

**Notes of Planning Review Meeting with
Housing Industry Association
Bridge Conference Room, 23-33 Bridge Street Sydney
Wednesday, 10th August 2011**

Attended by:

Housing Industry Association

David Bare, Executive Director NSW

Kristin Brookfield, Senior Executive Director,
Building Development & the Environment

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, please see the website for details of dates and locations
 - The web site will publish notes of all meetings to ensure maximum transparency in the process of the review
 - 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:

- Need to provide certainty in the system, which has been in a state of constant flux for many years.
- Consumer confidence very low
- Some elements of the present system work well and should be kept
- Need to include small scale subdivision as complying development
- System of rezoning and land supply is overly complex
- Review should address how to balance the competing interests operating in the planning system
- Introduce a method of appealing decisions and refusals to rezone land in the context of major metropolitan planning
- Need to meet demand for new housing
- Expand codified systems of approving new development
- Concerns re: reporting of construction certificates for subdivision. Need for better data capture of the subdivision certificate.
- Agree with objective of 40,000 - 45,000 new homes each year as the maximum the industry could currently deliver, however, analysis suggests 55,000 homes are needed to meet demand and reduce the backlog of supply by 2020

- Need to reduce the level of council discretion in determining what is complying development
- Support a target of 50% of all development to be complying development
- Complying development contains too many restrictions eg swimming pools are not considered complying development if carried out on bushfire-prone land
- Technical matters should be included in the building code and not in the planning system, which should be dealing with strategy not ceiling heights and setbacks.
- Integration of information needs to be electronically accessible
- Land & Supply Planning Taskforce should be allowed to continue the good work they are undertaking and should also focus on urban renewal
- Housing affordability should be a strong focus in new system
- Local govt has lost regard of its role as facilitating economic development rather than impeding it

Development Assessment

- Highly frustrated by the amount of time taken for planning decisions to be made
- Too much information required to be submitted with development applications
- Level of development assessment should be in line with the level of impacts of the development
- Need to improve efficiency in the system and focus on gaining agreement early in the development process
- Too much variation between council processes. Need for standardised conditions in development consents
- Generally need to improve the quality of the conditions of consent issued by councils and remind them they have a responsibility to produce quality conditions

Infrastructure Contributions

- Need to review who in the community is paying for infrastructure, particularly should new development be paying for the entire cost of new infrastructure
- Need to develop a range of funding options for infrastructure
- Improve transparency in infrastructure funding
- Ability to pool infrastructure contributions more effectively
- New homes buyers bear unfair burden of providing infrastructure to wider community
- Voluntary planning agreements are not truly voluntary in the process of rezoning
- Need to provide certainty of costs of infrastructure contributions

Private certification

- Allow private certifiers to rely on the same level of information that council officers are permitted to rely on eg private certifiers aren't allowed to rely on third party verification but council officers are.

** These notes were taken by Planning Review staff and incorporate changes subsequently requested by HIA.*