

**2.8: REVISION OF WA PLANNING COMMISSION RURAL PLANNING POLICIES**

<b>Land Description</b>	: Various
<b>Proponent</b>	: WA Planning Commission
<b>Business Entity Name</b>	: N/A
<b>Attachments</b>	: Nil
<b>Appendices</b>	: Draft State Planning Policy 2.5 'Land Use Planning in Rural Areas' : Draft Development Control Policy 3.4 'Subdivision of Rural Land'
<b>Responsible Officer(s)</b>	: E/ Director Planning and Development Services (G Bride)

**Maps and Diagrams:**

Nil.

**ITEM 2.8: AMENDMENT BY COUNCILLOR D BOSTOCK**

**MOVED: COUNCILLOR D BOSTOCK**  
**SECONDED: COUNCILLOR J BOSTOCK**

**THAT 1) (b) be removed from the Responsible Officer Recommendation.**

**LOST 3-9**

**Record of Vote**

For the Motion: Councillors Paver, J Bostock and D Bostock

**ITEM 2.8: RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

That Council NOTE the revised draft WA Planning Commission State Planning Policy 2.5 'Land Use Planning in Rural Areas' and Development Control Policy 3.4 'Subdivision of Rural Land' and PREPARE a submission to the WA Planning Commission advising of its concerns with certain aspects of the policies, namely:

- 1) WA Planning Commission draft SPP 2.5 'Land Use Planning in Rural Areas':
  - (a) It does not support the removal of the ability for a Local Government to nominate 'regionally significant agricultural land' for protection in local planning strategies and schemes.
  - (b) Irrespective of size, all tree farms (both for softwood/hardwood tree production plantations and carbon-sequestration plantations) should require planning approval from the relevant Local Government and which may be prevented from some areas of the City.
  - (c) The need for a reticulated water supply to be provided to all rural living lots (1 – 40ha's) is not supported or considered feasible in some instances. The City would recommend the Commission adopt a more flexible approach to recognise the need to allow for modest growth/expansion of existing settlements and encourage the retention of smaller rural communities within the City.
  - (d) The subdivision of rural land for carbon-sequestration lots is supported subject to it establishing (in conjunction with DC 3.4) some minimum criteria for carbon sequestration lots such as minimum lot size, shape, number of lots, management controls over time, restriction to one-off applications, must have local government approval for that purpose etc.
- 2) WA Planning Commission draft DC 3.4 'Subdivision of Rural Land':
  - (a) It does not support the mandatory requirement for a reticulated water service to be provided to all rural living lots.
  - (b) That the standards for subdivision construction, particularly roads and flood/stormwater drainage continue to be at the discretion of the Local Government.
  - (c) Whilst it does not affect the City directly, it is suggested the WAPC consider a more flexible approach to subdivision given the changes expected to agriculture types and practices expected from changing climates and world demands over time.
  - (d) The Policy should place less reliance on achieving minimum lots sizes and more effort on proving the lot is both capable and suitable for agricultural use consistent with similar lots and operations in the locality.
  - (e) The City wishes to retain the present 40ha balance lot requirement for homestead lots at this stage. The City will now seek advice from the Department of Agriculture and Food regarding the suitability of the existing minimum lot size criteria, prior to making any alteration.

**ITEM 2.8: RESOLUTION (Responsible Officer Recommendation)**

**MOVED: COUNCILLOR MATLA  
SECONDED: COUNCILLOR WOLFE**

**THAT the Responsible Officer Recommendation be ADOPTED.**

**CARRIED 11-1**

**Record of Vote**

Against the Motion: Councillor D Bostock

## **BACKGROUND**

1. The WA Planning Commission utilises these planning policies to determine applications for development within rural areas of the State, in particular the subdivision of rural land. SPP 2.5 (renamed from SPP 11 March 2002) sets out the Commission's state-wide policy for rural land use planning whilst DC 3.4 (February 2008) deals specifically with the subdivision of rural land (which includes general/priority agricultural land and rural living areas such as special rural lots etc).
2. The draft policies seek to more clearly elaborate the WAPC's long-held stance that rural subdivision and the conversion of agricultural land to rural living purposes should be limited.
3. SPP's are strategic policies of the WA Planning Commission that apply across the State and are required to be incorporated into local planning strategies and schemes including local planning policies by Local Governments. The review of SPP 2.5 and DC 3.4 therefore affects the recommendations in the existing City Albany Local Planning Strategy (ALPS) and relevant schemes and policies.
4. The Commission utilise the policies to guide decision-making on local planning strategies, schemes and scheme amendments and when considering subdivision applications in tandem with DC policies.

## **DISCUSSION**

5. The two policies are discussed below with respective recommendations for each section.

### **Draft State Planning Policy 2.5 'Land Use Planning in Rural Areas'**

6. The review has created a far less prescriptive SPP 2.5 policy than exists at present (Note: many of the more prescriptive elements relating to scheme provisions/zones will now be included in proposed Guideline 2.5.1 – Land Use Planning in Rural Areas, which has not been released). There is an attempt in the draft policies to consider the need for regional variations based on needs of differing rural areas throughout the State.
7. The objectives of the revised SPP are:
  - a) To protect rural land from incompatible uses by:
    - Requiring comprehensive planning for rural areas;
    - Making land-use decisions for rural land that support existing and future primary production and protection of priority agricultural land;
    - Providing investment security for the existing and future primary production sector.
  - b) To promote regional development through the provision of economic opportunities on rural land;
  - c) To promote sustainable settlement in, and adjacent to, existing urban areas;
  - d) To protect and improve environmental, landscape and cultural assets; and
  - e) To minimise land use conflicts that compromise rural land uses.

8. There are 6 main Policy Measures proposed:
- Protection of rural land;
  - Rural land in the Metropolitan Region;
  - Regional variation, economic opportunities and regional development;
  - Rural living precincts;
  - Managing and improving environmental and cultural attributes; and
  - Avoiding land use conflicts.

**5.1 Protection of rural land**

9. The draft Policy reiterates the current requirement for high capability land to be zoned Priority Agriculture and requires this land to be retained for food production purposes. The WAPC's view is that there is an existing supply of suitably sized and located lots throughout the State to cater for intensive and emerging primary production land uses.
10. The use of land for intensive or emerging primary production does not warrant creation of new rural lots. Creation of new rural lots will be allowed by exception as set out in DC 3.4 or when contained in an approved Local Planning Strategy.
11. The SPP proposes a different definition of priority agriculture land to delete reference to any regionally significant agricultural land and only focussed on the land considered to be of State significance. This approach is disappointing given the benefits and contribution that traditional agriculture plays within the State and especially in rural port towns such as Albany in the Great Southern.
12. The existing planning approach to high capability land suitable for intensive agriculture has been to promote investment through subdividing suitable/capable land into generally smaller lot sizes when compared to general or broadacre farming. This approach is not supported under the revised Policy.

**5.2 Rural land in the metropolitan region**

13. Given its location, this Policy does not impact on the City.

**5.3 Regional variation, economic opportunities and regional development**

14. The draft Policy indicates that the WAPC's decisions will be guided by the need to provide economic opportunities for regional communities and to protect the State's primary production and use of natural resource assets (i.e. soil, water etc).
15. The WAPC will continue to promote rural zones as highly flexible zones that cater for a wide range of land uses that can support primary production, tourism and environmental and cultural pursuits. Regional variations may be considered where these meet the stated objectives of the Policy and are contained in planning strategies endorsed by the WAPC. If there is no WAPC endorsed strategy justifying variations to the SPP, then the SPP will prevail.

16. This policy measure leaves open the door for local governments to seek regional variations. However, given the requirement that any variation has to meet the objectives of SPP 2.5, it is unlikely that the WAPC would endorse a planning strategy that seeks to promote rural subdivision or incorporate measures that are considered by the WAPC to be contrary to the policies objectives.
17. The Policy proposes to incorporate specific provisions relating to tree farming. The draft Policy contains the following provisions relating to tree farming:

*5.3.2 Tree farming*

*Tree farming is a generic term used to describe activity that centres on the planting of trees to generate economic return and environmental benefits. It has been a rapidly emerging industry in a number of rural locations in the south of the State. Usually this has involved the planting of trees for harvest, however more recently, the planting of trees solely for the purposes of carbon sequestration has emerged as a new land use on rural land. Tree farming involving harvesting is a primary production activity that also sequesters carbon. WAPC policy in regard to tree farming is:*

- a) *Tree farming is supported and encouraged on rural land as a means of diversifying rural economies and providing economic and environmental benefit;*
  - b) *Tree farming is a permitted use on rural land, but should generally not be permitted on land identified as priority agriculture;*
  - c) *Local governments may wish to manage the location and extent of tree farming in their communities through either local planning strategies or local planning policies;*
  - d) *In planning for tree farming, local governments should consider the potential environmental and economic benefit, visual landscape and transport impacts of tree farming (where harvesting is proposed); and*
  - e) *Tree farms should be subject to local government planning approval when harvesting is proposed, and/or the tree farm has a minimum aggregate planted area of 40ha.*
18. The statement appears confusing on the one hand declaring tree farms ‘supported and encouraged and a permitted use’ and then on the other stating ‘Local governments may wish to manage the location and extent of tree farming in their communities through either local planning strategies or local planning policies’. The preferred approach is for tree farming (either plantation or carbon-sequestration) to be discretionary within the rural zones, both general and priority as recommended in ALPS. This would support the Local Government’s ability to control tree farming within its district and remove the present ambiguity from the statement.
  19. Presently Town Planning Scheme No. 3 includes Silviculture as a ‘P’ land use in the Rural Zone which although permitted (i.e. an application would not be refused), requires planning approval and the setting of conditions mainly relating to fire protection, roads and harvesting activities.
  20. The draft supports the concept of rural enterprise zones within rural areas which combine light industry and ancillary housing (such as a caretaker’s house), provided they are planned for in a Local Planning Strategy and close to urban areas.

#### **5.4 Rural living precincts**

21. The draft Policy defines rural living as follows:

*A land use zone where residential is the predominant land use, generally characterised by large lots in the order of 1 to 40ha in a peri-urban location. Although primary production may occur on some rural living properties it is usually for hobby farming or incidental income purposes. In terms of land use zones this includes, but is not limited to, special residential, rural living, rural retreat, rural residential, special rural, rural smallholdings, and landscape protection zones. This also includes subdivision of rural land into smaller landholdings e.g. a boundary realignment which results in lots of a size where residential is the predominant land use. Rural living is not considered a rural or agricultural land use, as defined by the Planning and Development Act 2005.*

22. The draft Policy therefore expands the concept of 'rural living' to a wider range of zones. The existing Special Rural, Special Residential, Conservation and Landscape Protection zones will be considered 'rural living' and subject to the same types of controls as more traditional 'rural residential' zones.
23. These areas are; required to be located close to existing centres and services; not adversely affect rural production; are guided by land supply; and do not impede townsite expansion. As with the current SPP, rural living development needs to be identified in a planning strategy endorsed by the WAPC and zoned appropriately in the local scheme to allow subdivision.
24. Changes to the existing SPP include the requirement for reticulated water supplied by a licensed water service provider or it be proved that an alternative such as roof catchment water supply can be provided for domestic and fire fighting purposes. The draft Policy also seeks to ensure rural living is located on land that does not have an extreme bushfire risk.
25. The requirement for the provision of a reticulated water supply to all lots is not supported. Many of the smaller towns around Albany (such as Wellstead, Manypeaks, Redmond, Youngs Siding, Elleker, Torbay Hill, Kalgan, South Stirling and Cheyne Beach) do not have a supply at present and this requirement would prevent any growth or expansion which conflicts with the ALPS.

#### **5.5 Managing and improving environmental and cultural attributes**

26. The draft Policy seeks to promote the following elements:
- Private conservation areas.
  - Environmental corridors established in schemes and strategies to connect state land with private conservation areas.
  - Inclusion of registered Aboriginal sites and cultural corridors in schemes and strategies.
  - Considering the future ownership of conservation areas at the strategy stage and prior to zoning or subdivision of conservation land.
  - Supporting rural living proposals with a conservation theme.

27. The ability to identify possible private conservation areas at the time when a local planning strategy is prepared appears problematic and may be beyond the existing resources of the City.
28. Given the need under the Aboriginal Heritage Act to accommodate Aboriginal heritage issues in the development process, the possibility of showing registered sites in a strategy or scheme is not considered particularly onerous. However, it is necessary to consider what additional obligations this may have on City resources or on developments before being in a position to identify if the proposal is appropriate. The City is well-placed having already completed an Aboriginal Heritage Survey which has informed ALPS which requires the protection of Aboriginal and European heritage places.

### **5.6 Avoiding land use conflicts**

29. The draft Policy seeks to avoid creating land use conflicts with any existing rural land uses. It will manage conflicts such that:
  - New land uses that constrain existing or potential land uses will not be supported.
  - Buffers for hazard/amenity are determined by the relevant authority.
  - Buffer distances are guided by the EPA standards; and
  - Land affected by licensed buffers is included in strategies and schemes.
30. This approach will formalise the existing planning practise of assessing the need for buffers between new development and existing agricultural uses.

#### **Recommended SPP 2.5 Comments**

The City prepares a submission to the WA Planning Commission on draft SPP 2.5 'Land Use Planning in Rural Areas' advising:

- 1) It does not support the removal of the ability for a Local Government to nominate 'regionally significant agricultural land' for protection in local planning strategies and schemes.
- 2) Irrespective of size, all tree farms (both for softwood/hardwood tree production plantations and carbon-sequestration plantations) should require planning approval from the relevant Local Government and which may be prevented from some areas of the City.
- 3) The need for a reticulated water supply to be provided to all rural living lots (1 – 40ha's) is not supported or considered feasible in some instances. The City would recommend the Commission adopt a more flexible approach to recognise the need to allow for modest growth/expansion of existing settlements and encourage the retention of smaller rural communities within the City.
- 4) The subdivision of rural land for carbon-sequestration lots is supported subject to it establishing (in conjunction with DC 3.4) some minimum criteria for carbon sequestration lots such as minimum lot size, shape, number of lots, management controls over time, restriction to one-off applications, must have local government approval for that purpose etc.

**Draft Development Control Policy 3.4 ‘Subdivision of Rural Land’**

31. DC Policy 3.4 provides the subdivision control mechanisms to ensure SPP 2.5 is implemented. The majority of the draft remains the same as the existing policy although there are some variations as discussed below.

32. The policy objectives for DC 3.4 are the same as for SPP 2.5.

**3. Policy measures relating to rural living**

33. Rural living areas within the existing town planning schemes include:

- Special Rural.
- Special Residential.
- Conservation.
- Landscape Protection.

**3.2 Water for rural living**

34. Draft DC 3.4 increases the service implications for rural living subdivision over and above the existing situation. As discussed for SPP 2.5, there will be a requirement for reticulated water regardless of lot size. The draft Policy provides for existing zoned areas where reticulated water is not available or where there is no plan for the lots to be connected to reticulated water at the discretion of the WAPC. This may be seen as inappropriate in the context of the difficulty or inability for service providers to supply water to existing townsites. Requiring rural living lots to connect to scheme water in areas where there is an acceptable level of rainfall appears onerous and having to justify the continuation of this approach will invariably consume additional Council resources.

**3.3 Other infrastructure**

35. The draft DC 3.4 policy stipulates that the WAPC will generally require the following level of infrastructure for rural living subdivisions:

- Reticulated water (New requirement).
- Reticulated electricity (Current requirement).
- Sealed and drained roads (Was subject to the local government previously).
- Comprehensive drainage system (New requirement).
- Flood immunity above the Q100 flow channel (New requirement).
- Land stability (Previously applied on a case by case basis).
- Suitable on-site effluent disposal (Current requirement).
- Other infrastructure as required by the site conditions.

36. The requirements relating to drainage and flooding have come out of the Better Urban Water Management Guidelines and have been applied to recent subdivisions on a case-by-case basis.



37. In general, any policy change that increases the development cost of a rural living lot will ultimately put upward pressure on land prices and it is clear that development will not occur in areas where returns are already marginal.

**4. Policy measures for the subdivision of rural land and more intensive agricultural uses**

**4.1 General policy position**

38. The focus of the draft Policy has changed and the WAPC's position is that there is a sufficient supply of suitably sized and located rural lots to cater for intensive and emerging primary production land uses.

**4.2 Subdivision of rural lots**

39. The criteria to achieve a rural subdivision approval have been reduced from what was possible under the current DC 3.4. The proposed criteria for supporting rural subdivision are:
1. Boundary realignments with no increase in lot numbers.
  2. Protect and conserve places of cultural and natural heritage.
  3. To allow for the provision of utilities and infrastructure and/or access to natural resources.
  4. Homestead lots in the Wheatbelt.
  5. Other unusual or unanticipated purposes that are considered by the WAPC to be in the public interest.
40. The draft Policy removes part b) and modifies part e) by restricting homestead lots to the defined Wheatbelt area as follows:
- (b) *To reduce the area of large land parcels which are two or more times the area of typical lots used in the district for farming.*
- (e) *In the Wheatbelt Agricultural policy area (Appendix 4), to allow for the continued occupation of existing homesteads when they are no longer used in a farming operation.*
41. DC 3.4 outlines a small number of criteria for subdivision of rural zoned land. The draft DC 3.4 reiterates the draft SPP 2.5 position that it is view of the WAPC that there is sufficient rural lot supply for all agricultural uses without the need to create additional lots. Whilst it does not affect the City directly, it is suggested the WAPC consider a more flexible approach to subdivision given the changes expected to agriculture types and practices expected from changing climates and world demands over time

**4.3 Prevailing lot sizes**

42. The draft DC 3.4 allows for subdivision based on 'prevailing lot size' used for farming in the locality and where the new lots will be larger than 100ha and allow for continued broadacre farming. The current DC 3.4 does not provide a minimum lot size.

**4.4 Public utilities and ancillary uses**

43. The draft DC 3.4 policy now advises that ancillary farm dwellings such as aged persons or farm workers dwelling are not sufficient justification for subdivision which is new requirement.

**5. *Incentives for rural subdivision***

**5.1 *Property rationalisation to improve land management***

44. The draft DC 3.4 policy now may require any rural small holding lot created through boundary rationalisation to have a notice on title advising it may be impacted by rural production.

**5.2 *Conservation of heritage buildings and places***

45. The draft DC 3.4 policy now includes specific reference to Aboriginal heritage places and allows for subdivisions to be achieved conserving these places.

**5.3 *Conservation of biodiversity and natural heritage***

46. The draft DC 3.4 slightly alters the present policy and includes a covenant requirement relating to bush fire risk protection measures and the balance of the lot is suitable for the continuation of rural land use. This is different to the present policy that only requires the balance lot has sufficient area to be capable and suitable for agricultural use, not necessarily being used.
47. The draft Policy maintains the recommendation that Local Government's zone the conservation lots through an omnibus amendment or when reviewing the local planning scheme.

**5.4 *Homestead lots***

48. The draft Policy maintains its restriction on homestead lots to the defined Wheatbelt agricultural area. In accordance with the DC 3.4, the City has an operative local planning policy dealing with homestead lots which provides the justification and criteria for establishing homestead lots in the eastern parts of the City.
49. The draft Policy also allows where there a number of dwellings on a rural lot to create more than one homestead lot as a one-off application.
50. The City's policy allows for balance of title to be a minimum of 40ha's not 100ha's as required in the draft policy. It is suggested that approval be sought to retain the present 40ha requirement at this stage. In addition, the City should seek advice from the Department of Agriculture and Food regarding the suitability of the existing minimum lot size criteria, prior to making any alteration.

**5.5 Subdivision for carbon sequestration**

51. See previous comments in SPP 2.5 above.
52. This is new section of the draft DC 3.4 which allows the WAPC to consider a subdivision for a tree plantation specifically for carbon sequestration purposes subject to:
  - a) A carbon covenant is in place to secure the carbon for a period greater than 50 years; and
  - b) The average annual rainfall is lower than 400mm.
53. Under the proposed Local Planning Scheme No. 1, a carbon sequestration plantation would be treated the same as a 'normal' tree plantation which is permitted (i.e. an application would not be refused) in the General Agriculture zone and 'D' discretionary (i.e. may be approved or refused) in the Priority Agriculture zone as recommended in ALPS. This supports the Local Government's ability to control tree farming within its district.
54. The basis for the WAPC including this new opportunity for the subdivision of rural land for carbon sequestration lots has not been adequately explained or justified within the documents. This is important given the policy's aim to retain land for food production and the apparent restrictions on other subdivision for general or intensive agricultural use and development.
55. The minimum requirements should be established in the Policy and discuss minimum lot size, shape, number of lots, management controls over time, restriction to one-off applications, must have local government approval for that purpose etc. There is no issue if the proposal involves creating a lot over an existing portion of remnant vegetation within a broadacre farming property etc. Given the average annual rainfall in Albany exceeds 400mm it is unlikely that the policy would support a subdivision.

**6. Other matters**

**6.1 Strata proposals**

56. The draft DC 3.4 removes the existing criteria for rural strata lots and replaces them with a responsibility to achieve land management or environmental protection objectives. It also advises that any rural strata proposals where additional dwelling entitlements are created will be considered as rural living and assessed against SPP 2.5 (c.5.4). It is presumed that this will include the requirement for a rural strata development to be zoned for rural living purposes and serviced in the same manner, including reticulated water and being located close to an existing urban centre.

**6.2 Tied lots**

57. This is new section of the draft DC 3.4. The notion of 'tied lots' was introduced with the *Planning and Development Act 2005*. However, section 149 of the Act relating to them has not yet come into operation, some 5 years since the Act was proclaimed. The purpose of section 149 is to allow for the creation of a lot without dwelling entitlements that is tied to a

parent lot. The object is to allow smaller portions of farm land to be subdivided and sold to another farm operation with the parcel 'tied' to the new farm.

58. The draft DC 3.4 provides three criteria the WAPC will take into account when considering tied lot creation:
1. The minimum size of the tied lots;
  2. The distance between the tied lot and principle lot; and
  3. The proposed use of the lots.

**7. Information requirements**

59. The draft DC 3.4 includes some new information requirements to be submitted with applications including:
- b) *whether each lot has a sustainable water supply for domestic, fire management and agricultural purposes, including, if relevant, the need for and proximity to existing services and infrastructure and details of the service provider;*
- and
- j) *whether the proposal is consistent with the provisions of an endorsed local planning strategy or scheme operating in the district.*

**Concluding Comments**

60. Some of the measures in the draft policies, if approved, will directly affect parts of the existing rural planning policies at this time, whilst it will also impact when the ALPS is reviewed (due in 2015). At that time, all SPP's and other policies and measures will need to be considered and addressed in the review. Any variations to the WAPC's policy position will need to be justified and argued through this process and endorsed by the WAPC before they will have effect.

**Recommended DC 3.4 Comments**

The City prepares a submission to the WA Planning Commission on draft DC 3.4 'Subdivision of Rural Land' advising:

- 1) It does not support the mandatory requirement for a reticulated water service to be provided to all rural living lots.
- 2) That the standards for subdivision construction, particularly roads and flood/stormwater drainage continue to be at the discretion of the Local Government.
- 3) Whilst it does not affect the City directly, it is suggested the WAPC consider a more flexible approach to subdivision given the changes expected to agriculture types and practices expected from changing climates and world demands over time.
- 4) The Policy should place less reliance on achieving minimum lots sizes and more effort on proving the lot is both capable and suitable for agricultural use consistent with similar lots and operations in the locality.
- 5) The City wishes to retain the present 40ha balance lot requirement for homestead lots at this stage. The City will now seek advice from the Department of Agriculture and Food regarding the suitability of the existing minimum lot size criteria, prior to making any alteration.

**GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION**

61. The Western Australian Planning Commission is seeking comment from all local government authorities, industry groups and any members of the community across the state in relation to its amended policy statements relating to rural land.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION / ENGAGEMENT**

62. The Western Australian Planning Commission is seeking comment from all local government authorities, industry groups and any members of the community across the state in relation to its amended policy statements relating to rural land.

**STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

63. The City’s Albany Local Planning Strategy (ALPS) and Town Planning Schemes operate under the provisions of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*.
64. These planning instruments are required to be consistent with all WA Planning Commission State Planning Policies unless they have approved a variation.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

65. The Albany Local Planning Strategy has identified ‘Priority Agricultural’ land, which will be converted into a new agricultural zoning within Council’s Draft Local Planning Scheme No. 1.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

66. The proposed policies, if approved by the Governor, will affect some minor aspects of the City’s present rural planning policies - LPP 5 Rural and Environment Policy (adopted April 2011). At that time, staff will need to consider what alternations are required and prepare a report for Councillor consideration.

**RISK IDENTIFICATION & MITIGATION**

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Consequence</b>	<b>Risk Analysis</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Should the Governor approve the rural planning policies as drafted, then various growth strategies within the Albany Local Planning Strategy and its Local Planning Policies are updated to reflect state government policy.	Possible	Moderate	Medium	Ensure that once SPP 2.5 and DC3.4 are finalised that review of the Albany Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Policy 5 – Rural and Environment is undertaken.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

67. The cost to implement the outcomes of the draft SPP 2.5 and DC 3.4 and any required changes to existing rural planning policies would be undertaken by the Directorate using existing staff resources within existing budget lines.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

68. The City is required to ensure that its planning instruments reflect approved State Planning Policies.

**ALTERNATE OPTIONS**

69. Council has the option of responding, or not, to the call for submissions on the revised policies. Council may also seek additional information from the WAPC, if deemed necessary.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION**

70. It is recommended that Council note the information in the revised policies and provide a submission to the WAPC advising of its concerns with certain aspects of the policies.

<b>Consulted References</b>	Albany Local Planning Strategy (June 2010) Local Planning Scheme No. 1A & 3 Policy Manual (April 2011)
<b>File Number (Name of Ward)</b>	LP.PLA.7
<b>Previous Reference</b>	Nil