

Green Paper – Proposals for modernising the planning system

Response Template

This response template is intended to assist industry groups, local governments and practitioners respond in detail to the proposals outlined in the paper. The template is structured in accordance with the reform Proposals and the subheading and recommendations within those.

Completed templates may be submitted via the online survey at www.planning.wa.gov.au/planningreform. You will be directed to an upload page after the first two pages of identifying questions. Submissions close on 20 July 2018.

PROPOSAL		SUPPORT Yes/No/In Part	RESPONSE
1.0	A STRATEGICALLY-LED SYSTEM		
1.1	Prominence of Strategic Planning		
1.1.1	Provide in the PD Act that strategic planning is a purpose of the Act and provide a definition of strategic planning.	Yes	
1.1.2	Provide in the LPS Regulations that the review of a local planning scheme must be informed by, and respond to, a review of the local planning strategy.	Yes	
1.1.3	Provide in the LPS Regulations that a complex scheme amendment must be accompanied by a proposed amendment to the Local Planning Strategy.	In Part	<p>As per WALGA's draft Position Statement (DPS), it is considered that as the content of a Local Planning Strategy is broad, in many cases a proposed scheme amendment could be accommodated without requiring formal amendment to the Strategy. It is suggested that the White Paper includes a recommendation that a complex scheme amendment be accompanied by a proposed amendment to the Local Planning Strategy only if required, i.e. an amendment to the Local Planning Strategy should not be a mandatory requirement in the Regulations.</p> <p>Additionally, further information is required to explain how this reform would work in practice. For instance, when a complex amendment is approved, will the Regulations include exact wording of how the Strategy needs to be updated? Will the two processes run concurrently? (i.e. the Commission 'certifies' the Amendment to the Strategy as per Part 3(12) of the Regulations at the same time as it determines that a complex amendment is suitable for advertising). This could lead to confusion if the two processes do not operate in tandem.</p>
1.2	Need to Explain Sustainability for Land Use Planning		

PROPOSAL		SUPPORT Yes/No/In Part	RESPONSE
1.2.1	An overarching State Planning Policy be developed which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i Provides a definition of sustainability for the planning system which reflects a balancing of economic development, environmental considerations, and social needs; ii Reinforces sustainability as an essential element required to be taken into account in the making of any strategy or policy; and iii Indicates the particular steps related to how economic, social and environmental factors are balanced. 	In Part	There is scope to include this within State Planning Policy 1. Support WALGA's DPS, which suggests the White Paper includes the following definition: <i>The notion of sustainability includes three pillars: environment, social, economic. The proposed policy should make clear that the economic and social pillars are highly dependent on the sustainability of the environmental pillar.</i> Reference: Davidson, K. & Arman, M. (2014) Planning for sustainability: an assessment of recent metropolitan planning strategies and urban policy in Australia, Australian Planner, 51:4, 296-306.
1.3	Housing Distribution		
1.3.1	Provide that every local planning strategy include a local housing strategy, except for low growth and small regional local governments which only require basic local planning scheme requirements.	In part	Clarification is required under which circumstances a Local Housing Strategy (LHS) is required, including a clear definition of "low growth and small regional local governments" which would be exempt from the requirement. As per WALGA's DPS, it is further suggested that the term "low growth" be reconsidered. While the value of a LHS is noted, where the Local Planning Strategy already provides for adequate growth and housing diversity, the requirement for a LHS to be prepared prior to a Local Planning Strategy could add significant cost to local governments and may not add value. Clarification is also required as to how this requirement differs from the existing information contained within the Local Planning Manual.
1.3.2	The DPLH to provide guidance for local government in the Local Planning Manual on how to prepare a Local Housing Strategy, including a methodology for local housing analysis.	Yes	
2.0	A LEGIBLE PLANNING SYSTEM		
2.2	Arranging State Planning Policies for Brevity and Simplicity		
2.2.1	State Planning Policies be consolidated into a single state planning policy framework with supplementary technical guidance.	Yes	The Shire's support is based on the understanding that the term 'state planning policy framework' refers to a single State Planning Policy which will be based on models adopted in Queensland, the United Kingdom and Wales, which provide detailed technical guidance documents to practitioners and development proponents. It is also understood that technical guidance would be regularly updated, prepared in consultation with a range of stakeholders including local governments, and maintained in a soft format online, which can be more readily updated as circumstances change.

PROPOSAL		SUPPORT Yes/No/In Part	RESPONSE
2.3	Line of Sight		
2.3.1	<p>WAPC to establish common strategic “elements” for the State Planning Framework including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A “sustainability” element • A “land use element” that includes the distribution of uses of land as well as density • A “housing element” that includes the types of housing • An “environmental element” • An “open space element” • An “urban form and design element” • An infrastructure element. <p>and prepare Technical Guidance for the details of each element to be included.</p>	In Part	As per WALGA’s DPS, clarification is required as to how the proposed strategic “elements” clearly align with the objectives of the <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i> , those objectives being for economic development, environmental considerations, and social needs. The list provided in this recommendation does not encompass these objectives.
2.3.2	Provide that every State Planning Policy, Regional or sub-regional plan and the local planning strategy must follow these elements, unless otherwise agreed to by the WAPC.	In Part	
2.3.3	Provide that every local planning strategy must explain how it has addressed the requirements of each common strategic element against the requirements of State Strategy, Planning Policy or Regional or sub-regional strategy.	In Part	Further clarity is required around how this is to be delivered in a Local Planning Strategy. The State Planning Framework is extensive and to have to provide an explanation for every strategic element of this framework is likely to be unnecessary. It will be impractical and overly time consuming to adequately describe how every element of a policy or strategy has been addressed.
2.3.4	Provide in the PD Act that all planning decision makers are to have due regard to State Planning Policies.	Yes	
2.3.5	Provide in the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority Act 2011 that in performing functions under the Act, the MRA must have regard to State Planning Policies.	Yes	
2.4	Complexity locating and interpreting the local planning framework		
2.4.1	Require that a local planning scheme be published with the inclusion of the Local Planning Strategy (in the form of a local strategic statement) and Local Planning Policies in a document to be called a “Comprehensive Local Planning Scheme”.	No	As per WALGA’s DPS, Page 29 of the Green Paper states that “The approach would also require additional process at State level as it introduces the need for local planning policies to be subject to State Level scrutiny to ensure content does not conflict with State Planning policies and use of a consistent format. This should be undertaken by the DPLH and approved by the Minister for Planning” (which is then reflected in recommendation 2.4.2).

PROPOSAL		SUPPORT Yes/No/In Part	RESPONSE
			<p>The Shire objects to the review of Local Planning Policies (LPPs) by the DPLH, WAPC and the Minister. LPPs are intended to guide development-related matters specific to local considerations and do not guide strategic decisions. To have LPPs follow this process would raise significant administrative burden, require additional time and likely to lead to less responsive planning framework (due to local government reluctance to undertake the process to amend them). In accordance with one of the cornerstones of the proposed reform package, the State should direct its focus to strategic planning instruments, not LPPs.</p> <p>The implementation of a LPP template would improve consistency of planning policy across the State, however, it is worth noting that many local governments (including the Shire of Broome) have their own policy template that is applied across internal departments. This would make Local Planning Policies clearly distinct from other Shire of Broome policies.</p>
2.4.2	DPLH to provide guidance for local government in the Local Planning Manual on the content and format of a Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Policies.	In Part	
2.4.3	Local governments currently undertaking, or about to embark on, a substantive review of their planning frameworks delay preparation of local planning strategies and local planning schemes (and related omnibus amendments) until guidance on the format and content of local planning frameworks is available.	No	The Shire of Broome objects to this recommendation. Reform processes generally take time and to delay preparation of Local Planning Schemes and Strategies until the reform is completed is likely to lead to an outdated planning framework and poorer outcomes.
2.4.4	Provide in the LPS Regulations for a clear distinction of the purposes of Local Structure Plans, Activity Centre Plans, Local Development Plans and Local Planning Policies.	Yes	Examples of these could be incorporated into the Local Planning Manual.
2.4.5	The DPLH to provide guidance in the Local Planning Manual on the appropriate use of each local planning instrument.	Yes	As is stated several times throughout the WALGA DPS, a comprehensive review of the Local Planning Manual should be done as a <u>priority</u> , to ensure it is reflective of the current legislative framework and provides adequate guidance to local governments and development proponents.
2.5	Form of a Local Planning Strategy		
2.5.1	The DPLH to update the Local Planning Manual with guidance on the preparation, content and format of a Local Planning Strategy and strategic statement, in a similar form to a Victorian Municipal Strategic Statement.	Yes	Further information required. There is confusion as to whether the Green Paper is recommending that the WAPC has authority over LPP “content” or only “form and manner”. For example, 2.4.2 mentions “content”. 2.6.1 does not mention content. Shire of Broome does not support the State having authority over the content of a LPP.

PROPOSAL		SUPPORT Yes/No/In Part	RESPONSE
2.6	Form of Local Planning Policies		
2.6.1	The LPS Regulations be amended to provide that local planning policies are to be prepared in a manner and form approved by the WAPC.	In Part	As discussed above, further information required. There is confusion as to whether the Green Paper is recommending that the WAPC has authority over LPP “content” or only “form and manner”. For example, 2.4.2 mentions “content,” but 2.6.1 does not mention content. The Shire of Broome does not support the State having authority over the content of a LPP, or the requirement for LPPs to be endorsed by the State.
2.6.2	The DPLH to update the Local Planning Manual to provide guidance for the form, content and writing of a local planning policy.	In Part	
2.7	Consistency of local planning schemes		
2.7.1	Provide in the PD Act that deemed provisions are to be included in a comprehensive local planning scheme.	Yes	The Shire of Broome has already done this to assist users of the Scheme.
2.7.2	Provide in the LPS Regulations that a comprehensive local planning scheme is to include a specific section for deemed provisions.	Yes	
2.7.3	Provide in the LPS Regulations that there are deemed provisions which set out standardised zones, land uses and land use permissibility which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i group like-land uses into themes for which common development standards can be prepared ii identify low risk land use proposals by including suitable parameters for which a streamlined planning process apply iii are mandatory for local government to adopt within their municipalities through the next scheme review or omnibus amendment. 	In Part	While a movement towards greater uniformity in planning schemes may make navigating the planning process easier for proponents working across a number of local governments, the suggestion to make one set of zones, land uses and permissibility mandatory across the State by incorporating these elements into the Deemed Provisions is not supported. The Shire of Broome considers that this will reduce local Government’s ability to tailor their planning instruments to reflect local character and circumstances. It is preferred that the modifications, if undertaken, be contained in the Model rather than Deemed Provisions, as there needs to be an opportunity for local governments to vary them to accommodate special circumstances.
2.7.4	The DPLH to revise and keep up to date the Local Planning Manual to ensure it provides local government with the guidance required to prepare and administer its local planning framework and properly reflects the expectations of DPLH and WAPC.	In Part	Additional information required regarding the role and status of the Local Planning Manual. There is a lot of emphasis on the Manual which suggests that it may be elevated from a guiding document, which may impact upon its implementation. For example, if a local government is following the guidance, and then the WAPC changes it, will the local government have to amend its framework, or restart a review process that is already well progressed?
2.8	Location of Local Development Standards		
2.8.1	Provide in the LPS Regulations that there be a location within the model provisions for mandatory development requirements for key sites and matters.	Yes	

PROPOSAL		SUPPORT Yes/No/In Part	RESPONSE
2.9	On-line Local Planning Schemes		
2.9.1	Develop an interactive Planning Portal for keeping local planning schemes online and accessing them in a legible and user-friendly format.	Yes	It is considered that an up-to-date mapping system should form the cornerstone of any interactive planning tool. This could potentially be linked to other State mapping systems, including DWER and State Heritage mapping.
3.0	A TRANSPARENT PLANNING SYSTEM		
3.2	Community Engagement		
3.2.1	<p>The DPLH should develop a Community Engagement Charter for all aspects of the planning system that includes principles with regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i Planning authorities having a duty to engage with the community in a manner that allows residents to contribute to the making or amending of a strategic plan; and ii In the making or amending of a strategic plan, the community, as soon as possible, be given information as to what is proposed and any documents that the planning authority intends to examine. 	In Part	<p>A Community Engagement Charter may help to improve consistency. However, the current inconsistencies between some local governments may be related to constrained financial and staff resources in many jurisdictions.</p> <p>Meaningful community engagement is supported but any proposal should consider some of the time and cost implications to smaller local governments, who may not be able to achieve the same outcomes as larger local governments with a dedicated Community Engagement team. There is concern that institution of a mandatory process will necessitate that smaller local governments engage external consultants to carry out community engagement. In addition to adding costs, in some circumstances such consultants may not be equipped to access and appreciate local knowledge and gain community trust, which is critical to effective community engagement. Offering free or low-cost training to local practitioners may alleviate some of this risk.</p> <p>Any review should consider the role of social media and the effectiveness of newspaper notices. It would also be beneficial to research best-practice methods for engaging with people with a disability, as the current processes typically require a high level of reading comprehension and the ability to make submissions in writing.</p>
3.2.2	Align engagement processes in the planning regulations to the Community Engagement Charter.	In Part	
3.2.3	Revise public notification and engagement requirements for planning proposals in the PD Act and LPS Regulations to update out-dated requirements.	Yes	
3.2.4	Make provision within the LPS Regulations that the local planning strategy must be in accordance with the Community Strategic Plan under the Local Government Act to the extent that it is relevant.	In Part	The wording 'to the extent it is relevant' is critical. It will be difficult to achieve total alignment in practice at the Shire of Broome as the reviews of the two documents are led by different Directorates and occur during different cycles as directed under legislation.
3.2.5	DPLH to revise the Local Planning Manual to clarify that:	In Part	

PROPOSAL		SUPPORT Yes/No/In Part	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i actions in local planning strategies are limited to those matters that can be carried out within the local planning scheme ii acknowledge a concurrent community participation process between a Strategic Community Plan and a local planning strategy. 		
3.3	Reasons for Decisions		
3.3.1	The DLPH to publish a Guide as to the Scope of Reasons by Planning Decision Makers, having regard to the Queensland model.	In Part	The Shire supports the suggestion that if the planning system is changed to require reasons to be provided for decisions that a guide be prepared by the DLPH. This will ensure consistency across the sector. However, it should not be expected that planning decisions be accompanied by reasons to the same level set out by the State Administrative Tribunal, rather that these be simple in form and content. Given this, the Shire supports WALGA's recommendation that the LPS Regulations include a provision, which is similar to the Queensland model and mentioned in the Green Paper, that summaries should "be of a length that approximately reflects the nature, importance and complexity of the decision, as the time available to prepare it."
3.3.2	Provide in the LPS Regulations that reasons for decisions are to be provided on planning proposals.	In Part	This requirement could be considered as being unnecessarily arduous. However, when referring to the Queensland model, the Green Paper indicates that summaries should "be of a length that approximately reflects the nature, importance and complexity of the decision, as the time available to prepare it" (p.42). This seems to be an attempt to limit the arduousness of this new requirement, if introduced
3.4	Transparency of DLPH and WAPC Statutory Reports		
3.4.1	WAPC practice be modified to publish Statutory Planning Committee and WAPC agenda items, reports and recommendations on region and local schemes and amendments.	In Part	Local governments have raised this issue of transparency, or lack thereof, with the WAPC and SPC numerous times. However, this Green Paper recommendation only proposes the publication of agenda items, reports and recommendations on region and Local Planning Schemes and amendments. The Shire of Broome supports WALGA's recommendation that the scope of the practice modifications include: <i>all planning matters considered by the WAPC, including Local Planning Strategies, POS strategies, and submissions on State Planning Policy reviews, i.e. the consideration of any planning matter that has been publicly advertised should also be publicly available including the schedule of submissions and responses to submissions.</i>
3.5	Reporting by Local and State Government on Planning Matters		

PROPOSAL		SUPPORT Yes/No/In Part	RESPONSE
3.5.1	Provide in regulations mandatory reporting by local government on planning matters.	In Part	The Shire does not raise objections to mandatory reporting, however the scope and content needs to be workshopped with the sector to minimise administrative burden.
3.6	Transparency and Accountability of Development Assessment Panels		
3.6.1	Provide for DAP meetings to be held at regular times and outside of business hours.	Yes	
3.6.2	Provide for the recording of each meeting of a DAP and made available on the DAP website of DPLH.	Yes	
3.6.3	3.6.3 Provide clarification in DAP Practice Notes: i. If new information is submitted to the DAP after an RAR, the DAP should consider whether a decision should be deferred pending further RAR advice ii. As to when it may be appropriate to defer a decision, such as where issues are raised which require further detailed technical consideration by responsible authorities.	Yes	
3.6.4	Amend the DAP Practice Notes to require reasons for decisions to be given in all decisions made by a DAP, including where the DAP adopts the responsible authority's recommendation contained within the RAR.	Yes	
3.6.5	Provide for a requirement that applications amended through a SAT process are readvertised unless the amended plans comply with all development standards.	Yes	
3.6.6	Provide that where a DAP has been invited to reconsider its decision following a SAT mediation, new specialist members be drawn from the available pool of members.	Yes	
3.6.7	The SAT should consider preparing a framework for allowing parties with a sufficient interest in a matter to make a submission or be heard during SAT mediation of DAP matters.	Yes	
3.6.8	Provide for expert DAP members to be drawn from a pool of members across the State on the basis of the type and complexity of the application being heard.	Yes	
3.6.9	Provide for an expanded and flexible meeting process where the DAP Presiding member is of a view in relation to an	Yes	

	PROPOSAL	SUPPORT Yes/No/In Part	RESPONSE
	application for development that wider community and local government viewpoints need to be examined.		
3.6.10	Provide in the DAP Regulations that the WAPC retains its decision making ability with respect to development applications under region schemes.		
3.6.11	Provide for a Presiding Member to be appointed also as the Chief Presiding Member to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i Oversee the quality and consistency of DAP procedures and decisions (such as consistency of the use and content of conditions; the quality of RAR reports) and recommend changes to DAP procedures and Standing Orders to DPLH ii Assist in identifying panel members appropriate to sit in accordance with the basis of the type and complexity of the application being heard iii Identify training needs for DAP members for the approval of the Director General DLPH. 	Yes	
4.0	AN EFFICIENT PLANNING SYSTEM		
4.1	Arrangement of the WA Planning System		
4.1.1	Provide that the PD Act be amended to delete the WAPC function s14.(a)(ii) of advising the Minister for Planning on the administration, revision and reform of legislation.	Yes	
4.1.2	Provide for a local government accreditation process.	In Part	More information is required on this subject. The issue of 'appropriately qualified planners' is likely to require an investment in time and resources to establish an accreditation system. The Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) in the UK requires planners to undertake an assessment of professional competence. The implementation of such an initiative would require a long-term commitment from State government.
4.1.3	Increase delegations from WAPC to DPLH and local government, for the purpose of the WAPC focussing on the State policy framework and regional strategic planning.	In Part	The Shire supports the full content of WALGA's DPS with respect to this item, as set out below. <i>WALGA's understanding of this recommendation is that:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accredited Local Governments should receive delegation from the WAPC to determine small infill subdivision within the metropolitan area and regional centres, and subdivision in accordance with an approved local structure plan.

PROPOSAL	SUPPORT Yes/No/In Part	RESPONSE
		<p>- <i>The “Optional DAP applications” category specified within the DAP Regulations for accredited local governments could be removed, handing back determination of these applications to the local government.</i></p> <p><i>Based on this understanding, the recommendation is supported, subject to discussions with the local government sector on further detail as to what this accreditation entails.</i></p> <p><i>Consideration should also be given to extending these delegations to accredited local governments to include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Structure Plans. Local Governments have indicated that there is scope for substantial improvement in planning processing times if structure plan responsibilities are returned to local government;</i> - <i>Scheme Amendments, which are in accordance with an approved Local Planning Strategy. Local Governments have indicated that the WAPC typically add an extra 6 months (minimum) onto a scheme amendment timeline. Therefore it would be of assistance to proponents and state and local government alike if the table on page 53 listed accredited local governments as the approval authority for scheme amendments that are in accordance with an approved Local Planning Strategy, and DLPH as having approval authority where the local government is not accredited.</i> <p><i>These delegations would not only improve the performance of the planning system but also tie in with the Green Paper’s direction to give greater emphasis to the content, relevance, timeliness and consultation process associated with Local Planning Strategies as a leading planning document. Increasing delegations to local governments would help to avoid duplication and align with leading development assessment practices advocated for by the Development Assessment Australia, 2005: Principle number “5, a single point of assessment”.</i></p> <p>Reference: Development Assessment Forum (2005) A Leading Practice Model for Development Assessment in Australia, https://www.planning.org.au/documents/item/6876, p.13.</p>
4.1.4	Provide for the PD Act to be amended to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i Revise the membership of the WAPC to 5-7 members to have experience, skills or knowledge of any one or more of the following fields— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning, including strategic land use planning in 	Yes

PROPOSAL	SUPPORT Yes/No/In Part	RESPONSE	
<p>metropolitan or regional areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • infrastructure planning, delivery, policy and strategy • public administration and public policy • property development • housing supply • corporate or public sector governance • economics, finance or financial management • management of business or commercial ventures • local government. <p>ii Remove committees of the WAPC from Schedule 2, in favour of an ability for the WAPC to establish committees to advise the Commission on any matter, recognising the Statutory Planning Committee and Executive, Finance and Property Committee carry out core functions of the WAPC and will be required immediately under this new system. A committee would consist of at least one member of the Commission who is to be the chairperson of the committee.</p>			
4.1.5	The role and purpose of a Coastal Planning Committee be reviewed, and consideration be given to the most appropriate host organisation and regulatory framework for the Committee.	In Part	<p>It is recommended that State government provide a greater level of guidance to local governments dealing with coastal risk hazard risk. It is an issue – similar to bushfire – that presents a long-term risk to the state, particularly coastal communities. As per WALGA’s DPS:</p> <p><i>Currently, local governments can seek advice from various government departments and independent consultants to assist with these decisions. However there is potential for this advice to be inconsistent and conflicting. Most Australian states have specialist bodies who can provide multi-disciplinary advice to local governments in these situations (e.g. NSW Coastal Council, SA Coastal Protection Board, and Victorian Catchment Management Authorities).</i></p> <p>The Shire considers that a multi-disciplinary referral body with respect to coastal planning is likely to improve the quality of decision making and consistency across jurisdictions.</p>
4.1.6	Revise the Service Delivery Agreement between the WAPC and DPLH to accord with the revised roles of the WAPC and DPLH.	Yes	
4.1.7	Provide for new positions to be created to enable DPLH to recruit senior and experienced town planners to undertake strategic planning and policy development for the WAPC.	Yes	

PROPOSAL		SUPPORT Yes/No/In Part	RESPONSE
4.1.8	The DPLH and WAPC establish a protocol for the engagement of non-public sector expertise in the scoping and development of policies.	Yes	
4.2	Process Efficiency for Planning Proposals		
4.2.1	A Planning Reform Team be retained by DPLH to implement proposals arising from the planning review and ongoing reforms to the Western Australian planning system.	Yes	
4.2.2	A framework for referral of planning applications, to be incorporated in regulations as appropriate.	Yes	This recommendation is supported. The guidance should clearly establish when to refer, the length of the referral period, and the purposes of the referral. The Shire further supports WALGA's recommendation that referral times should be consistent across all State government departments.
4.2.3	As an interim arrangement, the DPLH Independent Planning Reviewer be available to assist on issues regarding referral for WAPC matters.	Yes	
4.2.4	Provide in regulation that an applicant may seek pre-lodgement advice for development applications.	In Part	This is currently undertaken by the Shire of Broome through issuing written planning advice. The fee associated with should be determined by the local government depending on the scope of advice sought.
4.2.5	Development Assessment Guidance be published by DPLH in consultation with local government and industry bodies.	Yes	
4.2.6	Provide in the LPS Regulations that a local government must advise an applicant within 10 business days of receipt of a development application whether additional information is required.	Yes	
4.2.7	Provide a procedure for local government and developer proponents to agree upfront the scope and content of a local structure plan with the DPLH and other agencies as appropriate.	Yes	Whilst this recommendation is supported it should not be assumed that no further changes may be required once referral agency responses have been provided. It is the local government's responsibility to balance any competing objectives and identify any issues once all the information has been gathered. Further correspondence with statutory authorities may be required to achieve a mediated outcome.
4.2.8	Provide in the PD Act that the implementation section (part one) of approved structure plans and activity centre plans are to be read as part of the scheme and have the "force and effect" of the scheme.	Yes	Agree that adopted Structure Plans should have the force and effect of the LPS6. The Regulations would need to be updated to be consistent as they currently set out that a local government is to have "due regard to, but is not bound by, the structure plan".
4.2.9	Provide in the LPS Regulations that local government may refuse to progress a local structure plan or activity centre plan and amendment, if it is of the view that the proposals lacks sufficient planning merit. The amendment should also	Yes	

	PROPOSAL	SUPPORT Yes/No/In Part	RESPONSE
	include ability for a proponent affected by such a decision to seek the views of the WAPC and the power for the WAPC to direct a local government to progress a proposal.		
4.2.10	Provide for development contribution plan cost and cost contributions schedules to be included as a schedule in local planning schemes.	No	Further information is required in relation to what constitutes a 'material change'. For example, what would require a scheme amendment – indexation increases? Receipt of successful grant funding? A revised cost estimate being provided? More information is required before any level of support can be provided, as incorporating detailed financial information which is subject to change in the Scheme is likely to lead to a high administrative burden. It is noted that costs associated with a Development Contribution Plan are generally reviewed by the local government yearly, in-line with best practice, to ensure an accurate assessment of liability can be rendered.
4.2.11	Establish a Development Contributions Infrastructure Panel to review proposed local planning scheme amendments that include Development Contribution Plans, with the cost of the review to be included as a development contribution plan administration cost.	In Part	As per WALGA's DPS, the Shire supports the establishment of a Development Contributions Infrastructure Panel, however it: <i>does not support the recommendation to add the cost of operating the Panel as additional item within the development contribution plan, as this would be more administration for a Local Government to manage within this process.</i> <i>If the DPLH needs additional expertise, then resources should be provided within the existing budgeting structures of the Department, not an additional tax placed on the DCP for local government to collate and send to the Department.</i>
4.2.12	Provide for in the PD Act an ability for the Minister for Planning to: i require a special report from a local government on the operation of a development contribution plan ii instruct a local government to take particular actions for the administration of a development contribution plan.	In Part	
4.2.13	Provide in the LPS Regulations for a voluntary 'deemed-to-comply' check for single houses and provide in the P&D Regulations a specified fee for the service.	Yes	
4.2.14	Provide in the LPS Regulations and R-Codes a fast-track 30-day planning approval process for single house applications that require only minor variations to the R-Codes.	In Part	Minor variations, such as reduced building setbacks, may require consultation with adjoining properties owners, and subsequently be referred to Council for determination. Such a provision would only be workable if the provision did not affect any adjoining properties.
4.2.15	A framework for "Basic", "Standard" and "Complex" streams for region scheme amendments, local planning strategies	In Part	As per the WALGA DPS, further information is required in terms of:

PROPOSAL		SUPPORT Yes/No/In Part	RESPONSE
	and amendments, and local structure plan/activity centre plans and amendments be developed by DPLH for implementation through regulation.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>The types of proposals that would fit within each 'track';</i> - <i>The timeframes for assessment, and form of consultation within each 'track' by application type; and</i> - <i>How the WAPC will delegate decision making for each 'track' by application type.</i>
5.0	PLANNING FOR CONSOLIDATED AND CONNECTED SMART GROWTH		
5.1	Planning for Targeted Urban Infill		
5.1.1	That the State Government develops clear arrangements for the planning and delivery of the key urban infill locations of activity centres, urban corridors and station precincts, including prioritising of areas which require State and local government collaboration.	No comment	
5.2	Updating Growth Management Policies		
5.2.1	A new Consolidated and Connected Smart Growth State Planning Policy that builds on the State Government's METRONET policy and establishes contemporary smart growth principles and practices.	No comment	
5.3	Planning for Land Use and Infrastructure Coordination		
5.3.1	The WAPC to assist with land use and infrastructure coordination for the delivery of priority precincts through a renewed Committee.	No comment	
5.4	Coordinating State Infrastructure with Regional Rezoning		
5.4.1	Provide in the Metropolitan Region Scheme an "Industrial Deferred Zone".	No comment	
5.4.2	The WAPC to ensure that any requirements for State infrastructure are in place in the lifting of Urban Deferment or Industrial Deferment, and that the draft Guidelines for Lifting of Urban Deferment 2017 be amended accordingly.	No comment	
5.5	Coordination of Infrastructure for Land Development		
5.5.1	Provision be made for advice on the forward planning of State infrastructure, including utility providers to assist local	Yes	

PROPOSAL		SUPPORT Yes/No/In Part	RESPONSE
	governments in the preparation of local planning strategies and structure plans.		
5.6	Coordination of Land Use and Transport for Corridor Development		
5.6.1	The MRS be updated to include "Urban Corridor" as a category of Reserved Roads based on Perth and Peel @ 3.5 Million, with the Department of Transport being made responsible for coordinating a whole of transport portfolio response to planning proposals along the corridor.	No comment	
5.6.2	A review be undertaken of regional road reservations in place to accommodate road widenings within the Metropolitan Region Scheme for designated Urban Corridors.	No comment	
5.7	Liveable Neighbourhoods		
5.7.1	Liveable Neighbourhoods be elevated to a state planning policy and maintained and refined as a best-practice approach to new greenfield development at regional, district and local level, rather including it into a single Neighbourhood part of Design WA.	Yes	The Shire of Broome supports the elevation of Liveable Neighbourhoods to a State Planning Policy. DPLH should as a <u>priority</u> complete its review of Liveable Neighbourhoods and review the various Development Control policies as they often conflict.