

That the Planning Scheme Review address the concerns outlined below:

Issues of concern to me - Planner and Architect of 37 years experience

The Process must reduce costs to community (and that is developer cost being transferred to community to cover delays introduced by lack of certainty in process) by offering greater certainty to applicant and potential objector.

The goal being if no certainty then high costs and delays to argue uncertainty.

Adjunct to this is that with the uncertainty the argument of an opinion relies more heavily on legal interpretation and legality/precedence than 'common sense' and intent. This is manifest in role of lawyers in the planning system today compared to 20 years ago. The need for legal representation is directly due to the various interpretation and uncertainty of meeting the Planning Scheme intent.

Planning Act has produced for example Rescode. Compliance with Rescode does not guarantee a permit or non-compliance does not ensure refusal. How can this be ?

If Performance Standards are established within an approval framework of advertising, review and recommendation, hearing of objections by independent panel and then decision ratified in scheme incorporation then compliance or non compliance of application should be automatically a decision for approval or refusal respectively.

Having said this it is essential that development performance standards must be developed to site specific to site/local context and this Rescode site specific standard must then become an incorporated document. Eg., Standards for West Melbourne should be different to Canberwell. Then above this Policy issues for encouragement for higher density about activity nodes should be reflected in relaxation of privacy, overshadowing issues within the specific areas.

The excuse of inadequate resources to develop local planning provisions is not an acceptable excuse from Local Government or State Government – together they must adequately fund development of such incorporated documents.

The State Government, free of local parochial views and political agenda must review and endorse the incorporated documents within an established 14 day framework for approval or refusal and if refusal have a panel review within 30days and decision 7 days thereafter. Resources are available through broad network of Certified practicing Planners to support these roles.

Timing of decisions should be much, much quicker > Councils must decide on an application within 30 days including objections.

- In accurate plans should bring about a fine (say \$500)for the applicant (Council should not have to check north point accuracy)
- Inaccurate Plans mean that application must be withdrawn and no new application for 60 days.
- Incomplete plans must be sent back within 48 hours for completion

I would wish to present to Hearing should the opportunity arise.

Peter R Hirst

Greenway Hirst Page Pty Ltd

ARCHITECTURE TOWN & REGIONAL PLANNING ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN PROJECT MANAGEMENT URBAN DESIGN
44 LEVESON STREET NORTH MELBOURNE VICTORIA 3051 B 03 9329 2611 F 03 93281691 M 0417 372 560