1. Please briefly explain to the Committee the role of the NSW Division of the Planning Institute of Australia and of its Metropolitan and Policy Committee.

- The Planning Institute of Australia (PIA) is the national body for a wide range of planning professionals. It has Divisions in each State and Territory.

- Its structure reflects the diversity of planning experience, with a general Urban and Regional Planning Chapter, specialist Chapters in Social Planning and Urban Design, and proposed specialist Chapters in Planning Law, Economic Development Planning, Transport Planning and Environmental Planning.

- The NSW Division of PIA represents over 1,000 planners across both metropolitan and regional NSW. It has a Division Committee and a range of other Committees, which support the Division Committee.

- The Metropolitan and Policy Committee (formerly the Metropolitan and Environment Sub-Committee) is one of these Committees. Its brief is to examine metropolitan planning and environmental issues relevant to the Sydney Metropolitan Area, and to develop policy for the consideration of PIA (NSW Division) on those issues.

- PIA’s national Vision is:

  To support the Australian planning profession and community in the creation of
  - liveable communities,
  - vibrant economies,
  - sustainable places,
  - diverse cultural expression and
  - social cohesion.

- This vision is supported by all State and Territory Divisions, including New South Wales.

- While all aspects of this vision are relevant to the future of Redfern/Waterloo, I believe that creating diverse cultural expression and social cohesion have specific relevance to the Terms of Reference of this Inquiry.
2. In your submission you talk about the goal of ‘a sustainable social, environmental and economic future for Redfern/Waterloo’.

- Please tell us more about what you envisage.
- You also contend that such a goal is ‘doomed to failure’ unless residents of Redfern and Waterloo are given the key role of defining the problems facing the area and shaping their solutions. Why do you believe this to be the case, and how would you recommend government ensure such engagement, both in the short and longer term?

(i) A sustainable future for Redfern/Waterloo

- PIA (NSW) cannot speak for the communities of Redfern/Waterloo in any detailed way on this matter.

- However it can indicate the key matters that need to be monitored in general in the attempt to achieve social, environmental and economic sustainability for any area, including Redfern/Waterloo.

(The matters involved are taken from PIA’s Liveable Communities policy of February 2004. The full title is: Liveable Communities: How the Commonwealth can foster sustainable cities and regions. This policy paper, as well as other publications relevant to sustainable communities, is available from the PIA web site at http://www.planning.org.au/)

- I can leave the full list with the Committee (see Attachment A). In the meantime, I will mention the ones most relevant to Redfern/Waterloo, which are:

- **For Social sustainability**
  - access to quality public transport service;
  - tolerable divergence in socio economic indicators;
  - comparative living standards in indigenous communities
  - accessible urban public domain per capita;
  - alleviation of housing stress.

- **For Environmental sustainability**
  - modal split in urban transport.

- **For Economic sustainability**
  - accessibility of metropolitan jobs by public transport;
  - growth in business service and other high value added exports;
  - availability of higher order skills in key regions;
  - rate of new business formation; and
  - growth in participation in the workforce and/ or training.

- These lists of matters need to be sensitised to local requirements by those best placed to determine:
  - whether any additional matters need to be added
  - the balance among them that is required in that area
  - the local measures, targets and indicators that would allow them – and others – to evaluate whether improvements have been made in each of these categories.
• The NSW Government’s Submission to this Inquiry indicates that residents and other stakeholders have already provided some information relevant this task, particularly in the areas of social and economic sustainability (eg pp 81-95). It is vital that sustained efforts are made to engage with the local communities on these matters to ensure the best possible outcomes from the resources available to the area.

• Finally, although we have listed the requirements for each category of sustainability separately, we would like to stress that in practice, there are many interrelationships among the categories, and these need to be reflected in the planning, budgeting and evaluation associated with them.

(ii) Importance of community engagement

• Community engagement is an ethical requirement within a democracy.

• It is also a practical requirement as:
  local knowledge and experience are forms of expertise, which must be acknowledged and valued
  unless this expertise is drawn upon, valuable local perspectives on the causes of problems in the area, and the most effective local ways of meeting them, are lost.

• Cynicism and lack of engagement result when either:
  this expertise is not tapped
  it cannot be demonstrated that it has been taken into account in decision making
  the decisions taken do not result in actions that improve the problems the consultation identified.

• Good consultation is not necessarily quick or cheap in the short term, but saves money in the long term.

• We are aware of the range of consultation measures outlined in the NSW Government’s Submission to the Inquiry (see Chapter 9).

• However, we are also aware that one of the principal mechanisms, the Community Council, has met only once since December last year and that was in relation to the Human Services Review, not Redfern/Waterloo issues generally.

• Moreover, the Community Council meetings are not open to the public, which means its deliberations are less transparent than those of local government.

(iii) Recommendations re short and long term engagement

• If the judgement is that the community engagement strategies in Redfern/Waterloo have been inadequate, and need strengthening, there are two main options in the short term:
  • go back to the drawing board
    • This option may well frustrate both decision makers and the local communities
  • continue with the decision making on matters already under consideration (eg the RED Strategy and the Human Services Review) - up to a point which would allow the recommendations on those matters to “lie on the table” while the community engagement strategy is reviewed and amended.
This option would allow the local communities to see what has been proposed and start developing responses to it; but it does not allow any of the matters to progress immediately.

However, the revised community engagement strategy could then be used as the basis for the public consultation on the recommendations referred to above; and the community would by that stage be able to participate from a well informed position.

In the longer term, an ongoing system of community engagement is needed that allows for:

- public review, at appropriate intervals, of the strategic objectives for the area and of the key outcomes associated with the objectives (say, every three years)
- annual reporting to the public on:
  - the achievement of these outcomes
  - factors affecting over-performance or under-performance
- regular forums (say, quarterly or six-monthly) which allow members of the public a formal opportunity to highlight areas that need earlier attention.

The community engagement strategy should specify the roles and responsibilities of all relevant parties.

The formal engagement processes should be synchronised, as far as is possible, with agencies’ ongoing consultation cycles so as to minimise ‘participation fatigue’.
3. In your submission you identify seven challenges to achieving a sustainable future in Redfern and Waterloo, and the first, third and fourth challenges, ‘Keeping our Cities World Competitive’, ‘Inequality and Social Exclusion’ and ‘Affordable Housing’ stand out as especially relevant for this inquiry. Would you like to comment further on how these relate to Redfern and Waterloo?

- The list of Challenges in our submission is taken from PIA’s National Policy statement on Liveable Communities (reference already provided in Answer to Question 2 (i)).

- While these challenges have relevance to all Australian cities, Sydney, as a wealthy Global city, has the opportunity to address these challenges with a strong likelihood of success.

- Achieving this success will be wholly dependent on our ability to ensure that the benefits of economic growth are distributed equitably to all residents and communities within the greater Sydney Metropolitan area. In particular, this includes the residents of Redfern and Waterloo.

**Challenge 1: Keeping Our Cities World Competitive**

- Successful global cities require attractive living and working environments within stable and equitable settings.

- Maintaining an appropriate balance in the development of Redfern/Waterloo, and retaining a social mix in the area, are elements that are essential, not only for the welfare of residents of Redfern/Waterloo, but also to maintain and promote Sydney’s global competitiveness.

- One of the key factors here is that Redfern/Waterloo occupies a strategic position in the urban fabric of Sydney, being contiguous to both the CBD and the airport corridor.

- A recent public statement made by the NSW Premier indicates that his 25 year time-frame for Redfern includes major commercial development of Redfern because of its public transport focus, its proximity to the investment being rolled out of the Australian Technology Park and because it is the obvious place to take a rollover, spill over of the commercial investment in Sydney’s Central Business District (Carr, 19 February 2004).

- Redfern is thus well placed to support significant development that will enhance Sydney’s global competitiveness and reap, in turn, the economic benefits that derive from such development.

- We believe that these benefits must be shared with the communities of Redfern/Waterloo.

- For this to occur, Redfern/Waterloo must develop in ways that:
  - retain a balance between new and old development
  - encourage residents who wish to remain in the area to do so, not force them out.

- PIA (NSW) is aware that the Redfern/Eveleigh/Waterloo (RED) Strategy, which is part of the Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Project (RWPP), encompasses more than major redevelopment sites, and intends using infrastructure to drive social outcomes. We also understand that it has developed principles to support this aim.
• However, we are also aware that there has been considerable delay in releasing the draft options designed to implement the principles.

• The draft options should be released for public comment as soon as possible, to allow a community response to the issues of:
  how well the options respond to the principles
  whether other action is required within the RWPP, or beyond it, to achieve a sustainable future for Redfern/Waterloo.
Challenge 3: Inequality and Social Exclusion

- Unfortunately, inequality and social exclusion mark the lives of many people in Redfern/Waterloo.

- All levels of government need to work with the community and with each other to identify and address the issues that contribute to this situation.

- This will necessitate a clear understanding of the interaction between spatial and aspatial policy, and the cumulative impacts of multiple disadvantage.

- Development of policies and programs to address inequality must be based on sound social planning principles, including:
  
  - commitment to a genuine process of community participation and on-the-ground outcomes from all stakeholders
  - access to employment, health, education, housing and a safe environment
  - recognition and valuing of the cultural environment
  - ensuring all the voices are heard - an inclusive process that engages community leaders, children, youth, women and men
  - a coordinated and cooperative approach to planning and service delivery in collaboration with the community to deliver real world outcomes.

- Current initiatives in Redfern/Waterloo, including the diverse range of initiatives under the umbrella of the RWPP, need to be reassessed in the light of these principles.
Challenge 4: Affordable Housing - Relevance to Redfern/Waterloo

- In common with other Global Cities, provision of affordable housing in the context of Sydney’s prevailing property market is a complex issue. A broad range of approaches is likely to be needed.

- Both public housing and community housing are important components of the Redfern/Waterloo area and must be retained.

- In particular, indigenous housing is a longstanding feature of the area, and is expressed most strongly in the iconic status of “the Block”.

- In relation to the Block, the Aboriginal Housing Company states that it has proudly accepted an invitation to work in partnership with the State Government’s RED Strategy to develop an integrated Master Plan for the Block in coordination with the regional plans for the whole Redfern area.

- PIA believes that the RED strategy has an unequivocal responsibility to achieve this outcome in active partnership with the AHC.
4. You advocate integrated policy, planning and program development across the three tiers of government as the best way to meet the challenges you have identified. You also suggest that in the absence of an agreed Commonwealth/state/local government framework, an integrated, inclusive planning approach can still be developed and implemented. Can you tell us more about why such an approach is so important, and how it can be facilitated in practice?

(i) Why integrated, inclusive planning approach is important

- Planning needs to be integrated because:
  - people’s needs cut across bureaucratic boundaries and solutions need to reflect that complexity
  - planning can respond to these needs by making sure space is available for people, their activities and the services they require (e.g., housing, employment, transport, education, and health and community services), but it cannot necessarily ensure those activities and services happen.

- They are more likely to happen if planning is linked to:
  - other relevant areas of public policy through integrated strategic planning and budgeting
  - other stakeholders with an interest in providing or using activities or services.

- Planning needs to be inclusive because people have:
  - different personal capacities
  - different values and priorities
  - different needs
  - different ways of meeting these needs.

- The diversity in our society is increasing:
  "one size fits all" solutions are therefore rarely going to be effective
  effective, inclusive planning processes are needed to produce a balanced set of solutions capable of meeting these diverse needs.

(ii) Why tripartite approach is important

- A tripartite approach is important because
  - all three levels of government contribute to the outcomes required for social, environmental, and economic sustainability
  - all three carry out activities that impact on the use of space, or on the way activities are distributed in space, or on whether that space can be used appropriately and effectively
  - they therefore all need to collaborate to ensure these activities maximise social, environmental, and economic sustainability.

- The role of local and state governments is often recognised here, partly because they are large service providers.

- However, the Commonwealth’s role is also critical because it controls major policy areas affecting how liveable our cities will be, including:
  - economic policy
  - taxation policy
  - income security policy
  - immigration policy
major infrastructure
considerable funding for hospitals and schools.

- The Commonwealth’s participation is in its own interests as well, not just those of the states and local governments, as there are considerable costs to the Commonwealth of poorly managed urban development.

(iii) How it can be facilitated
- A tripartite approach could be implemented through an overarching policy framework as outlined in PIA’s Liveable Communities policy (for reference see answer to Question 2 (i)), which:
  - specifies the key measures of social, economic and environmental sustainability
  - adopts targets to be reached within a particular time frame
  - is clear on the roles and responsibilities of the three parties in reaching the targets
  - is accompanied by time limited funding transitional funding related to both the degree of participation and performance in meeting targets.

(A one page summary outlining the 10 point plan associated with this proposal is at Attachment B.)

(iv) Developing an integrated, inclusive planning approach in the absence of tripartite approach

Preamble
- At this point we should probably make it clear that we are not assuming that the only decisions that matter in working towards social, environmental and economic sustainability are those made by the different levels of government.

- Many of the decisions made by other stakeholders - as individuals, or in business, industry, and further education and training, or as members of interest groups - also affect the achievement of liveable, sustainable communities.

- This merely highlights the need for governments at all levels to ensure there is appropriate participation in decision making by relevant stakeholders before they do make decisions.

An Alternative Approach
- When the reality is - as at present - that not all potential partners are involved in joint, holistic planning, you have to work with what you do have.

- In the absence of high-level Commonwealth participation in this process, the most effective way for any State/ Territory to proceed in general is to develop a system that allows it to:
  - articulate its objectives in broad terms, even if achieving those objectives is not entirely within its power
  - identify the contributions of each partner in government
  - identify the gap that needs to be filled by the Commonwealth
  - advocate to the Commonwealth on the measures required to fill the gap – at the agency level, the Ministerial level or through the Premier for issues specific to that State/ Territory; or via the Ministerial Councils, or the Premiers’ Conference/ COAG, where the issues affect more than one State/ Territory.

- In the meantime, the State/ Territory has to continue working on the matters, which are within its control.
• For specific areas (eg Redfern/Waterloo), this would involve a sub-system that allows for the joint planning and budgeting required for:
  the development, between the State Government and the relevant Local Governments, of joint objectives for the area, along with a strategic plan, action plans, and monitoring, evaluation and review mechanisms focussed on the outcomes associated with these objectives
  participation by all relevant stakeholders in developing these objectives and supporting mechanisms.

• It must be stressed that the measures and indicators associated with this approach need to reflect the changes that are needed for improved outcomes in people’s lives, and not just, for example, numbers of people presenting, or occasions of service, or money spent.

(The work of the UK Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, which operates out of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, offers interesting examples of outcomes, targets and indicators, which could be adapted to the changes needed in Redfern/Waterloo.)
5. In your view, is the place-focused approach appropriate for the Australian context, given our structure of government? If so, how effective do you believe the Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Project is a model of integrated and inclusive planning?

- Do you have any other comments on how the effectiveness of the RWPP could be maximised?

(i) Place Management
- Place Management can be a useful mechanism for integrating responses to the need for activities and services in an area

- However, it cannot be assumed that it will be sufficient on its own as:
  - individuals rarely meet all their needs from one “place”
  - for some services (e.g., air travel, highly specialised medical procedures) the “place” may well be the whole state.

- Place Management projects therefore needs to be linked, strategically, to other processes of government.

(ii) Effectiveness of the Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Project (RWPP) as a model of integrated and inclusive planning
- The first point to make is that even an ideal model of integrated and inclusive planning would have to overcome the long history of cynicism in the area (which is recorded in para 2, p 83 of the NSW Government Submission to this Inquiry).

- Even allowing for this, the RWPP model falls short of the criteria set out at the end of our response to Question 4.

- The most succinct description of the RWPP that PIA could currently find was on the NSW Government’s community builders website. It reads:

  Early in 2002, the NSW Government set up the Redfern Waterloo Partnership Project as a whole of government and whole of community approach to tackle a number of longstanding problems in Redfern and Waterloo.

  The Project brings together a wide range of partners to plan and bring about changes that will improve the quality of life of people living and working in these areas.

  Together they are working to:

  - Improve the built environment, local infrastructure, improve streets and public facilities
  - Reduce drug and alcohol abuse and related crime
  - Improve community safety
  - Provide support to vulnerable communities, especially families and young people
  - Improve the quality of services to the community
  - Promote more and better educational and employment opportunities
  - Engage the community in determining how the area grows and develops
• Over $7 million has been approved for this initiative over three years (2002-2005). $2.22 million of this is funded under the Community Solutions and Crime Prevention Strategy.

• We assume the first seven dot points are the RWPP’s objectives.

• These are similar to the list given in evidence by Mr Michael Ramsay of the RWPP on 18 May 2004 (p 6), which he referred to as the outcomes the RWPP is intended to achieve.

• From the evidence that PIA has seen so far, the RWPP presents as a collection of activities, rather than as a comprehensive strategy to address these objectives and outcomes.

• For example, to PIA’s knowledge:
  - there is no publicly available strategic plan for the RWPP as a whole
  - there are no publicly available action plans which indicate:
    - how the RWPP as a whole is addressing these objectives
    - how the inputs it is sponsoring relate to the outcomes and objectives
    - how it will know whether it has achieved the outcomes or not
    - how it will report the annual results to the Government and the community.

• It may be that a strategic approach will become evident when the matters still pending (ie the draft RED Strategy and the Human Services Review) are made public.

(iii) Maximising the effectiveness of the Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Project

• In the meantime, PIA advocates that attention be given to developing a focussed strategic framework for the RWPP along the lines outlined in our answer to Question 4.

• PIA also believes the RWPP would benefit from:
  - clarity about whether its role is to facilitate, or to coordinate, or to fund, or to do – or all of these
  - a realistic assessment of the resourcing required to allow the RWPP to perform its role or roles
  - recognition, in this resourcing, of the complexity of managing multiple roles in a challenging environment.
6. What are your views on the Redfern, Eveleigh Darlington (RED) Strategy? For example, how well do you believe it balances the interests of new development, commerce and current residents?

- We agree that the RED Strategy does need to balance the interests of new development, commerce and current residents.

- However, it is impossible to assess whether the Strategy will do so because so little of it has been made public.

- On my reading of the material in the NSW Government’s Submission to this Inquiry, we are still in **Stage 2 of the RED Strategy**, for which the process was:
  - research and analysis by Cox Richardson
  - review by the NSW Government of that material
  - drafting of RED options for community consultation, based on the NSW Government’s decisions.

- This stage was meant to conclude by Feb/March 2004, and to be followed by **Stage 3, community consultation on the draft RED options**.

- This means that in terms of what is proposed, only the principles have been made public so far - and that until the draft RED options are available, neither the community nor planning professionals can evaluate:
  - whether the options are consistent with the principles
  - whether they strike an appropriate balance among competing interests.

- PIA understands the RED Strategy is still being considered by the Government, but has no knowledge of how long it will be before a decision is made.
7. (To Ms Rice) In your submission, you propose an integrated local planning process for Redfern and Waterloo. Please tell us more about your ideas here, and how feasible you believe them to be.

(This question was directed to Ms Rice as an individual, in relation to her personal submission to the Inquiry (Submission No 54), not as a representative of PIA (NSW).

The written answer has been forwarded to the Inquiry separately, but is also available from Elizabeth Rice at erice@comcen.com.au)
8. **What would you like to see come out of this inquiry?**

(i) **General**
- In general we would like to see:
  - a holistic attempt to identify and solve the issues associated with Redfern/Waterloo, involving comprehensive strategic planning, within which land use planning is one component used to achieve a range of social, environmental and economic objectives
  - certainty for the residents in terms of consultation and the future of development
  - a long-term commitment to adequate resourcing for the RWPP or an alternative mechanism.

(ii) **Specific**
- The specific matters we would like to see include:
  
  **On Consultation**
  Implementation of a genuine process of community consultation that leads to policies and action plans that are funded and supported by all levels of government. This should allow sustained opportunities for the people of Redfern/Waterloo to participate effectively in shaping their own future, through the various measures advocated in our responses to earlier questions.

  **On Economic Development**
  A specific strategy to capture the economic benefits of any redevelopment and share them with the residents of Redfern/Waterloo. In this respect, the forthcoming Metropolitan Strategy provides an opportunity to integrate equitable development of the Redfern/Waterloo precinct with a cohesive regional planning framework for the Airport-CBD Arc.

  **On Social Inclusion**
  Delivery of a solution to the endemic problems of disadvantage and social exclusion that have been apparent in the past.

  **On Indigenous Issues**
  We refer the Committee to the outcomes identified in the Community Social Plan prepared by the Aboriginal Housing Company in 2001. Some of the issues highlighted there are the need for:
  - a sense of ownership and self-determination by the local Aboriginal people and the building of trust, cooperation and a sense of responsibility and well being among the local Aboriginal population
  - in relation to the future of the Block:
    - strong management structures, and efficient maintenance of the site, its buildings and spaces
    - funding for management and maintenance and biannual review of the business plan.
Within the context of a rejuvenated federation, this policy calls for the establishment of an **Australian Sustainable Development Charter**. This would describe the overarching principles for sustainable urban and regional development and set out time-bound and measurable national targets on matters like:

**Environmental sustainability**
- energy consumption per capita;
- greenhouse gas emissions per capita;
- water consumption per capita;
- water quality standards;
- air quality;
- environmental flows in key river systems;
- salination;
- bio-diversity retention or protection;
- native vegetation; and
- modal split in urban transport.

**Social sustainability**
- access to quality public transport service;
- tolerable divergence in socio economic indicators;
- comparative living standards in indigenous communities;
- accessible urban public domain per capita;
- alleviation of housing stress;
- tolerable divergence in per capita incomes between regional and urban areas; and
- conservation of built heritage.

**Economic sustainability**
- road congestion costs;
- accessibility of metropolitan jobs by public transport;
- growth in business service and other high value added exports;
- availability of higher order skills in key regions;
- rate of new business formation; and
- growth in participation in the workforce and/or training.
1. Commonwealth to commit to an additional $10 billion in *untied* funding to the States and Territories over 10 years.

2. Funding flow to the States and Territories to be contingent upon their signing up to a COAG sponsored “Australian Sustainable Development Charter”, and their adoption of policy initiatives to meet the targets set out in the Charter.

3. Relevant policies will include regional and urban plans and strategies; resource pricing and property right regulation; improved systems for infrastructure coordination; better development assessment systems; new arrangements for funding infrastructure, affordable housing and environmental rehabilitation/conservation; and marketing and education campaigns.

4. Further funds would flow to the States and Territories as they meet self nominated milestones linked to the Australian Sustainable Development Charter.

5. The Australian Sustainable Development Charter would contain up to a dozen national targets reflecting a triple bottom line approach. The targets could cover greenhouse gas emissions per capita, growth in energy consumption per capita, water consumption per capita, levels of housing stress, levels of urban road congestion costs etc.

6. The targets would be agreed via COAG.

7. States and Territories would be free to address all or part of the national targets. Their maximum payments would be pro-rata adjusted depending on the scope of their response to the Australian Sustainable Development Charter.

8. The adequacy of a jurisdiction’s response to the national targets, and the adequacy of progress towards nominated milestones, would be assessed by an independent Sustainable Development Commission, which would report directly to the Australian Parliament (not the Government of the day). Pending the Commission’s findings, full or part funding would flow to the jurisdictions in question.

9. The Sustainable Development Commission would conduct its enquiries through public hearings.

10. The $10 billion over 10 years commitment made by the Commonwealth would be paid for from the productivity dividend from more efficient and sustainable cities.