Dear Sally,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the latest papers published by DPTI regarding the Planning reforms.

Our comments are summarised below:

**Draft Accredited Professionals Scheme**
- A hierarchy of accredited professionals is proposed, which includes planning and building rules assessors and Council Assessment Panel members (aside from the Council member). Essentially, formalises existing practice.
- Grounds for cancellation or suspension of accreditation are proposed.
- Who will be the accreditation authority? How will conflicts of interest be managed?
- Continued professional development will be required. This is generally supported provided that this is of value and not generic.
- Audits of process adherence are mandatory. Accountability is supported and all professionals should be seeking to improve performance.
- Includes a complaint mechanism regarding the code of conduct of a professional. Does this add another layer to the multiple mechanisms already available to the public?
- Benefits of this additional complexity is difficult to determine.

**Performance Indicators – Measuring Development**
- A positive step in creating a greater efficiency in the collection of data and a more user friendly mechanism for the data to be shared with Councils.
- Suggest that in addition to what is already collected, that development cost and total lots created are also captured.
- Given the P+D code is still to be developed, we’d also suggest that a periodic review is undertaken of the new system to ensure amendments to what data is collected and how it is disseminated.

**Assessment Pathways – Assessing Development**
- Similar assessment pathways to existing, but changed terminology (complying, on merit and non-complying to be replaced by accepted, code assessed, impact assessed and restricted). Most positive impact is that public notification will be aligned with the complexity, rather than “ad hoc”, which currently exists.
- No context of what developments will fall into the above assessment pathways, suggest that consultation in regard to this is necessary.
- Relevant authorities now include State Planning Commission, Assessment Panels (including Council Assessment Panels (CAP) which have already been established) and Assessment Managers (essentially Council staff who are ultimately responsible for performance of their team). This approach is considered to be acceptable. There is also an ability for the Minister to appoint a Local Assessment Panel in place of the Council appointed CAP. It is suggested that the terms where this can be enacted be clearly defined.
• All restricted development (formerly non-complying) to be assessed by State Planning rather than primarily with Council. Difficulties may arise from suitable representation (by Council and any representors) through centralised decision making.
• Notification on the property and letter drop rather than in the local paper. What is the form of this – who pays for the signage and how is it confirmed that the notice stays in place for the entire notification period?
• Quality information is critical to making informed decisions. This should be enhanced under the new Act.
• Preliminary agreements proposed in regard to mandatory referral bodies (e.g. EPA, River Murray Minister). This can be useful in providing greater certainty and reducing timeframes of development.
• Third party appeal rights will still exist, but the number of applications subject to public notification is expected to drop, with only those developments not envisaged in the zone, subject to consultation.

Should your team wish to clarify any of our comments, please contact me on the details below.

Kind Regards,

**Luke Gray**
Manager Planning Policy and Strategy
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