Review of capital city strategic planning systems

Report to the Council of Australian Governments

23 December 2011
This work is copyright. In addition to any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, this work may be downloaded, displayed, printed, or reproduced in whole or in part for non-commercial purposes subject to an acknowledgement of the source. Inquiries concerning copyright should be directed to the COAG Reform Council secretariat.

COAG Reform Council
Level 24, 6 O’Connell Street
Sydney NSW 2001
GPO Box 7015
Sydney NSW 2001
T 02 8229 7356
F 02 8229 7399

www.coagreformcouncil.gov.au

The appropriate citation for this Report is:

About the COAG Reform Council

The COAG Reform Council has been established by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) as the key accountability body under the new arrangements for federal financial relations. The council is independent of individual governments and reports directly to COAG. The COAG Reform Council’s mission is to assist COAG to drive its reform agenda by strengthening public accountability of the performance of governments through independent and evidence-based assessment and performance reporting. The council is supported by an Expert Advisory Panel in its cities roles.

COAG Reform Council members

Mr Paul McClintock AO (Chairman)

The Hon Dr Geoff Gallop AC (Deputy Chairman)

Ms Patricia Faulkner AO

Mr John Langoulant AO

Dr Doug McTaggart

Ms Mary Ann O’Loughlin (Executive Councillor and Head of Secretariat)

Cities Expert Advisory Panel members

Professor Brian Howe AO (Chair)

Ms Lucy Turnbull AO (Deputy Chair)

Mr John Denton

Ms Sue Holliday

Professor Duncan MacLennan CBE FRSE AcSS

Ms Jude Munro AO

Mr Rod Pearse OAM

Ms Meredith Sussex AM

Acknowledgements

The council would like to acknowledge the assistance of officials in the Commonwealth, State and Territory governments in preparing this report. The council also wishes to thank the large number of stakeholders who helped by participating in the site visits to capital cities and in the continuous improvement program.
23 December 2011

The Hon Julia Gillard MP
Prime Minister
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Prime Minister

On behalf of the COAG Reform Council, I am pleased to present our report: *Review of capital city strategic planning systems*, prepared in accordance with clause A11(e) of the *Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations* and COAG’s communiqué of 7 December 2009.

This report presents the council’s findings reached after reviewing the eight capital city strategic planning systems with the assistance of the Expert Advisory Panel appointed by COAG. It contains significant detail on each planning system based on substantial work submitted to the council by each State and Territory government.

The council has found both strengths and weaknesses in each capital city strategic planning system. Governments have worked hard to improve their systems but there is further work to do to deliver integrated strategic planning. Continued intergovernmental collaboration on these matters would be a good way to manage the intersection of Commonwealth and State and Territory policies in cities and get the best out of Australia’s thinly spread expertise in managing its cities.

I wish to especially acknowledge the work of the Expert Advisory Panel on this report, particularly in taking the lead on the site visits to each city, on the continuous improvement workshops, and in analysing the submissions made by governments. The quality of the work in this report is in no small part due to the efforts of the panel and the commitment of its members to improving Australia’s cities.

The council hopes that the findings and recommendations in this report assist COAG with its reform agenda.

Yours sincerely

Paul McClintock AO
Chairman
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Overview

Introduction

The Council of Australian Governments has recognised the importance of cities—and of the long-term strategic planning of cities—to growth and productivity, sustainability and liveability, and accommodating demographic change and population growth.

In December 2009, COAG agreed an objective for reform of capital city strategic planning:

To ensure Australian cities are globally competitive, productive, sustainable, liveable and socially inclusive and are well placed to meet future challenges and growth (COAG 2009, p. 20).

In August 2011, COAG also highlighted that the ‘efficient and effective planning of our cities and towns is vital to productivity and investment’ (COAG 2011, p. 2).

COAG has given the COAG Reform Council three tasks in relation to capital cities:

- a review of State and Territory capital city strategic planning systems against nine agreed criteria
- support for continuous improvement in strategic planning
- building and sharing knowledge of best practice planning approaches.

COAG also appointed an Expert Advisory Panel (see Box 1) to assist the council in these tasks.

The nine agreed criteria are at box 1.1.

Governments have worked hard to improve their systems

When COAG agreed to these reforms, it identified nine criteria to ‘re-shape our capital cities’ to manage population and economic growth, address climate change, improve housing affordability and manage urban congestion (COAG 2009, p. 8). These criteria are the basis for the council’s review of State and Territory capital city strategic planning systems.

All governments have actively and genuinely participated in this review process and delivered considerable work. Through these efforts, governments have shown a strong commitment to improving their capital city strategic planning systems.

It has also become clear that, in dealing with the future of their cities, governments share a number of common goals, issues, and challenges.

The COAG reforms have shown the value of collaboration

The council and the panel consider that COAG’s reforms and this process have shown the value of collaboration by governments on planning capital cities. No one government or sphere of government holds all the policy responsibilities or expertise on strategic planning.
Box 1  Key messages from the Expert Advisory Panel

COAG appointed an Expert Advisory Panel (listed inside the cover) to assist the council. The panel has been active in the review, visiting all capital cities and working with governments on the continuous improvement program (see chapter 4). The panel’s advice has substantially shaped this report, its findings and recommendations.

A key message the panel delivered to the council in this review—and wishes to deliver to governments in responding to this report, and to the public in reading it—is that Australia is at a watershed point for its capital cities and their strategic planning. Population growth, demographic change, increasing energy costs and the shift to a knowledge economy have changed the assumptions underpinning the shape and development of Australian cities. Strategic planning of capital cities must change accordingly, underlining the importance of COAG’s agreement of criteria to ‘re-shape our cities’. In the panel’s view, this must also include reconsideration of Australia’s settlement pattern.

Infrastructure is a large part of COAG’s criteria for capital city strategic planning systems and this review. The panel sees a need for a changed approach to infrastructure planning and financing—investment must be strategic, to both overcome a lack of investment in recent decades and to manage infrastructure provision over the medium and long term. Key areas of further effort it has identified in reviewing capital city strategic planning systems are:

- improving freight transport and intermodal networks to support forecast port and airport capacity and growth in the freight task
- putting more emphasis on public transport to combat congestion and address social inclusion by integrating transport planning with land use decisions
- improving project and cost-benefit analysis frameworks so they take better account of externalities and do not unduly discount future benefits.

In criterion four, COAG agreed that capital city strategic planning systems should address a specific set of nationally-significant policy issues. These issues are crucial to the future competitiveness, productivity, sustainability and liveability of capital cities and COAG’s recognition of them is important.

None of the capital city strategic planning systems has been found consistent with criterion four. The panel has highlighted some particular issues that have not received an adequate response from governments:

- demographic change—which has implications for the nature, distribution and diversity of housing stock, for transport and other public services, and for labour market participation
- housing affordability—which remains a significant concern in need of an evidence-based and collaborative response from governments
- social inclusion—the spatial implications of which are poorly analysed and understood.

A key point of this review is that consistency with the criteria does not guarantee successful policy outcomes, or that the actions needed to deliver outcomes will be done. The findings on criterion nine—about implementation—highlight this as an issue for governments.

To meet these challenges, governments need to reflect on what drives change in cities and find ways to improve policy outcomes and to measure successful implementation. Only then can we assess how capital cities are really going against the COAG objective for cities.
There is great potential to improve the understanding between the spheres of government of each others’ perspectives and roles in cities. This would assist in managing the tensions and trade offs between the perspectives and tasks of each sphere.

Understanding and coordinating across the spheres of government are also important to the achievement of economic, social and environmental outcomes in cities. This is not only because it brings together the specific functions and perspectives of the spheres of government, but because it makes the best use of thinly spread expertise and skills in managing Australian cities.

To achieve COAG’s intent, it is important that governments continue to collaborate on the strategic planning of capital cities.

**Box 2 Recommendation 1**

The COAG Reform Council notes that all governments have put significant work into this project and responded to it in a constructive and collaborative way, and recommends that COAG:

- **continue** with intergovernmental collaboration on the strategic planning of Australian capital cities—working together, sharing information and expertise, and supporting ongoing research on cities.

**Review of capital city strategic planning systems**

This report presents the findings of the review of capital city strategic planning systems by the council and the panel. The approach taken acknowledges the breadth and complexity of capital city strategic planning systems and allowed substantial opportunities for input by governments. The approach primarily rests on critical analysis of an account by each government of its consistency with the nine criteria. Based on the analysis, the council made graded findings on consistency against each criterion (see box 1.1 on page 22 for an explanation of the consistency categories).

Some key points about the review are that:

- it is a review of *strategic* planning, not just statutory planning—meaning it looks at infrastructure planning and economic development and other issues broader than the typical planning domains of zoning and approvals
- it is a review of planning systems, not just plans—meaning it covers institutional and decision-making arrangements as well as strategic planning documents
- it is a review of consistency with the criteria, not against performance measures—meaning it does not make findings on the results of the system
- it is not a review of the policy directions being pursued by governments—for example, the review is silent on immigration levels or settlement patterns in Australia.

**Integrated strategic planning remains a priority**

One broad finding of the review is that the nine criteria are, in essence, about the practices and institutional arrangements needed to deliver integrated strategic planning. To differing degrees, all State and Territory governments have long term, whole-of-government and goal-oriented strategic plans, and all have exhibited strengths and weaknesses in their capital city strategic planning
systems. No system has been found wholly consistent with the criteria, which means that further work is needed on the institutional arrangements to deliver integration.

The need for integration is well understood even if how to deliver it is not. Integration cannot be quantified and there are likely significant lags between government vision-setting, planning and project delivery and the apparent current integration or otherwise of land use, economic development and transport in capital cities. Current examples of good or failed integration were likely set in train many years ago and may not relate to the way the system currently operates.

A continued focus by governments on improving integration is needed.

The Commonwealth Government also has a role in capital cities

This review focused on the capital city strategic planning systems of State and Territory governments—those with the main responsibility for capital cities. The Commonwealth Government’s policies regarding capital cities were not reviewed against the criteria.

However, the council and panel have observed that the Commonwealth Government’s policies are important to the future of Australian capital cities and their strategic planning. The Commonwealth Government’s stewardship of the Australian economy—which is significantly affected by capital cities and their productivity—means it also has a valid role in capital cities.

Funding decisions or contributions toward infrastructure should be made with regard for place and for the social, environmental and economic sustainability of capital cities. Although no system has been found wholly consistent with the criteria, the collective findings for the cities against criteria three and five—particularly relevant to infrastructure planning—are better than against most other criteria.

A discussion of the relationship between the Commonwealth Government’s approach and State and Territory strategic planning is provided in chapter 6. The extent of the relationship highlights that it is as important for the Commonwealth Government to take a coherent approach to cities as it is for State and Territory governments to take an integrated approach.

Findings on consistency for each capital city

Part D contains an explanation of the findings on each criterion for each capital city. The findings for each city are also summarised below.

Sydney

In reviewing the strategic planning system for Sydney, the COAG Reform Council and Expert Advisory Panel have made the following high level findings:

- The New South Wales Government is reforming its strategic planning system. As such, the system is in transition and this has affected a number of the findings.
- The system contains strong planning and policy content, however, it lacks the hard-edged accountability, performance and implementation measures to drive these policies.
- The drive toward densification and making Sydney a ‘city of cities’ requires a delicate balancing act between affordability and growth, on the one hand, and productivity and sustainability goals on the other.
A summary of the findings for Sydney against the nine criteria are in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion one: integration</td>
<td>Partially consistent—reform pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion two: hierarchy of plans</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion three: nationally significant infrastructure</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion four: nationally significant policy issues</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion five: capital city networks</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion six: planning for future growth</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion seven: frameworks for investment and innovation</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion eight: urban design and architecture</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (a): accountabilities, timelines and performance measures</td>
<td>Not consistent—reform pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (b): intergovernmental cooperation</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (c): evaluation and review cycles</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (d): consultation and engagement</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Melbourne**

In reviewing the strategic planning system for Melbourne, the COAG Reform Council and Expert Advisory Panel have made the following high level findings:

- The Victorian Government is reforming its strategic planning system. As such, the system is in transition and this has affected a number of the findings.
- Melbourne faces significant challenges accommodating future growth in freight both in terms of port capacity and the infrastructure to support expanded capacity.
- Strategic policies and underpinning analysis for nominated activity centres is unclear.

A summary of the findings for Melbourne against the nine criteria are in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion one: integration</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion two: hierarchy of plans</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion three: nationally significant infrastructure</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion four: nationally significant policy issues</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion five: capital city networks</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion six: planning for future growth</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criterion seven: frameworks for investment and innovation
Partially consistent

### Criterion eight: urban design and architecture
Largely consistent

### Criterion nine (a): accountabilities, timelines and performance measures
Not consistent

### Criterion nine (b): intergovernmental cooperation
Largely consistent

### Criterion nine (c): evaluation and review cycles
Partially consistent

### Criterion nine (d): consultation and engagement
Partially consistent

#### South East Queensland/Brisbane

In reviewing the strategic planning system for South East Queensland and Brisbane, the COAG Reform Council and Expert Advisory Panel have made the following high level findings:

- **Overall,** the Queensland planning system has robust mechanisms to support cross-government coordination and implementation. The 'line of sight' concept provides a useful means for articulating and driving vertical integration—the link between strategic visions/goals and actions on the ground.

- **While** the Queensland planning system has strong integration mechanisms, the same cannot be said about its accountability and performance measurement systems. For example, a set of performance indicators that are clearly linked to the goals and outcomes of the Regional Plan is yet to be developed.

A summary of the findings for South East Queensland/Brisbane against the nine criteria are in Table 3.

#### Table 3 Findings of consistency for South East Queensland/Brisbane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion one: integration</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion two: hierarchy of plans</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion three: nationally significant infrastructure</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion four: nationally significant policy issues</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion five: capital city networks</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion six: planning for future growth</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion seven: frameworks for investment and innovation</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion eight: urban design and architecture</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (a): accountabilities, timelines and performance measures</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (b): intergovernmental cooperation</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (c): evaluation and review cycles</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (d): consultation and engagement</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perth

In reviewing the strategic planning system for Perth, the COAG Reform Council and Expert Advisory Panel have made the following high level findings:

- The statutory underpinnings of the strategic planning system are strong, supported by sound mechanisms such as the Western Australian Planning Commission and the corridor reservations in the Metropolitan Region Scheme.
- However, at this stage, the plans that set out the long-term vision for Perth do not contain clear measurable outcomes or the actions to pursue those goals. Both accountability for and performance monitoring of outcomes and implementation are limited.

A summary of the findings for Perth against the nine criteria are in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion one: integration</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion two: hierarchy of plans</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion three: nationally significant infrastructure</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion four: nationally significant policy issues</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion five: capital city networks</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion six: planning for future growth</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion seven: frameworks for investment and innovation</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion eight: urban design and architecture</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (a): accountabilities, timelines and performance measures</td>
<td>Partially consistent—reform pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (b): intergovernmental cooperation</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (c): evaluation and review cycles</td>
<td>Partially consistent—reform pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (d): consultation and engagement</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adelaide

In reviewing the strategic planning system for Adelaide, the COAG Reform Council and Expert Advisory Panel have made the following high level findings:

- The Plan for Greater Adelaide provides a framework for integration and is supported by strong performance measures and implementation monitoring.
- However, the system remains to be tested and contains some ambitious targets for which the viability has not been clearly established.

A summary of the findings for Adelaide against the nine criteria are in Table 5.
Table 5  Findings of consistency for Adelaide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion one: integration</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion two: hierarchy of plans</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion three: nationally significant infrastructure</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion four: nationally significant policy issues</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion five: capital city networks</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion six: planning for future growth</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion seven: frameworks for investment and innovation</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion eight: urban design and architecture</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (a): accountabilities, timelines and performance measures</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (b): intergovernmental cooperation</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (c): evaluation and review cycles</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (d): consultation and engagement</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hobart

In reviewing the strategic planning system for Hobart, the COAG Reform Council and Expert Advisory Panel have made the following high level findings:

- The strategic planning system for Greater Hobart is changing. The Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy was declared on 27 October 2011 and will be basis of the Hobart Capital City Plan.
- Infrastructure in Tasmania could be better used to pursue strategic goals for Hobart through development of a capital city plan for Greater Hobart.
- The economic and other implications of ageing in Hobart are identified as a priority; however, there is no clear plan to address them.

A summary of the findings for Hobart against the nine criteria are in Table 6.

Table 6  Findings of consistency for Hobart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion one: integration</td>
<td>Partially consistent—reform pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion two: hierarchy of plans</td>
<td>Partially consistent—reform pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion three: nationally significant infrastructure</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion four: nationally significant policy issues</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion five: capital city networks</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canberra

In reviewing the strategic planning system for Canberra, the COAG Reform Council and Expert Advisory Panel have made the following high level findings:

- The recent Hawke Review of the Australian Capital Territory public service recommended improvements to strategic decision making and budgeting processes in the ACT that are being implemented—these may also address some of the findings of this review.
- There is an ongoing need to coordinate with the Commonwealth and New South Wales governments.

A summary of the findings for Canberra against the nine criteria are in Table 7.

### Table 7  Findings of consistency for Canberra

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion one: integration</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion two: hierarchy of plans</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion three: nationally significant infrastructure</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion four: nationally significant policy issues</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion five: capital city networks</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion six: planning for future growth</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion seven: frameworks for investment and innovation</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion eight: urban design and architecture</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (a): accountabilities, timelines and performance measures</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (b): intergovernmental cooperation</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (c): evaluation and review cycles</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (d): consultation and engagement</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Darwin

In reviewing the strategic planning system for Darwin, the COAG Reform Council and Expert Advisory Panel have made the following high level findings:

- The Northern Territory Government has a clear sense of the place of Darwin in the Territory and in the network of Australian cities as a result of its strategic geographic position.
- The draft Greater Darwin Plan—the metropolitan strategic plan for Darwin and a new initiative for the Northern Territory planning system—has been approved by Cabinet and will be released as a consultation draft in early 2012.
- Sound evidence-based land use planning is in place, but it will also be important that the new metropolitan plan considers how the planned settlement of Weddell, some distance from the city centre, will fit into the long term goals for Greater Darwin over time.

A summary of the findings for Darwin against the nine criteria are in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion one: integration</td>
<td>Partially consistent—reform pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion two: hierarchy of plans</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion three: nationally significant infrastructure</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion four: nationally significant policy issues</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion five: capital city networks</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion six: planning for future growth</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion seven: frameworks for investment and innovation</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion eight: urban design and architecture</td>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (a): accountabilities, timelines and performance measures</td>
<td>Partially consistent—reform pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (b): intergovernmental cooperation</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (c): evaluation and review cycles</td>
<td>Partially consistent—reform pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion nine (d): consultation and engagement</td>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Box 3  Recommendation 2

The COAG Reform Council recommends that COAG note that none of the capital city strategic planning systems were found to be wholly consistent with the agreed criteria—but a number of governments have put real effort into improving their systems over the course of this process.

COAG should encourage governments to continue to focus their efforts on improved integration—complementary and consistent planning and delivery across relevant parts of government, especially transport, economic development and land use, including:

- integration within governments, including the Commonwealth as well as State and Territory, and local governments
- integration between governments, based on continued collaboration.

Continuous improvement in strategic planning

Three areas have been highlighted by the COAG Reform Council and the Expert Advisory Panel as areas for continuous improvement by governments. The work done to support collaboration among governments on these issues under the continuous improvement program is discussed in chapter 4.

Building knowledge about capital cities

One area for continuous improvement is information on Australian capital cities.

To handle the complexity of strategic planning of cities requires sound information and evidence. In reviewing strategic planning systems in Australian capital cities, the council and panel have seen a variety of approaches to information and performance measures.

Three areas for further work in this field were identified:

- A need to improve information on cities—Work should be done to understand what information is readily available and what could be available through greater access to administrative data and ‘smart’ systems.
- Supporting sound policy evaluation and review—Based on better information, work could be done to improve evidence-based policy analysis and review regarding the nationally-significant policy issues in cities.
- Measuring progress—There is a case for greater knowledge sharing and collaboration on these systems across governments to improve the credibility of Australian capital city strategic planning systems and provide a sound framework for evidence-based policy interventions.
**Box 4 Recommendation 3**

The COAG Reform Council recommends that COAG note that the agreed criteria for capital city strategic planning systems are necessary but not sufficient to deliver on its objective of globally competitive, productive, sustainable, liveable and socially inclusive cities that are well placed to meet future challenges and growth.

COAG should focus continuous improvement efforts on outcomes in cities, including through:

- **collaboration** by governments to improve information and data about Australian cities
- a commitment to evidence-based policy interventions in cities
- **clear frameworks** for measuring progress and monitoring implementation of strategic planning in cities.

**Building mandates**

A second area for improvement is community engagement and consultation.

Guiding a capital city toward a long-term vision of the shape and nature of the city requires widespread support for the vision and recognition among non-supporters that the vision is credible and legitimate. This is especially the case where that vision is transformative.

The review found that all governments are consulting stakeholders and the public on elements of their strategic planning systems. However, despite this, there remains opposition and a lack of cooperation with some implementation activities in Australian capital cities—which can hinder governments in delivering their visions and can be an extra layer of risk on the private sector.

The Productivity Commission also found in its *Performance Benchmarking of Australian Business Regulation: Planning, Zoning and Development Assessments* the importance of community engagement at the strategic planning stage—that is, in setting the long-term vision of the city, its shape, its centres, its density and other factors (Productivity Commission 2011).

**Box 5 Recommendation 4**

The COAG Reform Council recommends that all governments commit to ongoing engagement with communities, business and all stakeholders in setting, implementing and reviewing long-term plans for capital cities.

**Building effective frameworks for investment and innovation**

In a market economy the delivery of most of the houses, buildings, jobs, services and infrastructure in a city will be done by the private sector. Strategic visions for cities that set out desired settlement and job dispersion patterns must take account of the motivations of these private sector actors and the frameworks within which they operate.

Some part of this framework is established by government in delivering public goods and trying to ensure that urban development achieves broader social, economic and environmental outcomes.
This is an issue common to all the systems the council reviewed. The main elements of a framework for investment and innovation that require further work are:

- consideration of the economic viability of the plans as part of planning—looking at the markets that affect housing, jobs, infrastructure and services and their locations
- consideration of the effect of government regulatory, planning and taxation policies on these markets and the likelihood of achieving the key elements of strategic plans.

**Box 6  Recommendation 5**

The COAG Reform Council recommends that COAG encourage governments to actively consider ways to improve the effectiveness of the frameworks for investment and innovation in capital cities, including by:

- enhancing the understanding of the urban and land economics of capital cities
- considering the cumulative impact of the planning, regulatory and taxation arrangements that apply to housing, jobs and infrastructure in capital cities.

**Best practice planning approaches**

In reviewing capital city strategic planning systems, the Expert Advisory Panel highlighted the following examples of best practice in consistency with the agreed criteria. These examples are set out in greater detail in chapter 5.

**Criterion one: integration**

NSW 2021 stood out as an example of a good State Plan that provides unifying objectives supported by clear actions and performance measures. The Northern Territory Government’s sense of the strategic position of Darwin and its long-term potential is also a highlight in terms of unifying objectives.

The Western Australian Planning Commission and the Western Australian Directors General Working Group were good institutional structures for delivering integrated, whole of government advice to Cabinet. The Planning Commission in particular stood out as an alternative to the typical path of plans through planning departments and Cabinet coordination processes.

**Criterion two: hierarchy of plans**

The ‘line of sight’ concept used in the South East Queensland Regional Plan is both a useful communication tool regarding the translation of high level priorities into local actions as well as a useful discipline in doing that translation.

**Criterion three: nationally-significant infrastructure**

The Queensland Infrastructure Plan, and especially the indicative planning of infrastructure projects beyond the typical forward estimates period, is a highlight of the responses to this criterion. The Western Australian Government’s Metropolitan Region Scheme stands out as a mechanism for identifying and reserving land for urban expansion and transport corridors.
Criterion four: nationally-significant policy issues

The cost-benefit analysis of alternative growth paths for Sydney done for the Department of Planning and Infrastructure by the Centre for International Economics provides a good example of informed policy-making—and allowing for it to be contested by being publicly released. The background technical analysis done by KPMG and others for the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide is another highlight in informed policy making in modelling the effects of meeting the goals in the Plan.

Criterion five: regional networks

The Tasmanian Government gave the clearest view of its regional networks and their particular significance, including potentially city-shaping opportunities as a result of the shift in freight handling from the Hobart waterfront to the Brighton intermodal terminal.

Criterion six: evidence-based land release

The Western Australian Urban Growth Monitor is a highlight in terms of information about land release. In particular, the Urban Growth Monitor includes information on infill development, reflecting the Department of Planning’s role. This shows the potential for intergovernmental collaboration on releasing administrative data to enable this level of information to be available in all capital cities (see recommendation 3).

Criterion eight: urban design

The South Australian Integrated Design Commission is a good example of a more systematic approach to design in strategic planning. Similarly, NSW’s State Environmental Planning Policy 65, requiring independent expert advice on the design of all residential flat proposals, is another good example.

Criterion nine (a): accountabilities, timelines and performance measures

The public performance reporting arrangements for the South Australia Strategic Plan, including the interactive supporting website, are a highlight among the responses to this criterion regarding accountability for outcomes and for implementation. Similar arrangements are sketched out for the Plan for Greater Adelaide but the first reports are yet to be released.

A standout part of these reporting arrangements is the inclusion of a focus on achievability of targets over the life of the plan—it is hoped this focus may lift the level of analysis of the viability of plans over time.

Criterion nine (b): intergovernmental coordination

The making of a strategic assessment agreement under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 [Cwlth] for the Melbourne Urban Growth Boundary expansion is a highlight regarding this particular aspect of the criterion. NSW, Western Australia and the ACT also now have such agreements in place.
Criterion nine (d): consultation and engagement

*Canberra 2030: Time to Talk* was a major community engagement by the ACT Government in 2010 to discuss the significance of a growing population, identifying the impacts, trade-offs, potential opportunities, and through this, the priorities for urban development policies. The outcomes of this process are being incorporated into the review of the Canberra Spatial Plan and the Time to Talk website continues to be used as a means of consultation with the general community.

**Box 7 Recommendation 6**

The COAG Reform Council recommends that COAG note the best practice highlights of consistency against the agreed criteria.
Recommendations

Recommendation 1

The COAG Reform Council notes that all governments have put significant work into this project and responded to it in a constructive and collaborative way, and recommends that COAG:

- continue with intergovernmental collaboration on the strategic planning of Australian capital cities—working together, sharing information and expertise, and supporting ongoing research on cities.

Recommendation 2

The COAG Reform Council recommends that COAG note that none of the capital city strategic planning systems were found to be wholly consistent with the agreed criteria—but a number of governments have put real effort into improving their systems over the course of this process.

COAG should encourage governments to continue to focus their efforts on improved integration—complementary and consistent planning and delivery across relevant parts of government, especially transport, economic development and land use, including:

- integration within governments, including the Commonwealth as well as State and Territory, and local governments
- integration between governments, based on continued collaboration.

Recommendation 3

The COAG Reform Council recommends that COAG note that the agreed criteria for capital city strategic planning systems are necessary but not sufficient to deliver on its objective of globally competitive, productive, sustainable, liveable and socially inclusive cities that are well placed to meet future challenges and growth.

COAG should focus continuous improvement efforts on outcomes in cities, including through:

- collaboration by governments to improve information and data about Australian cities
- a commitment to evidence-based policy interventions in cities
- clear frameworks for measuring progress and monitoring implementation of strategic planning in cities.

Recommendation 4

The COAG Reform Council recommends that all governments commit to ongoing engagement with communities, business and all stakeholders in setting, implementing and reviewing long-term plans for capital cities.
(recommendations continued)

**Recommendation 5**

The COAG Reform Council recommends that COAG *encourage* governments to actively consider ways to improve the effectiveness of the frameworks for investment and innovation in capital cities, including by:

- enhancing the understanding of the urban and land economics of capital cities
- considering the cumulative impact of the planning, regulatory and taxation arrangements that apply to housing, jobs and infrastructure in capital cities.

**Recommendation 6**

The COAG Reform Council recommends that COAG *note* the best practice highlights of consistency against the agreed criteria.
PART A: CONTEXT
Chapter 1. Introduction

At a glance

In December 2009, COAG asked the COAG Reform Council to independently review the consistency of capital city strategic planning systems against nine criteria and report back to COAG by the end of 2011.

- The council’s approach to its review of capital city strategic planning systems was developed in consultation with governments over the first half of 2010.
- The council has made graded findings of consistency to present a more subtle understanding of the capital city strategic planning systems it has reviewed, and to give credit to the positive aspects of respective government strategic planning systems.
- The council’s findings of consistency with the criteria are not comparable across the cities.
- There are several other limitations on comparing the results to keep in mind when considering the findings and their definitions:
  - they are an assessment of the institutions, decision-making structures and processes, and policy coherence in the system
  - they are a point-in-time assessment of consistency
  - they have not been adjusted for the scale of the challenges facing each city
  - strategic planning is acutely political.

1.1 COAG’s decisions

In December 2009, the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) agreed to reforms to the strategic planning of Australian capital cities. The objective of the reforms is:

To ensure Australian cities are globally competitive, productive, sustainable, liveable and socially inclusive and are well placed to meet future challenges and growth (COAG 2009, p. 20).

To pursue this objective, COAG also agreed to nine criteria for capital city strategic planning systems and that, by 1 January 2012, the States and Territories would have consistent systems in place for their capital cities. The nine criteria are set out in Box 1.1.

COAG asked the council to independently review the consistency of capital city strategic planning systems with the criteria and report back to COAG by the end of 2011. The council was also asked to support continuous improvement in capital city strategic planning systems and to build and share knowledge of best practice planning approaches.

COAG agreed that an Expert Advisory Panel would support the council in completing these tasks. The panel membership was announced by the then Prime Minister, the Hon Kevin Rudd MP, on 17 June 2010 (Rudd MP 2010).

This chapter sets out the council’s approach to this task and a guide to understanding the findings of the council.
Box 1.1 COAG criteria for capital city strategic planning systems

Capital city strategic planning systems should:

1. be integrated:
   a) across functions, including land-use and transport planning, economic and infrastructure development, environmental assessment and urban development, and
   b) across government agencies;

2. provide for a consistent hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans, including:
   a) long term (for example, 15-30 year) integrated strategic plans,
   b) medium term (for example, 5-15 year) prioritised infrastructure and land-use plans, and
   c) near term prioritised infrastructure project pipeline backed by appropriately detailed project plans;

3. provide for nationally-significant economic infrastructure (both new and upgrade of existing) including:
   a) transport corridors,
   b) international gateways,
   c) intermodal connections,
   d) major communications and utilities infrastructure, and
   e) reservation of appropriate lands to support future expansion;

4. address nationally-significant policy issues including:
   a) population growth and demographic change,
   b) productivity and global competitiveness,
   c) climate change mitigation and adaptation,
   d) efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets,
   e) connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets,
   f) development of major urban corridors,
   g) social inclusion,
   h) health, liveability, and community wellbeing,
   i) housing affordability, and
   j) matters of national environmental significance;

5. consider and strengthen the networks between capital cities and major regional centres, and other important domestic and international connections;

6. provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfields development;

7. clearly identify priorities for investment and policy effort by governments, and provide an effective framework for private sector investment and innovation;

8. encourage world-class urban design and architecture; and

9. provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:
   a) clear accountabilities, timelines and appropriate performance measures,
   b) coordination between all three levels of government, with opportunities for Commonwealth and Local Government input, and linked, streamlined and efficient approval processes including under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999,
   c) evaluation and review cycles that support the need for balance between flexibility and certainty, including trigger points that identify the need for change in policy settings, and
   d) appropriate consultation and engagement with external stakeholders, experts and the wider community.

Source: (COAG 2009, pp. 20–21)
1.2 The council’s approach

The COAG Reform Council’s approach to its review of capital city strategic planning systems was developed in consultation with governments over the first half of 2010. It involved two reporting stages:

- interim reports with preliminary findings delivered to governments in April 2011, which were not publicly released\(^1\)
- a final report delivered to COAG by the end of 2011 and publicly released shortly afterward.

This two report approach acknowledges the breadth and complexity of the issues related to capital city strategic planning systems. It provides substantial opportunities for input by governments, which is important given the council’s approach assumes each government gave the best possible account of its system against the criteria. The council then critically analysed these submissions through a basic logic testing process (detailed at chapter 7) with the assistance of the Expert Advisory Panel appointed by COAG.

Interim reports

The interim reports provided the council’s preliminary findings and an opportunity for governments to respond with further detail or evidence and/or with policy adaptation.

The key inputs to the interim reports were:

- an outline of the strategic planning system provided by each government
- information gathering and discussions with governments and key stakeholders through a series of visits to each city by the Expert Advisory Panel
- a self-assessment by each government of the consistency of its capital city strategic planning system with the agreed criteria
- internal and other research into key issues identified in these processes.

The interim reports were substantially based on information presented by governments in their self-assessments.

The interim reports provided a guide to governments on the areas of interest to the council and its Expert Advisory Panel for further research and discussion with governments. They also provided a basis for more detailed examination of the policy content of each strategic planning system—especially regarding its coherence with the objectives of that system.

---

1 The council agreed to a separate process for the delivery of interim reports for the New South Wales, Victorian and Western Australian Governments (in the case of New South Wales and Victoria owing to the change in government). The council delivered interim reports on Sydney, Melbourne and Perth to these governments by the end of June 2011.
Final report

This final report to COAG reflects the following additional inputs from governments:

- detailed comments from each government on the relevant final interim report
- discussions and further comments from governments on a consultation draft.

The final report also reflects the outcomes of the council’s continuous improvement work program that involved three workshops to shape a further piece of work to be delivered by the council in the first half of 2012.

1.3 What does consistency mean?

The COAG Reform Council has been given a specific task by COAG to review capital city strategic planning systems for consistency with nine agreed criteria. Some key points to note about this task are that:

- it is a review of strategic planning, not just statutory planning—meaning it looks at infrastructure planning and economic development and other broader issues than the typical planning domains of zoning and approvals
- it is a review of planning systems, not just plans—meaning it covers institutional and decision-making arrangements as well as strategic planning documents
- it is a review of consistency with the criteria, not against performance measures—meaning it does not make findings on the results of the system
- it is not a review of the policy directions being pursued by governments—for example, the review is silent on immigration levels or settlement patterns in Australia.

Different types of findings

The council has made findings on consistency against each of criteria one to eight and on the four components of criterion nine. A simple system of findings of ‘consistent’ or ‘not consistent’ would not sufficiently reflect the substantial efforts of governments even where they have not shown the council all elements of consistency with a criterion.

The council has made graded findings of consistency to present a more subtle understanding of the capital city strategic planning systems it has reviewed, and to give credit to the positive aspects of respective government strategic planning systems. An explanation of the categories of findings is at Table 1.1.
### Table 1.1 Categories of findings on consistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>The government’s submissions showed consistency of the strategic planning system with all attributes of the criterion and this was supported by a strong rationale and evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
<td>Most key attributes of consistency with the criterion were shown in the government’s submissions and were supported by evidence. One or two relatively minor attributes were not clearly shown to the council or were not fully explained, with the council confident that a process is in place to develop the missing attribute/s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Partially consistent—reform pending | This is applied to criteria where the following apply:  
  - one or two more significant attributes of consistency were not shown for the current system detailed in the government’s submissions  
  - the government’s submissions detailed impending changes to the system, which would apply after the council reports to COAG but may lead to a system that the council would consider more consistent than the current finding indicates, or  
  - very recent changes have been made to the system and it is too soon to tell if they are embedded in the government’s approach to strategic planning. |
| Partially consistent      | Most key attributes of consistency with the criterion were shown in the government’s submissions and were supported by evidence. One or two more significant attributes were not clearly shown or not fully explained. |
| Not consistent—reform pending | This is applied to criteria where the following apply:  
  - key attributes of consistency were not shown for the current system detailed in the government’s submissions  
  - the government’s submissions detailed impending changes to the system, which would apply after the council reports to COAG but may lead to a system that the council would consider more consistent than the current finding indicates, or  
  - very recent changes have been made to the system and it is too soon to tell if they are embedded in the government’s approach to strategic planning. |
| Not consistent            | The government’s submissions did not show key attributes of consistency with the criterion. |
The findings are not comparable across cities

The council’s findings of consistency with the criteria are not comparable across the cities. As noted above, the council’s methodology involves analysis of each government’s own account of its consistency with the criteria to allow for distinctive approaches to local needs—a key benefit of federalism.

There are several other limitations on comparing the results to keep in mind when considering the findings and their definitions:

- they are an assessment of the institutions, decision-making structures and processes, and policy coherence in the system
- they are a point-in-time assessment of consistency
- they have not been adjusted for the scale of the challenges facing each city
- strategic planning is acutely political.

These points have a number of implications.

**Institutions, structures and processes**

The council has reviewed each capital city strategic planning system against the key characteristics embodied in each criterion. The characteristics cover the key institutions, systems and processes, decision-making structures and principles, and policies of each planning system. These characteristics were developed in consultation with governments to provide more detail on what each criterion was intended to reflect without constraining the development of particular and locally appropriate responses by each government. The characteristics are set out in more detail in chapter 2.

This approach means that the review of consistency gives a view on the potential effectiveness of the structures and processes that make up the system but does not represent a view on the effectiveness of previous, current or future performance of the system against its own objectives or COAG’s objective for cities.

For example, through the criterion of integration, governments have agreed that integration of land use, infrastructure and economic development functions is fundamental to the achievement of the productivity outcome set out in the COAG objective. A finding of consistency on this criterion means the council has found that the system has in place what governments agreed is needed to make integration possible. This includes having overarching strategic goals and policy directions to guide the disparate activities of government, communication and coordination mechanisms to bring these activities together and budgeting, decision-making and implementation approaches that are consistent with and driven by these strategic directions.

In this respect, consistency with the criteria is necessary but not sufficient for successful strategic planning to achieve productive, liveable and sustainable cities.

**Consistency at a point in time**

The above point is accentuated by the fact that the council has reviewed the strategic planning systems at a point in time. Many of the relevant policy areas and functions that comprise capital city strategic planning systems change frequently, meaning a different finding could be made at
a different point in time. Indeed, in some cases, the COAG agreement on cities has prompted reforms to strategic planning systems, and some of the systems have only been recently put in place by the relevant government.

This has two implications:

- the findings of the council reflect the time at which the review was taken and the systems may change to become more or less consistent after the council’s findings are delivered
- the findings of the council, in some cases, cover systems that may recently have become structurally consistent but where the structures have not been in operation for sufficient time to have been tested and found effective.

This is complicated by the substantial lags between interventions in strategic planning and their effect.

**The scale of the challenges facing capital cities**

There are a number of common challenges facing capital cities, not the least of which are listed in criterion four on nationally significant policy issues. However, the nature and extent of the challenges, both in policy terms and in terms of strategic city planning vary across Australia’s capital cities.

For example, strategic planning for larger cities is arguably more difficult than for smaller cities, and this could be relevant to interpreting the findings in this report on the strategic planning systems for Sydney, Melbourne and South East Queensland. However, it may also be argued that the larger cities are typically wealthier and their governments are typically able to apply more resources to strategic planning than those of the smaller cities. This could be relevant to interpreting the findings in this report on the strategic planning systems for Hobart, Canberra and Darwin.

Population growth varies across Australian capital cities from the relatively low growth cities of Hobart and Adelaide to the relatively high growth cities of Darwin and Perth. In absolute numbers, however, each of Melbourne, South East Queensland and Sydney have accommodated population growth in excess of 300,000 persons over the past five years—with Melbourne growing by nearly 400,000—a number added to each city that is greater than the population growth over the same period of Perth, Adelaide, Hobart, Canberra and Darwin combined. It is not clear whether the greater planning challenge is absolute or proportionate growth.

Population growth also offers opportunities: the potential to spark economic growth; the potential to diversify and therefore stabilise the economy; the potential to reshape parts of the city to sustain higher level infrastructure services, such as rail, that benefit existing and new residents alike. It is notable that the Victorian Government has actively promoted growth and that the South Australian Government has a population growth target.

The point is that on these two key issues, there is no simple adjustment that can be applied to the analysis of consistency with the criteria to account for the extent of the challenges facing each city. Indeed, there is not even a clear picture on the direction of any such adjustment. The question becomes even more complicated once other challenges that vary across cities and are relevant to strategic planning, such as topography, climate, demography and exposure to international markets, are factored in.
So, the council has not adjusted its findings on consistency.

**Strategic planning is acutely political**

A further complication in doing this review is that the issues at the heart of strategic planning—the shape of the city, the types and locations of housing, what infrastructure to build and where—are the subject of high-level political contest. This means that a change of government can lead to a change of long-term strategic direction and affect the apparent coherence of a strategic planning system.

In the course of this review, two governments have changed: the Victorian Government in November 2010 and the NSW Government in March 2011. Policy changes to some elements of their strategic planning systems by these new governments are in train but, while they are not complete, cannot be found consistent with relevant criteria—even if they may have been consistent immediately prior to the change and may end up consistent once the change is implemented.

While this approach may seem finicky or trivial, it is consistent with the spirit (and some of the actual text) of the nine criteria. A key reason for the criteria is to provide a stable long-term framework for managing the growth of the city, and a stable basis for investment decisions by business and housing decisions by individuals. Strategic planning that is not durable through changes of government does not serve this end and is also unlikely to lead to the achievement of long-term goals.
1.4 Report structure

Table 1.2 How this report is structured

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>What it contains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>A summary of the whole report, its findings and recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Lists the recommendation of the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Part A—Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Explains the council’s approach and the limits of the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Criteria used in the review</td>
<td>Explains the council’s interpretation of the criteria and the different elements of consistency sought by the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Part B—The three COAG references</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Common themes in the findings</td>
<td>Sets out common issues in the findings of the council on its first reference from COAG—the review against criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Continuous improvement</td>
<td>Details the process and findings of the council on its second reference from COAG—supporting continuous improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Best practice highlights</td>
<td>Sets out the panel highlights from the third reference from COAG—sharing best practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Part C—Commonwealth Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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Chapter 2. Criteria used in the review

At a glance

COAG asked the COAG Reform Council to review capital city strategic planning systems against nine criteria agreed by all governments.

- To do this, the council asked governments to provide an account of their systems against the criteria, which the council then critically analysed with the help of the Expert Advisory Panel.
- To help governments with the self-assessment, the council developed a template that set out what it considered to be the key attributes or elements of each criterion.
- This chapter provides a brief overview of the elements of each criterion. It also highlights the important interrelationships between the criteria.

2.1 Approaching the criteria

COAG asked the COAG Reform Council to review capital city strategic planning systems against nine criteria that had been agreed by all governments (see box 1.1).

Given the nature of this task and the resources available to the council, its approach has been to ask governments to provide an account of their systems against the criteria, which the council has critically analysed with the assistance of the Expert Advisory Panel.

Each government was asked for four key inputs into the reporting process:

- an overview of its capital city strategic planning system
- a self-assessment against the agreed criteria
- a response to the council’s interim report
- comments on consultation draft reports.

The most substantial of these inputs is the self-assessment. To help governments with the self-assessment, the council developed a template that set out what the council considered to be the key attributes or elements of each criterion. These attributes were developed with advice from the Expert Advisory Panel and following a workshop and consultation draft process with governments.

The template asked open-ended questions about the key elements of each criterion and provided space for governments to show the consistency of their system.

The council encouraged governments to provide sufficient information against each attribute to allow it to reach a fair and informed view of consistency. The council also encouraged governments to provide supporting evidence and examples wherever possible.

This chapter sets out the key elements of each of COAG’s nine criteria for capital city strategic planning systems used in the council’s analysis.
2.2 Elements of the criteria

A brief overview of the elements of each criterion follows. There are important interrelationships between the criteria; therefore, governments were asked to consider some specific links between criteria.

### Criterion one—Integration

Capital city strategic planning systems should be integrated:

a) across functions, including land-use and transport planning, economic and infrastructure development, environmental assessment and urban development, and

b) across government agencies.

Capital cities are complex systems that are affected by many government functions and agencies. Isolated policy efforts or the work of a single government agency will not achieve the COAG objective of productive, liveable and sustainable cities. An integrated approach, where different functions and agencies work toward common goals or objectives, will ensure that urban growth and urban problems are wholly and properly addressed. Functions and agencies interact with each other and therefore need to be considered together.

Governments were asked to demonstrate integration, particularly of land use, economic development and transport functions, in the following strategic planning processes:

1. **A unifying set of goals or objectives**—are a starting point for integration. They are a view of the kind of future a government wants for its city and a basis for understanding what needs to be done to reach that future. To drive integration, the goals should preferably be based on outcomes or real effects on the wellbeing of the people in the city, rather than being based on specific government activities (e.g. efficient infrastructure).

2. **Communication and coordination**—across agencies and at different levels. Of necessity, governments have separate agencies performing different functions. Integration requires understanding of common goals and challenges to be shared across these separate organisations. This should not be limited to high-level agreement at the cabinet or senior-official level.

3. **Decision making and budgeting**—that is guided by whole of government objectives and informed by consistent evidence.

4. **Implementation and review**—mechanisms to coordinate the timing and location of projects and programs and that relate evaluation of projects and programs to whole of government priorities and objectives.
Criterion two—Hierarchy of plans

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for a consistent hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans, including:

a) long term (for example, 15–30 year) integrated strategic plans,

b) medium term (for example, 5–15 year) prioritised infrastructure and land-use plans, and

c) near term prioritised infrastructure project pipeline backed by appropriately detailed project plans.

This criterion focuses on translating the long-term vision and strategy for a capital city into actions and projects in the short to medium term. It refers specifically to a temporal hierarchy, where short and medium term plans are consistent with the long term strategic plan and vision for the capital city.

Strategic planning requires a consistent long term vision. This long term vision should identify goals for the city, the challenges and external forces to be dealt with, likely future scenarios and the strategies to address these challenges and scenarios.

This long term vision should be complemented by more detailed medium term planning for infrastructure and land use needs to achieve the long term goals. As the timeframe becomes closer, there should be a greater level of detail on specific priority infrastructure and land use activities in particular locations.

While this criterion is about a temporal hierarchy, there is a degree to which this temporal hierarchy is also spatial—as planning moves toward the near term it becomes more location specific, including specific projects.

The important attributes of this criterion relate to having a publicly available:

- long-term (for example, 15–30 year) integrated strategic plan
- medium-term (for example, 5–15 year) prioritised infrastructure and land-use plan
- near-term prioritised infrastructure project pipeline.

Crucially, the plans must be consistent with one and other to show that long term vision is being translated into current actions by governments. Or, considered the other way, to show that what governments are doing now serves their stated long term vision of the city.
**Criterion three—Nationally-significant infrastructure**

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for nationally-significant economic infrastructure (both new and upgrade of existing) including:

a) transport corridors

b) international gateways

c) intermodal connections

d) major communications and utilities infrastructure, and

e) reservation of appropriate lands to support future expansion.

Investing in infrastructure in cities can contribute significantly to the broad outcomes of COAG’s objective for capital cities—to be globally competitive, productive, sustainable and socially inclusive—particularly to economic productivity. This criterion distinguishes between providing new economic infrastructure and managing and upgrading existing economic infrastructure.

‘Nationally-significant’ has not been defined by COAG but may generally be considered as:

- infrastructure nominated or identified by the Commonwealth Government—given its funding role in this process
- infrastructure programs that are part of ‘national infrastructure systems’ (e.g. National Freight Network, AusRoads, National Ports Strategy)
- economic infrastructure identified by jurisdictions that would greatly improve the productivity, competitiveness and/or liveability of the city (i.e. infrastructure that would make a significant contribution toward COAG’s objective for Australian capital cities).

The COAG Reform Council has not assessed the infrastructure put forward by governments for whether it is national significant or otherwise. Its key concern is whether the strategic planning system provides for such infrastructure.

Governments were asked to outline:

- any nationally-significant infrastructure (either new or upgraded) that has been identified in the capital city strategic planning system
- the process used to determine the need for new, or upgraded, infrastructure
- whether alternatives were considered to providing new, or upgrading, infrastructure such as improving the efficient use of existing infrastructure.

What it means to ‘provide for’ infrastructure will differ according to the likely timing of the need for a given piece of infrastructure. An increasing level of certainty of delivery, location and project type is expected in moving from long term, through medium term, to the near term project pipeline.

Within this continuum from lesser to greater degrees of certainty, ‘providing for’ nationally-significant economic infrastructure may include:

- Reserving, protecting or buying land corridors and sites that, based on a plausible range of land use and infrastructure demand scenarios, are likely to support the city’s growth.
Having in train the relevant processes for environmental and other statutory approvals at the strategic planning and early project development phase to cover the anticipated uses of the corridors and sites.

Planning for the potential shared use of new and existing corridors and sites and resolving competing claims for their use.

Considering all options for new, upgraded, and managing existing infrastructure in accordance with long term needs to make the relative costs and benefits of the adopted options apparent. For example, in the case of water, options would include: expanding supply through new dams or desalination; reducing demand through pricing or restrictions on use; or making better use of existing water through recycling and reuse.

Having advanced project plans in place for near-term infrastructure requirements (see also criterion 2(c)).

**Criterion four—Nationally-significant policy issues**

Capital city strategic planning systems should address nationally-significant policy issues including:

- population growth and demographic change
- productivity and global competitiveness
- climate change mitigation and adaptation
- efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets
- connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets
- development of major urban corridors
- social inclusion
- health, liveability, and community
- housing affordability
- matters of national environmental significance

Strategic planning systems for capital cities need to be informed by sound research and analysis.

In order to properly ‘address’ nationally-significant policy issues, a planning system must cover the following:

- **Analysis**—considering, defining and analysing the issue and whether it has spatial implications for the capital city that require action.

- **Evidence and options**—demonstrating the basis for any proposed strategies and actions to deal with the issue, including the consideration of different options.

- **Action**—having in place strategies and actions to ameliorate, mitigate or overcome the issue.

- **Review**—having monitoring and review processes to ensure strategies are implemented and to ensure that they are adjusted over time to reflect shifting causes and trends.

The degree of effort for each of these tasks should be proportionate to the significance of the issue to each city and so is likely to differ from issue to issue and across the cities. In determining whether the degree of effort is proportionate, the council has considered the analysis set out by the government of each issue (i.e. the first task in the list above).
Governments were also asked how the capital city planning system manages the policy trade-offs between the identified nationally-significant policy issues.

This criterion links directly with all of the other criteria for capital city strategic planning. The nationally-significant policy issues are COAG’s view of the key policy challenges for Australia’s capital cities. As such, addressing these issues is a minimum requirement for capital city strategic planning systems in attempting to achieve COAG’s overarching objective for capital cities.

**Criterion five—Capital city networks**

Capital city strategic planning systems should consider and strengthen the networks between capital cities and major regional centres, and other important domestic and international connections.

Capital cities have important regional and national roles as hubs providing connections for trade and other interactions. The strength of these connections can influence the competitiveness, productivity and liveability of the city and surrounding regions.

Conversely, major regional centres are important in their own right and can play an important role in the prosperity of cities. Considering the role of major regional centres relative to capital cities can be informed by broader State and Territory policies.

Strengthening connections between capital cities and major regional centres may not always be necessary. Governments were asked to show how their planning system identifies which regional networks and domestic and international connections require strengthening and which do not.

Governments were also asked how the capital city planning system places the city in a broader national context and whether these networks and connections are being used to manage the nationally significant policy issues identified in criterion four.

**Criterion six—Planning for future growth**

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfields development.

This criterion focuses on the shape of the capital city and how its growth will be managed over time. The shape of a city affects its overall infrastructure needs and its performance against outcomes listed in the national objective.

An appropriate balance of development locations should be informed by the specific policy outcomes being sought within each jurisdiction. This should be enough to cover all land use needs. Orderly sequencing of development is needed for transport, utilities and social infrastructure to support new housing and job growth.

The evidence for and approach to land release should relate to the strategies, actions and intended outcomes for the city regarding the issues addressed in criteria four and five. The evidence should also show consideration of external forces—for example land and housing markets—and other
constraints including land suitability and environmental constraints, that affect the spatial settlement and form of the city.

Governments were asked to outline:

- how they determine further land requirements
- how they determine the capacity of existing developed areas and future development areas
- how they determine the balance of infill and greenfield development
- how they bring about sequenced land release
- mechanisms and monitoring programs to:
  - release and rezone land in sequence
  - deal with alternative or ‘out of sequence’ applications
  - deal with changes in the underlying assumptions
- how the system plans for the disposal of surplus government-owned land.

Criterion seven—Investment priorities and frameworks

Capital city strategic planning systems should clearly identify priorities for investment and policy effort by governments, and provide an effective framework for private sector investment and innovation.

The planning system should provide a good framework for government and private sector investment and innovation.

At one level, this involves the strategic planning system clearly reflecting a government’s intentions in the short, medium and long term—as this provides a stable environment for investment.

At a second level, this relates to how a government directly engages with the private sector in delivering housing, jobs and infrastructure. This covers, for example, taxation arrangements, infrastructure charging, public private partnership arrangements, and zoning and development approvals processes.

These policies, taken together, comprise the framework within which the non-government actors in our cities operate and determine their investment and innovation efforts. Governments would be expected to show some analysis of this framework to determine if it is effective, or likely to be effective, in delivering the spatial configuration of housing, jobs and infrastructure identified as needed by the strategic planning system.

Governments were asked to outline:

- current and future priorities for investment and policy effort
- the methods of financing these projects
- frameworks for private sector investment and innovation
- how the involvement of the private sector in infrastructure initiatives is determined
- how they know the frameworks for private sector innovation and investment are effective.
Criterion eight—Urban design and architecture

Capital city strategic planning systems should encourage world-class urban design and architecture.

Urban design covers how people use and move around places, interactions between nature and the built environment, and the processes for delivering and maintaining successful places. Urban design is concerned not only with how places look, but also, and more importantly, how they function.

Quality urban environments can contribute to public life and the attractiveness of a city as a place to live, to visit, or do business. Well-designed public spaces and precincts can contribute to important outcomes, including social inclusion and healthy living.

Governments were asked to outline how they encourage world class urban design and architecture across relevant processes as well as at different scales and types of development. The council has analysed the mechanisms set out by governments according to:

- whether they apply to specific projects or are applied systemically, as in to all activities or a class of activities
- the scale of application, be it metropolitan (e.g. polycentric city), precinct (e.g. transit-oriented development) or site (e.g. masterplan)
- the type of development covered—residential, commercial, utilities/infrastructure.

Criterion nine (a)—Accountabilities, timelines and performance measures

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

a) clear accountabilities, timelines and performance measures.

The council has made overall findings of consistency on the first eight criteria by reconciling different attributes. However, criterion nine brings together a range of different attributes of the planning system that cannot be reconciled. Therefore, the council has made separate findings on the four characteristics using the following attributes.

The criterion provides for three elements of managing performance: clear accountability, timelines and performance measures. The council examined whether strategic planning systems have these elements for both the outcomes being pursued by the system and the actions being taken to deliver those outcomes.

The specific attributes considered by the council were:

- **Clear accountability**—responsibility is assigned clearly and publicly for outcomes and for implementation of actions detailed in strategic plans and supporting plans.
- **Timelines**—there are publicly available timelines for achieving outcomes and for implementing actions detailed in plans, noting that beyond the short-term, timelines will likely be indicative only.
- **Performance measures**—whether outcomes measures are tied to government objectives.
The council considered whether the accountabilities, timelines and performance measures put forward by each government are a sound basis for reporting on the performance of the strategic planning system.

### Criterion nine (b)—Intergovernmental coordination

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

b) coordination between all three levels of government, with opportunities for Commonwealth and Local Government input, and linked, streamlined and efficient approval processes including under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

Within the Australian system of government, no government has sole responsibility for the policies and functions relevant to a capital city. The council has reviewed State and Territory government systems as directed by COAG, but the Commonwealth Government and local governments have significant responsibilities within capital cities.

The council acknowledges that there are limits to the capacity of State and Territory governments to ensure the engagement and alignment of the Commonwealth and local governments to their strategic planning objectives.

Governments were asked to describe the various mechanisms used to coordinate with the Commonwealth and local governments with emphasis on the following points broadly reflective of those used to consider integration within governments under criterion one:

- **Alignment of goals**—how each level of government pursues broadly similar objectives within the city.
- **Communication and coordination**—in preparing and implementing plans, policies and projects.
- **Implementation**—managing the activity of other levels of government.

Given that each level of government has approval functions within capital cities, governments were asked how their planning system provides for a streamlined and efficient approvals process and what aspects of the system make the system streamlined and efficient.

### Criterion nine (c)—Evaluation and review cycles

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

c) evaluation and review cycles that support the need for balance between flexibility and certainty, including trigger points that identify the need for change in policy settings.

Strategic planning can provide the basis of persistent effort focused on achieving long-term wellbeing. It is meant to be stable and systematic to provide a basis for people and businesses to make decisions.
However, strategic planning requires periodic review to deal with changes in the assumptions, trends and drivers that shape the long-term vision and the path to get there.

To balance this need for stability of plans with the flexibility necessary to adapt to changing circumstances, governments should specify in advance the regular evaluation and review cycles of their plans and the likely triggers of extraordinary reviews of plans.

Governments were asked to outline the mechanisms used to evaluate and review policies, adjust policy settings as well as any likely triggers of reviews. The council considered the frequency and content of reporting as well as the transparency of the processes.

**Criterion nine (d)—Appropriate consultation and engagement**

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

- appropriate consultation and engagement with external stakeholders, experts and the wider community.

Consulting and engaging with stakeholders is crucial in preparing, refining and implementing strategic plans. Consultation and engagement should occur with a broad range of people and organisations in these various stages. This is fundamental to building the legitimacy of the system.

Governments were asked about the ongoing processes for consulting and engaging with external stakeholders in the capital city planning system and how the outcomes of consultation are incorporated into plan-making, implementation and review.
PART B: THE THREE COAG REFERENCES
Chapter 3. Common themes in the findings

At a glance

This chapter gives an overview of how all Australian planning systems rate across the nine criteria and the common issues emerging from the review.

- The purpose of this chapter is not to compare. Rather, it identifies common themes and trends emerging across the nine criteria.
- It also highlights where governments have generally performed well, and where planning systems need to improve.

Criterion one—Integration

Capital city strategic planning systems should be integrated:

a) across functions, including land-use and transport planning, economic and infrastructure development, environmental assessment and urban development, and

b) across government agencies.

National overview of consistency

Criterion one is the most important of the nine criteria. The other criteria can be read as a guide to the practices and factors needed to deliver an integrated strategic planning system. That no system has been found wholly consistent against all criteria indicates that further work is needed on the institutional arrangements to deliver integration.

Integration is especially important in strategic planning due to the high degree of interdependence in capital cities of a range of complex systems, including geography, climate, land economics, construction, labour markets, road and transport systems, energy, water and sewer systems. This interdependence demands that the different functions of strategic planning jointly consider the possible consequences of the options available with a view to maximising the benefits of each function. Given that cities are about space, the interaction between land use planning and transport—how we use and get around space—will affect the economic, social and environmental outcomes in cities.

The need for integration is well understood even if how to deliver it is not. Integration cannot be quantified and there are lags between government vision-setting, planning and project delivery and the apparent current integration or otherwise of land use, economic development and transport in capital cities. Current examples of good or failed integration were likely set in train many years ago and may not relate to the way the system currently operates.

Unifying goals or objectives

All governments had unifying goals or objectives for their State or Territory. However, not all had goals or objectives for their capital city or even a translation of State-wide goals to the city. Goal-orientation is an important element of being strategic. It is a point of reference for disparate
government activities and a framework within which current and future challenges can be understood. This point of reference can also be an important guide for business in determining investment and for people in determining where to live and work.

While most planning systems have a series of goals to unify the functions of government, the extent to which they do so depends on the degree of political and bureaucratic accountability to these goals and associated actions to achieve the goals. Monitoring and public reporting of progress against these goals is paramount. There is a strong relationship between this criterion and criterion nine (a) and this is reflected in the council’s findings.

**Communication and coordination**

Planning systems across Australia have whole of government communication and coordination mechanisms in place—although some governments rely only on standard cabinet and budget decision-making mechanisms. Given they were in place in December 2009, COAG was probably looking for something beyond these standard processes to deliver coordination and integration.

Jurisdictions that received more favourable findings did have specific mechanisms in place to present integrated proposals to Cabinet rather than rely on Cabinet to resolve problems. Such mechanisms were purpose-built for specific planning and infrastructure functions of government. The Western Australian Planning Commission is an example of this approach.

In some cases communication and coordination mechanisms were created to deal with specific challenges faced by a particular government—Growth Management Queensland is good example of this.

**Decision making and budgeting**

In many cases, government departments charged with formulating economic policy and strategy, be they treasuries or other departments, are absent from strategic planning. This means that strategic objectives may not be supported by detailed economic analysis and understanding about the government’s capacity to deliver on the strategic objectives. This also means that treasuries are not engaged in the planning process and may not be committed to the objectives, directions and project—including expensive urban infrastructure project—produced by the process.

Jurisdictions that are largely consistent with this criterion showed significant integration across functions and agencies through all stages of the planning process. They also showed strong alignment of agencies, often through lower layers of the planning system, to the unifying goals or objectives.

**Implementation and review**

Integrated implementation and review arrangements help ensure that the unifying goals remain the focus of agencies.

Jurisdictions that demonstrated strong integration in implementation had dedicated committees to coordinate and oversee implementation. The better examples of these committees not only included representatives from a broad spectrum of agencies, but also representatives from all spheres of government—the South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee being the strongest example. However, this was not characteristic of most planning systems in Australia.
Criterion two—Hierarchy of plans

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for a consistent hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans, including:

a) long term (for example, 15–30 year) integrated strategic plans,
b) medium term (for example, 5–15 year) prioritised infrastructure and land-use plans, and
c) near term prioritised infrastructure project pipeline backed by appropriately detailed project plans.

National overview of consistency

A hierarchy of publicly available long, medium and near term plans is in place in most strategic planning systems in Australia.

Most governments have a long term strategic plan, but not all jurisdictions have a long term strategic plan that specifically applies to their capital city.

Most governments have medium term prioritised infrastructure plans and land use plans. Some governments are exemplary here because their infrastructure plans also identify funding beyond the forward estimates. This can assist in encouraging investor confidence and increasing the likelihood of delivery.

The Queensland Government’s approach is a case in point and should be commended as it may lead to a more mature public discussion of indicative processes for investigating infrastructure needs. While it is difficult for governments to go public with long term indicative commitments to infrastructure needs, it is important that they do so.

Most governments have short term prioritised infrastructure plans, in the form of forward estimates and budget commitments. States and Territories were not required to provide detailed project plans, but some jurisdictions presented a good process to increase the certainty of delivery of prioritised infrastructure projects.

Where there is no such hierarchy of plans it is because governments are either a) in the formative stages of developing a planning system and creating plans, like the Tasmanian Government, or b) have had a change of government and are producing new strategic plans—or reforming substantial elements of it. This is the case for the New South Wales and Victorian governments. This latter circumstance is entirely a matter for democratic governments but can be a barrier to long-term strategic planning, as noted in the introduction to this report (chapter 1).

This highlights the issue of bipartisanship, or its absence, and the effect this has on the enduring nature of metropolitan plans. Metropolitan planning is intensely political. Plans are used to articulate the points of difference of one potential government from another. This at times can lead to a loss of long term strategic planning.
Criterion three—Nationally significant infrastructure

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for nationally-significant economic infrastructure (both new and upgrade of existing) including:

a) transport corridors

b) international gateways

c) intermodal connections

d) major communications and utilities infrastructure, and

e) reservation of appropriate lands to support future expansion.

National overview of consistency

Some planning systems in Australia were found to be generally poor at integrating planning for international gateways and intermodal connections into broader metropolitan planning. This is most acute for ports and freight planning, where large growth in the volume of freight through Australia’s major ports is forecast. Most governments outlined growth in the use of their ports and airports. However, some did not show clear strategies for matching this growing demand with capacity for their capital city ports, nor for managing the integration of the port into the land use and transport systems of their cities.

The degree to which nationally significant infrastructure is ‘provided for’ varies across governments. This ranges from nationally significant infrastructure being fully or partially funded to prospective studies on future infrastructure requirements—though as noted in the section on criterion two above, a more mature public discussion of indicative and other processes for considering infrastructure needs will support better long term planning.

In many cases, planning systems ‘provide for’ this infrastructure by including it among the projects in metropolitan plans. However, the extent to which they are provided for will depend on whether the actions in these plans are implemented.

Most governments are working with Infrastructure Australia to develop the ‘National Infrastructure Priorities List’ and to have their prioritised projects identified on the national priority list. Though what is considered ‘nationally significant infrastructure’ from the point of view of the Commonwealth Government is not always clear.

All governments submitted that they had considered ‘demand management’ and ‘non-infrastructure solutions’ in determining the need for new and upgraded infrastructure. These solutions varied in their scope and for the large part were not of the scale to influence demand to the extent that road pricing or similar scaled reforms would achieve.
Criterion four—Nationally significant policy issues

Capital city strategic planning systems should address nationally-significant policy issues including:

a) population growth and demographic change  
b) productivity and global competitiveness  
c) climate change mitigation and adaptation  
d) efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets  
e) connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets  
f) development of major urban corridors  
g) social inclusion  
h) health, liveability, and community.  
i) housing affordability  
j) matters of national environmental significance.

National overview of consistency

No planning system in Australia wholly addressed all nationally significant policy issues. Most governments were found partially or largely consistent with this criterion. Generally the larger, better-resourced governments, with more established planning systems showing stronger policy capabilities than smaller ones.

This is one of the reasons why the council has recommended continued intergovernmental collaboration on cities to build up the evidence and information for planning so that all governments have access to resources that will allow them to address these nationally significant issues (see recommendations 1 and 3). This issue is also identified in the continuous improvement work (see chapter 4).

Nearly all governments were taking action on each issue. However, these actions were not always based on:

- a clear understanding of the spatial implications of the policy issues
- analysis of the underlying drivers of each issue and evidence to support the actions being taken.

Performance measures and review mechanisms were a common weakness across most jurisdictions.

The issue most consistently dealt with well by governments, in terms of analysis and evidence, was population growth. Nevertheless, the actions presented by governments were mainly aimed at providing the necessary housing to accommodate growth (and not always achieving that goal). The infrastructure, employment and service requirements of a larger population were not always addressed.

The associated issue of demographic change was not dealt with as well as population growth. The spatial implications of an ageing population in particular were not canvassed in most of the submissions of governments.

Many governments had difficulty explaining how their planning systems addressed ‘social inclusion’ and ‘health, liveability and community wellbeing’. While this is already a significant area of service delivery, governments that provided a superior response were able to describe an evidence-based approach to one or two programs in this area that had a spatial focus or implication for strategic planning policy.
Finally, while housing affordability is arguably one of the most salient issues facing all Australian capital cities, a comprehensive and coherent response to the issue was found wanting across most planning systems. In particular, it was not always clear why governments were pursuing particular actions to address housing affordability in light of the analysis provided. This suggests a stronger evidence-base is required to interrogate the various options available to government in addressing housing affordability.

Given that this is a national issue, greater Commonwealth Government leadership on this issue may help State and Territory governments in doing this.

**Criterion five—Capital city networks**

Capital city strategic planning systems should consider and strengthen the networks between capital cities and major regional centres, and other important domestic and international connections.

---

**National overview of consistency**

Governments generally have a strong sense of how their respective metropolitan region sits within a broader national context of networks, regional centres and domestic and international connections. This is clearer for the smaller capital cities with fewer networks and competing priorities. The larger capital cities are faced with harder decisions about which networks to strengthen given the scale and complexity of networks in these cities.

All jurisdictions were either consistent or largely consistent with this criterion. States and Territories have planning systems that place the capital city within the broader national context, and link to other key regions, capital cities, and international markets. However the relationship of city regions to their respective hinterlands, including land for agricultural use, was not always articulated. This also relates to the issue of preserving urban fringe agricultural land by managing urban expansion (see criterion six).

Similar to criterion three, the extent to which jurisdictions are strengthening their networks varies. Strong responses to this criterion identified projects, funding and timeframes for when these networks should be strengthened and how it aligned with the strategic priorities for the capital city region.

All governments identified ports and airports as key international connections. Some jurisdictions indicated that the ports and airports within the capital city region are forecast to experience significant growth. Some planning systems, however, fall short at planning and accommodating the future freight and passenger growth and the infrastructure and other projects required to address the growth pressures.
Criterion six—Planning for future growth

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfields development.

National overview of consistency

Most governments have the necessary mechanisms to provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfield development. This includes appropriate analytical methods to determine future land requirements for infill and greenfield development, including population and demographic projections.

Most governments have city growth strategies that encourage a more compact city. Generally this means encouraging growth into existing urban areas and limiting growth at the fringe of the city. This ratio of infill to greenfield varies and to some extent reflects the size of the city and its goals. In part this reflects the economics of the city, where higher land values in bigger cities act as a mechanism for promoting infill development.

The reasons for creating more compact cities are:

- **environmental reasons**—to limit the need to develop land outside the existing city structure, to preserve biodiversity and environmentally sensitive areas, to preserve urban fringe agricultural production, and to reduce the carbon emissions from private transport
- **social inclusion reasons**—to increase the efficiency of and access to services for the population without private transport
- **efficiency reasons**—by increasing use of existing infrastructure where it may have spare capacity and aiming for a city shape that encourages efficient infrastructure provision in the future
- **productivity reasons**—to benefit from agglomeration economies through more concentrated and diverse labour and product markets, knowledge transfer and innovation.

Metropolitan plans are the main tool that governments use to identify where and how population growth will be accommodated. These plans are typically supported by monitoring programs for land release and/or dwelling completions.
Criterion seven—Investment priorities and frameworks

Capital city strategic planning systems should clearly identify priorities for investment and policy effort by governments, and provide an effective framework for private sector investment and innovation.

National overview of consistency

Planning systems in Australia do not have fully effective frameworks for private sector investment and innovation. This is an issue common to all the systems the council reviewed. The main elements of a framework for investment and innovation that require further work are:

- consideration of the economic viability of the plans as part of planning—looking at the markets that affect housing, jobs, infrastructure and services and their locations
- consideration of the effect of government regulatory, planning and taxation policies on these markets and the likelihood of achieving the key elements of strategic plans.

The economic and fiscal viability of the broad-city shaping strategies in city strategic plans is particularly pertinent.

These plans spell out where, when and how it is hoped that housing, jobs and infrastructure will be delivered across the city. Governments are good at understanding the demand for the particular spatial strategy they are pursuing. Typically, this takes the form of population growth and demographic projections, which becomes a measure of future demand for dwellings, jobs and, in the better systems, services.

Some governments have sought to provide the economic justification for pursuing particular spatial strategies by modelling the benefits of different settlement patterns. New South Wales and South Australia in particular have done this well.

However, what is lacking is the analysis to determine whether the strategy can and will be approximately achieved over its timeframe—‘approximately’ owing to the uncertainty of long-term planning and the need for governments to have flexibility to respond to changing circumstances. This means understanding how a plan fits with what the market (say, for housing) is likely to do or provide. It also means understanding how government policies affect the market and the likelihood of delivering the things in the plan that are different to what the market would provide.

The consequence of not addressing these issues is that the housing, jobs and infrastructure in the desired locations and timeframes may not be delivered.

To date, these considerations have come too late in the process and are often project-focused rather than strategic. Further, while governments are implementing a number of reforms to encourage and facilitate specific private sector projects, these efforts remain singularly focused on specific issues. Many of these reforms are aimed at mitigating the impediments the planning system can place on the private sector—largely focused on the development approval process and reducing approval times.
Criterion eight—Urban design and architecture

Capital city strategic planning systems should encourage world-class urban design and architecture.

National overview of consistency

Capital city planning systems in Australia have a range of mechanisms to encourage good urban design and architecture across relevant decision-making processes, spatial scales and in locations where world class urban design would be expected. These include various design guidelines, strategies and development codes as well as institutional arrangements including government architects and design review panels.

However, the extent to which these mechanisms encourage above and beyond what is mandated in legislation is hard to determine. Planning systems in Australia rely on guidelines to promote good urban design. While guidelines provide a valuable resource, the degree to which they encourage good urban design is relative to whether they are used. Mechanisms to provide incentives to use guidelines are generally not used by governments.

In another way, urban design mechanisms in Australian planning systems are limited in that they are used for certain types of development or are focused on specific sites or precincts, rather than more systemically across development types and scales. This is probably sufficient in terms of the creation of iconic buildings and other aesthetic concerns, but does not get at the capacity for urban design to improve the way a city functions.

Stronger responses to this criterion demonstrated a systemic approach to urban design. Two different systemic approaches to urban design have stood out in this process. One approach, the South Australian Integrated Design Commission, is a good example of a systemic approach to design issues in high level decision making—with an emphasis on principles of design and public education about design and a focus on a key location: central Adelaide. The other approach, the NSW Government’s State Environmental Planning Policy 65, requires the use of independent expert advice—either through a registered architect or a specially appointed design review panel—on the design of all residential flat proposals.

Criterion nine (a)—Accountabilities, timelines and performance measures

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

a) clear accountabilities, timelines and performance measures.

National overview of consistency

Clear accountabilities, timelines and appropriate performance measures are strongly linked to integration. While many jurisdictions have strong integration mechanisms, these were not always matched by strong systems for accountability and performance measurement. Most jurisdictions were either partially or not consistent with this criterion.
In many cases, governments only had partial forms of accountability, timelines and performance measures. This was particularly the case for performance measures. For example, while many governments had some form of performance measurement in place, some were not supported by public reporting of these measures. In other cases, the performance measures were not clearly linked to strategic planning outcomes.

Most governments had at least one of the three elements (accountabilities, timelines and performance measures) well developed. For example, many jurisdictions had clear and publicly available timelines for infrastructure delivery. But for jurisdictions to be wholly consistent with this criterion, all three elements needed to be demonstrated. This was not the case for most jurisdictions and this led to findings of either partially or not consistent.

**Criterion nine (b)—Intergovernmental coordination**

Capital city strategic planning system should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

- coordination between all three levels of government, with opportunities for Commonwealth and Local Government input, and linked, streamlined and efficient approval processes including under the Commonwealth *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*,

National overview of consistency

Most jurisdictions received a finding of largely consistent or consistent for this criterion. These jurisdictions demonstrated strong consultation and communication mechanisms to engage other levels of government during the development and update of the plans for the capital city. Examples of these mechanisms include memorandums of understanding with local government, legislative requirements to consult other levels of government in plan preparation, and joint development assessment panels. The strongest examples were those that included representation from other levels of government on implementation and oversight committees.

Most governments were not clear about how they managed the impact of Commonwealth policies on their planning system. This includes management of the impact of Commonwealth policies (such as tax and immigration) and funding, Commonwealth owned land and airports. Instead jurisdictions reported how they accommodated Commonwealth requirements.

As an example, all jurisdictions reported that they had bilateral agreements in place with the Commonwealth regarding approvals under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Act. These bilateral agreements may not be sufficient in themselves. The council has previously articulated its concerns with this process in reporting on the National Partnership Agreement to Deliver a Seamless National Economy. Strategic assessments provide more extensive analysis of issues, but have not been agreed in all States and Territories, for all cities.
Criterion nine (c)—Evaluation and review cycles

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

c) evaluation and review cycles that support the need for balance between flexibility and certainty, including trigger points that identify the need for change in policy settings.

National overview of consistency

There was a clear divide between the jurisdictions that were consistent with this criterion and those that were partially or not consistent.

The jurisdictions that were consistent or largely consistent with criterion nine (c) showed that their capital city strategic planning system had regular review mechanisms built in and triggers for a review or policy shift if policies, programs or initiatives are not delivering against the strategic objectives.

The jurisdictions that were not consistent with this part of the criterion generally had review periods but did not demonstrate mechanisms to adjust policy settings or trigger points to signal a review needs to be done. In many cases, this involved a review of the plans under the planning system without a clear evaluation of the effectiveness of the previous plan.

Criterion nine (d)—Appropriate consultation and engagement

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

d) appropriate consultation and engagement with external stakeholders, experts and the wider community.

National overview of consistency

Consultation and engagement has been identified as a challenge facing all governments. Nonetheless, some jurisdictions were consistent with this criterion on the basis of having formal and wide-ranging consultation arrangements in place. The council has neither the resources nor the mandate to test the effectiveness of these arrangements.

Systems that were found consistent with this criterion made genuine efforts to engage the community and stakeholders in all stages of the planning process. They also showed a range of initiatives to engage community and industry stakeholders including stakeholder forums, websites and other online engagement tools, community meetings and opportunities for written submissions.

The consultation and engagement processes that stood out sought to engage community and industry stakeholders right from the start of the planning process. They also demonstrated how the findings from the consultation processes were incorporated during the various stages of the planning process.
Jurisdictions that were not consistent with this part of the criterion may have identified consultation processes, but they were limited to a particular point in the planning process rather than at multiple development, implementation and review stages. Generally, jurisdictions that only consulted with the community and other key stakeholders with a fully formed strategic plan or that did not demonstrate how the consultation was incorporated into the plan making were found to be partially consistent.
Chapter 4. Continuous improvement

At a glance

COAG asked the council to support continuous improvement and best practice knowledge sharing in strategic planning.

- To do this, the council organised a series of three workshops on common themes facing all Australian capital cities. These themes are:
  - building mandates for strategic long-term visions
  - building effective frameworks for investment and innovation
  - building information and knowledge about capital cities.
- In addition to these workshops, the council will fund a research project in 2012 on the current state of empirical research on productivity and agglomeration benefits in Australian capital cities.

4.1 The continuous improvement reference

COAG gave the council three tasks in capital cities:

- a review of State and Territory capital city strategic planning systems against nine agreed criteria
- support for continuous improvement in strategic planning
- build and share knowledge of best practice planning approaches (COAG 2009).

This chapter covers the council’s work supporting continuous improvement in strategic planning.

4.2 The council’s approach

The council’s approach to supporting continuous improvement was shaped by two key constraints: the council’s role in cities ceases at the end of 2011; and, under the Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations, the council cannot give policy advice.

Given these constraints, the program for continuous improvement focused on:

- delivering clear benefits to governments through intergovernmental cooperation—to demonstrate the prospects of future intergovernmental cooperation on cities
- highlighting possible future options to support continuous improvement that governments may or may not wish to adopt
- contributing, on a without prejudice basis, to public discussion of key issues in capital city strategic planning.
4.3 Areas for continuous improvement

The COAG Reform Council and the Expert Advisory Panel identified three areas for continuous improvement by governments:

- **building knowledge about capital cities**—improving information about capital cities; supporting sound policy evaluation and review; and measuring progress
- **building mandates**—gaining support and legitimacy for strategic long-term visions of capital cities and for the actions required to bring those visions about
- **building effective frameworks for investment and innovation**—ensuring that the cumulative effect of regulatory, taxation and other policies support the key policy directions in strategic planning for capital cities that rely heavily on the private sector for implementation, e.g. delivery of housing, jobs, centres, services and infrastructure.

The work done to support collaboration among governments on these issues under the continuous improvement program is discussed in sections 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 below.

**Building knowledge about capital cities**

**Consistency is necessary, but not sufficient**

In this review, each capital city strategic planning system has been considered against the key characteristics of each criterion. The characteristics cover the institutions, systems and processes, decision-making structures and principles, and policies of each planning system. The characteristics are set out in more detail in chapter 2.

As a result, this review of consistency is a view of the potential effectiveness of the system but not on the previous, current or future performance of the system against its own objectives or COAG’s objective for cities.

For example, through the criterion of integration, governments have agreed that integration of land use, infrastructure and economic development functions is fundamental to the achievement of the productivity outcome set out in the COAG objective. A finding of consistency on this criterion means the COAG Reform Council has found that the system has in place what governments agreed is needed to make integration possible. This includes having overarching strategic goals and policy directions to guide the disparate activities of government, communication and coordination mechanisms to bring these activities together and budgeting, decision-making and implementation approaches that are consistent with and driven by these strategic directions.

In this respect, consistency with the criteria is necessary but not sufficient for successful strategic planning to achieve productive, liveable and sustainable cities. To do this requires a focus on outcomes in cities and of strategic planning supported by better data and information.

**There is a need to focus on outcomes in capital cities**

The complexity of cities has already been emphasised. To handle this complexity and have a chance at strategic planning to deal with current and possible future challenges requires sound information, data and evidence. In reviewing strategic planning systems in Australian capital cities, the council and panel have seen a variety of approaches to information and performance measures.
Three areas for continuous improvement in this field were identified:

- A need to build the information base—Lack of relevant information or data constrains knowledge about what is happening in cities and what might happen in the future. It can also hamper efforts to understand the effects of policy interventions and to measure progress against government priorities. Work should be done to understand what information is readily available and what could be available through greater access to administrative data and ‘smart’ systems.

- Supporting sound policy evaluation and review—In the review of whether strategic planning systems addressed nationally significant policy issues (criterion four), policy analysis and review were the least clearly demonstrated attributes of the system by governments. This was particularly the case regarding housing affordability, demographic change, social inclusion, and health, liveability and community wellbeing. Based on better information, work could be done to improve evidence-based policy analysis and review regarding specific policy issues in cities.

- Measuring progress—Strategic plans for cities generally set out commitments to a range of high-level goals and priorities for government. The systems in place for measuring progress against these commitments in Australian capital cities are relatively new and have differing emphases and strengths and weaknesses within and across cities. There is a case for greater knowledge sharing and collaboration on these systems across governments to improve the credibility of Australian capital city strategic planning systems and provide a sound framework for evidence-based policy interventions.

Building mandates

Sound strategic planning is intended to deliver broad public benefits by managing externalities in capital cities. Typically, this requires a long-term view on the shape of the city; where its centres will be; where, what kind and how much housing is needed; and other questions.

Guiding a capital city toward that view requires widespread support for the vision and recognition among non-supporters that the vision is credible and legitimate. This is especially the case where that vision is transformative.

The review has found that all governments are consulting stakeholders and the public on elements of their strategic planning systems. However, despite these efforts, there remains opposition and a lack of cooperation with some implementation activities in Australian capital cities. This is especially in regard to increasing development in existing urban areas—a common approach in all capital cities for environmental, social and economic reasons.

Opposition not only hinders governments, it acts as an extra risk for the private sector, for example, by contributing to higher holding costs as a result of delays in development approval.

There is an onus on governments to discuss strategic planning, and its translation into actual on-the-ground activities, in ways that can be clearly understood. This includes adopting greater transparency about policy trade-offs rather than attempting to make everyone a ‘winner’.

The Productivity Commission found in its Performance Benchmarking of Australian Business Regulation: Planning, Zoning and Development Assessments, the importance of community engagement at the strategic planning stage—that is, in setting the long-term vision of the city, its shape, its centres, its density and other factors (Productivity Commission 2011). The Commission also noted that good practice requires significant engagement through all stages of the planning process and acknowledgement of the trade-offs inherent in many decisions.
Building effective frameworks for investment and innovation

In a market economy the delivery of most of the houses, buildings, jobs, services and infrastructure in a city will be done by the private sector. Strategic visions for cities that set out desired settlement and job dispersion patterns must take account of the motivations of these private sector actors and the frameworks within which they operate.

Some part of this framework is established by government in delivering public goods and trying to ensure that urban development achieves broader social, economic and environmental outcomes.

The panel has identified two broad areas for continuous improvement related to this issue.

**Urban and land economics are important to strategic planning**

The underlying economics of a city affect the viability and therefore the likelihood of achievement of the settlement patterns, centres and corridors identified in strategic plans for the city. However, it appears that insufficient regard has been had to economics in strategic planning for capital cities. Land economics are, of course, foundational for a city, but labour and other markets are also relevant in delivering economic development and jobs and doing so in particular locations.

For example, the physical size of a city and the number of people living in it will affect what types of housing development are possible. Most strategic plans seek to deliver a growing proportion of new dwellings through medium density infill development. Such development is more costly to build, due to increased complexity and higher risk. Medium density development depends in part on a scarcity of land to be economically feasible making it more costly to acquire land, especially in existing urban areas.

These extra costs can be offset by more efficient use of land. However, for significant parts of the market, to be attractive as a housing product, the final costs need to be lower than, or comparable to, single detached dwellings in locations of similar utility. Where this is not the case, the private sector will not have confidence that it will be able to sell the final product and so will not deliver it.

This situation relates not only to delivering on strategic visions but doing so while also delivering on high level priorities, such as housing affordability.

None of this is to suggest that the market should be left to its own devices—indeed the premise of long-term strategic planning is that there are significant externalities in cities as well as inertia and path-dependencies that justify intervention in the long-term public interest. The point is that the likelihood of success in addressing these externalities and achieving broader government objectives will be improved by greater consideration of the economic viability of the desired settlement patterns.

One element of this relates to the education of planners at the tertiary level. However, in the more immediate future, governments need to use their full range of analytical and policy tools to understand how their cities work and to drive the changes needed to deliver on the visions they set out in their strategic plans.

Earlier and more consistent involvement in strategic planning of the expertise of those responsible for economic policy and stewardship in treasuries and finance departments, as well as economic development and transport agencies, is needed. This includes involvement in the process of goal and direction setting as well as project assessment.
The cumulative effect of planning, regulatory and taxation arrangements

The issue here is how the frameworks of risk and reward created by the cumulative effect of various regulatory, taxation and infrastructure financing arrangements, affect the private sector’s capacity to deliver the housing, jobs, services and infrastructure identified as needed in strategic plans. This is especially notable for the delivery of affordable multi-unit dwellings for low income and ageing households.

The Productivity Commission also identified the complexity of planning and the multitude of actors and incentives involved in its Performance Benchmarking of Australian Business Regulation: Planning, Zoning and Development Assessments. The Commission noted that ‘good planning can create the environment for efficient and effective cities but the outcome is also dependent on the market, governments’ investment in infrastructure, and other government policies and actions’ (Productivity Commission 2011).

To support their strategic agendas, governments have a role in adjusting regulatory frameworks to reflect high level policy settings. For example, to encourage housing development to locate around public transport, the planning system typically adjusts zoning regulations that permit this type of development in these locations. However, these typical planning levers—designed originally to separate incompatible activities—are insufficient to achieve a positive agenda, such as enhancing the productivity or social inclusiveness of a city.

The Productivity Commission also noted the level of regulatory complexity at the development assessment stage. This complexity has led to the creation of a number of ‘special’ agencies to bypass the complex regulatory systems for major projects. This suggests that the complex regulatory system is acting as a barrier to the delivery of housing and infrastructure, not just for major projects, but for all projects (Productivity Commission 2011).

4.4 Supporting continuous improvement

The council and panel developed a two-pronged approach to promote continuous improvement and share best practice in strategic planning for Australian capital cities:

1. a series of three workshops on common challenges facing all Australian cities
2. a research project in support of the issues discussed at the workshops.

The objectives of this approach were to:

- connect government and non-government stakeholders, practitioners and experts across Australia involved in planning, investment and delivery in cities
- facilitate access to existing and new research, information and initiatives relating to best practice strategic planning, both here and overseas
- strengthen the culture of knowledge sharing between governments by facilitating initiatives that are both valuable and practical.
4.5 The workshop series

The ‘long conversation’: Workshop format and topics

Australian governments face complex challenges accommodating growth and change in cities. During the site visits, the Expert Advisory Panel identified implementation of strategic visions for cities as an issue for all governments as the key issue drawing together the issues set out above.

The panel hosted a workshop on each of the issues in various capital cities in 2011.

The aim was to provide an open and reflective forum to encourage a ‘long conversation’ across governments and with the private sector on the practical challenge of implementing strategic visions for capital cities.

Each workshop was guided by an external facilitator and attended by around 70 participants. The workshops ran over two days involving:

- speeches by relevant experts and stakeholders followed by questions from the audience
- ‘think pieces’ on relevant issues circulated before the workshop by speakers and other topic specialists
- working group sessions to discuss in greater detail the issues and possible solutions, including ideas for a further project supported by the council
- an informal dinner to encourage networking and exchange.

The themes were:

- **workshop one** (Adelaide, 5 and 6 May 2011)—gaining support and legitimacy for strategic long-term visions of cities and for the actions required to bring those visions about
- **workshop two** (Brisbane, 21 and 22 July 2011)—effective frameworks for investment and innovation in delivering the infrastructure, housing, jobs and services needed to achieve strategic visions
- **workshop three** (Melbourne, 12 and 13 October 2011)—on what we need to know about our cities to improve the information base, support sound policy evaluation and review, and measure progress (with partners the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute and the National Transport Commission).

Speakers at the workshops included: Sir Rod Eddington of Infrastructure Australia; Ms Jennifer Westacott from the Business Council of Australia; former NSW Premier Nick Greiner; and international experts Mr Josef Konvitz (former head of regulatory division at the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) and Mr Jay Stroebel (Director of Planning and Management, City of Minneapolis).

Boxes 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 contain summaries of the workshops. More detailed summaries, and workshop materials are available at the council’s website: [www.coagreformcouncil.gov.au](http://www.coagreformcouncil.gov.au). The content of the boxes is a synthesis of proceedings to give a broad overview of the nature of these discussions on cities. It is not the shared or published views of speakers, participants, the panel or the council. The council is prohibited from providing policy advice.
Box 4.1  Workshop one—building the mandate for change

On 5 and 6 May 2011, the panel hosted a workshop in Adelaide titled ‘Building the mandate for change: realising strategic vision in Australian cities’.

The main discussion points

- **The conversation itself.** Successful engagement requires a reasonable, honest discussion over time—one that acknowledges and accommodates resistance, involves different voices, and manages expectations in an open way by presenting real choices.

- **Going beyond the political cycle.** Building a mandate requires a longer-term focus beyond the political cycle and short projects.

- **Resourcing engagement.** Governments need to alter the way they plan and fund engagement processes, recognising that they are not easy or fast, and that trust is built by delivering on promises.

- **How we talk about cities.** Governments need to have a better grasp of how cities actually develop, and how facts about growth and development are communicated.

- **And what we know about them.** A common overarching request was for more information on best practice and a way to get that information and talk with those applying it. Research themes should include minimising silos, cross-sector collaboration, communicating change, meaningful timeframes and resourcing, and dealing with stakeholder input and resistance.

Box 4.2  Workshop two—frameworks for investment and innovation

On 21 and 22 July 2011, the panel hosted a workshop in Brisbane titled ‘Delivering change—supporting the private sector in the delivery of strategic vision for Australian cities’.

The main discussion points

- **The value of a strategic framework.** Long-term strategic plans provide an important basis for agreement on direction, in planning for infrastructure, attracting investment and improving mechanisms for development assessment and delivery.

- **Better engagement and leadership.** The importance of honest and effective early community engagement and its relationship to strong leadership. Capturing and communicating better data on housing and population was one way governments could tell a more evidence-based and considered ‘story’ about investment.

- **Increasing private sector involvement.** The potential of the private sector to bring its skills, techniques, partnerships, analysis and innovation to city planning and infrastructure delivery was considered, including its role in community engagement.

- **Rethinking the role of government.** Government has a role in leading the establishment of strategic visions and the frameworks for achieving those visions. There is also a need to properly consider and discuss the provision of public goods, the many positive externalities of good cities and good strategic planning.
Box 4.3 Workshop three—information needs for cities

On 12 and 13 October 2011, the panel hosted a workshop in Melbourne titled ‘COAG’s objective for cities—how are we faring?’ This workshop was held in partnership with the National Transport Council and the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.

The main discussion points

Discussion and debate covered meaningful indicators for evaluating and measuring progress against the national criteria for cities, and developing and implementing adaptive strategies to help realise the COAG objective for cities and determine how we are travelling.

- **Asking where to from here.** The COAG agenda for cities is about to reach its consummation. Nonetheless, there is a desire to perpetuate the good work that has been done thus far; after all, the agenda for cities is all about the long-term vision; overcoming the temptation to make decisions based on short-term gratification and economic imperatives or because there is intense pressure from interest groups. There is also the potential to establish a set of nationally-agreed performance indicators for cities.

- **The need for better and more readily available data.** The data we have are disparate and uncoordinated, raising the question of known unknowns; why do economists not examine the inner workings of cities and analyse what makes them so productive? There are some projects such as the Australian Urban Research Infrastructure Network that produce entirely relevant data for cities. The Network will provide stakeholders with access to a distributed network of aggregated datasets and information services. And yet this is only one piece of the cities data puzzle. For example, behavioural data—how people interact with cities would be beneficial. Moreover, communities usually care about the ‘un-measurable’ aspects of cities such as social capital and human wellbeing.

- **There is a desire for an ongoing initiative.** An initiative that can consistently and comprehensively collect data from all the relevant sources but also analyse and contextualise it is desirable. However, any research pod or centre of excellence created to embrace this challenge needs to have an interface with government whilst being independent of government; the former will prevent research publications from becoming dust-collectors, the latter will give the organisation a strong sense of legitimacy.

- **The conversation has come full circle.** The themes of the first two workshops are relevant to improving the information we have about Australian cities. For example, as well as resulting in purposeful action and evidence-based policy intervention rather than guesswork, better information must be able to play a role in galvanising community opinion (building the mandate for change) and designing quality projects aligned with future need in a way that gives the private sector certainty on investment opportunities (frameworks for investment and innovation).

Ultimately, it is governments that are charged with making decisions about the future of our cities and an overload of information that is not meaningful may not be helpful.
4.6 Continuous improvement research project

In 2011–12, the council has funds to support continuous improvement and best practice in strategic planning. The council and State and Territory governments agreed these funds would be used for a research project on a pertinent idea, theme or question arising from the workshops.

Description of the research project

State and Territory governments, the Expert Advisory Panel and the council agreed that the funds would be used to for the following research topic:

A study of the current state of empirical research on productivity and agglomeration benefits in Australian capital cities, including the costs and benefits in productivity terms of different urban forms and settlement patterns and detail of any information or data gaps that are hindering inquiry into productivity in Australian capital cities.

The aims of this research are:

- to support States and Territories in the strategic planning of their capital cities by informing their decisions on different urban forms and settlement patterns
- to support governments in resolving key information and data gaps on productivity and agglomeration benefits in cities.

The scope of the study should include:

- a literature review of current empirical research on productivity in Australian capital cities to distil what evidence there is on the economic, social and environmental costs and benefits of different urban forms and settlement patterns
- A review of how agglomeration and productivity benefits are, or could be, incorporated in project business cases
- analysis of any particular information or data gaps that have limited the accuracy or applicability of the above research to the relevant areas (i.e. Australian capital cities) or to different urban forms
- a review of overseas empirical research on productivity and agglomeration benefits in cities—for example, the Manchester Independent Economic Review—to find models for studying productivity in Australian capital cities and to draw out:
  - an indication of the potential productivity benefits and detriments of adopting different urban forms
  - any information or data gaps that hinder such studies in Australian capital cities, including the availability of data at small geographic scales
- clarification of the empirical factors which underpin productivity and agglomeration analyses, and how these relates to traditional cost benefit analyses.
- analysis of potential information and data sources to fill the gaps identified above and support empirical research on productivity on Australian capital cities
- analysis of the barriers to using the above information or data, including its use for comparisons between jurisdictions.
In addition, it is desirable that the study:

- apply the findings of the research to a number of cases studies in Australian capital cities
- look at the link between the identified costs and benefits and providing and using infrastructure in capital cities
- consider indicators of productivity in Australian capital cities.

How this project was determined

**Ideas emerging at each workshop**

The workshops were forums to discuss common challenges facing all Australian governments. These discussions raised a number of ideas, themes and questions about the topic area of each workshop. These ideas were presented to governments as options for this research project.

They are summarised below.

- **Building mandates for change**—with sub-topics including:
  - facilitating cross-sector collaboration
  - dealing with stakeholder input and resistance
  - making the best use of current and emerging technology
  - encouraging intergovernmental cooperation and mutual support in engagement

- **Frameworks for investment and innovation**—with sub-topics including:
  - the value of a national conversation and stable strategic framework for encouraging investment and innovation
  - evaluation of development agency models
  - the potential for new land tax arrangements to fund infrastructure
  - the potential for uniform code-based engineering and housing standards
  - a competitiveness index for Australian cities.

- **Information needs of our cities**—with sub-topics including:
  - What information do we need? What information is readily available? What could be available with a little work or cooperation (e.g. administrative data)?
  - How do we know what the key drivers and trends in cities are? How will we know if policy interventions are having an effect?
  - How can this information be translated into the strategic context—high-level government priorities such as those agreed in the COAG objective?

In addition, some topics not directly related to the workshops but still important to improving strategic planning in Australian cities were identified by jurisdictions at the workshops. These were also included in the list of options presented to governments and are summarised below:

- a scoping exercise on the costs and benefits of different approaches to development (e.g. infill, greenfield) or on the agglomeration benefits of cities
• investigating potential standardisation of indicators and definition of terms in an effort to improve the range and comparability of data about cities
• an independent review of the COAG reform process on cities to date
• research on how can we do metropolitan governance better
• an examination of what outcomes based on the nine criteria would look like
• a process to agree on the meaning and implications of the elements of the COAG objective (i.e. productive, liveable, sustainable).

Options papers and consultation

The council ran two consultation sessions with governments on the options for the research project. Each consultation was supported by an options paper setting out various topics and ways to deliver them. These papers analysed the strengths and weaknesses of each the options.

The first options paper refined a large list of options to a smaller set of more specific projects based on the strengths and weaknesses analysis. This paper formed the basis for the first round of consultation.

The second options paper provided a shortlist of project options based on the outcomes of the first round of consultation. The shortlisted options included:

• Original research on information needs for cities.
• Research synthesis or outline of best practice on information needs for our cities.
• Research synthesis or outline of best practice on community engagement.
• Preliminary analysis of frameworks for investment and innovation.
• Preliminary analysis on information needs for our cities.
• A research synthesis, preliminary analysis or scoping project on the costs and benefits of different urban forms or agglomeration benefits of cities.

Based on the analysis in the options paper and the preferences indicated in the consultations, jurisdictions settled on a hybrid of two of the options outlined above—information needs for cities and understanding productivity benefits of cities. Jurisdictions agreed that this project would be focused on research that helps to identify the information gaps in understanding and measuring productivity and agglomeration benefits of cities.
Chapter 5. Best practice highlights

At a glance

COAG asked the council to build and share knowledge of best practice planning approaches.

- The council’s role and the nature of the review limit how best practice can be applied.
- The panel highlighted good examples of what is necessary but not sufficient to achieve the aim of each criterion.
- A jurisdiction can have a particular example of good practice that is worth highlighting but not have all the characteristics needed to be found consistent with a criterion.

5.1 The best practice reference

COAG gave the COAG Reform Council three tasks in capital cities:

- a review of State and Territory capital city strategic planning systems against nine agreed criteria
- support for continuous improvement in strategic planning
- build and share knowledge of best practice planning approaches.

This chapter deals with the last of these references.

How the council defined best practice

There is no universally accepted definition of a ‘best practice’. However, ‘best practice’ is generally a practice that, on rigorous evaluation was successful, had a positive impact and can be replicated.

For example, the United Nations defines best practices as planning or operational practices that were successful in certain circumstances and can show what works and what does not to build and apply knowledge about how and why they work in different situations and contexts (United Nations 2011).

However, the council has not been able to use this definition of best practice due to the following two issues:

- The review of consistency is a view on the potential effectiveness of the system but not on the previous, current or future performance of the system against its own objectives or COAG’s objective for cities. As such, the council did not have evidence of ‘what works’ or ‘proven success’, or to evaluate the comparative impact or outcomes of systems from which to determine best practice.
- The council is not permitted to provide policy advice, so it does not offer examples of good practice so that they should or could be replicated in other contexts. It is up to governments and researchers to accumulate and apply knowledge about how and why certain structures work in different situations and contexts.
How the council selected best practice planning approaches

To build and share knowledge of best practice planning approaches, the council asked the independent Expert Advisory Panel to highlight good examples of what is necessary but not sufficient to achieve the aim of each criterion. These may be mechanisms, processes or policy.

This is an opportunity to separate out and highlight the individual strengths of a particular capital city strategic planning system, as well as against each criterion across the systems. It is possible for a jurisdiction to have an example of good practice that is worth highlighting but not have all the characteristics in place to be found consistent or even largely consistent.

5.2 Best practice planning approaches

In reviewing capital city strategic planning systems, the Expert Advisory Panel has highlighted the following examples of best practice in consistency with the agreed criteria.

Criterion one—Integration

NSW 2021 is a ten year plan that sets priorities to guide whole of government decision making and resource allocation across the State. It contains five strategies, 32 goals and 180 targets to guide policy and budget decision making. Many of the strategies and goals in NSW 2021 have implications for the planning system. This plan stood out as an example of a good State Plan that provides unifying objectives supported by clear actions and performance measures. The strongest aspect of this Plan is its clear accountability for the actions in the Plan.

The Northern Territory Government’s sense of the strategic position of Darwin and its long-term potential is also a highlight in terms of unifying objectives. The strategic planning system for Darwin contains the Northern Territory Government’s clear sense and vision of Darwin’s role within the Territory and Australia. This is reflected in the planning system, which also provides a good sense of Darwin’s role in the network of capital cities across Australia.

The Western Australian Planning Commission and the Western Australian Directors General Working Group were viewed as good institutional structures for delivering integrated, whole of government advice on planning to Cabinet. The Planning Commission in particular stood out as an alternative to the typical path of plans through planning departments and Cabinet coordination processes. To further this aim, the Working Group brings together Directors General from a broad range of different departments to consider advice from the Commission and provide advice through the Ministerial Taskforce on Approvals, Development and Sustainability to Cabinet.

Criterion two—Hierarchy of plans

The ‘line of sight’ concept used in the South East Queensland Regional Plan is both a useful communication tool in translating high level priorities into local actions, as well as a helpful discipline in doing that translation. The ‘line of sight’ is an approach to both strategic and project planning and internal and external communication that clearly links the highest level State strategic objectives through to the local planning schemes.
Criterion three—Nationally significant infrastructure

The Queensland Infrastructure Plan, and especially the indicative planning of infrastructure projects beyond the typical forward estimates period, is a highlight among the responses to this criterion. The Plan identifies and funds key projects in the forward estimates period, and it also outlines particular delivery timelines for infrastructure projects through to 2031 in the same document.

The Western Australian Government’s Metropolitan Region Scheme stands out as a mechanism for reserving land for long term urban expansion and transport corridors.

Criterion four—Nationally significant policy issues

The cost-benefit analysis of alternative growth paths for Sydney done for the Department of Planning and Infrastructure by the Centre for International Economics provides a good example of informed policy-making because of the sophisticated analysis provided. It is also worth highlighting that the NSW Government allowed it to be contested by releasing the information publicly.

Similarly, the background technical analysis done by KPMG and others for the South Australian Government’s 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide is a highlight of informed policy making through analysis. The background paper models the economic growth, productivity, social inclusion, energy efficiency and environmental benefits for Adelaide if the population growth, dwelling production, density and location targets are achieved.

Criterion five—Capital city networks

The Tasmanian Government gave a particularly well-articulated view of its regional networks and their significance, including potentially city-shaping opportunities as a result of the shift in freight handling from the Hobart waterfront to the Brighton intermodal terminal. This rationale is supported by the Tasmanian Infrastructure Plan. The Tasmanian Ports Corporation, Tasports, has released a strategic plan for the Port of Hobart which seeks to harmonise the State’s freight and economic development strategies and strengthen the port. Sector planning by the government dovetails with this strategic plan.

Criterion six—Planning for future growth

The Western Australian Urban Growth Monitor is a highlight in terms of information about land release. In particular, the Urban Growth Monitor includes information on infill development, reflecting the Department of Planning’s role in determining zoning. This highlights the potential for intergovernmental collaboration on releasing administrative data to enable this level of information to be available in all capital cities (see recommendation 3 in the Overview section of this report). It also offers the opportunity for such data to assist in evaluation, review and policy adaptation to support the achievement against relevant goals and indicators in Directions 2031.
Criterion eight—Urban design and architecture

Two different systemic approaches to urban design have stood out in this process.

One approach, the South Australian Integrated Design Commission, is a good example of a systematic approach to design issues in high level decision making—with an emphasis on principles of design and public education about design and a focus on a key location: central Adelaide. The Commission also provides advice to the government on key policy issues and major developments. One of the potential strengths of this new model is its use of design as a method for problem solving in the planning system.

The other approach, the NSW Government’s State Environmental Planning Policy 65 requires the use of independent expert advice—either through a registered architect or a specially appointed design review panel—on the design of all residential flat proposals. Its aim is to improve the design of all residential flat buildings to improve quality of life, housing choice and sustainability. This is a key focus given the growing proportion of people living in apartments.

Criterion nine (a)—Accountabilities, timelines and performance measures

The public performance reporting arrangements for the South Australia Strategic Plan, including the interactive supporting website, are a highlight among the reporting systems for outcomes and implementation the panel has seen. Similar arrangements are sketched out for the Plan for Greater Adelaide but the first reports are yet to be released. Both these publicly available documents contain a series of indicators and targets that can be used for measurement and reporting purposes and are linked to the outcomes in the plans.

A stand out part of the reporting of the South Australia Strategic Plan is that reporting is not only on current performance against the targets but also covers the likelihood of achievement of the targets over the life of the plan. Although the public reports are not themselves highly analytical documents on this question, it is hoped that the focus on achievability and the public discussion of it will drive a higher level of analysis within government of the viability of plans. This is also relevant to criterion seven and to criterion nine (c).

Criterion nine (b)—Intergovernmental coordination

The making of a strategic assessment agreement under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 [Cwlth] for the Melbourne Urban Growth Boundary expansion is a highlight regarding this particular aspect of the criterion. NSW, Western Australia and the ACT also now have such agreements in place. These agreements secure a formal process with the Commonwealth Government to review the overall impact of the metropolitan plan against the requirements in the Act for the metropolitan region. As well as its potential environmental benefits, it is an efficient way to outline and deal with the potential interactions over time between the policies and laws of these two levels of government as the metropolitan plans are implemented.
Criterion nine (d)—Appropriate consultation and engagement

*Canberra 2030: Time to Talk* was a major community engagement by the ACT Government in 2010 to discuss the significance of a growing population, identifying the impacts, trade-offs, potential opportunities, and through this, the priorities for urban development policies. Importantly, the outcomes of this process are being incorporated into the review of the Canberra Spatial Plan and the Time to Talk website continues to be for consulting with the general community.
PART C: COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT
Chapter 6. Commonwealth Government influences

At a glance

The Commonwealth Government’s policies and activities affect cities and the ability of city strategic planning systems to be consistent with the nine criteria.

- Commonwealth infrastructure spending affects the ability of States and Territories to provide for nationally significant infrastructure as agreed in criterion three.
- The Commonwealth recently increased its focus on urban issues, framing it as a national issue and elevating cities as principal centres of productivity in Australia.
- It is as important for the Commonwealth to think spatially and to take a coherent and coordinated approach to cities as it is for State and Territory governments to take an integrated approach, to help achieve the long term COAG objective for cities.

6.1 Why have a Commonwealth chapter?

COAG asked the COAG Reform Council to independently review the consistency of capital city strategic planning systems with the national criteria. The council notes that the planning and management of cities is a State and Territory responsibility, and that policy and strategy relating to cities is a State and Territory government activity.

However, in doing the review, the council observed a range of Commonwealth Government activities and policy settings that also affect planning and development in capital cities.

The extent of the relationship between the Commonwealth’s approach and State and Territory strategic planning, and the relationship both parties have with the private sector, also emerged as relevant in consultations with governments and other stakeholders.

The council has not reviewed the Commonwealth Government’s structures and policies that relate to capital cities against the agreed criteria in the same way that it has reviewed State and Territory systems in chapters 8 to 15.

Instead, this chapter contains the following:

- Section 6.2 sets out Commonwealth Government activities that are affecting cities and/or the ability of city strategic planning systems to be consistent with the nine criteria, based on the agreed requirements for State and Territory city strategic planning systems set out by COAG.
- Section 6.3 looks at the Commonwealth Government’s specific policies and emerging agenda on urban planning and development.
- The council’s view—outlined below—is that Commonwealth Government activity is relevant to the review not just for these reasons, but because of the importance of policy coherence across and between all governments in order to help realise the COAG objective for cities.
Policy coherence will help achieve the COAG objective for cities

The COAG objective of productive, liveable and sustainable cities cannot be achieved through the isolated efforts a single government agency, nor in many instances, a single sphere of government.

Increased Commonwealth engagement in urban issues has been publicly welcomed by a range of stakeholders. However, concerns have also been raised about inconsistencies within the Commonwealth Government and with State and Territory planning systems as well as a lack of clarity about how State and Territory systems should link to Commonwealth urban policy.

The council believes that it is not a case of Commonwealth Government activity being fully integrated with State and Territory government planning functions. What is important is that city-relevant Commonwealth structures and policies are clear, are pursued with a strategic perspective and with a view to the critical points of interaction and opportunities for coordination between the policy and programs of the different jurisdictions. With this in mind, the council has made the following observations on the role of the Commonwealth in cities.

- **Thinking spatially**—COAG has a broad and ambitious objective for Australian cities and it includes that cities be productive and globally competitive. The Commonwealth Government is responsible for managing the Australian economy—a large proportion of which is affected by capital cities and their productivity—and fiscal transfers to the States and Territories. In this central role, it is important that Commonwealth funding decisions, including contributions toward infrastructure, are made with regard for place and for the long term social, environmental and economic sustainability of capital cities.

- **Intergovernmental coordination**—Commonwealth Government activity affects cities. It is important for the Commonwealth to have a long term strategy for capital cities and for its activities and policies to be coordinated and aligned to that strategy. With the Commonwealth Government’s increasing involvement in the strategic direction of capital cities, improved and effective intergovernmental coordination will become increasingly important as shared objectives are adopted and implemented. This is an issue, for example, for the management of airports and airport land.

- **A clear, coherent agenda**—The Commonwealth Government has recently increased its focus on urban issues, framing it as a national issue and elevating cities as principal centres of productivity and economic activity in Australia. The new National Urban Policy, the Sustainable Population Strategy and the work of Infrastructure Australia form part of the Commonwealth’s emerging national approach to cities. By advocating for and developing overarching goals for cities, the government has indicated that it is considering its coordination role and policy direction for cities, and is aiming for a framework that provides greater policy clarity and coherence for cities in the national interest.

The council notes that there are at least three separate spatially-relevant Commonwealth policies with associated processes to develop indicator sets to measure performance.
6.2 Commonwealth Government activities affecting capital city planning

The following section outlines the council’s observations on the affect of Commonwealth Government activities on the ability of State and Territory city strategic planning systems to be consistent with the national criteria.

At times, these issues may be managed on a bilateral basis. However, many of the issues identified below are common to the planning processes of all jurisdictions. Most of the issues naturally cut across a number of criteria but are listed under the criteria where they have the most impact.

Criterion one—Integration

The council looked for four characteristics in State and Territory strategic planning systems to make findings on integration in city planning between land use, economic development and infrastructure investment functions. They are unifying goals and objectives, communication and coordination, decision making and budgeting, and implementation and review mechanisms.

It is instructive to point out how these elements apply to the Commonwealth Government, including how they support State and Territory governments to be consistent with the criterion:

1. A unifying set of goals or objectives—The Commonwealth Government has three possible sets of goals for capital cities in its National Urban Policy, Sustainable Population Strategy and Regional Development Australia. It is not clear how these policies fit together, nor how they provide a framework within which short term actions, such as infrastructure funding for the States and Territories, can be guided toward long-term goals. Commonwealth funding decisions affect State and Territory funding decisions and what projects States and Territories put forward. A clear picture of how the Commonwealth makes its funding decisions would help States and Territories in planning their cities.

2. Communication and coordination—The Commonwealth Government has a Cabinet process much as any State and Territory to develop whole of government views on policy issues. The internal Commonwealth Group on Cities formed following the agreement of the COAG agenda on cities, and the council understands that this is the principal vehicle for coordination of cities related activities in the Commonwealth Government. Its terms of reference are currently being revised to acknowledge the role of the new Standing Council on Transport and Infrastructure. The council understands that the Commonwealth Government is also talking to State and Territory Governments about the next steps for capital cities.

3. Decision making and budgeting—While the National Urban Policy nominally commits the Commonwealth Government to consider certain principles and objectives when recommending investments that may affect major cities (DIT 2011b, p. 9), it is not clear how this commitment and other supporting policies on cities will influence budgeting in the Commonwealth Government in practice.

Infrastructure Australia is an independent body that advises on infrastructure funding priorities. Its role has recently expanded to develop policies to deal with infrastructure bottlenecks, improve freight networks and encourage private sector investment in infrastructure. It is not clear how integral this advice is to Commonwealth Government budget decision making.
4. **Implementation and review**—It is not clear what arrangements are in place to implement the National Urban Policy or Sustainable Population Strategy, and to a lesser extent the Regional Development Australia policy, or to coordinate the timing and location of projects and programs aimed at delivering on the objectives of these policies.

It is important that relevant Commonwealth structures and policies—including but not limited to the cities-specific policies listed above—are clear, pursued with a committed strategic perspective and with a view to the specific points of interaction and opportunities for coordination between the policy and programs of the different jurisdictions. This does not appear to be the case.

---

**Criterion two—Hierarchy of plans**

**Funding for nationally-significant infrastructure**

The Commonwealth Government’s approach to infrastructure spending has an affect on the ability of State and Territory governments to plan and prioritise in the short, medium and long-term. This includes its near term commitments in the budget forward estimates and indicative nation-building commitments and overarching decision making frameworks in the medium and longer term.

State and Territory governments have generally welcomed the Commonwealth Government’s willingness to fund urban infrastructure and to use its resources consistently with capital city strategic planning systems.

The link made in the COAG communiqué between Commonwealth infrastructure funding and the capital cities review has provided a considerable incentive for governments to improve their capital city strategic planning. It also creates an opportunity for the Commonwealth Government to use its infrastructure funding more strategically to improve the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of people in capital cities.

Infrastructure Australia’s annual reports to COAG alleviate this concern to some degree. The independent body submits a National Priorities List to COAG in June every year. The list is also publicly released. It contains funding recommendations for nationally significant infrastructure projects generally in excess of $100 million that are both ready to proceed and those worthy of further development funding over time, drawn from State and Territory submissions (Infrastructure Australia 2011a, p. 70). It is important for this process to encourage and consider near term projects that align well with a State or Territory government’s own long term strategic directions and plans.

It is not necessarily clear, at least to the general public, how some State and Territory near term priorities fit into a long term picture. However, it is also not clear from the range of city-relevant policies of the Commonwealth Government how it would direct and prioritise infrastructure funding, even in the event that certain cities were found by the council to be wholly consistent with the criteria. The NSW Government made the point in its comments that it is not necessarily the case that final Commonwealth decision-making has regard for a State or Territory’s project identification and prioritisation process (NSW Government 2011, p. 64).
Criterion three—Nationally significant infrastructure

The above analysis is also relevant for criterion three. Commonwealth funded infrastructure processes and their associated national strategies provide a publicly available framework for investment decisions. They play a significant role in the overall picture State and Territory governments put forward of their strategic urban infrastructure planning and current investments. Again, this provides an incentive and opportunity for both levels of government to be strategic in their applications for and decisions about nationally significant infrastructure in cities by backing those projects that are supported by evidence they will help to achieve the COAG objective for cities.

Criterion four—Nationally significant policy issues

Commonwealth social and economic policy

There are a number of overarching Commonwealth policy issues that also affect State and Territory planning systems and the management of cities. Some State and Territory governments have reported that they are looking to the Commonwealth for guidance on how to address or better respond to these issues:

- Population growth and demographic change—Some States and Territories including NSW and Victoria have stated that the Commonwealth Government’s Sustainable Population Strategy will likely affect the need for and nature of strategies for managing population growth in capital cities. This may include developing alternative settlement strategies to manage population growth that would need to be done in concert with all levels of government.

  In addition to overarching strategies, a number of specific government policies affect this national issue. The Commonwealth Government is responsible for immigration policies, which have an impact on population growth in capital cities. A range of Commonwealth Government taxation, superannuation and income transfer policies affect the labour market effects of demographic change, and these have an effect on the housing needs, types and locations, and transport and other services that each city needs.

- Productivity and global competitiveness—Commonwealth Government trade policies and higher education policies have an effect on the productivity and global competitiveness of the Australian economy generally and in capital cities. Universities play a role in metropolitan development by providing an educated labour force and by attracting international students to study, work and spend in our cities. Universities are also agglomerations for research and innovation, business partnerships and exchange. This is relevant for larger and smaller capital cities alike. While all Group of Eight universities are based in the larger capital cities, universities based in smaller cities like Hobart and Darwin can play an equally if not more decisive role in the international competitiveness of that city.

- Climate change mitigation and adaptation—Some States and Territories have stated that the responses of capital city strategic planning systems to climate change mitigation and adaptation will depend on the Commonwealth Government’s decision to put a price on greenhouse gas emissions. While all jurisdictions have argued that their planning systems contain measures to respond to climate change, there is a general view that a national approach is required to effectively address climate change.
• **Housing supply and affordability**—The Commonwealth Government has a number of schemes aimed at improving affordability including the National Affordable Housing Agreement, first home owners’ grants and special savings accounts for home buyers. *Australia’s Future Tax System* (the Henry tax review) (*Australia’s Future Tax System Review 2009*) examined the cumulative effect of various taxation arrangements on housing. However, the recommendations made in relation to housing have not been adopted.

### Criterion five—Capital city networks

#### The management of airports and airport land

The issue of the management of airports, both in terms of aviation capacity and non-aviation uses of airport and surrounding land have been observed in most capital cities and by all jurisdictions.

- In aviation terms, airports are nationally significant economic infrastructure and airport capacity and location can have a city-shaping effect. This is especially important in Sydney and Darwin. This is also relevant to criterion three.

- In terms of land use, there is a benefit to ensuring that airports are integrated into the local transport and land-use arrangements and that non-aviation uses of airport land that have the potential to create land-use inconsistencies and increased congestion, air and noise pollution are managed. This is also relevant to criterion four in relation to health, liveability and wellbeing as because of the potential impact of noise and air pollution for local residents, and in criterion six.

The Commonwealth Minister for Infrastructure and Transport is responsible for Commonwealth policies relating to airports and aviation, including approving airport master plans. States and Territories have raised the importance of the Commonwealth minister ensuring that approvals of airport master plans are consistent with the goals and objectives in the relevant capital city strategic planning systems. The Commonwealth Government has indicated that it will do this.

The Commonwealth Government has noted in its correspondence with the council that poorly managed development around airports can result in unnecessary constraints on airport operations and affect community safety and amenity. It discussed the need to ensure that construction and development in the vicinity of airports and near flight paths is done in a way that is compatible with airport operations, both in the present and taking into account future growth. In particular, the future operation of airports can be prejudiced by encroachment of noise-sensitive developments such as housing and can therefore constrain economic growth.

Given the arguments put forward by the Commonwealth and by the States and Territories, there is potential mutual benefit in cooperation on the management of airports and land use in and around airports.

The National Aviation White Paper argues for the creation of Planning Coordination Forums for discussions between the airport operators and senior local, State and Commonwealth Government authorities responsible for planning and infrastructure investment (*DIT 2009*, p. 11). Despite this requirement, with the exception of the submissions of the NSW and Victorian governments, which reported on airport planning arrangements with the Commonwealth, the council has not received further details of formal cooperation arrangements to manage airport-related issues beyond Master Planning.
Management of Commonwealth owned land

The management of Commonwealth land is also important with defence sites being potentially strategically important, especially in Sydney, Melbourne and Darwin. The location of Commonwealth land within capital cities and adjoining areas can affect the shape of the city, including through the constraints it places on future development and opportunities it may create when that land is surplus or redundant.

Some States and Territories noted in their submissions the importance of the Commonwealth Government coordinating with the relevant State or Territory in the use of Commonwealth land. The approach to disposal of Commonwealth owned land is a key aspect of this, as opportunities may arise to pursue the strategic objectives for cities. Greater coordination with the States and Territories through the Commonwealth Government’s Department of Finance and Deregulation may help to seize these opportunities.

However, while some specific sites have been identified in this process, the Commonwealth Government reported that the amount of surplus land available for disposal in cities is declining. This will likely reduce the capacity of disposals to help meet demand for new housing development within cities. It also noted that there was further work being done to identify surplus land through COAG processes. This is promising.

Location of Commonwealth services

States and Territories outlined that the location of Commonwealth services, such as universities, and agencies like Centrelink and Medicare can have an effect on the capital city strategic planning system. There is an opportunity for these services to be coordinated with land-use plans, employment strategies and centres strategies if they are to support the goals and objectives of the capital city strategic planning system. This would need to be supported by State and Territory government having clear labour force and centres plans.

Better coordination between the Commonwealth and State and Territory governments may lead to more strategically located services that better contribute to the achievement of the goals and objectives for cities.

Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act

The Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 [Cwlth] is the Commonwealth Government’s central piece of environmental legislation and framework to manage and protect areas of national and international significance. Under the Act, development that affects matters of environmental significance requires approval from the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment. State and Territory governments also have environmental legislation that covers development within their jurisdiction.

Multiple approvals processes and site by site assessments remain an ongoing concern in terms of the constraints and delays on development that can result.

Bilateral assessment agreements are now in place between the Commonwealth and all States and Territories. These agreements allow for a single environmental assessment process by accrediting a jurisdiction’s assessment process as satisfying the Act. The council has noted in its National...
Partnership Agreement to Deliver a Seamless National Economy: Performance report for 2008–09 that these bilateral assessment agreements have only had partial success in reducing the regulatory burden of environmental assessment and approvals processes (COAG Reform Council 2010, pp. 43–44).

The Act allows for one-off strategic assessments to be used to assess large-scale, complex projects with multiple development impacts that would otherwise be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Although some jurisdictions have praised these high-level agreements and ensuing processes for their potential to speed up approval times in strategic growth areas in the medium-term, they are relatively new, and the practical impact and detail of the assessments on State and Territory planning remains to be seen.

Currently, the four strategic assessments affecting capital cities are:

- The Melbourne Urban Growth Boundary assessment began on agreement between the Victorian Government and the Commonwealth in 2008 and was endorsed by the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts in February 2010. Since then, two actions have been approved under the assessment and in October 2011 draft growth corridor plans including the outcomes of the rest of the assessment were released by the Victorian Government for consultation (GAA 2011).
- The Molonglo and North Weston Structure Plan assessment agreement was signed in 2008 and endorsed in October 2011, though no actions have been approved at this point in time.
- The Western Sydney Growth Centres (NSW) strategic assessment was agreed in November 2009 and is currently with the Commonwealth Minister for consideration.
- In August 2011, the Commonwealth and Western Australian Governments agreed to a strategic assessment of the Perth and Peel region, to assess the environmental impact of developments outlined in Directions 2031 on the Swan Coastal Plains.

This is also relevant to criterion four on matters of national environmental significance, and criterion nine (b) on intergovernmental cooperation.

**Criterion seven—Investment priorities and frameworks**

This criterion relates to both the degree of certainty of infrastructure provision and land use arrangements in line with government priorities and to the framework for investment and innovation created by the cumulative effects of planning, regulatory and taxation systems on private sector decision-making.

As noted above, the Commonwealth’s infrastructure funding approaches and decisions have an effect on State and Territory priorities and thus affect this criterion. The Commonwealth is also responsible for substantial regulatory (e.g. the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act), and taxation policies (e.g. capital gains tax concessions) that have an affect on the framework for private-sector decision-making.
Criterion eight—Urban design and architecture

While the Commonwealth Government may play a funding role in certain iconic projects and at particular sites, the council has not identified significant areas of Commonwealth Government activity that directly affect the ability of State and Territory governments to encourage world class urban design and architecture across the system, at the precinct level or at particular locations.

As a potential support mechanism, the council notes that the Major Cities Unit has released the Australian Urban Design Protocol to provide an overarching framework for the practice and delivery of urban design, which will be supported by case studies and a best practice toolkit (DIT 2011a).

Criterion nine (b)—Intergovernmental coordination

Planning of the national capital

The Commonwealth Government has a role in the strategic planning of Canberra through the National Capital Authority. The ACT Government noted the importance of effective coordination with the National Capital Authority if it was going to be able to deliver on the strategic goals for Canberra. To date, concerns have been raised by both the National Capital Authority and the ACT Government on the coordination needed for a complementary planning approach for the Territory.

The Commonwealth Government commissioned Dr Allan Hawke AC to independently review the National Capital Authority (Crean 2011). A number of reviews have preceded this one but failed to resolve fundamental problems of responsibility for planning in Canberra. The council hopes this review will be able to deliver results where previous reviews have not, although it understands that the findings of this review may not be made public.

6.3 Commonwealth Government policy on cities

The Commonwealth Government recently increased its focus on urban issues at the national level and in framing cities as the principle centres of economic activity and productivity in Australia. The following section describes the Commonwealth Government’s emerging national approach to cities through a number of recent policy and funding developments.

National Urban Policy

In May 2011, the Commonwealth Minister for Infrastructure and Transport released Our Cities, Our Future—A National Urban Policy for a productive, sustainable and liveable future. The National Urban Policy sets out a framework of high-level goals, objectives and principles intended to shape the Commonwealth Government’s approach to cities. The Policy outlines direct and indirect roles through investing in transport and infrastructure, health and education funding and through regulation. The Policy recognises that ‘in the past, Commonwealth policies, investments and activities were not always coordinated with other levels of government, nor well understood from the spatial/geographic perspective of cities’ (DIT 2011b, p. 9).
Within the framework of the National Urban Policy, the Commonwealth will produce:

- An annual State of Australian Cities Report, first released in 2010, which publishes data and discusses social and economic trends in major cities under some of the themes of the COAG objective for cities.
- The Australian Urban Design Protocol, to encourage world-class urban design and architecture by establishing a framework for the practice and delivery of urban design supported by case studies and a best practice toolkit.

**Sustainable Population Strategy**

In May 2011, the Commonwealth Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, launched *Sustainable Australia—Sustainable Communities: A Sustainable Population Strategy for Australia* (DSEWPC 2011). The Strategy outlines the Commonwealth Government’s framework to ensure that future population change is compatible with the economic, environmental and social wellbeing of people in Australia, and with appropriate settlement patterns and employment growth.

In the 2011–12 Commonwealth Budget, $150 million was allocated for measures to support a sustainable population in Australia, including developing jobs precincts, business opportunities in regional Australia, encouraging new migrants and others to consider ‘regional living’, measuring sustainability and improving information for decision making at the national and international levels including through developing indicators, managed motorways and urban renewal.

**Regional Development Australia**

Regional Development Australia is a Commonwealth Government initiative that brings together all levels of government to better coordinate activity and development in regions, and provide a policy and community engagement link between governments and people living in regions. This is delivered through a new national network of 55 committees to build partnerships between governments, regional development organisations, local businesses, community groups and regional stakeholders. Each committee comprises local leaders with broad and diverse skills and experience within their region. Regional Development Australia also aims to reduce duplication and overlap in regional activities, as well as bring a focus to the role of regional centres as a productive agricultural hinterland for urban and regional areas requiring proper strategic management.

Committees are encouraged to work together on projects and other activities where they have common interests and common boundaries. One of the roles of Regional Development Australia committees will be to develop a Regional Plan for their region.

**Infrastructure Australia**

Infrastructure Australia is a statutory body advising governments, investors and infrastructure owners on:

- Australia’s current and future infrastructure needs
- mechanisms for financing infrastructure investments
- policy, pricing and regulation and their impacts on investment
• the efficiency of the delivery, operation and use of national infrastructure networks.

It is also assesses Commonwealth funding priorities and investment for State and Territory nationally significant economic infrastructure.

Since its initial report to COAG in December 2008, Infrastructure Australia has highlighted the need to find ways to make better use of existing infrastructure, to remove the bottlenecks and gaps that are holding back Australia's growth, and to identify opportunities for new capital investment. In its following three reports to COAG, Infrastructure Australia has provided updated national infrastructure priorities and addressed elements of these issues including:

• 2009—nine challenges facing Australia and a framework to address them (Infrastructure Australia 2009)
• 2010—better use of infrastructure and investment reforms (Infrastructure Australia 2010)
• 2011—productivity and infrastructure, better projects and private funding (Infrastructure Australia 2011b).

Infrastructure Australia’s agenda for Australian cities includes the need for a national public transport strategy and a national roads network, managing road flows and congestion pricing.

Through Infrastructure Australia, the Commonwealth Government has also developed the National Ports Strategy and a Draft National Land Freight Strategy.

Health and hospitals

The Commonwealth Government’s Health and Hospital Infrastructure Fund was established in 2009 as part of its broader nation-building infrastructure program. The Fund is guided by legislation under the Nation-building Funds Act 2008 [Cwlth]. The stated objectives of the Fund, while not replacing State and Territory effort, are to:

• invest in major health infrastructure programs that will make significant progress towards achieving the Commonwealth’s health reform targets
• make strategic investments in the health system that will underpin major improvements in efficiency, access or outcomes of health care (DHA 2011).

Under the Act, all health infrastructure spending proposals need to be assessed by an independent, expert advisory board appointed by the Minister for Health and Ageing. The role of the Board is to advise the minister whether proposals for funding through the Fund satisfy the evaluation criteria and guidelines issued by the minister.

National Aviation Policy White Paper

In 2009, the Commonwealth Government released the National Aviation Policy White Paper: Flight Path to the Future. The aim was to bring together all aspects of aviation policy into a single, statement and to move away from an ad hoc approach to policy and planning for the aviation industry to a more coherent, strategic approach. The White Paper examines the industry from different angles and points to Commonwealth Government policy addressing challenges in each area. Analysis of the spatial implications for the current position of airports on surrounding
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communities and the growth of cities, as well as the nature of airports as transport and economic hubs, is discussed in the section on airport infrastructure (DIT 2009, p. 11).

Commonwealth Group on Cities

The Commonwealth Group on Cities is a forum on cities internal to the Commonwealth Government. It was formed in 2010 following agreement on the COAG agenda on cities. The council understands that this is the principal vehicle for coordination of cities related activities in the Commonwealth Government. The terms of reference are being revised to acknowledge the role of the new Standing Council on Transport and Infrastructure.

It comprises the Secretaries or nominees of these Commonwealth Government departments:

- Infrastructure and Transport (Chair)
- Prime Minister and Cabinet
- Treasury
- Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities
- Finance and Deregulation
- Regional Australia, Regional Development and Local Government
- Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs
- Education, Employment, Workplace Relations
- Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy
- Health and Ageing
- Climate Change and Energy Efficiency
- Immigration and Citizenship.

Invitations to participate on the Group have been extended to the Department of Human Services, and Department of Defence.

National funding for research on cities

The council has observed a number of Commonwealth-funded or joint State and Commonwealth funded research bodies on urban planning and infrastructure. This includes but is not limited to:

- The SMART Infrastructure facility at Wollongong University—this provides a research capability and collaboration with infrastructure planners, designers and researchers to better understand urban and regional development and model future growth of Australian metropolitan and regional communities. SMART stands for Simulation, Modelling, Analysis, Research and Teaching.
- The Australasian Centre for the Governance and Management of Urban Transport (GAMUT Centre) at the University of Melbourne—examining integrated urban transport in an international context.
- A $20 million Education Investment Fund Grant from the Commonwealth Government to establish the Australian Urban Research Infrastructure Network led by Professor Robert Stimson, Melbourne University. The network is designed to bring together a number of built
environment and urban researchers, designers and planners, and facilitate access to a distributed network of aggregated datasets and information services.

- The National Cities Research Program at The Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute—established to support the reform agenda of all governments seeking solutions to the economic, social and environmental challenges that face Australian cities. It is developing evidence focused on cities to support better integration of transport policy and infrastructure provision, and address the challenges of sustainable population growth.

Information and data on cities

The Commonwealth Government is developing some indicators through a number of reporting mechanisms relevant to cities:

- *State of Australian Cities* at the Department of Infrastructure and Transport
- *My Region* at the Department of Regional Australia
- *Measuring Sustainability*, including development of sustainability indicators for Australia, at the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities.

This reflects the potential disparate sets of objectives or goals for cities within the Commonwealth Government’s policy framework.
PART D: REVIEW AND ANALYSIS
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Chapter 7. About the review

At a glance

The review was done through 2010 and 2011 in consultation with governments and supported by an Expert Advisory Panel.

- It is a specific task that has limits:
  - it is a point-in-time assessment of consistency in changing systems
  - it examines structures and processes but not effectiveness or outcomes
  - it does not adjust for the scale of the challenges facing each city
  - it is in a field that is acutely political.
- The council has used basic logic-testing questions against the statements governments have provided to demonstrate consistency with the various attributes of the criteria.
- The council has made graded findings of consistency to present a more subtle understanding of the systems it has reviewed and to give credit to positive elements.
- Each city has a dedicated chapter and each finding sits on one page for easy reference. Technical detail on the council’s rationale behind findings is available online.

7.1 The council’s approach

As outlined in chapter 1, the COAG Reform Council’s approach to its review of capital city strategic planning systems was developed in consultation with governments over the first half of 2010. It involved two reporting stages:

- interim reports with preliminary findings, which were not publicly released
- a final report delivered to COAG by the end of 2011 and publicly released shortly afterward.

This two report approach acknowledges the breadth and complexity of the issues related to capital city strategic planning systems.

The approach allows ample opportunities for submissions by governments on how their systems are consistent with the criteria. The council critically analysed these submissions through a basic logic testing process (detailed below) with the assistance of the Expert Advisory Panel appointed by COAG.

The council has been given a specific task by COAG to review capital city strategic planning systems for consistency with nine agreed criteria. Some key points to note about this task are that:

- it is a review of strategic planning, not just statutory planning—meaning it looks at infrastructure planning and economic development and other issues broader than the typical planning domains of zoning and approvals
- it is a review of planning systems, not just plans—meaning it covers institutional and decision-making arrangements as well as strategic planning documents
it is a review of consistency with the criteria, not against performance measures—meaning it
does not make findings on the results of the system

it is not a review of the policy directions being pursued by governments—for example, the
review is silent on immigration levels or settlement patterns in Australia.

Some key limitations on comparing the findings across cities are detailed in chapter 1 and
summarised below. The findings:

- are assessments of the institutions, decision-making structures and processes, and policy
  coherence in the system
- are point-in-time assessments of consistency
- have not been adjusted for the scale of the challenges facing each city
- relate to a field—strategic planning—which is acutely political.

### 7.2 Logic testing

The findings of the council are based on critical analysis and logic testing of the information
provided by governments in self-assessments and subsequent submissions. The council used basic
logic-testing questions against the statements provided to demonstrate consistency with the various
attributes of the criteria. This involved a series of questions the council considered as follows:

- Does the response indicate that the relevant capital city strategic planning system is consistent
  with the criterion or has the relevant attribute?
- Is a rationale provided for this affirmative statement of consistency?
- Is the rationale logical, clear, convincing, and relevant to the attribute?
- Is there evidence to support the claim of consistency and its rationale?
- Is the evidence relevant and defensible?

In considering these questions, the council has used the advice of the Expert Advisory Panel and
insights from stakeholders to focus its efforts in the review.

If all of the above factors were present against a criterion/attribute, then the system was found
‘consistent’. If the factors were not all present, then the system was initially found ‘not consistent’.

### 7.3 Different types of findings

The council made findings on consistency against each of criteria one to eight and on the four
components of criterion nine. Simple findings of ‘consistent’ or ‘not consistent’ as discussed above
would not sufficiently reflect the substantial efforts of governments even where they have not
shown the council all elements of consistency with a criterion.

The council made graded findings of consistency to present a more subtle understanding of the
capital city strategic planning systems it has reviewed, and to give credit to the positive aspects of
respective government strategic planning systems.
Table 7.1 Categories of findings on consistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>The government’s submissions showed consistency of the strategic planning system with all attributes of the criterion and this was supported by a strong rationale and evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largely consistent</td>
<td>Most key attributes of consistency with the criterion were shown in the government’s submissions and were supported by evidence. One or two relatively minor attributes were not clearly shown to the council or were not fully explained, with the council confident that a process is in place to develop the missing attribute/s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially consistent—reform pending</td>
<td>This is applied to criteria where the following apply:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· one or two more significant attributes of consistency were not shown for the current system detailed in the government’s submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· the government’s submissions detailed impending changes to the system, which would apply after the council reports to COAG but may lead to a system that the council would consider more consistent than the current finding indicates, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· very recent changes have been made to the system and it is too soon to tell if they are embedded in the government’s approach to strategic planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially consistent</td>
<td>Most key attributes of consistency with the criterion were shown in the government’s submissions and were supported by evidence. One or two more significant attributes were not clearly shown or not fully explained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not consistent—reform pending</td>
<td>This is applied to criteria where the following apply:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· key attributes of consistency were not shown for the current system detailed in the government’s submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· the government’s submissions detailed impending changes to the system, which would apply after the council reports to COAG but may lead to a system that the council would consider more consistent than the current finding indicates, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· very recent changes have been made to the system and it is too soon to tell if they are embedded in the government’s approach to strategic planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not consistent</td>
<td>The government’s submissions did not show key attributes of consistency with the criterion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4 Structure of review and analysis chapters

The remainder of the review and analysis section is structured as follows:

- section 7.5 provides information on how to read the review for each of the capital cities
- chapters 8 to 15 summarise the formal review of each city’s planning system against criteria.
7.5 How to read the chapter on each city

Chapters 8 to 15 set out the council’s individual findings and a summary of the relevant city’s strategic planning system against the criteria. Information on each finding for each city sits on one page as set out in the sample diagram below. The only exception to this is the longer content in criterion four which sits over two pages, and criterion nine which sits across four pages covering nine (a) to (d).

A more detailed review and analysis of systems and an explanation of the findings on each capital city, including full bibliographic referencing, is available online at www.coagreformcouncil.gov.au. There are eight appendices A to H in the same city order as chapters 8 to 15 of this report.

Figure 7.1 How the council’s formal review is presented

This box shows which city and which criterion this page is about. The full list of criteria agreed by COAG is in box 1.1.

This is the finding the council has made on this criterion. Explanations of the different types of findings are listed in table 7.1 and on page 93 of this report.

This is a summary of the council’s analysis of the strategic planning system in relation to this criterion. Information on national issues in the findings is in chapter 3.

These are the words of the criterion as agreed by COAG. More information on how the council has interpreted the criteria is at chapter 2.

These are the main reasons the council made this finding. More detail on each city system and finding is on the council’s website.

This section is different for each criterion and may be a diagram, table or graph. It is a descriptive overview of the relevant mechanisms, processes, provisions or plans in place as part of a capital city strategic planning system. It is organised in a way that shows part of what the council looked at to consider whether a system was consistent with this criterion.
Chapter 8. Sydney

8.1 Context

Figure 8.1 Map of Sydney

Governance and context

The planning of Sydney is primarily the responsibility of the State government. This includes public transport, main roads, traffic control, and planning of major infrastructure projects.

Planning powers mainly rest within the Department of Premier and Cabinet, the Department of Planning and Infrastructure, and Transport for NSW, with the NSW Treasury having a role in funding. However, the strategic planning system is in transition following a change of government in March 2011. This transitional status of these mechanisms has affected the findings in this report.

The Sydney Metropolitan Region is divided into 43 local government areas. Local governments primarily have responsibility for development assessment and local strategic planning, except where proposals are deemed of state significance.
8.2 Key statistics

**People**

Historical and projected population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population of NSW, 2010</th>
<th>Population of Sydney, 2010</th>
<th>Proportion of NSW population in Sydney, 2010</th>
<th>Sydney annual average population growth rate (for the five years to June 2010)</th>
<th>Estimated population of Sydney by 2056 (ABS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>4.6 million</td>
<td>7.2 million</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>1.7% (330 500 residents)</td>
<td>7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median age of Sydney’s population 36

Median age of Australia’s population 37

**Economy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average annual income</td>
<td>$50,790</td>
<td>$45,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total containerised trade (TEU)</td>
<td>2,020,086</td>
<td>6,788,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air passenger movements (million, 2010–11)</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>135.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air passenger movements (annual % increase)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dwellings**

Typical (modal) Sydney dwelling price, 2009–10 $370,000

Median Sydney dwelling price, 2009–10 $490,000

Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, Sydney 43.9%

Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, national 42.0%

Homelessness rate per 10,000, 2006 (similar to other capital cities) 39

**Utilities**

Water use in Sydney in 2009–10 (the third highest among capital cities excluding Hobart) 205 kilolitres

Proportion of Sydney residents who used public transport to journey to work in 2006 26.3%

Proportion of Australians who used public transport to journey to work in 2006 13.5%

Notes and sources for this page are listed at the end of this chapter.
8.3 Overall views of strategic planning for Sydney

The council has reviewed the strategic planning system for Sydney against the nine criteria by critically analysing, with the assistance of the Expert Advisory Panel, information provided by the New South Wales Government. In doing this review, the council has reached the following high level views.

**Significant change in the capital city strategic planning system**

The strategic planning system for Sydney is changing following the election of a new government in March 2011. This has affected some of the council’s findings of consistency or otherwise with the national criteria, especially where the finding is ‘not consistent—reform pending’ or ‘partially consistent—reform pending’. The NSW Government is pursuing a number of reforms to its system that are recognised in this report as potentially more consistent with the criteria, however, this cannot be known until the reforms are fully implemented.

This is symptomatic of a general issue in the strategic planning of Australian cities, which requires persistent effort over timeframes in which it is likely that governments will change. Statutory frameworks and provisions can provide some continuity but do not replace the foundational importance of a strategic, integrated, long-term vision for the city—supported by a systematic implementation program—at any one point in time. This is not only important for guiding government activity, but also for creating a stable climate for investment in the city.

This issue highlights the importance of governments seriously and genuinely engaging the community and stakeholders in strategic planning so that these visions may be durable, should governments change.

**Strong planning and policy content**

The NSW Government’s strategic planning system for Sydney shows high-quality planning content. The vision and shape of the city are clearly articulated, including a focus on increasing density around key centres, such as Parramatta, and on key transport routes that have spare capacity. There is a clear role and supporting planning concepts for various parts of the city.

Similarly, a high level of analysis was shown by the NSW Government in terms of how it addresses nationally significant policy issues through its strategic planning system.

**But the hard-edged measures to deliver this in an integrated way are not in place**

The NSW Government has reporting measures against outcomes and strategic directions in its State Plan, NSW 2021, but no corresponding arrangements at the Metropolitan Plan level.

An outcomes focus is a good start as it ensures the focus of government is ultimately on the key real-world effects governments seek through their efforts. It remains important to have a clear rationale that links government efforts to these outcomes and mechanisms to drive the activities. Ideally, this is supported by clear public commitments, in advance, to the actions and timelines for implementation.

This is not currently the case in NSW. However, the incoming government says it will establish a Metropolitan Plan Delivery Group to report on implementation. This may address the council’s concerns given the stated intention to report annually to Cabinet and the public.
The compact city requires a new compact

The NSW Government has committed to its ‘City of Cities’ concept to guide a large proportion of residential growth into existing urban areas and around major centres in Sydney. The policy basis for this is clear—to provide better environmental outcomes, make more efficient use of land and infrastructure and harness the benefits of agglomeration and increased productivity.

The government reports it is meeting its 70 per cent infill target. However, this reflects a situation where the infill proportion of dwelling supply is being met but aggregate supply is not meeting targets. This has implications for Sydney’s growth—and given the national economic significance of Sydney—for the nation.

The goal of a more compact city is a delicate balancing act. Infill development will help Sydney meet sustainability and economic competitiveness goals but may have negative effects on affordability and growth. According to the National Housing Supply Council 2010 Report, in Sydney, housing construction in greenfield locations is more expensive than in infill locations. Measures such as passing on the costs of infrastructure services to greenfield sites—that have had the effect of driving urban consolidation—may undermine support from some stakeholders for the strategic planning system and its objectives.

This outcome has both positive and negative elements. On the one hand, the government’s steadfast approach has meant that some strategic outcomes have been both met and exceeded. On the other hand, the ongoing growth of Sydney and its push towards a more compact city will require increasing levels of trust and cooperation from all stakeholders. This is particularly the case for developers, who will deliver the housing, and local governments and their communities, who will approve, accommodate and serve increased densities in their local areas.
8.4 Review against the criteria

**Sydney: Criterion one—Integration**

Capital city strategic planning systems should be integrated:

a) across functions, including land-use and transport planning, economic and infrastructure development, environmental assessment and urban development, and

b) across government agencies.

**Finding**

**PARTIALLY CONSISTENT—REFORM PENDING**

**Key points**

- The arrangements for coordination, decision-making and implementation are yet to be established or are still developing.
- The hierarchy of goals is changing and not wholly consistent.

The key mechanisms to align budget and decision making processes and implementation with the overarching strategic goals and objectives of the strategic planning system are prospective and transitional at the time of writing. For example, the Metropolitan Plan Delivery Group is yet to be established and Infrastructure NSW only recently began. While the role of Infrastructure NSW outlined by the NSW Government creates a prospect of enhanced transparency and certainty regarding infrastructure decision-making, the plans it will develop are not yet complete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of integration</th>
<th>Characteristics of Sydney planning system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Unifying goals and objectives** | - A clear set of goals outlined in NSW 2021 and Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036.  
- Budget allocations require links to the unifying goals to be stated.  
- Public reporting against goals of NSW 2021 through online updates and an annual report tabled in the NSW Parliament. |
| **Communication and coordination** | - New arrangements are currently being put in place.  
- These include the Metropolitan Plan Delivery Group, Transport for NSW and Infrastructure NSW. |
| **Decision making and budgeting** | - Budget decisions made by Cabinet are informed by Total Asset Management budget submissions—submissions must demonstrate strategic need and links to unifying goals.  
- Infrastructure NSW is expected to affect decision making and budget procedures. |
| **Implementation and review** | - The key implementation mechanism—the Metropolitan Plan Delivery Group—is yet to be established.  
- Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority will coordinate place-based urban renewal. |
Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for a consistent hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans, including:

a) long term (for example, 15–30 year) integrated strategic plans,

b) medium term (for example, 5–15 year) prioritised infrastructure and land-use plans, and

c) near term prioritised infrastructure project pipeline backed by appropriately detailed project plans.

### Finding

**PARTIALLY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- Medium term plans that prioritise infrastructure and land use are still to be developed.
- Plans are not wholly consistent as a result of recent changes by the incoming government.
- All plans have a review cycle.

NSW has long, medium and near term plans that are generally consistent with each other. However, most short and medium term plans were published prior to the long-term Metropolitan Plan and NSW 2021 was only recently finalised. All plans have processes for review and evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td>The long-term strategic plan for accommodating Sydney's growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Directions</strong></td>
<td>Contains nine strategic directions—for example ‘strengthening a city of cities’—that guide the future growth and development of Sydney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Targets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure priorities</strong></td>
<td>Covers expenditure on capital assets over the next decade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Land use</strong></td>
<td>Outlines $140 billion of capital expenditure. Major items include South West Rail Link and upgrades of the Hume and Pacific Highways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Commitments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NSW 2021: Ten year whole-of-government plan</strong></td>
<td>Sets priorities for whole-of-government decision making and resource allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Asset Management Plans</strong></td>
<td>Contains five strategies, 32 goals and 180 targets, for example: rebuild the economy (strategy); rebuild state finances (goal); maintain AAA credit rating (target).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plans are supported by preliminary and final business cases and must show alignment to the NSW State Plan and/or Metropolitan Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Project plans</strong></td>
<td>Items in the budget papers reflect NSW 2021 and Total Asset Management Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Links to long term plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sydney: Criterion three—Nationally significant infrastructure**

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for nationally-significant economic infrastructure (both new and upgrade of existing) including:

a) transport corridors  
b) international gateways  
c) intermodal connections  
d) major communications and utilities infrastructure, and  
e) reservation of appropriate lands to support future expansion.

**Finding**

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

**Key points**

- Port Botany and Sydney Airport are important infrastructure requiring long-term planning.  
- A number of projects and initiatives for Port Botany and Sydney Airport are prospective.

The NSW Government has a number of programs, policies and initiatives that provide for nationally significant infrastructure including roads, passenger rail and intermodal connections.

New and upgraded infrastructure is identified in the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036 and the State Infrastructure Strategy. For example, medium and long term corridors for the North West and South West Rail Links have been outlined in the Infrastructure State Environmental Planning Policy.

Port Botany is a significant piece of nationally significant infrastructure. A number of actions detailed by the New South Wales Government to plan and provide for future port and freight capacity are yet to be done. This is similarly the case regarding future aviation capacity for Sydney.

The long-term strategy for Port Botany or alternatives to manage growth in container movements beyond its cap remain to be developed. A new Freight and Regional Development Division has been established within Transport for NSW with a leader at the Deputy Director General level, with this strategy among its tasks. The government has reaffirmed that finalising the NSW Freight Strategy and the Ports Strategy for NSW are immediate priorities.
Capital city strategic planning systems should address nationally-significant policy issues including:

a) population growth and demographic change
b) productivity and global competitiveness
c) climate change mitigation and adaptation
d) efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets
e) connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets
f) development of major urban corridors
g) social inclusion
h) health, liveability, and community
i) housing affordability
j) matters of national environmental significance.

**Finding**

**LARGELY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- Evidence of serious policy analysis on most issues, particularly:
  - population growth
  - efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure.

- Least convincingly dealt with:
  - demographic change
  - social inclusion
  - health, liveability and community wellbeing.

- Monitoring and review is the weakest element.

- Some evidence of measures to determine effectiveness.

**Approach to criterion four**

The council has considered whether the processes identified by the New South Wales Government cover the following four tasks regarding each issue:

- **Analysis**—consideration, definition and analysis of the issue and whether it has spatial implications for the capital city that require action.

- **Evidence and options**—demonstration of the basis for any proposed strategies and actions to deal with the issue, including the consideration of different options to deal with the issue.

- **Action**—strategies and actions to ameliorate, mitigate or overcome the issue.

- **Review**—monitoring and review processes are in place to both a) ensure strategies are being implemented and therefore the issue is being addressed, and b) to ensure that strategies and actions are adjusted over time to reflect shifting causes and trends.

The degree of effort on each task should be proportionate to the significance of the issue to each city and so is likely to differ from issue to issue and across the cities. In determining whether proportionate effort has been made on these tasks, the council has considered the analysis of each issue set out by the government (i.e. the first task in the list above).
The council’s analysis of the NSW Government’s response to the issues is summarised in the table below. A green cell shows a proportionate effort on the corresponding task for the policy issue in question. A dark blue outline shows issues nominated as a priority by the government.

**Table 8.1 Sydney—Summary of analysis on nationally significant policy issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Evidence/ options</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. population growth and…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… demographic change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. productivity and global competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. climate change mitigation and adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. development of major urban corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. health, liveability, and community wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. housing affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. matters of national environmental significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The system appears to be addressing most policy issues. Serious analysis on most issues was provided. Demographic change, social inclusion, and health, liveability and community wellbeing were least convincingly dealt with.

Policies and plans are in place for action on most issues. For the issues to be actually ‘addressed’, however, the actions need to be successfully implemented. Monitoring and review mechanisms are crucial to determine whether actions are implemented and whether they are successful—and this is the weakest element of the system.

The planning system shows some evidence of measures to determine effectiveness, however these can be strengthened to enhance accountability. The council is hopeful that newly established implementation mechanisms, including the forthcoming Metropolitan Plan Delivery Group, will deliver improvements.
Capital city strategic planning systems should consider and strengthen the networks between capital cities and major regional centres, and other important domestic and international connections.

**Finding**

**LARGELY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- Major networks and connections were described.
- Strategic plans describe certain connections as having strategic significance, though the basis for this is not clear.

The NSW Government provides a clear picture of the key connections and networks for Sydney. However, the connections were not prioritised by virtue of their significance to the city.

There is no formal process for determining the relative significance of different networks, but the Metropolitan Plan and other strategic plans describe certain connections as having strategic significance. It is not clear on what basis this is done. Regional planning work by the new government may clarify the role of and priorities for networks between Sydney and regional centres across NSW and interstate.

There is a clear set of policies and initiatives to strengthen important domestic and international connections, particularly the port and airport. Key elements—such as the Sectoral Strategy Statement for the Port Botany and Sydney Airport precinct as well as a ports and freight strategy—are still in development.

**Figure 8.2 Sydney—Key connections and networks**
Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfield development.

**Finding**

**CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- Mechanisms to provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release are in place.

The strategic planning system for Sydney has the mechanisms to provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfield development. These include:

- appropriate analytical methods to determine future land requirements for infill and greenfield development
- clear infill versus greenfield development targets underpinned by substantive research, examining the costs and benefits of various growth scenarios
- a Metropolitan Development Program that provides data on historic and forecast levels of land supply and dwelling production for both greenfield and infill locations
- a program of agency property reviews, which includes identifying surplus or underutilised land assets as part of its land release systems.

The figure below shows actual and forecast dwelling production in greenfield and infill locations.

**Figure 8.3  Sydney—Dwelling production**

*Source: (Department of Planning and Infrastructure [NSW] Forthcoming)*
Sydney: Criterion seven—Investment priorities and frameworks

Capital city strategic planning systems should clearly identify priorities for investment and policy effort by governments, and provide an effective framework for private sector investment and innovation.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Priorities for investment and policy are not clear—medium term plans for transport infrastructure are still to be developed.
- Some actions to encourage and facilitate private sector investment and innovation.
- Mainly focused on development approval timeframes.

The NSW Government’s current priorities for transport infrastructure are unclear because strategies are being redeveloped.

On frameworks for private sector investment and innovation, the council commends the NSW Government on its preliminary efforts to streamline and review the planning system.

However, these reform efforts, at this stage, are focused on addressing specific constraints caused by elements of the planning system.

This is an issue common to all the systems the council reviewed. The main elements of a framework for investment and innovation that require further work are:

- consideration of the economic viability of the plans—looking at the markets that affect housing, jobs, infrastructure and services and their locations as part of planning
- consideration of the effect of government regulatory, planning and taxation policies on these markets and the likelihood of achieving the key elements of strategic plans.
Sydney: Criterion eight—Urban design and architecture

Capital city strategic planning systems should encourage world-class urban design and architecture.

Finding

LARGELY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Focus mainly on major sites and renewal and greenfield projects.
- No clear systemic approach to design.

The NSW Government has a range of mechanisms to encourage good design across relevant decision-making processes, spatial scales and in specific locations. However with the exception of State Environmental Planning Policy 65, they focus on specific sites or precincts rather than more systematically across development types and scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.2 Sydney—Where and how the NSW Government encourages good design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precinct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm/Ind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/Inf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Government Architect
2. Joint regional planning panels
3. Landcom design guidelines
4. Local council design panels
5. Structure planning
6. Draft Centres Design Guidelines
7. Growth Centres Development Code
8. Design competitions for landmark sites
9. Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority
10. Good Design Guidelines for Medium density living (draft)
11. Design Quality Program for Residential Flats
Sydney: Criterion nine (a)—Accountabilities, timelines and performance measures

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

a) clear accountabilities, timelines and performance measures.

Finding

NOT CONSISTENT—REFORM PENDING

Key points

- Metropolitan Plan Delivery Group not yet established.
- No public reporting of progress.
- Timelines for actions in Metropolitan Plan not publicly available.

NSW 2021 has public accountabilities to specific ministers—including some timelines and an intention to report publicly against progress—for its strategies, goal and targets; however, no such measures are in place for actions in the Metropolitan Plan.

While the New South Wales planning system is strong on planning and policy content it lacks the hard-edged accountability, performance and implementation measures to drive these policies. The key pillar of the accountability framework, the Metropolitan Plan Delivery Group, is yet to be established.

Finally, while there are timelines for actions in the Metropolitan Plan they are not publicly available. This has implications for public reporting on progress.

Table 8.3 Sydney—Tracking and reporting on actions and outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes: Supported by performance indicators in NSW 2021 and Metropolitan Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountabilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Ministers and lead agencies responsible for delivering goals and targets of NSW 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministers and departments accountable for financial and non-financial performance annually in Budget Papers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation of actions: Provided by NSW 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountabilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Lead' directors general are assigned responsibilities under NSW 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional delivery plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

b) coordination between all three levels of government, with opportunities for Commonwealth and Local Government input, and linked, streamlined and efficient approval processes including under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

### Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

**Key points**

- NSW has a range of mechanisms for intergovernmental coordination.
- However, there is less emphasis on aligning strategic objectives of with other governments.
- Some forms of coordination and cooperation, particularly with local government, are more directive than cooperative.

The New South Wales Government has a number of mechanisms for communication and coordination with other governments. However, some approaches to cooperation with local government are limited to financial assistance, which may not be the same as coordination and cooperation. The council has not reviewed the local or Commonwealth government functions involved in these issues—and these levels of government must be considered contributors to the situation.

**Table 8.4 Sydney—Key components of intergovernmental coordination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Commonwealth Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal alignment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and sub-regional strategies translate metropolitan-wide strategic objectives—these strategies are not yet in place.</td>
<td>COAG and Infrastructure Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Planning Directions issued by the Minister.</td>
<td>Formal committees underpinned by agreed terms of reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation and implementation of plans, policies and projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and consultation protocol with local government.</td>
<td>Formal committees underpinned by agreed terms of reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding with City of Sydney.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Local Planning Panel to engage with local councils and report to NSW Government.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing activities of other levels of government</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint regional planning panels.</td>
<td>Member of Sydney Airport Planning Coordination Forum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

c) evaluation and review cycles that support the need for balance between flexibility and certainty, including trigger points that identify the need for change in policy settings.

**Finding**

**PARTIALLY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**
- Mandated review cycles for key policies, initiatives and/or projects.
- Metropolitan Plan Delivery Group, a key evaluation and review mechanism, is yet to be established.

The New South Wales Government’s capital city strategic planning system for Sydney involves regular automatic review processes for the key elements of the system and performance reporting against outcomes in the State Plan. The key delivery related evaluation and review mechanisms, including the Metropolitan Plan Delivery Group, are yet to be established and it remains unclear to what degree these mechanisms will cover implementation in support of outcomes performance measures.

**Table 8.5 Sydney—Evaluation and review cycles and/or trigger points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans, policies, initiatives, and/or projects</th>
<th>Mechanisms to evaluate and review impact</th>
<th>Mechanisms to adjust policy settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036</td>
<td>Mandated five year review cycle.</td>
<td>Metropolitan Plan Delivery Group—yet to be established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministerial discretion in light of significant change in circumstances (e.g. changes to population policy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional strategies and sub-regional strategies</td>
<td>Mandated five year review cycle.</td>
<td>Metropolitan Plan Delivery Group—yet to be established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Infrastructure Strategy</td>
<td>Mandated two year review cycle.</td>
<td>No specific information provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sydney: Criterion nine (d)—Appropriate consultation and engagement

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

d) appropriate consultation and engagement with external stakeholders, experts and the wider community.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Focus on upfront consultation with little evidence of ongoing consultation during implementation and review.
- No clear indication of how consultation affects plan-making, implementation and review.

Consultation and engagement in New South Wales largely focuses on upfront consultation. Information on processes for ongoing consultation, for example during implementation, was not provided. The government intends to address ongoing consultation on implementation of its strategies through its approach to the development of subregional strategies that support the Metropolitan Plan. The government has committed to give communities and stakeholders an opportunity to voice how they believe the planning system is performing with actions in the NSW 2021 Plan to achieve this end.

Table 8.6 Sydney—Ongoing processes of consultation and engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stakeholder</th>
<th>Consultation and engagement mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In plan-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholders</td>
<td>Community meetings, online discussion forum, discussion paper placed on public exhibition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts and Industry</td>
<td>Key stakeholder forums for industry groups, NGOs, peak organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How consultation is incorporated</td>
<td>No specific information provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes and sources from data listed in Section 8.2: Key Statistics

People:
The population projection graph refers to the Sydney Statistical Division and is derived from unpublished ABS estimated resident population data and population projections data cubes ABS 2008. There was a change in statistical geographic boundaries from 1995 to 1996.
Population of NSW, population of Sydney, proportion of NSW population in Sydney, Sydney annual average population growth rate: ABS 2011d
Median age of Sydney’s population, median age of Australia’s population: ABS 2011c

Economy:
Major employing industries graph: ABS 2007
Average annual income and unemployment rate for Sydney and Australia: ABS 2011b
Participation rate: ABS 2011a
Total containerised trade: Ports Australia n.d.
Air passenger movements: BITRE 2011

Dwellings:
Typical (modal) dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011b
Median dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011a
Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households: COAG Reform Council 2011b
Homelessness rate: Chamberlain & MacKenzie 2009

Utilities:
Water use: National Water Commission 2011
Public transport: ABS 2010
Chapter 9. Melbourne

9.1 Context

A general election in November 2010 led to a change of government. The new Liberal-National Coalition Government is reforming the strategic planning system for Melbourne. The council recognises that the system is in transition following the change of government.
9.2 Key statistics

### People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical and projected population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population of Vic, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of Melbourne, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Vic population in Melbourne, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne annual average population growth rate (for the five years to June 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated population of Melbourne by 2056 (ABS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Median age of Melbourne population: 36
- Median age of Australia’s population: 37

### Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average annual income</td>
<td>$46 608</td>
<td>$45 089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total containerised trade (TEU)</td>
<td>2 392 970</td>
<td>6 788 836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air passenger movements (million, 2010–11)</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>135.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air passenger movements (annual % increase)</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dwellings

- Typical (modal) Melbourne dwelling price, 2009–10: $350 000
- Median Melbourne dwelling price, 2009–10: $450 000
- Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, Melbourne: 46.6%
- Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, national: 42.0%
- Homelessness rate per 10 000, 2006 (similar to other capital cities): 41

### Utilities

- Water use in Melbourne in 2009–10 (the lowest among capital cities excluding Hobart): 142 kilolitres
- Proportion of Melbourne residents who used public transport to journey to work in 2006: 17.7%
- Proportion of Australians who used public transport to journey to work in 2006: 13.5%

Notes and sources for this page are listed at the end of this chapter.
9.3 Overall views of strategic planning for Melbourne

The council has critically analysed information provided by the Victorian Government on the strategic planning system for Melbourne, with the assistance of the expert advisory panel. In doing so, the council has reached the following high level views.

Change in direction of capital city strategic planning system

The strategic planning system for Melbourne is changing following the election of a new government late in 2010. This has affected a number of the council’s findings of consistency or otherwise with the national criteria.

This is indicative of a general issue in the strategic planning of Australian cities, which requires persistent effort over timeframes in which it is likely that governments will change. Statutory frameworks and provisions can provide some continuity but do not replace the foundational importance of a strategic, integrated, long-term vision for the city—supported by a systematic engagement and implementation program—at any one point in time. This issue highlights the importance of governments seriously and genuinely engaging the community and stakeholders in strategic planning so that these visions may be durable should governments change.

Given the legacy of 40 years of strategic planning for Melbourne, the council is heartened by the general consistency of strategic direction for Melbourne. This consistency is reflected in the current principles informing development of the Metropolitan Planning Strategy and underpinned by the continuing relevance of previous plans under the Victorian Planning Provisions. Similarly, the council welcomes the further clarity provided on infrastructure priorities in the recent Victorian budget, and the November 2011 submission to Infrastructure Australia (Department of Treasury and Finance 2011; Victorian Government 2011b).

Airports, ports and freight

The location and forecast use of airports and ports have a significant impact on the spatial organisation of cities and the transport challenges—both passenger and freight—faced by the city over time. Melbourne has historically developed to the east to a distance from the central business district that is comparable to that between central Melbourne and Geelong. This creates its own transport challenges irrespective of where major freight infrastructure is located. Over Melbourne’s long-term future a number of challenges are apparent:

- Melbourne’s two most significant airports—Tullamarine and Avalon—are located in the west, away from the city’s centre of gravity.
- Port Melbourne is forecast to be handling eight million containers per year by the end of the next 30 years but there is capacity planned for the port and in its surrounding freight network for just four million containers per year—and the local area is also identified as a major infill location.
- As foreshadowed in a recent publicly available Government submission to Infrastructure Australia, the potential expansion of Port Hastings to handle containers beyond Port Melbourne’s capacity is now a prioritised investigation project for which the Government is seeking funds. However, it is also in the south-east of Melbourne away from the airports and associated freight infrastructure in Melbourne’s west.

The council will be interested to see the Victorian Government’s vision for dealing with these long term challenges in the context of its broader ambitions for Melbourne.
Activity centres policy

The council notes that a large number of activity centres are identified for strategic policy focus as part of the wider government visions for Melbourne’s growth and development.

There are seven Central Activity Areas, 20 Principal Activity Areas, a further 10 Specialised Activity Areas and 94 Neighbourhood Activity Areas. While the existing size of some centres made them an obvious choice for identification as Central Activity Areas, it was not clear to the council what the policy aims were in terms of strategic investment and frameworks, and how impacts were being monitored and analysed.
9.4 Review against the criteria

### Melbourne: Criterion one—Integration

Capital city strategic planning systems should be integrated:

a) across functions, including land-use and transport planning, economic and infrastructure development, environmental assessment and urban development, and

b) across government agencies.

#### Finding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
<th>Characteristics of Melbourne planning system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unifying goals and objectives</strong></td>
<td>• New Metropolitan Planning Strategy to contain strategic unifying goals. Melbourne 2030 and Melbourne@5 million remain ‘relevant’ policy guidelines in the Victorian Planning Provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interim goals in the State and Local Planning Policy Frameworks, the Planning and Environment Act and the Transport Integration Act, and machinery of government changes to enhance integrated planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication and coordination</strong></td>
<td>• Cabinet Committee dedicated to strategic metropolitan planning, supported by central agency functions, and issue-specific forums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Places Victoria and Growth Areas Authority—specific bodies pursuing integrated development at strategic locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision making and budgeting</strong></td>
<td>• Cabinet and budget process, supported by effective decision-making tools and frameworks and a potential single pipeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation and review</strong></td>
<td>• Cabinet and Cabinet Committee, departmental, interdepartmental and administrative arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mechanisms linking local government to decision making, review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Victorian Government’s strategic planning system for Melbourne is not fully developed at the time of writing following a change of government in late 2010. The government is pursuing a major reassessment through a number of audits and strategies. This finding reflects the transition between systems—though the prevailing Victorian strategic planning system continues to operate as a clear set of rules and principles for general planning issues and applications.

Strong underlying mechanisms and a genuine potential for integrated strategic planning are in place, especially for decision making and budgeting. Typically, however, statutory planning provisions are insufficient to deliver integration of government functions and agencies to a strategic vision for the city.

Until a long-term vision and whole of government goals are settled, the strategic framework for Melbourne’s development is without certainty of direction.
Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for a consistent hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans, including:

a) long term (for example, 15–30 year) integrated strategic plans,

b) medium term (for example, 5–15 year) prioritised infrastructure and land-use plans, and

c) near term prioritised infrastructure project pipeline backed by appropriately detailed project plans.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- No publicly available long-term strategic plan for Melbourne that is supported by the current government—however, the previous strategic plans remain relevant under the State Planning Policy Framework.
- No publicly available medium term plans for infrastructure and land use.
- Near term infrastructure commitments were made in the most recent Budget, however, these commitments cannot be put in the context of a coherent view on the future shape of Melbourne.

Following the recent change of government, a new suite of plans for Melbourne is being developed. In the interim, the Victorian Government does not have publicly available plans for Melbourne for the long and medium term as required for consistency with this criterion. Near term infrastructure commitments are clearer due to the 2011–12 Budget—though these commitments cannot be put in the context of a coherent long-term vision for Melbourne.

The Victorian Government intends to develop a consistent long term and medium term plan for Melbourne, informed by up-to-date evidence drawn from a range of comprehensive assessments and audits. It also has a range of statutory requirements and programs at the line agency level that provide for some consistency with higher-level strategic planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Strategy. In development over next two years. Led by the Department of Planning and Community Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Directions</strong></td>
<td>Melbourne 2030 and Melbourne@5 million—under review. Previous long-term strategic plans remain ‘relevant’ under the State Planning Policy Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Targets</strong></td>
<td>As above. A number of strategies and audits will support the development of these plans. In addition, 5-yearly reviews for land use and infrastructure plans to test projects against long-term objectives, although this is not itself a medium term plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure priorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Land use</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Commitments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project plans</strong></td>
<td>2011–12 State Budget Clear near term infrastructure pipeline commitments focusing on the priorities of public transport, train purchases, roads and freight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Links to long term plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Melbourne: Criterion three—Nationally significant infrastructure

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for nationally-significant economic infrastructure (both new and upgrade of existing) including:

a) transport corridors
b) international gateways
c) intermodal connections
d) major communications and utilities infrastructure, and
e) reservation of appropriate lands to support future expansion.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- The 2011–12 Victorian Budget provides for major investments in rail.
- Port and intermodal freight plans are publicly available.
- However, there is no clear integrated long and medium term planning that links the predicted airport, port and freight demand with the plans to address transport and intermodal challenges facing Melbourne.

The Victorian Government identified nationally significant economic infrastructure against all categories. Generally, the rationale and evidence for provision of this infrastructure is clear, especially for international gateways and analysis of transport corridor upgrades. For these, a link is made between provisions in the planning system, current commitments to develop new infrastructure and how and why this is considered nationally significant.

Broadly, the Asset Management Framework provides a tool for addressing the asset management responsibilities of the State, and encourages better asset maintenance as an alternative to providing new infrastructure. Further detail has been provided on analysis of intermodal connections, especially with the intermodal plan discussion paper for the Port of Melbourne and the new Port of Hastings Development Authority. Detail has also been provided regarding the Regional Rail Link.

However, considering the significance of Port of Melbourne to the state and national economy, and the predicted increases in freight passing through this site, provisions do not yet appear to match the stated demand, nor are they supported by clear planning for a possible second major terminal at Port of Hastings. The Victorian Government has made a submission to Infrastructure Australia to fund project development activities for the first stage of the Port of Hasting expansion on the basis that the Port of Melbourne may reach capacity constraints between 2024 and 2027.

Intermodal planning is supported by a strong initial discussion paper but is not yet a strategy. In addition, responses on land reservation only indicate a number of upcoming plans and research initiatives which may identify infrastructure priorities. A link back to the greater strategic plan for Melbourne cannot be made against either of these issues as this plan is under review.
Melbourne: Criterion four—Nationally significant policy issues

Capital city strategic planning systems should address nationally-significant policy issues including:

- a) population growth and demographic change
- b) productivity and global competitiveness
- c) climate change mitigation and adaptation
- d) efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets
- e) connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets
- f) development of major urban corridors
- g) social inclusion
- h) health, liveability, and community
- i) housing affordability
- j) matters of national environmental significance

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points
- Climate change mitigation is addressed well, as is the development of corridors, housing affordability and matters of national environmental significance, which are among the priorities of the Victorian Government.
- Major audits and strategies are proposed as part of the new Metropolitan Planning Strategy, especially for population, liveability issues, transport and infrastructure.
- The evaluation and policy review mechanisms—which are largely missing from this response—may improve as a result of these audits.
- Social inclusion and liveability are not well addressed.

Approach to criterion four

The council has considered whether the processes identified by the Victorian Government cover the following four tasks regarding each issue:

- **Analysis**—consideration, definition and analysis of the issue and whether it has spatial implications for the capital city that require action.
- **Evidence and options**—demonstration of the basis for any proposed strategies and actions to deal with the issue, including the consideration of different options to deal with the issue.
- **Action**—strategies and actions to ameliorate, mitigate or overcome the issue.
- **Review**—monitoring and review processes are in place to both a) ensure strategies are being implemented and therefore the issue is being addressed, and b) to ensure that strategies and actions are adjusted over time to reflect shifting causes and trends.

The degree of effort on each task should be proportionate to the significance of the issue to each city and so is likely to differ from issue to issue and across the cities. In determining whether proportionate effort has been made on these tasks, the council has considered the analysis of each issue set out by the government (i.e. the first task in the list above).
The council’s analysis of the Victorian Government’s response to the issues is summarised in the table below. A green cell shows a proportionate effort on the corresponding task for the policy issue in question. A dark blue outline shows issues nominated as a priority by the government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Evidence/ options</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. population growth and…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... demographic change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. productivity and global competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. climate change mitigation and adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. development of major urban corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. health, liveability, and community wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. housing affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. matters of national environmental significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Victorian Government has largely identified and analysed the majority of the policy issues and attempted to develop strategies to address them. However, the rationales and evidence for the actions are not clear. Mechanisms for adaptation and review are missing for nearly all issues—though the council notes that the Victorian Government intends to establish policy review mechanisms as part of its Metropolitan Planning Strategy.

The approach to some issues would be strengthened by a greater link between the understanding of the problem and the strategies to address it. How the recently established Places Victoria will address affordability for low-income renters is yet to be determined. Arguments presented about health and liveability could be strengthened with a metropolitan-specific analysis, such as how the funding of new beds or the building of stadiums actually links to the plan for the city.
Capital city strategic planning systems should consider and strengthen the networks between capital cities and major regional centres, and other important domestic and international connections.

**Finding**

**LARGELY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**
- Major networks and important connections are identified and mostly well analysed.
- Port and airport capacity and development remain a significant issue.

The networks between Melbourne and major regional centres are rail, road and high-speed internet. Most important connections are identified and reasons generally given for their significance to Melbourne, including the recently announced Regional Rail Link and the new Port of Hastings Development Authority Board to develop this site as a second port for Melbourne.

More detail on strategic analysis and actual projects to strengthen these networks and connections, and more detail on how the planning system determined such choices, would assist. For instance, the Victorian Government's advocacy for high-speed rail could be supported by more policy detail.

**Figure 9.2 Melbourne—Key connections and networks**
Melbourne: Criterion six—Planning for future growth

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfields development.

Finding

**LARGELY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- The Growth Areas Authority and the new Places Victoria will guide future growth and development at specific locations.
- Infill to greenfield ratio to be determined.

Significant work has recently been done on land release in Melbourne with the expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary by Parliament. It is also illustrated by the operation of the current system and the new bodies to assess and pursue development in defined locations, such as Places Victoria and the Growth Areas Authority.

However, major work on modelling and understanding future and current land use, such as the Population Strategy, the Liveability Audit and the audit of government-own land for future use or disposal are still to be delivered. The balance of infill to greenfield is not specified.

**Figure 9.3   Melbourne—New dwellings 2004–09, proportion in Growth Areas**

![Graph showing new dwellings in Growth Areas](image)

*Source:* (Victorian Government 2011a)
### Melbourne: Criterion seven—Investment priorities and frameworks

Capital city strategic planning systems should clearly identify priorities for investment and policy effort by governments, and provide an effective framework for private sector investment and innovation.

#### Finding

**PARTIALLY CONSISTENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• An established system and a range of mechanisms and approaches for</td>
<td>encouraging infrastructure investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Long and medium term plans are still being developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2011–12 Budget gives further detail on infrastructure priorities, although some major investigations into priorities are still at the early audit and assessment stage. Ultimately, near-term priorities for government investment and policy effort are linked directly to the long and medium term plans of government and cannot be clearly determined in the absence of those plans. Given the sophisticated project-assessment methodology of the Victorian Government, the council anticipates that the eventual release of the plans will link the priorities with the spatial vision.

The Victorian Government has an established system and a range of mechanisms and approaches for encouraging infrastructure investment and public private partnerships. This includes:

- identifying Activities Areas to help manage Melbourne’s projected growth by focusing investment and policy effort within strategically designated precincts
- the role of Places Victoria at infill sites and the Growth Areas Authority at greenfield sites
- innovative analytical tools to guide clear thinking about investment priorities.

However, a framework for investment and innovation is beyond project focused facilitation mechanisms, public private partnerships and land development authorities. This is an issue common to all the systems the council reviewed. The main elements of a framework for investment and innovation that require further work are:

- consideration of the economic viability of the plans—looking at the markets that affect housing, jobs, infrastructure and services and their locations as part of planning
- consideration of the effect of government regulatory, planning and taxation policies on these markets and the likelihood of achieving the key elements of strategic plans.
Melbourne: Criterion eight—Urban design and architecture

Capital city strategic planning systems should encourage world-class urban design and architecture.

Finding

LARGELY CONSISTENT

Key points
- The Urban Design Unit has broad responsibilities to provide policy and project advice to government and industry, however the systemic impact of this mechanism needs to be clarified.
- The Government Architect is centrally located in government.

The Victorian Government has a number of different guidelines and bodies that work to advise on urban design, including a centrally placed Office of the Government Architect and an Urban Design Charter for Victoria. Good examples at particular locations help to show how some of these documents are used, and the Eastlink case study is an example of their use in a specific location.

Although the Office of the Victorian Government Architect is strategically placed inside the Department of Premier and Cabinet and provides advice on both projects and wider government policy, this does not extend to a system-wide approach to urban design.

Table 9.2 Melbourne—Where and how the Victorian Government encourages good design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm/Ind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/ Inf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Victorian Design Review Panel (in development—Terms of Reference approved)
3. Urban Design Unit within the Department of Planning and Community Development
5. Changing Places Program
6. Design Review Panels for specific local governments
Melbourne: Criterion nine (a)—Accountabilities, timelines and performance measures

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

a) clear accountabilities, timelines and performance measures.

Finding

NOT CONSISTENT

Key points

- Project and engagement plan in place to for the new metropolitan strategic plan for Melbourne.
- There are no publicly available timelines, detailed accountabilities and performance measures attached to this significant project yet.

The Victorian Government has clearly outlined government departments and agencies assigned responsibility for planning and shown how these assignments aid implementation and/or auditing.

The Victorian Government has endorsed a project and engagement plan for the new Metropolitan Planning Strategy—although this plan is not publicly available. The plan sets out timelines for further government decisions and actions to finalise the new Strategy, and will be led by the Department of Planning and Community Development. It has a clear high-level governance structure to encourage integrated thinking on the plan.

As the Victorian Government does not currently have a metropolitan plan for Melbourne, which is generally the central public document that assigns high-level accountabilities, timelines and outcomes, no further detail is available on how the implementation and effectiveness of the planning system will be tracked. The relevance of accountabilities assigned in Melbourne 2030 and Melbourne@5 Million is not specified.

Table 9.3 Melbourne—Tracking and reporting on actions and outcomes

| Outcomes: None at this stage—overarching metropolitan strategic plan under review |
|---|---|---|
| **Accountabilities** | **Timelines** | **Performance Measures** |
| None specified at this stage. | Not available at this time. | None specified, however, the new Metropolitan Planning Strategy is intended to be outcomes-based. |

**Implementation of actions:** largely agency-based with standard reporting channels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountabilities</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Timelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Planning and Community Development, Growth Areas Authority, Department of Transport, local government with regard to statutory planning.</td>
<td>Cabinet and Committee processes, Asset Investment Process, Auditor General, agency annual reports and corporate plans, generic policy coordination groups.</td>
<td>Not available at this time beyond certain near-term projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Melbourne: Criterion nine (b)—Intergovernmental coordination

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

b) coordination between all three levels of government, with opportunities for Commonwealth and Local Government input, and linked, streamlined and efficient approval processes including under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

Finding

LARGELY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Some of the innovations within the Victorian Government for managing the impact of activities at other levels are still in development.
- Standard processes are outlined.
- The Victorian Government notes a number of policy issues affected by Commonwealth Government settings, such as population growth.

The high-level goals and objectives of the Melbourne strategic planning system are not yet defined, making it difficult to illustrate coordination and alignment at this point. The Victorian Government has identified mechanisms to improve the partnership between State and local governments in delivering planning outcomes, and outlined alignment efforts with the Commonwealth for nationally significant policy issues through standard COAG processes.

Practical examples are given of forums, projects and organisations through which the Victorian Government engages with both levels of government on nationally significant policy and economic issues. Case studies of joint funding are cited, such as with the Commonwealth Government on the Regional Rail Link and with the City of Melbourne to scope the Melbourne Metro and develop the Arden precinct.

Table 9.4 Melbourne—Key components of intergovernmental coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal alignment</th>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Commonwealth Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and implementation of plans, policies and projects</td>
<td>- Human resource arrangements in government departments such as State Planners at the local level</td>
<td>- Example given of the Commonwealth investment in the Regional Rail Link.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing activities of other levels of government</td>
<td>- Upcoming commitments include a Planning Referral Authority and Central City Planning Authority.</td>
<td>- Example cited of release of surplus Commonwealth land at Maribyrnong Defence Site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Melbourne: Criterion nine (c)—Evaluation and review cycles

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

c) evaluation and review cycles that support the need for balance between flexibility and certainty, including trigger points that identify the need for change in policy settings.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Major audits and strategic analyses are underway to provide the evidence for the new metropolitan plan.
- These processes are an example of evaluation and review mechanisms in practice.
- The Victorian Government has a legacy of good strategic plan-making, but is not currently accountable for delivering on or using these review processes to develop new policy directions.

The evidence for the new Metropolitan Planning Strategy will be developed in a number of work streams and audits by the Department of Planning and Community Development that consider the scale of growth and change likely in Melbourne over the next 30 years. While these approaches indicate an extensive research process and a commitment to evaluation and review, they are prospective processes and their scope and sequence cannot be verified at the time of writing.

In the place of an operational metropolitan plan over the next two years, it is not clear what mechanisms will be established for evaluation and review. However, the system is, in effect, in the midst of such a review that will adjust policy settings. It is this extensive review and research project, that has a formal government funding commitment behind it that has led to the finding of largely consistent in lieu of reporting on existing plans.

Table 9.5 Melbourne—Evaluation and review cycles and/or trigger points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans, policies, initiatives, and/or projects</th>
<th>Mechanisms to evaluate and review impact</th>
<th>Mechanisms to adjust policy settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Metropolitan Planning Strategy</td>
<td>Population strategy and coastal strategy, audits on liveability, State-owned land and green wedge land use, registers of infrastructure development and public land. Work streams include examining built-form and growth scenarios, delivery mechanisms and reviewing the performance of past planning policy.</td>
<td>Recent adaptation triggers include expanding the Urban Growth Boundary to meet unexpected population growth and demand, leading to Melbourne at 5 million. More publicly available detail and timelines on how these strategies and audits will be delivered and incorporated would assist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Areas policy</td>
<td>New performance monitoring framework with five criteria, including housing and jobs.</td>
<td>Not provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Melbourne: Criterion nine (d)—Appropriate consultation and engagement

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

d) appropriate consultation and engagement with external stakeholders, experts and the wider community.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- New Metropolitan Planning Strategy will have a comprehensive engagement process.
- Engagement strategies for previous plans were not discussed.

The Victorian Government’s approach to developing its new Metropolitan Planning Strategy is relevant to this criterion. The Victorian Government has endorsed a project and engagement plan—although the details are not known to the council. This has affected the finding applied to this criterion.

The Victorian Government appears to have a range of mechanisms and processes for consultation and engagement on aspects of city planning or at specific locations, and to some degree, on initiatives to achieve strategic goals related to some nationally significant economic or policy issues. This is most clear in relation to transport, including the new Transport Solutions, and through the interdepartmental meetings held in 2010 to encourage integrated infrastructure planning.

Table 9.6 Melbourne—Ongoing processes of consultation and engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stakeholder</th>
<th>Consultation and engagement mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In plan-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholders</td>
<td>Transport Solutions project to reduce bottlenecks cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How consultation is incorporated</td>
<td>Not provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes and sources from data listed in Section 9.2: Key Statistics—City

**People:**
The population projection graph refers to the Melbourne Statistical Division and is derived from unpublished ABS estimated resident population data and population projections data cubes (ABS 2008, series B). There was a change in statistical geographic boundaries from 1995 to 1996.

Population of Vic, population of Melbourne, proportion of Vic population in Melbourne, Melbourne annual average population growth rate: ABS 2011d


Median age of Melbourne’s population, median age of Australia’s population: ABS 2011c

**Economy:**
Major employing industries graph: ABS 2007

Average annual income and unemployment rate for Melbourne and Australia: ABS 2011b

Participation rate: ABS 2011a

Total containerised trade: Ports Australia n.d.

Air passenger movements: BITRE 2011

**Dwellings:**
Typical (modal) dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011b

Median dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011a

Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households: COAG Reform Council 2011b

Homelessness rate: Chamberlain & MacKenzie 2009

**Utilities:**
Water use: National Water Commision 2011

Public transport: ABS 2010

Full references are in the bibliography at the end of this report.
Chapter 10. South East Queensland/Brisbane

10.1 Context

Figure 10.1 Map of South East Queensland/Brisbane

Governance and context

The State Government is responsible for strategic planning for the South East Queensland region. The *Sustainable Planning Act (2009)* [Qld] sets the framework for planning.
Over twenty small municipalities and shires were amalgamated in 1925 to form the City of Brisbane which is governed by the Brisbane City Council. The South East Queensland region comprises 11 regional and city councils:

- Brisbane City Council
- Gold Coast City Council
- Ipswich City Council
- Lockyer Valley Regional Council
- Logan City Council
- Moreton Bay Regional Council
- Toowoomba Regional Council (part of)
- Redland City Council
- Scenic Rim Regional Council
- Somerset Regional Council
- Sunshine Coast Regional Council.

The *Local Government Act 2009* [Qld] and the *City of Brisbane Act 2009* [Qld] set out the responsibilities of local government. Under these laws, local government is responsible for providing good governance for its local community. Any plans a local council makes must be consistent with the Queensland Government planning legislation.

In 2005, the local councils in South East Queensland formed the Council of Mayors—South East Queensland to coordinate local government advocacy.
### 10.2 Key statistics

#### People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical and projected population, Brisbane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![Graph showing population growth]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population of Qld, 2010</th>
<th>4.5 million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population of South East Qld, 2010</td>
<td>3.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Qld population in South East Qld, 2010</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Qld annual average population growth rate (for the five years to June 2010)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated population of Brisbane by 2056 (ABS)</td>
<td>4 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Median age of Brisbane’s population: 35
- Median age of Australia’s population: 37

#### Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brisbane</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average annual income</td>
<td>$45 464</td>
<td>$45 089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total containerised trade (TEU)</td>
<td>978 784</td>
<td>6 788 836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air passenger movements (million, 2010–11)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>135.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air passenger movements (annual % increase)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dwellings

- Typical (modal) Brisbane dwelling price, 2009–10: $350 000
- Median Brisbane dwelling price, 2009–10: $430 000
- Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, Brisbane: 24.6%
- Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, national: 42.0%
- Homelessness rate per 10 000, 2006 (similar to other capital cities): 56

#### Utilities

- Water use in Brisbane in 2009–10 (the second lowest among capital cities excluding Hobart): 143 kilolitres
- Proportion of SEQ residents who used public transport to journey to work in 2006: 17.5%
- Proportion of Australians who used public transport to journey to work in 2006: 13.5%

Notes and sources for this page are listed at the end of this chapter.
10.3 Overall views of strategic planning for South East Queensland/Brisbane

The council has reviewed the strategic planning system for South East Queensland against the nine criteria by critically analysing, with the assistance of the Expert Advisory Panel, information provided by the Queensland Government. In doing this review, the council has reached the following high level views.

‘Line of sight’ approach clearly links strategy to action

The ‘line of sight’ approach to planning, that clearly links the highest level state strategic objectives through to the local planning schemes, provides a strong basis for vertical integration—or translating strategic visions and goals into ground level projects. This line of sight approach is also helpful in articulating the reasons for these projects.

The scale and range of activities of local government in South East Queensland is unique and means that councils play a particularly significant role in development planning and approvals and infrastructure provision. The councils also inform regional planning in South East Queensland. One of the significant features of the ‘line of sight’ approach that operates in South East Queensland is that it extends to the neighbourhood, precinct and city level, providing a further basis for vertical integration between State and local planning objectives and outcomes.

Overall, the Queensland planning system has robust mechanisms to support integration. This is shown not only by the line of sight approach, but also by the South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee and Growth Management Queensland. Both these have been designed to promote cross-government communication, policy coordination and implementation with specific reference to growth management, infrastructure planning and implementation of the South East Queensland Regional Plan.

But performance measurement and reporting can be improved

Integration, accountability and performance measurement are strongly linked. The Queensland planning system has strong integration mechanisms, but the same cannot be said about its accountability and performance measurement systems.

A set of performance indicators that are clearly linked to the goals and outcomes of the Regional Plan is yet to be developed. The intention in the Regional Plan is to develop regional targets for the desired regional outcomes and report against these publicly in the State of the Region report (Department of Infrastructure and Planning [QLD] 2009, p. 41). However due to the five-year reporting cycle, the next State of the Region report will not be released until 2013. The indicators to be used in this report remain to be seen. Further, given that the Regional Plan was released in 2009, the last State of the Region Report in 2008 would not have reported against the current desired regional outcomes.

This makes it difficult for those with an interest to determine whether the government is taking the actions it has committed to and whether they are having the desired effect on outcomes.
10.4  Review against the criteria

**South East Queensland: Criterion one—Integration**

Capital city strategic planning systems should be integrated:

a) across functions, including land-use and transport planning, economic and infrastructure development, environmental assessment and urban development, and

b) across government agencies.

**Finding**

**LARGELY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- Clear hierarchy of unifying goals, supported by ‘line of sight’ approach.
- The South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee and Growth Management Queensland support cross-government communication, policy coordination and implementation.

The Queensland Government has robust mechanisms to support integration across government functions and agencies. The planning system has a clear hierarchy of unifying goals, supported by the ‘line of sight’ approach. This sees the highest level of strategic objectives translate to regional, local and site specific plans. The South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee and Growth Management Queensland promote cross-government communication, policy coordination and implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of integration</th>
<th>Characteristics of South East Queensland planning system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unifying goals and objectives</strong></td>
<td>Toward Q2 provides unifying goals and objectives that inform the South East Queensland Regional Plan and Queensland Infrastructure Plan. This is supported by the ‘line of sight’ approach—which describes the link between local-level and higher level plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication and coordination</strong></td>
<td>The South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee—involving representatives of the Commonwealth and local government in addition to Queensland—meets quarterly to oversee implementation. Growth Management Queensland has the role of facilitating cross agency and whole of Government coordination in all areas of growth management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision making and budgeting</strong></td>
<td>Standard government processes that support the effective operation of Cabinet and cross-government consultation, communication and policy coordination prior to Cabinet decision making. The Queensland Infrastructure Plan requires agencies to set infrastructure priorities to support the South East Queensland Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation and review</strong></td>
<td>The South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee advises the government on priority actions and monitors implementation. The Department of Planning and Local Government combines planning, infrastructure, local government and growth management. The Queensland Infrastructure Plan aligns infrastructure programming and delivery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for a consistent hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans, including:

a) long term (for example, 15–30 year) integrated strategic plans,
b) medium term (for example, 5–15 year) prioritised infrastructure and land-use plans, and
c) near term prioritised infrastructure project pipeline backed by appropriately detailed project plans.

### Finding

**CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- Queensland has a clear hierarchy of long, medium and near term plans for South East Queensland.
- All plans are consistent and are supported by the ‘line of sight’ approach.

Queensland has plans at the long, medium and near term. These plans are consistent with each other and are supported by the ‘line of sight’ approach to planning. This seeks to align strategic goals and objectives with the near term prioritised infrastructure program. All plans are publicly available and include regular review and updating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td>Sets targets under five themes: strong, green, smart, healthy and fair. These targets are used to monitor performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Directions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Targets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Toward Q2: Tomorrow’s Queensland: Sets out the high level and long term vision for the State.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>South East Queensland Regional Plan: Defines the long-term aspirations for South East Queensland, through to 2031.</em></td>
<td>The plan outlines 12 ‘Desired Regional Outcomes’ to address growth and management of the region. For each outcome, a set of principles and actions are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure priorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Land use</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Commitments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Queensland Infrastructure Plan: Outlines the Government’s infrastructure priorities to support the South East Queensland Regional Plan.</em></td>
<td>The Infrastructure Plan identifies and funds projects in the forward estimates period and outlines longer-term planning through to 2031. It is updated annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Connecting SEQ 2031: Integrated Regional Transport Plan for South East Queensland.</em></td>
<td>Provides a guide for government decision making to shape the transport system through to 2031.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Near term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Project plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Links to long term plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Queensland Infrastructure Plan</em></td>
<td>Shows funding commitments for infrastructure over a four year period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South East Queensland: Criterion three—Nationally significant infrastructure

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for nationally-significant economic infrastructure (both new and upgrade of existing) including:

a) transport corridors
b) international gateways
c) intermodal connections
d) major communications and utilities infrastructure, and
e) reservation of appropriate lands to support future expansion.

Finding

LARGELY CONSISTENT

Key points
- The Queensland Infrastructure Plan provides a ten year State-wide pipeline of project priorities, including projects of national significance.
- Queensland Infrastructure Plan provides for major investments in road, rail and port infrastructure that support the Regional Growth Strategy.

Within South East Queensland, five projects have been identified by Infrastructure Australia as nationally significant due to the contribution they will make to increasing public transport capacity and making better use of existing transport infrastructure. These projects include the Gold Coast Rapid Transit and Eastern Busway.

Planning for these nationally significant economic infrastructure projects is provided in the Queensland Infrastructure Plan and the South East Queensland Regional Plan. The Queensland Infrastructure Plan has robust prioritisation, sequencing and assessment of project readiness. Importantly, these plans outline priority infrastructure projects included in four-year forward estimates. These plans also outline indicative timeframes and cost estimates for longer-term projects. Although there is a clear policy to integrate metropolitan planning with port, freight and aviation planning, the evidence that links the government’s infrastructure to future planning for freight was not provided.
**South East Queensland: Criterion four—Nationally significant policy issues**

Capital city strategic planning systems should address nationally-significant policy issues including:

- a) population growth and demographic change
- b) productivity and global competitiveness
- c) climate change mitigation and adaptation
- d) efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets
- e) connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets
- f) development of major urban corridors
- g) social inclusion
- h) health, liveability, and community.
- i) housing affordability
- j) matters of national environmental significance.

### Finding

**LARGELY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- Evidence of serious policy analysis on most issues, particularly:
  - population growth
  - efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure
  - development of major urban corridors
- Least convincingly dealt with:
  - demographic change
  - productivity and global competitiveness
  - connectivity of people to jobs and markets
- Monitoring and review is the weakest element.
- Generally demonstrates strong policy content and process for most issues that relate to infrastructure.

### Approach to criterion four

The council has considered whether the processes identified by the Queensland Government cover the following four tasks regarding each issue:

- **Analysis**—consideration, definition and analysis of the issue and whether it has spatial implications for the capital city that require action.
- **Evidence and options**—demonstration of the basis for any proposed strategies and actions to deal with the issue, including the consideration of different options to deal with the issue.
- **Action**—strategies and actions to ameliorate, mitigate or overcome the issue.
- **Review**—monitoring and review processes are in place to both a) ensure strategies are being implemented and therefore the issue is being addressed, and b) to ensure that strategies and actions are adjusted over time to reflect shifting causes and trends.

The degree of effort on each task should be proportionate to the significance of the issue to each city and so is likely to differ from issue to issue and across the cities. In determining whether proportionate effort has been made on these tasks, the council has considered the analysis of each issue set out by the government (i.e. the first task in the list above).
The council’s analysis of the Queensland Government’s response to the issues is summarised in the table below. A green cell shows a proportionate effort on the corresponding task for the policy issue in question. A dark blue outline shows issues nominated as a priority by the government.

Table 10.1 South East Queensland—Summary of analysis on nationally significant policy issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Evidence/ options</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. population growth and... ... demographic change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. productivity and global competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. climate change mitigation and adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. development of major urban corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. health, liveability, and community wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. housing affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. matters of national environmental significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the record growth in South East Queensland, planning for population growth and demographic change is particularly significant for the Queensland Government. The sophisticated response of the government to the issue reflects this. This includes a well-developed planning system for accommodating growth.

Queensland also shows strong policy content and process for most issues that relate to infrastructure. This includes efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and development of major urban corridors. But not all of the policy issues are addressed with the same degree of rigour. Demographic change; productivity and global competitiveness and connectivity of people to jobs and business to markets are not analysed to the same degree and are not supported by programs of evaluation and review.
South East Queensland: Criterion five—Capital city networks

Capital city strategic planning systems should consider and strengthen the networks between capital cities and major regional centres, and other important domestic and international connections.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points

- Networks and connections are identified in main strategic plans for South East Queensland.
- The Queensland Regionalisation Strategy shows strong intent to strengthen capital city networks.
- The Queensland Infrastructure Plan reflects a state-wide approach to network planning.

Networks between capital cities and major regional centres, and other important domestic and international connections are identified in all the main strategic plans that guide land use and infrastructure for South East Queensland. The Queensland Infrastructure Plan and Connecting SEQ2031 in particular outline infrastructure investments to strengthen these links.

The Queensland Regionalisation Strategy shows strong intent to strengthen the links between South East Queensland and other regions in Queensland. The Regionalisation Strategy intends to encourage population growth and economic development in regions outside of South East Queensland. The Regionalisation Strategy will be supported by the existing Queensland Infrastructure Plan. The move to State-wide prioritisation, funding and delivery of infrastructure provides further evidence of a commitment to strengthen networks across the State.

Figure 10.2 South East Queensland—Key connections and networks
South East Queensland: Criterion six—Planning for future growth

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfields development.

**Finding**

**CONSISTENT**

**Key points**
- Mechanisms to provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release are in place.

The strategic planning system for South East Queensland has mechanisms to provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfield development. These include:

- appropriate analytical methods to determine future land requirements for infill and greenfield development, including population and demographic projections—these are documented in the South East Queensland Regional Plan
- minimum infill and redevelopment targets by local government area—these vary according to the capacity of each local government.

Growth Management Queensland monitors and reports annually on land supply. It aims to ensure an adequate supply of land on the market.

**Figure 10.3** South East Queensland—Cumulative dwelling approvals and pro rata total dwelling target 2006-2031

![Graph showing cumulative dwelling approvals and pro rata total dwelling target from 2006 to 2031.](Source: [DLGP 2011])
South East Queensland: Criterion seven—Investment priorities and frameworks

Capital city strategic planning systems should clearly identify priorities for investment and policy effort by governments, and provide an effective framework for private sector investment and innovation.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Priorities for investment are clearly articulated in the Queensland Infrastructure Plan and South East Queensland Regional Plan.
- Priorities for policy effort, outside of infrastructure, are less clearly articulated. This relates to the lack of implementation timelines in the South East Queensland Regional Plan.
- Reform efforts, at this stage, are focused only on specific components of the planning system.

The Queensland Government has outlined its project assessment and funding methodology, a commitment to streamlining development application and assessment, and working with the private sector particularly on project facilitation. In addition, the government’s infrastructure charges reform program has made good progress.

These are all important steps in improving the frameworks for private sector investment. However these reform efforts, at this stage, are focused only on specific components of the planning system.

This is an issue common to all the systems the council reviewed. The main elements of a framework for investment and innovation that require further work are:

- consideration of the economic viability of the plans—looking at the markets that affect housing, jobs, infrastructure and services and their locations as part of planning
- consideration of the effect of government regulatory, planning and taxation policies on these markets and the likelihood of achieving the key elements of strategic plans.

On this, the council notes the recent efforts of the Queensland Government to begin to understand the broader regulatory framework, namely, the Building Revival Forum, review of the implementation of the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 and Queensland Regulatory Simplification Plan.
South East Queensland: Criterion eight—Urban design and architecture

Capital city strategic planning systems should encourage world-class urban design and architecture.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Reliance on voluntary use of design guidelines.
- Design advice on a wide range of strategic projects but is reliant on the willingness of project proponents.

Queensland has a number of mechanisms that aim to encourage world class urban design and architecture. These include various design guidelines, strategies and development codes as well as design advice from the Queensland Government Architect and Board of Urban Places. The system relies on guidelines to assist local government in preparing development codes to promote good urban design. The degree to which they encourage good urban design is reliant on their use and it is not clear how the government provides incentives to use them. The Board of Urban Places and Government Architect advise on a range of projects. The ability of these institutional arrangements to improve urban design outcomes is reliant on the willingness of project proponents, the type of advice sought and the stage of the project. To some extent this is outside of the direct control of government.

Table 10.2 South East Queensland—Where and how the Queensland Government encourages good design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm/Ind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/ Inf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. South East Queensland Regional Plan
2. Transit Oriented Development Guidelines
4. Residential 30 Guidelines
5. Board of Urban Places
7. Design Guidelines for Government Buildings
8. Next Generation Planning (SEQ Place Model and Form-Based Codes)
9. Independent Design Advisory Panels
South East Queensland: Criterion nine (a)—Accountabilities, timelines and performance measures

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

a) clear accountabilities, timelines and performance measures.

**Finding**

**PARTIALLY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- No public assignment of responsibility for implementation and outcomes.
- The content and public availability of reporting on implementation is unknown.
- Indicators for the next State of the Region Report are not clear from the plan.

The South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee is the main accountability mechanism in the planning system. It oversees implementation of the Regional Plan and assigns responsibilities to agencies. However, these responsibilities do not appear to be publicly available. Similarly, while agencies report to the Committee on progress, the content and public availability of these reports is unknown. Timelines for implementation are outlined in both the Regional Plan and Infrastructure Plan. The State of the Region report is the main mechanism for reporting against outcomes. The last such report was in 2008 and provided a mixed set of results across a comprehensive range of data. However, it is not clear from the current Regional Plan what the indicators are for the next report.

**Table 10.3 South East Queensland—Tracking and reporting on actions and outcomes**

| Outcomes: Supported by broad performance indicators in *Toward Q2: Tomorrows Queensland and Desired Regional Outcomes in The Regional Plan* |
|---|---|---|
| **Accountabilities** | **Timelines** | **Performance Measures** |
| Responsibility is not publicly assigned for desired regional outcomes. | Timelines for outcomes do not exist. | Broad performance measures in *Q2: Tomorrows Queensland*. |
| Responsibility is not publicly assigned for desired regional outcomes. | Timelines do not appear to be in place for desired regional outcomes. | *State of the Region* reporting on comprehensive data—last report in 2008. |

| Implementation of actions: Provided by South East Queensland Regional Plan and South Queensland Infrastructure Plan |
|---|---|---|
| **Accountabilities** | **Reporting** | **Timelines** |
| Responsibility is not publicly assigned for implementation. | Progress report to Regional Planning Committee—report is not public. | Timelines for implementation of actions in South East Queensland are not provided. |
| Planning of infrastructure is coordinated by the Department of Planning and Local Government. | The Infrastructure Plan is updated annually, including a report on projects delivered in the previous financial year. | Delivery timeframes for infrastructure outlined in the Queensland Infrastructure Plan. |
South East Queensland: Criterion nine (b)—Intergovernmental coordination

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

b) coordination between all three levels of government, with opportunities for Commonwealth and Local Government input, and linked, streamlined and efficient approval processes including under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points

- South East Queensland Planning Committee includes local and Commonwealth Government representation.
- Line of sight principle aligns goals and is reinforced by statutory requirements.
- Local and Commonwealth government priorities reflected in the Queensland Infrastructure Plan and South East Queensland Regional Plan.

The South East Queensland Planning Committee is a strong intergovernmental coordination mechanism. It includes Commonwealth and local government representation and provides a forum for all levels of government to discuss plan preparation and implementation and to manage the impact of other tiers of government.

Goal alignment between State and local government is strongly supported by the line of sight approach, a practice which is ingrained across agencies and departments at both levels.

Table 10.4 South East Queensland—Key components of intergovernmental coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal alignment</th>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Commonwealth Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Line of sight principle to align local government plans</td>
<td>Commonwealth representation on South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local government members on the South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee</td>
<td>State Plan aims to reflect Commonwealth issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Preparation and implementation of plans, policies and projects | Local government was engaged in the development of The Regional Plan and represented on the South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee | Commonwealth representation on South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee |
|                                                             | Input into Queensland infrastructure Plan | National infrastructure Priorities reflected in the Queensland Infrastructure Plan |

| Managing activities of other levels of government | Local government members on the South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee | Commonwealth representation on South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee |
|                                                    | Any new policy or amendments to State Planning instruments override local government planning schemes | 
Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

c) evaluation and review cycles that support the need for balance between flexibility and certainty, including trigger points that identify the need for change in policy settings.

Finding

**CONSISTENT**

**Key points**
- Periodic review and evaluation of plans.
- The reviews are used to revise strategic plans and reflect shifting needs and priorities.

Review and evaluation of strategic plans in South East Queensland is done periodically. A review of the South East Queensland Regional Plan is completed every five years. The outcomes of this review are used to revise the Regional Plan. The annual review cycle of the Queensland Infrastructure Plan allows the plan to align with latest budget commitments.

**Table 10.5 South East Queensland—Evaluation and review cycles and/or trigger points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans, policies, initiatives, and/or projects</th>
<th>Mechanisms to evaluate and review impact</th>
<th>Mechanisms to adjust policy settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South East Queensland Regional Plan</td>
<td>Five year review cycle</td>
<td>South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Infrastructure Plan</td>
<td>Annual review cycle</td>
<td>Annual review cycle to align with latest budget commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Region Report</td>
<td>Five year reports against established targets</td>
<td>South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South East Queensland: Criterion nine (d)—Appropriate consultation and engagement

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

d) appropriate consultation and engagement with external stakeholders, experts and the wider community.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Consultation and engagement is largely of an informative nature.
- Way to Grow and Building Revival Forum are genuine attempts to engage with stakeholders outside formal plan making processes and on an ongoing basis.

Queensland’s Sustainable Planning Act 2009 requires public consultation on state plans and instruments and includes direction on consultation periods, mechanisms, and procedures for responding to public submissions. In this regard, consultation and engagement is effectively embedded in the planning system. However, the mechanisms employed by government to meet consultation requirements focus on providing information rather than active participation of stakeholders in setting the vision, plan-making and implementation.

Table 10.6 South East Queensland—Ongoing processes of consultation and engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stakeholder</th>
<th>Consultation and engagement mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In plan-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholders</td>
<td>• Public exhibition of draft plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hard copies of information at public locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentation to three public meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minutes of South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee meetings released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Way to grow’ website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts and Industry</td>
<td>• Public exhibition of draft plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hard copies of information at public locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentations to 27 stakeholder meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minutes of South East Queensland Regional Planning Committee meetings released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Way to grow’ website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building Revival Forum and Queensland Growth Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Six Stakeholder workshops. This shaped the terms of reference for the review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How consultation is incorporated

No specific information provided.
Notes and sources from data listed in Section 10.2: Key Statistics—City

People:
The population projection graph refers to the Brisbane Statistical Division and is derived from unpublished ABS estimated resident population data and population projections data cubes (ABS 2008). There was a change in statistical geographic boundaries from 1995 to 1996.

Population of Qld, population of Brisbane, proportion of Qld population in Brisbane, Brisbane annual average population growth rate: ABS 2011d
Population projection for Brisbane by 2056: ABS 2008
Median age of Brisbane’s population, median age of Australia’s population: ABS 2011c

Economy:
Major employing industries graph: ABS 2007
Average annual income and unemployment rate for Brisbane and Australia: ABS 2011b
Participation rate: ABS 2011a
Total containerised trade: Ports Australia n.d.
Air passenger movements: BITRE 2011

Dwellings:
Typical (modal) dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011b
Median dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011a
Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households: COAG Reform Council 2011b
Homelessness rate: Chamberlain & MacKenzie 2009

Utilities:
Water use: National Water Commision 2011
Public transport: ABS 2010

Full references are in the bibliography at the end of this report.
Chapter 11. Perth

11.1 Context

Figure 11.1 Map of the Perth and Peel Region

Governance and context

Strategic planning of the Perth and Peel regions is the responsibility of the Premier and Cabinet. Ministerial responsibility for key portfolio areas is held by the Minister for Planning supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission, the Minister for Transport, the Minister for Environment and the Minister for Lands. Local governments are responsible for making planning controls in accordance with state and regional strategic planning objectives.
### 11.2 Key statistics

#### People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical and projected population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Population of WA, 2010 | 2.3 million
---|---
#### Population of Perth, 2010 | 1.7 million
---|---
#### Proportion of WA population in Perth, 2010 | 74.0%
---|---
#### Perth annual average population growth rate (for the five years to June 2010) | 2.7%
---|---
#### Estimated population of Perth by 2056 (ABS) | 3.4 million
---|---

- Median age of Perth’s population: 36
- Median age of Australia’s population: 37

#### Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perth</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average annual income</td>
<td>$51 385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total containerised trade (TEU)</td>
<td>598 534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air passenger movements (million, 2010–11)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air passenger movements (annual % increase)</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dwellings

| Typical (modal) Perth dwelling price, 2009–10 | $410 000 |
| Median Perth dwelling price, 2009–10 | $470 000 |
| Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, Perth | 19.0% |
| Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, national | 42.0% |
| Homelessness rate per 10 000, 2006 (similar to other capital cities) | 47 |

#### Utilities

| Water use in Perth in 2009–10 (the second highest among capital cities excluding Hobart) | 276 kilolitres |
| Proportion of Perth residents who used public transport to journey to work in 2006 | 10.7% |
| Proportion of Australians who used public transport to journey to work in 2006 | 13.5% |

Notes and sources for this page are listed at the end of this chapter.
11.2 Overall views of strategic planning for Perth

The council has reviewed the strategic planning system for Perth against the nine criteria by critically analysing, with the assistance of the expert advisory panel, information provided by the Western Australian Government. In doing this review, the council has reached the following high level views.

**Statutory planning is strong, but strategy must lead the way**

The statutory underpinnings of the strategic planning system for Perth are strong and provide a good long-term foundation for the growth of the city. This includes a strong framework for integration in the Western Australian Planning Commission, and for land and corridor reservation for infrastructure and growth in the Metropolitan Planning Scheme.

The planning system for Perth has a strong overall housing and land strategy in Directions 2031, as a foundation for a strategy to shape the long-term future of Perth. However, at this stage, the plans that set out the long-term vision for Perth do not contain clear measurable outcomes or the actions to pursue those goals that form the basis for a wider planning agenda beyond simply accommodating growth.

**Accountability to come**

The strategic planning system for Perth has limited public accountability for outcomes and for timely implementation of the actions needed to achieve those outcomes. There is a stated intention to report every five years against Directions 2031, though it is a new strategy and recent report card does not cover all areas set out in the high-level plans. Having reviewed Directions 2031, it remains unclear to the council what would be reported on and if the five-yearly review would include project milestones against initiatives or just outcomes data to adjust projections. The council understands that this is being reviewed by the Western Australian Government.
11.3 Review against the criteria

**Perth: Criterion one—Integration**

Capital city strategic planning systems should be integrated:

a) across functions, including land-use and transport planning, economic and infrastructure development, environmental assessment and urban development, and

b) across government agencies.

**Finding**

**LARGELY CONSISTENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
<th>Characteristics of Perth and Peel planning system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good structure for integrated advice to Cabinet, including the Western Australian Planning Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sound communication channels across policy areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic plans and implementation arrangements do not yet support integrated implementation of actions toward clear long-term goals other than for land use planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Western Australian Planning Commission is a strong mechanism for providing integrated advice to Cabinet on strategic planning and investment for Perth. This is supported by sound interagency communication mechanisms for most policy areas.

The breadth of the planning approach in Perth means that it includes a considerable number of different agencies and plans, making integration all the more important. However, Directions 2031 does not yet provide a clear whole of government strategy for delivering the government’s desired outcomes in Perth. The analytical frameworks to routinely integrate the government’s strong land use planning processes with infrastructure prioritisation and broader economic goals are still being devised, as are processes and implementation mechanisms for Directions 2031.

**Elements of integration**

**Characteristics of Perth and Peel planning system**

| Unifying goals and objectives | • New State Planning Strategy (to be released shortly) will contain strategic directions for the ten main issues facing the State. |
|------------------------------| • Directions 2031 is the high-level metropolitan plan for Perth’s growth to 2.2 million by 2031. Goals are for Perth to be ‘green, more compact and accessible with a unique sense of place’. Broad objectives under the themes ‘liveable, prosperous, accessible, sustainable, and responsible’. |
| Communication and coordination | • Western Australian Planning Commission membership and model encourages joint decision-making and ownership of strategic plans. |
| Decision making and budgeting | • Investment advice by the Infrastructure Coordinating Committee. |
| Implementation and review | • Clear decision-making structure through the Economic Expenditure and Review Committee, Ministerial Taskforce, Directors General Working Group, and Asset Management tool, but no link to Directions 2031. |
|                            | • Good plans for major projects in housing and transport. Not supported by coherent implementation plan in Directions 2031 for all stated project beyond housing and land targets. Under review. |
Perth: Criterion two—Hierarchy of plans

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for a consistent hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans, including:

a) long term (for example, 15–30 year) integrated strategic plans,

b) medium term (for example, 5–15 year) prioritised infrastructure and land-use plans, and

c) near term prioritised infrastructure project pipeline backed by appropriately detailed project plans.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points

● Directions 2031 sets out a vision and broad themes and objectives.

● Medium-term plans have a spatial focus and set clear infill and greenfield targets, but are still drafts. Strong structure plans.

● The Urban Development Program will provide some sound data to support adaptation and review.

The Western Australian Government has publicly available plans at the long, medium and near term with associated spatial and delivery hierarchies. Some medium-term plans are still in draft form.

The table below shows a selection of the hierarchy within the strategic planning system for Perth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Directions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Targets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>State Planning Strategy—Under review</strong></td>
<td>Will set out State-wide principles for future planning decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(for release in 2012).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Directions 2031 and Beyond.</strong></td>
<td>High-level spatial framework and strategic plan establishing the long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Released in 2010. Reviewed every five</td>
<td>growth vision to 2031.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>years but without measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Metropolitan Region Scheme.</strong></td>
<td>30-year land reservation scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure priorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Land use</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Commitments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Directions 2031 Draft Central</strong></td>
<td>Urban consolidation targets and opportunities in inner/ middle Perth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Perth Subregional Strategy.</td>
<td>through precinct development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Directions 2031 Draft Outer</strong></td>
<td>Land supply and the sustainable development of greenfields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Perth Subregional Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td><strong>Project plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Links to long term plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Asset Investment Program.</strong></td>
<td>Whole-of-state capital works program for the budget year and the following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updated yearly in the budget.</td>
<td>three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Urban Development Program.</strong></td>
<td>Tracks land demand and supply, building and infrastructure development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short-term annual development and</td>
<td>annually for 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>infrastructure staging plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perth: Criterion three—Nationally significant infrastructure

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for nationally-significant economic infrastructure (both new and upgrade of existing) including:

a) transport corridors
b) international gateways
c) intermodal connections
d) major communications and utilities infrastructure, and
e) reservation of appropriate lands to support future expansion.

Finding

LARGELY CONSISTENT

Key points

- A wide range of infrastructure is provided for by the planning system for Perth.
- Effective decision-making tools are in place for guiding infrastructure investments.

The Western Australian Government identified a considerable number of infrastructure projects at various stages of development, including some major current investments including two identified priority projects for Perth and Peel. Given its breadth, this list of projects likely contains those of national significance.

A clear four-step process is in place to determine the need for new and upgraded infrastructure, although no examples are given for how this has resulted in any of the investments listed as nationally significant. Effective tools include the Strategic Asset Management Framework and the Strategic Transport Evaluation Model to support decision-makers, including a focus on the cross-portfolio treatment of advice on infrastructure.

The Western Australian Government has a strong legacy and continuing mechanism for providing for transport corridors through its Metropolitan Region Scheme.
Perth: Criterion four—Nationally significant policy issues

Capital city strategic planning systems should address nationally-significant policy issues including:

a) population growth and demographic change  
   b) productivity and global competitiveness  
   c) climate change mitigation and adaptation  
   d) efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets  
   e) connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets  
   f) development of major urban corridors  
   g) social inclusion  
   h) health, liveability, and community  
   i) housing affordability  
   j) matters of national environmental significance.

Finding

LARGELY CONSISTENT

Key points

● Clear link between analysis, evidence and current actions for the responses on population policy, housing affordability and health programs.

● No comprehensive treatment of demographic change or social inclusion in a spatial context.

● The Urban Development Program is one mechanism to assist monitoring and review against policy areas related to land release targets, but the triggers for policy adaptation must also be transparent for this sound to be effective.

● Forthcoming City of 3.5 million Metro Perth and Peel Strategy may contain more spatial policy detail on these issues.

Approach to criterion four

The council has considered whether the processes identified by the Western Australian Government cover the following four tasks regarding each issue:

● Analysis—consideration, definition and analysis of the issue and whether it has spatial implications for the capital city that require action.

● Evidence and options—demonstration of the basis for any proposed strategies and actions to deal with the issue, including the consideration of different options to deal with the issue.

● Action—strategies and actions to ameliorate, mitigate or overcome the issue.

● Review—monitoring and review processes are in place to both a) ensure strategies are being implemented and therefore the issue is being addressed, and b) to ensure that strategies and actions are adjusted over time to reflect shifting causes and trends.

The degree of effort on each task should be proportionate to the significance of the issue to each city and so is likely to differ from issue to issue and across the cities. In determining whether proportionate effort has been made on these tasks, the council has considered the analysis of each issue set out by the government (i.e. the first task in the list above).
The council’s analysis of the Western Australian Government’s response to the issues is summarised in the table below. A green cell shows a proportionate effort on the corresponding task for the policy issue in question. A dark blue outline shows issues nominated as a priority by the government.

Table 11.1  Perth—Summary of analysis on nationally significant policy issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Evidence/ options</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. population growth and...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... demographic change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. productivity and global competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. climate change mitigation and adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and other public assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. development of major urban corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. health, liveability, and community wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. housing affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. matters of national environmental significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, the ‘Way Forward’ sections in Directions 2031 identify the broad range of policy issues covered by this criterion and analyse them in spatial terms in line with growth projections. This has been done best regarding population policy, housing affordability and health programs where there is a clearer link between analysis, evidence and current actions. Most issues have a solid foundation in statutory provisions, which can give effect to Directions 2031 as a unifying and meaningful strategy over time. The Western Australian Government has a number of information sources and modelling tools to assist with review and adaptation such as the Urban Growth Monitor and Strategic Transport Evaluation Model. For some issues, there is no clear link between how and when this evidence has led to policy adaptation or consideration of new policy options. Policy trade-offs occur through the Western Australian Planning Commission, the Ministerial Taskforce, and Cabinet, although the transparency of these trade-offs is limited.
Perth: Criterion five—Capital city networks

Capital city strategic planning systems should consider and strengthen the networks between capital cities and major regional centres, and other important domestic and international connections.

Finding

LARGELY CONSISTENT

Key points

- The consultation draft Public Transport Plan provides supporting analysis for investment in identified corridors and growth locations.
- The major networks and the specific government priorities for Perth are not clear across all infrastructure and utilities.
- Strong analysis of freight demand but this is currently internal to government.

A number of major networks between Perth and regional centres have been identified, especially by road and rail, which are largely connected to plans. Clear analysis has been provided on regional growth, and the council notes significant analysis has been done on freight and intermodal planning although for commercial reasons this is still internal to government.

The draft Public Transport Plan to 2031 aims to address congestion and accessibility issues as Perth grows. This plan identifies the main public transport infrastructure needs and the links required between major activities centres such as universities and Perth Airport. Key initiatives include the introduction of light rail, the development of rapid transit corridors, expansion of the rail network and more buses and trains.

Figure 11.2 Perth—Key connections and networks
Perth: Criterion six—Planning for future growth

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfields development.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points

- Solid land supply strategy and mechanisms.
- Nominated balance of infill to greenfield, and a clear rationale.

Land supply is afforded considerable analysis in the metropolitan strategic plans, and is supported by strong statutory planning mechanisms and a long-term plan for land supply. The upcoming Strategic Assessment on the environmental impact of Directions 2031 will assist in determining how this supply can be delivered in a sustainable way.

The Western Australian Government has stated that one of its overarching goals for Perth and Peel to 2031 is for the city to develop as ‘a more compact city’ The current target to 2031 is to deliver 50 per cent of growth as infill and the same for greenfield development.

A clear articulation of the Western Australian Government’s reasons for its nominated balance between infill and greenfield development is provided.

Figure 11.3  Perth—New dwellings relative to 1991 baseline, and location

Source: (WAPC 2010, p. 67)
Perth: Criterion seven—Investment priorities and frameworks

Capital city strategic planning systems should clearly identify priorities for investment and policy effort by governments, and provide an effective framework for private sector investment and innovation.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Some subregional plans and strategies intended to provide an audit of areas for investment are still drafts, including the centres policy.
- Draft Public Transport Plan and upcoming freight and intermodal plans will help give greater certainty about government investment priorities.
- A focus on facilitation mechanisms, public-private partnerships and land development authorities.

The Western Australian Government presented comprehensive information regarding its approaches to doing business with the private sector and priority locations for investment and policy effort, including through demand analysis in subregional strategies and by improving implementation frameworks for Directions 2031. Much of this suite of subregional and supporting spatial plans to provide the framework for investment prioritisation and policy effort is still in development or draft.

The draft Public Transport Plan to 2031 provides evidence for attracting investment for rail extensions, light rail and bus rapid transit for growth areas. Completion of the Freight and Intermodal Network Plan, Public Transport Network Plan, and the Moving People plan will enable transport agencies and the Western Australian Government to finalise future transport investment priorities.

A framework for investment and innovation is more than project focused mechanisms, such as project facilitation, public-private partnerships and land development authorities. It requires a broader and systemic perspective on the city and the influence of the range of government policies on it.

This is an issue common to all the systems the council reviewed. The main elements of a framework for investment and innovation that require further work are:

- consideration of the economic viability of the plans—looking at the markets that affect housing, jobs, infrastructure and services and their locations as part of planning
- consideration of the effect of government regulatory, planning and taxation policies on these markets and the likelihood of achieving the key elements of strategic plans.

An effective centres policy is a complex and important aspect of most capital city strategic plans that has highlighted the above concerns. Work on investment requirements for activities centres in the short, medium and longer term by the Infrastructure Coordinating Committee is promising. Its goal is to align infrastructure spending with designated priorities and with economic analysis by the Department of Treasury. This work remains internal to government.
Capital city strategic planning systems should encourage world-class urban design and architecture.

**Finding**

**PARTIALLY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**
- A number of mechanisms to encourage consideration of good urban design, especially at specific locations.
- Some mechanisms are still in draft and/or do not have clear systemic application.
- Government Architect engaged on a project-by-project basis only.

The Western Australian Government has a number of mechanisms to encourage consideration of urban design issues, although many are still in draft form. Many mechanisms encourage good design through minimum standard of urban design practice rather than encouraging excellence. The Government Architect is only engaged on a project-by-project basis. A number of good examples are given on how good design is encouraged at certain strategic sites.

**Table 11.2  Perth—Where and how Western Australia encourages good design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm/Ind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/ Inf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Government Architect
2. Development Assessment Panels (forthcoming)
3. Density-by-design toolbox (referred to in Directions 2031, potentially forthcoming)
4. Landcorp demonstration projects
5. Better Urban Water Management Guidelines
7. Urban Design Centre
Perth: Criterion nine (a)—Accountabilities, timelines and performance measures

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

a) clear accountabilities, timelines and performance measures.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT—REFORM PENDING

Key points

- The Western Australian Planning Commission has carriage of the full set of Directions strategic planning documents.
- A clear structure exists for internal accountability to Cabinet.
- There are few public commitments in the suite of plans to delivery timelines and the achievement of metropolitan development outcomes—though a number of implementation frameworks are being developed.

Strong internal accountability bodies are in place, including the Western Australian Planning Commission, the Infrastructure Coordinating Committee, the Directors General Working Group, and the whole-of-government Strategic Asset Management Framework. These support the Ministerial Taskforce on Approvals, Sustainability and Development and the Economic Expenditure and Review Committee to Cabinet.

However, key public accountability measures and public reporting arrangements are still to be developed. These include the State Planning Strategy, which will include outcomes based accountability arrangements for the direction of Western Australia’s development, and the City of 3.5 Million Perth and Peel strategy, which will include implementation timeframes for specific actions to deliver on the aspirations of Directions 2031.

Table 11.3 Perth—Tracking and reporting on actions and outcomes

| Outcomes: Five themes with ‘ways forward’ in D2031, no clear reportable outcomes |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **Accountabilities** | **Timelines** | **Performance Measures** |
| The Commission has carriage of the overarching vision and frameworks, but clear measurable outcomes are yet to be set. | It is intended that medium-term outcome-based timelines will be added to subregional plans once approved. | Forthcoming State Planning Strategy may contain whole-of-state measures with infrastructure assessments. Spatial focus is not known. |

| Implementation of actions: Various new projects in D2031, no completion dates |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **Accountabilities** | **Reporting** | **Timelines** |
| Directors General and Land Availability Working Groups allocate Directions 2031 initiatives to lead agencies, mostly jointly to WAPC and Department of Planning. | Directions to be benchmarked and reported on every 5 years. Urban Development Program publishes data on land, growth and services. | Directions plans are frameworks for future growth and development with three generic timeframes for delivery and more detail to follow. |
Perth: Criterion nine (b)—Intergovernmental coordination

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

b) coordination between all three levels of government, with opportunities for Commonwealth and Local Government input, and linked, streamlined and efficient approval processes including under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Limited Perth-specific engagement with the Commonwealth Government—although the agreement to pursue a Strategic Assessment for Perth is positive.
- Local government link to strategic processes and planning that is overseen by the Western Australian Planning Commission.

The Strategic Assessment under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 [Cwlth], recently agreed between the Western Australian and Commonwealth governments, will support a more efficient approval process for issues affecting the ‘biodiversity hotspot’ of the Perth region. However, this is the only Perth-specific mechanism of engagement with the Commonwealth Government and it deals with only one element of strategic planning for the city.

The Western Australian Planning Commission has a number of channels for coordinating with and receiving advice from local government on goals, plans and activities.

Table 11.4 Perth—Key components of intergovernmental coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal alignment</th>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Commonwealth Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commission receives advice directly from local government district planning committees, which can shape strategic documents</td>
<td>Standard COAG processes, partnerships and agreements as applicable to all governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commission assists local governments to align plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation and implementation of plans, policies and projects</th>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Commonwealth Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yanchep Sun City centre development an example of formal delivery agreements with local government.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Citylink cited as an example of coordination between the three levels of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint development assessment panels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managing activities of other levels of government</th>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Commonwealth Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding between LandCorp and local governments regarding development within their boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement with the Commonwealth for an environmental Strategic Assessment, aiming to streamline approvals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above highlights the key components of intergovernmental coordination between local and Commonwealth governments in Perth.

---
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Review of capital city strategic planning systems
Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

c) evaluation and review cycles that support the need for balance between flexibility and certainty, including trigger points that identify the need for change in policy settings.

**Finding**

**PARTIALLY CONSISTENT—REFORM PENDING**

**Key points**

- Internal evaluation and review of sector-specific and strategic projects is strong, as are new frameworks for specific plans such as on housing.
- Clear implementation and outcomes measures remain to be developed for Directions 2031—meaning evaluation and review activity for structure plans and sectoral strategies has limited strategic context, at least publicly.
- Strong governance arrangements outlined in criterion one and the data from the Urban Development Program are good mechanisms for joint agency evaluation and review.

The Western Australian Government has shown a range of sound evaluation mechanisms at the individual project level, at the structure plan level and for some subregional and sectoral strategies. However, the clear implementation and outcomes measures for Directions 2031 remain to be developed. This leaves evaluation and review mechanisms at the subregional or sectoral level without the broader context of the goals and directions for metropolitan Perth and Peel.

These concerns will likely be addressed with the completion of the State Planning Strategy and the City of 3.5 Million Perth and Peel strategy.

**Table 11.5 Perth—Evaluation and review cycles and/or trigger points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans, policies, initiatives, and/or projects</th>
<th>Mechanisms to evaluate and review impact</th>
<th>Mechanisms to adjust policy settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic spatial plan—Directions 2031 suite of documents</td>
<td>Overarching plan released in 2010, subregional plans in draft. Reviewed five-yearly</td>
<td>Not provided against all objectives. Infill ratios and housing data supplied by UDP but adaptation unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector specific plans, e.g. new Housing Affordability Strategy and UDP</td>
<td>Progress monitored on dwelling supply and other clear indicators annually to ten years</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central strategic projects</td>
<td>At the end of a project of significance to the State, gateway model used</td>
<td>Reports to the Economic Expenditure and Review Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perth: Criterion nine (d)—Appropriate consultation and engagement

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

d) appropriate consultation and engagement with external stakeholders, experts and the wider community.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Consultation is a requirement of Western Australian planning legislation.
- A range of consultation and engagement mechanisms were used for Directions 2031 and consultation is proceeding on the State Planning Strategy.
- Consultation mechanisms are focused on the planning stage, with limited ongoing consultation mechanisms detailed.

Managing and harnessing stakeholder input and building mandates for action is a critical component of delivering significant investments and realising true long-term visions for a city. Legislative requirements are necessary but are not sufficient to be considered ‘effective...supporting mechanisms’ in the practical sense required by criterion nine.

The Western Australian Government has shown a range of different consultation and engagement mechanisms—including some innovative mechanisms—aimed at a broad set of stakeholders in capital city strategic planning. Much of the consultation effort is focused on information provision at the plan-making stage. Ongoing consultation mechanisms and mechanisms focused on implementation of the plans were not detailed.

Table 11.6 Perth—Ongoing processes of consultation and engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stakeholder</th>
<th>Consultation and engagement mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>In plan-making</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholders</td>
<td>Standard tools used for Directions 2031, such as public forums and submissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts and Industry</td>
<td>Experts and industry engaged for Directions 2031—general information only on who and why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How consultation is incorporated</td>
<td>Not provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes and sources from data listed in Section 11.2: Key statistics

People:
The population projection graph refers to the Perth Statistical Division and is derived from unpublished ABS estimated resident population data and population projections data cubes ABS 2008. There was a change in statistical geographic boundaries from 1995 to 1996.
Population projection for Perth by 2056: ABS 2008
Median age of Perth’s population, median age of Australia’s population: ABS 2011c

Economy:
Major employing industries graph: ABS 2007
Average annual income and unemployment rate for Perth and Australia: ABS 2011b
Participation rate: ABS 2011a
Total containerised trade: Ports Australia n.d.
Air passenger movements: BITRE 2011

Dwellings:
Typical (modal) dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011b
Median dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011a
Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households: COAG Reform Council 2011b
Homelessness rate: Chamberlain & MacKenzie 2009

Utilities:
Water use: National Water Commission 2011
Public transport: ABS 2010

Full references are in the bibliography at the end of this report.
Chapter 12. Adelaide

12.1 Context

Figure 12.1 Map of Adelaide

Governance and context

The Department of Premier and Cabinet is responsible for the Strategic Plan while the newly created Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure is the lead agency for land use planning, transport and infrastructure matters.

The *South Australia Local Government Act 1999* [SA] makes local government responsible for developing local and regional plans that cover the area within the council boundaries, providing infrastructure to their communities and for developments that occur within their boundaries.
12.2 Key statistics

### People

#### Historical and projected population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>15-64</th>
<th>0-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population of SA, 2010</th>
<th>1.6 million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population of Adelaide, 2010</td>
<td>1.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of SA population in Adelaide, 2010</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide annual average population growth rate (for the five years to June 2010)</td>
<td>1.2% (29 320 residents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated population of Adelaide by 2056 (ABS)</td>
<td>1.7 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median age of Adelaide’s population | 31
Median age of Australia’s population | 37

### Economy

#### Adelaide | Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average annual income</th>
<th>$42 686</th>
<th>$45 089</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total containerised trade (TEU)</td>
<td>297 698</td>
<td>6 788 836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air passenger movements (million, 2010–11)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>135.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air passenger movements (annual % increase)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dwellings

| Typical (modal) Adelaide dwelling price, 2009–10 | $330 000 |
| Median Adelaide dwelling price, 2009–10 | $370 000 |
| Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, Adelaide | 51.1% |
| Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, national | 42.0% |
| Homelessness rate per 10 000, 2006 (similar to other capital cities) | 47 |

### Utilities

| Water use in Adelaide in 2009–10 (below the capital city average excluding Hobart) | 191 kilolitres |
| Proportion of Adelaide residents who used public transport to journey to work in 2006 | 14.4% |
| Proportion of Australians who used public transport to journey to work in 2006 | 13.5% |

Notes and sources for this page are listed at the end of this chapter.
12.3 Overall views of strategic planning for Adelaide

The council has reviewed the strategic planning system for Adelaide against the nine criteria by critically analysing, with the assistance of the Expert Advisory Panel, information provided by the South Australian Government. In doing this review, the council has reached the following high level views.

An integrated planning system with strong performance measures

The Plan for Greater Adelaide is a framework for integration across the different functions and agencies of the South Australian Government. The targets in the Plan for Greater Adelaide are taken directly from the South Australia Strategic Plan, which links Adelaide’s strategic planning to whole of government strategic objectives. The Government Planning and Coordination Committee was established to oversee implementation of the Plan for Greater Adelaide and is a key mechanism for coordinating and integrating planning decisions for Greater Adelaide.

The Plan for Greater Adelaide links key performance indicators for chief executives of government agencies to the targets set out in the plan. This creates a strong incentive for government executives to deliver on the planning objectives.

The Plan for Greater Adelaide and the Government Planning and Coordination Committee are new features of the planning system. They provide a promising basis for integration of land use, transport and economic development planning, which remain to be tested against outcomes.

Capacity to deliver on strategic objectives

As noted above, this system remains to be tested against outcomes—largely set out in the targets that will be publicly reported over time.

Some of these targets are ambitious, including the target to achieve a ratio of building 70 per cent of new homes in established areas and 30 per cent in greenfield areas by the end of the 30 years of the Plan for Greater Adelaide (DPLG 2010a, p. 72). Not only is this ambitious, but the South Australian Government indicates it will serve both the strategic objective to create a more compact and sustainable city (DPLG 2010a, p. 71), as well as the important goal of housing affordability (DPLG 2010a, p. 99).

While the strategic planning system for Adelaide is generally consistent with the national criteria, it is difficult to determine at this stage whether the housing, jobs and infrastructure targets contained in the strategy can be delivered. As such, as with any prospective assessment, the capacity of the planning system for Greater Adelaide to deliver on its strategic goals and objectives remains to be seen.

In the absence of that clarity, the council notes that both the South Australia Strategic Plan and the Plan for Greater Adelaide have independent review mechanisms. The purpose of these is to track progress against the outcomes contained in each plan. Monitoring against the South Australia Strategic Plan also includes a measure of the likelihood of achieving each target. It remains to be seen whether reporting on the Plan for Greater Adelaide will include similar analysis—the first of these reviews is due to be completed by the end of 2011. Nonetheless as these reports are further refined and developed over time, the degree to which the South Australian Government is likely to deliver strategic objectives should become more clear.
12.4 Review against the criteria

**Adelaide: Criterion one—Integration**

Capital city strategic planning systems should be integrated:

a) across functions, including land-use and transport planning, economic and infrastructure development, environmental assessment and urban development, and

b) across government agencies.

**Finding**

**CONSISTENT**

**Key points**
- The South Australian Government has a strong set of unifying goals and objectives.
- All agencies are required to align their plans, policies and programs to these objectives.

Treasury requires all budget submissions to be consistent with the planning framework, ensuring that capital city strategic planning is reflected in the budget process. Statutory requirements ensure local government plans align with South Australia’s strategic planning. Mechanisms are in place for whole of government communication and coordination, as well as implementation and review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of integration</th>
<th>Characteristics of South Australian planning system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Unifying goals and objectives** | - A clear set of goals outlined in *South Australia’s Strategic Plan* which underpins the *South Australian Planning Strategy*.  
- Budget submissions must be consistent with planning framework.  
- Public reporting against goals of *South Australia’s Strategic Plan*. |
| **Communication and coordination** | - The Government Planning and Coordination Committee coordinates implementation of the planning strategy.  
- Whole of government communication is achieved through Premier and Cabinet Circulars, Treasurer’s Instructions and various across government committees. |
| **Decision making and budgeting** | - Whole of government collaboration and decision making is underpinned by interdepartmental committees, Cabinet committees and the Cabinet process.  
- Submissions to Cabinet must detail the consultation process agencies have followed in preparing proposals. |
| **Implementation and review** | - Department of Premier and Cabinet holds overall responsibility for the Strategic Plan.  
- Executive Committee of Cabinet, with the support of the Chief Executive’s Group, oversees implementation of the Plan.  
- The Strategic Plan is independently audited every two years in order to measure progress against each target. |
Adelaide: Criterion two—Hierarchy of plans

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for a consistent hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans, including:

a) long term (for example, 15–30 year) integrated strategic plans,

b) medium term (for example, 5–15 year) prioritised infrastructure and land-use plans, and

c) near term prioritised infrastructure project pipeline backed by appropriately detailed project plans.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points

- Full hierarchy of long, medium and short term plans.
- Plans are consistent and publicly available.
- All plans incorporate a review cycle.

South Australia has a hierarchy of long, medium and near term plans which are consistent with each other. The Five Step Planning and Delivery Framework manages the approval and construction of initiatives to implement government plans. All plans have processes for review and evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td><strong>Goals</strong>&lt;br&gt;- South Australia's Strategic Plan: a long-term course for South Australia built on six objectives, including: growing prosperity, improving wellbeing and expanding opportunity.</td>
<td>The Strategic Plan has targets for its six objectives with progress reports to Cabinet and to the public. For example, there is a target to increase by 10 per cent the number of people with disabilities employed in SA by 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Directions</strong>&lt;br&gt;- The South Australian Planning Strategy and 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide (a regional plan under the Strategy).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Targets</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Strategic Infrastructure Plan for South Australia: sets out infrastructure priorities for the whole state.</td>
<td>Specific initiatives presented in five-year timeframes and ranked in terms of priority. A sphere of government or the private sector is identified as having lead responsibility for each initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure priorities</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Housing and Employment Land Supply Program: a 25-year supply of residential, commercial and industrial land.</td>
<td>Ensures there is sufficient land capacity to meet housing and employment targets in the overarching plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td><strong>Land use</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Capital Investment Statement</td>
<td>Records the total investment program of the government over the forward estimates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Commitments</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Project plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td><strong>Links to long term plans</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Capital Investment Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adelaide: Criterion three—Nationally significant infrastructure

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for nationally-significant economic infrastructure (both new and upgrade of existing) including:

a) transport corridors  
b) international gateways  
c) intermodal connections  
d) major communications and utilities infrastructure, and  
e) reservation of appropriate lands to support future expansion.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points

- The South Australian Government identified nationally-significant infrastructure in each of the five subcategories.  
- Projects were earmarked in the Plan for Greater Adelaide as well as the Infrastructure Plan and linked to delivery of key Strategic Plan targets.

The South Australian Government’s Planning Strategy identifies existing and proposed strategic economic infrastructure networks and sites, and presents specific strategies/policies to optimise their use and protect them from incompatible land uses.

The government states that infrastructure planning processes identify future economic infrastructure priorities through analysis of Planning Strategy targets and projections, existing network analysis, and quantitative modelling and estimation. Emerging technologies and demand management are also considered.

South Australia released a population policy in 2004 that has informed the planning for future infrastructure provision and land supply, both for housing and employment land. The South Australian Government advises that it is currently updating this policy.

A Five-Step Planning and Delivery Framework helps determine the need for new infrastructure or upgraded infrastructure. In South Australia, airports, ports, intermodal connections, communications and electricity and gas utilities are the responsibility of either the Commonwealth Government or the private sector. This means the South Australian Government has a role, through its strategic plans, to provide broad directions and coordination with private sector infrastructure providers. The South Australian Government has made significant investments in infrastructure to support increased freight and passenger transport to and from its international gateways.
Adelaide: Criterion four—Nationally significant policy issues

Capital city strategic planning systems should address nationally-significant policy issues including:

a) population growth and demographic change  
b) productivity and global competitiveness  
c) climate change mitigation and adaptation  
d) efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets  
e) connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets  
f) development of major urban corridors  
g) social inclusion  
h) health, liveability, and community  
i) housing affordability  
j) matters of national environmental significance

Finding

LARGELY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Evidence of serious policy analysis on a majority of issues, particularly:
  - population growth
  - climate change
  - efficient development and use of infrastructure and other public assets.
- Monitoring and review processes are generally strong.
- Good evidence of actions to address nationally significant policy issues.

Approach to criterion four

The council has considered whether the processes identified by the South Australian Government cover the following four tasks regarding each issue:

- Analysis—consideration, definition and analysis of the issue and whether it has spatial implications for the capital city that require action.

- Evidence and options—demonstration of the basis for any proposed strategies and actions to deal with the issue, including the consideration of different options to deal with the issue.

- Action—strategies and actions to ameliorate, mitigate or overcome the issue.

- Review—monitoring and review processes are in place to both a) ensure strategies are being implemented and therefore the issue is being addressed, and b) to ensure that strategies and actions are adjusted over time to reflect shifting causes and trends.

The degree of effort on each task should be proportionate to the significance of the issue to each city and so is likely to differ from issue to issue and across the cities. In determining whether proportionate effort has been made on these tasks, the council has considered the analysis of each issue set out by the government (i.e. the first task in the list above).
The council’s analysis of the South Australian Government’s response to the issues is summarised in the table below. A green cell shows a proportionate effort on the corresponding task for the policy issue in question. A dark blue outline shows issues nominated as a priority by the government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Evidence/ options</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. population growth and…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... demographic change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. productivity and global competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. climate change mitigation and adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and other public assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. development of major urban corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. health, liveability, and community wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. housing affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. matters of national environmental significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The system is actively addressing most of the policy issues. Evidence of action on all policy issues was provided but in some instances limited evidence was put forward for the actions being taken. Further, it is not clear there was always consideration of different options to deal with the issue. This is particularly the case for, housing affordability, health, liveability and community wellbeing and matters of national environmental significance. Most policy issues had performance monitoring and review mechanisms to determine effectiveness of actions be taken.
Adelaide: Criterion five—Capital city networks

Capital city strategic planning systems should consider and strengthen the networks between capital cities and major regional centres, and other important domestic and international connections.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points

- Major regional centres and connections were described.
- Clear prioritisation of the connections.
- Strategic plans describe certain connections as having strategic significance, though the basis for this is not clear.

The South Australian Government provides a clear picture of the key connections and networks for Adelaide. These links have been analysed to determine their capacity to accommodate future transport demands.

A clear prioritisation of the connections by virtue of their significance to the city was set out.

There are a clear set of policies and initiatives to strengthen the Port of Adelaide and Adelaide Airport as domestic and international connections. Freight connections to Melbourne, Sydney, Perth and Darwin were also identified. Weaknesses, gaps and opportunities for strengthening the port, airport and freight connections are identified in the Infrastructure Plan and the Plan for Greater Adelaide.

Figure 12.2 Adelaide—Key connections and networks
Adelaide: Criterion six—Planning for future growth

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfields development.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points

- Mechanisms to provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release are in place.

The strategic planning system for Adelaide has sophisticated mechanisms that provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and boasts an ambitious infill target of 70 per cent by the end of the next 30 years.

This target aims to create a more compact and sustainable city while also helping make housing affordable. Typically, these twin goals are set as opposites, requiring careful trade-offs to be made in achieving both.

The Plan for Greater Adelaide:

- establishes housing and employment targets for each subregion of Greater Adelaide and specific policies regarding distribution of jobs and housing
- requires a 25 year rolling supply of land with at least 15 years zoned for urban development (the Housing and Employment Land Supply Program is instrumental to meeting this target)
- identifies a target for 70 per cent infill to 30 per cent greenfield development after 30 years.
Adelaide: Criterion seven—Investment priorities and frameworks

Capital city strategic planning systems should clearly identify priorities for investment and policy effort by governments, and provide an effective framework for private sector investment and innovation.

**Finding**

**LARGELY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- Priorities for investment and policy effort clearly identified.
- Reforms are focused on addressing specific constraints caused by elements in the planning system.
- The public reporting system offers an opportunity to improve analysis of the achievability of outcomes over time.

The South Australian Government has clear priorities, robust project assessment, and a commitment to red tape reduction and development facilitation. These help to improve the frameworks for private sector investment. However, they are mainly focused on addressing specific constraints caused by elements of the planning system.

This is an issue common to all the systems the council reviewed. The main elements of a framework for investment and innovation that require further work are:

- consideration of the economic viability of the plans—looking at the markets that affect housing, jobs, infrastructure and services and their locations as part of planning
- consideration of the effect of government regulatory, planning and taxation policies on these markets and the likelihood of achieving the key elements of strategic plans.

This raises the question of whether the right policies are in place to bring about the plan’s settlement pattern and associated outcomes. For example zoning land for development may not be enough to promote development. Major project facilitation is part of an answer to this, but will unlikely be enough to deliver all the dwellings and jobs needed.

A large proportion of dwellings and jobs will also be delivered by smaller investors and developers meaning the policy mix needs to influence many decisions by land holders, financiers, developers, businesses and others to bring about the desired results. Greater analysis is needed of the incentives and disincentives for action by these parties.

A distinguishing feature of the South Australian planning system is its public reporting arrangements for the South Australia Strategic Plan. This includes an analysis of the likelihood that the targets will be achieved over the life of the Plan, including targets that are relevant to the Plan for Greater Adelaide. This reporting framework provides an opportunity to review the viability of population, dwelling and other targets in the Plan for Greater Adelaide and prompt further analysis of targets that are unlikely to be achieved. In regard to those things in the Plan that are substantially dependent on the private sector for delivery, it is hoped that this approach to reporting will provide the impetus to improve consideration of the economic viability of the key directions and targets in the plan.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
**Adelaide: Criterion eight—Urban design and architecture**

Capital city strategic planning systems should encourage world-class urban design and architecture.

**Finding**

**CONSISTENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
<th>The Integrated Design Commission encourages world class urban design at different scales and in various forms.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Integrated Design Commission is a new model of urban governance and wields a broad remit in matters relating to multi-disciplinary design and the built environment. The Commission works with local, State and Commonwealth governments, as well as the planning and development sector to promote a more holistic approach to design, planning and development. It also engages with the community to raise awareness of the value of good design and a more sustainable built environment.

South Australian Premier and Cabinet Circular 24, *Integration of South Australia’s Strategic Plan into Government Agency Planning Processes* requires government agencies to consider the various Planning Strategies and the principles of the Integrated Design Commission.

**Table 12.2 Adelaide—Where and how the South Australian Government encourages good design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm/Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Integrated Design Commission
2. Design Review Panels
3. Integrated Design Strategy for Adelaide City
4. Local council design panels
5. South Australian Premier and Cabinet Circular 24
6. Treasury Guidelines for the Evaluation of Public Sector Initiatives
7. Places for People
Adelaide: Criterion nine (a)—Accountabilities, timelines and performance measures

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

a) clear accountabilities, timelines and performance measures.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points

- Accountability mechanisms in the strategic planning system.
- Public reporting of progress.
- Timelines for actions publicly available.

The Executive Committee of Cabinet oversees implementation of the Strategic Plan which is independently audited every two years against each of its targets. Responsibility for each of the targets is allocated to a specific minister and government agency.

The Government Planning and Coordination Committee is responsible for monitoring and implementing the Planning Strategy. It comprises 17 state government chief executives and is accountable to the Major Projects Review Committee of Cabinet in relation to implementation.

Timelines for the achievement of targets are contained in the Strategic Plan, the Plan for Greater Adelaide and the Infrastructure Plan.

The Plan for Greater Adelaide has an annual monitoring, evaluation and reporting system.

Table 12.3 Adelaide—Tracking and reporting on actions and outcomes

| Outcomes: Supported by performance indicators in Strategic Plan and Planning Strategy |
|-------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| **Accountabilities** | **Timelines** | **Performance Measures** |
| Executive Committee of Cabinet oversees Strategic Plan implementation—targets allocated to responsible minister/agency. | Strategic Plan has timelines for achievement of its targets. | Public reporting on outcome targets every two years (last in 2010) and through an interactive website. Includes changes to targets. |
| Government Planning and Coordination Committee responsible for implementing Planning Strategy. | Timelines in place for policies, initiatives and targets in Plan for Greater Adelaide. | Annual Report Card tracks demographic, economic and environmental targets. This is not yet released. |

Implementation of actions: Provided by the Strategic Plan and Annual Report Card

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Accountabilities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reporting</strong></th>
<th><strong>Timelines</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executives are assessed against Strategic Plan targets which are linked to their agency.</td>
<td>Report on progress against Strategic Plan targets every two years.</td>
<td>Reports on targets and timelines of Strategic Plan are publicly available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

b) coordination between all three levels of government, with opportunities for Commonwealth and Local Government input, and linked, streamlined and efficient approval processes including under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

### Finding

**CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- The South Australian Government has a range of mechanisms for intergovernmental coordination.
- Integrated and streamlined assessment and approvals process for developments, including major infrastructure.

The South Australian Government consulted with the Commonwealth Government in preparing the Plan for Greater Adelaide and the Infrastructure Plan. These plans interact with Commonwealth policies by aligning South Australia’s Five-Step Planning and Delivery Framework with Infrastructure Australia’s Reform and Investment Framework. The State-Local Government Relations Agreement (2004) is a protocol for both spheres of government to consult the other on legislative changes and other strategic initiatives. The Development Act 1993 [SA] requires the South Australian Government to consult in developing and updating the Planning Strategy. An update of South Australia’s Infrastructure Plan is currently underway and involves extensive engagement with local government.

### Table 12.4 Adelaide—Key components of intergovernmental coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal alignment</th>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Commonwealth Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan will be ‘regionalised’ through the development of sub-plans</td>
<td>• Local Government Act requires councils to set out how they align investment with government policies</td>
<td>• Alignment of Planning and Delivery Framework with Infrastructure Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Analysis of how nationally significant policy issues affect South Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation and implementation of plans, policies and projects</th>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Commonwealth Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication and consultation agreement with local government</td>
<td>• Legislative requirement to consult on Planning Strategy updates</td>
<td>• Communication and consultation with the Commonwealth Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managing activities of other levels of government</th>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Commonwealth Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Assessment Panels</td>
<td>• Bilateral Agreement with Commonwealth ensures consultation on major projects under EPBC Act provisions</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adelaide: Criterion nine (c)—Evaluation and review cycles

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

c) evaluation and review cycles that support the need for balance between flexibility and certainty, including trigger points that identify the need for change in policy settings.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points

- Government Planning and Coordination Committee meets quarterly to monitor implementation of Planning Strategy.
- Annual monitoring and reporting against targets in Plan for Greater Adelaide.

The South Australian Government’s Planning Strategy has strategic performance targets relevant to the area of Greater Adelaide. The Government Planning Coordination Committee meets quarterly to monitor implementation of the Planning Strategy. The main monitoring and review measures are:

- The Report Card on the Plan for Greater Adelaide to be released soon—Cabinet and the Government Planning and Coordination Committee use this to track progress on the targets.
- The Housing and Employment Land Supply Program—guides rezoning of land to accommodate future population and economic growth.
- Regional Plan Implementation Programs—will aim to clearly show how councils will meet targets.

Significant variance against the targets would trigger an earlier review of the relevant volume of the Planning Strategy than would normally occur every five years..

Table 12.5 Adelaide—Evaluation and review cycles and/or trigger points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans, policies, initiatives, and/or projects</th>
<th>Mechanisms to evaluate and review impact</th>
<th>Mechanisms to adjust policy settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| South Australian Planning Strategy           | • Government Planning and Coordination Committee  
                                           | • Mandated five year reviews              | • Government amendments               |
| Plan for Greater Adelaide                    | • Mandated five year reviews and annual government updates | • The Report Card can trigger a change in policies and/or targets |
| Strategic Infrastructure Plan for South Australia | • Revision of the Plan by government | • The 2010 Discussion Paper on the Plan will inform policy changes |
| Capital Investment Statement                 | • Reviewed annually                      | • The budget and Cabinet processes     |
Adelaide: Criterion nine (d)—Appropriate consultation and engagement

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

d) appropriate consultation and engagement with external stakeholders, experts and the wider community.

**Finding**

**CONSISTENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Ongoing engagement with stakeholders, local government and communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Community Engagement Board serves as a portal for communities to be involved in the Strategic Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Engagement Board provides independent leadership and a continuity of community involvement in the evolution of the Strategic Plan. Consultation during the revision of the Planning Strategy, including the Greater Plan for Adelaide, is a legislative requirement. Consultation also preceded the publication of the current 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide. The State/Local Government Forum provides advice to the Minister for State/Local Government Relations, the Premier and the Local Government Association on issues that are matters of priority to both spheres of government. The South Australian Thinker in Residence Program provides ongoing input by academics and industry experts to the capital city strategic planning system.

**Table 12.6 Adelaide—Ongoing processes of consultation and engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stakeholder</th>
<th>Consultation and engagement mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In plan-making</strong></td>
<td><strong>In implementation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholders</td>
<td>Community Engagement Board gives communities a voice in shaping South Australia’s goals for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts and Industry</td>
<td>Industry sector forums provide an interface for stakeholders to inform plan-making. Thinker in Residence Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How consultation is incorporated</td>
<td>South Australia publicly reports on how the previous targets have been translated into the updated Strategic Plan along with the reasons for changes and comments from the Independent Audit Committee’s Progress Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes and sources from data listed in Section 12.2: Key Statistics—City

People:
The population projection graph refers to the Adelaide Statistical Division and is derived from unpublished ABS estimated resident population data and population projections data cubes (ABS 2008). There was a change in statistical geographic boundaries from 1995 to 1996.

Population of SA, population of Adelaide, proportion of SA population in Adelaide, Adelaide annual average population growth rate: ABS 2011d

Population projection for Adelaide by 2056: ABS 2008

Median age of Adelaide’s population, median age of Australia’s population: ABS 2011c

Economy:
Major employing industries graph: ABS 2007
Average annual income and unemployment rate for Sydney and Australia: ABS 2011b
Participation rate: ABS 2011a

Total containerised trade: Ports Australia n.d.
Air passenger movements: BITRE 2011

Dwellings:
Typical (modal) dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011b
Median dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011a
Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households: COAG Reform Council 2011b
Homelessness rate: Chamberlain & MacKenzie 2009

Utilities:
Water use: National Water Commission 2011
Public transport: ABS 2010

Full references are in the bibliography at the end of this report.
Chapter 13. Hobart

13.1 Context

Figure 13.1 Map of Hobart

Source: (Geoscience Australia 2011)
Governance and context

**Tasmanian Government**

The Tasmanian Planning Commission is an independent body that has specific statutory responsibilities in a number of key areas, it also advises the relevant minister on planning matters.

The Resource Management Planning System targets a range of planning areas including: planning schemes, development controls and approvals. The *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* [Tas] is the principal piece of legislation underpinning the system. Local government conducts statutory land use planning with State policies providing overall direction.

The Regional Planning Initiative covers three regional planning partnership projects, across the northwest, northern and southern regions. These projects were established through agreements between the government, and respective councils and regional bodies.

**Local government**

Local government in Tasmania has primary responsibility for land use planning under the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* [Tas]. However, amendments to the legislation in 2009 have also established clear roles for the Minister for Planning and the Tasmanian Planning Commission. The minister is authorised to ensure State and regional land use planning interests are incorporated in regional strategies and implemented in council planning schemes. The Tasmanian Planning Commission independently assesses and determines planning schemes prepared by councils.

Southern Tasmania contains 12 local government areas. The ‘Greater Hobart’ area as defined in the draft Southern Regional Land Use Strategy comprises all of the Hobart, Glenorchy, Clarence and Brighton local government areas and the higher density urban areas of the local government areas of Kingborough, Derwent Valley and Sorell. The Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority is a key coordinating mechanism for local government in Southern Tasmania.

Recently, the Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority received a Commonwealth grant under the Local Government Reform Fund to examine reform options for southern Tasmania councils. It has appointed an independent panel of experts to find an alternative structure that would enable southern councils to provide the same or better level of service for residents at less cost and with greater benefits. The expert panel’s report was released on 14 November 2011 and a key recommendation is the formation of a Greater Hobart Council.
13.2 Key statistics

### People

#### Historical and projected population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population (000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Population of Tas, 2010**: 507 600
- **Population of Hobart, 2010**: 214 700
- **Proportion of Tas population in Hobart, 2010**: 42.3%
- **Hobart annual average population growth rate (for the five years to June 2010)**: 1.1% (11 200 residents)
- **Estimated population of Hobart by 2056 (ABS)**: 279 700

#### Median age

- **Median age of Hobart’s population**: 39
- **Median age of Australia’s population**: 37

### Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hobart</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average annual income</td>
<td>$41 264</td>
<td>$45 089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air passenger movements (million, 2010–11)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>135.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air passenger movements (annual % increase)</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Major employing industries, 2006

- Retail trade (12.3%)
- Public admin. and safety (11.3%)
- Health care and social assistance (12.4%)
- Prof., scient. and tech. services (9.7%)
- Constr. and associated activities (7.0%)
- Educ., training and care (8.9%)
- Manufact. (8.0%)
- Other industries (33.5%)

### Dwellings

- **Typical (modal) Hobart dwelling price, 2009–10**: $230 000
- **Median Hobart dwelling price, 2009–10**: $330 000
- **Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, Hobart**: 47.0%
- **Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, national**: 42.0%
- **Homelessness rate per 10 000, 2006 (similar to other capital cities)**: 53

### Utilities

- **Proportion of Hobart residents who used public transport to journey to work in 2006**: 10.3%
- **Proportion of Australians who used public transport to journey to work in 2006**: 13.5%

Notes and sources for this page are listed at the end of this chapter.
13.3 Overall views of strategic planning for Hobart

The council has reviewed the strategic planning system for Hobart against the nine criteria by critically analysing, with the assistance of the Expert Advisory Panel, information provided by the Tasmanian Government. In doing this review, the council has reached the following high level views.

**The Hobart strategic planning system is being developed**

The strategic planning system for Greater Hobart is changing. The Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy was only formally declared on 27 October 2011 and will be the platform for the development of the Hobart Capital City Plan. Many elements of the strategic planning system for Hobart are almost complete at the time of writing and related findings are qualified by expectations of what the system may look like on completion.

**Consultation with local government a strength**

The Tasmanian Government appears to have a close relationship and good consultation with local government. The regional planning project relies heavily on State and local government coordination. A capital city plan driven by the State Government would give local government a clear framework for land use planning.

The Tasmanian Government could improve stakeholder consultation arrangements both at an early stage of the planning process as well as throughout the process. The government reports it has prepared a comprehensive stakeholder and community consultation program for its draft Hobart Capital City Plan.

**Pursuing strategic and policy goals with infrastructure**

Using infrastructure to achieve the strategic economic, environmental and social goals of government and to manage national policy issues was not strongly demonstrated by the Tasmanian Government.

Significant progress is being made by the government in relation to its Economic Development Plan and Tasmanian Infrastructure Plan. The Economic Development Plan includes industry sector plans focused on Antarctic and Southern Ocean opportunities which link closely to the TasPorts strategic plan for the Port of Hobart, Sullivans Cove Master Plan and the Tasmanian Infrastructure Plan.

The Port of Hobart is an example of nationally significant and potentially city-shaping infrastructure as it is both close to central Hobart and the gateway to the Antarctic region and the Southern Ocean.

**A need to address demographic change**

Demographic change is a national policy issue that is particularly salient to the future of Hobart—and is acknowledged as a key challenge by the Tasmanian Government. Hobart is one of the most rapidly ageing of Australian capital cities.

Although it is noted as a key challenge, no specific policies, initiatives or actions to address demographic change were set out by the Tasmanian Government. The strategic planning of a city is
in large part about the long-term and goal focused vision for that city. If demographic change is a key challenge, the issue needs to be explicitly considered and addressed through policies or actions of government that should also be reflected in the capital city plan.

The Tasmanian Government’s recently adopted Southern Strategy, as well as its commitment to develop a population and settlement strategy, are positive developments on this policy issue.
13.4 Review against the criteria

Hobart: Criterion one—Integration

Capital city strategic planning systems should be integrated:

a) across functions, including land-use and transport planning, economic and infrastructure development, environmental assessment and urban development, and

b) across government agencies.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT—REFORM PENDING

Key points

- The Tasmanian planning system is being reformed.
- Although the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy has been declared, other key reforms remain incomplete.

The Tasmanian Government is reforming its planning system. The COAG Reform Council anticipates that once implemented, these reforms will improve the integration of the Tasmanian planning system. These include the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy and the proposed Integrated Planning Model for the Regional Planning Initiative. Beyond these reforms there are existing mechanisms for communication and coordination including the Capital City Project Steering Committee, State Government Interdepartmental Committee and the recently formed Tasmania Infrastructure Advisory Council. There are also currently no integrated implementation mechanisms for the capital city plan—reflecting that the plan itself is not yet complete. The COAG Reform Council anticipates that the strong unifying goals and mechanisms of accountability contained in Tasmania Together and the strategic directions of the Southern Strategy will be carried through to the capital city strategic planning system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of integration</th>
<th>Characteristics of Hobart planning system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unifying goals and objectives</td>
<td>● Tasmania Together provides the overarching strategic direction for the State. It sets out broad goals that are not specific to the strategic planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● The Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy 2010–2035 includes 10 strategic directions to guide the future development of Hobart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and coordination</td>
<td>● Capital City Project Steering Committee meets to implement planning reforms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Tasmanian Infrastructure Advisory Council coordinates infrastructure, land use planning and project priority setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making and budgeting</td>
<td>● It is anticipated that the proposed Integrated Planning Model for the Regional Planning Initiative will improve integration of decision-making and budgeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation and review</td>
<td>● Tasmanian Infrastructure Advisory Council advises the Government on infrastructure delivery and coordinates project delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● It is anticipated that the proposed Integrated Planning Model for the Regional Planning Initiative will improve integration in implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hobart: Criterion two—Hierarchy of plans

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for a consistent hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans, including:

a) long term (for example, 15–30 year) integrated strategic plans,
b) medium term (for example, 5–15 year) prioritised infrastructure and land-use plans, and
c) near term prioritised infrastructure project pipeline backed by appropriately detailed project plans.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT—REFORM PENDING

Key points

- The Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy has been declared and will underpin the Hobart Capital City Plan.
- An integrated capital city strategic planning system specifically for Greater Hobart that has a long, medium or near term plan is being developed.
- Promising elements of near and medium term infrastructure priorities are evident and will need to be brought together in a consistent manner for the Hobart Capital City Plan.

The Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy will form the basis of the Hobart Capital City Plan. The draft capital city plan embraces the notion of a consistent hierarchy of plans and clarifies the relationships between long and medium term plans and their connection with near term project plans. The Economic Development Plan and the Tasmanian Infrastructure Strategy are linked to long and short term planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td>The Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy: Broad policy document to manage growth and development within Southern Tasmania over next 25 years. The Strategy comprises three components: The Vision, Strategic Directions and Regional Policies. The Regional Policies outline how the Strategic Directions will be achieved. The Strategic Directions provide the broad policy framework to achieve the vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Directions</strong></td>
<td>Tasmanian Infrastructure Strategy: identifies the vision for infrastructure in transport, water, energy and digital. Sets goals for 0–3, 3–5 and 5–10 years for each sector. It comprises a mix of strategies, changes in governance and the delivery of projects and initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targets</strong></td>
<td><strong>Land use Commitments</strong></td>
<td>Economic Development Plan: charts economic development priorities over the next decade. Establishes four economic goals as a holistic framework coordinating the actions of all government agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td>Tasmanian Budget 2011–2012. Includes spending priorities for housing and transport infrastructure. Not aligned to long and medium term plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project plans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Links to long term plans</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hobart: Criterion three—Nationally significant infrastructure

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for nationally-significant economic infrastructure (both new and upgrade of existing) including:

a) transport corridors
b) international gateways
c) intermodal connections
d) major communications and utilities infrastructure, and
e) reservation of appropriate lands to support future expansion.

Finding

LARGELY CONSISTENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The Tasmanian Government has a clear view of its nationally-significant economic infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This infrastructure is acknowledged and supported by a range of transport plans, including the Tasmanian Infrastructure Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The recently declared Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy strengthens this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the lack of a metropolitan plan, the Tasmanian Government has a clear view of and is able to provide for new and upgraded nationally-significant economic infrastructure for Hobart. The Tasmanian Infrastructure Strategy strengthens this, providing an overarching plan through which new infrastructure opportunities are identified for the State. Nationally-significant infrastructure is also identified and planned for in the Southern Integrated Transport Plan and Sullivan’s Cove Master Plan.

The Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy is a land use framework to support the port, marine and polar gateway and the protection and management of existing and future infrastructure corridors and sites. It is not clear how the Tasmanian Government determines the need for new or upgraded infrastructure on a whole-of-government basis or how this relates to the spatial organisation of the city. However, the government recognises the importance of integrating spatial planning with strategic planning, land use and infrastructure priorities as part of a State-wide planning system.
Hobart: Criterion four—Nationally significant policy issues

Capital city strategic planning systems should address nationally-significant policy issues including:

a) population growth and demographic change  
   f) development of major urban corridors
b) productivity and global competitiveness  
   g) social inclusion
c) climate change mitigation and adaptation  
   h) health, liveability, and community.
d) efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets  
   i) housing affordability
e) connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets  
   j) matters of national environmental significance.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Social inclusion and efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets are the policy issues most comprehensively analysed and dealt with.

- Responses to most of the other policy issues provided limited analysis and little evidence was put forward for actions being taken.

- The Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy addresses many of the issues in greater detail.

Approach to criterion four

The council has considered whether the processes identified by the Tasmanian Government cover the following four tasks regarding each issue:

- **Analysis**—consideration, definition and analysis of the issue and whether it has spatial implications for the capital city that require action.

- **Evidence and options**—demonstration of the basis for any proposed strategies and actions to deal with the issue, including the consideration of different options to deal with the issue.

- **Action**—strategies and actions to ameliorate, mitigate or overcome the issue.

- **Review**—monitoring and review processes are in place to both a) ensure strategies are being implemented and therefore the issue is being addressed, and b) to ensure that strategies and actions are adjusted over time to reflect shifting causes and trends.

The degree of effort on each task should be proportionate to the significance of the issue to each city and so is likely to differ from issue to issue and across the cities. In determining whether proportionate effort has been made on these tasks, the council has considered the analysis of each issue set out by the government (i.e. the first task in the list above).
The council’s analysis of the Tasmanian Government’s response to the issues is summarised in the table below. A green cell shows a proportionate effort on the corresponding task for the policy issue in question. A dark blue outline shows issues nominated as a priority by the government.

**Table 13.1 Hobart—Summary of analysis on nationally significant policy issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Evidence/options</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Population growth and...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... demographic change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Productivity and global competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Climate change mitigation and adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and other public assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Development of major urban corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Health, liveability, and community wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Housing affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Matters of national environmental significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tasmanian Government identified actions against each of the listed nationally-significant policy issues. However, not all the actions were supported by the key elements of ‘addressing’ a policy issue—analysis of the issue; evidence for and consideration of options for action to address identified problems; and processes of evaluation and review. In particular, there were no mechanisms to monitor performance and effectiveness and adapt to change for most of the policy issues.

A specific gap is in the issue of demographic change. This is a key challenge for Hobart and warrants more specifically considered strategies and actions to overcome or mitigate the problem. The Tasmanian Government’s recently adopted Southern Strategy, as well as its commitment to develop a population and settlement strategy, are positive developments on this policy issue.
Hobart: Criterion five—Capital city networks

Capital city strategic planning systems should consider and strengthen the networks between capital cities and major regional centres, and other important domestic and international connections.

**Finding**

**CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- Clear understanding of important regional, domestic and international connections.
- This is supported by planning in the Southern Integrated Transport Plan, Tasmanian Infrastructure Strategy and Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy.
- Upgrades to Port of Hobart commenced with redevelopment of Macquarie Wharf for Antarctic and Southern Ocean vessels and cruise ships.

The Tasmanian Government has clearly set out its important regional, domestic and international connections for Hobart and the significance of each to the city. This is supported by the Southern Integrated Transport Plan, which provides a framework for the region’s transport system, including intrastate road and rail networks. The Tasmanian Infrastructure Strategy and Tasmanian Infrastructure Advisory Council provide further support and rigour to planning for capital city networks. Tasmania’s two most important domestic and international connections—the International Airport and Port of Hobart—are currently being or are to be upgraded. The Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy seeks to consolidate and strengthen the network, hierarchy, roles and functions of the existing regional centres in the Southern Region.

**Figure 13.2**  Hobart—Key connections and networks
Hobart: Criterion six—Planning for future growth

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfields development.

**Finding**

**PARTIALLY CONSISTENT—REFORM PENDING**

**Key points**

- The Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy provides broad guidance for a program of land release.
- However, further work is required to clarify specific targets and implement the recommendations contained in the strategy now that is has been formally gazetted.

Broad intentions for a program of land release are contained in the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy (STCA 2011, p. 91) but specific targets across and within areas are unclear and links between the settlement strategy and infrastructure provision are currently limited. The Southern Strategy identifies the need for a monitoring and review system to maintain and update the Strategy. This includes a Residential Land Release Program that would include greenfield growth targets and precinct structure plans for major greenfield release areas and an Infill Development Program. The Southern Strategy also provides for an urban growth boundary that will limit the extent of development but provide for a 20 year supply of residential land within it. However, the boundary does not commence automatically. Implementation of the urban growth boundary and the land release program will be through new planning schemes for councils in the Greater Hobart area as part of the Regional Planning Initiative.

Data on greenfield and infill development in Hobart is not available in a form the council could graph in the same way as it has in other cities.
Hobart: Criterion seven—Investment priorities and frameworks

Capital city strategic planning systems should clearly identify priorities for investment and policy effort by governments, and provide an effective framework for private sector investment and innovation.

**Finding**

**PARTIALLY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- Broad investment priorities are set out in government plans and policies
- Some reforms to encourage and facilitate private sector investment and innovation.

The Tasmanian Government clearly identifies investment priorities through its plans and policies. The Innovation Strategy also identifies target areas for encouraging innovation in the Capital City Plan. The government’s planning reform agenda and its integration with the Tasmanian Economic Development Plan and State Infrastructure Strategy go some way to addressing this issue. The preparation of state-wide planning codes for single and multiple dwellings to streamline residential development and the new planning scheme template for Tasmania are two examples.

These are important steps in improving the frameworks for private sector investment. However these reform efforts, at this stage, are focused only on specific components of the planning system.

This is an issue common to all the systems the council reviewed. The main elements of a framework for investment and innovation that require further work are:

- consideration of the economic viability of the plans—looking at the markets that affect housing, jobs, infrastructure and services and their locations as part of planning
- consideration of the effect of government regulatory, planning and taxation policies on these markets and the likelihood of achieving the key elements of strategic plans.
Hobart: Criterion eight—Urban design and architecture

Capital city strategic planning systems should encourage world-class urban design and architecture.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT—REFORM PENDING

Key points

- Mechanisms to encourage urban design focus mainly on major sites and renewal and greenfield projects.
- There is no systemic approach to urban design.

The Tasmanian Government has a number of initiatives in place to encourage urban design. However, these do not appear to offer very strong encouragement and in some cases, are limited in their application. For example, the Sullivans Cove Design Panel model could be used for all of Hobart City—beyond the boundaries of Sullivans Cove—now that the Sullivans Cove Waterfront Authority has ceased operation.

It is encouraging that the government’s future Integrated Planning Model includes a proposal for the Tasmanian Planning Commission to form a State-wide expert panel—providing best practice information and advice in regard to review and revision of the city-regional planning, urban improvement, urban design and building design issues. The State Architect is exploring a model for provision of urban design/architecture advice for all development projects of significance to the State.

Table 13.2  Hobart—Where and how the Tasmanian Government encourages good design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm/Ind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/ Inf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. State Architect
2. Sullivans Cove Waterfront Authority
3. Sullivans Cove Design Panel
Hobart: Criterion nine (a)—Accountabilities, timelines and performance measures

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

a) clear accountabilities, timelines and performance measures.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT—REFORM PENDING

Key points

- Limited accountability mechanisms.
- Broad performance measures for the State.
- Intention to report on progress in implementing the Southern Strategy.

The assignment of responsibilities within interdepartmental committees and the consequences of not meeting assigned responsibilities are not yet clear.

An integrated method of performance assessment for plans and policies is not in place, noting that the capital city plan is still in development. Broad performance measures are in place at the State level in Tasmania Together and the Economic Development Plan; however these do not have a direct relationship to strategic planning for Hobart.

The proposed governance arrangements—once implemented—and the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy will improve accountabilities, timelines and performance measures. The Southern Strategy includes broad intentions to set up a performance monitoring framework and its supporting document, 'The Process Forward', sets out intentions to monitor implementation and report on the implementation of projects. The draft Hobart Capital City Plan appears to have elements of accountability and timeframes.

Table 13.3  Hobart—Tracking and reporting on actions and outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes: Supported by Tasmania Together and the Economic Development Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountabilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plans, policies and projects are assigned to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant portfolio ministers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation of actions: Tasmanian Infrastructure Strategy and Southern Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountabilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Policy and Projects Oversight Committee oversees policy and projects of strategic significance to the State.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hobart: Criterion nine (b)—Intergovernmental coordination

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

b) coordination between all three levels of government, with opportunities for Commonwealth and Local Government input, and linked, streamlined and efficient approval processes including under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

Finding

LARGELY CONSISTENT

Key points
- Strong collaboration between the Tasmanian Government and local government.
- New regional planning governance arrangements are proposed that will significantly reshape intergovernmental coordination.

Collaboration between the Tasmanian Government and local government in the Greater Hobart area is good, especially on the Southern Tasmanian Regional Planning Project. The proposed Integrated Planning Model for the Regional Planning Initiative will significantly reshape intergovernmental coordination and regional planning governance arrangements.

It is unclear exactly how the planning system manages the impact of Commonwealth Government activities in Greater Hobart beyond the impact of Commonwealth environmental approvals and a willingness from State and local government to talk to Commonwealth counterparts, particularly through the Regional Development Australia initiative.

The Tasmanian Government’s approvals system provides for the categorisation of approvals for appropriate levels of consideration. This is a first step to a streamlined approval system.

Table 13.4 Hobart—Key components of intergovernmental coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Commonwealth Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal alignment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Southern Tasmanian Regional Planning Project is an initiative between the State Government and local government</td>
<td>● Dialogue with the Commonwealth Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Premier’s Local Government Council</td>
<td>● Interaction with the Regional Development Australia initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation and implementation of plans, policies and projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Southern Tasmanian Regional Planning Project is an initiative between the State Government and local government</td>
<td>● Consultation with the Commonwealth Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Project implementation as part of the Regional Development Australia process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing activities of other levels of government</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● None provided</td>
<td>● None provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

c) evaluation and review cycles that support the need for balance between flexibility and certainty, including trigger points that identify the need for change in policy settings.

**Finding**

**NOT CONSISTENT—REFORM PENDING**

**Key points**

- The Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy sets out broad intentions for evaluation and review.
- The proposed Integrated Planning Model will provide the foundation for evaluation and review of plans and projects.

The Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy and its supporting implementation document ‘The Process Forward’ set out broad intentions to monitor implementation and outcomes and tie this to evaluation and review mechanisms. The Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy, which will form the basis of the Capital City Plan, will be underpinned by the Integrated Planning Model. The government states that the new governance arrangements will provide the foundation for evaluation and review cycles for the Southern Strategy, as well as other plans and projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans, policies, initiatives, and/or projects</th>
<th>Mechanisms to evaluate and review impact</th>
<th>Mechanisms to adjust policy settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy</td>
<td>• The proposed Integrated Planning Model will address this</td>
<td>• The proposed Integrated Planning Model will address this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hobart: Criterion nine (d)—Appropriate consultation and engagement

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

d) appropriate consultation and engagement with external stakeholders, experts and the wider community.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Strong upfront consultation in the preparation of the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy and the proposed consultation strategy for the Hobart Capital City Plan.
- Ongoing engagement with stakeholders, local government and communities will be essential in implementing the Southern Strategy and the Hobart Capital City Plan.

The Tasmanian Government submitted that all major policies and plans must provide for consultation and engagement with external stakeholders (Tasmanian Government 2010, p. 59). Furthermore, policies and plans must include consultation strategies to be endorsed by Cabinet. The Southern Regional Planning Strategy project involved extensive consultation with the community, councils, State agencies and other key stakeholders. This included two rounds of presentations and workshops with local government, various meetings with infrastructure providers and public information sessions. A Technical Reference Group for infrastructure providers was created to assist in developing the Southern Strategy. A consultation strategy for the Hobart Capital City Plan will endeavour to stimulate feedback from the community and industry before the plan is finalised.

Table 13.6 Hobart—Ongoing processes of consultation and engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stakeholder</th>
<th>Consultation and engagement mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In plan-making</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholders</td>
<td>Presentations and workshops, public information sessions and displays, option of commenting online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts and Industry</td>
<td>Reference group for and meetings with infrastructure providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How consultation is incorporated</td>
<td>No specific information provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes and sources from data listed in Section 13.2: Key Statistics—City

People:
The population projection graph refers to the Hobart Statistical Division and is derived from unpublished ABS estimated resident population data and population projections data cubes (ABS 2008). There was a change in statistical geographic boundaries from 1995 to 1996.

Population of TAS, population of Hobart, proportion of TAS population in Hobart, Hobart annual average population growth rate: ABS 2011d

Population projection for Hobart by 2056: ABS 2008

Median age of Hobart’s population, median age of Australia’s population: ABS 2011c

Economy:
Major employing industries graph: ABS 2007
Average annual income and unemployment rate for Sydney and Australia: ABS 2011b

Participation rate: ABS 2011a

There is no containerised trade into or out of the Port of Hobart.

Air passenger movements: BITRE 2011

Dwellings:
Typical (modal) dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011b
Median dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011a

Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households: COAG Reform Council 2011b

Homelessness rate: Chamberlain & MacKenzie 2009

Utilities:
Data on water use is not available for Hobart.
Public transport: ABS 2010

Full references are in the bibliography at the end of this report.
Chapter 14. Canberra

14.1 Context

Figure 14.1 Map of Canberra

Source: (Geoscience Australia 2011)
Governance and context

**ACT Government**

Under the Constitution, the Commonwealth is the owner of land in the ACT. This forms the basis of the leasehold system of land in the Territory (NCA 2010).

There is no local government in the ACT so the ACT Government has the functions that would otherwise sit with local government. Self-government in 1988 saw the National Capital Authority and the ACT Government jointly take over the National Capital Development Commission’s metropolitan planning functions (NCA 2010).

The ACT Government announced in September 2009 that Dr Allan Hawke AC would review the structure and capacity of the ACT public sector (Stanhope 2010). His final report was publicly released in February 2011 recommending changes to the structure of the ACT public service (Chief Minister’s Department 2011). The ACT Government accepted the recommendation to form a single agency of nine directorates as the administrative basis of the ACT Public Service (Stanhope 2011). These new arrangements bring various land and planning services and authorities under two directorates, the Environment and Sustainable Development Directorate and the Economic Development Directorate.

- The ACT Planning and Land Authority, in the Environment and Sustainable Development Directorate, is the key planning agency in the ACT Government. The Authority prepared the Canberra Spatial Plan which sets the strategic directions for development over the next 30 years (ACT Planning and Land Authority 2004). The Authority administers the Territory Plan, which is the main statutory planning document in the ACT and provides the policy framework for the administration of planning in the ACT.

- The Economic Development Directorate is responsible for land release, land development, major land and property facilitation, government accommodation and property services. The Land Development Agency is also in this directorate and is responsible for the sale and development of land and strategic or complex urban development projects (Australian Capital Territory Government 2010, p. 24).

**National Capital Authority**

The *Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988* [Cwlth] establishes the National Capital Authority and requires it to prepare and administer a *National Capital Plan*. It also establishes the ACT Planning and Land Authority that must prepare and administer a statutory plan (the *Territory Plan*) that is not inconsistent with the National Capital Plan. These arrangements came into place with self-government (Australian Capital Territory Government 2010, p. 16)
### Key statistics

#### People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical and projected population</th>
<th>Population of Canberra, 2010</th>
<th>358 200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberran annual average population growth rate (for the five years to June 2010)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated population of Canberra by 2056 (ABS)</td>
<td>509 300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age of Canberra’s population</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age of Australia’s population</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canberra</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average annual income</td>
<td>$54 002</td>
<td>$45 089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air passenger movements (million, 2010–11)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>135.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air passenger movements (annual % increase)</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dwellings

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typical (modal) Canberra dwelling price, 2009–10</td>
<td>$430 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Canberra dwelling price, 2009–10</td>
<td>$450 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, Canberra</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, national</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness rate per 10 000, 2006 (similar to other capital cities)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Utilities

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water use in Canberra in 2009–10 (fourth highest among capital cities excluding Hobart)</td>
<td>199 kilolitres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Canberra residents who used public transport to journey to work in 2006</td>
<td>around 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Australians who used public transport to journey to work in 2006</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes and sources for this page are listed at the end of this chapter.
14.3 Overall views of strategic planning for Canberra

The council has reviewed the strategic planning system for Canberra against the nine criteria by critically analysing, with the assistance of the Expert Advisory Panel, information provided by the ACT Government. In doing this review, the council has reached the following high level views.

Improving strategic decision making and budgeting processes

The ACT Government’s strategic decision making capacity and associated budgeting processes may improve as it implements the recommendations of the Hawke Review. The Budget Committee of Cabinet, supported by the new Strategic Board, encourages a whole of government perspective on policy development and the consideration of budget implications for new initiatives. Through the implementation of the new directorate structure under the one ACT public service, the functions of transport and land use have been more closely aligned, which will help to deliver integrated long term direction setting as well as medium term planning.

The Hawke Review also found that the ACT Government could improve how it develops strategic priorities with a clearer line of sight from vision to delivery and that there was a gap in forming the government’s strategic intent and showing how it will be delivered. The increased transparency of Cabinet outcomes, an annual statement of Government Priorities, the performance and accountability framework and other recommendations from the Hawke Review, when implemented, should address these concerns.

Ongoing need to coordinate with the Commonwealth and NSW Government

Despite both parties recognising the problem, there was limited integration between the Commonwealth Government and the ACT Government in the spatial planning of Canberra. The review of the National Capital Authority by Dr Allan Hawke AC may help resolve this issue. The review was completed in 2011 and made public in October 2011. The Commonwealth Government will respond to the Review by the end of 2011 but has not done so at the time of writing. The ACT Government will also respond to the review, noting that it calls for reform to clearly assign ‘principal authority areas’ (Hawke 2011, p. 9). There have been a number of reviews in recent years that have not resolved planning responsibility issues for Canberra.

There are a number of mechanisms for cross border collaboration with the New South Wales Government. The fast growing city of Queanbeyan houses a large number of daily commuters into Canberra. A taskforce is currently examining transport between Queanbeyan and Canberra—a positive sign of work between the two governments. A current development proposal at Tralee, which is under the flight path of Canberra Airport and could affect the airport’s future growth, is creating less positive signs. Discussions with the NSW Government over a number of years have not resolved this issue. The Tralee development has not been approved by the NSW Minister for Planning and the Minister was advised not to proceed on two occasions by an Independent Review Panel in 2006, and the NSW Planning Assessment Commission in 2011.
14.4 Review against the criteria

**Canberra: Criterion one—Integration**

Capital city strategic planning systems should be integrated:

a) across functions, including land-use and transport planning, economic and infrastructure development, environmental assessment and urban development, and

b) across government agencies.

**Finding**

**LARGELY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- Clear goals in the Canberra Plan.
- Improved strategic decision making and budgeting processes.
- Structural changes to the ACT public service made to improve communication and coordination.
- Improved performance and accountability framework being implemented.

The 2011 review of the ACT public service by Dr Allan Hawke AC recommended improved integration of the ACT public service. The ACT Government is implementing the recommendations of the Hawke Review, including by creating one ACT Government public service department with nine directorates. The 2011–12 Budget Papers and directorate annual reports show that the directorates have been created on a financial reporting level. The directorates are supported by the new Strategic Board, which is designed to provide whole of government leadership and strategic direction for the ACT public service, and which may encourage integrated decisions across functions and toward these goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of integration</th>
<th>Characteristics of Canberra planning system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unifying goals and objectives</td>
<td>The Canberra Plan contains unifying goals for Canberra, supported by the Canberra Spatial Plan and the Sustainable Transport Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Infrastructure Plan has the same themes as the Canberra Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation against the Canberra Plan is reported annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and coordination</td>
<td>The structure of the ACT public service has recently been changed, including by creating a single public service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interagency bodies, like the Strategic Board, facilitate whole of government communication and coordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making and budgeting</td>
<td>Budget Committee of Cabinet reviews proposals in line with government priorities, which are then agreed by Cabinet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Strategic Board provides consolidated advice to Cabinet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation and review</td>
<td>A new performance and accountability framework is being implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directorates or interagency committees are responsible for implementation of projects and policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canberra: Criterion two—Hierarchy of plans

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for a consistent hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans, including:

a) long term (for example, 15–30 year) integrated strategic plans,
b) medium term (for example, 5–15 year) prioritised infrastructure and land-use plans, and
c) near term prioritised infrastructure project pipeline backed by appropriately detailed project plans.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points

- Clear long, medium and short term plans are publicly available.
- Projects can be traced from the short term plans through to the long term plans.
- Decision making processes follow from goals identified in the Canberra Plan through to the ACT Government Priorities that align to the Plan’s themes.

The ACT Government has a clear hierarchy of plans from the strategic level to a pipeline of projects. The ACT Government’s decision making processes through the Strategic Board and budget processes translate strategic needs and objectives into specific projects. For instance, the themes and actions in the Canberra Plan are reflected in the infrastructure plan and the ACT Government Priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goals</td>
<td><strong>The Canberra Plan:</strong> 30 year plan to guide whole of government decisions and resource allocation, implementation publicly reported annually.</td>
<td>Sets out seven strategic themes which each have an objective, projects and some progress indicators. It does not have any time-oriented targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Directions</td>
<td><strong>The Canberra Spatial Plan:</strong> Long-term plan for Canberra, reported on every two years, reviewed every five years. To be replaced by the Planning Strategy in 2012.</td>
<td>Strategic development of Canberra for a 30 year period as ‘a more compact city’. The spatial plan is also concerned with medium term objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Infrastructure priorities</td>
<td><strong>ACT Government Infrastructure Plan:</strong> Covers expenditure on capital assets over the next decade, released annually.</td>
<td>Outlines capital expenditure and infrastructure priorities over two, five and ten year periods in line with the Canberra Plan strategic themes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land use</td>
<td><strong>Four year indicative land release program:</strong> Annual program of land release.</td>
<td>Covers residential, commercial, industrial and community land releases for the following four years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commitments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project plans</td>
<td><strong>Budget Infrastructure Investment Program:</strong> Appropriation of capital funds.</td>
<td>Items in budget paper which can be linked to medium and long-term plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Links to long term plans</td>
<td><strong>ACT Government Priorities:</strong> Yearly priorities of Government</td>
<td>Priority projects and measures of achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canberra: Criterion three—Nationally significant infrastructure

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for nationally-significant economic infrastructure (both new and upgrade of existing) including:

a) transport corridors
b) international gateways
c) intermodal connections
d) major communications and utilities infrastructure, and
e) reservation of appropriate lands to support future expansion.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points

- Nationally-significant economic infrastructure is set out in the Canberra Spatial Plan.
- Funding for nationally-significant economic infrastructure is provided through the ACT Budget.

The ACT Government clearly identifies nationally significant economic infrastructure in the Canberra Spatial Plan and the Infrastructure Plan. Infrastructure is provided for in the ACT Budget, under the Infrastructure Investment Program. Infrastructure is maintained through the Strategic Asset Management Framework.

Two nationally significant transport corridors have been identified as government priorities and funded in the ACT Budget 2011–12:

- Majura Parkway—co-funded by the Commonwealth Government to improve freight and commuter traffic flows, linking the Monaro Highway and the Federal Highway.
- Northbourne Avenue—feasibility study and proposals for a rapid public transit corridor.

The Canberra International Airport is a regional gateway. The ACT Government supports the planned expansion of both passenger and freight activity at Canberra Airport. The Canberra Airport Integration Committee aligns the activities of the airport with planning in the ACT.
Canberra: Criterion four—Nationally significant policy issues

Capital city strategic planning systems should address nationally-significant policy issues including:

a) population growth and demographic change
b) productivity and global competitiveness
c) climate change mitigation and adaptation
d) efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets
e) connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets
f) development of major urban corridors
g) social inclusion
h) health, liveability, and community.
i) housing affordability
j) matters of national environmental significance.

Finding

LARGELY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Evidence of analysis provided for most issues, particularly:
  - climate change mitigation and adaptation
  - efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure
  - health, liveability, and community wellbeing
  - social inclusion
  - housing affordability.

- Monitoring and review mechanisms, particularly performance indicators, could be improved for all policy issues—this is partially addressed in the draft Planning Strategy which will replace the Spatial Plan in 2012.

Approach to criterion four

The council has considered whether the processes identified by the ACT Government cover the following four tasks regarding each issue:

- **Analysis**—consideration, definition and analysis of the issue and whether it has spatial implications for the capital city that require action.

- **Evidence and options**—demonstration of the basis for any proposed strategies and actions to deal with the issue, including the consideration of different options to deal with the issue.

- **Action**—strategies and actions to ameliorate, mitigate or overcome the issue.

- **Review**—monitoring and review processes are in place to both a) ensure strategies are being implemented and therefore the issue is being addressed, and b) to ensure that strategies and actions are adjusted over time to reflect shifting causes and trends.

The degree of effort on each task should be proportionate to the significance of the issue to each city and so is likely to differ from issue to issue and across the cities. In determining whether proportionate effort has been made on these tasks, the council has considered the analysis of each issue set out by the government (i.e. the first task in the list above).
The council’s analysis of the ACT Government’s response to the issues is summarised in the table below. A green cell shows a proportionate effort on the corresponding task for the policy issue in question. A dark blue outline shows issues nominated as a priority by the government.

**Table 14.1  Canberra—Summary of analysis on nationally significant policy issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Evidence/options</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. population growth and…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... demographic change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. productivity and global competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. climate change mitigation and adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. development of major urban corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. health, liveability, and community wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. housing affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. matters of national environmental significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ACT Government is addressing most of the issues, including climate change, efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure, social inclusion, health, liveability and community wellbeing, and housing affordability. On these, strategies were presented with clear analysis of the issue and a pointer to how evidence was used. Some structures were in place for monitoring implementation and performance, and adapting policy.

The Canberra Spatial Plan has a clear review cycle, however, some ‘monitoring indicators’ within the plan do not have available data. While some information on the plan was presented to the ACT Parliament for review after two years, a full report does not appear to be publicly available.

The recent Hawke Review of the ACT public service identified the need for more meaningful performance indicators. The ACT Government is developing a new performance and accountability framework with a focus on improved indicators, which has the potential to strengthen the review of policies and provide an evidence base for future decisions.
Canberra: Criterion five—Capital city networks

Capital city strategic planning systems should consider and strengthen the networks between capital cities and major regional centres, and other important domestic and international connections.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points

- Major regional centres and domestic and international connections are set out in plans and provided for in the Budget.
- Regional connections are supported by established communication and collaboration mechanisms.

The ACT Government clearly outlines the links between Canberra and its region.

To manage the ACT’s size relative to settlements in surrounding regions, like Queanbeyan, the government has developed several mechanisms which support collaboration, including the Regional Management Framework, Regional Leaders Forum and meetings with mayors.

Figure 14.2  Canberra–Key connections and networks
Canberra: Criterion six—Planning for future growth

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfields development.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points

- Mechanisms to provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release are in place.
- A balance of infill and greenfield development targets is specified to support the long term spatial plan.

The strategic planning system for Canberra has mechanisms to provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfield development. These include:

- appropriate analytical methods to determine future land requirements for infill and greenfield development, including population and demographic projections
- clear infill versus greenfield development targets, outlined in the spatial plan and monitored through the ACT Residential Land and Building Activity Report
- an Australian Capital Territory Indicative Land Release Program, covering four years and subject to market changes
- the Residential and Commercial Advisory Committee, Land Supply Working Group and Land Supply Committee, which meet monthly to discuss progress against planning targets and which inform future planning decisions.

Figure 14.3  Canberra–Dwelling types

Source: (Department of Land and Property Services 2011)
Canberra: Criterion seven—Investment priorities and frameworks

Capital city strategic planning systems should clearly identify priorities for investment and policy effort by governments, and provide an effective framework for private sector investment and innovation.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points
- Priorities for investment and policy are clearly identified in public plans.
- Some initiatives for encouraging private sector investment.
- The planned Regulatory Impact Assessment and any consequential reforms is a promising initiative.

The annually released statement of ACT Government Priorities and an annually updated 10 year infrastructure plan identify the government’s investment priorities. The government is also currently investigating partnerships with the private sector for a number of key projects.

The ACT Government, in the 2011–2021 Infrastructure Plan, recognises its responsibility as the lead planner, coordinator and provider of public infrastructure to support economic growth in the ACT. However, owing to the microeconomic reforms of the last 20 years, the private sector is able to play a larger role in infrastructure provision. However, these reform efforts, at this stage, are focused on addressing specific constraints caused by elements of the planning system.

This is an issue common to all the systems the council reviewed. The main elements of a framework for investment and innovation that require further work are:

- consideration of the economic viability of the plans—looking at the markets that affect housing, jobs, infrastructure and services and their locations as part of planning
- consideration of the effect of government regulatory, planning and taxation policies on these markets and the likelihood of achieving the key elements of strategic plans.

However, the ACT Government reports it will examine the barriers to private sector involvement through a Regulatory Impact Assessment, to be done by the Economic Development Directorate. This is intended to address the gap in information about the cumulative effect of ACT’s various regulatory and taxation frameworks on the incentives and risks facing the private sector in trying to deliver infrastructure in Canberra. This assessment would need to be shaped by Canberra’s underlying land economics and the relevant taxation and regulatory policies of other levels of government. This would be most effective if it was coupled with a review of the ACT Government business development grants and tax concessions.
Capital city strategic planning systems should encourage world-class urban design and architecture.

**Finding**

**LARGELY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- The Government Architect plays a role primarily at the project and precinct level to deliver design excellence.
- It is not clear whether some mechanisms play a decisive role in encouraging world class urban design.

While many mechanisms are in place to maintain good urban design in planning, it was not clear that all mechanisms actively and systematically encouraged design excellence. Rather, they just supported or guided it. The Canberra Spatial Plan contains a high level goal with outcomes and indicators to 'maintain a unique sense of place', but there is not a strong link between this and other mechanisms.

**Table 14.2 Canberra—Where and how the ACT Government encourages good design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm/Ind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/ Inf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Government Architect  
2. Urban design protocol  
3. Major Projects Review Group  
4. ACT Planning and Land Authority’s Executive Policy Committee  
5. National Capital Authority, through Development Control Plans  
6. Master Planning  
7. Statutory Planning: The Territory Plan (Structure Plans, Concept Plans, Precinct Codes)  
8. Lease administration and development assessment processes  
9. Design requirements (example, City Centre)  
10. 6 Star energy ratings for private housing
Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

a) clear accountabilities, timelines and performance measures.

**Finding**

**PARTIALLY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**
- Unclear accountabilities—only whole of government level public accountability and no timelines for actions in the Canberra Plan.
- No framework for accountability and implementation of Canberra Spatial Plan.
- Performance and Accountability Framework being implemented.

Performance monitoring is focused on short to medium term goals along the themes outlined in the Canberra Plan. The government includes a mix of outcomes and the actions to achieve goals in supporting plans. The Canberra Plan includes a strategic theme of 'A Vibrant City and Great Neighbourhoods', although the outcomes and actions for this theme are not spatial. Short term priorities are set out in the Government's Strategic Priorities. The government has recently reviewed its Performance and Accountability Framework and reports it will implement a stronger framework of integrated performance indicators.

**Table 14.3  Canberra—Tracking and reporting on actions and outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes: Objectives and strategic themes in the Canberra Plan</th>
<th>Accountabilities</th>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seems to be whole of government accountability only (i.e. Cabinet).</td>
<td>Neither timelines nor levels of change are specified for outcomes in the Canberra Plan. Government Priorities are reported annually.</td>
<td>The Canberra Plan includes strategic progress indicators that focus on outcomes. Some outcome measures in the Government Priorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also whole of government through Strategic Board (Head of Service and all directors-general).</td>
<td>Government Priorities reported annually.</td>
<td>Responsible against the ACT Government Priorities, which include some outcome measures reported annually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation of actions:** Canberra Plan, Infrastructure Plan, Government Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountabilities</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Timelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seems to be whole of government accountability only (i.e. Cabinet).</td>
<td>Annual reports on Canberra Plan and Government Priorities.</td>
<td>No timelines in the Canberra Plan. Government Priorities are reported annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also whole of government through Strategic Board (Head of Service and all directors-general).</td>
<td>Annual reports on Canberra Plan, Measuring Our Progress website and Canberra Construction Snapshots.</td>
<td>No timelines in Canberra Plan; Infrastructure Plan includes two, five and ten year time frames.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canberra: Criterion nine (b)—Intergovernmental coordination

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

b) coordination between all three levels of government, with opportunities for Commonwealth and Local Government input, and linked, streamlined and efficient approval processes including under the Commonwealth *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*.

**Finding**

**LARGELY CONSISTENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Good communication with local government authorities, the NSW Government and the Commonwealth Government.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continuing lack of clarity regarding respective functions of the ACT Government and the National Capital Authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ACT Government has many means of communication and consultation with the Commonwealth, NSW Government, and surrounding local government authorities. These structures, particularly at the local government level, allow the relationship to continue in spite of divergent opinions on some issues. Better cooperation between the ACT Government and the National Capital Authority is needed. Cooperation may be helped by more clearly defined roles and responsibilities, as recommended in the recent Hawke Review of the National Capital Authority.

These issues are not entirely within the remit of the ACT Government, so it may not be able to act unilaterally to resolve them. The Commonwealth and NSW governments will also need to play a part in resolving them.

**Table 14.4** Canberra–Key components of intergovernmental coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-border</th>
<th>Commonwealth Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal alignment</strong></td>
<td>• The Regional Management Framework—resolves cross border matters and plans the provision of government services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation and implementation of plans, policies and projects</strong></td>
<td>• The Regional Management Framework covers planning for health services, transport, climate change, service delivery, and regional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing activities of other levels of government</strong></td>
<td>• The Eastern Regional Transport Taskforce considers cross-border public transport that could be delivered between Canberra and Queanbeyan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

c) evaluation and review cycles that support the need for balance between flexibility and certainty, including trigger points that identify the need for change in policy settings.

**Finding**

**LARGELY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**
- Clear review cycles for key policies, initiatives and plans.
- No clear public reporting on outcomes or implementation of the Spatial Plan.
- Agency level evaluation plans not publicly available.

The ACT Government has clear review cycles for major plans, policies and projects. The ACT Government appears to have a whole of government process in place for evaluation and review of policies generally, although a greater link between the high-level goals for the city and how data are collected and assessed would assist this process.

The government is also developing an underpinning agency-based evaluation process. An Evaluation Policy and Guidelines will cover the various plans and policies that make up the capital city strategic planning system. These plans were not publicly available at the time of writing.

**Table 14.5 Canberra—Evaluation and review cycles and/or trigger points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans, policies, initiatives, and/or projects</th>
<th>Mechanisms to evaluate and review impact</th>
<th>Mechanisms to adjust policy settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberra Spatial Plan</td>
<td>Reviewed every two years (not public)</td>
<td>Five yearly review cycle, draft Planning Strategy to be finalised in 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra Plan: Towards our Second Century</td>
<td>Yearly Report on Implementation; Measuring our Progress website</td>
<td>Four yearly review cycle, including consultation and adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Government Infrastructure Plan</td>
<td>Canberra Construction Snapshots</td>
<td>Yearly review cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency level projects and initiatives</td>
<td>ACT Government Priorities statements; Agency Evaluation Plans (prospective); Annual Reports</td>
<td>Reviewed and adjusted annually through the Budget process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canberra: Criterion nine (d)—Appropriate consultation and engagement

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

d) appropriate consultation and engagement with external stakeholders, experts and the wider community.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points

- Consultation mechanisms are established and guided by formal documentation and legislation for some areas of planning.
- Ongoing engagement using websites.

The ACT Government has several consultation mechanisms in place to encourage participation of the community and organisations in preparing, implementing and reviewing strategic plans. The main mechanism is the Canberra 2030: Time to Talk process, which supports and applies legislated consultation on planning and development processes. For instance, the Time to Talk web site is an ongoing means of engagement with the community, complemented by the Community Engagement website and supported by the ACT Government Community Engagement Manual, the functions of the Planning and Lands Authority and its Guide to Community Engagement and Consultation.

Engagement occurs through online feedback forms and forums as well as submissions to discussion papers, public meetings and other public or targeted forums for stakeholder groups.

Table 14.6 Canberra—Ongoing processes of consultation and engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stakeholder</th>
<th>Consultation and engagement mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In plan-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholders</td>
<td>Legislated consultation for some planning activities and encouraged by protocols established by the guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to Talk website, and feedback mechanisms through Canberra Connect provide online engagement mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislated consultation for some planning activities and encouraged by protocols established by the guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts and Industry</td>
<td>Stakeholder forums; written submissions or correspondence; meetings; roundtables; and online forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In implementation, feedback mechanisms are included to, in some cases, monitor progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In review, consultation is included in redrafting of plans and reporting on their success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How consultation is incorporated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In plan-making, consultation is included in drafting final plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In implementation, feedback mechanisms are included to, in some cases, monitor progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In review, consultation is included in redrafting of plans and reporting on their success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes and sources from data listed in Section 14.2: Key Statistics—City

People:
The population projection graph refers to the Canberra Statistical Division and is derived from unpublished ABS estimated resident population data and population projections data cubes (ABS 2008). There was a change in statistical geographic boundaries from 1995 to 1996.

Population of Canberra, Canberra annual average population growth rate: ABS 2011d
Population projection for Canberra by 2056: ABS 2008
Median age of Canberra’s population, median age of Australia’s population: ABS 2011c

Economy:
Major employing industries graph: ABS 2007
Average annual income and unemployment rate for Canberra and Australia: ABS 2011b
Participation rate: ABS 2011a
Air passenger movements: BITRE 2011

Dwellings:
Typical (modal) dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011b
Median dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011a
Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households: COAG Reform Council 2011b
Homelessness rate: Chamberlain & MacKenzie 2009

Utilities
Water use: National Water Commission 2011
Public transport: ABS 2010

Full references are in the bibliography at the end of this report.
Chapter 15. Darwin

15.1 Context

Figure 15.1 Map of the Greater Darwin Region

Governance and context

The Northern Territory Government has sole responsibility for both strategic and statutory planning. The Northern Territory Department of Lands and Planning is responsible for developing and providing the strategic planning and growth frameworks, strategies and infrastructure plans required to develop the Territory. Local government authorities do not have statutory responsibility for planning, but are referral authorities for subdivision approvals and provide comments on amendments to the Northern Territory Plan. The Darwin metropolitan area has three local governments—Darwin City Council, Palmerston City Council and the Shire of Litchfield.
15.2 Key statistics

### People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical and projected population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population of NT, 2010</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population of Darwin, 2010</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of NT population in Darwin, 2010</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Darwin annual average population growth rate (for the five years to June 2010)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated population of Darwin by 2056 (ABS)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Median age of Darwin’s population**: 33
- **Median age of Australia’s population**: 37

### Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Darwin</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average annual income</strong></td>
<td>$49,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unemployment rate</strong></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation rate</strong></td>
<td>74.7% (NT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total containerised trade (TEU)</strong></td>
<td>10,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air passenger movements (million, 2010–11)</strong></td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air passenger movements (annual % increase)</strong></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dwellings

| Typical (modal) Darwin dwelling price, 2009–10 | $430,000 |
| Median Darwin dwelling price, 2009–10 | $450,000 |
| Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, Darwin | 51.1% |
| Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households, national | 42.0% |
| Homelessness rate per 10,000, 2006 (similar to other capital cities) | 276 |

### Utilities

- **Water use in Darwin in 2009–10 (highest among capital cities excluding Hobart)**: 458 kilolitres

Notes and sources for this page are listed at the end of this chapter.
15.3 Overall views of strategic planning for Darwin

The council has reviewed the strategic planning system for Darwin against the nine criteria by critically analysing, with the assistance of the Expert Advisory Panel, information provided by the Northern Territory Government. In doing this review, the council has reached the following high level views.

A good sense of Darwin’s place in Australia and the region

The key strength of the strategic planning system for Darwin is the clear sense and vision the Northern Territory Government has of Darwin’s role within the Territory and Australia. This is reflected in the planning system, which also provides a good sense of Darwin’s role in the network of capital cities across Australia. This sees the government’s focus on the key role of its port and rail connections, which enable Darwin to fill this role as a strategic connection to Asia and for mineral exploration to Australia’s north. A good plan is critical to realise this vision.

A new, more systematic program to achieve long term goals for Darwin

Taken together, the Territory 2030 Strategic Plan, the draft land-use plan and the new infrastructure strategies provide some important elements of a strategic plan for Darwin, but do not link the long-term vision for Darwin to strategic objectives and urban/spatially relevant paths to reach them for the metropolitan region. The council therefore welcomes the advice from the Northern Territory Government that it has approved the development of a draft Greater Darwin Plan as the new metropolitan strategic plan for Darwin. It will be released in 2012 for consultation. This is a new initiative for the Northern Territory planning system that will have strategic directions specifically for Darwin with a link to Territory 2030.

Sound land use planning, but how will it affect long term goals?

Greater Darwin has made a significant start in pursuing densification goals, including through brownfield development. To support the economic growth of Darwin including the nearby Ichthys gas field development, the Northern Territory Government provided a solid evidence base for the need to establish a new, discrete urban centre at Weddell in response to shifts in demand in the near term and the issue of land constraints close to the urban centre.

Weddell is some distance from the existing Darwin and Palmerston centres and is reshaping the city. The council’s role is to examine metropolitan strategic plans and planning and it is on this basis that the council is interested to see analysis not just of how this suburb came to be in that location (criterion 6) but rather how the new centre fits into and affects the emerging goals for Darwin over time, from car use to social inclusion (criteria 1, 4 and 9a). The upcoming draft Greater Darwin Plan may address this issue.
15.4 Review against the criteria

**Darwin: Criterion one—Integration**

Capital city strategic planning systems should be integrated:

a) across functions, including land-use and transport planning, economic and infrastructure development, environmental assessment and urban development, and

b) across government agencies.

**Finding**

**PARTIALLY CONSISTENT—REFORM PENDING**

**Key points**
- Spatial strategy for Darwin in early stages of development.
- Communication and coordination mechanisms suited to Darwin’s scale.
- Whole of government decision making and budget processes through Cabinet and interagency committees.

Territory 2030 contains a series of broad goals, objectives and strategic directions. However, the objectives in this document are Territory-wide with only some objectives for Darwin. Similarly, the targets and actions underpinning the various objectives are not urban or spatial in their orientation, despite in some cases being relevant. The ‘actions’ listed to pursue the objectives are often more detailed targets, meaning it is not clear what will be done to achieve the objectives.

The consultation paper for the Greater Darwin Region Land Use Plan provides seven strategic directions which are not aligned to Territory 2030, and remains a draft. However, the system is changing to become more integration. The Northern Territory Government has completed its ten year Infrastructure Strategy and Roads Strategy. It has also decided to develop a strategic plan for Darwin with an implementation program. These are positive developments that should improve integration of planning in Darwin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of integration</th>
<th>Characteristics of Darwin planning system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Unifying goals and objectives** | Territory 2030 has goals for the Northern Territory in six key areas.  
| | The draft Greater Darwin Plan has been approved for public consultation. |
| **Communication and coordination** | Cabinet proposals are circulated for agency comments.  
| | Interagency groups and others, like the Darwin Capital City Committee, cut across policy areas with broad membership. |
| **Decision making and budgeting** | Whole of government decision making through Cabinet and budget decision making processes.  
| | Interagency groups, particularly the Managing Darwin’s Growth Steering Committee, which considers the range of planning issues for Darwin. |
| **Implementation and review** | The Darwin Capital City Committee and the Palmerston City Committee assist with aspects of implementation for Darwin, but the accountability link to the different targets for Darwin in Territory 2030 is unclear.  
| | Territory 2030 to be reviewed every two years, with updates against targets. More robust performance reporting framework in development. |
Darwin: Criterion two—Hierarchy of plans

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for a consistent hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans, including:

a) long term (for example, 15–30 year) integrated strategic plans,

b) medium term (for example, 5–15 year) prioritised infrastructure and land-use plans, and

c) near term prioritised infrastructure project pipeline backed by appropriately detailed project plans.

Finding

LARGELY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Territory 2030 is a whole of Territory, goal-oriented plan. There is no long-term strategic plan for Darwin—but one is being developed for consultation in early 2012.
- Medium term infrastructure and roads plans are in place.

There is presently no long term strategic plan for Darwin, however a Greater Darwin Plan is being developed for consultation in early 2012. There is a Territory-wide plan but it does not deal with spatial issues or Darwin specifically. Medium term infrastructure and roads plans have been completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Territory 2030: Long-term plan providing goals and strategic directions for the whole Territory.</td>
<td>Territory 2030 has targets and ‘actions’ in six areas: education, society, economic sustainability, health and wellbeing, the environment, knowledge, creativity and innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Greater Darwin Plan: A long-term strategic framework to guide growth in Darwin, linked to T2030.</td>
<td>Yet to be released. The council understands it contains strategic direction and implementation planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Draft Greater Darwin Region Land Use Plan Consultation Paper: 15 year land use plan for Greater Darwin, for greenfield and infill development and Weddell.</td>
<td>Directions are different to the above, covering housing, work, growth, population, green issues and better land use, although Territory 2030 is referenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Year Infrastructure Strategy: A strategy to guide infrastructure prioritisation.</td>
<td>Detailed medium term priorities with some budget detail across infrastructure classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Year Road Strategy: A framework for managing road network planning and development.</td>
<td>A broad analysis of growth and road use in the Northern Territory, with some actions and priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Budget Papers: Four year forward estimates reviewed annually.</td>
<td>Includes Capital Works Program with a focus on utilities infrastructure and roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Darwin: Criterion three—Nationally significant infrastructure

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for nationally-significant economic infrastructure (both new and upgrade of existing) including:

a) transport corridors
b) international gateways
c) intermodal connections
d) major communications and utilities infrastructure, and
e) reservation of appropriate lands to support future expansion.

Finding

LARGELY CONSISTENT

Key points

- New 10 year Infrastructure and Roads plans detail a range of medium term investments and priorities.
- Darwin airport and port are not expected to experience a level of growth that requires significant forward planning or investment to manage capacity.

The capital city strategic planning system for Darwin provides for nationally-significant economic infrastructure in the draft Greater Darwin Land Use Plan and more importantly in the new 10 Year Infrastructure Plan and Road Plan.

The Darwin to Adelaide Railway, the Stuart Highway and the East Arm Port are identified as particularly significant to Darwin, and analysis of their impact on economic development is appropriately detailed.

In terms of growth at key sites:

- Expected airfreight increases are stated to be within the capacity of existing infrastructure for the next 20 years, with no requirement for dedicated airfreight services.
- Options were put forward for possible increases in air services to support regional communities, the growth in tourism and defence uses.
- The East Arm Wharf Masterplan 2030 details a number of projects to develop harbour capacity to support economic growth and shifts in capacity.

However, the draft Greater Darwin Land Use Plan highlights the need to identify approximately 1000 hectares of appropriate land for further development around the port required to cope with related heavy industry growth.
Darwin: Criterion four—Nationally significant policy issues

Capital city strategic planning systems should address nationally-significant policy issues including:

- a) population growth and demographic change
- b) productivity and global competitiveness
- c) climate change mitigation and adaptation
- d) efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets
- e) connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets
- f) development of major urban corridors
- g) social inclusion
- h) health, liveability, and community
- i) housing affordability
- j) matters of national environmental significance

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Population growth, productivity and global competitiveness, infrastructure investment and housing affordability showed the most comprehensive policy analysis.
- Evidence and options analysis and monitoring and review are the weakest elements.
- The Northern Territory Government faces complex and critical issues related to the social inclusion and economic development of its urban and transient Indigenous population, which may be further addressed in the upcoming Social Inclusion Plan.
- New resources projects offer an opportunity to explain how the Northern Territory Government will pursue its global competitiveness priority.

Approach to criterion four

The council has considered whether the processes identified by the Northern Territory Government cover the following four tasks regarding each issue:

- Analysis—consideration, definition and analysis of the issue and whether it has spatial implications for the capital city that require action.
- Evidence and options—demonstration of the basis for any proposed strategies and actions to deal with the issue, including the consideration of different options to deal with the issue.
- Action—strategies and actions to ameliorate, mitigate or overcome the issue.
- Review—monitoring and review processes are in place to both a) ensure strategies are being implemented and therefore the issue is being addressed, and b) to ensure that strategies and actions are adjusted over time to reflect shifting causes and trends.

The degree of effort on each task should be proportionate to the significance of the issue to each city and so is likely to differ from issue to issue and across the cities. In determining whether proportionate effort has been made on these tasks, the council has considered the analysis of each issue set out by the government (i.e. the first task in the list above).
The council’s analysis of the Northern Territory Government’s response to the issues is summarised in the table below. A green cell shows a proportionate effort on the corresponding task for the policy issue in question. A dark blue outline shows issues nominated as a priority by the government.

Table 15.1  Darwin—Summary of analysis on nationally significant policy issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Evidence/options</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. population growth and…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… demographic change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. productivity and global competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. climate change mitigation and adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and other public assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. development of major urban corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. health, liveability, and community wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. housing affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. matters of national environmental significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A clear attempt was made by the Northern Territory Government to pinpoint how it performs the four tasks for each issue in this criterion, for the whole Territory and in some cases specifically for Darwin.

Among the issues, population growth, productivity, infrastructure development and housing affordability have been generally addressed well. However, mechanisms to monitor performance and effectiveness, and adjust the underlying assumptions of the identified strategies, actions, policies and/or projects are not evident or are in development in most of the policy issues. This is an issue faced by most jurisdictions.
Darwin: Criterion five—Capital city networks

Capital city strategic planning systems should consider and strengthen the networks between capital cities and major regional centres, and other important domestic and international connections.

Finding

CONSISTENT

Key points
- Major international and domestic networks and connections identified.
- The significance of the networks and connections has been identified in the new 10 year road and infrastructure plans.

The draft Greater Darwin Region Land Use Plan—Towards 2030 Consultation Paper places Darwin in its regional context. Darwin is strategically located in relation to the Asia-Pacific region and is in a position to benefit from expanding economies in China and India as well as continuing to strengthen links with existing partners including Indonesia, Malaysia, Vietnam and Singapore.

In this context, Greater Darwin serves as a vital hub for Australia’s communications, trade, transport and logistics network and the Asia-Pacific economic region. Planning and provision of infrastructure is critical to strengthening Darwin’s nationally significant role as a hub to the Asia Pacific.

The Northern Territory Government is focusing its efforts on these networks to accommodate the continued growth of the Darwin economy, particularly the resources sector. The Territory economy is growing as a result of the development of East Arm Port and the Darwin to Adelaide Railway.

The Northern Territory Government has clearly articulated its main networks and connections and the role Darwin plays within the national network of capital cities and regions, with further detail in the 10 year Roads and Infrastructure Plans.

Figure 15.2  Darwin—Key connections and networks
Review of capital city strategic planning systems

Darwin: Criterion six—Planning for future growth

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfields development.

Finding

LARGELY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Mechanisms to provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release are clearly outlined for specific projects.
- A balance of greenfield and infill is specified, including detailed long-term demand analysis and recent government responses through both suburb and infill development.
- No formal ongoing land release program.

The strategic planning system for Darwin has mechanisms to provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfield land, including:

- future land requirements are identified using population and demographic projections, consideration of constraints on land use, including as a result of the Defence Estate, and biting insect breeding areas
- infill and greenfield development targets based on research, including census data and other data sources including the current housing supply and population growth projections
- a Land Release Unit which develops strategies for faster land release for residential development across the Territory in the short to medium term to address changes in housing supply.

The Northern Territory Government provided considerable detail on the issue of land constraints and the assessment processes for determining land needs and capacity for specific developments, including how this resulted in the development of Weddell.

Figure 15.3  Darwin/Palmerston and Litchfield—Historical building approvals

Source: (Northern Territory Government 2011)
Darwin: Criterion seven—Investment priorities and frameworks

Capital city strategic planning systems should clearly identify priorities for investment and policy effort by governments, and provide an effective framework for private sector investment and innovation.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- The Northern Territory Government’s priorities for the whole Territory are clearly identified.
- Public Private Partnerships are specified for current projects—Marine Supply Base and new Darwin Prison.
- New resources projects and other detail in the 10-year infrastructure strategy will require significant private sector investment.

The Northern Territory Government has recently released a 10 year Infrastructure Plan which details significant medium term desirable investment across infrastructure classes including broad costing. The Northern Territory Government also advises it will release a Greater Darwin Plan for consultation in 2012 that will set out an implementation program for Territory 2030 in Darwin, including investigating key infrastructure issues.

The government’s response to the question of its framework for private sector innovation and investment covers its regular business approach of public private partnerships, and a number of passive and active joint venture models including for recent new entrants to the development market. Government frameworks for private sector investment in cities are broader than simply public private partnerships—there are a range of economic and regulatory settings that affect the environment of risk and reward facing the private sector in delivering the housing, jobs, services and infrastructure required in a city.

Not all of these settings are within the control of the Northern Territory Government—for example, Commonwealth taxation settings and the underlying land economics of Darwin—but the Northern Territory Government should be mindful of these settings and their impact on the viability of its long-term objectives.

This is an issue common to all the systems the council reviewed. The main elements of a framework for investment and innovation that require further work are:

- consideration of the economic viability of the plans—looking at the markets that affect housing, jobs, infrastructure and services and their locations as part of planning
- consideration of the effect of government regulatory, planning and taxation policies on these markets and the likelihood of achieving the key elements of strategic plans.
Darwin: Criterion eight—Urban design and architecture

Capital city strategic planning systems should encourage world-class urban design and architecture.

Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT

Key points

- The Capital City Charter is the main whole of city guideline for good design.
- The reach and influence of the newly established Office of Urban Design is not yet clear.

The Capital City Charter is an agreement of the members of the Capital City Committee to enhance the physical, social, artistic, historical, cultural, commercial and environmental aspects of Darwin with a focus on the central business area. This includes climatically appropriate design and improved public spaces as well as heritage and safety. The Northern Territory Government is responsible for translating the objectives of the Capital City Charter into its planning frameworks, such as through the NT Planning Scheme and Area Plans. The Charter is also used to guide design of elements within joint projects such as the My0800 City Revitalisation Project.

The Urban Design Advisory Panel advises the Minister for Planning on amendments to the NT Planning Scheme such as city centre building heights and street fronts.

The competition and forum for Weddell are mechanisms to encourage urban design at a site level and these are important especially for the design of a whole new suburb. However, urban design principles for the whole of Darwin remain as guidelines through the Charter.

Table 15.2 Darwin—Where and how the Northern Territory encourages good design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm/Ind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/ Inf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Capital City Charter overseen by the Capital City Committee
2. Urban Design Advisory Panel
3. Design efforts at Weddell (forum, conference, competition)
4. Office of Urban Design (when established)
5. Architects commissioned for certain projects
Darwin: Criterion nine (a)—Accountabilities, timelines and performance measures

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

a) clear accountabilities, timelines and performance measures.

**Finding**

**PARTIALLY CONSISTENT—REFORM PENDING**

**Key points**

- Territory 2030 has reportable targets with timelines but does not include implementation actions or timelines.
- However, clearer and more robust indicators and public reporting arrangements are being developed, as are spatial goals and measures for Darwin.
- Considerable efforts have been made to embed Territory 2030 in government planning and delivery.
- Greater Darwin Land Use Plan still draft.

As a high-level framework, Territory 2030 provides a starting point for a set of goals and associated targets to which government activity could be oriented. While no specific accountabilities are publicly available for this plan, all agencies report publicly on progress toward the plan in their annual reports. While most of the targets are not supported by actions or implementation arrangements, and Territory 2030 does not set out a strategic plan for Darwin, more robust arrangements are in development for the first round of reporting.

The outcomes-focused nature of Territory 2030 is positive, but without actions and associated implementation planning, it is an aspirational document that does not provide the prioritisation and clear articulation of trade-offs that provide a real basis for engagement and then implementation. The Northern Territory Government advises that, in 2012, it will release for consultation a Greater Darwin Plan that contains an implementation plan for actions focused on the Territory 2030 goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes: Territory 2030 sets out core themes and some outcome-focused goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountabilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified for strategic planning documents such as Territory 2030 and Greater Darwin Land Use Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation of actions:** Short timeframes against some Territory 2030 actions only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Accountabilities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reporting</strong></th>
<th><strong>Timelines</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not specified or publicly available in Territory 2030. However, all departments report annually against aspects of Territory 2030.</td>
<td>Progress report every two years against the targets—the first will be in early 2012 as a scorecard.</td>
<td>Some targets have short-term timelines, but there are no specific implementation actions identified and no timelines to do so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Darwin: Criterion nine (b)—Intergovernmental coordination

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

b) coordination between all three levels of government, with opportunities for Commonwealth and Local Government input, and linked, streamlined and efficient approval processes including under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

Finding

LARGELY CONSISTENT

Key points

- Land use constraints due to defence land and the airport mean a more structured level of intergovernmental coordination may be needed to pursue Darwin’s strategic development.
- The single level of planning reduces some inefficiencies in approvals.
- The Darwin Capital City Committee will be important in the delivery of Territory 2030 targets for Darwin and requires effective cooperation arrangements.

As recognised by the Northern Territory Government, defence land and the location of the airport are among the significant land use constraints facing Darwin. These issues significantly shape Darwin and ongoing discussions with the Commonwealth Government are needed to make the most of Darwin’s strategic opportunities.

There is only one level of planning approval—Territory Government level. Local government authorities do not have statutory responsibility for planning but are referral authorities for scheme amendments and subdivision approvals and deliver municipal services.

Metropolitan coordination is still of strategic importance in delivering Territory 2030, including Indigenous development targets. The Darwin Capital City Committee has high-level membership and responsibility for broad and important targets specifically for developing Darwin. A clear plan and good accountability mechanisms will strengthen coordination.

Table 15.4 Darwin—Key components of intergovernmental coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Commonwealth Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal alignment</strong></td>
<td>• Darwin Capital City Committee is an intergovernmental forum that is guided by a Capital City Charter with general shared objectives to develop Darwin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation and implementation of plans, policies and projects</strong></td>
<td>• Darwin and Palmerston Committees are potential mechanisms for project implementation but their strategic role is in development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing activities of other levels of government</strong></td>
<td>• Joint regional planning panels. • Local government does not have planning responsibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Darwin: Criterion nine (c)—Evaluation and review cycles

Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

- evaluation and review cycles that support the need for balance between flexibility and certainty, including trigger points that identify the need for change in policy settings.

### Finding

PARTIALLY CONSISTENT—REFORM PENDING

#### Key points

- A significant gap in the evaluation and review cycles is the lack of a spatially oriented strategic plan for Darwin, as outlined in criterion two.
- Territory 2030 will be publicly reported against every two years, with data snapshots available in the interim.
- Review of Territory 2030 every 5 years, with current work to strengthen the evaluation framework.

Territory 2030 outlines broad goals and targets for the whole of the Northern Territory. Data snapshots, the new Territory 2030 Household Survey and the upcoming Territory 2030 Scorecard due in early 2012 are designed to assist with evaluation and review, but how this will affect spatial policy settings is not yet clear. The Northern Territory Government has created some data snapshots that will feed into the Territory 2030 Scorecard. This includes an initial prioritisation of 53 targets.

The Northern Territory Government has not identified evaluation and review mechanisms for its other levels of planning. Despite defined processes for Territory 2030, there remains a significant gap in the evaluation and review cycles that mirrors the lack of a spatially oriented strategic plan for Darwin, as outlined in criterion two. This will likely be addressed by the draft Greater Darwin Plan to be released for consultation in 2012.

### Table 15.5 Darwin—Evaluation and review cycles and/or trigger points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans, policies, initiatives, and/or projects</th>
<th>Mechanisms to evaluate and review impact</th>
<th>Mechanisms to adjust policy settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Territory 2030</td>
<td>Two-yearly reporting through a Territory 2030 Scorecard, with the first report to be released in 2012. Data snapshots and a Territory 2030 Household Survey will feed into the scorecard.</td>
<td>The plan will be reviewed by an independent steering committee every five years. Potential data inputs include the new Household Survey every two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Darwin Region Land Use Plan Consultation Paper</td>
<td>No clear evaluation or review mechanisms.</td>
<td>No clear mechanisms to adjust policy settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Paper No. 4</td>
<td>Specific activities assigned to agencies in the budget papers with reporting linked to Territory 2030 and published in relevant agency annual reports.</td>
<td>Annually, through budget decision making processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital city strategic planning systems should provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:

d) appropriate consultation and engagement with external stakeholders, experts and the wider community.

**Finding**

**LARGELY CONSISTENT**

**Key points**

- Range of consultation tools and a good timeframe for community involvement in developing Territory 2030.
- The Northern Territory Government advises consultation on a strategic Greater Darwin Plan will occur in 2012.

The Northern Territory Government involved various groups in the development of Territory 2030 and some other high-level plans and projects. The government is further developing the website, as well as its implementation and review mechanisms specifically for Darwin.

Surveys and forums were run in 2011, and considerable effort was made to reflect community views in the final plan. However, engaging seriously on policy trade-offs and priorities is fundamental to the development of a realistic plan and building the legitimacy to deliver it. In particular, community engagement on a strategic vision for Darwin and a plan to achieve that vision would be desirable. It is promising that the Northern Territory Government reports it will consult on a Greater Darwin Plan in 2012.

**Table 15.6 Darwin—Ongoing processes of consultation and engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stakeholder</th>
<th>Consultation and engagement mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In plan-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts and Industry</td>
<td>Eight-person independent Steering Committee. Weddell conference and design forum a specific example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How consultation is incorporated</td>
<td>Broad and considerable inclusion of community feedback for Territory 2030, which may have led to the comprehensive nature of Territory 2030. Transient population may be an issue for ongoing consultation. Approaches to engaging on Territory 2030 should also be applied to any future spatial plans for Darwin, including discussing priorities and trade-offs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes and sources from data listed in Section 15.2: Key Statistics—City

People:
The population projection graph refers to the Darwin Statistical Division and is derived from unpublished ABS estimated resident population data and population projections data cubes (ABS 2008). There was a change in statistical geographic boundaries from 1995 to 1996.
Population of the Northern Territory, population of Darwin, proportion of the Northern Territory population in Darwin, Darwin annual average population growth rate: ABS 2011d
Population projection for Darwin by 2056: ABS 2008
Median age of Darwin’s population, median age of Australia’s population: ABS 2011c

Economy:
Major employing industries graph: ABS 2007
Average annual income and unemployment rate for Darwin and Australia: ABS 2011b
Participation rate: ABS 2011a
Total containerised trade: Ports Australia n.d.
Air passenger movements: BITRE 2011

Dwellings:
Typical (modal) dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011b
Median dwelling price: COAG Reform Council 2011a
Proportion of dwellings affordable to moderate income households: COAG Reform Council 2011b
Homelessness rate: Chamberlain & MacKenzie 2009

Utilities:
Water use: National Water Commission 2011
Public transport: ABS 2010

Full references are in the bibliography at the end of this report.
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