Submission – Glenorchy City Council

Issue	Page	Comment
Planning reform	General	The strategy appears to be implying that there will be planning reform. However, the intent and extent is vague. GCC planning officers support reform, however in the case of this strategy we do not know what that reform might be, it is therefore difficult to support or not support many of the initiatives in the Strategy.
For larger projects of strategic economic significance, current legislative pathways involve overlapping regulatory processes without a truly integrated framework, creating uncertainty around timelines, assessment requirements and decision-making authority. Beyond major projects, planning settings do not always distinguish between the significance of different types of development, meaning investment aligned with state priorities can face complex approval pathways. Environmental, heritage and other regulatory approvals add further complexity.	19	It is agreed that the splitting of building matters from planning matters under the State Planning Provisions has essentially 'kicked the can down the road' for developers, and a return to an integrated planning system which allows for all relevant matters to be considered at the one time would be an improvement. There is also a concern that this statement appears to be indicating that **values** such as heritage and our environment 'complicate' outcomes. This appears to conflict with the essence of the strategy which promotes the economic value we receive from Tasmania's unique qualities, including its clean and green 'status'.

The Tasmanian Government's Economic Statement committed to a new Economic Future Act for the purposes of delivering a clearer, faster pathway for major job-creating projects. The approval and regulatory environment should work for investors — meaning clearer standards, and processes that move faster to yes, or faster to no.	19	It is unclear why larger projects should be subject a 'clearer' (less stringent?) assessment than smaller projects, nor why the process for smaller investors should be more complex than for larger investors. Any streamlining of requirements or processes should be justifiable at all scales – or if anything, more stringent for larger projects that have a greater potential impact.
List of potential initiatives	20	It is difficult to provide comment on many of these initiatives as they are quite vague in respect to their intention
Consistent with the Economic Statement, delivering a coordinated investment facilitation system...	20	Generally supportive of a coordinated investment system which helps simplify delivery of larger projects through navigating approvals; this needs to be a front door rather than 'back door' approach so that the usual approval standards and processes still apply, particularly in relation to consultation with councils and local communities. The investment system should help navigate approvals rather than water down approvals processes.
More predictable and faster pathways for the rezoning of land to meet emerging industrial, strategic and well-located housing needs, delivered through the program of ongoing reform	20	It is unclear why the term 'predictable' pathway is used. The LUPPA legislation clearly identifies the pathway for rezoning. 'Predictability' implies that the outcome is known (i.e. predetermined). The purpose of an assessment is to determine whether a proposal is appropriate (refer to the STRLUS/TPPs for scope). How is it proposed to make rezoning more predictable without undermining the purpose of an assessment? With respect to 'faster', perhaps more support/resourcing could be provided to the TPC to support hearing dates closer to the times of lodgement of a

		Council's report on representations. Again as the actual intent of the initiative is unclear it is difficult to provide feedback
Working with councils, industry and the planning sector to streamline planning assessments, improve consistency, and review the matters that require a planning permit where consistent with acceptable solutions in the Tasmanian Planning Scheme	20	Support an appropriate review of the SPPs – noting that the State Planning Office have been seeking to achieve this for some time but appear under-resourced. The concerns remain about 'streamlining' planning by separating it from other regulatory requirements (building etc) to only push matters that could have been addressed at the planning stage to the building stage and then potentially back to planning with no benefit at all to the customer. Again as the actual intent of the initiative is unclear it is difficult to provide feedback
Ongoing identification and review of statutory, regulatory and procedural barriers as they emerge through the development facilitation process, with findings reported publicly.	20	As noted above – some attempts to 'streamline' – such as the single permit for new businesses appear to add several layers of regulation, and still leave the outcome uncertain at the end of the process.
Improved access to higher-quality public datasets to enable public and private digital tools to support faster and better planning, regulatory processes and business decisions.	28	Supported
Continuing to reduce red tape that constrains business productivity and blocks investment, particularly in key areas of the economy that have the most to gain.	28	Support reduction of red tape; however, it's unclear where the focus for this initiative is, clarity is needed to make an informed comment

Improved regional economic, development, liveability and demographic data and projections to support decision-making by government, councils, industry and communities.	32	Supported.
A rolling mechanism to gather information from businesses, councils and communities about the supply of land for industry and well-located housing, and accelerate the pace of strategic land-use planning in response.	32	It is unclear what this initiative is seeking to achieve in respect to 'accelerating the pace of strategic land use planning'. If the intent is to appropriately resource the SPO and TPC to undertake and assess strategic planning work it is supported.
Developing an infrastructure pricing and developer contribution approach, that fairly apportions the costs of development while incentivising the supply of well-located housing and industrial land, consistent with the Future of Local Government Review.	40	Strongly support implementation of Developer Contributions It would be useful to have more information on levers to incentivise supply of new housing and development in well-located areas, as these incentives would likely need to be significant to counterbalance market tendencies to develop land on the urban fringe. These incentives shouldn't be tied to the (over) simplification of planning assessment and approvals that fails to account for relevant site constraints e.g. vegetation and heritage.