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ABSTRACT

Regional planning and its associated institutional structure has been given ad hoc consideration in New South Wales over the last thirty years. At the Federal level moves towards regionalization of planning have been based on party political platforms rather than carefully considered planning objectives. The States have traditionally held the mandate for regional planning, however, it has been circumscribed by the rigid and detailed procedures involved in statutory planning. Attempts at instituting regional planning have occurred without adequate recognition of the nature of regional planning, nor an adequate consideration of what the regional scale problems entail. This thesis evaluates a recently proposed planning system in New South Wales in the light of a reconsideration of the concept of regional planning and the regional problems that exist in New South Wales.

It is hypothesized that regional planning is an appropriate device through which to achieve an integration of functions and areal reform. Regional planning is defined as a continuous process at the supra urban/sub state scale. It is public planning based on law which is carried out by public institutions and is capable of effecting change in society's milieu.

Regional problems are classified into three broad categories: problems of service delivery arising from an urban/rural dichotomy; problems of land use conflict and resource management; and problems of area and function. Most of these generic problem areas were seen to result from the inability
of institutions to adequately reconcile area with function. It was contended that regional planning involves the reciprocal adjustment of function and area through areal reform and simultaneous functional co-ordination and integration. The regional level is the level at which a balance is found between the 'efficiency' of functional specialization, and some rationalization of areal particularism.

Based on such an articulation of the cause of regional problems, together with the consideration of the nature of regional planning, six principles of regional planning are identified as being essential for its success. Regional planning:
* should be based upon the identification of regional needs and the articulation of areal problems
* needs to fulfill national regional policy, needs to be co-ordinated with State policy, and should attempt a degree of co-ordination with the private sector
* should facilitate the co-ordination and integration of functions
* must possess a statutory basis on the one hand, and on the other, must remain flexible
* must explicitly recognize the process of regionalism
* regions should possess an adequate fiscal base upon which an institution can carry out its planning mandate.

These principles are the criteria against which the proposed regional planning scheme in New South Wales is assessed.

The following were the main observations made:
- The regional planning that was envisaged by the proposed scheme was based on a 'top-down' and rigid statutory framework, obviously still influenced by the rigidities of
The proposed institutional structure was found to be not politically accountable at the regional level, not autonomous in decision making, lacked executive authority over regional matters, and lacked community involvement in the mainstream of the planning process. As a result its potential for need identification and priority resolution was considered limited.

- No institutional mechanism exists for program integration at the regional level.

Based on these findings some modifications to the institutional structure were prescribed so that it could satisfy the proposed criteria. The most important were:

- the responsibility for regional planning should rest with an independent regional planning body (but responsible to the State government) in each region, composed of local government and regional community representatives.

- regional level sub-committees should be established in the areas of industrial resource development, social development, and natural resource development, so as to reflect planning structures at the State departmental and Cabinet levels.

- a regional program committee composed of the regional planner and sub-committee representatives should provide liaison between articulated regional needs and public program delivery.

- an extensive consultative structure should be established with individuals, groups, and private and government agencies.

These modifications of the proposed institutional structures can be viewed as the particular conclusions to the thesis.
conditions comparable to those in NSW, the six principles of regional planning are the generic conclusions and can be considered as essential preconditions for successful regional planning and regional progress.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: THE CONCEPT AND RATIONALE OF REGIONAL PLANNING

The Need For a Reassessment

Regional planning in Australia is evolving. No long regional planning tradition exists, and attempts to institutionalize some form of planning on a regional basis were first undertaken in 1944 by the federal Labor Government in cooperation with the States. At the Federal level moves towards regionalization of planning have been based on party political platforms. The rationale behind the establishment of these regional structures has tended to be based on such political concerns rather than carefully considered planning objectives. The States have traditionally held the mandate for regional planning, however it has been circumscribed by the rigid and detailed procedures involved in statutory planning.

Regional planning has not been given adequate consideration as a means of governmental decision making. A comparison between the regional planning institutions of the late 1940's and those that exist now leads to the conclusion that there have been no great forward strides in the implementation of regional planning in Australia. This observation can be made in the generic case as well. Generally, literature on the procedural aspects of regional planning and regional planning institutions has been lacking in comparison with that dealing with more substantive aspects of regional planning. Alden and Morgan (1974) and Gillingwater (1975) have been
among the few recent contributors towards an understanding of the institutional context of regional planning.

It is a contented in this thesis that attempts to institute regional planning such as those briefly mentioned in Chapter 2 have occurred without adequate knowledge of the nature of regional planning, nor an adequate consideration of what the regional scale problems entail. The result has been the formation of regional planning institutions which have not been equipped to deal with the needs of society or the complexities of modern government.

There is a need to reassess the nature of regional planning in NSW. The focus of this thesis is on such a reassessment. The proposal by the Planning and Environment Commission (PEC) for a regional planning system in New South Wales (NSW) is central to this reassessment. It represents the most recent thinking in NSW on the form of regional planning institutions. It is therefore appropriate that this proposal be evaluated in the light of a re-consideration of the nature of regional planning in NSW.

The hypothesis is that regional planning is an appropriate device through which to achieve an integration of functions and areal reform with government institutions. This hypothesis is substantiated in Chapter 4 and evolves out of a consideration of the generic concept and rationale of regional planning (to follow in this chapter) and a consideration in Chapter 3 of what problems regional planning should be tackling in NSW. Chapter 4 also develops some institutional criteria and these are subsequently used in Chapter 5 to
evaluate the regional planning structure proposed by the PEC. Chapter 6 synthesizes the findings of Chapter 5, and suggests a prescriptive outline for a more appropriate institutional structure for regional planning. Chapter 7 draws the particular and generic conclusions.

Before entering into an examination of the case study however, it is first necessary to introduce the generic concept of 'regional planning', and to establish its rationale.

Regional Planning's Basis in Regionalism

In order to understand the nature of regional planning it is necessary to relate it to the much broader concept of regionalism in which its roots are firmly grounded. Regionalism embodies regional interactions, and, in modern society, the process of government is continually influencing these interactions through various forms of public intervention that are perceived as necessary for solving regional problems. Figure 1.1 represents a model which places regional planning in a context of regional interaction. A brief explanation follows.

A region may be viewed as a 'fact' or 'hypothesis'. As a fact a region may be an area that displays a homogeniety of physical features. As a hypothesis a region may be considered as a means of explaining the incidence and distribution of certain phenomena (eg. a cultural region or an economic region). In the model man and the unique bundle of characteristics he possesses called culture interact with the existing phenomena of an area through the process of
FIGURE 1.1 REGIONALISM: A MODEL OF REGIONAL INTERACTION
regionalism, giving rise to a distinctive social pattern, folkways and economic linkages and thereby a collective self-consciousness. Regionalism is in this sense considered as the "interactional and processual activity that is essential to build a socially cohesive unit," separate from other such units. Such interactions are consistently in a state of flux and occur within the region, between regions and within and between economic, political and socio-cultural spheres, giving rise to regional variations.

The most significant form of regional variation that we are concerned with here is the regional imbalance. As a regional gestalt emerges due to the process of regionalism, it may be accompanied by serious socio-economic and cultural imbalances. "Basically, an imbalance occurs when the set of interactions which shape the region differ so substantially from other regions that (a) the region is handicapped or deficient in relation to other regions or the nation, or (b) the region experiences significant advantages in relation to other regions or the nation." When disadvantageous imbalances occur, they manifest themselves as regional problems such as loss of economic opportunity or pollution (the particular regional problems pertaining to NSW will be discussed in Chapter 3.)

The next steps in the model are much more central to the concerns of this thesis because they describe institutional aspects. Regional problems can be articulated through societal values and institutional characteristics, and together these will determine how a problem is perceived in an institutional
setting. It is vital to note that the articulation of a problem by an existing institution is inherently biased by the nature and organizational characteristics of the initiating institution. These characteristics will shape the institution's ability to accurately reflect expressed values, and in turn will affect the range of perceived solutions.

More will be said of institutional characteristics in later Chapters, however, at present it is intended to emphasize that regional planning is a particular form of intervention that arises when an institution articulates a regional problem in a certain way. The nature of any regional intervention will be such that its incidence will be on the set of interactions that a region has both within itself and the nation. Regional planning as a particular form of intervention will directly impinge on the process of regionalism. This is the essence of the relationship between regional planning and regionalism. A misunderstanding of the nature of this link or the interactions upon which intervention must impinge, may result in ill conceived solutions to articulated regional problems.

The Concept of Regional Planning

We have attempted to place the concept of regional planning into a broader context of regional interaction. However, what is meant by the term 'regional planning' has not as yet been articulated. There is no one accepted definition for 'regional planning' so a definition needs to be established, as it is critical for arriving at institutional criteria.
The concept of regional planning has implicitly been in existence ever since the emergence of regionalism in the literature. It is only till well into the 1900's that attempts were being made to define regional planning as a particular form of action, based on a concrete philosophy. Probably one of the most significant was Benton MacKaye's personal philosophy of regional planning, a romantic look at planning's relationship with natural and cultural resources. MacKaye saw regional planning as being:

the effort to arrange the environment in such a fashion that this goal (of living) may be effectively and eagerly pursued. It is the visualizing within a region of co-ordinated action for the purposes of general human living.8

More akin to the mainstream of the early thought in the U.S. were the concepts of regional planning that arose from the recognition of socio-cultural regionalism. An example of this is taken from a milestone study by the study by the National Resources Committee concerning regional factors in national planning and development:

...the whole meaning of regional planning is to devise a cultural pattern which will fit a large areal unit, and that the qualities inherent in the area not only dictate in large part the features of the plan, but also its areal extent.9

Regional planning was seen as the major instrument of dynamic regionalism.10 At the same time regional planning was emerging as a form of planning action that appeared to be capable of grappling with a number of society's problems. Alden and Morgan have categorized the development of the concept of
regional planning in the U.K. into basically three areas. It may be useful to briefly mention each one in turn. Firstly the problem of emerging depressed areas saw regional planning being used as a social tool to provide men with jobs, and was largely a response by society to safeguard its security and well being from the social cost of economic growth. This social aspect of regional planning is still an important concept today. More recently the development of the notion of national economic planning and the problem of economic growth in general has induced the view of regional planning as an integral component of comprehensive national planning.

Secondly the problem of the physical city arose as a result of the same set of forces that were in operation above, the difference being that they were operating in a constrained space. It was being recognized that the congestion problems of some cities and the unemployment of depressed areas were just different sides of the same coin. Regional planning in this context was seen as a process of intervention which was needed to solve the problems of the congested and ever growing metropolis, while at the same time solving the problems of depressed areas. More recently there has been a recognition of the need to develop strategies to cope with the problems of cities on an enlarged spatial scale (ie. the concept of the city region) rather than treating cities and regions as separate entities for planning purposes. Increasingly the demand for regional planning has been growing out of the recognition that the spatial explosion in patterns of human behaviour are being increasingly expressed on a scale which is not confined to a
The third area of development of the concept of regional planning was concerned with the difficulties of administering a complex society. More specifically this was manifested in the problems of the efficient delivery of services, health probably being the one of greatest concern. By its very nature this problem tended to be met in the U.K. by the movement towards regionalization of administration and decision making, concepts which have roots deep in Fabian philosophy of regionalism and local government problems. The emphasis was on achieving a more meaningful institutional framework for regional planning.

The concept of regional planning has clearly evolved as a response to tackling society's urgent problems. As a result attention has been taken away from the inherent structural characteristics it possesses as a form of public action. It is contended here that because of this lack of awareness of the structural nature of regional planning, and because of the preoccupation with urgent problems rather than process, a weak institutional framework has developed for regional planning in most countries, including Australia.

It is therefore necessary to start reconstructing the concept of regional planning to provide a workable basis upon which to build the rest of this thesis. It is useful to start by breaking down the term 'regional planning' into two components, 'region' and 'planning'. A 'region' can be defined in both prescriptive and descriptive terms. It can be defined as a fact or a hypothesis. There are many conceptions about
what a region constitutes and these have been adequately discussed elsewhere. A common conception is that a planning region should be one that comprises the territory within which the problems of the community can be treated adequately. However it would be somewhat premature at this stage to adopt a definition of a region upon the assumption that there are already in existence 'problems' to be dealt with. For present purposes it would be desirable to view a region essentially as an area or space. More precisely, a region can be viewed as a space that is larger than any single urban area (i.e. supra urban space), but smaller than a nation.

'Planning' on the other hand may be viewed as a highly disciplined and formalized activity through which society induces change in itself. In a more general sense, by planning we mean to take thought to determine an action or a series of actions beforehand. Implicit in these statements is that planning must be a process, undertaken by institutions accessible to and responsible to the public.

Having introduced the notion of public planning, it may be desirable to establish how public planning differs from any other form of planning. The essence of public planning is suitably captured in the following paraphrasing of Dror and Faludi:

public planning is the formal adoption by governments and their agencies of a process of administration which attempts to decide on major guidelines for future action based on the translation of aims and objectives into public policies and concrete action programs.

When these two components are merged into the concept of
'regional planning' some quite definite characteristics begin to emerge. Firstly, regional planning is a continuous process and involves the interaction of its own dynamic elements with a constantly changing planning milieu. This dynamic quality distinguishes it from other forms of government intervention, such as regional policy. Secondly, regional planning may be defined quite simply as a particular form of public planning. It is only one tool of the total public planning process, and other substitutes can be found among the government's armoury. Thirdly it is supra urban in scale and therefore needs to deal with a number of established local governments which have jurisdiction over smaller areas. Fourthly it is substate in the power it deploys, as it operates in a characteristic institutional setting (between state and local). Traditionally there have not been very many institutions created at this intermediate level in Australia or anywhere else. Regional planning in general typically lacks the executive power and control over a wide range of government functions because of this characteristic, unlike the States which possess legislated powers, and local government authorities which possess delegated powers.

It is contended by Alden and Morgan that it is characteristics such as these which give regional planning its unique identity and form, and it is these characteristics that differentiate it from other forms of public action. We have tended towards a definition of regional planning which stresses its administrative/operational characteristics, or in other words its structural characteristics.
Gertler, speaking of planning in the Canadian context provides a rather interesting and comprehensive definition of regional planning:

Regional planning is a process based on law and undertaken by a form of responsible government directed towards influencing development, private or public, in a manner that results in the areas where people settle and establish regional communities, in the best environment and soundest use of resources that our civilization is capable of effecting.\(^{23}\)

This statement recognizes that regional planning is a process, having some statutory basis and undertaken by institutions which possess powers either expressly granted, inherent or implied, and capable of effecting change. Furthermore it is recognized that regional planning is essentially concerned with social space and the use of resources in an efficient and equitable\(^{24}\) manner.

In the Australian context, the concept of regional planning has been somewhat underdeveloped in that it has not been adequately considered as a form of public action, and has been somewhat ill defined. Mills for instance, in one of the few articles specifically on regional planning in Australia, sees that planning at the regional level:

...requires the making of choices which have opportunity cost implications in terms of foregone alternatives both within and between regions.\(^{25}\)

This concept of regional planning is extremely pragmatic, and is more or less just a description of a spatial cost benefit analysis. It is necessary to arrive at a much more operational
definition of regional planning upon which to build the rest of this thesis.

In summary it is implied that the following elements are important to the concept of regional planning:
(1) it is a continuous process, (2) it is supra urban/sub state in scale, (3) it is a formalized activity, (4) as a form of public planning it is institutionalized, (5) it is legitimized by law, (6) it is capable of effecting change in a society's milieu. The following definition of regional planning capsulizes these components:
Regional planning as a continuous process at the supra urban/sub state scale is formalized public planning based on law, which is carried out by public institutions, and capable of effecting change in a society's milieu.

It is considered that this definition of regional planning is somewhat less circumscribing than some of the others, but yet still meaningful in an operational context.

It may be useful to establish how this concept differs from some other forms of public intervention which may directly impinge on the process of regionalism. Regional policy is the other main form of public intervention, and is frequently confused with planning in the Australian situation.

Regional Planning and Regional Policy

There are two senses in which the term 'regional policy' may be used. The most common usage is often connected with a 'top down' system of government where regional policy is imposed from a higher level. A more specialized usage relates
to describing a particular component of the planning process.

In the first sense the distinction between regional planning and regional policy is quite simple. Regional policy involves the allocation of resources among regions, whereas regional planning is concerned with the allocation of those resources within regions. It is implicit therefore that regional policy in this sense must be undertaken by a level of government that has an effective command over those resources, and thereby is able to allocate them. In such a hierarchical arrangement, regional planning may be seen as both a political and administrative vehicle which guides the translation of national regional policies into local action programmes. Morgan and Alden make the quite valid point that regional policy may in some instances induce regional planning in a political and organizational sense with a view to gaining these resources allocated by regional policy. This was in fact the justification for some of DURD's regional policies in Australia, in that they argued that the policies were conducive to regional planning and public participation. However, experience outlined in Chapter 1 has shown that this is a tenuous basis upon which to initiate regional planning.

Regional policy may also develop as part of the planning process and related decision making that goes on within a region. Once goals and objectives have been in some way defined, a policy may be established as a definite course of action to achieve those defined ends. This is more akin to the idea of a bottom up approach and regional policy may be seen here as a framework on which the policy making bodies may
hang their respective programs.

The need for a degree of consistency between regional policies of national, state and regional levels is obvious. It is easy to envisage the situation where the imposition of a national or state regional policy may constrain and conflict with the operation of regional planning. Ideally these levels of policy should be co-ordinated and this will be discussed further in Chapter 4.

As a background to the case study, the next chapter briefly describes past attempts by the Federal and NSW governments to institute regional planning in NSW.
FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER 1

1 Australia, Commonwealth Department of Post-War Reconstruction, *Regional Planning in Australia* (Canberra: 1949)

2 Appendix I briefly describes the division of Federal and State powers, while Appendix II describes the machinery of government in NSW.


4 Most of the ideas in this section originate from an unpublished research paper: V. Aleksandric, Marg De Grace and Graham Dragushan, "Regionalism: A Process of Regional Interaction," (Typewritten). A more detailed explanation is found therein.


6 Aleksandric, DeGrace and Dragushan; "Regionalism," p. 10.

7 ibid., p. 14.


11 Alden and Morgan, *Regional Planning*, p. 17.

12 This concept was for the first time in the U.K. recognized in the Barlow Report. For a brief summary see ibid., p. 25.


16 For a comprehensive cataloguing of these concepts see Odum and Moore, *American Regionalism*, p. 2.

For the purposes of this thesis we may define these elements of the planning process in the following simple, but generally valid fashion: goals---objectives---policy---strategy---program---implementation---evaluation---goals.

The distinction between regional planning and policy will be discussed in more detail later in this Chapter.


These two terms have been bandied about quite freely in the Australian context. F.J.B. Stilwell, Australian Urban and Regional Development (Sydney: Australian and New Zealand Book Company, 1974) claims that the criterion of efficiency is the most obvious one to judge the desirability of different patterns of urban and regional development. Efficiency is seen purely as a function of social welfare and because of the difficulty in defining this concept, the efficiency criterion is used in the more restricted sense of identifying allocations which are wasteful of resources. Equity, on the other hand, has traditionally meant the eveness in the distribution of income and wealth, and almost invariably would be perceived as the elimination of inequality. Equity, although an admirable goal, is somewhat esoteric in relation to the concept of regional planning.


What is meant by 'process' in planning has already been defined (see footnote 21). "Continuous", rather than being superfluous, is intended to denote that the process of planning is forever interacting with its environmental setting.

Gillingwater, Regional Planning and Social Change, p. 8.
Two distinct periods exist where quite definite impulses occurred towards the regionalization of planning; the first in the immediate post World War II years and the second in the early 1970's. A brief documentation of these is separated into Federal and State responses, based on which level of government appeared to initiate the moves towards the regionalization of planning.

The Federal Response

Regional planning in the immediate post-war era (1944-1949) developed out of the desire of the nation to reconstruct and look towards new heights of achievement. It was explicitly recognized that some regions had a direct impact on the development of the economy as a whole, and that the orderly development of these was seen as a key to both future economic prosperity, as well as national defence. In terms of economic prosperity, unbalanced development between regions was viewed as being counter-productive in that the overly prosperous regions "sucked away much of the nation's strength". It was believed that only by scientific study of resources and the careful working out of long range development plans was it possible to make the best use of Australia's resources. In terms of national defence, regional planning was viewed as a means of filling the empty spaces. The threat of invasion during the previous war heightened the Commonwealth's awareness
of the undeveloped nature of vast areas of Northern Australia.

The regional issues of the day could be summarized in the following statement made by the then Prime Minister at the inaugural Premier's conference on the subject:

Too many of our people are concentrated in limited areas. We have our economic eggs in too few baskets.3

At the time regional planning was envisaged as a strategy through which an assessment could be made of each (sub state) region's resource capabilities and that the development of each region could be related firstly to State and ultimately to national economic policy. Additionally, it was implicit in this strategy that in each region the interest, knowledge and experience of the residents of the region would be brought to bear on the region's problems and transmitted to the appropriate government or other body which could initiate steps to translate plans into action, fitted in with State and Commonwealth economic policy.4

It was at the initiative of the Commonwealth that a series of Commonwealth/State conferences between the Prime Minister and the Premiers of all States were held in 1944 and 1945, to discuss the prospects for State regional planning organizations. As an outcome Regional Development Committees (RDC's) were formed in some States. In NSW 20 were formed and each committee had twelve members: six appointed from local government, three or four senior officers of State Government departments resident in the region and two or three members who were prominent in commerce or secondary industries of the
It was the first attempt in Australia to regionalize in order to (i) assess the development potential in each region, (ii) encourage cooperation between Federal, State and local governments, (iii) decentralize regional planning down to local bodies, and (iv) co-ordinate the development of each region with state and national economic planning. It was felt that if regional planning was to come to grips with local problems, then it would be necessary for RDC's:

...to bring the enthusiasm, knowledge and experience of local people to bear on the problems of local development, to give the people the opportunity of participating in the planning of development, and to provide a direct link between governmental and non-governmental planning interests.

With the election of the Liberal Government to Federal office in 1949 and the defeat of the Labor Government, RDC's soon lost Federal support and began to wither from atrophy. Despite this the RDC's survived until 1972 in NSW when they were replaced by Regional Advisory Councils (RAC's), which were created in NSW, independently of the Federal Government. The second resurgence in Federal interest in regionalization occurred in 1972 with the formation of the Department of Urban and Regional Development (DURD). Among DURD's ten responsibilities were the following:
- development and implementation of a national urban and regional development strategy
- development and monitoring of an urban and regional budget program to co-ordinate resources allocated for investment in
urban and regional services by Federal departments, State and local governing bodies.
- initiation and co-ordination of Federal department activities in urban and regional development and co-ordination of advice to Ministers
- negotiation with and provision of advice and assistance to the States, semi-government and local government authorities in the preparation and implementation of plans for cities and regions.8

This time the role of regional planning was not explicit and regionalization was seen as being a technique of improving administration of government departments. It was generally thought that in time such regionalization would lead to forms of effective regional planning with the senior administrators using their discretionary powers to develop programs tailored to meet the needs of the region.9 In the words of the Prime Minister at the time: "integral with the concept of regionalism (meaning regionalization) are the concepts of devolution of responsibility for, and public participation in planning and decision making."

The move towards regionalization at the Federal level during the 1970's was a response to a number of factors:
(1) Fiscal Co-ordination: The movement into the regional arena was partly stimulated by the recognition that there was a need to co-ordinate regional programs, at both the Federal and State levels. Explicit recognition was being given to the fact that spatial allocation of public investment is as important as the traditional sectoral allocation. The need for regional
co-ordination of programs was primarily expressed in the form of an urban and regional budget. This was an internal administrative reform which attempted to provide a spatial, as distinct from sectoral framework for co-ordinating expenditures by federal, state and local governing bodies. Although called a budget, it was rather an information system, an economist's picture of urban and regional development in Australia. It provided a background for recommendations to the Minister for appropriate allocations for urban and regional development. In this regard it was an attempt by DURD to actively change its own character in order to become more responsive to the processes inherent in regionalism. At the same time an attempt was made to gain cooperation from other functional institutions at both the State and Federal levels of government. In part this was an attempt to overcome piecemeal one-dimensional solutions to regional problems.

(2) Local Participation:— It was hoped that by encouraging local government units to work together on a regional basis, regional organizations would become more accessible to citizen's groups. The Secretary of the Department of Urban and Regional Development summarized this ideal in the following way:

Regional organizations are seen to be potentially capable of providing a useful public forum for expressing regional needs without interfering with or limiting the functions of any existing structures. Of particular significance is the potential ability of the regional organizations to provide via their technical and advisory sub-committees direct access to community groups within the region to present their points of view and to participate in decision making which affects the region.
Of central importance here was the perceived need for public participation. It is difficult to ascertain whether this arose from a genuine 'grass roots' feeling, or whether it was just a part of the overall politicization of the public, by the Labor Government, and the need they perceived for the public to be included in the decision making machinery of government. The most significant attempt at the Federal level to respond to this was via the Area Improvement Program. It was established to involve people and organizations in identifying regional problems, working on regional development strategies, and devising appropriate means of implementation. The programs were primarily designed to remedy deficiencies in the provision of public facilities in certain areas. As such, it was probably the most responsive of the Federal programs to regional concerns because the initiative for the identification of regional problems and priorities was given to the regional population. Many of these programs however were very area specific. Most were in fact urban neighbourhood improvement programs, such as land acquisition for community purposes and provision of community centres. It was also the intention of these programs to promote strategic urban and environmental planning, although it was never clearly articulated how this was to be achieved.

(3) Regional Inequality: There was a recognition of the need to eliminate inequalities existing between different areas in Australia, and to improve the efficiency in the allocation of resources and delivery of services throughout the nation. A factor that was closely associated with this was an attempt to
make local government more effective, primarily through a federal Grants Commission program. Originally dealing only with the State level, this program was extended to deal also with regional groupings of local authorities. The Grants Commission was first established in 1933 as part of a conscious movement to bring unequal units toward equality; to bring the weaker States up to the standard of the others.\textsuperscript{14} It was hoped that these regional organizations would be encouraged to catalogue deficiencies within the regions (particularly in public infrastructure), would be encouraged to formulate a regional development strategy for major functions (eg. drainage, recreation and employment), and would be encouraged to act as a focal point to examine the planning intentions of all levels of government.\textsuperscript{15} However it seems from the evidence available, that it was mainly a funding exercise designed to promote fiscal equalization between local authorities, rather than attempt to further regional consciousness. It was essentially a 'back door' approach to regionalism and regional planning, by creating a sense of identity and stimulating regional interaction.

It is of some significance that the Federal government both in the immediate post-war period, and in the early 1970's became heavily involved with the push towards some form of regional organization for planning purposes. One of the obvious restrictions of Federal government involvement was that it had a lack of jurisdiction over 'regional planning'. The States have traditionally been responsible for the limited regional planning that has occurred. From this perspective
then, the role of the Federal government as an instigator of regional thought is indeed interesting, but not impossible to fathom. Both periods coincide with the Labor government being in Federal Office; the Chifley government from 1945-49 and the Whitlam government from 1972-75. Tendencies towards regionalization during these periods have been direct reflections of political ideology. The difference in outlook in Australia's polarized political structure were great. The Labor Party traditionally sees the machinery of government as something that can be used for making necessary changes in economic and social conditions through increasing the influence of the public sector. In addition there was clear evidence that the Labor Party's "New Federalism" philosophies, strongly advocated regionalization. For instance Whitlam, before he became Prime Minister in 1972 articulated this envisaged structure of government on a number of occasions:

If we were devising anew a structure of representative government for our continent, we would have neither so few State governments nor so many local government units. We would not have a federal system of overlapping parliaments, and a delegated but supervised system of local government. We would have a House of Representatives for international matters and national matters, an assembly for the affairs of each of our dozen largest cities and a few score regional assemblies for the areas of rural production and resource development outside of these cities. Vested interests and legal complexities should not discourage or deter us from attempts to modernize and rationalize our inhereted structure.

On the other hand, the Liberal Party has had a long tradition of conservativism, adhering to a basic 'laizze faire'
philosophy of minimal government intervention in the economic and social system. Even as late as the early 1970's such philosophy pervaded (and still pervades) their thinking:

Broadly, it is the view of the Commonwealth Government that economic planning in the more formal or integrated sense is not in the best interests of the Australian economy. The government holds the view that economic growth is best fostered by a predominantly free enterprise environment and thus confines its activities to providing the necessary economic infrastructure and ensuring that the economy is as close as possible to internal and external balance. The pattern of growth which emerges from this system is considered to be far more acceptable to the community than that emerging from alternative systems involving further government direction and involvement. 

Such thinking extended into areas of regional planning and regionalization of administration and any suggestions of reorganizing the structure of government to accommodate regional planning were spurned. It is contended here that the development of federally sponsored regional planning in Australia cannot be divorced from the political philosophies of the Federal level.

The State Response

As was mentioned earlier the State of NSW has the responsibility for the regional planning function. In this regard two significant events occurred which were to leave their mark for the next four decades. The first was the establishment of RDC's in the twenty regions of the State in co-operation with the Federal Government in 1946. The second, and by far the most significant event was the passing of the
Local Government (Town and Country Planning) Amendment Act, 1932. This act set the pattern of statutory planning which is still practiced in NSW. It authorized the preparation of land-use control planning schemes by Municipal and Shire Councils, and it provided procedures for the preparation, prescription, valuation and revocation of town and country planning schemes.

Planning remained at a local or County Council level till 1963 with the introduction of a Bill for the constitution of the State Planning Authority of NSW (SPA). Such a body was perceived as being necessary because it was realized that statutory planning and regional co-ordination required creative actions at a higher level than that of local councils. The State Planning Authority occupied a central position in planning in NSW between 1963 and 1974. Its primary function was the co-ordination of local land uses with the state provision of utility services, transport facilities and other requirements. However it soon became obvious that this authority's main concern was with physical planning and that its most important function was the supervision of statutory planning schemes of local councils. In effect the SPA did not materially change the statutory processes by which planning was carried out in NSW, but rather centralized its administration.

During the late 1960's another planning trend of significance became evident. This was the attempt to offset the dominance of the Sydney Metropolitan region over the rest of NSW. Considerable effort was devoted to the decentralization
of economic activities.\textsuperscript{25} This occurred through the Department of Decentralization and Development in 1966 whose efforts concentrated on the provision of financial incentives to decentralizing industries through 'carrot and stick' techniques. In 1969 it was decided that a strategy of selective decentralization would be superior to the failing programs of general decentralization, and the establishment of 'growth centres' was advocated.\textsuperscript{26} The 'conventional wisdom' was that such decentralization would stop the 'drift to the cities' and alleviate the urban development pressures on the present metropolitan regions. This program to date has been rather less than successful.\textsuperscript{27}

In 1972, under the provisions of the Regional Organization Act, the RDC's were abolished and seven Regional and two District Advisory Councils (RAC's) for the non-metropolitan part of the State were established, for the purpose of 'encouraging and stimulating regional development.' These bodies possess monitoring, planning, advisory and participatory functions. These RAC's were to have representatives from State government departments, local governments and citizen groups, and in the words of the Minister for Decentralization and Development at the time of their constitution:

\begin{quote}
...the Advisory Councils were being established to provide an effective medium for the contribution of informed regional advice on matters of planning and development in the newly constructed regions of the State, and, conversely, to provide for the effective dissemination of information from the central government agencies.\textsuperscript{28}
\end{quote}
Their main function however is to provide advice to the Minister for Decentralization and Development, and they may do this in relation to the encouragement of primary, secondary and tertiary industrial development; co-ordination and decentralization of the activities of government departments and public authorities; public works and services; civic improvements, community welfare projects and measures to improve the quality of life. There appear to have been some early accomplishments of these organizations, however for the most part they have had a fairly low profile. This is not surprising because firstly they do not have any statutory obligations, and their power is more 'advisory' than 'real'. Additionally their functions sound remarkably similar to those of the RDC's in 1946, whose influence over the previous 26 years had been minimal.

In November 1974, the State Planning Authority was abolished, and the Planning and Environment Commission created in its place. The PEC is a ministerial department headed by a chairman and four other executive directors, and composed of a planning staff. Section 20(1) of the New South Wales Planning and Environment Act provided that an investigation be made of:

a) the responsibilities, powers, authorities, duties and functions conferred upon it, and,

b) the law and practice relating to town and country planning, and land use and environmental planning.

A year later the Planning and Environment Commission submitted their recommendations for a new planning system in NSW. These recommendations will be discussed in the main body of this thesis.
'Statutory planning' deserves separate consideration because of the imprint it has had on planning procedure since it was first instituted in 1932, and the time and resources it has employed in local authorities and the SPA. There are several major limitations to such planning however, which make it highly inappropriate for solving planning problems at a regional scale.

Firstly, statutory planning had the effect of imposing a rigid and detailed procedure on the preparation of local planning schemes. Planning being a process and being responsive to a communities changing needs is not effective under such rigidities. Experience has shown that on the inception of statutory planning, on average ten years were being taken from the initiation to the prescription of a planning scheme, with a range of between five years and twenty years. In many cases planning schemes were out of date before they were prescribed:

...in terms of technique in that they have not adequately included advances in planning knowledge; in terms of facts in that they have failed to take account of changes in population forecasts, social and economic trends; in terms of policy in that they have not reflected changes in community attitudes and government intentions.

The second major limitation is that statutory planning is strongly oriented towards physical land use planning. It does not contribute to planning for the delivery of services, the enrichment of economic opportunities or the sensible management of resources. In addition
An it is a restrictive form of planning oriented towards regulations, restrictions controls and minimum requirements; all inherent characteristics of rigid land use zoning. This has led to a very negative image of planning in the mind of communities in local government areas, where the principle should be guidance rather than restriction. It is now generally recognized that land use is integrally related to other planning concerns such as those above and that a statutory plan only deals with one aspect of the problems relevant to planning.

Thirdly, under the present statutory planning system, the opportunities for public involvement in the planning process has been limited. More often than not the public's role has been delegated to commenting on draft planning schemes resulting in many objections being lodged for individual consideration. Public involvement tends to be ex post facto because the legislation does not include any requirements for soliciting public views during the preparatory stages of the schemes.

One final limitation that should be mentioned is that the present system has not attempted to provide a framework for the co-ordination and delivery of public services and relating their development to that of the private sector. Its focus has been too narrow, its rational base is outdated, and it does not cater for the needs of a modern, complex society. The challenge lies ahead to reconstruct our institutions and processes to assess and efficiently deliver programs appropriate to community needs.
Before commencing the main body of the thesis it would be useful to conclude this chapter by placing NSW as the case study into a broader Australian context from both a geographical and economic perspective.

NSW in an Australian Context

The Regions of NSW. NSW is situated in the south-east corner of Australia and comprises 10.4% of the land mass (Figure 2.1). It is divided into a number of quite distinct physiographic regions (Figure 2.2), each one possessing a unique combination of soils, vegetation and climate.

Figure 2.3 shows the set of regions that is in use at present for the purposes of the RAC's. There are at present 11 regions if the Sydney Metropolitan region is included. The focus of this paper is essentially the non-metropolitan regions, simply defined as those that possess a predominantly rural base. They may have urban areas within them (usually less than 60,000 population), acting as service centres to the wider rural region. Regions 1-8 in Figure 2.3 fit this criteria, as would regions 9 & 10 if they were modified to exclude the Greater Newcastle and Greater Wollongong urban areas.

The regions of NSW were delimited using a variety of criteria designed to measure both homogeneity and nodality:

They included community of interest, pattern of communication, topography including influence of major river valleys, distribution of natural resources, pattern of industrial and commercial development, existing State administrative divisions and districts and the potential capacity to sustain
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urban growth and counter the predominance of urban Sydney.  

It appears though, that the main delimiting factors were patterns of telephone traffic (nodality measure) and a concern for maintaining rational groupings of local government areas.  

NSW in an Economic Context

Problems at the State scale are often considered to be reflections of problems at a regional scale, and recently there have been suggestions that the issues at these two levels in NSW are inseparable for planning purposes. Such a view is not taken in this thesis, however it is recognized that there is an intimate connection between State performance and regional performance.

State inequalities in confederation almost exclusively have meant differences in fiscal capacity of the States. Generally speaking such inequalities have been largely reflections of differences in area, climate, topography, natural resources, size and distribution of population and productive capacity, levels of income and expenditure, and economic growth. More specifically however, the inequalities between States can be attributed to two main factors; differences in demographic structure and differences in income.

Tables 2.1-2.3 paint a broad sketch of the main demographic characteristics of the States. Table 2.1 shows considerable differences between the States in terms of population growth. NSW has the highest population but in recent years has had one of the lowest growth rates, and the
### Table 2.1 — Population of States: Comparative Rates of Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New South Wales</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>South Australia</th>
<th>Western Australia</th>
<th>Tasmania</th>
<th>Six States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase 1975-76</strong></td>
<td>31,800</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>32,300</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>22,700</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>121,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage increase</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural increase 1975-76</strong></td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>115,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As percentage of 1974-75 population</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net migration 1975-76</strong></td>
<td>(a) 400</td>
<td>(a) 8,500</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>(a) 1,000</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As percentage of 1974-75 population</td>
<td>(b) 0.15</td>
<td>(b) 0.23</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>(b) 0.25</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage increase 1974-75</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage increase 1973-74</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage increase 1972-73</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average annual rates of increase, per cent:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-71</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-66</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-61</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Migration loss.
(b) Decrease.

*Note: Based on revised population figures from 1971-72 onwards.*

**Source:** Commonwealth Grants Commission, 44th Report, 1977
### TABLE 2.2 — POPULATION OF STATES: DENSITY AND URBANISATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density (number of persons per square kilometre as at 30 June 1976)</th>
<th>New South Wales</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>South Australia</th>
<th>Western Australia</th>
<th>Tasmania</th>
<th>Six States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Urbanisation (a) as at 30 June 1976 (percentage of population residing in urban and rural areas) —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban — major — other</th>
<th>New South Wales</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>South Australia</th>
<th>Western Australia</th>
<th>Tasmania</th>
<th>Six States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0

(a) Preliminary figures from 1976 Census. Urban is defined as (i) major urban — population clusters of 100,000 or more persons, and (ii) other urban — population clusters of 1000 to 99,999 persons.

(b) Less than 0.1 per cent.

### TABLE 2.3 — POPULATION OF STATES: PROPORTIONAL AGE DISTRIBUTION 30 JUNE 1976 (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Last Birthday</th>
<th>New South Wales</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>South Australia</th>
<th>Western Australia</th>
<th>Tasmania</th>
<th>Six States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-18</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>25.96</td>
<td>26.37</td>
<td>26.04</td>
<td>26.80</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>25.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-64</td>
<td>57.31</td>
<td>56.35</td>
<td>55.04</td>
<td>56.69</td>
<td>56.06</td>
<td>54.68</td>
<td>56.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>9.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00

(a) Preliminary figures.

Source: Commonwealth Grants Commission, 44th Report, 1977
differences appear to arise to a large extent from the differences in the rate of growth from net migration. On the other hand, Table 2.2 shows that in 1971 NSW was the most urbanized State with 88.7% of its population living in urban centres, compared to a six state average of 85.9%. Table 2.3 reveals that NSW has the lowest proportion of population in the school age group, and the highest proportion in the working age group.

Tables 2.4 and 2.5 show some personal income and consumption statistics for each of the States. In terms of personal income NSW together with Victoria are well above the other States, while the level of personal consumption expenditure indicates much the same pattern. Such demographic and income factors tend to contribute to the fiscal capacities in each of the States. Differences in demographic structure and income are likely to give rise to differences in the need for state social services in certain fields. For instance a greater proportion of young people tends to produce a relatively greater need for expenditure on education and for infant and child welfare services. A small population or low population density may indicate the need for greater expenditure per head of population in order to provide comparable government services. Likewise, there can be little doubt that interstate differences in the levels of personal income contribute towards differences in relative State taxable capacity. Without dwelling too much further on such generalized concepts, it is clear that NSW is one of the 'have' as opposed to the 'have not' States in the confederation. This
### Table 2.4 — Personal Income per Head of Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New South Wales (a)</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>South Queensland (b)</th>
<th>Australia Western (c)</th>
<th>Tasmania</th>
<th>Australia Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>$4,435</td>
<td>$4,532</td>
<td>$3,955</td>
<td>$4,177</td>
<td>$4,216</td>
<td>$3,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>$3,866</td>
<td>$3,889</td>
<td>$3,477</td>
<td>$3,666</td>
<td>$3,566</td>
<td>$3,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>$3,190</td>
<td>$3,184</td>
<td>$2,821</td>
<td>$2,984</td>
<td>$3,090</td>
<td>$2,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>$2,645</td>
<td>$2,655</td>
<td>$2,362</td>
<td>$2,327</td>
<td>$2,330</td>
<td>$2,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>$2,348</td>
<td>$2,358</td>
<td>$2,067</td>
<td>$2,073</td>
<td>$2,144</td>
<td>$1,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 1970-71 to 1974-75</td>
<td>$2,348</td>
<td>$2,858</td>
<td>$2,530</td>
<td>$2,588</td>
<td>$2,639</td>
<td>$2,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 1965-66 to 1969-70</td>
<td>$1,684</td>
<td>$1,737</td>
<td>$1,474</td>
<td>$1,492</td>
<td>$1,580</td>
<td>$1,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 1960-61 to 1964-65</td>
<td>$1,254</td>
<td>$1,302</td>
<td>$1,111</td>
<td>$1,137</td>
<td>$1,057</td>
<td>$1,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 1955-56 to 1959-60</td>
<td>$983</td>
<td>$1,030</td>
<td>$881</td>
<td>$928</td>
<td>$831</td>
<td>$863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparative Index (Australia = 100)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>102.9</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>103.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>102.9</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>106.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Includes Australian Capital Territory.  (b) Includes Northern Territory.
Note: Based on revised population figures from 1971-72 onwards.

Source: Commonwealth Grants Commission, 4th Report, 1977
### Table 25 - Personal Consumption Expenditure Per Head of Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New South Wales (a)</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>Queensland (b)</th>
<th>South Australia</th>
<th>Australia (b)</th>
<th>Tasmania</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>3133.62</td>
<td>3097.12</td>
<td>2713.36</td>
<td>2842.25</td>
<td>2908.36</td>
<td>2709.69</td>
<td>3000.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>2709.67</td>
<td>2650.37</td>
<td>2309.13</td>
<td>2362.45</td>
<td>2431.61</td>
<td>2357.14</td>
<td>2565.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>2298.77</td>
<td>2236.51</td>
<td>1979.91</td>
<td>1903.41</td>
<td>2072.50</td>
<td>1956.59</td>
<td>2166.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>2002.20</td>
<td>1899.10</td>
<td>1680.76</td>
<td>1678.14</td>
<td>1801.47</td>
<td>1650.24</td>
<td>1868.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>1810.62</td>
<td>1740.25</td>
<td>1527.41</td>
<td>1512.22</td>
<td>1666.76</td>
<td>1529.02</td>
<td>1700.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 1970-71 to 1974-75</td>
<td>2104.97</td>
<td>2033.00</td>
<td>1790.53</td>
<td>1782.28</td>
<td>1915.17</td>
<td>1781.02</td>
<td>1982.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 1965-66 to 1969-70</td>
<td>1358.48</td>
<td>1327.91</td>
<td>1160.86</td>
<td>1148.64</td>
<td>1268.21</td>
<td>1148.74</td>
<td>1287.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 1960-61 to 1964-65</td>
<td>1013.95</td>
<td>1013.93</td>
<td>886.55</td>
<td>892.28</td>
<td>909.40</td>
<td>883.11</td>
<td>972.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 1955-56 to 1959-60</td>
<td>821.66</td>
<td>820.01</td>
<td>710.11</td>
<td>746.18</td>
<td>744.40</td>
<td>706.80</td>
<td>788.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparative Index (Australia = 100)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>103.3</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>107.2</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 1970-71 to 1974-75</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 1965-66 to 1969-70</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 1960-61 to 1964-65</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 1955-56 to 1959-60</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Includes Australian Capital Territory. (b) Includes Northern Territory.

Note: Based on revised population figures from 1971-72 onwards.

**Source:** Commonwealth Grants Commission, 44th Report, 1977
observation is bourne out by the fact that all Grants Commission Funds have been concentrated on the four smaller States of Tasmania, South Australia, Western Australia and Queensland while NSW and Victoria have never benefited from these special funds.

Such broad social indicators are of course of limited use and do not necessarily reflect problems at a regional scale. They certainly do not reflect other characteristics which may be pertinent to regional planning such as sociological and environmental characteristics, however, they do provide a brief State context upon which to base the rest of this thesis.
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32 It is not immediately clear why this action was taken. It appears that the Planning and Environment Act was based on the recommendations of two independent review committees, and that a body was needed to relate to the portfolio of 'Planning and Environment' which was created in 1973 to consolidate diverse environmental control functions.
33 New South Wales, Report, p. 9.
34 ibid., An indication of the magnitude of human resources employed on such activities is given in Chapter 15 and Appendix 3 of this report.
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Queensland has only been receiving grants since 1971.

This is not entirely true, as Grants Commission payments were made in NSW to local government authorities during the years that the Grants Commission was dealing with regional groupings.
CHAPTER III

REGIONAL SCALE PROBLEMS IN NEW SOUTH WALES: AN INTEGRATING PERSPECTIVE

Regional Problems and Regional Issues

In beginning to focus on regional scale problems in NSW there are several points which should be mentioned at the outset. Firstly, a distinction should be made between a 'regional problem' and a 'regional issue'. As discussed in Chapter 1, a regional problem is manifested by some form of disadvantageous imbalance. Such imbalances stem from the fact that impediments in the interactive process which is an inherent characteristic of regionalism are causing the region to be deficient in some way in relation to other regions or the nation. As a result the regional problems may take many forms and cover a wide spectrum ranging from intangibles such as psychological alienation, social disorder and anxiety, to very concrete problems such as unemployment, out-migration, low per capita incomes and loss of economic opportunity, or, to specifically environmental problems such as pollution, land use conflicts and an inability to manage scarce resources. A regional problem, by nature, is unique to a particular region, although it may be characteristically similar to those of other regions.

A regional issue on the other hand is a much broader concept and deals with general categories of problems without necessarily giving insight into what the exact nature of the
problems are. For instance issues may concern the quality of life, such as the spatial allocation of job opportunities, or the rationalization of administration, such as the devolution of decision making. Regional issues therefore must necessarily derive from regional problems, otherwise they may be rather tenuous. More importantly, regional issues are the forms in which institutions articulate regional problems. The second point that should be made at this stage is that at present there is a paucity of information about the exact nature of the regional problems in NSW. A perusal of the literature reveals that there has not been very much consideration given to regional problems, hence the specific goals and objectives that the planning process should take into consideration. A recent government report titled "Indicators of Community Well Being" concluded that this was basically because of four factors; lack of adequate social theory, poorly defined policy objectives, inadequacies of Australian social statistics, and the excessive secrecy of Australian bureaucracies.¹

This paucity of data has restricted a proper formulation of goals and objectives since planning must be based on a proper understanding of the nature of the problems. The model suggested in Figure 1.1 indicates that there are two ways that problems may be articulated. They may be articulated on the one hand by society in general through the political process, interest groups etc., or on the other hand by government institutions. Prior to the 1970's there was very little institutional articulation of regional problems. More recently however some articulation has occurred in particular
sectors of government, and inquiries have been conducted either on a functional basis,\textsuperscript{2} or in a broad problem area.\textsuperscript{3} For instance since 1973 inquiries into schools, hospitals, national estate, poverty and government administration have been conducted at the national level, while an inquiry into local government areas and administration has been conducted in NSW. These however, have been piecemeal and not necessarily regional in focus. Of significance however, is the fact that they have been in the forms of inquiries, which, by their nature are based to a certain extent on societal articulation of problems relating to the subject under inquiry, via the process of public hearings and submissions. In the absence of such articulation in the past, and the paucity of the data mentioned, such inquiries are of extreme significance for anyone with interests in planning. However, such 'ad hoc' inquiries hardly lead to a comprehensive picture of the elements that go towards circumscribing social well being. Nor is articulation of this nature truly sensitive to the needs of any particular region, which, by definition, are unique. Moreover, recommendations that arise out of such proceedings are aggregated to State or National levels, and are either in the form of policy issues or necessary administrative reforms.

It is with these constraints in mind that we begin to pursue the regional scale problems in NSW.

Regional Problems in NSW

Problems of planning and administration have been readily articulated on a state wide basis, however, the
recognition that the solution to many of them lies at a regional scale is only recently becoming more widely recognized. Therefore, a concise articulation of regional problems in NSW does not exist. It is the intention of this section to concisely summarize what is seen as being the major categories of problems in NSW, to highlight their regional character, and to provide an integrating perspective from which the rest of the analysis will proceed.

The regional problems were divided into three categories of issues: (1) the urban/rural dichotomy, (2) land use conflict and resource management, and (3) area and function.

Urban/Rural Dichotomy

This is a very general but useful category which is used to explain the growing disparities in the quality of life between urban and rural areas. Put succinctly, the major cities of Australia are taking up an ever greater share of the country's resources, thereby adversely affecting the quality of life in rural areas, while at the same time causing diseconomies to occur at the points of resource consumption. An imbalance has been perceived between country and city. The OECD recently reflected this when it summarized what was meant by the notion of 'regional imbalance' in the Australian context:

The problem of regional imbalance is seen not so much as that of differences in economic conditions - incomes, employment opportunities or unemployment - between different parts of Australia, though these exist, as that of a growing concentration in the cities. The growth of cities is in part an indication of comparative advantages over rural and thinly populated areas, advantages in employment opportunities
and social services and amenities. In part, however, it brings certain disadvantages notably in urban sprawl, congestion, community and environmental disabilities. It also produces its counterpart in rural areas, comparative lack of diversity of employment and a weak basis for the support of the population and its social needs.4

This situation is also the case in NSW. A key regional issue that has been articulated by government institutions such as DURD and the NSW Department of Decentralization and Development in various ways, is that of achieving a better balance in population and settlement by reducing the relative concentration in large cities and fostering growth of alternative urban centres which can exercise a positive effect on the surrounding region. Within this issue there are disguised numerous problems which are of significance to regional planning, although they are more often that not glossed over by institutional rhetoric such as 'decentralization' or 'regional development'. These problems basically exist in two areas, the non-metropolitan region and the city region.

When speaking of an urban/rural dichotomy, the dichotomy is usually institutionally perceived as being between those urban centres in non-metropolitan regions, and the metropolitan regions themselves. However, since regional planning is concerned with planning within a region, another distinction may be of importance. This is the dichotomy that exists between urban centres in rural regions and their surrounding farm communities. This distinction may indeed have significant policy implications in an institutional sense.5
Such an approach is not inconsistent with our view of regionalism as being the interactions that occur both within the region (e.g., farm areas and urban centres), and between regions (rural urban centres and metropolitan areas). For conceptual clarity it is of importance to note that non-metropolitan regions can be considered as composed of urban areas and rural areas. Urban concentrations will act as service centres to their region, and, as a result, many of the problems of non-metropolitan regions are focussed on such centres of activity (especially when viewed in the light of marked increases in accessibility due to transportation improvements over the last two decades).

The Essence of the Urban/Rural Dichotomy in Non-Metropolitan Regions

The ultimate goal of equitable distribution of economic welfare has been well accepted in Western society, and similarly in NSW. It is recognized that the well being and satisfaction of people reflects a wide range of economic and non-economic factors. This is of particular importance in non-metropolitan regions because indicators of social well being are very often biased towards what can be readily measured such as economic factors. Much of the appeal of such regions is intangible, such as a more relaxed 'country lifestyle'. Arising out of this goal are the concerns for an equitable lifestyle resulting from the provision of adequate opportunities for services such as health, welfare and education, as well as the provision of employment opportunities. Because of the
economies of scale involved in the provision of such services, it has invariably been the case that they need be located in urban concentrations. However, constraints do exist, causing an inadequate provision of such services to the above areas. This will be discussed further in the integrating perspective.

Given that it is an implicit goal of regional planning to improve the economic well-being of a regional population, it is now appropriate to discuss some particular aspects of well-being that are of importance in non-metropolitan regions, so as to more precisely establish the regional problems in NSW. Three aspects are discussed: (1) employment opportunities, (2) education, and (3) health and welfare.

Employment Opportunities:— One factor governing the social well being of society is the adequate provision of employment opportunities. It is this factor more than any other that regulates the growth and decline of non-metropolitan regions. Many factors contribute to the dynamics of employment in non-metropolitan regions, and these are in turn intricately related to city-system interdependencies and the locational decision making behaviour of government bodies and private enterprise. Although, in NSW, there do not exist any 'depressed' or 'distressed' areas in the British or North American sense, there do exist interregional differences in unemployment. Most unemployment problems in the non-metropolitan regions result from structural changes in the rural economic base, which are in turn dampened or magnified by good economic conditions. This combined with inadequate services and facilities has
resulted in a gradual 'drift to the cities' - increasing problems of overconcentration without seemingly reducing the problems of the non-metropolitan regions.

For school leavers, lack of employment opportunities and provisions for tertiary education are among the major reasons for the exodus from country districts. In some areas it appears that anything up to 75% of school leavers eventually leave the country regions. Such undermining of the potential employment base is obviously detrimental to the continuing growth and prosperity of country regions.

Factors related to the rural base of many country regions, such as seasonality of work and fluctuations in farm incomes, contribute to regional unemployment. Because of NSW's physical resource endowments, many regions possess soil and climatic conditions which allow only very limited diversification of agricultural production. So the situation arises where certain regions are almost wholly dependent on one sector of the agricultural industry (eg. dairying on the South Coast, fruit and vine in the Riverina, wheat in the Central West, sheep and grazing in the Far West), and are therefore subject to the whims of the market. Traditionally sectoral problems have been the domain of national agricultural policy, however they have obvious implications for any consideration of the role of regional planning in such areas, and the relationship between such national policies and planning, must eventually be considered.
Education:— Access to adequate educational opportunities is yet another important aspect of social well-being. Two broad justifications are advanced for the significance of education to social welfare in non-metropolitan regions. Firstly, the level of education of those in the rural sector is likely to be increasingly a factor in the efficiency and economic well being of those engaged in and connected with rural industries. Secondly, it should be the right of every child to have access to a level of opportunity which provides a reasonable basis for his own development and enable him to take advantage of opportunities available in other areas.

A report commissioned in the early 1970's by a joint Commonwealth/State study on decentralization concluded:

The major problem is the provision of tertiary education...the provision of tertiary education to country residents, without bringing them into the cities, appears to be the greatest challenge facing those providing for the stability and growth of country towns.\(^{10}\)

A recent working group report on Rural Policy to the Prime Minister found that many children in rural regions are also significantly deprived of some aspects of educational opportunity at the primary and secondary levels. This may be for sociological reasons embracing general attitudes towards education in rural regions, or more likely arising from factors such as lack of local employment opportunities utilizing a completed secondary education, high teacher turnover or lack of variety in courses offered at secondary and tertiary levels. These observations of course are mainly generalizations that relate to problems that exist in particular
areas. For instance the Karmel Committee\textsuperscript{11} on schools has concluded that the standard of primary and secondary educational service is not necessarily inferior to that offered city children. In the larger and more prosperous country towns it may be superior to that offered to many city children at the primary and secondary levels, particularly those children situated in low income or culturally deprived inner city areas. However, there is no doubt that a problem exists and has been recognized;

Given the role seen for education in promoting equality of opportunity, government effort has been directed to programs aimed at removing inequalities, improving accessibility, widening the range of opportunity and raising the standards both of educational facilities and the content of the educational programs being offered. The needs and problems of rural areas are, for the most part, seen as part of those general programs.\textsuperscript{12}

**Health and Welfare:** Another important factor contributing to the social well being concerns the provision of health services. Several factors complicate the delivery of health services in non-metropolitan regions. These include the great distances involved and the absence of towns of sufficient size to provide the infrastructure to support modern medical facilities. In addition, considerable administrative and staffing problems exist in country areas, particularly in a situation of rapidly developing specialization in medical practice and the centralization of knowledge and facilities that that implies. A recent investigation by the federal Health Services Commission\textsuperscript{13} recognized the regional nature of this problem and
suggested that regional planning and administration of comprehensive health services should go a long way towards easing some of the burdens of residents of rural regions.

Similar problems exist in the provision of welfare services. Personal hardships may be suffered in rural regions for a number of reasons:

(1) The large and often unpredictable fluctuations in farm incomes,

(2) High share of workforce self-employed in small limited security businesses,

(3) Seasonal nature of hired farm labour, and gradual displacement by mechanization.

These factors are most obviously manifested by depressed personal incomes which are often below minimum level of reasonable living. A Commission of Inquiry into Poverty recently determined that of the adult income units in rural locations, 14.4% were very poor (below poverty line) and a further 10.8% were rather poor as opposed to the capital city figures of 8.5% and 6.7% respectively. Although those figures relate to Australia as a whole, they also reflect the situation in NSW.

Because of the greater hardships suffered in country areas of NSW, greater demands per capita are placed on social security and welfare services. The specialist social welfare services such as retirement or rehabilitation services, have been gradually lacking in many rural urban centres. This problem has also been picked up in an institutional sense and it has been perceived as a regional problem. The Social Welfare
Commission, a federal body, is in the process of creating Regional Councils for Social Development as a part of a plan for the development of integrated patterns of welfare services at the regional level. It is envisaged that such an organization will provide a mechanism to assist people in the region to identify their unique regional needs and ways in which these might be met. This in turn reflects the recognition that there is a need for government institutions to ensure that the services provided reflect the priorities of the people in each region.

Education, health and welfare services are not the only ones that are of a regional concern. In some regions, infrastructure services such as water; sewage and power; roads; air, rail and road transport services; telephone and postal services; and radio and television, are either not available, or are not up to the standards of other metropolitan and non-metropolitan regions. The aim of the policy is generally that disparities between urban and non-metropolitan regions should be reduced. The problems of disparities between urban and non-metropolitan regions that characterized service delivery also pervade the provision of infrastructure.

Land Use Conflict and Resource Management

The problems which were mentioned above have been generally recognized and articulated by various government institutions in various ways, at various times. Another general category of problems that are very often manifested at a regional scale are those which can be broadly categorized as problems
of land use conflict, or problems of resource management. Recent thinking over land use conflicts has been based on the assumption that the effectiveness of public planning will depend on the amount of land the government possesses as opposed to the amount held in private.\textsuperscript{16} Evidence from Sweden and the Netherlands suggests that planning policies are much easier to administer when those that are administering them have effective control over the land.\textsuperscript{17} This is of particular importance on the rural/urban fringes of towns and cities, where some of the conflicts are more acute. In NSW, one third of all land (a total of 80.2m hectares) is either alienated or in the process of alienation.\textsuperscript{18} Out of the total 6.4m hectares for which Crown Land is reserved, 52\% is State forest or timber reserve areas, 16.3\% is State or National Park, 3.5\% is nature reserve and 28.2\% other types of reserves.

What then is the nature of the conflicts in NSW? There is evidence to suggest that this vacant Crown land has been subject to competition between agriculture, forestry, and to a lesser extent mining.\textsuperscript{19} Conflict that exists occurs in two areas: competing uses in high rainfall areas of NSW, and land use conflicts on the urban/rural fringes. In the dryer regions of the State, west of the Great Dividing Range, on the slopes and plains, conflicts between major resource uses are minimal. Factors such as climate and soil preclude competing uses such as forestry, and mining is generally carried out in the sparsely settled areas in the Far West of the State. It is generally true that many of the inland regions of NSW developed according to their produce producing capacities,
thereby precluding the population from overburdening the land, or other problems associated with denser population settlement. In these areas, the problems are more those of environmental land management. They relate to the determination of what the best land management practices on rural holdings should be, in order to minimize resource depletion.

**Resource Management Problems:** Because much of the population is concentrated in the coastal and tableland areas, it is inevitable that the greatest conflicts would occur in this part of NSW. Competition exists among resource uses, but also from the fact that the bulk of the population spend their leisure time in the coastal areas. It is expected that conflicts between forestry, recreation and agriculture will take on significant proportions in the near future. The Australian Forestry Council, an organization responsible for the planning and co-ordination of Australian forestry, has adopted a policy of making Australia self sufficient in softwood products by the year 2000. To meet this it is expected that the share of productive forest area under softwood plantations would increase from 1% to 3% (an expansion of 1.07m hectares in all). NSW, with its tableland areas ideal for such undertakings, would undoubtedly absorb a fair share of this increase. This is likely to have implications in the future for preservation of areas as National or State Parks, forest related passive recreation, as well as water management procedures. Evidence already exists of conflicts occurring between preservation for national parks, and public and private
plantations of exotic pines. It is also inevitable that diverse pressures for recreation space in the coastal zone are likely to increase tremendously over the next decade or so as society's demand for recreation activities increases. Such a concentration of activity is likely to have adverse effects on some of the ecological balance found along the coastal zone.

Similarly problems of access are beginning to develop around some of the coastal lakes and estuaries, which effectively are denying society as a whole the right to use them. Although this problem has not yet reached the dimensions it has in North America (most NSW beaches are readily accessible), it does not nullify the concern for adequate coastal zone management, and this is especially so since the coastline is one of Australia's resources most treasured by its population. The problem is one of a regional scale - the demand for space no longer is confined within the boundaries of urban areas, and problems traditionally concentrated in the city are beginning to be felt in non-metropolitan regions.

Environmental controversies also emerge at a regional scale. A recent example emerged on the South Coast of NSW in the conflict between clearcutting practices of the woodchip industry, and sound environmental principles. The Working Group on Rural Policy in Australia has concluded that:

There is also an undoubted need to develop more effective controls on the utilization of our forests and forest land resources to ensure that guidelines reflecting sensible compromises between the economic needs of society and the very proper concerns of the environmentalist are followed.
In addition, competing demands on natural resources would tend to indicate the necessity for multi-objective solutions. For instance, effective utilization can be made of forestry roads for passive recreation access - an idea which has not been explored to any significant extent. British Columbia provides an excellent example of the utilization of logging roads for recreational use - a concept which has till recently been shunned in NSW.

Problems of the Rural/Urban Fringe:- A classic example of land use conflicts is that which results on the rural/urban fringe - the direct conflict of urban development and agricultural use. This conflict is not unique to NSW or Australia. The problem manifests itself in many ways, the most common in NSW being the alienation of agricultural land needed to supply urban centres; land speculation associated with high cost of land for urban users; a scattered pattern of urban and non-urban uses and backlogs of needed urban public works such as roads, sewrage works and schools. A recent view has attributed such conflicts to the failure of the land market and planning system to ensure the efficient and economic conversion of rural land to urban uses. Other views have related the problems of urban/rural conflict even more fundamentally to the system of land tenures, and see the acquisition of development rights as a prerequisite to achieving comprehensive land use reform. The issues involved are obviously very complex, and works written on the subject have not been able to resolve them adequately, or even claim a comprehensive understanding.
The interface between larger urban areas and rural areas is of particular significance along the coastal regions. Two aspects should be mentioned which characterize the conflicts experienced in these areas. The first is that the activities of the farmer and the urban dweller are most intensely focussed in the coastal regions. The encroachment of the activities of the urban dweller on agricultural land has come to a head through the development of hobby farms or rural retreats. It is generally felt that such developments lead to 'urban related nuisances,' causing physical damage, pollution and destruction, to areas which are of importance to supplying urban centres with rural produce. The recent report on rural policy has articulated the problem in the following manner:

At times however, the use of land for hobby farming imposes additional costs of neighbouring farmers or on the community. The magnitude of these extra costs may be significant - such as pressures for additional roads and other services and added calls on extension services - urban hobby farms are small and sub-division consequently results in a very substantial increase in population density......There is a good case for hobby farms to be required to pay full costs of any additional public investment such as road construction which may be associated with land subdivision.27

The second major aspect is related to the first and that is the encroachment of urban related uses on prime agricultural land. Prime agricultural land is not unlimited, and the majority is located on the fertile soils of the coastal plains. Apart from the direct loss of agricultural land to urban uses there are also the problems of loss of
agricultural land to urban uses there are also the problems of loss of land through environmental damage (such as soil erosion). There has been a tendancy of planners in the past to regard regional metropolitan hinterlands as a reservoir to serve urban expansion. It is generally felt that more rational urban development will tend to minimize this type of encroachment, and thereby contribute to the more effective use of national resources.28

Area and Function

The third major area of problems which manifest themselves on a regional scale are those of the administration of public institutions themselves. Much of the recent literature in the field of public administration in Australia has focussed its attention on regional co-ordination and regional government.29 It is suspected that much of this reappraisal of administration was partly stimulated by the regional biases of many of the Labor Government's programs in the fields of Urban and Regional Development during the period 1972-75, and the realization that some form of regional organization could be the answer to solving many of the problems of the local government sector. At the same time various governments were following in the footsteps of the Royal Commission on Local Government in England30 in assessing the inadequacies of present administration and the potential of regional administration. At the Federal level a Royal Commission on Australian Government Administration articulated the main problem:
There appears to be a growing disjunction between the citizen and grass-roots organizations on the one hand and governmental agencies on the other—the 'we' and 'they' syndrome. The problem is likely to increase as more power is concentrated in central and sub central governments.31

In NSW a review of local government administration was undertaken in 1973 because it was felt that local government is becoming a less and less significant part of the governmental system. In many people's minds local government has a 'kerbs and guttering' image.32 The main problem, as articulated by the Committee of Inquiry into Local Government in NSW was that present local government areas were not the most appropriate to "securing proper, economical and efficient local government."33 The public demand for services in NSW is such that local government has been too weak to provide them.

In short, local government suffers from the existence of too many small uneconomic areas, resulting in fragmentation of authority, unnecessary duplication of assets, the underutilization of plant, equipment of human resources, and the inability to provide the varied kinds of expertise required by local councils in the modern world.34

Similarly Stilwell sees the problem as being basically the same and he articulates it as the inability of local government in peripheral areas to reverse the centralizing process because of their lack of resources.35

In terms of Fesler's classic analysis,36 these are the problems of area and function—the need for a reciprocal adjustment of area and function has been perceived. For conceptual clarity these two terms need definition. Area is
akin to our earlier classification of a region as a hypothesis, a result of the operation of regionalism; it is the ordinary citizen's ambit as he moves about in his daily activities, and the physical, social, and economic areas dictated by the location and the movement of phenomena with which social action is concerned. By function is meant all the activities with which modern administration is charged, such as the delivery of services and the protection of the environment. A mismatching of function and area by any level of government will result in imbalances on a regional scale. It is of importance to note that the vertical distribution of authority between the nation and the states and their local governments is a problem all of the one piece. However it is also of importance that horizontal problems are coincidental to vertical ones, and because they deal with the distribution of authority between governmental areas, they pose a different sort of problem. It is being recognized in Australia that the problems with which governments today must cope in a functional sense, are increasingly horizontal in that they cut across different sectors, while, at the same time, the machinery of government is still organized vertically in a system of departments with responsibilities limited to one sector. In an areal sense the boundaries of particular governments seldom coincide with or wholly embrace the natural areas defined by the problems with which society must deal.

Fesler considers three ways in which the problem of area and function may be resolved.

(1) The first way is to consider each function separately,
identify the areas best adapted to that function, and make the administrative areas for the function to conform.

(2) The second way is to start with an emphasis on an inter-relationship of functions and the need for co-ordinated administration of those functions, identify the best multi-factor areas for a composite of functions, sacrificing perfect adjustment of area to the individual functions, but trying to reduce the degree of sacrifice as much as possible.

(3) The third way is to accept the present areal framework and to readjust functional relationships between the existing governmental areas. This involves the development of more effective horizontal and vertical relations among existing governmental areas so as to mitigate the deficiencies of these areas.

Essentially the problem of area and function can be resolved then by either adjusting area to function, or function to area. 42

In reality of course the situation is not as clear cut, nevertheless Fesler's conceptualization of this classic problem is introduced at this point because it is particularly useful for explaining the problems experienced in NSW.

Traditionally regionalization of government institutions in NSW has lead to the formation of single purpose regional authorities, 43 an institutional response that Self terms 'ad hoc regionalism'. 44 As such they represent an adjustment of area to suit the function since they are statutory bodies established to plan, manage and deliver a specific service and to operate within a single function
region. Water and electricity are two prominent examples of services organized along these lines. In addition there has been a proliferation of field offices that has arisen out of the concern that institutions with functions such as agriculture, irrigation, education and highways need larger units of organization than the established local government system could provide. The result has been an even further crystallization of the structure of government. In their discussion of the proliferation of the above institutions, Power and Wettenhall observe that....

.....they followed the functional principle, specializing according to service of function in the first instance, spreading the apparatus from the capitals outwards, creating a veritable chaos of overlapping and conflicting administrative areas, and contributing little towards the cause of a truly decentralized regionalism.45

The Committee of Inquiry on the National Estate concluded:

One of our strongest impressions is of an incredible complexity and overlapping of authorities, boards, commissions, councils, government departments etc., all of whom have an interest in and whose activities have, or may have, an effect upon land-use planning and hence upon the National Estate.46

The cite an example of an area of Victoria where forty public bodies are involved in planning and management. It is safe to assume that the same general situation holds in NSW. Thus we are faced with three distinct types of governmental administrative areas: the general or comprehensive governmental area such as local government and the State, the special purpose government area such as the County Councils and the field service areas such as highways districts; all
possessing differing jurisdictions in functional and areal terms. The problems are compounded by the fact that not only do they lack horizontal integration, but also vertical integration, as the different areas are characterized by differing jurisdictions in the hierarchy of government.

The problems of local government in NSW are more akin to those resulting from an attempt to interrelate a number of functions into a multi-factor area. However the mismatch of area and function at the local government level is great. There has been a tendency of local councils to lose functions, or not to develop adequately the activities open to them under existing state legislation. For instance in recent years local government in the Sydney region has lost the responsibility for regional planning. Even more pervasive is the Committee of Inquiry's implicit recognition that the adjustment of areas is one of the most vital changes necessary to attain a degree of functional integration. The problem is perceived in the following terms:

too many meaningless boundaries......too much unnecessary fragmentation in situations where there are common problems of planning and development and where far closer co-operation and integration are needed to deal with these problems.

If we delve further into Fesler's analysis we can identify some further problems of local government which indicate a mismatch of area and function. Fesler identifies four important factors that bear on the reciprocal adjustment of governmental function and governmental area. The first one
is the need for adjusting governmental areas to the natural
distributions of phenomena with which government must deal.
It is a well known fact that local government areas in NSW
are not based on any principles of regionalism\(^49\) and that the
problems of the planning and development of modern society
transcend archaic and meaningless boundaries, which evolved out
of the settlement patterns of the 1800's and have remained
substantially unchanged since. The committee has perceived
the need to establish a viable basic areal unit.\(^50\)

The second factor relevant to solving the function
-area problem is administrative efficiency. Administrative
efficiency also sets the limits to the optimum size of
governmental areas. It is clear that the present local
government areas are not the most appropriate to secure proper
 economical and efficient local government.\(^51\)

The third factor is the adequacy of the fiscal
resources of the area. This is one of the classic problems
of local governments caused by an unequal distribution of
rating bases. This causes a checkerboard pattern of
functional efficiency between local government areas in that
the absence of an adequate rating base precludes or limits the
 provision of certain community services, or the supporting of
minimal standards of governmental performance. There has been
a tendency in the past to rely heavily on grants from other
levels of government to aid in the provision of certain
functions, such as roads, education and public works in general.\(^53\)

The fourth factor is popular control. As Fesler
points out this factor defies objective description, however it
is clear that the channels must be simple and clear and that people's interest in control must be essential. This issue is quite vital in any debate about local government in NSW. It is often said that small areas provide the greatest opportunity for public participation in local government, and the right of local individuals and groups to participate in local government is fundamental to a democratic society. At present however, local government is becoming an increasingly ineffective arm of government for many of the reasons discussed above. The democratic right of participation in local government is of little value if there is no real government in which to participate.

The case is clear. Whether consideration is given to the whole spectrum of vertical and horizontal institutional interrelationships, or only the problem of local government, there exists a mismatch of area and function in NSW.

An Integrating Perspective

To date much of the articulation of problems by institutions and societal groups has occurred along unifunctional or uni-sectoral lines. As such problems in the achievement of certain minimum standards of service delivery in non-metropolitan regions - a problem of a regional scale - have been articulated by and large independently of the overall problem of local government areas - another problem of a regional scale. Both, however, result from the institutional problem of the mismatch of area and function. The inability to provide the services needed to maintain an adequate standard of economic
welfare, is obviously caused by some impediment in the interactive process as was mentioned earlier. The nature of this impediment can be considered to be institutional, in that the departments responsible for the delivery of these services to the regions of NSW are not administratively organized on a regional basis and therefore are severely limited in coping with and monitoring the articulation of individual regional needs by the people living there. The delivery of health and welfare services for instance, have been traditionally planned on a state or national level, by single purpose institutions a unit of area unsatisfactory for the performance of the function. A recent report has stated:

It is inevitable that services planned on this basis will not meet the particular needs of disparate communities and attention must be given to planning closer to the level at which services are to be provided.\textsuperscript{56}

The evidence to support such conclusions is beginning to accumulate. The Federalism policy of the Fraser Liberal Government recognizes the need for a restructuring of Australia's forms and institutions of government and attitudes of mind to achieve co-operation and intelligent attention in areas such as education, health, social welfare, housing and urban development.\textsuperscript{57} The recent establishment of pilot schemes for the Australian Assistance Plan\textsuperscript{58} have articulated similar concerns, but with the explicit recognition of the areal element of a 'region':

The aims of the Australian Assistance Plan is to assist in the development, at the regional level
within a nationally co-ordinated framework of integrated patterns of welfare services, complementary to income support schemes and the welfare related aspects of health, education, housing, employment, migration and other social policies.\textsuperscript{59}

An inquiry by the Hospitals and Health Services Commission in 1974 recommended that hospitals should be more integrated into the planning of health services in general, and suggest a possible regional administrative system to achieve a rational allocation of resources to hospitals.\textsuperscript{60}

The evidence suggests that the problems are of an institutional nature, and that their solution seems to lie at a regional scale.

This analysis can be extended if we consider 'regional planning' as a broad 'function'. In a previous chapter we established what is meant by regional planning in an institutional sense. We do not intend to define regional planning in a more substantive sense except to say that it must obviously be concerned with the functions such as those outlined in this chapter, and must be of relevance to the problems experienced in NSW. The main thrusts in the fields of hospital and social welfare planning recently have been towards areal adjustment. The solutions have been seen in terms of Fesler's first method, and the problem of functional fragmentation still exists.

However, the concept of functional integration is becoming increasingly accepted in an area of planning that does not concern itself with any single function - resource management and land use conflict in general. In this area we
have many examples of separate bodies pursuing their own objectives with little regard for the objectives of others or the side-effects of their own actions. The solutions seem to lie in the reconciliation of the techniques of resource management with the values of society via the creation of appropriate government machinery.\(^6\)

The real issue as seen by Sinden is whether Australia or NSW for that matter can develop institutions to promote economic growth and simultaneously control the side-effects in a socially acceptable manner.\(^6\)

In short, even when considering the broader problems of resource management, the problem is an institutional one.

We tend to agree with Sinden's thesis that the inadequacies of human organization can often be the real barrier to economic development and the improvements in the quality of life. This view is also reflected by Emanuel in the following statement:

> Regional problems are not always the result of underlying social or economic causes, but can reflect deficiencies in administrative organization, the correction of which may be an essential precondition for regional progress.\(^6\)

The real issue pertaining to NSW is, therefore, given the concept of regional planning and given that many of the regional problems in NSW involve the reconciliation of area function, what are the criteria which a regional planning institution would be expected to possess in order to operate effectively? This will be considered in the next chapter.
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Towards Institutional Criteria for Regional Planning in NSW

Substantiation of the Hypothesis

The previous chapter indicated that problems of a regional scale do exist in NSW. It has been argued that many of the substantive problems such as achieving an equitable distribution of health and welfare services or the protection of the environment can be related to the generic problem of reconciling function with area. In this chapter it is intended to examine what contribution regional planning can make towards solving some of these problems, and what criteria are necessary to achieve this.

Regional planning is a means of reconciling the problem of area and function. This important point has not been adequately appreciated. The problem of area and function has tended to be treated exclusively within the domain of public administration,\(^1\) even though it is central to the concept of regional planning.\(^2\) The focus in NSW recently has been on questions of regionalization of administration rather than regional planning. These fields are interrelated, and one cannot be considered without the other. Firstly, some time will be taken to explain how regional planning relates to area and function.

Fesler considers two elements that are necessary for the reconciliation of area and function.\(^3\) The first is basic structural reform and the second is perfection of
co-operative techniques. Structural reform involves the reorganization of governmental areas towards some defined end. This implies a certain degree of interareal co-operation at the extreme of which lies the rationalization and integration of local government boundaries with those of other jurisdictions. Perfecting co-operative techniques on the other hand implies a certain amount of functional integration, and functional integration may occur at both higher orders or lower orders of government. Both interareal co-operation and functional integration may be achieved at all levels of government.

As mentioned in the last chapter there are three possible combinations of structural reform and co-operative techniques. These concepts borrowed from the field of public administration are extremely useful for an understanding of regional planning in relation to area and function. All three can constitute some form of regional planning although some fit our definition better than others. The easiest method of rationalizing area and function is that of arranging areas to that they best suit particular functions. This preserves the vertical arrangement of functional departments and it dispenses with interfunctional co-operation. Such forms of single function planning are perhaps most efficient from an administrative point of view. Proposals for such solutions have recently emerged in NSW.

The problems of this approach are obvious. Firstly, this does not lead to an integration of functions on an areal basis. Administrative efficiency may have improved, but the equity of the co-ordination and rational delivery of services
to the individual has not improved to any significant degree. A haphazard pattern of overlapping areas and conflicting goals and objectives still occurs. Secondly, the adjustment of government areas to single functions is of little value if there does not exist a mechanism through which regional needs are assessed and appropriate areas for the delivery of single purpose functions are determined. In many cases in NSW this mechanism is at present occurring through field office administrators, however, this is somewhat limited because a good deal of their time is taken up with daily administrative chores and correspondance with superiors.

Another approach is that of attempting an integration of functions and retaining the existing structure of governmental areas. In the present rigid structure of government in NSW this proposal has some merit. General functional integration can be achieved at two levels in the present structure. In the upper echelons of government functions may be grouped into a number of clusters by a top generalist. Ultimately it is a Cabinet minister who is the top generalist and may have responsibility for a number of functions. For instance, the Minister for Public Works in NSW has under his wing the State Dockyard, two Water Boards, the Metropolitan Water, Sewerage and Drainage Board, the Water Conservation and Irrigation Commission and the Maritime Services Board. In most cases the common denominator among these functions is that they all report to the same minister. Under these circumstances the minister does not employ any explicit powers of co-ordination or integration, rather he
merely monitors these functions. Such groupings of functions under a top generalist does not automatically assure co-ordination among them, and in most cases functional specialization is preserved.\(^8\)

The other level at which functions can be integrated is at the level at which they are administered. As Fesler sees it:

Area provides the other great foundation for the integration of governmental functions. Area provides the common denominator for the functions of the nation, the state, the country, or the town. Each of these governmental areas has a government that potentially can weave all its functions together so that they make a consistent pattern for the area in which they operate.\(^9\)

However, as seen in the last chapter, functions such as agriculture, irrigation, forestry, electricity, education, and transport and communications generally require larger units of organization than the present local government system can provide.\(^10\) Local governments possess mandates for only a very few of these functions,\(^11\) and it seems for the most part that major functions such as these are administered independently of local government concerns.\(^12\) Although Fesler is correct in observing that area provides a common denominator in the present structure of governmental jurisdiction in NSW, local government areas do not have the potential to weave together these vital functions, because, quite simply, they do not possess jurisdiction over them. There is no machinery for continuous Federal-State-Local integration of activities in any given area.\(^13\)
Further, Gillingwater has pointed out that once an attempt is made towards horizontal co-ordination of functions to attain a degree of equity, one has to sacrifice bureaucratic efficiency. The much articulated need to attain efficiency and equity in the delivery of services is for the most part self defeating. The most efficient way of carrying out functions is through a vertical hierarchy; the most equitable way is through horizontal co-operation. Gillingwater capsualizes the problem in the following way:

On the one hand departments and agencies attempt to discharge their individual functions as efficiently as possible, whereas on the other there is a need for those to be co-ordinated. In this kind of a situation efficiency and co-ordination cannot be maximized. Rather it is a problem of the level of efficiency limiting the degree of co-ordination, and the level of co-ordination limiting the degree of efficiency.

The reciprocal adjustment of function and area requires the criteria of equity to be met at the expense of efficiency.

Regional planning has been defined as a form of public planning carried out by government institutions of the supra urban/sub state scale. This is an area larger than any single local government area but smaller that a State. It has already been established that regional problems may arise because of the lack of functional and areal integration within government institutions, so the establishment of regional planning is intimately connected with some form of areal reform and some degree of functional co-ordination and integration. It is the major hypothesis of this paper that regional planning is an appropriate device through which to
achieve functional integration and areal reform. As such it is argued that regional planning looks towards a reciprocal adjustment of function and area.

To explain this further, consider the following conceptualization. If we consider area and function as being separable then the following generalizations may be made. In order to cope with the increasing demands on government institutions, it has been common for government departments to specialize functionally at higher levels of government and to generalize functionally at lower levels. So what has emerged have been small, highly specialized units within departments planning for the needs of NSW in general, backed up by regional field office staff, who, by their 'jack-of-all-trades' natures are generalists. The trend in government in NSW appear to have been one of functional specialization at higher levels of government planning and administration and functional generalization at lower levels of government planning and administration. In Figure 4.1 the fitting together of functions A, B, C etc. into a comprehensive delivery package occurs imperfectly in the domain of lower order levels of government planning and administration.

On the other hand, if area is considered separately as in Figure 4.2 then it could be said that the opposite was true. Area itself is a basis for specialization and the existence of democratically elected Councils in local government areas attests to this. Each local area will differ in its orientation towards public policy issues which in turn reflects the differing social and economic aspirations that they possess.
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Figure 4.1: Fitting of Functions
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Figure 4.2: Fitting of Areas
The problem in this case would be the fitting of specialized knowledge and needs of individual areas into much broader state of national contexts. The trend evident here is one of areal specialization at lower levels of government planning and administration and areal generalization in higher orders. The charge of parochialism of many lower order governments arises out of the tendency of these specialists to lose sight of the policies set in higher orders of government.

Herein lies the dichotomy between area and function. Functional specialization is concentrated in the enclaves of higher government departments where the majority of decisions are made in specialized units and the benefits that are to be gained from specialized knowledge are not generally available to the areas in which the functions are implemented. On the other hand, the machinery of government is so organized that particular areal planning concerns about certain functions become of a very generalized nature at the levels at which the decisions are being made. This is exemplified if we combine the diagramatic representation of area and function into the shape seen in Figure 4.3.

It is obvious that the reconciliation of area and function cannot be achieved by either areal specialization or functional specialization alone. The domination of either the functional or areal principles will result in the failure to achieve the effective integration of the delivery of services and opportunities to the individual. It is clear that there must be a reciprocal adjustment of both function and area; there must be a partial abandoning of the efficiency or functional
Figure 4.3: Dichotomy between area and function
specialization while at the same time some rationalization of areal particularism. What the above diagram suggests is that there is a level (represented by a plane) between higher order and lower order government planning and administration where some of these functional and areal principles may be partly reconciled. This level may be termed the regional level. At this level the process of interfunctional and interareal co-ordination would be facilitated by regional planning.

**Principles of Regional Planning**

Having established the major hypothesis it is now necessary to identify what principles regional planning must possess in such a situation for it to be effective. The foundations for successful regional planning must be based on the nature of the problems experienced in NSW as well as regional planning's procedural aspects. The following are considered the most fundamental:

1) One of the common themes throughout the previous three chapters has been that of identification of regional needs and articulation of regional problems. It is contended here that regional planning should involve the promotion of regional initiative in identifying the problems requiring attention, and ultimately in formulating plans. During the days of the Federal Department of Urban and Regional Development a view often advocated was that regional organizations were seen to be potentially capable of providing a useful public form for expressing regional needs without interfering with or limiting the functions of any existing structures.  

This view has also
been advocated by Gertler writing in the Canadian context:

...administrative arrangements that make possible the participation of the people of the region, through adequate representation, in all phases of planning.\(^{19}\)

Figure 4.3 suggests the need for fitting areal peculiarities into a broader regional context by the formulation of shared regional goals and objectives. Fesler presents a strong case in the following terms:

...the humanistic view starts with the individual citizen as a point from which to gain sound perspective. It is on him that all governmental activities converge.\(^{20}\)

The point of convergence of the myriad of government activities is the individual, and it is at this point of convergence that they must make sense. They cannot make sense unless some form of functional integration and co-ordination occurs rationally based on regional needs. Regional planning cannot operate adequately unless a mechanism exists for identifying regional needs and articulating areal problems.

2) Another very important principle concerns the nature of the relationship between regional policies articulated at the state or national level, and regional planning. The important distinctions between regional policies and regional planning were discussed earlier, and the need for consistency was foreshadowed. At this point it is necessary to emphasize that such consistency is necessary for regional planning to succeed.

One of Gertler's conditions for regional planning is that there needs to exist a State policy which is aimed at
co-ordinating regional interests in the light of State wide requirements. This is often a vexed question because this is a direct interface between regional planning and politics. Kuklinski recognizes that one of the basic weaknesses of regional planning is its decidedly low level of integration with regional policies. It seems that there must also be an increased vertical policy co-ordination between those of regional, state and national scales.

Gillingwater conceptualizes planning and policy making as being overlapping subsets of the process of decision making. His analysis is modified here to explain the type of policy co-ordination that is envisaged by this principle. Figure 4.4 shows regional planning as occurring at the interface of public policy making and private policy making. Figure 4.4 collapses all levels of decision making into one plane thereby eliminating its true vertical structure. The elements of the conventional planning process are shown, and, it is clear that policy co-ordination must occur at the point of overlap between planning and public and private policy making. At this point policies that are formulated within the regional planning process must be co-ordinated with those of other state and regional public bodies which possess decision making powers affecting the region. At the same time regional policies should attempt to fulfill any national policy that may have regional implications. Similarly some account should be taken of private policy making in a region, because of the dynamic role played by the private sector in determining the growth opportunities that prevail. The policies used in the
Figure 4.4: Interface between Regional Planning and Public and Private Decision Making
planning process therefore take into account regional goals and objectives as well as other public, and to some extent private policies. The flow of policy information between the planning process and the private and public policy subsets should necessarily be a two-way flow. Similarly as suggested earlier by Gertler it is expected that some direct account will be taken of regional objectives when decision making occurs in the other subsets. It is realized that this conceptualization oversimplifies, nevertheless, it is useful in explaining the fundamental principle that regional planning needs to fulfill national regional policy, needs to be co-ordinated with state regional policy, and should attempt a degree of co-ordination with the private sector.

3) The model in Figure 4.3 also suggests that there needs to be a mechanism which ensures the co-ordination and integration of functions. Two factors are involved in this principle: the need to co-ordinate policies at the State level and the need to integrate programs at the regional level. The distinctions between these two levels of functional co-ordination are quite significant for regional planning. Distinctions between policies and programs are rarely made in regional planning literature, policy for the most part being synonymous with programs. This is clearly not the case. Policies are often made in the upper echelons of government with very often little input from lower levels. Programs on the other hand are tangible manifestations of policy. They manifest themselves and interact with each other not at the broad state or national level, but rather at the point of delivery. It has been
postulated that because of the necessity for a reciprocal adjustment of area and function, the most appropriate level at which functional program integration should occur is the regional level, because it is at this level that the delivery of services begins to take on a meaningful perspective.24

These distinctions can simply be represented in Figure 4.5. Two types of co-ordination are evident; vertical and horizontal. Vertical co-ordination refers to the nature of the relationship between the regional planning process and the state policy making process. This has already been dealt with in the previous principle. Little has been said however about the importance of horizontal policy co-ordination. As represented in Figure 4.5 Cabinet is the supreme policy making body in the present governmental structure. It both feeds and is fed information from the much broader departmental policy making structure. Imperative here is the need to establish clear channels of communication between those ministers as elected officials, and senior department bureaucrats, who are appointed. It is within this broad departmental structure that the principal policy co-ordination among state bodies should occur. As suggested earlier policies of functional departments need to be based on a common set of goals and objectives, which, in aggregate, should be based on those articulated by the regional planning process. The process however is two-way; regional needs translated into goals and objectives need to be put into state or national contexts, and in turn these contexts need to take these regional needs into account. As the first sub-criterion policy co-ordination must occur between State
Figure 4.5: Relationship between Planning, Policy Co-ordination and Program Integration
bodies A, B, C, and so on.

It has already been stated that the optimal level for the integration of functional programs is the regional level. Programs $A^1$ and $A^2$ for instance represent programs administered by State agency A. These programs may be explicitly regional or may be of a supra urban dimension, but nevertheless possessing some regional components. It is suggested here that regional program integration is based on a commonality of goals and objectives which are also part of the regional planning process. Program integration must be carried out for regional planning strategies to succeed. The ability to co-ordinate and integrate functions is thus the third essential characteristic of regional planning.

4) Regional planning must possess a statutory basis. This, however, does not mean that it should be "statutory planning" in the negative and restrictive sense that has been attached to the phrase in NSW. Rather this characteristic implies that a regional planning institution should possess some mandatory functions as opposed to purely "advisory" ones. If an effective regional plan is to be created then it is necessary to possess the powers necessary to implement such a plan. Without mandatory duties there is a danger of any regional planning organization withering from atrophy.

Another related concern is that regional planning is a continuous process and the institutional structure should allow for a certain amount of flexibility to accommodate this process. This is a characteristic which is common not just to regional planning, but to planning in general. Much of the criticism
that was levelled at statutory planning earlier is based on its inherent inflexibility. It should suffice to say at this point that an essential precondition for the fulfillment of regional planning is that explicit recognition should be given to its flexible nature, and that such flexibility needs to be built into regional planning's statutory basis.

Although we do not intend to discuss the problems of defining boundaries of regions in any great detail, there are two further important preconditions which must be met before successful planning could be undertaken in any particular region:

5) The fifth concern arises directly out of the operation of regionalism. For effective regional aggregation of areal particularisms to take place, regions must coincide as closely as possible to the natural distribution of phenomena with which governments must deal. This is especially so in NSW, where relatively strong regional identities have existed for some time. What is perhaps of greatest importance is the identification of the centre of the region where intraregional interactions are usually focussed. Peripheral areas of the regions tend to be shared with others, however this is by no means an effective barrier to the operation of a regional planning function.

6) The sixth concern is that of the fiscal resources of a region to undertake a planning mandate. The question of fiscal resources will depend a great deal on the various alternative organizational arrangements that could be pursued, as well as on the extent of a regional organization's powers of program delivery.
It seems clear however that the degree of success that can be expected from a multi-functional regional planning organization whose main mandate may be to resolve competing priorities, will depend to a great extent on its ability to remain independent of funding by any other level of government. Funds not raised in a independent fashion tend to have 'strings attached', which in turn tend to cast dispersions on the true impartiality of the operations of the regional organization. If the principle of independence is to be maintained then the region must be of a sufficient size to be able to attain a strong fiscal base. This may in certain circumstances conflict with boundaries defined through the principles of regionalism, especially in circumstances of widespread regional poverty or a low population density. If the regional organization is to operate programs, then it seems essential that it will need the ability to raise revenues.

In this chapter we have established the major hypothesis that regional planning is an appropriate device through which to achieve the reciprocal adjustment of function and area. Reciprocal adjustment was considered as being superior to either structural reform of functional co-ordination. Six vital principles for regional planning were identified for NSW:

1. regional planning should be based upon the identification of regional needs and the articulation of areal problems
2. regional planning needs to fulfill national regional policy, needs to be co-ordinated with state policy, and should attem-
attempt a degree of co-ordination with the private sector

3. regional planning should facilitate the co-ordination and integration of functions.

4. regional planning must possess a statutory basis on the one hand, and on the other, must remain flexible

5. regional planning must explicitly recognize the process of regionalism

6. regions should possess an adequate fiscal base upon which an institution can carry out its planning mandate.

It is contended that these principles are the criteria against which regional planning schemes in NSW need to be assessed. Under comparable circumstances these criteria may have a wider applicability than to only the case in NSW. Because regional planning is an institutional process, the criteria become institutional criteria. The next chapter examines a proposed regional planning system for NSW in the light of these criteria.
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24. Two factors tend to make the integration of functional programs easier at this level. Firstly, regional needs in relation to individual functions will be aggregated to a level that will be useful to the decision makers at higher levels of government. The collective needs of about ten regions for instance, are much easier to synthesize in the upper echelons of government than the individual needs of 223 local government areas. This would make the horizontal integration of functions much easier as it would identify a certain commonality of objectives towards which each function would need to strive. The second factor would be that vertical co-ordination would improve in that much more specialized services could be offered at the regional level, and this level would not suffer as greatly from functional generalization at lower levels.
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The New Process in General

In November 1975 the review of planning in NSW that was required by Section 20(1) of the New South Wales Planning and Environment Commission Act, 1974, was completed by the PEC. The report was the third such report prepared, the previous two being discussion papers designed to elicit public response and critical comment. As such there does exist among the three reports a certain amount of evolution of ideas, however, since these three reports span only a period of a year, the learning process resulting from feedback from the discussion papers is probably marginal.

After consideration was given to the existing statutory planning system a set of major government objectives were arrived at, upon which the development of the new planning system in NSW was to proceed. These were:

a) to provide for practical, economic and environmentally satisfactory land use throughout the State,
b) to provide a system which is easily understood and expeditious in its procedures,
c) to separate as far as possible Statewide, regional and local issues,
d) to encourage the positive guiding rather than the restrictive aspect of planning, to achieve practical, economic and highly desirable land use,
e) to enable better recognition of the social, economic and environmental objectives to be achieved,
f) to provide for extensive delegation of authority on local planning,
g) to facilitate effective public involvement.²

These objectives reflected three main thrusts of change that were to be introduced into the planning system. The first was the recognition that present statutory planning had a very narrow range of concern and that any new planning system should attempt to incorporate and synthesize the many diverse social, economic and environmental factors relevant to each planning situation. The second thrust emerged from the recognition that the new planning system should allow the community's needs and aspirations to be reflected in planning proposals and in all stages in the planning process. The third thrust was aimed at reducing the involvement of the State planning body (the PEC) in local planning responsibilities. It resulted from the recognition that the central planning body should not become involved with local details, as this had proven counterproductive under the present system. This thrust was probably the most significant one in terms of institutional reorganization because it envisaged an intermediate level of planning responsibility between the State and local levels.³ The composition and functions of this new level of planning responsibility is reviewed in this chapter.

One of the striking features of the new system is the somewhat less than clear nature of the proposals for planning at the regional level. Some of the evolutionary trends in the
The first two reports by the PEC make it clear that three levels of planning would be involved in the new system, a significant departure from the present two tier State-local structure. This three tier system is shown in Figure 5.1 in the following example of a hierarchy of plans for a coastal region. However by the publication of the final recommendations it had been concluded that:

it is no longer practical to regard, even theoretically, State and regional planning as two separate processes. 4

This realization is not surprising, and as pointed out earlier by Fesler, in the distribution of authority, the parts cannot be divorced from the whole. The rationalization for this made by the PEC was, that in the past, what planning policies have existed outside the metropolitan areas have been policies enunciated by diverse State departments. The implication was that State policies were so intimately related to regional plans that a regional level of responsibility was not appropriate even though very little explicit regional planning was undertaken by State departments themselves. The solution to the problem was tempered by the restrictions of the past, and not by a realization of what the crux of the problem was: the need to achieve functional integration and areal reform.

As a result the final report advocated two levels in the preparation of environmental plans: the local level, involving the local detailed and local structure plans; and the State and regional level, involving State strategies and
Figure 5.1 - Hierarchy of Plans (Example of Planning for the Coast)

STATE

- Divide State into environmental zones (e.g. coastal, urban, tablelands, etc.)
- State map

- Definition of policy (to preserve the natural coastal environment, to allow for recreation use etc)
- Policy Statement

- Establish master programme including:
  - economic development (location of industries, transport, tourist facilities, etc)
  - public access design
  - circulation systems
  - recreation
  - land use planning
  - conservation objectives
  - cultural or historical elements
  - restoration of environment

REGIONAL

- Subdivide natural environments, e.g. beaches, peninsulas, spits, bars, dunes, estuaries, swamps, lakes, water caves, flood plains
- Coastal map (broad rather than cadastral)

- Survey and assessment of resources and natural environment

- Definition of policies and guidelines, e.g. criteria for sand removal, restriction of building on flood plains

LOCAL

- Definition of land use zones, e.g. rural, residential, foreshore protection
- Local Zoning plan (cadastral)

- Definition of policies and guidelines for land uses:
  - agriculture (uses and practices)
  - oyster farming, fishing
  - forest management
  - commercial development
  - special developments, e.g. marinas
  - mining
  - advertising structures
  - residential development
  - utility services
  - parks, foreshore protection
  - waste disposal
  - historical sites
  - recreation site

Local Plan report (including objectives, regulations and guidelines)

Source: Proposals for a New Environmental Planning System
regional plans and policy directions. This hierarchy is represented in Figure 5.2, and the different types of plans are shown in Figure 5.3. A brief discussion of the local level will precede more detailed discussions of the regional and State levels.

The Local Elements

The local detailed plan is intended to illustrate the way in which the parts of the local area may be developed in detail within the framework set down in the local structure plan. Its primary function is to guide and control development and to imbue the planning policies adopted by the local council with a consistency. The main area in which it differs from the present scheme is that it gives the local Council total responsibility in preparing and administering the plan at this level. Like the present system however, the major instrument by which it was to achieve its objectives was zoning.

The local structure plan provides the basic strategic planning structure of a sub-region or town. It is a statement showing for an urban area only the major elements, such as the location of the town centre, the major industrial core, the different residential areas and large shopping centres. It is once again very much physically oriented, is prepared by the local Council, and is subject to certification procedures by the PEC. The stated purpose of such plans are to:

a) give a guide to the physical, social and economic development of the area;
Figure 5.2

LEVELS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

feedback

local detailed plans

local structure plans

and

regional environmental plans

review

state policies
regional structure plan
(covers the region into which local structure plan fits, and includes elements such as expressways, railways etc. major conservation areas.)

local structure plan
(defines the major elements in the area.)

local detailed plans
(prepared independently as required for areas A, B, C, D & E.)

Figure 5.3
TYPES OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS

SOURCE: REPORT TO THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING
b) define aspects of the environment to be protected and the permissible uses to which land could be put;
c) provide a means of requiring governmental agencies to co-ordinate their proposed actions and thereby fulfill the objectives of the local council and of regional plans;
d) provide the local council with a management tool for future planning and a framework for its local detailed plans.7

Once again the structure plan would show the precise zonings related to identifiable land areas and is therefore similar to the interim development orders already in use in NSW.8

The Regional Elements

The PEC explicitly recognized the need for planning to be carried out at the regional level:

The regional level is most suited to environmental planning as New South Wales is too large for the sensitive surveys and assessments needed. Local government areas are too small and therefore rarely correspond with concepts of environmental systems.

The definition of regional planning however is fairly critical because, as stated in Chapter 1, there are many definitions of regional planning and the definition adopted will determine its institutional structure.

Regional planning or regional environmental planning10 has been defined by the PEC as:
...the investigation of, and the conscious management and development of, natural and man-made resources of a region, and the development of its infrastructure, so as to achieve equity, (improved) economic opportunity, (greater) efficiency, and (an improved) quality of life. (It is concerned) with the proper balance between development needs for the present generation and conservation of natural and man-made assets of (the) environment for the benefit of future generations.\textsuperscript{11}

This definition varies quite significantly from the one we developed earlier as it is more substantive than procedural, introducing the broad goals of equity, opportunity, efficiency and quality of life, and vague notions of dealing with natural and man made resources. Planning is seen as being goal oriented and procedurally endowed with the techniques of investigation, management and development.

The PEC has been well aware of the necessity to broaden its previously implied narrow notions of planning, and that the physical aspects of planning should not be treated separately from the social, economic and environmental.\textsuperscript{12} However its interpretation of this recognition must be treated with some scepticism at this stage, especially in the light of consideration given to more detailed goals and objectives for regional planning that are stated in the Final Report. In summary these are:

a) guidance on population and economic activity for growth and change, and distribution in the State;

b) development and/or conservation of agricultural land and other natural and man-made resources by reservation, zoning and subdivision control;

c) development and protection of the essential elements of the
State and regional communications and utilities network;
d) zoning of land for State and regional public and community purposes such as education health, roads, railways and open space;
e) programming the provision of regional community facilities (hospitals, universities, etc.) and for the co-ordination of Government policies and action affecting them.\textsuperscript{13}
b) and d) appear to describe some of the procedural elements of the regional planning scheme, which, once again are perceived in terms of physical land use planning and control. a), c) and e) imply that there has been at least some cursory recognition that co-ordination may be a pre-eminent function of regional planning. On the whole however, these goals and objectives do not fully reflect the PEC's claim of a broadenend view of planning.

A brief look at the actual plan making process will further clarify what the scheme involved. Regional plans would comprise environmental planning policy directions, policy advice and regional or sub-regional structure plans. It is obvious that such policy directions and advice would still be concerned with physical land use planning:

Such directions would be mandatory documents that the local councils would have to follow before approving any development application. These directions should be accompanied progressively by policy advice published by the Commission for each region. This advice should be taken into account by the local councils in the region concerned before they exercise their discretionary powers on local plans and development applications.\textsuperscript{14}
Clearly, quite a rigid, statutory framework was envisaged, obviously strongly influenced by the rigidities of the present statutory planning system. Figure 5.4 shows the procedure that would be involved in the preparation of regional plans. Further comment will be provided when the institutional characteristics are discussed in turn, but, at present the following should be noted. Interim policy directions by the PEC would provide a basis for regional planning and would primarily reflect existing State policies that are already in force through local planning schemes and orders. Two obvious problems can be ascertained here. Firstly, because of the highly centralized nature of the administration of many vital planning functions, especially those relating to services, (eg. health, hospitals, welfare, education, etc.) not many policy directions exist or have existed in the past at the local level. The system has tended to be one of central agency approvals for local matters. Decision making in many functions has not been devolved to lower levels, and this has hardly been conducive to local planning initiatives. Secondly, what regional planning policies do exist, are for the most part unco-ordinated and unintegrated, and do not appear to operate towards clearly defined objectives. Moreover, they are not necessarily spatially integrated either. Arriving at some interim policy for each region under these circumstances would indeed be difficult, if not impossible.

The remainder of the plan-making process is one involving soliciting public views, exhibition, consideration of
objectives from public agencies and private individuals and obtaining necessary approvals from the PEC and its Minister - all remarkably similar to the present procedure for the preparation and prescription of planning schemes. The fact that the end product of the planning process was something that could be permanently exhibited, tends to indicate that land use planning was very much in the back of the PEC's minds. The broadened view of the nature of regional planning could be more accurately interpreted as meaning to the PEC: land use planning cognizant of economic, social and environmental implications. Economic, social and environmental matters were regarded as being the subject of a survey, rather than factors which had to be planned for, and anticipated.

The Application of Institutional Criteria

The general planning system has been described above, some general observations have been offered about the nature of regional planning as envisaged by the PEC, and now the proposals will be examined in more detail in the light of the criteria developed in Chapter 4.

1) **Regional planning should be based upon the identification of regional needs and articulation of regional problems.** It is contended here that a mechanism must exist for the identification of such needs and problems and without such a mechanism, regional planning does not operate effectively or at all. It is reasonable to expect as it follows from our model of regionalism that regional needs would first have to be articulated by the community at large. This is logical if one accepts the
premise that all government activities focus on the individual, and that a collective regional consciousness is made up from the sum of individual parts. This aspect becomes even more critical given the paucity of knowledge that exists in NSW on regional needs and problems. The groups that have traditionally had most access to such knowledge; the community at large, the local authority, and State and Federal field office staff, have not been in a position to articulate these needs in policy and planning terms. The community usually has very restricted channels through which to articulate needs. Often, the only recourse is through election of representatives to local government, who, because of their mandates are only able to deal with limited aspects of community needs. The field office staff of functional departments may in some cases have adequate knowledge of regional needs, however, they are also restricted by clouded channels of communication and lack of mechanisms to translate these needs into policy and planning terms. Unworkable past scenarios such as these indicate that a 'bottom-up' approach to the determination of regional needs is essential.

Integrally related to this mechanism is the nature of the institution that is given the regional planning mandate. For instance the regional planning institution may employ an advisory structure (where advice is solicited from sub-committees or interest groups) or a corporate structure\(^\text{18}\) (where policies and plans are prepared in consultation with such groups). Each structure has differing implications for the institutions ability to articulate regional needs and problems. In addition in absence of a truly regional level of responsibilities, an
institutions ability to articulate will vary with the level at which the regional plans are being prepared; for instance whether they are being prepared by a group of local government representatives or by representatives of a more centralized level of government.

As mentioned earlier, the PEC has not recommended the creation of a new level of government at the regional level to which the function of regional planning would be delegated. Instead a rather 'top-down' structure is envisaged, and is described in the Final Report in the following terms:

Regional offices of the Commission would prepare and update the regional element in the environmental policy directions, advice and plans. They would be assisted by their government sector regional policy committee. There would be formal consultation in each region with all State departments, with an appropriate regional planning advisory committee, all local councils, and the general community about the objectives, as well as the content of such plans. The Minister would have the power to approve the regional environmental policy directions, advice and plans. They would have to conform with the State policies and strategies for environmental planning.

The emphasis is on fitting regional planning into State policies and directives, which are to be prepared in advance of any significant regional planning. Regional needs are to be inputed into the process at two levels. The first level is where regional plans are formulated in the process used by the regional offices of the PEC, and the second level is in the higher echelons where "co-ordinated State policies and strategies" for environmental planning are carried out. In order to help explain the structure related to the regional planning function that is envisaged, Table 5.1 has been compiled
Table 5.1 Representative Input in PEC Decision Making Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisory Groups</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g.s.r.p.c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Councils</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Advisory Council (R.A.C.)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Committee (R.P.C.) (2)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.s.p.c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub n.r.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Development Group (S.D.)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Resources Group (I.R.)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Industry Committee (D.I.C.)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Advisory Committee (C.A.C.)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Review Committee (P.R.C.)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
g.s.r.p.c. - government sector regional policy committee
R.A.C. - regional advisory council (constituted under Regional Organization Act, 1972)
R.P.C. - regional planning committee (constituted under State Planning Authority Act, 1963; Hunter and Illawarra regions only)
g.s.p.c. - government sector policy committee
n.r. - natural resources group sub-committee
s.d. - social development group sub-committee
i.r. - industrial resources group sub-committee
d.i.c. - development industry committee
c.a.c. - conservation advisory committee
p.r.c. - planning review committee

- direct representation
- indirect representation
from the information available in the Final Report and elsewhere. It is a matrix which describes the areas in which State authorities, local authorities, the community and professional organizations have input into the advisory or decision making structure employed by the PEC. This is done for both the regional and State level, and gives a preliminary indication of the types of input envisaged by the PEC.

The PEC has explicitly recognized the need for "community participation" in the new planning system:

The Commission believes greater opportunities should be given to the general community to influence decisions on environmental planning matters...This can best be done...by giving real opportunities for community participation in the formal procedures for environmental planning, complemented by the continuous monitoring of the views of all groups in the community...The individual who lives in an area is quite likely to have a valuable opinion about the needs and opportunities of that area, hence the necessity for harnessing such opinions during the preparation of local plans, and for seeking the views of those concerned, when regional plans are being prepared for a specific locality.20

The community provides input directly through two advisory bodies; the present Regional Advisory Councils on which they are represented, and through a provision for soliciting suggestions directly from the public. A third, less direct channel exists through the local councils also acting as advisory bodies. A closer examination of the nature of this input is needed to make a preliminary assessment of its worth. Firstly, it is obvious from Figure 5.4 that the 'community' will not be involved in the main stream of the plan making process (represented by the dark squares). After the
formulation of interim policies, the public will be 'invited' to provide "suggestions in the formulation of any regional policies or strategies".

There are two aspects of public involvement that are contained in the PEC's proposals; public information and public participation. The techniques that the PEC proposes for achieving community involvement are biased towards public information procedures and tend to concentrate on techniques to reduce the public's difficulty with understanding plans and the planning process. They include for example, planning staff availability, newsletters, public meetings, displays, mobile exhibitions and so on. Participation is seen as implying the influencing of decision making. In the PEC scheme 'participation' at the regional level is attained through the canvassing of public opinion in response to the results of the planning process carried out by the regional and State offices of the PEC. Public involvement is essentially equated with the public comment and in such a situation consultation is almost absent.

The necessity for public information and involvement as a characteristic of the planning process is recognized in this thesis as being of considerable importance, especially in the light of the PEC not being directly accountable to the general public, as are for instance local Councils. However in the light of the problems that were discussed in Chapter 3, and the intention of the criteria developed in Chapter 4, public involvement of this nature cannot give a clear indication of the problems and needs of a region. Several reasons exist for
this. Firstly, plans which can be exhibited stress land use aspects and say nothing about the provision of services or other factors (even though some space may be allocated to them on the plan). Responses to land use plans will be entirely conditioned by the physical reality of those plans and therefore will be responses to the concepts contained within them. Secondly, responses are likely to be non-representative of the community feeling because a large majority of responses will come from other people either adversely affected by the proposed scheme or those who have a lot at stake in its implementation.

It is necessary therefore to broaden the definition of community 'participation' in the light of the realities facing planning in New South Wales. A mechanism should be created where public involvement is part of the mainstream of the planning process. In the first instance such a mechanism should facilitate the identification of generic regional problems and needs. Within this process the identification of goals and objectives will begin to emerge as a basis upon which a planning process is built, and towards which the regional planning function must aspire. This most fundamental point is lacking in the present proposal, and should be the basis of a new planning system. In contrast the first step as recommended by the Commission is the following edict: "A regional environmental investigation and analysis shall be carried out by the Commission." As the first step of the regional planning process this statement rings somewhat hollow.

Community input is also provided through the intended involvement of the Regional Advisory Council. At present,
this body seems the most appropriate institution through which truly regional needs and aspirations may be articulated. However, as noted in the introductory chapter these organizations appear to be fairly low profile at present. In addition their role would need to be rationalized in relation to the PEC and the regional planning function in general. In the proposal as represented in Figure 5.4, it is envisaged that their input will be much along the same lines as that of the community, except that their orientation would hopefully reflect a more regional perspective.

Some of the problems of local government involvement at the regional level have already been discussed in earlier chapters. Most of these impinge on the ability of local government to attain a truly regional perspective even though it is commonly argued that local government representatives are already "fully aware of public sentiment and wishes." It is contended here that the politico-institutional characteristics of local government preclude any one of them having a regional outlook. Firstly, the Councils are composed of aldermen who are in the majority local businessmen or professional people with strict parochial interests. Secondly the functions performed by local governments are so limited in NSW that many community needs may fall outside of these functions and hence outside of the jurisdiction of local governments. Local governments cannot be expected to articulate those needs under these circumstances. 2) regional planning needs to fulfill national regional policy, needs to be co-ordinated with state policy, and should attempt a degree of co-ordination with the private sector. One of the
strongest points to be made for the proposed planning scheme is its explicit recognition of the importance of integrating regional planning with State policies. It has already been stated that the PEC takes the view that State policy making and regional planning are all one in the same process, and therefore great emphasis is placed on this in the scheme. Initially planning is going to be based on the interim policy directions prepared by the PEC, these reflect existing State policies. Built into the mainstream of the regional planning process is the Government Sector Regional Policy Committee, through which the co-ordination with regional policies of State agencies will take place. The success of this attempt will hinge on three factors.

Firstly, State policies that can be interpreted on a regional level must exist. The assumption that State policies exist at present in all functional areas is doubtful. Policies need to be capable of local/regional interpretation and need to be explicit. State policies that are not clear and unambiguous will often lead to great difficulties when attempting to plan at lower levels. This is especially so when the powers of decision making and implementation are isolated from the institution preparing the regional plan. Secondly, the lines of communication between those articulating policy at the regional level, and those making policy at the State level, should be clear. Much will depend on the level of personnel that staff the government sector regional policy committee. They should be decentralized enough to be able to understand regional concerns, but centralized enough to be able to
accurately disseminate State policies. Thirdly, it is important that the specific objectives for regional planning aspire to the goals upon which the State policies are based. This will depend upon the mechanisms for articulating regional needs (discussed previously) and the mechanisms for achieving functional co-ordination and integration.

The PEC proposal has the potential to meet this criterion, however, once the system is operationalized its success at the State level will depend very much on the above mentioned factors. National policies on the other hand pose a different set of problems, as region specific policies are not widely employed by the Federal government, however sector specific policies such as tariffs and income support schemes for instance do have quite significant regional impacts, often accompanied by far reaching implications for regional planning. Non-metropolitan regions of NSW are particularly susceptible to such Federal government activity as most have either a rural or a mining base. Prior to the Labor Government election in 1972 not much attention had been given to this significant link, because, in terms of political administration, this link did not exist in the federal structure of government. Likewise the institutional implications of accommodating Federal policies in a regional planning scheme have not been considered by the PEC. They do however concede that it is essential that Federal policies and advice are fed into the planning process if planning is to be effective. A continuing mechanism through which this could be achieved is not specified, however, and ad hoc bodies for special purposes such as growth centres are cited
as examples of previous policy co-ordination. However, there still remains the fear that direct involvement by the Federal government in local and regional issues must lead inevitably to an overlapping and misdirection of resources.

Private sector planning has not been given consideration in the PEC Final Report. There is a provision for a development industry committee at the State level, however its functions or characteristics are not specified. It is expected that it would consist of some representatives of the private sector as well as representatives from the Department of Decentralization and Development, and would oversee general State development strategies. Of even more fundamental importance would be the need to provide a mechanism at the regional level through which private sector representation could be achieved. Many NSW regions are subject to the whims of single sector industries and some representation by private interests would be mutually beneficial in the long run. The private sector would benefit from, and could contribute to, any improvement in the standard of economic welfare in a given region, brought about, for instance, by regional planning of service provision. In addition the private sector has a vital role to play in the provision of employment opportunities and regional planning cannot hope to effectively tackle this problem without their involvement. In reality however this is easier said than done, and, for the most part, the proposals have shied away from such important questions.

3) regional planning should facilitate the co-ordination and integration of functions. Two levels can be assessed here; the
attempt to co-ordinate policies at the State level and the attempt to integrate programs at the regional level. The PEC is potentially in an excellent position in relation to this criterion because its structure allows it to play a co-ordinating role at both State and regional levels. The need for co-ordination has been stressed by the public in the past since it is upon them that the myriad of government activities converge. The PEC has perceived the need for co-ordination and has realized its potential responsibility in that area:

As the overall planning body for New South Wales, the Commission has responsibility for co-ordinating the policies of State Government Departments and instrumentalities concerned with environmental planning and resource management in the State and regional context; co-ordinating information and activities related to environmental planning by other governmental departments at the State and Regional level; and integrating land use planning with present and projected population distributions and policies on transport and other public services.

The proposed techniques of co-ordination are probably the best documented mechanisms of the whole scheme. There are two procedures which allow the PEC to exercise its co-ordinating role. These are concurrence and consultation. Concurrence is a 'top-down' technique and in the past has been concerned with approvals by State government agencies over areas of special planning importance, such as properties fronting main roads for instance. As a technique for co-ordination at the State level this procedure is very weak. Concurrence does not lead to co-ordination, as it still maintains the status quo in terms of independent functional specialization. It has been the necessity for concurrence under the system of statutory planning
that has hamstrung the PEC's predecessor through having to pay attention to excessive administrative detail. In the present proposal it is expected to devolve these responsibilities to lower levels.

The second technique, that of consultation is expected to be the main one to achieve co-ordination at the State level in the PEC scheme. The main vehicle through which this is expected to be achieved is the Government Sector Policy Committee whose main function is envisaged as the "co-ordination of departmental, statutory authority and local government policies and programs to ensure maximum support for plans and objectives." The remaining functions of this Committee would be advisory. The following structure is proposed:

Departmental members of the Committee desirably should be departmental heads or deputy heads. They should be drawn from four or five groups of departments co-ordinated by the new Cabinet Sub-Committee structure, together with representatives of local government. Membership from the four groups should be as follows:

**POLICIES AND PRIORITIES GROUP**
- The Treasury

**NATURAL RESOURCES GROUP**
- State Pollution Control Commission
- Department of Local Government
- Valuer-General
- Department of Agriculture
- Department of Decentralization and Development

**INDUSTRIAL RESOURCES GROUP**
- Metropolitan Water, Sewerage and Drainage Board
- Proposed Water Resources Commission
- Public Transport Commission
- State Roads Authority
- Department of Mines

**SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT**
- Department of Education
- Housing Commission
- Health Commission

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT**
- Local Government Association
- Shires' Association
- Metropolitan Sydney (2 sitting members of local councils)
In addition it is envisaged that sub-committees should be established in the three critical areas of natural resources, social development and industrial resources. The main purpose of these is to:

a) receive and comment upon planning proposals presented by the PEC, and,

b) advise the Policy Committee about the plans and proposals of the authorities represented that have relevance to planning and environmental matters,

c) advise the Policy Committee as to the requirements of the authorities represented for future planning information, advice and procedures.

The expanded membership of the three groups should be as follows:

**NATURAL RESOURCES GROUP SUB-COMMITTEE**
- State Pollution Control Commission
- Metropolitan Waste Disposal Authority
- Sydney Cove Redevelopment Authority
- Department of Tourism
- Department of Local Government
- Forestry Commission
- National Parks and Wildlife Service
- Valuer-General's Department
- Central Mapping Authority
- Lands Department
- Western Lands Commission
- Department of Agriculture
- Soil Conservation Service
- Department of Decentralisation and Development

**SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT GROUP SUB-COMMITTEE**
- Department of Technical Education
- Department of Education
- Higher Education Authority
- Housing Commission
- Health Commission
- Department of Youth, Ethnic and Community Affairs
- The Library of New South Wales
- The Australian Museum
- The Art Gallery of New South Wales
- Department of Culture, Sport and Recreation
Its obvious from the above structural arrangements that the co-ordination of policies must initially take place at the sub-committee level. However, this does not appear to be the function of these sub-committees as they are principally intended to advise rather than to co-ordinate. No mechanism exists for co-ordination within each of the sub-committees, nor between the sub-committees. Functional specialization is maintained under such circumstances as planning and policy making still occurs within the confines of a functional department. Nor does a mechanism exist for the co-ordination of the sub-committee policies with the planning policies of the PEC itself. There should exist a mutual consideration or a two way flow between the policy objectives of the PEC and those of the sub-committees. Over a period of time if the planning process was operating correctly these policy objectives would tend to approximate each other. Under the present proposals, PEC planning policy proposals would be determined ex post of departmental plans and policies rather than through a mutual consideration.

The task of co-ordination is held by the full Policy Committee. They are however advised by the sub-committee which, as we have already established, will not be able to provide
advice that is by any means co-ordinated. It is hard to imagine how the heads of a few of the major departments will be able to provide co-ordination among policies of over 30 bodies, most unrelated to their own fields of specialization. The structural characteristics described here are clearly inappropriate towards achieving co-ordination at the State policy level.

Integration of programs at the regional level cannot be realized unless policies are reasonably co-ordinated at the State level. The PEC proposal calls for the establishment of government sector regional policy committees "in those regions where planning work justifies the need." It is expected that these committees employ the same sub-committee structure as envisaged at the State level of the PEC. Assuming adequate co-ordination is attained at the State level then the institutional mechanism must allow the following conditions to be met for successful functional integration to occur. Firstly as recognized in the Report itself it is necessary that the representatives of such regional committees should have the delegated power to advise the Regional Policy Committee and the Commission on all relevant aspects of the policy of their respective departments in that region. In the bureaucratized public service this will largely depend on the seniority of the officials that represent their respective departments. A balance must be struck between a senior officials knowledge of his department's policies, and the official's knowledge of his region. Experience elsewhere has shown that without this balance less than desirable results
are achieved. Secondly, there needs to be a considerable devolution of decision making power to regional officials so that time is not taken up by unproductive vertical paper shuffling between levels of authority in departments, and so that functional departments can become more responsive to the individual needs within each region.

Nothing is said about the need for program integration at the regional level in the proposed system. It has been established earlier that to achieve functional integration at this level, not only must there by policy co-ordination, but also program integration. No mechanism for program integration exists at the regional level. The Regional Policy Committee is envisaged as being a medium through which information on policies is disseminated to the regional level. It can only be assumed that it is expected that programs are soundly based on policies. This cannot always be assumed to be the case.

As mentioned earlier the Government Sector Policy Committee has the task of "co-ordinating departmental, statutory authority and local government policies and programs." It seems that the task of program co-ordination for regional planning is somewhat misplaced if it is to be attempted at the State level. Programs administered by government departments and statutory authorities will still be of a generalized areal application. On the other hand the Government Sector Policy Committee hopes to co-ordinate these with local government programs which are by nature really specialized. The basic dichotomy explained in the previous
chapter still remains under this arrangement.

It is the role of the Regional Policy Committee to effect some form of program integration if the regional planning process is to be successful. This would imply a devolution of administrative responsibility for program implementation to regional representatives of government departments and statutory authorities. This issue is sidestepped in the new proposals.

Once this structure is in place it will be necessary to achieve an integration of functions. It is our hypothesis that regional planning is the mechanism through which functional integration can be achieved, so it follows that integration falls squarely upon those who have the responsibility for the preparation of regional plans, at the regional level. In the PEC proposal it is the commission staff and associated committee structure that will have the ultimate responsibility for regional planning. Integration must occur firstly through the planning process. Regional needs and aspirations are articulated in the planning process into goals and objectives and these must relate to every function concerned with planning. Common goals and objectives are planning’s great integrating mechanism. For instance a complimentary delivery of services at the regional level can only be achieved if common objectives for such service delivery are perceived, by each functional department. However, in reality, a commonality of goals and objectives does not force compliance by functional departments. This can only be achieved through statutory provision.
4) **regional planning must possess a statutory basis on the one hand, and on the other, must remain flexible.** The importance of a statutory basis for planning has been recognized in the Final Report:

> It is proposed that in the future, environmental strategies and plans at the State and regional level should receive formal endorsement by the Minister. Thereby a more sophisticated level of co-ordination would be ensured, and all State authorities would be required to comply with the adopted environmental plans.⁴⁰

Firstly, this protects the citizen against arbitrary changes being made to regional plans, and secondly, it ensures an amount of certainty for forward planning of State and Private bodies alike. However the statutory basis also needs to possess a degree of flexibility in a number of ways. Firstly it needs to be recognized that regional planning is not an end in itself, rather a means to an end. The formulation of a regional plan does not need to be compulsory for all regions, and a different end result may emerge out of the planning process. Regional intervention does not necessarily need to be in the form of a regional plan, and the circumstances in each region will dictate what form the planning output takes. Alternative forms of regional intervention may take the form of sector policies (such as specific policies for mining) or other forms of policy directions. In the majority of regions it is expected that regional plans will be required, though. Whatever the final result of the planning process it must be recognized that functional integration on an areal basis is still the major requirement. The legislation should take this into account, but
in the present PEC proposal, only provisions for regional plans are made.

The flexible nature of planning should be also built into the advisory/consultancy process. For instance it is recognized by the PEC that each government sector regional policy committee does not need to have a fixed membership in every region. Membership should be varied as circumstances dictate. Similarly, it is not necessary to employ all the advisory bodies listed in the earlier Table, under all circumstances. It is indeed expected that with the enabling of the new planning system that some rationalization will occur in the advisory bodies that have been established under present diverse legislation.

Perhaps the most significant point to be made for flexibility is in the PEC's plan making process itself. The point of view taken by the PEC here is that plans are essential for the control of development. The Final Report concentrates on plan making, and the PEC's earlier realization that planning is cyclic, and is a set of decisions in need of frequent revision tends to be somewhat clouded over in the final set of proposals. The proposed scheme is highly oriented towards a statutory procedure of analysis, plan preparation, exhibition, amendments and final adoption. The only flexibility appears to be in allowing for amendments to a plan based on public, departmental and ministerial advice. No arrangements have been made in the proposed scheme for ongoing advice, implementation, monitoring or the frequent revision that is needed in the planning process.
5) **regional planning must explicitly recognize the process of regionalism.** Regionalism, as a rationale behind regional planning has not been explicitly considered or even implied in the proposal. The recognition of regionalism in operation would certainly benefit the understanding of the role of regional planning as a form of regional intervention and articulation of regional problems. It is not possible to determine in this study whether the existing regions are the most rational in terms of regionalism. One would suspect however that traditional regions such as Riverina and New England would adhere to the principle of regionalism more fully than some of the others.

The problems of boundary delineation have not been considered by the PEC, because of its intention to utilize the boundaries employed for the Regional Advisory Councils as shown in Figure 2.3.

The PEC's apparent lack of concern with boundary delineation tends to reflect their lack of concern for the principle that regional planning must be based on regionalism. It is suspected that the present system of regions is based on some rationalization of local government boundaries rather than considerations of areas sharing common needs and interests. It is not intended to overemphasize the importance of boundary delineation to the operation of regional planning. Rather, boundaries are necessary for reasons of administrative tidiness. However, a regional planning function will undoubtedly be concentrated on activities in the centre of a region and the necessity for precisely delineated boundaries is somewhat
problematical. At this stage it should suffice to say that the concept of regionalism should be taken into consideration in any proposed change of existing boundaries.

6) region should possess an adequate fiscal base upon which an institution can carry out the planning. The principle of maintaining a degree of independence is critical. An institution whose planning is hamstrung by the organization that is providing its funding cannot perform objectively or effectively. Ideally, each regional planning institution should be capable of financing its operations from its own sources derived from an adequate fiscal base.

The issues that are involved in financing and the provision of fiscal bases are not faced by the PEC in its proposal. This is partly due to the fact that the PEC believes that regional planning is inseperable from State strategies and should not be considered independently from the State in an institutional sense. The principle of independence is not a very valid one from the point of view of the PEC. Because of this the PEC believes that all administration costs should be funded ultimately by the State.

PEC's seeming lack of facing the issues is also probably partly due to the vexed and controversial nature of the issues themselves. A regional organization with the authority to tax implies a form of government - a question that has been carefully avoided in the prevailing status quo political climate. The PEC considers the State government and local councils as the only two indispensible elements in the proposed new system. Any organization inserted between these
levels is recommended to have no executive role and no power to
direct planning. The issue of the authority to tax is
redundant under these circumstances.

The need for the authority to tax is also determined
by the extent of the regional organizations powers of program
delivery. The PEC envisages no such powers - the issue is
double-barreled; local governments do not wish to lose powers,
and the centralized State departments and instrumentalities
are reluctant to devolve theirs. The issue of the authority to
tax is once again minimized.

The authority to tax itself has significant
practical ramifications. For instance the addage 'no
representation - no taxation' aptly summarizes one of these. In
reality however, even with adequate representation, direct
taxation is not likely to be very acceptable to the community.

The problem of independently funding regional
organizations still remains, even if only to cover administrative
costs. In two areas that possess Regional Planning Committees
at present, a rate of 1/24th of a cent in the dollar on the
unimproved value of all rateable land is assessed upon local
councils with a matching contribution from the State government.
This system is proposed to be retained until the State can take
over funding arrangements. Under such an arrangement it is
extremely likely that this principle will be violated,
restricting a regional organizations freedom of action.
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CHAPTER VI

SYNTHESIS AND PRESCRIPTION

The analysis of the previous chapter has identified the main institutional strengths and weaknesses of the proposed planning system in the light of the six criteria that were developed. In this chapter the findings of the previous chapter are synthesized, and, based on the major weaknesses of the PEC proposal, a prescriptive institutional framework for regional planning for NSW is proposed.

The importance of these criteria to the success of regional planning are vital, and any overview based on these will be useful for future action. The six criteria can be divided into two groups: the first three having direct significance for the characteristics of the institutional structure that is adopted, and the last three having significance for the substance of the planning carried out by these institutions. In attempting to construct a viable institutional structure for regional planning these six criteria become the objectives that the structure must aspire towards. The objectives are procedural in nature but are also based on the substantive regional planning problems that were discussed in Chapter 3.

The extent to which substantive planning problems were taken into consideration by the PEC is difficult to determine because such information was not documented. It is suspected that the proposed system was based largely on the perceived failings of the current system and a need for its reform. This
conclusion may be gained from the observation that the objectives articulated for the new system in the previous chapter, were, for all practical purposes, a point by point prescription for the major deficiencies of the present statutory system. It seems clear that the PEC proposals have been built upon the deep rooted foundations of the current planning system, and the relevance of this system to contemporary regional problems has not been questioned.

The objectives articulated in the previous chapter reflect an attempt to reform a system of 'statutory land use planning' that has been in existence since 1932. Strong elements of the permissive local and state land use planning system pervade the proposals for regional planning. It is questionable whether there is much justification in imposing a modified statutory planning system at the regional level.

It was mentioned in Chapter 3 that there has been strong evidence over recent years to suggest that regional organization and planning is the most appropriate level for the delivery of many individual functions. These are in the human resources (education, health, welfare) as well as the natural resources sector. Regionalization of administration has already occurred for many of these functions and the advantages of regional planning of service delivery, either co-ordinated with other functions or independently, are becoming more obvious to regional administrators. This trend appears to be the beginning of an attempt to reconcile area and function. It has developed independently of the statutory planning process which has concerned itself solely with controlling land use. If the
hypothesis that regional planning is an appropriate device for achieving functional integration and areal reform holds true, then this emerging trend is extremely relevant to any future regional planning organization in NSW. The objectives set out in Chapter 5 and subsequent proposals, do not reflect a real awareness of this significant trend. Regional planning as proposed by the PEC is constrained by the previous tradition of physical statutory planning.

In prescribing an institutional structure for NSW, three major areas were examined; those of needs identification and priority resolution, policy articulation and co-ordination, and program integration. Major deficiencies were perceived in each of these areas as they related to PEC's proposed institutional structure.

**Needs Identification and Priority Resolution**

One of the biggest failings of the proposed system is that it doesn't possess what could be described as a true regional structure. The institutional structure for regional planning is imposed from 'the top' (i.e. the State level), it is not politically accountable at the regional level, it is not independent in decision making, nor does it have any executive authority about matters concerning the region. This is a weak basis upon which to carry out effective regional planning. Instead of the ultimate responsibility for regional planning being delegated down to the officers of a State agency, as envisaged in the PEC proposal, it should rightly rest with some form of planning body in each region which is more capable
of providing a true regional perspective. Such a Regional Planning Body should be independent of any other State or regional organizations so that decisions can be made about regional priorities, and that competing objectives have a chance of being effectively resolved. However, the Regional Planning Body needs to be responsible to the Planning and Environment Commission, who provide the state context into which individual regional plans must fit. It is the Minister for Planning and Environment who has the ultimate authority for the approval of regional plans.

Additionally a regional planning body should be held accountable to the public. Such a body must come about as a result of a 'bottom-up' approach to regional planning because its structure needs to possess a clear ability to articulate regional needs and problems. This body in the suggested organizational structure in Figure 6.1, is called the Regional Planning Board. Several alternative methods of representation may be possible on these Regional Planning Boards, and one has been selected as suited to the NSW situation.

It is well established that it would be mandatory for local government organizations to be represented on any such Board. They are the form of government most responsive to community needs within defined areas, and they would introduce areal particularism into the regional context. They are also accountable to the public through local elections.

However, areal particularisms do not always reflect regional viewpoints and individual local government representat-
ives tend to be parochial. The position taken here is that some form of direct community representation is essential, along with representation from local government. It is suggested that at least one community advisory panel be established with an elected representative holding a joint position on a community advisory panel and the Regional Planning Board. The community advisory panel's main function ought to be the articulation of needs and problems and the formulation of regional goals and objectives. This is an essential departure from the proposals described in the previous chapter which appeared to be lacking in sufficient channels for the articulation of local government and regional community needs.

Policy Articulation and Co-ordination

The second major concern of the suggested structure in Figure 6.1 is with policy co-ordination and articulation, with and by other levels of government, as well as the private sector. At present the PEC is the overall planning body for NSW with the responsibility of co-ordinating the policies of State Government departments in the State and regional contexts. It is suggested here that the regional planning organizations should be independent of other levels of government but responsible to an overall co-ordinating body, such as the PEC. This co-ordinating body would possess to powers for determining policies and priorities as well as the powers to allocate fiscal resources in accordance with such policies and priorities. At present the PEC is not such a body, but does appear to have an
important role to play in the co-ordination of policies of major state agencies, and in shaping some of their priorities. The allocation of fiscal resources is not of immediate concern at present because in the first instance regional governing bodies would not possess the power of program delivery, rather of planning and co-ordination. Funds for the delivery of programs would be allocated through traditional line department channels, in a much more co-ordinated fashion, as a result of the PEC mandate for policy co-ordination.

One of the strongest aspects of the PEC proposals is the potential for policy co-ordination between the state and regional level of administration. For instance the present proposal envisages the Government Sector Policy Committee and associated sub-committees would be mirrored in some regions by the Government Sector Regional Policy Committee. Such a structure, if made mandatory for all regions would establish a critical channel of vertical communication. At present, although the PEC proposals contain the potential for this type of arrangement, they do not articulate this potential very well, and, in fact they do not seem committed to this structure in all regions, just in those were need is justified.

In our suggested structure the government sector regional policy committee as proposed by the PEC is given an expanded mandate of program integration rather than solely policy co-ordination. In Figure 6.1 it is represented as the Regional Program Committee (the composition of which is discussed later). This Regional Program Committee shall have advisory sub-committees which mirror those advising the PEC Government Sector Policy
Committee. Such an arrangement is illustrated in Figure 6.2, which shows the envisaged lines of public policy communication between state and regional levels.

Direct communication between the sub-committees in the critical areas of industrial development, social development and natural resources development would have the advantage of enhancing the dissemination of State level sub-committee policies to the regional level and vice versa. Additionally, traditional lines of communication through the vertical hierarchies of line departments would be reinforced because of the need to clearly articulate policies at the State level. In accordance with the third criteria, there must be a degree of policy co-ordination at the State level so that program integration at the regional level may have a chance of succeeding. If programs are an accurate reflection of policies at higher levels then the need for concurrence is minimized and more time may be spent on the integration of functions and planning at the regional level. As it stands in the present proposal it would be necessary to rework the terms of reference of the sub-committee of the PEC. These sub-committees should be considered more in a co-ordinative role than an advisory role in which they are perceived in the PEC proposal. Under such an arrangement functional specialization would still remain, but more account would be taken of the common goals and objectives of each of the broad sub-committee areas. Because these sub-committees reflect the structure of the sub-committees of Cabinet, the potential for quite a strong vertical and horizontal policy co-ordination exists in the area of natural
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resources, social development and industrial development.

**Program Integration**

Under the proposed PEC system, no mechanism for program integration exists at the regional level. Rather, as mentioned earlier, a government sector regional policy committee is envisaged, which, it is assumed, would attempt to mirror at the regional level processes occurring at the State level. However, it is the programs that result from the policies that are of more importance to the needs of the communities than the policies themselves. It is therefore vital that there be a Regional Program Committee with the function of ensuring integration of programs of both government and non-government agencies, towards common goals and objectives. It is here that the structure employed to achieve program integration is very important to the success of any regional organization, and the apparent lack of such concerns in the PEC proposal must severely limit what can be achieved by regional planning.

The prescriptive institutional structure that is suggested is characterized by a Regional Program Committee having the responsibility of co-ordinating the three regional sub-committee areas of natural resources, social development and industrial development, as well as the private sector. These three regional sub-committees would reflect those envisaged by the PEC at the State level, as well as the Cabinet committees. They roughly correspond to the problem areas that were identified in Chapter 3. Foremost among the substantive
regional problems that need to be tackled in NSW are those broadly described as problems of delivery of social services and the problems of management of natural resources. The third regional sub-committee area of industrial resource development is one that is more oriented towards the direction of future growth. The goal of decentralization of industry has been a major government commitment in NSW since 1966, but has to date mainly been operationalized through special purpose bodies (eg. Bathurst - Orange Development Corporation) rather than being the subject of regional planning. A commitment to decentralization of employment opportunities to country areas has been one of the few policies consistently articulated by the NSW government over the last decade. It is felt that is relevant enough to justify being included in any regional sub-committee structure.

A great potential for flexibility exists in the make-up of these regional program sub-committees. They should be manageable information disseminating and gathering bodies. As such they should not be very large, but rather should contain the high priority government agencies that have significant interests in each region. In some circumstances a particular agency, such as the Health Commission for instance may find it necessary to be represented in every region. On the other hand an agency such as the Mines Department or the Western Lands Commission may only be usefully represented in the Western regions of the State. Table 6.1 shows some of the patterns of perceived regional salience between major state agencies represented in the Riverina region. These are admittedly for
### Patterns of Perceived Regional Salience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Education</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare &amp; Social Welfare</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Conservation &amp; Irrigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Elevators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuer General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Regional Administrator in the Riverina
the purposes of the RAC's whose functions are oriented towards regional development, rather than regional planning, however, it is clear that within departments at least, there is a perception that some State agencies are of greater significance to the development of the Riverina region than others.

The functions of the regional sub-committees would be to:

a) comment on planning proposals presented by the Regional Planning Board,
b) integrate programs of the agencies represented with respect to regional planning objectives,
c) provide advice to the Regional Program Committee on such co-ordinated programs and as to future requirements of the agencies.

It is essential that the representatives of such regional sub-committees would have the delegated power to advise the Regional Program Committee on all relevant aspects of policy and program delivery in that region. It is also essential that considerable autonomy be given to regional representatives of Government departments.

The Regional Program Committee under this arrangement would consist of internally elected representatives of each of the regional sub-committee areas, as well as the regional planner of the organization (or those persons ultimately responsible for the planning function within the regional organization), who would also be the chairperson. The Regional Program Committee would provide the liaison between the regional needs articulated in the planning process and the programs which
are to be undertaken in each region. Advice on regional planning matters would be mandatorily sought from each of the sub-committees, and in return a regional perspective would be provided upon which the sub-committee members could plan their respective programs.

The functions of the Regional Program Committee would be:

a) co-ordinate and integrate each of the regional sub-committee areas to ensure maximum support for the regional plans and objectives,

b) provide advice to the Regional Planning Board on relevant policies in regional planning,

c) provide a forum for the integration of public and private sector policies and programs,

d) report on any other matters that may be referred to it by the Regional Planning Board.

Figure 6.1 also reflects a potential for advice to be sought from other organizations which may not be represented on the regional sub-committees. These may be:

(i) federal agencies which possess powers of program delivery or forms of regional assistance. The Regional Council for Social Development is a prime example. This is a pilot project funded by the federal Social Welfare Commission, and one of its functions is to devise plans for community welfare service provision to meet the needs of the region in consultation with Australian, State and local-government and non-government agencies. Eventually it would be hoped that such a structure would be rationalized, with the need identification functions of
the Regional Council for Social Development being channeled through the planning process and the integrative aspects of the delivery of community services being dealt with through the Social Development Sub-Committee.

(ii) private agencies which provide a multitude of welfare and community services.

(iii) the private sector\(^9\) representatives of commerce and industry which is critical to the continued development of some of the more populated regions of NSW. Such private sector representation should have a direct involvement with the assessment of regional needs and opportunities formulated in the regional planning process. For instance, it has been clearly articulated by the Department of Decentralization and Development over the last decade that the success of a growth centre strategy will depend primarily on the relative success that department has in attracting secondary industry. The success of attracting the private sector is likely to increase if they are involved directly in assessing the needs and opportunities available to them.

It is suggested that the devices used to incorporate the concerns of these three types of bodies should be consultative, rather than merely involving the dissemination of information to the Regional Program Committee. Provision for the possibility of such consultation should be mandatory, but seeking such consultation is optional so as to remain flexible, and will depend on the nature of the planning concerns. Provision should also be made for consultation with each of the regional sub-committees, as circumstances dictate.
One more element needs to be discussed so as to complete the characteristics of the prescribed regional organization. This involves determining the role of local government in relation to the regional organization. It is argued for the sake of expediency that the role of local government does not need to be changed significantly from that envisaged in the PEC proposal. At present it is not envisaged that the regional organization should have the powers of program delivery, so the further loss of local government power is not at issue. Local government responsibility would remain largely within the context of local detailed land use and structure planning, as well as the delivery of some basic local services. Such planning and service provision would need to be in accordance with the guidelines for such activities set out by the Regional Planning Board. Representation by local governments on this planning board has already been proposed here, however a separate device needs to be created where there is a technical and policy exchange between those responsible for regional planning and those for detailed planning at local government levels.

Legislative Foundations for Flexibility and Funding

Next, attention should be turned to the important foundations on which such an institutional structure ought to be based. These foundations are partly reflected in the last three criteria. To arrive at a synthesis of these in relation to the PEC proposal is rather difficult because these criteria are not discussed in any great detail, if at all. This
may in itself reflect the weaknesses in the base that the PEC proposal is built upon. One very important concern is that the past rigidities of 'statutory planning' be overcome. By legislating various flexibilities into the institutional structure, regional planning would become more relevant to the peculiarities and needs of individual regions. Unless such flexibility is given a statutory basis the rigidities which characterize the present planning system will tend to remain firmly entrenched. Flexibility must exist in the type of consultancy/advisory structure that is employed in each region. Channels of communication between the regional sub-committees and other advisory groups need not be formalized and will vary between regions. Similarly if the establishment of a regional plan for any particular region is to be mandatory, then a review of the plan should occur as often as is perceived necessary for the needs of each region. Nor should it be necessary to follow the rigid steps requiring exhibition of plans, and so forth, that is a legacy of 'statutory land use planning,' and which is required in the PEC proposals. Regional planning requires more flexibility than the procedure prescribed by statute in physical local area planning, and requires broad discretion in approaching the solutions to regional problems.

The question of funding is also vital. The principle of independence is disregarded by the PEC so the prescriptive suggestions must be raised here. The Regional Planning Board as proposed in this chapter does not have the powers of program delivery, so funding will only be required to support the administrative structure needed to carry out the function of
regional planning. Funding schemes can vary from total reliance on outside agency support to complete autonomy, through the regional organization raising its own revenues. If complete autonomy in the source of funds is desired then questions of the size and population of regions become of importance. This may to a certain extent be the antithesis of regions based on regionalism, so complete autonomy may not be considered very desirable especially in areas where a readily definable regional community possesses an economic disadvantage compared to other regions. In such a case a region may have to be widened to provide an adequate fiscal base by sacrificing the regional community of interest. Any number of funding arrangements could be pursued. This author tends to believe that the most practical solution for NSW is a position between complete autonomy and complete dependence. Complete autonomy may have the danger of leaving a region without an adequate fiscal resource base with which to carry out regional planning. Complete dependence may hamper the independent operations of the Regional Planning Boards. A funding arrangement between these two extremes would have the advantage of requiring State funding for a function that they have the ultimate mandate for, while at the same time keeping community interest in the planning function vital, through them having to make direct contributions.

A direct tax should be levied on each property owner in every local government area, based on say, the improved capital value of their property for rating purposes. Such a tax could be easily administered through the system of local taxes
that is already in operation, and could be collected by the regional organization from the various local governments.\textsuperscript{10} To ease the tax burden that this may create it is proposed that there also be a dollar for dollar matching grant from both State and Federal bodies. The State government has the ultimate responsibility for regional planning and has indicated willingness in the past to finance regional planning institutions. The Federal government has recently indicated its interest in financing various development proposals on a regional basis,\textsuperscript{11} and since scope exists for Federal government participation on a consultative basis, it would not be unreasonable to expect some form of assistance.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

Each possible alternative funding arrangement has different implications for the independence of the regional organization as well as for questions of fiscal federalism. A proper examination of the complex issues that arise is beyond the scope of this thesis, even though it is considered of vital importance to it.

Similarly there are many issues which arise from these proposals that have not been touched upon or have been mentioned only briefly. Among these are:

* rationality of present regional boundaries in the light of financing implications and regional community of interest.
* the issue of mandatory as opposed to voluntary membership for local government areas on Regional Planning Board.
* issues of proportional representation and voting structures on
Regional Planning Boards.
*balance between urban and rural representation on Regional Planning Boards.
*whether regional organizations should operate service delivery programs.

Although of considerable importance, to justly treat each of these in turn would tend to draw attention away from the six criteria that have been used in the analysis, and the central rationale for this thesis. Any more detailed proposals than that which is offered here would need to carefully consider the implications of each of these issues and many others. These issues and their complex implications should also be the subject of further study.

All involve the federal, state, and local governments to varying degrees so no one level of government can be exclusively involved in the further study of these matters. However, since it is the NSW government that holds the mandate for regional planning it is felt that they should play a central role. Because a commission of inquiry is capable of undertaking extensive research into diverse views that are likely to be expressed on these issues, it is felt that this is the most appropriate form of further study. The commission of inquiry should be appointed by the State government to:
(i) solicit the views of federal, state and local governments with regards to the issues under inquiry
(ii) hear submissions and requesting independent studies to be undertaken on aspects relevant to the inquiry
(iii) make a report and recommendations on the issues under
inquiry.
A general lack of information is a pervasive aspect that all planning must face in NSW.


If the region is very large, or if for some reason sub-regions are clearly definable, then more than one such community advisory panel should be established, each one having a representative on the Regional Planning Board. The representatives on these advisory panels would be elected by the regional community.

Some rationalization of present RAC's would need to occur under these circumstances. RAC's should be split into two: those parts dealing with identification of regional community needs, and those dealing with salience between government agencies. They could then be amalgamated into a wider regional structure.

New South Wales, *New South Wales Planning and Environment Commission, Report to the Minister for Planning and Environment* (Sydney: November, 1975), p. 86. What is meant by 'need justification' is not explained in the report.

This has occurred with the formation of the Department of Decentralization and Development.

For instance the Social Development Sub-Committee could contain the Department of Education, Housing Commission, Health Commission and the Department of Culture, Sport and Recreation.


- to give people of the region a greater opportunity to take part in planning, developing and controlling their own community services.
- to advise the Australian Government on the Development of its own departments services in the region, and on the allocation of grants and subsidies to bodies within the region.
- to help people in the region identify their needs and the way in which these might be met, to evaluate and monitor these, and to report on them to the Australian, State and local governments.

Such a consultative device could be carried out through a private sector committee composed of a balance of large and small business interests in the community, or it may be done on a less formalized individual basis.
Alternatively this could be a per capita tax.

Regional organizations of local governments were financed by the Grants Commission between 1973-76. Currently the federal Social Welfare Commission is administering the Australian Assistance Plan through Regional Councils for Social Development.
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS: TOWARDS A GENERIC CASE FOR REGIONAL PLANNING

The substantive conclusions to this thesis are twofold: the particular, relating to the case of NSW, and the generic. Each will be dealt with in turn.

The Particular Case of NSW

Regional planning in NSW is still in its early developmental years - a somewhat uncertain cause it seems, searching for an appropriate institutional structure. Over recent years however a groundswell has developed in favour of regional organization for the purposes of planning and administering certain functions, such tendencies being mainly articulated in the field of public administration, rather than in planning. The opportunity for regional planning to contribute to the mainstream of this swell is still a possibility and it is felt now is the time for an emphatic case for regional planning to be made. The evidence points in one direction - the region will be the form of organization for the administration of functions in the future. Regional planning could lead the way in this regard.

The PEC proposal in NSW is constrained both by a lack of a regional planning tradition from which past experience could be drawn, and by a rather limited 'statutory land use planning' structure upon which the proposal is built. PEC's proposal for an institutional structure to carry out regional planning does not seem appropriate towards solving the problems of area and
function that were articulated in Chapter 3. Regional planning seems to be rather ill defined and it has been contended here that it has not been adequately considered in the past as a means of governmental decision making.

In the thesis six criteria were developed in order to assess systematically the PEC proposals and to provide a consistant basis for some initial prescriptions for an institutional structure. In relation to most of the criteria the PEC proposals did not seem to form a relevant structure for regional planning. Based on the perceived failings of the PEC proposal in relation to these criteria, an attempt was made to outline the modifications that would be necessary for the criteria to be satisfied. The particular institutional structure that is suggested can be viewed as one of the substantive conclusions of this thesis. It has been based on a careful consideration of what the nature of regional planning is, what problems regional planning needs to face, and what seem to be the immediate realistic opportunities that a regional planning institutional structure can be based upon, given the nature of present government structure and the traditional enjoyment of much functional autonomy by government bodies.

Generic Applicability

The focus of the thesis thus far has been on an examination of the particular case of NSW. It is clear however, that the methodology used in examining the NSW case can be applied elsewhere. Under certain circumstances the six principles of regional planning that were enunciated in
Chapter 4 seem equally applicable to other regional planning structures, and could be considered of general generic value.

The definition of regional planning advanced for this thesis can be equally well applied to any comparable country where regional planning is a potential or actual function of the public sector. However the principles of regional planning are also based on the substantive problems that appear to require solutions of a regional scale in NSW. The general applicability of these principles therefore rests on the extent to which the regional problems experienced in NSW are of a generic nature.

It could safely be said that the problems of service delivery arising from the urban/rural dichotomy that were expounded in Chapter 3 are a function of rapid urbanization and are the problems experienced throughout much of the Western world. Imbalances between city and country areas are universal: imbalances in employment opportunities, delivery of social services and the provision of amenities are not unique to non-metropolitan regions of NSW, and occur anywhere where a centralized bureaucracy is not readily responsive to regional needs and where there is a gradual drift of employment opportunities and hence population to the cities.

Similarly the problems of land use conflict and the management of resources are also broadly applicable to most countries. The conflicts resulting from the individuals ever increasing use of space in his daily activities and his desire to interact with the environment are common problems. Problems of resource management will occur anywhere where one use will
affect the resource potential of other uses, these in turn having implications for the quality of life. Resource conflicts seem to be an inherent characteristic in all advanced societies.

The third major problem category is that of area and function. This is much more of a problem that is directly related to institutional structures involving governmental jurisdictions. Its generic manifestation will depend to a certain extent on the governmental and administrative characteristics of the individual country. The problems articulated in Chapter 3 related specifically to the three tier system of government and administration affecting the equitable delivery of governmental functions to the individual, based on the separation of powers outlined in Appendix 1. However, even in countries where the government possesses a unitary rather than federal structure, the problems of area and function may still be pervasive. For instance evidence has shown that the problems of local government areas (such as lack of appropriate jurisdiction) that were articulated in Chapter 3 are common to most countries possessing similar local government systems, particularly those of Britain, Canada and the United States. However, the extent to which problems result from a chaos of overlapping single purpose administrative areas such as in the case of NSW, is unknown. Efforts towards co-ordination of diverse policies and programs have occurred however, at the national level in Britain and the United States through 'super-departments' such as the Department of Environment (UK) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (US). No such integration of functions exists in Australia at any level of
Regional planning, as a form of public intervention dealing with regional problems, is intimately connected with some degree of functional co-ordination and integration and areal reform. This generic case for regional planning holds if regional problems can be viewed from a perspective that many of them result from a lack of functional and areal integration within government institutions. The extent to which the area/function dichotomy is applicable in the generic case will determine the extent to which the six principles will have general application, and could be considered of general generic value.

Each of these principles has its own particular set of conditions that it imposes on a general institutional structure for regional planning. An institutional structure must be capable of identifying regional needs and articulating areal problems and the administrative arrangements must be such that the regional population is adequately represented in all stages of the planning process. Furthermore, where regional plans need to be integrated into the policies of a higher order of government, clear channels of communication must exist between those responsible for preparation of the regional plan and those deciding policy at the higher levels. A clear vertical line of communication for each function within line departments and for overall regional planning policies is an additional requirement for a generic institutional structure, as is a conscious effort to co-ordinate with the decision making of the private sector.
Horizontal communication channels must also be in existence to facilitate co-ordination of policies at the higher levels and integration of programs at the regional level. As a general characteristic a mechanism must exist in higher echelons of government which is able to develop co-ordinated policy decisions between relevant agencies based on an aggregate set of common goals and objectives. A similar mechanism must be mirrored at the regional level where it would be necessary for relevant agencies to incorporate their programs into the regional planning process.

The exact nature of these mechanisms and channels of communication cannot be articulated more precisely without the introduction of a specific institutional context to which reference can be made. They will also be tempered to a certain extent by existing structure, as has been the prescriptive institutional structure that has been suggested in NSW. This however does not detract from the general usefulness of the six principles as being the generic objectives towards which institutional structures of regional planning must aspire.

Emanuel has suggested that regional problems can sometimes reflect barriers to interaction with other regions, caused by the deficiencies in administrative organization of government bodies. Such deficiencies have been identified in the thesis and have been articulated as being the mismatch of area and function, a concept first proposed by Pesler in his treatise on governmental areas and administration, and more recently by Maass (areal and capital division of powers), Stewart (place and function) and Friedman and Weaver.
(territory and function). The view has been taken that it is the correction of these deficiencies which may be an essential precondition for regional progress. It has been hypothesized in this thesis that regional planning is an appropriate device through which to achieve functional integration and areal reform within government institutions. Such a role for regional planning has not been explicitly recognized in the literature, and only recently have there been suggestions by Friedman and Weaver that the evolution of the regional planning doctrine is intimately related to the need for a reconciliation of territory with function.

The principles that were identified in Chapter 4 can be considered as objectives towards which regional planning institutions must aspire as a precondition to regional progress. Outside of the recent contributions by Morgan and Alden and Gillingwater, not much thought has previously been given in the generic literature to possible structures for regional organization of public decision making, or the criteria towards which they should aspire in order to be relevant in dealing with modern problems and needs. It is hoped that this thesis has been a useful contribution to this direction.
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CONSTITUTIONAL DIVISION OF POWERS IN AUSTRALIA

The division of parliamentary powers in Australia can best be explained by stating that the Commonwealth has only special powers, while the State Parliaments have more general powers over the Australian citizen. Section 51 of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act sets out the matters over which the Commonwealth has the power to make laws. Unless the Commonwealth Constitution has made a power an exclusive Commonwealth power or unless it has taken away a power from the States, the States are to continue to have all the powers they already had before Federation.

The Federal Parliament has two houses: The Senate or the "upper house" which was intended to represent the interests of the individual States, and the House of Representatives or the "lower house" representing the interests of the people of the Commonwealth. Both Houses are directly elected by the people, but for the Senate the six States vote as separate electorates.

It is necessary to look to the States' Constitutions to see what powers they have. The New South Wales Constitution Act simply says that the New South Wales Parliament shall:

"have power to make laws for the peace, welfare and good government of New South Wales in all cases whatsoever"- subject to the Provisions of the Commonwealth Constitution. Thus the New South Wales Parliament can make laws on such
general matters as regional planning, public health, education and so on.

The New South Wales Parliament is a bicameral legislature consisting of a nominated Legislative Council and an elected Legislative Assembly.

Part V  Powers of the Parliament

Legislative powers of the Parliament.

51. The Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power* to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to:

(i.) Trade and commerce with other countries, and among the States:

(ii.) Taxation; but so as not to discriminate between States or parts of States:

(iii.) Bounties on the production or export of goods, but so that such bounties shall be uniform throughout the Commonwealth:

(iv.) Borrowing money on the public credit of the Commonwealth:

(v.) Postal, telegraphic, telephonic, and other like services:

(vi.) The naval and military defence of the Commonwealth and of the several States, and the control of the forces to execute and maintain the laws of the Commonwealth:

(vii.) Lighthouses, lightships, beacons and buoys:

(viii.) Astronomical and meteorological observations:

(ix.) Quarantine:

(x.) Fisheries in Australian waters beyond territorial limits:

(xi.) Census and statistics:

(xii.) Currency, coinage, and legal tender:

(xiii.) Banking, other than State banking; also State banking extending beyond the limits of the State concerned, the incorporation of banks, and the issue of paper money:

(xiv.) Insurance, other than State insurance; also State insurance extending beyond the limits of the State concerned:

(xv.) Weights and measures:

(xvi.) Bills of exchange and promissory notes:

(xvii.) Bankruptcy and insolvency:

(xviii.) Copyrights, patents of inventions and designs, and trade marks:

(xix.) Naturalization and aliens:

(xx.) Foreign corporations, and trading or financial corporations formed within the limits of the Commonwealth:

(xxi.) Marriage:

(xxii.) Divorce and matrimonial causes; and in relation thereto, parental rights, and the custody and guardianship of infants:

(xxiii.) Invalid and old-age pensions:

(xxiiiA.) The provision of maternity allowances, widows’ pensions, child endowment, unemployment, pharmaceutical, sickness and hospital benefits, medical and dental services (but not so as to authorize any form of civil conscription), benefits to students and family allowances:

(xxiv.) The service and execution throughout the Commonwealth of the civil and criminal process and the judgments of the courts of the States:

(xxv.) The recognition throughout the Commonwealth of the laws, the public Acts and records, and the judicial proceedings of the States:

(xxvi.) The people of any race, other than the aboriginal race in any State, for whom it is deemed necessary to make special laws:

(xxvii.) Immigration and emigration:

(xxviii.) The influx of criminals:

(xxix.) External affairs:

(30.) The relations of the Commonwealth with the islands of the Pacific:

(30i.) The acquisition of property on just terms from any State or person for any purpose in respect of which the Parliament has power to make laws:

(30ii.) The control of railways with respect to transport for the naval and military purposes of the Commonwealth:

(30iii.) The acquisition, with the consent of a State, of any railways of the State on terms arranged between the Commonwealth and the State:

(30iv.) Railway construction and extension in any State with the consent of that State:

(30v.) Conciliation and arbitration for the prevention and settlement of industrial disputes extending beyond the limits of any one State:

(30vi.) Matters in respect of which this Constitution makes provision until the Parliament otherwise provides:

(30vii.) Matters referred* to the Parliament of the Commonwealth by the Parliament or Parliaments of any State or States, but so that the law shall extend only to States by whose Parliaments the matter is referred, or which afterwards adopt the law:

(30viii.) The exercise within the Commonwealth, at the request or with the concurrence of the Parliaments of all the States directly concerned, of any power which can at the establishment of this Constitution be exercised only by the Parliament of the United Kingdom or by the Federal Council of Australasia:

(30ix.) Matters incidental to the execution of any power vested by this Constitution in the Parliament or in either House thereof, or in the Government of the Commonwealth, or in the Federal Judicature, or in any department or officer of the Commonwealth.
This appendix gives a brief description of the present machinery of government in NSW, in order to provide an overall context against which the proposed planning system may be viewed. It is basically a summary of material contained in two articles by Barry Moore, these being "The Machinery of Government in NSW" in The Regional Administrator in the Riverina, John Power and Helen Nelson (eds.), 1976, and "Machinery of Government Changes in NSW", Public Administration, June, 1975.

Figure A summarizes the existing structure in a dartboard arrangement. The Cabinet is in the centre with each Minister looking outwards and exercising jurisdiction over a segment of the board. Each component of the machinery of government may be located in one of these segments, its distance from the centre being dictated by the extent of Cabinet control over its activities. The components of New South Wales Government administration may be classified into twenty "segments" representing the Ministerial portfolios of Cabinet, and cross-classified into the following four "rings":

1) ministerial departments - this is a classic department of government with a form of organization centred upon the needs of a Minister. It may be a small policy secretariat with operating functions given to sub-departments or to instrumentalities, or it may be a large organization responsible for operations as well as policy.

2) sub-departments - is not as closely linked to a Minister as
is the case with a Ministerial department. The permanent head is often an official with statutory powers in his own right or is the head of a body with corporate status.

3) semi-autonomous department - for the purpose of budgetary control it is regarded as an ordinary department, but the permanent head reports directly to a Minister, but enjoys a certain amount of operational freedom.

4) government instrumentality - like the Planning and Environment Commission some of these are regulatory authorities, while others are business undertakings. The governing body of each instrumentality reports to a Minister, but in practice it tends to operate with considerable independence from Cabinet.

A list of NSW government bodies and their major functions is also provided as a guide to interpreting the diagram.

The Cabinet

A new Cabinet structure was adopted in January 1975. As shown in Figure B, the new structure of Cabinet provides for five standing committees, in order to handle matters which had previously gone to a full Cabinet meeting for discussion and consideration. The Planning and Environment Commission was represented on the Natural Resources Committee which covered the policy field of natural resources generally and land use in particular. The Policies and Priorities Committee includes the chairman of the four other standing committees and brings an overall perspective to the more important proposals being developed for consideration be Cabinet. The four standing
committees on policy fields refer most of their recommendations direct to Cabinet, but matters involving significant policy or priority considerations are referred first to the Policies and Priorities Committee.
Figure A  THE "DARTBOARD" MODEL OF NSW GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION, 1975

Source: THE REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR IN THE RIVERINA.
# List of N.S.W. Government Bodies, 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number (see Figure A)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>- Provision of administrative services to Cabinet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Relationships with other States, the Commonwealth Government, and the United Kingdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Organization of State functions and celebrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Entertainment of distinguished overseas visitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provision of motor transport for Ministers and visiting V.I.P's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Administrative services to the Crown Employees Appeal Board and Promotions Appeals Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Public relations and communications services for the State Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Auditor-General's Department</td>
<td>- Auditing of Government finance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public Service Board</td>
<td>- Maintenance of Personnel standards and general efficiency in Government departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Recruitment of public service staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Treasury Department</td>
<td>- Supervision of Government finance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Preparation of public accounts and the State budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Premier and Treasurer (2 portfolios) contd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4                | Treasury Department (contd.) | - Regulation and taxation of bookmakers.  
|                  |       | - Collection and custody of unclaimed moneys.  
|                  |       | - Co-ordination of Revenue agencies.  
|                  |       | - Licensing and taxation of poker machines.  |

### Deputy Premier and Minister for Local Government and Tourism (3 portfolios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5 | Department of Local Government             | - Supervision of Local Government.  
|   |                                            | - Legal service to Local Government bodies.  
|   |                                            | - Technical advice to Local Government bodies.                                                          |
| 6 | Metropolitan Waste Disposal Authority      | - To co-ordinate waste disposal functions of local Councils in Sydney Metropolitan area.               |
| 7 | Sydney Cove Redevelopment Authority        | - Redevelopment of Sydney Cove.                                                                           |
| 8 | Department of Tourism                      | - Promotion of the Tourist Industry.  
|   |                                            | - Management of tourist resorts and a Government Travel Agency.                                          |

### Attorney-General and Minister for Justice (2 portfolios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9 | Department of the Attorney-General and of Justice | - Establishment of Courts.  
|   |                                                   | - Appointment of Judges and Magistrates.                                                            |
|   |                                                   | - Regulation of qualifications of registered Public Accountants.                                     |
### Reference Number (see Figure A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9                | Department of the Attorney-General and of Justice contd. | - Revision of legal statutes and legal procedures.  
|                  |       | - Regulation and control of the liquor trade.  
|                  |       | - Appointment of Justices of the Peace.  
|                  |       | - Legal Aid schemes. |
| 10               | Corporate Affairs Commission | - Regulation and control of companies |
| 11               | Crown Solicitor's Office | - Provision of legal advice and legal services to the Government. |
| 12               | Sheriff's Office | - Provision of services to the Judiciary. |
| 13               | Public Trust Office | - Provision of trustee services to the public. |

### Minister for Planning and Environment and Vice President of the Executive Council (2 portfolios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15               | N.S.W. Planning and Environment Commission | - Protection of the environment.  
|                  |       | - Provision of urban and country planning services. |
| 16               | State Pollution Control Commission | - Co-ordination of anti-pollution activities. |

### Minister for Public Works and Ports (2 portfolios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 17               | Department of Public Works | - Design, construction and maintenance of Government buildings.  
|                  |       | - Engineering services to Government departments and undertakings.  
|                  |       | - Maintenance of telephone services for the N.S.W. Public Service.  
|                  |       | - The testing of building materials for industry and for the public.  
<p>|                  |       | - Manufacture and sale of bricks. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number (see Figure A)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>State Dockyard</td>
<td>The management of a dockyard undertaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Broken Hill Water Board</td>
<td>Construction, maintenance and control of water supply, sewerage and drainage system for Broken Hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hunter District Water Board</td>
<td>Construction, maintenance and control of water supply, sewerage and drainage system for Newcastle area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Metropolitan Water, Sewerage and Drainage Board</td>
<td>Construction, maintenance and control of water, sewerage and drainage system for Sydney area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* There is a proposal to convert this government instrumentality into a sub-department, under the title of Department of Water Resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>**Maritime Services Board</td>
<td>Co-ordination of Port and navigation services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minister for Education (1 portfolio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Promoting the co-ordination of educational services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Providing an administrative service to certain Boards and Authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administering the Adult Migrant Education Service and the N.S.W. State Conservatorium of Music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Department of Technical and Further Education</td>
<td>Provision of vocational and further education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Major Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(see Figure 6)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Minister for Labour, Industry and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Federal Affairs (3 portfolios)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 27 | Department of Labour and Industry and Ministry of Consumer Affairs | - Promotion of safety, health and welfare of employees in industry.  
- Regulation of working conditions in factories.  
- Provision of vocational guidance services.  
- Regulation of explosives and inflammable liquids.  
- Protection of consumer interests.  
- Regulation of weights and measures.  
- Regulation of industrial relations and apprenticeship. |
| 28 | Worker's Compensation Commission  
Division of Federal Affairs (organised as part of the Premier's Department) | - Co-ordination of workers' compensation insurance. |
| **Minister for Agriculture (1 portfolio)** | | |
| 29 | Department of Agriculture | - Promotion of efficiency and well being of primary industries.  
- Provision of extension, research, regulatory and Agricultural education services.  
- Administration of plant and animal quarantine.  
- Maintenance and development of Royal Botanic Gardens; Domain and Centennial Park.  
- Administration of State Marketing Bureau and of provisions of Marketing of Primary Products Act concerning constitution of marketing boards and of producer representatives.  
- Administrative support for Pastures Protection Boards. |

**There are plans to rename this body the Ports Authority of N.S.W.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number (see Figure 4)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture contd.</td>
<td>- Registration or licensing of veterinary surgeons, farm produce agents, margarine manufacturers, dairy produce factories, potato growers, nurserymen, apiaries, veterinary medicines and pesticides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Meat Industry Authority of N.S.W.</td>
<td>- The licensing of establishments for the slaughtering of stock and the fixing of standards of design of such establishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Dairy Industry Authority</td>
<td>- Regulation and control of the supply and distribution of milk for human consumption and for manufacture into milk products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Grain Elevators Board of N.S.W.</td>
<td>- Bulk storage, transport and shipment of wheat and other grains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Metropolitan Meat Industry Board</td>
<td>- The operation and management of the Homebush Abattoirs, the meat hall and the Flemington Saleyards. - The control of slaughtering and public saleyards in the County of Cumberland. - The licensing of Abattoirs outside the County of Cumberland, which slaughter for supply of meat to the County of Cumberland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sydney Farm Produce Markets Authority</td>
<td>- Provision of public markets for the marketing of fruit and vegetables in Sydney metropolitan area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minister for Transport and Highways (2 portfolios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference number (see Figure A)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ministry of Transport and Highways</td>
<td>- Administrative services to transport authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Administration of fare concession schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The encouragement of road safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Department of Motor Transport</td>
<td>- Registration of motor vehicles and licensing of drivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Collection of motor vehicle taxation and compulsory third party insurance premiums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Administration of traffic laws and provision of traffic facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Regulation of commercial and private passenger-carrying vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Licensing of second-hand motor dealers and tow-truck operators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Licensing of private passenger ferries on Sydney Harbour and commercial intrastate aircraft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Public Transport Commission</td>
<td>- Administration and operation of government-owned railway, bus and ferry services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Department of Main Roads</td>
<td>- Construction and maintenance of main roads, motorways and tollways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Administration of the Sydney Harbour Bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Control of weights and loads on vehicles on main roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Major Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Corrective Services</td>
<td>- Management of prisons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>- Rehabilitation of prisoners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>- Protection of life and property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Preservation of law and order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Prevention of crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Detection and bringing to justice of criminals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Control of firearms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Department of Services</td>
<td>- Regulation of gaming and betting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Regulation of charities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Control of obscene and indecent publications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Licensing of speedways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Regulation of the production, distribution and exhibition of movie films.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Licensing of theatres and public halls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Management of a government information service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provision of computer services to State Government departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Regulation of real estate, stock and station and business agents, and auctioneers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Registration of births, deaths and marriages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Operation of letter delivery services for Government departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Co-ordination of stores, cleaning and printing services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Regulation of hawkers, second-hand dealers, private enquiry agents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Licensing of riding schools, livery stables, kennels and animal boarding establishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference number</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Major Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Government Printing Office</td>
<td>- Printing and publishing services to Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Government Stores Department</td>
<td>- Provision of supplies and services for government departments, schools, hospitals and government subsidised organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cleaning of schools and government offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Servicing of office and electronic equipment for government departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Manufacturing uniforms and household linen for government departments, hospitals and other instrumentalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Board of Fire Commissioners</td>
<td>- Preventing and extinguishing fires in settled areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minister for Mines and Energy (2 portfolios)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Department of Mines</td>
<td>- Regulation and development of mining industries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Promoting the safety and welfare of miners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Registration of mining titles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Assessment, conservation and utilization of mineral resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Electricity Authority</td>
<td>- Promotion, co-ordination and development of electricity supply authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Maintenance of safety standards in the electrical industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Electricity Commission</td>
<td>- Generation and supply of electricity to Local Government authorities for retail distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Generation and supply of electricity for government railways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Operation of state coal mines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference number (see Figure A)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Major Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Department of Decentralisation and Development</td>
<td>- Promotion of industrial expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Decentralisation of industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Assistance to country industries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Bathurst-Orange Development Corporation</td>
<td>- Development of Bathurst-Orange as a growth centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ministry of Housing and Co-operative Societies</td>
<td>- Co-ordination and oversight of housing and co-operative services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Regulation and control of rents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Investigation of strata title disputes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Regulation of building industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Builders' Licensing Board</td>
<td>- Regulation of building industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Housing Commission</td>
<td>- Construction and management of public housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Real Estate services to government departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Registry of Co-operative Societies</td>
<td>- Regulation and development of co-operative societies, permanent building societies and indemnities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Health Commission</td>
<td>- Promotion of public health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Management of child health centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Maintenance of pure food standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Regulation of private hospitals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Medico-legal advice to police and to coroners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Regulation and control of public hospitals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provision of ambulance services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference number (see Figure 4)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Major Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Government Insurance of N.S.W.</td>
<td>- Provision of insurance services to the Government and to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Land Tax Office</td>
<td>- Collection of Land Tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Stamp Duties Office</td>
<td>- Collection of stamp duties, death duties and pay roll tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>State Lotteries Office</td>
<td>- Management of State Lotteries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>State Superannuation Board</td>
<td>- Operation of a superannuation scheme for State public servants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.S.W. Superannuation Office</td>
<td>- Co-ordination of policies in relation to superannuation funds for employees of State and Local Government authorities and mine workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Rural Assistance Board</td>
<td>- Financial support for primary producers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Rural Bank of N.S.W.</td>
<td>- Provision of banking services to the Government and to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Totalizator Agency Board</td>
<td>- Provision of facilities for off-course betting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- (The Minister also receives administrative support from the Treasury – see No. 4 above).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer (2 portfolios)**

**Minister for Youth, Ethnic and Community Affairs (1 portfolio)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference number (see Figure 4)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Department of Youth, Ethnic and Community Affairs</td>
<td>- Provision for the welfare of children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provision of social welfare and services that supplement Commonwealth benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Promoting the welfare of aborigines, other ethnic groups, and immigrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Promoting youth services, community services and State immigration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minister for Youth, Ethnic and Community Affairs (1 portfolio)
contd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 65               | State Emergency Services    | - The organisation of civil defence against external aggression or natural disaster.  
|                  |                              | - Preventing and extinguishing bush fires.                                       |

Minister for Culture, Sport and Recreation (1 portfolio)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 66               | Department of Culture, Sport and Recreation | - Encouragement of cultural activities.  
|                  |                              | - Promotion of physical fitness through sport and recreation.  
|                  |                              | - Regulation and control of greyhound racing.                                   |
| 67               | Australian Museum            | - Management of a public museum.                                                |
| 69               | Sydney Opera House Trust     | - Management of the Opera House complex.                                        |

Minister for Lands and Forests (2 portfolios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 70               | Department of Lands          | - Regulation of the sale, occupation and management of Crown Lands (Eastern and Central Divisions).  
|                  |                              | - Provision of land for community and social needs.  
|                  |                              | - Control and management of Lord Howe Island affairs.  
|                  |                              | - Registration of Crown Land titles.                                             |
| 71               | Central Mapping Authority    | - Co-ordination of mapping services.                                            |
| 72               | National Parks and Wildlife Service | - Control and management of national parks and historical sites.  
|                  |                              | - Protection of native plants and wildlife.                                      |
Reference number (see Figure A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Major Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Registrar-General's Office</td>
<td>- Investigation and registration of dealings affecting title to land under the provisions of the Real Property Act and Strata Titles Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Investigation and registration of land subdivision plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Processing of applications for the conversion of Old System land to Torrens Title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Making official searches in land titles matters and making searches on behalf of other departments and instrumentalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Valuer-General's Department</td>
<td>- Valuation of real property for State Government and Local Government purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Western Lands Commissioner</td>
<td>- Regulation of sale, occupation and management of Crown Lands (Western Division).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Fish Marketing Authority</td>
<td>- Regulation and control of fish marketing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
<td>- Dedication, control, management and protection of State forests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure B

Source: Machinery of Government Changes in NSW.