

This presentation is focussed on the impacts of subject amendments, in particular with reference to **precincts** (VC267 and VC257).

This particularly refers to their capacity to delivery urban renewal through precincts redevelopment with regard to the following Objectives listed under section 4 of the *P&E Act* 1987:

s4.1(a) to provide for the fair, orderly, economic and sustainable use, and development of land

s4.1(e) to protect public utilities and other assets and enable the orderly provision and co-ordination of public utilities and other facilities for the benefit of the community

s4.1 (g) to balance the present and future interests of all Victorians

s4.2 (g) to encourage the achievement of planning objectives through positive actions by responsible authorities and planning authorities

General Observations:

- Welcome move by the government to address strategic urban infill and recognise (and normalise) a greater range of 'standard' dwelling types through the planning system
- Planning reform is significant in addressing housing and urban renewal, but is framed in a wider context of housing finance, infrastructure provision and demographic change in Victoria
- Evidence that fast-tracked planning permits in middle Melbourne are a small factor in the delivery of an affordable and desirable medium/higher density housing product
- It is unclear if changes presented through
- Removal of review rights in various situations risks undermining community engagement in planning (and demonstrably changes an 80 year old approach) and the necessary social licence for demonstrable restructuring of residential areas across Victoria – the removal of character considerations and the application of broad precinct approaches undermines long-developed local government approach to context-specific strategy
- The (extreme) housing focus fails to fully recognise infrastructure (social and physical) as essential to orderly planning and good community outcomes – it puts pressure on utilities and infrastructure without an adequate planning model

Learning from the Greenfields

We have a model of relatively rapid housing provision, which while it delivers housing products, the delivery of timely and adequate community infrastructure is less evident....

...lessons for established metropolitan precinct renewal from 20 years of greenfields development:

- PSPs s envisaged are often not realised or sequenced – no capacity in the UGZ to affect this fully (including ‘warrants’ for development linked to available physical and social infrastructure)
- Early and sequenced provision of services is essential for functioning communities and for efficient use of services in a regional context
- This has shown that an ‘open’ UGZ (much like Precinct Zone) the has not delivered the necessary diversity of housing and of land uses overall – nor has it demanded sequenced development from government and the private sector to meet the needs of new communities on the fringe
- 37.10-2 & 3 of the Precinct Zone offer some capacity to require the provisions of infrastructure in a framework plan, but, given lessons of PSPs, a clearer requirement (warrant) for staged development and necessary services and infrastructure is vital to creating health, liveable and connected precincts.
- 37.10-5 includes affordable housing as an outcome for exceeding development limits – this is a lost opportunity to factor across all development