

Building a Better Planning System

for Department for Planning and Infrastructure

Submitted by the Urban Development Institute of Australia (WA)



UDIA (WA)
Level 5, 150 St George's Terrace
Perth WA 6000

May 2009

Overview

The Urban Development Institute of Australia (WA Division) is the key representative body of the land development industry in Western Australia. This document states the views of the Institute in response to Consultation Paper of the *Building a Better Planning System* document published by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure in May 2009.

Key Performance Indicators

Whilst it is recognised that all stakeholders will have their own criteria for success, key performance indicators of this reform process from industry's perspective will be measured in terms of savings in **time** and **cost**. Without marked improvement in those areas the reform agenda will have failed to make a fundamental difference.

UDIA Support

UDIA recognises that industry has a role to play in the reform agenda and has highlighted our commitment to making the proposed changes a reality.

Reform of the Planning System

Wholesale reform of the planning system relies on the Western Australian Planning Commission:

- Defining its role
- Setting priorities
- Being funded appropriately

It is imperative that WAPC provide the leadership to ensure reform is genuine and significant to effect real change to the planning system.

There needs to be a whole of government approach across all agencies involved in the planning and approvals processes and, as such, this review is just part of the solution.

In order to achieve tangible planning reform, the WAPC must assume the mantle as the lead agency that sets the strategic direction of the state with the State Planning Strategy and the State Infrastructure Strategy underpinned by high level research and policy, WAPC's focus has to be on matters of regional significance such as activity centres, major transport corridors, key employment locations and the protection of environmental assets of city-wide, state and national significance. It is vital that WAPC plays a proactive brokering role to achieve growth management objectives for the various growth corridors and regional centres. It is UDIA's view that the centralised system, based on WAPC, has the capacity to work if the structures supporting it are reworked.



Strategic planning must become a priority for government. The complex competing issues of environmental preservation, water management, the provision of major infrastructure, the location of transport corridors and land uses must be resolved collectively ahead of the development industry moving into an area to provide certainty in long-term planning and development. This is critical to the housing and land development industry.

It was pleasing to note in the State Budget that the Commission intends to design "*a national best practice strategic and statutory land use development and planning framework for Western Australia*" to ensure the "*best possible social, environmental and economic outcomes for the state.*" Within the tightly constrained government resources that are also apparent in the State Budget it will be essential that the Commission works closely with the industry to identify development principles, particularly in regional areas. Developers can then rise to the challenge of meeting these principles rather than having a "yes/no" demarcation in a spatial plan or growth plan based on current officer knowledge. Innovation must be encouraged to address constraints.

Strengthening the role of the Infrastructure Coordinating Committee is fundamental to cross agency engagement and commitment to an integrated planning system.

UDIA fully supports the strategic role of WAPC however WAPC and the Department for Planning and Infrastructure need a clear statement of duties and responsibilities and must be adequately resourced to perform high order functions to ensure optimal decision making to benefit the future economic development of the state.

A whole of Government approach must be taken to Sustainability Assessment to provide a balanced outcome that takes into consideration environmental, social and economic factors.

UDIA strongly supports the reform agenda that is contained in the Building a Better Planning System consultation paper and looks forward to working with Government on ensuring that it is implemented effectively.

Strategic Priorities Action Plan

Methodology for this submission

It is recognised that it is not possible for the government to take concurrent action on all items identified in the *Building a Better Planning System* Consultation Paper. This submission has been developed to provide specific advice to the Department of Planning on the high priority areas where action should commence immediately.

To develop this advice UDIA facilitated a meeting with members where all of the proposed reform items were discussed and placed within a matrix of high, medium, low priority and short, medium, long timeframe.

Items were then grouped into “related” actions which can effectively be progressed concurrently or are inter-related.

Medium and Low priorities have been included in Appendix 1. They should not be regarded as unimportant; they are simply not as high a priority as those in the main document. Not all items identified in the *Building a Better Planning System* Consultation Paper were regarded as part of the reform agenda and, whilst supported, were not included in this submission. They are identified in Appendix 2.

Areas of Planning Reform

As mentioned above, UDIA identified areas for action. These task based groupings are simply to bring related items together not to replace the strategic priorities identified in *Building a Better Planning System*. The groupings are as follows:

- Integrated coordination of infrastructure and land use planning
- Improve environmental/planning coordination
- Streamline the administrations of schemes/structure plans
- Streamline development approvals and subdivision approvals
- Create a major projects pathway
- Policy Review

This submission focuses on these areas of reform and proposes the actions required to effect change according to priority and timeframe.

Timeframes

The intent is that reform would begin on all priority actions; the timeframes reflect the length of time the task may take to achieve satisfactory completion. Timeframes are classified as:

- Short – action can be achieved within 6 months as the task is relatively simple or has already commenced
- Medium – action can be achieved within 12 months
- Long – will take more than 12 months to achieve due to the complexity of the task

Priority Actions

Integrated co-ordination of infrastructure and land use planning

Short timeframe actions – substantial action can be achieved within 6 months

4.1	The development of State Infrastructure Strategy to identify and coordinate government infrastructure expenditure priorities
4.3	The development of a more comprehensive and reliable information land management program through the replacement of the Metropolitan Development Program with the Urban Development Program.
5.2	Prepare and regularly review growth management strategies for the metropolitan growth corridors and Peel Region
6.8	Institutional change to strengthen and focus the functional approach to planning and infrastructure coordination

Specific Industry Supporting Action

UDIA will support DPI/WAPC in these endeavours through the:

- Provision of data collected routinely by UDIA and, by agreement, additional data;
- Supporting and facilitating the participation of industry in data gathering to inform the Urban Development Program; and
- Promoting the need for a strengthened ICC to relevant ministers and government agencies.
- Provision of expert advice and participation on committees to support the ICC and to provide detailed information and feedback from industry to ensure the infrastructure planning and its provision is best suited for the whole community.

Key Issues for WAPC/DPI

UDIA recognises that infrastructure coordination is one of the biggest challenges for government. It is contingent on WAPC, through a refocused Infrastructure Coordinating Committee (ICC), to provide the leadership to move towards a clearer understanding of where future urban development will occur, the level of service required for the projected growth and the timelines for provision of infrastructure.

Consideration should also be given to the imposition of statutory obligations on the Commission to review and update growth management strategies on a regular basis to ensure growth strategies are reflective of current social, economic and environmental conditions.

Background Comments

The orderly supply of urban land relies on an integrated approach to infrastructure and land use planning to achieve the best possible outcomes for urban development. A key and ongoing issue for the development industry is the lack of coordination between service agencies such as Main Roads, Western Power and the Water Corporation. While a State Infrastructure Strategy is a useful long term document, what is required is for the WAPC through the ICC to actively plan for infrastructure in growth management strategies, inclusive of infrastructure priorities and programs and to actively solve delivery issues based on strategic planning priorities.

Strategic planning that underpins coordinated infrastructure provision has been neglected for the past decade and the government must allocate sufficient resources to ensure that this planning backlog is addressed.

To achieve this the proposed Urban Development Program and growth management strategies must be adequately funded and resourced. In the South West Region there is an immediate need for an Infrastructure Strategy that allows the region to fully respond to an increasing demand from industry and the community for services and housing. Bunbury, Busselton and Mandurah are in the top 20 growth areas nationally yet growth is occurring without an overarching strategy to guide development. Outstanding work in this area must be finalised expeditiously.

An effective State Infrastructure Strategy, as proposed in the reforms, must be supported by adequate funding to allow infrastructure providers to meet market demand in a timely manner, particularly in periods of high demand. It is essential that the Department of Treasury and Finance has an active role in this area of reform. The benefit of this reform is that effective infrastructure coordination will ensure maximisation of investment return to the state in terms of community development.

Improve environmental and land use planning coordination

Short timeframe actions – substantial action can be achieved within 6 months

- | | |
|-----|--|
| 6.9 | In conjunction with the DEC and EPA, negotiate a path for the integrated assessment of land release areas with the Commonwealth government under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 |
|-----|--|

Long timeframe actions – will take more than 12 months to achieve

- | | |
|-----|--|
| 2.5 | Integrate State planning and environmental approvals and approvals processes |
| 6.5 | Review of the dual planning approvals system, requiring both planning and environmental approvals for development applications |

Specific Industry Supporting Action

UDIA will support DPI/WAPC in these endeavours by:

- Promoting to Ministers the need for DPI/DEC/DEWHA to work together to achieve an integrated assessment model which is appropriately funded and resourced;
- Providing industry feedback and support in the development of policies and implementation strategies; and
- Promoting a whole of government consideration of the interface between environment and planning to achieve sustainable outcomes.

Key Issues for WAPC/DPI

Key tasks are to review the dual planning approvals system which requires both planning and environmental approvals and to negotiate a path for the integrated assessment of land release areas with the Commonwealth government. For both of these actions DPI/WAPC only has partial control over the outcomes. It is essential that the cross agency coordination and leadership issues are not allowed to overwhelm this key area of reform. A priority of the new Chairman of the WAPC should be to work with the Chairman of the EPA to develop appropriate and workable outcomes that provides for surety of outcomes and timeliness in the decision making process.

Background Comments

The hierarchy of environmental and planning legislation is out of balance with the Federal Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (EPBC Act) overriding all state based planning and environmental considerations and the state *Environmental Protection Act* taking precedence over the *Planning and Development Act 2005*. Whilst good environmental outcomes are critically important it is essential that the three tiers of government come together to focus on truly sustainable outcomes so that urban development achieves a balance of environmental, community and economic outcomes.



UDIA is supporting discussions between DPI, the Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) and the Federal Department of Water, Environment, Heritage and the Arts (DEWHA) to undertake strategic assessment of designated future urban growth areas in the Perth metropolitan area with the aim of better integration of Federal and State environmental approvals processes. High growth areas in the regions, particularly in the South West of the state, are also under pressure from delayed decision making resulting from duplicated processes and the overlay of the EPBC Act and these areas must also be subject to strategic assessment to achieve more sustainable outcomes.

This review should give due consideration to the practice of tying Federal strategic assessment to growth management plans as was done in New South Wales and is being implemented in Victoria. It is, however, recognized that there is a significant difference between the environmental significance of sites in NSW and Victoria when compared to those in the SW of Western Australia, including the Swan Coastal Plain.

Interaction of agencies is critical to the strategic planning of sites for essential infrastructure, for example waste water treatment plants, which must be identified and environmental assessments of these sites prepared well in advance of rezoning applications. In this way, the sites are secured and support the strategic urban planning process by being fully integrated with the provision of other essential infrastructure that underpins sustainable urban development. Successful outcomes rely on ongoing interagency coordination and communication.

The recent review of the Environmental Impact Assessment process (EIA) by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) is consistent with the broader planning reform agenda of which this consultation forms part; however the work around parallel processing of approvals is not yet complete. The primacy of the environment over the social and economic features of a proposal is an ongoing frustration for industry which must be addressed by Government through the establishment of a **balanced sustainability review process**. While action 2.5 is identified above as a long term action, it would be advisable to expedite an agreed framework for dealing with natural resource management and environmental policies pursuant to structure plans to achieve balanced and timely approvals.

Streamline the administration of schemes / structure plans

Short timeframe actions -- substantial action can be achieved within 6 months

2.2	WAPC to gazette schemes and amendments at final approval
4.4	Completion of a whole of State policy on developer contributions in which local governments are able to partner private developers for the provision of social and community infrastructure
6.1	Implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the WAPC and the DPI will clarify the roles of the WAPC and the agency
6.3	Increase the transparency of decisions made by the WAPC via web-based publication of decisions
1.11	Simplify and streamline structure plan layers and requirements
1.12	Avoid dual approvals for structure plans

Long timeframe actions

2.10	Initiation of local planning scheme amendments
------	--

Specific Industry Supporting Action

UDIA will support DPI/WAPC in these endeavours by:

- Assisting with the implementation of the state policy on developer contributions in cooperation with WALGA and the Department for Local Government and Regional Development.
- Providing expert industry input into the simplification and streamlining of structure plan layers and requirements.

Key Issues for WAPC/DPI

Whilst all of these actions require an allocation of time and resources, several are primarily about WAPC decision making such as increasing the transparency of decisions made by the WAPC via web-based publication of decisions. We suggest early inclusion of these items on the WAPC agenda so that action can be taken.

Background Comments

Simplifying and streamlining structure planning and avoiding dual approvals for structure plans are key priorities for industry. Feedback from UDIA members indicated that about 70% of delays and problems occur at structure planning stage of development and issues include the lack of timelines and the lack of control of the ever increasing level of detail required to get an approval for what is essentially a concept plan. The consideration and resolution of strategic issues early in the development process is imperative while detailed design issues are considered at the later subdivision or development phase.

The UDIA is aware of, and strongly supports, work being undertaken by DPI to amend to the *Town Planning Regulations 1967* and the Model Scheme Text. It also strongly supports the inclusion of new legislation provisions which will regulate the requirement for, and approval of, structure plans. The use of legislation will ensure a consistent state wide approach to the process of preparing structure plans.

The lack of statutory timeframes and appeals mechanisms associated with some structure plan provisions, and the lack of imperatives for agencies to participate in the assessment of structure plans initiated by a developer, is a major concern. There is an urgent need for standard provisions governing the form, content, and procedures for the preparation and approval of structure plans through either an SPP or regulations. A consultative process involving the development industry and other stakeholders must be established.

The Minister also needs powers to initiate rezoning for matters of state or regional interest or where a local government is unreasonably withholding a rezoning request.

Delays and uncertainty can often arise because local planning schemes are out of date. Local planning schemes are required to be reviewed and updated every five years. In practice, scheme reviews rarely commence within the five year period and often take more than five years to complete. Part of the problem is that schemes have become too complex. There is a need to simplify the form and content of local planning schemes and to provide greater flexibility. This would assist the scheme review process and minimise the need for scheme amendments.

Approval processes will be improved by introducing joint rather than sequential assessment of subdivision and local structure planning proposals which would be subject to scheme amendments (region and local) being undertaken consistent with district structure plans and development concepts. Timelines and consistent procedures must be put in place for the assessment of structure plans by government agencies and Local Government and assurance that policy responses from each are consistent for subsequent and more detailed proposals for the same development project or area.

UDIA also strongly supports finalisation of the draft SPP 3.6 on Developer Contributions for Infrastructure to preclude the need for local authorities to introduce interim arrangements. Implementation of this policy will result in improved transparency and consistency across Western Australia on how developer contributions are applied and funded. UDIA is working with WALGA and the Department for Local Government and Regional Development on the effective implementation of this policy including peer review and professional development for Council officers/elected members.

Finally, consideration should be given to the application of uniform nomenclature for structure plan titles as there is a disparity between local governments with regard to the naming of structure plans i.e. Local Structure Plan, Agreed Structure Plan, Outline Development Plan, Community Development Plan, Local Subdivision and Infrastructure Plan etc.

Streamline development approvals and subdivision approvals

Short timeframe actions -- substantial action can be achieved within 6 months

1.1	Extend the short track subdivision system
1.2	Simplify approvals for multi-unit housing
1.3	Provide greater clarity regarding subdivision engineering conditions
1.4	Monitor and enforce referrals and response times
1.5	Reduce and simplify model subdivision conditions
1.14	Ensure majority of single houses are planning approval exempt

Specific Industry Supporting Action

UDIA will support DPI/WAPC in these endeavours through the:

- Provision of expert advice and participation on committees such as the Multi-Unit Housing Code Reference Group and the IPWEA Subdivision Guidelines Reference Group
- Proactive provision of feedback on issues such as the streamlining of model subdivision conditions.

Key Issues for WAPC/DPI

The key issue for most of these initiatives is that DPI/WAPC will need to take a risk management approach to decision making and the challenge will be for all officers, not just senior staff, to take on board risk management approaches that provides for a balance between desired outcomes, timeliness and an open and accountable decision making process. There will also be challenges in enforcing referral response times unless the Commission is willing to move through the approval process based on there being *sufficient information* to make a decision rather than waiting for feed back from all referral agencies.

Background Comments

This is the detailed end of the approvals system but it is has been overwhelmed in recent years by the number of agencies involved and the reluctance of WAPC to enforce legislated timelines. The *Planning and Development Act 2005* requires subdivision applications to be determined within 90 days and the WAPC measures performance against this 90 day timeframe. WAPC performance statistics for 2006/07 indicate they achieved this statutory timeframe for determination of preliminary subdivision, strata and development applications 60% - 70% of the time. These figures do not differentiate between the scale of subdivisions nor delays resulting from “stop the clock” mechanisms.



UDIA is hopeful that this review will result in changes to the current protocol and to improving the determination rate.

We are aware that the majority of the high priority actions identified in this section are currently under review by DPI. It is our view that short track subdivision referrals should be extended to all local authorities and include subdivision applications which are consistent with an adopted structure plan. UDIA fully supports the monitoring and enforcement of the 42 day response period after which time agency responses should be deemed as raising no objections.

In relation to the review of the IPWEA guidelines (action 1.3), UDIA encourages DPI to release and pilot the guidelines as soon as practicable for a six months trial with review at the end of that period. Whilst the guidelines are not regarded at this time as an appropriate minimum standard, practical application is one of the most efficient ways to assess content, errors and omissions. This was the successful approach used recently for the Western Power UDS Manual. Once the guidelines are accepted by local government and industry, DPI must mandate their adoption to ensure standardization across local authorities. A joint industry/government monitoring panel should be established during the trial to regularly monitor the outcomes and recommend any changes to the guidelines to overcome any unforeseen issues.

UDIA has also been working internally on developing model conditions for subdivision which are streamlined, easily understood by proponents, are consistent, and against which compliance can be readily measured. UDIA looks forward to working with the government on reviewing the model conditions to improve this aspect of the approvals system.

Major projects pathway

Long timeframe actions

1.18	Development Assessment Panels
3.2	Call in powers for major land and housing projects of State and regional significance
3.3	Consider options for the management of major land and housing projects across Western Australia

Specific Industry Supporting Action

UDIA will support DPI/WAPC in these endeavours through by:

- Being a strong voice of support for the implementation of Development Assessment Panels (DAPs) and call in powers for the Minister for Planning.
- Providing expert industry input into the development appropriate legislation to support these changes.

Key Issues for WAPC/DPI

The actions identified in this section will take significant resources to achieve as they involve considerable legislative review. UDIA strongly urges DPI/WAPC to consider legislation used in other states which can be customized and “bolted on” to the existing Western Australian legislation to expedite this process.

Background Comments

UDIA advocates creating a major projects pathway to facilitate the approval of projects of state significance to reduce the cost of delays. This includes the creation of DAPs¹ and call in powers for the Minister. At the moment all applications are treated the same in a policy sense.

Whilst DAPs have been included under the “Major Projects Pathway” they have an essential role to play in urban development as they enable development, which is in the best interests of the broader community, to be progressed expeditiously. Where DAPs have an advisory function only they may not require the participation of elected officials, however if they were to be decision making bodies DAPs would require the participation of elected officials.

DAPs could be a vehicle for overcoming the enormously problematic issues of urban redevelopment where the lack of certainty precludes all but the most exclusive developments where a rate of return, relevant to the risk involved, can be achieved. Affordable infill development under the current

¹ As the acronym DAP (Detailed Area Plan) is already in use in the Planning system, UDIA suggests these panels be named Planning Assessment Panels. It also opens the door for assessment panels to determine subdivisions and structure plans.



arrangements of Local Government approval is regarded by industry as virtually impossible. DAPs can also play a role for greenfields development where coordination of state agencies is required.

The criteria for determining the types of applications that should be referred to Development Assessment Panels will need to be developed by the Commission and discussed with the development industry and other key stakeholders prior to implementing.

Industry advocates the introduction of an industry accreditation scheme to underpin a fast track approvals process for conditional approval of applications. Certified practitioners would move through the system quickly and their work would be subject to auditing to ensure the requisite standards are met and maintained.

Policies

Long timeframe actions

2.12	Provide mechanisms for the statutory implementation of strategic policies
2.6	Reduce policy complexity
4.7	Review the development and processes of State Planning Policies and operational policies to determine their effectiveness in delivering and supporting the government's strategic priorities

Specific Industry Supporting Action

UDIA will support DPI/WAPC in these endeavours through:

- Participation on review committees and providing expert feedback from members
- Drawing policy conflicts and gaps to the attention of DPI/WAPC

Key Issues for WAPC/DPI

The UDIA strongly supports these major initiatives but believes that they may not be achievable without on-going and specific funding and resources.

Inconsistencies between local government policies and between state and local government policies is a matter of major concern which could, in part, be addressed by standard regulations governing the form, content and procedures for the adoption of local planning policies.

Background Comments

A rigorous and effective policy framework is essential however the policy framework for development has become extremely complex and the process of compliance is a now a major issue for the industry. Policies appear to have been introduced across government agencies with little regard to their overall impact including delays and costs, or indeed, existing requirements. It is essential that government policies are assessed for their overall benefit which takes into consideration impacts on housing affordability, sustainability outcomes as well as recognition of existing government policies. The process used in regulatory impact statements should be considered although in most cases it would need to be in a simpler form for it to be practical for assessment of policies.

In some instances new requirements are emerging with no policy to support implementation. For example, developers are currently expected to "climate-proof" developments without any overarching government policy of guidance. There is an urgent need for the government to develop a strategic response and state policy to address climate change and not allow "requirement creep" without clear guidance.

Whilst the timeframe has been assigned as "long" work should commence on this as a priority to at least ensure that any new policies are not exacerbating the problem.

Appendix 1
Overview of Strategic Priorities for UDIA

Strategy	Priority	Timeline
1.1 Subdivision system	high	short
1.11 Simplify and streamline structure plan layers and requirements	high	short
1.12 Avoid dual approvals for structure plans	high	short
1.13 Track and monitor structure plans	low	short
1.14 Ensure majority of single houses are planning approval exempt	high	short
1.15 Ensure appropriate information is provided with applications	medium	short
1.16 Simplify and streamline public works approvals	medium	short
1.17 Abolish dual approvals for development	medium	medium
1.18 Development Assessment Panels	high	long
1.19 Development decisions tracked and reported	medium	medium
1.2 Simplify approvals for multi-unit housing	high	short
1.3 Provide greater clarity regarding subdivision engineering conditions	high	short
1.4 Monitor and enforce referrals and response times	high	short
1.5 Reduce and simplify model subdivision conditions	high	short
1.6 Delegate most built strata subdivision applications to local government	medium	short
1.8 Adopt a risk-based approach to development assessment	medium	long
1.9 Adopt a risk-based approach to subdivision assessment	medium	long
2.1 Rewrite the Model Scheme Text based on Development Assessment Forum principles	low	long
2.10 Initiation of local planning scheme amendments	high	long
2.11 Consider reducing amendment consultation timeframes	low	medium
2.12 Provide mechanisms for the statutory implementation of strategic policies	high	medium
2.2 WAPC to gazette schemes and amendments at final approval	high	short

Strategy	Priority	Timeline
2.3 Regulatory gateway process for new planning legislation, including regulatory impact assessment statements	low	long
2.5 Integrate State planning and environmental approvals and approvals processes	high	long
2.6 Reduce policy complexity	high	medium
2.7 Extend the scope of minor amendments under the region schemes	low	short
2.8 Model Scheme Text for region schemes	low	long
2.9 Underpin planning by supporting preparation of timely and simplified local planning strategies	medium	long
3.2 Call in powers for major land and housing projects of State and regional significance	high	long
3.3 Consider options for the management of major land and housing projects across Western Australia	high	long
4.1 The development of State Infrastructure Strategy to identify and coordinate government infrastructure expenditure priorities	high	short
4.3 The development of a more comprehensive and reliable information land management program through the replacement of the Metropolitan Development Program with the Urban Development Program.	high	short
4.4 Completion of a whole of State policy on developer contributions in which local governments are able to partner private developers for the provision of social and community infrastructure	high	short
4.5 Preparation of a State Development Plan to give a spatial context to the State Infrastructure Strategy and prioritize regional planning needs	medium	long
4.6 Provision of adequate and reliable funding sources for strategic land acquisitions in regional schemes to enable future infrastructure development	low	long

Strategy	Priority	Timeline
4.7 Review the development and processes of State Planning Policies and operational policies to determine their effectiveness in delivering and supporting the government's strategic priorities	high	medium
4.8 Develop a strategic response to climate change as part of the State Infrastructure Strategy	medium	long
5.1 Develop regional planning on high growth regions of State importance	medium	long
5.2 Prepare and regularly review growth management strategies for the metropolitan growth corridors and Peel Region	high	short
5.3 Develop a strategic vision and plan for Perth	medium	long
5.4 Target smaller regional centres under pressure	medium	long
5.5 Develop a strategic vision and plan for the State	low	long
6.1 Implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the WAPC and the DPI will clarify the roles of the WAPC and the agency	high	short
6.2 Development and complementation of a new governance framework for the management of regional schemes, including regional planning committees and delegated authority, is underway	medium	long
6.3 Increase the transparency of decisions made by the WAPC via web-based publication of decisions	high	short
6.5 Review of the dual planning approvals system, requiring both planning and environmental approvals for development applications	high	long
6.6 Investigate and review the effectiveness of existing disputes resolution mechanism through the State Administrative Tribunal		
6.7 Undertake a formal review of the statutory and other supporting committees of the WAPC to determine their effectiveness	medium	medium
6.8 Institutional change to strengthen and focus the functional approach to planning and infrastructure coordination	high	short
6.9 In conjunction with the DEC and EPA, negotiate a path for the integrated assessment of land release areas with the Commonwealth government under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999	high	short

Appendix 2

Items not prioritized by the development industry

1.7 Fast track public housing works on zoned land
2.4 Restrict pre-selling of lots
3.1 Establishment of an industry advisory group on the approvals processes for major resource development projects. Transfer of the Office of Development Approvals Coordination to the Department of State Development.
4.2 An effective process to ensure that the State is able to maximize its share of major infrastructure projects that attract Commonwealth funding.
6.4 Establishment of a joint training program for elected members of local governments in partnership with the Western Australian Local Government Association and local governments on the planning system processes
6.6 Investigate and review the effectiveness of existing disputes resolution mechanism through the State Administrative Tribunal