



Obj Ref: A4169949

Mr Mick Gentleman MLA
Chair
Standing Committee on Planning and Environment
ACT Legislative Assembly
GPO Box 1020
CANBERRA ACT 2601



Dear Mr Gentleman

I have received a copy of the letter sent to you by Ms Annabelle Pegrum (National Capital Authority) dated 30 July 2008, regarding my submission to the Standing Committee on Planning and Environment on Molonglo and North Weston. I wish to make a final reiteration of my position on the matters raised by Ms Pegrum and indicate that further correspondence regarding these matters by either party seems of little value.

I stand by my claim that ACTPLA had limited access to the **ngh** environmental (**ngh**) brief. It is correct that ACTPLA was asked for comment on the brief; however in no way was ACTPLA invited to be involved in the formulation of the framework and objectives of the brief; rather asked only to agree to a brief that had already been established. ACTPLA was able to make some minor amendments (of which several were consequently not adhered to); however I do not consider this level of involvement anything other than 'limited'.

I stand by my claim that ACTPLA had limited access to the report until it was essentially committed and finalised. The attachment to Ms Pegrum's letter identifies that **ngh**'s consultation programme with ACTPLA consisted of (1) a request for a copy of a document; (2) one telephone conversation; (3) provision of two draft final reports; and (4) one meeting after the draft final report comments were given. Furthermore, the NCA identify (in their attached chronology) that they received the first draft report from **ngh** in March, but for reasons uncited did not mention nor forward this version to ACTPLA. Rather ACTPLA had to wait until a draft final report was forwarded one month later.

I do not consider this level of involvement by ACTPLA in the preparation of the report as even close to sufficient, and I can only conclude that a major discrepancy exists between what the consultant and NCA consider to be appropriate consultation and what I consider as appropriate consultation with such a critical entity as ACTPLA given its role in this exercise.

I note that Ms Pegrum does not wish, in her letter, to discuss nor refute my claim that the credibility and usefulness of the **ngh** report in defining land use boundaries is questionable.

The other issues raised in Ms Pegrum's letter to you pertain to Central Molonglo. The media article (Canberra Times 30 July 2008) referred in Ms Pegrum's letter, suggests that the NCA has 'ruled out urban development altogether [in Central Molonglo]'. This phrase is not a quote from my presentation, as evidenced by the transcript of my submission to the Committee.

The matter of Central has been resolved between ACTPLA and the NCA. However, I would like the opportunity to reiterate my position that identifying to the Canberra community that the Central Molonglo area will continue to undergo environmental investigations, is a more responsible action than the NCA's approach to rule out development 'at this time', leaving the community with little certainty on future actions in this area.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Neil Savery', written over the typed name and title.

Neil Savery
Chief Planning Executive

8 August 2008