

**Legislative Council
Hansard
Thursday 26 March 2026**

The President, **Mr Farrell**, took the Chair at 11 a.m., acknowledged the Traditional People and read Prayers.

UNIVERSITY OF TASMANIA (PROTECTION OF LAND) BILL 2025 (No. 58)

Second Reading

[4.25 p.m.]

Ms WEBB (Nelson) - Mr President, I rise to speak on the University of Tasmania (Protection of Land) Bill, noting agreement with the member for Elwick that this is actually, quite cruelly, an ironically named bill.

This bill, Mr President, is a matter of particular interest to me and my constituents in Nelson as it relates to the Sandy Bay campus of the University of Tasmania, which is situated in the lovely, beautiful electorate of Nelson. Specifically, Sandy Bay campus extends across areas of the suburb of Sandy Bay and also adjacent to the suburb of Mount Nelson.

I'd also put on the record here for the purposes of this debate that I am currently resident in Mount Nelson. I rent a home in that suburb, and although I do so, it's not directly adjacent to the area that's dealt with in this bill, I'm also a member of that community.

Mr President, matters relating to the Sandy Bay campus of UTAS have been an active area of interest and concern for Nelson constituents the entire time I have been their elected representative in this place. At the time I first campaigned for the seat in 2019, we were in the early stages of a very contentious community conversation about the proposal to move the entire campus into the Hobart CBD and see the Sandy Bay campus fully redeveloped.

Community concern for residents of Sandy Bay and Mount Nelson only grew from that point and at that time it was already of high concern. A great deal of energy was mobilised in the community to oppose that original proposal of a wholesale campus move. The community campaign effort resulted in public meetings and an elector poll held in conjunction with the 2022 local government elections, which delivered a damning result of 74 per cent of voters in the elector poll being against the move of the campus to the CBD. And that was after an advertising campaign from the university, putting both the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor at the very forefront of that extensive and expensive advertising campaign which the people of Hobart were utterly unconvinced by.

The issue of changes and potential disposal of the Sandy Bay campus has continued to be very much a live matter of discussion and concern for the residents in Nelson. Last year when I was campaigning for re-election, we did extensive door knocking in Sandy Bay and Mount Nelson, and the rezoning proposal in this bill was a topic raised frequently as a matter of concern. I can say there was virtually no support for it in the community that was raised with me while we were doing that door knocking and campaigning.

The original election commitment which led to this legislation was made by the Liberal Party in the context of the 2024 election and was a fairly straightforward proposition to require parliamentary approval for disposal of gifted land in Sandy Bay - gifted land to the university.

Then, in an abrupt pivot that was made after the bill had been tabled in parliament, the government put forward an amendment to their own bill to include a parliamentary rezoning of parcels of land above Churchill Avenue. This was, of course, very jarring, given it was inserted into the very bill which was to give effect to a promise to provide greater protection to the Sandy Bay campus land. The irony, Mr President, the cruel irony.

It was also an extraordinarily inappropriate attempt to dodge the governance and probity requirements of a regular planning system rezoning process. This is plainly an attempt to cast aside all expected elements of a good practise planning decision, including assessments of environmental, social and infrastructure impacts, community consultation processes, a provision of independent expert advice to decision makers, to name just a few, in an effort to ram through an outcome for which no robust business case exists. It is highly questionable in terms of the long-term public interest, not just of Sandy Bay and Mount Nelson, not just of the Nelson electorate, not just of Hobart, but of Tasmania itself.

Mr President, these are matters I will speak on in more detail in my contribution, but before that I would like to put it to members that it is a presumptuous affront to demand this Parliament, this Chamber, act as a planning authority without making any coherent case as to why this should be necessary. I ask all members here if there were a major planning decision in your electorate which had a significant demonstrated community opposition and which had impacts that would be permanent and substantial in shaping two suburbs comprising a large part of your electorate, would you find it acceptable and appropriate to have that planning decision taken from the regular planning system with its checks and balances, and brought to this parliament abruptly like this, shoved into a piece of legislation designed to do the very opposite.

Would you find it appropriate if it was done in a way that avoided any of the requirements of the planning system, or even of the *Housing Land Supply Act*, which is our other way we rezone quickly through this place. To underpin its consideration in this place, would you find it appropriate that it was presented without a comprehensive business case, let alone any assessment of the social, economic and environmental impacts or credible community consultation demonstrated?

Oh, and at the same time that the local council in that area, in your electorate, in this thing we're imagining here, this hypothetical was developing a neighbourhood plan for the same area but was yet to complete that process. Would you, each of you here in this place, as a member of your electorate, representing your electorate, feel that was appropriate? And something that you could support?

I put it to you that it wouldn't be. And if it wouldn't be appropriate and able to be supported in your electorate, why do you think it's appropriate to be supported in my electorate?

The rezoning attempt in this bill is a huge red flag on integrity and good governance in our state. It comes after the Rockliff government has developed a bad habit of bringing planning decisions to parliament. But this time, as stated also by the member for Elwick in her contribution, this time there has not even been an attempt to put this through or be assessed under the regular planning scheme. A clear message should be sent from this Chamber that it is unacceptable to sidestep our legislated planning scheme, especially via a behind closed doors arrangement directly with our Premier.

It is unacceptable and this Chamber should be sending a message back to the government that it's time to break their habit, especially when they're taking this to a new precedent of bad governance.

Mr President, to elaborate on some key points here, I'm going to start by speaking about the original commitment that sits behind this bill. After that resounding defeat of the first proposal to move the Sandy Bay campus into the CBD, there was clear community sentiment about the value placed by the community on the Sandy Bay campus of the University. The Liberal Party then went to the 2024 election knowing that it needed to sandbag a potential loss of votes in Sandy Bay due to the UTAS campus issue. And so, to sandbag that, to stem the bleeding, the Liberal made an election commitment. A 2024 election promise from the Liberal Party was to insert into our *University of Tasmania Act* a requirement for UTAS to seek parliamentary approval for the sale or long-term leasing of gifted land, the Sandy Bay campus. That was a good idea. Much that it was done for very, very poor reasons, self interested reasons by the Liberal Party, it was the right thing to do. It was in line with the finding and a recommendation of the UTAS inquiry that this place undertook and reported on in 2022. Actually, I think we began it in 2022 and reported in 2024. Still waiting for a response on that inquiry.

The government apparently can't respond to our inquiry because there are still matters going on at a national level that relate to university governance. Those matters completely align with so many of the findings from our inquiry, all raising highly concerning questions about university governance across the nation, including here at UTAS. Now, while that's all still in train, apparently at a national level there is huge concern about university governance, and how poor it is. The government can't respond to our inquiry and its recommendations, but apparently it can allow the university to make place shaping decisions about matters to do with our capital city, even though governance questions hang over this university, as well as others in the nation.

It can't respond to an inquiry while that's happening, but we can actually let the university charge ahead, through special deals behind closed doors, to have a permanent impact on a jewel in the Crown campus at Sandy Bay, and the impact it will have on the suburbs around it. Astonishing.

It was the right thing to do to insert into the *University of Tasmania Act 1992* some sort of requirement for there to be oversight of a decision to sell campus land that had been gifted in Sandy Bay. That would put us in line with other jurisdictions who have similar sorts of requirements. There's a variety of them, but they're all of similar intent to put some sort of oversight in place, because otherwise university councils or similar governance mechanisms are virtually a law unto themselves. There's very little accountability for those bodies.

It was appropriate, too, given the context of the place-shaping decisions that would be made by UTAS council in relation to that campus, the one of which we're seeing right here in this bill, and to which Hobart citizens have consistently demonstrated that they strongly object to.

A bill was developed to give effect to the election commitment made and it was tabled in the House of Assembly on 20 June 2024. The government had also made its expectation clear that any proposal for sale or long-term leasing of land brought to parliament under the original bill, would be expected to have a full business case provided for consideration. Indeed, this was confirmed on 7 November 2024 by Minister Ogilvie on ABC Radio *Mornings* program, where she said this:

What I have said is I want to see the full business case of what the proposal is. And my view is that business case ought to come through parliament. So, that's our position.

That was the original intent stated by the government; very clear and committed to at the 2024 election, and still being put forward 7 November 2024 by Minister Ogilvie, that the government would be expecting to pass this legislation which put a new requirement to come through parliament, and that a full business case would be expected to accompany any such proposal to come to us.

That commitment of the election, and then the subsequent work done on the bill, was something that was had been factored in by many voters, I believe, who are residents of Sandy Bay and Mount Nelson, and they were reassured by it in the original sense. But then something happened. Something changed after that original intent and the work that was done to begin giving effect to it through a bill. Something happened behind closed doors, because having made the commitment to protect the Sandy Bay campus via this bill, one week prior to debating it in the other place, on 28 November 2024, the government put forward an amendment to insert the rezoning provisions which we now see in clause 7 and schedule 2 of the bill.

What did happen between times? Well, certainly after the Liberal Party had made that election commitment and then post-election when the Liberals formed government and work began on a bill to give effect to the commitment, UTAS certainly started arcing up no doubt over the bill. They started getting very fussed about the requirements that would be put on them and the constraints that would be put on them through that bill. They no doubt started talking to the Liberal Party behind closed doors - the now Liberal government.

They also started talking to the Labor Party, and that became very uncomfortable for the government because with the UTAS talking to the Labor Party and stirring up the Labor Party about the problems of this bill, they were able to trigger, of course some, political argy bargy. That becomes very uncomfortable for the government when - and it's interesting to see a significant public institution like UTAS use politically an opposition to put pressure on a government is quite an interesting decision when you think about the integrity of an important public institution, like UTAS. The government became very uncomfortable with UTAS talking to the Labor Party, stirring them up about this bill, and then also no doubt coming under pressure and interacting with UTAS about it - also behind closed doors.

Eventually a deal was made, with the government committing to circumvent normal planning laws to facilitate rezoning of the upper campus by attaching it to the bill. But I think

it's important to state here what we now know about some of the things that went on behind closed doors at that time. Certainly, there's been extensive RTIs done on matters relating to the interactions between UTAS and the government around this decision and how they came to actually completely pivot to insert something that was certainly against the original intent of the bill. The RTI documents that have been sought and received were both from DPAC and from DECYP and from UTAS. That is my understanding. It's interesting, I believe in excess of 1700 pages have been received through RTI on this matter and there's a few things that come to light through the documents, even through the redactions that are rife through them. One of the things that's clear is that ministers Ogilvie and Palmer, who are the original ministers most relevant and responsible for the bill as intended from the election commitment maintained, are steadfast, arguing in favour of the original form of the bill.

They maintained that all the way through to July 2024, but then something changed on 2 August 2024, when UTAS chancellor, Alison Watkins, wrote to the minister, Ms Ogilvie, revealing that UTAS had appealed over the heads of ministers Ogilvie and Palmer - she'd gone above them - to the premier himself, Premier Rockliff, and that UTAS was now dealing directly with Premier Rockliff and his office on this matter. It indicated that a meeting was held between the Vice-Chancellor convened with the premier on 23 August 2024.

RTI documents provided by DECYP indicated that Minister Palmer had ceased to have any real responsibility for this bill from 30 September 2024 onwards. RTI documents also indicated that DECYP would continue to brief with a strong line against UTAS criticism of the original UTAS Land Bill. DECYP were continuing to argue that it was ill-founded, these criticisms, at least until 30 September 2024, which is very interesting. Clearly, they were well out of the loop of the behind-closed-doors conversations between the premier and UTAS and perhaps DPAC folk and UTAS on behalf of the Premier.

The exact process then leading to the amendments that inserted the rezoning is somewhat obscure. It's actually quite murky still, even given RTI documents received, but the Premier and his office were certainly closely involved. Drafting responsibility for the amendments seems to have not been sat with DECYP, but to have transferred to DPAC. In its RTI response, DPAC, though, has failed to even identify that any documents or correspondence, it would appear, relating to drafting instructions for the amendments exist.

They haven't come forward through the RTI process, which I find quite astonishing because obviously drafting instructions on this amendment came from somewhere in the government. Someone asked OPC to draft the amendment that the government put onto its own bill. Who was it? If those drafting instructions, and even if they were redacted under RTI, we should still see that there was an email or a piece of correspondence or something that related to it, but that didn't emerge through the RTI process.

That tells us either something really weird was going on in terms of advising and instructing OPC, or DPAC have utterly failed to comply with the *Right to Information Act 2009* in relation to these RTI requests. Both of those eventualities, both of those options, are highly concerning and reflect on DPAC, I believe, unfortunately.

However, documents largely obtained under RTI from UTAS show that DPAC and UTAS were working closely and intensively on the amendments in October and November 2024.

This work between UTAS and DPAC involved a number of people who are senior in both those organisations, and quite likely some of whom sat before us yesterday in briefings and said to us, to our faces there, that they didn't know where the amendments came from. I'm not going to reflect further on that other than to say that's highly disappointing, and perhaps if better information had been released through RTI that clearly mapped out - or even if it hadn't had to be RTIed - even if the government had been prepared to be upfront about how this process worked, how this decision-making about this rezoning amendment worked; if that was something the government could be transparent about or UTAS could be transparent about, then we wouldn't have to wonder who'd done something murky here maybe.

Nevertheless, the draft amendments went to cabinet on 18 November 2024, we find out from RTIs, and the bill was probably expected to be done and dusted quite quickly at the end of 2024 once it went through the lower house.

It would have been expected probably to come to us at that same time and go through here. Interestingly, that's not what happened, of course, and when things get drawn out over time, there's plenty more time to start digging into what has happened, particularly some of the murky areas around decision-making and around deals done behind closed doors during that decision-making process.

We end up with a bill that now has a rezoning clause in it, even though it's called a protection of land bill. We're going to ditch some land while we're under the protection of land bill. That's come to this parliament, and it has effectively put us in the position, yet again, of being a planning authority, in that it hasn't been tested through a normal process. It hasn't gone to the local council that it should have gone to, the City of Hobart, and it hasn't gone to any Tasmanian Planning Commission process, it's come straight to us.

Members probably received an e-mail from Brian Risby, previous director of the planning unit or planning division in the government, now retired and no longer working there. He wrote to us by e-mail, and some of the things he said is this, in relation to this positioning of the parliament as a planning authority on this matter. He said, and I quote:

The point here though, is not whether the land in question should be rezoned and sold off, it's the process for determining that. While Parliament has acted directly in the planning system a few times in recent years, at least those have all been informed by the processes of relevant local councils or the Planning Commission. In that sense, honorable members were acting more like elected councilors with access to carefully considered professional assessment before they voted. Even the more contentious housing land supply orders, such as for Huntingfield, were fully consulted on, assessed and reported on by planning professionals, but not so in this case.

Mr Brian Risby there is indicating why he, as what we would all regard as an expert in this field, thinks that this is an inappropriate use of parliament acting as a planning authority.

Section 7 of the bill is not supported by any planning information nor expert assessment made available to us as the decision makers here. It doesn't even provide us what's required under a housing land supply order, which, just to remind ourselves, includes being able to demonstrate that the land is suitable and well serviced, that the proposed zoning is consistent with state policies and regional land use strategies, that the proposed zoning is consistent with

Schedule 1 objectives of the *Land Use Planning Act*, which requires that economic, environmental and social effects have been concerned, that there will be no significant land use conflict and that public infrastructure is protected and the provision of utilities are protected. That would be required under the housing land supply orders, and it's not required here in this instance, even though this is an incredibly major piece of rezoning and planning decision-making that we are expected to give effect to in this place, and that some members, astonishingly are prepared to do without any of that in place for us to consider.

I also note, in correspondence to us from the National Tertiary Education Union, they've also raised concerns around this positioning of our Chamber as a planning authority. I'm going to read some things from their letter that they sent us, because I'd like it to be on the record from some of these key stakeholders how concerned they are about these matters. NTEU says:

Perhaps the most egregious and enduring concern the NTEU Tasmania holds about this legislation is the process by which the rezoning of the land above Churchill Avenue is being affected. Clause 7 of the bill rezones specific parcels of land from particular purpose zone three to inner residential by Act of Parliament. This is not a planning outcome produced by the planning system. It is the planning outcome produced by legislation without geotechnical assessment, without transport infrastructure analysis, without community consultation through the established planning scheme amendment process, and without the involvement of Hobart City Council, whose neighborhood planning process for Sandy Bay and Mount Nelson was already underway and had engaged community members, residents and experts in good faith.

The government has acknowledged that this approach is taken precisely to avoid Hobart City Council rezoning processes, which it describes as lengthy. That is not a justification for bypassing the process, it is a description of the problem. The community consultation, expert assessment and public exhibition that accompany a proper planning scheme amendment exists to protect the public interest. They exist to ensure that rezonings are appropriate, evidence based and informed by the people most affected. Circumventing them by statute does not speed up good planning, it replaces good planning with no planning.

They go on to say that:

The Legislative Council has a long and proper tradition of acting as a House of review, scrutinising legislation in the public interest and insisting on appropriate process. NTEU Tasmania urges members to exercise that function here. If this rezoning is genuinely appropriate, it can be accomplished through the established planning system with proper community engagement. If it cannot withstand that scrutiny, it should not be accomplished at all. Parliament should not substitute itself for the planning system whenever the planning system is considered inconvenient. The precedent this sets, that land use can be changed by legislation without independent assessment or public process, is one with consequences well beyond this particular bill.

It's spot on, absolutely spot on.

As I said in my opening, this is unacceptable and all members here should see this as a precedent that should not be set, and if it is set, it risks being quite a dangerous one. It's a slippery slope to people feeling they can go straight to the Premier behind closed doors and have our planning system disregarded entirely without having even attempted it in the first place.

I know the university says they did attempt it back in 2021, but that was with the master plan that related to the whole campus move. What was clear to them then is that that wasn't going to fly. Then they didn't actually come back with this proposal and put it through the Hobart City Council planning system where it should have gone. They should have done that. That would have been the right way to do it. They knew that there would be some friction in doing that, no doubt. They knew they would have to face some of those requirements, including community consultation. They knew full well that wasn't going to go all their way. With that uncertainty in front of them, they've chosen instead to do the wrong thing. To discard integrity, good process and good governance. They have chosen to be sneaky and go to the Premier behind closed doors to make a secret deal. They have decided to use political influence to do that by operationalising the Labor Party opposition to put pressure on the government and make them feel unsafe. Absolutely astonishing behaviour from a public institution, Mr President, astonishing behaviour, but then there's been a lot of astonishing behaviour under the leadership of this institution in recent years.

Back to this bill: I'd like to talk a little bit about the inner residential rezoning that is given effect to if this bill passes. The bill automatically rezones all the parcels that are described, the two particular parcels of the land, to inner residential zoning under the Hobart Local Provisions Schedule. Mr Brian Risby has something to say about that in his correspondence to us. He says this about it:

The rationale for this appears to be to maximise its development potential and thereby its financial value, presumably so UTAS can fund the development of a new STEM facility on the remnant campus below Churchill Ave. A worthy cause, perhaps, but this part of the bill represents a flagrant abuse of process without any apparent strategic basis.

He also says this:

The only justification appears to be that part of the land in question adjoins an area currently zoned inner residential. Few planners would think the highest density zone makes sense on most of this challenging terrain.

This of course, is a highly credentialed planning expert saying this to us. Mr Brian Risby also goes on to say this:

The reality is that despite the zoning, it will be the Hobart City Council that has to assess the future subdivision and any associated issues with servicing and road layout. At the end of the day, I doubt that the intent of the inner residential zone will be deliverable on much of the area and its blanket application will delay the development at later stages. So, any perceived gains in time through this legislative rezoning will likely be

counterproductive. Areas like this with complex layers of environmental infrastructure and topographic constraints and opportunities need a structure plan to guide the development potential with the zoning to follow and reflect that. The Huntingfield Housing Land Supply Order included a range of zones, not selected arbitrarily, but based on a master plan. Interestingly, a careful reading of Section 7 of the bill suggests that in fact, the inner residential zoning may only be a holding position anyway because subsection 8 allows any of the land to be rezoned to something else in the future, presumably following a proper strategic planning process initiated by the council and approved by the Commission.

That would be the regular planning process that may have to come into play down the track. It's astonishing to me, as Mr Risby identifies there, to just blanket rezone these two areas is absolutely unheard of in a responsible planning sense. That is not what we would expect to happen under a normal process. That is not what a planning expert would do here if they were progressing it.

In fact, it could be false economy. This was done to get things done quickly, to not have to go through troublesome friction-field processes at the local council level or the Planning Commission level, but as Mr Risby points out, that might be a false economy in terms of time. It's already taken 2 years instead of the few months it was hoped probably to take and here we are down the track, probably having to redo the work through the normal system at a later date. This is false economy. It's poor practice. Often when you rush things and try to sneak around them, what you end up with is something that's a bugger up - excuse my unparliamentary language - that has to be fixed up later.

We don't know whether these two parcels of land should be zoned in a residential or not. We don't know that because we haven't been given the right information to make the assessment as the decision-makers. Should there be a more nuanced approach to zoning on these two parcels of land? We don't know. An expert has said to us that's probably what should happen, but again, we haven't been given the right information, or any information, upon which to make that determination. It comes back to the fact that what's being done here today is an absolute abhorrence. It's poor practice, it shouldn't be done this way, and it sets a precedent.

I was interested, too, that in Mr Brian Risby's correspondence to us he also picks up on the fact that there were already processes underway relating to this general area and that this process here with this bill through this place makes a mockery of that to some extent. He says in his letter,

What makes this even more unjustified is that the Hobart City Council is midstream on exactly the strategic work required to determine the right mix of zones for the broader surrounding area and the arbitrary exclusion of such a large area of land not only means they will need to start again, but they will have to do so with the zoning predetermined for this large, strategically positioned parcel.

Moreover, this presumptive rezoning will have implications for the land around it, as the council will need to limit the extent of other high-density residential land because the overall density for the area will be distorted by the legislation.

That's astonishing. Not only are we putting the cart well before the horse by not waiting for the Hobart City Council's strategic planning work to be done, we're also shaping, inappropriately, what that work can then deliver because we've dumped these inner residential parcels right into the middle of it and that will limit opportunities for other potential development proposals nearby. That's not very fair, it's not appropriate, and it doesn't make for good city planning.

Hobart City Council passed a motion on 15 December 2025, and it said this -

The Council notes:

- (1) There is no business case supporting the extraordinary use of Parliament by the Tasmanian Government to attempt to rezone two sections of land at the University of Tasmania's Sandy Bay Campus through the passing of the University of Tasmania Protection of Land Bill 2025.
- (2) Hobart City Council officers recommended the usual statutory process for rezoning land should be followed rather than rezoning through legislative processes.
- (3) UTAS has committed to rejuvenating and rebuilding a stem centre on the campus based around the existing stem facilities that already exist on that campus.
- (4) The land proposed for rezoning is fire prone, steep rocky, has limited road access and is unsuitable for the high density development possible if it is rezoned as inner residential.
- (5) The Sandy Bay Mount Nelson neighbourhood plan is currently being formulated by council. The draft plan recommended staged and sensitive urban renewal if this land was to be developed and UTAS undertook to use this neighbourhood plan to inform its campus plans.
- (6) The council completes the Mount Nelson Sandy Bay neighbourhood plan as soon as practical.
- (7) Submits the completed Mount Nelson Sandy Bay Neighbourhood Plan to Legislative Council as a matter of urgency so that it can be considered as Hobart City Council's contribution to the debate on the University of Tasmania (Protection of Land) Bill 2025.
- (8) Write to Legislative Council requesting that they defer final decision on the University of Tasmania (Protection of Land) Bill 2025 until they receive the submitted Mount Nelson Sandy Bay Neighbourhood Plan for consideration.

That's a very clear piece of communication from the key local government area affected here to this place. We all received it by correspondence. The Mount Nelson Sandy Bay

Neighbourhood Plan has not been completed and provided to us to inform this decision. We don't have it. We have a discussion paper that was put out for consultation, and we have an engagement report, saying what was heard in relation to that discussion paper.

I note the government likes to point to the discussion paper as if it somehow proves that the Hobart City Council supports the sort of development they're intending in this area. It doesn't; it's a discussion paper that's put out to the community to respond to. The engagement report - which the government takes great trouble not to mention - makes it very clear that there is fairly comprehensive opposition to the sort of development and that the wholesale rezoning in this area to being an inner residential zone is something the community does not support.

Here we have the local government that's relevant - and I ask you to just again, hypothetically, put yourselves in your own electorate. Pick the biggest local government in your electorate, responsible for the most significant urban area in your electorate. Now imagine there's a proposal here in your electorate that is significant and place-shaping and permanent for two of the biggest suburbs you have there and the local government in your area says to you, 'Please don't do this via parliament. It should be done the proper way through local government.' That's what your elected local government representatives sent to you as a piece of correspondence, and you do what? Do you ignore it? Do you say, 'No, parliament is the right way to do it'? How are you going to justify that to your local government in your electorate? I don't think you can. If you couldn't do it in your electorate and wouldn't think it's appropriate in your electorate, why would you think it's appropriate in mine?

Hobart City Council engagement on the Mount Nelson and Sandy Bay Neighbourhood Plan is detailed in that engagement report I mentioned. It was provided to us by the City of Hobart along with this correspondence and it's really clear on residents' views on development in their suburbs. I can point people to page 7 of that report, it says a range of things, but I'm going to paraphrase a couple of them. From Mount Nelson, for example, there's support for restricting future development due to constraints such as limited road access and bushfire risk. For Sandy Bay, there are concerns expressed about new development and adding to existing problems around traffic congestion and the rationale behind population forecasts. It's not supportive of any new developments. There is some support for new architecturally designed mixed-use and medium-density housing - that's not what's being proposed potentially under this rezoning effort that we're being asked to do today. What we're being asked to do, does not comply with what the local community wants. They have not been allowed to have any meaningful, proper process of community consultation in this planning decision that we're making today. None. Any of us supporting this here today are spitting in the face of the communities in these suburbs and telling them that they do not deserve to have a say in this place-shaping decision of their local area. Are you okay with that? Every member in this place? Would you be okay with it in your electorate?

Something that's been touched on by others and I will touch on briefly is the question of whether UTAS have a coherent business case for what happens next if this rezoning occurs or not. The NTEU certainly had a view on that, and they shared it with us in their correspondence. They said this:

The bill's central financial rationale is that land sales above Churchill Avenue will raise approximately \$100 million, which will then be directed towards a \$500 million STEM precinct redevelopment. The NTEU Tasmania regards this proposition as 'financially incoherent'. The \$100 million figure has not

been independently verified, is not supported by a current market valuation that has been made public, and there is, as matters presently stand, no identified buyer for the land.

More significantly, the \$500 million STEM redevelopment is dependent not only on the \$100 million that may or may not be realised from a land sale, but on a further \$400 million from the Commonwealth Government. No commitment to that funding has been secured. The Commonwealth has not made any public undertaking to provide \$400 million, whether on an 80:20 basis, as originally hoped, or on the 50:50 terms that more recent federal policy suggests.

The Infrastructure Australia submission made by the state government does not constitute a federal funding commitment. It constitutes an expression of interest in a queue. Similarly, the state government has not committed its own funds as a capital contribution to the STEM project. In the absence of both federal and state funding commitments, the STEM precinct cannot proceed regardless of whether the land is sold. The university would be left with, at best, \$100 million against a \$500 million project; a shortfall that makes the plan undeliverable.

Furthermore, the university has acknowledged that its \$500 million STEM plan does not include the cost of replacing all the facilities that would be lost through the rezoning and sale of the land above Churchill Avenue. Estimates put the replacement cost of those facilities at approximately \$300 million. No funding has been identified for this. The Legislative Council is being asked to approve a land sale that would destroy existing infrastructure without any credible plan or means to replace it.

The rezoning and sale provisions are predicated on the UTAS STEM business case, and there are absolutely huge questions over the viability of the STEM business case. As NTEU so succinctly say. It is unfunded. They missed the opportunity for Commonwealth funding at the 2025 federal election. The assumption of \$100 million in state government funding is unsound, as the state government has confirmed that it has made no such commitment.

The \$100 million land value above Churchill Ave is not a market valuation. The central cost figure that UTAS puts forward for its STEM project of \$501.5 million is not supported by clear evidence. On all counts, it's likely a significant to be significantly undercosted. It does not appear that UTAS has costed the movement and replacement of all the STEM facilities that might be required as part of that process.

In November 2024, the Vice-Chancellor of the university said that work would need to start within 12 to 18 months for this to happen and for this to be viable. We've basically missed that window. Here we are now, with an unfunded, questionable proposition in terms of costs laid out and the timelines blown. This doesn't look good in terms of being a comprehensive, credible business case.

By the way, the \$100 million from the state government is an absolute smokescreen. There's no real understanding about how that \$100 million gets realised here. For a start, the valuation was based on residential land sold in the area surrounding here - I think it was a 3 or

5 kilometre radius they've looked at residential land sales across a period of time, they've averaged it out. This is not residential land ready for sale. This is an entirely different proposition to that. It's bizarre to me to hear an assertion that, somehow, the \$100 million valuation is a market valuation. I don't think anybody could claim that to be credibly true. The government isn't going to be handing over \$100 million to take possession of the land. It's not clear that there's any developer who would be interested to hand over \$100 million for the value of the land.

When I've had briefings of this in the past from the university and I've asked them how will you realise this money from this land if we rezone, there's been no coherent answer provided. I've even been told 'Well, we're talking to the government about maybe partnering to do development on the land.' That seems astonishing to me. I asked who are you talking to? Is it DPAC? Is it Homes Tasmania? Is it Department of State Growth? Not really sure - sort of talking to DPAC mostly; no clear plan about it. If the state government and UTAS were thinking about developing this land themselves, that puts a whole other question out there. Who's funding all the work that would need to be done to get it ready for development, and presumably eventual sale or use to realise the \$100 million? Because we've got to find it somewhere. Where does the \$100 million come from, that can then be put towards the STEM facilities below Churchill Avenue? I'm not surprised that the university has stated that it's prepared to have signed some sort of deed poll, to say we promise that the money we get for the land will be spent on the STEM precinct. Because it's completely unclear that they'll have any avenue to actually get money for this land, even if we rezone it here today. Unbelievable.

State government appears to have supported the UTAS business case, submitting it through to Infrastructure Australia. It is certainly not clear that the state government did any analysis to assess its validity or its merits, or to even properly acquaint itself with it. There's certainly no indication that Infrastructure Australia will support this project as a priority.

With no Commonwealth funding insight, no state government funding promised for the land above Churchill Ave, no realistic market valuation for that land, and no definite development proposal for the land above Churchill Ave, which would recoup for UTAS the funding required to move all the STEM to below Churchill Ave, or even to make a decent start on it, it's clear there needs to be a reconsideration of what's realistic, and the strategic options we that we have here.

Pressing ahead on this path, which may have seemed the easy and quick way forward in 2024, is clearly not that now. By trying to subvert proper process, UTAS and the government have wasted two years. In the meantime, we still have current facilities that continue to be allowed to be degraded, and we still have no clear options going forward for how we realise this STEM vision for the Sandy Bay campus.

I'm going to talk a little bit now about the loss of vital infrastructure and future capacity that would be imposed on us if we pass this bill, and allow for what's planned to occur.

From the NTEU, from their correspondence to us:

The land above Churchill Ave is not vacant. It contains the life sciences building, 16 plant science research glasshouses, the Bush Fire Research Centre, the seismic research station maintained in partnership with the

University of California San Diego, and a significant amount of student accommodation.

These are not redundant facilities. They are active functioning assets that support the university's research output and its capacity to house students. Losing them without replacement does direct and immediate harm to the university's academic and research mission.

The NTEU Tasmania draws the Legislative Council's attention to the longer-term significance of this land. The Sandy Bay campus represents the university's principal footprint in the state's capital. That land, once sold and rezoned, is permanently lost to the institution.

The suggestion that the university can later expand or develop additional student accommodation facilities on the remaining land below Churchill Ave has not been adequately assessed. There is insufficient space below Churchill Ave to replace what would be lost above it.

Approving this bill forecloses future options for the university at a time when its student accommodation capacity is already under pressure, and when retaining students in Tasmania should be a strategic priority for the institution and the state.

I completely concur with the NETU on this. What's typically presented to us by the government and the university when we're talking about this proposition is, 'Look, it's all just a bunch of rubbish old buildings up there anyway, not fit for purpose. People are rattling around in them. Better to get rid of them, and we can do something better squashed in below Churchill Ave.'

It's just not true. Some of those buildings have been recently refurbished and upgraded. Money has been invested and spent on new facilities up there, including our Fire Research Hub, and including the Seismic Vault, which is actually a incredibly unique facility up there. It's not clear how that's going to be dealt with and what impact it will have. We haven't been provided with any information clearly about that. That Seismic Vault was a site specifically selected nearly 70 years ago for the first station in the Southern Hemisphere where there would be these measurements made of seismic activity. We've been collecting data consistently at that site - the only one in Australia to consistently collect data across the time period of 1957 to 2026. We're part of a worldwide network. We're a reliable part of that network. We've also, just in 2024, had the University of California, San Diego upgrade and pay for the refurbishment of the facility in 2024. What's going to happen to that facility? Is it going to be affected by this? What will we do in terms of that valuable partnership we've had for 70 years, providing that information and data? I don't know.

Again, it's part of the gap, the void of information we don't have here. The thing that I find really quite galling and disrespectful is statements that appear in the government's second reading speech, for example, but are also spouted by all sorts of people promoting the rezoning in this bill and the proposition of getting rid of the land above Churchill Ave, that this is surplus land and nobody's using it, it's not going to be needed. Well, rubbish. We have never been provided with any assessment of future need that shows this won't be needed.

Never. Once it's gone, it's gone. It's presumptuous right now, particularly if you're not even prepared to put a piece of analysis in front of us and forward planning in front of us that says we definitely know for sure the university won't need this at any time in the future, because as soon as we give it away, as soon as it's gone to be developed for other purposes, we never get it back.

This is gifted land. This was gifted from the Tasmanian people for education purposes. It's a unique location for a university campus. It's an absolutely beautiful location broadly, across that Sandy Bay campus. A lot of the land above Churchill Ave is bushland. It's really valuable and beautiful in terms of environment to be in, to do all the different sorts of work that's being done there.

We can't just pretend it's surplus, it's rubbish, it's crappy old buildings on it, we might as well get rid of it, we'll never need it. No one has presented us with any analysis that tells us that is true. But we're prepared to permanently ditch it, to permanently constrain our university into the future, to probably close doors for options. There are new things that have been developed there just in recent years. There would be, absolutely, inevitably, ways that land would be useful and important and attract partnerships and attract opportunities into the future for the university if it was to be retained for the university as intended when it was gifted by the Tasmanian people.

How offensive, to have the presumption to say we will never need it when you haven't even bothered to present us with analysis that backs that up. By the way, what's quite obvious is that we have facilities there, which have been characterised as old and rundown and not good enough to attract people and yet, those facilities under, say, the Plant Science area, see UTAS ranked as 35 in the world when we talk about academic ratings.

The thing that draws students and staff and research partners to a university, the things are rankings, what we deliver in terms of quality output. Clearly, in the area of plant science, just to name one, UTAS is delivering incredibly. We are 35 in the world for that discipline in our ranking. Astonishing to pretend that the places in which that work is done are somehow so unfit for purpose we need to ditch them in order to attract people into them.

We can clearly, with our rankings, do that very effectively. That's the same actually when we talk about students. We've heard clearly from from numerous people, and I don't care what AI says because- quite frankly - AI would have gone onto the internet and scraped off all the promo material from every university there is who's just built a brand spanking, shiny new building. That's where AI would have got its information about what students like and about how important it is to have all these brand spanking, shining new facilities. Sure, it's nice to have those, but actually we've seen no evidence to tell us that students are being turned away by the facilities on offer here. We've seen no evidence put to us about that. Claims made that what we need to attract students, and no evidence to back those claims up. Not one. The one thing we do know is that rankings attract students, and actually rankings in our STEM areas are not too bad. I do notice that the minister, in her second reading speech, did not take the trouble to celebrate our successes in STEM. She took the trouble to point to apparent gaps in the digital space, and I don't dispute that, I'm sure we can better develop our capacity in the digital area and absolutely do that. We'd have all sorts of options for doing that. It is not contingent on this bill for us to contemplate how we might best do that. By all means, let's charge ahead in terms of digital capacity under our STEM areas, but what a disgrace to have a

minister not even take the time to acknowledge in the second reading speech that we have some exceptional outcomes in STEM areas already under current facilities.

I'm going to talk a little bit about the area of the housing outcomes we apparently may expect from this effort. I am a strong proponent of pulling all the levers we have to address our housing crisis in this state, and I don't think there's anybody who could pretend that I wasn't. I'm well aware of the need to address our housing crisis. I'm particularly aware of the need for us to increase our social, affordable or public housing, in this state. I'm particularly aware of the need to address the deficiencies of our private rental market in this state, all of which I speak about regularly here. There is absolutely nothing about this bill and the information we have to accompany it, which is virtually zilch, that guarantees to us any particular housing outcome from the rezoning of this land. Nothing. There's particularly nothing that guarantees anything about social, affordable or public housing outcomes from the rezoning of this land. Nothing. No guarantee. We've heard this also from the NTEU, and I'm going to put on the record what they've put to us in their correspondence on this aspect of the bill. They say this:

Proponents of this bill have repeatedly invoked the housing crisis as justification for rezoning the land above Churchill Avenue to inner residential. This framing is not supported by evidence and misrepresents the character and limitations of the site. Much of the land targeted by the rezoning comprises steep, rocky terrain, and is occupied by existing university buildings, including student accommodation, teaching facilities, research infrastructure and specialist scientific installations. The premise that this land is ready, or even suitable, for residential development has not been tested through any proper planning or geotechnical assessment. No developer has come forward with an offer to purchase and develop the land. No business case establishing that the site can sustain the kind of residential density that inner residential zoning anticipates has been produced or tabled in the Parliament. The claim that this legislation will produce affordable or social housing is at best speculative and at worst deliberately misleading. The NTEU Tasmania is not aware of any commitment from the university, any developer, the state Government or any other party that a single affordable or social dwelling will be delivered on this land as a result of this bill. The community deserves more than rhetoric on this question. The Legislative Council should not bend its authority to housing promises that have no foundation in evidence, no identified buyer and no planning framework to deliver them.

I agree with the NTEU on that front. There's no guarantee out of this of any eventuality of any particular housing outcome on this site.

We also don't know what the sequence of events will be here. We rezone the land; it then has to go through a whole bunch of other processes with development applications that maybe eventuate. That's after the uncertainty of whether we are selling the land. Is the university partnering with the state to develop the land. Is it going to be done holus-bolus. What's the time frame for it to be done? We have STEM facilities that need to remain in use until there's somewhere else to put them if we're developing new ones down below Churchill Avenue. But we need the money from selling and then having the developer develop that land before we can afford to build

one below Churchill Avenue. That's going to be a very complex sequence of events about how any of that works in practice. In the meantime, those facilities above Churchill Avenue would sit there, left to deteriorate without maintenance, presumably, because why would you invest in facilities you're intending to replicate, even if the ability to replicate them and shift people to below Churchill Avenue is realistically nowhere in sight?

This is a really fraught proposition. There's nothing clear about the sequence of events that's expected after this rezoning if it goes through this place. They haven't bothered to present us with a clear outline of what that would be in a way that's credible and evidenced. I've heard all sorts of speculation, but I've never had anything put before me that clearly explains what the expectation is. Again, when you sneakily go to the Premier behind closed doors and get a special deal for yourself to bring it through this place's legislation without any of the requirements of a planning system, that's what happens. We end up with no explanation and nothing on the record.

I want to touch on some matters from the minister's second reading speech that I feel need to be commented on. The minister talked about the fact that Tasmania has only one university and its future matters deeply, not only for higher education but for our economy, our workforce and our capacity to grow and prosper as a state. I absolutely agree with that statement. That's true. There are so many people here passionately hoping for our university to thrive and to do well.

That's why it's quite tragic, quite frankly, that the government hasn't stepped up in any meaningful way through all sorts of crises and drama that this university has experienced for a long time now. I know the member for Hobart spoke about this in her contribution quite well. This is a university that has lurched from one problematic situation to another for many years now; when it comes to governance, when it comes to community trust. When it comes to questions over management culture and leadership within the university. There have been all sorts of disturbing things that have occurred, vast numbers of academics exiting the institution, most of them not able to talk about it once they do. Vast numbers of disquieted students and staff who don't feel they can necessarily speak up about it safely, certainly through the inquiry process we did, we heard from them. On the record, we had to hear from retired academics and staff because they were safe to speak to us in that inquiry, but we heard from others who couldn't openly speak about things because they were fearful of repercussions.

There've been questions about the accountability and transparency and governance standards of the university, and not once have I seen this state government step up with concern to try to address any of those things. To ask itself what might we need to do to ensure that this precious public institution, our one university in our state, isn't jeopardised in this current moment through poor governance, management missteps, or losing the confidence of the Tasmanian people.

If you want to talk about why students might be going into state instead of staying here, I suggest you look at the sorts of things that we've been hearing through staff surveys, from student representative groups, through concerns being raised about governance over the last at least 7-8 years, under this university's leadership. If the state government wants to speak about the importance of this university and how we have to ensure its future, they have done nothing about all those very vocally expressed very clearly in the public domain, identifiable issues that have been going on.

There should have been alarm bells ringing when the university wanted to holus-bolus, move its campus into the CBD and the Hobart community en masse stood up 74 per cent of the voters who did the elector poll said, 'No, we don't want you to do that.' That was because they hadn't been asked properly; the proposal hadn't been robustly tested and put to them. There was no social licence for it. It should have sounded alarm bells for the state government about the behaviour of this precious public institution.

I just want to mention some of the other things from the second reading speech briefly. In one part, this was said:

But at Sandy Bay, many STEM buildings are among the oldest on the campus. They are no longer fit for purpose and enrolments have declined as a result, despite growing national demand.

Where's the evidence? At no stage in this whole process has anyone presented us with evidence about that. It will be interesting if the minister on summing up stands up here and somehow has something to refute me saying that because, my goodness, would that tell us that there was information and evidence sitting behind this that wasn't presented to us prior to making the decision in this place. So far, we have certainly not seen anything to back up a statement like that. I think second reading speeches are pretty important in this place, they can certainly get referred to later in courts and the like. It's pretty important to make sure that they make accurate statements. If I was the minister and I was told to stand up and say that 'they are no longer fit for purpose and enrolments have declined as a result,' I would want to know that there is evidence about that to back up the statement. I wonder if the minister did, I don't know. We haven't seen the evidence. Maybe she has? If she has, she hasn't shared it with us. That's an indictment in itself.

There's no pathway created by this legislation. The second reading speech suggested that it creates a pathway for value generated from the land to be reinvested in a world-class STEM precinct. My goodness, we all want a world-class STEM precinct for UTAS, that would be great. Of course, that's something we want to see come to reality. This is not a pathway for it though, because there's no clear way that the decision made here today, if it goes ahead, lays out clear steps to get us there. It doesn't. There's no funding available, there's no clear plan for it. The sequence of events hasn't been mapped out.

I've spoken about rankings. There were things in the second reading speech that seemed to suggest that new facilities are needed to attract top researchers and educators. I think that's, at best, partially true. No doubt, new facilities are attractive, but are they, fundamentally, what attracts top researchers and educators, and partners in research projects, for example, other institutions? Another institution who wants to partner with us isn't going to care about a shiny building. They're going to care about are we ranked similarly to them or above them, because that would build their credibility. Rankings are what count, fundamentally.

The thing that I found quite offensive, as the member for this area in the upper House, is the statement in the second reading speech that said, 'The future of the Sandy Bay campus has been the subject of extensive community discussion and engagement.' It sure has, and do you know what the community has resoundingly said every single step of the way? Every time UTAS has put forward something they want to do with this campus, the community has said, either no or not quite like that, it should be done differently. Also, we should be consulted with differently, generally, because they weren't consulted with respectfully in the first place. It has

not been the subject of extensive community discussion and engagement. Certainly the discussion part is right. I've discussed it a lot. There's a lot of discussion in the community, but they don't feel engaged with. It says in the second reading speech that this bill was the result of that engagement and discussion, apparently.

It also talks about the fact that the proposed rezoned areas - the parcels of land above Churchill Avenue - were included in the university's master plan, which was apparently informed by a substantial program of engagement in 2021. Well, I can tell you, in 2021 that master plan was resoundingly rejected, at every stage, through any form of consultation that was had, but certainly then through the elector poll in 2022. Again, the people have spoken on this quite resoundingly, but it's not in the university's favour, it's not in favour of what's proposed here. I can't let it go through this place without making that crystal clear and emphasising it. These are Tasmanians who are directly affected. This is the community of Hobart. These are people who we legislate to have a say in our planning system. Under the normal processes, it's required that we listen to the voice of the community and take it into consideration. It doesn't always eventuate that things go the way the loudest voices say, but we have a process that allows for it. This process didn't have that in a meaningful way in this planning decision we're making here today.

I've talked about the Hobart City Council process regarding their neighbourhood plan and the fact that they put a discussion paper out, but then they heard things from the community and the engagement paper makes that really clear. The community is highly concerned about this sort of proposal of high density. They like the idea, potentially, of medium density, they like the idea of well thought-out development, perhaps, but they're really concerned about the impacts of high-density development, particularly on the amenity, the traffic, et cetera in the area.

I find it really interesting that second reading speech says:

The university has continued to receive technical and planning advice from the Hobart City Council offices on this land.

Now that's astonishing, because when we asked to see that, we weren't given it. Wasn't made available to us. It's really murky, there's a space, a void of transparency that exists between the government, the university and potentially the Hobart City Council in terms of their planning staff and any involvement they've had in discussions. That space there is not visible to us. It hasn't been made accessible to us. We haven't had the benefit of any expert advice coming out of it, and the fact that actually hasn't even been properly documented and laid out for us, what these interactions look like, is really suspicious. It does not point to good governance. It doesn't point to probability. It points to questions over integrity.

With so much uncertainty and lack of information or detail available to us, clearly there's been plenty of machinations behind the scenes to cook up this deal resulting in this rezoning amendment to the bill. Neither the Rockliff government nor UTAS governance and senior management and leadership provide confidence that we should take anything on trust or have uncritical faith in their probity and their commitment to good governance. Nothing. All they've done is actually give us reasons to question it.

There's been obstructive approaches to RTI from both the government and from UTAS. There's been a lack of transparency. There's the purposeful decision to make these interactions

and decisions behind closed doors instead of in an open and accountable way. UTAS governance broadly is not accountable. The University Council is virtually answerable to no one. It's also a very internally focused group at risk of groupthink, and that's something that came out of the UTAS inquiry here; it's something that's come out of the Senate inquiry nationally and the other reviews that have been done on university governance matters broadly, certainly demonstrated here.

All of these things do not invite us to have confidence when we see this murky behaviour behind closed doors here between the government and the university.

It's not acceptable to expect us here, as responsible parliamentary decision-makers for this state, to basically have to take on faith that the government has satisfied itself that all planning assessments are fine and they've talked to the Hobart City Council staff all about it. It's all good, no worries, mate.

It's not realistic to expect us, a permanent cost to the valuable publicly gifted asset of the Sandy Bay campus, to give free rein to UTAS council and senior management for a project or series of projects that are based on non-existent funding opportunities, no comprehensive business case, a history of projects stalling, changing, having costs overrun, and a future plan based on a mud map. It's entirely unacceptable.

Before concluding, there's one thing I really want to do as part of my contribution, and that's to express my absolute deep appreciation for every single community member who's contacted me about this issue to express their high concern, their distress, their anger, their frustration, their puzzlement, and their sadness about what this bill proposes to do, and they're absolutely befuddled as to how on earth this could be seen as being appropriate or possible. How on Earth could our parliament act like this and pass this sort of travesty of a bill?

I've been contacted by hundreds of people, if not thousands, on this over the years, the different iterations and stages of concern about decision-making on this matter. I've been contacted by community members, by current students, by parents of current students and future students, by retired academics, by current academics, sometimes freely writing to me, perhaps sometimes also as union reps, so they've got that protection behind them. But I've also had current academics and staff members contacting me very quietly, very concerned. They don't want any repercussions because they've spoken to me to express their views.

I've had family members of current staff who've contacted me to express concerns about this, but also made it clear they don't want that to become known because they're worried about their family member having repercussions from a family member speaking to me about it. It's really quite sad, actually.

I've had locals in Mount Nelson and in Sandy Bay talk to me about this at length. I've had even members of, for example, the Bushcare groups that are responsible for those local areas getting in touch with me to tell me about their concerns about it. I've had business-owners, local and otherwise, talking to me about this. I've even had farmers from other parts of the state getting in touch to tell me their views about this. All raising concerns; all expressing their hope that we do not pass this bill.

I know we've had people on the other side asking us to pass it. My assessment of most of those is: they want to see the outcome in relation to STEM, an improvement in STEM facilities.

That's something we all want, but they have swallowed the misapprehension that this bill is the only pathway to that and that it's an appropriate and acceptable pathway to that. I agree with their stated outcomes that they want. I agree that we one day want to be able to update STEM and for us to have excellent facilities in that area in ways that perhaps we don't have now. But it's a shame that they've been made to believe this bill is the only way to do it and therefore they have to support this bill and ask us to support it. I still appreciate them getting in touch, though, and sharing their views about it. I share their aspirations for the university, very much.

Where to from here? From the NTEU, I quote a final piece from them. They said this in their correspondence to us:

The right course of action is to restore the bill to its original protective form, requiring parliamentary approval before any disposal of Sandy Bay land can occur, and to allow planning and financial preconditions for any future transaction to be properly established before this parliament is asked to approve one. That approach respects the community, protects the university's assets and preserves the integrity of the planning system.

I agree with the NTEU on that. That is the right course of action: to retain the original intention of the bill, the protection of land for the Sandy Bay campus; to reject the inappropriate rezoning and to remove it from the bill.

I have amendments drawn up to assist us to do that, which I may or may not have the opportunity to do. This would involve deleting section 7 and schedule 2, voting against those clauses, and then adjusting schedule 1 to make sure the whole campus area is included as protected land. This would leave Hobart City Council to be able to resume its strategic planning process for the Neighbourhood Plan and then any effort to rezone those areas be pursued under a normal process, an accountable process, a legislative process, one that we can all have confidence and faith in.

This bill is an inappropriate imposition on this Chamber to be a planning authority without any expert advice and accountable evidence to inform our decision. We all want UTAS to thrive, to be successful, to be a jewel in the crown for our state. It's highly important because they are one and only university.

However, that position is one that we cannot achieve just through this bill. We have to think about how we can achieve that but also not dispense with good process and proper governance. We need to be able to say no, the university doesn't get a free pass on appropriate governance, it doesn't get a free pass on integrity, it doesn't get a free pass on probity. It should have to go through our legislative processes like everybody else. I do want to reiterate my earlier point, Mr President, in closing, to every single member here, and I mean this sincerely, I would like every single member here to hear this sincerely; if this was in your electorate, being done in this way to your community, would you- could you- support it?

I can pretty much guarantee that if any member was in my shoes with this situation, they absolutely could not and would not support this bill. So, on that, Mr President, I cannot support the bill.