



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

Official Committee Hansard

**HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES**

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE

Reference: Sustainable cities

THURSDAY, 25 MARCH 2004

CANBERRA

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

INTERNET

The Proof and Official Hansard transcripts of Senate committee hearings, some House of Representatives committee hearings and some joint committee hearings are available on the Internet. Some House of Representatives committees and some joint committees make available only Official Hansard transcripts.

The Internet address is: **<http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard>**

To search the parliamentary database, go to:
<http://parlinfoweb.aph.gov.au>

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE

Thursday, 25 March 2004

Members: Mr Billson (*Chair*), Ms George (*Deputy Chair*), Mr Barresi, Mr Cobb, Mr Hunt, Mr Jenkins, Mr Kerr, Mr Lindsay, Ms Livermore and Mr McArthur.

Members in attendance: Mr Billson, Mr Cobb, Ms George and Mr Jenkins

Terms of reference for the inquiry:

To inquire into and report on:

Issues and policies related to the development of sustainable cities to the year 2025, particularly:

- The environmental and social impacts of sprawling urban development;
- The major determinants of urban settlement patterns and desirable patterns of development for the growth of Australian cities;
- A 'blueprint' for ecologically sustainable patterns of settlement, with particular reference to eco-efficiency and equity in the provision of services and infrastructure;
- Measures to reduce the environmental, social and economic costs of continuing urban expansion; and
- Mechanisms for the Commonwealth to bring about urban development reform and promote ecologically sustainable patterns of settlement.

WITNESSES

COSTIGAN, Mr Paul Michael, Executive Director, Australian Institute of Landscape Architects..... 1
COX, Mr Tony, National President, Australian Institute of Architects 1
HOBBS, Mr Neil, National Councillor, Australian Institute of Landscape Architects 1

Committee met at 11.09 a.m.

COSTIGAN, Mr Paul Michael, Executive Director, Australian Institute of Landscape Architects

COX, Mr Tony, National President, Australian Institute of Architects

HOBBS, Mr Neil, National Councillor, Australian Institute of Landscape Architects

CHAIR—I declare open this public hearing of the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Environment and Heritage inquiry into sustainable cities 2025. This is the seventh hearing of the inquiry. I welcome the representatives of the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects. Although the committee does not require you to give evidence under oath, I should advise you that these hearings are formal proceedings of the parliament. As such, they warrant the same respect as proceedings of the House itself. It is customary to remind you that giving false or misleading evidence is a serious matter and may be regarded as a contempt of parliament. On that bright opening note, would you like to make a brief statement or some introductory remarks in support of your submission?

Mr Cox—Thank you. Firstly, I congratulate the government on this very important initiative. Our group, being very involved in the built environment, recognise that there is a lot to develop and improve in the way we develop our cities. That is becoming more and more critical in this century as well. Landscape architects are particularly interested in the environment. We deal with the environment and the built environment on a daily basis in our profession. We are very conscious of that. How we approach the development of cities has major impacts on the environment. Through good planning design and construction, there are excellent benefits to be made for the community at many levels. Probably most importantly in relation to that, as far as we are concerned, it is very much the health of the community and the health of the environment. It is an area where we believe that landscape architects have a lot to offer and where considerations for a sustainable city really need to be taken into account. I think the health of the community is an important aspect, and what it is that defines and leads to a healthy community. In many ways, that is the way that a community interacts—how it relates to its environment—and very often that relates to public areas and public domain, the areas where people meet and interact. That is all I have to say in my initial statement.

CHAIR—Neil or Paul, would you like to add anything at this stage?

Mr Hobbs—Part of the role that landscape architects can play is, in a sense, to lead a lot of this work. We are trained in all the areas of natural science as well as built science and so on.

CHAIR—Can you give us a thumbnail sketch of the skills set and competencies that your profession brings to the table.

Mr Hobbs—Landscape architects work with any areas within the built environment. They work with external areas, natural systems, cities and the whole gamut of environments in Australia, from cities to desert, from coastal to arid environments, and so on. We have particular skills to draw together the benefits of the natural systems within those areas—coastal cities, desert cities, inland, whatever the positions are of those environments. Part of the planning

process is research. Research is tied into that too, including studying good examples, establishing what the parameters are and what appropriate development is, and so on. So the research that goes with the planning is also important.

CHAIR—Paul, do you want to add anything?

Mr Costigan—I would like to add to what Neil said. I will give you some concrete examples, and I will rely on Tony and Neil to throw in a few others. It could be anything from a residential site or a state site to Olympic Park. The area around this very building is a landscape architect's work. We could be talking about the planning of a roadway or maybe, with the implementation of that plan, doing the verges of a roadway. Other examples are Martin Place and Olympic Park in Sydney, Federation Square or the university area. This really gives you an idea of the scope of where these people work. They could be just doing the planning or they could also be doing the project management and overseeing the delivery of same.

CHAIR—We have had evidence from the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. Much to their chagrin, they told us that only six per cent or something of homes that are built ever get looked at by an architect, that that was a suboptimal level of engagement and that so much more could be achieved if architects were more involved. What kind of proportion of projects—residential, commercial and even recreational open space planning and the like—does your organisation and its members get involved in? Is it common or is it rare that that skills set is brought to the table?

Mr Cox—I can understand from the architect's point of view that they cannot have that kind of involvement in a residential project. It is different still from a landscape architect's point of view. Our involvement directly in residential places is probably less. However, we have a high involvement in the fabric that ties the housing together. Thinking about examples of what landscape architects have done, the capital of Canberra is a good one—although it was not necessarily designed by a landscape architect. Walter Burley Griffin's approach to the planning and design of the city was very much landscape driven. In many ways well before his time he gave great consideration to the way landscape and environment can determine outcomes for urban planning and management. There have been discussions about how well or not well that has been done, and there will continue to be debate on it. The framework within which individual buildings can develop is really where we have a lot to add.

CHAIR—So at the moment you focus more on major projects, subdivisions—

Mr Cox—Yes, we do do subdivisions. Small profit practices and big companies do do individual houses, and we do a lot of that and we have the skills to do that. Very often it is a cost thing. Who can afford an architect? If people cannot afford an architect, they are unlikely to invest similar moneys in a landscape architect to do the landscaping.

CHAIR—Ian Gosh did a great job at my place in south Frankston! He made sure my backyard transitioned neatly into the bushland river reserve at the back and helped with species selection. I feel a better man for that experience.

Mr Cox—It is a lot to do with education as well. The client has to be educated and has to realise what the values are. Something to look at in this inquiry, too, is how we can develop a

body of knowledge and have continual improvement in our understanding of how we can move to sustainable cities. Can we set up mechanisms so that there is continual improvement and continual development? There has been plenty of work done on sustainable cities using European and North American examples, but they are not for Australian people and they are not for the Australian environment, which is quite distinct. Within Australia there is probably limited research and development in that area. That is an important aspect, not just for landscape architects; it is importance for architects and the whole group of people who are involved in those cities and urban areas.

CHAIR—Would you say your goal is to advance the health of the natural systems at a city wide, municipal wide or even project level? Your people can help advance that?

Mr Cox—Certainly. I think the critical thing is to be able to see both levels. When you are looking at the detail of an individual house, at how you might collect and reuse rainwater, you will also have to be looking at the bigger areas, such as how that fits into the Murray-Darling Basin or whatever. That is happening at all levels. It is about being conscious of all of those levels and of where environmental impacts are happening along that whole continuum, which is critical.

Ms GEORGE—Can you point to any more recent projects or urban development where the involvement of landscape architects has made a difference in the planning and design?

Mr Cox—There are plenty of examples in that, and some of the recent state and national awards programs have recognised that. Some awards in Queensland recently recognised new urban planning models that have been developed. We are looking at new semirural areas which are about to undergo major urban developments. They are very conscious of public open space and of environmental factors determining growth patterns and urban patterns. More recently, there is obviously great expansion happening in Sydney. There is some work happening in Western Sydney in the Rouse Hill area.

CHAIR—In the regional park there?

Mr Cox—Yes, the regional park program. What is the actual title of it? Sorry—I am from Darwin so I am not right onto it.

Mr Costigan—I know he has been there!

Mr Cox—The regional park program that is being run by the planning department is very conscious of that. Landscape architects are driving those programs and doing a lot of that planning. It also gets down to the detailed design level of small estates—that is, the street trees, open space, community centres and so forth.

Mr Costigan—Just off Mascot airport, on the left as you come into Sydney, there is an area called Victoria Park and a whole new housing development. What underpins that was work done by landscape architects.

Ms GEORGE—Is that Green Square?

Mr Costigan—Yes.

Ms GEORGE—We have visited there.

Mr Costigan—Yes, how the water is controlled and everything else is the work of landscape architects. They happen to be in the New South Wales government but they are still landscape architects.

Mr Cox—Another high-profile project is the Olympics—the Olympic village and so forth. The master planning and everything was driven by landscape architects for the Millennium Parklands and so forth. That again is recognising the value of open space areas, how that fits into a fabric of increased densities and how those areas relate.

Mr JENKINS—Last week the committee visited Inkerman Oasis in St Kilda. It is a five-storey residential apartment complex but it has the use of a natural water system—I am trying to think what it is called.

CHAIR—Filtration.

Mr JENKINS—The real problem there is that there is really no great reward for effort from the water authority, even though the water authority gets the spin-off of winning the contract to maintain the filtration system.

CHAIR—It is a no-loss outcome for everyone!

Mr JENKINS—It surprised me. Given what urban Melbourne is going through with water supply and things like that, this should end up being a win-win situation rather than the authority taking all the gains without any of the pain. Is this something that you strike in some of the developments or do you have greater cooperation from time to time from water supply authorities?

Mr Cox—I cannot really speak from direct experience with it, but I think what tends to drive developers pursuing that approach is that, while some legislation talks about what quality et cetera covers that, to some extent they are taking those approaches because they think there is a market advantage. They think they can appeal to particular people who value that sort of environmental approach. It is good that there is a market out there and that developers believe that, but I think there should also be recognition that there are substantial savings to authorities and infrastructure costs and so forth. The whole issue of how you account for the environment and the cost to the environment have never really been dealt with. Costs for infrastructure, water supply, energy and all the rest of it are not accurately accounted for when you look at the economics of urban areas. If you were to do that, the waste water authorities would see what the real benefits of those microdevelopments are.

Mr JENKINS—Over several inquiries this committee has been trying to grapple with what could be offered as drivers. You people, because of your professionalism and skills, supply the tools but I take it there is sometimes an additional cost and people balk at actually implementing it because we do not give the economic signals to encourage them. It is because of the public good benefit not being transferred to the private.

Mr Costigan—In our additional submission, that is what we are targeting. I think you can all see the connection. I do not think I need to go ahead and say it, but it is obvious that if we can get more research to back up the arguments and convince those people then what you are talking about can be addressed.

Mr JENKINS—So you still think that we need to have that connection with the overall benefits; you are saying they are not recognised.

Mr Costigan—As a general answer, yes. But I can give you exceptions to the rule, of course.

CHAIR—So you are saying that aesthetically it may be but the value in natural systems health terms is not quite as appreciated as the aesthetics.

Mr Cox—That is certainly part of it. I think some people do understand the environmental values. I think the other one that is missed out is the long-term benefits and the life cycle costs of these sorts of developments. In buildings and landscapes and so on, very often people are too focused on the immediate costs of what we do today and not thinking about the fact that this is a space or building that is going to be used and that is going to have implications for management for 50 years or more.

CHAIR—But in the city you would be called ‘landscape architects’; in the country you would be called ‘natural resource managers’. In the city you would put site plans in place; in the country you would put farm management plans in place.

Mr Cox—Some landscape architects do do some work out in the country.

CHAIR—As I say, the competencies and the objects of what you are trying to do are similar. It might be a language thing that is happening there. Sorry, Harry—you were on a roll there.

Mr JENKINS—I am willing to go into this notion of the proposal that you put to us that is Commonwealth in nature—the deductible gift recipient status. You touched on the purpose of the research and education. Do you want to expand on the types of research and educational benefits that you want to see?

Mr Cox—We have not looked at that in great detail. Just in general principles, the key areas we would be focusing on would be the areas where we can see the most benefit to communities as a whole.

CHAIR—So, they are public good projects?

Mr Cox—Yes; and typically, that might reflect the areas where we do most of our work now—the areas that we see as critical. There is no question that a lot of the work that we do as architects is in the area of urban development, redevelopment and new residential areas. But before you get to the stage of digging holes, there is a lot of planning. So at one level it is about how you plan for change and development, then there are the details of what is going to work once you get down to the nuts and bolts. They are two clear areas.

There are a lot of areas in which you might pursue research. Things that might be particularly pertinent to the Australian situation are water and fire and how that interacts with our landscape and what it means for landscape and environmental planning. There is a lot of work still to be done in that area. Previously, fire research has been done from a purely natural systems basis, but there has been less research done on how fire fits into the urban environment and the urban edge. That might be moving a bit out of our area and into other areas, but they are the sorts of things.

Mr Hobbs—We have had some input into the replanting of Canberra's fire affected areas.

CHAIR—This is the non *Pinus radiata* stuff?

Mr Hobbs—We have been more focused on the urban areas—street trees, parklands and so on—as opposed to the Urban Edge Review, which is something that others have been working on. We have been trying to look at some of the outcomes from that study within urban areas where possible. It is retrofitting, which is obviously always hard.

CHAIR—What kinds of insights have you gained?

Mr Hobbs—Things like using better planting methods, better plant selection and better sorts of mulches—using inorganic mulches, which might be recycled concrete, as opposed to organic mulches which obviously are subject to ember attack and that would carry the fire further into areas. In Canberra's environment, there are things like putting some sort of moisture retentive additives into the soil such that the tree will grow faster and stronger. There are also relatively obvious things like species selection, so you try to reduce the fuel load by selecting species that do not attract a lot of dead branches and foliage close to the ground. That has been happening in the last 18 months, particularly in Canberra but in other areas too.

Mr Costigan—The point is to have all this information—no matter what the subject area is—available and accessible to local councils and developers so that they understand it and can accept it. At the moment, it is an ad hoc process. The point I am trying to make is that we need to get that research happening. It would be helpful if we could get some of the private companies to help sponsor that research. The incentive is not there at the moment.

CHAIR—We might come back to parameters in a moment, but Mr Cobb has a couple of questions.

Mr JOHN COBB—I take it that you want to see more parkland and more openness in the city.

Mr Cox—Not necessarily; some of the issues are not so much the volume or quantities as the quality. We have done a lot of work in Alice Springs. As a little city, Alice Springs has an enormous amount of open space.

Mr JOHN COBB—I think that is a fair statement.

Mr Cox—But most of it is not necessarily accessible or meeting the needs of the people. It is not a question of quantity: it is a question of quality and how it can meet the needs of the

community. Also, within open space areas, you need flexibility because people's communities age or their cultural backgrounds change and so forth. You need a basic open space that has flexibility, can adapt to change and has a quality to it that makes the best use of that space. There are a lot of resources going into managing open space, so you have to make sure that it is well focused and doing the right thing.

Mr Costigan—I saw a good example in Hobart. I am sorry our member from Hobart is not here because he would be able to talk more about it. It was pointed out to me that this particular park area was a dump. Now it has a skate park and well-landscaped areas in it. There is a multitude of uses now in that area. The local kids love it. The park is a very well-managed site now whereas before it was just a bare spot.

Mr JOHN COBB—That is making use of existing opportunities. I am thinking more about the expanding places such as Sydney et cetera. To what extent do you want to see everything open? We are wasting a lot of country too and taking out good country. Do you think there is a limit to how open it can be? Obviously, we do not want everyone living in flats.

Mr Cox—That is a difficult one because there is the old Australian dream of having the quarter acre block, and that translates to expanding—

Mr JOHN COBB—The quarter acre block is a different issue, I have no argument with that. The more we spread everything out, the more country we actually waste.

Mr Cox—I do not know that you necessarily spread it out, but if it is spreading out it has to be done in a way—and that is starting to get into some transport planning as well—that does not waste the land that you are using. You need to make good use of it. There needs to be some higher density living and so forth, but where the higher density living is you certainly need high quality open space areas that people can use. As Sydney city rapidly expands it has got some very important quality open space areas that are very accessible. They may not be grass fields and so forth but there are areas that are very accessible. It is the type of open space that suits the needs of the development.

Mr JOHN COBB—Do you do any work in inland cities?

Mr Cox—I have done work for over 15 years in Alice Springs. We have done work in Broome and Katherine. I am from the Territory.

Mr JOHN COBB—I am not necessarily thinking of the totally remote areas but more the Dubbos and the Toowoombas. Do you concentrate as much on the openness there?

Mr Cox—I am not sure, in talking about openness—

Mr JOHN COBB—It seems to me that it is a state of mind as much as anything. People in those places do not really think of being boxed in in the way that Sydney people do in the first place. Are the requirements different?

Mr Hobbs—Most of the local government work that occurs in those inland cities has been the upgrading of the existing suburban areas, the shopfronts and the small suburban parks.

Sometimes it might be river corridors and those sorts of things, which have always been used as recreational areas in some manner. It would be a matter of upgrading or reinterpreting those and all those sorts of things.

CHAIR—You are not running a scale argument; you are running a quality of space argument.

Mr Hobbs—Yes, and it is the use of the space. If the space is appropriate for housing, that is great. If it is not appropriate for housing, what other use can it have?

CHAIR—Rather than leave it as a barren wasteland, do something engaging and create, I think the term was ‘inspirational living space’.

Mr Cox—The other one too, often in rural areas as opposed to city areas, is outlook. As a profession, we often talk about the borrowed landscape and views. That sense of openness can be engendered by views and a perception of openness—it does not necessarily mean that things are very open.

Mr JOHN COBB—Do you have to concern yourselves with fire?

Mr Cox—Yes.

Mr JOHN COBB—In a big way, because it seems to me that a lot of our idyllic lifestyles are most at risk as well.

Mr Cox—That is the case in just about every city. People want to be in their wooded retreat.

Mr JOHN COBB—On bush blocks.

Mr Cox—Often those people are aware of the risks and accept those risks.

Mr JOHN COBB—I do not think they are either aware of them or accept them. I think they are totally impervious to them.

Mr Cox—I think that is also the case.

Mr JOHN COBB—If you have a look at a farmhouse, the farmer has his house paddock eaten out to make sure it cannot get burnt out. People on the fringe areas do everything wrong.

Mr Costigan—I have got a paper that has just landed on my desk from the CSIRO person—I cannot remember his name—who is specialising in fire work. I am sure you have seen him on the television. He gave a talk to one of the inquiries locally—and that is all I can say as I have not actually read it. I have just got hold of copy and I would like to see it published through our system anyway.

Mr JOHN COBB—But it is something that as landscapers you are always aware of?

Mr Costigan—Oh, yes. But apparently he is addressing what you are talking about now: what are we doing putting all these houses in amongst wooded areas and not thinking about the consequences?

Mr Cox—Local council within Australia is a major employer of landscape architects and I think there are changes happening. I know the Blue Mountains City Council have got landscape architects working in their planning department. They certainly are involved in issues relating to fire in the Blue Mountains. I am familiar with some of the Sydney situations, including the northern beaches.

Mr JOHN COBB—In northern Sydney it is just as bad.

Mr Cox—They are there but, from our professional point of view, we have really only probably in the last five or 10 years been getting a higher profile and recognition within local government. It is an area that we do deal with but it is still probably not done—

CHAIR—This is the house as neatly arranged fuel! You are not happy about the current open space contributions that are chapter and verse with land use planning rules, but it is just that they tend to get handed over as crappy, poorly looked after, undeveloped bits of wasteland. Surely it is within our wit to, say, not only provide the open space but have it in a functional state to support the occupation of the housing lots that adjoin it or are in the vicinity of it. Is there not enough emphasis placed on having the functional open space provided concurrently with the subdivision? Is that an area—

Mr Hobbs—I think the key thing is that those facilities follow some time after and, because landscape takes such a long time to establish too, once that is done it is still 15 or 20 years before the landscape has achieved the design intention anyway. So it is all very well, but the subdivision is well into its 15th year before you are getting some sort of benefit from that initial landscape planning. That is the key.

CHAIR—Linking it to the tax rebate proposition, you are not imagining that a developer could lay off the cost of preparing their open space as a charitable gift—or are you? If we went down the path that you are opening, the first thing I would imagine people would say would be, ‘For doing what I think is the right thing’—that they should be doing anyway—‘we’re going to offer a rebate or a chance to claim it as a deductible donation or something like that.’ Is that what you had in mind? Or are you looking more at remedying space that is already there in the public domain, one that something has to be done with? And then you have to ask, ‘Where do we find the cash?’ and then you have to finance some of the research into gaining new insight kind of work. How would you put a fence around the gift deductibility idea that you have put forward?

Mr Costigan—It is more the research. We are more interested in the research to inform those people.

CHAIR—So it is more knowledge acquisition rather than an activity on the ground?

Mr Costigan—It is quite discrete. Rather than where you started, I would be saying that this is about—

CHAIR—It was potentially provocative.

Mr Costigan—being in keeping with the taxation rules and that you have a discrete reason for it. I would see the discrete reason being the research and getting that information base rolling.

CHAIR—So building the body of knowledge—

Mr Costigan—To inform local council.

CHAIR—is the object, not the broader transformation of spaces into more landscape sensitive—

Mr Cox—That would be the implementation or the use of it.

CHAIR—And you would not argue that that is covered by the deductible gift?

Mr Costigan—That is another argument—plan B.

Mr Cox—Going back to the models of open space contributions, I think the model is a correct model; it might need to be refined and so forth, but it is how that is then applied. As you pointed out, sometimes it is not delivering what is expected, but part of that is a lack of knowledge. A lot of local governments are not in a position to know how much open space they need or what they should be doing.

CHAIR—There is a lack of courage, too. In Western Sydney we were shown a pretty barren, nondescript park that had a playground with a bit of tanbark thrown around, and there was a major gain. It had obviously sat there as wasteland for 30 years. Then we inquired about a new suburb that was being developed over the back and posed the question, ‘Are you requiring the subdivider to provide functioning open space?’ and they said, ‘No, that’d just push up the cost of the housing.’ So we asked, ‘Are you going to transfer the cost onto everybody else in that municipality when you’re simply not requiring the developer to do what they should be doing anyway?’ It should be just part of the DA process.

Mr Costigan—You are talking to the converted with that argument.

Ms GEORGE—In terms of the tax deductibility issue, what kind of philanthropic support do you think would be around in the community to contribute to knowledge and research into the built environment? What kinds of organisations are out there that you envisage would potentially be contributors to the cause?

Mr Costigan—It is the ‘how long is a piece of string’ answer, I am afraid. I think it is huge. What we find already is that we approach people—even the bigger organisations like the Pratt Foundation or something like that—and the little guideline says: ‘Don’t go past this unless you can offer us the tax deductibility status. Just don’t go past here. We don’t want to know about you unless you can offer this.’ I have been through all the philanthropic books. You sit there, tick them off and think: ‘Okay, do we want \$5? That’s about all we’re going to get this time around.’ I think you said the same thing. Yes, somebody out there will come on board but they are going to be hard to find, whereas we can open a bigger gate and get a lot more people involved. I am

giving you a generalised answer—I hope you do not mind—but I believe a lot of organisations are becoming more interested in these issues. We can come across a border and get them to come up with the cost and see this as one area they can work in.

Meanwhile, they are quite happy to spend their dollars on other issues, such as the arts. I am not going to argue against the arts, because that is my background. They are putting their money into the arts and the natural environment because they can get the tax deductibility. We cannot offer that. A whole body—it could be anybody as big as BHP and right through to someone local—could come on board, but they are not going to come on board while they can say: ‘Hang on, we can get a benefit over here. Why are we going to go into the built environment?’ I think it will also crack the argument: ‘What is the built environment? Why don’t we get more involved?’ The money and the argument will start to follow.

CHAIR—There has to be awareness raising.

Mr Costigan—Yes. If there was something on the board, they could say, ‘We can go here now and tax deductibility is available,’ and then we would get more organisations involved. Even some of the developers themselves, who are doing the work or doing the damage, are prepared to put some money in. We have a bid or two with one or two developers now. They are interested. I think they would be more interested—

CHAIR—Of course, particularly if you were monitoring one of their projects. We understand there are two proposals floating around about a cooperative research centre for sustainable cities. Have you guys dealt yourselves into that process? Is that an alternative pathway to perhaps pursue the ideas?

Mr Costigan—We are pursuing a foundation. We would like to see a foundation that is quite discrete and focused on the areas that the landscape architects are interested in. We are always interested in partnerships because we work with the other building design professions. We are open to anything, but at the same time we have a very particular focus—whereas these people are delivering to local councils—and would like to keep our focus there to get the body of knowledge to them.

CHAIR—Thank you for coming and making the big trip. That was very good of you, Tony.

Mr Cox—Thank you for the opportunity.

CHAIR—I hope you did not get too many chilblains coming to Canberra.

Mr Cox—It is a beautiful change.

Mr Costigan—I will leave you with this.

CHAIR—That would be great.

Mr Costigan—Within that are a couple of articles on landscaping when it comes to prisons and aged care facilities—the sorts of things we did not talk about, but it is all applicable. It happens to be an issue about health and the environment.

CHAIR—That would be good. The article on CRCs—houses as neatly arranged fuel in adjoining bushland areas—is interesting. Could you send it in and we can share it with our colleagues. Mr Cobb is particularly interested in that. We appreciate your time and your two submissions—the supplementary one was good. If you have any thoughts that pop into your mind as a result of our conversation today, fire them in. Thank you.

Resolved (on motion by **Mr John Cobb**):

That this committee authorises publication of the proof transcript of the evidence given before it at public hearing this day.

Committee adjourned at 11.45 a.m.