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## PIA NSW: building planners’ skills through professional development

| **February** | 6-7 | Climate change: Planning Practice Course* - to be rescheduled |
| | 24 | Northern Branch regional seminar, Kempsey |
| | 29 | Bartier Perry Toolbox Evening Series - Working with the Courts |

### March

| | 16 | Connecting our Region, Illawarra South Coast Branch regional seminar, Goulburn |
| | 27 | PD Workshop Series – Skills for evidence-based planning |
| | 28 | Bartier Perry Toolbox Evening Series - Developer contributions |

### April

| | 18-20 | Rural development assessment: a short course, Module 1, Tamworth |
| | 19-20 | Project management Planning Practice Course* |
| | 27 | Hunter Planners Newcastle Ports tour [to be confirmed] |
| | 29-2 May | PIA National Congress, Adelaide - www.piacongress.com |

### May

| | 10 | Norton Rose Seminar Series - The Planning Review Green Paper |
| | 09-11 | Rural development assessment: a short course, Module 1. Wagga Wagga |
| | 10-11 | Urban design Planning Practice Course* |
| | Mid May | **YP Boot camp** |
| | 22 | Bartier Perry Toolbox Evening Series-Compulsory acquisition |
| | 24-25 | Rural development assessment: a short course, Module 2. Tamworth |
| | 25 | Northern Branch regional seminar, Bellingen |
| | 31-1 Jun | Rural development assessment: a short course, Module 2. Wagga Wagga |

### June

| | 18-19 | Professional ethics Planning Practice Course* |
| | 26 | Planners’ dinner, Doltone House Sydney |

### July

| | 6 | PD Workshop series-Sustaining heritage values through planning workshop |
| | 25 | Bartier Perry Toolbox Evening Series - The art of facilitation |
| | 26-27 | Climate change Planning Practice Course* |
| | 27 | Illawarra South Coast Branch regional seminar |
| | tba | PD Workshop Series - Hunter Planners Consolidated toolbox day seminar |

### August

| | 1-2 | Economics of development Planning Practice Course* |
| | 15 | PD Workshop series - Negotiation skills |
| | tba | Norton Rose seminar series – EPBC strategic assessment |
| | 31 | Northern Branch regional seminar |
| | Mid-Aug | YP Trivia night [to be confirmed] |

### September

| | 1 | Hunter Planners Race Day |
| | 11 | Bartier Perry Toolbox Evening Series - Social impact analysis |
| | 13-14 | Urban design Planning Practice Course* |

### October

| | 15-16 | Legislation & governance Planning Practice Course* |
| | 17-19 | **NSW State Conference, The Glasshouse, Port Macquarie** |
| | 26 | Illawarra South Coast Branch regional seminar |

### November

| | 5-6 | Climate change Planning Practice Course* |
| | 14 | Bartier Perry Toolbox Evening Series - Development economics |
| | Mid Nov | **NSW Awards for Excellence** |
| | 30 | Northern Branch regional seminar |

### December

| | 5 | End of year colloquium hosted by Norton Rose |
| | tba | YP Christmas drinks |
| | 7 | PIA Christmas event-2012 year in review |

---

**MORE INFORMATION AND HOW TO REGISTER**

Forthcoming programs and events are advertised through the PIA NSW fortnightly newsletter and on PIA website www.planning.org.au/nsw. Programs are subject to sufficient registration numbers. All programs are open to both PIA members and to non-members. *Information on the Planning Practice Courses and the CPP scheme is available on our website. For information on membership please visit www.planning.org.au. Contact the NSW Division Office on 02 8904 1011 or email nswevents@planning.org.au**
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This issue of New Planner focusses on “Putting People First” in the planning process. As a social planner, my focus is not just about identifying social issues and impacts but about achieving the best social outcomes for people through collaboration and capacity building. It is to influence the building of liveable, inclusive and friendly neighbourhoods; strong local economies; and sustainable and vibrant places. In this edition we have included articles on a range of planning initiatives that focus on great social outcomes, including how universal design can provide better housing and public infrastructure for all people; how child friendly design can make our places more inclusive for children and young people; and a number of innovative housing models for older people and for the homeless.

Whilst “Putting People First” as part of the planning process seems obvious, there has been much discussion lately within the planning profession about what the role of the planner is in achieving better social outcomes. We hope that planning professionals can have a visionary “outcomes focussed” role, but there is concern that planning as a whole has become increasingly about enforcing regulations and controlling or blocking community-led change.

My experience engaging with local communities has shown that people want to feel heard by government and to participate in local decisions in a real way. They feel frustrated that their ideas for local improvements are not heard. The rise of online engagement tools and online movements such as Get Up shows how social media is enabling people, who formerly felt disconnected from decision making, to get involved and influence change. Locally and internationally, examples of community-led or “guerilla” urban improvements are going ahead without planning approvals. This shows that people are increasingly frustrated with the blocks they receive from government and have started taking independent action to make their streets greener, to improve their neighbourhood connections, or to improve local infrastructure.

In my neighbourhood it is common to see gardens created by residents on the footpaths outside their houses and the City of Sydney has responded to this trend with their new Footpath Gardening Policy. There are also pop-up art galleries set up under bridges by artists who can’t access gallery space. In the inner-West, guerrilla knitters knit colourful “jumpers” on signposts, trees and public places to provide more colour and to soften the concrete public domains. In London, in one of the disused Victorian settling tanks, ‘The Spot’ has become a self-made freestyle BMX park, envisaged and built entirely by local riders from the housing estate. Its conception arose in response to the lack of adequate locations being provided by the public sector at the time.

On Parking Day in 2011 (an annual worldwide event that invites people to transform metered parking spots into temporary parks for the public good) university students and green groups took over car spaces in Brisbane’s CBD and gave them mini-park makeovers with environmental messages. Metered parking in London was used for parks, a putting green, play areas, reading nooks, and a dance studio.

Considering the diverse needs of people at the outset of the planning process, how they use place, how they interact in neighbourhoods, how they get around sustainably and what makes living worthwhile - rather than just getting through the day - is essential in achieving the outcomes of strong, resilient and healthy communities. It’s not just “touchy feely” as I often hear the social side of planning referred to, it’s about how we all live our lives and what makes living better.

Planners are at the forefront of many local, state and national issues and by putting people first and being outcomes focussed we have the opportunity to make a difference that has long-term positive benefits for society.

Sarah Reilly is Principal Consultant Cred Community Planning and NSW Convenor of the PIA Social Planning Chapter. Sarah can be contacted at www.cred.com.au
Executive Officer’s report

Robyn Vincin PIA NSW Executive Officer

Results of Committee elections

The PIA NSW Committee for 2012-13 met for the first time at the beginning of February, with the aim of developing a strategic focus for PIA NSW for the next two years. The Committee is operating for the first time under the new PIA Constitution and By-Laws, which set the framework for how we operate as a Division of PIA.

The 2012-13 Committee has members representing all of the Chapters, Networks and Branches in NSW.

The incoming President is Sarah Hill and you can read about Sarah’s aims for PIA NSW elsewhere in this issue.

At the first meeting of the year, the Committee elected a number of Office Bearers, including Vice Presidents Greg Woodhams, David Ryan and Scott Anson. Greg has been on our Executive for a couple of terms and also chairs the Policy Committee. He is Environmental Services Director at Willoughby City Council in Sydney so brings a local government perspective to the Executive team. David Ryan is an Executive Director Planning at City Plan Services. He is Convenor of PIA NSW Planning LawGroup and guides our input to the current NSW Planning Review. Scott Anson is the Senior Development Manager, Planning at the Hunter Development Corporation, and is based in Newcastle. Scott has a background in local government in metro and regional councils, and brings this broad perspective to the Executive team.

A full list of Committee members and their portfolios appears in the back of this issue. They are your representatives and you are invited to contact them via the NSW Office.

Planning review update

The ‘big ticket’ item this year will be the review of the NSW planning system.

PIA continues to be involved through the formal submission process; a number of stakeholder meetings and in making representations on behalf of our members. Associated with the review is PIA’s strong commitment to addressing the culture of planning; essential if there is to be real change in how planners and planning operate and are perceived in NSW. The Institute is keen to have your input to these issues if we are to make change happen.

Professional development

As the New Year begins, it is a good time to review your professional development plan and think about the areas you need to develop. PIA offers a range of professional development opportunities and works in partnership in promoting external courses. These are advertised through our fortnightly eNews.

New for 2012 is our Toolbox series, initially a series of six evening seminars delivered by speakers with recognised expertise in various aspects of the NSW planning system. Details of the sessions are in our fortnightly eNews and on our website. All of our programs are offered to PIA members at a discounted price.

The professional development program for 2012 includes a number of seminars and workshops in the Sydney CBD and two Rural DA workshops scheduled for Tamworth and Wagga Wagga. Other major events coming up this year include the Young Planners Forum in May, a number of regional seminars which are coordinated through our Branches, and networking events supported by our major sponsors.

A Balancing Act: NSW State conference

Planning is well underway for the 2012 NSW conference and local government planners’ forum in October. This annual event is our principal professional development activity for the year and provides an opportunity to showcase a region of New South Wales. This year’s conference is for planned Port Macquarie where delegates will be able to experience a state of the art conference venue, a program designed to deliver thought-provoking and topical presenters and an opportunity to experience the region which is one of growth and change.

Partnering with PIA

Sponsorship of PIA NSW brings you to the forefront in the planning industry. You can develop vital relationships with industry leaders and build brand recognition for your company. We have designed the sponsorship and advertising packages to offer your business excellent exposure to the planning industry, no matter what your choice. We ensure you receive maximum value and are happy to tailor a package to suit your business’ marketing needs. Please contact our Office for more information.

WANTED-New Planner Editors

After six years as the Editor of New Planner, Stephen McMahon has resigned from the position. The NSW Division extends its appreciation to Stephen for his efforts and contributions over that time.

We are looking for a team of at least two people to become Editors of our quarterly journal.

The editors’ main tasks are:

• To produce a quality quarterly magazine of interest to members of the planning profession and to members of the wider public.

• To encourage members of the Institute to contribute to New Planner.

• To encourage discussion of matters of interest to planners within the pages of NP.

• To ensure editions of the magazine reflect any particular set themes.

• To assist in the promotion of the magazine.

• To assist in gaining advertising for, and subscriptions to the magazine.

Please email your expression of interest to Robyn Vincin NSW Executive Officer at robynvincin@planning.org.au or phone 02 8904 1011 by Tuesday 20th March.
President’s message
Sarah Hill, President PIA NSW Division

President’s Letter

Dear Members

May I take this opportunity to wish you a very successful start to 2012 and to introduce myself as your President for 2012-2013.

As the incoming PIA NSW President I am very excited about the opportunities the year holds and the benefits we may secure for our profession, our members and the NSW Planning System.

For 2012 PIA NSW has identified some key directions for the Institute to continue to promote along with some new priorities including:

- A new planning Act and System for NSW;
- A change in the culture of planning in NSW;
- An integration of land use and transport planning;
- A focus on strategic planning;
- New initiatives for affordable housing.

We have already achieved some significant gains in the above referenced policy areas thanks to the hard work of our past presidents and the PIA NSW Team. To continue to advance our policy positions I will be working with your Committee and meeting with Government and industry stakeholders over the coming weeks and months.

In addition, we will be refocusing our professional development program, to provide you with opportunities to update and develop your skills and to engage with others in your profession.

In the meantime, I invite you to read about our policy priorities and to keep up to date with our activities via our fortnightly eNews, our website and the quarterly editions of New Planner to be sent to you.

I look forward to working with you this year and to representing you in a range of important areas. Should you wish to provide your comments on our proposed agenda or your thoughts on how to improve the value of PIA NSW to our members please contact our NSW Executive Officer Robyn Vincin on nswmanager@planning.org.au

Regards

Sarah Hill
PIA NSW Key Policy Platforms 2012 Update

The PIA has policy positions on a wide range of planning issues. In NSW our focus over the past few years has been in the following three areas: A new Planning Act for NSW; an integrated Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney; and improved Strategic Planning at the local level. A common thread is the emphasis on sound strategic planning.

This document updates our position on those three key policy areas and identifies the PIA NSW policy and advocacy direction for 2012-13 to be:

- A new planning Act and System for NSW;
- A change in the culture of planning in NSW;
- An integration of land use and transport planning;
- A focus on strategic planning;
- New initiatives for affordable housing.

The NSW Planning System

PIA NSW first called for a review of the NSW planning legislation in our submission to the NSW Upper House Inquiry on Planning Reform (2008). The NSW Planning System Review commenced in 2011 and the PIA NSW has outlined what we believe are the key components for a 21st Century planning system in our submission to that Review.

PIA’s view is that legislative reform is only one of the elements of the wider planning reform exercise that is urgently required in NSW. The complete package of planning reforms, which PIA submits should be undertaken concurrently include:

- A review of current planning legislation;
- A comprehensive (appropriately resourced and administered) strategic planning policy formulation process driven from the State and regional planning levels;
- A comprehensive review of governance arrangements affecting all planning functions on a whole-of-government and local government basis;
- A comprehensive program to promote positive cultural change within State, local and planning related authorities to set the framework to enable a new Act to be most effectively and efficiently implemented.

PIA NSW will continue to actively engage in the planning review process through submissions, responses and participation in workshops, forums and meetings.

Cultural Shifts in Planning

PIA NSW believes the Review of the NSW Planning System should be broader than the preparation of a new planning Act. We identify that a cultural shift in planning is required first and foremost to set a framework or foundation to enable a new Act to be most effectively and efficiently implemented.

PIA NSW has identified a number of ways in which the culture of planning in NSW could be positively influenced and changed including:

- The promotion of strategic and evidence based planning
- The recognition of planning’s bigger picture
- Support for, and the development of, courageous leaders and champions
- The development of ‘smarter’ planners
- The promotion of, and support for, better community engagement
- Recognition of planners as professionals and decision makers
- Alignment of the new culture of planning with the new Act
- Positive media that celebrates planning achievements.

We are in the process of developing action plans and engaging with a broad range of stakeholders and the community to put these actions into practice.

Integrated Land Use & Transport Planning for NSW

In 2009 PIA NSW called for a comprehensive, integrated strategic plan for the Sydney Metropolitan Area to accommodate growth over the next 30 years. In 2010 PIA also called for a detailed metropolitan transport plan with clearly defined deliverables and a timeframe consistent with the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney.

PIA believes that future planning for the State will involve integration at a number of levels and can be achieved through:

- Integration of land use and transport planning
- Integration of regional networks with planning for Greater Sydney
- A greater integration across agencies through an improved governance structure.

We will continue to advocate for integrated land use and transport planning for the Greater Sydney region and across regional connections.

Affordable Housing Initiatives

NSW is experiencing a critical undersupply in the provision of affordable housing which is having a wide range of social and economic implications for our communities. In order to identify initiatives and amendments that could be made in the NSW planning system to help address this challenge, the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure established the NSW Affordable Housing Taskforce in July 2011. Two members of the Institute were invited to join the taskforce and build on the policy work undertaken by the PIA Committee and Members.

PIA will continue to engage with Government and stakeholders on this important issue.

Opportunities and Engagement

PIA NSW will from time to time make submissions on a range of planning related matters. To view our submissions please visit our website.

Our New Planner quarterly magazine and fortnightly eNews provide updates on our work on behalf of the planning profession.

If you would like to know more about PIA policies visit our website www.planning.org.au or contact our Division Office on 02 8904 1011.

January 2012
Introduction

The Issues Paper for the NSW Planning System Review was released in December 2011. It documents the consultation phase of the review being undertaken of the NSW Planning System. The consultation phase was informed by 91 community forums, 70 stakeholder meetings and 330 written submissions.

Given the theme for this edition of New Planner relates to planning for people, I thought it would be interesting to take a look at the Issues Paper from the perspective of disadvantaged individuals and groups in Australian society, questioning whether social justice issues appear to rate highly.

Stakeholder Consultation

As expected the list of stakeholders includes development industry associations, professional institutes, environmental groups and a wide range of single interest organisations; however the list also includes the Council of Social Service of NSW, the Office for Ageing, NSW Commission for Children and Young People and the NSW Aboriginal Council. Therefore it is likely that the concerns of disadvantaged individuals and groups and general social justice issues were raised by some of the stakeholders the Review Panel met with. In addition almost 2000 people attended the community forums and no doubt social issues were raised during this consultation process.

Questions Posed

The principal output of this first stage of the review is the list of 238 questions identified as worthy of further investigation and ongoing consultation. However, only a very small number of questions raised relate to social justice issues. One of these was the very last question posed (F9) which relates to the accessibility of information about the planning system being made more accessible in a multicultural society. Other social justice questions posed related to student housing, the potential for compensation when zonings are altered and Aboriginal Reserves being given recognition in planning legislation.

Objectives of the Act

The Issues Paper notes that feedback during the consultation phase indicated that the objectives stated in the 1979 Act were generally still considered relevant and supported, however a wide range of additional objectives were put forward for consideration. Amongst the new objectives raised were; 1. Encouraging Decentralisation 2. Protecting Prime Agricultural Land 3. Fostering Healthy Living Patterns 4. Consideration of the Potential Impacts of Climate Change 5. Promoting Economic Development 6. Promoting Tourism 7. Ensuring Social Impacts and Social Resilience are Considered

This last objective was the nearest any of the suggested new objectives came to enshrining social justice considerations into the objectives of any new planning legislation.

Conclusions

Clearly the Review Panel has been selective in posing the questions they are seeking feedback on to assist in the next phase of the Review which will see the release of a Green Paper. However, it is disappointing to see that social justice issues have not featured to any significant extent in the questions posed following the consultation phase. The planning system should be an integral part of social justice fabric of society and actively foster a “Life without Barriers” for less fortunate members of our community as the sign in the photograph depicts.

The sign in this sensory park in Newcastle carries a message of hope

It is to be hoped that the concerns of disadvantaged individuals and groups and general social justice issues will feature in the Green Paper which is expected to be released prior to the end of April 2012.
Norton Rose Review
Land and Environment Court decision may affect development approvals
Felicity Rourke Partner, Amelia Dixon-Weidner Associate

Introduction

On 24 November 2011, the Land and Environment Court delivered its landmark decision in Hunter Environment Lobby Inc v Minister for Planning [2011] NSWLEC 221 requiring the owners of a coal mine to offset part of its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as part of planning approval to expand the existing Ulan coal mine located near Mudgee in NSW. This is the first time the Court has imposed such a condition on a planning approval in NSW.

The decision potentially broadens the range of conditions of approval that may be imposed by the Minister or the Court under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act) in relation to new or modified proposals for existing or proposed coal mines, and more broadly for other emissions intensive developments.

Facts

The proceedings were an objector appeal by Hunter Environment Lobby (Hunter) against the merits of a decision to grant a Part 3A approval under section 75L of the EP&A Act. The Minister had granted Part 3A approval in November 2010 authorising the expansion of the mine’s operation and doubling of the mine’s production rate.

Hunter successfully argued that the approval be modified by adding conditions requiring Ulan to report on, mitigate and offset its scope 1 emissions (being emissions that are a direct consequence of the carrying out of the activities authorised by the project approval) which exceed the scope of “the original emissions budget projection”.

Issues raised

Justice Pain imposed the GHG conditions notwithstanding evidence from the Department that, in its view, conditions of approval were “unsuitable for implementing a regulatory regime to require proponents to offset some or all of the GHG emissions of their projects”.

Hunter argued the principles of ecologically sustainable development (ESD) must be applied in the assessment of the project. In this respect, Justice Pain held that ESD principles are an aspect of the public interest and could therefore be a relevant consideration in the Court’s decision, although she did not ultimately decide the question of whether they were a mandatory consideration in the determination of a Part 3A application.

Justice Pain found that the power to impose conditions on a Part 3A project approval is wider than the power to impose conditions on a development consent granted under Part 4 of the EP&A Act, and stated that “[a]s the purpose of the EP&A Act includes the protection of the environment, the imposition of conditions to address GHG which are attributable to the project under Part 3A are arguably within power”. In reaching this conclusion, Justice Pain held that the principles of ESD were a relevant consideration.

Fair and reasonable?

The Court then considered whether the proposed offset conditions were fair or reasonable, or whether, as argued by Ulan, they were discriminatory (as no other coal mine in New South Wales is subject to an offsetting condition) and therefore so unreasonable that no planning authority would impose them. The Court also considered whether the offsets were proportional to the environment impacts the applicant was seeking to have addressed.

The Court concluded the proposed conditions could reasonably be implemented. In reaching this view, the Court noted the conditions related only to the additional emissions generated over the extended 10 year period of the mine and could be implemented reasonably. Pain J also held that a consent authority was at liberty to impose similar conditions when approving a modification or extension of operations of an existing coal mine, or when a new mine is opened.

One of the conditions endorsed by Court authorises the Director-General of the Department of Planning to waive compliance with the requirement to report on and offset GHG emissions if he/she is satisfied that a “regulatory liability has been imposed under another law of any jurisdiction” in relation to the relevant emissions”. It may therefore be the case that, at least once a carbon price is in operation, the likelihood of similar conditions being imposed in future approvals is reduced. However, given that only a relatively small number of Australian businesses will be directly liable under the Carbon Pricing Mechanism, there is still an open question as to whether applications for other types of emissions-intensive projects, which are not directly liable under the Carbon Pricing Mechanism, may be subject to conditions requiring their emissions to be offset.
Welcome to the first Infrastructure Matters column in New Planner.

The column is brought to you by Newplan - a leading provider of advice to government, councils and developers in the area of infrastructure planning and delivery and development contributions.

There is no debate that modern, liveable communities must be supported by a range of economic and social infrastructure including water, sewer, roads, drainage, parks and community facilities. But what is often argued is who should provide or meet the cost of that infrastructure.

In Infrastructure Matters we will be reviewing recent issues in infrastructure planning for greenfield and brownfield development areas.

Tools for the delivery of development-generated infrastructure - including conditions of consent, voluntary planning agreements, and different developer contributions schemes - and examples of their use will be a focus of this column.

Major infrastructure investment also leads investment in new urban development. In Infrastructure Matters we will also highlight infrastructure works that are being rolled out and that will have a profound impact on settlement patterns and timing.

IPART and the NSW development contributions system

The Issues Paper of the NSW Planning System Review that was released in early December 2011 poses many questions about the current and future planning system. In this first edition of Infrastructure Matters we examine some of the Issues Paper questions relating to the development contributions system in NSW.

The Issues Paper poses a dozen or so questions relating to the contributions system, the majority of which are about the potential role of the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal (IPART) in that system. For example, should IPART be given the power to:

- Resolve matters relating to the funding of any shortfall in development contributions brought about by the contributions cap?
- Determine the extent, standard and nature of community infrastructure works included in contributions plans?
- Determine applications from councils for variations of the contributions cap?
- Examine in detail all contributions plans prepared by councils?
- Prepare guidelines or recommendations on such matters as preparing contributions plans, costing community infrastructure, prioritising works and the (deferred) timing of contributions payments?

As Newplan assisted IPART in its first round review of above-the-cap contributions plans in 2011, we have some insights to contribute in terms of IPART’s process and lessons learned.

Our impressions of IPART’s involvement so far include the following:

- IPART acted as a credible independent umpire in determining the reasonableness of the initial 3 contributions plans. The rigour applied in IPART’s assessment of the plans was significant and commendable.
- The initial contributions plans review represents a substantial body of work that is relevant to all councils infrastructure planning, particularly in terms of comparing construction costs in release areas, appropriate indexing and net present value costing methodologies.
- The analyses of the Blacktown and The Hills council plans did yield downward, albeit minor, adjustments to contribution rates and showed that the councils concerned had prepared plans that were generally sound.

In our view, IPART’s work did much to dispel industry concerns about unreasonable costs or ‘gold plating’ of works, at least in terms of the councils concerned.

The analyses showed that the cost of land in Sydney relative to other areas intra- and interstate is a key factor that has driven the high contribution rates we have seen in recent years.

Ultimately, though, the tensions between stakeholders in the system will remain intractable. Councils and Government will always want the financial risk of development-generated infrastructure to lie with the land developer as much as possible and not with rate- and tax-payers; while developers will always seek removal or reduction of development levies.

IPART has shown however that it has the expertise to shape a fair policy of who should pay for urban infrastructure. It has performed this role effectively for many years for the pricing of water and other utilities and that experience can be usefully applied to the development contributions system.

Our view is that the IPART role in development contributions should continue and be expanded. For example:

- IPART could benchmark the life cycle costs of local infrastructure provided in greenfield areas. Some costs benchmarking with the initial plans review has been done but a comprehensive analysis of urban release infrastructure costs across NSW would assist in ensuring all future contributions plans and complementary funding schemes are robust and transparent.
- Similar to the costs analysis, IPART could benchmark the rates or standards of provision of...
infrastructure that is required to meet the demands generated by residential and employment release areas. This could be accompanied by benchmarking of local infrastructure specifications throughout NSW. Each council has its own specification for roads, drains and parks, yet in principle there is no reason why a more standard approach cannot be used for many items.

- There is currently little transparency in contributions for State and regional infrastructure. IPART could be empowered to determine or at least recommend to Government the level of Special Infrastructure Contributions for the different Special Contributions Areas throughout the state. IPART’s review would examine the effect of all utility charges and contributions on the affordability of development in each area.

- IPART should be given a wide brief in recommending contributions policy settings to Government. One of the criticisms of the contributions cap was that it was policy-on-the-run with little thought applied to its impact on council funding plans. IPART should be empowered to investigate the impact that the section 94 contributions cap has had on the amount and location of new development throughout NSW. Has it done anything to accelerate housing supply? Where a contributions cap is in place, IPART should also be able to directly assist the local council and its community prepare a sustainable financial strategy using multiple funding sources to meet the cost of all the infrastructure generated by development – and not just so-called ‘essential infrastructure’.

- One of the perennial criticisms is that the contributions system is too complex. Yet it is not always possible to prepare and manage fair and transparent nexus-based contributions schemes that are brief documents. Web-based tools can significantly reduce complexity and enhance accessibility. IPART should, in partnership with growth area councils, develop a template software tool that allows all councils to set and effectively manage their development contributions; and that allows developers and users of the contributions plan to find out what they need to know. The Shoalhaven Contributions Plan 2010 – the recipient of two recent PIA awards for excellence – is an example that can be used as a basis for such a template.

- IPART in recent years has been given the role of determining applications of special rate variations by local councils. Similar issues arise in the rates and contributions system of 11Who should pay for services and facilities and how much should they pay?’ IPART is therefore at the forefront of seeing how councils and their communities are making these decisions, and this knowledge could be used to prepare best practice guidance on how to effectively work with local communities to make good trade-off decisions about the appropriate level of service of infrastructure in their areas.

Did you know…?

‘Essential infrastructure’ as defined in the IPART Practice Note is only relevant to section 94 contributions plans that, if applied to a residential development, would result in the consent authority imposing a monetary section 94 contribution greater than $20,000 for any dwelling (or $30,000 for any dwelling in a greenfield area). For ‘below-the-cap’ contributions plans the only legislative restriction on the types of infrastructure that may be the subject of section 94 contributions is that they must be ‘public amenities or services’. Public amenities or public services do not include water supply or sewerage services (see s93C EP&A Act).

Date:
Conference Thursday 18 & Friday 19 October
Welcome Reception Wednesday 17th October
Conference Dinner Thursday 18th October

Place:
The Glasshouse Arts, Conference & Entertainment Centre, Port Macquarie

Be involved:
• Visit the website to find out about submitting an expression of interest;
• Note the conference dates in your diary NOW;
• Northern Region planners are invited to contribute to conference organization;
• Become a conference supporter through one of the many sponsorship opportunities.

More information:
There will be regular updates on our website www.planning.org.au/nsw and in the fortnightly eNews or email nswmanager@planning.org.au
How did you first get started in planning?

Well I started out at university doing a science degree, with the intention of doing Medicine. I was introduced to the property industry through my father who is a land economist and established Hill PDA in 1990. My grandfather, who was a Doctor, advised me that following in my father’s footsteps, rather than the medical side of the family would be a better option so I enrolled in the master of urban and regional planning at USyd. I had no idea at the start what I was getting into but I soon worked out that I really loved it and it all took off from there.

What are the key things you want to achieve during your term as President?

Firstly, I want to strengthen the relevance of PIA to our members and non-members – what do we mean to them.

Secondly, I want to strengthen the relevance of PIA to our members and non-members – what do we mean to them.

Thirdly, I want to promote what I have termed the ‘missing years’ – those aged roughly 25 – 40 years who are very active in practice but have become less engaged with PIA. I’ve noticed that we lose a lot of people through that age group, for obvious reasons – life and career get in the way, but they have a lot of value to contribute and it would be great to get them more involved with PIA too.

So how do you think PIA can get these “missing years” more involved?

Well it’s a difficult challenge that is going to be a progressive undertaking. We’re trying to find the right kind of event to get things started. I recently attended one of the Newcastle Branch Planner in the Pub sessions, and it was really inspiring. There were over 70 people in attendance, from a broad range of ages and backgrounds. They put together a fun and educational afternoon that was of great value to everyone I think. But a lot of it will also be about just talking to people, encouraging them to be involved.

With the planning system review underway, what would you like to see come out of that process?

The overarching issue is that we need a change in cultural approach to planning beyond just planning and processes. We need a brave new world with a positive can do attitude in NSW, where planners are seen as leaders and professionals – enablers rather than barriers to development and progress. We’ve had ongoing meetings with the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure as well as the Department on this issue of generating cultural change and we have developed a proactive action plan setting out layers of actions and specific time frames to get things started.

And how do you think individual professionals can prepare for the changes in their day to day work?

Well obviously keeping in the loop with PIA and using PIA as a vehicle for knowledge and change will help! I think that planners need to start addressing the big picture in their own ongoing professional education and development, and not just in traditional areas but in other aspects such as mediation and community engagement. Planners need to look at training in leadership – the new culture is going to need that.

We also need to look at mentoring, using senior members of our industry to provide more mentoring to those missing years and the juniors. It is those groups who are going to inherit the new planning system so they need to get involved and have a say.

Now I know you worked in the UK for a while and were involved in the London Olympics bid. Can you tell us a bit about what you did there?

In 2003 I was working for a local council in the east end as a principal planner. It was a pretty poor part of London. The proposed Olympic site covered 4 local government areas and they were looking for one planner from each to be involved in putting together the master plan to go into the bid. My boss was reluctant but I convinced her to release me onto the project. We had 6 months to put together the Olympic and non-Olympic master plans. One of the things I had learnt from my father, who had worked on the Sydney Olympic Park Masterplan post Games, was the importance of legacy planning – the housing and community opportunities to be built for future generations. The key was insisting on obtaining development approval for that at the same time as the main facilities so that it didn’t get forgotten about later. As it turns out we were able to get some fantastic wins for the area – 3 new rail lines, affordable housing, sporting arenas for local kids, job training programmes, so many things. We had about 3000 consultants working on the bid; it was the biggest project you could possibly imagine. The community consultation, which I was responsible for, was the biggest program ever undertaken in the UK and probably Europe. We had a rowing bus travelling around the country, a letter drop of 30,000, stalls at markets across the country, you name it. It was quite a buzz and obviously with such a tight timeframe we were under enormous pressure, but it was an amazing experience to be part of and the energy of everyone involved was incredible. It does rather make any other master planning project that I work on now kind of pale in comparison!

In the end we secured planning consent for not only the Olympic and Paralympic Games but their legacy. This occurred simultaneously across four local government authorities (literally all on the same day at the same time). We were recognised with numerous community engagement awards, RTPI awards and the Mayor of London’s Award for Planning Excellence. So are you going back to see the outcomes of your hard work?

Unfortunately despite my name being on the planning approval, I haven’t been given any tickets to the Olympics, but my husband is in the Australian sailing team and will be competing in his fifth Olympic Games so we are going to London for the Games and to...
introduce our new baby, who will have arrived by then, to London and where it all started. We’ll have come a full circle.

A question that every new president of an industry association gets asks I am sure, what do you think are the biggest challenges facing planners and the planning industry over the next 5 years?

I think the biggest challenge, as I’ve mentioned before, is changing our culture, changing our perception of ourselves and outsiders’ perceptions of us. I also think that making the most of the planning review and getting those long lasting positive outcomes hoped for from the process will be a challenge. We also need to get the community on board and help them to realise the importance of development and aligning what we do with their vision of planning. Keeping up to date is always a challenge and not going to get any easier. Also learning to promote ourselves and our wins better, particularly through the media, is important.

And finally I think we still need to focus on enjoying the job we choose to do and focus on making positive changes. Many people were excited to become planners because that was what they loved, but they become demoralised and worn down. We need to stay positive, particularly in the light of the economic climate and just stay aware of the broader market and what we can deliver.

And finally, tell us a bit about the real you.

Well it is fair to say that I have always been fairly sporty. I am passionate about rowing. I was on the NSW rowing team last year and I’ve represented England at an international level. It’s a hard habit to break; I was still competing when I was 4 months pregnant – I took my baby bump off to the Head of the Charles competition in the States at the end of last year, which is the largest regatta in the world. I admit that at times it can be difficult to balance training as an elite athlete with a heavy workload; I used to have up to 12 training sessions a week, but I’ve been rowing for 20 years now and it’s just part of my life and I love it - it keeps me balanced. The real Sarah loves to fit as much as she can into her day!
Planning housing for social outcomes: a new way of growing older

Barbara Squires, General Manager, Ageing, The Benevolent Society

The challenge

The ageing of Australia’s population is a success story of medical, social and economic advances. The prospect of our population over 65 doubling by 2050 is often referred to as a “tsunami”. But this is a false metaphor as it is neither unexpected nor a disaster. This new demographic shift does however present challenges as profound as those we face in climate change and globalisation.

Not all older people are the same. The over 65 population is very diverse in terms of socio-economic circumstances, health status, cultural background and so on. The life experiences and expectations of those of us now in our 60s are very different to people in their 90s. It is also important to distinguish between the ‘younger old’ (roughly 65 – 80) and the ‘older old’ (those over 80), especially as health and disabilities begin to increase more rapidly in later old age. (The Benevolent Society, A Roadmap for ageing well: Independence, connections and care, www.bensoc.org.au, 2010)

Our current aged care system has been built on the assumption that people will have to move to get the care they need. Nursing homes are seen as the last resort but inevitable for nearly everyone. The Benevolent Society has been at the forefront of trying to find solutions to social problems for nearly 200 years, so we started to look for a better way to grow older in Australia which did not assume a move to nursing home. We found our inspiration in the Humanitas organisation in the Netherlands. Its “Apartments for Life” (AFL) are complexes of apartment buildings where people can live full and connected lives to their end of their days, with care being brought to them in their apartment if needed.

In 2003 we started to devise a new way of living that would give older Australians an alternative to traditional forms of retirement accommodation and aged care. We did extensive research and set out clear principles based on the Humanitas model which underpin every aspect of the project. (The Benevolent Society, Apartments for life in Australia: Lessons from Humanitas in The Netherlands, www.bensoc.org.au, 2009)

An innovative response

The AFL project will be located at The Benevolent Society’s landmark site at Bondi in Sydney’s eastern suburbs. It will include 128 self contained units in two medium-rise and one low-rise buildings, designed to blend with the existing streetscape, minimise impact on neighbouring residents, and conserve historic Scarba House and surrounding gardens. Half the site will be publically accessible green open space, with community facilities such as meeting rooms, a café, a men’s shed and a day centre for people with dementia.

Its purpose-built age-proof universal housing design enables residents to live as independently as possible whatever their state of health. A Care Advisor will help residents obtain care assistance if they need it from one or more of the many care agencies in the area.

Apartments for Life’s universal design incorporates special features to accommodate changing levels of ability and dexterity. These include: Extra access and safety features, including no steps or stairs, level entries, purpose designed lifts and wider doors and hallways.

Kitchens with switches, plugs and cupboards within easy reach and bathrooms designed to be useable and safe.

Technological advances to make life easier for residents and to enable them to get help quickly, such as personal alarm systems.

A key aim of the project is that the apartments are affordable by local older people in a range of financial circumstances so they can stay in the area and the resident mix will reflect the diversity of the local community. 40 percent of apartments will be offered at below market rates, with some for very low rental. The apartments will be offered on a ‘loan licence’ or a rental basis and the Society will retain freehold ownership, ensuring the apartments will remain affordable for future residents.

By providing safe, secure and affordable housing for older people in their local communities, innovative housing solutions like AFL help preserve local support and friendship networks and reduce social isolation. The Apartments for Life model incorporates recreational amenities, organised group activities such as exercise classes and adult education, and a community hub to further promote interaction with the local community, as well as public access to the site. The site has easy access to retail, entertainment and transport facilities.
The challenges to innovation

Well designed and well located housing, close to services and shops that enables people to stay in their familiar local neighbourhood, will most likely involve in-fill development, or re-development from previous uses. This is the case with our Bondi site and it aroused local sensitivities.

After extensive planning and consultation, the NSW Land and Environment Court approved the project in May 2010. The citing of the substantial social benefits and extensive local demand for such a project set a precedent. However, the Commissioner required a reduction in the height of one building, and a consequent reduction in units. The Court’s approval for 128 units, instead of the 140 units we proposed, created a fresh challenge to our ability to deliver our goal of 40 percent affordable housing units, while maintaining the project’s financial viability. We continue to seek government and private funding to make the project a reality.

The future

Over the many years of planning for the AFL project, we have seen a growing awareness of the importance of secure, appropriate and affordable housing to support older people’s independence, health and connection to their community. Suitable housing also makes it possible to deliver care to people in their own homes. (Australian Government the Treasury, Advisory Panel on the Economic Potential of Senior Australians, Realising the economic potential of senior Australians: Turning grey into gold, www.treasury.gov.au/EPSA/ 2011)

There has been a rapid expansion over the past ten years of community aged care services. Many more people are now cared for in their own homes than in residential aged care facilities. There is now a recognition of the ‘service integrated housing’ sector, which is housing specific to older people and in which there is some provision of services, support or care. Jones, A, Howe A, Tilse C, Bartlett H, Stimson B, Service integrated housing for Australians in later life, Final Report 141, AHURI 2010. ‘Service integrated housing’ can include a wide range of ownership, built form, tenure and service model, including boarding houses, social housing and retirement villages.

The AFL project fits into this typology, but is unique in its aims of a high percentage of affordable housing and of 95 percent of residents not needing to move again to a residential aged care facility.

The Productivity Commission’s report on its inquiry into ‘Caring for Older Australians’ marks a major shift in thinking. The opening words of the report are ‘Older Australians generally want to remain independent and in control of how and where they live; to stay connected and relevant to their families and communities; and be able to exercise some measure of choice over their care.’ (Productivity Commission, 2011, Caring for Older Australians Inquiry Report, Overview, p.XXIII).

The report makes a number of recommendations that will help to give older Australians what they are clearly saying they want. It has a strong focus on care being available to people in their own homes, up to the end of their lives. Chapter 12 on ‘Age friendly housing and retirement villages’ discusses universal design, home modifications, ways to make it easier for older people to move to more suitable housing, and the need for more affordable housing [ibid].

One of the key aims of the Apartments for Life project is to disseminate the lessons from it to the aged care sector, researchers and government policy makers, for others to replicate or adapt. We are encouraged by the growing number of not-for-profit organisations who are planning developments with similar aims. It remains a challenge for all of us to work together to overcome the challenges posed by the various state planning systems and the lack of funding for affordable housing so Australia’s older people can have a better way to grow older.

ERM is one of the world’s leading providers of environmental, social and planning consulting services. We have over 100 offices in 40 countries and employ over 3,000 staff. In NSW, our key planning contacts are:

**Sydney**

T: 02 8584 8888

Chris Jack  BSc(Hons), MEnvPlanning
Christine Allen  BSc(Hons), LGTCP

**Hunter Valley**

T: 02 4964 2150

Stephen O’Connor  BTP(Hons), MSc(Hons), LGTCP, FPIA, CPP

**North Coast**

T: 02 6584 7155

Christine Allen  BSc(Hons), LGTCP

www.erm.com
Age and Place: 
Are our environments ageing-ready?

Dr Jane Bringolf, COTA NSW

What makes a person ‘old’? Pension age? Grandparenthood? Physical and/or cognitive decline? When younger people treat you differently? Or when you stop going out because it is too difficult to get about? The benchmark for being ‘old’ is often considered retirement age – around 65 years. In other contexts, being older begins at 55 years – the age at which one can access superannuation. For others it is around 85 years when things seem more difficult to achieve. Old, however, is often a state of mind, and not just that of the older individual, the attitudes of younger people also have a part to play.

In just ten years time the Australian Bureau of Statistics projects there will be four million people aged between 65 and 85 years (4102.0 Australian Social Trends, March 2009). These are the people most likely to be living independently in their family home, not in residential care settings.

The number of people aged 85 years and over is also projected to increase to approximately half a million in the next ten years, and a million in twenty years. While some of the oldest persons in this grouping are likely to be in residential care, many more will choose to have aged care delivered to their homes.

Currently, about five percent of people aged over 65 years live in residential care settings and while this figure will grow in actual numbers, the proportion is expected to remain at a similar level. Consequently, the environment, built and social, will need to be ‘ageing-ready’. This means changing our notions of what we think ageing is about, and who should be taking responsibility.

Stereotypes of older people as being frail, helpless and dependent still endure. The reality for many people aged between sixty and eighty, and even into their nineties, is quite the opposite – they are living active and independent lives. At the other end of the spectrum, there are others with chronic health conditions who require assistance with daily living activities. Consequently, we are not talking about a homogeneous group. We can, however, generalise a little.

People in their late fifties are seeing their adult children enter the world of work, and by mid sixty they might be grandparents with child care duties. Part time work now starts to appeal – it gives structure to the week and means the savings nest egg remains largely intact. Time for hobbies and travel starts to take priority if finances allow, and volunteer work and social groups gradually take up more time. Once fully retired from the workplace the home is re-arranged to suit new activities and changing family needs. The home is no longer just a place to eat and sleep after work: it takes on new meanings as it becomes the centre of everything now, as does the neighbourhood.

The strategy of ageing in place is a win-win for everyone. Whilst governments value the cost efficiencies, individuals value happier, healthier and fuller lives. But will the home and the neighbourhood support people as they age – will it allow them to remain active and healthy for as long as possible?

Ageing in place is not always easy in a home with steps to the front and back entrances, narrow corridors and pokey hallways, and inconveniently placed light switches and power outlets. With a patchwork of various and sometimes costly modifications, most of the unhelpful features can be overcome. If finances allow, there are a few specialist...
are we ageing ready?

... to remain at home and in the community social services be able to support people planners is, will our infrastructure and... walks or the social club and back again. person feels they can walk to the local... profound affect on whether an older... to keep up their activities. These can... a little more help than others.

... build environment can have a positive impact on population health. This is the case for all ages. But some groups need a little more help than others.

The built environment can have a positive effect on population health. For all ages, some groups may need additional support to maintain their independence. It’s a long walk to the toilet from the street.

... building and... infrastructure are not ends in themselves, but the means by which people can lead healthy, productive and independent lives. By joining the dots between departments and disciplines, connections are made that seem obvious once pointed out. A simple example is installing a bus stop and at the same time, ensuring there are footpaths leading to it and a concrete apron from which to alight and disembark the bus.

Another helpful instrument is the Access to Premises Standard, which is called up by the Building Code of Australia for all new and refurbished public buildings and multi-unit dwellings. This should ensure that new buildings are physically accessible regardless of whether one is pushing a wheelchair, a pram or a trolley. However, this Standard does not fix the access to existing infrastructure and consequently we have ‘islands of accessibility’ in the community. Neither does it cover housing.

Approximately 145,000 new homes are built each year. Although they represent a small proportion of dwellings overall, in seven years this equals more than a million dwellings. For all the public discussion about an ageing population, the housing industry continues to design homes as if people will never grow old. This is possibly due to the stereotyping mentioned earlier, whereby older people, at a suitable time, are expected to enter an aged care setting and become the responsibility of the state. Nevertheless, there have been various attempts to bring the market into the picture.

Incentives began in 2004 with the Seniors Living Policy, which allowed multi unit development in infill areas provided a certain proportion were of a specialised design that was seen to suit the needs of older people.

Landcom took a more educative approach and launched their Universal Housing Design Guidelines in 2008. These are well researched and focus on spatial and structural elements of the home rather than the design details which feature strongly in the Adaptable Housing Standard referenced by the Seniors Living Policy. In 2007 the Commonwealth Jobs Stimulus Package brought universal design into full focus in social housing, albeit with some confusion about what this actually meant in practical terms.

The recently formed initiative, Livable Housing Australia, aims to promote the Livable Housing Design Guidelines, which were developed by the National Dialogue...
Built for Kids

Megan Mitchell, Commissioner for Children and Young People

Take a look around and ask yourself, what does our built environment say about our attitudes towards children and young people? How about putting yourself in the shoes of somebody who isn’t old enough to drive, and question, how would I get around safely without relying on a grown up with a car? Where am I allowed to hang out with my friends in a safe environment, an activity which is both normal and necessary for my emotional, physical and social growth? Too often our built environment reflects an attitude that children and young people are either nuisances or that they simply don’t matter or aren’t present.

Yet we know that an intimate connection exists between the built environment and the well-being of people and that this connection is especially important for the development of children. Failing to take the needs and desires of children and young people into account in the built environment is increasingly recognised as a contributory factor to many childhood concerns including obesity, depression, poor socialisation and child abuse. To counteract this, children need clean air, open spaces, natural surroundings and opportunities to play freely and socialise. If we want them to spend more time in the real world instead of its virtual counterpart, we need to give them a reason to do so.

This imperative takes on a greater urgency when demographic data shows that since 2004 the rate of newborns has increased every year and the 2009 census tells us that in NSW, this is currently the most populous demographic. With this ‘baby boomlet’, we can expect a growing population of children and young people in the years to come. To deal with this, the built environment needs to be equipped with exciting and challenging play areas, safe roads, open green spaces, accessible transport and a place to simply ‘hang out’ without being made to feel in the way or having to pay for the privilege. Forward thinking, planning and innovation will be rewarded with sustainability, a healthy and happy generation of children and young people and countless other positive long term benefits which will be felt not only by children but the community as a whole. A built environment which takes into account the needs of children will also benefit many others in the community including people with disability and older people.

The NSW Commission for Children and Young People has long worked to bring the needs of children into the thinking of policy makers and built environment professionals. In 2009 we launched our good practice guide to creating child-friendly built environments, built4kids. In this we highlight a number of principles which underpin children’s well-being and can guide our thinking:

- By providing Agency we can enable children to independently access a diverse range of services and activities and help build their capacity to engage actively in their local community.
- Safety and security can make public places safer and increase the ability for children to feel connected to their community.
- And we can encourage a Positive sense of self by creating green spaces and natural areas that offer children a sense of fun, welcome, support and emotional restoration.
- We envisage an environment which not only respects the needs of children and young people but actively encourages their participation in its redevelopment.

The next step in this journey will be a four part seminar series to be held in 2012, Beyond playgrounds and skate parks: Advocating for kids in the built environment. The seminars are being delivered in partnership with the University of NSW and aim to cultivate champions for children’s needs in the processes involved in developing the built environment, promote children’s participation in these processes, build bridges between stakeholders and deliver better built environment outcomes for kids. The seminars will bring together policy makers from state and local government agencies and built environment practitioners - architects, landscape architects, planners. Guests will hear from experts whose insights will enable interactive discussion and sharing of ideas about the needs of kids in the built environment, how to develop good built environments for kids and what this looks like. For further details on the forthcoming seminar series and access to the Commission’s publication, built4kids which provides information and practical guidance on children, young people and the built environment, please visit the Commission’s website at http://kids.nsw.gov.au/kids/ourwork/builtenvironment.cfm.

Through a willingness to work together and a genuine, long term commitment to this process of change, the Commission believes that our vision for a built environment which meets the needs of children and young people will be realised.
X, Y, Z: Generating change?

Generation gaps are the focus of public debate – but Elton Consulting’s recent research for Parramatta City Council shows these differences make for a dynamic future.

Current research shows that, often, the biggest divide facing society is not a gender divide, racial divide, income or technology divide but the generational divide. Council needs to better understand how each generation “thinks, feels and acts”, the synergies and differences between them, and what this means for the way generational groups live and interact within the community.

Parramatta City Council is taking the lead in planning the future of its communities, with a recent study set to inform Council’s decision-making and planning for long-term social, environmental and economic sustainability. Council’s key objective for the study is to increase understanding of the differing attitudes, behaviours and values of generations X, Y and Z in Parramatta, in order to shape future planning and improve the social wellbeing and liveability of the LGA. The study considers three areas: work and study; living (play, recreation and leisure); and participation.

With a younger population than most local government areas, Parramatta is an ideal case study on how to bridge – and celebrate – generational differences.

Lucy Greig, social researcher at Elton Consulting, said people from different generations can work well together despite their age gaps.

Through the generations: a snapshot

Generation X (1966-77)

- Currently establishing their careers having entered the workforce in the late 1980s in a climate of economic rationalism and job market insecurity.
- Many have had one or more career change due to the 1990s recession and the recent economic downturn.
- This ‘entrepreneurial generation’ is regarded as having fewer opportunities than the Baby Boomers – a factor which may inspire their creative and driven approach to work and study.

Generation Y (1977-1986)

- Grew up with high rates of family breakup, the internet and social media and high levels of prosperity.
- Highly motivated and educated, many combine work with higher education, and are popular with other generations in the workplace.
- Strongly value close relationships with friends – they are more ‘tribal’, attempting to create surrogate extended families to compensate for instability or dysfunctionality within their own families and using friends to cope with life in an uncertain, unstable world.
- They are ‘fearless of the future’, but for many home ownership is out of reach.

Generation Z (1986-2006)

- Also known as the iGeneration – grew up with mobile phones, computers and the internet, an increased awareness of global social and economic instability and climate change, and a world shaped by 9/11.
- Gen Zs are going into primary school already using the internet and computers and are the most ‘information intensive’ generation of all.
- High levels of technology use means that many Gen Zs have highly developed speed and dexterity, but this is also connected to reduced physical activity and increased childhood obesity.

Note: All of the above information is subject to change based on the latest research and data.
Inbox

Nicole Philps

Sue Francis and David Ryan are happy to announce the rekindling of a prior working relationship, with Garry Fielding joining the City Plan group as Regional Director of the Newcastle office of City Plan Strategy and Development. Garry will be joined by Jill Kral, who has worked with Garry (and Sue and David) in previous companies. Sue and David are delighted to have the team back together again. The Newcastle office will operate from 14 Watt Street, Newcastle and Garry can be contacted on 0413 999 517.

North Coast consultant Steve Connelly attended the Housing Strategy and Reforms to the Planning System conference in London on 24th January. The conference was looking particularly at the delivery of affordable homes. Steve reports that in the UK 232,000 new households form every year however only about 115,000 homes are built. House prices doubled between 2000 and 2010. The new UK government is radically reforming the planning system to «get things moving». Steve had been in Paris for 2 weeks before the conference visiting his new granddaughter.

News from out west is that Ashley Albury has moved from Wellington Council to commence a position with Department of Planning in Dubbo.

James Rosenwax, AECOM Director, Design + Planning is pleased to announce that Roger Swinbourne has recently been appointed to the AECOM Design + Planning team as an Associate Director. Roger’s focus will be on the enhancing and improving the planning and facilitation of sustainable urban communities.

Roger will be working closely with AECOM’s sustainability specialists on embedding best practice into urban development projects as well as working with the Sustainable Systems Integration Model (SSIM) to facilitate and optimise sustainability options. The SSIM is a GIS based sustainability assessment tool, comparing a range of sustainability parameters and evaluating the sustainability merits and costs of alternative urban form solutions, master plans and buildings. Roger joins AECOM following a 3-year stint with Urbis.

Philip Graus from Cox Richardson has sent in the news that last December he published a book with Philip Cox and Bob Meyer titled “Home: The Evolution of Housing in Australia”. The book provides an insight in the history and development of the Australian house and its place in the broader community, with a focus on choices for the future. With the authors’ backgrounds as architects and planners they hope that the book will provide a sound context for readers to understand our housing past and engage more fully in thinking about the future forms of our cities and how we live. The text is illustrated by 50 original watercolours painted by Philip Cox especially for this book. A review of the book will be available in an upcoming edition of Australian Planner.

If you have any stories, announcements or other interesting news that you believe is worthy of publication, I would love to hear from you at nikphilps@gmail.com – Nicole
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When councils change their minds – redetermination of development applications

In recent judicial review proceedings the Chief Judge of the Land and Environment Court has examined the statutory provisions relating to a change of determination of a development application by a consent authority. The Court’s decision has implications in terms of the necessary procedural requirements in situations where a council reverses its earlier determination of a DA.

In Brown v Randwick City Council [2011] NSWLEC 172 (14 September 2011), the Court upheld a challenge to the validity of development consent granted for the erection of a swimming pool and deck. The primary ground of challenge was that the Council had no power to determine the DA under s 80 of the EPA Act because the Council had, under delegation, already determined the DA by refusing consent to the application. Significantly, the Council had not rescinded or reviewed this earlier determination refusing consent before purporting to make the later determination granting consent to the application.

In its second consideration of the DA the Council could not, said the Court, exercise the power under s 80 of the EPA Act to determine the DA by granting consent because that power had already been spent by determining the DA by refusing consent. Further, the failure of the Council to issue notification of the earlier determination (as required by s 81 of the EPA Act) did not affect the conclusion that the Council, by its delegate, had already exercised the power of determination under s 80.

In upholding the primary ground of challenge, the Court indicated that the provisions of the Act require that where a DA is determined by refusal of consent, this determination must first be formally rescinded or reviewed before it may be reconsidered by the Council and a redetermination granting consent issued. Conversely however, this procedure is not required in the situation where Council’s initial decision is to grant consent – as here the statutory scheme provides first for a determination of a DA by the grant of consent and, secondly, the notification of that consent.

Specifically, under s 83(1) of the EPA Act a consent is not effective and does not operate until notice is given under s 81 of the EPA Act, which means that the decision to grant consent can be reconsidered any time up until that consent takes effect – that is in the period between determination and notification. There is no such equivalent procedure that applies to a refusal of consent: there is no provision such as s 83(1) or any requirement in s 81 that a refusal of consent is not effective and does not operate until notice is given. This means that a determination under s 80 to refuse consent to a DA is effective from the time of determination. Therefore, to reconsider a refusal of consent, the decision must either be rescinded to then permit the reexercise the power of determination, or reviewed following a request by the applicant under s 82A of the EPA Act.

A further successful ground of challenge was that Council had failed to consider a relevant matter in making its determination, namely cl 4.4 of Randwick City Council Dwelling Houses and Attached Dual Occupancies DCP. Nowhere in the reports before the Council, said the Court, was this clause of the DCP addressed. Failure to consider this matter, which related to side setbacks, was particularly important as the DA did not comply with the provisions of this clause, and thus constituted a material error in the determination.

In defense, the Council claimed that the applicant’s claims were precluded by the privative clause in s 101 of the EPA Act, as the proceedings were commenced after three months from public notice of the granting of consent being given. However the Court held that the privative clause in s 101 did not preclude judicial review on the basis that a material omission and jurisdictional error were evident in Council’s purported determination of the DA.

Firstly, the material error related to the public notice given in a local newspaper of the determination to grant consent. The public notice only mentioned the swimming pool and omitted reference to the deck. This was a material omission since, without reference to the proposed development of the new deck, the public notice could not be said to describe “the development the subject of the consent” as required in the EPA Regulation. Secondly, even if proper public notice had been given, this did not protect the development consent from jurisdictional error. Here, the jurisdictional error was that the Council had no power to make the later determination to grant consent to the application, having made the earlier determination to refuse consent to the application. A development consent suffering from jurisdictional error remained subject to judicial review, despite a privative clause such as s101.

Accordingly, the Court upheld the challenge of the validity of the development consent on the ground of absence of power to grant consent and failure to consider a relevant matter, and so declared the determination of Council granting consent invalid.

---
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There is mounting concern about the health of children today. Newspapers and television regularly run stories about childhood obesity and lack of physical activity – spending too much screen time. While some of these reports err on the sensational side, there is legitimate cause for concern.

Children are not as active as they were a generation ago. Research repeatedly reports that the proportion of Australian children walking to school has declined. In NSW, data from the 2010 ‘Schools Physical Activity and Nutrition Survey’ shows that activity levels have continued to fall most recently, and 1 in 4 children surveyed are not in the healthy weight range.

Regular physical activity helps maintain a healthy body weight. Being overweight is a risk factor for chronic disease, including diabetes, cardiovascular disease and some cancers. A sedentary way of life is also a risk factor for mental health problems, such as depression. It is critical that we encourage children to be physically active, as well as eat healthy foods and interact with others to maintain good physical and mental health.

Planners have an important role to play in ensuring that the places where youngsters grow up, play, move about and go to school support these healthy behaviours. So how can planners create a healthy built environment for children?

The environment needs to support children being physically active and socially connected as part of everyday life. Being able to walk or cycle to school can be an important aspect of this. Planners can work with other agencies to make the route to school safe, fun for exploring and learning, and clearly sign-posted. Physical activity and social interaction are also supported through play spaces and parks.

Indeed, access to green, wild spaces is critical for everyone’s physical and mental health. Richard Louv’s popular book ‘Last Child in the Woods’ posits that indoor lives and constant supervision contribute to both physical and mental health problems for children (including obesity, attention-deficit disorder and depression).

Well designed streets and neighbourhoods are supportive environments for active and socially engaged children. Creating such environments involves traffic management, as well as elements that appeal to children exploring their local area. With rising urban population densities, planners face new challenges in creating child-friendly environments.

Claire Freeman and Paul Tranter in their recently published book ‘Children and their Urban Environment: Changing Worlds’ consider many of these challenges. They provide practical case studies, as well as pertinent research to argue for policies that will ensure children have access to high quality and accessible public spaces in higher density living. Strata title can potentially affect children’s well-being if there are overly restrictive rules about playing on common property or owning pets. Animals can give a child companionship and, in the case of a dog, be a great walking companion – often in the absence of adult supervision. Planners can help with open space provision that supports dog ownership in smaller dwellings.

A healthy environment for children also supports access to healthy food. Community gardens can engage children in growing and eating healthy fresh produce. They also aid learning about cooking, gardening, composting and recycling. Strategic plans and policies need to facilitate community-led edible landscapes, farmers’ markets and other related sustainability neighbourhood practices. Fast food advertising and fast food outlets close to schools are not supportive of healthy eating and planners should seek to regulate such practices.

Useful resources for planners

The NSW Commission for Children and Young People (http://kids.nsw.gov.au/) has a freely available publication that can assist planners create child-friendly environments. Called ‘built4kids’, it...
identifies three themes that underpin children’s well being. These then form the ‘Indicator Frameworks’ for child-friendly built environments.

Theme one is ‘agency’ which relates to a child’s ability to be independent in daily life. A healthy built environment enables children of all ages, abilities and cultural backgrounds to independently access diverse community services and activities that are relevant to them. Agency is also supported by free movement within communities and involvement in local development processes.

The second theme is ‘safety and security’. This relates to children’s ability to engage with their communities independently and in meaningful ways, as well as being able to access safe public spaces where they feel a sense of belonging. The third theme is a positive ‘sense of self’. This can be actualised in spaces – particularly green natural areas – that are fun and welcoming.

Another great resource is ‘Child Friendly by Design’ (CFbD) – an initiative of Healthy Cities Illawarra (http://www.healthyillawarra.org.au/healthycities/). As well as trialling child-friendly indicators advocated by the NSW Commission for Children, CFbD emphasises the importance of giving children a voice in the planning process. Practical workshops support the dissemination of the CFbD principles – see the web site for details.

It is clear that cities designed for children are good for everyone’s health and well-being.

Authors: Susan Thompson is Associate Professor in Planning and Associate Director (Healthy Built Environments) City Futures Research Centre, UNSW. Anthony Capon is Foundation Professor of Public Health and Head, Discipline of Public Health in the Faculty of Health, University of Canberra.
A fresh start for contributions planning
Shoalhaven Contributions Plan - winner President’s Award PIA NSW Division 2011
Awards for Excellence in Planning
James Harris, Shoalhaven City Council

Development contributions / Section 94. Can the management and interpretation of such a planning instrument be made easier for everyone in the planning and development industry? How can local government avoid criticism that Contributions Plans are unnecessarily complex, lack transparency and generally difficult for the layperson to understand?

These were questions that inspired the development of Shoalhaven Contributions Plan 2010 – a unique, innovative and interactive website that is pioneering access and transparency to the development industry and the general public. Further, the Plan allows developers to estimate contributions for different development scenarios online.

For a management authority, the website platform allows for greater integration of planning policies and practices while also linking to capital and financial reporting to deliver projects most needed by development and the community. An additional benefit of a website based plan is immediate access to current information, reduced resourcing and environmentally sustainable outcomes.

Why consider a new way for contributions planning?

Infrastructure funding, coordination and delivery are planning issues generating much public debate in recent years. Historically, poor housing statistics in NSW has focused attention on the costs of developing land, particularly contributions required by local government for the provision and upgrade of infrastructure. Therefore, to keep pace with such changes, planning instruments need to be both flexible and dynamic in today’s online world.

Objectives behind creating Shoalhaven Contributions Plan 2010

A key objective was to keep the Plan simple and easy to use. Too often planning instruments are large, complex and technical, which in turn, inhibits their interpretation and implementation. In developing the Plan, all unnecessary detail would be omitted or electronically linked to supporting information and therefore available to the reader/user when required.

Two other key objectives also influenced development of the Plan, being the linking of existing electronic databases and to provide a “fluid” instrument that is easily updatable.

Project delivery team

To deliver the Plan required a diverse array of skills from Shoalhaven City Council’s in-house project team, including:

• Planners
• Analyst programmers
• GIS draftpersons
• Website drafting specialists
• Accountants
• Lawyers

This project team was guided by an internal Steering Committee and external Peer Review process provided by Greg New from Newplan.

Ensuring that one plan fits all access needs

Recognising that not all users of the Plan will have internet access or a computer, the website is designed to operate on an “off line” USB stick, or alternatively can be printed in whole or part. Therefore, “online” or “offline” use of the Plan has considerable environmentally sustainable outcomes.

Industry recognition

Since becoming effective in March 2011, the Plan has received much industry recognition, including:
2011 NSW Planning Institute Australia awards for:

• Improving planning processes and practices
• Presidents award (overall Planning Excellence award)

Best practice presentations to:

• New Framework for Development Contributions Short Course (UTS: Centre for Local Government)
• NSW Southern Councils Development Contribution Group
• NSW Mid-North Coast Group of Councils - Development Contribution Group
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Conclusion

For Shoalhaven City Council, Shoalhaven Contributions Plan 2010 provides a valuable solution and efficiency gains for a potentially complex planning instrument that it is heavily reliant on to assist with funding essential community infrastructure. However, just as importantly, the Plan provides improved access and transparency to the development industry and general public who may have interest in examining the justification and nexus of each contribution project contained within the Plan.

For information on the Shoalhaven Contributions Plan contact James Harris at Shoalhaven City Council.
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In October of last year I was very fortunate to attend the 2011 Royal Town Planning Institute’s Young Planners Conference in Birmingham UK as part of a scholarship programme awarded by the Planning Institute of Australia and BBC Consulting Planners. The topic of the conference was ‘Planning for Growth’ and a key focus was the recent planning reforms and the challenges that planners in the UK, particularly young planners, faced in this uncertain and economically fragile climate.

Not having an extensive knowledge of the UK planning system, I was intrigued to hear about the need for planning reforms particularly as the NSW government is currently in the process of reviewing the state’s planning system. In the UK, the main reasons for planning reform were to make the planning system more streamlined and accessible to local communities, to promote sustainable development, to protect and enhance natural and historical environments, and to encourage economic and housing growth.

The UK planning reforms were being introduced through two documents - the Draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Localism Bill (now an Act following Royal Assent on November 15 2011). Under the Draft NPPF, Local Planning Authorities prepare Local Plans by which development in that region must accord with. If a development doesn’t accord with its Local Plan it may still be approved if it achieves the objective of sustainable development. A contentious issue amongst UK planners is the level of involvement that the community plays in the preparation of the Local Plans and whether this is an effective way of achieving community interests. The Draft NPPF also encourages local authorities to look favourably on development proposals with ‘good’ levels of engagement. Achieving ‘good engagement’ is not as easy as simply advertising in local papers or holding community information sessions, as commonly employed here in NSW, but must be inclusive and representative of all sectors of the community. Consultation on the Draft NPPF has now finished and is expected to be approved by April 2012.

The Localism Act 2011 attempts to simplify the planning system by abolishing Regional Spatial Strategies which accounted for around 60% of the UK’s planning policies. However, some UK planners see this as more creating a ‘hole’ in the planning system rather than simplifying it. Further, under the Localism Act 2011, communities will be given the right to buy local amenities and buildings, to offer to take over the running of public services and to have decisions on what development is allowed in their local area. By granting these rights it is believed that the responsibility for achieving the needs of the community will be put back into the hands of those who know the community best, that is local authorities and community members, thereby reducing the involvement and responsibilities of Central Government in local planning.

This situation is similar to the recent amendment to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 to remove Part 3A in an attempt to give back more control to local government. To what degree this has been achieved is a matter of opinion – and I’ll leave that discussion to others more knowledgeable than I. However, the contention in the UK over the introduction of the Localism Act 2011 is whether too much control has been given to the local communities by allowing them to make planning decisions instead of professionals. The current planning system in the UK and, by association, planners, are seen as ‘getting in the way’ of growth. The UK planning system has now been drastically simplified with the abolishment of Regional Spatial Strategies and, with NSW’s growing number of planning policies, we may find ourselves in a similar situation in the next couple of decades.

I thoroughly enjoyed my time at the conference, especially as I was able to meet other young planners from the UK. I am very thankful to the Planning Institute of Australia and BBC Consulting Planners for giving me the opportunity and highly recommend that other young planners apply for the 2012 Scholarship.
Seoul

Seoul is the capital of a country that in 50 years has gone from being poorer than many African nations to becoming one of the world’s most prosperous and technologically advanced. Although Seoul is the second largest metropolitan region in the world, it has escaped the miseries of other megacities and is a clean, mobile and highly functional metropolis that has an increasingly vibrant architecture and design culture.

Planning US, November 2011

Localism Act

The act compels developers to consult local people before submitting large planning applications. Developers will have to engage with the community rather just saying “This is the application”. There could be legal challenges if key groups feel that consultation has been inadequate. This is a big opportunity for third parties and pressure groups to challenge whether the statutory duty is being carried out properly.

Planning UK, 5 December 2011

Brownfield Parks

Back in 1975, the rusted pipes and immense corroded tanks of Seattle’s Gas Works Park seemed bizarre and incongruous against its verdant lawns. If old factory brownfields were repellent, and green parks were alluring, how could the two ever mate? But the imaginative flash by landscape architect Richard Haag broke that mould, and the reuse of that polluted property gave rise to an icon.

Planning US, December 2011

Industrial Estate

The Gateshead’s Team Valley trading estate, which signalled central government’s foray into land and property development in 1963, is living proof that carefully targeted state support (in short, pump-priming the private sector) can reap economic and social dividends by stimulating growth and job creation to the benefit of the economy as a whole.

TCPA, December 2011

Region Planning

Regional planning has ridden up and down a rollercoaster of popularity in the US. From those who led the way – Jane Jacobs, Lewis Mumford, Ian McHarg – to the present, planners have created a formula for livable communities in a regional context, with affordable housing, accessible public transportation, green space, and good jobs as part of the mix. Now regionalism is getting another chance through the HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant program, which aims to create and implement regional plans.

Planning US, December 2011

Neighbourhood Plans

Of course people must be encouraged and assisted to participate in the planning of their area. But so should our town halls be equipped with skilled staff and enough money to perform statutory planning and development control services for which they have been created and we continue to pay our taxes.

TCPA December 2011

Mediation

Zoning and other planning disputes have been resolved through an adversarial process for so long that it is hard for many city planners to imagine another way. However, many cities have turned to mediation, and it has helped to resolve disputes, limit lawsuits, reduce staff time spent handling such situations, and save money.

Planning US, November 2011

Community Design

Some argue that community design is about the physical shelter of human settlements, but the purpose of community design is to create relationships between people, not buildings, and the ultimate measure of a community design must be the extent to which it brings people together.

Planning US, November 2011

Housing

Ultimately, increasing house building comes down to funding. The fall in the number of homes developed for market sale has more to do with mortgage availability than perceived red tape. Without mortgages, people are unable to buy homes, without people to buy the homes, house builders are reluctant to build. It is a vicious circle.

TCPA, December 2011

Myths from Grotton

Myth  Change isn’t needed. Planning isn’t the problem.
Fact  It’s generally recognised by everyone who matters that planning is responsible for everything that is wrong with society today.

Myth  Isn’t it going to be a developer’s charter?
Fact  Close!! It’s going to be a lawyer’s charter.

Myth  Let’s face it, the government hasn’t got a clue what it means by “a presumption in favour of sustainable development”, has it?
Fact  This really isn’t rocket science. To be quite clear, “sustainable” development is development that isn’t unsustainable. That’s why there is a presumption in favour of it. Obviously.

Myth  The government isn’t really interested in proper planning at all.
Fact  Dear, oh dear – wrong again! We do not want to get too technical here, but our approach is firmly “evidence based”. This means that we really do want planners to be aware of the social, environmental and economic impact of development before ignoring the first two bits.

Planning, UK, 16 December 2011
Life Fellows of the Planning Institute 2011

The Institute congratulates NSW Members who have been elevated to Life Fellows of the Institute.

Elevation to Life Fellow is recognition by the PIA Board of existing Fellows of PIA who are considered to have made an exceptional contribution to the planning profession and/or to PIA over a significant period of time (not less than ten years).

Max Fragar, LFPIA CPP
Max has had a commitment to PIA/RAPI and Local Government Planners Association which has stretched from Queensland Divisional Treasurer on the Lewis Keeble Committee in the late 1960s to National Treasurer and NSW Councillor for 7 years until 2011. During that period, there has been very little time when he has not held a formal PIA role.

With over 40 years’ service in planning, 20 at Local Government Director level in NSW, plus early local government experience in Queensland and 18 years in consultancy, Max has demonstrated a passion for planning that does not look like waning.

Neil Ingham LFPIA
After graduating as a surveyor and working on a number of major engineering projects, Neil studied urban planning and moved into planning consultancies.

Neil worked in the first town planning consulting practice in Australia, and established one of the earliest consulting practices in 1973. His professional work has been primarily in community, environmental and development studies, together with the preparation of masterplans.

He was the inaugural secretary and founding member of the Consulting Planners Association, which later became part of the Planning Institute and actively involved with the Planning Research Centre at the University of Sydney.

Wendy Sarkissian LFPIA
Dr Wendy Sarkissian is an accomplished planning academic and educator, planning practitioner and significant contributor to planning in Australia. She continues to make an exceptional contribution to the planning profession and the body of knowledge that shapes and nurtures the profession. Wendy qualified as an educator; she has written and presented extensively on a range of planning matters relating to community engagement, social housing and environmental ethics.

Building a career as a social planning consultant in Australia when there was no such discipline, she pioneered innovative planning and development approaches in an astonishing variety of contexts, across all levels of government in Australia and Canada. She has specialist expertise in the design of housing and other environments for older people and children and the restorative value of parks and public open space.

She has pioneered innovative community visioning approaches in a wide range of contexts and this work has won her high professional regard and recognition.

David Winterbottom LFPIA
David has given many years of service on PIA NSW Committees; including conference and policy committees. His involvement has extended from RAPI to the Local Government Planners Association and the NSW Division Committee.

David was NSW President from 1994-1996 and National Councillor. He has continued to have an active role for many years on Divisional and National Policy Committees.

David continues to make a valuable contribution to PIA journals and has been seen as the word of wisdom on planning internationally. So many have looked on his planning journal articles as some of the most informative, readable and entertaining aspects of those magazines.

On a professional level, David held positions at Wollongong City Council, one of our most important communities. As Chief Planner at Albury Wodonga he actively pursued regionalisation.

David was the recipient of the prestigious Sidney Luker Medal in 1992. This Medal is awarded biennially to a person who has made a notable contribution to the science, and/or practice of town and regional planning in the Commonwealth of Australia.
NSW Consulting Planners

Clare Swan Convenor, NSW Consultant Planners’ Network

With 2011 being labelled by some as the year that “has been a lost year for urban development in NSW”, it was wonderful to receive a rush this month on recent consultant planners’ projects. In a good news story, there are some significant quality projects being undertaken around the state.

St Christopher’s Cathedral Precinct - Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB)

PB in a team headed by Cox Humphries Moss Architects, has been engaged by the Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church for the Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn to prepare a Master Plan for the St Christopher’s Cathedral precinct. The plan is designed to guide future development to accommodate new facilities catering to the future needs of the archdiocese and the community. In order to further modernise the St Christopher’s precinct a DCP was prepared by PB to resolve contradictions between the provisions of the National Capital Plan and those of the Territory Plan. The resolution of that conflict resulted in a doubling of the potential development yield for the client.

The endorsement of the DCP allowed for the submission of the development application for the project. The proposed facilities of the Master Plan include offices limited to church administration, church related facilities including a bookshop and meeting rooms and aged care housing. The St Christopher’s Cathedral precinct is a significant community facility in the life of the South Canberra community and is of heritage significance. PB proactively managed the expectations of stakeholders and the project objectives to deliver a successful outcome.

St Christopher’s Cathedral Precinct - Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB)

City of Sydney Gourmet Food Trucks (Urbs)

Urbs is currently involved in an exciting initiative by the City of Sydney’s Late Night Economy team, to trial mobile food trucks selling gourmet take away foods, located in 13 key locations around the City of Sydney LGA, including Belmore Park (Central Station), the Customs House forecourt and Sydney Park in Alexandria.

The initiative was announced by Lord Mayor Clover Moore on 23 January 2012. Clover Moore has said that, “People have been telling us it’s hard to get a restaurant quality meal in Sydney after 10pm, and they want more access to quality casual dining...mobile food trucks can help fill this role of providing high quality food at different places throughout the night”. A fleet of 10 food trucks were selected through a rigorous selection process to deliver “more quality food at all hours”. Similar mobile gourmet food trucks have been successful in many metropolitan areas of the USA, including Manhattan.

Following a successful tender bid, Urbs has been commissioned by the City of Sydney to manage the Development Approval process for the first ‘roll out’ of trading locations. Urbs’ role includes both town planning and heritage services, comprising an initial advisory stage which, working with the City, recommended specific trading zones for the trucks at the series of selected sites.

Bankstown Local Area Plans (HillPDA Land Economists, Planners and Valuers)

Hill PDA was engaged by Bankstown City Council as part of the planning team preparing the North West Local Area Plan. The plan seeks to provide for increased residential populations envisaged in the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy within Bankstown LGA through planning for medium density residential development in town centres. Markets and feasibility were analysed to ensure that proposals would be viable in terms of redeveloping existing residential lands where mainly detached housing exists. Other opportunities such as government lands and factors such as infrastructure were also considered in the context of encouraging redevelopment in and around the town centres.

Example of food trucks in L.A.
Parramatta Commercial Lands Analysis (HillPDA)

Hill PDA has been engaged by the Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority and Parramatta City Council to assess the land use options for Auto Alley in Parramatta. Pressure for increased residential development around the CBD has called into question the demand for commercial use of the precinct with potential for new apartments to meet growing demand close to transport infrastructure and employment. Economic analysis of competing land uses and trends in the automotive industry, including long term demand for employment lands, was undertaken to provide background for development of rezoning options to balance the short and long term needs of the precinct against broader strategic planning objectives for the region.

Green Square Town Centre (SJB Planning)

SJB Planning continues to build on its history of planning work for Green Square Town Centre, one of the largest urban renewal projects being undertaken in Australia. The Town Centre will be the heart of the fast growing Green Square urban renewal area, already featuring many newly constructed residential and mixed use developments.

On behalf of Proponents Landcom, Mirvac Projects Pty Ltd and Leighton Properties Pty Ltd, SJB Planning prepared a Planning Proposal for updated planning controls for approximately 40% of the Town Centre land. The Planning Proposal includes built form controls to accommodate approximately 210,000m² of floor space, including high-street retail, commercial office buildings and residential apartments, as well as public plazas, open space and a public transit corridor. The built form design work was prepared by Mirvac Design, with other architectural consultants contributing to the project included Gehl Associates Architects and Hassell.

SJB Planning, together with members of the design team, presented at a number of public and Council forums as well as negotiated the refinement of the built form and statutory planning controls with the Council.

The Planning Proposal was approved by the City of Sydney Council and the Central Sydney Planning Committee in December 2011. The Voluntary Planning Agreement which includes amongst other things a tri-generation energy system and an automated waste collection system is expected to be finalised in early 2012.

SJB Planning will continue to be involved with the preparation of DAs applications for the staged development of the Town Centre, with initial applications anticipated to be lodged during 2012.

Rhodes West Master Plan, LEP and DCP (Architectus Planners and Urban Designers)

Architectus were commended for their work on the Rhodes West Master Plan, LEP and DCP at the 2011 PIA National Urban Design Awards held in Canberra and the 2011 PIA NSW Awards for Planning Excellence.

Rhodes West is a precinct of former industrial land on the Parramatta River west of central Sydney. Architectus have provided advice to some of the major landowners at Rhodes West on a range of proposals since the late 1990’s.

After the adoption of a planning framework and approval of the major precinct remediation and development approvals the State Government handed back the area to the City of Canada Bay Council. Architectus worked with the major landowners, Council and urban designer Professor John Toon to prepare the Master Plan that also led to the preparation of a new suite of planning controls that will transform the precinct into a highly connected mixed use neighbourhood, recognisable on the Sydney skyline.

Architectus’ work involved reviewing the current DCP to bring the controls into line with current residential amenity and design quality standards, including SEPP 65. Precinct and site-specific building envelope controls for the remaining development sites were prepared in collaboration with Council’s Urban Design Consultant to provide a high degree of certainty for landowners/developers, Council and the community.

Architectus prepared a 3D REVIT model of the Rhodes West Master Plan, which was used for community consultation activities to illustrate the changes to the scale of built form and the public benefits. Public benefits to be delivered include additional public open space, enhancements to a planned community centre, local road upgrades and car share schemes.

The City of Canada Bay's General Manager, Mr Gary Sawyer thanked Architectus for their contribution to the achievement of the PIA national award, saying:

“The benefits to be created within the Rhodes community will become increasingly evident as building progresses, and will be enjoyed by current and future generations.”
Happy New Year and welcome to our first edition of BasePlan for 2012!

In this edition, you can find out more about some recent events held in Sydney, including the YP Study Tour of the Central Park development and the annual YP end of year celebration. We are also pleased to introduce Harry Quartermain, our new NSW Young Planner Committee Convenor.

As always, the Young Planners have lots in store this year and to start off we will be holding the popular PIA Student Welcomes at various NSW universities in Semester 1. Also, YPConnect is not to be missed. The event addresses what matters most to young planners. This year it will be held in Adelaide on 28 and 29 April; we look forward to the opportunity to exchange ideas, network and socialise with other likeminded young professionals! After a successful YP Planning Skills Bootcamp, held in Sydney last year, the YP Committee is in the process of organising another exciting Bootcamp to engage with NSW YPs.

Overall, it looks like a busy year and we hope to see many new faces at our upcoming events!

Central Park Site Visit
Thursday 3 November 2011
By Sebastian Tauni

On 3 November 2011 the Young Planners visited Frasers Property’s Central Park project, one of Sydney’s most exciting urban renewal sites. Located at the southern edge of the Sydney CBD, the former Kent Brewery in Chippendale is currently undergoing a dramatic transformation from a derelict industrial site into an intelligent interplay of innovative buildings and public spaces. Led around the site by Project Director, Michael Goldrick, the Young Planners were given an opportunity to learn more about some of the key issues faced by the developer during the planning process, inspect the range of stylish apartments on show in the display centre and observe works being carried out on the site. The tour concluded at a nearby pub for a well earned post-tour beer.

The NSW Young Planners would like to thank Michael Goldrick of Frasers Property for taking the time out to show us one of Sydney’s most important development projects.

YP Christmas Drinks, Paddington Bowling Club
November 2011
By Lachlan Abercrombie

The 2011 NSW PIA Young Planners Christmas Drinks were held on the 24th of November at the fine inner-city establishment, affectionately known as Paddo Bowls. The intermittent rain didn’t keep the partygoers away, nor dampen the spirits as the majority of the attendees took part in a friendly (for the most part) round robin, barefoot bowls comp.

Teams for the competition were assigned randomly, which created some lively chatter on the greens between drinks and delicious canapés. Team tactics were thrown about and consolidation strategies were devised to ensure all bowls were within walking distance of the jack.
The NSW YP committee is composed of a group of emerging professionals, usually with under 5 years of professional experience. The current committee is composed of a great cross section of students and planning professionals from both public and private sectors. This gives the organisation a fantastically broad skillset on which to draw. The YP Convenor also has an involvement with the PIA NSW Chapter; this role involves integrating the work that the Young Planners do with emerging professionals with the work that the wider organisation is doing throughout NSW to promote good planning practice. The committee meet on a monthly basis, normally in the CBD, and usually organise four big events each year.

**What are the highlights so far of being the YP Convenor and part of the committee?**

I have been filling this role of YP convenor for only a few months now, Sebastian did a fantastic job before me and has given me some big shoes to fill. There are many highlights of being involved with the YPs that have become apparent over the past months. Not least of these is the chance to build a professional network, meet and learn from other likeminded young professionals working in different planning disciplines. I work in the Environment Team at URS, this allows me to work within a very strong team, on some very exciting Projects and deal with interesting and varied planning issues. Working within a committee with experience from throughout the different fields of planning allows me to interact with other planning professionals who are approaching the same issues from a different perspective.

**What can the YP Committee offer to the young planners in NSW?**

It is a very exciting time to be involved with planning in NSW. Over the next few years, planned changes to the EP&A Act will shape the way in which plans are made and executed throughout the state. As young planners this will have an impact on the way in which we do our jobs in the future. By allowing young professionals to have a voice within PIA at state and national level through the NYPC, the YPs play an important role in helping us to shape our own professional future. Additionally, by providing a platform for constructive professional development the committee helps to build planning professionals with diverse skill sets who are well equipped to deal with the challenges of the future.

**Get ready for YPConnect in Adelaide**

By Michael Dixon

NSW National Young Planners Network

As we launch into 2012 with much vigour, now is the time to think about your professional development and what better way to enlighten your planning mind than to attend YPConnect in Adelaide from 28 to 29 April 2012!

Hosted by the PIA National Young Planners Network, YPConnect is an annual event that allows young planners, both students and graduates, to have a voice on a national scale and to participate in professional development specifically targeted at young planners.

This year the program includes a vast array of speakers covering topics on how planning can respond to our current economy, where planning is heading in the future, and how young planners can adequately perform their role as future planners and decision-makers.

The YPConnect12 Program is available at http://www.piacongress.com/ypconnect/program.html along with links to further information and registration forms.

**Upcoming Young Planners events (mark these dates in your diary!):**

We hope to see you at:

**Student Welcomes in Semester 1 to be held at various universities across NSW**

**YP Connect, Adelaide 28 to 29 April 2012**

**YP Bootcamp – date TBC**

The NSW Young Planner Committee is currently comprised of the following members:

Harry Quartermain - URS

Michael Dixon – Roads and Maritime Services

Sebastian Tauni – Department of Planning and Infrastructure

Marta Bach – Transport for NSW

Lachlan Abercrombie – Cox Architecture

Timothy Sneesby – SGS Economic and Planning

Benjamin Cebuliak - Department of Infrastructure and Transport

Justine Yates – Auburn Council

Pat Quinlan – Newcastle City Council

Red Tandog – Aurecon Group

Wil Nino – P&P Projects

Christina Livers – Hill PDA

Rebecca Lockart – Marrickville Council

Gary Cheung

Mathew Quattroville
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Up north

The SMH has reported that a new campus is to be built in Port Macquarie by a consortium, comprising the University of Newcastle, the University of New England, and North Coast TAFE, reportedly to deliver on a commitment of NSW Premier Barry O’Farrell taken from the Prime Minister, Julia Gillard, in return for his support for Labor forming government last September. Under the $30 million expansion, the university is also able to complete an entire medical degree in four years from 2014.

Down south and the Illawarra

Plans for a $500 million gas-fired power station in the Southern Tableland near Bathurst have been submitted to the New South Wales Department of Planning, according to the ABC. Snowy Hydro has prepared a preliminary environmental assessment for the 200-megawatt station, pipeline and electricity transmission line from Bathurst, north of Goulburn. No timeline or predictions of potential job creation have been developed at this stage.

Goulburn Airport is also likely to see further expansion reports SMH with the plans to build more offices and another hangar increasing the area of operations by two and a half times. The airport developers are also looking to capitalise on its transit and freight and passenger development in Sydney areas.

Inland

A provisional decision for the Hunter Environment Levy has been announced by the Land and Environment Court. The ruling that the $100 coal mine sector would have to pay to offset some of its greenhouse emissions as a condition of operation, an outcome the SMH reports is a landmark decision. Morton Rosenthal QC, the judge, is quoted as saying that the decision has the potential to broaden the range of conditions approval which may be imposed by the minister or the court under the EP&A Act in relation to new or modified development proposals.

Central Coast and the Hunter

More than a year after developer GPT pulled the plug on its massive Newcastle redevelopment plan, the ABC has been told it is considering a smaller development in partnership with another stakeholder, GPT scrawling cash for its $600 million CBD development as the Newmarket motorway failed to cut the retail line at all time.

The controversial $1.5 billion project to build Hunters New City, the first new town in the Hunter in 50 years, on track according to the SMH, after the developer won a major court approval. An overturning a previous decision. The Huntline development has a two to three year(JSONObjectValue) with the intention to build mixed-use buildings and shopping centres. The Minister has acknowledged that the strategy has some risks and a committee of government department heads chaired by the director-general of the Premier’s Department has been established to find suitable sites, SMH has reported that agencies such as Sydney Water may be required to replot private capital assets. Developers may need to build infrastructure themselves, to meet the rezoning rules. The local council is likely to be affected were concerned about the implications of new housing without jobs, The New East, of big, new housing estates is over, according to the NSW Housing Minister with the government announcing they will now pursu new public-private partnerships to include a mix of public and private housing. The trend towards diversifying tenure on housing estates is growing around the world and has begun under the current government.

The Local Government Minister Don Page recently announced that councils now have to make the many millions in dollars in interest subsidies offered by the NSW Government under the Local Infrastructure Renewal Scheme, which will help big businesses. The Scheme provides interest subsidies to councils to help cover borrowing costs on the loans required to fix the infrastructure backlog, with the government paying the first 4% of the interest on the loan.

State-wide and National

Research commissioned by the South Australian government has found that sight that 10 people have taller never heard of the state government’s 30 year urban development plan for greater Adelaide or know little of its details. The plan promotes increased high-density living, particularly in the city centre and inner-city islands, urban sprawl and carbon-emission growth which cater for an estimated population growth of 500,000. However, Planning Minister John Rau has told The Advertiser that the suggestion was well understood by councils, industry and residents.

Australia has lost twice as much farmland to urban sprawl than to foreign buyers, according to a report. 89 million hectares in a generation, housing subsidies, national parks, forest plantations and logging issues consumed 18 per cent of Australia’s agricultural land in 1994, according to an Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics and Sciences study on the extent of foreign investment in agriculture.

The Australian reports that the statistics show how planning dilemmas are having more impact on food security than changing the “farm” to foreigners. They have already doubled their stake in Australian farms, however the area of land owned or part-owned by foreigners grew by 16.5m ha – less than a fifth of what has been lost to housing, mining and conservation. Queensland registered the first state to quarantine farmland when it pushed through laws to come into force at the end of January, restricting development or mining in strategic cropping land and wetlands designated as “sensitive areas”.

Winemakers in the Swan Valley area are concerned that an inquiry into the Swan Valley Planning Act which protects the area could see small blocks of wineries being rounded which would shrink block sizes and impact on the viability of their vines according to the Sunday Times. Winemakers are also concerned increased density standards to be imposed by the Act would have a negative impact on their production. The Mayor, and the WA Planning Minister disagree, but may have to wait and see until results are released in March.

Every federal referendum since 1977 has been defeated. But Australians may face a new federal referendum as soon as next year reports the SMH, following the release of a report from a federal panel led by the former NSW chief justice Jim Spigelman on a topic that has been lurking in the public mind for decades – referendums about the constitution to formally recognise local government.

And if you ask what bring it up again, well apparently it’s all about money. Ever since a High Court case last year an emerging Rudd government’s $1000 tax cut, there has been a legal question mark hanging over the government’s power to grant money directly to local government, instead of funneling it through the states. Councils argue their responsibilities now extend beyond roads, rates and rubbish and in 2010 the sector was 12 billion on nationally. Commonwealth funding is typically general in purpose, with no contractual ties as so what it can be spent.

The panel has acknowledged that a widespread public education program would be necessary first and the federal government would need to gain the co-operation of the states of any referendum on the topic would be dooned.

Late last year Urban Analyst reported that the Victorian government has announced a $2.8 million in funding for a council Planning Flying Squad of planning position millenial regional and rural councils by providing short-term minded and assistance to ease the backlog of planning cases. The Flying Squad would provide short-term staffing as well as access to local consultants being the role for the specific needs and workload of each council.

The government that newspaper advertisements will appear shortly inviting expressions of interest from suitably qualified and experienced consultants to deliver expert planning advice.

International

Do you thought you tried never heard? A recent report in the Wall Street Journal on the New York City Zoning Resolution was the zoning in middle age is hot, the cougar of urban residential devices, more flexible and dynamic than ever? The Planning Commission has reportedly moved from zoning that is dealing with negative social issues to a positive approach, mainly targeting food markets in low-income neighborhoods in the new york’s mom-and-pop stores and establishing bike lanes.

The trend has been to move zoning away from shaping big buildings to using it to shape how buildings and places are used towards diversifying tenure on housing estates, with some sites posing significant risks to human and environment health. Whilst there are now stricter measures in place to prevent this from happening in the future, there is considerable potential for developers to find the funding to address the existing backlog.

In late November 2011 the Murray-Darling Basin Draft Plan was made by big basin Alliance, public comment over a extensive 20 week period of discussion and listening with commenters across the basin. The report and supporting documents are available on the web and are “the next step in the ongoing journey of water reform and builds on a load of good work that has already been done” according to the Authority Chair, Craig Knowles.

Comprehensive Government has recently released draft Environmental Offsets Policy to determine the process for applying on and offsets when and if adopted. The draft policy will be used in the assessment of actions likely to have a significant impact on matters of national environmental significance under Part 9 of the EPBC Act. Offsets will be considered at the assessment stage but not the referral stage.

What’s happening in Macquarie

The Local Government Minister Don Page recently announced that councils now have to make the many millions in dollars in interest subsidies offered by the NSW Government under the Local Infrastructure Renewal Scheme, which will help big businesses. The Scheme provides interest subsidies to councils to help cover borrowing costs on the loans required to fix the infrastructure backlog, with the government paying the first 4% of the interest on the loan.

The SMH has reported that transport planners are considering a smaller project in the City in Central Coast and the Hunter.

What’s happening in Macquarie

The Local Government Minister Don Page recently announced that councils now have to make the many millions in dollars in interest subsidies offered by the NSW Government under the Local Infrastructure Renewal Scheme, which will help big businesses. The Scheme provides interest subsidies to councils to help cover borrowing costs on the loans required to fix the infrastructure backlog, with the government paying the first 4% of the interest on the loan.

The SMH has reported that transport planners are considering a smaller project in the City in Central Coast and the Hunter.
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