimming pool and ice-skating rink.
- **Stage 2:** Demolition of existing 50m swimming pool and construction of Residential Tower C and basement parking.
- **Stage 3:** Demolition of existing ice-skating rink and construction of Tower D and E, basement parking and central courtyard plaza and construction of substation S3.

DA-202443325 proposes works for Stage 1 of the development only which is still currently being assessed by the Authority. The other stages (i.e. stages 2 and 3), including the demolition of the existing pool, will be submitted under separate future DA(s). These applications will be considered by the Authority, and relevant ACT Government agencies, against the requirements of the Territory Plan and *Planning Act 2023*.

The ACT Government responded to a previous Assembly Resolution, which was tabled in the ACT Legislative Assembly in February 2025. This response provided further detail on considerations relating to pools within the area. It is available on the ACT Legislative Assembly website at

[https://www.parliament.act.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0011/2798597/d4f2437f47b4f74b232dec072a9fc43b99deed57.pdf](https://www.parliament.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0011/2798597/d4f2437f47b4f74b232dec072a9fc43b99deed57.pdf).

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

Date:

By the Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development, Chris Steel MLA

QTON No. 286

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Miss Laura Nuttall MLA

Addressed to: Yvette Berry MLA, Minister for Sport and Recreation

In relation to: Skate Park Strategy timing

Hearing: 06 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: p 31.

Transcript provided: 13 August 2025

Answer Due: 20 August 2025

**Yvette Berry, Minister for Sport and Recreation took on notice the following question(s):**

**MS NUTTAL:** Do you have a timeframe for the skate park strategy?

**Ms Berry:** I just cannot recall. I will take that on notice.

**Ms Yvette Berry MLA:** The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

The ACT Skate strategy is currently being drafted and is expected to be finalised and released in 2026.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

By the Minister for Sport and Recreation, Ms Yvette Berry MLA

Date:

QTON No. 287

**Legislative Assembly for the  
Australian Capital Territory**Select Committee on Estimates 2025–  
2026

# Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2025–2026 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2025–2026

## Answer to question taken on notice

---

Asked by: Miss Laura Nuttall MLA

Addressed to: Yvette Berry MLA, Minister for Sport and Recreation

In relation to: Skate Park Strategy consultation

Hearing: 06 August 2025

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: p 31.

Transcript provided: 13 August 2025

Answer Due: 20 August 2025

**Yvette Berry, Minister for Sport and Recreation took on notice the following question(s):**

**MS NUTTAL:** Beautiful. Last but not least, do you have any detail on what consultation with skate park user groups will look like?

**Ms Berry:** Again, I just do not have anybody here that can help me with the answer of these, so I will take it on notice and see what I can provide.

**Yvette Berry MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:**

Targeted stakeholder engagement is expected to be undertaken with the ACT Skateboarding Association, Canberra Region Old School Skaters and ACT BMX Association regarding the ACT Skate Strategy. This consultation is expected to commence in the third quarter of 2025.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates

Signature:

By the Minister for Sport and Recreation, Ms Yvette Berry MLA

Date: