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ABSTRACT

The potential contribution of strategic spatial planning, with its emphasis on territorial development and quality of spaces, to urban governance at the metropolitan and local level has attracted considerable attention since the 1970s. Although strategic planning at the local government level within a wider state planning framework is an established element of Australian planning systems, there has been limited research on how such planning takes place and its contribution to creating more effective governance. There is vigorous and ongoing debate about creating a more sustainable, affordable, liveable and politically efficient metropolitan area in Perth. This provides an opportunity to explore the nature, character and contribution of local strategic planning to effective governance within a situated context and in the process contribute to wider knowledge about this planning endeavour in other metropolitan areas.

This study adopts a ‘pracademic’ and case study approach to explore the historical, geographical and institutional contexts underpinning the conception and evolution of the Local Planning Strategy (LPS). The LPS planning instrument is a WA state government mandate on local government introduced in 1999. More specifically, this study is concerned with analysing (i) the rationale behind and the delivery expectancies of state government for this instrument; (ii) the response of local government to this state government imposition and the underlying influences on this response; and finally (iii) an evaluation of the potential future contribution of local strategic planning to urban governance in the Perth metropolitan region (PMR).

In overall terms, local strategic planning has struggled to gain solid traction and comprehensive coverage within the PMR. This is reflected by the relatively low adoption rate of the LPS by local councils. But, more importantly, the value of local strategic planning, its potential for coordination, networking and regulation and contribution to ‘joined up’ governance is barely recognised in the metropolitan planning and governance landscape. The study explores why this is the case, some 14 years after the setting of this distinct policy direction, and in particular what have been the key resistances to its implementation amongst the actors and within the institutional, political and policy environment. The case study demonstrates close links to theoretical debates about urban governance and planning and provides a useful contribution to a wider understanding to the role of local strategic planning in promoting effective governance.
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Chapter 1 - INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Perhaps after all we do need more ‘storytelling’ in the planning field, in particular stories about planning efforts in specific contexts, the case study firmly located in the histories, geographies, potentialities and possibilities in which it is embedded. We need this not just to help participants in planning processes co-learn about and co-design strategies, policies, projects and actions to address the issues that concern them, but to learn about why planning as an activity gets mobilized, how it gets institutionalized, and how far that liberates potentialities rather than builds in restrictive resistances. (Healey, 2005: 308-309)

Introduction

In a rapidly urbanising world, policymakers have been faced with numerous challenges related to the dynamic and uncertain nature of future development, the demand for active participation by a wider community and the quest to improve quality of life (Hohn and Neuer, 2006; Healey, 2006; Cars et al., 2002). The failures of past urban governance efforts in the social, economic and environmental spheres, have prompted the search for more effective modes of governance in an increasingly diverse and diffuse society. Gleeson et al (2010:1) contend that strong metropolitan governance is an essential precursor for any serious policy response to threats of ‘global economic stability, climate change, resource insecurity and social inequity’. The Perth Metropolitan Region (PMR), the most intense node of urbanisation in Western Australia (WA), has been at the forefront of public policy debate about its future as a sustainable, affordable and liveable city within a framework of efficient and effective metropolitan governance (Metropolitan Local Government Review, 2012; Committee of Perth, 2012; State of WA, 2010).

Strategic spatial planning is one mode of policy governance with considerable potential to contribute to more effective urban governance. Not only does it have a long association with the improvement of material conditions in the built environment, the delivery of services and the promotion of sustainability (Healey 2007), but it also lays claim to the underlying themes of partnership, coordination and integration (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2009; Stead and Meijers, 2009). Strategic planning at the metropolitan level has a long history in WA dating back to the early 1900s (Stokes and Hill, 1992). Despite significant shifts in the substance and nature of strategic plans over that period, it remains an enduring feature of the contemporary urban planning and governance landscape.

The terms ‘governance’ and ‘strategic planning’ have multiple meanings, assume many forms and operate at different spatial and governance levels. A simple definition of governance is ‘the process of making and implementing collective decisions for a society’ (Pierre and Peters, 2005:6). Verma
(2010:399) clarifies the planning orientation of governance as one ‘concerned with how all policies, programs, and initiatives, come together and get enacted at the local level’. For governance to be deemed effective, sound and effective management of policy making is required (Verma, 2010) and the cooperation and collaboration of a broad spectrum of actors towards a politically promoted shared vision or strategic vision (Koen, 2009). This project adopts a normative view of strategic planning, one that presents ‘an overall vision and framework for realising change and improving the quality of the built environment’ (Albrechts, 2004:747). It is concerned with strategic planning at the metropolitan level and a legislative and policy change in WA in 1999, which introduced the requirement for this form of strategic planning at the local government level.

The historical background to this policy initiative is unpacked within the wider theoretical context of governance and urban planning and, more specifically, within the political, policy and institutional framework of the planning system in WA. This analysis has a specific focus on the emergence and shifting response to strategic planning since the early 1900s. A critical analysis of the response of the local government sector to this state government directive traces the trajectory of the policy over the past 14 years and evaluates its success in achieving mobilisation and institutionalisation in the West Australian planning landscape. Overall, the study aims to enhance understanding of the ‘potentialities of’ and the ‘resistances to’ strategic planning at the local government level in general and, in particular, its potential for making a contribution to more effective urban governance in the PMR.

Central themes and concerns for the study

The primary aim of this chapter is to provide an overview of the two central themes that underpin this study. First, attention is devoted to exploring the conceptual meanings of governance in order to explain the changing nature of regulation and management of land and space. This assists in understanding and explaining the nature and shifts in the governance landscape of WA since 1900, future expectations for and the important components of effective governance in urban areas. The study is concerned with a policy mode of governance with a focus on place and territory as this is the specific domain of spatial planning systems (Vigar et al, 2000). It explores the wider debates about the focus of policy attention on spatiality as an alternative to the focus on sectoral state agency functions, typical of many countries including Australia (Healey, 2006). The second theme concerns the general role of urban planning as an instrument of urban management since the beginning of the 20th century and the key shifts in its nature and emphasis. More specifically, it explores the governance response to such changes and how this has influenced the nature, form and role of strategic planning practice.
Two dominant themes emerge from an exploration of the literature which provide a conceptual framework for the analysis of the local strategic planning episode in WA. On the one hand, the resilience and recent resurgence of interest in strategic planning that seeks to improve integration and transform urban governance (Bunker and Ruming, 2010; Stead and Meijers, 2009; Albrechts, 2006). And, on the other hand, the significant relationship between strategic spatial planning and the urban governance framework (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2011; Healey, 2007; Brindley et al, 1996).

**Governance and Policy**

The governance of cities and regions has changed significantly since the 1970s in response to many diverse influences. Amongst these have been the forces of globalisation, deregulation, decentralisation and privatisation and increasing social, economic and spatial polarisation and fragmentation (Hohn and Neuer, 2006). At the same time, there has a demand by society for changes in policy agendas and politics (Healey, 2006). This has engendered considerable debate, within the social science and public policy literature, about the nature and significance of new governance and prompted the emergence of new governance initiatives (Williams and Maginn, 2012; Allmendinger and Haughton, 2009).

Policy development and its ability to make strategic decisions and implement directions and actions, plays a key role in articulating the purposes of governance (Healey, 2007). In the 1990s, public policy debate in most western countries took two distinct directions. Firstly, there was an increasing focus on the potential of locality, place and territory to facilitate regional solutions (Vigar et al, 2000). Secondly, a burgeoning interest in economic, environmental and social sustainability, along with recognition of the need for wider knowledge and interaction and some level of government intervention (Wiseman, 2005). This marked a move by governments, both globally and in Australia, towards integrated models of administration and policy development, more commonly referred to as ‘joined-up’ government (Watson cited in Gleeson et al, 2004). It was within this context that spatial planning systems and strategic planning, in particular, with its emphasis on territorial development and quality of space, attracted new interest as a potential form of effective policy governance (Bunker and Searle, 2010; Stead and Meijers, 2009).

**Spatial Planning and Governance**

Since the onset of large scale urbanisation in the 20th century, the activity of urban planning or spatial planning has been closely associated with the ideal of quality of life in cities (Healey, 2007). It has emerged as an established part of government systems and the main mechanism through which the state manages land use change (Haughton and Allmendinger, 2011). The failures of planning and its
outcomes are well documented (Freestone, 2000). But so too are the successes, its contribution to improved living conditions through the provision of open space, mass transport, basic public services and protection of natural and cultural resources (Freestone, 2000). There have been notable shifts in the nature, role and processes of planning systems and practice, broadly influenced by new waves of intellectual thought and analysis, the emergence of political movements and changing socio-economic conditions over the past century. Perhaps one of the more significant changes has been a move away from formality and control to steering, guiding and managing processes, prompted by the need to operate within and across a range of arenas (Hillier and Healey, 2008).

Spatial planning activity operates within many different modes of governance, from those associated with entrepreneurial and corporatist forms of governance and driven by the market, to those more intent on controlling the market with a greater focus on pluralist democracy and clientism (Healey, 2007; Pierre and Peters, 2005). Each mode through its broad structural policies and processes provides a platform for different approaches to spatial planning and differing levels of government intervention in the planning process. Spatial planning also operates at a range of different geographical and political scales and as such multi-scalar and multi-level forms of governance have also emerged (Healey, 2006; Cars et al, 2002).

Strategic planning, despite significant shifts in emphasis over time, has demonstrated a remarkable resilience within Europe, the UK and Australia as a potential means of addressing urban problems (Healey, 2007). It has been a strong and consistent feature of the Australian political landscape since the early 1950s and seems set to continue even in the current neoliberal climate with enduring interest in increasing capital city competitiveness and strong influence by the development industry (Bunker and Searle, 2010). But as Vigar et al (2000) observe, the evolution of strategic spatial planning has not been smooth given the inherent tension between its dual purposes of resolving potential conflicts between different interest groups and the wider public interest. Traditional land use planning according to Allmendinger and Haughton (2009), Albrechts (2004), with its narrow land use focus, reliance on legalistic processes, focus on outputs rather than objectives and poor history of collaboration, has struggled to address the needs of urban areas. Theoretical debates on strategic planning promote a more transformative approach. That is, spatial planning needs to be broad in scope, but based on sound evidence, more democratic and collaborative in its processes and engaged in delivering integrated urban outcomes (Taylor, 2010; Albrechts, 2010; Shaw and Lord, 2009; Nadin, 2007). More recently, the efficacy and effectiveness of this wider spatial approach in a neo-liberal governance environment has encountered considerable criticism (Allmendinger, 2009).
Stein (2012) notes that strategic spatial planning at the local government level within a framework of state government policy is embedded in many contemporary planning systems in the UK, Europe and Australia. It is regarded as having some unique characteristics for the coordination and regulation of urban development (Hohn and Neuer, 2006) and the delivery of more effective policy programmes. More closely connected with the local community, it is well positioned to understand the concerns and aspirations of the local stakeholders and build trust, confidence and understanding in the process and between the actors (Bunker and Searle, 2007). Operating at the ‘coalface’, it also tends to be more action oriented, but in this way can manage uncertainty and change more effectively by creating short term as well as longer term actions (Albrechts 2006; Gleeson et al 2004).

Research Aims and Objectives

The overall aim of this thesis is to analyse the nature and character of strategic planning at the local level and its potential to contribute to more effective governance in urban areas. This is to be achieved by examining a particular planning instrument, the Local Planning Strategy (LPS), within the WA planning system. The LPS is a state imposed requirement on each local government to develop a strategy indicating the broad direction of growth in their area within the context of higher ordered state planning policy frameworks such as the metropolitan plan for Perth (State of WA, 2010) and the State Planning Strategy 2050 (WAPC, 2014).

The conceptual framework underpinning this thesis is premised on two propositions, grounded in theoretical debate about urban planning and governance. The first is that the LPS reflects consistent and ongoing recognition of the value of strategic spatial planning in urban governance. The second is that the mobilisation and institutionalisation of the LPS has been significantly influenced by the nature of governance within WA at the overall state and metropolitan level. These propositions are explored through three interrelated research questions:

- What were the key theoretical, political and policy-related drivers for the introduction of the requirement for the Local Planning Strategy in 1999 by the WA State Government?

- How have local governments in WA responded to this change in policy direction by the State, particularly in the Perth Metropolitan Region, and what has influenced the response?

- What are the future prospects for an effective contribution by local strategic planning to wider strategic planning objectives and better governance of the Perth Metropolitan area?
The objective of the first question is to examine the rationale and expectations for the LPS against a theoretical planning background and within the practical reality of the planning and governance landscape in WA at that time. This leads on to the second question which explores the response to this policy initiative – the extent to which mobilisation and institutionalisation had taken place and identifies the key factors influencing this response. Collectively, the first two questions provide information about the gap between the expectations and actual implementation of the LPS idea and inform the evaluation of its current and potential future contribution to effective urban governance in the final question.

The decision to use a case study approach (Yin, 2009) reflected the focus on the historical, geographical and institutional contexts underpinning the LPS and was prompted by the simple fact that there has been no academic analysis of the LPS. Furthermore, the LPS is analysed through a ‘practice movement’ lens (Watson, 2002). As a professional planner with 40 years of experience, this thesis presents a ‘pracademic’ view of planning by combining a theoretical perspective with a practical perspective, informed by inside knowledge and experience of the WA planning system and the views of planning practitioners.

The evolution of strategic spatial planning in the PMR provides an essential context for the introduction of the LPS idea in WA. The objective of such analysis is to expose the political, policy and institutional circumstances that (i) underpin the planning system in general, (ii) have had a particular influence on the idea of the LPS and (iii) the response since 1999. This is achieved through a review of the literature and collecting empirical data from a variety of sources – archival data, a survey of local government planners, LPS case studies and a series of interviews with planning practitioners and representatives. Collectively, the findings from the research process respond to each of the research questions, the rationale for the emergence of the LPS in 1999, a critical analysis of the response since then and its future prospects as a mode of effective governance, particularly in the PMR.

**Structure of Thesis**

This thesis comprises a total of seven chapters, including this introductory chapter. It highlights the academic debates surrounding urban governance and strategic planning, the methodological approach adopted to analyse the purpose, significance and impact of the LPS and the findings of the research which ultimately evaluate the future potential for local strategic planning in the PMR.
Chapter 2 provides a brief overview of the debates about urban governance in the context of public policy making in general, and spatial planning practice more specifically. The evolution of planning theory and practice during the 20th century is explored to highlight the nature and reasons for key shifts in theory, practice and methodology. This provides a conceptual framework for analysing the trajectory of planning in Western Australia, with a particular emphasis on the important links between spatial planning and governance and the resurgence in interest in strategic spatial planning. Additionally, it explains the expectations for strategic planning in future urban governance and sets out an analytical context for the LPS.

Chapter 3 explains the choice of methodology and research method adopted for the study. To reiterate, a case study was adopted whereby a mix of historical, quantitative and qualitative data from both primary and secondary sources is collected in order to make sense of the LPS as a policy manifestation of local strategic planning.

Chapter 4 includes an account of the evolution of strategic spatial planning and the changing urban governance landscape in the PMR as it responded to shifting theoretical, socio–economic and political conditions. This establishes a contextual setting to help explain the circumstances which led to the introduction of the LPS and influenced the subsequent response. Given the potentially wide scope of such analysis and the need to limit the focus of analysis, the primary focus is on the key policy institutions and actors engaged in the LPS initiative: state government and their planners in their role as architects of this policy initiative; and local government and their planners who are responsible for implementing the LPS on the ground.

Chapter 5 provides a descriptive analysis of the original purpose of the LPS as set out by state government, the expectations for implementation of this policy initiative and the subsequent policy response by local government. Compliance with the policy and state government direction for the preparation of the LPS is measured in two ways: (i) a chronological and geographical analysis of the take up of the LPS by local government over the past 15 years; and, (ii), a comparative analysis of the form, content and the processes followed in three metropolitan LPS case studies.

Chapter 6 sets out the major findings of the research to enable interpretation and explanation of the nature of the policy response to the LPS described in the preceding Chapter. These are discussed within two key areas of influence: (i) the state governance framework; and (ii) the local governance framework and the specific implications of each for contemporary and future attempts at local strategic planning. The final part of the chapter summarises the potential for future contribution to
urban governance in the context of the resistances and potentialities exposed in the study and the possible solutions.

The final Chapter 7 sets out a summary of the ‘pracademic’ research journey and some general reflections on the future contribution of local strategic planning to more effective governance in WA and in a wider context.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, the effective governance of Australia’s metropolitan regions has been predicated on the existence of a strategic spatial plan. Although there is considerable academic debate about strategic planning at the regional and metropolitan level (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2009; Stead and Meijers, 2009; Healey, 2007, 2006), there is a paucity of research on local strategic planning, an integral, if dormant, component of most planning systems in Australia.

A ‘pracademic’ approach to this particular episode of local strategic planning activity in Western Australia offers an opportunity to combine academic analysis with policy experience (Campbell, 2012). Professional and practical knowledge of this area can be combined with empirical research grounded in planning practice. Overall, this research aims to provide a comprehensive narrative about the origins and evolution of a particular policy instrument that forms an important component of the Western Australian planning landscape. In this way, it seeks to make a contribution to a clearer understanding of local strategic planning practice in WA and to wider knowledge about such practice as a mode of urban governance in other urban areas.
Chapter 2 - SPATIAL PLANNING AND URBAN GOVERNANCE

All over the world cities are searching for appropriate ways of governance in the context of far-reaching political, economic, social and institutional transformations affecting all levels of scale. These transformations are taking place with profound changes in networks and balances of power among stakeholders of the public, private and civil society sector. They trigger off the evolution of innovative strategies, procedures and instruments of how to coordinate, manage and govern urban development processes and stimulate the formation of new formal and informal actor networks. (Hohn and Neuer, 2006:291)

Introduction

The key concern of this thesis is the contribution of strategic planning at the local government level to the effective governance of wider metropolitan areas. This involves setting out and explaining knowledge about how this form of planning has evolved as a mode of urban governance and how it fits within the urban governance landscape. From this broader context, an overarching framework can be derived for analysing the general trajectory of planning and governance in WA, how local strategic planning is positioned within this framework and its contribution to more effective governance.

This chapter, presented in three parts, develops this context and establishes an analytical framework for the case study of the LPS. The first part provides a broad overview of governance and policy in urban areas, its significance in urban management and its shifting nature and dynamics. It explores the meaning of ‘effective governance’ and the components for delivering such an outcome in an urban environment. The second part turns to urban planning, and, more specifically, strategic planning at the state and local level, to demonstrate how it has developed in theory and practice and contributed to urban management. As the term ‘strategic planning’ is loosely applied to many forms of planning action, the meaning of this term, in the context of the LPS and the present study focus is clarified. A brief account of the evolution of the theory and practice of spatial planning follows in order to expose the major intellectual, political and institutional shifts over time and how this has influenced the nature and emphasis on strategic planning in urban areas. The third, and final, part of the chapter focuses on two dominant themes emerging from the review of literature which provide the conceptual framework for the subsequent analysis of strategic planning at the state and local level in the PMR. The first points to the resilience and continuing interest in strategic spatial planning as a mode of urban governance. At the same time, it emphasises the demand for a more sophisticated approach to address the deficiencies of past planning practice and meet the challenges of modern society. The second highlights the important influence of government and governance on the nature and effectiveness of strategic planning itself.
Urban Governance

The need to channel economic development and balance the goals of economic competitiveness, social cohesion and liveability in all urban areas (OECD, 2001) have long been recognised as principal issues for urban governance and cities will continue to face these challenges into the future. Australia, although sparsely settled, has always been highly urbanised (Thompson and Maginn, 2012) and has one of the highest population growth rates in the OECD. In the period between 2006 and 2011, Perth, Darwin, Brisbane and Cairns had growth rates in excess of 10% (Figure 2.1) and in the 2011–12 year, the major capital cities grew almost 50 per cent faster than the rest of the country (Department of Infrastructure and Transport, 2013). This population growth has raised community and policy concerns about the environmental and social impacts of such growth on quality of life (Sansom et al, 2012).


Source: ABS 2012b

Pierre and Peters (2005:6) defined governance simply as ‘the process of making and implementing collective decisions for a society’. They distinguish between the network perspective whereby the role of the state is negligible, and a number of other approaches where the state, although no longer
omnipotent, still plays a dominant role in controlling critical resources. In general, past governance efforts have been criticised for increasing socio-spatial and economic polarisation (Hohn and Neuer, 2006; Lawson and Gleeson, 2005) and an inability to manage environmental impacts and satisfy community demands for participation, inclusion and empowerment (Healey, 2007; Albrechts, 2006). Since the late 1970s, this has prompted a robust search for more effective modes of governance to manage urban growth (Allmendinger, 2009; Healey, 2006).

**Government to Governance**

Madanipour *et al* (2001) notes the significant shift in the role of the state in the 1980s from that of a powerful decision-maker with a high degree of control over the political economy of a specific territory to the emergence of a diverse and fragmented range of governance landscapes within a specific territory. This ‘new’ concept of governance is characterised by significant changes in the delivery of public services. Such delivery has shifted away from formal and legal steering by the state to involve interaction by many more hands (Torfing *et al*, 2012). It now transcends boundaries between state and civil society and operates at a range of different levels and scales (MacCallum, 2009).

With so many more players operating within the urban governance landscape, a wide range of new governance initiatives began to emerge. Some of these took the form of urban regimes and partnerships involving both private and public actors (Cars *et al*, 2002), others sought to empower grassroot voices through citizen involvement and collaborative action (Healey, 2007). Different levels of governance have been explored including initiatives to decentralise policy making to lower levels of government and models of multi–level and multi-scalar governance (MacCallum, 2009; Healey 2006; Cars *et al*, 2002). More recently, urban governance has moved to what Allmendinger (2009:24) has described as ‘soft spaces and fuzzy boundaries’ characterised by the emergence of new governance modes such as development corporations and redevelopment authorities operating across administrative boundaries (Williams and Maginn, 2011).

**Effective governance**

In the context of metropolitan governance, both the organisation of governance and the essential components of effective governance in metropolitan areas have been widely debated in urban social science. Initially, two widely conflicting views dominated the debate about how governance should be organised (Kubler, 2005). The ‘metropolitan reform tradition’ regarded the presence of independent jurisdictions such as local governments as the main obstacle to efficient and equitable area wide governance and advocated their consolidation. Conversely, the ‘public choice perspective’ held the view that such autonomy and the associated competition led to effective matching of area–
wide service demands and efficiency in the allocation of public resources to produce such services. An alternative to these polarised views, labelled as ‘new regionalism’, emerged from later research based on evidence that that more effective area wide governance could be achieved through cooperative arrangements based on negotiation between cooperative actors (Kubler, 2005). This approach has substantially less focus on institutional arrangements and relies on the more difficult task of governance building through collaboration across the public and private sector. Essential components of governance within this perspective are engagement and cooperation within a broad spectrum of actors and a commitment to a politically supported shared vision and strategy for the metropolitan area (Kroen, 2009).

Role of Policy in Governance

Healey (2006) notes that policy making in the last century represented a mechanism to make government both more effective in delivering its objectives and more accountable by providing political communities with principles by which to judge its performance. The initial welfare thrust of public policy was to deliver economic stability, health and education but towards the end of the 20th century, the focus turned to how such strategic objectives could be achieved in particular places and territories (Vigar et al, 2000). A mix of economic, environmental and socio-political factors help explain this change (Healey 2007). Economists recognised the positive and negative place effects on the value of individual economic activities and regional economic competitiveness. Environmentalists saw the value of territory to evaluate interaction between natural resource systems, ecological systems and human systems. And, finally, socio-political analysts acknowledged the link between place quality, social identity, cohesion and well-being and the propensity of citizens to mobilise to protect local interests.

Wiseman (2005) identified three important international trends underlying wider debates about the nature of public policy in urban areas in the 1990s. Firstly, recognition of the need to seek policy settings that achieve economic, environmental and social sustainability. Secondly, an acknowledgment that some level of government intervention and endeavour is needed to address the security and freedom of the community. And finally, the need for wider knowledge and interaction rather than blind faith in rational planning, goals, objectives and performance criteria. This fostered new interest in initiatives, such as strategic spatial planning, with its potential to promote longer term investment in sustainable resilient communities, connect multiple sources of knowledge and facilitate the integration of environmental, social and economic and cultural perspectives (Wiseman, 2005).
Urban Planning in Urban Governance

Planning theory, as a relatively recent field of academic enquiry, has tended to concentrate on understanding the scope, function and responsibility of planning activity and the gap between its abstract and practical application (Hillier and Healey, 2008). The task is not easy given the overlap with other social science disciplines and use of diverse methodologies (Campbell and Fainstein, 2003) and has, according to Allmendinger (2009), produced a cluttered assortment of ideas and theories. Others regard the porosity and capaciousness of ideas as a positive move and the opportunity for academics and practitioners to continue to engage in critical reflection and constructive reflexivity about planning (Hillier and Healey, 2010, 2008).

Land use or spatial planning has had a long association with concerns about the environment and the setting it provides for life choices and quality of living (Freestone, 2000). It has become an established part of government systems in most countries through which the state manages land use change (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2011; Healey, 2007) even when used partially and inconsistently (Watson, 2009). According to Freestone (2000) it has tended to overestimate its ability to implement and manage change and this has exposed it to censure along the way. There is some consensus, however, about its significant contribution to living conditions on all continents over the past century, through the provision of open space, mass transport, basic public services and protection of natural and cultural resources (Freestone and Hamnett, 2000; Hall, 1988). Vigar et al (2000) point to the inherent conflict in the principle purpose of planning — the resolution of conflicts in places and territories. On the one hand, planning is charged with regulating development impacts between neighbours through regulatory or statutory activity. And, on the other hand, it has a responsibility to promote wider quality of life objectives through strategic planning. Although these two streams are expected to operate together with the latter leading and guiding development, they have had an uncomfortable, and at times, detached, relationship (Vigar et al, 2000).

Strategic Spatial Planning – A Definition and Study Context

Albrechts (2004) notes that there is no universal definition of the term ‘strategic spatial planning’. Nevertheless, there is a general agreement that it had an early association with the military and the need to plan for rapidly changing business corporations in the US. Equally, in planning practice, the term is not easily bedded down. Bryson (2004:57), for example, points out that it is not one thing, but more ‘a set of concepts, procedures and tools that may be used selectively for different situations’. The strategic planning process, according to Servillo and Reimer (2013) is both dynamic and flexible as it tackles certain spatial challenges, broadens the scope of possible futures and empowers certain groups. Its purpose therefore, is to think strategically, rather than just produce a strategic plan, and
thus its outcome in plans and planning systems can take many forms, including positions, perspectives, processes or ploys (Hrelja, 2011; Mintzberg cited in Bryson, 2004).

Newman (2008) highlights the significant contribution of Albrechts and Healey to the theory of strategic planning and their view of strategic spatial planning as normative, set within a deliberative and democratic governance environment that requires transformative institutional change. This study is primarily interested in a strategic approach to spatial planning, defined in general terms as a ‘public-sector led socio-spatial process through which a vision, actions, and means for implementation are produced that shape and frame what a place is and may become’ (Albrechts, 2004: 747). It explores this form of strategic planning at the local government level, but at the same time is mindful of the wider view of what constitutes strategic planning in the urban environment, and how this has been manifested in the planning and governance environment of WA.

**The Evolving Role and Nature of Urban Planning**

The nature and emphasis in planning theory and practice has undergone substantial change in response to key intellectual waves and changing political, social, economic and technological conditions in the urban environment over the past century. An understanding of these shifts and their impact on strategic planning practice over time provides a broad context for understanding what has occurred within the political, policy and institutional contexts of WA and, more specifically, the PMR.

Allmendinger (2009) observes that the evolutionary process of planning has been far from linear. As such it defies easy analysis and compartmentalisation, given the overlap between planning theories and the wide variety of practical approaches in different localities. Four broad time periods have been identified to explain the major shifts in planning theory and practice, each underpinned by shifts in philosophy, politics and institutional structures. The first period (1900-1945) followed the birth of planning as a reform movement in the late 19th century and marked the establishment of the town planning tradition (Cherry, 1988). Allmendinger (2009) refers to the next era (1945-1970) as the modernist era where knowledge was regarded as objective and the future could be shaped by those in power. The third (1970-1990) and fourth (1990-present) periods were marked by a post-positivist approach, the questioning of the powers of scientific prediction, regular patterns of events and the emergence of new ideas about the relativity of knowledge (Allmendinger, 2009).
Reformist Spatial Planning 1900-1945

The idea that planning could shape the utopian dream had its origins in the spirit of housing reform in the late 19th and early 20th century and the belief that orderly habitation in healthy urban environments would harbour physical and spiritual development (Bureaugarde, 2005; Watson, 2003). The town planning tradition took over from the piecemeal attempts at urban reform in this initial era and provided the foundation for the style and nature of plan making in Britain (Cherry, 1988). In Cherry’s view, planning was initially driven by a narrow imperative – the need to reconstruct cities, improve housing quality and introduce government regulation over private land. It gained momentum as a public policy endeavour as it responded to emerging and wider economic, technological and political issues between World War 1 (1914-18) and World War 2 (1939-45). The idea of planning, institutionalised as a public sector activity, providing a detailed picture of future land use patterns within a fixed period of time, became firmly embedded in the governance culture.

Unsurprisingly, given the close cultural and political ties between Australia and the UK, the emergence of an Australian planning tradition followed broadly similar patterns to the UK. Proudfoot (2000) referred to the rise of a new form of consciousness, with a belief in new techniques of planning to provide order, amenity and beauty in cities, strongly influenced by international thought and championed by advocates for town planning. Australian planning, according to Hamnett and Freestone (2000), became concerned with new priorities in this period: (i) housing redevelopment; (ii) regional planning; and, (iii) the quest for professionalism. Despite some of the grand design ideas of this era, Freestone (2000) points to the limited achievements in plan making. Instead, more attention was paid to preparing an administrative, legislative and policy framework for future planning practice to manage the tension between state and local government and need for coordination of planning practice (Hutchings, 2000).

Modernist Spatial Planning 1945-1970

The consolidation of the town planning tradition and its emergence as a valid profession provided a firm footing for the pursuit of an energetic planning agenda in post-war Britain. Cherry (1988:185) pointed to the prevailing concept of a benevolent state ‘buttressed by a touching faith in institutions of local democracy and a cadre of enlightened, expert and neutral administrators’. The initial thrust of plan making was premised on a relatively simplified physical view of cities (Albrechts, 2006). It used the survey-analysis-design process, espousing principles of aesthetics, efficiency and modernisation to be implemented through development control systems and zoning schemes (Watson, 2003). This approach assumed a continuing scenario of slow growth and public agency
involvement but this was soon to be dispelled by rapid population growth, rising prosperity and consumer demand and increasing involvement of the private sector in the 1950s (Hall, 1992).

By the 1960s, planning was under the influence of ‘scientific’ societal management driven by developments in economics and management science associated with the Chicago School in the 1940s plus the new science of ‘cybernetics’ and the rise of computer power (Allmendinger, 2009; Hillier and Healey, 2008). Cities and regions were now regarded as complex sets of connected parts in constant flux, but with the reassurance that growth could be predicted and controlled by expert planners using a systems or rational approach (Allmendinger, 2009). Rydin (2011), for example, notes that both the systems and rational approach assumed comprehensive knowledge about the past and future, enduring faith in the expertise of planners and the existence of means to implement plans. Public agencies went about producing holistic, comprehensive and long term plans based on the generation and evaluation of alternatives that were supported by systematic, deductive logic (Allmendinger, 2009; Hillier and Healey, 2008). Planning in this era emerged as being in the public interest, comprehensive, technocratic and scientific and yet still reformist (Freestone, 2000).

Simultaneously, planners continued to wield considerable influence over their political masters and the policy process itself due to their technocratic authority (Hall, 1988). Plans at both the statutory and strategic level designated future land use with careful segregation of incompatible uses to promote local health and well-being and facilitate economic prosperity (Rydin, 2011).

In Australia, this period was concerned primarily with the orderly development of land and service provision by the state to accommodate rapidly expanding urban populations through a rational technocratic approach and the establishment of statutory planning systems and regional planning (Gleeson et al, 2004; Freestone and Hamnett, 2000). Master plans in the British tradition, carefully segregating land uses, but also intent on promoting extensive networks of freeways and corridor development, were prepared for metropolitan areas by professionals within a culture of state agency governance (Gleeson et al, 2004).


Gleeson and Low (2000) contend that fundamental economic changes after the post-War boom caused significant spatial changes in cities, the demise of some urban economies and a new emphasis on establishing an economic base. Post-war baby boomers, those born between 1946-1964, began to question and reject the notion of the centralised benevolent state, noted widespread failures of planning activity and expressed distrust towards expert top-down planning (Hall, 1988). This ushered
in a period of uncertainty leading to considerable theoretical debate, wider intellectual enquiry and, predictably, a wide range of responses on how to do planning (Allmendinger, 2009).

The value of planning was scrutinised from two widely different political perspectives and dominated academic debate through much of the 1970s and 1980s. The first was the Marxist perspective which regarded planning as a complicit component of the state’s role in facilitating capital accumulation and, ultimately, sustaining the capitalist system (Hillier and Healey, 2008). The neo-liberalist view emerged in the late 1970s in tandem with the rise of Thatcherism in the UK. According to Gleeson and Low (2000), planning was regarded as a regulatory tool with the potential to distort land markets and raise the transaction costs of development, thereby obstructing economic development and social mobility. Allmendinger (2009) noted a concerted shift in interest at this time towards the social processes of policy development and delivery, but also towards the pragmatic view of seeking practical answers for urban social problems.

Responses by the British government to the economic uncertainty of the 1980s and 1990s were many and varied. Brindley et al (1996), in their analysis of the UK planning system, identified this period as one of fragmentation which prompted the emergence of a range of different planning styles in an effort to counter the broad neo-liberal criticisms levelled at planning. The idea of comprehensive strategic planning suffered serious setbacks with the view that progress cannot be planned and such planning was a time wasting constraint for development (Healey, 2003). Consequently, strategic and statutory planning transformed into vehicles for city promotion and boosterism with new governance bodies such as enterprise zones and redevelopment corporations being set up (Vigar et al, 2000). Projects and city spectacles became the alternative to regulation and wider city management, often at the expense of wider suburban needs (Motte et al cited in Albrechts, 2006). Urban design emerged in this era as a flexible, dynamic and enduring planning idea, directly engaged with land use and design, linked to more sophisticated environmentalism and, ultimately, a better quality of life (Fainstein, 2000). Interestingly, development plans were still predominantly concerned with land use patterns, but the idea of mixed land use emerged ostensibly to address the problems of segregation, increased travel times and creation of inactive areas (Rydin, 2011).

Hamnett and Freestone (2000) note that Australian urban planning during the 1970s was characterised by the rise of environmentalism, heritage protection and resident action. This heightened interest in planning issues was reflected by Labor government initiatives with new reformist urban programs premised on the ideas of equity and efficiency. These programs, under the administration of a new Department of Urban and Regional Development (DURD), included Area Improvement Plans,
funding of sewage works in fringe urban areas and urban rehabilitation projects (Huxley, 2000). The short life of the Whitlam-led Labor government (1972-1975) halted this interventionist program and saw successive governments, in a more fiscally conservative era, refocusing on tensions between state intervention and the market, conflict between state and local controls and changing organisational structures (Huxley, 2000). Financial and banking deregulation and federal immigration policies under the Hawke and Keating Labor governments in the 1980s, ushered in an era of entrepreneurial governance. Relatedly, planning became deployed as an instrument of economic facilitation in many urban areas (Gleeson et al., 2004; Hamnett, 2000). The form of strategic planning practised in Australia during the late 1970s, which had been based on international policy trends such as corridor planning and primarily directed to facilitating land release and infrastructure, was increasingly seen as hopelessly out of date and irrelevant during this period (Lennon, 2000).

Post-positivist Spatial Planning—1990 onwards

By the 1990s, a wave of arguments for the re-evaluation of planning activity and a resurgent interest in strategic spatial planning surfaced, predominantly led by environmentalists and those promoting more democratic and collaborative approaches to urban governance (Gleeson and Low in Freestone, 2000). Urban sustainability had gained considerable momentum following the Rio Conference and publication of the Bruntland Report (United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987) which turned attention to issues such as urban consolidation, energy efficiency and environmental protection. Simultaneously, there was a shift to more collaborative and deliberative forms of planning aimed at delivering consensual or mutually acceptable agreements through integrated engagement with multiple stakeholders (Rydin, 2011). Although collaborative and deliberative planning was criticised for its belief in planning as a democratic process and overlooking the existence of domination, repression and ideology in society (Fainstein, 2000), this mode of planning has become a consistent component of mainstream planning (Allmendinger, 2011). Perhaps more significantly, it has been credited for providing the intellectual base for the significant resurgence of interest in a the broader spatial planning approach, strongly promoted by the Labour Government in the UK in the early 2000s (Rydin, 2011; Allmendinger and Haughton, 2009).

The spatial planning approach was seen as a significant departure from the traditional land use planning approach and a shift from the deregulatory planning agenda of the 1980s (Rydin, 2011; Allmendinger and Haughton, 2011). It attempted to rebrand planning in a new and positive role, engaged with long term strategic thinking linked to a sound evidence base, but also reflecting market dynamics and community engagement (Baker and Wong, 2013; Nadin, 2007). Importantly, it was expected to bring coherence to fragmented governance and move society towards sustainable
development (Rydin, 2011; Allmendinger and Haughton, 2009). Implementation of this new approach at the local government level was to occur through local development frameworks within the context of a broad national policy framework set out in planning policy statements and statutory regional spatial strategies (Rozee, 2008).

The mobilisation of this new strategic approach to planning at the local level proved to be a difficult task in the UK for a number of reasons. In the UK context, Allmendinger and Haughton (2011) point out that spatial planning was steered by central priorities and narratives at a national level, guided by regional government offices and devolved administration and accompanied by multiple forms of soft spaces and associated governance processes. In their view, the consensus approach to resolving conflict met with considerable difficulty. In particular, the commitment to urban growth resulted in those with a contrary view being marginalised. Furthermore, there was a disconnect between the vision, discourse and implementation of the urban growth agenda. It masked rather than resolved difficult issues and proved unsuccessful in delivery, prompting further changes in the planning system, with less involvement of planners and even significant damage to the notion of planning (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2011). The Conservative/Democratic Liberal coalition, which came into power in 2010 in the UK, has, in the view of Baker and Wong (2013: 99), ‘seemingly turned its back on the strategic element of spatial planning’. The emphasis is now on “localism”, with a lesser role for planning and more emphasis at the sub-regional level and promoting local economic partnerships (Baker and Wong, 2013; Allmendinger and Haughton, 2011).

Australia, as was the case in Britain, saw a return to favour of long term strategic planning in the 1990s, with the federal government actively promoting policy integration and place management in planning which focused on the triple bottom line and cutting across levels of government (Gleeson et al, 2004). Hamnett (2000) identified the potential disjuncture between the policy rhetoric and reality of public policy direction at an early stage. In the first instance, he argued that the lofty ideals of integrated economic, social and environmental strategic planning sat uneasily with a deregulatory agenda, focused on market outcomes, individual choices and the streamlining of regulatory processes. Secondly, the idea of a shared community vision did not reflect the aspirations of diverse fragmented communities. Finally, the excision of key sites for development from planning regimes was inimical to public sector planning (Hamnett, 2000). The conflict between strategic metropolitan ambitions and regulatory reform, and the potential threat this presents for the implementation of strategic visions, arises as a consistent theme in a recent review of planning reform in Australian cities (Ruming et al, 2014; Steele and Dodson, 2014; Maginn and Foley, 2014). The rhetorical commitment to big picture spatial planning, gaps between vision and implementation frameworks and predisposition for major
projects and diverse governance models have become the hallmarks of strategic planning practice in each of the major cities.

**Dominant Themes in Planning and Governance**

Although the nature of urban planning and urban governance has changed substantially since the early 1900s, there is evidence to suggest that there has been some circularity of discourse and consistent threads associated with the particular project of strategic planning. Amongst these are the conceptual commitment to holistic plans of a spatial nature, a tendency still to emphasise logic, order, science and rationality and an enduring belief in enlightened public intervention for the greater social good (Healey, 2007; Freestone, 2000). The preceding account of the evolutionary path of planning indicates that the purpose of planning systems varies very little. But, the way they are managed, administered and ultimately achieve urban outcomes is highly variable as they respond to shifts in policy systems influenced by value judgements, the prevailing political view on what is desirable and what can be realistically achieved (Vigar et al, 2000; Cherry, 1988).

Nevertheless, two dominant themes emerge which provide a useful framework for the analysis of the contribution of spatial planning activity to effective governance and vice versa. The first highlights the past resilience and continuing interest in strategic planning as an effective mode of urban governance, premised on its particular claim that place and territory provide a significant organising device for joining up policy and action (Nadin, 2007). Associated with this, however, is the realisation that substantial changes are needed to improve the purpose, form, process and delivery of strategic planning. This new approach to strategic planning must be able to influence, encourage and, ultimately, shape spatial development, through its understanding of critical spatial issues, engagement with a wide range of stakeholders and success in achieving the necessary policy integration. The second theme points to the importance of understanding the dimensions of government and governance within which strategic spatial planning operates and what impacts this might have on the nature of planning practice in any jurisdiction. Hence, the limits and potential of strategic planning are likely to be shaped by a range of factors: (i) current and emerging political and professional discourses about what is required for effective governance; (ii) the institutional structures through which planning operates and is implemented; (iii) organisational culture; and (iv) professional attitudes in terms of planning practices, styles and routines. These two themes are further explored to refine the conceptual framework for the exploration of the local strategic planning project in Western Australia.
Value of Strategic Planning in Governance

The potential value of strategic planning in achieving more effective ‘joined up’ governance of urban areas and moderating political short-termism in public policy making is widely touted in the literature. Stead and Meijers (2009), for example, argue that it has the ability to consult and negotiate agreements across policy sectors and promote essential collaboration within a diversified governance environment. Furthermore, Albrechts (2012, 2006) regards it as providing a context for specific development projects and rescaling of issue agendas between levels. The resurgence of interest in this activity as a mode of governance is somewhat predictable in an environment of growing complexity, increasing concern about rapid and apparently random development, the need for better coordination and the dramatic increase in interest in environmental issues (Albrechts 2006). But perhaps more significantly, it reflects the realities of the modern neo-liberal environment with growing political influence of the development industry, demand for coherent integrated spatial strategies to stabilise market conditions and reduce risks and emphasis on capital city competitiveness (Bunker and Searle, 2010; Healey, 2003, 2005).

Local strategic spatial planning is one of a number of initiatives within the ambit of multi-scalar and multi-level urban governance with the potential to contribute to more effective governance. Its proximity to and better understanding of the local community enhance its potential for coordination, networking and regulation, not only to address areas of disadvantage, but to promote local economies and structural change (Hohn and Neuer, 2006). It is more suited to a shorter time perspective with an ability to manage uncertainty, respond to rapid changes and engage with the community (Bunker and Searle, 2007) and more action oriented to enable intervention and management of change (Gleeson et al, 2004). Furthermore, Albrechts (2006) argues that it has the ability to create short term as well as longer term actions, thereby building trust, confidence and understanding in the process and between the actors.

Strategic planning at the local level is common in many planning systems across the UK and Europe and embedded within a framework of principles and policies set by a higher tier of government (Stein, 2012). This is also true of Australia where local strategic planning continues to be validated in the current planning reform programmes being implemented throughout the states (NSW Government, 2012; Kellet, 2014; Steele and Dodson, 2014). At the federal level in Australia there has been, at the very least, rhetorical recognition of the need for a more cooperative, strategic and multi-layered approach to capital city planning systems (Bunker and Ruming, 2010).
The effectiveness of strategic planning *per se* has been the subject of considerable academic debate. Friedmann (2004:49), argues that too much attention has been given to strategic plans and not enough to ‘locally-based studies of the dynamics of urban socio-spatial development’. Conversely, Balducci (2004), sees the value of strategic planning as not necessarily the production of the plan, but the mobilisation it offers from a process that has identified problems, dealt with them and promoted the commitment of actions. The evidence for coherent strategic planning is regarded as weak by Albrechts (2006), and Newman (2008) contends that it largely overlooks the slow pace of institutional development and the day-to-day work of actors. In the Perth region, Adams (2010) questions the quality and expense of producing such plans in the face of their poor record of implementation. Irrespective of these criticisms, it is clear that there is still qualified support for strategic planning. There is, however, a need for a ‘new’ approach to strategic planning if it is to meet the aspirations, expectations and requirements for effective governance in contemporary urban areas.

**Strategic planning at the regional and local level – a more effective approach**

Albrecht’s (2006) view of strategic planning is normative, broad in scope and is carried out within a democratic, open, selective and dynamic process. Healey (2007) delves further into the nature of strategic planning, pointing out that it has an intellectual and political dimension. The intellectual task is to pose new concepts within which to frame policy interventions; the political task is to implement those interventions through changes in discourse and practice, altering allocation of resources and the exercise of regulatory power. The role of planning within this dual process is seen to be one of articulation rather than control, of reaching out and engaging with other policy makers and finding ways of exerting influence on other actors to facilitate sustainable development (Nadin, 2007). Accordingly, it is less about regulation and more involved in coordination and collaboration with different stakeholders (Shaw and Lord, 2009). Central to the spatial development process (Nadin 2007), it should become a facilitating force, backed up by a strong sense of purpose rather than operating as a mediator of conflicting interests (Rydin, 2011). If planners are to be constructive in this process, they require more wide ranging skills and knowledge to comprehend and communicate the wider substantive agenda for planning, respect local knowledge and think spatially and creatively about positive futures (Baker and Wong, 2013; Albrechts, 2006).

Albrechts (2012) notes that the key substantive issues of this new form of strategic planning include spatial quality, sustainable development, equity and fairness. However, there is a convincing argument that the issue of overriding importance, in a neoliberal environment, is economic growth and competitiveness with other issues assuming a secondary status (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2011, Freestone *et al*, 2012). Despite this, Searle and Bunker (2010) predict a move away from the
emphasis on greenfield developments in Australia to meet the wider urban challenges of housing affordability, climate change, energy, water management and provision for infrastructure. Rydin (2011) reiterates the need for a sound strategic framework to guide sustainable provision of physical and social infrastructure for future development. In her view, the modern tendency for development to dictate and direct this infrastructure provision is not capable of meeting these urban challenges.

The processes for such planning are both innovative and transformative. Planners are urged to abandon their fruitless searches for utopia or certainty and refocus on how planning is done and can be done differently (Hillier 2007). This can be achieved by promoting learning through the exchange of ideas amongst all stakeholders (Albrechts, 2006). Openness and transparency are at the heart of the process and fostering collaboration and partnership amongst public service providers, utilities and the property development industry to work towards consensus in plans (Shaw and Lord, 2009). In one sense, there is a return to the idea of comprehensiveness with the call for a robust and credible evidence base using formal analytical methods during the early stage of the planning process (Stein, 2012; Nadin, 2007). But according to Bunker and Searle (2007) this should be centred on critical locations and centres of change. Institutional support at the highest levels and innermost circles of all decision-making structures is essential and strategic planning activity needs to inspire and gain support from many different actors in different positions in a governance landscape (Rydin, 2011; Albrechts, 2010). Taylor (2010) contends that the outputs of this new form of strategic planning would be visionary, wide ranging and, most importantly, deliverable. The emphasis is less on land use allocation and more on complementary sectoral strategies integrating provision of physical and social infrastructure (Rydin, 2011; Nadin 2007). The concept of a dual layer of plans, one to provide a frame of reference that gives direction across a diffused governance landscape and the second justifying the specific interventions envisaged in the frame appears as a consistent theme (Stein, 2011; Healey, 2007; Hillier, 2007).

Ultimately, as Healey (2007, 2006) observed, such an approach presents substantial challenges to the institutional design of formal government, requires a new geographical imagination and a rethinking of government and who should be involved in the new spatial planning approach.

**Contribution of Strategic Planning to effective governance**

In the past, planning has made a contribution to governance in a variety of ways and been determined to a large extent by national and local political ideologies, fiscal policy and financial pressures. Rydin (2011) refers to its early contribution through the direct role of the public sector and the use of regulation, zoning, information and education. In later years, with a widening of governance
initiatives, public and private sector partnerships have emerged and contributions have expanded to the building of new infrastructure and financial inducements (Rydin, 2011).

Traditionally, the delivery of core policies and service by state governments in Australia has focused on agency functions such as transport, electricity and education. The shift in the 1990s towards a more ‘joined up’ approach to government (Gleeson et al, 2004), placed more emphasis on spatially-based approaches to the delivery of policy, which in turn encouraged the momentum for the production of strategic plans in metropolitan areas. Vigar et al, (2000) have argued that spatial planning systems, with their place-based focus, were ideally positioned to take up a more significant role in urban governance. But, in their view, this did not materialise in the UK largely because of the focus of planning practice on centralisation and regulatory activity and its inability to deal with the new governance landscape and its associated networks. Verma (2010) argues that planning needs to soften its attitudes towards key planning tasks and display greater willingness to consider competing perspectives.

The role of state governments in urban planning within Australia is well established. Although both federal and local government have limited roles in planning, questions have consistently been raised about the ability of these policy settings to promote and manage integrated solutions through the mechanism of strategic planning (Sansom et al, 2012; Stilwell and Troy, 2000). More recently, Australian cities have been referred to as ‘large metropolitan regions with complex, overlapping and often haphazard governance arrangements’ and devoid of a representative and responsible forum for the expression of the collective planning will (Gleeson et al, 2012: 1). A number of explanations for this have been suggested in the wider literature.

In the first instance, despite the principle of integration underpinning strategic spatial planning, Nadin (2007) notes the absence of authority within the UK planning system to act as an integrative focus for sectoral policy. Similarly, Allmendinger and Haughton (2011) highlight the tenuous link between strategic plans and infrastructure and conclude that the challenge is not agreement on strategies but the collective delivery of the necessary levels and range of infrastructure. In Australia, the COAG Reform Council (2012) arrived at a similar conclusion in their evaluation of capital city strategic planning, noting significant deficiencies in the delivery of infrastructure and responses to demographic change, housing affordability and social inclusion.

Secondly, Baker and Wong (2013) point out the ongoing problem of delivering planning policy initiatives within spatial entities defined by administrative boundaries rather than functional entities.
reflecting wider issues of commuting patterns, housing market areas and protection of significant environmental values. The need for more effective strategic planning is asserted as part of the rationale to amalgamate local governments in metropolitan Perth (Metropolitan Local Government Review, 2012). The review does not overtly justify the changes in terms of creating more functional spatial entities and tends to disregard many of the traditional resistances to this activity, the state government’s responsibility for providing infrastructure and diverse visions by stakeholders about the future of the area (Bell, 2012).

Thirdly, Haughton et al (2009) suggest that the reworking of state power through the formation of new forms or vehicles for planning and development, both horizontally and vertically, is in reality a form of meta-governance. That is to say, the state has not relinquished its powers, but is merely pursuing its aims in different ways by setting the rules for how institutions work and are governed. Importantly, they highlight the potential of such an approach to sidestep wider responsibilities relating to strategic social and environmental objectives and become the problem for urban management rather than the solution. This planning deficit according to Gleeson et al, (2010:1) is compounded by the ‘complexity, fragmentation and underdevelopment of the mechanisms that guide urban development’. Ongoing planning reforms in WA, Victoria, NSW and Queensland have essentially focused on the centralisation of planning control, streamlining of planning approval processes, incorporation of private interests into governance structures and the emasculation of local governments which run counter to fostering improved strategic planning frameworks (Ruming et al, 2014; Maginn and Foley, 2014; Williams, 2007).

Local strategic planning needs to be examined not only with regard to its relationship to the wider ambit of state and national governance, but also in the context of local governance and its relationship to local government reform. Dollery et al, (2006) note that international shifts in local governance arrangements were initially premised on local governments’ failure to provide efficient services. Later reforms tended to focus more on reducing resources, modernising and improving processes, encouraging competition by the use of market mechanisms and contracting out services to the private sector. Since the early 2000s this focus has turned again, emphasising the importance of democracy, political accountability and citizen participation (Tewdr-Jones and Morphet, 2006; Dollery et al, 2006). A key component of local governance in the UK was the introduction of the need for a Community Strategy under the Local Government Act, 2000 to provide an overarching policy statement for each local council, supported by programs and funding. Tewdr-Jones and Morphet (2006) examined the nexus between this document and the spatial planning instrument, the Local
Development Framework, and concluded that there was potential for conflict and tension, but also synergy if the processes were properly managed.

Planning reform within local government in Australia has followed a similar path facilitated by changes to state government legislation for local government. This, according to Dollery et al (2006), has shifted the narrow emphasis on ‘roads, rates and rubbish’ to wider service delivery particularly in the areas of health and community safety but also accessible transport and environmental management. More recently, local governance reform in several states in Australia has introduced the requirement for an overarching framework to articulate the direction of each local government community in terms of social, economic and environmental wellbeing. An example of this in WA is the Community Strategy (Department of Local Government, 2010), with a focus on business and local community objectives in the short to medium term, rather than an integrated and sustainable vision for the future.

**Conclusion**

A review of the literature on urban governance indicates the continuing emphasis on finding ways to achieve more effective governance of our complex and dynamic urban environments to address urban expansion and the essential issues of distributive justice, economic vitality and environmental wellbeing (Hohn and Neuer, 2006; Cars et al, 2002). For governance to be effective, it is argued that it needs to be focused on a shared vision and strategy and have the commitment of a broad spectrum of actors willing to work cooperatively and collaboratively (Kroen, 2009, Kubler, 1995).

The shift in the 1990s towards the idea of a more joined up approach to urban governance rather than a concentration on agency functions, fostered new interest in spatially based approaches and governance modes for delivery of policy. In this context, strategic spatial planning with its emphasis on the quality of place, lead role in regulation in highly contested contexts and interaction with a wider range of stakeholders at the state and local level, was regarded as well placed to interrogate and improve governance practices and consolidate diverse initiatives (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2009; Stead and Meijers, 2009; Healey, 2007, 2006).

The nature of strategic planning has always been strongly influenced by political, policy and institutional shifts in governance. At times there has been scepticism and even rejection of strategic planning, in response to concerns about government intervention and evidence of the many failings of planning in the urban environment. Despite this, belief in its potential to provide a valuable contribution to effective governance has shown signs of resurgence on a number of occasions and it
remains a resilient element of urban governance. Implementation of its aspirations is obstructed by the lack of planning authority to integrate sectoral policy, its focus on spatial entities defined by administration rather than function, its inherent woolly nature and tendency to overlook the slow pace of institutional development. In a local governance context, with a reform agenda focused on providing community services, citizen participation and political accountability, the value of long term strategic planning is often obscured.

The late 1990s witnessed a strong resurgence of interest in strategic planning, couched within the idea of a shift from the narrow and largely regulatory land use planning of the past to a wider spatial planning approach. It was labelled as progressive as it would devolve responsibilities, promote sustainable development improve cross sector policy working and consensus building as an effective means to achieve ‘win/win’ solutions between conflicting objectives (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2011). The desirable components for strategic planning within this new approach included an ability to provide indicative direction for significant issues confronting urban areas, use sound evidence and analytical frameworks to support recommendations and consult and collaborate with stakeholders. Within this new approach, planning was seen as empowered and responsible for implementation, by mediating and facilitating urban change and management in an inclusive manner (Shaw and Lord, 2009; Healey, 2007; Hillier, 2007).

In the first decades of the new century and the enduring neo-liberal spatial governance environment, the role and effectiveness of this planning in dealing with fundamental challenges in the urban environment is once again under scrutiny. In the UK context, it had to be implemented within the overriding national focus to deliver higher levels of new housing and promote economic competitiveness. For Allmendinger (2011), this was not compatible with attempts to promote sustainability, smart growth and community participation. Secondly, the implementation at local government level encountered resistance and resulted in poor delivery. Research showed that local governments struggled with the necessary cultural changes and could not always understand or apply the expectations of central government (Gunn and Hillier, 2012; Baker and Hincks, 2009).

Whilst there has been considerable research into the role of local government in the wake of changes to the planning system in the UK (Shaw and Lord, 2009; Department of Communities and Local Government, 2008; Morphet, 2009; Baker and Hincks, 2009; Gunn and Hillier, 2012), the same cannot be said for Australia. This is somewhat curious given the key role of local councils in the planning system. Healey (2005), Freestone (2000) and Watson (2002) attribute this to the complexity of the analysis, the difficulty of unravelling planning from other influences, but also a general lack of
interest in examining the policy space of local planning which is perceived as being dominated by
development control or development approval. Given this research gap, there is considerable merit in
exploring the rationale and response to local strategic planning, as manifest in the Local Planning
Strategy (LPS), an initiative of the WA state government but a planning instrument of local
government.

The next chapter sets out the research approach and framework to meet the objectives for the study.
This involves only identifying the resistances to and potentialities of local strategic spatial planning
in the WA planning and governance landscape, but also making a wider contribution to general
knowledge about this mode of urban governance in other urban localities.
Chapter 3 - EMPIRICAL METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

When someone reflects-in-action, he becomes a researcher in the practice context. He is not dependent on the categories of established theory and technique, but constructs a new theory of the unique case. His inquiry is not limited to a deliberation about means which depends on a prior agreement about ends. He does not keep means and ends separate, but defines them interactively as he frames a problematic situation. He does not separate thinking from doing, ratiocinating his way to a decision which he must later convert to action. Because his experimenting is a kind of action, implementation is built into his inquiry. Thus reflection in action can proceed, even in situations of uncertainty or uniqueness, because it is not bound by the dichotomies of Technical Reality.

(Schon 1983: 68)

Introduction

The research problem at the heart of this thesis falls within the broad ambit of the need for improved governance in urban areas. More specifically, the focus is on the nature of a particular mode of governance (i.e. strategic spatial planning) that operates at the local government level. The research is focused on two inter-related issues. On the one hand, the policy interest in the role and potential of strategic spatial planning as a solution to more effective governance of urban areas. And, on the other hand, the nature of the relationship between spatial planning and the governance framework within which it operates.

Threaded through the long running debate within the social sciences about the rigour, validity and power of quantitative and qualitative research, has been recognition that contrasting methods have always existed in social science, they are not mutually exclusive and can be used in a complementary fashion (Yin, 2011; Maginn, 2006). More recently, the debate has shifted away from the merits of each methodology to matching the choice of methodology to the research questions, solving the research problem and refining the techniques of the craft to ensure rigour and trustworthy outcomes (Maginn et al, 2008a, 2008b; Thompson, 2006). In broad methodological and epistemological terms, a ‘pracademic’ approach is used to analyse the two central issues of this thesis. This approach draws on the original idea of the reflective practitioner and its recognition that practitioners use their intuition and inside knowledge to cope with unique, uncertain and conflicted situations (Schon, 1987). In simple terms, the pracademic approach is premised on an analytical approach that comprises three major components: (i) the development of a conceptual framework; (ii) the collection of empirical data; and (iii) the application of professional experience and knowledge.

The principal aims of this chapter are twofold. Firstly, to set out and explain the methodological approach to the study and secondly, to document and explain the choice of specific research methods used to elicit data to answer the research questions as outlined in Chapter 1. The first part of the
chapter briefly traces the history of analysis of planning systems and discusses the widespread use and utility of case study research. Two recent and relevant studies in the UK, with a focus on local strategic planning, are then discussed in terms of their objectives, methodological approach and choice of methods. Attention then turns to an examination of methodological approaches that have been used in the past to analyse planning systems. Collectively, each of these steps assists in providing the overarching framework and justification for the methodological approach and choice of case study research method for this thesis. The second part of the chapter sets out the principal components of the research design and then documents how the data was collected, analysed and interpreted in order to respond to the research questions.

**Analysis of Planning Systems**

Early study of planning systems concentrated on formal descriptions of structures as demonstrated through plans, regulatory powers and procedures, on the assumption that these structures were created for, and empowered to perform specific functions. (Vigar et al, 2000). This emphasis shifted as it became evident that comprehensive plans depended on unrealistic and unattainable levels of information, knowledge and technical capability (Campbell and Fainstein, 2003) and were often separated from the vast political and economic forces that shaped and constrained planning (Allmendinger, 2009). Analysis of planning practices began to focus more on the power games of governance and how key players and agencies developed and implemented policy ideas through their relationships, alliances, negotiation and bargaining (Vigar et al, 2000; Barrett and Fudge, 1981). A new wave of sociological and institutional research on governance processes in planning emerged in the 1990s drawing on broad ideas of ‘new institutionalism’ (Hillier and Healey, 2008). The world was seen as dynamic and relational, processes took place in a wider context of economic activity and civil society and people had a key role in shaping change (Vigar et al, 2000). A concurrent theme in research at this time was the emergence of the ‘practice movement’. This was premised on the view that specific and context bound accounts of planning practice were well placed to bridge the gap between planning theory and practice (Watson 2002). In addition, Sandercock (2003) argued that narrative or storytelling was an effective way to transfer experience and insights into how messy planning problems had arisen.

Flyvbjerg (2013) points out that much of what we know within the social sciences has been discovered from case study research. The case study approach has been used to cover a broad range of topics across all manner of disciplines in order to evaluate the implementation of processes and analyse the outcomes of interventions. Robson (2011) credited Robert Yin’s role in promoting the case study as a serious option in social research and cited his definition of this approach:
Case study is a strategy for doing research which involves an empirical investigation of a particular contemporary phenomenon within its real life context using multiple sources of evidence. (Yin in Robson, 2011:136)

Despite its prolific use, the case study methodology according to Yin (2013) has been the subject of academic criticism, principally on the premises that theoretical knowledge is more valuable than concrete empirical knowledge generated via case studies and the difficulty of drawing statistical generalisations from an individual case. In response to these criticisms, Yin (2013) explains that the goal of the case study is to expand and generalise on the theory in an analytical manner rather than a statistical sense, thereby supplementing and transferring knowledge to scientific development and using narratives to explain case outcomes.

This study of local strategic planning in urban governance satisfies many of the distinctive features of case study research advocated by Yin (2012). It is focused on an in-depth understanding of a particular and not well understood aspect of planning practice and its complex and contextual conditions in a real world setting. It is founded on a theoretical perspective evident in the wider literature, that strategic planning at the local level has the potential to make a significant contribution to better urban governance. The opportunity to examine a distinct and relevant initiative of planning at this governance level in WA is taken up by ‘a reflective connected researcher’ (Thompson, 2006:19) with good access to information about what led up to its introduction and the subsequent response by local government. Finally, it opens up possibilities for a wider contribution to knowledge about the effectiveness of local strategic planning, an entrenched component of many planning systems.

Recent research on local strategic planning

Two significant research projects designed to evaluate a spatial planning reform initiative introduced in UK legislation in 2004, are of particular relevance to the current research. This initiative replaced the local development plan with a more flexible and collaborative planning instrument, the local development framework, and in that respect showed a close parallel with the LPS initiative in WA.

The first research study was a major undertaking sponsored by the UK government Spatial Plans in Practice (Department of Communities and Local Government, 2005). This study, according to Shaw et al (2007), assessed the response of local government to the new spatial planning approach in the UK in the context of five themes which had driven the reform agenda. These included: (i) responsiveness in terms of timely planning and delivery of planning policy; (ii) inclusiveness through
effective participation and collaboration; (iii) collaboration in providing an integrated approach towards sustainable development; (iv) results driven in delivery of government policy to encourage and actively shape place based development; and (v) a sound and supporting evidence base. The methodology underpinning this study was initially informed by literature reviews to clarify what was meant by the terms ‘spatial planning, culture change and stakeholder engagement’. A broad strategic survey of all local governments was then conducted over a three year period to find out how practices were changing and how senior planners viewed the application and value of the new system. Separately, action learning events were convened with a wide range of stakeholders to canvass issues emerging from the new approach. In addition, numerous workshops were convened to discuss how core strategies had been prepared, who was involved in the process and how they linked with the delivery of infrastructure. The final step in the methodology involved longitudinal case studies of 25 local governments who had prepared the local development framework and represented a range of localities, economic and social contexts.

In a more recent study, Gunn and Hillier (2012) investigated the response of local government to three key elements of this spatial planning approach: (i) a greater emphasis on flexibility; (ii) use of a sound evidence base; and (iii) linking planning with infrastructure provision. The theoretical basis for the study used an adaptation of Healey’s (2006) model for analysing the capacity of a policy concept to become mobilised and institutionalised and combined this with an actant network – an inspired investigative approach. The focus, therefore, was not only on understanding the dimensions of the specific episode, the associated governance processes, institutional practices and culture, but also how it was influenced by intermediaries significantly engaged in the reform process. The methodology for the study included documentary analysis of texts and the educative processes of actants revolving around the reform of the planning processes and combined this with interviews of a wide range of planners at the regional and local level.

The planning reform initiative in the UK in 2004 had close links to debates in planning theory and governance at that time which centred on better collaboration, wider and integrated approaches to urban governance and use of a sound evidence base. The LPS in WA and the local development framework (LDF) in the UK have some strong similarities. They are both planning instruments prepared and implemented by local government, they emphasise local strategic planning and are a product of a higher level of government. Both of the above studies used an approach that relied predominantly on qualitative analysis to investigate planning change within its real life context and to underpin the selection of research methods for the current study. Each endeavoured to capture and analyse data about how those involved in the process interpreted the policy and applied it in working
practices. Both used multiple research methods linked to underlying theoretical propositions associated with the broad spatial planning approach, with the aim of encouraging convergence of findings and improving validation and verification. The underlying research questions in each of the studies closely reflects those of the current study. In short, their focus was on three broad questions: How has the LDF travelled over a period of time? What have been the key influences in the political and institutional environment? What are the potentialities and resistances for future implementation?

**Research Methodology and Methods**

The approach to the study draws principally on the broad methodological approaches advocated by Watson (2002) and Healey (2006) for the purpose of planning analysis. The former advocates paying particular attention to history to explain the evolving institutional and legislative frameworks within which planners operate and how practices come about. This is then combined with an ethnographic analysis of planners’ behaviours, experiences and views. Healey (2006) places more emphasis on the analysis of how new ideas in planning initiatives become accepted, embedded and meet the challenge of existing and continually changing power structures. She proposes three distinct steps to analyse these issues: (i) focus on understanding the episode of strategy making within the context of broad governance, shifts in the economy and society, governance discourses and localised practices; (ii) examine the governance processes, institutional practices and networks and assemblages; and, (iii) question how those involved in the strategy-making derive meaning, legitimation, encounter resistance or are encouraged by the ideas promoted in the strategic episode.

The three research questions at the heart of this project require a descriptive and explanatory account of past and contemporary planning practice in WA, in order to understand the political and institutional setting for the LPS, its associated policies and processes and the views of actors and individuals immersed in this initiative. These are essentially ‘how’ and ‘why’ type questions that are, according to Yin (2009), well suited to case study and historical research methods.

**The Case Study Research Design**

Yin (2009) has identified five important components of case study research design: (i) the study questions; (ii) propositions; (iii) unit of analysis; (iv) the logic linking data to propositions; and (v) the criteria for interpreting findings. The first three components provide the essential framework for deciding on what data should be collected and the last two guide the process after the data collection, the strategies for analysis and reporting of findings. Figure 3.1 indicates the broad process for the research design for the study and some of the inevitable linkages between these overlapping tasks (Robson, 2011). The research design is discussed within each of these components.
Research Questions and Propositions

The research questions seek understanding of the rationale for the introduction of the LPS, the response to this initiative and its future potential as a form of governance in the urban environment. Two theoretical propositions underpin the research project and, in overall terms, help guide the collection of data and provide a template against which to evaluate the research data. The first is that the LPS instrument reflects consistent and ongoing recognition of the value of strategic spatial planning in urban governance. Secondly, the changing nature of governance in WA has had and will continue to have a significant influence on the way the LPS policy is mobilised and institutionalised within WA generally and more specifically, the PMR.

Unit of Analysis

A decisive factor within the design process in case study methodology is the choice of the individual unit of study and the setting of its boundaries (Flyvbjerg, 2013). In this case, the LPS, a distinctive planning instrument introduced in Western Australia in 1999, is the individual unit of analysis, a bounded policy entity with a compelling theoretical framework and a single case study (Yin, 2012). The selection of this unit of analysis was also based on the close connection of the researcher to this planning initiative, who took up a newly created specialist planning position in the Department of Planning in 1999, to coordinate the assessment of schemes and strategies in regional areas and provide support to local government in this area.

The boundaries of this unit were further refined to provide a realistic scope for the research and establish priorities for the collection and analysis of data (Yin, 2012). In the first instance, the research concentrates primarily on the institutional, political and policy frameworks that underpin the planning and management of the PMR. This choice is informed by the predominance of the Perth region in the state in terms of its concentration of population and level of urbanisation. Additionally, it has been the focal point of most strategic planning in WA at the state level which provides the necessary planning framework for local strategic planning. In the second instance, the focus is on those actants most closely involved with the development and implementation of the LPS initiative – i.e. state and local government.

Linking Data to Proposition

Data collection commenced with initial discussions about the nature, objectives and purpose of the research with a number of key local institutions – the Planning Institute of Australia, the Local Government Planners Association and the West Australian Local Government Association. Each of these organisations distributed information about the research to their membership in late 2012,
opening up an opportunity for some early comment and support. Formal data collection subsequently commenced, using multiple sources of evidence to encourage the development of converging lines of enquiry to enable the triangulation of evidence from different sources and thus strengthen the validity of findings (Yin, 2009). Five interrelated and complementary research methods were selected to collect a range of empirical data with explicit links to the research questions:

(i) a historical analysis of planning and governance in the PMR between 1900 and 2014 to provide a contextual setting and explanation in political and policy terms for the introduction of the LPS in 1999, the response to the initiative since 1999 and to inform its future prospects for contribution to more effective governance in the PMR;

(ii) archival analysis of data about the stage of each local government with regard to completion or preparation of the LPS, obtained from the Department of Planning to quantify the response to the initiative and provide the basis for qualitative analysis of the response;

(iii) a survey questionnaire submitted to all local government authorities in WA that sought to obtain a general overview of understanding, attitudes and experiences amongst planning managers and directors to strategic planning at the state and local level and more specifically the response to the LPS requirement;

(iv) semi-structured interviews of planning representatives with experience and knowledge of the planning system and the LPS. This involved planning representatives with broad experience in the strategic and policy field and planning practitioners charged with implementing the LPS at the local and state level to establish the rationale for and expectation of the LPS and the key factors influencing the response; and

(v) content analysis, within the single case study of LPS, of three individual LPS case studies in the Perth Metropolitan Area to examine in more detail the response to the initiative in terms of the format and content, the move to strategic planning and the perceived status and value of the LPS in their local government environment.

**Historical Analysis of Planning and Governance in the PMR**

The account in Chapter 4 of the thesis has a specific focus on strategic planning activity, planning reform and governance changes in the PMR between 1900 and 2013 and the roles of state and local government within this planning and governance landscape. The LPS is regarded as a significant planning and governance instrument for implementation of state and regional policy, devised with the objective of promoting more effective urban governance. This evolutionary account provides an essential context for understanding the introduction of the LPS in 1999 and its subsequent implementation in the first research question.

It is argued in Chapter 2 that for strategic planning to be more effective in urban governance it needs to be more broad based and indicative (Albrechts, 2006), focus on significant issues rather than
comprehensiveness (Bunker and Searle, 2007) and be accompanied by a sound implementation framework (Stein, 2011; Hillier, 2007; Healey, 2007). Planning should take a central and leading role, operating as a mediator, collaborator and facilitator and with a high level of institutional support (Rydin, 2011; Albrechts, 2010; Shaw and Lord, 2009). The processes associated with this more sophisticated plan making uses formal analytical methods and a sound evidence base to arrive at outcomes (Stein, 2011; Nadin, 2007) and employs open, participative and inclusive processes (Shaw and Lord, 2009; Albrechts, 2006).

An analytical framework is derived from these views in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the five key strategic plans for the PMR produced within this period. The seven criteria included in this analytical framework are: (i) a broad based spatial planning approach, (ii) a focus on significant issues rather than comprehensiveness, (iii) leadership by planning, (iv) planning involved in mediation, collaboration and facilitation, (v) an open and participative process, (vi) use of formal analytical frameworks and a sound evidence base and (vii) an effective implementation framework to demonstrate the shifts in their emphasis over time and their relative performance in the context of this new scenario about strategic spatial planning and its effective contribution to more effective urban governance. The evaluation process draws on two primary sources. First, the available literature on analysis of strategic planning texts, (MacCallum and Hopkins, 2011; Bunker and Searle, 2009; Albrechts, 2006; Stokes and Hill, 1992). And, second, the views of planning practitioners, to obtain a broader view of the institutional and policy environment over that period and establish a live policy framework for the study (Richardson and Jensen, 2003). Collectively, these sources contribute information to address the research questions about the influences on the LPS response and its future prospects.

Archival Analysis

This analysis used quantitative data supplied by the Department of Planning which set out the dates of endorsement of LPSs between 1999 and the end of 2013. Information was also obtained on the preparation status of the LPS in all other local government areas in order to identify at what stage these councils were in the LPS process. The objective, in the first instance, was to provide a quantitative overview of the response of local government across WA and within the PMR since 1999 and, secondly, an indication of the current participation and commitment to LPS preparation.

Survey Questionnaire

An online survey (see Appendix 1) was designed to investigate, in the first place, the understanding of and views of local government planners on strategic planning and their experiences specifically
with the LPS. The survey focused on four key themes. The first two themes were directed at all local governments: (i) understanding and perceptions of the concept of ‘strategic spatial planning’ at the regional level and, more specifically, its nature, role and value; and (ii) views about the role and responsibilities of local government when it came to strategic planning. The second two themes were more specific to the LPS instrument and directed to a smaller sample of local governments, those who had been specifically involved in the preparation of LPSs. This explored: (i) the main drivers behind the LPS; (ii) the processes followed and the timelines for such processing; and (iii) the perceived value and utility of the LPS for their local government area. The main aim of this research method was to cast the net wide and explore the broad perceptions of local government about the LPS and its position within the wider strategic planning context. This also identified, on a preliminary basis, some of the influences behind the response that would require more detailed investigation through individual interviews.

The draft questionnaire was piloted through consultation with a group of six planning practitioners from the Department of Planning, who were involved in the assessment of local strategic planning activities and in close contact with local government planners. The survey questionnaire was distributed to all 139 local governments in WA inviting their planning director/manager to complete the survey online. Reminder emails were sent out twice to respondents in an effort to prompt a higher response rate to the survey. A total of 35 responses (25.5%) with 16 (46%) from local governments in the Perth and Peel region. The majority (80-90%) of respondents were professionally qualified, experienced and operating at a managerial or senior level. The level of response in the metropolitan area and the seniority of the respondents was regarded as a positive factor, as it indicated that respondents were likely to have a good understanding of planning practice in WA and particular issues at the local government level. In addition, 86% of all respondents had been or were closely involved in the LPS process at various stages and were therefore well placed to offer informed views about their experience with this planning instrument.
Semi-Structured Interviews

Whilst the survey provided data from local government planners on their attitudes and experiences of the LPS and local strategic planning in general, the next stage was more purposive, with the intent to unpack the policy and political contexts for the LPS and the ensuing response. To this end, interview requests were sent to 20 key policy actors from across the public and private sectors and included:

- policy actors who were central to the development of strategic planning policy in general and the LPS in particular during the late 1990s and early 2000s and their implementation between 2000-2013 (9 interviewees);
- local government planners and planning consultants involved in the crafting of actual LPSs since 1999 (6 interviewees); and

- state government planners involved in assessment of the LPS since 1999 (5 interviewees).

The selection of prospective interviewees was largely informed by the researcher’s knowledge of and professional relationship with key planning representatives in WA who were known to have good knowledge and a reflective interest in strategic planning and the LPS. The potential disadvantage of insider status and the associated potential for bias of the researcher was recognised and attempts to overcome this were employed. In the first place, a good mix of planning practitioners and bureaucrats from the local and state government sectors and the private sector, as well as those operating in metropolitan and regional areas was selected. Approximately 30% of those approached were female and 70% male. In an attempt to remove any perception of bias, a particular effort was made to include interviewees, less well known to the researcher, who had become engaged in the assessing and crafting of the LPS in more recent years. The response was positive with 17 out of 20 targeted respondents expressing keen interest in participation. The researcher’s support from key planning institutions and insider status as a recently retired practitioner proved useful in securing access to interviewees (Miles and Huberman, 1994). During the interviews, the researcher carefully and clearly explained that the research recognised the value of practitioner views on the practical realities of implementation (Schon, 1987) and that the purpose of the research was to improve understanding about this instrument with no prejudgement of outcomes.

Interview questions (see Appendix 2) were based around three main themes directly linked to the research questions. These focused on (i) the nature, value and role of strategic spatial planning at the regional level; (ii) the rationale for introduction of the LPS; and, (iii) the value and effectiveness of local strategic planning over the past 15 years. The purpose was to establish whether there was a consistent understanding of strategic planning and to explore general views about the value and utility of such planning. In particular, the interviews sought to extract what was seen as the resistances and potentialities of such activity at both the regional and local level. Planning practitioners with firsthand experience in the crafting of LPSs were asked why it had been undertaken by their particular local government, to recount their experiences with the process and then reflect on its impact on planning practice and urban governance. Planning practitioners at the state government level with experience in the assessment of LPSs were asked questions in a similar vein, but also asked to comment on its ability to direct future growth and development within the framework of state and regional policy.
Interviews were undertaken on an individual basis in convenient and informal research settings, principally within the workplace environment of interviewees and lasted between 30-60 minutes, all were audio-recorded to assist with transcription and analysis and all interviews were self-transcribed. The researcher used personal experiences of planning practice at times to open up the debate but kept a close focus on the research questions. This flexibility encouraged the respondents, who came from different political and professional perspectives, to expound their views in a conversational manner and presented opportunities for pursuing innovative lines of thought about the process and future prospects for local strategic planning in WA.

The use of multiple sources of data collection, the survey, interviews and case studies provided a suite of interrelated data and in some cases, unearthed some unexpected and interesting responses. Amongst these were some rival explanations that indicated scepticism about the value of the LPS initiative and an intent not to proceed with the preparation of this planning instrument.

**Content Analysis of LPS case studies**

This research method used textual analysis of existing LPS documents, clarified where necessary by survey responses and informal interviews with senior planners to explore how certain local governments authorities had responded to this change in policy direction and to explain what had influenced their response. The interview of these planners was not part of the semi-structured interview process as already outlined. The policy and geographical focus of this project was principally on the nature of local strategic planning within the PMR and a sample of three endorsed LPSs were selected for closer scrutiny: (i) Town of Claremont; (ii) City of Belmont and (iii) Shire of Kalamunda. These LGAs were selected because they offered a range of differences in terms of population size, geographical location within the Perth metropolitan region, socio-economic profile, and land-use mix. Each had been prepared within the context of the legislative requirements for the review of their local planning schemes and provided an opportunity to measure how they complied with the new policy direction of state government.

The framework used for this analysis combined theoretical views on effective strategic planning discussed in Chapter 2 with the expectation and direction for the LPS specifically provided in educative texts (Ministry for Planning, 2000; WAPC, 2010). This guidance, provided by state government, was seen as providing a template for local strategic planning within this localised context and a link between theory and the reality of planning practice. Three criteria were selected on the basis that they covered the significant components of effective strategic planning in a theoretical sense and this situated context for evaluation of each of the case studies:
(i) the extent to which they comply with state government guidance in terms of format and presentation;

(ii) evidence of a broad strategic planning approach, nexus with the state and regional planning framework of WA, a focus on significant issues and evidence of an open and participative process; and

(iii) the recognition and status of the LPS in the local government environment.

**Criteria for Interpretation of Findings**

A systematic approach was taken to the analysis of the interview data with care taken to observe established principles of social science, the creation of a case study database and maintaining the chain of evidence (Yin, 2009). The potential for analytical bias by the researcher, particularly with insider involvement, was recognised throughout and care taken not to regard events as more patterned and congruent than they were, or to risk becoming too involved with the subject and losing perspective.

In the first instance, this required careful documentation of all the relevant evidence in the empirical data including any rival explanations. The data from the interview responses was organised in terms of a thematic display reflecting the underlying themes of the thesis, the influence of governance on spatial planning, the potential of strategic planning and in particular strategic planning at the local level. This data was broken down and organised into sub-themes to assist the analytical process. Information about the influence of governance on spatial planning was drawn from responses to questions about the responsibility for strategic planning at the federal, state or local level and the proposal to amalgamate local governments in the PMR. Interest and understanding about the broad activity of strategic spatial planning was grouped in terms of responses about its perceived value and the obstacles to its implementation at the state and local level. Data related more to the activity of local strategic planning was grouped according to expressed views about the rationale for the LPS and its ability to encourage a more strategic approach and guide decision making. It also included views about what drove the LPS in local government and its status within the local government environment. Triangulation of these data sources provided some potential for checking the consistency of findings or for further analysis of inconsistencies and their reasons. These thematic displays were then interpreted using a range of tactics such as the noting of patterns and themes to facilitate contrasts and comparison and clustering of responses to reflect the concepts expressed in the research questions (Miles and Huberman, 1994).
The data from the content analysis of the three selected LPSs was grouped and displayed according to the selected evaluation criteria relating to the format and presentation of the documents, evidence of a broad strategic planning approach and the value and status of the LPS in the local government environment.

Conclusion

The need to understand and explain the emergence, adoption, attitudes towards and the implementation of the LPS initiative within Perth, led to the selection of a historical and case study approach for this research. The research design and the analytical frameworks used within the process to evaluate strategic planning at a state and local level in the PMR set out to ensure that data was closely linked to the theoretical propositions underlying the research questions. These propositions involved recognition of the value of strategic planning in urban governance, the need to approach this type of planning in a more effective manner and the overarching influence of governance on strategic planning. The design included a historical account of strategic planning and associated governance in the Perth metropolitan area to identify the key political, policy and institutional influences and establish the real policy context for the LPS. Data was collected from multiple sources of a quantitative, but predominantly qualitative nature. This included a content analysis of recently approved LPSs in the PMR, an online survey and semi structured interviews of professional planners’ attitudes and experiences of the LPS initiative.
Chapter 4 - A GOVERNANCE AND PLANNING CONTEXT FOR LOCAL STRATEGIC PLANNING -1900 to 2013

In complex urban governance contexts, with multiple actors, arenas, and struggles over discourses and practices, strategic actors who can make a difference will be those who focus on real opportunities for innovation and who work with the ‘grain’ of emergent properties of specific situations. (Healey, 2003:117)

Introduction

This chapter sets out to explain the emergence and evolution of strategic spatial planning in the PMR since the early 1900s, and in particular, how it relates to shifts in planning and governance frameworks during this period. This involves tracing the key events in strategic planning activity, planning reform and governance and drawing on the available literature and interview responses to understand the influences behind the changes. The principle aim, as expressed in the research questions, is to explore the contextual factors that contributed to the development and introduction of the LPS and the response to it from the local government sector. The emphasis is therefore on the development of local strategic spatial planning in the PMR over this period, and to what extent this has been influenced by the political, policy and institutional framework at the state and local level.

The chapter comprises four parts. Part one begins with a brief background of the early development of local planning and the first forays into strategic planning prior to 1900 before moving into a descriptive account of three broad eras of planning between 1900 and 1990: (i) the utopian era; (ii) the era of professional and rational planning; and, (iii) the era of pragmatic and economically-based planning. This period explains the evolving relationship between state and local government and the development of strategic spatial planning at the metropolitan and local scale.

Part two covers the period from 1990-2013 and is of particular importance for this project as it represents what could be described as the ‘gestation, birth and early childhood’ of the LPS. Planning and governance within this period can be divided into three broad transformative eras: (i) the integrative era (1990-2001); (ii) the sustainable and deliberative era (2001-2008); and (iii) the big picture and reformist era (2008-present). A synthesised overview of the key strategic planning and reform initiatives in WA and the PMR between 1900 and 2012 is included in Table 4.1.

Part three provides an evaluation of each of the five strategic plans produced for the PMR between 1955 and 2011. This recognises the pivotal role of such plans in WA (MacCallum and Hopkins, 2011) and their particular influence on the role and direction of strategic planning at the local level. This
evaluation uses an analytical framework derived from theoretical perspectives about a more effective approach to strategic planning as discussed in Chapter 2. Six key criteria are used for the evaluation of the plans as described in Chapter 3 and the process draws on literature about strategic planning in the PMR and the interview responses from planning practitioners.

Part four summarises the contribution of this historical analysis of strategic planning and the analysis of strategic plans in the PMR drawing out the political, institutional and policy changes and relationships between the key state and local government actants and the implications for local strategic planning.

**Early Planning and Governance in Perth: pre-1900 to 1990**

The footprint of the PMR emerged as urban development spread out along the Swan River and rail linkages were established between the town sites of Perth, Fremantle and Guildford (Berry, 1992). The layout of these early town sites, established within 10 years of colonial settlement in 1829, marked the beginnings of traditional land use planning with allocation of land uses and reservation of land for social and community purposes (Poole cited in Berry, 1992). Today, the PMR extends over an area of approximately 5,380 square kilometres made up of 30 local government areas and accommodates approximately 1.65 million people. It is estimated that a population of 2.2 million will be reached by 2031 requiring 353,000 additional jobs and 328,000 additional houses, and beyond that horizon, the population is predicted to reach 3.5 million (WAPC, 2013).

Although Greive (2000) highlights the central interest and role by the state in the development and regulation of land at the time of colonisation and subdivision of rural land for settlement, its dependence on some form of local governance emerged at an early stage. Berry (2012) noted that the initial governance bodies, town trusts and local committees and then road committees and road boards, were involved only in managing roads and other local infrastructure. Municipalities were established in 1871, marking the birth of ‘local government’, and a broader responsibility for civic improvements, subdivision and development (Berry, 2012). In effect, this set the boundary between the two tiers of government and encouraged some early discordance between state and local government about their respective roles. But importantly as Berry (1992) has noted, this fragmented approach to local governance did little to encourage the provision of capital-intensive physical and social infrastructure and led to a rapid deterioration of urban conditions as the population expanded. Ultimately, these circumstances prompted the first moves by the state government to introduce strategic spatial planning for the Perth region.
The Utopian Era – 1900-1950

The drive to recognise planning in WA was a laborious process largely driven by prominent civic leaders, most notably William Bold and Harold Boas, who had an energetic interest in sharing information about urban theories and development in other parts of the world (Stokes and Hill, 1992). The introduction of the *Town Planning and Development Act, 1928* represented the first formal step towards the centralisation of planning as a state government activity and gave state government the responsibility for regulating the subdivision of land (Foley, 1995). Although this established the legitimacy of town planning, Foley records the confusion about which formal government structure should assume responsibility for planning regulation and administration. In the first two years this role was shuffled between the Minister for Public Works, the Attorney General and the Minister of Lands, before being transferred back to Public Works in 1935 and subsequently to the Minister for Local Government in 1947. Liaison between local and state government on planning matters during this early era was largely limited to securing infrastructure improvements.

Importantly, the 1928 Act set out the key cornerstones of strategic planning at the metropolitan level in Western Australia. This included: (i) the establishment of a metropolitan planning commission with a responsibility for strategic planning; and, (ii) the inclusion of planning mechanisms such as town planning schemes for each local government area (Stokes and Hill, 1992). The requirement for a town planning scheme to guide development within a specific local area could be viewed as the first attempt in WA to introduce the idea of local strategic planning, although it is likely that the intentions were more technocratic and inwardly focused on the local government area. Despite these promising beginnings, both state and local government showed little inclination to pursue a strategic approach to planning. Hedgcock and Yiftachel (1992) have noted that the first strategic plan prepared for Perth in the early 1930s was never actually endorsed by the state government. There was also little interest shown in preparing town planning schemes amongst local councils, with the exception of initiatives in Guildford and Melville in the 1930s (Berry, 1992). Whilst this inertia reflected a gradual waning of interest in planning, largely due to the impact of the Great Depression and the Second World War, other factors, particularly at the local government level, were at play. Amongst these were the slow pace of development, fears by local government of compensation claims against scheme restrictions and a general lack of planning expertise (Berry, 1992). Many local governments enacted zoning by-laws during this period, which Bain and Hedgcock (1992) argue, merely reflected existing conditions in their respective areas and did not deal with new and emerging development pressures.
Table 4.1: Key Strategic Planning and Reform Initiatives 1900-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Spatial Planning Activity</th>
<th>Planning Reform And Governance Changes</th>
<th>Role of State / Local Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utopian Planning (1900-1950)</strong></td>
<td>Establishment of the Greater Perth movement and Town Planning Association</td>
<td>First step towards centralisation of planning function with State Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Energetic promotion of value and need of SSP by civic leaders</td>
<td>• Introduction of Town Planning and Development Act and establishment of Commission for Metropolitan Region, 1928.</td>
<td>• Local government involvement in planning limited to subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparation of metropolitan plan by Commission in early 1930’s – not accepted by Government</td>
<td>• Introduction of effective planning mechanism (town planning schemes) to implement metropolitan planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Waning of interest in planning activity during and after 2nd World War</td>
<td>• Establishment of the Greater Perth movement and Town Planning Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Professional and Rational Planning (1950-1970)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Release of Stephenson/Hepburn Plan, 1955 - comprehensive master plan for future growth</td>
<td>• Royal Commission enquiry into state of planning, 1952</td>
<td>• Prime role of state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appointment of Hepburn as Planning Commissioner and Stephenson as consultant to Government – 1952/3</td>
<td>• Little interest shown in local government planning and limited response to preparation of town planning schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Metropolitan Region Scheme Act promulgated and substantial reform of planning system by establishment of statutory regional plan and authority and special tax for land acquisition for public purposes</td>
<td>• Interdependence of local and state government in strategic planning process recognised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning course set up at Perth Technical College</td>
<td>• Compulsory preparation of town planning schemes by state and provision of strategic and administrative guidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Federal intervention in planning (DURD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establishment of Joondalup Development Corporation, 1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Graham report on proposals for an integrated planning system, 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expansion of planning course – moved to West Australian Institute of Technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Election of Labor Government, 1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establishment of West Australian Development Corporation, 1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review of planning system identified deficiencies with system of plans, policies and controls and complicated nature of statutory planning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establishment of State Planning Commission, 1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Protection Authority Act, 1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establishment of Town Planning Appeals Tribunal, 1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Most local governments prepared town planning schemes by late 1970s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes in institutional structure maintained the dominance of state government in planning but provided for greater local government representation on State Planning Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rising polarisation between state and local government in planning arena in response to local planning issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Key Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Integrative Planning (1990-2001)** | • Rise in power of community groups opposing development in rural areas of the Metropolitan Area  
  • Release of State Planning Strategy, 1997  
  • Release of hierarchy of regional strategies, policies, structure plans and operational policies to provide guidance for town planning schemes, subdivision and development  
  • Growing interest in ‘New Urbanism’ and Planning for Liveable Neighbourhoods  
  • Western Australian Land Authority Act, 1992 (Landcorp)  
  • Election of Liberal /National Coalition Government, 1993  
  • Establishment of planning offices in the Regions.  
  • Establishment of West Australian Planning Commission with more members.  
  • East Perth, Subiaco and Midland Redevelopment Authorities established to create urban villages in inner city areas outside local government control  
  • Review of town planning scheme system and introduction of Model Scheme Text and LPS  
  • Establishment of Steering Committees with local government representation for all major strategic projects  
  • Local governments notified in writing of requirement to review schemes  
  • Consultation with local government, private industry and other stakeholders regarding new form of schemes. |
  • Emphasis on integration of land use and transportation  
  • Network City released (2004)  
  • Emphasis on Transport Oriented Design around stations on rail routes  
  • Election of Labor Government, 2001  
  • Creation of new Government department dealing with Planning and Transport  
  • Public participation program “Dialogue with City” undertaken in 2003/2004  
  • Review of statutory processes focused on streamlining of approvals  
  • Creation of Armadale Redevelopment Authority  
  • Focus on the State and Minister taking responsibility for strategic planning but within participatory governance framework  
  • Responsibility of local government in implementing state policies such as urban consolidation actively promoted by Minister for Planning and Infrastructure |
| **Big Picture and Reformist Planning (2008-2012)** | • Release of Directions 2031 and Beyond (2010)  
  • Initiation of major city projects, Perth Link and Waterfront, Riverside Gardens  
  • Release of State Planning Policy for Activity Centres  
  • Release of Public Transport Plan, 2011  
  • Draft Capital City Planning Framework – spatial strategy for central area  
  • Election of Liberal Government 2008 and splitting up of Department in 2009  
  • Significant reform process focused on improving planning system and greater strategic focus through legislative and institutional change  
  • Metropolitan review of local government with focus on boundary change  
  • Creation of Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority  
  • Establishment of planning program based on structure and project planning and new governance structures for implementation.  
  • Release of Framework for Integrated Strategic Planning for local government  
  • Focus on centralisation of state government and devolution of power of local government |
Professional and Rational Planning – 1950-1970

The post-war era from 1950-1970 was characterised by rapid population, suburban and industrial growth both globally and in Australia. During this period, planning had become a key function of state government activity, with planners charged with protecting the ‘public interest’. Planning evolved as an increasingly professional bureaucratic endeavour underpinned by scientific knowledge and technical skills. Greive (2000) notes that planning in WA became increasingly politicised in the wake of the growing population and increasing international migration attracted by large scale mining prospects in the north-west and the building of a refinery in Kwinana, a town in the southern metropolitan region. This prompted new interest in the idea of regional planning, and a recommendation by a Royal Commission in 1952 for a single planning authority for the whole state (Foley, 1995).

The Plan for the Metropolitan Region, Perth and Fremantle, 1955 (Figure 4.1) was prepared by government appointed experts, Professor Gordon Stephenson and Alistair Hepburn and represents the first formal expression of strategic spatial planning. Responding to the growth pressures of this period, it recognised the need to comprehensively plan for the upgrading of key state infrastructure such as rail transport and ports and provide for open space, sewerage, rubbish disposal and decentralised industrial areas (Gregory, 2012). It proposed a compact urban form centred on a large city centre, a secondary centre in Fremantle with expanded road and rail links between these centres and future urban areas on the outskirts of the city at Joondalup, Midland, Armadale and Rockingham (Yiftachel and Kenworthy, 1992).

Hedgcock and Hibbs (1992) saw the 1955 Plan being underpinned by the idea that planners at all levels were engaged in the promotion of balanced communities rather than individual interest and empowered through a sound planning system. It was accompanied by a suite of planning reforms that established a sound statutory framework for implementation through the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act 1959. This led to the introduction of a number of key institutional and policy changes to the planning system. They included: (i) the establishment of a statutory regional authority - Metropolitan Region Planning Authority (MRPA), responsible for strategic spatial and strategic statutory planning; (ii) the preparation of a statutory region plan - Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) to operate as a strategic zoning plan for the metropolitan region; and (iii) a hypothecated tax – Metropolitan Region Infrastructure Fund – to enable the acquisition of land for public purposes. In addition, district planning committees with local government representatives were established, ostensibly to improve coordination between the state and local governments.
The Stephenson-Hepburn Plan, and its accompanying legislation, recognised the interdependence of local and state government in the strategic spatial planning process and the important contribution of local planning through town planning schemes. It dispelled local government concerns about compensation by validating the legal status of planning control and at the same time mandated the preparation of town planning schemes and their five yearly reviews. More importantly, it encouraged strategic planning at the local level in Perth by providing an overarching strategic framework for future land uses, open space and major infrastructure in the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Figure 4.2) and guidance on the nature of schemes and their preparation through the Town Planning Regulations, 1967 (Government of Western Australia). Within this institutional framework, each level of government was seen to have a distinct role. State government was to commission, administer and implement the strategic plan. Local government would fill in the local details and provide for administration and implementation through town planning schemes (Gregory, 2012; Berry, 1992). At the time of release of the plan, only six local governments in WA had actually prepared schemes and despite this active encouragement, local government continued to show little interest in taking up this opportunity for local strategic planning.

The Stephenson-Hepburn plan was a good example of the traditional blueprint master plan of the period. Watson (2003) points to the survey-analysis-design approach of such plans, the promotion of principles such as aesthetics, efficiency and modernisation and implementation through zoning and development control. The Plan was based on rigorous production of data, clearly articulated opinions and values, proposed a spatial outcome of benefit to the community and was received with remarkable political consensus (Gregory, 2012; MacCallum and Hopkins, 2011). The plan has been criticised for the primacy it attributed to the private vehicle and its disregard for public transport (Newman, 2014; Seddon and Ravine cited in Gregory, 2012). Stephenson himself admitted that the plan did not foresee the extent of suburban development and the need for a decentralised pattern of future development (Gregory, 2012). Ultimately, the 1955 Plan has had an enduring influence on the development and urban form of the metropolitan area, particularly in terms of the control of land and reservation of land for public purposes. It continues to provide the strategic direction for growth and the bones of the legislative and institutional framework for planning in Perth.
Figure 4.1: Stephenson Hepburn Plan

Source: Stephenson and Hepburn (1955)
Figure 4.2: Metropolitan Region Scheme

Source: MRPA (1973)
Pragmatic and Economically Based Planning 1970-1990

The third major era in the evolution of WA’s planning system was a period broadly characterised by disenchantment about the economic and social impacts of modernist planning (1960-70), loss of economic stability (1970-1980) and the emergence of the environmental movement (1980-1990) (Freestone, 2000). This prompted the questioning of traditional planning and governance modes in general, and in a period of major change in WA, had inevitable ramifications for the nature of strategic spatial planning.

The late 1960s and 1970s saw sustained economic growth, exponential growth in car ownership and demands for urban land supply and with it an increasing emphasis on facilitating and managing growth in the Perth region (Hedgcock and Yiftachel, 1992). The ability of the MRPA to guide and direct strategic planning in the metropolitan area attracted increasing criticism and scepticism. Seddon (1972) in his seminal work Sense of Place, highlighted two reasons for this failure. On the one hand, local government had been provided with little guidance as to their planning role, and, on the other, there was a lack of authority over other agencies involved in the spatial planning process. In particular, Seddon regarded town planning schemes as no more than zoning diagrams and their certification a mere formality as the state government provided little direction and critical comment to ensure they reflected regional policy. Faced however with the pressing demands of accommodating rapid urban growth in Perth, the state government’s focus turned to the inadequacies of the Stephenson-Hepburn Plan to direct growth (Hedgcock and Yiftachel, 1992) and the need for a new strategic plan.

During this era, there was a notable thrust in public-led strategic planning activity at the state level and the production of three major strategic plans for the PMR. The first of these was the Corridor Plan for Perth, 1973 (MRPA, 1970) (see Figure 4.3). This was a schematic plan indicating a redistribution of growth along four major metropolitan corridors to the north-west, south-west, south-east and east, in order to improve equitable access to services for the planned sub-regional centres of Fremantle, Midland, Joondalup, Armadale and Rockingham.

The Corridor Plan, according to Yiftachel and Hedgcock (1992), was prepared at the peak of scientific–rationalist planning but also, as MacCallum and Hopkins (2011) note, at a time of uncertainty and questioning of what constituted the public interest, rising interest in the environment and public participation. Although the 1973 Plan built upon the blueprint of the Stephenson Hepburn Plan, it was significantly different in a number of areas. First, unlike the 1955 Plan, the Corridor Plan was subjected to public debate, political involvement and power play. Next, the plan took an apolitical stance in stark contrast to the bold political commitment of government as reflected in the 1955 Plan.
(MacCallum and Hopkins, 2011). In a substantive sense, it had a narrower perspective on economic growth and facilitating development (MacCallum and Hopkins, 2011). Operationally, it was not set up to guide and control growth, but identified the need for a second level of state strategic planning, the preparation of structure plans for each corridor to guide and direct the preparation of town planning schemes (Stokes and Hill, 1992).

The second plan during this era, Planning for the Future of the Perth Metropolitan Region (Review Group, 1987), was essentially a review of the deficiencies identified in the Corridor Plan (Figure 4.4). These included: (i) lack of development in sub-regional centres; (ii) continued concentration of employment in the CBD; (iii) congestion; (iv) the high cost of infrastructure provision; and (v) social isolation associated with continued low density expansion along corridors (Stokes and Hill, 1992).

The 1987 Plan, which only reached draft status, had a relatively bold vision in terms of urban containment within the metropolitan area, the creation of employment opportunities, priorities for road construction and public transport and extensions to regional open space. It also proposed a new institutional initiative, the Metropolitan Development Program, designed to coordinate public works with private sector urban development.

More than 1,200 submissions were received to the proposals, opposing the urbanisation of semi–rural and bushland areas and expressing concerns about designation of commercial centres and the future role of public transport. Implementation of what was potentially a bold attempt to limit urban sprawl in the PMR, required strong political and policy leadership at the state government level, in the face of this daunting display of community opposition. The ensuing result was essentially a pragmatic response with the release of the third plan, Metroplan (DPUD, 1990). This strategic plan retained only 65% of the urban land identified in the draft plan, claiming responsiveness to public interest and involvement (Stokes and Hill, 1992) but opening the way for further urban sprawl. The implementation of this plan is discussed more fully in the following era of ‘integrative planning’.
Figure 4.3: Corridor Plan

Source: MRPA (1970)
Berry (1992) contends that local planning in the 1960s and early 1970s was limited with most planning undertaken by building surveyors within a rigid statutory system and little interest from planners to work in this area. There was however one example of successful local strategic planning during this period whereby local government exercised significant intervention via the use of resumptive and guided development schemes. These schemes, typically carried out in physically constrained areas, authorised the acquisition and assembly of land, construction of physical infrastructure, re-subdivision of the land within a defined strategic framework and full recovery of costs from the landowners. Although seemingly a democratic and equitable means of coordinating development at the local level, the development scheme mechanism has rarely been used by local government since the 1980s. The costs and difficulties of administering the financial aspects of such schemes, led in some cases to dismissal of local councils and the rise of community awareness and general mistrust of authority proved to be effective deterrents.

By the late 1970s however, the situation had changed radically. Perth was facing planning pressures on a number of fronts which gave rise to increased interest in planning at the local government level. There were concerns about inner-city development, particularly the loss of industries, transport and congestion issues, growing community interest in planning activity and a rise in conflict between local and central control (Hedgcock and Yiftachel, 1992). Interest in the profession had been buoyed by the provision of a planning course in the late 1960s at what is now Curtin University. Gradually, as more qualified planners became employed in the local government sector, a Local Government Planning Association was set up and, more importantly, most metropolitan local governments had prepared town planning schemes by the end of this period (Berry, 1992).

The influence of such statutory schemes on land use and development patterns was substantial. Their zoning designations, density codes and development controls were seen by some (Yiftachel and Kenworthy, 1992) as exerting not only a greater influence on development than the state, but also creating an adverse influence on metropolitan planning objectives, such as residential density and urban centre development. In particular, Bain and Hedgcock (1992) contended that this form of local strategic planning, influenced by the nature of local governance, had actively contributed to residential, population and industrial decline in inner city localities. Such schemes, in their view, pursued physical solutions to physical problems with little analysis or understanding of their social, environmental and economic outcomes. Not only did they reflect a lack of professional expertise and a narrow political spectrum of opinion, they were also constrained by their lack of authority in the areas of transport and infrastructure, the policy domain of state government administration (Bain and Hedgcock, 1992).
Figure 4.4 - Planning for the Future of the Perth Metropolitan Region

Source: Review Group (1987)
The thrust to facilitate urban growth and development in the 1970s gained momentum in the 1980s, a period regarded by some as the height of political neo-liberalism (MacCallum and Hopkins, 2011). Planning emerged as a tool for economic growth with the new Labor Government, during what is referred to as the infamous “WA Inc” era, interested in lifting the state out of recession and actively participating in the market and development projects (Hedgcock and Yiftachel, 1992). In the same period, the then Labor government initiated a major review of the planning system in WA amid concerns about the costs and delays associated with statutory processing. The O’Meara Review (1984) concluded that the statutory framework for planning was sound, but the problem rested with the complicated nature of its process and the implementation of the duties by state and local government and other agencies involved in land use planning. The need to simplify and streamline the statutory planning process was identified and this remains an enduring facet of subsequent planning reform programs throughout Australia and in WA (Freestone et al, 2012; Maginn and Foley, 2014). What also emerged in the 1984 review was the need to improve the link between strategic and statutory planning. This was seen to require not only improved collaboration between local and state government, but also acknowledgement of the strategic function of region and local planning schemes. A key recommendation of this review was the inclusion of a ‘Written Statement’ to explain the strategic intent of key statutory documents, the Metropolitan Region Scheme and local government town planning schemes (O’Meara, 1984).

Perth – Planning and Governance after 1990

*Integrative Era 1990-2001*

Whilst a neo-liberalist philosophy and the need for economic efficiency had dominated political thinking since the 1990s, it was not immune from the demands for community involvement and civil discontent over environmental degradation. Hamnett (2000:182) describes the 1990s as ‘quintessentially the decade of strategic planning’ but also points out that government at the time was focused on facilitating development through a regulatory agenda.

Predominantly governed by a Liberal Coalition state government in WA, planning and governance activity operated within a national policy direction towards seeking integrated solutions to urban development (Wiseman, 2005; Gleeson and Low, 2004). What emerged at the political and bureaucratic level during this era was a belief in the potential of strategic spatial planning to improve urban governance. Perhaps more importantly, there was recognition of the need to provide a comprehensive planning framework to link and support state and local government planning. In particular, the potential to coordinate and facilitate a whole of government approach to urban development through the unique institutional legacy of an independent metropolitan commission in
WA, appeared to be firmly grasped. The State Planning Commission was replaced with the creation of the West Australian Planning Commission (WAPC), with increased membership and the inclusion of the heads of state government departments involved in land use planning (Maginn and Foley 2014). Other institutional changes reflected the emerging call for better collaboration and communication which had become one of the hallmarks of mainstream planning activity during this era. Included in this was the setting up of state government planning offices in the regions, working groups and steering committees across the state to encourage active engagement of local government and other stakeholders in planning processes.

*Metroplan* (DPUD, 1990), the key strategic document of this period for the PMR, was broad in scope and promoted as an integral part of the political process (Stokes and Hill, 1992) (see Figure 4.5). The policy discourse in the plan had shifted to a wider perspective associated with sustainability and the need to consider a combination of social, economic and environmental outcomes, all of which ultimately required to be translated into statutory action. A concerted attempt was made to bridge the gap between strategic planning vision and statutory planning at the local level, both in the regions and metropolitan areas, by production of an expansive suite of plans and policies. This was undoubtedly, as several interview respondents pointed out, an energetic and productive period in the historical background of strategic planning in WA, undertaken by a relatively small state government department.

At the top of the hierarchy was a State Planning Strategy, outlining a broad economic, environmental and social planning agenda for WA through to 2029 (WAPC, 1997). In the metropolitan area, structure plans were released for the each of the development corridors: (i) *Foothills Structure Plan*, 1992; (ii) *North West Corridor Structure Plan*, 1992; (iii) *North West Corridor Structure Plan – Yanchep*, 1993; (iv) *South West Corridor Structure Plan*, 1993; (v) *North East Corridor Structure Plan*, 1994; and, (vi) *South East Corridor (South of Armadale) Structure Plan*, 1996. Three regional centres were also produced: (i) *Canning Regional Centre Structure Plan*, 1991; (ii) *Morley Regional Centre Structure Plan*, 1992; and (iii) *Stirling Regional Centre Structure Plan*, 1994. Further plans provided for the development of regional parks – *Yellagonga Regional Park*, 1992; *Beeliar Regional Park*, 1993; *Darling Range Regional Park*, 1995 –and major highways –*Stirling Highway Policy Plan*, 1990.
Figure 4.5: Metroplan

Source: DPUD (1990)
A suite of state planning policies and strategies were released to provide guidance on a broad range of specific planning issues during this era and the early 2000s:

- SPP2.3 Jandakot Groundwater Protection Policy, 1998;
- SPP4.3 Poultry Farms Policy, 1998;
- SPP2.4 Basic Raw Materials, 2000;
- SPP4.2 Metropolitan Centres Policy Statement for the Perth Metropolitan Region, 2000;
- SPP3.2 Planning for Aboriginal Communities, 2000;
- SPP2.5 Agriculture and Rural Land Use Planning, 2002;
- SPP2.6 State Coastal Planning Policy, 2003;
- SPP2 Environment and Natural Resources Policy, 2003;
- SPP2.7 Public Drinking Water Source Policy, 2003;
- SPP5.1 Land Use Planning in the Vicinity of Perth Airport, 2004;
- SPP5.2 Telecommunications Infrastructure, 2004.

An overarching policy, *Statement of Planning Policy 1 – State Planning Framework Policy, 1998* (SPP1) was developed to consolidate all existing state and regional policies which applied to land use and development in Western Australia (WAPC, 1998). Critically, SPP1 recognised the importance of the link between state and local planning and this is illustrated in Figure 4.6. An explicit objective of SPP1 was to provide guidance to local governments in preparing planning schemes and to ensure as part of the assessment process that they were consistent with state and regional policies (SPC, 1998). This consolidated thrust to expand planning policy reflected the public policy debate at that time about joined up governance, policy settings to achieve economic, social and environmental sustainability and the need for government direction (Wiseman, 2005). It also represented a move to rebrand planning as a positive force in promoting more effective urban governance (Nadin, 2007).

Concerns about the quality and variability in local planning schemes were given early attention by the state government in consultation with local government during this period. Whilst schemes were recognised as having a positive value, providing for public input, certainty, predictability and regulating development, they were seen as lacking flexibility and sensitivity to changing market and community needs and unable to articulate and implement growth and development of their municipal area (Stokes, 1992). In an effort to standardise schemes, the Model Scheme Text was introduced, but at the same time the state government sought to enhance their strategic planning potential by introducing a requirement for a *Local Planning Strategy* (LPS). This was to replace the somewhat static Scheme Report, which in most cases had only provided background local information to explain the intent and provisions for the scheme with little attention to wider state planning objectives. This reflected theoretical views about the value of local strategic planning given its ability to understand the needs of the community and its potential to promote local economies and structural change (Hohn and Neuer, 2006)
The LPS objectives were to set out clearly and coherently the aims of each local government for longer term growth within the context of broader state and regional policies, set the local context for more detailed policies, plans and local guidelines and provide a firm basis for rational and consistent decision making on planning matters (Stokes, 1992). This initiative not only reflected the theoretical turn to more strategic and integrated planning in a wider governance framework, but also followed planning practice elsewhere. It had strong parallels to the introduction of the single district wide local plan and unitary development plans introduced in legislation in the UK in 1991 (Rozee, 2008). Closer to home, it had similarities to the local environmental plan in New South Wales originally introduced in the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 and the municipal strategic statement in Victoria (Planning and Environment - (Planning Schemes) Act 1996). This was undoubtedly a decisive attempt to address the disjuncture between metropolitan planning objectives and local planning direction and encourage a more integrated approach to future planning.

This era also saw the emergence of a range of new planning styles (Brindley et al, 1996) and governance solutions (Madanipour, 2001) in an effort to improve urban governance. Public transport and land use solutions such as transit oriented development, building on the past decision to electrify existing rail lines and construct the new northern line in the late 1980s were identified (Curtis, 2011). The growing interest in urban design, influenced by the international recognition of the “New Urbanism” movement prompted the undertaking of a series of ‘Enquiry by Design” workshops in areas with development opportunities. This reflected wider shifts to partnering and an entrepreneurial form of governance (Healey, 2006) and the enduring idea that urban design contributed to more sophisticated environmentalism and a better quality of life (Fainstein, 2000). In line with the wider objectives of facilitating growth and deregulation, the East Perth Redevelopment Authority (EPRA) was established, boosted by Federal funds, and marked the beginnings of a government intervention program to create ‘urban villages’ in post-industrial urban areas. This redevelopment authority model was later extended to another inner-city area, Subiaco, and the outer-suburban areas of Midland and Armadale.
This account of the period between 1900 and 2001 sets out the planning and governance circumstances in the PMR which led up to the introduction of the LPS in 1999. The next part of this chapter deals with those circumstances for the period between 2001 and 2013. This was the period when local governments were required to respond to the LPS requirement and given its more recent history and the currency of some of the plans, this predictably attracted more response and comments from interviewees.

**Sustainable and Deliberative Era 2001-2008**

Vigar et al (2000) note that although planning policy continued to focus on economic growth at the turn of the century, environmental issues were re-emerging. Simultaneously, there was a ‘democratic turn’ in planning, and urban politics more generally, with the emergence of participatory governance that emphasised sustainability as a consolidated response to a range of economic, social, environmental and ecological concerns. During this era in WA, the then recently elected Labor Government, under Premier Geoff Gallop, exhibited a strong commitment to the ideas of
sustainability, strategic planning and participatory democracy (Maginn, 2007; Hopkins, 2010). The commitment to these issues was reflected on a number of fronts. First, the Premier set up the Civics and Citizens Unit whose aim was to promote greater public consultation and participation in state government policymaking. A State Sustainability Strategy (WA Government 2003) was released and the Departments of Planning and Transport were consolidated into a single comprehensive bureaucratic entity, Department of Planning and Infrastructure (DPI).

This commitment to inclusive and participatory decision-making and environmental sustainability was championed by the then Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, Alannah MacTiernan. This was particularly evident in the development of Network City (WA Government, 2004), the draft strategic plan for Perth produced during her time in office. As part of the policy development underpinning Network City, the Minister convened a major exercise in deliberative democracy, Dialogue with the City, with the aim of developing a consensus and potentially a mandate for effective implementation of a new spatial planning strategy for the City (Hopkins, 2010; Maginn, 2007; Albrechts, 2006). This was a distinct shift towards placing the planning role in the political arena. As one respondent commented:

>This was an unusual step to ask the broader public to give the direction on an area of professional expertise.......it not only undermined the professional role of planning but was also a ‘serious indictment on the ability of the Department to carry out strategic planning

(Respondent 7)

On the face of it, the Network City Plan (Figure 4.7) and its processes appeared to be a decisive response to improved collaboration, a broader spatial planning approach. It introduced some debate about alternatives and options for growth (Nadin, 2007) and demonstrated a more sophisticated and strategic approach to public participation than in past plan making (Hopkins, 2010) and elevated planning at a political level. It was however subject to considerable criticism from a number of directions. Several respondents pointed to:

>‘…a lack of fulsome analysis in these plans of the wider issues facing the region such as identification of areas for employment growth, location of hospitals and universities and promotion of sustainable settlement patterns using formal analytical methods and a credible evidence base.... The emphasis was seen to be more about process than substance, facilitating development, driven by ABS population statistics, economic or transport priorities rather than a comprehensive strategic overview.’

(Respondent 7)

The validity of the deliberative aspect of the participation process was questioned, particularly its ability to achieve equity amongst stakeholders and achieve a consensus about future direction
(Hopkins, 2010; Maginn, 2007). The plan was particularly criticised for its lack of direction on implementation and its conflicting and confused recommendations (MacCallum and Hopkins, 2011).

Perhaps the most significant shift in this period was a distinct turn in mainstream planning away from integrated strategic policy to project planning as a means to provide strategic delivery and concerted attention to the improvement of statutory planning processes. State government resources were directed to a raft of urban projects to promote transit oriented design in major activity centres along existing rail routes. While the issues of servicing and land pooling have been resolved in a few cases through active involvement by Landcorp and other state agencies, many of these plans remained shelved until the difficulties of implementation can be addressed. Following Premier Gallop’s departure and appointment of Alan Carpenter as his successor in 2006, there was less emphasis on participatory democracy and sustainability and more emphasis on managing the demands of the mining boom, the demand for land supply and economic competitiveness. The reform of statutory planning to ensure more efficient processing of applications was given a high priority, prompted by the property boom which took place in 2006-2007, the spectre of shortages and affordability of urban land in the metropolitan region and considerable pressure from various lobby groups in the property industry. Freestone (2012) attributes this to the neo-liberal orthodoxy pervading Australia in the past decade and its focus on facilitation of economic growth.

The dominance of the state in the planning process and the responsibility of local government to deliver on state and regional policy were reasserted in this era. For Hopkins (2010), the Network City idea of a publicly-mandated city-wide vision based on a compact city has a twofold effect. In the first instance, it reduces the power of local government to set their own strategic direction. And, secondly, it places more responsibility on local government for implementing state government directives. In many respects, this was a return to the past view of the relationship between state and local government with a decidedly secondary and subservient role for the latter. In the view of several of the respondents, the symbiotic relationship between strategic and statutory planning seemed to be poorly understood and the chasm between the two main streams of planning widened considerably. The 1999 concept of local strategic spatial planning within a clear regional planning framework, actively undertaken by local government through discussion, collaboration and negotiation with state government, appeared to lose impetus in this era and was clearly dwarfed by this new planning agenda.
Figure 4.7: Network City Plan

Following the unexpected defeat of the incumbent Labor Party in the 2008 state election, the newly elected Liberal-National coalition government moved quickly to stamp its authority on planning on two major fronts. First, the government outlined that it would significantly reform the planning system. The planning reform agenda is now in its second phase of policy roll-out - *Planning Makes It Happen: Phase Two - Planning Reform Discussion Paper* (WAPC 2013). Secondly, a new metropolitan plan was to be devised. Put simply, the new government’s planning agenda was explicitly about sustaining economic development and ‘cutting red tape’ (Maginn and Foley, 2014).

In terms of strategic spatial planning, the government released its new broad spatial strategy for the Perth and Peel Metropolitan Region, *Directions 2031 and Beyond* (WAPC, 2010) (Figure 4.8) to manage the expected growth of the population in Perth and Peel. MacCallum and Hopkins (2011) regarded this plan as a normalised version of the urban growth principles of *Network City* with the intent of providing a spatial framework for future implementation. The plan designated areas for future development, largely reflecting developers’ intentions at the time, but provided no evidence of strategic analysis of such localities. This analysis was deferred to the second stage of strategic planning, the preparation of a detailed sub-regional planning framework for each corridor. Some three years later these remain ‘a work in progress’ delayed by the need to satisfy the Federal requirements for strategic environmental assessment and the lack of an evidence base to justify urban growth patterns in the region.

Strategic planning delivery has continued through project planning and has been firmly encapsulated in the state government’s political agenda of promoting the ‘Bigger Picture’. This has taken the form of major projects in the city, rather than a visionary spatial plan for the PMR. It includes the Elizabeth Quay waterfront development, Riverside Gardens and the Perth City Link. Several projects outside the central area such as the Stirling Centre, Cockburn Centre and new health centres at Nedlands and Murdoch have been undertaken. The implementation of major development or redevelopment is undertaken largely within a large new governance structure, the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority (MRA), which absorbed the four existing redevelopment authorities, but also through various protocols, alliances and delivery assistance by Landcorp, the development arm of government.

The planning reform process during this era has substantially increased its focus on improving and streamlining application processes. Significant legislative changes have occurred with the introduction of development assessment panels to deal with high value development applications and
increased authority to the Minister for Planning to intervene in rezoning and other planning processes. Recent reform document provisions Planning Makes It Happen: Phase Two -Planning Reform Discussion Paper (WAPC, 2013) and Discussion Paper – Local Planning Schemes Regulations, 2014 (WAPC, 2014) focus on the standardisation of statutory provisions in local planning schemes but pays scant attention to the strategic element of schemes and the efficacy of the LPS. The review and release of policies have generally reflected the state government’s agenda to facilitate growth and improve statutory processes. These have included: Activities Centre State Planning Policy (WAPC, 2011), Residential Design Codes, (WAPC, 2013), State Planning Policy 3.6 - Development Contributions for Infrastructure (WAPC, 2009).

Two important state government initiatives undertaken in this era have implications for strategic planning at the local level, and illustrate further the widening in the gap between state and local government in understanding and implementing local strategic planning. The first is an independent review of metropolitan local government, intent on reducing the number of local governments, with the view that this will significantly contribute to “achieving metropolitan wide social, economic and environmental goals of prosperity, environmental sustainability and justice” (Metropolitan Local Government Review, 2012:123). In July 2013 the Liberal Government announced a plan to create 14 local government areas over the next two years in the region. The proposed amalgamations were largely premised on argument that this would result in efficiency and economies of scale – this initiative has since been abandoned. Fewer and larger local governments were seen as a move to facilitate state strategic planning, link the strategic directions of state and local government, attract better professional staff and improve collaboration with public and private stakeholders (Metropolitan Local Government Review, 2012). Interestingly, the review report identified some of the key characteristics of the WA planning and governance landscape which are seen to obstruct effective strategic planning at the local level. These included: (i) responsibility continues to reside with the state for the provision of physical and social infrastructure rather than local government; (ii) there is limited understanding of the driving forces behind city development; (ii) lack of evidence based planning; and (iii) poor integration within and between levels of government. These have been consistently highlighted in past literature and reviews (O’Meara, 1984; Seddon, 1972) and reflect the deficiencies of the current approaches to strategic planning (Albrechts, 2004).

The second initiative is part of the local government reform process for an integrated strategic planning framework (Department of Local Government, 2010), that requires councils to prepare a 10 year ‘Strategic Community Plan’ (SCP) in collaboration with the local community. This reflects the direction of wider local government planning reform (Dollery et al, 2006) and the introduction of a
similar overarching policy statement for each local government in the UK during the early 2000s. The Department of Local Government in WA has no urban planning remit and the plan has a corporate emphasis on improving local business delivery rather than promoting integrated solutions to urban governance. As pointed out by Tewdr-Jones and Morphet (2006), this raises the potential for tension with spatial planning instruments, which is the LPS in this case. There are also some opportunities for synergies between the two documents if properly managed.

In summary, there have been significant shifts in both the state and local planning and governance contexts over the past three periods and these are likely to have had a substantial impact on the implementation of strategic planning at the local level. The state planning framework and the lead documents within this framework, the strategic plans, have a significant role in providing overarching guidance to local government in undertaking this role. A more detailed analysis of the shifts in nature and emphasis of each of the major strategic plans, released for the PMR, assists in explaining the potential impact.
Figure 4.8: Directions 2031 and Beyond

“by 2031, Perth people will have created a world class liveable city; green, vibrant, more compact and accessible with a unique sense of place”

“The region will have grown to a population of 2.2 million, which represents over a half a million new residents to be housed in 328,000 new dwellings and needing 353,000 new jobs”

“To meet this growth, Directions 2031 recognises that we must work with the current form of the city to achieve greater consolidation; we must make more efficient use of land and infrastructure; and we must prioritise land that is already zoned”

Source: WAPC, 2010
An Evaluation of Strategic Plans for the Perth Metropolitan Region

Strategic planning at the state level sets out the broad objectives for urban governance in its plans and policies and provides the essential framework for the process of local strategic planning. Strategic spatial plans have been pivotal in the planning landscape of WA, although there is some doubt about the effectiveness of their implementation and actual influence on settlement patterns and sustainable development (MacCallum and Hopkins, 2011; Adams, 2010). An evaluation of the performance of each of the major strategic plans for the PMR in terms of the theoretical expectations for more effective strategic planning is therefore useful, as it provides some indication of how the emphasis in the substance of such plans has shifted over time and how this may have influenced the approach to implementation of state and regional planning objectives at the local government level.

A key theme in the theoretical debates about strategic planning as outlined in Chapter 2 is the past failure of traditional approaches to make a significant contribution to effective governance in our increasingly complex urban areas and the need for substantial change to its nature, form and process. It is argued that the nature of such planning needs to be more broad based and indicative (Albrechts, 2006), focus on significant issues rather than comprehensiveness (Bunker and Searle, 2007) and be accompanied by a sound implementation framework (Stein, 2011, Hillier, 2007; Healey, 2007). Planning should take the central and leading role, operating variously as a mediator, collaborator and facilitator and with a high level of institutional support (Rydin, 2011; Albrechts, 2010; Shaw and Lord, 2009). The processes associated with this more sophisticated plan making should be based on formal analytical methods and robust evidence to arrive at outcomes (Stein, 2011; Nadin, 2007) and employ open, participative and inclusive processes (Shaw and Lord, 2009; Albrechts, 2006). The framework drawn from this debate, to be used in this evaluation of the plans and described in Chapter 3, is based on the following seven key criteria:

(i) a broad based spatial planning approach which is visionary and wide ranging but also provides a frame of reference that gives direction and justifies specific action.

(ii) a focus on selection of significant issues rather than attempting comprehensiveness.

(iii) planning taking the leading role.

(iv) planning engaged in facilitation, mediation and collaboration.

(v) an open and participative process.

(vi) use of formal analytical frameworks and a sound evidence base.

(vii) an effective implementation framework.
An evaluation of the performance of each of the strategic plans for the PMR is undertaken drawing on available literature, (MacCallum and Hopkins, 2011; Bunker and Searle, 2009; Albrechts, 2006; Stokes and Hill, 1992) and the views expressed by interview respondents. A simple scoring mechanism (1 = Does not comply with criteria; 2 = Satisfactorily meets criteria; 3 = Substantially satisfies criteria) was used for the evaluation and is displayed in Table 4.2. Figure 4.9 provides a useful illustration of the shifts in strategic direction over the past 50 years, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of each of the plans, when evaluated against these benchmarks for effective strategic planning.

**Analysis Findings and Implications for Local Strategic Planning**

Since the formal establishment of strategic spatial planning in the 1950s in WA, there has clearly been a significant shift in the form of strategic plans from planning blueprints to plans based more on policy and principles and processes that are reflective of the state government in power. MacCallum and Hopkins (2011) note two other significant shifts. The first occurred in the 1970s with the shift in concern to abstract efficiency rather than concrete human needs. The second in the 1990s marked a significant shift in the planning role from steering to rowing and the inclusion of soft, reactive recommendations such as support, encourage and promote growth in place of interventionism. These shifts in the nature and process of these plans over the past 60 years are a reflection of wider political, intellectual and institutional shifts in planning and governance, but also the influences of the particular demands of the region in terms of urban growth and public opinion.
## TABLE 4.2 - Comparative Analysis of Strategic Plans in Perth Metropolitan Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad and Indicative Spatial Planning Approach</td>
<td>'Professional and Technical’</td>
<td>'Pragmatic/Economic’</td>
<td>'Integrative’</td>
<td>'Sustainable &amp; Deliberative’</td>
<td>'Big Picture &amp; Reformist’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term ‘blueprint’ planning prescribing land use and infrastructure development</td>
<td>Schematic plan based on universal trends for ‘corridor planning’ complemented by more detailed plans for each corridor</td>
<td>General framework for economic growth.</td>
<td>Broad based spatial strategy and management framework based on idea of networks and relational view of space.</td>
<td>Broad based spatial strategy, network based but specific designation of future urban growth nodes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive but strong link with infrastructure provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on issues that matter</td>
<td>Control and direction of efficient growth pattern to meet human needs and aspirations relating to employment, housing and open space.</td>
<td>Concerned with maximum economic efficiency in coordination and release of land for urban growth.</td>
<td>Main focus on economic growth but recognition of social diversity, heritage, urban design and environmental protection.</td>
<td>Focused on wide range of issues within and outside traditional planning (e.g. employment growth, education, social cultural capital).</td>
<td>Focused on wider issues of but also specific land use and development action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning R as the Leader</td>
<td>Primacy of plan and its commissioning, administering and implementing by state government</td>
<td>Interventionist plan by state government to shape form but attempt to separate politics from business of planning.</td>
<td>Less interventionist response to the market and joint action with private development sector. Shift from directing to steering planning.</td>
<td>Broad spatial plan and politicisation of planning role - ultimate responsibility still with state government.</td>
<td>Broad spatial plan not integrated with infrastructure provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning a facilitator, mediator, collaborators</td>
<td>Engagement with state agencies involved in land use planning process</td>
<td>Engagement with state agencies involved in land use planning process</td>
<td>Planning seen as having a strong role in facilitation, mediation and collaboration</td>
<td>Facilitative public participation process, less evidence of mediation and collaboration</td>
<td>Planning primarily in collaboration with development industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Professional and Technical’</td>
<td>‘Pragmatic/Economic’</td>
<td>‘Integrative’</td>
<td>‘Sustainable &amp; Deliberative’</td>
<td>‘Big Picture &amp; Reformist’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open, Participative and Inclusive Process</td>
<td>Assumed consensus on principles of planning.</td>
<td>Subject to criticism and enquiry and responds to criticism plan by justifying plan in report</td>
<td>Emphasis on consultation and collaboration with all stakeholders but assumed consensus on principles of economic growth and urban form.</td>
<td>Concerted, well publicised attempt for deliberative and participative planning dialogue and more openness</td>
<td>Public seen as beneficiaries of good planning rather than active participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound evidence base and use of formal analytical frameworks</td>
<td>Legitimation based on use of technical information and professional expertise.</td>
<td>Legitimation based on scientific method.</td>
<td>Legitimation linked to assumed consensus about economic growth.</td>
<td>Legitimation based on consensus building exercise</td>
<td>Legitimation based on good planning principles rather than sound evidence base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Implementation Framework</td>
<td>Promoted at the highest level of government through expert consultants. Sound legislative and policy implementation framework involving local government.</td>
<td>Implementation poorly resourced little evidence of integration with other service agencies.</td>
<td>Government returns to foreground with Ministerial involvement Production of expansive suite of supporting plans and policies to implement plan</td>
<td>Broadening of governance arrangements to implement policy but no clear implementation framework</td>
<td>No clear implementation framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(MacCallum and Hopkins, 2011; Bunker and Searle, 2009; Albrechts, 2006; Stokes and Hill, 1992)
An interesting observation in this evaluation is that the first plan, *Plan for the Metropolitan Region, Perth and Fremantle, 1955* (SH Plan) meets most of the criteria whereas the most recent plan, *Directions 2031 and Beyond* (DR 2031), shows the most significant departure from the criteria.

Two of the criteria require a broad and indicative spatial planning approach and a focus on issues that matter rather than comprehensiveness. That spatial planning approach is intended to be visionary and wide ranging extending beyond a narrow and prescriptive land use focus (Taylor, 2010), but also one which provides a frame of reference that gives direction and justifies specific action (Albrechts, 2010). The SH Plan provides a distinctive vision for the desired end state of Perth in the form of a prescriptive blueprint for the growth and development of land use and infrastructure in the region. It has a clear focus on physical planning outcomes which it considers will provide balanced urban growth and sound infrastructure provision seen to be in the overall interest of the community. Subsequent plans continue the emphasis on urban growth but gradually move to comprehensiveness before embracing the wider mantle of sustainability. The *Corridor Plan for Perth, 1973* (CP), responds to rapid growth demands in the 1970s but moves away from prescription, presenting a
schematic view of the general shape of urban development within future transport corridors. *Metroplan* (MP) in the 1990s responds to the perceived failures of planning and recognition of urban complexity producing a general framework for growth (MacCallum and Hopkins, 2011). It also has a strong focus on facilitation of economic growth but widens its scope to acknowledge other issues such as social diversity, heritage, urban design and environment. *Network City* (NC) embodies the idea of a broader spatial planning approach by acknowledging a more fluid and dynamic urban environment (Albrechts, 2006), promoting a conceptual view of urban growth integrated with transport networks (Bunker and Searle, 2009) and extending into areas mandated by other agencies (MacCallum and Hopkins, 2011). It claims to be interventionist and visionary, but in effect does not propose any material change (MacCallum and Hopkins, 2011). The most recent plan although promoted as a broad spatial planning framework for development with a wider scope than planning and including firm benchmarks, targets and directions for growth, still limits its actions to land use and development. Both *Network City* and *Directions 2031* embrace a wide range of issues within the broader mantle of sustainability. In overall terms, there has been little indication of a move away from traditional planning with its focus on land-use zoning and sub-division, to a spatial planning approach which gives emphasis to policy integration and improved collaboration between those involved in the land use planning of the state.

The role of planning in this plan making has also shown some distinctive shifts. The leadership role of planning so firmly entrenched in the primacy of the SH Plan, its implementation and administration by state government and its assumption of cooperation of other agencies has never been reasserted in subsequent plans. The role of planning as a facilitator, mediator and collaborator emerges in the case of *Metro Plan* and *Network City* with the conscious move from steering to rowing. In the former, this is expressed in its subsequent implementation framework of sub-regional planning, policy formulation and institutional changes to improve collaboration within state government and with local government and other stakeholders (Respondent 9). The *Network City* plan was prepared within the context of a significant institutional change, amalgamation of the key Departments of Planning and Transport to improve collaboration between two major land use planning agencies and attempts to reach consensus about future growth with the wider public through dialogue. Unfortunately, due to a lack of an implementation framework it failed to establish the necessary link with other agencies involved in land use planning to achieve this objective.

The commitment to open and participative processes is expressed more strongly in *Metro Plan* and *Network City*, although the veracity of this process has been subject to criticism. It is notably absent
in the SH plan process with an assumption of a consensus about town planning principles (MacCallum and Hopkins, 2011) and the most recent plan, Directions 2031.

There is far less emphasis on the use of analytical frameworks and the establishment of a sound evidence base to explain their recommendations in all the plans released after the SH Plan. The SH plan included analytical projections based on quantitative information about physical conditions (MacCallum and Hopkins, 2011) to demonstrate an evidence base to support the direction of the plan. Nadin (2009) attributes this trend to the shift from technocratic planning approaches to more interactive and collaborative approaches, but also to the emphasis on speed and efficiency in the planning process. The other conclusion of the analysis indicates a distinctive change in the nature of implementation frameworks. The SH plan is notable for its clear link between vision and implementation framework and responsible for the establishment of an ongoing statutory framework for planning in WA. Whilst subsequent plans have expanded their scope and paid attention to discourse on more effective governance of urban areas, supporting implementation frameworks have been an ongoing omission.

The shifting emphasis and form of strategic plans over this period has inevitable consequences for local strategic planning. In the first place, the broadening of the agenda for good urban governance to encompass wider economic, social and environmental sustainability objectives has not been accompanied by comprehensive sub-regional planning and policy support to assist in interpreting and applying such principles at the local level. The two most recent strategic plans, NC and DR 2031 for Perth offer much in the way of rhetoric on issues such as urban consolidation, lifestyle choice, affordable housing and sustainable urban transport. As one respondent pointed out:

‘…such plans fall short of demonstrating how such discourses translate into policy direction with supporting implementation frameworks and governance initiatives to direct and manage the envisaged changes.’

(Respondent 9)

Planning reform and governance has shifted notably over this period. As one interviewee (Respondent 8) noted there has been a rhetorical shift in the focus of planning reform documents from ‘planning for people’ in the last century to ‘planning makes it happen’ in the new century. Despite the consistent review of strategic plans since the 1970s, several respondents observed that the broad strategic direction of the past has not changed in any significant way, and the focus has continued on areas for new urban growth. This reflects, to some extent, the demands for certainty and direction about the spatial pattern for future development (Bunker and Searle, 2007) and a bargaining and negotiating process with the development industry (Nadin, 2007). Most respondents saw strategic plans as
effective in identifying and managing new areas for urban growth in the outer areas of the city and to some extent preventing the servicing impacts of leapfrogging and minimising environmental impacts. There was a general consensus amongst respondents that all of the plans since the first plans for the city in 1955 had been far less effective in managing growth and development within the existing urban area of the PMR.

In addition, the shift in strategic planning towards a wider range of objectives involving many players other than those engaged in planning depends on the involvement, collaboration with and commitment by these multiple stakeholders. As these responsibilities are not properly understood or clearly defined and planning continues to lack authority and leadership skills to effect implementation, this adds complexity to the task of local strategic planning. Finally, the expectancy of the role of local government in delivering local strategic planning has seldom been made clear and continually shifted in position as state government has sought to establish what is required.

**Conclusion**

The historical account of planning and governance in WA and the PMR discloses some key findings and messages for the study of local strategic planning and its contribution to urban governance. Greive (2000) points to the early establishment of the land-based economy, which not only defined the central role of the state in land development, but also established an ongoing financial interest in land development by the majority of the population. The demands on the state in this regard led to the need for involvement of another tier of government and gave rise to the institution of local government. The respective roles of each tier of governance was the source of early conflict and marked the beginnings of early discordance between state and local government in the land development area (Berry, 1992). The need for a more strategic approach to planning emerged in the early 1900s to address the demands of rapid population growth and the fragmented approach to managing land development and the policy and institutional framework for such activity was incorporated in legislation in 1928.

Strategic planning at the state level was only established in the 1950s in response to rapid post war growth but since then has become a consistent and accepted element in the planning and governance landscape of the PMR with bipartisan support. Local strategic planning, on the other hand, through the instrument of local planning schemes, was slow to take off and it was only in the late 1970s that it began to assert itself in response to the rise of local issues and the conflict with state government authority.
Strategic planning in the PMR, which provides the overarching framework and guidance for planning at the local level, reflects many of the shifts described in Chapter 2 influenced by new waves of intellectual thought and changes in political and socio-economic conditions. As Vigar et al (2000) and Cherry (1988) highlight, the purpose of planning does not shift substantially but their outcomes are strongly influenced by prevailing political views and what can be realistically achieved. Public-led strategic spatial planning, the focus of this study, promoting the formulation and implementation of long range integrated planning outcomes at the state and local level has shown signs of resurgence on two occasions. Both were driven by strong political and bureaucratic leadership and belief in the value and effectiveness of the planning process. The first of these, in the 1950s, occurred in an era characterised by a belief in professional and rational planning, and responded to population growth and major development initiatives. The second was a response to a national drive for an integrated and joined up approach to governance in the mid-1990s. In the latter period, decisive attempts were also made to close the gap between strategic and statutory planning in both tiers of governance.

The shifts in the nature and emphasis of the five strategic plans for the PMR between 1955 and 2011 inevitably has implications for the way planning is applied at the local level. Evaluation of these plans shows a significant move away from the clear, although physically dominated strategic vision of the first plan released in 1955, to a wider discourse about what constitutes desirable growth and ultimately effective urban governance. In particular, there has been less evidence of the inclusion of implementation frameworks or justification for recommendations grounded in analysis and evidence in the latter plans. In the first decade of the new century, the mood has changed substantially as planning reform has refocused in two main directions. Delivery of strategic planning has become centred on major projects within a wide spatial planning framework and an increasing preoccupation with improving regulatory processes without any discernible linkage. New modes of governance, to bypass complex statutory processes have been formed to deliver such projects and there has been a strong initiative to amalgamate local government boundaries in the PMR. Collectively, these two shifts have widened the gap between strategic and statutory planning and potentially constrained the agenda for strategic and collaborative action between state and local government. Resistances to local strategic planning are also evident within the culture of local government where resources are limited, political priorities dominate the planning agenda and there is little recognition of the link between strategic spatial planning and future community wellbeing.

This account has set out and explained the broad planning and governance context in WA, and particularly the PMR, for the introduction of the LPS and its implementation over the past 14 years. It has examined the shifting nature of strategic plans for the PMR over that period, recognising their
overarching role in directing local strategic planning and drawn out how such shifts are reflected in the response of local government to this role in the planning system. The next chapter turns more specifically to a descriptive analysis of the LPS, its purpose as a planning instrument in the WA planning landscape, and how it has emerged in a chronological and geographical sense since 1999. The substance, processes and status of three LPS case studies in the PMR are analysed to demonstrate their response to the challenges of taking on a more strategic approach to local planning and effectively implementing the governance and planning objectives of the state.
Chapter 5 - EXPECTANCIES FOR AND DELIVERY OF LOCAL STRATEGIC PLANNING

It is possible to identify two diametrically opposed approaches to the question of appropriate policy making at the local government level. In the first place, elected representatives and municipal managers can adopt a ‘minimalist’ position and seek to reduce the gap between rising expectations on the part of the public and higher tiers of government and their limited ability to meet these expectations by sticking to their historical ‘core’ functions of ‘services to property’. Alternatively, councils can pursue a more ‘activist’ posture and attempt to play a catalytic role in the economic and social development of their communities by expanding ‘services to people’. (Dollery et al., 2003:4)

Introduction

As noted in Chapter 2, strategic planning has a major role to play in integrated urban governance (Albrechts, 2012; Stead and Meijers, 2009). Chapter 4 explains how the idea and value of strategic planning emerged in the early history of WA and since the 1950s has been an established feature of the state government’s efforts to plan for the Perth metropolitan region. In governance terms, the role of the state government and local government has always been clearly defined. The former is responsible for developing and overseeing the overall planning system and establishing the broad strategic planning framework whilst the latter is charged with planning and managing growth and development within this wider framework at the local level (Dawkins, 1989; O’Meara, 1984; Seddon, 1972).

The LPS is a strategic planning instrument introduced in 1999 by the state government in an effort to foster and operationalise a more effective strategic approach to planning at the local government level. Councils were encouraged to think and plan strategically within the context of the state planning framework broadly focused on the principles of encouraging sustainable development. This effectively required a distinct change in local government planning, encouraging an active rather than minimalist approach to policy making and implementation, and one which would involve a review of existing governance structures and views.

The main aim of this chapter is to clarify, in descriptive terms, the express purpose of the LPS, the expectations for implementation as set out and explained by the state government, and the ensuing response of the local government sector to the delivery of local strategic planning. This chapter is in four broad parts. Firstly, it traces the conception, development, purpose and format of the LPS drawing on educative texts and interview responses. Secondly, it examines the statistical response to
the policy initiative across the State. This illustrates the rates of adoption of the LPS and reveals an interesting spatial schism between regional WA and metropolitan Perth.

Thirdly, an analysis of the degree and extent of policy compliance of three LPS case studies within the PMR is presented. Policy compliance is measured by applying an analytical framework derived from the literature in Chapter 2 and explained in Chapter 3. This framework combines the components for a more effective approach to strategic planning derived from the literature with the specific expectation and direction for the LPS provided in educative texts (Ministry for Planning, 2000; WAPC, 2010). Three criteria are used to evaluate each case study:

(i) the extent to which they comply with state government guidance in terms of format and presentation;

(ii) evidence of a broad strategic planning approach which includes nexus with the state and regional planning framework of WA, a focus on significant issues and evidence of an open and participative process; and

(iii) the recognition and status of the LPS in the local government environment.

The evaluation of each case study is based on textual analysis, the responses to the survey questionnaire and individual interviews.

The fourth and final part of the chapter reaches some general conclusions about the response of local government to the expectations for the LPS, in a statistical and qualitative sense, and the implications for the research questions in Chapter 1.

The Emergence and Purpose of the LPS

Past efforts to involve local government in strategic planning in WA have been singularly focused on the mechanism of the town planning scheme (TPS). Although introduced into early legislation through the *Town Planning and Development Act, 1928*, the utility of the TPS was slow to be appreciated by local government. By the 1970s momentum had gathered, partially prompted by mandatory requirements for schemes introduced in the *Metropolitan Region Scheme, 1963 Australia*, but also by rising interest in local issues and local planning. The TPSs adopted for most metropolitan local governments areas were essentially development control documents. Although dismissed by Seddon (1972) as ‘zoning diagrams’, others (Bain and Hedgcock, 1992; Yiftachel and Kenworthy, 1992) pointed out their potential to conflict with state planning objectives, particularly with regard to redressing residential and population decline, declining employment, traffic congestion, and parking
in inner city areas. The deficiencies of such schemes was attributed to the lack of planning expertise at the local government level, limited understanding of the issues and potential impact of zoning and development controls, but also to the lack of clear guidance at the state level. Although, various attempts were made to remedy some of these deficiencies in subsequent years, interviewees still regarded them in the early 1990s as:

‘…a system of implementation rather than planning.’ (Respondent10)

‘....out of date, inflexible planning instruments, unable to guide decisions about future development at the local level.’ (Respondent 8)

One of the responses to the deficiencies of the instrument was:

‘…the preparation of multiple, separate and costly studies by local government to address specific issues such as land capability to justify subdivision and environmental impacts to support development proposals’. (Respondent 10)

The introduction of the LPS idea in 1999 was a distinct attempt to address these deficiencies and improve planning practice. Ultimately, this led to a new form of planning scheme in WA, made up of a Model Scheme Text, the standard format for each local government scheme, and a requirement for an overarching strategic statement (LPS) to explain and complement the scheme. The LPS instrument was seen as the opportunity to provide an integrated and strategic approach to planning and consolidate these disparate and often conflicting initiatives (Ministry for Planning, 2000). Perhaps of most importance, the LPS, which replaced the requirement for a Scheme Report, reached beyond the bounds of the local planning scheme. It was regarded as the logical link between state and local planning and the primary implementation tool for state and regional planning policy (WAPC, 1998).

When the LPS was introduced in 1999 the legislation, Town Planning Amendment Regulations, 1999, required them to: (i) set out the long-term planning directions for the local government; (ii) apply state and regional planning policies; and, (iii) provide the rationale for the zones and other provisions of the Scheme. An interview respondent closely associated with the LPS idea said:

‘…we were very careful in the drafting of the regulations to explain that it was not intended to be a development control document’ (Respondent 10)
State government guidance on the LPS was published shortly after the legislation and outlined in the Planning Scheme Manual (Ministry for Planning, 2000). Here, the LPS was referred to as the ‘main focus for the planning context of town planning schemes’, the vehicle for ‘schemes to clearly express the strategic vision, policies and proposals of the local government’ and a ‘means to interpret state and regional policies at the local level’ (Ministry for Planning, 2000, 2.1.0.4). Furthermore, the Planning Manual suggested two possible formats for the LPS, one more suited to metropolitan local governments and the other for regional local governments. A later publication, the Local Planning Manual (WAPC, 2010), provided more extensive guidance on the purpose and scope of a strategy and the process for preparation. It stated that the local planning strategy should:

- be consistent with state and regional planning policy, including current strategies, structure plans and strategic development initiatives (or provide the rationale for why it is not);
- provide strategic direction for land use planning and development over the ensuing 10 years or longer as the basis for the local planning scheme;
- set out the strategic direction for sustainable resource management and development in the context of state and regional planning;
- provide the rationale for the zoning and reservation of land and for the provisions of the scheme relating to development and development control;
- provide a strategic framework for assessment and decision-making in relation to proposed scheme amendments, subdivision, and development;
- provide the context for coordinated planning and programming of physical and social infrastructure at the local level; and
- identify the need for further studies or investigation within a local government area to address longer-term strategic planning and development issues.

(WAPC, 2010: 6)

Thus, the purpose of the LPS and expectations for implementation appeared to be explicitly set out and explained by the state government in legislative and policy documents.

**The Geography of the LPS**

As noted previously, there has been continuing tension between state government and local government, especially in the metropolitan region, over issues of planning governance (Berry, 1992; Hedgcock and Yiftachel, 1992). It should come as no surprise therefore that when the state government introduced the LPS it was greeted with varying degrees of support. This support (or lack thereof) is reflected, for example, in the adoption rate of the LPS across metropolitan and non-metropolitan local councils. As shown in Figure 5.1 the LPS was adopted at a faster rate by non-
metropolitan councils between 1999 and 2013. In overall terms, by the end of 2013 and some 14 years after the LPS was introduced in legislation, less than half (45%; n=64) of the 139 local governments in WA, had an endorsed local planning strategy. The overall low adoption rate plus the low number of metropolitan councils without an LPS is intriguing to say the least, especially given the fact that the LPS, like the TPS, is a statutory requirement. The low endorsement rate amongst metropolitan-based local governments in this earlier period is also curious, given the longstanding history of strategic planning within the metropolitan region, the demographic pressures it has faced over the last 50 years and is predicted to face in the future as outlined in *Directions 2031 and Beyond* (WAPC. 2010). In this context, and given that metropolitan local governments are more likely to employ strategic planners, a stronger response would have been expected.

Figure 5.1: LPS Endorsement 1999-2013

Reflecting on professional experience in this area, there are a number of possible explanations for this difference. In the first place, the policy emphasis of state government on the implementation of the LPS had a greater thrust within the regions than the metropolitan area. This included the creation of a specialist unit in 1999, to coordinate the assessment of schemes and strategies and provide support to local government in the regions. As far as the LPS was concerned, this included provision of supporting mapping, general planning advice on the preparation of such documents, presentations to individual local governments and collaboration with planners involved in the process about implementation. In the 2004/2005 financial year, there was further institutional commitment to this
task, with the allocation of WAPC funding for two senior regional support officers to undertake a specific and proactive role in the LPS implementation task. Although this reflected active efforts by the WAPC at this time to promote strategic planning in the regions, a possible further explanation was that the policy was seen to be best trialled in the relatively benign environment of the regions. Not only was the task likely to be less complex than in metropolitan areas, there was also less conflict between state and local government and a readiness to accept support given lack of planning expertise and resources. In addition, many local governments in the regions, according to respondents, recognised the opportunity to deal with their immediate issues, such as declining population and economies in depressed areas of the Wheatbelt and pending booms in resource-based areas such as the Pilbara and the Kimberley.

Table 5.1 demonstrates the changing status of the LPS across local governments in Western Australia within the metropolitan and outside the metropolitan area. This indicates the numbers of LPSs endorsed, those in an advanced stage of the process with advertising completed, those still under preparation and those where no progress has been made by the end of 2013. Given the legislative requirement to review all schemes and prepare local planning strategies within five years, this information confirms that there is an expected momentum in place across the state. The level of activity in the PMR however, has risen substantially with a further 17 of the 30 (57%) local governments engaged in the process. Only four local governments are not actively involved in the process, the City of Perth, Fremantle, South Perth and Gosnells. Each has shown a preference for strategic planning focused on particular issues such as commercial development, housing or planning for specific project areas. Outside the PMR, 33 of the 109 (28%) local governments are engaged in the process and 21, the majority of which have populations of less than 2000 people, have made no progress.
TABLE 5.1– Status of Local Planning Strategies Western Australia– 1999-2013

LPSs ENDORSED IN WA -1999-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Metro Perth (N=30)</th>
<th>% of Metro Local Governments</th>
<th>Outside Metro Perth (N=109)</th>
<th>% Non-Metro Local Governments</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-2003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2013</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Metro Perth (n=30)</th>
<th>Outside Metro Perth (n=109)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endorsed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising completed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under preparation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No progress</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Planning

The foregoing presents a statistical analysis of the response in WA to the requirement for the LPS, derived from archival data, and provides a background to a qualitative assessment of the response in terms of policy compliance. The first step in this assessment was a survey undertaken of local government planners across WA to establish their understanding and perceptions about strategic planning in general, the role of local government in strategic planning and their experiences with the LPS planning instrument. The overall response rate in WA to the survey was 25%, but 46% of local governments in the PMR responded. The following is a summary of the findings:

- There was a good understanding of the purpose of strategic planning and it is strongly supported in the planning system (86%).

- It was difficult to understand and apply the state planning framework at the local government level. A need for more local government involvement was expressed during the process of plan and policy formulation and clear guidance about the expectancies for implementation.

- The planning reform process in recent years was not considered to have improved or simplified planning processes and the emphasis on big picture planning had not encouraged strategic planning at the local level.
In local government, the local planning scheme is regarded as the most important document for managing development and the priority is on statutory rather than strategic planning.

The LPS was seen as an important document but its value was linked with land use planning and associated decision making rather than wider local governance objectives.

The predominant drivers for the LPS in local government was the statutory requirement to review the scheme but this also often corresponded with the corporate objective of achieving performance indicators.

Most LPSs were prepared in house and involved interaction across other areas of local government. There was considerably less involvement with other local governments and relevant state agencies.

A number of barriers to the process were identified such as lack of resources at both the state and regional planning level, poor and inconsistent advice, poor processing time frames, complexity issues, inflexible application of policies and general disregard for local issues by state government.

This response to the survey of local government planners and the responses from interviewees in the subsequent semi-structured interviews is used to complement the following textual analysis of three specific LPS case studies in the PMR.

**Strategic Policy Compliance – An Assessment of Three LPS case studies**

**Local Government Profiles – Claremont, Belmont and Kalamunda**

The Town of Claremont is a small inner-metropolitan local government area (approximately 4.9 square kilometres) located 8 kilometres west of the Perth CBD with an estimated population of around 10359 (ABS, 2014). The area is bounded by the Swan River to the south and traversed by a railway line (Fremantle line) and major highway (Stirling Highway) between Perth and Fremantle. In terms of current land-uses, the area is predominantly residential in character but includes a highway strip area with commercial and retail land-uses and a ‘town centre’ that includes Claremont Quarter, a large multi-purpose shopping centre. Claremont is one of several small local government areas in the higher income western suburbs of Perth proposed to be amalgamated into one larger municipality (Metropolitan Local Government Review, 2012). Current state planning initiatives - *Directions, 2031 and Beyond* (WAPC, 2011) recommend increased residential density within this area and a combination of residential and commercial uses along major highways. The LPS for the Town was endorsed in February, 2011.
The City of Belmont is located 5.5 kilometres to the east of the Perth CBD and approximately 40 square kilometres. It has an estimated population of 40,083 (ABS, 2014). It is bounded by the Swan River to the north and the Perth Airport, which occupies just under one-third (32%) of the local government area, to the east. It is traversed by a number of major metropolitan roads. Historically, Belmont was an area with a significant presence of State Housing Commission accommodation, but it has developed into a primary employment area with a diverse mix of commercial, semi-commercial and industrial activities, mainly located along Great Eastern Highway. Residential development includes a diverse mix of housing for the Perth region with high rise apartments in the vicinity of the Swan River, medium density villas and single residences. Substantial redevelopment of the Perth international and domestic terminals and associated industrial development has occurred in recent years and the current state government has flagged plans to construct a rail link from the CBD to the airport as a budget priority. The LPS was endorsed by the state government in December 2011.

The Shire of Kalamunda is an outer-metropolitan local government area (approximately 349 square kilometres) located 20 kilometres east of the Perth CBD and is peri-urban/rural in character. It has an estimated population of 59,716 (ABS, 2014). The area is bounded by the Darling Escarpment to the east and includes traditional low density residential development. The area has high prospects for employment and associated urban growth associated with substantial expansion of the airport and Kewdale freight and industrial area. The LPS was endorsed by state government in February, 2013. Figure 5.3 shows the locational context of the three LPS case studies.
Table 5.2 provides an overview of each LPS case study using the criteria derived from literature on what constitutes an effective strategic planning approach and the specific state government objectives for the LPS. The format and the presentation of the LPS is considered to demonstrate an understanding of what is required of this planning instrument in terms of its express purpose within the local government environment, substantive content and supporting analysis. The shift to strategic thinking is expected to incorporate a clear vision of future growth and development based on evidence of a participative and collaborative approach. It needs to demonstrate how it has addressed the framework of the plans and policies of the state and identify the specific issues that matter within each respective local government area. The status and value of the LPS is expected to reflect the importance of the instrument in directing and facilitating integrated development across the whole of local government. The following section discusses the findings of this evaluation process, drawn from analyses of the texts, the survey and the interviews.

Format and Presentation of Local Planning Strategies

The 1999 changes to legislation introduced a standard format for the TPS in the form of a Model Scheme Text, but placed no expectation on local governments for a common format for the LPS. This was reiterated in the most recent guidance for the LPS as follows:
‘There is no prescribed format for a local planning strategy. However, a standard arrangement is recommended, which highlights the strategic plan and associated priority actions (a ‘best practice’ example is provided in Appendix 5.7). This should be based on identification and analysis of key issues, and be underpinned by relevant background information. Data and analysis is important but should not overshadow the strategic conclusions’. (WAPC, 2010:7)

Although the descriptive analysis in Chapter 5 indicated that there seemed to be a reasonably clear and consistent understanding of what was required in the LPS, interviewees who worked in state government at the time and who were closely involved with the LPS initiative noted that the development of the LPS was not intended to be a complex and cumbersome process:

‘[The WAPC] were not looking for a grand document but one which addressed a series of simple questions: Where are we? What has happened to bring us to this point? Where do we want to go? And, how do we get there?’ (Respondent 8)

The format and presentation of each of the three case study LPS documents is significantly different. Claremont and Kalamunda have generally followed the format suggested in the Planning Schemes Manual and prepared them as separate documents to the TPS. The Claremont LPS is a relatively concise, simple and user-friendly document of 60 pages with frequent use of quotes to reflect the direction of Council and extensive use of graphics to illustrate various issues. The LPS sets out broad desired outcomes in providing for housing, employment, accessibility, recreation and community services and protection of heritage and through position statements, sets out the general principles for applying these outcomes. The document does not include details of analysis to support such direction for the Town. Conversely, the Shire of Kalamunda LPS comprises some 200 pages with extensive background information. The strategy follows the path suggested in the guidance document, identifying issues, opportunities and constraints and implications for planning and then moves on to state the main thrust of the strategy and policy recommendations. Belmont opted not to develop a separate LPS. Rather, the LPS was incorporated as part of its then revised and updated TPS, Local Planning Scheme No 15 – Scheme Report (Incorporating Local Planning Strategy) (City of Belmont, 2011). Put simply, it retains much of the format and characteristics of the traditional scheme report and is a relatively short document of 38 pages that sets out background information about the City and then summarises the recommendations of a number of separate strategic studies done in the City to direct future growth (Local Housing Strategy, Local Commercial Strategy, Belmont Town Centre Development Options). Each of these studies, however, includes comprehensive information to support final recommendations.
Whilst the directions of state government with regard to format and presentation were not particularly prescriptive, the case studies demonstrated three very different approaches to this task and were influenced by the professional views of actants and wider institutional contexts when preparing the LPS. The survey of local government planners and subsequent interviews confirmed that there were diverse views about the understanding of the nature and need of the LPS. A respondent from one inner metropolitan local government pointed out that the LPS requirement ‘was not hugely advertised’ (Respondent 14) and that their local planning scheme had been rejected by state government in 2006 with little or no reference to or explanation of the requirement for an accompanying LPS. Another respondent involved in assessment of LPSs in the PMR observed that ‘there is a tendency not to provide the level of information we would expect’ (Respondent 2).

Preference was also shown in the case of many local governments, as in the case of Belmont, to address strategic planning on an issue basis through separate studies, rather than integrating each of these elements within one strategy.

Shift to Strategic Thinking and Improved Collaboration

The Claremont LPS has a distinct and bold vision: ‘…to develop the Town as an exemplary, sustainable locality’ (Town of Claremont, 2011). It embraces wider strategic objectives of urban consolidation and implementation through increases in housing density and diversity and the creation of recreational, community and local employment opportunities. In this way, it explicitly acknowledges and responds to relevant state planning policies and actively engages with the current public discourse about economic, social and environmental sustainability. It was prepared as a part of ‘a highly collaborative process involving the Department of Planning, Town of Claremont Elected Members, Council staff and the community’ (Town of Claremont, 2010:4). On the face of it, the LPS process and outcome appears to be flexible, inclusive and collaborative and strongly aligned to the theory of what constitutes effective strategic planning as outlined in Chapter 2. Closer analysis reveals however that it is largely aspirational, with strategic direction expressed in terms of broad and woolly objectives that are tentatively indicated on plans. The potential for implementing increased densities and greater housing diversity, as per the aims of Directions 2031, in this well established, conservative and higher income area is somewhat doubtful. The difficult task of implementing this ambitious agenda and presenting the realities of the changes to the community is deferred to the next stage, which will involve the preparation of the statutory scheme and local planning policies. Furthermore, since the endorsement of the LPS, the original architects of the LPS have left the Council and there is some evidence of grass roots dissatisfaction with recent State government intervention in the local planning arena (Thomas, 2012).
The Scheme Report/LPS document for the City of Belmont contains no overarching vision for the local government area, but defers to a number of specific strategies relating to commercial, housing, public open space, business, heritage and environment to explain the strategic direction within the City. The report does not include any significant reference to state and regional plans and policies apart from a reference to ‘the need to respond to changes in State government policy and local priorities’ (City of Belmont, 2011:38) through the updating of the supporting strategies. The strategic vision is expressed clearly in the LPS by reference to these comprehensive strategies with a decided preference to retain these as separate, guiding documents. The LPS, therefore, presents a strategic view for the City of Belmont but it is not couched clearly within the context of wider objectives for future metropolitan growth. It is evident from the texts on each strategy that they are underpinned by in-depth research and extensive consultation with the community. Not surprisingly, the strong nexus between the Belmont Scheme Report/LPS and the town planning scheme and policies translates into a clear and reasonably prescriptive implementation framework for development in terms of land use and specific precincts. Whilst the LPS/Scheme Report does not conform to the LPS expectancies for a broader spatial planning approach, it needs to be noted that the City is one of the few inner metropolitan local governments that have had success in implementing urban consolidation. This success is premised on a highly collaborative approach undertaken by experienced planners and the Council with the local community over many years.

The Shire of Kalamunda LPS adopts the same vision as the corporate Strategic Plan 2009 – 2010:

‘The Shire will have a diversity of lifestyles and people. It will take pride in caring for the natural, social, cultural and built environments and provide opportunities for people of all ages.’

(Shire of Kalamunda, 2011:14)

The LPS acknowledges the relevance of state and regional policy and recommends strategic direction based on a selected future population scenario. The analysis stretches beyond its boundaries, recognising the rapid employment growth around the Perth airport and possible future extension of a rail link to the area as the justification for urban expansion. It includes a broad strategy plan that provides guidance on the various areas within the Shire where rezoning or changes in density codes could occur over the next 20 years. The Shire of Kalamunda LPS responds and makes specific recommendations on a number of issues facing the shire. These include: (i) demand for aged-persons accommodation; (ii) further subdivision of special rural areas and land use in the orchard areas; (iii) industrial growth and employment and the impact of Perth Airport growth and expansion; (iv) future housing development and community infrastructure; (v) public transport to Perth; (vi) protection of biodiversity; (vii) facilitation of tourism development; and (viii) urban design and streetscape. The
LPS also identifies ‘Investigation Areas’ that present development and growth opportunities. It then sets out the matters to be resolved before these areas are developed, such as bushfire risk, transport/movement networks, infrastructure/servicing, environmental and landscape impacts and urban water management. The LPS demonstrates a distinct move to think strategically about its future, responding to the needs of the community but putting this within the context of development in the wider metropolitan area.

Once again there are significant differences in how each local government has interpreted and applied strategic planning direction. Some differences are to be expected, given the variations in terms of size, socio-economic profile, the range of land-uses plus the different issues and stages of development within each LGA. In the case of Kalamunda, there is the potential for new urban development and in the face of state government opposition, the opportunity to think strategically about such growth. The ability to think strategically about changes within the existing urban structure in Claremont and Belmont presented more difficulty. This reflected the view of one respondent when commenting on the strategic planning at the state level which ‘was very effective in terms of land supply and planning for new urban areas but less effective in managing growth and change in urban areas’ (Respondent 10).

Interview respondents also identified some of the potential obstacles of adopting a strategic view at the local government level:

‘…the failure of the state to provide good guidance to local government leaving them with a sense of having to pick up strategic planning…’ (Respondent 8)

‘…it was an imposition by state government telling local governments to do an LPS when its policies were far from consistent and little guidance was given…’ (Respondent 10)

‘…wariness by local government about facilitating change at too quick a pace…’ (Respondent 2)

‘…wastefulness associated with lengthy and costly environmental analysis and other studies in local government areas…’ (Respondent 1)
TABLE 5.2: Comparative Analysis of Local Planning Strategies - Town of Claremont, City of Belmont and Shire of Kalamunda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA FOR ANALYSIS</th>
<th>CLAREMONT</th>
<th>BELMONT</th>
<th>KALAMUNDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Format and Presentation** | • Complies with recommended LPS format and content.  
• Short and concise with quotes and graphics | • Follows Scheme Report format.  
• Refers to several separate strategies dealing with future growth. | • Complies with recommended LPS format and content.  
• Lengthy document with extensive background information |
| **Evidence of a broad strategic planning approach, nexus with the state and regional planning framework of WA, focus on significant issues and evidence of an open and participative process** | • Acknowledges broad discourse and direction of state and regional policy  
• Highly indicative direction  
• No overall plan  
• Deals with a wide range of issues linked to broader sustainability and discourse revolving around living, working, enjoying and connecting with Claremont  
• Evidence of extensive collaboration in preparation with state government, elected members and other stakeholders  
• Limited engagement with community  
• Normal public advertising period | • LPS consolidates strategic direction included in housing, commercial, environmental areas  
• Direction is more prescriptive than indicative and not strongly linked to state and regional policy  
• No explicit focus on significant issues.  
• Evidence of close collaboration, mediation and facilitation with the community and stakeholder in preparation of individual strategies  
• Extensive consultation during preparation of individual strategies  
• Normal public advertising period. | • Clear acknowledgement of wider state and regional policy framework, wider planning issues in the surrounding area and proposes future growth recommendations linked to a population scenario.  
• Significant issues identified in LPS  
• Early evidence of collaboration with community in preparation of LPS  
• Attempts to collaborate with service agencies.  
• Normal public advertising period. |
| **The recognition and status of the LPS in the local government environment** | • LPS is corporate driven and contains position statements relating to action by the Town  
• LPS referred to in strategic investment area on website and linked to planning for sustainability  
• Multi-disciplinary team with less experienced planners | • LPS not highlighted in website under Strategic Planning or listed as a Corporate Document  
• LPS the portal for reference to other planning strategies  
• Strategic direction is driven by experienced planning team | • LPS is included in the list of documents relating to the planning area and integrated with Strategic Plan for area  
• Undertaken by experienced planners |
A further key aspect of the new approach to strategic planning, both in contemporary planning debates and the expectancy for the LPS, involved greater collaboration between stakeholders and active engagement by planners in this process. In each of the case studies, there is evidence in the text that consultation was undertaken with the local community at the early stages of preparation and each local government was required to advertise the LPS through the statutory consultation process. Although the Claremont process involved more extensive collaboration and included a peer review process, the idea of reaching out and engaging with other players (Healey, 2007; Nadin, 2007) both within and outside the local government environment does not appear to have been a significant feature of the LPS process in any of these cases. Respondents to the survey and the interviews emphasised the need for better collaboration. One state government planner proffered the view that ‘early involvement is crucial and this is where we need to invest the time and share ownership’ (Respondent 2)

The status of the LPS in the local government environment

In each of the case study areas, the LPS is not the lead document in providing future direction for Council activity and delivery of services, but is of principal relevance in dealing with planning matters. Its relationship with other key Council documents in each case is somewhat unclear, and at its best regarded as a supplementary document within the corporate strategic direction for the Council.

The Claremont LPS is included as a strategic initiative on the council’s website and strongly endorsed by the Mayor. In this way it has the appearance of a higher profile document within this local governance environment. This was far less evident in the case of Belmont. The LPS/Scheme report is associated with the planning scheme, there is no reference to the plan on the website nor is it listed under strategic planning activity in the area. The City has a separate strategic plan Strategic Community Plan 2012 – 2032 (City of Belmont, 2012) which makes no specific reference to the LPS. Rather this strategic plan is more concerned with achieving the overall vision and community aspirations and measuring such achievement through key performance indicators. In a subsequent interview with a senior planner at the City of Belmont, reassurance was given that the planning department was closely involved with all other departments in the Council in pursuing joint strategic objectives and the elected Council have always provided strong support for planning at the strategic level. In the case of Belmont, the LPS was driven by an experienced planning team with the objective of satisfying the statutory requirements of planning scheme review, having already addressed most of the outstanding strategic issues by way of separate strategies.
The nexus between the LPS and other corporate documentation is more apparent in the case of Kalamunda. The LPS is easily accessed on the website and specifically referred to as one of the informing documents for the *Kalamunda Advancing – Strategic Community to 2032* (Shire of Kalamunda, 2013). Interestingly, the Strategic Plan, although not spatial in nature, includes many of the key issues referred to in the LPS and key land use recommendations. An interview with a senior planner at this Council indicated that the LPS provided the catalyst for pursuing projects for improvements in the town and other commercial centres and did encourage better collaboration with the community and other stakeholders. In Kalamunda, the LPS was driven by an experienced planning team, intent on providing the justification for community demands for growth and change in their area.

The status of the LPS within the corporate structure of each local government was fairly consistent across each case study with planning and its spatial expression of future direction seen as offering only one component and not necessarily significant part of the bigger picture for the Council. The response to the survey and interviews confirmed this view:

‘…energy in local government goes into regulation of land use seen as the means to the end and there is little appreciation of the role of the LPS in explaining the rationale behind such regulation’

(Respondent 2)

**Conclusion**

This descriptive account of the emergence and purpose of the LPS indicates that this planning instrument was closely associated with the governance environment of the 1990s. Within this era there was a national focus on joined up governance and a state government response to improve policy frameworks, link state and local planning and encourage strategic thinking at the local government level. The idea of the LPS was a decisive attempt to address the strategic deficiencies of local planning schemes, which lacked a nexus with state planning policy, offered little guidance for decision making and prompted the undertaking of costly strategic studies to deal with issues such as land capability and environmental protection. The LPS was also seen as an instrument of governance at the local level, not only providing direction for land use planning but providing spatial expression for wider decisions about the timely provision of physical and community infrastructure.
The response to the LPS requirement was taken up slowly by local governments particularly in the PMR, but there is some evidence of greater participation in the preparation of LPSs in the metropolitan region in recent years as local governments moved to meet statutory requirements in terms of local planning schemes and strategies. More critically, the response to the LPS in terms of format and content of the document, the move to strategic thinking and its status in the local government environment revealed a big gap between expectation and actual delivery. Responses to these requirements were diverse and the differences appeared to reflect the professional views of those involved in the process and the outcome required for each local government, rather than any sound understanding of the value and utility of local strategic planning. Overall there are signs of formidable resistance to the implementation of local strategic planning and its role in promoting better governance within the policy and institutional frameworks of state and local government.

This raises the question about why this mode of strategic planning, broadly espoused in theoretical debates and strongly championed in the 1990s at the political and policy level, has shown little sign of mobilisation or institutionalisation. The next chapter uses an interpretive lens, to understand and explain the underlying influences for this response and the potential of the LPS instrument in the future planning and governance of the PMR and WA more broadly.
Chapter 6 - THE RESPONSE TO THE LPS AND ITS POTENTIAL – AN INTERPRETIVE VIEW

New concepts have to challenge and shift an array of already routinized governance processes, with their complex mixture of conscious and taken-for-granted modes of practice. New concepts have to “jump boundaries” and “break through resistances”, involving implicit and explicit struggles. For initiatives seeking to create a new concept and arena for territorially-focused collective action, this may involve a complexity of relations between different departments of local government, between administrators/officials and politicians, between politicians/officials and citizens, between the state and all kinds of power elites and lobby groups each with their own relation to allocative power, regulatory power and their own discursive frames.

(Healey, 2006:305)

Introduction

The two preceding chapters, with their descriptive analysis of the evolution of contemporary planning and governance in the PMR and the response of the local government sector in developing local planning strategies, present a relatively negative prognosis for local strategic planning and its potential contribution to better urban governance. This chapter delves deeper into this issue in an effort to interpret and understand what has influenced the response from local councils in the metropolitan region. At the same time, it tests the primary theoretical proposition of the thesis – i.e. strategic planning can be an effective mode of urban governance, by evaluating whether such influences present significant obstacles or whether they can be removed, diffused or redirected towards a more positive outcome.

The chapter is divided into three parts and directly address the research questions posed in the introductory chapter of the thesis. Part one reiterates the theoretical drivers behind the LPS and explains the political and policy related drivers behind the LPS as required in first research question:

What were the key theoretical, political and policy related drivers for the introduction of the requirement for the Local Planning Strategy in 1999 by the WA State Government?

Part two is concerned with the second research question and in particular the influences on the response to the LPS described in Chapter 5.

How have local governments in WA responded to this change in policy direction by the State, particularly in the Perth Metropolitan Region, and what has influenced the response?

The discussion draws on the data from the survey, interviews and the analysis of the three LPS case studies to explain what has influenced the response. It concentrates on two key issues which feature
prominently in the findings of the empirical research and reflect the theoretical view about the significant relationship between strategic planning and the urban governance framework in Chapter 2. These are the shifts since 2001: (i) the state governance and planning framework; and, (ii) the local governance and planning framework. An exploration of the political, policy and institutional changes within each of these frameworks draws out their implications for local strategic planning and explains the response to the LPS in Chapter 5.

Part three is concerned with the third and final research question:

\[ \text{What are the future prospects for an effective contribution by local strategic planning to wider strategic planning objectives and better governance of the Perth Metropolitan area?} \]

Building on the research findings in the first two parts of the chapter, the key potentialities of the LPS and the resistance it has faced are discussed from an institutional, policy and process and actor perspective. Some of the ideas that have emerged from the empirical research about what is required to improve the effectiveness of local strategic planning are documented and discussed to assist in coming to some conclusion about the future potential of this mode of governance in WA.

**Theoretical, Political and Policy Drivers behind the LPS**

An exploration of the rationale behind the LPS, against the backdrop of broader theoretical debate and the political and policy environment in WA, offers a more insightful understanding of the forces that drove this policy change and the original expectations of the policymakers for the LPS.

**Theoretical Drivers**

The LPS was introduced in the 1990s, an era where key themes in public policy debate were centred on the need for ecological sustainability, democratic deliberation and a "joined up" approach to governance (Gleeson et al, 2004). This reignited interest in strategic spatial planning as an effective mode of urban governance and delivery of policy (Albrechts, 2012; Stead and Mejier, 2009; Healey, 2007). At the same time there was recognition of the need to replace traditional physically determinist land use planning with a more flexible, creative, open-ended and collaborative process (Healey, 2007; Albrechts, 2006). The search for more effective modes of urban governance since the 1970s has also included different models of multi-level and multi-scalar governance (Healey, 2006; Cars et al, 2002). Local strategic planning with its proximity to the community, ability to plan for the shorter term and adopt a more action
oriented approach (Bunker and Searle, 2007; Albrechts, 2006; Gleeson et al, 2004) was seen as one mode of governance with the potential to promote integrated urban governance. This theoretical turn, although influenced by political and philosophical debate, was also influenced by analysis of the deficiencies of past planning practice. In this regard, the policy shift towards promoting a more strategic planning approach at the local government level in Western Australia was firmly in line with academic debates about planning and urban governance at the time.

Political and Policy Drivers

As indicated in Chapter 2, the idea of strategic planning at the local level within a framework of principles and policies set by a higher tier of government has been embedded in many planning systems in the UK, Europe and Australia (Stein, 2012). The nature of this activity and its relationship to higher level tiers of governance has been the subject of consistent legislative and policy review (NSW Government, 2012; Morphet, 2009). The introduction of the LPS in WA marked a convergence in political and policy thinking between the then Planning Minister, Richard Lewis, the WAPC and a small group of senior planners within the Department of Planning. From a political perspective, the Minister, a land surveyor by profession and with strong local government connections, became actively engaged in the planning reform process and particularly the improvement of planning schemes. The development industry had been continually lobbying for better quality and consistency in local planning schemes, but as one respondent indicated:

‘The Minister had also become ‘tired of Councils with out of date schemes wanting to approve development and subdivision outside the scheme’ (Respondent 8)

The political thrust of the planning reform process was to standardise the planning scheme format through the development of a Model Scheme Text. It was considered that if all town planning schemes followed a particular template this would help contribute to improving the overall efficiency of planning at the local level. The policy makers grasped the opportunity to deal with what had long been seen as glaring deficiencies of schemes—a lack of strategic content and context. This was aided to some extent by the broader policy atmosphere in state government to find integrated solutions to governance. The WAPC had also been made aware of concerns expressed by the then Town Planning Appeals Tribunal (now the State Administrative Tribunal), about ‘the difficulties in making decisions in the absence of a sound state planning policy framework’ (Respondent 8)
This prompted attempts through the expanded and multi-disciplinary membership of the WAPC to bring together all agencies involved in land use planning and review their policies in an effort to provide a consolidated approach to planning. The result was a state policy – Statement of Planning Policy 1 – State Planning Framework Policy, 1998 – with overarching principles and a listing of all relevant policies arranged in a hierarchical order. Within this framework, local planning schemes and the local planning strategy, in particular, were regarded as the logical link between state and local planning and the primary implementation tool for state and regional planning policy.

As interviewees noted, the rationale for the introduction of the LPS in 1999 was:

‘…to some extent a logical and necessary step and modernising exercise but also a decisive attempt to bridge the gap between regional and local planning’ (Respondent 7)

‘…an opportunity to address one of the principal deficiencies of past strategic planning at the metropolitan level by providing a policy framework for managing change in developed urban areas’ (Respondent 10)

**Dominant influences behind the LPS response**

Interviewees offered a range of reasons for the poor adoption rate of the LPS amongst local councils. A few were sceptical about the value of strategic planning given its woolly nature and saw more efficient ways of achieving strategic delivery or utilising scarce resources. Others identified a general lack of strategic planning expertise and lack of commitment or interest in this area of planning. Most of the respondents cited the broader influence of shifts in political direction and urban governance since 1999 in both state and local government and the implications this had for local strategic planning practice.

This reflected the theoretical debates discussed in Chapter 2 on the shifts in urban governance, their influence on strategic planning delivery at all levels and how this contributes to effective urban governance. The findings are discussed within these two principal areas of governance and planning frameworks at the state and local government level. The shifts in political discourse, policy direction, institutional changes and actant behaviour within each of these frameworks has had an inevitable impact on the response to local strategic planning and the wider implications of these shifts are examined in more detail.
State planning and governance framework

The LPS, as discussed earlier, emerged in response to the drive for integration and a whole of government approach to urban governance during the 1990s and the view that local government would actively engage in local strategic planning within the institutional and policy framework of the state government. Since then, however, there has been a substantial shift in the political debate and direction of urban governance in Australia and WA (see Chapter 4). Freestone (2012) attributes the shift to the priority given to economic growth and Allmendinger (2011) and Hamnett (2000) point to the disjuncture between the policy rhetoric of integrated planning and the reality of public policy direction focused on economic growth and a deregulatory agenda.

Whilst there have been some distinct differences in the philosophical and ideological approach to urban governance in WA between the Labor state governments of 2001-2008 and the current Liberal/National state government since 2008, the outcomes in terms of mainstream planning practice have been surprisingly similar. Strategic and statutory planning practice have been regarded increasingly as distinct and separate areas of planning activity, and therefore subject to different planning and governance reform initiatives. Strategic planning has seemingly retreated from the idea of a long term normative vision with a focus on key areas for action and intervention (Albrechts, 2006) and taken the form of a broad spatial plan as reflected in Network City (WAPC, 2004) and Directions 2031 and Beyond (WAPC 2010). Strategic planning delivery has become a vehicle for city promotion and boosterism (Vigar et al, 2000) with a focus on project planning and spectacles such as Elizabeth Quay and the Perth City Link projects (www.mra.wa.gov.au). Statutory planning however has been the focus of significant reforms designed to streamline development approval processes, and included wide ranging legislative and institutional reforms that have centralised planning authority but across a more diffuse range of state actors – the Planning Minister, the WAPC and the MRA (Maginn and Foley, 2014). Recent debates on planning reform in Australian cities highlights the conflict between strategic metropolitan ambitions and regulatory reform, and the potential threat this presents for the implementation of strategic visions (Ruming et al, 2014; Steele and Dodson, 2014; Maginn and Foley, 2014).

The Broad Spatial Planning Approach

The two strategic metropolitan planning documents produced since 2001, Network City (WAPC, 2004) and Directions 2031 (WAPC, 2010) were considered by some respondents as being deficient in providing clear strategic direction in a number of respects. They were seen to:
‘…deal predominantly with growth in new urban areas, through a form of master planning leaving existing areas to be controlled through regulatory planning.’ (Respondent 10)

‘…be a series of discussion papers or discourses on issues such as managing growth, environmental issues, density, political engagement and what the city should look like.’ (Respondent 8)

The intention of the hierarchy of regional plans and policies in SPP1 was to provide integrated and clear guidance to local government in undertaking their local planning role and specifically the preparation of local planning strategies and local planning schemes. The overwhelming majority (90%) of local government respondents in the survey expressed a negative view about the effectiveness of these plans and policies. Only a small proportion (9%) regarded them as providing a link to the provision of infrastructure and funding and clarifying responsibility for policy implementation. Almost a third (28%) said that they provided clarity on the direction for future growth in their local government area. Respondents also alluded to the trend, particularly in recent years, of formulating policies ‘on the run’ in relation to areas such as water conservation, integrated transport and land use planning and bushfire risk. This not only raised conflict with other policies, but was seen to cause serious delays in completing strategic documents at the local level. What also emerged in the responses to both the survey and interviews was confusion about the interpretation of the policies and who had overall and direct responsibility for their implementation. The majority of respondents confirmed the need for a ‘more definitive state and regional strategies and the clear translation of state views into land use outcomes to assist local government to provide strategic delivery at the local level’ (Respondent 7).

*Shift to Project Planning and New Forms of Governance*

The implementation of strategic objectives has become squarely focused on the implementation of major planning projects. Some have been completed, most significantly the 70 kilometre rail link between Perth and Mandurah in 2007 under the then Labor Government. Others are in various stages of construction and include major projects within and outside the city such as Elizabeth Quay, Perth City Link, Riverside Precinct, Cockburn Central Town Centre and Scarborough Beach Redevelopment (www.mra.wa.gov.au).

Interview respondents generally expressed support for the idea of project planning, recognising its unique ability through independent funding, to assemble land, coordinate infrastructure and deliver discrete high quality urban places within the city. But the idea of this taking place in the absence of a wider framework
for strategic planning for the region was a source of concern. One respondent described the various major projects being rolled out across the metropolitan region as being akin to:

‘…the jewels in the crown but potentially held together by alcan foil.’  

(Respondent 9)

Others emphasised the importance of making decisions about projects on the basis of:

‘....directing development of major employment drivers such as universities and hospitals to localities likely to maximise sustainable development objectives.’  

(Respondent 7)

Peter Newman (1992), a key advocate for sustainability and public transport in WA, predicted that opportunities to maximise rail access would be lost in the absence of supportive policies such as land use integration, scrapping road competition, land pooling and provision of servicing infrastructure. This failure to translate public policy into statutory implementation was reiterated by Curtis and Mellor (2011) in their analysis of transit oriented development initiatives in the Perth region. Several respondents confirmed Newman’s concerns along the southern rail line. Large tracts of land, with good accessibility to the railway line, are severely constrained by groundwater protection areas, notional industrial buffers, uncertainty about the provision of servicing, future station locations and transport infrastructure. Similarly, areas in close proximity to existing stations along other rail lines offer:

‘…potential redevelopment at increased densities, but encounter community resistance, a general lack of political appetite to tackle local conflict and the difficulties of land assembly’  

(Respondent 6)

It was pointed out by several respondents that most of the supportive policy requirements cited by Newman (1992) were actually the essential components of a rigorous strategic spatial planning process to justify and implement such development projects. The value of a wider strategic planning vision for the PMR within which each major project is evaluated to ensure maximisation of economic, social and environmental benefits, minimisation of potential traffic flows and impacts and public expenditure was continually highlighted. The COAG Reform Council (2011), in its recent evaluation of capital city strategic planning in Perth, reiterated this conclusion. It notes that while there were clear and coherent plans for major projects, Directions 2031 and Beyond lacked the necessary analytical frameworks for
integrating the land use processes of the state with infrastructure provision and implementing broader economic goals.

The delivery of such projects has avoided the constraints of current statutory provisions and boundaries with the state introducing new forms of governance which have created ‘fuzzy boundaries and soft spaces’ within urban planning decision-making (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2009: 619). These include: (i) the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority (MRA) which has total responsibility for some major redevelopment projects; (ii) Landcorp, the development arm of state government; and (iii) the Stirling Alliance which is comprised of state and local government representatives to facilitate the development of a middle-ring regional centre. One of the major problems identified with these various governance structures was ‘the lack of clear identification between them and link between them and the strategic plan’ (Respondent 6)

An important initiative in the wider governance framework was the push to amalgamate local governments in the metropolitan region with the express purpose of facilitating strategic planning (Metropolitan Local Government Review, 2012). This was in accordance with the metropolitan reform tradition (Kubler, 2005) which regarded the fragmentation of governance as the most serious obstacle to effective urban governance. Interviewees were asked to give their views on whether this would improve strategic planning in the metropolitan and country regions and improve collaboration between local governments. A small number of respondents queried the efficiency of larger local governments and raised the spectre of larger local governments posing a serious challenge to state government direction. In overall terms, however, respondents felt that amalgamations would bring more positives than negatives. Respondents recognised that larger municipalities offered significant potential to employ skilled staff but also to promote urban growth and infrastructure provision in a more sustainable manner. But in all cases there was considerable scepticism about how this would work without a commitment from both levels of government to a sound strategic planning framework and an improved collaborative relationship.

Role of planning and planners in urban governance

The political shifts in urban governance and the ‘politicisation’ of the planning processes in the early 2000s has had some inevitable implications for the status and role of planning. Professor Peter Newman, the head of a specialist policy unit set up especially by the then Premier, Geoff Gallop, and responsible
for the development of the WA Sustainability Strategy (State of Western Australia, 2003) was regarded as ‘the go to person for all matters in planning, transport and environment’ (Respondent 8).

Nadin (2007) notes that a central problem with implementing any public sector-led long range strategic plan is the reality that spatial planning is undertaken and influenced by a plethora of government agencies at the national level in the UK and at the state level in Australia. Although respondents understood that the purpose of the amalgamation of the Departments of Planning and Transport under the Labor government in 2001 was to achieve integrated land use planning, they saw this move as being:

‘…obscured by vested interests and power struggles between the two areas.’ (Respondent 6)

‘…leading to expansion of bureaucracy, but at the same time a diminishing of the planning role.’ (Respondent 11)

‘... subsuming the important objective of strategic spatial planning.’ (Respondent 7)

Respondents also identified a significant shift in the views and operations of infrastructure agencies involved in land use planning during this period. These were described as:

‘A new focus on regulation and cost effectiveness coupled with the loss of dedicated planning staff who understood the responsibility to contribute to strategic planning delivery.’ (Respondent 9)

‘.....in the past, these agencies had understood the broader role of planning in coordinating strategic direction and acknowledged that what governed them was only part of the picture.’ (Respondent 1)

This diminution of the planning role was reflected in the inability of the WAPC’s Infrastructure Coordinating Committee, a special committee comprised of service agency authorities, to manage the wider strategic planning process. A number of respondents attributed this to:

‘…the inability of agencies to commit themselves to funding for longer than 1 to 2 years in an environment of economic efficiency and accountability.’ (Respondent 8)

‘…the corporate structure and recruitment in the Department of Planning which had resulted in a big change in personalities, with more emphasis on professional managers than professional planners and less understanding and ability to promote and facilitate strategic planning at the higher level.’ (Respondent 11)
The role of the WAPC and the Department of Planning was seen to have diminished substantially over the past 10 years, and at one extreme, was even regarded as:

‘…lacking leadership, dysfunctional and unnecessarily involved in complex layers of strategic and spatial planning.’

(Respondent 6)

Another significant issue emerging from the interviews was the role of the planner in strategic planning and:

‘…the need for having clarity and ability to take your political masters with you.’

(Respondent 8)

Interview respondents drew attention to the increasingly risk averse response of many planners in current planning practice and in particular a concerted turn away from independent thinking. This was attributed to a combination of factors. In the first instance, the absence of sound and integrated strategic frameworks to justify and provide the confidence to recommend planning direction. A second factor which emerged during interviews was concern about the diminution of strategic planning skills within the planning profession generally and state and local government specifically. On the latter issue, this was seen to have been affected to a fairly large extent by the loss of experienced planners through retirement, retrenchment or redundancies. In addition, considerable weight was also attributed to the obsession with ‘cutting red tape’ and streamlining statutory planning processes and the resultant focus on corporate management and regulation rather than on strategic thinking and planning per se. This decline in the quality of contribution of planners to spatial policy is recognised in the wider Australian context (Gleeson et al, 2010) with more emphasis in the profession on negotiation, dispute resolution and development control skills than a wider comprehension of urban structure and its significance to improving quality of urban space.

Local Governance Framework

The role of planning in local government, as indicated in the evolutionary account of planning in Chapter 4, was slow to achieve recognition and only assumed some authority in the latter half of the last century. The traditional focus on ‘roads, rates and rubbish’ had, by that stage, elevated the importance of finance and engineering within this tier of governance. This trend has continued in the modern local governance environment, with its emphasis on service delivery in the areas of health, welfare, safety and community facilities. As one interviewee observed:
Within this broader context of local governance, the survey, interviews and individual case studies sought to establish what prompted the preparation of the LPSs and once endorsed, what was its status and value.

**Main Drivers, Status and Value**

Those local governments which had embarked on the journey of preparing the Local Planning Strategy were clearly driven by the statutory requirement to review their schemes and at the same time produce an accompanying strategy (80% in the case of the local government survey). This requirement had also become encapsulated in the corporate culture of local government with the focus on each department setting and achieving performance objectives. There was some evidence however that these were not the only drivers. Some were frustrated about state government reluctance to support development, seemingly contrary to or not supported by proper strategic analysis. This was the case in the Shire of Kalamunda, where there was demand for new residential growth but constraints in terms of services and bushfire risk. Interestingly, only one of the interviewees involved in the preparation of a LPS in the metropolitan area, a senior local government planner (Respondent 17) acknowledged the explicit expectations of the LPS, and the opportunity to take a proactive approach to local strategic planning in line with state strategic objectives.

State government legislation and guidance (Ministry for Planning, 2000; WAPC, 2010) suggested that the LPS would provide the overarching local framework, not only for directing and managing growth within the local government boundaries, but also as a context for determining the prioritisation and allocation of funding and resources to implement such development. Responses to the survey, interviews and case studies revealed that this was far from the case.

The overwhelming view from the survey respondents (84%) and from the case studies was that the LPS was no more than a complementary or subset document to the wider corporate strategies of the organisation such as the Strategic Plan or Community Plan. It was evident that planners often had significant engagement with the Chief Executive, corporate executives, elected members and the general public in the preparation of the LPS and participated in the Strategic Plan/Community Plan process. Despite this, the LPS was still regarded as a stand-alone document, with less status and recognition. Its principal role was to guide land use regulation by the planning department and there seemed to be little
appreciation of its potential to provide an integrated approach to the whole ambit of local government activity in a spatial form. This response was similar to that experienced in the UK in the implementation of local development frameworks as local governments struggled with the required cultural change and could not always understand or apply the expectations of central government (Gunn and Hillier, 2012; Baker and Hincks, 2009).

Respondents cited a range of obstacles which had prevented the LPS taking a leading role in the armoury of planning instruments used by local councils. For the most part, the obstacles pointed to a failure to think and act strategically in the urban environment at both the state and local government level. It was pointed out by a senior local government planner that:

‘. . . local government have so many ongoing issues to resolve on a day to day basis, their priority is to regulate development and they accordingly see more value in taking on specific projects than concentrating resources on broader strategic planning direction’.

(Respondent 13)

The long held view of local government planning as a regulatory function was reflected in the views of local government planners about the role of the LPS and the local planning scheme:

‘. . . it was not seen as a strong development control tool.’

(Respondent 2)

‘. . . it is hardly worth all the angst and money as the scheme determines most of the decisions.’

(Respondent 1)

This was reiterated in the response to the survey questionnaire where all of the respondents cited the importance of the local planning scheme and around 80% the importance of the LPS and other planning strategies and policies. Others interviewees (Respondents 14 and 15) noted that some local councils were wary and reluctant to promote a new strategic direction in the event that it might provoke political and community conflict and direct funds away from areas favoured by the community. The overriding emphasis in planning practice on statutory processing at both the state and local government was seen as a key reason for a lack of commitment to strategic planning.

It was clear from the research that the LPS is neither a lead document nor has it achieved a high profile in the local government environment. There are also disparate, generally negative or at best neutral views amongst planners of its value and utility. This highlighted the diverse nature of governance in local
government and the different perception of the value and utility of planning in general by the range of actants involved in the process. Given the interdependency between state and local government in the planning system, the political, policy and institutional shifts at both tiers of governance have had some significant implications for the way local strategic planning has been carried out and its contribution to effective governance.

**Implications for Local Strategic Planning**

The implications of these shifts were explored through the survey and interviews with practising planners being asked about their perceptions and understandings of the purpose of strategic planning at the state and local government level and its value to the urban environment. Views were also sought on the nature and extent of collaboration between state and local government in the preparation and assessment of the LPS.

*Recognition of the value and utility of state and local strategic planning*

The survey disclosed a clear understanding and wide support for strategic planning at the regional level (80-90%). Its role in dealing with complexity, balancing conflicting objectives, improving material conditions and providing stability for the development industry and service providers, was regarded as of high importance. The important role of the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) in leading the charge in strategic planning at the regional level was widely acknowledged in the survey and interview responses. The majority of respondents indicated that both planners (86%) and elected members (70%) saw a need for a greater level of involvement of local government in strategic planning at the regional level. Similarly, there was universal support for local strategic planning at a rhetorical level and recognition that it had a significant role in implementing the strategic planning objectives contained in metropolitan strategic plans. Local government with its close association with the community was regarded as being in a better position to understand the issues and aspirations of the local community. The most supportive and positive responses saw strategic planning as:

‘…allowing local government to step back and look at the bigger picture.’ (Respondent 2)

‘…empowering planners at the local government level to make a difference by engaging in real visionary planning…. when it becomes a collaborative approach we achieve amazing things’ (Respondent 9)
Others respondents, cited the value of having a robust strategic framework for decision making with some state government planners pointing to how it had led to an increased delegation of authority to officers and more streamlined decision-making. It was also observed that:

‘…local government had started to work out that if they have a clear policy framework for planning it will support decisions in the State Administrative Tribunal.’ (Respondent 6)

‘...there was some evidence of integration of the LPS with the local government Community Plan.’ (Respondent 11)

Despite this positive expression of the value of the LPS as a strategic policy tool, shifts in the planning and governance frameworks at the state and government level had actively discouraged the implementation of local strategic planning and its contribution to effective governance. Central to this, as pointed out by many of the respondents, has been the philosophical widening of the gap between strategic and statutory planning. The concerted emphasis on improving statutory processing processes over the past ten years appeared to have missed or misunderstood the integral role of development control in implementing strategic planning objectives and the potential of sound strategic frameworks to improve and streamline decision making. This has contributed to what Vigar et al (2000) refer to as an increasingly detached and uncomfortable relationship between the two streams of planning. Simultaneously, the continuing and somewhat myopic emphasis on improving and streamlining statutory process over the last decade has had a debilitating impact on the development of essential strategic planning skills. These skills require an understanding of the wider substantive agenda, respect for local knowledge and the ability to think spatially and creatively about the future (Baker and Wong, 2013; Albrechts, 2006). The implications of the shifts in governance, strategic planning practice and collaboration between the two tiers of government on strategic planning at the local level are discussed in more detail below.

Shifts in governance and strategic planning

The broad nature and inconsistencies of strategic plans and policies has presented a significant obstacle to local governments engaged in local strategic planning. A respondent involved in state government planning at the senior level reflected on the problem of this imposition on local government noting that ‘state policies were often not consistent or clear and there was a lack of guidance about the implementation of such policy’ (Respondent 10).
Another respondent (Respondent 8) cited an example of one regional local government forced to take on the costly role of sub-regional planning to fill the void. And, a planning consultant, experienced in preparation of LPSs, pointed to:

‘…the need for a detailed regional strategy between state and local government ... the grunt work needs to be done at state level in consultation with local government to provide clear direction... the LPS can then deal with local issues more simply’ (Respondent 3)

The focus on project planning at the state level has inevitably flowed through to local government with several examples of project driven planning being pursued where opportunity arose, rather than justified within a wider local strategic framework.

In this regard, there was an interesting response from one planner (Respondent 16) involved in the New Towns Program in regional areas, an initiative that would have been expected to take up the idea of an overarching LPS to guide development. This respondent indicated that there was a perception that the LPS was a static document that lacked the ability to incorporate an economic development strategy and respond quickly to funding targets. On this premise, the LPS instrument was rejected and funds were expended on economic and engineering studies aligned more to justifying and facilitating selected infrastructure and development projects within the towns. A contrary view of the process was offered by another respondent from the state government who commented that:

‘…this process effectively hijacked the LPS concept in the regions, ignoring much of the evidence and information provided in such documentation and its ability to collaborate and coordinate strategic direction within and across the regional towns.’ (Respondent 11)

These conflicting views point to two major issues about the difficulty of implementing local strategic planning. First, there was clearly a lack of recognition and understanding of the role and potential of an integrated approach to local strategic planning. Rather, there is a perception that such strategic planning is a cumbersome and ineffective activity. This is compounded by a lack of institutional cooperation and coordination between different state agencies involved in planning activities, albeit coming from different policy angles. This illustrates the predisposition to complex, overlapping and somewhat haphazard governance arrangements (Gleeson et al, 2012) in an attempt to bypass the constraints of accepted planning practice (Allmendinger, 2009).

The difficulty of the strategic planning task cannot be underestimated at any level but raises some particular problems for local government in terms of local politics and resourcing and priorities (Bell,
2012). The close interface with the local community and continual confrontation with local political issues and lobbying tend to discourage the pursuit of options likely to stifle development or attract community opposition. In addition, resourcing tends to lean towards the day-to-day work, associated with statutory processing of applications and this does not foster the necessary skills and understanding needed to promote the merits of strategic spatial planning. Collectively these have all contributed to the lack of understanding of the value of the LPS to empower local government to direct growth and development in their areas and allocate resources appropriately.

**Collaboration between state and local government**

The LPS represents a form of ‘top-down’ policy intervention given the fact that it is a creation of the state government but is to be devised and implemented by local councils. Put another way, the LPS represents a policy interface between state and local government whereby the former expects the latter to help realise its meta-strategic planning objectives as set out in the various metropolitan plans since the late 1990s such as *Network City* and *Directions 2031 and Beyond*. To this end, it would be reasonable to assume that there would be considerable collaboration with the state government on how to craft the LPS and incorporate it within their pre-existing planning framework.

Despite attempts to set out what was required of local government in developing their LPSs as per key state government guidance documents – *Planning Schemes Manual* (Ministry for Planning, 2000) and the *Local Planning Manual* (WAPC, 2010) – there was some obvious signs of a disconnect between what was envisaged for the LPS and what was actually being prepared. Interviewees from the state government sector expressed diverse views about the process for preparing the LPS and what they would like in terms of aims and objectives:

‘...a simple process of opportunity and constraint mapping rather than detailed demographic and precinct analysis.... with a focus on agility in the document in order to respond to changing circumstances and incorporating a really good plan, some precincts plans accompanied by statements of key issues and how they are addressed generally and within precincts.’

(Respondent 9)

‘…the need to focus on the cadastral level, link proposals to population estimates, identify no go areas for development, clear links with infrastructure and importantly set criteria for dealing with unexpected proposals.’

(Respondent 11)
It would appear that state government planners responsible for overseeing the introduction of the LPS had not fully considered the time, effort and costs local councils would expend in preparing the LPS. In this regard, the survey revealed that 60% of LPSs took more than 12 months to prepare; the remaining 40% took between 6-12 months to complete. As to the cost estimates of preparing the LPSs, these ranged from $50,000 up to $700,000.

Interviewees from the local government sector were highly critical of the conflicting and confusing advice they were given by state government about what was expected to be included in the LPS. Relatedly, there were difficulties in sourcing the required base data for strategy preparation. A further key concern was the inconsistent assessment of the LPS by the state government planners who operated across seven teams, two dealing with metropolitan strategies and five with regional strategies. Consultants and local government planners involved in the crafting of the LPS pointed to inconsistencies across LPSs endorsed by state government in terms of their size and content and the lack of good examples or templates to provide them with guidance. The survey respondents indicated that the time taken by the WAPC to advertise an LPS ranged from (i) over six months (56%); (ii) 3-6 months (33%); and (iii) less than three months (11%). Moreover, the period taken from initial submission of LPS to the WAPC and final endorsement varied between one year and more than three years. A number of respondents expressed the view that the slow pace in processing and approving LPS applications was due to a combination of two key factors. On the one hand, the LPS was not a priority task of the state government planners. And, on the other hand, there was regular staff turnover within the Department of Planning. This meant that there was a lack of continuity and understanding of the LPS itself and how to approve LPS applications.

Views about the assessment of the LPS by state government planners ranged from a complex and comprehensive assessment process requiring a lot of supporting information about the local government and its future potential to a relatively simple view:

‘Does it have planning merit? Does it comply with policy? If not is it a fatal flaw and how can we balance the outcome?’

(Respondent 9)

A major criticism from local government respondents was the expectations of the department for comprehensiveness. Respondents expressed the view that:
‘…the assessment of the LPS used the rigour associated with assessment of a statutory planning scheme, focused on irrelevant requirements and was undertaken by officers not versed in strategic planning.’

(Respondent 17)

‘...that it had become a hugely extended box ticking exercise.’

(Respondent 6)

‘…assessment staff saw themselves as gatekeepers rather than enablers.’

(Respondent 11)

A senior local government representative (Respondent 17) who had been proactive in the process, expressed extreme frustration with delays and incompetence in the assessment process, seriously questioning the value of such an undertaking in the future. This illustrated a disjuncture between the more effective strategic planning approach cited in the literature to focus on the issues that matter, the strategic nature of the document and its nexus with strategic policy (Bunker and Searle, 2007; Albrechts, 2006) and the actual reality of planning practice.

Despite the rhetorical support for local strategic planning and its entrenched status in the WA planning system, a range of unfavourable conditions in the political, policy and institutional environment have hampered its trajectory towards providing more effective governance. In order to respond to the final research question about the future prospects for this mode of governance in the urban environment, the last section of the chapter sets out to summarise the potentialities, resistances and potential solutions to improve the standing of local strategic planning.

**Future potential of the LPS and local strategic planning in general**

As outlined earlier, the LPS policy initiative reflected the direction of theoretical debates in planning during the 1990s. This encouraged modes of urban governance which placed emphasis on the qualities of place and spatial organisation (Madanipour et al, 2001; Healey, 2006) and the potential of local planning to manage uncertainty, respond to rapid changes in the short term and engage with the community (Bunker and Searle, 2007). Table 6.1 sets out the key potentialities of and resistances to such activity, some of the shifts and changes required in the institutional, policy and process frameworks and the attitudes and behaviours of the key actants emerging from the research. In addition, it offers ideas and information about how some of these resistances to planning at the local level can be liberated (Healey, 2005). A discussion of these provides the basis for an evaluation of the future prospects for the LPS instrument in WA and the PMR and at the same time contributes to knowledge about local strategic planning in other metropolitan urban environments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>RESISTANCES</th>
<th>POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Entrenched two tier system of planning governance</td>
<td>• Poor collaboration between state and local government, uncertainty and duplication of roles.</td>
<td>• Positive attempt to identify needs of each tier, reduce duplication and work collaboratively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increasing trend to state centralisation and potential diminishing of local government role.</td>
<td>• Recognise different needs of local government and adopt a more fluid rather than dichotomous approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Long standing commitment of government to strategic spatial planning</td>
<td>• Greater emphasis on big picture spatial planning and individual projects to achieve strategic objectives.</td>
<td>• Commitment by state government across all agencies to strategic planning at big picture, sub – regional and local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Priority on statutory processing in state and local government</td>
<td>• Recognition of the nexus between strategic and statutory planning and value of sound strategic framework to improve statutory planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independent state planning body (WAPC) with potential to promote and implement a shared strategic vision at a high political level.</td>
<td>• Failed attempts to integrate the activities of agencies involved in land use planning.</td>
<td>• Increased emphasis on integration of state government agencies involved in land use planning through WAPC linked with high level government (Treasury or Department of Premier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Silo mentality’ still operating and general lack of understanding and commitment to strategic spatial planning by service authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Government reform agenda focused on a corporate approach to creating stronger, more effective and more capable local government sector</td>
<td>• No spatial focus in requirement for Community Strategic Plan or recognition of value of strategic spatial planning.</td>
<td>• Combination of Community Strategic Plan with LPS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local governments unwilling to take on strategic planning because of adversarial nature.</td>
<td>• Establish multi-disciplinary teams within local government to work across policy areas to achieve spatial outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proposed local government amalgamation</td>
<td>• Potential discord at local government level or strengthening of position of some local govt areas to resist implementing wider objectives</td>
<td>• Support and incentives from State Government for local strategic planning and working across boundaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: The LPS – Opportunities, Resistances and Potential Solutions

Institutional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>RESISTANCES</th>
<th>POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policies and Processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotes wide strategic and policy focus on spatial quality, sustainable development, equity and fairness.</td>
<td>• Narrow current focus on economic competitiveness and efficiency.</td>
<td>• Widen view on strategic direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development driving infrastructure provision</td>
<td>• Direct development to locations most likely to optimise sustainable outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Narrow current focus on economic competitiveness and efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development driving infrastructure provision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development driving infrastructure provision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Entrenched in planning legislation and state planning policy, momentum established and review process under way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General lack of promotion and guidance from state government in the past - no longer regarded as major implementation tool to achieve strategic direction.</td>
<td>• Commitment at WAPC and DoP level to a concerted campaign to promote and recognise link between local and regional strategic planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The role of the LPS in achieving strategic direction is not understood by service agencies or promoted at the higher government level.</td>
<td>• Greater involvement of the Minister for Planning in approval of Local Planning Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• LPS has potential;</td>
<td>• Improvement in quality and consistency of strategic plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To provide one stop shop for negotiation and integration of demands of policy sectors and community.</td>
<td>• Consultation and collaboration with State agencies on infrastructure potential, local government and other stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Certainty for future growth and development and framework for coordinated infrastructure development within a realistic time frame of 10 – 15 years</td>
<td>• Clear and coherent support in terms of data and advice from state government to clarify expectation for the nature and content of LPS and application of state policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence based strategic framework to facilitate decision-making, delegation and contest Tribunal reviews</td>
<td>• Establish clear guidelines for assessment methods for LPS and criteria to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Liaison between Department of Planning and Local Government to explain LPS and nexus with other local government plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong state government support for strategic objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actors – Attitudes, Action and Attributes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shift from narrow land use planning perspective to a broader spatial planning approach premised on wider sustainability issues</td>
<td>• Lack of strategic planning skills in local and state government with over emphasis on statutory planning tasks and acquiring the necessary planning skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Demand on planners for conciseness clarity and quick processing – no room for meaningful discussion and use of intelligence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Widening of planning skills to encourage more reflection, use of analysis, comprehensive understanding of local environment and better communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerted shift to involve all planners in strategic and statutory planning process to improve understanding of nexus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential for planners to engage inclusively and collaboratively with all stakeholders and wider community, promote planning as a serious solution to improving and making a difference to quality of life.</td>
<td>• Poor collaboration and understanding of respective roles of local and state government in local strategic planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not cost effective for consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PIA and Local Government Planners Association to focus on value of local strategic planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage in-house production by providing resources and support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An institutional perspective

In an institutional sense, the idea of local strategic planning remains entrenched in most planning systems, including WA, but its management and implementation has continually changed course in accordance with shifts in governance and planning discourses. A key resistance to effective delivery has been the uncertainty about the roles of state and local government and ongoing problems of collaboration. The research indicates that this has seriously compromised the delivery of local strategic planning and without significant institutional changes, the ability of local strategic planning to contribute to effective governance is likely to be remain limited.

The complex and dynamic nature of the urban environment and the increasing resource demands on government require that each tier works cooperatively and that duplication is reduced. One senior practitioner in state government challenged the need for dichotomous roles for each tier of government in the process of undertaking strategic planning at the regional or local level. She pointed out that as circumstances differed substantially between local governments more emphasis should be placed on ‘the important conversation about their needs and resources, how to fill in the gaps and who would be best placed to provide support (Respondent 11).

The research indicated that there is a general acceptance and understanding of the value of that form of strategic planning which presents ‘an overall vision and framework for realising change and improving the quality of the built environment’(Albrechts, 2004). More recently, some of the negative outcomes of project based planning undertaken without a strategic framework for sustainable development, such as traffic congestion and poor accessibility, have become apparent. The idea of planning taking a leading role in strategic planning, particularly with regard to integration with other policy sectors and negotiating outcomes with major stakeholders provides a compelling opportunity. The WAPC, for example, with its independent role and collaborative structure, provides a unique opportunity to coordinate this strategic overview. In the local government institutional environment, the opportunity exists to integrate the initiatives of the Department of Planning and the Department of Communities and Local Government for plan making towards a spatial and wider strategic vision. Whilst the thrust for local government amalgamation was effectively abandoned in 2014 by the WA state government, opportunities for other effective area-wide governance through collaboration across the public and private sector remains an option (Kubler, 2005).
A policy and process perspective

The policies and processes operating within WA and the wider Australian context are couched within a neo-liberal environment focused on economic growth with a tendency to respond to individual development industry demands and promote project development. In such instances, development tends to dictate and direct the provision of physical and social infrastructure with scant attention to the wider sustainability implications of traffic congestion, environmental impact and housing affordability (Rydin, 2011). Within this planning and governance context, local strategic planning is no longer regarded as a significant implementation tool and there is a disincentive to engage in such activity. If such planning is to make an effective contribution to urban governance, the link between state and local planning and its advantages needs greater recognition at the state government level and needs to be championed by the relevant Minister(s). The potential of such planning to provide certainty and reduce risk in terms of growth areas and infrastructure provision, needs to be actively promoted and explained to the development industry, a powerful force in influencing reform of planning practice in WA.

A commitment to the preparation of a sound planning framework not only in terms of broad spatial direction but also within comprehensive sub-regional planning and policies is an essential requirement to guide but also direct local government in their responsibility for implementation. The Statement of Planning Policy 6.1 – Leeuwin-Naturaliste Ridge Policy (WAPC, 1998) was cited as a particularly good example of a document which provided such guidance. It was described as providing:

‘...a comprehensive amount of guidance but did not preclude local planning taking place... its success as an implementation tool was attributed to its timely preparation before development pressures mounted, sound evidence base and prescriptive direction where necessary.’

(Respondent 9)

An actant perspective

The research disclosed that actants involved in local strategic planning at the state and local level had diverse and conflicting views about the role and utility of such planning, but the most obvious deficiency was the inability of a growing number of professional planners to think and act strategically. Whilst this was established historically in local government with its focus on regulatory activity, changes in planning and governance at the state government level have also shown a distinctive shift away from strategic planning in its broad sense to one focused more on specific strategic projects. Cultural change in this area is therefore an essential issue at both levels of government if local strategic planning is to achieve
momentum. Some of the potential solutions to this include changes to academic planning programs by giving more emphasis to strategic planning, the same also applies to professional development programmes for practising planners, and there is a need for strategic planning to be promoted more widely by bodies such as the Planning Institute of Australia and Local Government Planners Association. The dichotomy between strategic and statutory planners needs to be removed with recognition that planners need to have a sound understanding of both streams of planning to perform effectively in the complex urban environment.
Chapter 7 - THE LPS IN FUTURE GOVERNANCE - CONCLUSIONS AND REFLECTIONS

Rather than looking for coherent regimes, collaborative networks, ideal strategic plans and planning, a more favourable theoretic context for developing research questions about contemporary practice may focus on how actors assess the challenges, opportunities and the incentives necessary for collaboration and possibly fail, for many reasons, to achieve even short-term objectives. We need to give more attention to the ordinary politics of planning.

(Newman, 2008:1382)

Introduction

This study was concerned with tracing and analysing a particular facet of the WA planning system – the local planning strategy (LPS). The LPS was introduced in WA in late 1999 under the auspices of the then Liberal Government led by Premier Richard Court. The idea of promoting strategic planning at the local government level was championed in the early 1990s by the then Minister for Planning, Richard Lewis and a small cohort of senior planners. The narration of this story, approached from a ‘pracademic’ perspective, exposes the potentialities and resistances of local strategic planning in a situated context, but at the same time offers a contribution to wider understanding about the value of local strategic planning as a mode of effective governance.

Rationale for the LPS

The study first sought to explain the rationale for and expectations of the LPS when introduced in 1999. This disclosed that it was intended not only as an instrument for more effective strategic planning, but also as an instrument for more effective governance at both the state and local government level. The LPS was intended to help the WAPC/DoP implement its state and regional strategies and policies by compelling local councils to devise local strategic plans that reflected the aims and objectives of these higher ordered plans. In addition, local councils were encouraged to move away from their reliance on town planning schemes to control and manage development within their jurisdictions and adopt a wider strategic overview through the LPS mechanism. Not only was the LPS expected to coordinate and integrate economic, social and environmental development in the local government areas, but it would also provide a sound framework to streamline and facilitate decision making, a key tenet of planning reform. It reflected popular academic debate and policy in the UK and Europe at the time (Healey, 2006; Albrechts, 2004) centred on the idea that strategic planning could promote integrated solutions for sustainable urban development in places and territories.
Response to LPS

When town planning schemes, the first mechanism for local strategic (statutory) planning in WA, were introduced under the *Town Planning and Development Act 1928* and made compulsory some 35 years later under the *Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act, 1959*, the response from local government was exceptionally slow (Berry, 1992). A descriptive analysis of the response of local government to the LPS requirement revealed a similar lack of enthusiasm. In many ways the lacklustre response of local government to state government policy edicts is one of the defining characteristics of state-local government relations in WA. This project sought to explore why this was the case, what the principal resistances to such activity were and whether this mode of urban governance could realistically achieve expectations for improved urban governance in the PMR. It reached a number of major conclusions about the LPS, its effectiveness as a mode of strategic planning and governance and its overall contribution to effective governance in the metropolitan area.

The Influence on the Response

In overall terms, the ideal of a more strategic, innovative and collaborative approach to local planning through the mechanism of the LPS has not become institutionalised in WA planning practice over the last 14 years. Although there had been some concerted early attempts to promote the LPS idea in regional areas, this had not occurred to the same extent in the PMR which houses the areas of most intense urbanisation and the focus of most strategic planning activity. Furthermore, the understanding of and interest in mobilising this initiative had been obscured and overtaken by other priorities in the overall urban and planning governance framework.

The research found that the failure to effect the envisaged transformation of planning practice was strongly influenced by significant changes in urban governance at the state and local government level, reflecting one of the underlying theoretical premises of the thesis. At the state government level there was a strong political shift towards broad spatial planning documents and delivery of strategic planning and major infrastructure through projects and alternative forms of governance. And, at the local government level recent reforms had not elevated the role of planning. Rather, they encouraged internally focused strategic and community planning that had little focus on achieving wider spatially integrated outcomes. In both the state and local government contexts, mainstream planning similarly reflected the neo-liberal orthodoxy of facilitating economic growth and streamlining and improving statutory processes to further even more economic growth. Vigar *et al* (2000) highlight similar failures in the UK
where centralisation and regulatory activity remained the focus of planning practice, instead of a focus on dealing with the new governance landscape and networks. These shifts widened the gap between strategic and statutory planning, did little to improve the fractious relationship between the two tiers of government or remove confusion about their respective roles in the planning process. Whilst the rhetorical value of strategic planning at both the state and local level was recognised by those surveyed and most of the interviewees, the practical reality was a lack of belief in the value and the utility of the local planning strategy.

**Future Prospects for the LPS and Local Strategic Planning in Urban Governance**

The LPS is embedded in the WA legislative and institutional framework which has all the basic tenets of a sound framework and supportive governance structure for strategic and statutory planning (COAG, 2012). The framework provides for a system of plans at different spatial levels, a comprehensive policy framework to guide land use decision making and an independent planning body, capable of giving strategic direction and facilitating positive collaboration between local and state government. The state has a sound economy and the use of strategic frameworks to guide the growth of the PMR has been a longstanding feature of planning and governance culture. Despite the slow beginnings, over 75% of all local governments in WA either have an endorsed LPS or are in various stages of preparing one. There are even a few councils that have embarked on a second edition of their LPS. There has been some acknowledgement, if somewhat tentative, of the value of local strategic planning with the Shire of Mundaring, an outer metropolitan local council, receiving a PIA (WA) Award for Excellence for its LPS and TPS in November, 2014. There are also some small but encouraging signs of shifts towards a more strategic approach to planning with the emergence of integrated approaches to land use and environmental and bushfire protection and attempts to improve collaboration and implementation.

**Conclusions**

The project has exposed and reinforced some of the potentialities of state and local strategic planning to produce integrated and efficient place focused planning outcomes within WA and in other metropolitan areas of Australia. First, its ability to integrate the demands of policy sectors and negotiate outcomes with the community and other stakeholders was seen as a significant advantage for the development industry. The ability to promote greater certainty for future growth and development and a framework for cost effective and timely delivery of both hard and soft infrastructure by service agencies clearly has the potential to promote a more risk free environment. Secondly, in the current national climate of cutting
red tape and improving regulatory processes, a comprehensive, well justified planning framework is likely to facilitate processes and the quality of statutory decision making at both the state and local level.

The research confirmed the theoretical view about the influential nature of governance on planning practice, but challenged the theoretical proposition and conventional generalisation about the value of strategic spatial planning in the urban environment. It identified a number of obstacles for local strategic planning in making a contribution to effective governance which have wider application to other urban areas in Australia. These included: (i) the absence of authority to act as an integrative force for policy (Nadin, 2007); (ii) the focus on administrative boundaries rather than functional entities (Baker and Wong, 2013); and (iii) the tendency to use new forms or vehicles for planning which potentially sidestep the wider responsibility of social and environmental objectives (Haughton et al, 2009). Additionally, deficiencies in and disjunctures between the substantive content of state and local planning frameworks, a general discordance in the process between state and local government and a general diminution of strategic planning skills in both tiers of government provided further resistance to effective local strategic planning.

The PMR and other metropolitan areas continue to grow rapidly but face increasing problems in terms of housing affordability, traffic congestion, uncertainty about major public transport and infrastructure delivery, concerns about water supplies and responsible environmental planning. It seems clear that the combination of ‘big picture spatial planning’ and infrastructure project planning offer a short term response to the imperatives of economic growth and competitiveness. They do not, however, appear to be a substitute for comprehensive strategic planning in metropolitan areas (Gleeson et al, 2010). In this regard, the pendulum may well shift, as it has in the past, in recognition of the need for more integrated solutions to urban governance and bridging of the gap between strategic and statutory planning and state and local government institutions. Put simply, there remains a sound case for promoting and improving strategic spatial planning at both the regional and local level as a mode for more effective governance. Rethinking the current approach to planning and governance, however, will require substantial shifts in political discourse, policy and process commitments and the views and behaviours of those involved in urban governance.
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APPENDIX 1 – Survey Questionnaire for Local Government Planners

SECTION A

WA PLANNING SYSTEM – ROLE OF STRATEGIC SPATIAL PLANNING

Strategic spatial planning originated in the early 1900s in Western Australia in response to the need for coordination of growth and development in the Perth Metropolitan Region. The State Government has taken responsibility for this key planning activity since then and has released a number of spatial strategic plans for metropolitan and regional areas.

1. In terms of relevance, on a scale of 1 (most relevant) to 3 (least relevant) please indicate which one of the following definitions /descriptions most closely represents your current understanding of the term “strategic spatial planning”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ‘blueprint plan” based on strategic and social objectives which gives clear direction and guidance to all stakeholders on future spatial development and provision of infrastructure within an area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A plan which selects a strategic direction for future development of an area but provides a flexible framework and guidelines for decision making and negotiation between major partners to work towards that direction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A plan which opens out a range of opportunities and alternative futures in a fluid and generalised spatial structure and encourages creative responses to future development through networking, communication and negotiation with all stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. To what extent do you Agree/Disagree with the following general statements regarding the need for strategic spatial planning in WA?

(SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D= Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic spatial planning is necessary to deal with increasing complexity in urban and rural environments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic spatial planning is necessary to achieve a balance between conflicting objectives or priorities and to resolve the conflicts between economic, social, environmental and cultural imperatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic spatial planning is necessary to improve material conditions in the built environment and create good place planning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic spatial planning is necessary to provide certainty and stability for the development industry and service providers with associated reduction of risk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic spatial planning is largely ineffective given its long time frames and inability to deal with changing economic conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic spatial planning is largely irrelevant as decisions on growth and development are inevitably determined by the market and led by the development industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. To what extent do you **Agree/Disagree** with the following statements regarding the responsibility for strategic spatial planning in WA?

(SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D= Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Federal Government should have more involvement in providing direction for strategic planning within all the states of Australia including WA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic spatial planning should be undertaken predominantly by the State Government in consultation with relevant state government agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government should have a greater level of involvement in strategic spatial planning given its significant role in implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic spatial planning should be undertaken predominantly by local government in consultation with relevant stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **In the past five years has a draft or final metropolitan or regional framework strategy** *(e.g Directions 2031 and Beyond, Greater Bunbury Strategy, Pilbara Planning and Infrastructure Framework, Wheatbelt Land Use Planning Strategy)* **been released by the state which affects your area?**

- YES [Proceed to Question 5](#)
- NO  [Proceed to Question 7](#)

5. **What is/are the title(s) of the strategy/strategies?**

- Strategy 1  [Proceed to Question ?](#)
- Strategy 2  [Proceed to Question ?](#)
- Strategy 3  [Proceed to Question ?](#)
6. In your view, how effectively/ineffectively does the strategy or strategies meet the following key objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Partially Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarifies the direction for future growth and development in your local government area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides a close link with the provision of infrastructure and funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifies responsibility for implementation of proposals and delivery of planning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please indicate the level of involvement of your local government in the process of preparing a metropolitan or regional strategic spatial plan to guide development in your local government area in the past five years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance/representation on Steering Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at forums /workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with State government officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written or oral submissions to draft strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The WAPC has a state planning framework policy (SPP1) incorporating a hierarchy of plans for specific areas and policies relating to specific planning issues.

8. How useful, in your view, are these different levels of plans and policies in providing direction and/or guidance to your local government for land use planning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Little or no use</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Not relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Planning Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan or Regional Strategic Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional/Sub- Regional Structure Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. How useful, in your view, are these plans and policies in providing direction and/or guidance to your local government in planning for the following matters?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Little or no use</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No relevance to area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Supply and Affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Densities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of infrastructure provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Agricultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Basic Raw Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In September 2009, the State Government released a publication “Planning Makes It Happen- a blueprint for planning reform”. The key aim of this planning reform document is to improve the planning system by simplifying and streamlining approval processes and developing a more strategic approach to planning.

10. To what extent do you Agree/Disagree with the following statements regarding the impact of the planning reform agenda in Western Australia over the past three years?

(SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D= Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The planning reform agenda has simplified the approvals processes, cutting red tape and reducing time lines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The planning reform agenda is providing greater certainty and accountability in the planning processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The planning reform agenda has improved the planning system by providing clear strategic direction for future growth and infrastructure provision through the release of new plans and policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategic planning focus of the planning reform agenda has focused predominantly on big picture planning in metropolitan areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The planning reform agenda has focused predominantly on the facilitation of major projects in regional areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The planning reform agenda has facilitated local strategic planning by local governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Have you received any formal or informal training/education about the LPS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>Proceed to Question 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Proceed to Question 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Where have you gained your understanding of the role and rationale of the Local Planning Strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Professional Workshops/Seminars</th>
<th>Proceed to Question 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WAPC published information</td>
<td>Proceed to Question 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Workshops/Seminars</td>
<td>Proceed to Question 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts with other professionals</td>
<td>Proceed to Question 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – please specify</td>
<td>Proceed to Question 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Who was the provider of the external workshop/seminar?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Government Planning Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WALGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Institute (WA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. In your view, to what extent does your elected Council Agree/Disagree with the following roles for strategic spatial planning for your local government area?

(SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D= Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic spatial planning should be undertaken predominantly by the state to provide a planning framework for land use planning by local government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government should play a dominant and active role in strategic spatial planning for its area by the preparation of strategic plans and policies to guide land use planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Local Planning Strategy should be seen as one component of the overall Strategic Plan/Strategic Community Plan for the local government which deals with the element of future land use and development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Local Planning Strategy should provide the overarching framework for future growth and development in the local government area and the financial delivery of future services and infrastructure for the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How many people are employed in your local government to undertake the professional planning function?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. In your view, which one of the following ‘organisational arrangements most closely represents the functioning of the planning division in your local government?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrangement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate sections for strategic and statutory planning with largely autonomous roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate sections for strategic and statutory planning but close coordination of functions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No separation between strategic and statutory planning functions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. In your view which of the following areas of planning activity within your Council are regarded as statutory and/or strategic in nature?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Planning Activity</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
<th>Statutory</th>
<th>Statutory and Strategic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processing of subdivision applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing of development applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing of application for rezoning or scheme amendments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to appeals /reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of policies and guidelines to guide decision making on land use matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of town planning scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of strategic growth plans for future growth and development of the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific planning projects such as redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. In your view, how important/unimportant in terms of assignation of planning priorities and resources is each of the following areas of planning activity within your local government area to your Council?

(VI =Very important; I= Important; SI = Somewhat important; U=Unimportant; VU= Very unimportant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Planning Activity</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>VU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processing of planning applications for subdivision, development and rezoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of policies and guidelines to guide decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of strategic plans such as the LPS for future growth and development of the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in specific planning projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. How important/unimportant are each of the following local government documents in guiding land use planning within your local government area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>VU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Strategic Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Community Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Planning Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Planning Strategies (eg Commercial, Housing, Urban Design)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Planning Scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. What is the current status of your Council’s Local Planning Strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Proceed to Section C - Question 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endorsed by the WAPC</td>
<td>Proceed to Section C - Question 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising completed</td>
<td>Proceed to Question 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awaiting certification to advertise</td>
<td>Proceed to Question 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under preparation</td>
<td>Proceed to Question 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No work yet commenced</td>
<td>Proceed to Question 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. To what extent do you **Agree/Disagree** with the following reasons as contributory factors underpinning the lack of progress in developing your LPS?

(SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D= Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources or skills to undertake the task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority given to day to day statutory processing of planning applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding and appropriate guidance for preparation of documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty about future direction of growth in the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty about future local government boundary changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubts about the utility and effectiveness of such a document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for and priority given to use of other planning tools or mechanisms to guide and control development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ( please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Proceed to Section E – Respondent Details*
### 22. How Important/Unimportant were each of the following drivers in influencing the decision to prepare an LPS for your local government?

(VI = Very important; I = Important; SI = Somewhat important; U = Unimportant; VU = Very unimportant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory obligation - part of the Local Planning Scheme review process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate obligation - directive from the Council or senior management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of the need to respond strategically to planning issues in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other? Please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 23. Who prepared the LPS for your local government area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-house planner/s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An in-house team of multi-disciplinary staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly by planning or other consultants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially by consultants in consultation with planning staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ( please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 24. Was the LPS prepared:

- As a separate planning document
- As part of a new planning scheme
25. To what extent, if any, were the following stakeholders involved in the preparation of the LPS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Chief Executive Officer and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other corporate executives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special interest groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government planners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State Government planners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved in the provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of servicing and housing infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other local government authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. In your overall view how important/unimportant was each of the following in influencing the final outcome and nature of the draft report?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>VU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert and technical research and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data providing evidence base for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic direction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge obtained from social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processes and debate with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to state and regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plans and policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representations by lobby groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific local planning issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. How long did it take to prepare the LPS in a form ready for submission to the WAPC for certification to advertise?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-6 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. **How long after submission of the LPS did the WAPC make a decision supporting advertising?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. **What methods of public participation were utilised in the preparation and display of the draft LPS?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper advertising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys of community/stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Workshops/Forums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. **How long was your LPS advertised for public comment?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The minimum period of 3 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weeks to 12 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 weeks or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. **How many submissions were received to your LPS during the advertising period?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. In overall terms, how substantial were the changes, if any, to the LPS after the advertising period closed?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately substantial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few or no changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If your LPS has not been endorsed at this stage proceed to Question 35*

33. How long did it take from commencement of process of preparation of LPS to final endorsement by the WAPC?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. On reflection what do you consider were the three principal barriers experienced by your local government in progressing this document to final endorsement?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barrier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION D

#### VALUE AND UTILITY OF LPS/DRAFT LPS

35. **To what extent do you **Agree/Disagree** with the following general statements regarding the status of the LPS in your local government?**

(SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D= Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The LPS is widely promoted in Council documents and the website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LPS is an internal working document widely used and referred to by the Council and Council staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LPS is an internal working document used primarily by the planning department to guide decision making on land use planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LPS is seldom used or referred to by staff or Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. **To what extent do you **Agree/Disagree** with the following statements regarding your LPS / Draft LPS?**

(SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D= Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The LPS/draft LPS provides clear guidance on the future development of the area by setting out the aims and objectives and the policies, proposals and programs for their achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LPS/draft LPS makes proper provision for development whilst at the same time taking into account the interests of conservation and the need to protect the local environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recommendations in the LPS/draft LPS are based on consultation and negotiation with key utility providers, public agencies and other relevant stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LPS assists the implementation of broader state and regional policies by interpreting and adapting them to local circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LPS is closely linked to and provides the rationale for the zoning and provisions within the scheme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LPS provides useful and clear guidance in the assessment of statutory planning applications (subdivision, development, rezoning/scheme amendments) and making recommendations to the Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LPS increases public confidence in and understanding of the planning system and enables the planning process to work more smoothly in this local government area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. To what extent do you **Agree/Disagree** with the following statements?

(SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D= Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Council give serious consideration to the LPS/draft LPS in their decision making on development, subdivision and rezoning applications in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department of Planning give serious consideration to the LPS/draft LPS in their decision making on development, subdivision and rezoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LPS /Draft LPS has been used successfully to contest appeals to development and subdivision decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Please provide any comment on how you think the LPS could be utilised more effectively to achieve better planning outcomes in your local government area.
SECTION E
RESPONDENT DETAILS

39. What is the name of your local government authority?


40. Do you have a professional planning qualification?

NO

YES

If you answered NO, you have now completed the survey – thank you.

If you answered YES to the above question, proceed to Questions 41 and 42

41. What is your position /role within the planning department of your local government?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager/Director of Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager/Senior Planner - Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/Senior Planner - Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Officer – Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Officer – Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. What is the length of your experience in planning practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 1 year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
43. **How long have you been employed as a planner in this local government?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey is now completed – thank you.
APPENDIX 2 - - Interview Questions

RESEARCH QUESTIONS FOR THESIS

1. What were the key theoretical, political and policy related drivers for the introduction of the requirement for the Local Planning Strategy in 1999 by the WA State Government?

2. How have local governments in WA responded to this change in policy direction by the State, particularly in the Perth Metropolitan Region, and what has influenced the response?

3. What are the future prospects for an effective contribution by local strategic planning to wider strategic planning objectives and better governance of the Perth Metropolitan area?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

A. Senior Planning Representatives

Strategic Planning in WA

1. What in your view have been the principal drivers behind the steady release of strategic spatial plans for the major metropolitan area since the Stephenson /Hepburn Plan, 1955?

2. How effective do you think these plans have been with regard to:
   - providing direction for integrated future growth and development,
   - promoting coordinated provision of infrastructure,
   - balancing economic, environmental and social sustainability
   - opening up ideas for new approaches to urban governance

3. What, if any, have been the barriers facing the implementation of such initiatives?

4. In your view, what level of support/commitment is there in WA from politicians and policy sectors for spatial planning in general and as a guide for decisionmaking?
5. Do you think there is an ongoing role/need for the production of such plans or are there more effective ways to achieve strategic planning objectives in urban areas such as project planning initiatives?

6. What is your view of the role and responsibilities of Federal, State and Local Government in strategic spatial planning for the State?

**Local Strategic Planning in WA – Past**

7. Did you have a direct involvement in the introduction of the LPS in WA – What was your role or responsibility in the introduction of this policy change?

8. What in your view were the key reasons and intentions of the state government in requiring a Local Planning Strategy to accompany the town planning scheme in place of the Scheme Report in 1999?

**Local Strategic Planning in WA – Future**

*Only 5 local governments of the 30 in the Perth Metropolitan Region and 40 outside the Region have had their Local Planning Strategies endorsed since 1999.*

9. What in your view are the key reasons for the slow response to implementation of this state initiative in the Perth Metropolitan Region by local government?

10. Do you think there is an ongoing role for strategic spatial planning at the local level in the WA planning system with regard to providing for better place outcomes or are there other more effective ways to achieve these objectives?

11. If you do value the role of local strategic planning, how do you think this activity can be encouraged and improved?

12. Do you think amalgamation of local government areas within and outside the Perth Region has the potential to encourage the activity of local strategic planning and improve relationships between state and local government and other agencies involved in land use planning?

**B. Crafters of Local Planning Strategies**

**Strategic Planning in WA – role and relationship between state and local**
1. What in your view were the key reasons and intentions for the state government requiring a Local Planning Strategy to accompany the town planning scheme in place of the Scheme Report in 1999?

2. Given that the state government has traditionally performed the predominant strategic planning role in WA, what is your view on placing greater emphasis on strategic planning at the local level?

**Local Government Response**

3. What were the main drivers within your local government behind the preparation of your LPS?

4. A LPS is required to implement state and regional policy. Can you comment on the clarity and usefulness of the state government planning framework in assisting this component of your preparation of the LPS?

5. What barriers, if any, did you experience in the process of preparing and completing the Strategy?

6. In your view does the LPS:
   - Facilitate more integrated and coordinated growth and development in the local government area by involving a wide range of public and private stakeholders,
   - Provide clear guidance on decision making on rezoning, subdivision and development of land?
   - Include some new or diverse approaches to managing urban development.

7. What is the status and function of the LPS in your local government area, how does it fit in with the Strategic Plan / Community Strategy or corporate vision?

   *Only 5 local governments of the 30 in the Perth Metropolitan Region and 40 outside the Region have had their Local Planning Strategies endorsed since 1999.*

8. What in your view are the key reasons for the slow response to implementation of this state initiative in the Perth Metropolitan Region by local government?

9. Do you think there is an ongoing role for strategic spatial planning at the local level in the WA planning system with regard to providing for better place outcomes or are there other more effective ways to achieve these objectives?
10. If you do value the role of local strategic planning, how do you think this activity can be encouraged and improved?

11. Do you think amalgamation of local government areas within and outside the Perth Region has the potential to encourage the activity of local strategic planning and improve relationships between state and local government and other agencies involved in land use planning?

**Assessors of Local Planning Strategies**

**Strategic Planning in WA – role and relationship between state and local**

1. What in your view were the key reasons for the state government requiring a Local Planning Strategy to accompany the town planning scheme in place of the Scheme Report in 1999?

2. Given that the state government has traditionally performed the predominant strategic planning role in WA what is your view on placing greater emphasis on strategic planning at the local level?

**Response of Local Government**

3. How many Local Planning Strategies have you assessed?

4. In your assessment of an LPS for various local government areas in the Perth Metropolitan Region can you provide your view on:
   - The understanding of the local government of the objectives and purpose of the LPS
   - The ability of the LPS to articulate a clear strategic direction for growth and development and provide guidance for decisionmaking on rezoning and subdivision at the state level.
   - The understanding of and the adherence to recommendations in state and regional policy.
   - Evidence of collaboration with a wide range of stakeholders or new or diverse approaches to managing urban development.

5. Did you experience obstacles/ barriers in the process of your assessment and if so can you provide details?

*Only 5 local governments of the 30 in the Perth Metropolitan Region and 40 outside the Region have had their Local Planning Strategies endorsed since 1999.*
6. What in your view are the key reasons for the slow response to implementation of this state initiative in the Perth Metropolitan Region by local government?

7. Do you think there is an ongoing role for strategic spatial planning at the local level in the WA planning system with regard to providing for better place outcomes or are there other more effective ways to achieve these objectives?

8. If you do value the role of local strategic planning, how do you think this activity can be encouraged and improved?

9. Do you think amalgamation of local government areas in Perth Region will encourage the activity of local strategic planning and improve relationships between state and local government and other agencies involved in land use planning?

**Other interviewees with no commitment to LPS**

1. What in your view were the key reasons for the state government requiring a Local Planning Strategy to accompany the town planning scheme in place of the Scheme Report in 1999?

2. Given that the state government has traditionally performed the predominant strategic planning role in WA what is your view on placing greater emphasis on strategic planning at the local level?

3. What are your reasons for pursuing alternatives to the preparation of a LPS and what in your view is the most effective way of implementing strategic planning objectives at the local government level?

4. Do you think amalgamation of local government areas in Perth Region or outside the Metropolitan Region will encourage the activity of local strategic planning and improve relationships between state and local government and other agencies involved in land use planning?