

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 3 April 2025

The SPEAKER (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell) took the chair at 11:01.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, we acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia and their connection to land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures and to elders both past and present.

The SPEAKER read prayers.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: BRAHMA LODGE KINDERGARTEN NEW FACILITY

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:02): I move:

That the 119th report of the committee, entitled Brahma Lodge Kindergarten New Facility, be noted.

Brahma Lodge Kindergarten is located within the Salisbury local government area at 64 The Strand, Brahma Lodge. The project proposed by the Department for Education will relocate the kindergarten to Brahma Lodge Primary School, located at 20 Mortess Street, Brahma Lodge. A socio-economic guide known as the Index of Educational Disadvantage is used to allocate resources to schools in need of support. This index considers both the Brahma Lodge Kindergarten and Brahma Lodge Primary School to be category 1 institutions, which indicates they serve the most socio-economically disadvantaged communities.

Both the kindergarten and primary school have a high number of children from families that have English as a second language, with several children utilising the Inclusive Education Support Program, which provides funds for behaviour, speech and language needs. This project will provide a modern facility for early childhood education and care that meets legislative compliance requirements and will deliver the department's benchmark accommodation for preschool-age children, with a key aim of the project to co-locate the kindergarten with the primary school to provide a seamless transition between preschool and school, as well as providing flexible spaces suited for the delivery of early childhood education and care.

At the beginning of the 2024 school year, the existing kindergarten had 41 enrolments and a capacity for 60 enrolments, based on a two-session program with 30 children per session. The proposed works will provide a facility and supporting infrastructure that delivers an increased total capacity of 66 children over two 33-children sessions. The work will provide a new standalone preschool building; activity areas; administration and staff workspaces; storage areas; consultation spaces for visiting allied health professionals; amenities for staff, children and the community; outdoor learning areas; and car parking and dedicated pedestrian and vehicle access.

In addition to the delivery of a new gymnasium at the Brahma Lodge Primary School, which has just commenced construction, the architectural form of the new building has been designed to provide a facility that is welcoming for the entire community. With a separate entrance to the facility located on Kent Avenue, the kindergarten will retain its own identity while still being an integral part of the school community.

The external fabric of the structure will include compressed fibre cement cladding with aluminium-framed glass windows and doors. Designed around an architecturally featured raked ceiling above the main activity space, the building's interior design will create flexible and functional spaces with contemporary finishes, including the use of plasterboard and acoustic ceilings, carpet and vinyl flooring, and laminate joinery units, and will feature acoustic pinboards.

The project has considered requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act with respect to making provisions for persons with disabilities and will be fully certified in accordance with legislative requirements. Landscaping of the outdoor environment has been designed by a consultant with

expertise in outdoor play for early childhood and will provide aesthetically pleasing external spaces that are flexible to accommodate learning. This will include a sand pit, a swing, and water and nature play elements framed by lawn and low maintenance native planting.

The new facility is estimated to cost \$6 million, with the funds drawn from the department's 2023-24 capital works program. Any changes in the recurrent cost to the school's operating budget as a result of this redevelopment will be defunded from within the department's existing resources. All works will take place on the Brahma Lodge Primary School site, which has the title registered in the name of the Minister for Education.

Beginning with the demolition of existing structures, construction of the new facilities are anticipated to commence in April this year, with the aim for works to be complete next January. The project will be managed and delivered by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) in accordance with the requirements of the project implementation process. DIT has appointed lead professional service and cost management contractors, and construction contractors will be appointed utilising an amended general conditions contract. Tenders will be sought from contractors registered in the applicable DIT Prequalification System category.

Project delivery will follow the best practice principles for project procurement and management, as advocated by the state government and construction industry authorities. The project management process is responsible for identifying potential risks as well as implementing minimisation and mitigation strategies. The department states that the project has a low level of risk, noting the small scope of the project as well as the extensive expertise and experience of both DIT and the project team.

The primary school will continue to operate throughout construction. The contractors' compound will clearly delineate school operations from the construction works. Any potential interruptions to school operations will be kept to a minimum, and the works programmed during school holidays as well as out of hours or over weekend periods.

The design and development of the project has incorporated sustainability principles to reduce energy consumption and associated greenhouse gas emissions over the life of the project. Taking a holistic approach to planning, design, costing, construction, maintenance and building management, these initiatives include:

- maximising energy efficiency through passive design features;
- selecting heating and cooling systems that employ energy recovery systems;
- utilisation of solar power;
- the maximisation of natural ventilation;
- minimisation of energy usage through the selection of efficient lighting;
- selecting efficient water fixtures and irrigation systems;
- maximising use of rainwater; and
- selecting durable, renewable and recyclable materials.

The design also reduces the need for new building requirements by the re-use and redevelopment of existing built infrastructure, as well as considering non-built service delivery options.

The Register of Aboriginal Sites and Objects has identified no entries for Aboriginal sites within the project area, and the department confirms native title has been extinguished on the site. The SA Heritage Places database discovered no local heritage places within the project's location. The management team is in ongoing consultation with stakeholders in the community.

The school's leadership and staff have been closely involved throughout project development, and the department notes their endorsement of the redevelopment and scope of the works. Similarly, during concept planning stages the department states that care was taken to consult widely to ensure the needs of all stakeholders were considered, with the project documentation reviewed by relevant government personnel, departments and agencies.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Brahma Lodge kindergarten new facility. Witnesses who appeared for the committee were Helen Doyle, Director, Capital Projects and Technical Services, Department for Education, and Anthony Donato, Director, Anthony Donato Architects. I thank the witnesses for their time. Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I would like to welcome to parliament today Erin Leggat, the CEO of the McLaren Vale Grape Wine and Tourism Association. It is wonderful to have you in at parliament today. Thank you for all the advocacy that you do on behalf of the winemakers and the tourism operators of McLaren Vale.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL SUSTAINMENT PROJECT VARIATION—PAEDIATRIC INTENSIVE CARE UNIT UPGRADE

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:10): I move:

That the 120th report of the committee, entitled Women's and Children's Hospital Sustainment Project Variation—Paediatric Intensive Care Unit Upgrade, be noted.

The project variation proposed by the Department for Health and Wellbeing, referred to as SA Health, will increase the scope and budget of construction works at the existing Women's and Children's Hospital as part of the ongoing sustainment works program. The original \$50.2 million Women's and Children's Hospital sustainment works project was presented to the committee and tabled in the house in December 2018, with a \$7 million addendum request for additional sustainment works presented and tabled in September 2022.

The Women's and Children's Hospital provides care to more than 260,000 consumers annually across outpatient and inpatient services. Over 46,000 children present to the emergency department, with approximately 5,000 babies born each year. The proposed project outlines a \$10.3 million variation for additional works that will refurbish and expand the hospital's Paediatric Intensive Care Unit, alongside a related package of enabling and refurbishing works to other areas of the hospital.

The existing sustainment works program was established in early 2018, based on a prioritisation of infrastructure and engineering works, with the eventual delivery of the new Women's and Children's Hospital in mind. These works were completed in May 2022 and include operating theatres, the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service, neonatal services, upgrade of the paediatric emergency department and associated infrastructure and engineering issues.

Additional sustainment works were approved by the government in December 2021 and were considered by the Public Works Committee in September 2022. These include paediatric emergency administration and treatment spaces, clinical upgrades to the adolescent ward, engineering and site infrastructure upgrades, biomedical equipment replacement and fire master plan stages 1 and 2.

The current Paediatric Intensive Care Unit has a capacity of 13 bed spaces and, during times of peak capacity, critical elective surgery lists can be impacted, reducing both the intensive care unit and high dependency unit intakes to allow for emergency trauma and critical consumer admissions. Furthermore, SA Health notes that the current Paediatric Intensive Care Unit is the only tertiary unit of its kind within South Australia, and the increased capacity will provide much-needed additional space.

As part of the 2023-24 state budget, a proposal to expand and refurbish the intensive care unit was approved by the state government to address identified compliance, accreditation and

general asset condition matters. SA Health states that the budget for the proposed upgrade works is contained within the hospital's additional sustainment project on the 2024-25 agency statements.

The proposed construction works include \$5.9 million for the intensive care unit expansion, with an additional three beds, including one isolation bay with ensuite. These works will also refurbish change rooms, build a new overnight sleep area for parents and family members, create a significantly larger equipment bay and storeroom, install a new reception area, provide a new anteroom and create a staff base, a four-person office and new staffrooms and lockers.

There is \$3.8 million for reallocating anaesthetics, theatres, administration and Adelaide University paediatrics from level 3 to level 2. The relocation of these support areas will provide room to construct the additional intensive care beds, while also providing those relocating departments new space for additional staff and areas to conduct training and meetings. A further \$620,000 is for the temporary relocation of the intensive care unit to level 4's existing medical day unit area for the duration of the main works.

The project involves multiple enabling stages and will be undertaken within an operational 24/7 hospital location. To minimise associated pressures, SA Health will deliver the works employing the appropriate government facilities management arrangements, supporting its commitment to provide reliable and effective services to the community. All aspects of project delivery will be overseen by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT). To improve the efficiency, value and outcomes from the project, the government has re-engaged the services of the current professional services team, making use of existing stakeholder relationships and specialised local knowledge of the current facility.

To maximise collaboration and flexibility when delivering the works, DIT will use established procurement, evaluation and contracting processes via the engagement of a managing contractor. Given the immediate transition from the additional sustainment works to the intensive care unit expansion works, a two-tier governance structure will remain for the project throughout planning and implementation. To manage risks and any arising issues, an executive leadership team will continue to be responsible for strategic oversight of the project, facilitating key approvals of significant changes pertaining to scope, budget or project program.

The integrated management team will continue to be responsible for overall day-to-day operational management, and key risks will be managed centrally through DIT in accordance with the mandated standards and ongoing practices. The project works are expected to commence this April, with the final expansion works of the intensive care unit aimed to be practically complete in September of next year. The project will also explore all opportunities to deliver multiple stages concurrently to achieve an earlier completion date.

The original 2018 submission for the hospital's upgrade sustainment program confirmed no record of Aboriginal sites in the proposed work's location. The Angas and Allan Campbell buildings on King William Street are both listed on the SA Heritage Register, but SA Health does not anticipate any works to impact upon these heritage buildings. Although the works will have a relatively limited asset life, the project is still considering greening principles and previous best sustainable practice throughout the design.

The existing hospital upgrade sustainment program consulted with hospital clinical and non-clinical staff, encompassing primary users and secondary stakeholders as well as executive stakeholders and project sponsors. Consultation has covered design, management and ongoing health delivery. The Women's and Children's Health Network is managing required communications and logistics to ensure all hospital users receive appropriate information.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Women's and Children's Hospital sustainment project variation. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Tim Packer, Executive Director, Infrastructure, Department for Health and Wellbeing; Jane Jennings, Chief Operating Officer, Women's and Children's Health Network; John Jenner, Portfolio Manager, Health Infrastructure Delivery, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Gary Hazel, Studio Director, GHD Design. I thank the witnesses for their time.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NORTHERN CRISIS STABILISATION CENTRE

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:17): I move:

That the 121st report of the Public Works Committee, entitled Northern Crisis Stabilisation Centre, be noted.

The Department for Health and Wellbeing (SA Health) propose to deliver a multipurpose two-level facility to expand mental health service capability and capacity for the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network by supporting improved hospital capacity and helping to address the growing demand for community mental health services in Adelaide's northern suburbs.

This local health network is the second largest in the state with a resident population of approximately 400,000, equating to 32 per cent of metropolitan Adelaide's population, with this figure expected to grow further by 2030. It contains the highest percentage of the most vulnerable residents, at 61 per cent, in comparison to the rest of the state, at 32 per cent. It also contains higher percentages of people experiencing psychological distress in comparison to the rest of the state.

In 2022, the introduction of a mental health and suicide prevention bilateral agreement between the commonwealth and state governments outlined the commitment for the state government to fully fund the establishment of a new crisis stabilisation centre to be co-located with a commonwealth-funded Head to Health centre.

The Northern Crisis Stabilisation Centre will aim to provide a wide range of services for mental healthcare consumers in northern Adelaide. Located in the suburb of Elizabeth South, it will also take statewide admissions. The integrated service will deliver a 12-chair assessment area within a mental health-focused, calming and therapeutic environment. This assessment area will be supported by a 16-bed inpatient unit for short-term admissions, supporting stabilisation and establishing connections between consumers and social services as well as community mental health programs.

In May last year it was announced that both services within the stabilisation centre will be commissioned to non-government organisations. The commonwealth government has engaged the service provider Sonder for the Northern Adelaide Head to Health, while the provider for the 16-bed inpatient unit at the time of this hearing was yet to be tendered.

The Mental Health Services Plan, developed by the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist South Australia and the SA Mental Health Commission, demonstrates the necessity of a crisis response model that incorporates alternative pathways to accessing mental health support, avoiding emergency department presentations, and connects users to mental health crisis supported care. In support of these aims, the crisis centre aims to:

- offer a place of rest and recovery in times of distress, integrating existing services provided by the local health network and the community;
- provide opportunities to evaluate acute inpatient bed pathways and direct admission pathways that would improve service capacity;
- reduce the reliance on emergency departments as the admission pathway to mental health services;
- decrease the number of mental health-related walk-ins;
- improve the mental health flow for acute inpatient services via reducing crisis presentations; and
- facilitate community-based assessment of mental health consumers, as well as direct entry to inpatient services when required.

SA Health has prepared the project brief for the crisis centre in conjunction with the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist, and it will be delivered by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT). The facility will be built at Lot 4711 Oldham Road, Elizabeth South, on land compulsorily acquired from the City of Playford.

The ground floor will house the walk-in support service and the floor space will include eight consulting rooms; one emergency counselling room; one family counselling room; one group room for up to eight people; a staff break room, lounge room and kitchen; reception and waiting areas; staff shared offices, work area and quiet rooms; a utility room and building plant; bathrooms, showers, and a cleaner's room; a lift; and an outdoor staff area and courtyard space.

The 16-bed short-stay facility, located on the first floor, is available to consumers for up to three nights. The facility's functional spaces include: 16 bedrooms with ensuites, including two accessible rooms; four sub lounges; a communal lounge area; consumer kitchen and dining room areas; a consumer balcony overlooking an adjacent park; circulation areas; two counselling rooms; a family lounge room; a communal laundry; and back-of-house facilities, including a staff kitchen, utility rooms, cleaner's room, bathroom and storeroom.

By working with consumers as partners in their own care, this project supports the local health network's Clinical Services Plan by enhancing the focus on early intervention, prevention and promotion, and increasing service partnerships and integration. Upon completion, it will improve the capacity of acute mental health beds, mental health bed flow and decrease the number of mental health related emergency department presentations. The project will cost \$20.4 million drawn from funds committed in the 2021-22 state budget. Construction commenced in January of this year with completion anticipated in March next year.

The delivery of the project will follow best practice procurement and management as advocated by the state government and construction industry authorities. DIT is managing the process of engaging the construction contractor and has developed a tailored procurement plan. Upon completion, the design will be tendered to a select panel of building contractors to deliver the project. An integrated management team has been established to monitor the project, and the project team is managing risk in conjunction with DIT.

The team has established formal processes to ensure that sustainability issues are considered throughout the project life cycle, with initiatives including provisions for adapting to future technologies with the potential for electric vehicle charging; maximisation of energy efficiency, including the installation of solar energy systems; selection of efficient water fixtures; selection of durable and ethical sourced materials; minimisation of emissions; and the hiring of a sustainability advocate consultant.

The central archive has identified no record of Aboriginal sites in the proposed works' location and SA Health states the project will have no impacts on commonwealth, state or local heritage-listed places.

The project is in ongoing consultation with clinical and non-clinical staff, consumer reference groups and industrial bodies. The management team has undertaken various reviews with relevant stakeholders within SA Health, Sonder and the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network, focusing on specific project requirements. Throughout project implementation, the local health network and the department's media and communications unit will manage the required external communication, media inquiries and press releases.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Northern Crisis Stabilisation Centre. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Melissa Nozza, Director, Capital Projects, Infrastructure, Department for Health and Wellbeing; Peter Tynan, Director, Greenway Architects; John Jenner, Portfolio Manager, Health Infrastructure Delivery, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Darren Golley, Director, Capital Program Delivery Unit, Northern Adelaide Local Health Network. I thank the witnesses for their time.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NEW WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL EARLY WORKS PACKAGE—STAGE 2

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:25): I move:

That the 122nd report of the committee, entitled New Women's and Children's Hospital Early Works Package—Stage 2, be noted.

It is well publicised that in September 2022 the state government announced that the New Women's and Children's Hospital would be built at the former South Australia Police Thebarton Barracks site. The new hospital facility will comprise 414 beds, representing 56 more overnight beds than the current Women's and Children's Hospital, and will also have the capacity for a 20-bed expansion. The hospital joins a growing medical precinct located in close proximity to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and Adelaide BioMed City.

The proposed works from the Department for Health and Wellbeing (SA Health) are for a second package of early works in preparation for construction of the hospital proper. The initial \$306 million early works package was considered by the committee in December 2023, with variations to the package sought in September of last year. This stage 2 early works package is anticipated to cost an additional \$427 million, which is funded as part of the \$3.2 billion approved budget for the broader hospital project.

Significant activity at the new hospital site is underway, with fencing installed, bulk earthworks commenced and the establishment of the piling platform underway. The first stage of works has so far completed demolition of the police barracks, widening of the Bonython trail, establishment of the Gaol/Bonython link road, installation of Gaol Road stormwater outfall, and ongoing works on the car park, central energy plant and Lendlease site compound.

With the significant milestone of SAPOL formally handing over ownership of the remaining Thebarton Barracks site last September, the construction team is now preparing the main site for the hospital building. Stage 2 will ensure continuity of works associated with the car park, central energy plant and other enabling work activities in preparation for the main hospital works and are critical in enabling commencement of construction and providing the ability to continue market engagement to deliver the project. The further scope of works include:

- installation of electrical, hydraulic and communication services for the car park;
- further works on the central energy plant, including installation of services, piles and other supporting works;
- upgrades to Port Road, including road widening and the construction of additional inbound and outbound lanes from the city;
- procurement of tower cranes to support construction of the car park, central energy plant and main hospital;
- construction and installation of substructure and in-ground services;
- supply and installation of piles, pile caps, tower crane base piles and bridge abutments to facilitate construction;
- enabling works with authority services; and
- precinct services installation, including electrical, hydraulic and communication.

The expanded geographic footprint of the stage 2 works will also require the removal of vegetation, including a mix of significant, regulated and protected smaller trees, as well as shrubs and exotic species. Stage 2 planning consent provides statutory approval for removal and pruning where required. A land division is being prepared to create a certificate of title for the site.

SA Health has followed a competitive market approach to project procurement for both design and construction, awarding Lendlease the early contractor involvement contract, which has subsequently been amended to reflect the delivery of early works to date. The existing design and

engineering professional service contractors will continue with all other works and be given opportunity to participate in the new procurement approach.

Project management will follow best practice guidelines as advocated by the state government and construction industry authorities. The new hospital's project team has developed a tailored risk and issue management plan that has been informed by project staff expertise and from lessons learned from other major infrastructure projects across Australia. Project management will identify and manage risk as well as ensure compliance with the legislative requirements of the development act.

SA Health has incorporated sustainability principles into the scope of the project, understanding that facilities with good environmental qualities are essential to achieving value-for-money solutions, reducing energy and water consumption, reducing the consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources, and minimising recurrent project costs. The project services consultants are leading the process, and the department states that the design of the new facility will incorporate key design principles to reduce energy and water use and associated greenhouse gas emissions. SA Health states that a strategic work group is tasked with ensuring that all sustainable considerations are fully integrated into all key project decisions.

The Register of Aboriginal Sites and Objects determined there are two Aboriginal cultural sites in proximity to the proposed works. Authorisation has been sought and received from the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, and a cultural heritage management plan will be utilised and negotiated with the traditional owners. SA Health states that native title has been extinguished over the whole area of the site.

The car park and central energy plant will fall within the Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout as listed on the National Heritage List. An assessment has been undertaken for the significance of the impact of the new hospital on the national listed Parklands and the commonwealth minister's delegate has determined that the project is free to proceed. Due to the location and nature of the site, there is potential for the works to disturb heritage artefacts or evidence of past occupation and use of the site. As a result, the project has engaged a qualified archaeologist to provide advice and manage any discoveries during construction.

SA Health is in consultation with the Women's and Children's Hospital clinicians, staff, consumers and stakeholders to finalise the new hospital's functional design. The department will remain in ongoing consultation with various stakeholder groups during the design and construction process, including precinct partners, public realm interfaces, traditional owners, Planning and Land Use Services, service authorities and government executive representatives.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the new Women's and Children's Hospital early works package—stage 2. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Jane Jennings, Chief Operating Officer, Women's and Children's Health Network; Judith Formston, Deputy Chief Executive and Interim Project Director, Department for Health and Wellbeing; and Mark Filipowicz, Deputy Project Director, Department for Health and Wellbeing. I thank the witnesses for their time.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SEATON APARTMENT PROJECT

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:31): I move:

That the 123rd report of the committee, entitled Seaton Apartment Project, be noted.

Seaton is undergoing a once-in-a-generation transformation, delivering hundreds of new homes and a close and connected lifestyle in an established community. The South Australian Housing Trust (the agency) plans to construct a new public housing apartment building as part of the broader Seaton renewal. The commonwealth government's Social Housing Accelerator program has

dedicated \$2 billion to deliver approximately 4,000 new and refurbished homes across Australia; this includes \$135.8 million earmarked specifically for South Australia.

The Seaton apartment project will draw on a portion of these assigned funds to build apartments that are catered towards accessibility, liveability and the transition for over 55s to more appropriate accommodation that facilitates ageing in place. The project also aims to increase the supply of public housing within the Seaton area in conjunction with Renewal SA's Seaton demonstration project. The agency is responsible for delivering the project on behalf of the government of South Australia.

The apartments will take the form of a five-storey development featuring 22 two-bedroom dwellings. The dwellings will be complemented by car parking, communal spaces and landscaping. Two of the apartments will meet accessibility standards and provide accompanied accessible car parking. The agency states that the five-storey design demonstrates an appropriate residential density for the site and ensures a balance of density, operational functionality, suitability for surrounds and a valuable long-term investment.

The proposal seeks to deliver essential provisions of public housing while maintaining amenity for residents and the surrounding community. This aligns with the envisaged uplift of the broader Seaton renewal project, which includes a mix of apartment buildings and traditional forms of housing, including affordable and market housing.

The new building will be located within Seaton at the corner of 143-145 Frederick Road and 97 Matthews Avenue, taking the form of a traditional podium-and-tower structure. This design strives to blend appropriately at ground level, particularly at key road frontages. The single-storey podium is sympathetic to surrounding low-density development, which is predominantly of masonry construction.

At Frederick Road, the vertical planes are highly articulated, reducing visual bulk and creating opportunities for both hard and soft landscape treatments. The tower is significantly set back from Frederick Road, reducing its scale when viewed from the primary frontage and surrounds, and the northern and eastern elevations feature a mix of materials to further reduce bulk when viewed from the street. The apartments will afford views of the east, the central business district, the Adelaide Hills and coastline to the west.

Due to the urgency of the project and the parameters of the built form, the works will progress as a single-stage development. All opportunities to accelerate the project are being explored, including concurrent planning, building rules consents, streamlined construction technology and early site preparation. Civil works for the broader Seaton demonstration project are underway, and the agency expects the site to be available for construction on schedule.

The project will require the construction of a new electrical transformer at the site, and SA Power Networks is responsible for its installation. Construction is anticipated to commence this April, with the aim to be complete by October of next year. The project is expected to cost \$12.6 million, and the costs associated with the ongoing management and maintenance of the project will be drawn from the agency budget, which is also expected to be responsible for tenancy management, in line with current systems and policies.

The project will follow best practice principles for project procurement and management, as advocated by the state government and construction industry authorities. Project management will be responsible for preparation and monitoring of a works program that reflects the scope of the project; the development of formal communication channels between end users, stakeholders and the agency; establishment of and compliance with a cost plan; regular reviews of design, documentation and construction progress with consideration of time, cost and quality; and the appointment of a professional services contractor and cost manager.

The agency is engaged with professional service contractors for initial project development, and the request for tender has been released through a competitive market process to contractors that hold an appropriate Department for Infrastructure and Transport pre-qualification rating. The project team is also responsible for risk management and an assessment has been undertaken with the agency's risk management framework. The assessment indicates a moderate level of risk,

identifying the following issues: the significant scale of the project; the fast-tracked development program required to meet the project deadline; the challenges of timely acquisition of development approvals; the dependency on SA Power Networks to install electricity infrastructure; and competitiveness of the market for contractors and subcontractors.

Mitigation measures include the engagement of external consultants that are highly experienced in the design and delivery of high-density apartment developments, as well as the use of an independent probity adviser to oversee builder procurement. The agency expects little disruption to local residents or businesses as construction will occur on a vacant site. A search of the central archive identified no Aboriginal sites within 200 metres of the project area.

The agency aims to deliver resilient public housing that responds to a changing environment. Key sustainability goals include increasing energy efficiency and reducing energy demands for future customers. The development's ecological and sustainable design features include natural ventilation and the use of materials of thermal mass to support passive temperature control; selective finishings to improve internal environments and common spaces; the use of locally sourced appliances, where possible; waste streams that support recycling and organic waste; as well as landscape elements that benefit the local tree canopy and biodiversity.

The overall built form has been designed considering the minimisation of materials consumption, with an eye to minimise ongoing operational costs. The project will be overseen by the agency's Procurement Governance Committee, which is responsible for strategic direction, review of progress and key decision-making. The public was notified of the development in July of last year and no representations were received as part of the public consultation process. The agency's media and communications team will manage any direct inquiries.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Seaton apartment project. The witness who appeared before the committee was Tom Currie, Director, Major Projects and Housing Initiatives, Property Services, South Australian Housing Trust. I thank the witness for his time. I would also like to thank the member for Lee, who provided a written statement to the committee in support of this project in his electorate.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: VIRGINIA PRIMARY SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:38): I move:

That the 124th report of the committee, entitled Virginia Primary School Redevelopment, be noted.

Virginia Primary School is located on Park Road, Virginia, within the City of Playford. The school reflects its wider community, with a student body that contains a significant percentage of students from culturally and linguistically diverse families, representing 19 different cultural backgrounds. The Department for Education's Index of Educational Disadvantage assesses the school as category 5 within a scale where category 1 indicates the most socio-economically disadvantaged schools and category 7 the least.

The school's culture imbues high expectations of academic achievement and has embedded effective interventions for students requiring extra support academically, socially and emotionally. Special areas of learning include science, the arts, physical education and Vietnamese. As of mid last year, the school has 425 enrolments with a total capacity of approximately 450.

The proposed redevelopment by the Department for Education, hereon referred to as the department, will construct a new education facility that expands student capacity to a total of 700 students. The project will also demolish an existing building, taking care to remove asbestos in the process. The new facility will:

- provide learning areas that support contemporary teaching and learning pedagogies;

- provide a connected, multidisciplinary learning environment that engages all learners; and
- develop creative, flexible spaces to enhance student engagement and allow collaborative teaching practices.

To meet these aims, the project will construct interdisciplinary learning spaces, a studio, workshops, teacher preparation areas, staff and student amenities, storage and outdoor learning areas. The facility will take the form of a single-storey building that considers shade, shelter, ventilation and natural vegetation. It will include visible and physical connection to learning areas, utilising glazed partitions and contemporary finishes. Each space will provide a welcoming palette and be adaptable to specific sensory needs. Landscaping will retain existing vegetation where possible and, to minimise water consumption, favour a selection of plant species that are indigenous and drought-tolerant. Construction is anticipated to commence in July this year, with the aim to be complete in December of 2026.

The project is expected to cost \$15 million, and any change to recurrent costs of the school's operation as a result of the redevelopment will be funded from within the department's existing resources. No outstanding land purchase transactions or agreements beyond the formal construction contract are anticipated. An early site investigation, in conjunction with the Department for Environment and Water, has revealed the opportunity to build the facility on a pocket of previously cleared farmland. The new location will provide a more efficient building process, as well as allow for expansion in the future. The land contains rough scrub, but investigations confirm it is not naturally occurring vegetation.

The project will be delivered by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) in accordance with the requirements of the project implementation process. The lead professional service contractor and cost management contractor were appointed last year, and the department proposes construction contractors will be appointed utilising general conditions of contract, with tenders sought from contractors registered in the applicable DIT Prequalification System category.

The project will be delivered following best practice principles for project procurement and management, as advocated by the state government and construction industry authorities. Project management processes include:

- evaluation and review of the brief;
- preparation and review of the project program;
- development of formal communication channels with stakeholders and end users;
- establishing a cost plan and compliance;
- scheduling regular audit reviews; and
- identifying and managing potential risks.

The department states that an assessment indicates a medium range of risk. Mitigation measures include the extensive experience of the proposed project team members in delivering educational projects, as well as DIT's support providing full risk management services in project management design, cost, procurement and construction.

The project has incorporated a range of sustainability strategies within design development to reduce energy consumption and associated greenhouse gas emissions. Initiatives include:

- passive design principles for solar, lighting, shade and ventilation;
- high levels of insulation to optimise thermal performance;
- air conditioning systems that incorporate heat recovery technology;
- use of high-efficiency lighting systems with motion control sensors; and
- photoelectric cells for daylight harvesting.

The design also considers water and waste efficiency initiatives, including the selection of efficient water fixtures, harvesting of rainwater and treatment for re-use, permeable paving to increase groundwater penetration, a comprehensive waste management plan and maximising the recycling and re-use of demolition materials.

The City of Playford falls within the Kurna people's native title claim, but native title has been extinguished on the project site. A search of the central archive indicates there are no entries for Aboriginal sites within the search area. The SA Heritage Places Database confirms there are no state or local heritage places or items on the site.

The department is taking care during the concept planning stage to consult widely with stakeholders to ensure that their needs are met. The Virginia Primary School's principal, governing council, school staff and the education director have endorsed the redevelopment and scope of works outlined in the project. Throughout each stage of project development, the governing council and staff of the school have been closely involved and provided direct representation on the project's development. The submission has been reviewed by relevant government personnel, departments and agencies, which have provided input in the production of documentation for this project.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Virginia Primary School redevelopment. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Helen Doyle, Director, Capital Projects And Technical Services, Department for Education; John Collier, Assistant Director, Building Projects, Infrastructure Delivery, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Simon Thomson, Director, Thomson Rossi Architects. I thank the witnesses for their time.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: OPEN ACCESS COLLEGE LIBRARY AND STUDENT SERVICES REFURBISHMENT

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:44): I move:

That the 125th report of the committee, entitled Open Access College Library and Student Services Refurbishment, be noted.

Open Access College, hereon referred to as the college, is co-located with Marden Senior College on a shared campus located on Marden Road within the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters. The college was established in 1991 to provide a complete education, as well as learning experiences for students who are unable to attend a traditional school. This might include for reasons of health, travel, elite sport or work commitments.

As of the August 2024 census, the college has approximately four and a half thousand enrolments with a total capacity of 5,000 students based upon current staffing and resourcing. Teaching at the college occurs through a blended approach of online classes, virtual small group classes and face-to-face opportunities, such as workshops and laboratory sessions.

The refurbishment proposed by the Department for Education will provide flexible and contemporary facilities that aim to create modern and educational accommodation that supports students and staff. The facilities will consider provisions for persons with disabilities in line with the Disability Discrimination Act and comply with all legislative requirements. The multidisciplinary learning environment will develop creative learning spaces that enhance student engagement and allow collaborative teaching practices, facilitate future administrative requirements and support the health and wellbeing of staff and students.

The redevelopment will refurbish existing college buildings 4 and 5, which house student services and the library resource centre. The works will provide new library resource spaces, new administration and staff workplaces, general learning and breakout areas, storage, meeting spaces, amenities for staff and an outdoor learning area. The internal fit-outs will combine the use of timber and bronze anodised aluminium framing, as well as install acoustic baffles and absorptive ceilings to minimise disruptive noise.

The refurbishment of building 4 will retain the existing high-level windows to maximise the available daylight to meeting rooms and workspaces and to ensure acoustic separation from the educational spaces. The mechanical plant will be contained within bulkheads. Building 5 will continue to predominantly support the use of its existing grid pattern, using contrasting circular elements and implementation of a light shelf to reflect daylight from windows. A small wooden veranda is also proposed as an addition to the west of building 5, with access via a sliding door. The project imagines minimal landscaping changes as most of the work is occurring internally.

The project is expected to cost \$6 million and any change in the recurrent cost of the school's operation as a result of the refurbishment will be funded from the department's existing resources. Beyond the formal construction contract, there are no outstanding land purchase transactions or agreements necessary. The project will advance in one stage and all works to take place on the college site.

Construction is expected to commence this May, with the aim to be complete in October. Students and staff will remain at the school during construction and the constructor's compound will clearly delineate school operations from the construction works. Any potential disruptions will be kept to a minimum, with a preference to program works during school holidays, weekends and out-of-hours periods.

The refurbishment will be managed and delivered by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) in line with relevant requirements of the project implementation process that governs prescribed construction processes. The professional services and cost management contractors were appointed in January of last year and the department states that construction contractors will be appointed using general conditions of contract. Tenders will be sought from construction contractors registered in the applicable DIT Prequalification System category.

The project will follow best practice principles for procurement and management as advocated by the state government construction industry authorities. The department states an assessment has indicated a medium level of project risk and that mitigation measures include the selection of a project team experienced in the delivery of education projects, as well as DIT support providing full project risk management services in management design, cost procurement and construction.

Project design has incorporated sustainability strategies to reduce energy consumption and associated greenhouse gas emissions over the life of the project. The project has identified initiatives including:

- prioritising low embodied energy materials;
- the maximisation of natural lighting;
- consideration of finish materials;
- a requirement that new lighting be LED;
- the selection of water-efficient fixtures;
- a mechanical system that utilises energy recovery, ventilators, carbon dioxide control and economy cycles; as well as
- the recycling and re-use of demolition materials where possible.

The installation of additional openable windows to the resource building will also provide increased daylight and better ventilation, and increased double glazing of doors and windows will increase the energy efficiency of heating and cooling.

The proposed works are within the Kaurna people's native title claim, and the department confirms that native title has been extinguished at the project site. The central archive has no entries for Aboriginal sites in the project area. A search of the SA Heritage Places Database confirms there are no state or local heritage places or contributory heritage items on the site.

The department has been in ongoing consultation with the school staff and governing council, who, along with the college principal and education director, have endorsed the

refurbishment and scope of the works. Documentation for the project has been circulated amongst government departments and agencies for review, and the resultant feedback has informed development of the project.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Open Access College library and student services refurbishment. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Helen Doyle, Director, Capital Projects and Technical Services, Department for Education; John Callea, Assistant Director, Building Projects, Infrastructure Delivery, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Guy Berry, Senior Associate Architect, Phillips/Pilkington Architects Pty Ltd. I thank the witnesses for their time.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: You are reminding me of the senator in the US who spoke for 24 hours without a break two days ago, member for Adelaide. Thank you for your tireless work.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PORT AUGUSTA HEALTH SERVICE UPGRADE

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:51): I move:

That the 126th report of the committee, entitled Port Augusta Health Service Upgrade, be noted.

The Port Augusta Hospital is situated on the coastline of the Spencer Gulf, approximately 2.7 kilometres from Port Augusta's town centre. The proposed upgrades to the hospital by the Department for Health and Wellbeing plan to support the delivery of consumer care for people living within the Flinders and Upper North Local Health Network catchment.

The network manages the delivery of public health services for northern South Australia, servicing approximately 50,000 people living across a large remote region stretching from the Spencer Gulf to the state's borders with the Northern Territory, Queensland and New South Wales. Core network health services are provided by Port Augusta Hospital and Whyalla Hospital as well as a range of community-based facilities and outreach services to the border region.

An assessment of the existing Port Augusta Hospital building and services has provided a high-level summary of the infrastructure's condition and suitability, which has informed the creation of a master plan for the site. The plan's primary objective for this project is to upgrade priority ageing infrastructure and improve hospital security.

As part of its 2022 election commitments, the state government committed \$8 million of capital funding to address ageing infrastructure at Port Augusta Hospital. The upgrades aimed to support projected growth of consumer presentations at the hospital as well as address quality and safety of care improvements and improve operational workflows. A planning study identified priority objectives to make upgrades and refurbishments to the emergency department (ED), the main switchboard, hospital security and the mortuary. The works will deliver:

- a dedicated new entry zone;
- the installation of new cameras for the safe assessment room;
- expansion of and upgrades to the ED triage and reception area;
- additional write-up space for triage support;
- provision of a new respiratory assessment room;
- upgrades to the waiting area;
- replacement of services pendant devices in the ED resuscitation room;
- provision of new security measures to staff bases;
- replacement of the existing main electrical switchboard;

- upgrades to security access control;
- additional security cameras;
- refurbishment of the existing mortuary;
- six new body fridges; and
- an extension of the mortuary to accommodate new equipment.

Hospital services will remain operational throughout the works, and the department does not expect interruption to services. The works may impact the hospital's entry area, and measures are in place to ensure any disruption does not affect service delivery. Works are anticipated to commence early this year, with the aim to be complete and commissioned by December.

The department has prepared a tailored contract procurement plan for the project. The Department for Infrastructure and Transport has engaged a professional services contractors team, comprising a lead professional services contractor, building services engineer, structural engineer and a cost manager. DIT is also managing the engagement of a construction contractor using established processes and competitive market approaches. Appointed contractors are to maintain current DIT qualification levels for the delivery and design of the project. Further, specialist professional service contractors may be engaged as required. An early works package to upgrade security screens in several nurses' stations has already been tendered.

Project delivery will follow best practice principles for project procurement and management, as advocated by the state government and construction industry authorities. These principles include extensive consultation to ensure incorporation of new and emerging strategies, valuation of solutions against the brief, development of formal communications with end users, establishment of a cost plan, regular reviews of design, and identification and management of project risks. Risk mitigation strategies include the establishment of an integrated management team comprising executive leadership representing the department (DIT), the local health network and the lead professional services contractor.

The project team has ensured that sustainability strategies are incorporated in the project, with the design work group tasked with ensuring initiatives are integrated into all work undertaken. These initiatives include:

- the establishment of an environmental management plan;
- the provision within the mechanical system for upgrades to meet potential increased adverse weather conditions, including higher temperatures;
- maximisation of natural light;
- efficient tapware and showerheads that meet government standards;
- development of building management protocols and the comprehensive commissioning and tuning of the facility;
- use of LED lighting to replace fluorescent fixtures;
- procurement of building materials that are durable, environmentally responsible and locally sourced where possible; and
- the selection of refrigerant in accordance with the Australian Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Code of Good Practice.

The department is in ongoing consultation with clinical and non-clinical staff and consumer reference groups and the industrial bodies concerning the development and delivery of the project. The local community has been consulted through an ongoing two-way process at various levels, which will be supported by targeted communication when development approvals are lodged.

The project team has also undertaken expert reviews with various units and agencies within both the department and the local health network. The network, along with the department's media

and communications unit, will manage required communications, media inquiries and press releases. Relevant government departments have also been consulted regarding the project.

A search of the central archive has identified no record of Aboriginal sites within the proposed work locations, and the department states there are no registered state or local sites located within the project area. Consultation will continue through the final stages of design, construction and service readiness.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Port Augusta health service upgrade. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Melissa Nozza, Director, Capital Projects, Department for Health and Wellbeing; Jonathan Mau, Principal Architect, Hodgkison architects; John Jenner, Portfolio Manager, Health, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Trevor Byles, Director, Corporate Services, Flinders and Upper North Local Health Network. I thank the witnesses for their time.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart) (11:57): I would also like to speak today on the Public Works Committee submission regarding the long-overdue upgrade to the Port Augusta Hospital. The upgrades that are proposed will be the first improvements to this hospital for many years. These upgrades will be welcomed not only by the patients and residents of Port Augusta and surrounding areas who are serviced by the hospital but very much so by the dedicated staff. The staff and the doctors who utilise this facility will be greatly appreciative of these improved facilities, which will include the first major upgrade of the emergency department for nearly 20 years.

The waiting areas and reception will be far more welcoming and effective for patients and will include a dedicated room to better manage people who may have a potential infectious issue, which will assist with the health and wellbeing of other patients and staff. Very importantly, security will be improved, with state-of-the-art surveillance facilities.

Regional hospitals are the lifeline of communities. They service those living in the region but also offer great employment for the local communities that have, for many years, been forgotten. It is very pleasing to finally see some great improvements not only to Port Augusta Hospital but also to other regional hospitals, and for this I thank the state government very sincerely.

I would also like to thank the Minister for Health and Wellbeing for referring this to the Public Works Committee for their consideration, and at the same time I want to sincerely thank the members of the committee for their deliberation on this matter. I know for a fact from talking to people in Port Augusta and the council that they are very supportive and very appreciative of these works and are looking forward to their continuation and completion.

Motion carried.

Bills

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (ENVIRONMENT AND FOOD PRODUCTION AREAS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 April 2025.)

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (12:00): I rise today to express my support for the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Production Areas) Amendment Bill. This bill represents a much needed step forward in tackling South Australia's housing challenges while maintaining a balanced approach that respects our environment, our communities and our agricultural sector.

As South Australians, we take pride in our state's liveability. We value the quality of life that comes with well-planned, well-serviced communities, access to green spaces and the ability to live,

work and raise families in areas that meet our needs. However, as our population grows and more older people are staying in their homes for longer and families are living across multiple households, the demand for housing continues to increase. If we are to maintain this standard of living while accommodating new residents, we must be proactive in planning for our future.

For too long the focus has been on urban infill as a primary means of meeting housing demand. While infill does have a role to play, it is not a silver bullet. We have seen firsthand the negative consequences of over relying on this strategy, particularly in suburban areas such as Sturt, Oaklands Park and Dover Gardens. We need a new approach, one that ensures we build homes in a way that enhances rather than degrades our communities. This is exactly what this amendment bill seeks to achieve.

The idea behind urban infill is straightforward. Rather than expanding housing developments into new areas, we increase housing density within existing suburbs. This means replacing single family homes with townhouses and apartment complexes, subdividing larger properties and allowing for multistorey developments in previously low-density areas. In theory, this approach makes efficient use of existing infrastructure and reduces urban sprawl. However, in practice, the rapid increase in urban infill has created serious challenges, particularly in suburbs that were never designed to accommodate such density.

Within the City of Marion we can see clear examples of these challenges. Once known for its balance between residential living, green spaces and accessibility, it is now facing significant pressure from increasing housing density. Traffic congestion has worsened as more cars compete for limited road space, particularly in areas where roads were never built to handle such a high volume of vehicles. Parking has become a nightmare for residents, with many streets now lined with cars from households that suddenly have three or four dwellings on a block that once contained just one.

Community members have voiced concerns about the loss of local character. Neighbourhoods that once had tree-lined streets and open yards are now filled with tightly packed developments, reducing green space and increasing the urban heat island effect. This is particularly concerning given South Australia's hot summers, where greenery plays a vital role in keeping our suburbs liveable. The Greening Marion initiative highlights the importance of maintaining tree cover and green areas for environmental and community wellbeing, yet with increased urban infill, which they have allowed, these spaces are disappearing at an alarming rate.

Additionally, the increased need for housing puts a strain on our infrastructure. Waste management, stormwater drainage and community facilities all experience added pressure and many other areas across metropolitan Adelaide are facing similar challenges. The reality is that urban infill, when pushed too far, can create more problems than it solves. It can degrade quality of life, erode community character and place unsustainable pressure on existing and ageing infrastructure.

This is why the Malinauskas government's amendment bill is so critical. Rather than continuing to force high-density housing into areas that are already struggling, this bill allows for a more balanced approach. It recognises that urban infill alone is not enough and that South Australia must expand housing into new well-planned areas to meet demand. By designating specific areas for new housing development, we ensure that growth occurs in a way that is properly planned and supported by infrastructure. Roads, public transport, schools and healthcare facilities can be built alongside new housing developments rather than being retrofitted into areas already under strain.

This approach allows us to maintain the character of existing suburbs while ensuring those moving into new developments have access to the services they need. Furthermore, expanding housing into new areas allows us to incorporate sustainability from the outset. Rather than squeezing high-density developments into existing suburbs with limited green space, we can design new communities with parks, tree-lined streets and environmentally friendly infrastructure.

Sustainable building practices, water sensitive urban design and renewable energy initiatives can be integrated into these new developments, helping South Australia to meet its climate goals while providing high-quality housing. Economic benefits also flow from this approach. The construction of new housing developments creates jobs across multiple sectors, from construction and infrastructure to retail and local services. A well-planned expansion of housing supports

economic growth while ensuring affordability by increasing housing supply in a way that is sustainable over the long term.

One of the concerns raised about expanding housing into new areas is the potential impact on agricultural land. South Australians are rightly proud of our state's agricultural industry and we must ensure that food production remains a priority. However, it is important to separate perception from reality. This amendment bill makes careful adjustments to the environment and food protection areas to unlock land for housing, but it does so in a highly measured way. The changes proposed will affect less than 1 per cent of the Greater Adelaide region's agricultural land.

This means that we can provide the housing South Australians need without significantly compromising food production. Moreover, not all land within the environment and food production areas is actively used for food production. Some areas are underutilised or better suited for development due to their proximity to existing infrastructure and services. By making these targeted changes, we can strike a balance, ensuring that our most fertile and productive agricultural land remains protected while allowing for housing growth where it makes sense.

In conclusion, the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Production Areas) Amendment Bill is a sensible, forward-thinking solution to South Australia's housing challenges. It acknowledges the limitations of urban infill and the growing pressures on existing suburbs, while providing a practical alternative that ensures housing growth is managed responsibly.

This bill is not about reckless expansion; it is about smart planning, and it is about ensuring that new housing developments are properly serviced with infrastructure, that community character is preserved, and that sustainability remains at the heart of our decision-making. By supporting this bill, we are making a choice about the kind of future we want for South Australia, a future where housing is affordable and accessible, a future where growth is planned and sustainable, a future where our communities can continue to thrive. I commend the bill to the house.

Ms O'HANLON (Dunstan) (12:08): South Australians need choice. They need freedom if they are to tackle this state's, this country's, indeed, the developed world's housing supply shortage and we need more housing. If we are to return to young South Australians the ability to be able to believe in the right of home ownership, the quintessentially Australian deal that if you work hard at school, then technical college or university, and then work in your chosen profession or industry, and put something away each week, that homeownership is something you have a right to believe in, then we need more housing.

If we are to be honest and say that the bank of mum and dad is actually un-Australian—we are not Great Britain; Australia is not supposed to have a class system—our ethos is egalitarianism. So the bank of mum and dad, as the party of those opposite believe in, runs contrary to the Australian ethos. The only way we will return a half reasonable chance of young Australians being able to aspire to home ownership is to build more homes. If we do not do this, then we are failing our young people.

But more housing will not happen by accident; it will not happen without a plan. It needs to be planned for, and that is what the Malinauskas Labor government has done—the hard work, the policy development, required to return that right to the young people of this state. The Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Production Areas) Amendment Bill 2025 exemplifies just that. It is a significant piece of legislation aimed at keeping South Australia's planning system responsive as we manage population growth and housing demand.

A key initiative of the government's Housing Roadmap and the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan (GARP) is ensuring a sufficient supply of service land to meet both current and future housing needs. The GARP has identified land needed for long-term growth and, given there are limited options, much of it falls within the current environment and food production areas. Based on these investigations, approximately 61,000 new homes will be built on land currently designated as EFPA.

When the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 was first introduced, government policy prioritised urban consolidation, targeting 85 per cent of all growth through infill development. However, that approach is inconsistent with current policy, which identifies both infill and greenfield development as necessary to meet housing demand. Why? Again, because we

listened. I have done a lot of doorknocking in my electorate. I have spoken to thousands of people and what they told me time and time again—and you can have this for free, save using your FOIs to discover what the issues are—is that they were sick of seeing one property replaced by four or even six townhouses.

They were sick of the pressure that put on street parking. They were fed up with trades, contractors, babysitters, family and friends not being able to park nearby. Of course, that impact is even worse on elderly people—people who have lived in their home for years in perfectly liveable suburbs and then suddenly in recent years an explosion of urban infill means they are literally hemmed in by cars. Some streets have become impassable. I passed that on. I had meetings. I had a meeting about it with Minister Champion as far back as April 2022 and the minister listened and the Malinauskas government listened. They listened to the concerns of my community and responded.

One response was the increase in garage sizes, a measure specifically called for by many people I spoke to. People told me time and again that garages were too small for modern cars, and probably not just modern cars, to be honest. I do not think you would have been able to get out of a Holden Kingswood in many modern garages. The new garage sizes mean you will be able to open your car door in the garage, meaning fewer people will need to park on the street. This represents major policy, policy that is thoughtful and responsive to the needs of our population now and into the future. If you remember, Labor went to the 2022 election as the only party with a plan for the future.

There were people who voted Labor for the first time who told me they were doing so because Peter Malinauskas had a vision for the next 30 years for this state. That is exactly what this bill is part of: that vision. But the truth is, if you do not support a freeing up of that imposition to build 85 per cent of all new housing within our existing residential area, then you just are not listening. The EFPA provisions, which were designed to enforce urban consolidation, now need to be adjusted to reflect the reality of South Australia's housing needs.

To address this, the government has introduced this bill to amend the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, ensuring EFPA boundaries align with the GARP's long-term growth areas. This bill will establish a revised GRO plan, outline new EFPA boundaries, ensure any land removed from the EFPA is protected from premature fragmentation through the limited land division overlay and remove the outdated urban consolidation test that has restricted boundary amendments. It also guarantees that future variations align with the GARP's 30-year land supply framework, and strengthens requirements for considering population growth in planning decisions.

Extensive assessments, as part of the GARP process, have guided these changes, taking into account agricultural land quality, environmental sensitivity, cultural heritage significance and proximity to existing services and infrastructure. The reality is that even with these revisions key agricultural lands surrounding Greater Adelaide will remain protected, with less than 1 per cent of key agricultural land affected.

The EFPA, along with the Hills Face Zone and Character Preservation Districts, will continue to serve as a strong urban growth boundary, balancing housing development with agricultural preservation. Importantly, while this bill amends EFPA boundary criteria it does not change the process for making amendments. The Planning Commission will still review the EFPA every five years, considering housing and employment growth, protection of rural and environmental lands, and consistency with the GARP. Findings will continue to be tabled in parliament, allowing both houses to pass a motion of disallowance if necessary.

This bill is a critical first step towards ensuring South Australia's growth is well planned and our communities remain liveable and well serviced. Without these changes, our ability to meet housing demand would be severely constrained, limiting opportunities for sustainable development. At the same time, the Malinauskas Labor government is committed to protecting our built heritage and character areas.

I want to say that I sincerely appreciate the genuine consultation that Minister Champion has engaged in with me. We have spoken many times about the importance of protecting our state's heritage. Well before 2022, he listened to me as I explained to him in detail the concerns of my community, concerns I knew because I have lived in my community for over 12 years and I have

been talking with and listening to people in my community since well before I made the decision to run for parliament.

Minister Champion knows that heritage protection is a particular passion of mine and something I am determined to pursue as a representative now of my wonderful electorate of Dunstan. Minister Champion has listened to the voices of my community. He has taken notice of our passion for protecting our state's built heritage. Indeed, since the 2022 election the Premier, the Deputy Premier and Minister Champion have made it a priority to strengthen the state's planning rules to provide greater protection to historic buildings and character areas.

Unlike under the Marshall Liberal government, the door has now been opened to enable councils to elevate character areas to historic areas, ensuring stronger demolition controls and better preservation of South Australia's unique streetscapes. This government, through the department, is providing councils with guidance and support needed for this to happen, including detailed requirements for heritage surveys and procedural steps for updating character and historic area statements. By refining these statements, councils can ensure that new developments complement the distinct character of historic neighbourhoods, another very important change many in my community asked for.

Stronger demolition controls have also been introduced, requiring that any demolition in character and historic areas can only occur once the replacement building has been approved. Again, this was called for by my community and is important in preventing inappropriate gaps in established streetscapes and ensuring that new developments contribute positively to the area's character.

Additionally, the government is strengthening protections for South Australia's state heritage-listed places by increasing penalties under the Heritage Places Act 1993. Maximum fines for demolition through neglect have been doubled, with individuals facing penalties of up to \$500,000 and body corporates up to \$1 million, a proper protective measure. Additional enforcement measures, such as repair notices and restoration orders, will further deter neglect of heritage-listed properties.

I want to recognise Mayor Robert Bria, with whom I have a great working relationship and who I know is also passionate about protecting our local character and heritage, and the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters, who are embracing their role in protecting our local heritage and who have been proactive in implementing these reforms, initiating a code amendment to identify additional representative buildings and extend the historic area overlay to increase protections. This is part of a broader effort to enhance heritage protections in our shared area.

Recognising the importance of these local initiatives, the state government is supporting councils like Norwood Payneham & St Peters by providing matched funding grants of up to \$75,000 to assist with code amendments that strengthen heritage protections. Beyond housing and heritage, the government is investing heavily in infrastructure to support growing communities. SA Water has committed \$1.5 billion between 2024 and 2028 to unlock new growth areas within Adelaide, and key transport corridors are being safeguarded to ensure long term connectivity. Additionally, the Northern Adelaide Parklands project will provide nearly 1,000 hectares of green space, enhancing biodiversity and creating new recreational opportunities.

This bill is part of a broader, coordinated effort to prepare South Australia for the future. By ensuring our planning system is responsive, our housing supply is sustainable, our heritage is preserved, and our infrastructure is strategically developed, we are protecting what makes our communities unique while ensuring they remain vibrant and liveable for generations to come. I commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:20): I rise to speak on this bill, but before I get to the actual crux of the bill itself I would just like to provide some context because, like most things we do in this place, things have meaning when you can provide some context—so it is really important to provide context. This bill, the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Protection Areas) Amendment Bill 2025, is before us in the context of two other major policy announcements by the government.

The first was the announcement—last year, I think—of the Housing Roadmap, which did two things. First, it outlined where we are as a state in terms of making sure we had enough housing to meet demand and, secondly, it clearly identified that we do not have enough supply and that work needs to be done on how we can provide land, enable land to be supplied for housing, as well as a whole range of issues. In other words, that we have a workforce to provide that housing and we have the legislative framework that supports houses being built. So there were a lot of changes to the regulations to enable proposals to be approved or assessed more quickly.

That is where the broader context of this bill comes in because this bill, in part, gives effect to that road map, if you like. That road map was a commitment by this government to ensure that, within a reasonable amount of time, we would enable people who want to buy a house or live in a house—or any other accommodation—in South Australia to do so. Part of that road map identified the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan, an extensive plan covering the whole of the broader Adelaide metropolitan area, including parts of Light and also the adjoining electorate of Frome, where I am duty member. The comments I make today are in the context of both Light, where I am the member, as well as some of the issues that have been raised with me in my capacity as the Labor duty member for Frome.

It is important to understand, once we brought those two important policy announcements, what this is trying to do. That is not to say that there have not been issues raised by the community, so the first thing I want to talk about is what the community reaction has been to the GARP, because the GARP is the foundational document for this bill, the response to the bill, and also the road map itself. I will do that first as the member for Light, and then I will go on to some issues that are a little bit different in terms of being the duty member for Frome.

As the member for Light I have been having a whole range of community meetings with residents over a number of years regarding the development of the town of Gawler, but also our contribution to delivering land for housing. Given its location next to major public transport routes like the train line, and next to services and transport corridors, etc., that southern part of Gawler is well placed to enable that area to be developed. It is well placed in terms of people's day-to-day needs but also in ultimately delivering the infrastructure to people who live in that community.

We had a community meeting just last weekend, and the Hon. Nick Champion MP, the minister, came along. We probably had over 130 people come along to this meeting in what is essentially the rural parts of the Gawler council area. People's reaction to the GARP was generally positive. Obviously, they wanted more details, they were interested in timing issues, etc., but people understood the rationale behind it. They also understood the need to make sure that we not only make land available but support it with infrastructure and that we support the full functioning of communities.

Sadly, there have been a number of examples throughout this state over the years where we literally just plonked down houses with no infrastructure in terms of public transport or transport, and no infrastructure in terms of schools or other services. That has created problems for us from a policy point of view. What this GARP does is it provides an important framework to make sure that the infrastructure is delivered on time.

The adoption of the GARP sends a message to all the government agencies that this is where we plan to provide opportunities for people to build a home, to build businesses, to build schools, etc. Now all the agencies need to start planning ahead to make sure that, when the people arrive, the services are there to deliver to them, but some of the services have to be delivered before people arrive. For example, water and sewerage have to be there to enable these developments to happen.

We have seen where there has not been a plan. We did not have a plan to meet our housing crisis before this government came in. We did not have a plan, so what did we have? We have developments now that have come to a standstill because the infrastructure is not there in time. That is the major difference. Both the plan itself—the GARP, which is the road map—and the bill indicate very clearly the direction the government wants to take. It provides an important indicator, for people who want to invest in housing, where they should be investing. The government and the private

sector can then come along and provide the infrastructure that is required, and that is a really important point.

We have had a number of examples: Mount Barker is one and, in my own community, Gawler East is another example. They are not good examples of doing planning right. This is a much more comprehensive, thoughtful and thought out process. One of the good things about this plan is it enables us to open up new land to provide housing. As the member for Dunstan quite clearly indicated—and this is true in my own area in the southern parts of my existing electorate—people are over gutter-to-gutter housing and narrow streets where streets literally become car parks. People want a better environment. People are tired of the cutting of the quarter-acre block into four or five, etc.

This ad hoc development, while it was well intentioned in what it was trying to achieve, has created a number of problems. Partly, it has created these situations where some communities are not as ideal as they should be because they do not have the infrastructure. Secondly, particularly in what they call the infill areas, the existing infrastructure was not enough, like with stormwater. Those areas were not engineered for stormwater for that many houses and people. They have a lack of sporting facilities, recreational facilities and a whole range of other services.

While I understand the concerns and criticisms of this mentioned by others, this is what we as a government need to balance up. We need to balance up creating liveable communities against what we have to forgo to do that, and I will touch upon those in a moment.

In the southern part of my electorate people have welcomed this, because it provides more land and also land choices and housing choices. I am a firm believer that all communities need a whole range of housing choices for the whole range of different people with different backgrounds and experiences who live in those communities. Balanced communities are thriving communities.

This proposal before us today shifts the boundary of where you can do residential development. In part of my electorate it shifts that from the Gawler River northwards to past Roseworthy. For some residents and some businesses, this creates new opportunities. There is an area around Buchfelde, Gawler River, Ward Belt and Gawler Belt where people welcome this.

There are opportunities for people through this process to develop land for a whole range of different purposes, not just residential purposes but a whole range of other purposes. They welcome that. That will hopefully then bring some infrastructure like some sealed roads and a whole range of other infrastructure to those communities. So these people are now exploring the opportunities this change will offer them.

As the duty member for Frome, the issues raised there are a little bit different. It would be fair to say that perhaps both the GARP and this bill have not been as well received among all people. Probably the key group of people who do not like the idea are people in the farming community. They have a number of concerns. Firstly, from their point of view there is the alienation of farming land. They see that as reducing our capacity to produce important food and to maintain our, if you like, food sovereignty in this country.

That is a legitimate concern to raise. It would be foolish not to think about that. In alienating farming land we have to make sure we have explored, firstly, all the other opportunities and, secondly, that there will be a net gain—in other words, that we have considered the cost of alienating the farmland and that there will be a net gain to the rest of the community and how we are then going to achieve the same sort of productive capacity.

As a quick aside, I should mention that even though we are alienating some farmland here, which from one point of view is not desirable, what is important to add is that South Australian farmers—and I do say South Australian farmers—are probably the most productive and efficient farmers in this country. When it comes to farming, we are one of the most efficient and productive countries in the world.

We just do it better than other people. Even in times of drought, such as at the moment—and this is why people raise concerns about alienating primary production land—we are still producing an output, when 20 years ago there would have been nothing. We have the most efficient, productive farmers in this country. Our dryland farming techniques are the best in the world. Our

farmers plan ahead. That is not to say they do not deserve support; they certainly deserve some support and assistance, and the government has indicated it will provide that, but we have some of the best farming practices in the world, and we should be proud of that.

For some of those people who live in the metropolitan regions and in, perhaps, certain suburbs who look down on farmers and say, 'They are not good at managing land,' etc., I can tell you they are. If they were not, they would not be producing more output for the same piece of land, etc. They do look after their land, they are very careful with their practices, they are improving every day. I think we need to understand that people produce food not only to supply our country but also to supply the world, and we do it really well here. Certainly, the farmers I have spoken to and seen do really understand the importance of good farming practices to protect the environment because an unproductive environment means they cannot farm, whether it is cropping or raising livestock.

Land can be alienated for a whole range of reasons. Sometimes land is alienated in country areas to expand townships and that, done properly, I think is important because some townships need a critical mass of population to support a thriving small town. There are quite a few towns throughout the Frome region and further north where they are struggling a bit because of population decline. I think it is important that we do provide opportunities for those townships to have that sort of population to create the demand so you at least have minimum services in those communities, which service not only those townships but also the surrounding areas.

I think one thing which is perhaps not best understood but is really important is the interdependence between towns and the rural communities around them. Quite rightly we focus a lot of attention on supporting our farmers and primary producers, but we also need to support those small towns because when things get tough, like they are at the moment, the townships suffer as well. Not only do the small businesses suffer because the farmers have less to spend, etc., but also the sporting groups—the footy clubs, netball clubs, all those sporting groups. The money is not flowing; the money is not there to sponsor and support the groups. For example, the local show societies, which are a really important part of our regional communities, do not have the funds to do that either.

The towns need to expand, but they also need the infrastructure, with water being one of them. Managing wastewater is important, and that is why our road map not only addresses the metro area but also our country townships, working out how we can actually provide infrastructure. It is no accident that it took this government to announce an investment of \$1.5 billion to make sure that the infrastructure of water and wastewater is spread to these areas to make sure that we can meet increasing housing demand. It is also important that we have water in these areas to enable economic activity. Without water or wastewater management, there are no opportunities to actually have economic activity, and they are important in country towns as well.

We also often alienate land in country areas to enable farming-related industries to be set up, and that is really important to provide jobs locally. As farms become bigger and much more efficient, the machinery gets bigger and the technology increases, the actual amount of labour required per unit reduces. Therefore, we can have a really successful farming community but fewer jobs, and so we need to create other opportunities for jobs in those rural communities to make sure that we actually have stable communities.

The other one, which is an example of achieving a balance between alienating farmland and doing good for another purpose, would be wind farms. I am a supporter of renewable energy. I think it is the way to go. I think that we owe it to our next generations, and hopefully my grandkids will benefit one day—when my kids get around to giving me some grandkids. We will leave this world a better place for our grandkids than when we entered it. That is our obligation as people. To do that, we need to actually improve our environment. Renewable energy is part of that; however, it is like all things, there has to be a net benefit for the community.

I would just like to share a concern some residents in Frome have about a proposed wind farm, the Twin Creek Wind Farm proposal, which actually runs across three councils: Goyder, Light and Barossa. The wind farm there is of such a magnitude that they are concerned about the impact it will have on the community and the environment. This project is located between Kapunda, Eudunda and Truro. It spans three council regions and proposes to have 42 wind turbines, a battery

storage facility and associated infrastructure. These wind turbines I think are about 220 metres tall, so anything you see in the City of Adelaide is dwarfed by the size of this wind farm.

While renewable energy is critical for our future, it is essential to ensure that these projects strike a balance between progress, community needs and environmental responsibility. Many locals have raised concerns about the project's environmental impact, such as potential effects on endangered species as well as visual and noise implications for residents. Again, one of the things we need to do is to consider what impact this could have on tourism in the region. We need to make sure that we balance those environmental things with economic and also community needs.

A local advocate, Mary Morris, has been a passionate community advocate for this community, and I would like to thank her for her tireless efforts in organising community forums to make sure people understand what these wind farms seek to do, and also to be aware of the concerns. I have encouraged residents in the area to use the existing processes to make sure their concerns are addressed.

These are just examples of making sure we achieve a balanced outcome. What this bill seeks to do, what the GARP seeks to do and what the Housing Roadmap seeks to do is to achieve a balance.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (12:40): I, too, rise in support of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environmental and Food Production Areas) Amendment Bill 2025. I truly believe that this bill is central to the future success of our state. South Australia, like the rest of the country, is experiencing a housing crisis. But this is not a crisis without solutions. Our government is actively and decisively ensuring that South Australians can access secure, affordable housing now and into the future.

We must get the balance right: we need to make sure, as our state grows, that we plan well, invest in the right infrastructure, protect what makes our communities great and build a future that works for everyone. This is not just about building houses, it is about creating communities. It is about ensuring that our children can afford to buy a home, that workers can live near where they work, and that families can access schools, hospitals, transport and green space.

South Australia is growing. People are choosing to live here, and rightfully so. Since the 2022 state election, almost 12,500 more businesses have started operating in SA and 73,000 new jobs have been created, 54 per cent of them full-time. We are a city whose population is projected to reach 2.2 million by 2051.

Adelaide is capturing the nation's attention like never before with new events such as Gather Round, LIV Golf and the return of the Adelaide 500 all adding to our status as the Festival State, which also includes the Adelaide Festival, the Fringe Festival, WOMAD, the Cabaret Festival, Tasting Australia, Illuminate and more. With this being combined with our beautiful Art Deco and heritage buildings and with our world-renowned Parklands, beaches and wine regions on our doorstep, it is no wonder *Architectural Digest* named us the world's most beautiful city. Meanwhile, major projects like AUKUS are driving innovation and investment, and our mining and mineral sector continues to strengthen.

With this buzz, vibrancy and growth comes responsibility. We need to ensure our housing supply keeps pace with demand, that development is sustainable and that we are investing in the right infrastructure to support our communities. This is why last month our government launched the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan, otherwise known as GARP, which is a once-in-a-generation plan to guide how and where 315,000 new homes will be built over the next 30 years.

This plan is about smart, sustainable growth. It preserves land for future infrastructure needs, schools, hospitals, roads and public transport. It identifies housing locations already connected to infrastructure or earmarked for future investment. It ensures that, as our population grows by an expected 670,000 people by 2050, we are planning ahead. Importantly, no new general infill developments have been planned as part of the GARP—the GARP has removed the former objective in previous versions, which targeted that 85 per cent of future housing be infill projects. I know this is very welcome news for my community, particularly in suburbs such as Prospect, which I believe has done its fair share of heavy lifting in this space.

Instead, the GARP prioritises new homes in major land releases, as well as developing higher density homes along strategic corridors and in the CBD. This plan identifies a diversity of housing choices across the region. New housing targets will ensure that local councils are actively planning for their communities' housing needs and finding ways to provide housing choices suited to their local area. This provides certainty for homebuyers, businesses and our communities, and it will ensure that the right infrastructure is in place before new housing developments are built.

One of the key steps in delivering the GARP is aligning our environment and food production areas with our long-term housing strategy. That is why we have introduced this bill, which will amend the EFPA boundaries to ensure we have a 30-year housing supply, rather than the current 15-year limit; allow approximately 61,000 new homes to be built on greenfield development areas; ensure that land removed from the EFPA will not be fragmented or developed in an ad hoc way, it will be rezoned in a staged, orderly manner; and ensure that reviews of these boundaries occur every five years based on housing demand and infrastructure capacity.

A key point to make is that this process has been guided by careful analysis, and the changes represent a loss of less than 1 per cent of key agricultural land in the GARP area. This, together with the current Character Preservation Districts and Hills Face Zone, ensures we retain a strong urban growth boundary.

In regard to identifying high-density housing in the CBD, it is always fascinating to look at the most recent statistics of current CBD living. There are 26,120 city residents, of whom—and I find this quite fascinating—40.1 per cent are lone-person households. More than half of those residents, or 56.5 per cent, are renting their homes. Just 8 per cent of households are couples with children, and almost one in four, or 23 per cent, of the city's population attends university.

The City of Adelaide is aiming to almost double the residential population to 50,000 by 2036. This is the equivalent of adding 1,000 dwellings per year to the city over this timeframe. This will not be achieved by adaptive re-use alone, or by residents living in workers' cottages or townhouses; this will be achieved by apartment living. According to the City of Adelaide's city growth plan 2036, a lot of this potential uplift identifies the north and north-west of our CBD. High on the agenda, identified in its report, is the Grote Street gateway. Currently, it has a residential population of only 853 people. The City Plan identifies a 15-year growth horizon of 3,950 to 4,850 people; that represents 13.3 per cent of city growth.

I think key to this development are, obviously, sites like Market Square and the former Australia Post site near West Terrace. These are two important stimulus projects for future residential growth. With our renowned Adelaide Central Market, Gouger Street and Chinatown precinct on the doorstep, as well as being well serviced by retail and other essential infrastructure, it makes complete sense for the Adelaide City Council to grow its residential and business population in this area.

Another area identified for city growth within the council's plan is West Terrace. It currently only has 1,259 residents, and the plan identifies potential for this area to grow to up to 4,350 residents over the 15-year growth horizon, representing 10 per cent of city growth. Indeed, there are multiple large underutilised vacant land parcels in this local area that I believe, appropriately managed, could contribute to mixed-use development to grow and support the local community. The council's city growth plan also identifies the West End local area as one that will:

...continue to evolve as one of the city's most diverse and vibrant neighbourhoods through increased education, health and medical uses, and more residential development supported by improved access to open space and community facilities.

In its plan, the council identifies the current population of around 2,300 people increasing to up to 4,850 over the 15-year growth horizon; that represents 8 per cent of city growth.

I look forward to the City of Adelaide undertaking this important work and seeing this plan turn into action. Increasing the CBD population through appropriate medium and high-density living will take the pressure off our inner metropolitan suburbs, in particular our heritage and character suburbs of Prospect, North Adelaide, Walkerville, Medindie and Gilberton.

The state government is taking its own active steps to achieve this, increasing opportunities and undertaking the work to unlock and build more crucial housing stock in the CBD. The

Malinauskas government secured two adjoining sites at 274 and 275 North Terrace on the corner of Frome Road and situated directly across from the Lot Fourteen innovation precinct and the new Adelaide University.

I joined our planning minister and Property Council CE, Bruce Djite, to make this announcement, pitching the combined package as a rare opportunity for the development sector to shape the city skyline whilst providing critical housing stock for the CBD. Combined, these sites offer a rare 2,800 square metre triple-street frontage block and the potential for uninterrupted views of North Adelaide, the Adelaide Hills and the Parklands

Renewal SA will demolish the building at 275 North Terrace and has settled on the neighbouring property at 274 North Terrace, creating a highly flexible, prominent corner development site which could incorporate one or more towers. This site could accommodate a range of potential uses, including market apartments, build-to-rent apartments, hotel accommodation or purpose-built student accommodation and affordable housing.

Renewal SA was also chosen as the successful proponent by the City of Adelaide to develop the old Franklin Street bus depot. This multimillion dollar development will be known as Tapangka and is envisioned to be delivered as Australia's first carbon neutral precinct. Renewal SA will act as master developer of the site, delivering a new standard of inner city living, with two mixed-use towers and a central signature building. The signature building will be carbon neutral in operation and achieve a six-star Green Star certified rating. It will deliver commercial floor space combined with the place of learning, entertainment, culture and community.

This project will provide accommodation for about 1,000 people in our CBD, with 392 apartments being delivered alongside a 200-plus key hotel. Tapangka will also introduce institutional build-to-rent apartments into our city's CBD. Across the two towers, a minimum of 35 per cent will be offered as affordable housing, including apartments for rent and purchase.

Speaking of these strategic master plan sites, the Malinauskas government is also getting on with the job to address the housing crisis through the creation of the new suburb of Southwark. Renewal SA is set to transform the historic former West End Brewery site into a thriving community, setting a new standard for inner city living. The new \$1 billion mixed-use development will deliver up to 1,300 new dwellings, which is an increase of up to 300 more homes than originally anticipated.

Southwark was first laid out in 1881 and featured streets lined with cottages on the edge of the Parklands. Some of these cottages then made way for the former brewery, which was rebadged as Southwark Brewery in 1949. Due to the rapid expansion of the brewery and former subdivisions in the area, Southwark became known as Thebarton. At least 20 per cent of the housing at this 8.4-hectare site will be offered for affordable sale or rental through HomeSeeker SA, while the development will also provide for retail, commercial, hospitality and community-use opportunities with direct access to key transport links, employment centres and cultural and sporting attractions.

Importantly, we will also expand the River Torrens Linear Park Trail at this site, with the potential to return more than 6,000 square metres of upgraded green space into public ownership. Key objectives for this development include, as I was saying, that generous inclusion of public and open spaces and a new relationship with a rejuvenated River Torrens corridor; an integrated street, cycle, walking and public transport network, including a new shared-use path connecting the Parklands under Port Road; sustainable buildings in an ecological setting, with a target of a 30 per cent tree canopy; and a six-star Green Star Communities rating, including water-sensitive urban design.

We are not just planning for where houses will be built; we are also ensuring they are built faster, more affordably and with the right services in place, and that is why we released our South Australian Housing Roadmap. It outlined the following key actions:

- investing in skills and training, so we have enough tradies to build these new homes;
- infrastructure coordination and investment, to ensure new developments have the roads, the water, the schools and the hospitals that they need to create thriving communities;
- delivering more public housing across the state;

- protecting renters' rights and improving affordability; and
- abolishing stamp duty for first-home buyers building or buying a brand-new home.

On that last point, the reason I was able to buy my very first home was thanks to a Labor government introducing the policy of abolishing stamp duty on new homes within the CBD. Just over 10 years ago, I was able to become a home owner thanks to the work of Labor governments.

As I previously mentioned, with more than 50 per cent of those living in our CBD renting their homes, I found it an incredibly important part of my responsibility as the member for Adelaide to advocate for improved renters' rights. This has certainly been a key focus of mine over the last three years. I was proud to partner with constituents Ariba and her partner, Toby, to advocate for and succeed in the banning of rent bidding after the couple, who relocated from Melbourne to Adelaide, contacted me as their local MP to share their experience with this practice. This was just one measure that the Malinauskas government included in its biggest reforms to our state's rental laws in a generation. Under the reforms:

- landlords now need prescribed grounds to terminate or not renew a tenancy;
- the notice period to end a fixed tenancy has increased from 28 days to 60 days;
- tenants' information is now better protected; and
- rental properties have to comply with minimum housing standards.

Also, for the first time, tenants are allowed to keep pets in rental properties with clear guidelines to be set by their landlords, such as keeping the animal outside or having carpets cleaned at the end of the tenancy.

As well as improving renters' rights, importantly, we are planning for liveability. We know that open space is vital to our health and wellbeing and that is why we are expanding the Parklands and setting strong environmental targets. In addition to the focus on open green space at Southwark, recently we announced we will create the Northern Adelaide Parklands, which at maturity will cover almost 1,000 hectares. Just to understand how large an area that is, it is 39 per cent larger than our beloved Adelaide Parklands.

The Malinauskas government is investing \$53 million in the first stage of this Parklands project, and at the heart will be a 60-hectare Village Green sport and recreation area, which will be the equivalent of 31 Adelaide Ovals in size, featuring courts and clubroom facilities. We want to get kids off screens and outside, keeping active with their friends, and this is why this Parklands policy is not just an environmental policy but a preventive health policy, supporting happy and healthy communities.

In regard to the environmental benefits, more than 760 hectares will be preserved as native green space, increasing biodiversity habitats for native wildlife. The GARP also sets a target of 30 per cent tree canopy across Greater Adelaide by 2055. These new Northern Adelaide Parklands will complement the investment we are making in accessible green space in our nationally heritage-listed Adelaide Parklands.

We are creating 1,000 extra square metres of Parklands as part of our brand-new Adelaide Aquatic Centre, and we are also creating tens of thousands more accessible Parklands as part of our new Women's and Children's Hospital project. Areas of this land for years have been inaccessible, and behind padlocked gates and wire fencing. Meanwhile, the olive groves were fenced off to house the SAPOL greys. This new area of accessible Parklands will be available for both the public and patients of the new Women's and Children's Hospital, from nature play to picnic areas.

Access to open green space is so incredibly important as a therapeutic perspective, as well as respite and wellbeing for families. I will never forget the calm of Adelaide Botanic Gardens during my stepdad's long-term stays for cancer treatment at the old Royal Adelaide Hospital. I know, firsthand, the value of open green space when you are experiencing some of the most challenging moments in your life, so I am proud of this investment in accessible Parklands not just for the general public but for families navigating health challenges.

If we are to encourage the next generation to love the Parklands as much as we do, then we need to foster these connections, encourage more families into our Parklands and create opportunities for more people to enjoy them. They are not owned by one vocal minority, demographic or group. Our Parklands belong to everyone—whether you live five metres, 500 metres, five kilometres or 50 kilometres away. They are a state asset, and everyone deserves a chance to experience our Parklands, whether you love sport including golf or football, or whether you love swimming or cycling, walking or running. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Independent Commission Against Corruption—Evaluation of SAFECOM and the Country Fire Service, Metropolitan Fire Service and State Emergency Service on the management of conflicts of interests

By the Premier (Hon. P.B. Malinauskas)—

Public Sector Act 2009—Overseas and Interstate Travel
Attorney-General Report, 20 February to 21 February 2025
Minister for Infrastructure and Transport Report, 27 January 2025
Minister for Trade and Investment Report, 22 January to 2 February 2025
Premier Report, 27 January 2025

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. J.K. Szakacs)—

Electoral Commission of South Australia—2022 Council Election Report

Ministerial Statement

ELECTORAL COMMISSION'S 2022 COUNCIL ELECTIONS REPORT

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Local Government, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: Today, I am pleased to table the Electoral Commission's 2022 Council Elections Report, which provides a comprehensive review of the elections conducted for 66 of South Australia's 67 councils. I would like to thank the Electoral Commissioner for his hard work in both undertaking the November 2022 elections to elect representatives to a total of 683 possible positions and preparing this important report.

I note that the Electoral Commission has been required to undertake a number of significant activities since the last periodic local government elections, including the inaugural elections for the South Australian Voice followed by by-elections for the state seats of Dunstan and Black.

Whilst there is no legislative requirement for the commissioner to prepare a report on local government elections, commissioners have periodically done so in order to inform the state parliament and the South Australian community more widely on all election matters and to identify potential improvements to the conduct and integrity of local government elections.

In his report, the commissioner has made 19 recommendations, which the government will now consider. In conjunction with the Local Government Participation and Elections Review, the

government will consider measures that may strengthen the integrity and the efficiency of council elections.

I thank the Local Government Association and individual councils for their ongoing constructive engagement with the Electoral Commission of South Australia. I also commend the LGA and councils for their engagement with government to see local government elections that are both fit for purpose and truly engaging of local communities.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I would like to welcome to parliament today students from Nazareth College, the year 12 Legal Studies students. They are guests of the Minister for Trade and Investment. You just got to see him live and in action. It will probably be the highlight of your month, I think, although it is early days, the 3rd, but we will see how we go.

The Hon. J.K. Szakacs: They asked me to get kicked out, sir. They wanted you to kick me out, sir.

The SPEAKER: I won't kick you out. If the St Mick's kids were in, I might have kicked you out so they could see one old scholar kick another old scholar out. That would have been fun.

Question Time

US TARIFF ANNOUNCEMENT

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is to the Premier. What impact will today's US tariff announcement have on South Australian jobs and the South Australian economy? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Just over six months ago, the Minister for Trade said, and I quote:

South Australia's beef industry is a vital contributor to our state's economic growth and is fundamental in the economic activity of our regions.

South Australian beef export markets were valued at over \$400 million last year, and the United States is South Australia's second largest merchandise export market, valued at more than \$2 billion just over six months ago.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:04): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his important question on a significant day in terms of global economic affairs. I have taken the opportunity throughout the course of this morning to speak to a number of significant players, both in the export industry itself and also with my federal government colleagues, not least of whom was the federal Treasurer.

The first thing is this—let's just get some facts out on the table in this forum: there was speculation early this morning about the possibility of a beef export ban on the back of references to the biosecurity arrangements that Australia maintains and will not change. There is no beef export ban, is the advice that I have received. Instead, there is the position of the 10 per cent tariff that we see being applied more broadly across all products going to the US. That 10 per cent beef tariff will have implications, but it is far too early to say exactly how that plays out in practice.

The Leader of the Opposition referenced a number of statistics, which I am in no position to dispute. In the numbers that I was in receipt of this morning for the 12 months most recent, we export over \$300 million worth of beef but also over \$300 million worth of lamb too. We should contemplate the implications for lamb, which are no different to beef, amongst other goods.

I spoke this morning also to Darren Thomas. I was very grateful to have a couple of chats with Darren, the longer one of which was after the conclusion of President Trump's media call. Mr Thomas and I had the opportunity to engage with leaders within his enterprise, which of course is very substantial. His advice to me—and I discussed the ability to be able to share this publicly—is there is a lot that needs to transpire before a full picture will form on the implications of the 10 per cent tariff on Australian beef.

It is true to say that obviously there are tariff differentials that the Trump administration has applied to different markets. In respect of some products and some goods, not necessarily beef, the tariff on Australian products is a lot less than other jurisdictions. That will, over time, result in a calibration of the market in terms of where the US buys its beef from and then, in turn, what that implication is for us.

Take, for instance, a set of circumstances where China or Japan, in turn, applies a reciprocal tariff arrangement on the US. Given that China, from memory, is 34 per cent and Japan is 26 per cent, that then may result in a set of circumstances where the Chinese or Japanese markets are highly attracted to Australian product.

So there is a bit to wash through the system before a full picture will emerge. There is, however, confidence within the sector that Australian beef being of the quality that it is, notwithstanding the 10 per cent tariff, still will have the ability to be able to compete in the US market, given other conditions.

So we will have to assess the situation. I don't think there is any doubt, though, that the Trump tariff policy is not good for the global economy. Any open trading economy such as ours will face implications of this, but it would be wrong, and I think premature, to immediately assume that there is all negative in the absence of opportunity in the announcement made by the Trump administration. Our job is to ameliorate the pain where we can and focus on the opportunity where it exists.

AUSTRALIA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:09): My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. What action, if any, did or will the minister and/or the Premier take to advocate on behalf of South Australian exporters and traders to enforce the terms of the Australia-United States Free Trade Agreement?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Local Government, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:09): I thank the member for Chaffey for his question. I will certainly invite the member to ask the Premier of his appetite and actions or otherwise, and I don't seek to speak for him. What I can speak to directly is the efforts of the state government, the efforts of the Department of State Development and certainly mine as minister.

But what I can perhaps inform the member of immediately is that it is not for state governments to seek to enforce constitutionally enshrined commonwealth matters, and that is bilateral free trade agreements. The signatory to the free trade agreement is the commonwealth government of Australia and, as we have seen time and time again, we are in the hands of a good, sound, responsible federal government. The Albanese government is not only talking the talk but walking the walk when it comes to trade.

For the comfort of the member, in answering the question which was directly to the enforceability of international trade agreements can I speak to the efforts made by the commonwealth government in returning full trade to China? The Albanese government, coming into government, faced the prospects of a fundamental breach of trading order. There were very clear statements and very clear agendas from the Albanese government to do two things, the first of which was to ensure that for international trade agreements, matters that can be litigated at the WTO are done so. The Prime Minister today has already—

Mr Patterson: So what are you doing?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: What I won't be doing is lodging action in the World Trade Organization.

Mr Telfer: Not what he said.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: It was, because the question was, 'What will the government be doing to enforce the terms of a free trade agreement?' I am sorry to be the one who breaks the bad news to the member for Morphett—the former trade minister, no less. Just talk to the department about his years. The question is: what will the state government be doing about—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left will come to order and listen to the minister in silence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta can leave until the end of question time. I just said, 'Can members on my left listen to the answer in silence.' It's getting a little rowdy on the right as well.

The honourable member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: The question from the member was, 'What will South Australia be doing to pursue the legal enforcement of free trade agreements?' As should be known to those opposite, that is directly and entirely a matter of standing for the federal government. Today, I am very pleased to hear that the commonwealth government has both reserved and foreshadowed the prospects of WTO action in the event of matters failing to resolve in the interests of South Australians and Australians. That is a good thing.

So, to the satisfaction of the member if he wasn't watching the news this morning, the Prime Minister, as the Prime Minister should, was leading from the front and was acknowledging that the place for this to be litigated is the World Trade Organization. Much to the disappointment of those opposite, that is the federal government.

BEEF INDUSTRY

Ms PRATT (Frome) (14:13): My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. How has the minister assisted the South Australian beef industry, like Princess Royal Station at Burra, to attain access to new markets over the last six months? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms PRATT: Just over six months ago the minister said, and I quote:

We'll continue to work closely with the industry to assist them with their efforts to attain access to new markets to further diversify.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:13): I thank the member for Frome for her question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders is on his final warning, and the Minister for Education is on a warning as well.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I thank the member for Frome for her question. The member for Frome would know better than most, I would have thought, the value and the power of governments at both a state and a federal level working in a strategic way to open as many markets as possible. Now, there is more than one way that can be achieved. One way, of course, is the commonwealth negotiating free trade agreements with as many jurisdictions as possible, and we have seen that being undertaken at a pace really unlike we have ever seen before, notwithstanding the fact there has been a consistent bipartisan effort at the federal level towards achieving free trade agreements and opening up markets.

The biggest two markets Australia has in terms of exports, of course, are the US and China. It was this federal government that stabilised the Australia-China relationship to allow us to be in a position to again export beef to that country, along with barley, along with wine, along with other products, which was absolutely fundamentally important. The reason why that is able to be achieved is that we have a federal government that is working cohesively, we have a federal government where everyone knows what their respective ministerial portfolios are without wondering whether or not the Prime Minister has taken them off of them in secret, and they have been able to get on with the task of stabilising the relationship with countries like China without compromising basic, fundamental principles that all of us in this place presumably hold dear.

But more than just foreign affairs and defence posture and trade policy at a commonwealth level, there are also actions that we can pursue at a state level. We are very glad that as a government we have been seeking to undertake a range of actions to achieve that. Let me give you a for instance. Only this morning, in terms of getting access to other markets, one of the things that informs that beyond trade policy is actually having a freight corridor to be able to transport your product. As of this morning, South Australia is now connected to the largest economy in the world—direct.

That's not just important for tourists. That's important for businesses, including primary producers who want to be able to get their product to the US market in the belly of the plane. That will make a big difference. Those policies, amongst others, will ensure that this state is able to continue to see the sort of export growth that we have already been able to deliver. It is this jurisdiction that has led the nation when it comes to export growth in recent years. We want to maintain that trajectory of growth through thoughtful policy and leadership, and that's exactly what we are going to deliver.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:16): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Was and, if so, when was the minister first informed that any surgeries had taken place at the Women's and Children's Hospital with equipment that was not stored appropriately? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: It has been reported in *The Advertiser* that dozens of children and female patients were put at risk during surgery after medically unsafe surgical equipment was stored in a humid room for more than a day.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:17): I will go and check, but to the best of my knowledge, I was made aware in terms of the cancellations but not in terms of the issue that had been raised of the previous operations that had taken place until there was a media inquiry about that subject. I think, as has been described by the Women's and Children's Hospital CEO, from the head of SA Health, there was a very minimal risk in terms of those operations that had taken place. The hospital acted prudently to make sure that all the patients were informed of those matters. There has been no harm that has occurred in relation to any of those surgeries that took place. The hospital made sure that they complied with their responsibilities in terms of notifying patients and made sure that they took remedial action to make sure that there was no risk to patients in that matter.

DROUGHT ROUND TABLE

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart) (14:18): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier please update my constituents about the outcome of the roundtable discussions held yesterday with relevance to the key stakeholders and regarding the ongoing drought conditions and also any opportunities? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain a bit further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Following my questions on Tuesday regarding potential further issues for my farming communities, due to the ongoing drought conditions and the challenges my constituents are facing, can the Premier please indicate what, if any, funds or assistance might be given?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:19): I thank the member for Stuart for his question. Yesterday evening myself, the Treasurer and the Minister for Primary Industries had the opportunity to sit down with quite a broad representation of the state's primary production sector, both geographically and also in terms of what was produced. We had people from the South-East, the Riverland, the Barossa, we had people from the Mallee and across the state. There were people representing beef production, lamb production, people representing broadacre agriculture, viticulture, stone-fruit growing, and it was quite an impressive array. I have got to say from the outset—

Mr Telfer: How many actual farmers?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Quite a few actually.

Mr Telfer: How many?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I will get you the number.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders, interjections are unparliamentary. You will stop interjecting and you will listen to the Premier's answer.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I have to say that the Treasurer and I and the minister reflected immediately after the meeting on just how grateful we were for their thoughtfulness—certainly their passion and enthusiasm, but their keenness to engage with the government to make sure that they can provide their knowledge and assistance in how we calibrate our second round of the drought assistance package that we intend to announce in the next couple of weeks.

Earlier this morning, under my request, the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet was convening relevant groups of officials to make some adjustments to the package that we have been planning, on the back of some of the information that was shared with us last night.

An honourable member: Such as?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: You will see when the package comes. There are a number of things that we are changing, just in terms of what we give weight to over and above other considerations, but the types of issues that we were discussing in the context of our second round of drought assistance is: to what extent does the government place an emphasis on immediate relief versus the type of relief that will inform long-term better outcomes for drought-resilient farming practices.

I think there is an aspiration amongst farmers and primary producers themselves to focus more on the latter than the former, because the objective here is to make sure the industry remains as productive as it has been over a long period of time, which represents one of the most productive agriculture and primary production sectors anywhere in the world.

I was speaking to a dry seed broadacre farmer yesterday. It's just amazing what so many growers in our state are able to produce with so little water. In other parts of the world it would be incomprehensible. These are innovative and highly-productive businesspeople who, quite frankly, are running some of the most sophisticated operations of any business in the state and what they want to see from the government is collaboration with them, not just on a short-term hand-out—although there is a place for that in some instances—but, more importantly, on allowing them to invest in the infrastructure, as they have done for generations, to be increasingly resilient and successful.

So we are making sure that we are trying to get that balance right within the government. I really appreciated their feedback on a range of measures, I have to say, and I just cannot stress enough how the tone of the engagement was just really productive and genuine and worthwhile. I am very grateful for the time that we had and I hope that we can repay that faith and that gratitude with a well-calibrated package that we will announce in the not too distant future.

ADELAIDE TO THE UNITED STATES DIRECT FLIGHTS

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (14:23): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier please inform the house how South Australians will benefit from direct flights from Adelaide to the US?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:23): I thank the member for Elder for her question. The member for Elder is a worldly individual and has a high consciousness of how much South Australians can benefit from having an open-hearted position to other parts of the world and how we can learn so much from them. I think it would not be unreasonable to say that for more than 20 years South Australia has wanted a direct flight to the US. It's been going on for well over 20

years, and today, because of the actions of this government, we now have direct connection into the US.

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The Leader of the Opposition interjects saying, 'Oh, San Fran, San Fran.' The Leader of the Opposition would do well to familiarise himself with the fact that under the stewardship of the former government a trade office was set up in San Francisco, and it was done for a good reason.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Let's just reflect on the fact that this is one of our top three trading partners and, depending on which measure you use, either the largest or second-largest economy in the world. In terms of population size, it is the third biggest country in the world and it is a country with which this nation has had a long-held relationship that is not about to change anytime soon.

One of the reasons why we haven't had a direct flight into the US in the past is because no airline has had a sense of confidence that it would stack up economically, until now. They look at the fact that we are the fastest growing economy in terms of state GSP per capita, they look at the relative position that we have on a whole range of metrics in respect of our national performance and the fact that we consistently are ranked as one of the top-performing economies anywhere in the country.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: They don't particularly like that. The airlines look at these metrics and they are able to formulate a position on whether or not it stacks up economically to establish that flight. With respect to San Francisco, the reason why San Fran is because the connectivity into 75 separate destinations in the US through United Airlines is able to be achieved out of San Francisco versus any other airport.

If the Leader of the Opposition wants to change the arrangement in the future, if he ever gets elected, and remove San Fran, then he will start taking cities off the list that are otherwise able to deliver direct connection. Now, South Australians will be able to go Adelaide-San Fran and then San Fran onto 75 other destinations throughout the United States of America. It is an unprecedented opportunity for South Australians to get greater access to the US market.

That speaks to convenience for holidays and businesspeople alike, but what we are far more preoccupied with isn't what is going out but what is going to come in. That is what we care about. We want the front of that plane, coming from the US, 75 different destinations—San Fran to Adelaide direct—full through economic opportunities where the US wants to invest in our state, where they want to continue to see relationships built upon as a result of AUKUS, as a result of what we are achieving in the space and defence industries, in higher education, amongst others.

No government before this one has been able to achieve it. The Minister for Tourism deserves great credit for the work that she and the team at SATC have done. We are very proud of this achievement. Those opposite will snipe and snigger. What we will do is we will just keep delivering for this state like no-one else has before.

ADELAIDE TO THE UNITED STATES DIRECT FLIGHTS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:27): Supplementary to the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right, I can't hear the member for Chaffey. Please come to order!

Mr WHETSTONE: Premier, what was the cost to South Australia to have the direct flights brought to Adelaide?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:27): I thank the shadow minister for his question. Of course, there was an airline attraction incentive package that we put on the table to US airlines. It has been a policy that we have had for some time. In fact, I think it is a policy that

many governments before us have had. Not too dissimilar to other airlines, we have entered into an arrangement.

I want to thank the Adelaide Airport for their participation in the package too, which is quite considerable in terms of what the Airport have brought to the table. Between the South Australian government and the Airport, we have placed an incentive in place. Not too dissimilar to other new routes that have started from different destinations and different airlines, our ambition is that that weans off over time and our arrangement with United allows for that.

It is very deliberately calibrated, of course, to make sure that the fuller the plane is the better the outcome, which makes sense for all concerned. What we saw with United Airlines in particular when they started their direct flight from Brisbane is that they, too, started three times a week and then over time it graduated up to a daily service. We would love to be in a position where that could be achieved in this instance.

Other elements of the package that are important that people should be familiar with include the fact that United has a relationship with Virgin Australia. That means that there will be codeshare flights through to the US. That means a lot of Velocity Frequent Flyer points for people who are part of that regime. That is of great value. We also see an opportunity for people coming from Perth to Adelaide to then go on to the US, which is a far simpler way for them to be able to go.

The opportunity for us to be able to get access to the hundreds of thousands of people who travel from the US to Australia to now come to our state is profound because we know—and you well know this, Mr Speaker, from your time as tourism minister when you were able to deliver direct flights as well—your ability to be able to get overseas visitors to visit your city or state improves dramatically if there is a direct flight. It might not be the case that Americans fly directly into Adelaide; they might choose Sydney or Melbourne, but they will be able to fly direct out of Adelaide or vice versa.

If you just get yourself on that itinerary, particularly for international travellers—if they are coming from a long way away, they are not coming for two or three days; we know that they are coming for weeks and the ability to be able to get yourself on that itinerary to be able to enjoy KI or the Flinders or the Fleurieu Peninsula or the Hills or wine regions or wherever it might be, and get access to those travellers, escalates infinitely.

Like I said, we are just so clear-eyed and determined to make sure that the economic strategy of the government is across sectors. We see tourism playing a role. It is where we have been able to deliver a huge amount of growth since we came to government. That growth lends itself to attracting yet more private investment and this is very much an example of that.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Is the Flinders Medical Centre safe for patients and staff? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: A SafeWork SA entry permit holder report submitted by the South Australian Salaried Medical Officers Association on 17 March reported:

I was told on arrival that there was a medical patient in the FMC ED waiting 46 hours for a bed. The longest mental health patient had then been waiting in the FMC ED for 41 hours. I was told this was a replica of last year at this time when the hospital was in Code Yellow and nothing has changed or been implemented to ensure a safe working environment.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:31): I welcome the question from the shadow minister because it goes to exactly why we are expanding the Flinders Medical Centre. It goes exactly to why we have a \$498 million program between the commonwealth and the state government to build additional beds at the hospital, including mental health beds, which are now under construction. Those beds at the back of the Flinders Medical Centre and at the Margaret Tobin Centre are well under construction, will be open this year and are some of the around 100 additional mental health beds that are coming into the system this year. That is the biggest increase in mental health beds in our system in a generation.

We know why those beds are so critical for the exact reason that the shadow minister outlined, and that is because—and from the report that was on the radio a few days ago—mental health patients, unfortunately, do get stuck in our emergency departments waiting for inpatient beds because we haven't got enough of those beds in the system. That's why part of that \$498 million plan to expand Flinders Medical Centre is not only expanding the Margaret Tobin unit but also in SALHN we are building an additional 24 mental health beds at Noarlunga Hospital. We are also building an additional 24 mental health beds at The QEH. We are also building an additional 24 mental health beds at Modbury Hospital. All of those additional beds are coming online this year.

In addition, a number of Hospital in the Home beds for mental health are coming online as well across our northern and southern suburbs. Additional beds are coming online at Mount Gambier hospital. There are additional beds to come in the new Mount Barker hospital for the first time in the Adelaide Hills. So we know how critical mental health is to addressing the care not only for mental health patients but for other patients in our emergency departments. That is why we have a very detailed plan in terms of expanding the capacity.

Would I have loved to have had those plans in place previously? Would I have loved if we came to office and those plans were ready to go, ready for construction and ready to start work? Of course, but they were not. There were no plans for expanding mental health care in our system. We had to start from scratch. We had to do the consultation. We had to get the construction teams on board. Those construction works are well underway at the moment and will be open over the course of the next 12 months. They will provide a generational uplift in terms of the capacity of our system to cater for increasing demand on our mental health services, which will not only help those patients but all the other patients in our emergency departments who need that care.

Again, this goes to the point that we have been making and goes to the plans that we are implementing to build a bigger healthcare system. If the shadow minister has an alternative plan then we very much welcome the opportunity to see that.

The shadow minister asked me a question before in relation to the Women's and Children's Health Network. I have taken the opportunity just to check that in the last five minutes. I can confirm that on 12 March, when those cancellations occurred, my office was told that there had been notifications made to patients the day prior and there was very low risk to those patients, and the appropriate process took place in relation to those patients.

RAPID OFF-LOAD PROCEDURES

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:35): My question is again to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Are rapid off-load procedures standard practice at hospitals under this government? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: A SafeWork SA Entry Permit Holder Report of FMC submitted by SASMOA on 17 March reported, and I quote:

Rapid offload had been requested by the ramp on a number of occasions but there was no space in the ED—we told them 'we are drowning'.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:36): I welcome, all day, if the member wants to ask me questions from SASMOA's report that they have submitted, because it goes to why we are building these additional beds at Flinders Medical Centre, it goes to why we are building a bigger healthcare system: so that we've got more capacity. What happens is patients who need a ward bed get stuck in the emergency department and that's why we are building those additional beds.

You can see out the front of Flinders Medical Centre construction works are now underway on that new seven-storey building that will be built out the front of Flinders Medical Centre, part of our plan for 160 extra beds between Flinders Medical Centre and the Repat site. A number of those are in place already—I think in the order of about 50—but with over 100 more to come down the track, and that's to address this very significant issue.

Of course, at the same time, we are working to try to address the issues with the federal aged-care system, which are meaning that more of our beds are getting clogged at the other end for people who are ready to be discharged.

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order: standing order 98(a)—that's the second question in a row on this point. The question is very much a question about the present. It's not about 'coulda, woulda, shoulda', it's not about the future, it's about the present circumstance: is this standard practice right now?

The SPEAKER: I have been listening very carefully and it seems like he has been talking for a lot longer than 10 seconds as the clock would indicate. He is actually referring to a report, and that was what was referenced in the question, so the minister can resume his answer.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: As we are expanding those hospitals, as we are putting in that additional capacity to make sure that our teams have the ability to get people from the emergency department into the ward, our teams are working as hard as they can to deal with the patients that present to our emergency department, whether through ambulance or through the waiting room, to make sure they can be seen as fast as possible with the current bed constraints that we have, while those construction works are underway.

I would contrast that with the report that was not a union report but an independent report commissioned by the previous Liberal government, the Monaghan report, into what happened at Flinders Medical Centre before the last election under the previous government, which said that the works that the previous government had done to Flinders Medical Centre actually made the situation worse. It made the situation worse for patients by converting inpatient beds to emergency department beds. It made no difference; in fact, it potentially made ramping worse at the hospital. That's an independent report that was commissioned by the previous government.

We are not just changing the label of beds from 'inpatient' to 'emergency department'—we are not going down that path—we are actually building additional capacity. We are actually building expansions to our hospitals and we are putting in additional doctors and nurses and paramedics and allied health professionals to care for patients in our system.

REGIONAL HOSPITAL HELIPADS

Ms PRATT (Frome) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Has construction on all regional helipads been completed?

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders can leave until the end of question time.

The honourable member for Flinders having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Can you start the question again? I cannot hear.

Ms PRATT: My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Has construction on all regional helipads been completed and, if so, are they all operational? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms PRATT: MedSTAR pilots are reported to be landing at the Clare aerodrome instead of at the Clare Hospital helipad.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:39): We are very delighted to have this question in terms of our program for upgrading the helipads at our regional hospitals. I thank the Treasurer for his support of this project in the state budget, which is a very substantial project. I think there are about a dozen upgrades to helipads that the state government is delivering.

The question is: is that program finished? Absolutely not. There are still works continuing. This is going to make a meaningful difference in terms of making sure that we have those helipads available at our regional hospitals, which provide a vital link between those hospitals and our

metropolitan hospitals. We are prioritising this work as fast as possible, and it is in stark contrast to the fact that this issue was known about by the previous government.

Ms Pratt interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Frome, you have asked your question. Can you stop yelling out while we are trying to listen to the answer? Thank you.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: This issue was known about by the previous government, and they did nothing about it. There was no money in the budget to address it. There was no program to address this. We are actually addressing it.

At the same time, we have also signed a new contract for our helicopter services. I commend the work of the Treasurer and also the Minister for Emergency Services because, through this contract, we are going to be getting additional fleet, better fleet, which will enable more of the state to be accessed by our MedSTAR and helicopter service, which will save lives—ultimately, this is what this is about. It will mean faster access to more areas of the state through a helicopter service. So we will have better helicopters, more helicopters and better helipads through the investment this government is making.

ROBE NURSE PRACTITIONER

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:41): My question is to the health minister. Can the minister advise if a nurse practitioner has been employed in Robe? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: Back in January, the minister announced that recruitment was underway to employ a nurse practitioner at both Robe and Ceduna as part of a two-year pilot program. These nurse practitioners are vital in regional communities as they help address the GP shortage.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:42): Thank you to the member for MacKillop for his strong advocacy on behalf of his local regional health services and in particular Robe. We know Robe is an important area of the state. It is an area of the state where the population significantly increases at various times of the year, and we are coming up to one of those times at Easter. It is an area that has been very well served for a long period of time by Dr David Senior as a medical practitioner, and I pay credit to him for his very longstanding service to the region and to the health care of all South Australians.

It is an area under pressure in terms of primary healthcare services, so the Premier was able to obtain through national cabinet some funding for primary care pilots to run in the state, and one of those areas that we identified was to pilot the use of nurse practitioners in primary care where they can play an expanded role of practice. Already, we have deployed three of those in the city: one in the northern suburbs, one in I think the Old Port Road clinic and one in the Reynella clinic as well, which have been providing excellent service for people in the city. But we wanted to make sure that we can pilot this program in regional areas as well, and we have identified Robe as one of those regional areas in which we want that to happen.

I am pleased to update the house that we now have commenced a nurse practitioner at the Robe medical practice. That has happened in the past couple of months in that well-established practice, providing care alongside Dr Senior to Robe and the surrounding community. I am advised there will be a further nurse practitioner who we are expecting within coming months to start in Ceduna as well. They are two areas of the state that are quite different but important and also face issues in terms of their access to primary care.

We believe that this will be a really positive development, and we believe it will also demonstrate to the federal government—whoever wins the forthcoming election—that if we can make changes to the Medicare system to allow the ability for nurse practitioners to undertake more work in the Medicare system, then that will open up the ability for patients to get access to really good quality primary healthcare services in city areas but also country areas.

We will certainly be undertaking very detailed studies of how this pilot has played out so we can present that work nationally. Then I hope that that will lead to more nurses deciding to undertake their further studies to become nurse practitioners and then more nurse practitioners undertaking this great work in the community to provide excellent primary healthcare services.

I hope that this will be very welcome news for the member for MacKillop and his local constituents, particularly in the Robe area, and that they will be able to go to a local nurse practitioner and receive treatment from their primary healthcare services in a timely way. This will all, of course, be covered, bulk-billed, under the program that we are rolling out. I hope that it is just the beginning of what could be national changes that can see more and more nurse practitioners playing this role right across the country.

COST OF LIVING SUPPORT

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:45): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer update the house on measures undertaken to help South Australians with cost-of-living pressures?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (14:45): I thank the member for Badcoe for this important question because, no doubt, South Australians have been doing it tough in recent years with the cost-of-living pressures that the entire nation has been under and also here in our state.

When Labor state and federal governments were elected at the beginning of 2022, inflation was already rampant. More than half a trillion dollars of fiscal and monetary stimulus had been deployed in 2020 and 2021. The Reserve Bank said that at March 2022 inflation was already running at more than 5 per cent per annum. Of course, it only continued to accelerate during the course of that year.

Even before Australians headed to the polls in May 2022, the Reserve Bank started increasing interest rates to try to get this rampant inflation under control. It has led to questions, particularly in the current context of a federal election, of: who is better placed to look after South Australians and Australians with these cost-of-living pressures? It is abundantly clear whose record stands clearly head and shoulders above others.

The Malinauskas Labor government has delivered nearly \$830 million of cost-of-living supports for South Australians across three budgets, whether it has been pairing with the federal government to reduce energy bills: more than \$130 million out of the state budget to support one in every two households, or 86,000 small businesses supporting a rebate.

Hospital car parking has been made cheaper. We have extended free public transport for seniors and Health Care Card holders. We have provided additional cost-of-living concession payments last year and we have increased the Cost of Living Concession. We have doubled it for those renting their properties. We have increased the sports vouchers scheme and we have increased the discount on the school materials and services charges. We have also worked incredibly hard to open up more housing, particularly affordable housing and public housing, for those South Australians most in need.

We have also made sure that those hardworking South Australians most in need of a pay rise get a decent pay rise. When we came to government, ambulance officers had not received a pay rise for five years under the previous government. Not only did we give them a pay rise for that five years but we also gave them a pay rise for the forward years as well. We have done the same thing with nurses and we have done the same thing with police officers.

It is not just us who have been supporting South Australians because the federal government has also been supporting Australians and South Australians with the cost of living: retargeting the stage 3 tax cuts to make sure that all workers benefit from a tax cut in the stage 3 tax cuts. Then, again, introducing new tax cuts in last week's budget. They have made medicines cheaper. They are expanding bulk-billing, making it cheaper to go to the doctor, and making sure that more Australians get access to energy bill relief.

They have cut student debts by 20 per cent, making sure that when graduates hit the workforce they have less of a burden on them. They have raised real wages for some of our lowest

paid workers in the economy. Of course, there is no bogus Robodebt scheme, charging Australians for fake debts and even driving them to suicide. These are the actions of Labor governments supporting their communities. Of course, we know those opposite went to the last election promising to do nothing about the cost of living.

SOUTH COAST ALGAL BLOOM

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Will the government continue to use the testing services of the University of Technology Sydney? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BASHAM: On 24 March, a story from *The Conversation* was published in the *National Tribune* and on various social media channels, authored by staff from University of Technology Sydney. This was a day before a media statement from the minister was released on March 25. The article by the University of Technology staff said, and I quote:

Today we can reveal the culprit was a tiny—but harmful—type of planktonic algae called *Karenia mikimotoi*.

The SA government sent us water samples from Waitpinga Beach, Petrel Cove Beach, Encounter Bay Boat Ramp and Parsons Headland on Tuesday. We studied the water under the microscope and extracted DNA for genetic analysis.

Our results revealed high numbers of the tiny harmful algal species—each just 20 microns in diameter.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (14:51): I am happy to answer this question in some detail. I would point out that the tests were sent off by PIRSA to a number of laboratories, including that one, so it is not part of my portfolio responsibilities, but I am happy to answer on behalf of the government.

For those who might be struggling to follow, this is referring to the algal bloom that has been spotted off the south coast, which has seen the death of numerous marine animals and has been a source of pretty serious concern across even possibly to Kangaroo Island. There are currently investigations occurring about the extent to which that may or may not have affected other species. We saw that there were a couple of dead seals, for example, spoken of in the last 24 hours. We don't know if they are related, but this is being taken seriously and investigated.

The question that is being asked is that the day before a press release was put out by the government, by myself, to indicate what the species was that had been determined through the research undertaken via PIRSA, one of the laboratories that had received the samples chose to publish what they had found. Then the question of course is whether we would continue to use them. Having not used them myself, having it been PIRSA, I couldn't say on what basis they choose the different laboratories, and they are welcome to do that on a scientific basis only, of course.

The suspicion that is raised, though—the spectre that is raised, shall we say—is whether we were holding onto information in order for me to put a news release out in the morning, when really we should have been able to do it the day before because this one laboratory did. That is what is trying to be implied by the tone of the question.

The truth is that, as I understand it from the expert in the EPA—and I don't in any way pretend to be an expert on this, but he was asked this in the media—because PIRSA had sent out for this information to a number of different places and it had come back through, they wanted to know not only what the species was but what the concentration was, because these species are reasonably common, but getting the big bloom is the question, and is that what that bloom all was?

While they were interested in what that university found, they wanted to be able to collate all of them. It was sometime in the early evening when they were able to finally get all of that data together, and then they were prepared to go out in public and state what it was.

None of that suggests that we shouldn't continue to use that laboratory, should the experts determine that that is the right place to do it, and nor does it imply that anything amiss was occurring in terms of hiding information. We have attempted to be up-front at all times, of course, needing a degree of scientific certainty to understand what occurred and what has been occurring. It is a

concerning event that has happened. It is likely to have happened through a combination of relatively still weather, which means that the ocean is not breaking up what is accumulating, and a localised heatwave.

I try not to pass up the opportunity to inform the house and elsewhere about the very real challenges we are facing with climate change. I would note that NASA Science has stated that of all of the global warming that has occurred over recent times, 90 per cent has been absorbed by the ocean. So while we feel it on land and we are not seeing it in the ocean, it is making a very big difference to the capacity of the ocean to remain healthy and productive. Of course, we are all utterly dependent on fish life, in particular, and the ecosystems working as a collective in order to continue to be able to harvest food for people.

VAILO COMPANY

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): My question is to the Premier. Does VAILO, the Adelaide 500's major sponsor, and its founder, Mr Aaron Hickmann, owe any money to the state government, and what assurances can the Premier give that VAILO's reported financial troubles won't affect the future event? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: *The Advertiser* reported online on Adelaidenow on 1 April 2025 that:

Australia's tax man wants to bankrupt a South Australian millionaire over unpaid taxes, a court has heard, as the financial crisis engulfing the embattled entrepreneur widens.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (14:55): I thank the leader for his question. Of course, VAILO the company is no longer the sponsor of the Adelaide 500. But putting that aside, yes, we are aware that the companies that are owned by VAILO's principal, Aaron Hickmann, owe money—according to the media reports that the Leader of the Opposition cites in his explanation—to the Australian Tax Office. It is also a matter of public record, in fact I think we may have had a question on it previously, about monies owed to RevenueSA for unpaid property taxes as well.

I will have to take on notice that part of the question just to seek an update as to whether those unpaid property tax matters have been resolved. But, of course, given that VAILO the company is no longer in a commercial agreement with the Adelaide 500—or, as I understand it, any other part of the state government—this remains a matter between a private individual who I understand resides now in Queensland, the Australian Tax Office and potentially RevenueSA, as well as other creditors.

ADELAIDE CENTRAL SCHOOL OF ART

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Arts. Will the state government be making a \$4 million contribution to the Adelaide Central School of Art at Glenside and, if so, what is the nature of that contribution and when will it be delivered?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (14:57): I thank the member for the question. It is a really fantastic project. The federal government has committed \$7 million to providing that, to create a central arts hub at the school with some involvement from some of the neighbours around the arts and health precinct as well. It is going to be a fantastic project. Minister Catherine King was here probably about a month ago announcing that project.

Yes, the state government is committing in kind \$4 million of land, which is the basis of our contribution to make sure that project gets off the ground. It is something we are really proud of. It is one of the—

Mr Batty: You're giving them land?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: Yes, worth \$4 million.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: Yes, it is an in-kind contribution to get a really fantastic project off the ground that has lain dormant in the member's electorate for quite some time without any contribution whatsoever. There is a state Labor government and a federal Labor government committed to making sure that project gets off the ground.

KORDAMENTHA

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:58): My question is to the Premier. Could the Premier inform the house why KordaMentha was chosen as the preferred financial institution to administer the Whyalla Steelworks? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: KordaMentha is a Victorian-based business. KordaMentha assisted the purchase of the Whyalla Steelworks by Sanjeev Gupta. KordaMentha is apparently receiving \$1 million a day to help administer the Whyalla Steelworks. South Australian financial businesses missed out on this process, so South Australian taxpayers' funds are being absorbed by a Victorian business with Victorian employees and a Victorian skills base. As history tells us, the State Bank collapse hurt the South Australian economy but what hurt more was the costly failed investments made outside South Australia.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:59): I thank the member for MacKillop for his question. There are a range of reasons why the state government has made the decisions it has in conjunction with the commonwealth. Of course, ultimately the body that selects the final administrator that oversees the exercise are the creditors themselves, of which there is a great number beyond the South Australian government. It is true to say that, as an initiator of the administration process, we did engage KordaMentha in conjunction with the federal government, and quite deliberately so. Why?

Principally because KordaMentha have a greater degree of familiarity with the steelworks and the port and the mine's operations as a result of their experience back in 2016-17. That breadth of experience that KordaMentha bring to the operations of the steelworks has already stood this current administration of the steelworks in good stead. They have been able to bring with it their corporate knowledge and also a number of personnel who have a great degree of familiarity in how the steelworks operates and bringing it to actuation in terms of how they go about doing their work, and we are very grateful for that. That was the reason above all else.

KordaMentha do enjoy a very good reputation in Australia for major corporate, or major liquidations, or major administration processes. This is what they do. This is what they are good at. On this side of the house, we have a view that you engage experts to do the things that they do well. We do not think you get administrators and corporate liquidators in to run public hospitals. We are a party that has been rather fulsome in our criticism of deploying KordaMentha in ways that we do not think are appropriate. We think they know less about running public hospitals than they know about running steelworks.

We will operate without fear or favour in the deployment of KordaMentha's skills. We are very grateful—very grateful—that they are on board. We think that Mr Mentha and his team are doing an exceptional job thus far in terms of what they have been able to achieve at the steelworks. They are building up. They are not just stabilising operations at the steelworks; they are also—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I am doing my best, member for MacKillop, to answer your question without getting distracted by what is being discussed after a big sitting week. They are doing a good job. Obviously, they are already employing people on the ground in Whyalla on top of stabilising the business. We thank them for the work that they are undertaking. We think they are going to be at it for some time yet. I should note that KordaMentha have engaged very senior lawyers, like Leon Zwier, who enjoys an exceptional reputation. KordaMentha have engaged 333 Capital partners, who are leading the sale process. Again, they have hit the ground running.

We hope that in the not too distant future, once the business is stabilised, we will then move into the transition phase of going from stabilisation to the formal sale of the exercise and, like I said,

there will be other people who play a role in that regard beyond KordaMentha themselves. I appreciate the tenet of the member for MacKillop's question. Running an administration is an expensive exercise. The fees are substantial. There is no denying that, but there are good reasons why we have chosen KordaMentha to do this. We look forward to there being a strong outcome in the end.

PORT AUGUSTA

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Can the minister update the house on cooperation with the commonwealth to support Port Augusta, and is the minister aware of any alternative policies?

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services, Minister for Seniors and Ageing Well) (15:03): I thank the member for Giles for the question. He is a fantastic advocate for the region around Port Augusta. Port Augusta itself is a critical meeting place, and it has been for tens of thousands of years, for Aboriginal people. Around 40 languages are actually spoken by those people who travel through Port Augusta. The Umeewarra radio station up there has a piece of art on the wall, and it speaks to all of those languages.

I want to point out Umeewarra radio station and congratulate them on their recent music festival that was held up there with the support of a range of government departments and other sponsors. They played host to Senator Karen Grogan—who is a fantastic advocate for the region and who I bump into a lot when I am up there—myself, and many others, and hosted this outstanding music festival. It is true to say that we are trying to do as much as we can to stimulate the activity and the options for entertainment for people in and around Port Augusta.

People might cast their minds back to when we came into government. We promised \$150,000 to support the City Safe program in Port Augusta that had been left to die under the previous state Liberal government and council. Over the last few years we have worked really hard with our own team, including the hard work of the Treasurer, myself, local members, the Attorney-General and other ministers, who have travelled up there to understand what it takes to invest in a community such as Port Augusta to help it to thrive.

Over that time, in partnership with the federal government and with advocacy by ministers like Minister Linda Burney and now Minister Malarndirri McCarthy, we have actually committed around \$30 million to help Port Augusta to stay safe, to thrive and to provide other activities. I think it is worth noting that every time I have travelled up there I have had the mayor, the council and local elders advocating to me about their wharf.

The Port Augusta wharf is a hub for entertainment and activity for young people. There is free access to the water there. The irony is it is a place called Port Augusta that had no safe access to the water for that activity, and with the excellent advocacy of the local community, the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport here has now helped to sign that agreement, and I believe it is another \$15 million into the community to actually rebuild and restore the wharf of Port Augusta, which will be excellent for the future. Going forwards, young people will be able to access the water and undertake that free, prosocial, healthy activity. I think it shows what can happen when good governments work together and listen to the people in the regions, and I thank the local members for assisting with that as well.

Grievance Debate

MALINAUSKAS LABOR GOVERNMENT

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (15:07): Whether it is our farmers, people in the regions or the most vulnerable South Australians, when they have needed this government the most, what has happened? This government has gone absolutely missing in action. This government was elected on a promise. Remember the corflutes, the right priorities with the little thumbs up in the corner. That was the ironclad commitment to the people of South Australia from this Premier. It is safe to say we can chalk that one up again as another broken promise.

What did the Premier prioritise just this past week? A chinwag with Greg Norman on the green to discuss redesigning a golf course over meeting our farmers amid a record-breaking drought.

They say the right priorities—well, it is just another empty promise from just another politician. As we know, these broken promises continue to pile up, and pile up they do. Let's go through them.

They obviously promised to fix ramping. We know it has got worse. They promised to reduce electricity costs. Prices have skyrocketed—absolutely skyrocketed. They promised no new taxes, but what have we seen? Further and further price hikes, tax grabs left, right and centre. They promised more homes, but we know out of the four releases not even one slab has been laid and all while the Premier stands on podiums, on stages and on golf courses while our farmers, their families and their communities are doing it tougher than ever.

For around seven months, we have been calling on this government to take this drought seriously, not just with words but also with action. With many of my colleagues on this side of the chamber we have traversed all corners of the state. These people and their families have fed this state for generations. They are not asking for necessarily charity, but just genuine assistance—genuine assistance in what has probably been the toughest period that they have ever faced.

Just when things could not get worse, they have with today's announcement: devastating US tariffs are about to hit the sector, quite frankly, like a freight train. In South Australia, in the past we have exported 400,000 tonnes of beef and over 100,000 tonnes of sheep meat to the US. Our farmers are desperate for support but, instead of standing with them, this government has stood back and watched. Just today on radio, the Premier said that he was still considering—considering—how we calibrate the next round of support. Well, our farmers cannot wait for any more monitoring or calibrating or watching. They need support right now.

Why has this government been caught so flat-footed again? Where have they been this last year? How many more hits does our agriculture industry need to take before this government wakes up and actually does something meaningful? Let's go through some of the adversity: tomato brown rugose fruit virus, frost, drought, extreme weather, fruit fly outbreaks, labour shortages, the rising cost of inputs like energy, and now tariffs today. The list goes on. Unlike this city-centric Labor government, we have actually been out there listening to farmers, not waiting for political convenience or when it is too late to call for action. Farmers are tired, they are exhausted and they need support now. It does not stop at drought though.

On health, we know that South Australians are waiting longer to be seen in emergency at the moment than anywhere else in the country as the health system continues to endure pressure. South Australians are facing the worst ramping crisis in our history under this government, with the 33 worst months of ramping with patients. Paramedics have now spent more than 129,000 hours stuck outside our hospitals on the ramp since Labor was elected. This week, we called for free flu vaccinations for all South Australians. This is a simple, sensible measure, as they have done interstate, to protect our most vulnerable citizens and also to relieve pressure on our ailing health system.

What about on housing? We know that Adelaide is now the second least affordable capital city in the country to buy and also the least affordable to rent. We will need to take the gong over Sydney maybe on both fronts before this government actually acts. We have proposed smart, responsible reforms to unlock housing, such as releasing more land not suitable for farming. We have also called for supporting the training of apprentices and cutting payroll tax for employers who take on these apprentices to build our skilled workforce. We want to see more homes built quicker and cheaper.

Of course, then we have child protection. Nowhere is the failure of this government clearer than in child protection. We will continue to hold this government to account because, unlike this government, we are not just here for the good times and the cameras. We are here for the people of our state. South Australians are tired of the slogans. Promises that are made are promises that must be kept, and that is exactly what we will deliver if given the opportunity to get elected to government.

FEDERAL ELECTION

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:12): While the federal election was called last week, the campaign was already underway in Boothby. I was doorknocking recently and a number of residents drew to my attention a flyer that had landed in their letterbox that used very convoluted language so

that, at a glance, the reader would be misled into believing that both Nicolle Flint and I, according to this Labor propaganda, supported, via tricky wording, the Holdfast Bay council's recent rate rise.

This, in fact, is the polar opposite of the truth. The truth is that Nicolle Flint and I have publicly and strongly opposed such a rate rise during both state and federal Labor's cost-of-living crisis. Reassuringly, of course the residents saw right through this fabricated Labor lie that was designed to deceive voters. Quite rightly, they pointed out and understood that both Nicolle and I had in fact opposed such a rate rise, and they knew that we had both been very vocal since May last year. That led to us writing to Holdfast Bay council in July 2024 asking the council to, and I quote:

...immediately pause the proposed rate rise to support \$30 million in Council expenditure until the current State and Federal Labor government cost-of-living crisis is under control.

And to:

...prepare, cost and release the proposed designs and conduct extensive community consultation.

Pensioners and young families have been raising with me that they could not afford this rate rise during this cost-of-living crisis. They had already seen power bills go up by 45 per cent, the highest on record. Their grocery bills are up, their insurance is up and their housing is up. Of course, these same concerns would have been raised with the Labor federal member for Boothby. However, all they got publicly from Louise Miller-Frost, hidden away in her office, was deafening silence—nothing at all. There was a complete lack of support for them during Labor's cost-of-living crisis.

In March this year, the council finally conducted community consultation—as was requested by myself and Nicolle—and it is fair to say there is concern amongst local residents and some of the long-term business owners about the impacts on car parking and traffic on Jetty Road and the surrounding suburbs. It was pointed out to me by companies that have experience in shopping precincts that the loss of anywhere between 29 and 60 car parks, depending on the design, will have an economic impact on the precinct unless there are replacement car parks.

As a result, Nicolle and I again wrote to the council requesting an urgent meeting between ourselves, key Jetty Road stakeholders and the council. This requested meeting would have allowed further questions to be asked, including why the funding agreement with the Albanese Labor government has caused a reduction in car parks and has shut down streets in the proposed Jetty Road upgrade plans.

In parallel with this request, I also attended a community forum where these concerns were ventilated. The request from this meeting was for the council to provide modelling of the traffic and parking analysis for each of the designs. The Labor federal member for Boothby, silent since May last year, was an unsurprising no-show at this meeting; instead, she put out a letter saying that if the council wanted to, it could 'make a request to change the project scope or details with the federal government.' This is an admission that the Albanese Labor government's requirements placed on the council to deliver the Jetty Road project are the reason for losing car parks and shutting down streets and the inevitable traffic congestion.

You would have thought a hardworking MP responsible for the funding would have been getting regular briefings on the local project and meeting with key Jetty Road stakeholders to ensure that the plan would produce a win-win. Instead, what do we have? A lose-lose. Instead, what do we have? We have a cover-up for Louise Miller-Frost's lethargy and absenteeism.

Labor put out a flyer designed to trick people about Nicolle and me. This is the type of dishonest, negative campaigning that, sadly, Boothby has become accustomed to. A truthful flyer would have stated that Nicolle Flint and Stephen Patterson opposed Holdfast Bay's special rate rise during state and federal Labor's cost-of-living crisis. Instead, this shady and deceitful episode just reinforces that if the voters of Boothby want a hardworking representative in Canberra to stand up for their best interests and to deliver results, there is only one choice, and that is to vote for Nicolle Flint for Boothby in this upcoming federal election.

SAY THEIR NAME DAY

Mr DIGHTON (Black) (15:17): I rise to highlight the importance of Say Their Name Day. Say Their Name Day was last Tuesday 25 March. Say Their Name Day is recognition that every

baby and child matters and deserves to be celebrated, and every family deserves to be supported through their grief.

This morning, the member for Newland and I held a parliamentary morning tea for a number of bereaved families. Both the member for Newland and I thought it was important to demonstrate that this place, this institution, recognises the impact of pregnancy, infant and child loss, and wants to play a role in overcoming stigmas that often lead to bereaved families not speaking about their grief and loss journey or not getting the opportunity to remember, honour and say the name of their little one.

Of course, it is all very well for us to organise an event, but it is not meaningful without members of the community attending, and I want to acknowledge the courage that they showed today in turning up and joining with others to share their story. I hope that these families leave us knowing that they are part of a community and a network of bereaved families and organisations that includes members of parliament.

This morning, the member for Newland and I read out the names of children lost, and we want to record those names in *Hansard* today. I will now read half the names and the member for Newland will read the others in a few moments. They are: Clancy Alexander, the son of Claire and myself, whose story I shared in my first speech earlier this year; Kendra Jessie, daughter of Bonnie, who also coordinates Red Nose in South Australia; Olivia and Sophie, daughters of Liza; Leo Kelly, son of Kirilea; Hunter Jude, son of Kyra; Sam Davis, son of Nat, the member for Hurtle Vale and Minister for Human Services; Emma Warland, daughter of Jane, who is also on the board of Still Aware, a huge advocate and researcher; Avery Macolino, son of Darren; Celeste McCranor, daughter of Michelle and Tim, who were involved in Stillrunning For Stillbirth; Mia Sienna Halsey, daughter of Darren; Chaunte Rose and 12 angel siblings, daughter of Rachel; and Poppy, daughter of Melodie.

For many in the infant loss community, there is a great sense of comfort and honouring when people say our little one's names. We should not be worried about saying the wrong thing or upsetting people. What is more important is that people create a space for families to grieve and honour their child. If that does make us upset then that is a healthy response and something we need more of in our society.

Sadly, like many within the bereaved community, both Claire and I have experienced the isolation that can occur in our grief journey when friends and family and colleagues do not continue to mention our loss, or sometimes remark that there are no words to describe it. I can understand the sentiment, as sometimes it feels like there are not enough words to describe the shattering experience of grief and loss. Yet in our experience, any number of words are better than no words. Any number of stumbling, uncomfortable words has been comforting for us because it is a recognition of the empathy and an acknowledgement of the tragedy of our experience.

I listened recently to an interview with Colin Campbell, the author of *Finding the Words: Working Through Profound Loss with Hope and Purpose*. Following the devastating death of his two teenage children in a car accident, he discovered that people struggle to find the words, to share their sorrow with him in helpful ways. Colin argues that well-intentioned phrases like, 'There are no words,' or 'Everything happens for a purpose,' or 'They are in a better place,' can unintentionally shut down discussions about grief. He says there are words that can express the depth of any grief and we need to find them.

Sharing our story, our loss, our grief is an important process for us to change understanding in our community, to help our society to find the words to support bereaved families. Our experience demonstrated to us why events such as Say Their Name Day Remembrance Service, organised by Red Nose, and the Coastal Walk to Remember, organised by Red Tree Foundation, are important events to support our grief-loss community.

SAY THEIR NAME DAY

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (15:23): I, too, would like to acknowledge for the record, following on from the member for Black's words, a number of babies and children taken too soon. Firstly, I

would like to acknowledge Claire and Alex's son, Clancy Alexander. I think it is particularly fitting that he gets to share your name, Alex.

For myself and for the member for Black, it is incredibly important to acknowledge babies and children loved and to say their names in this place. I am not, of course, a bereaved parent but a bereaved sister, and I went through life loving and knowing my baby brother as I know so many older brothers and sisters have, and I will always do what I can to break that silence for him and for the parents who I know are not often able to.

My brother, Benjamin Isaac, shaped my life, and for me he is very much shaping the work we are doing here in the Parliament of South Australia. I acknowledge my brother, Benjamin Isaac; and Jaye, son of Tamara and Adam. Tamara has written an incredible book about loss called *Born to Fly*. I also acknowledge Charlotte Gigi Cavallaro, daughter of Demi. It was lovely to meet Charlotte's little brother, Archie, today, who is earthside. I acknowledge Emma Doecke—Emma's grandparents are with us in the gallery today, and also the Doecke angel babies. Thank you for joining us.

I acknowledge Oscar, son of Renee; Isabelle Nellie Haggett, daughter of Carrie and Adam; Sofia Josephine Pollock, daughter of Danielle and Mark; Theodore Lawrence Miller, son of Locky and Jess; Mitchell, son of Kylie and Scott; and Gabriel, son of Zoe. We also acknowledge on Say Their Name Day that a number of parents decide to give their babies a nickname, often reflecting what they called their baby in utero, and I acknowledge little Gromit today, son of Kieran and Kirsten.

We know that for families of babies and children loved and lost, saying a name is incredibly important, as is creating a legacy for loved ones that were not given the chance to make one of their own. Every time a bereaved family member speaks out or advocates, they are contributing to the legacy of their beloved little ones, and I want to thank them for that.

It was a privilege to join with bereaved families this morning to celebrate what could have been. We shared stories and memories, and I heard more about the incredible submissions that have been made to the parliament's committee into stillbirth. I genuinely believe it will be one of the great privileges of my career and my life more generally to get to know the stories of little ones and to see what incredible impact their short lives will have.

For me, I continue to say my brother's name in this place because I feel that I have to, because I owe it to him, as his big sister, to continually acknowledge the footprints he left in our lives. I believe we owe it collectively to all the babies and children who we hold only in our hearts. This morning, we lit candles for each child in their memory. We also lit candles for children loved and lost, babies loved and lost, and pregnancies loved and lost, acknowledging those who are not able to speak up or advocate but are of course equally as touched by the loss of an infant or child. Today, for the house, for our loved ones, we say their names.

SCHUBERT ELECTORATE

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:26): There are a few topics that I would like to touch on for the purpose of my grievance today. Firstly, I have had the pleasure of hosting a number of school leaders in the parliament over the last couple of weeks. I hosted Nuriootpa High School school leaders here, and I would like to read out their names: I had Abbey Mattner, Oliver, Paige, another Oliver, Eliza and Makayla. I hosted them here in the parliament, and they had the great pleasure of seeing parliament in action, where in fact they saw an issue that they are really passionate about, and that was increasing transport options to the Barossa Valley.

They saw the debate of the Passenger Transport Act and bringing rideshare companies like Uber to the Barossa Valley and a whole host of other things. More than that, we had a fantastic conversation about the issues that they feel need to be addressed for young people and the next generation more broadly, things like the cost of living. That was front of mind for people from Nuriootpa High School, as well as transport options, wanting to see the Barossa hospital and also housing affordability.

Housing affordability was the biggest issue that was raised with me again last night when I hosted the school student leaders, or the senior leaders, of Faith Lutheran College here in the parliament with me. I had Desi, Ned, Mitchell, Bella, Jack and Grace join me, and they are really

scared about housing affordability. This was the number one topic of conversation, as well as the impact on social media, which does occupy quite a bit of their time outside of school.

They are really grateful that the leaders at Faith Lutheran College made the decision to ban phones in schools this year. They said that almost instantly they noticed an uptick, a lift, in the atmosphere of the schoolyard, that they had more energy to put into conversations and just getting on with extracurricular activities themselves. So I was really delighted to host them, and I am looking forward to hosting school leaders from Birdwood High School as well over the next few months.

It is something that I like to do each and every year, just to tap into what the young kids are thinking. Certainly, I am always reminded that I am well and truly behind with the lingo of this next generation, like 'sigma' and 'rizz' and all those fancy words that I have no idea about. But thank you very much to those students for coming to join me here in the parliament and to all the other parliamentarians who had a chat with them along the way, including the Minister for Education, who stopped to have a chat with my students from Nuriootpa High School. That was greatly appreciated because of some of the challenges that they have been facing.

I would like to give a brief shout-out to all the winter sport that is starting in my community over the weekend. We have the local footy, netball and hockey. I am looking forward to getting out and supporting them. Everyone knows that the Angaston Panthers are my home team. My family has played there for six generations or thereabouts and so I am well and truly sticking with the blue and white colours, barracking for Angaston, but I wish every single club all the very best over the course of this winter.

I was not going to reflect on this, but in light of the comments that were made by the member for Black and the member for Newland, I would like to acknowledge all the work they have done with their stillborn committee. I think it has been really remarkable to see a light shone on that because for far too long it has been a bit of a taboo topic.

My mum actually had a stillborn baby between my brother, Shannon, and I and it is not something that we often spoke about in our family. Reflecting on the stories that the member for Newland has shared, and indeed the member for Black, I say power to them for shining a light on this and for having the courage to encourage others to say their name. My brother was Dylan Thomas. I think particularly for families in regional communities, having just had my little one, lots of people in the community ride the wave of your pregnancy with you and to come home without a baby would be one of the hardest things that people go through. Well done to those members of parliament and congratulations on all the work that they have done.

ADELAIDE ELECTORATE

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:31): It has been three years since the Malinauskas government was elected to office and it has been my absolute pleasure over those years to represent the electorate of Adelaide. I am proud to say that over those last three years all the election commitments that I made to our community are either already delivered or under construction.

I am very passionate about greening our neighbourhood and we have been able to do that through the creation of pocket parks. One of my election commitments was to create a pocket park in Prospect, on the corner of Main North Road and Da Costa Avenue, which we were able to open in October 2023. I was very pleased to be able to add to that with the creation of another pocket park, the Churchill Road pocket park in Ovingham, with construction currently underway on that park, which adds more open green space to our community and another space for our community to connect and, obviously, as well, increases our tree canopy.

Another of our election commitments that I have been able to deliver is an upgrade to R.L. Pash Park on the boundary of Collinswood and Nailsworth. We were able to open that last year, which has retained the open green space in the area, upgraded the play equipment for kids, upgraded the exercise equipment, particularly for seniors within our community, and also added some activities as kids transition from little kids into tweens. I know my two very much love the new climbing boulder that we have been able to place in the upgraded park.

As part of my commitment to greening our neighbourhood, I was very proud as well to save Helen Mayo Park. That park was due to effectively be destroyed by the former Liberal government's

plan for a basketball stadium on the site. We were able to save that park and fully restore its parklands protection. We are delivering community infrastructure and I am very pleased to see the progress being made with the brand-new Adelaide Aquatic Centre. That is due to be opened in the summer of 2025-26 and, importantly, will be returning 1,000 square metres of extra parklands to our community.

I do say it often, but it will be a game changer for our local area to have both indoor and outdoor pools, to have water slides—another favourite that my kids are very much looking forward to—water splash play areas, a dedicated learn-to-swim pool, a dedicated hydrotherapy warm-water pool and also the main pool for lap swimming, for water polo and for deepwater aquarobics. We are very much looking forward to this incredible piece of community infrastructure opening in the summer of 2025-26.

Just a short way away is the brand-new Walkerville recreation centre, which is now currently under construction. That was the site of the former Walkerville YMCA, which was closed by the previous Town of Walkerville council. I made it a commitment to our community that I would return sport, rec and wellbeing services to that site, so I am very excited to see that project underway.

Also, growing up in a country town, I have spoken about the importance of our main streets. It is where people know your name, it is where you drop in for a coffee, to grab a loaf of bread or a carton of milk and, even if you are just chatting about the weather, you feel like you are part of a community, a place where people know you, say hello and have a chat. I believe it is so incredibly important, whether you live in a country town or whether you live in the middle of a capital city. So my investments in main streets like Hutt Street and Melbourne Street are really purely designed around supporting those local businesses, creating vibrancy and creating a hub where locals want to come together and connect.

In the road safety space for my election commitments I was very proud to deliver the brand-new roundabout at the Howard and Rosetta streets intersection in Collinswood. We were not able to really pinpoint why there would be so many accidents at that site, but I am proud to say, just talking to a couple of locals the other day, it has been such an improvement to road safety by adding in a roundabout at that site, along with new 25 km/h school zones in Gilles Street in front of Pulteney Grammar.

We are investing in public infrastructure in my community—the brand-new Women's and Children's Hospital, a brand-new ambulance HQ and Adelaide ambulance station. Also, we have delivered the expansion of Adelaide Botanic High, which is just wonderful.

Finally, it was a smaller commitment to invest in our free City Connector, but I want to highlight what an important service this is for so many people in my community to access the services they need, and I am very proud to have delivered those commitments for my community.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (15:36): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 29 April 2025 at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

FINES ENFORCEMENT AND DEBT RECOVERY (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (15:37): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017 and to make related amendments to the Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007 and the Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (15:38): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2025 amends the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017 to enhance the process of recovering moneys owed to government.

The Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017 establishes the Chief Recovery Officer as the central authority for recovering government-owed debt, including expiation fees, pecuniary sums and civil debts, as well as certain specially debts, such as victims of crime payments. After several years in operation, various technical issues and administrative anomalies have been brought to my attention by the Chief Recovery Officer, who has also identified opportunities for operational efficiencies and improvement.

The Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2025 proposes amendments to deal with these issues. The bill will address inconsistencies and provide clarity around the powers of the Chief Recovery Officer.

The bill will allow the Chief Recovery Officer to extend an existing payment arrangement to include a newly referred enforced expiation or pecuniary sum. This will avoid clients incurring further fees or enforcement action when they have an already established payment arrangement in place with the fines unit. The client will have 14 days to opt out and will retain their rights available to them for outstanding expiations to challenge the expiation, even after it is included into the arrangement.

The bill will impose late fees for pecuniary sums according to the date that the sum fell due, rather than imposing one late fee per criminal charge. This will reduce the number of fees applied to a client's account where multiple pecuniary sums have been ordered on the same day.

The bill also clarifies that victims of crime are prioritised by directing the Chief Recovery Officer to ensure that court-ordered compensation or restitution is paid fully to all victims of the offender before further funds are distributed to any other recipient. The bill also ensures that reminder fees and enforcement fees are added gradually to a pecuniary sum where the debtor does not address the balance. This will incentivise the early resolution of court-ordered fines and avoid multiple fees being added at the same time.

The bill repeals too harsh and ineffective sanctions for non-payment of debt. First, it removes the option for the court to order that a client with outstanding fines debt must undertake a treatment program. While the government is committed to addressing the underlying causes of offending, such as drug and alcohol addiction, there is doubt to the efficacy of involuntary drug and alcohol treatment by these debtors.

Additionally, the bill removes the draconian penalty of imprisonment for noncompliance with mandatory treatment. This would not assist the debtor's underlying problems and would worsen the client's circumstances, potentially placing a client and their dependents into further hardship. I emphasise that this bill only proposes to remove involuntary treatment from the fines enforcement regime. The debtor may still undertake voluntary treatment in lieu of paying a criminal fine.

The bill also removes the potential for imprisonment for not paying a civil debt, both under the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act and for the enforcement of court monetary judgements generally. No civil debtor will be at risk of going to prison. Imprisonment will be replaced by a monetary penalty which can be added by the court if it is proved that the debtor has failed to comply with a payment order without reasonable excuse in circumstances where they could afford to pay without suffering hardship.

Furthermore, the bill will also allow for more efficient administration of government debt matters, saving time for both the fines unit and debtors. As with fines debt, the Chief Recovery Officer will be able to add a new civil debt to an existing payment arrangement unless the debtor opts out. The client will still retain the right to challenge the amount or existence of the debt.

The Chief Recovery Officer will also have the ability to apply overpayments of one debt type to another unless the debtor objects. The Chief Recovery Officer will have the ability to revoke, vary or suspend a civil debt determination on their own initiative so as to respond flexibly to unique circumstances without the need of a public authority withdrawing a debt and re-referring it.

The bill will clarify that payment arrangements for civil debts can exceed 12 months, to avoid placing a debtor in further hardship or creating payment arrangements that a debtor cannot pay. The bill also expands some of the civil debt recovery provisions, clarifying that the central role of the Chief Recovery Officer under part 8 of the act is to recover civil debts owed to government.

The bill explains how the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act is to interact with other debt-creating acts to avoid inconsistencies and competing enforcement provisions. The definition of 'debt' for the purpose of part 8 excludes debts of a prescribed kind. This will allow for flexibility to exclude some statutory debts that have separate enforcement schemes so comprehensive and specialist that it would be undesirable to deal with them outside of their own legislation.

There are some statutory debts that exist under acts which allow tribunals such as the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal to review administrative decisions under the debt-creating act. Currently, this creates difficulties with respect to jurisdiction; however, the bill allows the Chief Recovery Officer to suspend a civil debt determination until the tribunal has decided the matter and states that the Magistrates Court is bound by any previous tribunal decisions. I emphasise that this does not take away any of the rights a person might have to appeal the tribunal ruling. It simply ensures that they do so in the appropriate forum.

The bill also addresses minor and technical overlaps, such as specifying the correct application of interest rates on unpaid civil debts and providing that confidentiality requirements do not prevent an agency providing information to the Chief Recovery Officer for the purpose of debt enforcement. The bill will allow the Chief Recovery Officer to act as judgement creditor on behalf of other government agencies under the Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991. Although part 8 does not apply to court judgement debts, this amendment will mean that the Chief Recovery Officer is available to act as a central enforcement point and provide debt recovery services to government agencies that have obtained court judgments.

Consequential amendments will also be made to the Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007 to allow the Chief Recovery Officer to recover debts owed to South Australia Police for outstanding clamping and impounding fees incurred by prescribed, convicted offenders, if they are debts subject to an enforcement determination. The bill also makes a variety of additional minor technical amendments. These are outlined in the explanation of clauses. Accordingly, I commend the bill to the house and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017*

3—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause amends the definition of *personal details* so that details of a kind prescribed by the regulations are included within the definition.

4—Insertion of section 3A

This clause inserts a new section 3A.

3A—Application to youths

Proposed section 3A makes it clear that the Act applies to debtors and alleged offenders who are under the age of 18 years. The proposed section also provides that an additional power exists, in relation to

enforcement of a pecuniary sum or expiation notice, for a youth or the Chief Recovery Officer to apply, at any time, to the Youth Court for the making of a community service order in respect of the youth (as if section 46 of the Act applied in respect of the pecuniary sum or the amount due under the expiation notice).

5—Amendment of section 9—Amounts due under expiation notices may be treated as part of pecuniary sum

This amendment is consequential to the repeal of section 14 and the amendments made to section 18.

6—Repeal of section 10

This clause repeals section 10, as the enactment of section 3A will make section 10 obsolete.

7—Amendment of section 12—Payment of pecuniary sum to Chief Recovery Officer

This proposed amendment clarifies that the Chief Recovery Officer must pay an amount received in payment of a pecuniary sum, first, to satisfy any order for compensation or restitution made by a sentencing court. If the debtor is subject to more than one such order, payments are to be made to satisfy the amounts payable under those orders, in chronological order, until all such amounts have been paid, before any other payments are made. This clause also changes the description of defendant to debtor.

8—Repeal of section 14

Section 14 is repealed.

9—Amendment of section 15—Arrangements as to manner and time of payment

Section 15(9) currently provides that an arrangement under the section can be varied by agreement between the debtor and the Chief Recovery Officer. The subsection as proposed to be amended by this clause will provide that arrangements as to the manner and time of payment may be varied by the Chief Recovery Officer on their own initiative by extending them to apply to another pecuniary sum payable by the debtor. The section as amended by this clause will also provide that if an arrangement is terminated and not reinstated, after 14 days the sum will be added to the pecuniary sum payable by the debtor.

10—Amendment of section 18—Reminder notice

The proposed amendment provides that if amounts remain unpaid or unrecovered for more than a certain period after a reminder notice is provided to the debtor, the prescribed amount is added to, and forms part of, the pecuniary sum payable by the debtor. Currently, the Chief Recovery Officer may waive payment of a reminder notice fee. Under section 18(4) as amended by this clause, the Chief Recovery Officer will be able to waive the whole or any part of an amount payable by a debtor in accordance with the section. This clause also changes the heading of the section.

11—Amendment of section 19—Enforcement action

The proposed amendment recasts the Chief Recovery Officer's enforcement powers, particularly in relation to the power to waive payment of, or write off, a pecuniary sum.

12—Amendment of section 20—Arrangements as to manner and time of payment

The proposed amendment broadens the scope of the section to allow the Chief Recovery Officer to vary an arrangement as to the manner and time of payment. Amendments are made to subsections (6) and (8) in relation to alleged offenders entering into approved treatment programs. The section as amended would allow the Chief Recovery Officer to aggregate any number of amounts due under expiation notices. Proposed subsection (12) gives a debtor the right to request rescission of a unilateral variation made by the Chief Recovery Officer. The clause also makes consequential amendments to sections 20(17) and 20(18). Subsection (19a), as inserted by this clause, will provide that if an arrangement is terminated and not reinstated, the amount due will be added to an amount due under a notice under section 26(1)(b).

13—Amendment of section 22—Enforcement determinations

The proposed amendment clarifies that the Chief Recovery Officer may make enforcement determinations in accordance with section 22(14) and 23(5)(c) without the conditions required by section 22(3)(a) or (b).

14—Amendment of section 25—Enforcement actions by Chief Recovery Officer

This clause proposes to amend the wording of section 25 to recognise the multiple powers of the Chief Recovery Officer in Part 7.

15—Amendment of section 26—Amounts unpaid or unrecovered for more than certain period

Section 26(1)(b) is expanded by this clause so that if an amount due under an expiation notice is not the subject of a section 20 arrangement at the end of the 28 day period commencing on the making of an enforcement determination, an additional amount will be added to the amount due under the relevant expiation notice.

16—Amendment of section 27—Writing off bad debts

The proposed amendment clarifies that the Chief Recovery Officer may write off an amount payable under an expiation notice if they consider that certain requirements are satisfied.

17—Amendment of section 30—Power to require information

This clause seeks to expand the types of material that may be required to be produced to the Chief Recovery Officer to include those relating to an amount due under an expiation notice.

18—Amendment of section 32—Disclosure of information to prescribed interstate authority

This clause makes a change in terminology so that 'interstate authority' becomes 'authority of another jurisdiction'.

19—Amendment of section 33—Charge on land

This clause clarifies that the pecuniary amount referred to in section 33(1) is that which is payable by the debtor.

20—Amendment of section 35—Aggregation of monetary amounts for the purposes of enforcement

This clause expands the provision to apply to an alleged offender.

21—Amendment of section 36—Seizure and sale of assets

This clause proposes the insertion of a provision granting the Chief Recovery Officer the power to eject from land any person who is not lawfully entitled to be on the land, if a determination provides for the sale of an interest in the land.

22—Amendment of section 38—Suspension of driver's licence

The proposed amendments clarify the operation of certain aspects of section 38 and make it clear that the fee that forms part of the monetary amount owed by a debtor or alleged offender applies only if the Chief Recovery Officer makes a determination under subsection (1).

23—Amendment of section 39—Restriction on transacting business with Registrar of Motor Vehicles

The amendment proposed by this clause makes it clear that the fee that forms part of the monetary amount owed by a debtor or alleged offender applies only if the Chief Recovery Officer makes a determination under subsection (1).

24—Amendment of section 40—Suspension of section 97A of *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*

The amendment made by this clause makes it clear that the fee that forms part of the monetary amount owed by a debtor or alleged offender under section 40(5) relates only to a determination of the Chief Recovery Officer pursuant to section 40(1).

25—Amendment of section 46—Community service and approved treatment program orders

Section 46 currently provides that, if the Court is satisfied that a debtor or alleged offender does not have, and is not likely within a reasonable time to have, the means to satisfy a monetary amount owed by the debtor or alleged offender without the debtor or alleged offender, or the dependants of the debtor or alleged offender, suffering hardship, the Court may, on application by the Chief Recovery Officer, make a community service order, or require the debtor or alleged offender to complete an approved treatment program. This clause proposes to amend section 46 by removing references to approved treatment programs. This clause also makes various amendments consequential on the removal of the Court's ability to require completion of an approved treatment program. The clause deletes provisions referring to approved treatment programs, including subsections (13), (14) and (15), and makes an amendment to the heading of the section deleting the reference to approved treatment programs.

26—Amendment of section 47—Community service and approved treatment program orders may be enforced by imprisonment

This clause proposes the removal from section 47 of all references to completion of approved treatment programs, including by amending the heading of the section.

27—Amendment of section 48—Interpretation

This clause amends the definition of *debt* that applies for the purposes of Part 8. As a consequence of this amendment, the term will not include the following:

- a pecuniary sum;
- an amount payable under an expiation notice;
- a judgment debt;
- a debt of a prescribed kind.

A definition of *judgment debt* is also inserted so that the term has the same meaning as in the *Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991*.

28—Insertion of section 48A

This clause inserts a new section 48A.

48A—Provision of information

Proposed section 48A authorises a public authority to provide the Chief Recovery Officer with information considered necessary, or requested by the Chief Recovery Officer, to enable the Chief Recovery Officer to take action in relation to a debt. This applies despite any other Act or law.

29—Insertion of Part 8 Division 1A

This clause inserts a new Division 1A into Part 8.

Division 1A—Recovery of civil judgment sum

48B—Chief Recovery Officer may act for judgment creditor

Under proposed section 48B, the Chief Recovery Officer will be able, on application by a public authority that is a judgment creditor under the *Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991*, to assume the role of the authority for the purposes of recovering the debt and, if necessary, take proceedings under that Act for enforcement of the judgment.

30—Amendment of section 49—Notification of debt

Section 49, as amended by this clause, will provide that a debt may be notified to the Chief Recovery Officer under the section despite any other relevant Act or law. The section as amended also gives the Chief Recovery Officer the power to vary, revoke or suspend a civil debt determination issued under the Act.

31—Insertion of section 49A

This clause inserts a new section 49A.

49A—This Part prevails over other Acts

Proposed section 49A provides that, if a civil debt determination is in force in relation to a debt, and the Act under which the debt arises (the *debt creating Act*) makes provision for recovery of the debt, Part 8 applies to recovery of the debt, and action for recovery of the debt may not be taken under the debt creating Act. If there is an inconsistency between any applicable provisions of the debt creating Act and Part 8, Part 8 prevails to the extent of the inconsistency.

32—Amendment of section 50—Application to Court in relation to debt

Section 50 currently provides that a debtor who disputes the existence, or the amount, of a debt the subject of a civil debt determination may apply to the Court for revocation or variation of the determination. Under the section as amended by this clause, a debtor will also be able to apply for revocation or variation of a civil debt determination if they have been notified that the determination has been confirmed or varied. It is also proposed to change the time within which an application may be made under the section from 1 month to 28 days.

33—Amendment of section 51—Enforcement action

The clause changes the time limit that applies in respect of the presumption that a debtor will be taken to have admitted liability for a debt to which a civil debt determination relates if the debtor has not entered into an arrangement under section 57. The time limit is changed from 1 month to 28 days.

34—Amendment of section 52—Internal review of decision to take enforcement action

The clause changes the general time limit within which an application for internal review of an enforcement notice must be made from 30 days after the day on which the applicant received the enforcement notice, to 28 days after the day on which the applicant received such a notice.

35—Amendment of section 53—Review of decision to take enforcement action

This clause amends section 53 to provide clarity on the powers available to the Court when an application for review of a decision by the Chief Recovery Officer is made under the section, and provides that no further appeal can be made following a decision of the Court.

36—Repeal of section 55

The clause repeals section 55, which provides that any costs incurred by the Chief Recovery Officer in relation to the exercise of powers and functions under Part 8 are added to and form part of the debt owed by the debtor. (See section 66B (inserted by clause 43), which substantially re-enacts section 55.)

37—Amendment of section 56—Interest on debts

As a consequence of amendments to section 56 proposed by this clause, if a debt becomes the subject of a civil debt determination, any provisions of another Act under which interest accrues on the debt will cease to apply from the day following the day on which the determination is made. The clause also amends section 56 to require that the public authority to which a debt is owed under a civil debt determination must make a request in order for interest to accrue under the Act on such a debt.

38—Amendment of section 57—Voluntary arrangement as to time and manner of payment

Under section 57 as amended by this clause—

there will be no time limit on the period that may apply to an arrangement entered into by a debtor with the Chief Recovery Officer for payment of a debt by instalments; and

the Chief Recovery Officer may, under proposed section 57(7a), unilaterally vary a payment arrangement by extending it to apply to another debt payable by the debtor; and

a debtor may apply under proposed section 57(8a) for rescission of a variation of a payment arrangement made under section 57(7a), and the Chief Recovery Officer must, on receipt of the application, rescind the variation.

39—Amendment of section 58—Investigation of debtor's financial position

Section 58 sets out the Chief Recovery Officer's powers of investigation. As a result of the amendments proposed by this section, the Chief Recovery Officer will not be able to give written notice to a person under the section during any period during which the liability for, or the amount of, the debt to which the notice relates is subject to review by a court or tribunal.

40—Amendment of section 59—Power to require information

This clause updates a reference to 'contact details' to 'personal details', which is defined.

41—Amendment of section 61—Requirement for payment of instalments etc

This clause removes provisions granting the Court power, on application by the Chief Recovery Officer, to issue a summons to require a debtor to appear for examination before the Court. It also removes provision for the Court to issue a warrant to have a debtor arrested and brought before the Court if they fail to appear as required by a summons. The power of the Court to commit to prison a debtor who has failed to pay instalments in accordance with a determination of the Chief Recovery Officer under the section is also removed. Some of these provisions are re-enacted in proposed section 66A (see clause 43).

42—Amendment of section 63—Seizure and sale of assets

The effect of the amendments made by this clause is as follows:

it is clarified that section 63(1) refers to land or personal property owned (whether solely or as co-owner) by a debtor;

the power of the Chief Recovery Officer is extended so that they can affix clamps or any other locking device to any vehicle in order for it to be seized and removed under existing provisions of the section;

it is clarified that the Chief Recovery Officer may operate on behalf of a relevant public authority in accordance with the Act;

it is proposed that if the Chief Recovery Officer determines not to sell any personal property seized under section 63, the property must be returned to the debtor or left at the land from which it was seized.

43—Insertion of Part 8 Division 5 Subdivisions 4 and 5

This clause inserts 2 new subdivisions into Part 8 Division 5.

Subdivision 4—Failure of enforcement process

66A—Monetary penalty

Proposed section 66A grants the Court the power if a debtor fails to comply with a determination under section 61(1) to, on application of the Chief Recovery Officer, issue a summons to require the debtor to appear for examination before the Court. The Court may issue a warrant if the summons is not complied with. If the Court is satisfied that certain prescribed conditions are met, the Court may order that the debtor pay a monetary penalty of an amount determined by the Court (which will be payable in addition to the monetary amount owed by the debtor).

Subdivision 5—Costs

66B—Costs

Proposed section 66B provides that any costs incurred by the Chief Recovery Officer in relation to the exercise of powers and functions under Division 5 may be added to, and will then form part of, the debt owed by the debtor.

44—Amendment of section 67—Authorised officers

This clause amends section 67 such that the Minister may, by instrument in writing, delegate their functions and powers under the section to a particular person, or to a person holding a particular position.

45—Insertion of section 69A

This clause inserts a new section 69A.

69A—Dealing with overpayments

Proposed section 69A provides for the event that a debtor or alleged offender pays an amount of money to the Chief Recovery Officer towards the amount outstanding under the Act and the amount paid exceeds the amount outstanding. The Chief Recovery Officer may apply the excess amount towards any other pecuniary sum, amount payable under an expiation notice or debt owed by the debtor that is payable to the Chief Recovery Officer if certain prescribed requirements are met, including that the debtor or alleged offender is advised of the overpayment and invited to apply for the amount to be returned.

46—Amendment of section 76—Regulations

This clause amends section 76 to—

make it clear that fees under the Act are prescribed by fee notice; and

provide an ability for transitional provisions consequent on the amendment of the Act by another Act to be made by regulation.

Schedule 1—Related amendments and transitional provisions

Part 1—Amendment of *Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007*

1—Amendment of section 9—Removal of clamps or release of impounded vehicle and fees

This clause makes amendments to the *Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007* in order to allow the Chief Recovery Officer to recover certain debts due to the Commissioner of Police under that Act. It provides that, subject to the section, the Chief Recovery Officer may exercise any power or do anything that they are authorised or empowered to do under the *Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017* in relation to an enforcement determination as if an applicable debt were an amount due under an expiation notice that the enforcement determination related to.

2—Amendment of section 12—Court order for impounding or forfeiture on conviction of prescribed offence

This clause deletes a note at the foot of section 12(1a) of the *Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007* which is no longer relevant.

Part 2—Amendment of *Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991*

3—Amendment of section 5—Order for payment of instalments etc

This clause proposes to repeal section 5(5) to (8) of the *Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991*. These provisions relate to the powers of the court if a judgment debtor fails to comply with an order under the section. These provisions are made redundant by the insertion of section 5A under clause 4. A substantive change in these proposed amendments is the removal of the power of the court to commit a judgment debtor to prison.

4—Insertion of section 5A

This clause proposes the insertion of a new section 5A.

5A—Monetary penalty

This provision provides that if a judgment debtor fails to comply with an order under section 5(1), the court may, on application by the judgment creditor, issue a summons to require the judgment debtor to appear for examination before the court. If the judgment debtor fails to appear as required by the summons, the court may issue a warrant. The court may order that the judgment debtor pay a monetary penalty of an amount determined by the court if the court is satisfied in relation to certain prescribed matters.

Part 3—Transitional provisions

5—Transitional provisions—*Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017*

6—Transitional provisions—*Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991*

These clauses set out transitional provisions that apply for the purposes of the measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Hurn.

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (ENVIRONMENT AND FOOD
PRODUCTION AREAS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:46): I rise to continue my remarks on this very important bill. As it happens, when I was speaking earlier, I was talking about the importance of open green space and our Parklands when talking about higher density living in our CBD. I was speaking about the fact that when there is an increase in housing density it must be matched with open green space, which is why I am incredibly proud to be delivering this for my community through the creation of pocket parks. Apologies, there will be a few repetitions from my grievance.

In late 2023, I opened the Prospect Pocket Park on the corner of Main North Road and Da Costa Avenue in Prospect in partnership with the City of Prospect. I wanted to change the thinking about the future of Main North Road as a place not just for car yards but for neighbourhoods and for communities. I commend the City of Prospect for its work in also creating a vision for this part of our community through their plans for the Prospect Lifestyle Precinct.

Council's overall goal is to create a thriving community destination which contributes to the day-to-day vibrancy of our council area. Their objectives are to build on a generational legacy that celebrates the larger oval precinct at Prospect Oval, home to the mighty North Adelaide Roosters, to create a space that can be used every day by the local community through increased quality public amenity and to create a quality health, wellness, fitness and sporting precinct that attracts the highest level of community usage and sporting participation, particularly as we see more families move into our community and kids grow up.

Objectives also include creating a destination acting as a catalyst to attract commercial and residential outcomes through taking advantage of the Main North Road frontage and Parklands setting, as well as increase connectivity between Main North Road, Prospect Oval and Prospect Road through a precinct approach. I am also very proud to say that work at this very moment is underway on a brand-new pocket park, the Churchill Road Pocket Park at Ovingham. This additional green space will support the communities along Churchill Road and Devonport Terrace, which have seen higher densities over the past decade. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (15:49): I am very pleased to rise in support of this important bill; in fact, it is not only important but timely. Anyone who has lived in Greater Adelaide for quite a while now, as I expect the majority of members of this house have, will recognise that Adelaide and South Australia have been on a trajectory of change for some time. Greater Adelaide has changed a great deal, in particular over the last couple of decades.

This change has been remarkable to observe. Labor governments, in particular, have worked hard to guide our state and our city to grow in population and reputation. Increasingly, Adelaide and South Australia are globally recognised as a highly desirable place to visit and to live. Our beautiful regions, our stunning beaches and our captivating city attract significant international attention. Our recent spectacular successes in major events and festivals are continuing the work of expanding and strengthening our domestic and global reputation as a destination of distinction.

Of course, we are also growing in numbers. Since a brief period of relative stagnation during the late 1990s, we have experienced a fairly steady rate of positive population growth. This growth, too, is something we should celebrate because growth brings opportunity. For our economy, for our community, and for the culture of our city and state, growth is a healthy phenomenon.

However, growth also presents challenges. Amid ongoing challenges that are shared across jurisdictions around Australia, and indeed around the world, like the rest of the nation we are currently experiencing a housing crisis. Many South Australians are feeling these circumstances very acutely. In order to protect and preserve the quality of life that makes Adelaide and South Australia such a wonderful place to live, a good government will recognise the need to act. To remain one of the most liveable cities in the world, to remain a place where residents of our communities are supported to

live well, we need to plan for the growth that we know will continue. We need to support and facilitate development that will meet the future and long-term needs of our community.

By 2050 Greater Adelaide's population is expected to grow by some 670,000 people relative to today's population numbers. As a state we are on track to reach two million people by 2030. We need to act now to lay the groundwork to support development that will enable Greater Adelaide to adapt and respond to rising needs for housing, as well as for the infrastructure to accompany housing growth well into the future. This means that we need an ongoing supply of development-ready land over the next 30 years.

Since coming to office, the Malinauskas government has approved 30 code amendments, rezoning 500 hectares of land to create at least 7,000 new dwellings. With the bill now before the house, we seek to take further crucial steps forward. Earlier this month, the Malinauskas government released the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan (GARP), a blueprint for Greater Adelaide's future growth. Alongside the Malinauskas government's Housing Roadmap, the GARP seeks to ensure that there is an appropriate supply of serviced land to meet current, emerging and future housing and infrastructure demand. The GARP identifies where 315,000 new homes will be built over the next 30 years and preserves important land for future infrastructure requirements.

When the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 was first drafted in 2015-16, government policy was strongly focused on urban consolidation, with a target set for 85 per cent of all growth to occur through infill development. This is no longer consistent with government policy and, as such, the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan has removed the former objective in previous versions, which targeted 85 per cent of future housing being infill projects.

While infill will remain an important element in the mix of providing for the future growth of Greater Adelaide, we can observe through a wealth of lived experience that infill carries its own significant challenges. Appropriate physical infrastructure and social infrastructure are both required to make infill work well for our community. This is why discussions around infill sometimes draw a distinction between the practice of general densification and carefully planned infill.

Mr Acting Speaker, you only need to visit my electorate and go to Para Hills or Ingle Farm to see that the infill pressure on our parking and traffic is causing problems in our state. Para Hills and Ingle Farm are particular hotspots in our north-eastern Adelaide area because people moved there 50 years ago into a fantastic planned area. They lived well, and often their families have also moved into the area, or indeed have stayed in the area, and now they are finding the houses are being knocked down and three or even four are being built on the block in their place. This is causing enormous trouble in my electorate for car parking and also for local traffic. I can say on behalf of my constituents that I am very glad the government has decided to reduce the pressure for infill development.

Infill retains the potential to play an important role in meeting future community need for housing, provided that it is carefully planned and appropriately managed. We can refer to this practice as strategic infill. The sort of infill that we will see at the West End site is a good example of the strategic infill that this government chooses to embrace and pursue. However, we know that what the Premier has previously characterised as a 'letting it rip' infill has a tendency to create or exacerbate challenges, particularly in the form of increased congestion on our roads, as well as in the form of unsustainable demand on both our physical and social infrastructure and amenity.

Residents across my own community can attest to the sort of infill whereby we see suburban blocks being subdivided to accommodate a doubling of dwellings, or a trebling, and sometimes more. This type of infill is having a significant impact on quality of life for many people across Greater Adelaide. It is also the case that South Australians deserve the opportunity to avail themselves of choice in terms of what sort of housing they want to live in. For a government to restrict development to an overwhelming focus on infill has the effect of making what is still a commonly held ambition among South Australians—that is, the ambition to live in a house with a backyard and a bit of space in which their families can grow and thrive—harder for people to achieve.

In considering where the balance lies, a great fact to highlight is this: we have form in ensuring good planning where development is thoughtfully managed and is undertaken in a deliberate way. The planning system in South Australia is ranked first in the nation by the likes of the

Business Council of Australia for a reason, and that is because when land is rezoned we have a process in place to drive successful planning outcomes. Whether it be greenfield development through rezoning or strategic and carefully managed infill, we approach development in a holistic way that considers the impacts on our infrastructure and on our community.

The introduction of a bill to amend the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 to vary the environment and food protection areas (EFPA) so they align with the GARP is an important step in doing exactly that. The bill also aims to ensure that the EFPAs remain consistent with the GARP for new growth areas over the next 30 years. The Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Protection Areas) Amendment Bill seeks to achieve the following:

- amend section 7 of the act to designate a revised GRO plan setting out new EFPA boundaries based on the GARP;
- confirm that any land that is removed from the EFPA on commencement of the bill has limited land division overlay applied through the Planning and Design Code to prevent unorderly fragmentation of the land, which would make it harder to develop for a residential purpose at a later date;
- remove the current urban consolidation test for future variations to the EFPA boundaries, which essentially prevents amendments to EFPA boundaries unless Greater Adelaide is unable to support infill development;
- ensure that future variations of the EFPA are consistent with the GARP and ensure a 30-year land supply rather than 50 years; and
- insert new provisions in section 64 of the act requiring the GARP to consider population growth and to identify land to be developed in the short term.

Growth areas to be removed from the environment and food protection areas were determined through an extensive land assessment that was undertaken as part of the GARP process. The areas that are to be removed from the EFPA will still need to be rezoned before they are used primarily for residential development. This will occur in a staged manner over the next 30 years to ensure orderly development, and it will be based on demand. We will also take into account infrastructure provision and costs.

Crucially, the revision of the EFPA seeks to ensure that key agricultural lands surrounding Greater Adelaide remain protected. The changes for the EFPAs represent a loss of less than 1 per cent of key agricultural lands in the GARP area. This, together with the current character preservation districts and Hills Face Zone, ensure we retain a strong urban growth boundary. It is important to highlight that areas identified through the GARP for new homes are either already connected to infrastructure, have infrastructure commitments in place or are located in areas where future investment in infrastructure is planned.

The Malinauskas government's South Australian Housing Roadmap represents a coordinated approach to bring more housing to market sooner. We are strengthening skills and training in our state to ensure we have the trades available to construct the new homes our community will need into the future. We are coordinating and investing in crucial infrastructure. We are delivering more public housing, strengthening and protecting rights for renters, and addressing affordability, including by abolishing stamp duty for first-home buyers at eligible price points.

In recognition that planning for water is a crucially important part of overall planning for growth, it is important to note that SA Water has committed to \$1.5 billion of spending between 2024 and 2028 to unlock these new growth areas within Greater Adelaide. The GARP also supports our efforts to lock in land for schools, hospitals and emergency services. The GARP also addresses the protection of key rail infrastructure corridors. The preserved railway corridors aim to ensure that we are not losing potential opportunities to alleviate demands on private vehicle reliance. These elements offer valuable strategic and financial advantages, saving the South Australian taxpayer money down the track.

It is also important to note that there is no requirement for farming activities to cease simply because land has been removed from the EFPA. I mentioned that the areas being removed from the EFPA will still need to be rezoned before they are used for residential development and that this needs to occur in a staged manner, and that is what will happen over the timeframe of the next 30 years. The government will also give consideration to updating key policies around the urban and rural interface to ensure that agricultural activities can still continue. These policy investigations will take into account issues such as bushfire protection, dust and noise between residential and farming areas.

Consideration has also been given to public amenity that will support quality of life across key emerging growth areas, including Angle Vale, Kudla and the Gawler River. The Malinauskas Labor government has committed \$53 million towards the first stage of the Northern Parklands. At maturity, these Parklands will cover almost 1,000 hectares of land, which is 39 per cent larger than the Parklands surrounding the CBD.

The centrepiece of the Northern Parklands will be the proposed 70-hectare Village Green sport and recreation area. The playing fields will include ovals, courts and clubroom facilities that will provide an excellent home to local sporting clubs. Located along the electrified Gawler railway line, the Village Green sport and recreation area will feature public transport connections as well as car parking. More than 760 hectares will be preserved for natural green open space across the Northern Parklands, promoting biodiversity and securing habitat for native animals.

A key principle that underlines all of these policy efforts is that development and growth are best undertaken through careful planning. Ensuring adequate infrastructure planning and provision at the outset is crucial. The Greater Adelaide Regional Plan provides the direction, the guidance and the methodology for future development within Greater Adelaide. Our intention is that it will transform the way we approach both infill and greenfield development within our city and region.

The GARP is a crucial strategic element to our Housing Roadmap. These are significant policies that the Malinauskas government is steadfastly committed to because we are determined to support South Australians to access opportunity and choice in housing. All forms of development have a role in our future. Where infill is undertaken, it must be done strategically, and future urban and suburban growth must be planned for correctly to ensure appropriate infrastructure is in place. Traffic management and suitable access to schools, health service infrastructure, public transport and public amenity must all be taken into account.

A good government sees these challenges on the horizon and seizes the opportunity to meet them head-on. A good government acts. I am pleased to commend this bill to the house and urge members to support it. I want to take this opportunity to thank the Minister for Housing for bringing this bill to the parliament and for his ongoing commitment to making sure that South Australians have access to housing.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (16:03): I rise to support the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Production Areas) Amendment Bill, and I am enthused to be doing so because this is an issue that is critical to my electorate. In fact, I would go so far as to say that housing and planning and development are the number one issue for my electorate, and have been for the entire time that I have been lucky enough to serve as the member for Badcoe.

This legislation goes to the heart of the issue that my constituents have been raising with me over many years and, I am sure, were raising before that as well. The question that is critical for our area, which is very close to the CBD—it borders the Parklands, in fact—is the question between spreading out or up. In recent years, my electorate has certainly seen a lot of the up, and that increased density has not been without serious questions and sometimes some ill consequences for my local area.

What this bill seeks to do in terms of providing a much greater area of land in which future housing can be built on the outskirts of the existing greater metropolitan Adelaide area, really, even though it may be quite some kilometres away from my electorate of Badcoe, has an immediate, real and direct impact on the people who live in my inner suburban area.

I have had that many debates with people about this question of out or up. Of course, the starting point for those discussions is often previous policies, particularly those made around 2015-16 that were dictating that 85 per cent of new development should be infill development. There are certainly people in my community who are fans of this approach.

There is quite a lively contest of ideas in my area about urban infill versus expansion out of the existing greater metropolitan area, and both arguments have merit and both arguments have their detractors. But certainly my electors have been asking me for some time, 'Why is it that this policy was put in place? Is it relevant for the current environment that we find ourselves in, particularly in a housing crisis?' and of course, what does it mean for the people living in the 16 suburbs that I represent. Different people have different perspectives on that.

Regarding some of the pressures that people in my electorate are facing, obviously the density that has come due to that previous policy is undeniable. We have certainly seen in the last 10 to 15 years a much greater level of urban infill in the seat of Badcoe and probably much greater than some other electorates have experienced.

There is probably no great mystery about why that has happened. Quite frankly, our area is awesome. We are right between the city and the beach. We are close to the Airport. We have a hospital in our electorate and two others either side—Ashford in the electorate, and the Royal Adelaide and Women's and Children's to the north, and then Flinders to the south. We also have fantastic schools. Some of the best schools in the state, public and private, are in or close to Badcoe.

We also have wonderful community facilities, things like the Unley swimming pool and Edwardstown Oval. We have great shopping, such as at Castle Plaza, and Goodwood Road. These are the things that make our area very attractive, but they are also the things that mean developers are very attracted to our area and want to be building quite dense new accommodation in our area. They know that it is a very saleable area. They know they will make a profit. The difficulty has come for existing residents who are then having to deal with the consequences of some of that densification.

To be clear, there have been some projects, namely those led by Renewal SA, that have been good or look like they are going to be great for our area. There are projects at the old Le Cornu site. Construction is underway there and the plans are very well known and I think have been received very well by our area. We are also looking at Keswick Barracks. Obviously there is a land-swap agreement with the federal government in relation to that site and that has been earmarked for further development, including housing.

The Castalloy site at North Plympton has been in the news a little bit lately. Certainly there will be some development of that site after a long history as an industrial site. Quite near it, just on the other side of the road, is the old Boral site, which also has been recently rezoned for housing.

There is land down near Castle Plaza as well that is being hotly looked at as to what the future there will be. With regard to the Airport land, the Airport has been developing semi-industrial uses like the large freight and packaging companies going in there and using that land. We have also seen the bakery site at Forestville, the subject of a current planning debate as well, not yet resolved.

We have also seen a great deal of two-for-one infill throughout our suburbs. Those big planned projects on really key parcels of land across my electorate have really had a lot of focus and a lot of energy go into making sure that the planning, development, design and the way that they work within the existing community is sound, and in fact they are welcomed by the existing community. What is, I think, overwhelmingly not welcomed in my community have been the two-for-ones, three-for-ones, four-for-ones and sometimes six-for-ones on ordinary house blocks in my area.

There have been significant changes to the planning and development code since I became the member for Badcoe, and some of the excesses that have been carried out, particularly in suburbs like Kurralta Park, are actually not able to be built anymore. That is a good thing, but those suburbs have been left with the legacy of those decisions.

I might just depart for a moment to say that this is one of the great difficulties of planning legislation, because it does take some time for the rubber to hit the road. We change the rules in one spot, but then often it is five or six years, maybe longer, before we actually see the outcome of that. It can be very difficult, I think, for the public especially to appreciate that rules might have changed when they are still seeing what they may think is bad development—what may be bad development—continuing to go on because there have already been approvals granted under previous legislation.

Some of those projects that I just outlined I think will contribute quite positively to our community. I am particularly excited about that of the old Le Cornu site at Forestville, and I am awaiting what I think will be a great debate about the future of the Keswick Barracks and the potential that it holds. But the pressures that people raise with me that have to be dealt with when those projects are being considered, but even more so the two-for-ones, three-for-ones and six-for-ones, are contributing negatively to things like green space and public space.

We have seen development in our area on standard-sized blocks that has basically left no green space, not a tree in sight, barely a blade of grass. That cannot happen anymore, but it has happened too much already, and we need to compensate for that. We need more public space, more green space, more shared open green space for people in our communities, and even more so now that we have a greater level of density across our suburbs. Children growing up in those environments, if they do not have their own backyard, need to have access to a park around the corner, a decent oval at school, trees in the street.

Those are some of the things that there have recently been planning regulation changes on and that I am looking forward to seeing actually come to fruition. Parking is the other one that has really impacted my area. There are so many more cars parked on the street. Partly that is because of generational changes; we have people living at home for longer, more people with more cars needing more places to park them. Previous housing construction, especially in my area, which has a lot of old housing, was just not catering and did not need to cater for sometimes four cars in one household. That is certainly a difficulty.

Community amenities also have not necessarily kept pace, or people have been concerned that they have not kept pace, with the level of densification that is happening in my community. We are seeing more and more people move into an area, but that is not necessarily being reflected in the design of our roads, our water and utilities, our parks and gardens, and our school capacity in particular. I have done an extensive amount of work talking with my community about planning and development issues from day dot. That is everything from holding forums, particularly when legislative change has been on the table, and hearing the views of people and being able to feed them back to government.

I am pleased to see now that some of the policies that this government is coming forward with have been informed by that work that I have done in my community and have put through to the decision-makers in our government. Those people have been listened to. Instead of just whingeing about things, their coming to a forum, responding to a survey, talking to me at a street-corner meeting is actually creating real change. I know that my colleagues are doing that work across their electorates as well and that is all culminating in our government really having a deep understanding of what is going on in our suburbs and what needs to change and what the expectations of our community are.

I come back again to this question of out or up. As I said, it is not unanimous that people in my electorate all share the same view on this, but I would say that probably most of the people in my electorate have probably been advocating for some time, to me at least, that we should be looking at expanding our metropolitan area out. There are a significant number of people who are fans of going up, but I think what really has happened here is that we do not actually need to choose between out and up.

What we need are policies that are flexible enough that we can make the right choice for the right environment, that we can have a level of densification of height, and that that is being done sensibly and with respect to the existing communities while also providing for others who may be quite happy to live a little bit further away from the CBD and utilise our transport system, and the

people who want to be able to live in a property, with a backyard, with a bit of space, as opposed to those who may be way more comfortable having an apartment or living in city-living environments.

My area also has character areas like Glandore and this policy goes to the protection of areas like that too. There are certainly people in my community who would like to see more character areas established. We are very lucky in having quite a lot of 1900s housing, but even more so some very special housing from the 1930s and 1940s in the Art Deco era. I do have significant numbers of people asking that more of those character zones are established because people do fear that we will lose that beautiful heritage that we have in our community. I think that this policy allows us to have some of those debates and to entertain the possibility of that happening.

We are obviously in the midst of a housing crisis and our top priority should be making sure that people have safe and affordable housing for themselves. Surely that is what governments are here to do, to make sure that we are looking after our most vulnerable, but also that we are looking after people who are working hard and who aspire to own their own home or, at the very least, be able to rent affordably in our community. Sometimes we are finding that the desire to preserve heritage clashes with the need to be building more housing.

So through this bill, the EFPAs will provide, as I am informed, the possibility of 61,000 new houses being built. There is no question that if pressure is alleviated on areas like mine then that gives us greater flexibility to be able to do some of the things that people are advocating in terms of preserving heritage, in terms of putting in more parks and gardens, in terms of expanding our schools, and in terms of building new schools and new facilities. Those things cannot happen if the primary pressure on our area is housing and we are needing to use all of our available land for housing.

I am hoping that this might provide some relief in time, that we will meet the challenge of building homes for people and then we may be able to turn our minds to lifting the standard of living, the quality of our suburbs, and making them everything that we want them to be. Certainly, I think that that is the aspiration of people in Badcoe.

As I said, the question my electors ask me is why we cannot build out from the established metropolitan areas. For quite a long time, one of the answers to that question, which is put to me at street-corner meetings, at forums, in letters, in emails and on social media, has been: what that requires is infrastructure. It requires water pipes, it requires electricity lines, it requires local and major roads, it requires the extension of train lines, it requires new schools and hospitals and health clinics. It requires councils investing in infrastructure as well.

For a long time, it has been put to people that we cannot do this because we cannot facilitate the infrastructure or that providing the infrastructure would be too expensive. Under this government I think the answer to that question has now well and truly changed. What this government is saying with this legislation and also with the GARP is that this is possible. We can go out and up. We can build infrastructure in a timely way, ahead of and in concert with the development of new housing. The investments that are being made by this government to ensure that the infrastructure is there and that housing can be built efficiently and quickly is really the cornerstone of what is trying to be achieved here.

I commend the minister and the government as a whole. Instead of saying, 'No, that's something we can't do. No, that's a barrier to being able to build our suburbs out,' the government is actually tackling the hard questions, doing the hard work and providing the infrastructure so that we can say yes to building further out. That does not mean that we are not into building up as well. What it means is it provides a greater level of flexibility to put the right developments in the right places and to develop areas like mine in a sensible and strategic way. It ensures that, as we have greater housing in the inner suburbs, it is done in a way where it is a place that people want to live.

You may choose to live in an apartment, but you will know that there will be infrastructure in your community to support you. You know you will have a place to park your car. You will have a spot to put your rubbish bin out. You will have a park to take your children to on the weekends. Your local sporting club will have grounds for you to be able to participate in sport. You will be able to get a park at the shops. You will be able to go to the hospital nearby. And you will be able to send your kids to a nearby school rather than right across the other end of town. That is made possible by this

legislation but also the policies of this government to make sure that the infrastructure is in place to achieve the housing that we want to see developed and developed rapidly.

Nothing breaks my heart more than when constituents come in to my office to speak with me or give me a call to express to me that they are facing down the barrel of homelessness, that they cannot afford a home no matter how hard they are trying, and that they cannot afford the rent and the rent increases that are impacting many in my community. It is absolutely heartbreaking to me to have those conversations. The truth of it is that the only way that we are going to alleviate the situation for those people, or at least the primary step, is to provide more housing. Supply is the problem.

That is why this is incredibly important legislation not just for the amenity and enjoyment of people in my community but also for the survival of people in our community. No-one should be going without a roof over their heads in South Australia in a privileged place like Adelaide, and we are making sure that that is not the case by providing 61,000—it is an incredible number—more homes through these policies. What we are doing is making sure that our suburban areas are beautiful places to live but, even more so, that people from all backgrounds have a place to call home. That is a good thing, and that is why I commend this bill.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (16:23): I also rise to support the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Production Areas) Amendment Bill 2025. I would have to say a lot of this is a long way from my electorate, but it is important as a state that we get this right. As other members have indicated, there is going to be a lot of population pressure over the coming years. The anticipated population of Adelaide is 2.2 million by 2051, so there is a need to act. There is a need to act in a very coordinated fashion when it comes to providing the houses that are needed for people and providing the houses that are affordable in a genuine way. Sometimes the word 'affordable' is used in an incredibly loose way. For a lot of people I know, the current definition of an affordable house—well, I tell you what, it is not an affordable house. There is a need for affordable houses that people can purchase or affordable rents that are not going to break the bank of tenants.

There has been that emphasis on urban consolidation, and you need some of that. Some of that has been pretty good; some of it has been very ordinary, to say the least, and has generated a lot of angst in the suburbs. If you do get it right, that is a good thing because you are utilising existing infrastructure to a degree, but when you get it wrong, you really get it wrong. It cannot just be left to consolidation, so we do need to have greenfield sites opened up in order to permit housing developments.

What is proposed here with these changes is creating that capacity for 61,000 additional dwellings within the environment and food production areas. I know that there has been controversy. Grain producers and others have had something to say, and I am mindful of the fact that we do not want to see productive farmland disappear. But I think it is also important that we have a degree of perspective.

For the area that we are talking about today to the north of Adelaide—and someone with more knowledge about primary industries than me can correct me if I am wrong—the grain producers were saying that we are going to lose around about 28,000 tonnes of grain production through the loss of our cropping land. I think that has to be put into context. I think over the last 10 years of grain production in South Australia, the average has been around about eight million tonnes. I agree that there is a bit of a sacrifice there, but there is this really pressing need to provide land for housing and, in providing that land for housing, to ensure that there is a fairly rigorous process attached when it comes to identifying the areas.

It is my understanding that there has been a degree of rigour applied. They have looked at factors such as good quality agricultural land, land subject to natural hazards, environmentally sensitive land, land of cultural heritage value to Aboriginal people, and land located near to existing services and infrastructure. They are all important elements. Often, the really costly element is the existing and nearby existing infrastructure, so the more we can build near to existing infrastructure, the greater the savings when it comes to development.

Obviously, water provision and the infrastructure needed for that has been a live topic, as has the disposal and treatment of effluent. That is incredibly important infrastructure. When it comes to the transmission and distribution of electricity, that is incredibly important as well. But there is a

whole range of other factors that come into play when you are doing big developments on greenfield sites, and that is ensuring that the services are there: the health services, the school services.

One of the other incredibly important pieces of infrastructure is transport, ensuring that there is transport available to move people around in an efficient way—and not just between outlying areas and the CBD but more laterally as well. Of course, there seems to have been a lot of job growth in the northern parts of Adelaide, so having housing developments near where there is employment is also very important.

When I drive into Adelaide sometimes and see some of these new subdivisions, I just shake my head. When you have subdivisions where housing is crammed in, almost gutter to gutter, and a sea of black roofs, I say, 'How far have we advanced?' When you look at housing, you look at the lack of appropriate orientation and a lot of other basic features when it comes to designing houses to be more energy efficient.

I do not think we have progressed as well as we should have. I say that because I think I initiated the first energy efficiency standards in residential developments in South Australia way back in the 1990s, when I was on the Whyalla City Council. To see the slow progress since then has been, to me, quite frustrating. I know that this is now tied up with national COAG decision-making, but it is often the least common denominator approach.

I know that developers express some angst when we talk about energy efficiency, and what have you. They will argue that it adds costs. But we are condemning people to live in housing that will have high ongoing costs because they are not efficient. It would be good, with these developments to the north of Adelaide, to see an improvement in energy efficiency, and that is just going to become more and more important as time goes on. There is all this pressure in Adelaide for development. As I said, it is this balance between infill and doing that right and greenfield sites that can be developed to accommodate current and future needs.

Coming from a regional community, some of our challenges are somewhat different. If I look at my electorate, Whyalla is prime for infill. There is so much Crown land internally within the current urban envelope of Whyalla that could be developed. Sometimes, council say, 'We need to do this, we need to do that,' when it comes to significant subdivisions. I say to council, 'Show me the demand,' because the private sector is not going to step in and do significant subdivisions if they cannot have a degree of confidence about future demands, and that always gets back to something incredibly basic, and it is the economic foundations of a community and the job growth in that community.

At the moment, we are relatively stable; there is some new build. It is good to see some new Housing Trust build in Whyalla, and it is also good to see the Office for Regional Housing looking at some of the issues around accommodation for essential workers. In Port Augusta, there have been some subdivisions, and some of the infrastructure has been not up to scratch. Some people have had to depend upon septic tanks, and what have you, to handle their waste. Once again, there is not massive demand for growth.

Look at a community like Roxby Downs. Assuming Northern Water goes ahead, assuming the desire of BHP to expand copper production threefold and turn Olympic Dam into the hub for a potential mine, such as Oak Dam, it is a very promising prospect indeed. You have Prominent Hill and you have Carrapateena. There could be significant job growth, but how much of that is going to be accommodated by fly-in fly-out? There is already a significant number of fly-in and fly-outs in Roxby. Time will tell.

You can look at some of the smaller regional communities in my electorate, for instance in Quorn or Hawker. There is a little bit of growth in Quorn. A few tree changers have moved in. One of the issues in places like Quorn or Hawker is attracting and retaining—and it can be nurses and others—essential workers. One of the challenges is often the quality of housing. That goes for police as well in our regional communities. It is going to be difficult to get people to move out to regional communities if the standard of housing is not up to scratch, so it is good to see the Office for Regional Housing with a number of their pilot projects across the state looking at how we can develop models to accommodate essential workers.

There are challenges out in regional communities. I guess one of my bugbears, and the minister has received a letter on this, is the risk that you have in communities like Whyalla, which probably on a per-capita basis has more Housing Trust properties than any other regional community. We have probably got about 10,000 properties in Whyalla, of which just over 2,000 are Housing Trust properties. What that tends to do is concentrate people with multiple and complex needs in a regional community. That is probably, from a social planning perspective, not a good thing to do.

That has been happening because we had that massive legacy of public housing in Whyalla, far more than 2,000 in its heyday. I think over 60 or 70 per cent of the properties in Whyalla were public housing. We have still got a significant legacy of public housing, and because of policy, the way it is at the moment and the understandable emphasis on category 1, you end up concentrating a number of people with complex needs in a regional community without the services. It is not good for those people and it is not good for the broader community. So I am keen to see a little bit of a shift in policy when it comes to the Housing Trust areas in Whyalla, otherwise we are going to get ongoing growth and some quite disturbing antisocial behaviour in some of those areas in Whyalla.

We have met those changes over the years as old working families drop off the perch to be replaced by other people. This is not to stigmatise people on category 1. It is just to say that a regional community, like Whyalla, should not disproportionately have to bear the burden of a number of challenging social issues. That needs some attention when it comes to regional communities like Whyalla and indeed Port Augusta, which has over 700 Housing Trust properties. It is not as many on a per-capita basis, but it is still significant.

Getting back to Adelaide, clearly these changes are needed and they need to be well planned, because one of the things that happens—and you do see it when you have that very significant growth in some of the other cities in Australia, whether it is Melbourne or Sydney, population growth outstripping the infrastructure that is available and all the issues that it then generates. So there is an opportunity to plan this and get it right in Adelaide.

There can be a bit of a tendency at times to say the whole 'north of Gepps Cross' stuff, where we try to play off the regions against Adelaide. Well, we work best if we treat it as a cohesive role. Some of the people that are going to be living in those northern suburbs are going to be working in regional South Australia. They are going to be fly-in fly-out workers in the current mines and the mines that are being developed in the years to come. It is important that we accommodate those workers.

Obviously, I would give priority to accommodating those workers, as much as we can, closer to the mine sites. As I said, a place like Whyalla or a place like Port Augusta has a lot of land within its current urban envelope that can be developed. They are far closer to the mine sites than Adelaide, and it would be good to see those communities get some of that benefit. In order to get that benefit, affordable housing, whether on a rental basis or a purchase basis, is something that is needed in those communities, but of course those developments are going to reflect the anticipated demand.

A big lesson, especially with Whyalla, is that that dependence upon one industry in a regional community is both a strength and a massive vulnerability, so anything we can do to diversify communities like Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie—and mine developments to our north is one way of doing that—would be a real plus. I have to say that I am greatly encouraged, obviously, by the commitment of the federal and the state government to Whyalla and to other major regional communities when it comes to securing our future. That is a very positive thing.

As time goes on, I also want to see the Office for Regional Housing, when it fully hits its stride, initially start to address some of those essential worker challenges in regional communities, and that is not just confined to my electorate, that is across the board in most regional communities. Indeed, some regional communities are in decline. In the cropping areas, we have seen farms get bigger and they employ fewer people. When you look at the number of footy teams that used to be on Eyre Peninsula and you look at the number of footy teams now, it is an indicator of that decline on Eyre Peninsula. However, communities like Port Lincoln and others are growing.

When we were on Yorke Peninsula just recently looking at the health needs of the Yorke Peninsula, one of the issues there was about housing and housing growth, because there is a

population increase, especially on the northern part of Yorke Peninsula. That is made up of two components: retirees moving to Yorke Peninsula, but also young families because there is partly more affordable housing and a good lifestyle to boot.

There are obviously some areas of growth, and the South-East and other parts of the state are growing. Anything we can do as a government, through the Office for Regional Housing and other initiatives, to support housing developments in those areas is a real plus. Sometimes the private sector will just get on with it if that demand is there and the complexity is not there, but in some communities there is complexity. When you build in some regional communities there is a real premium to building, and it could be up to 30 per cent, so it is very significant.

I commend the bill. We do need to have greenfield sites to develop on and, as I said, there needs to be that degree of perspective. Yes, we are losing some cropping land and some horticultural land, but it is in order to address a really big need. Indeed, when you look at horticulture, there are other options available now. Sundrop Farms in Port Augusta is a capital intensive example of high-end horticulture, and there are some other alternatives that have been looked at.

In semi-arid areas and arid areas, you can get horticultural development based on desalination, or indeed based on photovoltaic fuels being used as catchments, so you are providing both electricity and water as a catchment to high-tech greenhouses. There are options for other ways of growing horticultural products if they make financial sense. With those few words, I will take my seat.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (16:43): I rise in support of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Production Areas) Amendment Bill 2025. This bill represents a really important step forward in our shared commitment to the future of South Australia. It is a future that will accommodate our growing population, it will drive economic opportunity, it protects our environment and it will ensure that we remain one of the most liveable cities in the world. And why would you want to live anywhere else? I look around when I walk around town, when I walk around my own community, and I think that with everything going on in the world there is nowhere else I would like to be, and that is the same for many in our community: they do not want to go anywhere else.

It was only probably seven years ago that I remember someone asking a group of young people if they planned to leave Adelaide when they finished university, and a big proportion of them put their hand in the air. Well, that has changed. They are all wanting to stay here. They are wanting to stay close to family. We saw during COVID that a lot of families came home and they are staying, and they want to raise their kids here because it is safe and because it is a beautiful place to live. In terms of young people, the opportunities are endless, whether that is within shipbuilding, engineering, space, the health system, carpentry—the opportunities are here for young people and they are going to stay, and we need to find places for them to live.

South Australia is experiencing significant growth. Our population is set to reach 2.2 million by 2051. Like I said, we need to find places for people to live. We see older people who are living longer and they are living in their own homes. They want to stay where they grew their families. They want to stay where they have established their lives, where they have church, where they have their gym—I talk about my mum, who cannot move anywhere because she needs to go to her gym all the time. They have friends, they have their normal practice, they go to their favourite shops, they know where everything is and they are staying in place and ageing in place. That means bigger houses are not coming up as often to be taken over by other families, so we need to find new places for families to grow, to put down their roots and to really grow their family and create new communities and new memories.

Our businesses are also thriving because of this, with almost 12,500 more businesses operating in our state since the 2022 election. We need to continue to support these businesses with workers and with opportunity for them to be able to sell their produce, their product, and to support their local community as well. There will be opportunity for them through this bill.

In just a few years we have seen the creation of 73,000 new jobs, with over half of these being full-time positions. It is really hard to find someone who cannot find the job that they are looking for, or at least something to tide them over until they can. We have an incredibly low unemployment

rate and we need to continue to be like that because it means that people are in work and they are able to support themselves.

The growth is not just economic, it is also cultural, social and demographic. We are witnessing an exciting and really positive transformation in South Australia, and people can feel it. They talk about it on the street. You can see that they are excited about what is coming. However, growth comes with the need for planning. As I already said, we need to find homes for people to live in. We cannot simply afford to just build randomly, either. We need to ensure that the plan for growth is done in a way that benefits everybody: the people who call this place home today and the people who will be coming in the future, whether that is through being born here or moving here. We need to make sure that we are planning and making sure we get it right.

The Greater Adelaide Regional Plan, which this bill aligns with, is the blueprint for our urban future. It identifies the construction of 315,000 new homes over the next 30 years, planning for infrastructure that will support that as well—not just the housing but the services and resources that are needed by thriving communities, and the green spaces. We know that when you look out the door, if you see concrete everywhere it is really hard to feel great in your head and feel great about your family's future, but if there are green spaces where you can get outside and enjoy nature it definitely improves mental health.

This bill aims to make sure that we align our growth with the GARP, ensuring that we have ample land available to meet both the current and future housing demand, while also safeguarding our environment and food production areas. It is not a bill about cutting away agricultural land or undermining the environment, it is actually the opposite: it is about creating a more balanced approach to land use and development.

The areas being removed from the environment and food production area represent less than 1 per cent of key agricultural areas within the Greater Adelaide region, and these are not the lands that serve the backbone of our food production. We are still protecting the lands that are vital for farming, food security and the cultural and natural heritage of our state. This is about choice. One of the key benefits of this bill is that it creates more choice for housing development. By providing land for greenfield development, we are not just expanding Adelaide's footprint, we are offering people the opportunity to live in communities where there is space for growth, space for infrastructure and, importantly, that green space.

It is an approach that ensures we are not merely crowding into the already built-up areas of Adelaide but creating new neighbourhoods where people can thrive, where they can put down their roots, where they can grow their families, where they can create memories.

More choice also means less pressure on infill development. For too long, we have been pushing the urban consolidation model with a target set for 85 per cent of growth to occur within infill development. It does not lead to good outcomes. Infill development will continue and it does have a role to play in the growth of Adelaide, but this bill acknowledges the need for a more diverse approach to the land release. It ensures that we are not forcing development into areas that are already struggling with congestion or limited infrastructure. By providing land for greenfield development, we help reduce the pressure on our existing urban areas and ease the strain on our roads, our schools and our local services.

The bill, in essence, ensures that we meet the growing demand for housing without compromising our quality of life. By supporting greenfield growth, we can help to prevent the issues often associated with overdevelopment in existing neighbourhoods—congestion, strain on services and loss of community character. The growth areas identified for release have been carefully chosen based on comprehensive assessments that include the environmental opportunity and agricultural and cultural values. These areas have access to infrastructure or are earmarked for it in future investment, ensuring that they are sustainable, well planned and provide the necessary support for new residents.

Environmentally, this bill is forward thinking as well. The plan to remove land from the EFPA is not a callous decision: it is a strategic move to ensure that Adelaide's growth is properly managed and surrounding agricultural and natural lands are protected. Importantly, the Northern Adelaide Parklands project will cover almost 1,000 hectares of land—significantly larger than the Adelaide

Parklands. This project will serve our emerging growth areas, with more than 760 hectares dedicated to preserving natural green open space. This space will provide greater biodiversity, provide recreational opportunities, and ensure that our communities are living in harmony with nature.

Moreover, the GARP sets ambitious environmental targets, such as achieving 30 per cent tree canopy cover across Adelaide by 2055. I cannot stress enough how important it is to make sure we have tree canopy, to ensure that we do not clear all of the trees because not only do trees provide shade but they actually make it cooler. They make our areas cooler and better for biodiversity. We have more native animals and more undergrowth as well. Being able to live in that kind of environment, as I said, is especially good for your mental health.

We are ensuring that new developments are planned in a way that supports low emissions and enhanced liveability. This bill supports those targets by ensuring that all new housing developments are structured in a way that integrates these green spaces, the parks and the sustainable infrastructure. The bill's provision also acknowledges the need for ongoing reviews of the EFPA boundaries, ensuring that they remain flexible and responsive to the needs of our ever-growing population. Every five years, a commission will review the EFPA, ensuring that we can continue to adapt to changing circumstances while protecting vital agricultural and environmental lands.

The bill is not just a piece of legislation, it is a lifeline to local communities across Greater Adelaide. It ensures that the growth of our city is orderly, sustainable and conducive to creating vibrant communities. By providing a mix of greenfield and infill opportunities, we allow people to live in the kinds of neighbourhoods that suit their lifestyle and their needs, whether that be a quiet suburban street, a community near key services, or a green, family-friendly space.

As we look to the future, we also ensure that this growth does not come at the expense of our environment. The strategic planning outlined in this bill helps us preserve the important agricultural lands and natural spaces that have always made Adelaide a beautiful, liveable city. You only need to look out the door and look up to the Hills to see exactly what protecting a Hills Face Zone does. It ensures that we create an urban-rural interface that is respectful of farming activities while allowing growth and development.

Within my own community, I often hear from concerned residents about large housing blocks having the existing home demolished and two to three new residences being built in their place. This usually results in trees being cleared from the block so that developers can get maximum bang for their buck. Creating opportunity in new greenfield locations creates choice. I often worry about my son, who is now 21. He has told me he is going to just build on the end of my block. At 21, that is a nice dream. I am sure at some point he is not going to want to live next door to his mother.

Ms Savvas: You won't, either.

Ms HUTCHESSON: You are probably right. But where is he going to live within the Waite community? There is very limited space for infill. As we said, it is usually only one or two here or there. He will grow, he will meet the love of his life, and he will need to find a home and a place to set up his own family, hopefully not too far away from his mum. These opportunities will be there.

Within Waite, we also live in a high bushfire risk area with very limited egress roads out of the area if an evacuation is called. Continuing with the old urban infill adds to congestion, as I said, and in doing so that adds to risk. It is important that we find new ways to accommodate our growing population, and the GARP is doing just that.

In my area, I also have an existing environment and food production area that skirts the southern end of my community, including the back of Upper Sturt. This area is filled with native bushland, and with no mains water or sewerage, it is not easy or desirable for creating more housing areas. The GARP took this into consideration. The growth areas to come out of the EFPA were determined following an extensive land assessment as part of the GARP process that considered many factors, including good quality agricultural land, land subject to natural hazards, environmentally sensitive land, land of cultural heritage value to Aboriginal people and locating land near existing services and infrastructure.

All of this was taken into consideration, and the revision of the EFPA still ensures that key agricultural lands surrounding Greater Adelaide are protected. The changes to the EFPAs were based on a comprehensive analysis, and it represents a loss, as I said, of less than 1 per cent of this key agricultural land. Together with the current character preservation districts and Hills Face Zone, particularly where I am, this ensures that we retain strong growth boundary areas, such as Upper Sturt, and we make sure that they are protected.

This bill is about making sure that South Australia grows in the right way, a way that ensures that we have the land, the infrastructure and the environmental protections needed for a prosperous, sustainable future. It is about making sure that the people of South Australia today and tomorrow have the housing choices they need while maintaining the green spaces, the heritage and those agricultural lands that make this place great.

Our government is making decisions for the future of our state, for its people who are here now but also those who will be here in the future, creating once again opportunity for young people to reach the goal of home ownership, laying down their roots and growing their families, new communities with new journeys to begin. It is an exciting time to be South Australian as we all work together for a bright future where we can say goodbye to the housing crisis and where houses create communities, creating opportunities. I commend the bill to the house.

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (16:57): It is a real pleasure today to be speaking to this bill in acknowledgement that South Australia, like the rest of the country, is going through a housing crisis. That is no surprise to any of us. I am sure I am not alone in saying that I am constantly contacted by residents unable to find a home or friends asking what options are available to help them enter the housing market. Of course, a key initiative of the government's Housing Roadmap and the GARP more generally is both to ensure that we have an appropriate supply of serviced land to meet both current and emerging housing demand and also to make sure that we have options in the way that we do so.

We very much, as members of parliament representing different communities across our great state, love living here in South Australia. I think we are unfortunately perhaps having to now account for our own successes because other people love living here, too. We are a city that will reach 2.2 million people by 2051. Today, I really want to speak about what that means for us and the ways in which we as a government are tackling this good problem. It is a good problem to have. Of course, the economy here is very strong. Events are booming, and we have more jobs than we have ever had before.

On 17 March, the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan was launched. It does identify where 315,000 new homes will be built over the next 30 years, but also preserves important land for future infrastructure requirements.

I, of course, am a young person and I am at this particular stage of life where there is a wedding one weekend and a baby shower the next. I am constantly being contacted by young people, not just my constituents but my friends, school mates and uni mates, about housing affordability and location. I am not ashamed to say that I am someone who has well and truly benefited from government policy with respect to housing.

My mum grew up in co-op housing and in public housing and she was the first and only person in her family to have ever purchased a house. We certainly did not have the means available to us for me to be supported by the 'bank of mum and dad' when it came to getting into the housing market myself. Although I would have absolutely loved to buy my first home in my community, close to my two family homes in Tea Tree Gully, I was not able to. That definitely was just not an option available to me. I needed to look elsewhere in order to build or buy and eventually come back home where I belonged.

It was, of course, building a house off the plan, pointing at a spot on a field that was not yet a housing development in Mount Barker, with the support of a building grant that helped me and my partner at the time to get into the housing market. It was also the sale of that same property that assisted me to eventually buy my own property in St Agnes.

I think that those two things are really relevant. It was not only the fact that there was an option for me to get into the housing market that would not have been available to me otherwise by building in a development in a community I did not know very well but also the fact that the sale of that property post-COVID, noting that I built there pre-COVID, meant that I had the opportunity to go and buy a house of my own in the community that I wanted to return to. I think that is very significant when we talk about individuals getting into the housing market. It is not just, of course, where they start that journey but what it means for the next stages of their journey as well.

We know that Mount Barker, where I first built a home, has, of course, continually sustained incredible growth. We, as a government, need to ensure that opportunities like the one that I had exist all over our great state. I am incredibly pleased to see that the GARP has identified areas for new homes that are either already connected to infrastructure or have infrastructure commitments in place or, of course, are located in areas where future investment will be planned. My experience with moving to Mount Barker was not, in fact that. I think it is an example of where we have seen sustained growth but perhaps not the infrastructure to keep up with it at times.

When we first moved into what is now a very well serviced part of Mount Barker—it was at the back, towards the direction of Wistow, not far from the current Mount Barker hospital, not to be confused with the new Mount Barker hospital—there was not the option to walk to a shop or to walk to a cafe. We were literally in the middle of nowhere and it would have taken probably an hour to walk into Kmart or into Coles in the centre of Mount Barker and that was at the time when there was only one centre with a major supermarket.

We have seen now significant changes with respect to that, but when we moved in we were moving into developments that could not quite keep up with themselves. I think that the GARP is a really important example of government policy that stops those things from happening. We want people to move into areas, we want them to build in those developments, we want our areas to expand, but we want to do so in a way that is actually conducive to living a happy, healthy life and being part of a community as well.

I would also like to speak to, of course, what is a great win for those of us in my section of Tea Tree Gully who at times considered ourselves the next frontier in terms of general infill. I note that we are, of course, in the chamber next to the member for Torrens. When I was a local councillor I represented the suburbs of Gilles Plains and Holden Hill, which have, of course, been the subject of significant infill over time.

I know that although so many individuals were pleased to have the opportunity to buy newer, smaller homes at accessible prices, there were, and I assume continues to be, major issues with parking in those communities. When I was a local councillor, I was consistently called on to assist with parking complaints. We do not quite have that issue yet in the portion of Tea Tree Gully that I now represent, and I must say I am pleased.

We love living in Tea Tree Gully because we have the city and the country at our doorstep—10 minutes on the O-Bahn to town and five minutes to the kangaroos at Anstey Hill. I am not sure why anyone would live anywhere else. We also very much in my community value the opportunity to have a garden if we want one, and this is a housing plan that gives those options to families. It provides options to residents in my community who are looking for family homes close to the incredible array of sports clubs and public transport infrastructure that we have but also options to young people, like I was, perhaps moving out of their community either temporarily or longer term, in a new build in a developing area without the need for a family home.

I myself live in a knockdown rebuild—I think it was the fourth knockdown rebuild—and do not have a significant garden of my own, but at this stage of my life I do not need it. Again, I have that option there on my street in my community, but I know that I also have the option two minutes up the road to have a bigger property and a garden if I so want one. I think that is why I am incredibly pleased to know that no general infill development areas have been planned and that the plan removes the former objective in previous versions, which targeted that 85 per cent of future housing would be infill projects. This will make a difference.

I often talk about politics that touches people. A lot of individuals, particularly living in the burbs, perhaps rushing around, taking kids to school and to sports clubs and those sorts of things,

do not necessarily see that politics touches them. But what a lot of them can see is when they are stressed and they cannot get out of their driveway, or when they are running late and struggling to get through their street because there are cars parked on either side.

Again, with significant infill, the parking issues have been a significant problem. For people in my community who are busy, who have families, who a lot of the time are working full-time jobs, with kids at two or three sports clubs and after-school commitments, that is something that actually they do see and can see in their day-to-day lives. I think that a plan that takes that into consideration is one that people will see the impacts of.

Many people talk about examples, not in the community we live in but others that they go to visit, and they ask me the question, 'Are we going to be next? Are we going to be the ones who can't get out of our driveways to the same extent as those in other communities?' I think this is a plan that takes that into consideration and makes sure we still have options. In order to coordinate the growth, we need to retain options, as I have said.

I am so pleased that I can tell my residents that we are increasing housing supply in a way that means they can still park on their streets and have the choice to have a larger property, should they want it. This provides housing choice but also abolishes targets for infill development, which has placed pressure on key sites in Adelaide. My community, I hope and believe, will be one of the communities a little bit further out from the city that will not necessarily have the same pressures that perhaps those inner city areas have had in the past, and I think that is something that residents generally will be quite pleased about.

I also think it is really important to talk about what this means for jobs. My community in Tea Tree Gully is very much tradie heartland. We have more individuals working as sole traders in construction and associated fields than any other industry, and our government is coordinating the way that we build houses, including ensuring that we have the people to do it. Not long ago, we launched our Housing Roadmap, which was the coordinated response to bringing housing to market.

One of the things I would like to talk about is the commitment by the then opposition to build five technical colleges around the state and what that means for meaningful employment for individuals in communities like mine. I think it is incredibly important not just to give students options but to know that we are preparing for the jobs of the future and the jobs that we need to cater to the demand that we have.

People often talk about not being able to get a tradie in. That is a comment that I hear very often in my community, that people are waiting two or three months to get a plumber. I think that is unfortunately a product of governments continually not investing in trades and in vocational education. I am really pleased that we are doing so at The Heights Technical College in the member for Wright's electorate but, of course, in my community.

I think it is also really important to discuss infrastructure. As I often do, I thought I would give you the example of infrastructure that was not invested in and, as a result, could not keep up with the growth of a metropolitan area. That is, of course, the Tea Tree Gully Community Wastewater Management Scheme. You have no greater example of a community that could not keep up with growth than these septic tanks in Tea Tree Gully. The simple fact of the matter is that 50-odd years ago Tea Tree Gully was a semirural area where people would install septic tanks on farm-style properties and then you would see a house a kilometre down the road.

In order to keep up with the growing area, we did all sorts of interesting things at the time—I say 'we' but I well and truly was not even alive yet—to keep up with the demand for housing in that area, and one of them was to continually tack houses onto a septic tank scheme that could not keep up with it.

Whenever anyone asks me the question, 'Why do we have 4,700 septic tanks in a metropolitan area of Adelaide?' I tell them the area was too popular and we could not keep up with the infrastructure required for the housing. We see that in lots of ways in my community, but one example is where you go down streets like Elizabeth Street in my electorate, which is home to a number of sports clubs, three major schools and housing and you see examples of septic tank,

SA Water, septic tank, SA Water. It was a real piecemeal approach to managing infrastructure in a community.

Of course, now we are seeing the impact of that, which is that a government is having to intervene, invest significant money and literally rip up people's front and backyards in order to retrofit the infrastructure that should have been invested in 50-odd years ago. I think that when we look at the GARP, it is actually investing and identifying the ways in which we need to invest in infrastructure to ensure that that will not be happening again in 50 years' time.

We see that SA Water has committed to \$1.5 billion of spending between 2024 and 2028 to make sure those growth areas are catered for. That is, of course, necessary spending to make sure that we are not continually fixing the mistakes of the past like we are currently doing in my electorate.

I am very pleased that there is a sensible approach being taken to planning here, one that continually gives those options, whether it be an option to live in a townhouse like I do or perhaps to live two minutes up the road in a property with a large backyard. I think South Australians deserve options. They deserve opportunities to have housing and to enter the housing market, and of course to have infrastructure that will accommodate their needs, particularly their needs as their family grows or changes in different stages of life.

I would like to acknowledge the steadfast work of my friend and colleague, Minister Champion, the member for Taylor, who is incredibly passionate about his work in planning, and of course all of the individuals who have contributed to the GARP. It is one that I am very pleased with and looking forward to seeing the results of in years to come.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (17:12): I appreciate the opportunity to rise and make some contributions to this bill. I have enjoyed listening to those contributions made by other members of parliament about the importance of the work that is being done here and the importance of the work that is being done by the Minister for Planning.

I should start by talking about the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan and the announcement that I joined the Premier and the Minister for Planning to make out in the northern suburbs, in Eyre, just a couple of weeks ago about our inclusion of a piece of land to build a brand-new public high school in the northern suburbs. It will be open for the start of the 2028 school year, so not far away at all.

The government has already set aside the \$155.3 million that will be needed to build that school. That should be taken as both a sign of our commitment in terms of building quality new schools and also a sign of how expensive things are now to build as well—that a standalone high school with about 1,300 student capacity is now about \$155 million to build, but that is another story.

Nonetheless, I was very proud to stand with the Premier and Minister Champion at the site of where this school will be built in the suburb of Eyre. It is of course a vacant paddock now, but in not too long it will be bustling with school students. It will mean that we can provide the kind of choice around education that we so often speak about, I think, as politicians but we do not always live up to those expectations. There are a number of examples where I think governments of both political persuasions have failed to meet the tests in terms of building for the future, particularly when it comes to education, in years gone past. I would point to Mount Barker as being a good example of that, where our infrastructure did not keep up with the growth in the area. Certainly in terms of schools, that was true.

I was pleased, though, earlier on in this term of government, to announce that we are building a new primary school and a new preschool in Mount Barker. We have the land, we have budgeted the money to make sure that happens, to ensure that the growing population in Mount Barker has good opportunities in terms of a public school and preschool. As part of the same process that we went through with Infrastructure SA, and doing a business case about where the most growth and need was for enrolment pressure in South Australia, it was very clear that the northern suburbs were number one. Although Mount Barker was number two and had very real and genuine need in that area, to be perfectly frank there was daylight between numbers one and two such is the need in the northern suburbs for new schools and new enrolment places.

I am pleased we are getting on with the business of providing those public school opportunities in what will be a world-class school. I know we use that term a lot, but we are going to build an absolutely cracking school out there. I for one am proud that we will be able to put our hand on our heart come 2028 and say that, at that stage, the newest and grandest and most impressive piece of public school infrastructure in Australia will be in the northern suburbs of Adelaide, which I am not sure is something we have ever been able to say before, but we will be able to say that.

At the press conference I attended with the Minister for Planning and the Premier, there were some local residents who had recently purchased houses in the vicinity; I think it might be St Andrews. The Minister for Planning will correct me if I am wrong about the housing development's name. They joined us at the press conference. They were a young couple. She was expecting her first child. The journalist asked, 'What does it mean to you in terms of not just being able to find a home for what will soon be your growing family but in terms of having the option of a brand-new public school just down the road?' In fact, it would be a five or 10-minute walk from where they were planning on living.

The husband said something that I thought was very interesting and powerful about the need for not just housing but for making sure that the other infrastructure that is needed in the area where you live is provided at the same time. He said that they wanted to live somewhere they could have their children go to school with people who were their neighbours, people who were their community members, the people who they lived with and saw at the shops and at the football on the weekend, and all those sorts of things, people who were also fellow parents at the school where they wanted to send their kids. That was a really insightful comment.

Because of things that have been done poorly, or things that just have not been done, we have made many parents feel like they need to drive to the other side of town to get the kind of schooling they want for their child. That is not really what a community is about, so it is important that we get it right when we are opening up more land for houses, which is the work that the Minister for Planning has been doing, which I strongly endorse. All the members who have spoken this afternoon before me have traversed this very well. There is not much need for me to necessarily repeat how important an issue this is in terms of housing availability and affordability.

What we also forget is that people do want to live in a community. They want their kids to go to school with the people from their community, with their neighbours. That is kind of how the whole model of our society is supposed to work. You have your local school, and you have got a lot of confidence in that, and you do not think twice about sending your child there. I thought it was a very powerful comment from those soon to be local residents around what appealed to them about buying a house at that housing development. It was not just that it was the area they wanted to be in, but they wanted a house that would be the right size to have children, so there would be bit of space out the back. It was a modern house that had all the amenities they wanted, but there was also going to be a school that their child could walk to and they would be going to school there with their neighbours and with the other people who chose to live in that community.

I think that is a good example of us actually making the early decisions to get things right. Minister Champion and I have had a number of conversations, which he has instigated since being the Minister for Planning, which I have really appreciated, where he has been pushing to me the need for us to put land aside.

We have made some bad mistakes as governments in years gone past—I think we have probably all been guilty of it—where our land has been sold or potentially developed without a great deal of forethought to the future. Then, lo and behold, demographics might change, you might get some unexpected growth in a part of town where you had not first thought that was going to happen, and then you are scrabbling around looking for a vacant piece of land to actually build a school or a hospital or whatever it might be, and you get into these very perverse situations where you are almost forced as a government to look at buying back pieces of land you had previously owned on which to build schools.

The former education minister knows what I am talking about. These are the situations governments get themselves into if we do not get the planning right, and that is a bad outcome. It is a bad outcome not just for the people who would be living in that area, but a bad outcome for the

taxpayer as well, because you potentially end up buying back land that you previously owned at a greater rate than you sold it, often decades ago. Not only do you do that, but the bit of land that you can find that is available to buy back that you used to own is not in the perfect spot for the school.

I really want to commend the Minister for Planning in terms of the conversations he has had with me, and that is around not just making sure that we plan for the future and making sure there is a spot available to build, for instance, a school near where we are going to put new housing, but making sure it is the right bit of land, the prime bit of land, because that is where we should be building public infrastructure, where we should be putting schools, regardless of whether they are public schools or non-government schools. Schools are such an important part of our social fabric that we should not be cutting corners. We should not be cutting corners in terms of the build quality—and I have to say we are not doing that.

Governments of both persuasions in the last 10 years have built quality new schools, but sometimes we have to make compromises in terms of where we build them. I am really pleased that the work that is part of the GARP that the Minister for Planning has been really driving is around making sure we do not repeat those mistakes, but that the pieces of land that we get, not just for housing and all those debates we have had around the trunk infrastructure and making sure we have got that so we can open it up, but also making sure the land we have for all the other bits of public infrastructure provision that we have to put in place are the best bits of land so that people do flock to the local public school, because the best outcome for all of us is that mums and dads have the confidence that their local school around the corner is the school they want to send their kids to.

It means that we get higher rates of kids riding their bike to school or walking to school; we get cars off the road. This is something that the member for Newland just touched upon before and made an excellent point about how busy people's lives are. In my mind the root cause for so many of society's ills these days is that households are so busy and stretched and they feel that they are not able to devote the time—I say this as Minister for Education—to helping their kids with their schoolwork or perhaps just having a bit of time to themselves and relaxing like they would like to. The kinds of things that governments can do to facilitate that is making sure that, when we open up new housing, we have all the other ancillary infrastructure of a quality that means that people who move there and buy a home there decide to use their local infrastructure, their local schools and all those kinds of things.

It means that you do get all that extra benefit that we have been talking about a lot as a state and a nation around active kids—how do you get active kids? Every single time there is an issue around a kiss and drop at a school—and that is about twice a day the way it goes these days—everyone bemoans the fact that no-one walks to school any more and kids do not ride bikes.

Some of the things that we have to do, if we want to turn that around, are the kinds of things that we are talking about in this amendment bill around being able to make the decisions ahead of time to make sure that when we do open up new pieces of land for new housing developments and what will become new communities, they have everything they need so that we are not sending people to the other side of the metropolitan area for something that they should be able to get around the corner. That has a sometimes unseen cost and toll upon people, whether it is parents whose busy lives get even busier. I really want to acknowledge the work that the Minister for Planning has done on this.

I say that as the Minister for Education, because making sure that we have enrolment places available for people in their local area is something that all Ministers for Education have always had to grapple with, such as schools that might be full and then have a capacity management plan and are zoned and there are families who desperately want to get into that zone and they cannot, or they feel like the school they are zoned to is not the one they would like their kids to go to. It is never an enjoyable thing as Minister for Education to write back to parents who are desperately trying to get their kid into a particular school and tell them that they cannot because it is full. Making good planning decisions around this will make sure that kind of scenario happens less in the future and I will be very pleased about that.

Perhaps I will talk just a little bit before I wrap up around the housing crisis more generally. I feel that in the last three or four years, or certainly the time that I have been fortunate enough to be

a member of this place, which is just on seven years, it really has gone from an issue that was spoken about a little bit to really the thing that is raised every time you are talking at a public forum, or at a street corner meeting, or you are even just at a barbecue with friends or something like that. Often the first thing that is put forward now is around the cost of housing, the availability of it, the availability of rentals, all those sorts of things.

The litmus test I often use around what the issues are that people are most concerned about—and it is very useful being a cabinet minister—is going to country cabinets or metro cabinets. You get a really good flavour at those from punters who come out and ask what is on their mind. It is a very unfettered kind of environment where they get to stand in front of the microphone and say whatever they think and you get all sorts of interesting things. I have been taken aback at the number of questions that the Minister for Planning and the Premier and others have received around the cost of housing and the availability of housing and the need for government to do more around that.

I am proud to be a member of a cabinet that is actually really tackling it and making hard decisions. I think that was a question that the Premier got at the Golden Grove Football Club metro cabinet on Monday night. The Minister for Planning might remember better than I can, but it was a very fair question put to the Premier around the cost of water and the decisions that this government had made.

I thought the Premier answered it in a really forthright way, which was to say that is a great example of the hard decisions we have to make to get this right. If you have not got the trunk infrastructure, for instance, in place to be able to get the water to these new developments then everything after that cannot come. Do governments enjoy putting up the price of utilities or things like water? Of course we do not and we are absolutely cognisant that we are amidst a cost-of-living crisis, not just in Australia but around the world, and that is a difficult decision to make.

But we also know that there is a much bigger opportunity cost if we do not make that decision, because the opportunities we are now talking about in great detail here in the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Production Areas) Amendment Bill are not possible unless you make those tough decisions earlier so you can build more houses, open up more land and make sure there is going to be water and sewerage.

I talk as the member for Wright and refer to what the member for Newland correctly pointed out, which is that the north-eastern suburbs are actually an excellent example of where we did not get it right, where the governments of the day cut corners because there was not capacity within the sewerage system to accommodate more homes. They basically said, 'You can develop that land, you can build homes, but if you are going to do it you are on your own and you are going to have to put in place a septic tank.'

Of course, that was an interim measure; I think they were supposed to last from memory maybe 10 or a bit more years. Most of the residents who purchased the properties back in the day when those suburbs were built, such as in my patch of Redwood Park and Surrey Downs, actually were not even told there was a septic tank in the backyard. They did not know until it overflowed. It was not on the plans and they found it out later on.

In terms of the cost the taxpayer ultimately wears here in terms of trying to fix that problem later on, well, we are now supporting the City of Tea Tree Gully to replace a system that was supposed to be replaced about 40 years ago that is about to collapse. So when we talk about what the cost is now for decisions that were not made 10, 20, 30, or, as in this case, 50 years ago, well, they are really serious implications and repercussions that affect the amenity of those people's homes who every now and then have to dig up the soil on top of their septic tank hatch and get someone around to pump it out.

I remember the first time I doorknocked on Hancock Road in Redwood Park. I marched up to the door and there was a massive pit right next to this bloke's front door. I said, 'What is that?' He said, 'That's my septic tank.' I said, 'What do you mean it's your septic tank?' He said, 'We are on septic here.' It is as suburban an area as you can imagine, and he is on a septic tank. He has to live with that and, of course, the government has to find a way of supporting a council to replace about 4,700 other homes like that because those tough decisions were not made.

I want to commend the minister for his work on this and thank all those members of this place who have spoken passionately about it, because this is really, really important stuff. It is not particularly often that you get the chance to be a part of something in the work that we do that will well and truly outlive us. I think this is one of those examples where, hopefully, when we are all long gone from this place, there will be people down the track who will acknowledge that actually we got something right that had long-term benefits for people. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TOBACCO AND E-CIGARETTE PRODUCTS—CLOSURE ORDERS AND OFFENCES) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. New clause, page 7, after line 11—Insert:

9A—Amendment of section 69CA—Interpretation

- (1) Section 69CA, definition of *closure order*—after paragraph (a) insert:
 - (ab) a short term closure order; or
- (2) Section 69CA—after the definition of *prescribed product* insert:
 - short term closure order*—see section 69CBA.

No. 2. New clause, page 7, after line 11—Insert:

9B—Amendment of section 69CB—Interim closure order

Section 69CB(4)—delete subsection (4) and substitute:

- (4) The interim closure order has effect from the time specified in the order until 72 hours after the time specified in the order (but nothing prevents the making of a subsequent interim closure order in respect of the same premises).

No. 3. New clause, page 7, after line 11—Insert:

9C—Amendment of section 69CB—Interim closure order

Section 69CB—after subsection (5) insert:

- (6) For the purposes of this section, the Minister is not required to act in accordance with the principles of procedural fairness.

9D—Insertion of section 69CBA

After section 69CB insert:

69CBA—Short term closure order

- (1) The Minister may, by notice in writing, order that specified premises be closed (a *short term closure order*) if the Minister reasonably suspects that—
 - (a) prescribed products are being, or are likely to be, sold or supplied at the premises as part of a business being carried on at the premises; or
 - (b) tobacco products or e-cigarette products are being, or are likely to be, unlawfully sold or supplied at the premises as part of a business being carried on at the premises.
- (2) A short term closure order has effect for a period of 28 days from the day specified in the order (but nothing prevents the making of a subsequent short term closure order in respect of the same premises).
- (3) The Minister may, by notice in writing, vary or revoke a short term closure order.
- (4) A notice under this section must be—
 - (a) given to the person apparently in charge of the premises; or
 - (b) given to the owner of the premises; or

- (c) posted in a conspicuous place—
 - (i) in the case of premises other than mobile premises—at the entrance to the premises; or
 - (ii) in the case of mobile premises—
 - (A) on the mobile premises; or
 - (B) at the entrance to premises that are connected to the business carried on from the mobile premises.
- (5) A short term closure order may be made regardless of whether an interim closure order is, or has been, in effect in relation to the premises.
- (6) For the purposes of this section, the Minister is not required to act in accordance with the principles of procedural fairness.

No. 4. Clause 10, page 7, after line 14—Insert:

- (1a) Section 69CC(1)—delete '6 months' and substitute '12 months'

No. 5. Clause 10, page 7, after line 16—Insert:

- (2a) Section 69CC(2)—after 'interim closure order' insert:
or a short term closure order
- (2b) Section 69CC(2)—delete 'under section 69CB'

No. 6. New clause, page 7, after line 24—Insert:

10A—Amendment of section 69CD—Tobacco of e-cigarette products not to be sold or supplied at closed premises

- (1) Section 69CD, heading—delete 'Tobacco or e-cigarette products not to be sold or supplied at' and substitute:
Offences relating to
- (2) Section 69CD—after its present contents (now to be designated as subsection (1)) insert:
 - (2) Subject to subsection (3), a person who is present on premises in relation to which a closure order is in effect is guilty of an offence.
 - Maximum penalty:
 - (a) in the case of a body corporate—\$500,000;
 - (b) in the case of an individual—\$250,000.
 - Expiation fee:
 - (a) in the case of a body corporate—\$10,000;
 - (b) in the case of an individual—\$2,500.
- (3) The Minister may, by notice in writing (an *exemption notice*), exempt a person from the operation of subsection (2) in relation to specified premises on terms and conditions specified in the notice.
- (4) An exemption notice must—
 - (a) be given to the person to whom the exemption applies; and
 - (b) specify the closed premises in relation to which the exemption applies; and
 - (c) set out the details of the condition of the exemption specified in subsection (5).
- (5) It is a condition of an exemption under subsection (3) that the person to whom the exemption applies must not carry on a business, or cause or permit another to carry on a business, on the closed premises specified in the exemption notice.

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I move:

That all six amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CLAIM FARMING) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:32 the house adjourned until Tuesday 29 April 2025 at 11:00.