

## Summary of Key Points

1. AILA supports the intentions and principles of the Planning System Review and Reform.
2. Specifically commending:
  - a. the clarity provided on: 'line of sight' between policy, development controls, implementation, and city management
  - b. deliver the vision for a well-designed resilient city in a changing climate, adapting and inspiring an array of outcomes.
3. AILA reiterates the will to engage with the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate (EPSDD) in the process of review and reform and testing the mechanics of a revised system.

## ASKS

1. **What is the Vision for our City and Territory? Why is the whole ACT not captured in this document?**
2. **How will the Planning Reform** pertain to delivery and sustainability of the 'Bush Capital'? how will the wellbeing indicators for the ACT and a whole living system approach obtain balance between the natural and built environs and achieve a well-designed system?
3. **Invest** in a Landscape Policy plan with focus on integrity, quality, and management of landscape systems.
4. **Landscape character mapping** to provide data to underpin principles of good planning and key objectives as stated in the Act:
  - a. **CULTURE** – traditional custodians
  - b. **PLANNING** – for population and growth and creating an attractive place to live
  - c. **DESIGN**- encourage innovation and design led built outcomes
  - d. **BIODIVERSITY AND LANDSCAPE**- integration of natural, built, cultural and heritage elements
  - e. **CUSTOMISATION** – people focused, design-led built outcomes and enhancement of local area needs
  - f. **NET ZERO APPROACH** – through mitigation and adaptation of best practices
5. **Understand existing conditions** to better apply knowledge and planning and a strong and respectful sense of place.
6. **The Territory's landscape is not ubiquitous** and is a living system - the landscape must be considered holistically to retain the 'Bush Capital', whilst allow for densification, connection, health, tree canopy and walkability. 'Landscape' needs to be clearly integrated from the macro to micro scale of planning our city. It should not be a leftover, disconnected, part of a city tapestry.

## PLANNING DISCUSSION

1. **Strategic Planning -Integration of policies**
  - a. **Spatial outcomes** – how will these be integrated into related policies, management, authorities, projects and thus their visions and constraints?
  - b. **Will the strategic through to district plans refer to the Territory's Well- Being indicators to assess merits of innovative proposals?**
  - c. **Planning strategy** lack of detail on spatial dimension issues and initiatives – Living Infrastructure, Plan, Transport Planning, Major Projects, Cultural Heritage, Biodiversity? Need for a Territory wide framework capturing all key objectives and actions - *addressing connectivity across the whole territory*
  - d. **Incorporation into the ACT Strategy** – *will these policies receive statutory planning effect*
  - e. **Key Planning Principles need to be embedded across all relevant documents to ensure our city vision is collaboratively met.**
2. **Keeping the Strategic live and responsive**
  - a. responsiveness to change – *KPIs and monitoring mechanisms, 5-yearly review. When will we integrate planning up to our borders as this is our Territory?*
3. **District Planning- Retaining the Strategic Outcomes**
  - a. **Informing the District Consultation** –How or why should districts adopt a uniform approach? There is a broad range of character within each precinct. What densification is appropriate to their landscape and demographics (urban area)
  - b. **Responsible and responsive assessment of heritage values**- Integration of all professional institutes when these are challenged to allow for outcomes-based planning and innovation
  - c. **Disparities between community expectations and implementation**
  - d. **ACT's green and blue corridors need to be mapped, zoned, and clearly integrated into the district plans.**
  - e. **Ecological values of key habitats to be protected** - *Landscape does not work to definite and linear boundaries and open space can border more than one precinct?*
4. **Development Codes and Precinct Codes**
  - a. **Ensure there are unambiguous quantifiable outcomes and measuring mechanisms as well as clearly identified targets and set non-negotiables**
  - b. **Allow for and encourage innovation**
  - c. **Transparency of decisions and competing visions for all stakeholders**

5. **Development Assessment and relationships between cascading plans and which plans will have priority**
  - a. **Outcomes focussed planning system relies on the decision maker assessing the proposals. Due to the ambiguity in determining what is a 'great' and innovative design, we feel a panel of suitably qualified and diverse representation of professions relevant to the project would be best informed to make the decision.,**
  - b. **Will district plans have more or less 'legal' weight than 'codes'?**
  - c. **Heritage Council, Conservator, Utilities, TCCs, Major Projects, how will their approvals affect the design outcome Planning Reform? Who determines what overrides what?**
  
6. **Community Consultation and transparency in decision making**
  - a. **Effective community engagement – funding and resourcing is required to maintain this.**
  
7. **Design Review Panel**
  - a. **Enhance the role of the DRP, and allow assessment of a broader range of projects, and thus recommendations to changes to Territory Plan to achieve the best design outcome**
  - b. **Core representation by Architect, Landscape Architect and Planning institutes, receive more funding and thus help implement a design outcome driven planning system.**
  - c. **Need for a Senior Landscape Architect to be part of the Government Architect's office to advise on all landscape matters and ensure the bush capital vision is retained.**
  - d. **Ensure that DRP recommendations can inform changes to the Territory Plan if meets desired outcomes for our 'Bush Capital'**