

**Notes of Planning Review Meeting with
Council of Social Services of NSW**
Bridge Conference Room, 23-33 Bridge Street Sydney
Tuesday, 16th August 2011

Attended by:

Warren Gardiner, Senior Policy Officer,
NCOSS

Adam Farrar, Executive Director, NSW
Federation of Housing Associations

Sarah Fogg, Senior Policy Manager, The
Benevolent Society

Craig Johnston, Principal Policy Officer,
Shelter NSW

Planning System Review

Tim Moore, Co-Chair

Ron Dyer, Co-Chair

Lia Saunders, Planning Review Manager

Rosemary Bullmore, Department of Planning
and Infrastructure (Notes)

Tim Moore & Ron Dyer (Planning System Review)

- Brief overview of process
 - NSW-wide consultation to meet with key groups and community members,
 - The web site will publish notes of all meetings to ensure maximum transparency of review process
 - All written material submitted to the Review Panel will be published on the website
 - The only outcome instruction that has been given to us is that the Minister requires our outcomes to maximise the use of information technology capabilities
- General timelines
 - A listening and scoping of key principles and objectives for system will be undertaken from now until mid-November 2011. Submissions for this first stage will be accepted until 4 November 2011.
 - A discussion paper outlining identified issues & tensions within the system will be put on exhibition in the first week of December 2011 for public comment until 17 February 2012.
 - A green paper will be submitted to the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure before the end of April 2012.

Overview of discussion points:

- Greater need for consideration of social and health impacts of proposed development eg increased costs of rental housing when a mine is opened in a country town
- Need to create a system that facilitates the development of social housing projects including affordable housing, group homes and accessible housing for seniors
- Council 'social plans' have no weight when making planning decisions
- *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* saw the environment given greater status in the planning system. New act should give similar status to social inclusion as a central focus of the planning system
- System needs to strike an effective balance at local level eg some social housing is determined on the basis of who will be living in the development rather than the planning impacts of the development
- Planning system should capture the windfall gains of development and use that funding for the broader public benefit
- Planning system must address the needs of an aging population with adaptability and responsiveness
- Request for strong commitment to affordable housing via enabling provisions. Targets needed to be established. SA model is good
- Consideration should be given to the distance people travel between home & work and the social costs of that travel

- Strategic plans should be more enforceable at the local level
- Need to balance interests of people who want to develop against the interests of people who do not want to develop
- Recognise the need for “smart growth” that provides dwellings and also protects the amenity of neighbourhoods
- Proper strategic planning is important at all levels – state and local. Linkage needs to be established between planning and other policy instruments such as social strategic plans. It is often the latter that picks up on social issues
- Consideration of location of social housing relative to services and transport
- Allow for greater flexibility in built form of residential dwellings to allow for a range of residential uses
- Need for high profile leadership from state government on built form and accessibility
- Development for the purpose of a boarding house is contentious issue and will be dealt with differently from one local government area to another
- Need for transparency in decision making
- Need for leadership from state government sending the message that there is public benefit in providing social housing
- Affordable rental housing SEPP is working well
- Infrastructure that would have been previously been funded by taxes is being funded by infrastructure contributions which unfairly burden purchasers of new dwellings
- Infrastructure contributions should not be levied to provide infrastructure that will have intergenerational benefits
- Total lack of transparency re S94 contributions. Need for clarity about financing of community infrastructure
- S94 is a tax rather than a usage charge. Rate pegging has an impact.
- The principle that infrastructure that has intergenerational benefits should be financed though intergeneration funds must be balanced against the need to provide social facilities in new development areas
- New system must contain a commitment to provide affordable housing