

A Response - Invitation by the WA State Government (DPC) for public comment on a -

Draft Perth and Peel Green Growth Plan for 3.5 million.

Executive Summary.

Planning of the Perth Region has become an internationally exposed disgrace as one of our major tourism assets, the unique biodiversity, has been squandered and almost obliterated in the region. It has become obvious that the current Planning System has generally been causing, rather than solving such urban development problems.

The elaborate but obscure Plan documentation and the reasons for it have again directed knowledgeable and informed professional attention to the accumulated dysfunctional overall operation of the Planning management system in WA further confirming that is not appropriate for a rapidly changing future.

This response comments on the current content and presentation of the Green Growth Plan in terms of suitability to seek public comment on what purports to be a very long-term plan that cannot be securely relevant in an era of unprecedented and accelerating social change. Then later proceeds (with a detailed functional review attachment) to explain various Planning System-related aspects that must first be given attention, concluding with suggesting component models to restructure the Planning System that could in due course facilitate attainment of the Commonwealth/ State objectives.

The Draft 'Green Growth' Plan refers primarily to the progressive loss of unique biodiversity in the Region and really only suggests how it might possibly be slowed in future, while at the same time substantially increasing the scale of development to almost double the population, but does not give attention to analysing the overall reasons for the loss.

This response paper objectively considers background reasons for that major (70%) loss of indigenous natural biodiversity in the Perth and Peel Region, internationally recognised as a unique asset. It demonstrates that the **main cause has been ineffective control of urban development directly attributable over a long period to the traditional structure and management practices of the State Government run Land-use Planning system** comprising the Planning Commission, its supporting Department of Planning and interaction with Local Authorities.

The essence of this response is to confirm virtual certainty that this draft Plan alone will have little constructive effect on retention of remaining natural biodiversity in the Region where it is accessible to the public. Furthermore that it will certainly not achieve the objectives of the Commonwealth Government proposal agreed in principle with the State Government in 2011 to conditionally relinquish some environmental referral conditions for development approvals and transfer that responsibility to the State with the objective of 'streamlining' the planning

approvals system to accelerate development in the public interest. That simplistic action misunderstands the context that it is the overall Planning System that needs ‘streamlining’.

If the underlying objectives are to be achieved it will first be essential to re-structure the Planning Agencies, substantially modify their operational methodology, extend the range of skills, redefine their respective roles and functions and substantially change the nature of their interface with Local Authorities in managing development Planning Approvals. This paper suggests a basic model for that re-structuring to achieve an overall Planning System that could cope much more effectively with the urban growth proposed.

Contents:

Topic.....	page.
1. Content of ‘Green Growth’ Proposal.....	3
2. The preceding and emerging ‘narrative’	4
3. Historical perspective on Official Planning in the Region (brief synopsis).....	6
4. Communication of environmental concepts.....	9
5. ‘Levels’ of Planning Policies and Guidance documentation and biodiversity.....	9
6. System Realities – where ‘High Level’ planning is and is not relevant.....	10
7. Safeguarding Public interest.....	11
8. Properly managed creative Urban Planning is different.....	12
9. Future Urban Planning management generally and in higher density areas.....	13
10. New resources to support future planning.....	13
11. Public engagement in future-planning of their localities.....	14
12. Future ‘social-intelligence’ in urban planning – the vital dimension.....	15
13. Community Development as a Planning objective.....	16
14. Overall Urban Planning performance - in summary.....	17
15. Future relevance of the Local Government Administrative system to development planning.....	18
16. Natural environment loss.....	18
17. Truth and consequences.....	19
18. Review and Restructure?.....	20
19. Question and reconsider major Planning objectives and assumptions.....	22
20. Green Growth protection, clearance, value, management and futures.....	22
Postscript – (planning team notes, ‘coping with change’)	25

*(Please note there is an *attachment herewith – referred to at page 20 in this submission)*

.....

1. Content of the 'Green Growth' Proposal.-

Unfortunately this vague draft Plan is a confusing mixture of ideas and DPC should have first independently read and summarised public comments on the WAPC's immediately preceding draft Perth and Peel at 3.5 million Plan and for which public comments were returned by 31st July 2015. Without that, it is by no means clear what land-use Planning proposals the various responsible Government Agencies would have after receiving those comments, or how the Green Growth Plan relates to them. (The System throughout has an unfortunate tradition of largely ignoring community input.)

In the absence of that summary being made public, the community is inevitably obliged to guess what the combined outcome effects of two apparently related draft plans would be. Such inevitable guesswork is no fair way to engage public opinion on a matter as important as planning our State Capital City Region for the next 30 years.

In this draft 'Green' growth (or natural environment impact) proposal, the Plan does not communicate what and where the unique indigenous natural biodiversity that now remains is to be saved, and what lost, or clarify the risk-factors entailed in it. (Or even where in the higher density urban areas, sufficient public parkland is to be incorporated). **Therefore, there is as yet no firm basis for community comment in the Plan, other than to engage in diverse conversations about it. (and certainly no negotiable basis for relaxing existing environmental approvals).**

Since this draft 'planning' has been developed using public funds over four years since 2011, the Community deserves a far higher level of clarity of intentions and likely early outcomes relevant to future urban expansion than is evident.

Furthermore such an important Planning Policy document, to be taken seriously, bearing mind that it is about future planning on an urban site that is already developed, should have included a frank and factual critical evaluation of recent urban development; its impact on the natural characteristics of the region related to the legislative and managerial systems that have been responsible for planning it over at least the past three decades. (In the business world that is an on-going essential corporate 'feedback' loop incorporated in forward planning.)

Those essentials are all missing and without them there **can be no sensible shared understanding of how natural environment in the Region will be managed in future or a starting point for the community to consider.**

The overall documentation presented as multiple vague map overlays is insufficiently clear and concise for the community to clearly understand what exactly is being proposed, not only overall as the Plan for a Future City Region, but in the numerous localities of the Region.

Such a proposed plan must also more clearly state the assumptions it is based on in order that the community can evaluate those against their own perceptions. Those are particularly crucial when such a plan must be about creating future longer-term living frameworks affecting vast numbers of incoming people from different cultural traditions and value systems. Those essential assumptions are obscure.

It seems that the State Government Agency Contributors to these Planning proposals need to be sharply reminded and re-focused on the fact that ‘Environment’ for people comprises the entirety of their surroundings, not exclusively either natural or man-made.- We exist and share in a biodiverse set of interrelated ‘ecosystems’ in which, despite our apparent superior human intellect, to survive sustainably there is both gain and loss around us. Not only in dominance of claimed territory, but in all the features of it and quality of shared lives. *(In a hot drying climate in south-west WA, shade, moisture and recreation space are becoming rarer in urban areas, yet more could be available with intelligent forward planning.)*

1. The preceding and emerging ‘narrative’.-

This Perth and Peel ‘Green Growth Plan for 3.5 million’ has its origin in a proposal to “streamline development approval procedures” that would not have been necessary **if the present WA land-use Planning System overall had been managed and adequately adequately relevant to its assigned functions to comprehensively guide and manage future Urban development towards the scale proposed.**

What has emerged so far in this partial plan is still predicated upon continuation of general horizontal urban low density sprawl, except now with some vertical higher density infilling rising towards a vaguely defined metropolitan core but without any overall conceptual basis.-

The ‘**Connected City**’ is not a future concept or ‘vision’ but simply a retrospective ‘marketing’ illusion being used to disguise vast unmanaged predominantly linear sprawl along more than 160 kms of coastal Plain that has **not actually been ‘connected’** and will now require a huge community investment on public transportation as well as extraordinary future inconvenience-cost to growing families in the peripheral areas.

Even more fundamentally, no overall alternative population growth timing or distribution trajectories are offered. It would have been possible from those to offer alternative location and activity-zone modelling directly linked to socially relevant residential and associated concentrations on a phased plan. Absence of those will inevitably result in more future cost penalties (social and environmental destruction) to eventually retro-fit, scaled-up convenience services and connection corridors.

This Green Growth Plan appears as some form of independent 'remedial' response by the Dept. of Premier and Cabinet - having become publicly embarrassed by the trail of appallingly costly and anti-social sprawl, grossly extended transportation routes, and environmental destruction in a region of acknowledged unique biodiverse landscape; as managed through and by the existing WA Planning system.

The wide-ranging costly impacts of this (avoidable) unmanaged urban sprawl has slowly emerged into the public consciousness as general environmental awareness and education have come into sharper focus locally, increasing the retrospective need for new major public expenditure on 'palliative' measures such as improving local community services and faster public transportation.

The WAPC and its servicing agency the Department of Planning, took three years, major draft published documentation, and a Conference of Agencies, in 2014 to develop a **State Planning 'Strategy; vision to 2050. (That devotes only 3 pages out of 130 to 'Environment')**

Then another year to prepare a draft '**Plan for the Perth and Peel Regions**' in a set of four 'frameworks' on the basis of crudely estimated population growth to **3.5 million by 2050**, that again made only generalised reference to future environmental impacts.

The State Government's own separate Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) however, reporting on the background and implications of all of this to their Minister, documented the recent planning outcomes in the Region exposing the many negative 'Environmental Impacts and Risks' essentially of relying in future on the existing Planning System to manage development.

It is inevitable now therefore that the community is being obliged to guess what the combined effect two loosely related draft plans would have, and also have in mind the independent extensively documented critique by the EPA. This necessary inevitable guesswork is no reasonable way to seek and engage public opinion.

All of the above conveys a picture of muddled, thoroughly out-dated urban Planning, combined with evident **absence of future creative vision** about responses to rapid technological and associated social change.

This demonstrates an urgent need in the public interest to fully restructure the WA Planning System that embraces the Planning Commission, its supporting Agency the Department of Planning and the way they managerially interact with Local Authorities on development planning and means of approval control.-

Not only their tiered management structure as it currently exists, but also the narrow range of professional disciplines included and the relevance to practical delivery processes wherever they are creating new and modified environments – namely on actual sites.

The overall system must be far more rapidly responsive, innovative and relevant to the increasingly changing and multi-faceted challenges that lie ahead for the Region; as well as to fully integrate relevant and up-to-date applied environmental and social research into its procedures. It is at present a sharply stratified system overall with very poorly managed relationships between the various layers that inevitably results in repeated failures to deliver sensible and efficient outcomes.

.....

3. Historical Perspective on Official planning in the Region - (a brief synopsis)

There are very few regional cities in the world that have had the benefit of starting with such a 'clean slate' in recent times and so many natural site advantages as Perth Western Australia. Yet most likely none that have been planned so poorly for and by an advanced society with such lack of balanced forward perspective as to now seriously inhibit its future potential.

Perth grew from a beautiful sheltered estuarine setting, backed by an extensive densely tree-covered escarpment, from which two river systems with many small tributaries drain into the broad meandering Swan River estuary, and fronting a relatively shallow marine coastline with clean sandy beaches.

It had the combined beneficial legacies of having experienced no destruction through cyclic wars during human evolution, no exploitation during the social effects of the 19th century heavy industrial revolution, or from the industrial dereliction that followed, elsewhere in the world.

The population of Perth has grown increasingly rapidly over the past 50 years by attracting a young incoming population keen to make a fresh start, typically escaping from much older and overcrowded human settlements and cities in other parts of the world. Plus the added attraction of a stable already evolved imported democratic system of government, and the additional advantage of remoteness from sporadic regional conflicts.

The initial official Planning was done in the early post second world-war period, derived from basic principles of the 1947 British Town and Country Planning Act, but not then foreseeing a large City to be planned overall in context of its setting (as was Canberra), but rather for orderly development of a growing town, essentially around and close to the Swan River estuary.

At that time, almost 50 per cent of Australia's export income was from agriculture, principally wheat and wool, with WA as a major contributor, but with no other substantial local industries.

The adjacent downstream port of Fremantle grew serving those major exports and otherwise as a focus of service-industry imports for a growing State-wide population.

There was still very little early public recognition of the future comparative advantage of the uniquely biodiverse surroundings of Perth. Official future land-use planning around Perth was still sub-consciously influenced by the 'slash burn and clear' settlement practices that had been the foundation of the early predominantly agricultural economy.

Sadly since then, despite the knowledge revolution that has penetrated the psyche of most of us and drastically changed our concepts of living, working, recreation and leisure; the WA Planning System has proved unable to cope with aggressive but narrowly conceived short-term profiteering from land clearing for development, that harks back to former eras in WA, but in earlier times was far more beneficial in accruing broad social benefits.

That official Planning System is today in 2016 struggling ineffectually to appear to be relevant but has recently had to quietly concede the enormous disaster of having actively facilitated gross low-density urban sprawl that will be almost impossible to economically redress. The extent of sprawl now adding the Peel Estuary region 80kms south, as part of what is referred to as Perth and Peel but also including development a similar distance north to Yanchep, Two Rocks and beyond. (At present over 160kms of sprawl).

In the process this Official Planning System has been blind-to, yet managerially responsible for, needlessly destroying over 70 per cent of the unique indigenous biodiversity that existed, and with this 'Green Growth Plan' is still on track to destroy much more of it and even trying to make it easier for more land-use exploitation to occur under the guise of "streamlining" the approvals system to aid private sector commercial Developers, who are currently allowed to profit handsomely from simple land sub-division but to have no future commitment or accountability to the Community for related social or environmental outcomes.

In comparative terms there are many extremely habitable cities incorporating networks of managed continually regenerating urban parkland landscape with a footprint of those dimensions elsewhere in the world that accommodate a population over five times that of this Region. The chances of such balance in the Perth Region are now very low on account of the accumulated restricted layout and what has already been lost.

That Official Planning System has adjusted its 'spin' retrospectively several times in an attempt to excuse the needless sprawl, now having abandoned a "Networked City" ideology and unashamedly 'marketing' the extended linear sprawl as a "Connected" City. But now having little alternative but to retrospectively support higher urban densities by promoting urban "Infill". However that infilling now has severe limitations because many even inner city areas

are predominantly residential and lack adequate space for the range of communal services that are now necessary, without substantial preceding wasteful demolition.

One unfortunate result is that we currently have the unedifying spectacle of Perth inner city multi-storey residential units being 'shoe-horned' into ad hoc locations, many without access to an adequate range of local services, and with the ground floor egress immediately adjacent to heavily trafficked roadways. Other modern cities even without the previous advantages available to Perth have long ago moved to separate pedestrian and mixed vehicular movement routes to provide a predominant pedestrian 'realm' with level-separation for all other than local 'hop on and off' people-transit systems including travellers, light-rail (trams) and other slow-moving automated systems.

The accumulated effect of this planning disaster is now being openly criticised by the increasingly well-informed and environmentally aware community. People of all ages, but particularly the young who will inherit this unfortunate legacy, have woken up to the need for closer every day contact with the components of living natural environment in a warming climate – shade protection, photosynthesised plant material transpiring to produce breathable fresh air, regenerating flora and fauna etc. all now essential to offset the increasing indoor individually pressured way of life that is bringing higher overall prosperity, but also substantially altering work forms; locations; home/ life/family balance; opportunity and life-styles.

There have been world-wide advances in every aspect of human knowledge and capability, including in environmental awareness and planning techniques to match development outcomes to the changing social needs of future urban living. But Perth has been officially constrained by a Planning System that has lacked - respect for its environmental setting, a relevant applied social research base, innovative creativity and proved quite unable to respond to and manage change.

In that overall context, the deliberate irrecoverable loss of indigenous biodiversity incurred under the present Planning system throughout the Perth and Peel Region on our watch, in the face of known alternatives will be a catastrophe that future generations will undoubtedly blame on developmental greed and incompetent planning, managed by both State and local Governments in this early part of the 21st century.

.....

4. Communication of Environmental concepts:

Any Conservation Plan to make sense must begin with ecological mapping (or at the very least detailed aerial photography displaying climax species present). The absence of ecological mapping of even major natural vegetation communities, from both the Draft WAPC Draft Perth and Peel at 3.5 million and to support the Draft Green Growth Plan, reveals more than just what is being used by the DPC.-

It displays lack of comprehension (within the overall WA Official Planning system) that thoroughly investigating the overall qualities and natural ecology of sites being considered for development is fundamental to 21st century land-use Planning. Allowing deliberate clearance without knowing site assets is just stupid policy.

That lack of comprehension alone effectively invalidates the standing of Official Planning guidance offered by the WAPC and its supporting Agency the Department of Planning. The State Government must regard this unforgivable omission as a further reason for a fundamental review and restructure of the Planning System in WA)

5. 'Levels' of Planning Policies and Guidance documentation and biodiversity.-

The primary reason for grossly excessive clearance of 70% natural biodiversity in the Perth and Peel region regarded internationally as a unique 'hot spot', is the outdated and narrow perspective of the main central public service land-use Planning Agencies in WA. Those Agencies have in recent years operated exclusively a simplistic theoretically based dictatorial (hands-off) style of policy guidance and management, backed by Legislation, termed 'high level' planning that Local Authorities have been obliged to copy.

Practical professional planning processes of urban development at site-realisation level are far more complex, and that is where the form and layout of real developments projects are actually determined.

The excessive and mismanaged land clearance for development and extended urban sprawl that the Perth Region community will now have to live with, is largely due to the absence of senior professional personnel with knowledge and expertise in the natural environment, and in the holistic community development aspects of planning. (Even in the very recently revised 'Liveable Neighbourhood' guidance document.)

The central Agencies, Planning Commission and Department of Planning in WA as currently operating are simply not capable of managing Planning at City Region scale for the future and in the public interest in urgent need of investigation and re-structuring.

The current WA Official Planning System does not appear to comprehend in its exclusively "high level" land-use planning guidance that neither administrative, ownership boundaries, or

topographical maps convey anything useful concerning the existence of indigenous natural biodiverse ecosystems.

Such complex systems that have developed and survived over many centuries have far more widespread interdependencies and the capability to continuously regenerate and recover from most natural events, unless deliberately destroyed by human intervention.

Urban intervention could however, if their natural processes were better understood by responsible Planning personnel, be managed selectively to include man-made components and enrich the lives of those who will live in close proximity to them.

6. System Realities -where 'High Level' planning is, and is not relevant.-

State-wide Regional Planning that requires broad-based analysis to determine optimum and physically appropriate locations for new settlements, major industrial activity, transportation corridors and other large-scale man-made infrastructure zones; can be properly determined by Commissions mainly comprised (as WAPC is) of senior representatives of State Government Services Providers, documented and communicated sensibly by 'high level' mapping and preferred broad zoning.

However, such overall Directing forums with that predominant membership are not appropriate to oversee or have any authoritative role in creating or setting policy for detailed Urban planning today for the future, since that is a far more complex multi-professional and science/technology/design team effort throughout, involving many different skills, managed to attain genuine creative, innovative and constantly evolving community objectives.

The WAPC, that authoritatively sits over and uses the Department of Planning as a serviceing workforce, are today universally applying only 'high level' strategic thinking and presentation style and wrongly using that as authoritative communication over all Planning decision-making in urban localities.

That coupled with its directive language, has led Local Authorities, (most of whom do not have multi-disciplinary urban design teams), to produce and publish Local Plans and advise Developers at that same 'high level', or vague and unspecific scale. As well as also respond to public submissions not against locally validated criteria, but against those same simplistic 'high level policy' guidelines.

The term often used by WAPC to justify such exclusively high level documentation is that it 'will inform', but that is the reverse of fact when the WAPC/DoE are themselves uninformed by being completely detached and out of touch with the real business of creating developments to fit actual sites and the social conditions necessary to build inter-generationally supportive communities. **That detachment is a major system-failure that Governments must first**

comprehend and address before worsening actual outcomes by the piecemeal tinkering at the final site development approval stage as suggested.

(Decades ago, with very much lower volume, speed and scale of Urban development in the Perth and Peel regions, such coalition of participants might have been seen then as economically appropriate, but is today and for the future thoroughly outdated and inappropriate.)

7. Safeguarding Public interest.-

Planning system management is faulty and has costly outcomes.-

The WAPC's exclusively theoretical 'high level' management of the Planning process for an urban area at City Region scale **has had extremely costly effects for the community** in permitting grossly excessive urban sprawl, extended travel times, poorly planned suburbs with little or no community development provision, without nearby access to daily services, poor or no recreational provision and wholesale clearance of trees and biodiverse natural features that could have been used for public benefit recreation and education.

As further explained below.-

Causing higher public expenditure and inflating land value.-

The direct consequence of this outdated and clearly dysfunctional Planning System is not in the public interest, in terms of securing creative, socially relevant and timely community environments at affordable cost, and has the effect of **artificially inflating land values**. e.g.-

Typically, smart opportunistic and enterprising commercial Developers use the extreme latitude of the system and its prematurely published vague 'high level' zoning, to scout early for outer suburban land and borrow money to purchase it, usually on a promissory payment bases, from unprepared landowners. They draw up very basic structure plans to sub-divide (with Local Authorities incapable of being creatively involved or properly scrutinise likely social or environmental outcomes, since they usually do not have that expertise available to them).

If those Developers are stalled by resistance from L/A Councils, they Appeal to the State Administrative Tribunal (SAT). Such Appeals are costly for L/As to defend from Council Rates derived funds, (c\$30,000 is usual) and of course such Developers can point to the only vague and unspecific 'high level' preliminary guidance given.

By this means commercial Developers are easily able to make 'obscene' profits for minimal effort and outlay and **also walk away with zero accountability for the often hopelessly anti-social and poorly serviced residential developments, that are often no more than aggressively marketed small subdivided blocks of land with roads and sewers, with no real visual identity and very little or no creative future community benefit**. Typically just soulless housing estates

with fancy titles. **Also in the process grossly inflating land prices to handsomely benefit them, but to obvious public financial disadvantage.**

8. Properly managed creative Urban Planning is different to the above.- e.g.

As an example at a suburban residential scale compared to the above. (*only in illustrative outline*) - the process is (or should be) a creative multi-disciplinary professional team effort during which several layout and design concepts will emerge in outline CAD/sketch-plan form offering alternative layouts for comparison, costing and client approval.-

Basically these grow from choice and detailed appraisal of site and its location; analysing all aspects of what is already there; quantifying and documenting all existing assets both physical and ecological. Then a multi-disciplinary professional assessment of potential use and limitations set against both human and natural environmental values, based on thorough research of known local facts and foreseeable change in every component of the proposed plan. Its particular site, services availability, all existing natural and man-made site assets, any physical services supply or legal easement obstacles, surface features, hydrology and potential to contribute to overall future community evolution in the outlook period.

From that stage, based on all site circumstances particularly on previously researched local social needs, for access to services such as schools, shopping, medical, employment and public transportation, the creative process begins, moving progressively from two dimensional to three dimensional.

In first drafts, major 'activity areas' already agreed to be accommodated are located with particular attention to communal and social/family needs and convenience, privacy, access, grouped storage etc. all 'trial' located. Together with possible vehicular and pedestrian movement corridors linkages to existing outer connections, and natural environment features available, those features linked where possible for outer wild-life movement protection.

Thereafter alternative three-dimensional forms are created with attention given not only to buildings, relative elevation, orientation and shadowing plus the utility and visual quality of spaces between them etc. until alternative overall visual depictions are eventually created for team and client discussion and approval.

In a properly planned urban development, site layout is not separated from an overall three dimensional socially integrated concept providing a thoroughly workable community environment. That will be flexible to accommodate different individual and incoming family-choices and affordability, but is still created as a workable master-planned environment that has identity as a community framework for living and with mutual intergenerational support capability.

9.Future Urban Planning management generally and in higher density areas.–

For the future, Urban Planning and design at any scale must be a fast-moving creative professional/ scientific multi-disciplinary team activity, where comprehensive human needs in all locations, using all available technology are met. With overall multi-building functions, forms, and spatial relationships both internal and external, in any given location, all set against cost and demand 'marketability' as well as durability against predicted life -expectancy to meet foreseeable future changing needs.

Such planning must be deliberately managed as an integrated process, documented at mid and low 'levels' for a human world of completely unprecedented change, and requires constant systematic review and adaptation (akin to the challenge of hitting a moving target), with progressively changing new models of organisation that can respond rapidly and flexibly to innovation arising from all areas of human endeavour.

10. New resources to support future planning.-

World-wide on-line networking is currently delivering to us, through an ever-widening window, new knowledge and an expanding range of new scientific discoveries, many of them generating fresh technologies, and multiple potential applications.

For forward Planning to remain constantly relevant to the related changing externally sourced pressures affecting inhabitants, those on-line resources must be constantly reviewed, researched, and selectively tested locally against both current planning strategies and widely disseminated in abstracted professional publications locally.

In terms of a hierarchy of delivering actual outcomes, 'high-level' strategies affecting broad intentions are less dynamic, therefore less relevant to immediate developmental outcomes, than the tactical delivery systems that should operate at 'mid to lower' ends of Planning, where creative ideas responding to both human-social and other longer-evolved natural elements, are combined with available financial resources and converted into on-site development.

From the above then, it is easy to see that the current overall Official Planning system in Western Australia in early 2016 is absolutely incapable in its present form of meeting that Regional Capital City Urban Planning challenge to accommodate a population of 3.5 million for the Perth and Peel Region.

Communication and engagement with the client public – who are being planned – for.

As implied above throughout the current Planning system genuine community engagement is pronounced weakness and there is in general little real effort at any level to seriously gather views on up-to-date community needs as expressed, and actually respond to them.-

The Planning System at present throughout its various levels does not-

- a) Commission and publish independent evaluation of the outcomes from its own 'guidance' policies but presents them as immutable. (no embedded public feedback loop)
- b) Does not set out to openly secure and carefully respond to community comments, but avoids independent compilation of them. This style generated by WAPC/DoP is followed out to Local Authorities as a result of the 'top-down' authoritative ethos prevailing. Public comments are generally coalesced only against pre-judgement of untested and detached high level theoretical beliefs within the administration, and inconsistencies frequently ignored without query.

The WAPC adds to public obfuscation by using many different names for documents.- Strategies./ Frameworks./Schemes./Structure Plans / Policies etc. some of which are related to legislation some not. Some required to be authorised by WAPC as part of 'higher level' direction, others not.....

11. Public engagement in future-Planning of their localities.-

Local Authorities in general get much positive comment in local community newspapers from their communities about local services, particularly about social activities such as entertainment, arts and recognition of personal efforts and achievements by local citizens.

The one stand-out exception is Planning-related topics that are more usually negative, and after developments have been approved or completed.

Many of those stem from lack of timely community engagement in the process, frequently limited to formal newspaper notifications by way of formal local newspapers notices and on Council web-sites as 'Invitation for Public comment'.

Unless there has previously been public controversy on key aspects, the responses are often few, and the usual feeling is that "it won't make any difference so why bother" knowing that whomsoever drafted the detailed notice within the Local Authority is most likely to be same to summarise the responses before the decisions are taken by the elected Councillors, and even then that won't be final but could be contradicted by WAPC or appealed to SAT.

Furthermore responses through that formal process in truth rarely 'engage' people, who on average today are leading very busy lives and may not even become aware of that opportunity. This is even more particularly the case regarding Local Planning Schemes regarding permitted

land uses. Those are regarded as over-riding planning 'Policy' required to be approved by the WAPC/DoP (*from its detached 'high level' view related to their wider Region schemes*) and reviewed at least on 5 yearly intervals. (*and yet can sometimes sit with the WAPC/DoP for years without query or acceptance.*)

Local Authorities often later quote defensively when community complaints about particular approval outcomes are raised "public have had the opportunity to comment when the Local Planning Scheme was advertised for comment and that issue was not raised then". Hardly sensible set against realities in the community that the System largely ignores.

A very small number of the larger L/As advertise (usually those with larger Planning Officer teams) and run local 'Community workshops'.e.g. City of Swan, as a deliberate means of engaging not only comment, but constructive feedback on Planning Schemes or large development proposals, since they realise that L/A Officers and elected Councillors cannot possibly keep abreast of the wide spectrum of changing living pressures and needs in a rapidly changing society. – yet are likely to be in position required to advise-on or make decisions at request for approval stage on development approval requests.

12. Future 'social-intelligence' in urban planning - the vital dimension.-

Urban planning today for the future in Perth and Peel is certainly not just about detached 'High level' strategic location of man-made infrastructure and basic zoning then theorising about conventional results based on historical procedures.

It is primarily about stimulating **urban innovation to improve quality of lives by creating new efficient, exciting yet safe high-density environments** to meet the future needs of all inhabitants taking fully into account every aspect of human endeavour, expectations and aspirations; as well as respecting and conserving previously evolved landscape assets wherever feasible for the benefit of future generations.

Creative innovation is essential in terms of fostering social development throughout the Region including inner and outer city areas. Tracking social realities and change has a strong role to play in that (but ignored as a policy issue in current planning). The form and relationships of buildings and the spaces between them can induce, help, create and foster social community cohesion, intergenerational support and through that inclusive facilitation, a collaborative ethos and shared sense of personal and community identity.

13. Community Development as a Planning objective.-

(The following discussion suggests why and how professional community development staff are of increasing high value to Local Authorities in provision of services and henceforth should be included as an essential service.)

“In an era where concentrated remote communication devices are forcing many people, particularly the young to disengage from interpersonal group contact; it is important to remember that humans are instinctively social animals. If that sociability is lost through lack of opportunity at home or with peers, it leads to isolation, depression, drug and alcohol dependency.

In the case of younger people they often drift to small gangs of peers who feel similarly excluded, from a society that has no local identity and offers no means to build a sense of belonging anywhere. (Often remote from both work and job-training opportunities.) The inevitable result is nuisance behaviour, vandalism and minor crime. –

Look at any outer suburban area of Perth that now has a high percentage of teenagers (because their parents impetuously rushed to take advantage of seductively marketed blocks and homes.) Typically no social focus, very limited play or recreation space, no trees to hide around or climb, or mud to get messy in... Only extremely busy and ‘helicopter’ parents who just have to be there for supposed safety, but then spend valuable family time glued to mobile phones, and even distract their younger children in prams by giving them an electronic pad. How would we the older generations cope with that? and what sort of citizens would we become?

If this all sounds familiar, the particular point of relevance to planning is – **each Local Authority urgently needs at least one, but preferably more Community Development Officers** (probably with a social psychology qualification). Their job would be out and about continually everywhere in the L/A localities, listening to young and old on their ‘turf’, gently forming social groups; listening to and recording their ideas and constantly working on the tasks of community-building. At the same time they would be an invaluable source of genuine social ‘field-research’ that would allow Councillors to have an improved ‘information-base’ drawn from monthly reports, from which to more objectively make their decisions on all sorts of local Services, but most importantly future development.

The suggestion is for Councillors to also have with these **Community Development Officer/s a regular informal Consultative (committee/group)** that would meet, say monthly (and include other relevant L/A staff as required) as an on-going forum to exchange and seek information from the ‘grass roots’ of the community and set out to answer questions that cannot be sourced in any other way.

.....

14. Overall Urban Planning System performance, - in summary.

The present Planning system model is not capable of responding-to and managing overall land-use planning to cope with the foreseeable rate of social change.

It is over-focussed on theoretical 'high-level' strategies that have not worked in application because they are too detached from the practical tasks of delivering sensible and balanced urban development at the far more complex lower levels, where at present multi-disciplinary professional evaluative and creative skills, that need to be applied are missing.

The WA Planning Commission mainly comprises a membership of senior executives from the Government-run Services supply Agencies that may have a contributory role in State-wide infrastructure development, that is of course a 'high-level' broad strategic function, but has been improperly accorded an Official lead and controlling role in urban planning, that is far too complex and remote from their expertise to encompass the complex practical business of urban planning.

The Department of Planning is, (but should not be) simply regarded as an operational service unit reporting to the WAPC. That Department is in turn obliged to operate in the same high-level strategic style of the WAPC, but starved of practical exposure to the far more complex business of engaging in and managing practical delivery of creative urban development to where it materialises on-sites. – Operating in a detached theoretical 'cocoon'.

Most Local Authorities in turn competently manage a range of other local services but regarding Planning are not professionally staffed to undertake creative urban planning or managing development that should be, but is usually not, analytically social and site-sensitive. Yet they are obliged to approve local development based on vague Local Schemes that are still primarily 'high-level' and theoretical, and to follow that level of 'guidance' generated by the Department of Planning but authorised by WAPC.

That matter is even further out of sensible control since Councillors under the present system are inhibited in trying to operate, both as supposed first-hand communication links with their communities, but also required to make decisions on applications for development.- Guided only by professional staff who themselves are skilled only in interpreting the predominately 'high-level' authoritative but theoretical only guidance that emanates from the remote WAPC.

Worse still most Local Authorities do not undertake any serious on-going independent local social research and enquiry regarding new local community social needs relating to

development, or any detailed sites assessment. Consequently those essential aspects of future urban development are usually overlooked.

15. Future relevance of the Local Government Administrative system to development Planning? –

The current mismatch with the functions of creative professional futures planning, at a Local Authority level, is because creative urban Planning is not simply an administrative deployment of money to local services or even the application of received Statutory Instruments, but involves detailed 'live' enquiry; assessment and interpretation of context - both physical on-site; and social interaction with the community, plus foresight derived from recording trends and probabilities, visualisation of alternative projections on outcomes, and recommending on balance of options.

These functions are markedly different and indeed far too complex for Councillors to fit with their other wide range of responsibilities, and in practise they have great difficulty in engaging helpfully with them. (sometimes they will say they 'discuss the detail privately beforehand,' but this generally not borne out by what is usually demonstrated to the Community in formal Council meetings.)

16. Natural environment loss.-

The majority of the incredible 70% recorded loss of indigenous natural Biodiversity in the Perth and Peel Region has occurred over the past 20 years, when the present Land-use Planning System and associated legislation has been little changed. As a consequence of relative remoteness of Perth, professional Planners working at all levels within the System will have had minimal exposure to training and experience elsewhere in the world where urban planning systems are more advanced and sophisticated.

It is therefore perhaps unfair to hold them even collectively responsible for the environmentally damaging urban sprawl, outer suburban social degradation, extended and congested public transportation systems throughout the Perth and Peel Region, but who else could have been? Elected Politicians may have contributed knowingly or not, but probably relied on, and rarely questioned detailed modelling and guidance, except when constrained by funding in a few minor policy areas. State Parliament has rarely intervened and been broadly co-operative when adjustments were requested by the 'Executive'.

17. Truth and Consequences.-

The Commonwealth/ State tentative agreement in 2011, to have a review of relative roles and responsibilities in referrals of planning approvals focussed on adjusting environmental approvals at the point of planning delivery is now effectively stalled. The Strategic Assessment of Perth and Peel Region, SAPPR that the Commonwealth thought could be a model format for managing growth, is emerging quite differently, exposing the fact that **the current Planning System in WA is now completely out of its depth in terms of supporting Governments with forward perspective and capability to plan and manage growth. -**

For instance -The transportation framework has grown without properly planned foresight and almost ground to a virtual halt in confusion. Costly urban sprawl has continued unabated and uncontrolled site development has grossly inflated suburban land prices .e.g.-

New unplanned neighbourhoods springing up on carelessly bulldozed sites in ad hoc locations as little more than bleak un-serviced housing estates, because they were approved only as land divided into cleared blocks (of ever-shrinking dimensions).

Both governments now being obliged to do an about- turn and refocus funds on inserting new public transportation systems to outlying areas. Unplanned maritime linkages in turmoil as a result of unresolved controversy regarding volumetric forecasting and efficient site locations.

Residential sprawl in the south, both around and even IN the Peel Harvey Estuary that in health terms is a substantially risky mosquito-infested wetland, with what appears like a large inland body of water, but is in fact very shallow and a water-bird paradise that is supposed to be protected by an international (Ramsar) treaty but actually isn't.

Most recently we have the public spectacle of an increased large scale clearance of unique natural biodiverse landscape being presented for public comment with euphemistic title of a Green GROWTH Plan, essentially to disguise the fact that the WA Planning System has regarded even unique local vegetation as of merely decorative value, and doesn't employ professional staff who know it is of far more future value than that to an increasingly indoor techno mind-focussed community.

For all the above copious reasons and local history, it must be concluded that the existing overall Official WA Planning System is now completely unsuitable to administer and guide future Urban Development for a population expected to rise to 3.5 million in the Perth and Peel Region.

A thorough independent review leading to a restructured Planning system is therefore unavoidable to safeguard the public interest.

That review and re-structuring should be undertaken (independently) before any decision is knowingly taken by the Commonwealth Government to relax any of its current Environmental authority in order to 'streamline' the approvals system in WA, since that would, with the present system still in operation, be contrary to the public interest (as well as most likely be close to negating some long established international commitments concerning natural environment.)

18. Review and restructure? -

To assist in this bearing in mind that existing public sector organisations find objectivity extremely difficult when any change is proposed and great reluctance to review and restructure themselves. Refer to ["A Preliminary Independent Functional Review of the land-use and development Planning System in Western Australia; with proposals for enhanced future relevance and management."](#) (Page 21 - Proposal)

The essential concluding components of a suggested future re-structured model that results from that lengthy analysis are.-

1. A State Futures Planning Council advisory to the State Government comprising senior representatives of all WA Public Services Agencies, with a strong forward thinking research-focussed supporting executive . 'Responsible to Cabinet for co-ordinating 'high level' planning for location, timely growth ahead throughout the State, and monitoring all aspects of major infrastructure provision in the State. That would begin with a small core of research staff transferred from the present Department of Planning and senior secondments with future R&D skills from some of the larger Agencies. (But would not be involved as the current WAPC is with overseeing urban land-use development planning management.)
2. A fully restructured Department of Planning and Urban Development that would become a separate administrative entity, include distinct but broadly similar operational capability to the present, but with reorganisation and restructure plus the addition of -
 - (a) a more specialised professional Legal Unit;
 - (b) a Planning Liaison Unit; and
 - (c) a group of directly employed Regional Urban Planning teams .
 This functionally revised Department would include a specialised Social research unit and a Biodiversity/ urban Landscape planning unit.

The new Department would have a strategic metro and regional planning framework brief, but that would be altered from the present to have a much more proactive fast-moving and flexible 'rolling' planning function with fewer layers of 'frozen' plans made feasible by the following.-

To substantially improve community development planning, and contain land prices, the Regional/Urban Planning Teams would be engaged, sites and district specific as required, with a detailed urban design evolution and a delivery role.

Seven multi-disciplinary professional Teams would be continuously preparing detailed conceptualisations in Comprehensive Development Area (CDA) 'precinct' etc. form. Five of them for the Perth-Peel metro Region and two for outer Regions, supplemented as required for newer growing urban centres such as Bunbury, Geraldton and Karratha.

The extent of detailed district modelling would depend on local landholdings. Commercial Developers would have an opportunity to use in full the modelling options developed by the Regional Teams or introduce their own design group. – provided an equivalent new DP standard of CDA urban design was achieved. Those teams would be mainly funded on a cost-recovery basis by a 'Planning Fee' on a sliding scale according to the extent of service utilised.

The Regional/Urban Planning Teams would interface with Local Authorities quite differently to the way L/As currently link with WAPC and DoP. Firstly through new appointments by Local Authorities of Local 'Community Development Officers' with part of their function being direct communication with their respective Regional/Urban Planning team, as and when local developments are under consideration.

(Reminder -Local Authority personnel typically at present don't do any actual creative developmental planning at all.)

Local Authority roles in development Planning would be significantly altered.- In this overall model Councillors would be relieved from the specific decision-making role (i.e. in the present 'voting' format with minimal free discussion possible as at present under Dept. of Local Government's 'Standing Orders' with which they must comply).

However, all Councillors would have an opportunity to participate via their own new 'Standing-Community Development Advisory Group. To work with and support their own Community Development Officers - who will be conveying first hand social and community needs information to the Council as well as their wider role in assisting the evolution of more socially integrated communities and providing needs information across the range of services Local Councils provide

The overall effects of this re-structure model would be to.-

- a) Substantially accelerate the pace of urban development ,
- b) Greatly improve the overall designed quality of urban development, and
- c) Contain the rising cost of land.

(Please Refer to: The 'Functional Review' paper attached herewith for further analysis details and related comment.)

19. Time then to question and reconsider major Planning objectives and assumptions.-

Questions.- Is the site of Perth/Peel to be one single urban complex or several that are linked and concurrently -

Is it truthfully, on balance of longer term overall living environment 'profit and loss' to the future inhabitants, a suitable and/or preferred site for a population of 3.5 million people, bearing in mind the limitations and community-cost of inevitable partial demolition to insert higher density communities into low-density almost exclusively single storey sprawl, that already has insufficient recreational and community services provision to meet acceptable standards of living?

Objectives.- An Urban Planning System fit to manage development of the Perth and Peel Region for the future, must be fully appropriate in both structure and operational competence to take responsibility for ensuring, in all aspects of the public interest, that the best and most relevant information available from world –wide sources is applied and skilfully managed to creatively achieve social, industrial and employment growth compatible with known needs and aspirations as they evolve, of the community.

.....

20. Green Growth, protection, clearance, value, management, policies and futures.-

As initially commented in this Response, the currently available information is inadequate to provide a sound basis for overall or specific comment. The following are therefore only a few 'conversational' reactions to what may or may not be intended, picking out some of the apparent implications. -

Primary issue comment.-

The overall documentation certainly does demonstrate that the State Government Planning / Development System management procedures and processes are NOT adequate to allow the Commonwealth Government to relinquish any existing legislative responsibility in the area of environmental oversight of urban development in WA.

Understanding mis-use of Environmental 'Offsets' if applied to biodiverse areas.-

This off-site 'replacement' action, often given as an excuse for land clearance is a faulty concept when applied to indigenous natural biodiverse areas, that have been a prominent feature of this Region.

It may be reasonable for instance to 'offset' removal of a group of mature trees planted by humans in the past, that are not part of a thriving continuously regenerating biodiverse system, by replanting trees elsewhere nearby, (except when slow maturation and the loss of shade factors is not important).

However, destruction of any part of indigenous natural biodiverse system, that depends on continuous interaction of multiple biotic species of all sizes, from microscopic sub-surface to the largest trees, is altogether different.

Any destruction of those is permanent and irreplaceable, and must therefore be acknowledged as an overall net loss of that local biodiversity.

Pine 'Offsets' and Cockatoos.

Large Pine plantations in the North of the Region, in one view are simply a monoculture or 'crop.' When deliberately planted in close canopy to produce straight timber, they obliterate the ground-layer under them through starvation of light. At first glance they could be 'offset' with new cropping on already cleared land elsewhere. However, due to massive unselective clearance, of (70+percent) of biodiverse areas in the Region, seed-food requirements, breeding hollows in native trees, as well as small pools of surface water, have gone. Some rare cockatoos only found locally are therefore now on the verge of extinction. They have found that the seed cones of mature pines are a partial nutritional substitute, hence can be found feeding in the canopy of those pines. That substitute food stock is however now inadequate to prevent their imminent extinction (15 percent further fall counted in the last year in the Carnaby's Cockatoos). In that case offsets by new planting will be far too late, since pine seed-cones do not develop until those trees are nearing maturity.

That factor now demands a complete ban on any further damage or clearance of indigenous natural biodiverse areas in the Perth and Peel Region. In addition this ban must also apply to any existing trees in the Region that have been currently noticed as providing foraging or breeding habitat for any black cockatoo species, whether or not they still have an intact biodiverse understorey .e.g. One such example is in the proposed Forrestfield North development area, where a substantial mass of tall trees between Brand and Brae Roads are heavily used for daily foraging by black cockatoos.

Darling Range Escarpment.-

This major mass of bushland is worthy of full legislative protection against further development, including some small areas of Crown Land shown on one of the map overlays as 'Urban' (e.g. One fully intact biodiverse area East of Wilkins Road in Kalamunda (that is providing daily foraging habitat for Carnaby's Black Cockatoos).

The fundamental reasons for full protection are that there are few opportunities remaining in central Perth for Public Parkland. This area is neither suitable nor needed for urban expansion, but is already managed in part for recreational access and has substantial local and inbound Tourism employment-creation potential with the new adjacent rail station at Forrestfield North being only 20 minutes travel-time from central Perth, and 6 minutes travel time from the International airport. This large area is a very distinctive feature of the Region and is also known to provides climatic amelioration effects to significant areas around Perth on the coastal plain below.....

Footnotes:

- A) At a broader scale perhaps the most important immediate matter for DPC to explore is just how to secure legislative determination for all of the conservation measures that have been given 'assurance' by State Governments in the past, but not made secure.)**

 - B) There is an extensive range of other related issues that will be presented if and when clearer proposals are offered for public comment.**
-

(Postscript only for a reader of this paper who may not be familiar with the wide range of issues involved in future urban planning);-

Urban Planning for the future where increasingly rapid change is inevitable.-

To explain the rising complexity and extent of rapid change that a future urban planning system must respond, and the expertise involved, 'see below what an urban planning team first project discussion preparatory check-list might look like – (a snapshot only today.....) -

What kind of urban future? –

Need for fresh visions /targets/ sets of objectives/ means to cope with change / means to grasp opportunities. to avoid extremes/ flexibility / balance of permanent. short-life. temporary. major scale structures. / what. where. location options. mass transport access /other attractions /parks. recreation space/.play space. free-range. exploratory. formal enclosed/ supervision.

New Targets.-

Aim for population growth while simultaneously creating more self-integrating caring communities – where and how – economics- affordability ranges.

Deliberate population distribution to create balanced living conditions/concentrations where and how/ connecting them/ essential links. optional links/natural environment/landscape connections/ safety v freedom of movement.

Social effects of expansion particularly teenagers. the elderly /ways of creating social cohesion and 'belonging'/counteract mental deterioration/ psych.isolation. young people erratic anti-social behaviour. drug use. crime. self-harm.

New Starting points.-

Land surface. how much to protect. manage./ essential v optional inclusion. conservation. biodiverse natural environment. how. where./for inclusion. conservation of biodiverse natural environment- assessment. how. where. expertise needed/ availability/ is it usefully located. for what purposes. how related to foreseeable demand. present. future/ management.

Maintenance. can it be economically re-profiled.

New transportation devices.-

Personal/ public. small. slow. high-speed. volume/external connections. Purpose. free-range automated / rail confined/ on traditional roads or elevated structures/ multi-storey stacking roads to save land?/ tunnelling./ smart access systems availability/ parking. storage. electrical. hydrogen. fuelling. charging. accessibility.

New building construction techniques.-

Off-site produced units/ rapid on-site assembly / lighter elements generally/ shorter economic life. replacement in situ/ disposable elements/ complex component shapes easier at lower cost/ moves away from boring flat curtain wall for multi-storey / internal flexibility. rearrangement facility.

User needs – personal. collective.-**Physical.**

Climatic cycles and variation. Drying. Temperature profiles- day/night – seasonal – shelter - wet/dry – hot/cold –windy/calm – safety/risk – ground water tables –water. air. noise pollution local microclimatic effects around development. gully winds. local prevailing patterns.

Psychological.-

Light. shade /excitement ‘vibrancy’>moderately active>total relaxation from stress/ offsetting personal focus /promoting social connections./ promoting intergenerational mix./ people of all ages, but particularly young live with and profoundly affected by, quality and relevance to their lives of total environment experience around them./Vital need to continually research and interpret how people will live /choices they will seek/ essentials and options.

Design response.-

Applying psychology of visual perception/ team collaboration./ emerging new and different specialisms./ architectural. urban landscape expertise. links/ level separated movement separation objective/ securing pedestrian realm. linkages. spatial experiences. continuity/ downward view landscape seen from upper levels./aim for extensively planned comprehensively serviced development./ interactive commercial local work communities./work home combination potential demand./ local climatic. microclimatic effects within new urban space.

Snapshots of living today -?

(Already for younger people) - increasingly obligatory screen-based, miniature robotic technology rich, impersonal world-connected, virtually reality dominated way of living. Face to face social connection being replaced by many forms of on-line virtual /synthetic contact. Inter-personal services being modelled and replaced by on-line artificial intelligence based /robotic services. Working parents today now leading increasing busy and complex lives and trying to balance their own and their children’s lives, with everyone losing ability to concentrate on other than screen based communication (even at school). Consider overall new development implications. certainties. possibilities.

Situational trends. -

Increasing constant yearn for better life balance

Indoor/ outdoor- need for closer every day contact with components of living natural environment/ shade protection, photosynthesised plant material /transpiration/ breathable fresh air /regenerating flora, range of bird life fauna etc. downscale effect?- begins even with miniaturised elements. home indoor/ miniaturised/ roof gardens. flat. vertical- heat tolerance. irrigation. recycling./ socialising./ collective activity/ recreation choices/ team activity /personal fitness /group entertainment./to suit different age groups.

Industry and employment.-

Employment and work profiles (change accelerating) / work-place flexibility / personal. home.

local sharespace./ automated production. extractive. manufacturing/service industries. robotic effects/ personal. collective transportation./ relative homes location. density/ education/ life-long learning/ cyclic up-skilling/ on-line learning/ access-to feasibility. how./

Economic factors.-

Cost of development./ timing. supply. demand. need./alternatives to upgrade. or demolish/ who really pays. short term. long term.

Provisioning and Health .-

*Daily - Food supplies. storage. availability. accessibility/ food-health-conscious links
Occasional – household goods / apparel/ medical. information. on-line diagnoses/
age-related differences./ special needs./clinics. hospitals. locations. where/ accessibility*

Essential Services to homes.-

Electricity/ water/ sanitation/drainage/electronic networks/remote monitoring/billing/solar energy substitution. home. shared local. storage. dimensions. locations

Aggregation of user needs.-

All the above on-going change/ social enquiry and localised fact finding/ select issues essential for future incorporation. / access to wider social research. identify current needs. evolving future trends./prioritise. test assumptions /community engagement. workshops. focus groups. community enterprise partnerships...open-mind. flexibility to change. expect the unexpected !

.....

Submission from: Peter H Forrest, Kalamunda, WA
(email: community23@bigpond.com)