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1. Introduction

On 19 September 2013, the Minister for Planning launched Planning makes it happen: Phase two. This included the Planning Reform Discussion Paper, which detailed 12 statutory planning reform initiatives, and six governance and administrative reform initiatives.

Following a period of public consultation, the Planning Makes it Happen: Phase Two — Blueprint for Planning Reform document was released by the Minister in August 2014. The Blueprint incorporated a number of initiatives, including the preparation of new Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2014 (the Regulations), to replace the existing Model Scheme Text. In November 2014, the draft Regulations Discussion Paper was released for public comment, with submissions invited from 18 November 2014 to 30 January 2015.

This report provides a summary of submissions received on the Regulations and outlines the changes undertaken as a result of those submissions.

For ease of reference, the Regulations are set out as follows:

Local Planning Scheme Regulations — set out how local planning strategies and schemes are prepared and amended;

Schedule 1 — Model provisions (for local planning schemes) — operate in the same way as the previous Model Scheme Text; and

Schedule 2 — Deemed provisions — will apply automatically upon gazettal of the Regulations.

These terms will be used throughout this report to differentiate between the various sections of the Regulations.
A total of 76 submissions were received on the Regulations and the associated discussion paper. A list of submitters is included as Appendix A. Within the 76 submissions, more than 2,300 individual comments were made on approximately 400 different sections within the Local Planning Scheme (LPS) Regulations, the model provisions and the deemed provisions.

In order to identify the nature of interest the various respondents have in the Regulations, and any themes in the kinds of comments received from different stakeholder groups, the written submissions were categorised as follows:

- **Community** – including members of the general public and users of the WA planning system;
- **Planning professionals** – including representative bodies such as the Planning Institute of Australia, and practising planning industry professionals (excluding those responding on behalf of a local government or State Government agency);
- **Related industry** – including representative bodies such as the Urban Development Institute of Australia; Housing Industry Association; and the Property Council of Australia, as well as other development industry professionals such as development companies; builders; and lawyers;
- **Local government** – including representative bodies such as the Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) and the Local Government Planners Association; and
- **State Government** – including representatives of State departments, agencies and other State-owned corporations.

Table 1 outlines the number and percentage of submissions received from each stakeholder category.

### Table 1: Written submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of respondent</th>
<th>Number of submissions</th>
<th>Percentage of total submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning professionals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related industry</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.
3. Summary of submissions

This section summarises the number of submissions that were supportive of, expressed qualified support for, were opposed to, or were neutral about each of the schedules, parts and divisions within the Regulations.

S = support
QS = qualified support (general support but with recommended changes)
O = oppose
N = neutral (includes submissions with no indication of support or opposition; and submissions which did not specifically mention the reform initiative)

A substantial proportion of responses are categorised as neutral for each initiative. This is because the majority of written submissions and survey responses included detailed responses on some of the content of the Regulations, and little to no comment on others. In general, each respondent indicated a strong interest in a particular category, and the nature of this interest varied across respondent types.

Of the 76 submissions received, 74 (98%) indicated ‘support’ or ‘qualified support’ for the Regulations overall. (Table 2) (Chart 1)

Table 2: Regulations overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position on reforms (number of submissions)</th>
<th>Position on reforms (% of submissions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>QS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations overall</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number
3. Summary of submissions

The total number of submissions that indicated ‘support’ or ‘qualified support’ for the LPS Regulations, the model provisions and the deemed provisions, were 57 (75%), 46 (60%) and 60 (79%) respectively. A breakdown of the nature of submissions in respect to each part and division within the Regulations is detailed in Table 3.

Table 3: Submissions on each part and division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulations</th>
<th>Position on regulations (number of submissions)</th>
<th>Position on regulations (percentage of submissions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPS Regulations - General comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Preliminary</td>
<td>3 54 0 19</td>
<td>4% 71% 0% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Requirement for local planning scheme</td>
<td>1 4 0 71</td>
<td>1% 5% 0% 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Local planning strategies</td>
<td>0 22 0 54</td>
<td>4% 16% 0% 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Preparation or adoption of local planning scheme – General comments</td>
<td>3 27 0 46</td>
<td>0% 29% 0% 71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 1 – Proposal to prepare or adopt local planning scheme</td>
<td>0 4 1 71</td>
<td>4% 36% 0% 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 2 – Advertising local planning scheme</td>
<td>1 24 0 51</td>
<td>0% 5% 1% 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 3 – Giving effect to decision on local planning scheme</td>
<td>0 4 0 72</td>
<td>1% 32% 0% 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Amending local planning scheme – General comments</td>
<td>8 38 2 28</td>
<td>0% 5% 0% 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 1 – Preliminary</td>
<td>3 28 1 44</td>
<td>11% 50% 3% 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 2 – Process for complex amendments to local planning scheme</td>
<td>1 22 2 51</td>
<td>4% 37% 1% 58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 3 – Process for standard amendments to local planning scheme</td>
<td>0 28 2 46</td>
<td>1% 29% 3% 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 4 – Process for basic amendments</td>
<td>0 20 0 56</td>
<td>0% 37% 3% 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 5 – Giving effect to decision on amendment to local planning scheme</td>
<td>0 3 0 73</td>
<td>0% 26% 0% 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Review and consolidation of local planning schemes – General comments</td>
<td>4 32 3 37</td>
<td>0% 4% 0% 96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 1 – Review of local planning scheme</td>
<td>3 32 3 38</td>
<td>5% 42% 4% 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 2 – Consolidation of local planning scheme</td>
<td>1 0 0 75</td>
<td>4% 42% 4% 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Summary of submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulations</th>
<th>Position on regulations (number of submissions)</th>
<th>Position on regulations (percentage of submissions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Development contribution plans</td>
<td>5 18 1 52</td>
<td>7% 24% 1% 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 8 – Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1 4 1 70</td>
<td>1% 5% 1% 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 9 – Repeal and transitional provisions</td>
<td>2 4 1 69</td>
<td>3% 5% 1% 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 1 – Model provisions for local planning schemes – General comments</td>
<td>4 42 1 29</td>
<td>5% 55% 1% 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Preliminary</td>
<td>0 5 0 71</td>
<td>0% 7% 0% 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Reserves</td>
<td>4 9 1 62</td>
<td>5% 12% 1% 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Zones and use of land</td>
<td>8 18 0 50</td>
<td>11% 24% 0% 66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – General development requirements</td>
<td>2 16 2 56</td>
<td>3% 21% 3% 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Special control areas</td>
<td>2 6 0 68</td>
<td>3% 8% 0% 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Terms referred to in scheme – General comments</td>
<td>2 33 0 41</td>
<td>3% 43% 0% 54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 1 – General definitions used in scheme</td>
<td>0 13 0 63</td>
<td>0% 17% 0% 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 2 – Land use terms used in scheme</td>
<td>2 28 0 46</td>
<td>3% 37% 0% 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Legends used in scheme – General Comments</td>
<td>2 21 1 52</td>
<td>3% 28% 1% 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 1 – Reserve legends used in scheme</td>
<td>0 10 0 66</td>
<td>0% 13% 0% 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 2 – Zone legends used in scheme</td>
<td>0 20 0 56</td>
<td>0% 26% 0% 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 2 – Deemed provisions for local planning schemes – General comments</td>
<td>3 57 2 14</td>
<td>4% 75% 3% 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Preliminary</td>
<td>0 14 0 62</td>
<td>0% 18% 0% 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Local planning framework – General comments</td>
<td>4 19 1 52</td>
<td>5% 25% 1% 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 1 – Local planning strategy</td>
<td>0 4 1 71</td>
<td>0% 5% 1% 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 2 – Local planning policies</td>
<td>3 17 0 56</td>
<td>4% 22% 0% 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Heritage protection</td>
<td>4 23 2 47</td>
<td>5% 30% 3% 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Structure plans</td>
<td>2 39 2 33</td>
<td>3% 51% 3% 43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 3. Summary of submissions

## Regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Local development plans</th>
<th>Requirement for development approval</th>
<th>Applications for development approval</th>
<th>Procedure for dealing with applications for development approval</th>
<th>Bush fire management</th>
<th>Implementation of development contribution plans</th>
<th>Enforcement and administration – General comments</th>
<th>Powers of local government</th>
<th>Delegations</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Forms referred to in this Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.
4. Detailed feedback on the key issues

This section provides a summary of the submissions received on the key issues within the Regulations. With more than 400 different regulations, clauses and sub-clauses within every part and division of the Regulations addressed in the submissions, this section focuses on the parts and divisions that received the greatest number of submissions.

Part 5 – Amending local planning schemes

Chart 2: Support for amending local planning schemes

The concept of implementing a risk-based tracking approach to local scheme amendments, via the incorporation of the ‘basic’, ‘standard’ and ‘complex’ amendment processes was largely supported. It was acknowledged that the provision of the three processes, or tracks, would assist in delivering a more efficient scheme amendment system.

A general observation was made that this initiative would only function effectively if appropriate timeframes were imposed on the Department of Planning (the Department) and Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) and if additional timeframes were imposed on local government to undertake the various functions associated with each track.

A number of submissions requested clarification on the determining body for particular tracks of a proposed amendment. Clarification was also sought in respect to which tracks of amendments are required to be initiated by the local government. Submissions also indicated that the Regulations were unclear regarding the operation of the ‘consideration period’ for complex and standard amendments, how this relates to the submission period and what it means in terms of assessment timeframes.
There was a reasonable level of support for the requirement to undertake a five year interim review of local planning schemes, as a means of promoting improved reporting and strategic planning by local governments. The timeframe of six months to prepare a report of the review was not supported in a number of submissions as it was considered that this timeframe is unrealistic and should be extended to 12 months, particularly in light of local government reform (as proposed at that time).

Concern was also raised in respect to the resourcing implications for smaller local governments to undertake these reviews within the specified timeframes. The prohibition on local government to amend their scheme if a review has not been undertaken was generally not support and was viewed being counterintuitive to the reform process and having the potential to ‘freeze’ local planning schemes.

The lack of timeframes imposed on the Department and WAPC to undertake the various functions was a recurring theme.

There was no opposition to the general definitions and land use terms proposed in the model provisions, with five new general definitions and 71 new land use terms suggested. Submissions also recommended five modifications be undertaken to the general definitions and 81 modifications be undertaken to the land use terms, with limited consistency across the submissions in terms of the nature of the requested changes.

Three submissions queried why the proposed land use terms had been included as model provisions and not as deemed provisions. These submissions suggested that having deemed provisions that include general definitions and land use terms would provide greater consistency and uniformity across all local government authorities in Western Australia. This, in turn, would assist applicants, assessing officers and decision makers throughout the planning approvals process.
4. Detailed feedback on the key issues

Schedule 2, Part 3 – Heritage protection

Chart 5: Support for heritage protection

- Support: 62%
- Qualified support: 30%
- Oppose: 5%
- Neutral: 3%

The submissions indicated general support for the ‘heritage protection’ provisions of the Regulations, specifically in respect to the heritage conservation notices and enforcement provisions.

A majority of submissions related to the likely implications that would arise from the local government municipal inventory becoming the heritage list for the scheme area, as they are used for different purposes and should remain separate. One submission specifically requested the inclusion of a transitional provision that enables the municipal inventory to become the heritage list only until such time as a separate heritage list is established by the local government, in accordance with the Regulations.

A number of submissions also sought clarification that a heritage list, register or schedule established under a previous scheme will be regarded as being a heritage list for the purpose of a new scheme and therefore will be exempt from the notification and consultation requirements of the Regulations. This has been clarified in the Regulations.

Schedule 2, Part 4 – Structure plans

Chart 6: Support for structure plans

- Support: 43%
- Qualified support: 51%
- Oppose: 3%
- Neutral: 3%

A reoccurring theme through the submissions was the concern that local government powers are being removed as the WAPC is intended to become the sole determining authority for structure plans. Where the WAPC as the single decision maker was supported, submitters gave qualified support on the basis that the Department was adequately resourced to fulfil this role on behalf of the WAPC.

A majority of submissions stressed the need for endorsed structure plans to have the ‘force and effect’ of the scheme in order to bring certainty to the zonings, reservations, density codings and statutory development controls. It is believed that the absence of this provision will result in a number of broad ranging implications for the development industry, government agencies and financial institutions. Clarification has also been sought as to whether the deemed provisions apply to existing structure plans or only to new structure plans approved after gazettal of the Regulations. The Regulations have been revised to clarify that existing structure plans will not be affected, however the Regulations will apply to amendments to existing, or preparation of new structure plans.
4. Detailed feedback on the key issues

The ability for the WAPC to direct the local government to provide additional information was generally not supported as the consensus was for this information to be provided by the applicant. On the basis of these submissions, the ability for the WAPC to recover costs from the local government is not supported.

A number of submissions requested the inclusion of additional provisions that enable structure plans to be prepared over ‘all or part’ of a structure plan area and provide the ability for the WAPC and local government to consider subdivision and development ahead of a structure plan. This has been provided.

The inclusion of a sunset clause that limits the duration of a structure plan to a 10 year period received mixed comments, with concerns relating to the possibility for larger development projects to operate beyond this timeframe, the creation of an administrative burden for local government and the resultant uncertainty for the development industry. It remains open to the WAPC to extend this timeframe on a case by case basis, should the situation warrant it.

Timeframes were another key issue, where it was requested that local governments have a longer time period to undertake certain functions. The Regulations provide for variations to timeframes where warranted.

Although a significant number of submissions generally supported the expansion of circumstances where development does not require approval, a number of comments referred to additional development that should or should not be included. In this regard, there was a desire for the list of exempt development to broaden its scope outside of the residential environment and include certain commercial, industrial and rural development.

Further, there was a general level of concern that the list provided is not exhaustive and therefore does not cover the list of exempt development already contained within existing local planning schemes. Accordingly, clarification was sought as to whether individual local governments can add to the list of exempt development to suit local circumstances.

In regard to specific development that does not require approval, there was a reasonable level of discomfort that single dwellings only need to comply with the deemed-to-comply provisions of the Residential Design Codes (R-Codes), as this removes the requirement to comply with any other planning framework, such as...
local planning policy provisions. Likewise, the ability for development to be exempt from approval if it complies with a local development plan was not supported. However, it remains open for schemes to require development approval for single homes where it is warranted, for example where bushfire protection is required, or if an area is affected by flooding.

Comments on other matters

Other comments and suggestions about the Regulations that were made in the submissions are summarised below.

1. Timeframes should be imposed on the Department and WAPC for each statutory process specified in the Regulations.

2. Clarification required on how deemed provisions will operate and whether they need to be incorporated into individual local planning schemes via a scheme amendment. A legislative note has been included in the Regulations to clarify this matter.

3. Clarification whether the Regulations will prevent individual local governments from making variations, exclusions or additions to their schemes to address local circumstances. There is capacity for variation to the model provisions, where there is clear justification.

4. General support for the standardisation of zones and clarification whether additional zones can be included.

5. General support for the reintroduction of ‘Incidental’ (I) land uses.

6. Concern that the Development Contribution Plan provisions are split between the LPS Regulations and the deemed provisions.

7. Additional delegation powers should be provided to local government to perform certain functions, in lieu of the WAPC. This may include some types of structure plans.

8. Additional appeal provisions to be provided if various timeframes are not met by the Department / WAPC or local government.

9. There should be a consistent approach as to how various documents are advertised and for how long.

10. The colour coding used for various land use zones is confusing and needs to be better differentiated.

11. The finalised version of the Regulations needs to include the Bush Fire Risk Management provisions.

12. Local government (or other responsible authority) should have the ability to ‘stop the clock’ or seek additional information from applicants throughout each step of the various statutory processes.
5. Outline of proposed changes to the Regulations

As previously noted, more than 2,300 individual comments were made across more than 400 different sections within the Regulations. This section discusses the main changes proposed arising from the key issues discussed in Part 4 of this report, together with additional changes that, although not heavily commented on, may affect the way in which the Regulations operate.

Part 5 – Amending local planning scheme

The regulations have been modified to clarify that all three tracks of scheme amendments (basic, standard and complex) require a resolution from Council to prepare/adopt. Only complex amendments require a second resolution to proceed to advertise. Further, it will be at the local government’s discretion to determine whether an amendment is basic, standard or complex.

Part 7 and Schedule 2, Part 10 – Development contribution plans

Although the submissions raised concern about these provisions being split between the LPS Regulations and the deemed provisions, the process for their creation needs to be put in the LPS Regulations as development contribution plans form part of the local planning scheme.

As the final format of a Development Contribution Plan should retain some flexibility, the provisions in Schedule 2 Part 10 were deleted and replaced with a requirement for a Development Contribution Plan to be prepared in accordance with State Planning Policy 3.6 - Development Contributions for Infrastructure (SPP 3.6). Further, an additional clause was inserted to ensure that SPP 3.6 is given legal status by being ‘read into’ a Scheme, similar to the current reference to the R-Codes in the Regulations.

Schedule 1, Part 6 – Terms referred to in scheme

A number of new general definitions and land use terms were to be included, including modifications to existing definitions. As these definitions are located within the model provisions, each local government has the ability to seek variations to the definitions, or include additional definitions, if required, subject to approval by the WAPC and Minister.

It is not possible to make the land use terms deemed provisions at this time, as requested in a number of submissions, as this would render most current local planning schemes unworkable. However, the consideration of additional land use terms is a body of work that has merit, and will be retained for future iterations of these Regulations.

Schedule 2, Part 3 – Heritage protection

As requested in the submissions, municipal inventories should not automatically become the heritage list for a Scheme area, as they are not intended to function in this way, and may result in unreasonable delays for planning and building approvals. To ensure that the municipal inventory and the heritage list remain separate, this clause was deleted. Further, a transitional provision has been included that will ensure that existing heritage areas and lists under current schemes will continue to have force and effect upon gazettal of the Regulations.

An appeal provision is included to provide a right of review to the State Administrative Tribunal if a person is aggrieved with being issued a heritage conservation notice by the local government.
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5. Outline of proposed changes to the Regulations

Schedule 2, Part 4 – Structure plans

As discussed, a majority of submissions refer to the need for structure plans to have the ‘force and effect’ of the local planning scheme, as provided for in a number of existing schemes. However, there is no legal head of power to do this. Allowing a structure plan approved by the WAPC to be ‘read into’ a scheme would bypass the process for amending a scheme, as detailed in Part 5 of the Planning and Development Act 2005, and effectively allow the WAPC to give approval to the content of a scheme, rather than the Minister. This is not supported.

For this reason, requests for a ‘force and effect’ provision have not been supported, and a structure plan is to be given ‘due regard’ until it is incorporated into a scheme via an amendment. To assist in this process, the Regulations were modified to enable this to occur by way of a ‘basic’ amendment, in lieu of a ‘standard’ amendment as originally proposed. This will ensure that structure plans can be incorporated into the scheme in a timely manner to provide them with the statutory effect that is being sought.

Schedule 2, Part 6 – Requirement for development approval

This part is recommended to be modified to address the concerns that a single dwelling will be exempt from the need to obtain approval if it complies with the deemed-to-comply provisions of the R-Codes only. This doesn’t account for any other local requirements stipulated in a relevant policy or other document. It is proposed to modify the wording to reflect the need for the single dwelling to not only comply with the deemed-to-comply provisions requirements of the R-Codes, but also with any requirement contained within a local planning policy made under the R-Codes, a local development plan and an activity centre plan that amend or replace certain deemed-to-comply provisions listed in clause 7.3.1 of the R-Codes.

General modifications

Throughout the Regulations, timeframes should be required of the Department / WAPC to perform certain tasks. These relate to the preparation of, amendments to and the review of local planning schemes, and the preparation of local planning strategies by local governments.

As local government will be able to seek extension of time from the WAPC, the Department and WAPC will likewise be able to seek extensions from the Minister or his authorised representative.

Other issues

There are a number of other issues raised in the submissions that have been clarified. These include:

• That the local planning scheme does not need to be amended to incorporate the deemed provisions, as the deemed provisions are ‘read into’ the scheme automatically.
• That the Regulations will not prevent local governments from making variations, exclusions or additions to their schemes to address local circumstances. Section 257A (3) of the Planning and Development Act 2015 empowers the Minister to approve any exclusions or variations to the model provisions (but not deemed provisions); and Section 73 (2A) of the Planning and Development Act 2015 allows a local planning scheme to include supplemental provisions (including to both model and deemed provisions), provided those supplemental provisions are consistent with or not already covered by the Regulations.

These points will be clarified through other means, including training and ‘toolkits’ for the planning industry, and do not require the Regulations to be amended. Legislative notes are also to be added to the Regulations, where possible, to provide clarification.

5. Outline of proposed changes to the Regulations
Appendix A – Schedule of submitters

1. Alcock Brown-Neaves Group
2. Altus Planning and Appeals
3. Australand
4. City of Armadale
5. City of Bayswater
6. City of Bunbury
7. City of Busselton
8. City of Canning
9. City of Cockburn
10. City of Fremantle
11. City of Gosnells
12. City of Greater Geraldton
13. City of Joondalup
14. City of Kalgoorlie-Boulder
15. City of Mandurah
16. City of Melville
17. City of Nedlands
18. City of Perth
19. City of Rockingham
20. City of South Perth
21. City of Stirling
22. City of Subiaco
23. City of Swan
24. City of Vincent
25. City of Wanneroo
26. CLE Town Planning + Design
27. D W Bowman
28. Department of Housing
29. Department of Water
30. Disability Services Commission
31. Dowling Giudici + Associates
32. Enrico Pennacini
33. Franca Genesio
34. Freight and Logistics Council of WA
35. Gina Tedeschi
36. Housing Industry Association
37. John Elliott
38. Landcorp
39. Landgate
40. Large Retail Format Association
41. Law Society of WA
42. Local Government Planners Association
43. Mario Pennacini
44. McLeods
45. Michelle and Barry Standen
46. PEET
47. Planning Institute of Australia (WA)
48. Planning Solutions on behalf of Coles Liquor
49. Property Council of Australia
50. Pulse Property Solutions
51. Ray Stokes
52. Shire of Boddington
53. Shire of Broome
54. Shire of Exmouth
55. Shire of Gnowangerup
56. Shire of Kalamunda
57. Shire of Koornang
58. Shire of Murray
59. Shire of Nannup
60. Shire of Plantagenet
61. Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale
62. Shire of Toodyay
63. Shire of West Arthur
64. Shire of Woodanilling
65. Shire of Wyndham East Kimberley
66. Small Business Development Corporation
67. State Heritage Office
68. Swimming Pool and Spa Association
69. The Chamber of Minerals and Energy
70. Town of Cambridge
71. Town of Claremont
72. Town of Victoria Park
73. UDIA
74. Urbis
75. WALGA
76. Waste Authority