



## SPOTLIGHT ON AUSTRALIA'S CAPITAL CITIES

An Independent Audit Of  
City Planning Systems



Built Environment Meets Parliament (BEMP) is the premier annual conversation between parliamentarians and industry leaders that showcases the relationship between Australian communities and their built environment.

BEMP offers an opportunity to explore the economic, social, environmental and governance issues that help shape national prosperity.

The joint hosts of BEMP are: Australian Institute of Architects, Consult Australia, Green Building Council Australia, Planning Institute of Australia and Property Council of Australia.



Australian  
Institute of  
Architects



green building council australia



Planning  
Institute  
Australia



## **Built Environment Meets Parliament**

### **Discussion Paper**

## **Spotlight on Australia's Capital Cities**

**An independent assessment of city  
planning systems**

© 2010 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved.  
KPMG and the KPMG logo are registered trademarks of KPMG International.  
Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

1 June 2010

This report contains 73 pages



## Responsibilities

### ***Inherent Limitations***

*This report has been prepared as outlined in Sections 1, 2 and 3. The services provided in connection with this engagement comprise an advisory engagement, which is not subject to assurance or other standards issued by the Australian Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and, consequently no opinions or conclusions intended to convey assurance have been expressed.*

*The subjective findings in this report are based on a desktop study of available documents and limited consultation with the Property Council of Australia, on behalf of the Built Environment Meets Parliament partners. To the extent that outcomes of the consultations have been incorporated they reflect a perception of the Property Council of Australia, on behalf of the Built Environment Meets Parliament partners but only to the extent of the sample surveyed, being the Built Environment Meets Parliament partners consultation list.*

*No warranty of completeness, accuracy or reliability is given in relation to the statements and representations made by, and the information and documentation provided by, the Property Council of Australia, on behalf of the Built Environment Meets Parliament partners and stakeholders consulted as part of the process.*

*KPMG have indicated within this report the sources of the information provided. We have not sought to independently verify those sources unless otherwise noted within the report.*

*KPMG is under no obligation in any circumstance to update this report, in either oral or written form, for events occurring after the report has been issued in final form.*

### ***Third Party Reliance***

*This report is solely for the purpose set out in Sections 1, 2 and 3 and for the information of Property Council of Australia, on behalf of the Built Environment Meets Parliament partners, and is not to be used for any other purpose or distributed to any other party without KPMG's prior written consent.*

*This report has been prepared at the request of the Property Council of Australia in accordance with the terms of KPMG's engagement letter dated 9 February 2010. Other than our responsibility to the Property Council of Australia, neither KPMG nor any member or employee of KPMG undertakes responsibility arising in any way from reliance placed by a third party on this report. Any reliance placed is that party's sole responsibility.*

*KPMG was the lead consultant for the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide. To avoid any appearance of conflict KPMG has had this paper reviewed by the Property Council of Australia, on behalf of the Built Environment Meets Parliament partners. KPMG has also engaged Ms Rebecca Richardson to perform a high-level expert review of the report. Ms Richardson is an experienced town planner and a Principal from the firm Urbanista.*



## Contents

1	Executive Summary	1
1.1	Context	1
1.2	Approach	2
1.3	Results	4
1.4	Recommendations	15
2	Terms of Reference	20
2.1	Project scope	20
2.2	Strategic context	20
3	Methodology	21
3.1	COAG criteria	22
3.2	Key external indicators	24
4	Results	27
4.1	COAG criteria performance	27
4.2	Key external indicator performance	28
5	Capital City Analysis	35
5.1	Adelaide	35
5.2	Brisbane	38
5.3	Canberra	41
5.4	Darwin	43
5.5	Hobart	45
5.6	Melbourne	47
5.7	Perth	49
5.8	Sydney	51
6	Systematic issues	54
6.1	Integration – criteria 1	54
6.2	Presence of plans – criteria 2	54
6.3	Infrastructure – criteria 3	55
6.4	Addressing policy issues – criteria 4	55
6.5	Emphasis on networks – criteria 5	57
6.6	Land release policies – criteria 6	57
6.7	Encouraging investment – criteria 7	58
6.8	Urban design – criteria 8	58
6.9	Implementation – criteria 9	59
A	The COAG Criteria	62



## B Documents reviewed

64

### Tables and Graphs

Table 1-1: Relative capital city performance .....	5
Table 1-2: Performance against external indicators .....	6
Table 1-3: Summary of performance .....	6
Table 3-1: Scoring framework .....	22
Table 3-2: Scoring framework .....	25
Table 4-1: COAG criteria performance .....	27
Table 4-2: External indicator performance .....	29
Table 4-3: Level of budget funding linked to capital city planning objectives.....	30
Table 4-4: Population management .....	31
Table 4-5: Ratio of median house price with average key worker earnings, capital cities 2009	32
Table 4-6: Capital city congestion .....	33
Table 6-1: Capital city planning targets .....	60



# 1 Executive Summary

## 1.1 Context

### *Purpose of the Report*

Built Environment Meets Parliament (BEMP) comprises the Property Council of Australia (PCA), the Australian Institute of Architects, the Planning Institute of Australia, Consult Australia and the Green Building Council Australia and it conducts an annual summit between parliamentarians and the property and building industry to discuss opportunities to improve life in Australia through the built environment.

BEMP has welcomed the introduction of the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) reforms to capital city strategic planning systems. In support of these reforms, BEMP has engaged KPMG to undertake an assessment of existing capital city strategic planning systems as of 1 June 2010. The purpose of this engagement is to establish a baseline of performance against the COAG criteria and against a range of independent indicators, in an effort to determine how well Australian capital cities are performing.

Through their focus on the criteria agreed to by COAG, the BEMP seeks to encourage and facilitate a constructive public dialogue about capital city planning systems. Through this current work BEMP is seeking to:

- assess each existing metropolitan strategic planning framework against the COAG criteria;
- test the performance of each capital city against a range of independent indicators in order to assess if strategic planning objectives are being achieved;
- identify gaps between the COAG criteria, existing strategic planning objectives and practice;
- propose solutions for improving performance against individual COAG criteria; and
- propose systemic reforms that will deliver more liveable, competitive and sustainable capital cities in the future.

### *COAG Agenda*

On 7 December 2009, COAG placed reform of Australia's capital city strategic planning systems on the national agenda.<sup>1</sup> At this meeting COAG agreed to a set of national criteria relating to capital city strategic planning. Each of the nine criteria was designed to assist capital cities to deal with the significant future challenges that they are currently confronting, including population growth, climate change and urban congestion. The nine criteria agreed by COAG are provided in *Appendix A*.

At the time, COAG recognised that all jurisdictions were currently engaged in the process of strengthening their strategic metropolitan planning systems and as such, different jurisdictions were at different stages in the reform process. To support each jurisdiction's efforts in

---

<sup>1</sup> Council of Australian Governments, *Communiqué*, 7 December 2009, Brisbane, pg 8.



undertaking these reforms, the COAG Reform Council has been tasked with the following actions:

- an independent review of existing capital city planning systems and their consistency with the national criteria. This review is proposed to be undertaken during 2010 and 2011;
- provision of support for continuous national improvement in capital city strategic planning; and
- building and sharing knowledge in relation to current best practice relating to strategic planning.

To further drive the national criteria, COAG has also agreed that from 2012 the Commonwealth Government will allocate future infrastructure funding to jurisdictions according to their achievement of the criteria.

## **1.2 Approach**

### *Methodology*

KPMG's assessment has two stages. First, KPMG has conducted a desktop review of the publicly available information relating to capital city strategic planning systems and scored each jurisdiction against the nine COAG criteria based on these documents. It is important to note that this review of documents has been undertaken at a certain point in time and our review may not reflect subsequent policy or reform proposals announced by Governments. Second, KPMG has reviewed the performance of each capital city in relation to a range of external indicators in order to assess their current ability to deliver on their strategic planning objectives.

The second aspect of this assessment has been particularly challenging due to the limited range of nationally consistent data available on the performance of all capital city planning systems. For example, there is limited publicly available data in respect of all capital cities for greenhouse gas emissions, water availability, biodiversity, housing supply and liveability. As such, it has not been possible to consistently assess capital cities on these criteria.

Thus at this point in time, we have chosen to focus on four external indicators that are supported by nationally comprehensive data. These indicators are

- budget alignment;
- population planning;
- key worker housing affordability; and
- congestion.

### *Desktop Assessment Against COAG Criteria*

Our desktop assessment was used as the basis for an estimation of compliance with the nine COAG national criteria and a tenth criterion that was a score for the overall average performance of each jurisdiction. The assessment against the COAG criteria was primarily based on two considerations:





- **evidence of a framework:** whether the planning system currently had an existing, documented framework in place to meet the criteria; and
- **practical delivery of the framework:** where there was an existing framework in place, how successful the framework was in practice in achieving desired results.

The performance of each capital city system was rated out of a maximum score out of 10. Then these scores were converted as a percentage to determine an overall score. Each capital city has then been ranked in terms of their relative performance to other capital cities.

Further information in relation to the methodology is outlined in *section 3.1*.

### *Assessment Against Key External Indicators*

The selection of the key indicators was based on the availability of high quality, reliable and complete data. Evidence for the four indicators was drawn from nationally consistent data which is collected at least annually. As previously outlined, as a result of the lack of available data, a number of important external indicators had to be omitted from this review. To carry out a robust into the future there should be consideration to consistent city based data for issues such as housing supply, housing affordability, productivity, gross city product and greenhouse gas emissions.

Therefore the following should be read as indicative key external indicators:

- **budget alignment** – the actual capital city infrastructure projects funded in 2009-10 State and Territory budgets<sup>2</sup> have been compared with the infrastructure needs identified in the relevant metropolitan and infrastructure plans for each capital city. This serves to highlight if proposed plans are leading to investments;
- **population management** – the target population levels for each capital city over the next 25 years (as reported in their metropolitan plans) have been compared against the high scenario population growth forecasts prepared by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) and the actual population increases experienced by each capital city in 2008-09. While population levels do fluctuate over the long term, this is meant to highlight the extent of population growth that can occur over a short period potentially leading to the need for more regular performance reporting and updating of projections;
- **housing affordability for key workers** – the comparative affordability of housing for ‘key worker’ groups have been compared across each capital city for 2009. The figures are sourced from the BankWest Key Worker Housing Affordability Report 2009; and
- **congestion** – the projected estimates of the costs of congestion as reported by the Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics (BTRE) for each capital city have been analysed and compared<sup>3</sup>. The aggregate figures reported by the BTRE have been adjusted in order to calculate per capita estimates for each capital city.

Each capital city system has been assessed against the four criteria and given a score out of a maximum of 10. Given there is no benchmark or best practice target available for capital cities

<sup>2</sup> Note, given the major planning policy reform announcements of the Northern Territory Government, we have had regard to the investments reported in the 2010-11 budget delivered on 4 May 2010.

<sup>3</sup> Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics, *Estimating Urban Traffic and Congestion Cost Trends for Australian Cities*, April 2007.



in relation to any of the key external indicators, the score for each capital city has been assessed based on their performance relative to other capital cities. Given that there are four indicators, a total score out of 40, which has been converted to a percentage, has been determined for each capital city by adding together the individual scores for each indicator.

Further information in relation to the methodology is outlined in *section 3.2*.

## 1.3 Results

### *How are capital cities performing against the COAG criteria?*

Our desktop assessment considered the compliance with the nine COAG national criteria (*Appendix A*) and then ranked cities based on their average percentage score as an indicator of the overall performance of each jurisdiction. The COAG criteria are:

1. **integration:** the level of integration of the strategic planning system (COAG Criteria 1);
2. **presence of plans:** existence of a consistent hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans (COAG Criteria 2);
3. **infrastructure:** inclusion of nationally-significant economic infrastructure (COAG Criteria 3);
4. **addressing policy issues:** specifically addressing nationally-significant policy issues (COAG Criteria 4);
5. **emphasis on networks:** consideration and strengthening of the networks between capital cities and other important regions (COAG Criteria 5);
6. **land release policies:** land release and balance of infill and greenfield development (COAG Criteria 6);
7. **encouraging investment:** identified priorities for investment and policy effort by Government and the private sector (CAOG Criteria 7);
8. **urban design:** world-class urban design and architecture (COAG Criteria 8); and
9. **implementation:** effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms (COAG Criteria 9).

*Table 1.1* includes the results of the relative scoring for each capital city and reveals that Melbourne is ranked 1<sup>st</sup>, Brisbane 2<sup>nd</sup>, Adelaide 3<sup>rd</sup>, Perth 4<sup>th</sup>, Canberra 5<sup>th</sup>, Sydney 6<sup>th</sup>, Darwin 7<sup>th</sup> and Hobart 8<sup>th</sup>.

When the scores for all of the jurisdictions are added together, the average score for Australian capital city planning systems is 54 per cent. It is clear from our assessment that Australia's capital cities are not yet operating at a level that demonstrates sound performance in relation to the nine COAG criteria. However, it should be acknowledged that the criteria have only been recently been adopted to guide and measure success and that different jurisdictions are at different stages of the reform process or are in the process of reviewing a range of future oriented plans.

It should also be acknowledged that the size and function of capital cities varies significantly across the jurisdictions. While they are relevant to all, some of the criteria will be more crucial



for achieving success in the larger more complex cities that are experiencing rapid growth. For example a hierarchy of plans will be more critical for success in Sydney than in Hobart. Similarly the emphasis in nationally significant infrastructure and policies will be more important for Sydney than for Hobart.

**Table 1-1: Relative capital city performance**

Criteria	1. Integration (10)	2. Plans (10)	3. Infrastructure (10)	4. Policy (10)	5. Networks (10)	6. Land release (10)	7. Investment (10)	8. Urban Design (10)	9. Implementation (10)	Total Score (%)	Relative Ranking (1-8)
Melbourne	7	8	7	7	7	6	7	7	6	69	1
Brisbane	7	8	7	7	7	4	7	5	6	64	2
Adelaide	7	7	7	8	7	4	5	5	5	61	3
Perth	4	4	2	7	7	6	7	7	6	56	4
Canberra	6	7	6	6	3	4	5	6	6	54	5
Sydney	6	4	3	5	7	5	4	5	3	47	6
Darwin	4	4	4	4	4	3	6	6	5	44	7
Hobart	4	4	4	3	7	1	5	3	3	38	8
Average	6	6	5	6	6	4	6	6	5	54 <sup>4</sup>	

### *How are capital cities performing against external indicators?*

The assessment of capital cities is a starting point for evaluating external criteria. It is limited greatly by the lack of nationally consistent annually updated data and hence only covers a few key aspects drawing on what national data there is available (which itself has inherent limitations). As such, the following assessment is illustrative of trends and cannot be used to assess the actual performance of Australian capital cities.

Accordingly, **Table 1.2** reveals that Adelaide ranks best out of the jurisdictions when assessed against the four external indicators - budget alignment, population management, housing affordability for key workers and congestion.

Despite the presence of a relatively strong alignment between infrastructure plans and budget allocations, **Table 1.2** also reveals that Brisbane ranks relatively low out of the jurisdictions as it appears that its ability to manage strong population growth, congestion and affordability for key workers is under pressure. This indicates a need for Brisbane's strategic planning system to develop further in order to address these significant challenges.

<sup>4</sup> This is the average of all 72 raw data points and not the nine average data points.



Perth is ranked 7<sup>th</sup> because it would appear it is dealing with large population growth and there is the emergence of congestion and reduced affordability for key workers.

Sydney's rank of 8<sup>th</sup> is partly a reflection of its performance in relation to managing congestion. Without delivery of further major transport infrastructure, this challenge is likely to worsen due to forecast increasing population growth.

In summary, these external indicators are valuable to the extent they provide an indication of where jurisdictions need to reconsider policy and investment effort in order to improve the performance of their capital city. These indicators also serve to reveal the need for strong national performance monitoring and reporting in order to ensure that the goals contained in capital city strategic plans are actually implemented and delivered.

**Table 1-2: Performance against external indicators**

City	Budget alignment (10)	Population management (10)	Housing affordability for key workers (10)	Congestion (10)	Total Score (%)	Overall relative ranking (1-8)
Adelaide	6	9	8	6	73	1
Canberra	7	8	5	7	68	2
Hobart	3	3	9	8	58	3
Brisbane	8	4	6	4	55	4
Darwin	2	N/A <sup>5</sup>	5	9	53	5
Melbourne	7	6	3	3	48	6
Perth	4	5	4	5	45	7
Sydney	5	7	2	2	40	8
Average	5	6	5	6	55	

**Table 1.3** summarises the performance against the COAG criteria and the external indicators. While it is not a perfect system to compare these two types of rankings together because of the limited data and evidence to support our analysis, Melbourne and Adelaide seem to perform reasonably against the COAG criteria and the external indicators.

<sup>5</sup> Note, there does not appear to be a population growth planning target for Darwin and so it has been not possible to determine how Darwin is managing and planning for population growth. We note that the Government provides population forecasts for the NT, refer to [www.nt.gov.au/nt/economics/nt\\_population.shtml](http://www.nt.gov.au/nt/economics/nt_population.shtml). However, a Darwin growth target does not appear to have been developed.



*Table 1-3: Summary of performance*

City	Ranking against COAG Criteria	Ranking against external indicators
Adelaide	3	1
Brisbane	2	4
Canberra	5	2
Darwin	7	5
Hobart	8	3
Melbourne	1	6
Perth	4	7
Sydney	6	8

### *Overview of how each capital city performs against the COAG criteria*

#### *Adelaide*

Underpinned by strong planning reform, Adelaide recently introduced a comprehensive capital city plan, the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide (the Plan) which largely meets the national policy priorities in the COAG criteria. It is one of the few plans that have integrated spatial planning with major infrastructure initiatives, including urban rail projects and desalination. The Plan also includes trigger points (or performance indicators) for housing and employment land supply and affordable housing as well as performance reporting.

However, we have not been able to rank Adelaide higher than third because, it has yet to deliver on a rolling housing and employment land supply program. Indeed, given that the Plan has recently been introduced it is too early to tell how well it is implementing 70 per cent of new growth in existing areas of Adelaide. The key challenge now is how relevant government institutions meet the targets contained in the Plan and collaborate with local government.

#### *Brisbane*

Recently, the Queensland Government has embarked on strong reform of its capital city strategic planning system which includes the SEQ Regional Plan and the SEQ Infrastructure Policy and Program. Both documents are evidence of a well-integrated approach to planning and infrastructure. In addition, the Queensland Government also recently conducted a state-wide growth summit to explore how it should deal with anticipated rapid population growth. A report following on from the summit was released at the end of May 2010.

Such initiatives mean that Brisbane's strategic planning system rates reasonably well when compared with other systems and ranks second overall. However, it is noted that its strategic planning system does not appear to incorporate performance reporting or trigger points for critical issues such as housing supply and water security, and this will be vital to incorporate into the planning system given that South East Queensland is the fastest growing region in the



country. It is important to note that there is evidence of the implementation of plans and policies are sometimes at odds with each other such the inconsistency between the plans for growth in South East Queensland and the draft Queensland Koala Conservation Strategy.<sup>6</sup>

### *Canberra*

Through the establishment of the Canberra Plan, the Canberra Spatial Plan and Infrastructure Plan, Canberra's strength is in the well-integrated nature of its strategic planning system and alignment with the budget. This is regularly reviewed and updated. This is evident in the current consultative review of the Canberra Plan, and this is why it ranks fifth.

Canberra is the seat of national government. It has two planning systems in operation - the National Capital Plan and the Canberra Spatial Plan. Under these arrangements, the ACT Government must plan and manage growth based on the spatial directions established in the National Capital Plan. Canberra's challenge is to work with the Commonwealth Government to harmonise planning systems and provide greater certainty around roles and responsibilities of government institutions for the future management of Canberra's growth. Indeed, the integration of these planning systems and the interaction at a regional level with NSW will be important to better manage growth into the future.

### *Darwin*

The Northern Territory Government has recently released *Territory 2030* which is a solid strategic platform to transform both the Northern Territory and Darwin. It is noted that the Government has backed *Territory 2030* with funded actions in its 2010-2011 Budget.

Darwin is ranked seventh against the COAG criteria because, based on the evidence, there is substantial reform to be undertaken. For example, there is the need to develop a land supply program and an infrastructure plan, the need to address national policy issues and the establishment of better implementation arrangements across government and with local government. There appears to be very good scope to deal with these issues through the Northern Territory Government - Darwin City Council Capital City Committee, which appears to be a unique and constructive governance arrangement to manage future growth in Darwin.

### *Hobart*

The Tasmanian Government has approached planning across its three regions through the Regional Planning Initiative, and in the South specifically through the Southern Regional Planning Initiative and the Southern Regional Transport Plan. Tasmania has also published a State Infrastructure Strategy and recently introduced a planning commission.

However, Tasmania ranks last against the COAG criteria as the Southern Regional Plan is not yet in place and there is no current land supply program. Like Darwin, there remains a large amount of reform to be completed in order to meet the COAG criteria, particularly in relation to how these plans will be implemented and how density and linkages to infrastructure delivery will be achieved, and to clarify which government institutions will be responsible for delivery.

---

<sup>6</sup> Queensland Government, Draft South East Queensland Koala Conservation State Planning Regulatory Provisions, Department of Infrastructure and Planning, Brisbane, December 2009. Accessed at [http://www.derm.qld.gov.au/wildlife-ecosystems/wildlife/koalas/koala\\_crisis\\_response\\_strategy/documents/draft\\_koala\\_sprp.pdf](http://www.derm.qld.gov.au/wildlife-ecosystems/wildlife/koalas/koala_crisis_response_strategy/documents/draft_koala_sprp.pdf)



### *Melbourne*

Melbourne is ranked first because it has the strongest representation of a capital strategic planning system supported by a metropolitan plan, a transport plan, land supply program and the recently released Integrated Housing Strategy. It has established a strong review and audit process conducted by independent experts that has triggered the development and implementation of *Melbourne@5million*. The Housing Strategy attempts to refocus VicUrban's role to provide housing in established areas, particularly along major public transport routes, in activity centres in metropolitan Melbourne and in large regional centres. However, these plans are yet to be translated into action and so it is too early to tell if VicUrban can achieve these new directions.

The key challenge for Melbourne is how it continues to implement its plans in the face of strong population and economic growth. We note that, in Melbourne 2030, approximately 60 per cent of growth was to be directed to strategic site development and in existing urban locations.<sup>7</sup> However, in *Melbourne@5 million*<sup>8</sup>, this target has shifted due to increasing population growth with 53 per cent of growth directed into existing locations, so that there is now 47 per cent urban development occurring in greenfield locations. This is a substantial shift in spatial development and requires the reorganisation of policy and funding initiatives across all levels of government. Several industry and professional groups have advocated the establishment of a Planning Authority in Melbourne as a potential means of achieving this in Victoria.

Issues of implementation, monitoring, reporting and whether or not the current legislative and regulatory frameworks can deliver the desired outcomes are further challenges facing Melbourne. Accordingly, the reason why Melbourne has not reached a perfect score because we have not observed evidence of trigger points and performance reporting on key capital city measures to better monitor and adapt to rapid change as it happens.

### *Perth*

Last year, the Western Australian Government introduced significant planning reforms aimed at strengthening strategic planning in Perth, including the establishment of a Land Supply Coordinator to manage issues such as system blockages, the enhancement of the land supply program for the Perth Peel region and completing *Directions 2031*. At the centre of the planning system is the Western Australian Planning Commission which has worked well to integrate planning and infrastructure decisions to support the growth of Perth and Peel. In recent years, the East Perth Redevelopment Authority has also undertaken a number of urban renewal projects. All of these changes indicate that Perth is moving towards a strong capital city strategic planning system.

However, because the land supply program and *Directions 2031* are not in place, Perth ranks fourth. Accordingly, Perth must ensure that the development of the planning system stays on track and that both current and new mechanisms continue to respond and adapt to strong population and economic growth.

<sup>7</sup> Victorian Government, *Melbourne 2030: Planning for Sustainable Growth*, Melbourne, October 2002, pg 30.

<sup>8</sup> Victorian Government, *Melbourne@5million*, Melbourne, December 2008, pg 3.





## *Sydney*

Sydney has a range of regional, metropolitan and State based plans that provide the framework for its capital city strategic planning system including the State Infrastructure Plan and the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy (which is under review). However, despite this strong documentation, Sydney ranks 6<sup>th</sup> against the COAG criteria principally because of poor implementation. This view is largely attributable to recent changes in priority to major transport infrastructure projects such as the North West Rail Link, CBD Metro and West Metro. These changes indicate a lack of predictability and certainty in the way the Sydney strategic planning system operates and tends to suggest a breakdown in the way the system delivers strategic priorities. Indeed, it would appear that land supply delivery is also failing due to the lack of clear integration with infrastructure particularly as it relates to these major transport decisions.

This year, Sydney has prepared a Sydney Metropolitan Plan Review discussion paper, a draft Metropolitan Transport Plan and announced the establishment of the Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority. While these are positive steps, these mechanisms are not yet in place and, together with the apparent failure in the implementation of strategic planning decisions, means that Sydney ranks sixth.

## *Overview of the systemic issues across the COAG criteria*

From our desktop assessment we have found there is limited data and evidence available to assess each capital city against the COAG criteria. Nevertheless, the desktop assessment has revealed a number of systemic issues which undermine or impact upon the effectiveness and implementation of capital city strategic planning systems. Based on the nine COAG criteria, we have found the following issues.

### *Criteria 1: The level of integration of the strategic planning system.*

We have found it difficult to properly score this criterion because COAG has not defined what is encompassed in a capital city strategic planning system or what are the critical strategic linkages. For this reason it has been hard to determine with accuracy if there is integration of a planning system across agencies and functions among the jurisdictions. This probably explains why we have observed that the jurisdictional planning and infrastructure departments appear to have sole responsibility for capital city strategic planning. This present arrangement potentially ignores the critical roles played by other departments, such as:

- the role and accountability played by Treasury departments in relation to long-term, fiscal planning for major infrastructure requirements;
- the role and accountability played by Housing departments in relation to the supply of social housing,
- the role and accountability played by Environment departments in relation to the application of biodiversity, water and climate change policies into spatial actions; and
- other agencies whose locational decisions have impacts upon urban settlement and travel patterns.

In addition, the lack of integration between land use and infrastructure planning remains a problem in many jurisdictions.





Consequently, defining capital city strategic planning systems and the critical strategic linkages for successful integration are key areas where the expert panel supporting the COAG Reform Council should provide some guidance so that jurisdictions are better equipped to respond to this criterion.

*Criteria 2: Existence of a consistent hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans*

Melbourne, Brisbane and Canberra have the clearest completed hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans. In saying this, for jurisdictions such as Melbourne and Sydney there are quite a number of documents to navigate to identify the plans for these cities and for Sydney in particular some of these plans are inconsistent in as far it relates to the priorities for major transport infrastructure.

However, based on our review of the evidence, we have not been able to easily find in any jurisdiction clear documentation of priorities for major projects supported by appropriately detailed project plans. This means that currently it is difficult to gain a national picture of the future major planning and infrastructure proposals for Australian capital cities.

*Criteria 3: Inclusion of nationally-significant economic infrastructure*

This is an area of considerable weakness among all jurisdictions as no capital city appears to be dealing with this criterion comprehensively. This is likely to be attributable to the relatively recent, and still limited, role played by the Commonwealth Government in providing investment for nationally significant infrastructure including desalination, urban transport and telecommunications. From our review of documentation, it remains unclear as to how jurisdictions should identify nationally significant infrastructure to support efficient functioning of cities in their future oriented plans. Should State and Territory plans identify these projects before or after decisions are made at a Commonwealth level to fund these projects? This is an area where jurisdictions would perhaps benefit from clarification from the Commonwealth Government.

*Criteria 4: Specifically addressing nationally-significant policy issues*

At the present time, Adelaide is performing best when it comes to effectively addressing the nationally significant policy issues with a range of spatial policies and targets that respond to these issues. However, based on our review of documentation, Adelaide, like all jurisdictions, needs to integrate matters of national environmental significance into their plans and supporting documentation.

We have found based on our review of documentation that most jurisdictions are in a process of review and reform, and, therefore, there is scope for jurisdictions to better address these nationally significant policy issues. We believe though this will require substantially more work over the next few months for jurisdictions to develop evidenced-based, spatial measures and targets for climate change, housing affordability, social inclusion, productivity and global competitiveness.



*Criteria 5: Consideration and strengthening of the networks between capital cities and other important regions*

The networks we create between our cities and regional centres are important as our regional centres are increasingly likely to become locations which will accommodate future population and economic growth. They can also play a more significant role in alleviating the pressure on existing metropolitan areas by providing a livable alternative, particularly if linked to employment generation and transport. Some jurisdictions are working towards providing for networks between capital cities and major regional centres, and this is documented in their metropolitan plans and infrastructure planning. For example, the approaches adopted for Melbourne, South-East Queensland, Adelaide and potentially Southern Tasmania include an emphasis on planning and infrastructure inter-connections with regional centres. However, this is an area of improvement for other cities such as Canberra and in Sydney.

*Criteria 6: Land release and balance of infill and greenfield development*

This is an area of significant weakness among all capital cities. The review of available evidence indicates that few jurisdictions have medium to long-term land supply programs in place or strong targets that underpin these programs. The National Housing Supply Council has estimated that there will be a shortfall of some 640,000 to 1.6 million dwellings over the next twenty years<sup>9</sup> based on current supply arrangements across the nation. This is a significant gap that does not appear to be adequately addressed by capital city strategic planning systems.

Moreover, there is limited:

- information on and monitoring of the supply pipeline from land identification to development approval stage for infill and greenfield development;
- information on the availability of employment lands (industrial and commercial) and linkages with residential land supply programs and transport infrastructure;
- understanding of the barriers to the take-up of land supply opportunities;
- publicly available updates to land supply programs (such as the, there are quarterly land supply and housing activity reports available in Western Australia);
- understanding of how well land supply programs identify and respond to the need for a mix of housing types, sizes and affordability levels and how effectively housing is linked to transport and employment opportunities; and
- annualised public reporting on whether supply arrangements are meeting targets for infill and greenfield development and actual demand, against a 15-year zoned and 30-year unzoned land supply linked to forward infrastructure plans from each jurisdiction.

As resistance from local government and residents is frequently encountered when seeking to realise infill opportunities, emphasis is often placed on greenfield development to achieve supply. However, this can lead to under utilisation of existing infrastructure and less efficient, less accessible urban expansion. There is further work to be done to explore opportunities for achieving well designed and appropriate infill housing and to decrease the reliance on greenfield development around capital cities in order to satisfy demand.

<sup>9</sup> Australian Government, 2010 State of the Supply Report, National Housing Supply Council, Canberra, 27 April 2010, pg 65.  
Accessed at [www.nhsc.org/state\\_of\\_supply/2009\\_ssr\\_rpt/SoSR\\_key\\_finding.htm](http://www.nhsc.org/state_of_supply/2009_ssr_rpt/SoSR_key_finding.htm)



*Criteria 7: Identified priorities for investment and policy effort by Government and the private sector*

Across all jurisdictions, it is difficult to ascertain consistent and up to date information regarding policy, investment and innovation opportunities or clear statements of priorities. While some jurisdictions, such as in Victoria through the Annual Statement of Intentions, provide a list of proposed policy and investment priorities, this is an area that is very patchy across jurisdictions and requires significant improvement.

It is not clear from the documentation we have reviewed what the priorities are for significant development areas (such as major greenfield precincts, transit corridors and major centres), nor is the role of the private sector clear in the delivery of major infrastructure or in the delivery of urban renewal areas.

*Criteria 8: World-class urban design and architecture*

A desktop review of jurisdictional urban design guidelines reveals that the majority of these guidelines are development specific. Whilst this might be appropriate, there is a clear need to elevate achievement of design excellence as a priority for urban development across all areas. The City of Perth has recently developed an Urban Design Framework for the CBD, which provides guidance and illustration on a range of elements that make up a city environment.<sup>10</sup> We note that some jurisdictions, such as Darwin and Adelaide, are to establish bodies dedicated to excellence in design in order to better support the development of urban renewal and major greenfield developments.

Given that the vast majority of new developments are expected to occur in infill areas (such as transit corridors and activity centres) it appears that urban design and architectural guidance for these types of developments will increasingly be required, combined with incentives for good design (such as bonuses for design excellence). Based on our review of documentation, this is an area requiring stronger policy guidance and encouragement within capital city strategic planning systems. In addition, we have observed that some jurisdictions continue to have an office of Government Architect. As such, we believe that there is perhaps scope to better integrate the role of the Government Architect into capital city planning systems to advocate design excellence in the pursuit of good quality urban renewal.

*Criteria 9: Effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms*

A key issue we have found in our review of documentation is that accountability and the timelines for delivery of urban renewal and greenfield areas are unclear. That is to say, the documentation indicates the targets for where growth will occur, but there is little supporting information as to who will be responsible for delivering these growth areas and the timing associated with the roll-out of these developments.

The significant issue for all Australian capital cities is how strategic plans translate into actions and developments that make our cities more competitive, productive, sustainable, liveable and socially inclusive. This means that the role and accountability of government institutions need to be better aligned to meet the significant spatial directions for our capital cities.

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.cityofperth.wa.gov.au/documentdb/1612.pdf>, viewed at 11 May 2011.



It would appear that only Adelaide and Canberra provide performance reporting for their capital city strategic planning systems; however, these performance reports have yet to be implemented on a regular basis. While some jurisdictions have mechanisms in place to review their strategic metropolitan plans, it would seem they are adjusting to major fluctuations in population and employment growth, housing demand and housing affordability. Key challenges to achieve meaningful implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms is around the accountability, role and timing of:

- regular performance reporting to keep pace with rapid change;
- periodic reviews of targets as opposed to the fundamental policies and principles; and
- recasting capital city plans.

Without clear and functioning implementation and review processes, planning systems prove to be fundamentally ineffective. The establishment of trigger points or performance indicators will be critical to enable all jurisdictions to better monitor and respond to these major fluctuations in growth.

Gaining an understanding of the views of, and impacts on, communities is central to successful strategic planning, as is clear communication of proposed spatial changes to residents and stakeholders. Jurisdictions undertake consultation in a variety of ways. For example, the Queensland Government recently conducted a Growth Summit which sought to involve experts and stakeholders in developing responses to rapid population growth, while the NSW Government has recently launched a draft transport plan and a Metropolitan Strategy Review discussion paper for consultation. In Victoria, an independent assessment of Melbourne 2030 was conducted by a panel of experts. In Adelaide, a draft of the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide for community and stakeholder consultation included proposed regional and sub-regional targets for population, housing, affordable housing and employment. The critical issue in all of these consultative arrangements is whether, at a strategic level, the community and industry is across and supportive of the rationale and direction for the spatial development of Australian capital cities, as opposed to contesting these issues at each and every development application. This is a critical challenge for all jurisdictions.



## 1.4 Recommendations

Capital cities account for 65 per cent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP)<sup>11</sup> and 65 per cent of national net job creation in Australia.<sup>12</sup> This is significant contribution to the national economy, and yet the contribution of Australia cities to national productivity is below the OECD average.<sup>13</sup> Capital cities are central to continued national economic performance, and it imperative that jurisdictions are putting in place strategic planning systems to support the future growth of Australian capital cities.

The principal finding in this assessment is the apparent gap between the aspirations we have for our cities which we are seeking to guide through our planning systems, and the implementation and achievement of the key targets and outcomes contained in those plans. Not surprisingly, the documentation that we have reviewed is complex and extensive. What is not clear from our review is how readily capital city planning strategies can be translated by Commonwealth, State and local governments and the private sector into positive and practical steps towards the outcomes sought for our cities under the COAG national objective.

These gaps have led to the development of the following recommendations aimed at strengthening the strategic planning and performance of Australian major cities.

### **Recommendation 1. Lift Commonwealth Government Involvement in City Based Metropolitan Planning**

- The Commonwealth Government can play a decisive role in facilitating world-class urban policy. This would include initiatives to:
  - release an urban strategy for Australia that includes national performance targets that address economic, social, environmental and governance objectives for Australia's capital cities;
  - establish a robust framework for delivering carrots and sticks – Commonwealth government funding should be tied to meeting COAG criteria and agreed performance targets. The current process direction should be further enhanced by moving to a full

<sup>11</sup> The estimates of gross product by capital city were derived using the Murphy Model Regional (MMR). MMR is a multi-region, multi-industry model of Australia. It is in the Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) family of economic models. MMR divides Australia into 32 regions, each with 18 industries. The regions used are the statistical regions applied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) in its labour force survey. The 18 industries correspond to the Australian and New Zealand Industry Classification (ANZSIC) also used by the ABS. MMR uses statistical information from the ABS Input-Output tables and labour force survey to characterise the regional economies in terms of capital and labour stocks. The total capital stock of each industry is allocated across the regions using employment shares within each region. Employment, value-added turnover and consumption for each region are determined as a function of the estimated labour and capital stocks. MMR includes the following capital cities as separate regional economies; Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide, Perth and Hobart. The Australian Capital Territory (ACT) and the Northern Territory (NT) are treated as single regional economies, as labour force data is not collected for sub-regions of either Territory. Estimates of gross product for each of the capital cities above were calculated using MMR. These were then compared with estimates of GSP for the corresponding states (also calculated using MMR) to determine the contribution of each capital city to GSP. For consistency with the national accounts, ABS estimates of GSP for 2007/08 were apportioned to each capital city using the capital city shares calculated using MMR. MMR estimates of GSP and national accounts estimates of GSP are slightly different as a result of minor adjustments made during calibration.

Note this modelling has been used to derive the statistics provided in section 4 of the report.

<sup>12</sup> Australian Government, *Changes in Australia's industry structure: main cities 2001-06*, Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics, Canberra, June 2009. Accessed at <http://www.bitre.gov.au/info.aspx?NodeId=111&ResourceId=709> Note this report has been used to derive the statistics provided in section 4 of the report.

<sup>13</sup> Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, *OECD Territorial Reviews: Competitive Cities in the Global Economy*, 2006, pg 67.



National Competition Policy style model, including an independent commission to ensure progress against targets is rewarded (or penalised);

- launch a refreshed Better Cities Program –seed funding for significant ‘circuit-connecting’ infrastructure that helps achieve state (and national) targets;
  - expand the Building Australia Fund (BAF) to provide for a more substantial, longer-term commitment to urban infrastructure - the non regional/heavy infrastructure elements of BAF should be wrapped into the ‘Better Cities 2.0’ proposal;
  - streamline Commonwealth responsibility for cities – appoint a Cabinet level Minister responsible for coordinating Commonwealth involvement in urban issues and running ‘Better Cities 2.0’. The system of coordinators general should be formalised into a permanent network for rolling out this program and other Commonwealth infrastructure initiatives;
  - review and reform the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act* and integrate it into State, Territory and local strategies and plans – this law currently creates additional intersections of confusion within planning systems;
  - champion the research projects identified below: a national urban database and visual planning design tools. This would also include the development of nationally consistent city based data sets in order to assess the performance of Australia’s capital cities; and
  - establish a centre for design excellence similar to the Centre for the Advancement of the Built Environment (CABE) in the United Kingdom.
- The Commonwealth Government should release a companion study to the Intergenerational Report that analyses the economic, social and environmental implications of population growth and demographic change.

## **Recommendation 2    Establish Metropolitan Delivery Authorities in Each Capital City**

- A dedicated metropolitan authority should be established in each capital city. The establishment of a metropolitan authority puts one entity in charge of delivering the critical elements of the metropolitan planning strategy.
- A metropolitan delivery authority may sit under a broader state planning commission. In some cases, the authority may also be charged with developing and refreshing metropolitan strategies.
- As indicated below, the top priority of metropolitan authorities is to co-ordinate delivery of zoned and serviced lands for housing and employment (commercial, industrial, retail), along with critical infrastructure.
- This proposal will join up government efforts to deliver on government policy commitments.

## **Recommendation 3    Metropolitan Strategies to take Precedence over all Planning Instruments**

- Metropolitan strategies should include clear priorities and targets for growth, including growth corridors and precincts, within a robust governance structure. To support the





implementation of these priorities and targets metropolitan strategies must take precedence over all local government planning schemes or area based schemes.

- Neither State government departments nor local government authorities should be allowed to use local government planning schemes or area based schemes to counteract a metropolitan strategy.
- The metropolitan development authorities should be empowered to step in where departments or councils act to break or inhibit this process.
- To promote this approach, existing planning laws should be revised and modernised to accommodate the model outlined in these proposals.

#### **Recommendation 4 Streamline and Improve the Timeliness of Development Assessment**

- All States and Territories should fully adopt all ten elements of the Development Assessment Forum (DAF) model for reforming their development assessment processes.
- To streamline and improve the timeliness of the development assessment process there should be a national framework for complying development that includes comparable approval timeframes and processes.
- This framework will increase the share of complying development for single residential, multi unit, commercial and industrial developments, consistent with growth targets for in metropolitan strategies. These developments should be processed within a guaranteed 30 days. Access to Commonwealth funds should be contingent on comprehensively meeting this commitment.
- By 2012, all Governments should proclaim complying development status to the growth corridor, activity centre and precinct plan elements of metropolitan strategies - that is, compliance with the relevant development standards should satisfy compliance for development approval for these priority growth areas.
- To support streamlined processes, electronic development assessment should be adopted universally by 2015.

#### **Recommendation 5 Allocate Priority Activity Areas for Existing and Future Communities**

- As indicated above, the top priority of the metropolitan authority is to co-ordinate delivery of zoned and serviced lands for housing, employment (commercial, industrial, retail) and other community activities. These land supply delivery plans should cater for existing and future communities, and be complemented by transport linkage programs that connect up priority growth areas identified in metropolitan strategies.
- Fifteen year inventories of zoned/serviced capacity and 30-year overall capacity land delivery plans should be developed across all jurisdictions.
- Independently audited reports on implementation against these inventories should be published annually.



#### **Recommendation 6    Develop and Roll out a 30-Year Infrastructure Pipeline**

- All State and Territory Governments should develop 30-year infrastructure delivery pipelines specifically designed to meet spatial policy targets identified in metropolitan strategies. These pipelines should be integrated into the long term fiscal planning of State and Territory Governments.
- A statement of the estimated delivery date and cost for *each* infrastructure project should be provided. Full funding solutions for projects to be delivered within the next decade, on a rolling basis, should also be published.
- To support the robustness of the pipeline, an annual, independently audited report card on delivery against timelines and costs should be published.

#### **Recommendation 7:    Establish modern public funding mechanisms**

- Each State and Territory government should:
  - issue infrastructure development bonds, including growth area bonds, to help fund its infrastructure pipeline;
  - provide an annual statement of Public Private Partnerships opportunities for infrastructure projects (drawn from the 30 year list) to the private sector;
  - cap developer contributions based on an agreed formula;
  - place the setting of developer contribution levies in the hands of an independent price-setting entity; and
  - consider bidding for Commonwealth infrastructure and planning innovation funds (as above).

#### **Recommendation 8    Set City Based Performance Targets**

- Metropolitan planning and infrastructure strategies should serve as broader policy objectives of governments. To this end, these objectives should be articulated as quantified and measurable policies of State and Territory Governments. These targets should be approved at a Cabinet level, and the performance of these goals must be monitored and reported to COAG and the public.
- It is only by positioning these policy priorities into measurable targets that State and Territory governments can integrate their overall spatial service delivery requirements for capital cities.
- Indeed, trigger points must be included in this approach to enable more timely decisions to support city growth and development. Such trigger points may relate to land supply, housing affordability and growth area priorities.
- A range of government departments are responsible for a number of spatial implementation measures for capital cities. Consequently, all government departments should be assigned and directed to achieve the State and Territory spatial policy goals through key performance requirements provided in corporate plans, executive performance contracts and State and Territory budgets.





- Independently audited reports on implementation against these targets and inventories should be published annually.

**Recommendation 9 Commit to and Enable Meaningful National Reporting on Progress Against Objectives**

- COAG should establish an online, publicly available urban database that drives the evidence-based design of metropolitan strategies. Such a database could also be employed to test the assumptions behind metropolitan strategies – that is, enable scenario testing equivalent to the econometric modelling applied to major public policy programs.
- Governments should also then commit to annual reporting on the delivery of metropolitan strategy outcomes against objectives. In all cases, these reports should tie back to the achievement of State/Territory policy targets. All annual reports should be independently audited and released publicly.
- The Commonwealth Government should establish a research project to achieve this objective. The first task of such a project would be to develop evidence-based spatial measures, including metrics for greenhouse gas emissions, housing affordability, social inclusion, productivity and global competitiveness. This task could be conducted in collaboration with the COAG Reform Council.

**Recommendation 10 Increase Australia's Strategic Planning and Design Capacity**

- The institutional and strategic arrangements arising from these proposals require top quality urban designers and planners to operate within Australia's policy-making apparatus. This means that Government architects and chief planners should be established in all jurisdictions as a means of guiding the world class urban design in our capital cities.

**Recommendation 11 Enhanced Community Consultation to Support the Development and Implementation of Metropolitan Strategies**

- Consultation over metropolitan strategies should occur upfront.
- To support this consultation there must be greater levels of community engagement to draw in stakeholders regarding the proposed changes to the urban form of our capital cities. State and Territory Governments must have common consultation principles or standards for engaging with the community and stakeholders. Once settled, strategic plans (and their supporting instruments) should be fully revised once a decade, and reviewed against the Census and Intergenerational Report every five years. This review should not change the fundamental principles of the metropolitan strategy.
- All metropolitan strategies (and supporting instruments) should be presented in a form that helps community members visualise the intent and operation of metropolitan plans at a city, precinct and building level. To enable this approach, the Commonwealth Government should establish a research centre to develop this technology.



## 2 Terms of Reference

### 2.1 Project scope

BEMP conducts an annual summit between parliamentarians and the property and building industry to discuss opportunities to improve life in Australia through the built environment. BEMP includes the Property Council of Australia (PCA), the Australian Institute of Architects, the Planning Institute of Australia, Consult Australia and the Green Building Council Australia.

In order to identify the need for systematic reform of capital city planning across the jurisdictions, KPMG has been engaged by the BEMP to undertake a review of the current status of each of Australia's capital city strategic planning systems against both the COAG national criteria and also a range of key external indicators.

### 2.2 Strategic context

COAG has put the future strategic planning of Australian capital cities at the centre of the national reform agenda. At their December 2009 meeting, COAG agreed that strategic planning was central to ensuring Australian cities remained prosperous, sustainable and liveable. COAG also agreed that future Commonwealth infrastructure funding should be tied to achieving these goals. The criteria agreed to by COAG are included in *Appendix A*.

As a stakeholder in the planning system of each jurisdiction, the BEMP has commissioned this report in order to review and audit the current status of existing planning systems. However, the BEMP is conscious that different jurisdictions are at different stages of the reform process. As such, this review is designed to provide a snapshot of where jurisdictions currently are in the process of reform, including both their current strengths and weaknesses and the extent of further reform that will be required to comply with the national criteria. To this extent, we have attempted to highlight what jurisdictions 'say' is being done for capital cities, and what jurisdictions 'do' for capital cities.

The ultimate purpose of this review is to highlight which reforms remain outstanding and that are necessary to ensure that the COAG criteria are a success. Ultimately, success can only be measured by real and tangible results on the ground in Australian capital cities.



### 3 Methodology

Our methodology has involved a desktop assessment of existing capital city strategic planning systems against the nine COAG criteria, and also the consideration of some key external indicators to test whether the strategic planning documents have translated into actual positive actions. In undertaking these subjective tasks, we have used experienced professionals that have and continue to be involved in the development of capital city related policy. Also, we have had this report subject to an external high-level review by an experienced town planner.

While performing tasks we have found it challenging. First, there is little documented guidance on what constitutes a capital city strategic planning system. Accordingly, we have reviewed a range of documents that may amount to a capital city strategic planning system, but these documents may not be correct according to the interpretation applied by jurisdictions. Nevertheless, we have reviewed documents such as:

- State / Territory strategic plans;
- metropolitan strategic plans;
- infrastructure plans;
- land supply programs;
- budget papers as it relates to planned major infrastructure investments; and
- annual reports for agencies such as land management corporations, planning departments, infrastructure departments and treasury departments.

Second, we acknowledge that each capital city has a different approach to strategic planning and most jurisdictions are currently engaged in the process of either review or reform. This has meant that, for those jurisdictions that only have draft or proposed capital city plans, we have rated these jurisdictions low because, as it stands, they do not yet meet the COAG criteria. Furthermore, we may have missed a recent policy or reform announcement due to the point in time this report was prepared.

Third, there are few nationally consistent capital city related data sets that can be used to assess the performance of capital cities, and this is particularly evident for productivity and environmental and social issues. This is a critical issue warranting further development at the Commonwealth or COAG level. In the meantime, we have used indicators such as population growth, housing affordability for key workers and congestion in an attempt to assess the performance of the Australian capital cities. However, this is merely illustrative and does not actually reflect capital city performance.



### 3.1 COAG criteria

#### *Approach*

Our desktop assessment considered the compliance with the nine COAG national criteria (*Appendix A*). The performance of each capital city strategic planning system in relation to the criteria was based primarily on two subjective considerations:

- whether the planning system currently had an existing documented framework in place to meet the criteria; and
- in circumstances where there was an existing framework in place, how successful the framework was in practice. That is, do the actual outcomes match the objectives of the system based on an analysis of evidence derived from reliable data sources?

#### *Scoring framework*

The scoring framework used to assess the performance of each capital city planning framework against the COAG criteria is outlined below. Each capital city system has been assessed against each individual COAG criterion to determine a score out of 10. Then these scores were converted as a percentage to determine an overall score.

**Table 3-1: Scoring framework**

Score	View on Capital City Performance
1 – 2	No evidence that there is a framework in place to meet the criterion. Significant reform is required.
3 – 4	Minimal evidence that there is a framework in place that only partially meets the criterion. No evidence that this framework is being delivered. Significant reform is required.
5 – 6	Evidence that there is a framework in place that meets the criterion. Little evidence that the framework is being delivered. There remains room for improvement.
7 – 8	Evidence that there is a good framework in place that meets the criterion and that the framework is being delivered. There remains some room for improvement.
9 – 10	Evidence that there is an excellent framework in place that fully meets the criterion and that it is being delivered.

#### *Relative ranking*

Based on these scores, each capital city has then been ranked in terms of their relative performance to other capital cities. Given there are eight States and Territories, the best rank a city can receive is one and the lowest is eight.



### *Documents reviewed*

The documentation used during the assessment of capital city planning systems against the COAG criteria is set out in *Appendix B*. It is important to note that we have concentrated our review on those documents that can be easily found through relevant government agency websites however, we acknowledge that some documents may have been missed and that new policy reforms could have been announced following our review of documents.

### *Examples of assessment*

To illustrate how the strategic planning system of each capital city was assessed against each COAG criterion, two practical examples are provided below.

#### *Example 1: Assessment of Sydney against COAG Criterion 3*

Analysis of Sydney's capital city strategic planning documents such as the State Infrastructure Strategy (2008) draft Metropolitan Transport Plan (2010) reveals the following:

- there is only limited consideration of intermodal hubs and interconnections;
- there is a heavy focus on Port Botany as the prime international gateway with limited consideration of other key international gateways;
- there is uncertainty in relation to whether major transport projects will proceed given the changes in direction for projects such as CBD Metro and the North West Rail Link; and
- other than the South-West rail line, there does not appear to be land provision for future transport developments.

The available documentation does not appear to adequately consider each element relevant to the criterion. Accordingly, a number of nationally significant infrastructure priorities are not sufficiently considered in Sydney's planning documents and, where they are contemplated, there is a lack of certainty as to whether these projects will actually proceed. Therefore, it has been determined that Sydney does not address this criterion well and that there is significant improvement required. As a consequence, a score of three out of 10 has been awarded to Sydney against this criterion.

#### *Example 2: Assessment of Hobart against COAG Criterion 9*

Analysis of Hobart's capital city strategic planning documents reveals that the Southern Regional Planning Initiative and the Southern Transport Plan are in development. Together these documents would provide the framework for the strategic land use and transport planning for the region. Given they are in development, there is limited evidence that demonstrates effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, as evidenced by:

- an absence of clear accountabilities, timelines and appropriate performance measures;
- a lack of coordination between all three levels of government, with opportunities for Commonwealth and Local Government input, and linked, streamlined and efficient approval processes including under the *Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*;



- an absence of evaluation and review cycles that support the need for balance between flexibility and certainty, including trigger points that identify the need for change in policy settings; and
- a lack of appropriate consultation and engagement with external stakeholders, experts and the wider community.

Accordingly, Hobart (through the southern regional planning documents) does not address this criterion well and there is significant room for improvement. As a consequence, a score of three out of 10 has been awarded to Hobart against this criterion.

### 3.2 Key external indicators

Key external indicators have been incorporated into this assessment in order to determine whether existing strategic planning systems are effecting actual change to the performance of capital cities. This has been a challenging task due to the absence of annually produced nationally consistent data on the performance of capital cities. This means that there is limited data to assess if the achievement of the COAG objective for capital city strategic planning systems.

As such, the key external indicators that we have chosen are:

1. the degree to which budget funding is aligned to existing capital city planning objectives - designed to measure how well capital cities are actually funding, and meeting the objectives contained in their strategic metropolitan and infrastructure plans on an annual basis;
2. population management - designed to indicatively measure how capital cities are planning for, and responding to, anticipated population growth;
3. housing affordability for key workers – the comparative price of housing for key worker groups have been compared across each capital city for 2009. The figures are sourced from the BankWest Key Worker Housing Affordability Report 2009;<sup>14</sup> and
4. congestion – the projected estimates of social costs of congestion as reported by the Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics (BTRE) for each capital city have been analysed and compared<sup>15</sup>. The aggregate figures reported by the BTRE have been adjusted by the population in each capital city to calculate per capita estimates.<sup>16</sup>

#### *Scoring framework*

The scoring framework used to assess the performance of each capital city against the key indicators is outlined below. Given there is no benchmark or best practice target available for capital cities in relation to any of the key external indicators, the score for each capital city in relation to each indicator has been assessed based on their performance relative to the other capital cities.

<sup>14</sup> BankWest, *2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Key Worker Housing Affordability Report*, July 2009.

<sup>15</sup> Commonwealth Government, *Estimating Urban Traffic and Congestion Cost Trends for Australian Cities*, Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics, Canberra, April 2007.

<sup>16</sup> Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Population Projections, Australia, 2006 to 2101*, Cat. No. 3222.0, September 2008.



Each capital city system has been assessed to determine a score out of 10 for each of the four key indicators. Given that there are only four indicators, a total score out of 40 is provided, which has been converted as a percentage.

**Table 3-2: Scoring framework**

Score	View on Capital City Performance – Key External Indicator
1 – 2	The capital city is one of the poorest performing cities against this indicator relative to the other capital cities.
3 – 4	The capital city is not performing well against this indicator relative to the other capital cities.
5 – 6	The capital city is an average performer against this indicator with some cities performing better and others performing more poorly.
7 – 8	The capital city performs well against this indicator relative to the other capital cities but there are other capital cities that perform better.
9 – 10	The capital city is one of the best performing cities against this indicator relative to the other capital cities.

### *Examples of assessment*

#### *Example 1: Assessment of Brisbane's strategic policy and project priorities compared to budget papers*

The 2009-10 Queensland State Budget outlines approximately \$22.2 billion in infrastructure expenditure in 2009-10, across all funding sources. The key South-East Queensland and Brisbane projects funded (either in part or full) in the 2009-10 budget are as follows:

1. SEQ Water Grid projects including the Northern Pipeline Interconnector Stage 2, Wyalong Dam and Hinze Dam Stage 3;
2. Transport projects including funding towards the Ipswich Motorway upgrade, Gateway Bridge, Bruce Highway upgrade, Centenary Highway duplication, Pacific Motorway upgrade, Northern and Eastern Busways and Gold Coast Rapid Transit System; and
3. Planning and development for the three new tertiary hospitals in SEQ.

On the basis of the number and magnitude of projects that have been funded in the 2009-10 Queensland Budget, it can be concluded that there is a high level of compliance of budget initiatives with planned projects for Brisbane and the SEQ region. As a consequence, Brisbane has been awarded a relatively high score of eight-out-of-ten for this indicator.



*Example 2: Assessment of Sydney's housing affordability for key workers compared to the other capital cities*

BankWest publishes a Key Worker Housing Affordability Report each year in July. In 2009, the average income for key workers such as nurses, firefighters, ambulance officers, teachers and police was fairly consistent between all capital cities (average of approximately \$73,000 per annum)<sup>17</sup>. However, considering Sydney's median house price for March 2009 was \$564,500 (around 60 per cent higher than Hobart's), the ratio of affordability is significantly worse. As a consequence, Sydney has been awarded the lowest score (two-out-of-ten) for this indicator. Hobart, on the other hand, has been awarded nine-out-of-ten, as its median housing price was \$354,500 for the March 2009 quarter.

---

<sup>17</sup> <sup>17</sup> BankWest, 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Key Worker Housing Affordability Report, July 2009.





## 4 Results

### 4.1 COAG criteria performance

The following table contains the results of the review of capital city planning system performance against the nine COAG criteria.

*Table 4-1: COAG criteria performance*

Criteria	1. Integration (10)	2. Plans (10)	3. Infrastructure (10)	4. Policy (10)	5. Networks (10)	6. Land release (10)	7. Investment (10)	8. Urban Design (10)	9. Implementation (10)	Total Score (%)	Relative Ranking (1-8)
Melbourne	7	8	7	7	7	6	7	7	6	69	1
Brisbane	7	8	7	7	7	4	7	5	6	64	2
Adelaide	7	7	7	8	7	4	5	5	5	61	3
Perth	4	4	2	7	7	6	7	7	6	56	4
Canberra	6	7	6	6	3	4	5	6	6	54	5
Sydney	6	4	3	5	7	5	4	5	3	47	6
Darwin	4	4	4	4	4	3	6	6	5	44	7
Hobart	4	4	4	3	7	1	5	3	3	38	8
Average	6	6	5	6	6	4	6	6	5	54 <sup>18</sup>	

**Table 4.1** shows that the average total score for Australian capital cities is 54 per cent. This indicates there is significant room for reform across the nation when it comes to actually delivering better planning in capital cities.

Melbourne has been assessed as currently having the best performing capital city planning system in Australia, when measured against the COAG criteria. This is largely due to the extensive reforms that the Victorian Government has pursued in recent years to improve Melbourne's planning system.

Hobart and Darwin score low against the criteria due to the current absence of metropolitan and infrastructure/transport plans, and land supply programs. However, it is understood that the Northern Territory and Tasmanian Governments will shortly release plans relating to the future planning of Darwin and Southern Tasmania.

When assessed according to the COAG criteria, Sydney currently performs relatively poorly given its size and its critical importance to the national economy.

<sup>18</sup> This is the average of all 72 raw data points and not the nine average data points.



It is important to note that, despite the relatively good performance of cities such as Melbourne, Brisbane and Adelaide, there is a capacity for the capital city planning system to improve in all jurisdictions.

## **4.2 Key external indicator performance**

The following table outlines the results of the assessment of the performance of capital cities against the following four key indicators:

1. level of budget alignment linked to capital city planning objectives;
2. population management;
3. housing affordability for key workers; and
4. congestion.

While there could have been a range of other indicators chosen, these external indicators highlight the need for strong national performance monitoring and reporting to ensure whether what capital city plans 'say' will be done matches with the achievement of capital city outcomes.

**Table 4.2** indicates that cities such as Sydney, Brisbane and Melbourne face increasing challenges regarding urban congestion, whereas Hobart, Brisbane and Perth have higher population growth levels than the annual planning level, and this means that they may face challenges in the way they respond to housing supply and service provision. Therefore, these types of indicators have the potential to test capital city planning systems and provide a trigger for the review of the effectiveness of Government policy and investment efforts.



**Table 4-2: External indicator performance**

City	Budget alignment (10)	Population management (10)	Housing affordability for key workers (10)	Congestion (10)	Total Score (%)	Overall relative ranking (1-8)
Adelaide	6	9	8	6	73	1
Canberra	7	8	5	7	68	2
Hobart	3	3	9	8	58	3
Brisbane	8	4	6	4	55	4
Darwin	2	N/A <sup>19</sup>	5	9	53	5
Melbourne	7	6	3	3	48	6
Perth	4	5	4	5	45	7
Sydney	5	7	2	2	40	8
Average	5	6	5	6	55	

#### *Level of budget funding alignment to capital city planning objectives*

The provision of budget funding is critical to determining whether jurisdictions are actually implementing their strategic planning objectives. In order to assess the jurisdictions' financial compliance with strategic planning objectives, the infrastructure projects funded in 2009-10 State and Territory budgets were compared to the economic infrastructure needs identified in State and Territory metropolitan and infrastructure plans.

It is clear from **Table 4.3** that there is wide variance between the jurisdictions in relation to actually providing funding for their stated strategic planning objectives. The best performing cities are Adelaide and Canberra. This is largely due to strong links between budget funded initiatives and the priorities outlined in their metropolitan and infrastructure plans.

The poorest performing cities are Sydney and Perth, both of which do not currently have a comprehensive strategic planning framework in place. The lack of capital city related planning documents, including land supply programs, hampers the ability to rate both of these cities.

<sup>19</sup> Note, there does not appear to be a population growth planning target for Darwin and so it has been not possible to determine how Darwin is managing and planning for population growth. We note that the Government provides population forecasts for the NT, refer to [www.nt.gov.au/nt/economics/nt\\_population.shtml](http://www.nt.gov.au/nt/economics/nt_population.shtml). However, a Darwin growth target does not appear to have been developed.



**Table 4-3: Level of budget funding linked to capital city planning objectives**

City	Budget alignment (10)	Population management (10)	Housing affordability for key workers (10)	Congestion (10)	Total Score (%)	Overall relative ranking (1-8)
Adelaide	6	9	8	6	73	1
Canberra	7	8	5	7	68	2
Hobart	3	3	9	8	58	3
Brisbane	8	4	6	4	55	4
Darwin	2	N/A <sup>20</sup>	5	9	53	5
Melbourne	7	6	3	3	48	6
Perth	4	5	4	5	45	7
Sydney	5	7	2	2	40	8
Average	5	6	5	6	55	

### *Population management*

Significant population growth is arguably the greatest challenge confronting Australia's capital cities. In order to assess the preparedness of each jurisdiction to deal with the consequences of population growth, the target population levels for each capital city over the next 25 years (as reported in their metropolitan plans) were compared against the high scenario population growth forecasts (prepared by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS)). From the information we have reviewed, Darwin does not appear to have a publicly available population target.

Given the relatively recent nature of the current population boom, a high level analysis was also undertaken of the actual population increase in each city in 2008-09 as measured by the ABS. It was anticipated that more recent population growth data from 2008-09 would highlight the scale of population growth in a year.

While population growth may fluctuate year on year, the significant differences between the planned forecasts and the increases for 2008-09 demonstrates that, in every jurisdiction, actual population growth was significantly higher than planned population growth, with the exception of South Australia. Of concern is the extent of growth occurring in Brisbane. This issue appears to have underpinned the Queensland Government's recent growth management summit

<sup>20</sup> Note, there does not appear to be a population growth planning target for Darwin and so it has been not possible to determine how Darwin is managing and planning for population growth. We note that the Government provides population forecasts for the NT, refer to [www.nt.gov.au/nt/economics/nt\\_population.shtml](http://www.nt.gov.au/nt/economics/nt_population.shtml). However, a Darwin growth target does not appear to have been developed.



initiative and subsequent policy reforms (refer to section 5.2) to better respond and manage to growth.

While jurisdictions are in the process of review and reform such as in Tasmania and in Darwin, the possible disconnect highlighted below indicates the need for more regular performance reporting to ensure that government institutions are adequately tracking demand so that there is up to date and informed service delivery decision making on how best to respond to growth.

**Table 4-4: Population management**

City	Planned increase in population (25 years)	Planned annual population increase	Actual population increase (2008-09) <sup>21</sup>	Proportional difference (%)	Score (10)	Relative Rank (1-8)
Adelaide	466,666 <sup>22</sup>	18,666	17,613	-6	9	1
Brisbane	279,000 <sup>23</sup>	11,160	52,100	367	4	6
Canberra	101,800 <sup>24</sup>	4072	5,869	44	8	2
Darwin	N/A <sup>25</sup>	N/A	3,733	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hobart	8,796 <sup>26</sup>	352	2,568	630	3	7
Melbourne	1,500,000 <sup>27</sup>	60,000	93,478	56	6	4
Perth	545,500 <sup>28</sup>	21,820	52,165	139	5	5
Sydney	1,416,666 <sup>29</sup>	56,666	85,394	51	7	3
Average score:					6	

<sup>21</sup> Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Regional Population Growth, Australia 2008-09*, Cat. No.3218.0 30 March 2010. Note the figures for Adelaide include metropolitan Adelaide and Outer Adelaide. Data sourced direct from the South Australia Department of Planning and Local Government.

<sup>22</sup> The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide, Government of South Australia, February 2010, p 3. The Plan for Greater Adelaide includes a projection of 560,000 additional residents for Adelaide over the next 30 years. This figure has been used to determine the number of additional residents over 25 years.

<sup>23</sup> South-East Queensland Regional Plan 2009-2031, Queensland Government, July 2009, p 17.

<sup>24</sup> ACT Population Projections 2007 – 2052, ACT Government, May 2009, p 32.

<sup>25</sup> Note, there does not appear to be a population growth planning target for Darwin and so it has been not possible to determine how Darwin is managing and planning for population growth. We note that the Government provides population forecasts for the NT, refer to [www.nt.gov.au/nt/economics/nt\\_population.shtml](http://www.nt.gov.au/nt/economics/nt_population.shtml). However, a Darwin growth target does not appear to have been developed.

<sup>26</sup> Tasmania Population Projections 2007 – 2032, Demographic Change Advisory Council, December 2008.

<sup>27</sup> Victoria in Future 2008, Victorian Government, 2008. Victoria in Future 2008 includes a projection of 1,800,000 additional residents for Melbourne over the next 30 years. This figure has been used to determine the number of additional residents over 25 years.

<sup>28</sup> Western Australia Tomorrow: Population Report no. 6, Western Australia Planning Commission, November 2005, p 6.

<sup>29</sup> Metropolitan Strategy Review: Sydney Towards 2036 Discussion Paper, NSW Department of Planning, March 2010, p 2. The Paper includes a projection of 1,700,000 additional residents for Sydney by 2036. This figure has been used to determine the number of additional residents over 25 years.



### *Housing affordability for key workers*

Housing affordability for 'key workers', that is the workers who provide essential services, for example ambulance officers, fire-fighters, nurses, police officers and teachers, has declined sharply in recent years. The BankWest key worker housing affordability index measures the median house price against the average earnings of key workers. Housing is considered to be unaffordable for key workers if the ratio is above five. As can be seen in **Table 4.5**, in March 2009, all of Australia's capital cities, with the exception of Hobart, were found to be unaffordable for key workers. Sydney was found to have the lowest level of key worker housing affordability, with a median house price to earnings ratio for key workers at 7:7.

**Table 4-5: Ratio of median house price with average key worker earnings, capital cities 2009<sup>30</sup>**

City	Median house price (Mar 2009)	Average key worker earnings	Key worker ratio 2009	Percentage change to ratio over 5 years to 2009	Score (10)	Relative Rank (1-8)
Adelaide	373,500	\$ 73,235	5.1	0.5	8	2
Brisbane	439,500	\$ 73,250	6	0.6	6	3
Canberra	457,000	\$ 73,710	6.2	0.3	5	4
Darwin	453,000	\$ 73,065	6.2	2.1	5	4
Hobart	354,500	\$ 73,854	4.8	0.6	9	1
Melbourne	478,000	\$ 73,538	6.5	0.6	3	7
Perth	462,500	\$ 73,413	6.3	1.6	4	6
Sydney	564,500	\$ 73,312	7.7	-2.1	2	8
Average score:					5	

Over the last five years, housing affordability for key workers has deteriorated in all capital cities, except in Sydney where affordability has improved (yet Sydney still remains the least affordable city). The largest deterioration in affordability has occurred in Darwin and Perth.

Breaking the data down by local government areas shows that 100 per cent of the areas within Darwin and Canberra are unaffordable for key workers, while for Perth the share is 90 per cent, in Sydney 86 per cent of areas are unaffordable, and in Brisbane the share is 78 per cent. Hobart and Melbourne have considerably more areas that are affordable for key workers than the other capital cities, with only 14 per cent of areas being unaffordable in Hobart and 68 per cent in Melbourne.

<sup>30</sup> BankWest, 2nd Annual Key Worker Housing Affordability Report, July 2009.



It should be noted, that this is an area where further data is required to assess the underlying causes of housing affordability for key workers. This particularly relates to the adequacy of supply and the accessibility of housing stock that is identified as affordable to key workers.

### ***Congestion***

One of the most significant issues facing our cities is increasing congestion. It is forecast that the movement of freight in Australia will grow by 70 per cent between 2003 and 2020.<sup>31</sup> Without appropriate action, congestion will contribute to the decline in productivity and reduce the liveability of many of our cities. As a consequence, the performance of capital cities in managing congestion will become increasingly important in coming years as cities seek to build international competitiveness and preserve high standards of living.

It is clear from **Table 4.5** below that there is a strong link between the size of capital cities and the level of congestion that they experience. The three largest capital cities, namely Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane, are characterised by relatively high levels of congestion while the three smallest capital cities, namely Darwin, Hobart and Canberra, are characterised by relatively low levels of congestion. The table shows that strong population and economic growth in capital cities, if not properly planned and managed, can be accompanied by inducing higher levels of congestion. In this way, Australian capital cities can become victims of their own success. This issue is particularly pertinent for Perth and Brisbane which are currently experiencing strong population growth.

**Table 4-6: Capital city congestion**

City	Congestion Cost in 2006 per Capita <sup>32</sup>	Congestion Cost in 2020 per Capita <sup>33</sup>	Proportional Increase (%) <sup>34</sup>	Score (10)	Relative Rank (1-8)
Adelaide	\$538	\$801	49	6	4
Brisbane	\$690	\$1,136	65	4	6
Canberra	\$350	\$463	32	7	3
Darwin	\$166	\$203	22	9	1
Hobart	\$248	\$272	10	8	2
Melbourne	\$835	\$1,241	49	3	7
Perth	\$605	\$920	52	5	5
Sydney	\$862	\$1,448	68	2	8
Average score:				5	

<sup>31</sup> Australian Government, *State of Australian Cities*, Infrastructure Australia, Major Cities Unit, Sydney, March 2010, pg 2.

<sup>32</sup> Commonwealth Government, *Estimating Urban Traffic and Congestion Cost Trends for Australian Cities*, Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics, Canberra, April 2007.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Expected average growth in congestion indicator between 2006 and 2026.

***Built Environment Meets Parliament***  
*Spotlight on Australia's Capital Cities*



The assessment of congestion is also an area where more regular reporting is required to better assess the impacts from changes in population growth and the implementation of new major transport investment and policies.





## 5 Capital City Analysis

The following analysis is a high-level summary of the key features in capital city strategic planning systems.

### 5.1 Adelaide

#### *Summary of results*

COAG Criteria Score (%):	61
Average COAG Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	54
COAG relative ranking (1-8):	3
Key External Indicator Score (%):	73
Average Key External Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	55
Key External Indicator relative ranking (1-8):	1
Trend in performance:	↑
<p>South Australia has recently released a Plan for Greater Adelaide which is a spatial representation of the South Australian Strategic Plan and its recent Economic Statement.<sup>35</sup> The Plan for Greater Adelaide identifies growth corridors that are tied to planned rail transport upgrades. The challenge for the South Australian Government is to deliver the housing and employment lands supply program and to achieve infill development to meet its 70 per cent target.</p>	

#### *Snap shot of Adelaide*

- Population – 1.1 million in 2006 and expected to grow to 1.8 million by 2056.
- Planning areas – 25 councils within seven Government Administrative Regions plus the regional township of Murray Bridge.
- Estimated GDP contribution – 5 per cent of GDP.
- Estimated share of state employment – 70 per cent of jurisdictional employment located in Adelaide.

#### *Overview of the Adelaide Strategic Planning System*

Since 2004, South Australia (SA) has had a strategic planning framework in place through the South Australian Strategic Plan (SASP). The SASP contains the strategic priorities of the Government and includes pathways to support economic growth, prosperity and sustainability over a 10-year period.

<sup>35</sup> KPMG was contracted by the South Australian Government to undertake the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide.



A range of other initiatives has complemented the SASP, including:

- Economic Statement (March 2009) - the proposed economic strategy for SA for the next decade;
- Water for Good Plan (June 2009) – the water security plan for SA for the next 50 years; and
- Strategic Infrastructure Plan (April 2005) – the SA Infrastructure Plan for the next decade.

Earlier this year, the SA Government introduced a strategic planning framework for its capital city, the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide (the Plan for Greater Adelaide).

The Plan for Greater Adelaide sets out the SA Government's policies and targets in relation to the city's future growth. The Plan for Greater Adelaide specifically targets the creation of new transit corridors, growth areas and transit-oriented developments and centres. The Plan for Greater Adelaide also establishes clear investment priorities for all levels of Government.

### *Key strengths*

- SA has introduced strong planning and development assessment reform initiatives.
- The Plan for Greater Adelaide is a spatial expression of the SASP and is also underpinned by the Economic Statement and the Water for Good Plan. It is the only metropolitan Plan in Australia that covers most of the nationally significant policy priorities, provides for trigger points and annual performance reporting in relation to the achievement of certain spatial targets.
- The Plan integrates with major transport infrastructure and directs major urban growth to transit corridors where there are funded infrastructure investments.
- There are detailed population, housing and jobs targets at the regional and sub-regional level that can be translated to Regional Implementation Plans.
- The Plan seeks to promote good urban design through the proposed establishment of the Commission for Integrated Design.
- The Government has established a Government Planning Coordination Committee to provide whole of government coordination for the implementation of the Plan.

### *Areas for improvement*

- There is an urgent need for the implementation of the proposed Housing and Employment Land Supply Program so that it can guide supply consistent with the targets for:
  - 70 per cent of infill development; and
  - A rolling 15 years zoned capacity and 25 years overall capacity.



- While SA is in a process of major reform, there is little guidance in the documentation we have reviewed on the role of government institutions in implementing the spatial policies and targets. This is particularly the case for delivery of strategic site developments in the infill areas of Adelaide.
- The annual reporting requirements of the Plan for Greater Adelaide is a good feature, but it should be consolidated with SASP reporting to strengthen the integration of government service planning.
- The Plan for Adelaide has limited statutory effect, it does not have primacy and so, in some cases, Local Development Plans can take precedence over the Plan for Adelaide. The SA Government should consider strengthening the legal position of the Plan so subordinate instruments do not erode the implementation of the Plan.



## 5.2 Brisbane

### *Summary of results*

COAG Criteria Score (%):	64
Average COAG Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	54
COAG relative ranking (1-8):	2
Key External Indicator Score (%):	55
Average Key External Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	55
Key External Indicator relative ranking (1-8):	4
Trend in performance:	↑
<p>Queensland has a relatively strong framework with good coordination across government when it comes to planning. The conduct of its recent growth management summit is evidence of this strong action. However, the significant scale of growth in South East Queensland (SEQ) means that the ability of the strategic planning system to adequately provide for housing and infrastructure is constantly being tested. There are early signs that new government policies could potentially erode the effectiveness of the existing strategic framework.</p> <p>The actions arising out of the growth summit indicate a substantial policy shift by the Queensland Government. The state's Urban Land Development Authority (ULDA) has been accorded a major role in increasing land supply, and is now taking on responsibility for the delivery of new master-planned communities. The newly established coordination agency, Growth Management Queensland (GMQ), and the proposed development of a state-wide capital works plan indicate a move to stronger centralisation and coordination by the Government.</p>	

### *Snap shot of Brisbane and South East Queensland*

- Fastest growing region in Australia.
- Population – 1.8 million in 2006 and expected to grow to 5 million by 2056.
- Planning areas – the SEQ region comprises 11 regional and city councils.
- Estimated GDP contribution – 9 per cent.
- Estimated share of state employment – 45 per cent of jurisdictional employment located in Brisbane

### *Overview of the Brisbane Strategic Planning System*

Released in 2008, 'Towards Q2' provides the strategic direction for Queensland and focuses on key policy priorities including the economy, the environment and lifestyle, education, job skills, health and the community. Underpinning *Towards Q2* is a well-established framework for urban and infrastructure planning in the Brisbane and SEQ area which includes:



- the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2009-2031 (the SEQ Regional Plan) - an urban plan to guide growth, change and development; and
- the South East Queensland Infrastructure Plan and Program 2009-2026 (the SEQ Infrastructure Plan and Program) - a program of infrastructure and major projects.

Both of these documents identify two critical issues for Brisbane - population growth and dwelling demand.

In March 2010, the Queensland Government conducted a growth management summit to discuss the implications of population growth and to identify new strategies to ensure long-term, sustainable solutions for Queensland. The overall findings and directions from the summit were delivered in May 2010. Major recommendations included:

- the Urban Land Development Authority will master plan three new model communities at Ripley valley, Greater Flagstone and Yarrabilla. These three new cities are expected to be home to around 250,000 people;
- the establishment of a new agency – Growth management Queensland (GMQ) to deliver a focused and coordinated approach to growth management across Queensland with a focus on improving DA processes, creating delivery timetables for land supply and accelerating development of infill sites; and
- a new state-wide capital works plan – the Queensland Infrastructure Plan (QIP) – which is aimed at combining other state infrastructure planning documents such as the SEQ Infrastructure Plan and Program and the Roads Investment Program.

### **Key strengths**

- The Queensland Government has engaged widely with the community, the Commonwealth government and local government authorities through its Growth Summit to discuss the implications and potential solutions for managing growth.
- There appears to have good cross-agency coordination with both the SEQ Regional Plan and the SEQ Infrastructure Plan and Program being well integrated. Both plans have also been given statutory effect to enshrine their importance.
- The SEQ Regional Plan and the SEQ Infrastructure Plan and Program establish priorities for investment including in relation to the budget process.
- The recent establishment of the Urban Land Development Authority will see a new focus towards the development of strategic urban sites in SEQ and regional cities declared by the Queensland Government.
- RiskSmart provides for 5-day approval process.
- There is an ongoing process of planning system reform as evidenced by the growth summit but also the recent introduction of the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009* which seeks to shift the focus from planning processes to delivering sustainable outcomes and reducing complexity through standardisation of the planning system.



### *Areas for improvement*

- While the Government has implemented a greenfield land supply program, we have not been able to identify an equivalent program for infill development across SEQ. This is a critical area requiring urgent attention if it is to meet its priorities for infill development, particularly at strategic sites.
- There is emerging evidence that some recent policies are inconsistent with metropolitan and infrastructure plans. For example, the draft Queensland Koala Conservation Strategy<sup>36</sup> is an important policy, but an alternative strategy may be to integrate high conservation areas and habitat corridors into the SEQ Regional Plan. Such an approach would serve to reinforce predictability and certainty regarding the location for growth and change, and may limit the effectiveness of the SEQ Regional Plan.
- It would appear that two systems for land development in Queensland are emerging. One system, which operates under the ULDA, is intended to be the 'fast track'. By implication, all other development will follow the 'slow track'. While the action being taken to fast track development is welcome, it further reinforces the fact that Queensland's 'normal' planning and development system – as per the Sustainable Planning Act – needs improvement.
- Based on our review of documents, there is a need for the planning system to respond to all of the nationally significant policy issues, as well as including more comprehensive monitoring and reporting on the achievement of spatial targets. . This should be complemented by development of trigger points to better monitor and respond to rapid changes in population and economic growth.

---

<sup>36</sup> Queensland Government, Draft South East Queensland Koala Conservation State Planning Regulatory Provisions, Department of Infrastructure and Planning, Brisbane, December 2009. Accessed at [http://www.derm.qld.gov.au/wildlife-ecosystems/wildlife/koalas/koala\\_crisis\\_response\\_strategy/documents/draft\\_koala\\_sprp.pdf](http://www.derm.qld.gov.au/wildlife-ecosystems/wildlife/koalas/koala_crisis_response_strategy/documents/draft_koala_sprp.pdf)



## 5.3 Canberra

### *Summary of results*

COAG Criteria Score (%):	54
Average COAG Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	54
COAG relative ranking (1-8):	5
Key External Indicator Score (%):	68
Average Key External Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	55
Key External Indicator relative ranking (1-8):	2
Trend in performance:	→
Canberra has well integrated strategic, spatial and infrastructure planning and strong links to the budget process. Canberra as the national capital has had the benefit of long term planning and investment in infrastructure.	
However, national capital planning requirements mean that the ACT Government has less discretion to make strategic planning decisions than other jurisdictions. Action should, therefore, be taken to harmonise these planning systems to give consumers and developers greater predictability and certainty regarding the directions for growth.	

### *Snap shot of Canberra*

- National capital and the seat of government.
- Population – 0.4 million in 2006 and expected to grow to 0.7 million by 2056.
- Planning area – settlement of Canberra.

### *Overview of the Canberra Strategic Planning System*

The ACT Government has established an integrated strategic planning framework that links urban planning, economic strategy and infrastructure planning and priorities. In 2004, the ACT launched the Canberra Plan to guide growth and development and to set the strategic planning framework for Canberra into the future.

The Canberra Plan comprises three strategic initiatives:

- Building our Community: Canberra Social Plan (2004) – the social plan for Canberra over the next 15 years;
- The Canberra Spatial Plan (2004) – the spatial direction to guide the development of Canberra for the next 30 years; and
- The ACT Infrastructure Plan (2010) – to provide the strategic context for infrastructure development over the next 10 years.





In 2009, the ACT Government released the Canberra Plan, Towards a Second Century<sup>37</sup> which will underpin community consultation to inform the development of the directions and policies for the next iteration of the Canberra Plan. In time, this is likely to influence other policy documents of the Government including the Canberra Spatial Plan and the Infrastructure Plan.

### *Key strengths*

- There is a good process of community engagement in the review of the Canberra Plan as evidenced by the process to support the Canberra Plan, Towards a Second Century.
- We have observed that the Canberra Spatial Plan is focussed on local employment, good travel connections and residential intensification.
- From the review of the Canberra Spatial Plan, Infrastructure Plan, and the Indicative Land Supply program, there appears to be high level of integration present in the strategic planning framework with links between urban planning and infrastructure. Uniquely, there is monitoring embedded in the Canberra Spatial Plan with reporting proposed every two years to the Legislative Assembly.
- Budgeted infrastructure initiatives align closely with the ACT Infrastructure Plan.

### *Areas for improvement*

- The ACT is subject to both Commonwealth and Territory planning systems. These dual planning schemes should be integrated to give the community and investors' greater certainty and predictability on future directions and priorities.
- Greater integration with the NSW Government is also required to better manage cross border growth.
- Unique planning provisions apply to the ACT driven by the planning principles and policies in the *National Capital Plan*. This influences spatial distribution and the consequential infrastructure requirements for the ACT. As a result the ACT government is somewhat constrained in its ability to meet the national criteria because the Commonwealth has a significant influence in the spatial directions for the ACT. As such, the roles and responsibilities between the ACT and Commonwealth Governments need to be better defined.
- Given the ACT is a small area and land locked, there is a need to ensure more compact and efficient forms of urban development. The land supply and infrastructure programs have a focus towards greenfield supply, and it is difficult to determine the overall, zoned capacity for infill within Canberra.
- The indicative land supply program should be enhanced to provide both greenfield and infill supply.

<sup>37</sup> Australian Territory Government, *The Canberra Plan, Towards a Second Century*, Canberra, 2008. Accessed at [http://www.cmd.act.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0013/120217/canberra\\_plan\\_text\\_V5.pdf](http://www.cmd.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0013/120217/canberra_plan_text_V5.pdf)



## 5.4 Darwin

### *Summary of results*

COAG Criteria Score (%):	44
Average COAG Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	54
COAG relative ranking (1-8):	7
Key External Indicator Score (%):	53 <sup>38</sup>
Average Key External Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	55
Key External Indicator relative ranking (1-8):	5
Trend in performance:	↑
<p>The Northern Territory (NT) has recently introduced its 'Territory 2030 Strategic Plan' which provides a strong strategic foundation for managing growth and change. Central to <i>Territory 2030</i> is the achievement of a more balanced housing market and the development of Waddell as a world-class, green city. The key issue moving forward is for the NT Government to ensure <i>Territory 2030</i> is implemented, particularly around the Government processes and systems to maintain a robust housing supply and supporting infrastructure.</p>	

### *Snap shot of Darwin*

- Population - 0.1 million in 2006 and expected to grow to 0.3 million by 2056.
- Planning area - Darwin City Council.

### *Overview of the Darwin Strategic Planning System*

Released in December 2009, the Territory 2030 Strategic Plan focuses on improving access to affordable housing, reforming the health and education sectors, improving conditions in remote and regional areas and kick-starting key projects, including infrastructure. Of particular relevance to capital city planning is the focus on affordable housing and the provision of infrastructure.

*Territory 2030* states that the immediate focus is on achievement of a balanced housing market through appropriate planning and land release and the identification of key price targets for long-term, sustainable housing. The NT Government also plans to invest in infrastructure including road upgrades and to investigate other projects including a Mount Isa to Tennant Creek rail link and a Darwin light rail system. Other key initiatives include the development of Waddell as a world-class green city, the establishment of an Office of Urban Design in 2011 and the establishment of a Future Fund to fund the future growth of the NT.

<sup>38</sup> Ranked low because we could not identify population growth targets for Darwin in order to make an assessment for population management.



### ***Key strengths***

- *Territory 2030* represents a strong platform to manage growth and change and is underpinned by strong targets.
- The NT Government has already commenced with funding of proposed policy initiatives in its 2010-11 State Budget.
- The NT Government has a long-standing partnership with Darwin City Council through the Capital City Committee aimed at improving the city's sustainability and economic growth.

### ***Areas for improvement***

- While we acknowledge from *Territory 2030* that further reforms are underway, there are currently no publicly available land supply and infrastructure plans applicable to Darwin.
- Given the strong foundation provided by *Territory 2030*, it is critical that these plans are implemented as soon as practical and underpinned with clear responsibility and actions for how these plans will be delivered.
- Strong monitoring and reporting on the residential supply program will be important to better gauge and respond to supply blockages as they arise.
- The partnership with Darwin Council would be enhanced if the Council was given planning responsibility to support the direction of the capital city.



## 5.5 Hobart

### *Summary of results*

COAG Criteria Score (%):	38
Average COAG Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	54
COAG relative ranking (1-8):	8
Key External Indicator Score (%):	58
Average Key External Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	55
Key External Indicator relative ranking (1-8):	3
Trend in performance:	→
<p>The Tasmanian Government has taken significant steps to improve its strategic planning system with the preparation of its Regional Planning Initiative. Tasmania still needs to undertake significant ongoing reform if it is to achieve compliance with the COAG criteria, particularly in relation to land supply to support housing and economic growth.</p>	

### *Snap shot of Hobart*

- Population – 0.2 million in 2006 and expected to grow to 0.4 million by 2056.
- Planning areas – Greater Hobart comprising Brighton, Clarence, Glenorchy, Hobart, Kingborough and Sorell local government authorities.
- Estimated GDP contribution – 1 per cent.
- Estimated share of state employment – 45 per cent of jurisdictional employment located in Hobart.

### *Overview of the Hobart Strategic Planning System*

First released in 2001, *Tasmania Together 2020* contains the strategic priorities for the island State and is given effect through the *Tasmania Together Progress Board Act* 2001. There is also an Infrastructure Strategy which focuses on investment in the digital economy, energy, transport and water. The Tasmanian Government has also released a consultation draft of the Southern Integrated Transport Plan, and it is understood a final plan will be released in mid 2010.

Linking to these other documents is the Regional Planning Initiative (the Initiative) for the three regions of Tasmania - the South, North and Northwest. The overall purpose of the Initiative is to undertake joint planning between State and Local Government to introduce coordinated and consistent planning schemes based on a comprehensive regional land use and infrastructure and investment strategy. The development of the Southern Regional Planning Initiative commenced in early 2009, and it is understood that community consultation will commence in mid 2010.



In Tasmania, local government authorities have a greater role in setting directions for land use than in most other jurisdictions. As such, a State and local government collaborative arrangement is also used to manage transport planning and general service provision.

### *Key strengths*

- There is strong regional collaboration across local government authorities.
- The three regional local government authorities are preparing separate regional plans through the Regional Planning Initiative. According to the draft documentation, this is expected to result in consistent and contemporary planning schemes based on a common strategy and supported by regional transport strategies.
- The Tasmanian Government recently established a Planning Commission (similar to the Western Australian model) to drive a strong approach to major project development.

### *Areas for improvement*

- There is a critical need to develop and implement a housing and land supply strategy in Tasmania. It is unclear from the documentation reviewed if present housing demand is being adequately met and what it means for infrastructure planning and delivery.
- Both the Southern Integrated Transport Plan and the Southern Regional Planning Initiative are still in draft form; therefore, Tasmania still has substantially more work to be done to meet the COAG criteria, particularly as it relates to nationally significant policy issues and in the implementation arrangements.
- To this end, Tasmania has yet to define how and who will deliver key growth targets. Is this to be led through the Planning Commission or local government? The role of the private sector also needs to be defined.



## 5.6 Melbourne

### *Summary of results*

COAG Criteria Score (%):	69
Average COAG Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	54
COAG relative ranking (1-8):	1
Key External Indicator Score (%):	48
Average Key External Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	55
Key External Indicator relative ranking (1-8):	6
Trend in performance:	→

Based on these criteria, Melbourne's performance has achieved the highest rating relative to other Australian capital cities. However, Melbourne still faces many challenges within its strategic planning system and cannot afford to be complacent when presented with opportunities for reform.

Melbourne's planning system exhibits many aspects of a strong strategic planning framework. However, Melbourne should consider the creation of a program of regular performance monitoring on key national policy issues given the substantial challenges of implementing large-scale urban renewal to meet growth targets.

### *Snap shot of Melbourne*

- Population - 3.7 million in 2006 and expected to grow to 8.0 million by 2056.
- Planning areas – metropolitan Melbourne comprises the combined catchments of Western Port and Port Phillip Bay, the boundaries of the total area governed by Melbourne's 31 municipal councils and Melbourne 2030's urban growth boundary.
- Estimated GDP contribution – 18 per cent.
- Estimated share of state employment – 70 per cent of jurisdictional employment located in Melbourne.

### *Overview of the Melbourne Strategic Planning System*

Since 2001, 'Growing Victoria Together' (GVT) has provided the strategic priorities of the Victorian Government and outlined the key issues and priority actions to guide budget and policy decisions. Three key complementary documents outline the Victorian Government's strategic plans for Melbourne, namely:

- Melbourne 2030 (2002): A long-term plan for Melbourne and the surrounding region;
- Victorian Transport Plan (2008); and



- Melbourne@5 million (2008): A refinement of Melbourne 2030.

The refinements in Melbourne@5 million take account of the pace of population and economic growth by expanding the Urban Growth Boundary. The targets in Melbourne @5 million shift the emphasis of growth to 53 per cent infill development and 47 per cent greenfield development, and this contrasts the targets in Melbourne 2030 where it was approximately 60 per cent infill development and some 40 per cent greenfield development.

A key challenge for Melbourne is how it will efficiently accommodate and deliver an increasing demand for housing through a balanced policy of greenfield and infill development.

### *Key strengths*

- The urban planning and infrastructure planning strategies of the Victorian Government align well to GVT, and this provides a strong framework for integrated future oriented transport and infrastructure planning and funding initiatives.
- Both Melbourne 2030 and Melbourne@5 million demonstrate strong networks and connections between the capital city and regional centres.
- The Victorian Government engaged a panel of experts to audit Melbourne 2030. The result was a range of new strategic planning priorities which included the release of Melbourne@5 million.
- Through the Integrated Housing Strategy (2010), the Government has refocussed VicUrban to concentrate on transit corridor and activity centre developments in Melbourne and regional Victoria. While this has not yet become operational, if it is put into practice it will send a strong message on the future role for land development agencies.

### *Areas for improvement*

- Victoria has a strong strategic planning framework in place and clear future-oriented plans. However, there is little regular performance reporting in place and a five-yearly audit is too long a timeframe to report on the management of spatial growth.
- If population growth exceeds current planning levels, as evidenced in Melbourne@5 million, there is a need for Melbourne to better monitor key growth issues so it can provide more timely spatial and institutional responses.
- The Annual Statement of Intentions provides a good snapshot of the priorities for policy, projects and programs each year. There is a need, however, for ongoing reporting measures to be implemented. Presently, the implementation and progress of commitments are not effectively measured.



## 5.7 Perth

### *Summary of results*

COAG Criteria Score (%):	56
Average COAG Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	54
COAG relative ranking (1-8):	4
Key External Indicator Score (%):	45
Average Key External Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	55
Key External Indicator relative ranking (1-8):	7
Trend in performance:	↑
<p>The Western Australia (WA) Government has announced major reforms to the strategic planning system that will lead to greater compliance with the COAG criteria. While these steps position WA to more effectively plan for Perth's future, it is still to develop its land supply program and implement <i>Directions 2031</i>. Accordingly, there is a great deal of potential in the strategic planning reforms announced late last year; however, the focus must now be on implementation.</p>	

### *Snap shot of Perth*

- Population – 1.5 million in 2006 and expected to grow to 4.2 million by 2056.
- Planning areas –urban areas of Perth and Peel.
- Estimated GDP contribution – 10 per cent.
- Estimated share of state employment – 70 per cent of jurisdictional employment located in Perth.

### *Overview of the Perth Strategic Planning System*

In September 2009, the WA Government released its proposed planning reforms in the report 'Planning Makes it Happen: a Blueprint for Planning Reform'. These reforms provide a strong indication that the WA Government is seeking to establish an integrated infrastructure and land-use planning framework for urban areas which will include a revised State Planning Strategy, the *Directions 2031* spatial framework and accompanying sub-regional plans and a revised Urban Development Program. Moreover, the WA Government proposes to introduce a capital city planning framework.

The reforms seek to use the Urban Development Program to monitor and coordinate the supply and timely delivery of residential and industrial land to the metropolitan Perth and Peel regions and to targeted regional centres. It is also designed to serve as an evaluation tool to measure delivery of the key aims of *Directions 2031* and sub-regional urban growth management





strategies. Importantly, WA is the only jurisdiction to establish a Land Supply Coordinator to drive the implementation of supply.

One of key challenges facing the WA planning system is significant population growth and how to manage the demands that this will place on services and infrastructure. This will be important to achieve an efficient liveable and prosperous city.

### ***Key strengths***

- From the documentation we have reviewed, the WA Planning Commission integrates planning and infrastructure with state-wide responsibilities for urban, rural and regional land use planning and development. This represents a strong and integrated approach to infrastructure and planning.
- There is good quarterly reporting published for land supply and housing activity.
- Critically, there are a range of very good planning reforms announced last year. In particular, the establishment of a lead agency governance framework for strategic planning, strengthening the role of the WA Planning Commission to monitor and coordinate the supply of land, the establishment of the Urban Development Program to coordinate delivery of infrastructure to new urban land and the establishment of Land Supply Coordinator to manage both system blockages, housing supply chain and linkages to longer term infrastructure.

### ***Areas for improvement***

- While there appears to be good integration of transport and planning, there are few future oriented infrastructure related plans which means there is limited medium and short term information for the private sector on infrastructure investment and innovation opportunities.
- While there are sub-regional population, jobs and dwellings targets, there are no annual targets or performance-monitoring framework. This is particularly important given strong economic growth in WA.
- WA needs to implement its Urban Development Program and *Directions 2031* Spatial Framework as soon as possible.



## 5.8 Sydney

### *Summary of results*

COAG Criteria Score (%):	47
Average COAG Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	54
COAG relative ranking (1-8):	6
Key External Indicator Score (%):	40
Average Key External Criteria Score across jurisdictions (%):	55
Key External Indicator relative ranking (1-8):	8
Trend in performance:	→
<p>The New South Wales (NSW) planning documentation is comprehensive but there is a need to strengthen its decision making frameworks so that there is greater predictability and certainty attached to the delivery and implementation of major transport infrastructure projects. There are major challenges in terms of linking growth with employment and transport, avoiding further social polarisation and removing obstacles to land supply and development.</p> <p>The proposed establishment of the Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority appears to be a step forward to better integrate and deliver on strategic site and major infrastructure developments. However, there is limited detail on how this Authority would meet the challenge to deliver the significant infill developments in Sydney.</p>	

### *Snap shot of Sydney*

- Population – 4.3 million in 2006 and expected to grow to 7.6 million by 2056.
- Planning areas – 43 council areas and includes an area made up of five regional cities and 22 other strategic centres.
- Estimated GDP contribution – 21 per cent.
- Estimated share of state employment – 65 per cent of jurisdictional employment located in Sydney.

### *Overview of the Sydney Strategic Planning System*

The current city planning strategy for Sydney is encapsulated in five key Government strategy documents. These are:

- the NSW State Plan (2010);
- City of Cities: A Plan for Sydney's Future (2005);
- State Infrastructure Strategy (2008);



- Towards Sydney 2036 – a Discussion Paper (2010); and
- Metropolitan Transport Plan (2010) (Draft).

These plans place a strong emphasis on improving the efficient use of existing infrastructure and economic centres as the basis for future growth. Increasing the use of public transport, building around existing public transport and economic corridors, and improving the efficiency of the road network are all central to the broad strategy being pursued by NSW. However, the transport and infrastructure planning has a horizon of 10 years compared to the Sydney metropolitan plan has a vision for the next 25 years and this seems to be a fundamental flaw in the way planning is undertaken in NSW.

The planning for housing and major transport infrastructure is unclear and uncertain. In particular, the changes in priorities for major transport projects such the cancelling and reinstatement of the North West Rail Link<sup>39</sup> as has set back Sydney's ability to be a productive and competitive global city and deterred investment.

The key challenge for Sydney is how it will go about strengthening the planning and coordination of government decision making and delivering on its major transport priorities.

### *Key strengths*

- The NSW Government proposes to establish the Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority which will be responsible for strategic site developments such as transit corridor developments. It is understood the Commonwealth Government will also have a role in the Authority.<sup>40</sup>
- The release of the draft Metropolitan Transport Plan seeks to integrate with the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy.
- There is a good documentation supporting the infill and greenfield land supply program in place and this is updated annually.

### *Areas for improvement*

- Based on the review of documentation, the NSW Government has a mixed track record of implementation for major transport infrastructure. This has led to a lack of clarity and predictability around investment priorities for NSW, and uncertainty about the role of the private sector for these types of developments.
- There is limited performance reporting and there are no trigger points used in the review and assessment of critical spatial targets.
- The Sydney Metropolitan Plan Review discussion paper does not address the networks between Sydney and regional centres such as Wollongong and Newcastle (although it does include the Central Coast).

---

<sup>39</sup> New South Wales Government, *Draft Metropolitan Transport Plan: Connecting the City of Cities*, 2010, Sydney, pg 34.

<sup>40</sup> Minister Albanese Address, Australian Davos Connection Cities Summit, 29 March 2010. Accessed at <http://www.anthonyalbanese.com.au/file.php?file=/news/CIWHUXOPAVOOPSVTMFYFMLFW/index.html>



- The draft Metropolitan Transport Plan and the Sydney Metropolitan Plan Review discussion paper are still in the process of consultation; therefore, there is a critical need to ensure these documents are finalised and are being implemented before the end of 2011.
- The land supply arrangements are not meeting spatial targets or priorities and this is particularly evident for greenfield areas.
- Moreover, the legislative formation of the Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority is critically urgent to enable establishing the resourcing and funding arrangements to deliver on strategic site developments. This will help better define the roles and responsibilities of the planning department, the transport department, Landcom, the private sector and also the role of local government authorities in order to provide greater certainty of their role to deliver upon the priorities to develop strategic sites such as transit corridor developments across Sydney.



## 6 Systematic issues

Our review of capital city strategic planning systems reveals that there are some systemic issues that require improvement across jurisdictions. The critical issues relate to:

- the accessibility of publicly available reliable data and evidence;
- identification and co-ordination of government wide activities that impact on the achievement of strategic planning objectives; and
- whether implementation arrangements achieve on the ground tangible results for Australia's capital cities.

### 6.1 Integration – criteria 1

Only in recent years have jurisdictions undertaken a whole of government approach to strategic planning, and this has been affected through the introduction of state-based strategic plans. Capital city planning is now recognised as a part of this framework. While COAG has not defined what a capital city strategic planning system is; its criteria indicate that these systems do go beyond the role of planning and infrastructure agencies to cover nationally significant policy issues including social inclusion, productivity and global competitiveness, climate change mitigation and adaptation, health, liveability, community wellbeing, housing affordability, and matters of national environmental significance.

In our review of documentation, most jurisdictions still identify the role of capital city planning as resting primarily with the relevant planning department and sometimes supported by cross government working groups. In reality, most government agencies have a role in the development and future growth of our capital cities. For example, Treasury departments have a substantial role in shaping capital cities through the budget process and the incorporation of major infrastructure requirements into long term fiscal planning.

A critical area is the need for integration within planning systems of objectives and strategies to achieve housing choice and affordability. From documentation we have reviewed, Victoria and Queensland have begun to coordinate planning and housing functions to deliver an integrated approach to housing. However, from our review of land supply programs, outcomes for housing choice and for social housing have yet to be truly integrated into these programs and identified as key deliverables for land management organisations across all capital cities. The role of environment and climate change departments is also critical to the development of capital cities. Most jurisdictions have greenhouse gas emissions targets, but it would appear that only Adelaide has developed spatial policies and targets that would contribute to reduced emissions intensity while the capital city grows. We note that the ACT Government is also considering this issue through its Sustainable Futures forum.

### 6.2 Presence of plans – criteria 2

Most jurisdictions are in the process of reform so not all have in place future oriented plans contemplated by this criterion, including:

- long term (for example, 15-30 year) integrated strategic plans,
- medium term (for example, 5-15 year) prioritised infrastructure and land-use plans, and



- near term prioritised infrastructure project pipeline backed by appropriately detailed project plans.

From the evidence we have reviewed, we have not been able to identify any jurisdiction that is preparing near term infrastructure project pipeline projects supported by detailed project plans. The plans that may come closest to this requirement are perhaps State and Territory Budget papers as well as Infrastructure Australia's National Infrastructure Priorities report prepared in May 2009. However, none of these documents provide detailed project plans that support the proposed implementation for, say, 'shovel ready' projects.

### **6.3 Infrastructure – criteria 3**

Most jurisdictions now have infrastructure plans or specific sector based infrastructure plans, such as transport infrastructure plans. We have observed that the relationship between metropolitan plans and infrastructure plans is strongest in Adelaide, Brisbane, Canberra and Melbourne.

Critical to the provision of major infrastructure is whether such projects are being incorporated into long-term, fiscal planning. This type of planning will give jurisdictions the tools to make decisions on when and how major infrastructure should be delivered and the ability to provide more predictability and certainty.

At a threshold level, it is not clear how jurisdictions should nominate such nationally significant projects. This is an area where more guidance from the Commonwealth Government is required. Infrastructure Australia has developed a pipeline of nationally significant infrastructure which was published in 2009 and which included many projects that are contained in State infrastructure plans. While there will always be changing priorities, Infrastructure Australia needs to determine how to maintain its pipeline of projects and better integrate it with State and Territory infrastructure planning. By way of example, the pipeline currently includes two major urban transport projects in Sydney (CBD and West Metro projects) which are no longer being pursued by the NSW Government.

A rolling pipeline of major infrastructure can also support greater transparency to the private sector on future investment opportunities.

### **6.4 Addressing policy issues – criteria 4**

The nationally significant policy issues represent a significant shift in the range of issues to be addressed in our capital city planning systems. Some jurisdictions have commenced addressing these issues, with the Plan for Adelaide including nearly all of the following issues identified by COAG:

- population growth and demographic change;
- productivity and global competitiveness;
- climate change mitigation and adaptation;
- efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets;
- connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets;



- development of major urban corridors;
- social inclusion;
- health, liveability, and community wellbeing;
- housing affordability; and
- matters of national environmental significance.

From our review, the performance of capital city strategic planning systems is very patchy in relation to these matters. Many systems list matters of these kinds as objectives but do not include real strategies for their achievement. This perhaps reflects the difficulty that planners have in responding effectively on these broader issues and the need for strong cross government commitment to taking these beyond broad statements.

However, we have not identified any jurisdiction that has included matters of national environmental significance. This is an area requiring attention by all jurisdictions and consideration of whether it means identifying areas where matters of national environmental significance are to be protected.

The key challenge for jurisdictions is how they spatially integrate these national policy issues into objective policies and targets for capital city related plans. For example, it is broadly accepted that excessive levels of greenhouse gas emissions are contributing to climate change.<sup>41</sup> Cities are disproportionately responsible for emissions that are contributing to climate change as it is believed that, globally, cities account for approximately 75 per cent of greenhouse emissions.<sup>42</sup> In Australia, some of the greatest sources of emissions are those produced in cities – such as road transport – and those released in the production and consumption of goods bound for cities, such as electricity. In Australia, per capita transport emissions are high by world standards – they are the fourth highest of OECD countries and the seventh highest in the world.<sup>43</sup> Jurisdictions have adopted greenhouse emissions targets but, from our review of capital city strategic planning systems, jurisdictions have yet to comprehensively translate the directions of capital city planning into tangible measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

In *PlanNYC 2030*<sup>44</sup>, the New York City Council's metropolitan plan is underpinned by spatial measures that provide quantified reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. These include:

- avoided sprawl 15.6 million tons/yr;
- clean power 10.6 million tons/yr;
- efficient buildings 16.4 million tons/yr; and
- sustainable transportation 6.1 million tons/yr.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>41</sup> See, for example, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), (2007, *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis*. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (eds: Solomon S., Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen, Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K., Tignor, M.M.B., Miller, H.L. Jr and Chen, Z.) Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA.

<sup>42</sup> C40 Cities website: [www.c40cities.org/climatechange.jsp](http://www.c40cities.org/climatechange.jsp) Accessed 18 August 2009.

<sup>43</sup> Gamaut, R., 2008, *Garnaut Climate Change Review: Final Report*, Cambridge University Press, p.161.

<sup>44</sup> New York City Council, *Plan NYC 2030*, 22 April 2007. Accessed at <http://www.nyc.gov/html/planyc2030/html/downloads/the-plan.shtml>

<sup>45</sup> Ibid, pg 134.





This issue is illustrative of the challenge for governments to provide spatial policies that can be measured and monitored to ensure the primary directions for Australian capital cities are being achieved.

## **6.5 Emphasis on networks – criteria 5**

There is evidence of strong planning for the networks between capital cities and regional centres evident in planning documents for Victoria and Queensland, as well as in the Plan for Greater Adelaide. A similar approach is emerging in the planning being undertaken in the Tasmanian Southern Regional Planning Initiative, and we note it is being addressed in the draft NSW Metropolitan Transport Plan with proposed projects including the upgrade of the Hume Highway and the Pacific Highway.

From our review of the documentation, only some capital city planning systems are comprehensively responding to this criterion. We note that the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy Review discussion paper does not address this issue (except for the relationship with the Central Coast) and yet Sydney's role and relationship with regional centres like Wollongong and Newcastle is critically important to the overall extent of population growth to be accommodated in the Greater Metropolitan Region. In other words, the implications of the spatial development of Sydney is likely to have major implications for these regional centres; therefore, these flow on effects need to be considered in the next iteration of the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy to alleviate the pressures on Sydney.

## **6.6 Land release policies – criteria 6**

Land supply programs are designed to provide up to date information on the availability of zoned supply for infill and greenfield housing and employment (commercial and industrial) lands. In other words, they are the working element of a capital city plan. Based on our review of documentation, we believe that it is one of the greatest weaknesses for all capital cities that few jurisdictions have up to date land supply strategies for both greenfield and infill sites.

Our review of available evidence reveals that there is no data available on the supply/demand balance for housing and employment land for all capital cities. Moreover, it is difficult to determine across the board:

- the supply pipeline from land identification to development approval stage for infill and greenfield development;
- the availability of employment lands (industrial and commercial);
- systematic updates of land supply programs through regular reporting (e.g. in Western Australia, it provides quarterly land supply and housing activity reports); and
- public reporting on whether supply arrangements are meeting targets for infill and greenfield development, or actual demand.

While the National Housing Supply Council monitors housing supply in most capital cities (except for Darwin, Hobart and Canberra)<sup>46</sup>, there is no organisation that monitors the state of

<sup>46</sup> Commonwealth Government, *National Infrastructure Priorities*, Infrastructure Australia, Sydney, 2009.  
[http://www.infrastructureaustralia.gov.au/files/National\\_Infrastructure\\_Priorities.pdf](http://www.infrastructureaustralia.gov.au/files/National_Infrastructure_Priorities.pdf), viewed at 11 May 2011.





supply for employment lands across Australia. Accordingly, there is no single national picture on the state of supply for all capital cities for housing and employment lands and the balance to be provided between infill and greenfield areas of capital cities. It means that, as a nation, we do not comprehensively know if our capital city strategic planning systems are providing sufficient supply or if they are meeting the spatial targets for locating growth.

We note that COAG has recently announced a Housing Supply and Affordability working group via the Ministerial Council for Federal Financial Relations, to review the housing supply pipeline and the Government policies that may act as barriers to supply or that stimulate demand.<sup>47</sup>

## **6.7 Encouraging investment – criteria 7**

From the documentation we have reviewed, it is difficult to ascertain an up to date and succinct national picture on the investment and policy effort by Governments or to identify clear frameworks for private sector investment and innovation. The only documentation that may come close to meeting this criterion are State and Territory budget papers but, on this analysis, it is difficult to determine the proposals for capital cities and the framework for private sector investment and innovation. Currently, the only framework of infrastructure priorities we have identified appears to be Infrastructure Australia's national infrastructure pipeline list. However currently, this does not appear to incorporate a rolling pipeline of projects.

The priorities for significant development areas (such as major greenfield precincts, transit corridors and major centres) are not clear from the documentation we have reviewed nor is the role of the private sector in the delivery of major infrastructure or delivery of these development areas.

While some jurisdictions provide a list of proposed policy and investment priorities, such as Victoria's Annual Statement of Intentions, there is an area that is generally not well addressed across jurisdictions and requires significant improvement.

## **6.8 Urban design – criteria 8**

In our review of documentation, there are many guidelines that State and Territory governments and local government authorities have prepared a significant amount of guidance on urban design and architecture. These include:

- the NSW Residential Flat Design Code;<sup>48</sup>
- the Melbourne Activity Centre Design Guidelines;<sup>49</sup>
- the Brisbane City Council Residential Design Guidelines;<sup>50</sup> and

<sup>47</sup> Council of Australian Governments, *Communiqué*, 19-20 April 2010. Accessed at [http://www.coag.gov.au/coag\\_meeting\\_outcomes/2010-04-19/index.cfm?CFID=618156&CFTOKEN=51796874](http://www.coag.gov.au/coag_meeting_outcomes/2010-04-19/index.cfm?CFID=618156&CFTOKEN=51796874)

<sup>48</sup> <http://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/Programsservices/DesignQualityProgram/ResidentialFlatDesignCode/tabid/158/language/en-AU/Default.aspx>, viewed at 12 April 2010.

<sup>49</sup> [http://www.dse.vic.gov.au/CA256F310024B628/0/1F8224C16463B705CA2570130021078E/\\$File/Activity+Centre+Design+Guide+lines.pdf](http://www.dse.vic.gov.au/CA256F310024B628/0/1F8224C16463B705CA2570130021078E/$File/Activity+Centre+Design+Guide+lines.pdf), viewed at 12 April 2010.

<sup>50</sup> [http://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/BCC:BASE::pc=PC\\_276](http://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/BCC:BASE::pc=PC_276), viewed at 12 April 2010.



- the City of Perth Urban Design Framework.<sup>51</sup>

From the arrangements we have observed across the jurisdictions, urban design and architectural guidance is patchy and usually development specific.

We note, however, recent developments in Darwin and Adelaide are to establish bodies dedicated to excellence in design in order to better support the development of urban renewal and major greenfield developments.

We also note that some jurisdictions maintain the office of Government Architect. In NSW, the role of the Government Architect is an advisory role in the Department of Services, Technology and Administration. It provides direct advice to Ministers and senior government staff and also through statutory positions on committees and boards such as Heritage Council, NSW Architects Registration Board, Central Sydney Planning Committee and numerous design review panels. By contrast in Victoria, the role of the Office of Government Architect is located in the Department of Premier and Cabinet and it has both an advisory role (to provide strategic advice to Government about architecture and urban design and to offer a critical understanding of building design to Government Ministers and Departments,) and an advocacy role (to promote an awareness of the importance of good design including the process of making great places and sustainable urban environments). To this extent, the Office has produced a range of good design publications in support of its advocacy role.<sup>52</sup> Consideration should be given to integrating the role of the Government Architect into capital city strategic planning systems.

In moving forward, a change is needed in the way Governments consistently approach excellence in urban design. Incentive arrangements could be another policy mechanism along with advocacy and guidelines.

## 6.9 Implementation – criteria 9

This criterion requires jurisdictions to provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, such as:

- clear accountabilities, timelines and appropriate performance measures,
- coordination between all three levels of government, with opportunities for Commonwealth and Local Government input, and linked, streamlined and efficient approval processes including under the *Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*,
- evaluation and review cycles that support the need for balance between flexibility and certainty, including trigger points that identify the need for change in policy settings, and
- appropriate consultation and engagement with external stakeholders, experts and the wider community.

From our review of the documentation, the implementation arrangements across the capital cities is patchy.

<sup>51</sup> <http://www.cityofperth.wa.gov.au/documentdb/1612.pdf>, viewed at 11 May 2011.

<sup>52</sup> <http://www.dpc.vic.gov.au/CA256D8000265E1A/OrigDoc/~83BAEEE0CB6BE3A9CA2572FB000A9F4F?OpenDocument&1=10-Listing~&2=None~&3=0-he+Office+of+the+Victorian+Government+Architect+-+Initiatives->. Viewed at 11 May 2010.



But, the role of these mechanisms are important given that the development of our capital cities is changing, with an increased focus towards infill development.

**Table 6.1** indicates that the majority of growth is to occur in infill areas. Based on our review of documentation, most of the infill growth will occur within centres, transit corridors and transit oriented developments.

**Table 6-1: Capital city planning targets<sup>53</sup>**

Jurisdiction	South East Queensland	Sydney	Canberra and the ACT	Melbourne	Adelaide	Perth and Peel
Population growth	1.6 million by 2031	1.7 million by 2036	98,200 by 2031	1.8 million by 2031	560,000 people by 2038	556,000 people by 2031
Jobs	-	760,000 new jobs	-	-	282,000 new jobs	356,000 new jobs
Dwellings	754,000 new dwellings	770,000 new dwellings	58,000 to 90,000 new dwellings	600,000 new dwellings	258,000 new dwellings	328,000 dwellings
Infill vs. greenfield development	50 per cent of new dwellings through infill	60 – 70 per cent of new dwellings through infill	Majority of greenfield	53 per cent of new dwellings through infill	70 per cent of new dwellings through infill	47 per cent of new dwellings through infill

The significant issue for all Australian capital cities is how strategic plans translate into actions and developments that make our cities more competitive, productive, sustainable, liveable and socially inclusive. The areas where this will prove to be most challenging are in the priority growth areas of our capital cities as indicated above. This means that the role and accountability of government institutions need to be better aligned to meet the significant spatial directions for these locations.

The establishment of institutions, such as VicUrban, the East Perth Redevelopment Authority and the soon to be established Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority, are important organisations that will be instrumental in implementing major growth precincts, particularly in the infill areas of our capital cities. However, their success will be dependant on whether they are granted the right tools to achieve the development of strategic sites.

It is not clear from our review of capital city strategic planning systems what will be the role of local governments in the execution of metropolitan plans. It is noted that Tasmania appears to have strong collaborative arrangements with local government authorities. Similar collaboration appears to be underway in Adelaide and in South East Queensland. The real challenge is if planning strategies can be easily translated and implemented by local government authorities so that they can effectively and efficiently respond to local planning as well as local service delivery. To this extent, the time taken to amend and update local environment plans and sub regional plans after the publication of capital city plans has the potential to delay the implementation of capital city strategic plans. As such, jurisdictions may need to consider more

<sup>53</sup> Tasmania and Northern Territory are in the process of developing their urban plans; as such, there are no targets in place.



nimble means to ensure local government authorities can effectively implement capital city plans and plan for services.

There is considerable national effort to implement streamlined development approval processes, including COAG's agreement:

*“to work towards harmonising code-based development assessment standards between jurisdictions, increasing the proportion of code-assessed DAs, and developing stand-alone assessment codes for houses, units and commercial developments. Code-based DA systems mean that simple development proposals can be assessed more quickly and free-up planning resources to assess more complex proposals.”<sup>54</sup>*

However, an area that does require review and reform is in relation to streamlining the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* into State and Territory approval processes. Presently, this process sits outside State and Territory planning approval processes, and this leads to length delay and uncertainty.

Change is inevitable, but the pace and scale of contemporary change is clearly challenging our existing processes and structures. It would appear that only Adelaide and Canberra provide performance reporting for their capital city strategic planning systems; however, these performance reports have yet to be implemented on a regular basis. While some jurisdictions have mechanisms in place to review their strategic metropolitan plans, this timeframe means that they are adjusting to major fluctuations in population and employment growth, housing demand and housing affordability. New methods for keeping pace of regular change are required along with clarifying the role and timing of review points and recasting capital city plans.

Jurisdictions undertake consultation in a variety of ways in the establishment of capital city plans or in the review of these plans. There are no consistent approaches across jurisdictions, with Queensland providing a Growth Summit, Victoria undertaking an audit conducted by independent experts and, in Sydney, there is consultation supporting the release of the Metropolitan Strategy Review discussion paper. Effective consultation is a critical challenge for all jurisdictions, and perhaps national guidance is needed to ensure the community and industry is across and supportive of the rationale and direction for the spatial development of our capital cities, as opposed to contesting these issues at each and every development application.

---

<sup>54</sup> Council of Australian Governments, Communiqué 2 July 2009. Accessed at [http://www.coag.gov.au/coag\\_meeting\\_outcomes/2009-07-02/index.cfm](http://www.coag.gov.au/coag_meeting_outcomes/2009-07-02/index.cfm)



## **A The COAG Criteria**

This appendix details the COAG national objective for capital city planning systems and the associated nine criteria.

### **A.1 National Objective**

To ensure Australian cities are globally competitive, productive, sustainable, liveable and socially inclusive and are well placed to meet future challenges and growth.

### **A.2 Capital City Strategic Planning Criteria**

Capital city strategic planning systems should:

1. be integrated:
  - a. across functions, including land-use and transport planning, economic and infrastructure development, environmental assessment and urban development, and
  - b. across government agencies;
2. provide for a consistent hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans, including:
  - a. long term (for example, 15-30 year) integrated strategic plans,
  - b. medium term (for example, 5-15 year) prioritised infrastructure and land-use plans, and
  - c. near term prioritised infrastructure project pipeline backed by appropriately detailed project plans;
3. provide for nationally-significant economic infrastructure (both new and upgrade of existing) including:
  - a. transport corridors,
  - b. international gateways,
  - c. intermodal connections,
  - d. major communications and utilities infrastructure, and
  - e. reservation of appropriate lands to support future expansion;
4. address nationally-significant policy issues including:
  - a. population growth and demographic change,
  - b. productivity and global competitiveness,
  - c. climate change mitigation and adaptation,
  - d. efficient development and use of existing and new infrastructure and other public assets,
  - e. connectivity of people to jobs and businesses to markets,
  - f. development of major urban corridors,



- g. social inclusion,
  - h. health, liveability, and community wellbeing,
  - i. housing affordability, and
  - j. matters of national environmental significance;
- 5. consider and strengthen the networks between capital cities and major regional centres, and other important domestic and international connections;
- 6. provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfields development;
- 7. clearly identify priorities for investment and policy effort by governments, and provide an effective framework for private sector investment and innovation;
- 8. encourage world-class urban design and architecture; and
- 9. provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms, including:
  - a. clear accountabilities, timelines and appropriate performance measures,
  - b. coordination between all three levels of government, with opportunities for Commonwealth and Local Government input, and linked, streamlined and efficient approval processes including under the *Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*,
  - c. evaluation and review cycles that support the need for balance between flexibility and certainty, including trigger points that identify the need for change in policy settings, and
  - d. appropriate consultation and engagement with external stakeholders, experts and the wider community.



## B Documents reviewed

The following documents were reviewed as part of the assessment of each jurisdiction against the COAG criteria and the key external indicators.

Adelaide (SA)	Brisbane (Queensland)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>South Australia Strategic Plan (2004) and updates and performance reports<sup>55</sup></li> <li>Strategic Infrastructure Plan (2006)<sup>56</sup></li> <li>Water for Good Plan (2009)<sup>57</sup></li> <li>Economic Statement (2009)<sup>58</sup></li> <li>Corporate Plans from the Department of Planning and Local Government<sup>59</sup>, Department of Transport, Energy and Infrastructure<sup>60</sup>, Department of Premier and Cabinet<sup>61</sup>, Department for Families and Communities<sup>62</sup> and Department of Treasury and Finance<sup>63</sup></li> <li>Land Management Corporation Annual Report (2009)<sup>64</sup></li> <li>Residential Metropolitan Development Program<sup>65</sup> and Industrial Land Supply Program<sup>66</sup></li> <li>2009-10 South Australian Budget<sup>67</sup></li> <li>30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide (2010)<sup>68</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>South-East Queensland Regional Plan 2009-2031 (2009)<sup>69</sup></li> <li>South-East Queensland Infrastructure Program 2009-2026 (2009)<sup>70</sup></li> <li>Queensland Housing Affordability Strategy<sup>71</sup></li> <li>Queensland Urban Land Development Authority Annual Report (2009)<sup>72</sup></li> <li>Corporate Plans from the Department of Infrastructure and Planning<sup>73</sup>, Department of Transport and Main Roads<sup>74</sup>, Department of Premier and Cabinet<sup>75</sup>, Housing and Homelessness Services<sup>76</sup> and Treasury<sup>77</sup></li> <li>Towards Q2<sup>78</sup></li> <li>2009-10 Queensland Budget<sup>79</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>55</sup> <http://www.saplan.org.au/content/view/79/131/>, viewed on 21 April 2010

<sup>56</sup> [http://www.infrastructure.sa.gov.au/strategic\\_infrastructure\\_plan](http://www.infrastructure.sa.gov.au/strategic_infrastructure_plan), viewed on 21 April 2010

<sup>57</sup> <http://www.waterforgood.sa.gov.au/2009/06/water-for-good-sas-water-management-plan-to-2050/>, viewed on 21 April 2010

<sup>58</sup> <http://www.sapo.org.au/pub/pub13263.html>, viewed on 21 April 2010

<sup>59</sup> <http://www.planning.sa.gov.au/index.cfm?objectid=AE5DBC39-F203-0D46-AD91FEC4267FE204>, viewed 10 May 2010

<sup>60</sup> [http://www.dtei.sa.gov.au/government\\_strategies](http://www.dtei.sa.gov.au/government_strategies), viewed 10 May 2010

<sup>61</sup> [http://www.premcab.sa.gov.au/dpc/publications\\_strategic.html](http://www.premcab.sa.gov.au/dpc/publications_strategic.html), viewed 10 May 2010

<sup>62</sup> <http://www.dfc.sa.gov.au/pub/tabId/238/itemId/274/moduleId/1060/default.aspx>, viewed 10 May 2010

<sup>63</sup> [http://www.treasury.sa.gov.au/dtf/about\\_us/corporate\\_plan.jsp](http://www.treasury.sa.gov.au/dtf/about_us/corporate_plan.jsp), viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>64</sup> <http://www.lmc.sa.gov.au/home/inner.asp?pageID=40&mainID=16>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>65</sup> <http://www.planning.sa.gov.au/index.cfm?objectid=F20FD702-F203-0D46-AD39BD756F1A8E9C>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>66</sup> <http://www.planning.sa.gov.au/index.cfm?objectid=A1338AAF-96B8-CC2B-6E13EE81050D14A2>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>67</sup> <http://www.premier.sa.gov.au/budget/index.php>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>68</sup> <http://www.dplg.sa.gov.au/plan4adelaide/index.cfm>, viewed 21 April 2010. KPMG was contracted by the South Australian Government to undertake The 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide.

<sup>69</sup> <http://www.dip.qld.gov.au/seqregionalplan>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>70</sup> <http://www.dip.qld.gov.au/regional-planning/seq-infrastructure-plan-and-program.html>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>71</sup> [http://www.dip.qld.gov.au/resources/publication/housing\\_affordability\\_strategy\\_updated210608.pdf](http://www.dip.qld.gov.au/resources/publication/housing_affordability_strategy_updated210608.pdf), viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>72</sup> [http://www.ulda.qld.gov.au/01\\_cms/details.asp?ID=21](http://www.ulda.qld.gov.au/01_cms/details.asp?ID=21), viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>73</sup> <http://www.dip.qld.gov.au/corporate-publications/strategic-plan.html>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>74</sup> <http://www.tmr.qld.gov.au/About-us/Corporate-information/Publications/Corporate-plan.aspx>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>75</sup> <http://www.premiers.qld.gov.au/publications/categories/plans/strategic-plan.aspx>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>76</sup> <http://www.public-housing.qld.gov.au/partnerships/affordable/publications/index.htm>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>77</sup> <http://www.treasury.qld.gov.au/about/corporate-plans/treasury-corporate-plan.shtml>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>78</sup> [http://www.towardq2.qld.gov.au/tomorrow/index.aspx?kwc=KNC-adwords\\_Q2&gclid=CI27ypGw1poCFc0vpAodOip43Q](http://www.towardq2.qld.gov.au/tomorrow/index.aspx?kwc=KNC-adwords_Q2&gclid=CI27ypGw1poCFc0vpAodOip43Q), viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>79</sup> <http://www.budget.qld.gov.au/>, viewed 21 April 2010





Canberra (ACT)	Darwin (NT)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ National Capital Plan (1990) and updates<sup>80</sup></li> <li>○ Economic White Paper (2003)<sup>81</sup></li> <li>○ Building our Community: Canberra Social Plan (2004)<sup>82</sup></li> <li>○ The Canberra Spatial Plan (2004)<sup>83</sup></li> <li>○ Infrastructure Plan for the ACT (2008)<sup>84</sup></li> <li>○ Corporate Plans from ACT Planning &amp; Land Authority<sup>85</sup>, Dept. of Territory and Municipal Services<sup>86</sup>, Chief Minister's Dept<sup>87</sup>, Dept of Disability, Housing and Community Services<sup>88</sup>, Dept. of Treasury and Finance<sup>89</sup></li> <li>○ Indicative Land Release Programs (2009)<sup>90</sup></li> <li>○ Territory Plan (2009)<sup>91</sup></li> <li>○ Sustainable Future Planning Program<sup>92</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Territory 2030 Strategic Plan<sup>93</sup></li> <li>○ Climate Change Policy (2009)<sup>94</sup></li> <li>○ Housing the Territory Strategy (2009)<sup>95</sup></li> <li>○ Corporate Plans from the Department of Lands and Planning<sup>96</sup>, NT Transport Group<sup>97</sup>, Department of the Chief Minister<sup>98</sup>, Department of Housing, Local Government &amp; Regional Services<sup>99</sup> and Department of Treasury and Finance<sup>100</sup></li> <li>○ 2010-11 Northern Territory Budget<sup>101</sup></li> </ul>
Hobart (TAS)	Melbourne (VIC)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tasmania Together 2020<sup>102</sup></li> <li>○ Review of the Tasmanian Planning System - Steering Committee Report (2009)<sup>103</sup></li> <li>○ Southern Tasmania Regional Planning Project (2009)<sup>104</sup></li> <li>○ Industrial Land Demand Tasmania (2008)<sup>105</sup></li> <li>○ Tasmanian Infrastructure Strategy (2010)<sup>106</sup></li> <li>○ Draft Southern Integrated Transport Plan (2009)<sup>107</sup></li> <li>○ Tasmanian Transport Infrastructure Investment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Growing Victoria Together (2001) (updated in 2005)<sup>115</sup></li> <li>○ Melbourne 2030 (2002)<sup>116</sup></li> <li>○ Melbourne @ 5 Million (2008)<sup>117</sup></li> <li>○ Urban Development Program<sup>118</sup></li> <li>○ Victorian Integrated Housing Strategy</li> <li>○ Victorian Transport Plan (2008)<sup>119</sup></li> <li>○ Our Water Our Future: The Next State of the Government's Plan (2007)<sup>120</sup></li> <li>○ Victorian Schools Plan (2006)<sup>121</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>80</sup> [http://www.nationalcapital.gov.au/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=372&Itemid=260](http://www.nationalcapital.gov.au/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=372&Itemid=260), viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>81</sup> <http://catalogue.nla.gov.au/Record/3070119>, viewed on 21 April 2010

<sup>82</sup> <http://www.cmd.act.gov.au/policystrategic/socialplan>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>83</sup> <http://www.engagingcommunities2005.org/abstracts/S12-angharad-d.html>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>84</sup> [http://www.cmd.act.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0010/119728/infrastructure\\_plan.pdf](http://www.cmd.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0010/119728/infrastructure_plan.pdf), viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>85</sup> [http://www.actpla.act.gov.au/tools\\_resources/legislation\\_plans\\_registers/plans/territory\\_plan](http://www.actpla.act.gov.au/tools_resources/legislation_plans_registers/plans/territory_plan), viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>86</sup> [http://www.tams.act.gov.au/live/about\\_our\\_department/annual\\_reports](http://www.tams.act.gov.au/live/about_our_department/annual_reports), viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>87</sup> <http://www.cmd.act.gov.au/policystrategic/canberraplan>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>88</sup> <http://www.dhcs.act.gov.au/hcs/publications>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>89</sup> <http://www.treasury.act.gov.au/about/publications.shtml>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>90</sup> <http://www.cmd.act.gov.au/functions/publications>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>91</sup> [http://www.actpla.act.gov.au/tools\\_resources/legislation\\_plans\\_registers/plans/territory\\_plan](http://www.actpla.act.gov.au/tools_resources/legislation_plans_registers/plans/territory_plan), viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>92</sup> [http://www.actpla.act.gov.au/topics/significant\\_projects/change/sustainable\\_future](http://www.actpla.act.gov.au/topics/significant_projects/change/sustainable_future), viewed at 11 May 2010.

<sup>93</sup> <http://www.territory2030.nt.gov.au/>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>94</sup> <http://www.greeningnt.nt.gov.au/climate/policy.html>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>95</sup> <http://www.housingnt.nt.gov.au/>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>96</sup> <http://www.nt.gov.au/dlp/publications/index.shtml>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>97</sup> <http://www.transport.nt.gov.au/transport/publications/index.shtml>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>98</sup> [http://www.dcm.nt.gov.au/strong\\_territory/government\\_vision](http://www.dcm.nt.gov.au/strong_territory/government_vision), viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>99</sup> [http://www.territoryhousing.nt.gov.au/corporate/annual\\_reports](http://www.territoryhousing.nt.gov.au/corporate/annual_reports), viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>100</sup> [http://www.nt.gov.au/nt/annual\\_report.shtml](http://www.nt.gov.au/nt/annual_report.shtml), viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>101</sup> <http://www.budget.nt.gov.au/>, viewed 11 May 2010





Hobart (TAS)	Melbourne (VIC)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategy (2006)<sup>108</sup></li> <li>o Tasmanian Infrastructure Strategy (2010)<sup>109</sup></li> <li>o Corporate Plans from the Department of Infrastructure, Energy &amp; Resources<sup>110</sup>, Department of Premier and Cabinet<sup>111</sup>, Department of Health and Human Services<sup>112</sup> and Department of Treasury and Finance<sup>113</sup></li> <li>o 2009-10 Tasmanian Budget<sup>114</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Corporate Plans from the Department of Planning and Community Development<sup>122</sup>, Department of Transport<sup>123</sup>, Department of Premier and Cabinet<sup>124</sup>, Department of Human Services<sup>125</sup> and Department of Treasury and Finance<sup>126</sup></li> <li>o VicUrban and Growth Areas Authority Annual Reports (2009)<sup>127,128</sup></li> <li>o 2009-10 Victorian Budget<sup>129</sup></li> <li>o Annual Statement of Intent (2010)<sup>130</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>102</sup> [http://www.tasmaniattogether.tas.gov.au/reports\\_and\\_papers](http://www.tasmaniattogether.tas.gov.au/reports_and_papers), viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>103</sup> <http://www.justice.tas.gov.au/landuseplanning/planningsystemreview>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>104</sup> <http://stca.tas.gov.au/?p=228>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>105</sup> [http://www.iris.tas.gov.au/planning\\_and\\_development/land\\_use](http://www.iris.tas.gov.au/planning_and_development/land_use), viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>106</sup> <http://www.dier.tas.gov.au/infrastructure2/home>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>107</sup> <http://stca.tas.gov.au/?p=254>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>108</sup> <http://www.transport.tas.gov.au/publications>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>109</sup> [http://www.dier.tas.gov.au/plans\\_and\\_strategy](http://www.dier.tas.gov.au/plans_and_strategy), viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>110</sup> <http://www.transport.tas.gov.au/publications>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>111</sup> <http://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/divisions/corporate>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>112</sup> [http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/about\\_the\\_department/strategic\\_directions\\_2009-2012](http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/about_the_department/strategic_directions_2009-2012), viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>113</sup> [http://www.tenders.tas.gov.au/domino/DTF/DTF.nsf/LookupFiles/2009-10-Corporate-Plan.pdf/\\$file/2009-10-Corporate-Plan.pdf](http://www.tenders.tas.gov.au/domino/DTF/DTF.nsf/LookupFiles/2009-10-Corporate-Plan.pdf/$file/2009-10-Corporate-Plan.pdf)

<sup>114</sup> <http://www.budget.tas.gov.au/>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>115</sup> <http://www.dpc.vic.gov.au/CA256D8000265E1A/page/Growing+Victoria+Together!OpenDocument&1=30-Growing+Victoria+To+gether-&2=-&3=->, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>116</sup> <http://www.dse.vic.gov.au/melbourne2030online/>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>117</sup> <http://www.dse.vic.gov.au/DSE/nrenpl.nsf/LinkView/1352EB2F109044AFC2575120016BE8B25FA24FDEB7476BACA25761E001FDF4D>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>118</sup> <http://www.dse.vic.gov.au/DSE/nrenpl.nsf/childdocs/-3AFDBF77580D7A93CA256D19002583CC-F06FB8E23F7AA5E1CA2572370019297C-ADB0CA35BA19FB09CA25723A0013B5FC?open>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>119</sup> <http://www.transport.vic.gov.au/web23/home.nsf>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>120</sup> <http://www.ourwater.vic.gov.au/>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>121</sup> <http://www.education.vic.gov.au/about/directions/victorianschoolsplan/default.htm>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>122</sup> <http://www.dpcd.vic.gov.au/web14/dvc/dvcmmain.nsf/allDocs/RWP0D535590A1A3A77ACA2570D6007FAF63?OpenDocument>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>123</sup> <http://www.transport.vic.gov.au/DOI/Internet/Home.nsf/AllDocs/DC37D3466636B539CA25739A00159ACC?OpenDocument>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>124</sup> <http://www.dpc.vic.gov.au/CA256D8000265E1A/ListMaker!ReadForm&REFUNID=7DEE5FF17CD8B12CCA257654001EB304-c0unter+V=DateListingD-&K=Annual+Reports-&1=60-Our+Leadership+Role-&2=70-Publications-&3=0-Annual+Reports>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>125</sup> <http://www.housing.vic.gov.au/publications/strategies-and-frameworks>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>126</sup> <http://www.dtf.vic.gov.au/CA25713E0002EF43/pages/about-us-plans-and-policies>, viewed 11 May 2010

<sup>127</sup> <http://www.vicurban.com.au/cs/Satellite?c=VPage&cid=1147912434953&pagename=VicUrban%2FLayout>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>128</sup> <http://www.gaa.vic.gov.au/Publications.aspx?PageID=206>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>129</sup> <http://www.budget.vic.gov.au/>, viewed 21 April 2010

<sup>130</sup> [http://www.premier.vic.gov.au/premier/speeches.html?task=text&media\\_id=363](http://www.premier.vic.gov.au/premier/speeches.html?task=text&media_id=363), viewed 21 April 2010



Perth (WA)	Sydney (NSW)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Planning Makes it Happen: A Blueprint for Planning Reform (2009)<sup>131</sup></li> <li>o State Planning Strategy<sup>132</sup></li> <li>o Directions 2031 (Draft) - Spatial framework for Perth and Peel (2009)<sup>133</sup></li> <li>o Urban Development Program<sup>134</sup></li> <li>o LandCorp Annual Report (2009)<sup>135</sup></li> <li>o Industrial Land Strategy (2009)<sup>136</sup></li> <li>o East Perth Redevelopment Authority Annual Report (2009)<sup>137</sup></li> <li>o Land Supply and Housing Activity Quarterly Report (Dec 2009)</li> <li>o Corporate Plans from the Department of Planning<sup>138</sup>, Department of Transport<sup>139</sup>, Department of Premier and Cabinet<sup>140</sup>, Department of Housing<sup>141</sup> and Department of Treasury and Finance<sup>142</sup></li> <li>o 2009-10 Western Australia Budget<sup>143</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The NSW State Plan (2006) (updated in 2010)<sup>144</sup></li> <li>o City of Cities: A Plan for Sydney's Future (2006)<sup>145</sup></li> <li>o Metropolitan Development Program (2009)<sup>146</sup></li> <li>o Corporate Plans from the Department of Planning<sup>147</sup>, Department of Transport and Infrastructure<sup>148</sup>, Department of Premier and Cabinet<sup>149</sup>, Housing NSW<sup>150</sup> and NSW Treasury<sup>151</sup></li> <li>o Metropolitan Transport Plan (2010) (Draft)<sup>152</sup></li> <li>o Metropolitan Strategy Review: Discussion Paper (2010)<sup>153</sup></li> <li>o Landcom Annual Report (2009)<sup>154</sup></li> <li>o NSW Budget Papers: Budget Paper 4<sup>155</sup> Infrastructure Statement (Mini Budget 2008 &amp; 2009-10)<sup>156, 157</sup></li> </ul>

- <sup>131</sup> <http://www.planning.wa.gov.au/Plans+and+Policies/Publications/1991.aspx>, viewed 21 April 2010
- <sup>132</sup> <http://www.planning.wa.gov.au/Plans+and+Policies/Publications/52.aspx>, viewed 21 April 2010
- <sup>133</sup> <http://www.planning.wa.gov.au/Plans+and+Policies/Publications/1924.aspx>, viewed 21 April 2010
- <sup>134</sup> <http://www.planning.wa.gov.au/Publications/777.aspx>, viewed 21 April 2010
- <sup>135</sup> <http://www.landcorp.com.au/News-and-Media/Publications/>, viewed 21 April 2010
- <sup>136</sup> <http://www.planning.wa.gov.au/Plans+and+Policies/Publications/2043.aspx>, viewed at 21 April 2010
- <sup>137</sup> <http://www.epra.wa.gov.au/News-and-Library/Publications/>, viewed 21 April 2010
- <sup>138</sup> <http://www.planning.wa.gov.au/Publications/1720.aspx>, viewed 11 May 2010
- <sup>139</sup> <http://www.dpi.wa.gov.au/2542.asp>, viewed 11 May 2010
- <sup>140</sup> <http://www.dpc.wa.gov.au/Publications/Documents/DPC%20Strategic%20Plan,%202009-2012.pdf>, viewed 11 May 2010
- <sup>141</sup> [http://www.dhw.wa.gov.au/585\\_420.asp](http://www.dhw.wa.gov.au/585_420.asp), viewed 11 May 2010
- <sup>142</sup> <http://www.dtf.wa.gov.au/cms/content.aspx?id=472>, viewed 11 May 2010
- <sup>143</sup> <http://www.ourstatebudget.wa.gov.au/>, viewed 21 April 2010
- <sup>144</sup> <http://www.nsw.gov.au/stateplan>, viewed 21 April 2010
- <sup>145</sup> <http://www.metrostrategy.nsw.gov.au/dev/uploads/paper/introduction/index.html>, viewed 21 April 2010
- <sup>146</sup> <http://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/Programsservices/LandSupplyandManagement/Metropolitandevlopmentprogram/tabid/126/language/en-AU/Default.aspx>, viewed 21 April 2010
- <sup>147</sup> <http://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/SettingtheDirection/Corporatepublications/tabid/95/Default.aspx#cp>, viewed 11 May 2010
- <sup>148</sup> <http://www.transport.nsw.gov.au/publications/annualreport.html>, viewed 11 May 2010
- <sup>149</sup> [http://www.dpc.nsw.gov.au/publications/publications/publication\\_list\\_-\\_new#970](http://www.dpc.nsw.gov.au/publications/publications/publication_list_-_new#970), viewed 11 May 2010
- <sup>150</sup> <http://www.housing.nsw.gov.au/About+Us/Reports+Plans+and+Papers/Corporate+and+Other+Plans.htm>, viewed 11 May 2010
- <sup>151</sup> [http://www.treasury.nsw.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0012/10911/corp\\_plan\\_2008\\_11.pdf](http://www.treasury.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0012/10911/corp_plan_2008_11.pdf), viewed 11 May 2010
- <sup>152</sup> <http://www.nsw.gov.au/metropolitantransportplan>, viewed 21 April 2010
- <sup>153</sup> <http://www.metrostrategy.nsw.gov.au/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=K3OvHZ6LP-I%3D&tabid=286&language=en-AU>, viewed 21 April 2010
- <sup>154</sup> <http://www.landcom.com.au/annualreport2009/>, viewed 21 April 2010
- <sup>155</sup> [http://www.treasury.nsw.gov.au/budget\\_2009-10/bp4/2009-10\\_budget\\_paper\\_4](http://www.treasury.nsw.gov.au/budget_2009-10/bp4/2009-10_budget_paper_4), viewed 11 May 2010
- <sup>156</sup> [http://www.budget.nsw.gov.au/bp09-10/bp4/2009-10\\_budget\\_paper\\_4](http://www.budget.nsw.gov.au/bp09-10/bp4/2009-10_budget_paper_4), viewed 21 April 2010
- <sup>157</sup> [http://www.treasury.nsw.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0016/12706/08-09\\_Mini-Budget.pdf](http://www.treasury.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0016/12706/08-09_Mini-Budget.pdf), viewed 21 April 2010