reason this has come forward is because it was originally to be debated in June, so it would have been okay for 1 July. However, because we held the bill over until August the date was wrong. That is all it is. The gazettal date will be fixed in time for the next financial year.

Mr WOOD: The date will be fixed. It says on the amendment, 'Insert the day fixed by the Administrator by *Gazette* notice'. There will be a date before the beginning of next financial year? This act will not happen until that date is fixed, and it will be fixed before the next financial year?

Mr GILES: That is right.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported with amendment; report adopted.

TERMINATION OF UNITS PLANS AND UNIT TITLE SCHEMES BILL (Serial 104)

Continued from 23 October 2014.

Ms FYLES (Nightcliff): Mr Deputy Speaker, before I start I thank the minister and his office. I became the shadow minister responsible for this only a few weeks ago. They have been very accommodating in my requests for briefings and in providing additional information they have perhaps already provided to the opposition. I appreciate there were numerous e-mails back and forth between me and the minister's office with people helping me on this. Before we get into the debate I wanted to acknowledge that and the departmental staff who made themselves available to provide briefings at short notice. I thank the minister and his team.

The government's unit titles bill seeks to amend the legal framework for the redevelopment of unit complexes when not all owners are in agreement. In 2009 the Labor government introduced the first legal framework for the termination of unit titles by the majority of owners. This legislation allowed for the termination of units based on 90% of agreement for schemes at least 20 years of age and for new schemes established from 2009. This provided certainty for purchasers buying after the commencement of a unit development and for owners after that date. This scheme was not applied retrospectively, as at the time this could instead go to court for 100% agreement by owners.

The former Labor government held a strong record of leading redevelopment and providing economic foundation for investors to invest here. We had examples of that with the Wirrina redevelopment in Parap which was the first redevelopment of a large public housing complex resulting in a mix of public, affordable and private units.

Again, I point to the record of the previous Labor government in supporting development to provide the Territory's housing needs. Looking around our CBD, there has been considerable redevelopment in the past 15 years.

In November 2011, there were over 2000 units with approved development status across Darwin, and the majority were in the CBD pending finance and construction. By December 2012, over 600 units were under construction across Darwin CBD and suburbs. In the five or so years before 2012, about 5000 new units were built in Darwin CBD, the equivalent of a new suburb of homes, including the number of units built at the waterfront, which is now becoming a feature of Darwin city.

We also identified and made election commitments to redevelop aged public housing complexes in a process that would involve private developers providing a mix of housing options on these sites. I notice the current government has adopted some of these projects, but it feels as if this commitment has been reshaped at the expense of public housing. We have not seen that obligation met.

On this side of the House we are pro-development and redevelopment, but it needs to be in strong consultation with our communities. We need to bring our communities with us. We recognise there are unit schemes currently which will soon arrive at the end of their economic life. On Mitchell Street is a key example of an old building on a valuable piece of land. The challenges in achieving redevelopment at that site due to the owners' inability to reach unanimous agreement are very much understood on this side of the House. A solution is required.

However, we feel this legislation does not provide the solution in a sound and equitable legal framework for a number of reasons, not least of which is that it lacks adequate safeguards and is poorly framed, exposing both homeowners and developers. We feel in developing this bill the government has failed to consult with the people – Territory homeowners who will be directly affected.

There is considerable tension between the concept of redeveloping land – particularly to prevent ghettos – and the rights of the property owners who would like to enjoy their property without interference. We want to see a balance between redevelopment and those rights. It is extremely important to get the balance right.