

Submission to the Joint Standing Committee  
on the  
National Capital and External Territories.

Inquiry into the National Capital Authority.



***Submitted by Mr Brian Binning.***

*Brian Binning is a former Director of Strategic Planning and Urban Design in the National Capital Planning Authority, positions which followed similar roles with the National Capital Development Commission. His career includes responsibility for several Metropolitan Plans. Clients of his present Planning Consultancy include the Commonwealth, NSW, and ACT Governments. He is currently a member of the Australian Capital Regional Development Council, and on the Board of the NSW Nature Conservation Trust.*

***Synopsis.***

*This submission is an individual one. To establish reference points, it outlines some of the background to Canberra's Town Planning, using this to assess the present situation. The submission reaches the conclusion that if Canberra is to remain a distinguished National Capital, better methods and resources will be needed to review an outmoded National Capital Plan. There will also be a need to for the Commonwealth and Territory Governments to agree on the role of Territory planning in this review. The submission recommends that the Committee consider a series of actions. When followed through, these can produce a new Joint Metropolitan Plan, agreed by both the Commonwealth and Territory Governments. This would become the basis for determination of the future National Capital Plan and of the role of the National Capital Authority.*

## Submission.

### 1. Responding to the Terms of Reference.

The Terms of Reference set out for this Inquiry relate to the role of the National Capital Authority (NCA), its management of the National Capital Plan, issues relating to the management of Designated Land, and the relation between the NCA and Territory Planning Authorities.

Because of their interdependency, separate responses to each of these matters is difficult. To overcome this, this submission begins by outlining the relationship between the various Plans for Canberra, and the manner in which the city has now developed. The underlying cultural and political influences are then discussed to identify recurring themes, positive features, and weaknesses. This analysis forms the basis for the conclusions presented.

### 2. The Context.

*NCA's exclusive responsibility for administering the National Capital Plan.*

The current legislation is directed towards "ensuring that Canberra and the Territory are planned in accordance with their national significance". In 1988, when the Commonwealth devolved powers to the Territory, existing Metropolitan Planning policy was simply transferred. The National Capital Development Commission's *1984 Metropolitan Policy Plan* was reformatted to become the *National Capital Plan*, with the Commonwealth retaining overriding powers to administer adherence to those aspects of the *National Capital Plan* that determined the overall physical structure of Canberra. The new Act also gave the (then) National Capital Planning Authority the sole power to amend the *National Capital Plan*. As there has been no substantive amendment to the *1984 Metropolitan Plan*, this means that Canberra's current Metropolitan Plan is almost 20 years old. Precedents elsewhere suggest that it is very unusual for this length of time to have elapsed without conducting a thorough review of a Metropolitan Plan.

### *National and Territorial aspirations.*

The reason for giving the Commonwealth the sole power to administer the *National Capital Plan* was rooted in the concern of people within the NCDC's executive, who were highly influential in drafting the current legislation; of attitudes in the previous Territory Administration, and of its Legislative Assembly. Tensions of this nature reach far back into Canberra's history; beginning with the time when the Commonwealth Department of Works almost succeeded in an attempt to discard Griffin's winning design for the Capital, and replace it with a Plan of their own. Throughout Canberra's history, an almost unbroken state of tension has persisted between locally based interests, and others who hold the view that the National Capital should manifest National aspirations. For the latter group, an undue emphasis on localism has always been seen as a certain recipe for diminishing National Capital qualities. Whatever the future of the NCA, this will be an ongoing issue. To assure a positive future, new ways will need to be found of reconciling these positions. There will remain a need to secure the National Interest, and at the same time recognise the growing maturity of Territory Government.

### *Obstacles standing in the way of Plan Reviews.*

The immediate benefit of retaining the Commonwealth powers at the time of introduction of self- government was to retain the *1984 Metropolitan Policy Plan (the Y Plan)*. This was not to be tampered with by Territory Government, who would have a restricted role, limited to filling in the detail as the metropolitan area developed. At the time, the evidence was that the Territory Government would need time to integrate its new planning functions with its other, and already established, administrative arms. With the benefit of hindsight, the retention of the Commonwealth's pre-eminent right to administer the new *National Capital Plan* through the NCA, whose legitimacy has continuously been under scrutiny by Territory Government, has fostered a reluctance on the part of NCA to expose this Plan to proper reviews.

Certainly, the legislation allowed amendments to the *National Capital Plan*; but equally, it did not fully respond to the new duality of governmental interest in Canberra. It remains a static view, with the legislation failing to spell out the length of time within which a review should occur. Reporting to Parliament relied on NCA's internal perceptions of problems, as well as its own institutional constraints.

### *The aspirational character of Canberra's Planning.*

The history of successive and different planning cultures throws additional light on the underlying nature of conflicts, and warrants inclusion of the outline which follows.

Canberra's planning has always been perceived as an instrument for achieving visionary urban settings. The *Griffin Plan* succeeded because it fully expressed the cultural idealism of Australian society at the time of Federation. In the 1980's, the *Y Plan* incorporated and revised this vision to provide for much larger populations. It represented an era in which Governments, suitably advised by their planners fit to determine an optimal course for the arrangement of a city; and who then carried out its implementation. In this spirit, the *Y Plan* included a directive approach to the location of land uses, including decentralisation of employment, to separate townships, which were interlinked by arterial roads. The townships and roads were arranged to avoid disruption of the older Griffin-based areas at the centre: be that either by pressure for rebuilding or infilling, or by traffic congestion. This followed technical studies, which showed that planning additional townships to the East and/or West of Griffin's Central Area would severely congest its available road capacity.

The adopted form of the *Y Plan* successfully elaborated Griffin's bush setting; and it laid the basis for introduction of a sophisticated system of environmental management, ranging from waste-water to biodiversity protection. The Commonwealth's aggressive programme for consolidating its Administration in Canberra, which reached its peak during the period between 1960 and 1980, resulted in very fast rates of population growth, which the Plan accommodated efficiently. Canberra's growth was dominantly suburban; but despite growing dependency on the private car, this was achieved without disrupting already established areas. Canberra became widely regarded as an exemplary piece of Town Planning, drawing the attention of countless visiting delegations, and becoming a training ground for aspiring Town Planners.

#### *The Plan as a fixed product, in conflict with a changing City.*

Nevertheless, these gains in "efficiency" achieved by the *Y Plan* were measured in terms of its ability to meet predetermined planning targets, under expansionist conditions. Planners conceptualised the city in a mechanistic way, as a finite end product. There was little consideration of the fact that rapid growth might lead to future problems. Today, we can more easily see that following a period of extremely rapid growth, equally fast ageing processes would come to the fore. To pick but two consequences: there would be an ever-increasing drain on revenue to maintain the capital base of earlier investment in infrastructure; and as populations aged successively in each of the "new" Towns, there would be changing demands on roads, housing, and social services.

In the Central Area, an initial impression of completeness had been contrived by landscaping large areas of potentially developable land, cementing future conflicts between the right to build or to retain landscaping. Central Area office space built during the period of rapid growth, also aged and became less attractive to tenants.

#### *The City at the time of self-government.*

It is against this background that the period between 1980 and the present brought more than self-government to the ACT. It brought the inheritance of a city which,

taken as a whole, was beginning to age prematurely. This malaise would continue into the future. For example, a tenured but ageing workforce would continue to hold jobs, and in their search for opportunity, many of the brighter young people would leave. Along with falling fertility rates, dynamics of this kind present a major challenge in sustaining the vitality of the City. This should be a matter of concern to both the Commonwealth and Territory Governments.

*The impact of deregulation on state-sponsored Plans.*

The onset of governmental deregulation in the 1980's also meant that the bulk of new development, and many services, would be provided by the private sector. Increasingly, the private sector gave less attention to investing in outer locations favoured by the *Y Plan*, and instead preferred the greater certainty and returns available in central locations. Developers readily moved outside the established built up or landscaped areas, to construct new buildings on vacant lands: in Barton, Deakin, the Airport, or Fyshwick. Their response secured lowered capital costs and increased returns, compared with the alternative of renovating or rebuilding in Civic. The result was that pressures for growth at the urban core further dispersed development within Canberra's already extensive Central Area; which now extends well beyond Civic.

Throughout Inner Canberra, there was also growing opposition to higher density redevelopment of sparsely occupied areas of detached housing. Consequently, there is additional pressure for growth at the Metropolitan fringe, accompanied by an increasing need to commute to centrally located places of work.

*The unique character of Canberra's Central Area.*

In itself, Canberra's Central Area poses some unique problems for planners. In Capitals like Washington, the National Areas are capable of being planned as separate enclaves set within, and largely independent of, the day-to-day arrangements which govern the workings of their host city. This is not the case in Canberra. Here, the Central National Area also contains the hub of the city transport networks, which are constrained by two bridgeheads across the lake. In other cities of a 300-500,000 population size, Central Areas would usually include an intensively developed Central Business District (CBD). This commonality allows these other city administrations to draw from each others experience; be that in managing parking and public transport access, or in rebuilding areas with mixed-use developments to bring added vitality to their retailing and entertainment areas. Most cities of this kind also developed policies to ensure that their CBD related effectively to other parts of their Metropolitan Area.

Canberra's Central Area is unique. It includes both a CBD and a National Area. Its developments are very widely scattered within a unifying landscape setting. Access by car is easy, and parking is freely available. Yet further employment growth will result in growing congestion. This will not be easy to counter, given the dispersion of destinations which has already taken root.

*A dilemma: to find a new strategy for the Central Area.*

If the best way to attract investment and help build a diverse and vital economy is to create a larger and vital Central Area, one possibility might be to continue to live with the problems of dispersion and congestion within the area, and to fully provide for commuting by private car. Another possibility would be to vigorously consolidate, a measure which would help support relatively costly forms of public transport. Whatever the option that wins out, a determining test may lie in the sheer difficulty and cost of upgrading metropolitan access by car. Since Canberra's Central Area is also its transport hub, this means that the futures of the National and Business areas of Canberra will remain inextricably intertwined. There has to be a way of reaching common agreement on a Plan for the Central Area, and of making this a key element in development of a new Metropolitan Strategy.

*The landscape setting of the Capital.*

The setting of the "Bush Capital" was formed by non-urban spaces, which included nature reserves, broadacre farming, and plantation forestry. Some of these areas were identified as "future urban use" under the *Y Plan*; and subsequently, of the *National Capital Plan*. Together, these areas formed a barrier which contained the spread of urban development, and especially of smaller scale rural subdivisions. Through these policies, the "Bush Capital" of *Griffin's Plan* was initially conceived of as a statement of visual and recreational amenity, in which city dwellers could relate to a Europeanised countryside. The more specific agenda of securing nature conservation, and of the *Y Plan* itself, were later developments.

The desire to avoid any repetition of the recent catastrophic bush fires has recently caused Territory Government to review these policies, but it is not yet clear how this might modify the urban edges, or serve to introduce different non-urban land uses. The NCA was originally staffed to monitor these aspects of the National Capital Plan, but now appears to have increasingly withdrawn to a position where it limits its activities to commenting on policy development proposed by Territory Government. Even if a case is made for change to the "Bush Capital" settings, it is not clear how or if this will give sufficient weight to questions of cultural and amenity. The NCA needs to maintain a close involvement to safeguard these aspects of National Capital values.

*Cross Border issues.*

As a result of the restriction on rural subdivision in the ACT, there are now substantial areas of rural residential developments generated by ACT residents and located in NSW. NSW also includes the City of Queanbeyan, functionally an extension of Canberra's Metropolitan Area. Water supply to Canberra was secured from NSW under the founding Commonwealth *Seat of Government Act*, and supplies were later made available to Queanbeyan. Even after ACT self- government, the

Commonwealth has retained its power to approve any cross-border water supply agreements. Queanbeyan City has used up its available residential land, and indications are now that it is now moving to secure additional areas for development, with water supply being sourced from Googong Dam.

For its part, the ACT Government seems likely to seek to contain settlements within its own borders. Be that as it may, issues of water, social services, and settlement options are now all on the table. Any review of the NCA should consider these arrangements, and ensure that settlement and fiscal outcomes meet National Capital objectives.

### *The Form and Content of the Y Plan.*

A further conceptual problem is the confusion which currently reigns between the form and content of the *Y Plan*. The *Y Plan* is increasingly criticised because of variations to its originally planned distribution of activities. And this criticism includes the structure of the Plan itself: with the term "structure" describing a system of urban settlements arranged along transport corridors. Even if specific distributions of population and employment underpinned the empirical basis used in the original formulation of the Plan, its form and content do not necessarily have to relate in this way. Today, the *Y Plan* could equally well be adapted to provide for increasing centralisation of employment, supported by much improved public transport. This proposition needs to be evaluated, including the effects of different choices on a new Central Area Plan.

We have seen that the needs of a dynamic private sector have now been laid over an urban fabric originally established to serve the different, state-dominated, planning philosophy. We can also see that there are some key issues, impacting on both National and Territorial interests. These issues coalesce around the future of the Central Area, and of finding the best possible relationships to a future Metropolitan structure. It also includes the issues of the future of the non-urban areas, and of cross-border settlement. Dealing effectively with these matters poses difficult choices for revitalising the City, and for the future role of the National Capital Authority. Can the past performance of the NCA shed light on its powers, influence, capacity, and abilities to contribute to this task?

### **3. Performance of the NCA in Canberra's system of planning.**

It is against this background that the performance of the NCA, as conducted within the existing legislative and administrative arms, should be considered. At stake now, is the need to clarify the best possible future arrangements.

In the main, the history shows that the NCA has largely gone along with events, modifying proposals here and there to make sure they "fit" into the existing parameters of the National Capital Plan.

*Recent action or inaction on the part of the NCA notably includes the following matters:*

- The NCA is frequently seen by the development industry as merely duplicating the development approval processes of Territory Government on Designated Land ( eg as in Northbourne Avenue). Resolution of this problem seems to me to be more of an administrative matter than an issue of strategy. It should be possible to have NCA delegate development approval powers for these areas to the Territory, conditional on prior endorsement of Master Plans;
- NCA has recently made very valuable contributions to the Capital by implementing a programme to refurbish and maintain the Commonwealth's infrastructure asset base. However, it appears to be doing less to realise the value of vacant Commonwealth land in positive ways;
- The NCA has encouraged investors to take up vacant sites outside Civic, usually within the wider Central Area, and often on land which the Commonwealth controls. Territory Government appears to be critical of NCA for allowing this to occur; maintaining that this weakens their efforts to revitalise Civic. In several instances, such as the recent spate of new office developments at Canberra Airport, NCA would appear to be acting in contravention of the stated policies of the National Capital Plan;
- The NCA does little to constrain parking demand on sites which the Commonwealth occupies. This weakens opportunities to improve public transport, increases the need for the Territory Government to build new arterial road links, and allows surface parking to spread across National Land. Although this may seem only a management issue, it has direct implications for Metropolitan transport strategy;
- Territory Government has strenuously objected to NCA's powers to determine matters such as the routing of arterial roads. This is a vexed issue, especially as the NCA is required to assess proposals advanced by Territory Government in terms of the policies of the National Capital Plan;
- The NCA does not appear to have been able to set terms of reference for the Territory Government to develop its current Spatial Plan Strategy. For example, there has recently been a proposition from the Territory that Commonwealth-controlled rights to access water supplies be denied to major new settlement initiatives in NSW, possibly in favour of sites in the ACT. This is even when the proposals in NSW would be as costly to service as some of those currently being canvassed by Territory Government. Some of the sites under consideration by both NSW and Territory planners are also poorly placed for effective provision of Metropolitan public transport services, and the traffic patterns generated by their development could have adverse impacts on the Central National Area;



- Until very recently, the NCA has been slow in coming to terms with the planning problems of the Central National Area, and of the consequential impacts on Metropolitan Planning. At stake are both the need to address matters which overlap into the spheres of Territory Government, and the future quality of the Central National Area;
- The Territory Government's current effort to formulate a Spatial Planning Strategy has not been presented to the public as an internal investigation; but has rather appeared as a manifestation of Territory Government's intention to take over NCA's pre-eminent power to revise the *National Capital Plan*. If this interpretation is correct, then the ACT Government is proceeding in direct contravention of the present legislation.

Even though problems of this kind remain, there have been occasions when joint policies have been attempted, and others when NCA has attempted major initiatives. Some major failures are noteworthy. Most notable of these were NCA's initiatives taken in the mid-1990's, to replan the Central National Area. Reaching similar conclusions to those of the much later OECD Report, this programme proposed a greater concentration of activity in the Central Area, allied to improved provision and use of public transport. It proposed to use the otherwise vacant National Lands for intensive residential and commercial developments. Here, NCA was attempting to cater for change, by adapting the areas under its responsibility; and in ways that began a broader review of the National Capital (ie Metropolitan) Plan.

For its part, the Territory Government resisted these initiatives, preferring to concentrate on revitalisation of Civic, and to redevelop other Inner Canberra residential areas. There may well have been a judgement by NCA that, at the time, it did not enjoy strong support for its Central Area proposals from the Commonwealth Government. This is not a criticism of NCA, but may simply be a reflection of political reality. Better ways forward may have been possible if Parliament had been better informed of the issues at stake.

Underlying all these manifestations of tension is the question of who "owns" the right to respond to change. For their part, we can see that NCA continues to administer a dated National Capital Plan (ie the Y Plan). Yet the Territory Government increasingly argues that Canberra's economy, governance, and citizenry, are now essentially local interests; giving them the sole right to determine the nature and course of a Metropolitan Plan Review. This is the course that ACT Government are now following in their programme for Canberra Spatial Plan. NCA has recently begun to participate in this work at the level of having observer status, but the reality is that it would appear to neither have the staff, resourcing or political patronage to secure a substantive place at the table.

An added complication in the current debates is that the Westminster-style governance of the Territory Government is linked to different Ministerial responsibilities. This has led to self-contained and separated consultative processes covering social, economic, environmental, and physical strategies; when the real issue centres on the cross-sectoral choices which are essential to achievement of effective Metropolitan planning. The current absence of effective administrative arrangements

within Territory Government, manifested in ways which integrate well with the Commonwealth interest, does little to provide optimism in the minds of those standing outside of government.

#### 4. Systemic Failure.

Each of the elements which follow represent separate fragments: but in sum, they reinforce the view that there is a systematic weakness, both in Canberra's planning system, and in its administration.

##### *Planning Review.*

There is no agreement between the Commonwealth and the Territory Governments on the need, nature, interests, and desired outcomes in a review of the National Capital (ie Metropolitan) Plan. Some internal discussions between Territory Government and NCA have taken place recently, but the results of these are not publicly accessible.

##### *Culture.*

There is little, or no agreement between the two governments on the nature of Canberra's planning legacy: and especially of the future scope of Commonwealth interest. Territory Government is attempting to redefine the definition of interest in its own terms.

##### *Denial.*

NCA has apparently abrogated its responsibility to pick up and react to some of the contentious proposals being floated by the Territory Government in its Spatial Planning Options. These include Settlement Options and Central Area impacts.

##### *Adaptation.*

The Y Plan era saw a statist style of planning. While rightly now assuming that market-driven growth should drive development, the Territory Government appears to ignore the reality that the Commonwealth functions, and their offshoots (eg the NGO's, privately owned R&D, tourism, and educational spinoffs- all of which are major drivers of the Canberra economy), create a complex web of interdependencies which require better understanding, and which should logically influence future strategy. The underlying question here is the scope of the Commonwealth's role as a "responsible corporate entity". As noted, this is a question which extends beyond that of purely physical planning.

### *Professionalism.*

In the period since self-government, there has been a substantive erosion of professional resources available for Canberra's Metropolitan Planning, extending across both Governments. Notwithstanding the efforts that have gone into creating a programme for a new Spatial Plan, the necessary integration of the various components of a new Plan, and especially of defining and integrating National and Territory matters, appear ineffective. This comment relates to both the substance and tempo of working which will be required to cover the issues canvassed in this submission.

### *Interdependence.*

It has been argued that Canberra's layout is unusual, incomplete in its physical form, and will continue to be exposed to change, with both National and Territorial impacts.

### *Finance and Economic Development.*

The Commonwealth is the major contributor to Canberra's economy. This includes tourism, and a host of ancillary, non-governmental activities. There is a question of whether these relationships can be encouraged to develop further, and how the planning of the Commonwealth land and asset holdings might contribute to economic growth. A useful precedent is Washington's Pennsylvania Avenue Development.

*Each of the preceding paragraphs serve to define a systemic failure. Events, circumstances, and attitudes have all led to an unsatisfactory position, nearly all of which bear on the future role of the NCA. The conclusions which follow are but one of many the Inquiry will receive. Since it could well prove difficult to cut through inevitably conflicting views, the conclusions of this submission recommend a process to achieve consensus. This starts with a review of the Commonwealth's role, and then advocates a commonly agreed Joint Metropolitan Plan. This Joint Metropolitan Plan would become the basis for a New National Capital Plan, and of its Territorial equivalent. Any consequential change to the legislation, and of the future role of NCA would coincide with approval of a new National Capital Plan by Parliament. A common and independent Joint Planning Authority, administering both the National and Territorial Plans, is considered unworkable.*

## 5. Summary and Recommendations.

*The principal causes of the current situation are:*

- the deterministic formulation of measures to support the Y Plan;
- the lack of dialogue between the Commonwealth and Territory Governments;
- the lack of a clear directive on the timing and procedures for major reviews of the National Capital Plan;
- pressures to redefine the future role of the NCA prior to completion of an adequate review of pre-existing 1984 Metropolitan Policy Plan;
- Action by Territory Government to formulate a Spatial Plan, independent of the Commonwealth's interest.

*As an immediate priority, the Inquiry should consider:*

- reaching a position on the nature of the Commonwealth's future interest in Canberra.

*In this regard, if the Committee agrees that:*

- the Commonwealth should review how best it can contribute to the economic, social, cultural, and environmental quality of the Capital;
- the quality of Canberra's natural setting is of National significance;
- the Central Area includes Civic and a high quality, vital Central National Area;
- the Metropolitan form of settlement and transportation is a matter which directly relates to the future quality of the National Capital;
- a response to the preceding points is a matter of urgency, warranting high quality review, with outputs being integrated with the Territory Government's Spatial Plan Review processes, resulting in agreement of both Commonwealth and Territory Governments on a Joint Metropolitan Plan .

*It is then recommended that this Committee give consideration to:*

- a statement that the Commonwealth's interest in the National Capital requires urgent review;
- that this interest be set out by this Committee, as a series of defined principles ;

- that priority and resources be secured to form a highly skilled professional group who draw on these principles to review the scope of the National Capital Plan;
- that the conclusions of this group be referred back to this Committee for agreement;
- that the Committee seek the agreement on these conclusions from Territory Government, and agree a programme for jointly integrating these principles in a Joint Metropolitan Plan;
- that the resulting Joint Metropolitan Plan be referred to both governments for endorsement;
- that any legislative or administrative changes to NCA are approved concurrently, or following endorsement of, the preceding Joint Metropolitan Plan.
- That the Commonwealth retain the sole power to approve any consequential National Capital Plan, covering the National Capital Interest. The Territory Government would retain similar powers over those matters which are under its jurisdiction, conditional on consistency with the National Capital Plan.

*The foregoing recommendations could also include:*

- a decision to retain the NCA but to ensure that any subsequent reviews of Canberra's Metropolitan Planning also report to Parliament. This would help facilitate a sound basis for an ongoing relationship between the Commonwealth and Territory arms, and NSW Government;
- any required redefinition of NCA's role and of the matters over which it should retain pre-eminent powers.

*The procedure I have outlined would achieve several aims:*

- It would avoid the need for precipitate administrative or legislative changes, made without reference to any proper scoping or definition of working methods needed to achieve a Joint Metropolitan Plan for Canberra. These are real dangers; as the original legislation establishing the National Capital Plan drew on the pre-existing Y Plan. A new Joint Metropolitan Plan should logically become the basis for any change to the legislation or administration of planning. This new Joint Metropolitan Plan has yet to be established;
- It would avoid tensions by agreement between the Commonwealth and the ACT Governments on the immediate steps to be taken to resolve a new and Joint Metropolitan Plan;
- it would maintain the Commonwealth interest in Canberra, using the terms of reference recommended by this Committee;
- it would engage the Commonwealth rapidly and professionally, with ACT Government processes that are already well advanced;

- it would lead to a Joint Metropolitan Plan which could be endorsed by both governments;
- the new Joint Metropolitan Plan could be forwarded to Parliament, accompanied by recommended changes to the legislation and future role of the NCA;
- it would not expose successfully working elements of the NCA to arbitrary and rapid change;
- investor confidence would be lifted if the future Statutory Planning processes and controls over development were subsequently and properly redefined: both in regard to the interests of the Territory and of the Commonwealth Governments. I do not consider that a Joint Metropolitan Plan would legally bind the Commonwealth unless it retained overriding powers of approval over those aspects of the Plan which had National significance. This would be expressed in a new National Capital Plan;
- It also seems unrealistic to believe that an independent and Joint Planning Authority could implement a new Joint Metropolitan Plan on behalf of both governments. The Statutory Administration of the National and Territorial aspects of a commonly agreed Joint Metropolitan Plan are quite separate matters. They also stand apart from any arrangements that may be entered into in order to conduct a review of the existing Metropolitan Plan.
- Once any changes to the scope of the National Capital and Territory Plans were agreed, each of the participating governments would need to approve those matters which fall under its control, into its own Statutes.

I would like to thank the Committee for providing the opportunity to make this contribution to their Inquiry.

Yours faithfully,



Brian Binning.

*M.Arch (Urban Design) Illinois; RTPI (London); PLA.  
Weeroona,  
Yass NSW.*

23 May 2003.