**GREATER HOBART COUNCILS PARTNERSHIP**

August 2026

# Greater Hobart: the Economic Diversification and Investment Strategy demonstration region

*GHCP partnership proposition in response to the*
*Tasmanian Economic Diversification and Investment Strategy (EDIS) Consultation Draft (2026)*

## Introduction

The Greater Hobart Councils Partnership (GHCP) is the alliance of four councils: Clarence, Glenorchy, Hobart and Kingborough. The GHCP works closely with adjoining growth councils Brighton and Sorell.

Greater Hobart is Tasmania's capital city region. The four member councils are home to 212,267 people, 36.9 per cent of the State's population, and the region generates around 45 per cent of Tasmania's Gross Value Added. On the wider Australian Bureau of Statistics Greater Hobart boundary, which takes in the adjoining growth municipalities, the population is 255,250. It is a single labour market, a single housing market and a single transport network spread across four municipalities and one river.

We support the draft Strategy. We support its vision, its three goals, its emphasis on private investment, productivity, innovation and workforce participation, and above all its commitment to measure outcomes rather than activity. It reads as a serious attempt to concentrate scarce public effort where it will do the most good, and we want it to succeed.

This is therefore not a conventional consultation response.
It is an offer to help deliver it.

That offer sits inside a clear architecture. We see the EDIS as the overarching economic framework for Tasmania; the new Tasmanian Antarctic Gateway Strategy as the State's sector strategy for the region's most distinctive industry; and the GHCP Strategic Plan 2026-28 as the place-based expression of both in Greater Hobart. Read together, the three describe one agenda at three levels of resolution: what Tasmania is trying to achieve economically, how a priority sector will be grown, and where and by whom the work is done.

GHCP made a partnership proposition through the Antarctic Gateway consultation in July 2026 and makes a matching one here. The two processes are running closely enough together to be sequenced deliberately, and we ask that the final Strategy make the relationship between the three documents explicit.

The draft commits to drawing on functional labour markets as the analytical unit for regional engagement, "while councils and communities remain the partners through which regional implementation happens" (page 31). We agree that this is the right method. In the south it does not need to be built, because Greater Hobart is already that functional region and already has the partner, the governance and the shared work program to act as one. What the Strategy needs here is not new machinery. It needs a place to start.

We propose that the Tasmanian Government name Greater Hobart in the final Strategy as an early demonstration region: the place where the Strategy's regional method, its investment proposition, its land and infrastructure sequencing and its outcome measures are tested first, at pace, with a partner already organised to deliver. What follows sets out what the region brings, six pieces of work we propose to deliver with the State, and where we believe the draft should change.

## Our position in short

- **We support the Strategy's direction**: private investment, productivity, innovation, participation, and outcomes over activity.
- **We offer Greater Hobart as an early demonstration region**, with six pieces of work we propose to deliver with the State (Appendix A), and Macquarie Point as the Strategy's demonstration precinct.
- **We identify the Northern Suburbs Transit Corridor as a complementary demonstration corridor** to Macquarie Point, testing transit-oriented housing, industrial renewal and activity-centre revitalisation at the other end of the region.
- **We set out what a demonstration region would actually involve** (roles, first priorities, resourcing, measures and an indicative 12 to 24 month work program) so the proposition can be agreed with precision rather than in principle.
- **We ask that Antarctic and marine industries be named a priority sector** in the Strategy, connecting the EDIS explicitly to the new Tasmanian Antarctic Gateway Strategy. It is the clearest comparative advantage our region holds, it is the first economic priority of our Strategic Plan, and the evidence base needed to convert it into investment and jobs is within reach. We propose it as the first practical demonstration of the partnership model.
- **We ask that the Strategy recognise local government as a strategic delivery partner**, not only as planning authority, but as strategic land use planner, provider of enabling infrastructure, facilitator of development and builder of investment-ready communities.
- **We ask that investment facilitation be a front door rather than a back door**, coordinating agencies and councils instead of creating an alternative approvals pathway, and that any streamlining be justifiable at every scale of development rather than being more generous to the largest projects.
- **We ask that reform be resourced.** Faster planning outcomes depend on the Tasmanian Planning Commission and the State Planning Office having the capacity to deliver them. Councils cannot fix this alone, and neither can legislation.
- **We strongly support developer contributions and infrastructure pricing**, co-designed with councils and consistent with the Future of Local Government Review, and we ask for a regional dimension in the Strategy's indicators and public reporting so that outcomes can be analysed and celebrated region by region.

## Greater Hobart is the functional region

We support the draft Strategy's regional methodology. Economic opportunities and workforce flows do not align with administrative boundaries, so the analytical unit should be the catchment within which people live, work and access services, while implementation happens through councils and communities.

Greater Hobart is a textbook case. A worker living in Kingston may build in Glenorchy, a business in Cambridge may serve a customer in Hobart, and a headworks constraint in one municipality can stall housing supply in another. No single council can resolve these issues alone, and the Partnership exists to resolve them together.

What the Strategy would gain from a Greater Hobart demonstration:

- **Scale and consequence.** With 37 per cent of the State's population and 45 per cent of its economic output, results achieved here move the statewide numbers the Strategy proposes to measure.
- **A capital city's statewide function.** Greater Hobart provides the port, airport, hospitals, university, courts, cultural institutions and Antarctic gateway that serve all Tasmanians. Investment in its capacity is not investment in one region at the expense of others.
- **A partner with legislated standing.** The Greater Hobart Act 2019 already convenes State Ministers and the four Mayors through the Greater Hobart Committee, supported by the Greater Hobart Advisory Group of council chief executives and senior State officials. There is no need to build new machinery, negotiate a new memorandum, or wait for a governance model to mature.
- **Alignment already achieved.** The GHCP Strategic Plan 2026-28 and the Greater Hobart Committee Work Program 2025-28 share the same five focus areas: the 30-Year Plan, medium-density housing, major transport initiatives, sporting and cultural facilities, and economic development. State and local priorities in this region are already the same priorities.
- **A working delivery record.** The Greater Hobart Strategic Planners Working Group has met 86 times since 2020 and has delivered the substantial majority of the 30-Year Plan's twelve foundational priority actions. The Greater Hobart Sport Infrastructure Strategy, covering around 25 sports across a 20-year horizon, was produced by the four councils together with Brighton and Sorell. The region already plans as one where it matters.

**A regional economy hidden by municipal boundaries**

A recent sector analysis commissioned by the City of Hobart shows why the functional region is the right unit. It mapped the region's blue economy and found a substantial concentration of high-value activity and employment. But it counted only organisations with a confirmed street address inside one municipality. It acknowledges that the boundary is an artefact of who commissioned the work, while the sector itself "typically operates as a Hobart wide system" including Clarence, Glenorchy and Kingborough.

The consequence is that a careful, primary-source analysis of one of Tasmania's most distinctive sectors necessarily excluded the marine manufacturing and vessel servicing capability at Prince of Wales Bay in Glenorchy, the Antarctic-capable airport and aviation and freight precinct at Cambridge in Clarence, and the Australian Antarctic Division's national headquarters at Kingston and the IMAS facilities at Taroona in Kingborough. Three of the four councils that hold the sector's assets do not appear in the count at all.

The Strategy's functional-region approach is designed to solve that problem, and Greater Hobart is where to solve it. The method now exists and has been tested at municipal scale. Extending it across the four councils would produce, for the first time, an economic picture of the sector that matches the way the sector actually operates, faster and at lower cost than starting from nothing.

We recognise that a demonstration region is only useful if what is learned there travels. GHCP commits to sharing method, evidence and findings openly with the Tasmanian Government, other councils, LGAT and Tasmania's other regions, so that a Greater Hobart demonstration accelerates the Strategy statewide rather than absorbing it.

## What a demonstration region would involve

A demonstration region should be agreed with precision rather than in principle. The risk otherwise is that everyone supports the idea without knowing quite what has been agreed to. What follows is our opening position on how the arrangement would be co-designed with the State. We expect it to be negotiated, not adopted.

**How it would differ from the way we work together now**

The Greater Hobart Committee and Advisory Group already bring State Ministers and the four mayors together, and the region already has a shared work program. What is missing is not a forum. It is three things: an agreed set of first priorities carried through to delivery rather than to discussion; explicit leads and resourcing attached to each; and outcome measures that both parties report against publicly.

A demonstration region converts an existing relationship from coordination into joint delivery, using machinery that already exists. That is the whole of the change, and it is why it can start quickly.

**Roles**

- **The Tasmanian Government** sets the priorities the demonstration is testing, names a lead agency and a single senior accountable officer, brings the Strategy's levers to bear (invest, facilitate, fund, partner and advocate) and commits to reporting results publicly through the Strategy's action plan.
- **GHCP** convenes the four councils (and adjoining growth councils as appropriate), provides a single regional point of contact, leads the place-based dimension of each priority, aligns council planning and investment behind it, and reports through the Greater Hobart Committee.
- **Member councils** deliver within their own municipalities and contribute officer capacity to the shared work program.
- **Other partners** such as utilities, industry bodies, civic groups, the Tasmanian Polar Network, research institutions and the adjoining growth councils, participate where the work touches them, on terms agreed at the outset rather than negotiated project by project.

Where another organisation is better placed to lead, it should lead. We have applied that test throughout this submission and in our Antarctic Gateway submission, and we would apply it here.

**First priorities**

We propose beginning with a small number of things rather than the full work program, chosen because they are ready, because they test different parts of the Strategy's method, and because each produces something reusable:

- **Antarctic and marine industries** as the first sector application, beginning with the economic development roundtable GHCP has offered to convene under the Antarctic Gateway Strategy, followed by the discovery and opportunity work at Proposal 1.
- **The development services system** as the test of the Strategy's planning and investment facilitation initiatives, working from live cases.
- **Land release and infrastructure monitoring** as the test of the Strategy's regional data and rolling land supply commitments, and the evidence foundation for everything that follows.
- **Macquarie Point and the Northern Suburbs Transit Corridor** as the tests of coordinated investment facilitation and infrastructure sequencing, at precinct scale and at corridor scale respectively.

**Resourcing**

Recognition without resourcing produces a coordination burden rather than a demonstration. We are not asking the State to fund the region's ordinary business, and each council will contribute officer capacity as it does now.

What we ask is that the agreed work program be funded as a single multi-year line in the Strategy's first action plan, with agreed milestones and consolidated reporting, rather than assembled from separate applications across different programs and rounds. One agreement with one acquittal is cheaper for the State to administer than six, and it is consistent with the Strategy's commitment to outcomes over activity.

Some components carry a modest ongoing cost rather than a one-off project cost. The land release and infrastructure monitoring program is the clearest example: its value is that it is continuous, and funded once and then discontinued it produces a snapshot rather than a trend. Where that is the case we have said so, and we ask that those components be funded accordingly.

**Measures and reporting**

We propose a short, fixed set of measures agreed at the outset and published annually alongside the Strategy's own reporting: private investment facilitated and delivered; approval timeframes at each stage of the development services system rather than council assessment alone; net additional well-located dwellings and progress against the 30-Year Plan's 70:30 infill target; development-ready industrial and residential land; participation and workforce measures; and the share of priority-sector procurement value retained in the region.

Status reporting should state why an action matters, the risk if it is not delivered, the practical outcome achieved and the recommended next step. Greater Hobart has already adopted that format for its own reporting.

**An indicative 12-to-24-month work program**

- **Months 1 to 3.** Agreement on scope, first priorities, leads, resourcing and measures. The Antarctic and marine industries economic development roundtable convened. The development services system working group established.
- **Months 3 to 9.** Discovery and opportunity work under Proposal 1 underway. Land release and infrastructure monitoring funded and operating. First public report on barriers identified and removed.
- **Months 9 to 18.** Investable opportunities tested across the region's three economic priorities. Precinct and corridor sequencing agreed for Macquarie Point and the Northern Suburbs Transit Corridor. Medium-density demonstration underway.
- **Months 18 to 24.** The Greater Hobart Investment Prospectus published, built on the evidence rather than ahead of it. First annual outcome report. Method and findings shared with Tasmania's other regions and with LGAT.

We would expect the State to want to change this. That is the point of co-designing it.

## What the Greater Hobart councils offer

The Strategy's six priorities all land at scale in Greater Hobart, and each member council brings an adopted economic agenda, live projects and investment-ready precincts.

**City of Clarence**

The *Clarence Strategic Plan 2025-2035* and the *City Heart Plan* are converting Rosny Park and Kangaroo Bay into a walkable activity and employment hub, planning for more than 1,000 additional jobs and a step-change in medium and higher-density housing by 2041. At Cambridge, the Hobart International Airport precinct anchors the State's aviation, freight and Antarctic air-link capability. Its catalytic effect is visible in follow-on private investment well beyond the original *Hobart City Deal* scope, including a $130 million runway strengthening program and a privately funded $200 million international terminal expansion.

**Glenorchy City Council**

*Prosperous Glenorchy 2031* sets out an agenda for shared growth from a $3.23 billion economy (gross regional product, year ending June 2024) supporting more than 3,000 businesses, 96 per cent of which employ 20 people or fewer. It is backed by the Glenorchy Jobs Hub, which has delivered 1,340 employment outcomes under the *Hobart City Deal*, the Northern Suburbs Transit Corridor as the backbone for transit-oriented renewal, the Prince of Wales Bay marine and defence manufacturing precinct, and a visitor economy anchored by MONA and MyState Bank Arena.

**City of Hobart**

*The City Economy Strategy 2023-28* and *Capital City Strategic Plan 2023* position the capital as Australia's Antarctic and Southern Ocean science gateway, a working port, a cultural and creative economy of national standing, and Tasmania's knowledge, visitor and night-time economy centre. Precinct planning through the *Central Hobart Plan* and *North Hobart Neighbourhood Plan* is enabling inner-city housing growth.

**Kingborough Council**

*Transform Kingston* and the *Kingston Place Strategy* are renewing one of Greater Hobart's fastest-growing centres, with Stage 1 complete, while the *Kingborough Integrated Transport Strategy 2025* sets the mode-shift agenda. The municipality hosts the Australian Antarctic Division's national headquarters at Kingston and the University of Tasmania's expanding IMAS campus at Taroona, now also home to the nationally significant Southern Ocean Research Aquarium.

Individually, these are council strategies. Aligned through the Strategy's regional implementation, they become a coordinated pipeline: activity-centre renewal in every municipality, two nationally significant industry precincts, a research system of national depth, and the housing and transport programs of the 30-Year Plan to carry the growth. That is what a functional region, organised, looks like, and no fragmented set of bilateral projects can match it.

## What we propose to deliver in partnership

Appendix A sets out six pieces of work in detail, with proposed leads, partners and status. Each requires State partnership, and most require co-investment. Where another organisation is better placed to lead or deliver, we will say so.

### 1. A GREATER HOBART ANTARCTIC AND MARINE INDUSTRIES STUDY

Antarctic and marine industries, as the GHCP Strategic Plan describes them, span the ocean-dependent and ocean-enabled activities that generate market value through the sustainable use, management, protection and innovation of marine and coastal resources including primary production, energy generation, transport, infrastructure, knowledge services and supporting supply chains, together with the Antarctic gateway functions that distinguish this region internationally. On that definition, Greater Hobart holds a concentration of activity that few cities of its size anywhere can match: research institutions, a working deep-water port at the CBD waterfront, the Antarctic gateway, the commercial fishing fleet, aquaculture head offices, specialist supply chain businesses, international governance secretariats, and a growing marine visitor economy. The Antarctic component alone contributes over $204 million annually to the Tasmanian economy and supports more than 1,100 full-time jobs.

A rigorous analysis of this sector already exists for one municipality. It maps the supply chain as a system, quantifies economic contribution, and identifies specific gaps and opportunities. Extending that method across all four Greater Hobart councils would deliver three things the current study cannot:

- **A complete supply chain.** Vessel servicing, refit and polar equipment manufacturing at Prince of Wales Bay, Antarctic aviation and air freight at Cambridge, the Australian Antarctic Division headquarters at Kingston and the expanding IMAS campus at Taroona are all outside the current boundary, though all are part of the same system.
- **A defensible regional figure.** A single, credible economic contribution number for Greater Hobart's Antarctic and marine industries, on a consistent method, is the foundation of any investment prospectus, any procurement argument and any advocacy to the Australian Government.
- **Opportunities assessed at their appropriate scale.** Where value is captured or lost, which gaps are worth closing, and which small number of opportunities would return the most, assessed across the whole region rather than one part of it.

The existing analysis also identifies practical initiatives that are regional in nature and currently unowned. An Antarctic and marine industries capability register, synthesising what the Tasmanian Polar Network, Antarctic Tasmania, IMAS and TasPorts already hold into a single accessible picture of who is in the sector and what they do, would address a documented problem: procurement defaults to mainland suppliers when Tasmanian capability exists but is invisible. Local environmental analytical capacity is a second gap, with specialist laboratory testing routinely sent to Melbourne because local capacity does not exist at scale, in a city holding some of the world's deepest marine and environmental research expertise. A third is the working history of the port and waterfront, which no institution currently owns and which underpins the region's visitor and cultural offer.

Roles should follow capability. GHCP would convene the four councils and lead the place-based dimension (land use, precincts, transport, workforce housing and council economic development). Industry-facing components would be addressed in collaboration with the sector's established networks including the Tasmanian Polar Network, whose delivery expectations should be matched with resourcing.

Commissioned once, this study serves both processes. It is the regional evidence base the EDIS needs for its functional-region method, and it is the economic evidence base the new Antarctic Gateway Strategy needs to convert gateway status into local contracts, jobs and investment.

## 2. A DEVELOPMENT SERVICES SYSTEM WORKING GROUP

Most of the initiatives proposed under EDIS Priority 1 (page 20) bear directly on the planning and development system that councils administer. The City of Hobart has been calling for a properly constituted working group to do this systematically for some time. Greater Hobart offers to host it: councils, the State Planning Office, the Tasmanian Planning Commission, utilities and industry, with named leads, a prioritised work program and public reporting of barriers identified and removed.

Two qualifications, raised by member councils and shared by the Partnership. First, the group should complement the State Planning Provisions review already underway rather than duplicate it. If the practical need is simply for the State Planning Office to be resourced to complete that review, that is the more valuable investment and we would say so. Second, the group requires resourcing on both sides: councils will contribute officer time, but the tracking, analysis and public reporting that make it more than a meeting need to be funded. We would rather scope it modestly and resource it properly than establish it and let it lapse.

This provides a real-world testing environment for the Strategy's planning initiatives that could be convened immediately.

## 3. A GREATER HOBART INVESTMENT PROSPECTUS

The draft Strategy commits to "sharper sector and regional investment prospectuses, aligned to this Strategy's priorities" (page 19). GHCP offers to co-produce the first of them. We are clear about what makes a prospectus work: the strongest ones define specific investment opportunities and are explicit about the private capital being sought, which means the discovery work has to come first. Without it, a prospectus becomes a regional brochure.

We propose to sequence the work properly, beginning with the Antarctic and marine industries study and the data foundations described here, and to package the results into a genuine investment proposition. This also delivers a priority already identified under the Greater Hobart 30-Year Plan: identifying strategic development opportunities capable of attracting private investment, and supporting partnerships between landowners and external investors.

Behind the prospectus sits a broader and more useful process. We propose to progressively identify and test investable opportunities across all three of the region's economic priorities (Antarctic and marine industries, sustainable advanced industries, and place-based innovation and pilots) rather than treating opportunity identification as a single exercise preceding a single publication. Each opportunity would be scoped, tested for investment appeal with the market, and either developed further or set aside, with the strongest packaged into the Greater Hobart investment proposition as they mature. Antarctic and

marine industries would be the first application of the method, which would then be applied to the other two priorities in turn.

The prospectus should draw on opportunities from every part of the region. Glenorchy's industrial and activity-centre opportunities are a case in point: the Prince of Wales Bay marine and defence manufacturing precinct and the industrial land around it, and the transit-oriented renewal capacity of the Glenorchy activity centre along the Northern Suburbs Transit Corridor. These are among the region's most investable propositions and among the least visible to investors outside Tasmania. Comparable opportunities sit at Rosny Park and Cambridge in Clarence, in central Hobart, and at Kingston and Taroona in Kingborough.

## 4. SHARED DATA AND DIGITAL FOUNDATIONS, BUILT ONCE AND USED EVERYWHERE

EDIS Priority 3 identifies public datasets and technology adoption as productivity priorities, and Priority 4 proposes improved regional data and a rolling mechanism on land supply (pages 28 and 32). Greater Hobart is the right place to build these assets first, being small enough to deliver and large enough to prove. It includes four components:

- **Fund the Greater Hobart land release and infrastructure monitoring program.** This is the highest-priority carry-forward action under the 30-Year Plan and remains unfunded. The groundwork is already done: consultants have designed a counting method every Tasmanian council could use, and a Property Land Use Dashboard has been built and is maintained. What is missing is funding to make it permanent, and what is required is a modest ongoing budget line rather than a one-off project grant. The program's value is that it is continuous, to produce trends, rather than a snapshot. Without it, no one can say whether the 70:30 infill target is being met, because approvals are not homes and the current data misses subdivisions altogether.
- **Sustain the infrastructure capacity mapping.** The first consolidated map of pipes, power, roads, schools and health services was delivered to the regional land use strategy review. Keeping it current, resolving the water and sewerage capacity gap, and putting it in councils' hands would turn a point-in-time product into a standing regional asset.
- **Deliver the digital planning outcome councils and industry need**: a single reliable pathway through which an applicant can find the rules that apply to a site, lodge once, and track progress across every agency involved, with the underlying planning data published in open, machine-readable form. We take no position on which product delivers that outcome. What matters is that the outcome is specified, tested with users and funded through to completion, rather than a system being treated as delivered while the need remains. Machine-readable planning rules across the region's schemes are also the necessary groundwork for any defensible use of artificial intelligence in planning.
- **Instrument Macquarie Point and specify the architecture once**, so it can be replicated affordably in Rosny Park, Glenorchy and Kingston, and deliver technology-adoption and digital skills programs through council business networks, the Jobs Hubs and education partners. *Connected Hobart* has already delivered more than 60 smart-city and digital initiatives, many now embedded as ordinary services, and is transitioning into a broader innovation agenda.

Each asset is designed for reuse. What is built for Greater Hobart becomes available to Launceston and the North-West, turning the Strategy's digital commitments into transferable capability rather than one-off projects.

## 5. MACQUARIE POINT AND THE WORKING WATERFRONT EDIS DEMONSTRATION PRECINCT

Macquarie Point is the largest place-based investment in Tasmania: the multipurpose stadium approved as a project of State significance in December 2025, an updated Precinct Plan and Site Master Plan released in April 2026, $240 million in Australian Government urban renewal funding, and a fixed delivery timeline that forces coordination whether or not it is planned for.

Member councils hold a range of views on individual elements of the precinct, and the City of Hobart continues to advocate for high-quality design, heritage, transport and public realm outcomes as planning authority for surrounding land. The Partnership's shared position is forward-looking: the investment is committed, and it should now be made to return region-wide value.

The precinct should not be planned in isolation from the working port around it. TasPorts is currently master planning the Macquarie Wharves and Sullivans Cove precinct, CSIRO has begun master planning its Battery Point site, and the Macquarie Point Development Corporation is progressing its own precinct work. These processes share a waterfront, a freight network, a workforce and a visitor economy. Aligning them, with councils at the table as planning authorities and as the community's representatives, is the single highest-value coordination opportunity in the region.

We therefore propose the Strategy adopt Macquarie Point and the working waterfront as its demonstration precinct for coordinated investment facilitation, infrastructure sequencing and outcome measurement, with a benefit-sharing program reaching all four municipalities. Used this way, the precinct becomes a strategic lens for all of the Partnership's focus areas rather than a single project:

- **Implementing the 30-Year Plan.** Precinct planning, land use protection for port and gateway functions, and infrastructure sequencing tested at the scale the Plan describes.
- **Medium-density housing.** Precinct workforce demand used to demonstrate the typologies, modern methods of construction and infrastructure sequencing the region needs at scale.
- **Major transport initiatives.** Precinct access planned as regional infrastructure, covering ferry network expansion, the Rapid Bus Network business case, port freight and heavy vehicle routing, and event-day operations that leave a permanent uplift in the network.
- **Sporting and cultural facilities.** Precinct venues and programming connected to regional cultural and sport planning, so event and visitor demand flows to facilities across the region, together with the public-facing Antarctic and Science Precinct commitment.
- **Economic development.** Procurement that grows Tasmanian supplier participation, connecting Glenorchy's manufacturers, Clarence's freight and logistics precinct and the region's services base, and a clear economic narrative connecting the stadium, the Antarctic gateway and the science precinct.

Macquarie Point is also the natural first application of the consistent community benefit framework proposed later in this submission.

**The Northern Suburbs Transit Corridor as a complementary demonstration corridor**

Macquarie Point tests coordinated investment facilitation at precinct scale, on a single site with a fixed timeline. The Northern Suburbs Transit Corridor tests something different and equally important: whether transport investment, housing supply, industrial renewal and activity-centre revitalisation can be sequenced together along a corridor, over time. Both are needed, and they can be run in parallel.

The corridor connects central Hobart to Glenorchy and the northern suburbs and is anchored by the Rapid Bus Network detailed business case. It carries the region's clearest transit-oriented housing opportunity, its most significant concentration of marine and defence manufacturing and industrial land at Prince of Wales Bay, and an activity centre with substantial renewal capacity. It connects directly to the River Derwent Ferry Network expansion and to the medium-density demonstration at Proposal 6.

We propose the Strategy adopt the Northern Suburbs Transit Corridor as a complementary demonstration corridor alongside Macquarie Point, with the same disciplines: named leads, sequenced infrastructure, and measured outcomes. Between them, a precinct and a corridor cover most of what the Strategy's regional method needs to prove. Neither is a project for one municipality. What they test (coordinated facilitation, infrastructure sequencing, transit-oriented renewal and benefit-sharing) transfers directly to the priority precincts of every member council: the aviation, freight and Antarctic air-link precinct at Cambridge and the Rosny park and Kangaroo Bay renewal in Clarence; the Australian Antarctic Division headquarters at Kingston and the expanding IMAS campus at Taroona in Kingborough; and inner-city housing and the knowledge economy in central Hobart. They are also physically connected to those places. Antarctic and marine supply chains run from Prince of Wales Bay to the waterfront to Cambridge and Kingston, and the ferry and rapid bus networks the corridor and the precinct depend on are the same networks that carry workers to the eastern shore and the south. The value of proving the method twice, in two different settings, is that the region ends with a repeatable approach it can apply across all four municipalities.

## 6. A MEDIUM-DENSITY HOUSING AND ENABLING INFRASTRUCTURE DEMONSTRATION

The draft Strategy is right that housing supply, land readiness and infrastructure sequencing are economic enablers rather than separate concerns (page 31). The 30-Year Plan commits Greater Hobart to 30,000 new homes by 2050 at a 70:30 infill to greenfield split, and increasing medium-density supply is the second focus area of our Strategic Plan. Current market conditions favour the terrace and townhouse typologies that can be delivered now, and this is the focus area where a demonstration would show results soonest.

This workstream is still in its early stages. To date, activity has focused on preliminary exploration and facilitated workshops between the four councils and their State agency partners through the Greater Hobart Strategic Planners Working Group, rather than direct engagement with external stakeholders. That is the logical next step, and one we expect to undertake in the near term.

The vehicle carrying this work, however, is far from new. Through Phase One of the Greater Hobart 30-Year Plan, the same Working Group delivered most of the Plan's twelve foundational priority actions in partnership with the Tasmanian Government. These included the settlement pattern work now incorporated into the draft Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy, the Medium Density Design Guidelines, and an ambitious suite of local strategic planning initiatives, from the Central Hobart Plan to Transform Kingston.

The key lesson from that phase is highly relevant here: producing technical strategies and planning outputs is necessary, but not sufficient. The focus of Phase Two must be on implementation, monitoring and delivery. A medium-density demonstration project represents exactly that shift, moving from planning and policy development into practical, place-based action that can test approaches, build confidence, and inform broader implementation across Greater Hobart.

**Two things are under exploration.** The first is how to lift the region's maturity towards modern methods of construction. GHCP has prepared an opportunity assessment of pathways to an MMC capability hub in Greater Hobart, most of which connect Tasmania to national capability rather than duplicating it, and the work is complementary to the State's own kit of parts program with Building 4.0 CRC. The second is how to reduce the practical barriers to medium-density and infill delivery: headworks and enabling infrastructure costs, utility sequencing, planning consistency across four schemes, and feasibility at the typologies the market will actually build.

We are also exploring regional collaborative applications to Australian Government funding. Commonwealth enabling-infrastructure programs increasingly pay local government directly and ask applicants to rank and sequence projects, which is a form a functional region organised as one can meet and four or more separate applicants cannot. A single Greater Hobart submission, tested against the 30-Year Plan's growth areas and endorsed by the State, is a stronger proposition than four councils competing for the same allocation and cheaper for both governments to assess. We ask the State to work with us on that approach.

We offer this workstream as the demonstration site for the Strategy's infrastructure pricing and developer contribution work, and for testing incentives for well-located housing.

## Comments on the Strategy's directions

*The following comments respond to the Strategy's six priorities and the initiatives on which views were sought. Detailed comments against specific initiatives are consolidated in Appendix B.*

### PRIORITY 1: UNLOCKING PRIVATE INVESTMENT

We support a clearer, faster and more competitive investment pathway, and we support clear timeframes for planning scheme amendments through the Tasmanian Planning Commission. Local government commits to working with the State on all parts of the development services system, with the following caveats:

#### A front door, not a back door

We are supportive of a coordinated investment facilitation system that helps proponents navigate approvals. That is a front door. It becomes a back door if it operates around the ordinary standards and processes, particularly consultation with councils and local communities. The distinction matters for public confidence in the projects the Strategy is trying to attract. We recommend the final Strategy state explicitly that investment facilitation assists proponents to navigate approvals and does not alter the standards those approvals apply.

The front door should coordinate agencies and councils, not create an alternative approvals pathway. Early engagement with councils improves project outcomes and reduces delay, and the facilitation model should be designed to trigger it rather than to bypass it.

To work, the system will need clear points of accountability, early advice for proponents, coordinated regulatory pathways, infrastructure sequencing, and transparent public reporting on the barriers identified through the facilitation process. Those features are what distinguish a facilitation system from a contact point.

#### Streamlining should be scale-neutral

The draft observes that planning settings "do not always distinguish between the significance of different types of development" and proposes a clearer, faster pathway for major job-creating projects (page 19). It is not clear why larger projects should be subject to a clearer or less complex assessment than smaller ones, nor why the process for smaller investors should be the more complex of the two. Any streamlining should be justifiable at all scales, and if anything, scrutiny should be greater, not lesser, for the largest projects, which carry the greatest potential impact. The Strategy's stated ambition to move "faster to yes, or faster to no" is a good one. We ask that the same speed be available to everyone.

#### Heritage and environment are the asset, not the obstacle

Page 19 lists environmental, heritage and other regulatory approvals as adding "further complexity". We understand the drafting intent, but the framing sits awkwardly beside the Strategy's account of Tasmania's competitive advantage: *a global brand for quality, a clean and green reputation, rich cultural and heritage assets, and an environment that is central to the visitor economy and to the region's ability to attract and retain workers.* These values are among the reasons investment comes here. We recommend rewording the passage so that the problem identified is the fragmentation and sequencing of approval processes, rather than the values those processes protect.

**Predictability of process, not of outcome**

The initiative on "more predictable and faster pathways for the rezoning of land" (page 20) needs definition. The Land Use Planning and Approvals Act already identifies the pathway for rezoning. The word "predictable" risks implying that the outcome is known in advance, when the purpose of an assessment is to determine whether a proposal is appropriate against the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy and the Tasmanian Planning Policies. We support predictability of process, meaning clear timeframes, clear information requirements, and hearing dates set closer to lodgement of a council's report on representations, and ask that the final Strategy make that distinction clear.

**Integration, and the resourcing to deliver it**

The separation of building matters from planning matters under the State Planning Provisions has, in practice, moved problems down the line rather than resolving them. Matters that could have been addressed at the planning stage surface at the building stage and sometimes return to planning, with no benefit to the applicant. A return to integrated consideration of all relevant matters at one time would be a genuine improvement. The Tasmanian Planning Policies were made in November 2025 and took effect on 1 July 2026, and the State Planning Provisions are now being reviewed to align with them. We support that review and ask that it be completed with councils at the table.

None of this is achievable without capacity. The Tasmanian Planning Commission must be properly resourced to meet the timeframes the Strategy wants, and the State Planning Office must be properly resourced to lead the reform work. We note too that the effort to create a single permit for new business appears, at present, to add rather than remove layers of effort, and we would welcome the opportunity to work through that experience with the responsible agency.

**Reform the whole development system, not one part of it**

Council assessment is one component of the time a project takes. Referral agencies, infrastructure and utility providers, digital systems and the quality of applications lodged are equally determinative, and often more so. A reform program aimed principally at local government assessment processes will not deliver the timeframes the Strategy wants, and risks concluding that councils are the constraint when the binding constraint sits elsewhere in the chain. We ask that the final Strategy frame this work as reform of the development system as a whole.

**Definition of initiatives**

Across Priority 1 in particular, several proposed initiatives are described at a level of generality that makes considered comment difficult. We would value a further round of engagement with councils once the initiatives are more fully defined, before they are settled in the first action plan.

## PRIORITY 2: ACCELERATING GROWTH AND INNOVATION

The illustrative domains of emerging strength, including autonomous marine systems and underwater robotics, sensing and engineering for extreme environments, remote and extreme environment healthcare, and traceability and biosecurity technologies, map closely to Greater Hobart's Antarctic, marine and research capability. Our Strategic Plan identifies three economic priorities: Antarctic and marine industries; sustainable advanced industries; and place-based innovation and pilots.

That third priority is a direct offer to this Strategy. Greater Hobart's scale, institutional density and geography make it well-suited to trialling new technologies, services and business models in real-world conditions before broader deployment, a proposition of value to firms well beyond Tasmania. We would welcome the Strategy recognising place-based demonstration and testing as a Tasmanian competitive advantage.

**Name Antarctic and marine industries as a priority sector, and let the region deliver on it**

We ask that Antarctic and marine industries be explicitly named as a priority sector within the Strategy. The sector is globally distinctive, export-oriented, high-wage and difficult for other jurisdictions to replicate, which is the definition of comparative advantage the Strategy's decision-making principles ask government to apply. It is also the first economic priority of the GHCP Strategic Plan 2026-28, so naming it aligns state and regional effort at no cost.

Naming it this way also connects three documents that should operate as one. The EDIS is the overarching economic framework, the new Tasmanian Antarctic Gateway Strategy is the State's sector strategy, and the GHCP Strategic Plan is the place-based expression of both in Greater Hobart.

Naming it matters because there is a body of practical work waiting to be done, identified through recent analysis of the sector, that is regional in nature and currently has no owner. Once the evidence base is extended across all four Greater Hobart councils, GHCP is positioned to facilitate a number of these initiatives:

- **An Antarctic and marine industries capability register**. Knowledge of the supply chain sits across the Tasmanian Polar Network, Antarctic Tasmania, IMAS and TasPorts, but no single accessible picture exists of who is in the sector, what they do and how they connect. Without it, procurement defaults to mainland suppliers when Tasmanian capability exists, advocacy lacks specificity, and planning decisions are made without a clear view of who is affected.
- **Local environmental analytical capacity.** Specialist laboratory testing and analytical services are routinely sent to Melbourne because local capacity does not exist at the required scale, adding cost and delay to the environmental assessment work that supports port development approvals, aquaculture compliance and marine projects. Exploring shared-use arrangements for existing research infrastructure, and advocating for local capability, is work no agency currently owns.
- **Port, freight and precinct coordination.** Traffic and heavy vehicle routing around the port precinct involves TasPorts, councils and the State without a formal mechanism to align them, at a time when precinct development will materially change freight movement. Councils are the road authorities and the planning authorities, and are well placed to convene.

- **The working waterfront and its narrative.** The interpretation of the port's working history, the balance between industrial function and public experience, and the visitor and conference offer that depends on both, sit squarely within council mandates as planning authorities, event activators and public space managers.
- **Estuary health and restoration funding pathways.** Private interest in funding restoration exists, but the mechanism to channel it into accountable projects does not. Brokering that pathway is a convening task rather than a delivery task.

The common thread is that these are coordination and convening roles rather than delivery roles, and that the specialist organisations leading each part of the sector are already doing their own work well. The gap is regional coordination across four municipalities, and that is the role GHCP was established to play. We would take it up, provided the Strategy recognises it and the resourcing follows.

**Innovation ecosystems, not only commercialisation pathways**

The draft rightly identifies research capability and the commercialisation pathway. Comparatively less attention is given to the ecosystem around them. Internationally, innovation performance tracks the strength of the networks connecting researchers, entrepreneurs, investors, industry and government, and those networks are built deliberately, through innovation precincts, cluster development and cross-sector collaboration mechanisms. We ask that the final Strategy treat collaboration infrastructure as a productivity investment.

On commercialisation, the Strategy would benefit from naming the practical mechanisms: founder support and founder capability, investor readiness, industry challenge programs, procurement pathways that give young companies an early customer, and assistance for early-stage and scaling businesses to reach capital, markets and customers. Business formation also begins in places the current framing does not reach, with people moving from industry expertise or a community-identified problem into a new enterprise rather than from a research institution. Also, innovation is not solely technological. Service design, social innovation, community partnerships and new delivery models improve participation, workforce outcomes and resilience, and therefore belong in the Strategy's definition.

**Where the Strategy understates our strengths**

Alongside the Partnership's three economic development priorities, the capital city carries specialisations that warrant naming in a statewide strategy: Antarctic research and the blue economy; creative technology and events; the night-time and visitor economy; and health and medical research. Each is export-facing or visitor-facing, each concentrates talent, and each is already the subject of adopted council strategy.

Creative and cultural industries receive little discussion in the draft, yet they drive innovation, talent attraction, productivity and place competitiveness, and in Greater Hobart they are among the clearest reasons people choose to move here and stay.

The circular economy is barely referenced, despite its potential to create new markets, reduce input costs and lift resource productivity across construction, manufacturing, food systems and resource recovery. We ask that it be recognised as an economic development opportunity, not just an environmental one. The circular, blue and night-time economies, artificial intelligence adoption, and inclusive cultural assets that attract and retain key workers have all been identified as emerging priorities for the next phase of the Greater Hobart 30-Year Plan.

## PRIORITY 3: LIFTING PRODUCTIVITY

Improved access to higher-quality public datasets, to enable public and private digital tools to support faster and better planning and regulatory processes, is strongly supported. This is one of the most practical initiatives in the draft, and councils are both major users and major generators of the data involved. We would participate readily in its design.

We would go further and say that public data should be treated as economic infrastructure. It enables investment confidence, business decision-making, planning efficiency and market transparency, and like other infrastructure, it needs deliberate investment and clear stewardship. The practical step is to identify the priority datasets with the highest economic value and establish consistent governance arrangements for their maintenance, licensing and use, rather than releasing data opportunistically.

For example, recent sector analysis found multiple organisations independently collecting equivalent or overlapping publicly funded environmental data for the Derwent estuary, covering monitoring, water quality sampling and habitat mapping, with no default position that such data be publicly available. Making it open by default would reduce duplication, improve the consistency of environmental assessment across the sector, and speed up planning decisions for the kind of waterfront and industrial development the Strategy wants to see. Much of the available productivity gain lies in practical initiatives of this kind, even if they attract little attention.

On red tape, we support the intent, but note the initiative does not indicate where the focus will fall. Cumulative regulatory burden arises across State and local requirements together, and the most useful reform will be identified through the development services working group proposed above, working from live cases rather than from general propositions.

Reliable, affordable digital connectivity should be named explicitly as essential economic infrastructure rather than treated as a precondition in passing, because regional connectivity gaps continue to constrain productivity, business growth and service delivery, and closing them requires coordinated State and Commonwealth investment. While the focus on Tasmania's largest service sectors is appropriate, the Strategy should also acknowledge productivity opportunities in agriculture, aquaculture, forestry and food production, which remain critical to the economies immediately adjoining Greater Hobart and to the regions the Strategy is trying to activate.

## PRIORITY 4: ACTIVATING OUR REGIONS

This is the priority in which our offer sits, and we support each of its proposed initiatives: improved regional economic, development, liveability and demographic data; alignment of regional partnerships and regional capability building; joint identification of regional strengths, workforce needs, catalytic infrastructure and land use barriers; and a rolling mechanism on land supply.

**Delivering on the intent of the Hobart City Deal**

The Hobart City Deal, signed in February 2019, was Australia's first capital city deal and remains the largest coordinated investment program in the region's history, growing from around $1.4 billion in original commitments to roughly $2.5 billion by 2022. It is the clearest available evidence that place-based, multi-year agreements work in Tasmania, and that this region can deliver against them.

The achievements are substantial. Border services at Hobart Airport were funded and direct international flights commenced in 2021, catalysing a further $130 million runway program and a privately funded $200 million terminal expansion. Up to $470.9 million was committed to Antarctic stations and Hobart-based capability, RSV Nuyina arrived at its home berth, the Antarctic Facilities Zone at Macquarie Point was remediated, and the Southern Ocean Research Aquarium is being delivered at IMAS Taroona. The Bridgewater Bridge opened in 2025 and the South East Traffic Package is substantially complete. The Derwent ferry service moved from trial to permanent operation with three new terminals in delivery. Precinct plans have been adopted across all four councils, the Medium Density Design Guidelines were released, and 134 social housing dwellings were delivered. The Glenorchy Jobs Hub has produced 1,340 employment outcomes, and Connected Hobart delivered more than 60 smart-city initiatives now embedded as ordinary services. The Greater Hobart Act 2019, a legislated framework for metropolitan collaboration, has outlived the Deal's original structures and continues to generate shared work programs.

The Deal remains legally in force to February 2029, major projects continue to be delivered under it, and no equivalent Commonwealth policy has replaced it. That creates an immediate opportunity, and the partners are moving to take it up through a completion pathway with four elements: re-baselining remaining commitments, funding and delivery responsibilities; selecting a small number of priority completion projects; restoring annual public reporting to 2029 with a standing item on the Greater Hobart Committee agenda; and using the completion record to shape a successor agreement.

The priority completion projects most relevant to this Strategy are a renewed focus on activating the Northern Suburbs Transit Corridor, anchored by the Rapid Bus Network detailed business case and the corridor's potential for transit-oriented housing and employment growth; expansion of the Derwent ferry network; resolution of the Southern Outlet transit lane and Tasman Bridge upgrade pathways; converting the enabled precincts into medium-density housing completions across all four councils; and defining the public-facing Antarctic and science elements at Macquarie Point. Each of these is an economic project as much as an infrastructure project, and each would be strengthened by explicit alignment with this Strategy.

We ask that the final Strategy commit to joint advocacy for completion of the Deal, and for a successor multi-year investment agreement for Greater Hobart negotiated to commence on expiry in February 2029. Given the negotiating lead time, and the volume of Commonwealth fiscal decisions falling due in 2029-30, we ask that the State commit to opening successor discussions during 2027 rather than approaching expiry.

**Development-ready land is not the same as zoned land**

The Strategy should distinguish clearly between development-ready land and zoned land. Across Greater Hobart and the municipalities adjoining it, infrastructure servicing capacity (water, sewer, power, stormwater and road access) is now a greater constraint on housing and industrial land supply than the availability of zoned land. The 30-Year Plan identifies capacity for over 34,000 dwellings inside the current Urban Growth Boundary against anticipated demand of 30,000. The binding constraint is not zoned area. A land supply mechanism that counts hectares zoned without testing servicing capacity will overstate readiness and understate the investment required to unlock it. We ask that *development-ready land* be the unit of measurement, and that the rolling mechanism proposed at page 32 be designed accordingly.

**A consistent community benefit framework**

The draft references wider economic and social benefits and community benefit arrangements, building on approaches developed for major renewable energy investments. We support extending that thinking, and suggest the Strategy establish a consistent framework for assessing the public value generated by major investments, covering workforce pathways, local procurement, capability development and broader economic participation. A common framework benefits proponents as much as communities, because it tells investors what will be expected of them before they commit rather than after. Macquarie Point is the logical place to apply it first.

**The capital city region is a distinct case**

Australia's capital cities occupy 0.03 per cent of the nation's landmass, generate 22.5 per cent of GDP and support more than 3.2 million jobs. They are national economic infrastructure, and investment in them returns economy-wide productivity gains rather than purely local benefits. Greater Hobart performs that role for Tasmania, and its infrastructure and housing capacity constrains or enables growth well beyond its boundaries. The Strategy should recognise the capital city region as a distinct regional case rather than one region among several.

**How the region is funded**

The Strategy's partner lever should extend to how the region is funded. Independent analysis of the Tasmanian and Federal Government Grants Database (SGS Economics and Planning, January 2026) found that Greater Hobart councils received 11.6 per cent of all tied grant funding awarded directly to Tasmanian councils between 2016 and 2025 ($34.9 million of $300.1 million). Each Greater Hobart council received on average $8.7 million over the decade, against $10.6 million for each non-metropolitan council. On a per capita basis that's $22 per resident in 2024, against $98 per resident in non-metropolitan council areas.

We do not put this forward as an argument that funding should follow population or economic output. We support fiscal equalisation, and we support it at both tiers of government. Our point is narrower: current funding formulas weight resident population, road length and geographic dispersion, and do not adequately account for functional population, employment concentration or non-resident service use. Those three factors define a capital city's cost structure, and represent cost disabilities rather than capacity advantages.

The Productivity Commission's August 2026 interim report on GST distribution reforms confirms that Commonwealth payments to local government, whether made directly or passed through the State, are excluded from the GST distribution because they are treated as not supporting state-government service delivery.

Commonwealth funding directed to Greater Hobart councils therefore does not reduce Tasmania's GST share. State support for council-directed Commonwealth investment in this region carries no fiscal cost to the State, creating scope for joint State and regional advocacy. We raise it because it removes a longstanding obstacle rather than creating a new one.

The report is also relevant to how a successor to the Hobart City Deal should be framed. Its interim recommendations discourage low-value Commonwealth funding agreements with highly localised benefits, and favour consolidation of many small schedules into fewer multi-year agreements. A successor agreement presented as a locality arrangement is exposed to that reasoning; the same agreement framed against national objectives (such as Australia's Antarctic and Southern Ocean gateway, National Housing Accord delivery, national urban policy, and the capital-city services Greater Hobart provides for Tasmania) is more closely aligned with the Commission's direction. We ask that the State adopt this framing in future joint advocacy.

Our argument is not to redirect funding away from other regions. Rather, we support transparent, needs-based funding that properly recognises capital city functions, and multi-year, place-based investment agreements as the standard mechanism in place of fragmented short-term grant rounds. Competitive application processes, co-contribution requirements and reporting obligations disadvantage resource-constrained councils, and tied funding is often disconnected from local priorities and unaccompanied by operational support. We would welcome the Strategy recognising these challenges.

## PRIORITY 5: GROWING OUR CAPABILITY

We support improving the accessibility and currency of public-facing workforce, training and regional labour market data, and we call for a Tasmanian Government workforce plan to sit alongside it. The shortage of skilled workers in the housing and construction sector is acute and is not currently being addressed at the scale required. It directly limits the housing supply on which the Strategy's regional, participation and investment ambitions depend, and it also constrains councils' capacity in planning, engineering and infrastructure delivery.

Workforce capability should also be considered alongside housing, transport, childcare, health services and liveability. Attracting and retaining workers is a whole-of-government problem rather than a skills problem, and the Strategy's analysis of participation barriers (page 8) acknowledges this. The capability priority should be written to match. We also support continued place-based employment models, including the Jobs Hub networks operating at Glenorchy, Brighton and Sorell, which connect local employers with local workforce opportunities and respond to conditions in specific labour markets.

The Strategy would also benefit from a stronger emphasis on talent attraction and retention, covering graduate retention, founder attraction, researcher attraction and skilled migration outcomes. These groups make a disproportionate contribution to innovation, business formation and growth relative to their number, and they are the most mobile part of the workforce. It's particularly applicable to early-career Antarctic and marine scientists trained here who leave at the moment they would begin contributing to Tasmanian businesses and research partnerships. Retaining them is local value capture, and it depends on the housing, transport, cultural and community infrastructure that councils deliver.

GHCP is exploring the possibility of a partnership with the Melbourne Polytechnic Future of Housing Construction Centre of Excellence to modernise construction training, research and materials for medium-density delivery. We would welcome the State's involvement, and see it as a ready-made demonstration of the alignment between skills, housing and economic policy the Strategy seeks.

## PRIORITY 6: STRENGTHENING INFRASTRUCTURE

We strongly support developing an infrastructure pricing and developer contribution approach, consistent with the Future of Local Government Review, provided it is developed collaboratively with councils from the outset rather than presented for comment once designed. The City of Hobart's *Housing Action Plan* calls for the State Government to join its *Inner City Housing Supply Incentive Policy*, which is an available starting point.

Incentives intended to direct supply toward well-located land will need to be substantial to counterbalance market tendencies to develop on the urban fringe, and the draft would benefit from more detail on the levers that can be employed. The incentives should not be tied to a simplification of planning assessment that fails to account for genuine site constraints such as vegetation, heritage and topography, because that would trade a short-term supply gain for long-term cost.

We also note that headworks and enabling infrastructure costs, and the sequencing of utility investment, are among the most binding constraints on medium-density housing delivery in Greater Hobart. Earlier coordination between councils, utilities and government would unlock supply at relatively low public cost, and is work we are already convening.

The Strategy should also name the enablers. Transport, water and sewer, energy, telecommunications and stormwater should be explicitly recognised as enabling economic infrastructure underpinning housing delivery, industrial land development and private investment, not as separate utility matters. The draft also refers to Infrastructure Tasmania, government businesses and a range of strategic frameworks without explaining how they will coordinate delivery between them. Greater clarity on governance, responsibilities and accountability would strengthen implementation, and would give councils and other proponents a clear line of sight to who decides what.

## Implementation and investment readiness

The Strategy would benefit from a clear implementation framework identifying lead agencies, delivery partners, governance arrangements, performance measures and annual public reporting. Strong implementation will be as important as the strategic direction itself, and the draft is presently stronger on direction than on delivery. Greater Hobart has developed this capability. The region is ready to report against a State framework because it is already building one to align with the Greater Hobart Committee Work Program.

We also suggest adopting “investment readiness” as a guiding principle throughout, meaning the recognition that successful investment depends on coordinated planning, enabling infrastructure, workforce capability, serviced land and effective collaboration across government. It’s a useful discipline because it names preconditions rather than ambitions, and because it makes each partner in the chain visible to the others.

Connecting the two, the Strategy gives limited consideration to place-based economic development as a delivery mechanism. Cities, precincts and strategic employment centres are where talent, investment, knowledge and infrastructure concentrate, and where statewide priorities become real (or not). The draft is strong on sectoral and statewide direction and lighter on where it will land. Naming demonstration environments (places where investment attraction, workforce, innovation and infrastructure initiatives can be coordinated, evaluated and then scaled) would give the Strategy the practical delivery settings its goals require, and would enable measurable outcomes and cross-agency coordination.

Underpinning all of this, the Strategy should explicitly recognise local government as a strategic delivery partner in economic development. Councils are not only planning authorities. They undertake strategic land use planning, deliver enabling infrastructure, facilitate development, support housing growth and create investment-ready communities. A strategy that treats councils principally as a regulatory step will under-use the capability available to it, and will find its regional ambitions harder to deliver than they need to be.

## National and international alignment

A Greater Hobart chapter would make the Strategy more fundable. The Partnership's focus areas already map onto Australian Government policy: the National Urban Policy and the Regional Investment Framework; the National Housing Accord, Housing Australia Future Fund and Housing Support Program; the Infrastructure Investment Program and the National Freight and Supply Chain Strategy; Future Made in Australia, the National Reconstruction Fund and the Industry Growth Program, each bearing directly on the region's Antarctic, marine and sustainable advanced industries; and the Australian Antarctic Strategy and 20 Year Action Plan, currently under Commonwealth review. A State and regional partnership presenting agreed priorities with evidence behind them is the strongest configuration for capturing those programs.

**An international pathway now open to the region**

Greater Hobart is one of only two Australian regional groupings established under the European Union's International Urban and Regional Cooperation (IURC) program. This is a significant opportunity. It gives the region a standing relationship with European city and regional partners, a structured pathway into reciprocal exchange and study visits, and a credible platform from which to form consortia.

Work is now underway to convert it. A blue economy cluster and living lab initiative in the Port of Hobart, developed by the City of Hobart with TasPorts and European partners including Catalonia's blue economy network, is progressing toward consortium formation. It demonstrates the kind of place-based innovation and testing proposition the region can offer internationally, using the working port as the demonstration environment, and it opens a route to significant Horizon Europe funding opportunities, which will become more accessible to Australian participants from 2027.

The Strategy's trade, investment and innovation levers, applied alongside an existing EU relationship and an established consortium pathway, would give Tasmanian businesses and researchers access to funding, markets and collaborators that no single council can secure. We ask that the final Strategy recognise international research and innovation funding, including Horizon Europe, as a deliberate target rather than an incidental opportunity, and that Greater Hobart's IURC standing be used as the vehicle.

## Measuring what matters

We endorse the principle of measuring outcomes rather than activity, with public reporting through rolling action plans. For a demonstration region, meaningful measures might include private investment facilitated and delivered; approval timeframes at each stage of the development services system; net additional well-located dwellings, including medium-density completions and progress against the 30-Year Plan's 70:30 infill target; development-ready industrial and residential land; participation and workforce measures; talent attraction and retention, including graduate and researcher retention; and the share of priority-sector procurement value retained in the region. Housing supply and land readiness indicators should sit alongside the workforce and investment measures rather than in a separate housing frame, because that is how they operate in practice.

Status reporting should state why an action matters, the risk if it is not delivered, the practical outcome achieved and the recommended next step, not simply whether it is complete. Greater Hobart has adopted that format for its own progress reporting.

## What we ask

GHCP requests that the final Strategy and its first action plan:

### 1. RECOGNISE THE REGION AND ITS PARTNERS

- **Name Greater Hobart as an early demonstration region** for the Strategy's regional method, with a defined work program, named leads and timeframes.
- **Recognise local government as a strategic delivery partner** in economic development, not only as planning authority, but as strategic land use planner, provider of enabling infrastructure, facilitator of development and builder of investment-ready communities.
- **Recognise GHCP and the Greater Hobart Act 2019 governance structures**, being the Greater Hobart Committee and Advisory Group, as the delivery mechanism for the functional region, rather than establishing parallel arrangements.
- **Co-design the demonstration region arrangement with GHCP**, covering roles, first priorities, resourcing, measures and a 12-to-24-month work program, so that what is agreed is specific rather than in principle.
- **Recognise the capital city region as a distinct regional case**, reflecting its statewide functions and its role as national economic infrastructure.

### 2. MAKE IMPLEMENTATION AS STRONG AS THE DIRECTION

- **Publish an implementation framework** identifying lead agencies, delivery partners, governance arrangements, performance measures and annual public reporting.
- **Adopt investment readiness as a guiding principle** throughout the Strategy, recognising that successful investment depends on coordinated planning, enabling infrastructure, workforce capability, serviced land and effective collaboration across government.
- **Recognise place-based economic development as a delivery mechanism**, and name demonstration environments where investment attraction, workforce, innovation and infrastructure initiatives can be coordinated, evaluated and scaled.
- **Include a regional dimension in the Strategy's key indicators** and public reporting, and give regional partnerships defined governance, roles, measurable outcomes and ongoing local government participation.
- **Provide a further round of engagement with councils** once the proposed initiatives are more fully defined, before they are settled in the first action plan.

## 3. REFORM AND RESOURCE THE DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM

- **Establish the development services system working group** with councils, the State Planning Office, the Tasmanian Planning Commission, utilities and industry, and resource the Commission and the State Planning Office to deliver the reform program the Strategy depends on.
- **Frame reform as reform of the whole development system**, covering referral agencies, infrastructure providers, digital systems and application quality, not council assessment processes alone.
- **Clarify that investment facilitation assists proponents to navigate approvals**, coordinating agencies and councils rather than creating an alternative pathway, and that streamlining will be justifiable at every scale of development.
- **Involve councils in Economic Future Act consultation from the outset**, clarify the Act's purpose, implementation status and relationship to existing planning and economic frameworks, and settle early how an integrated major-project pathway will interact with regional land use strategies and local planning schemes.
- **Reword the treatment of environmental and heritage approvals** so the Strategy identifies process fragmentation, not community values, as the problem to be solved.

## 4. FUND THE ENABLERS

- **Co-design the infrastructure pricing and developer contribution framework with councils** from the outset, and use Greater Hobart to test incentives for well-located housing supply.
- **Measure development-ready land, not zoned land**, and explicitly recognise transport, water and sewer, energy, telecommunications and stormwater as enabling economic infrastructure, with clear accountability for how Infrastructure Tasmania and government businesses coordinate delivery.
- **Treat public data as economic infrastructure**, identifying the priority datasets with the highest economic value and setting consistent governance for their maintenance and use.
- **Fund the Greater Hobart land release and infrastructure monitoring program**, together with the other shared data and digital foundations set out in Appendix A, and build them for statewide reuse. The method is designed and the dashboard is built. What is missing is funding.
- **Adopt Macquarie Point and the working waterfront as the Strategy's demonstration precinct, and the Northern Suburbs Transit Corridor as a complementary demonstration corridor**, aligned with the TasPorts and precinct master planning processes already underway, and with a benefit-sharing program that returns value across all four municipalities.
- **Establish a consistent community benefit framework** for assessing the public value of major investments, covering workforce pathways, local procurement, capability development and broader economic participation.

## 5. BACK THE SECTORS, THE WORKFORCE AND THE REGION'S FUNDING

- **Name Antarctic and marine industries as a priority sector** within the Strategy, aligned with the new Tasmanian Antarctic Gateway Strategy and the GHCP Strategic Plan, and support GHCP to facilitate the regional coordination initiatives set out in this submission, with resourcing to match. We propose the sector as the first practical demonstration of the partnership model.
- **Recognise the innovation ecosystem alongside commercialisation**, including innovation precincts, clusters and cross-sector collaboration, and align with the proposed Greater Hobart Innovation Precinct. Back founder capability, investor readiness, industry challenge programs and procurement pathways for young companies.
- **Name the sectors and capabilities the draft under-weights**: creative and cultural industries, creative technology and events, the night-time and visitor economy, health and medical research, and the circular economy as an economic development opportunity.
- **Target international research and innovation funding, including Horizon Europe**, using Greater Hobart's standing as one of only two Australian regional groupings under the EU International Urban and Regional Cooperation program.
- **Commit to a Tasmanian Government workforce plan**, with early attention to the housing and construction workforce, treating workforce capability alongside housing, transport, childcare, health services and liveability, strengthening talent attraction and retention, and sustaining place-based employment models including the Jobs Hub network.
- **Commit to a progressive opportunity-development process across the region's three economic priorities, and to co-producing a Greater Hobart Investment Prospectus** as the first regional prospectus under the Strategy, sequenced after the discovery work described in Appendix A.
- **Commit to joint advocacy to the Australian Government** for completion of the Hobart City Deal and a successor place-based agreement that recognises Greater Hobart's capital city role.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this submission, and to begin work on any element of it immediately.

Yours sincerely,

**Cr Brendan Blomeley**
**Mayor, City of Clarence**

**Ald Sue Hickey**
**Mayor, City of Glenorchy**

**Cr Anna Reynolds**
**Lord Mayor, City of Hobart**

**Cr Christian Street**
**A/Mayor, Kingborough Council**

# Appendix A: What we propose to deliver in partnership

*Six pieces of work GHCP proposes to deliver with the Tasmanian Government under the first action plan. Each requires State partnership and most require co-investment. Scope, sequencing and funding shares to be settled jointly; where another organisation is better placed to lead or deliver, we say so.*

| Proposal | What it involves | Strategy alignment | Lead, partners and status |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Greater Hobart Antarctic and marine industries study** | • Extends across all four municipalities the sector mapping method already tested within the Hobart local government area, covering research, the working port, marine and vessel services, primary production, specialist supply chains, professional services, governance bodies and marine tourism.<br>• Captures the parts of the system currently outside the boundary: vessel servicing, refit and polar equipment manufacturing at Prince of Wales Bay; Antarctic aviation and air freight at Cambridge; the AAD headquarters at Kingston and the IMAS campus at Taroona.<br>• Produces a single defensible economic contribution figure for Greater Hobart's Antarctic and marine industries on a consistent method, and identifies where value is captured or lost.<br>• Scopes the regional initiatives the existing analysis identifies as unowned: an Antarctic and marine industries capability register; local environmental analytical capacity; port, freight and precinct coordination; the working waterfront narrative; and restoration funding pathways.<br>• Outcome: an economic development agenda and practical workplan, and a place-based evidence base serving both this Strategy and the new Antarctic Gateway Strategy. | • Priority 2: emerging domains including autonomous marine systems, sensing and engineering for extreme environments (p25).<br>• Priority 4: identification of regional strengths and catalytic opportunities (p32).<br>• Sector alignment: Tasmanian Antarctic Gateway Strategy; GHCP focus area 5 (Antarctic and marine industries). | Lead: split by capability. GHCP convenes the four councils and leads the place-based dimension.<br>Industry-facing components, being supplier connections, procurement opportunity development and the capability register, sit with the Tasmanian Polar Network and the sector's established networks, resourced accordingly.<br>Partners: Antarctic Tasmania, AAD, UTAS/IMAS, CSIRO, TasPorts, Hobart Airport, TPN members, four councils.<br>Status: method proven at municipal scale; regional extension ready to scope. Co-investment sought. |
| **2. Development services system working group** | • A standing group of councils, the State Planning Office, the Tasmanian Planning Commission, utilities and industry, addressing the development services system as a whole rather than in parts.<br>• Prioritised work program with named leads and timeframes; barriers identified, tracked and publicly reported as they are removed. | • Priority 1: working with councils, industry and the planning sector to streamline assessments and improve consistency (p20).<br>• Priority 1: ongoing identification and review of statutory, regulatory and procedural barriers, with findings reported publicly (p20). | Lead: joint, GHCP and the State Planning Office.<br>Partners: four councils, TPC, TasWater, TasNetworks, industry bodies, LGAT.<br>Status: can commence immediately. City of Hobart has sought this arrangement for some time. |

| Proposal | What it involves | Strategy alignment | Lead, partners and status |
|---|---|---|---|
| | • Works from live cases and real applications, giving the Strategy an evidence base for regulatory reform grounded in practice. | • Priority 3: reducing red tape that constrains productivity (p28). | |
| **3. Greater Hobart Investment Prospectus** | • A regional investment proposition built on clearly defined investment opportunities and an explicit view of the private capital being sought.<br>• Sequenced after the discovery work in proposals 1 and 4, so the product is a prospectus rather than a regional brochure.<br>• Packages the strongest opportunities across the region's three economic priorities into a single narrative for domestic and international investors. | • Priority 1: "sharper sector and regional investment prospectuses, aligned to this Strategy's priorities" (p19).<br>• Priority 1: strengthening market-facing investment engagement and closing information gaps (p20).<br>• GHCP focus area 5: build a stronger Greater Hobart investment narrative. | Lead: GHCP with the Office of the Coordinator-General and the Department.<br>Partners: four councils, Brand Tasmania, RDA Tasmania, industry and investor networks.<br>Status: ready to scope. Dependent on proposals 1 and 4. |
| **4. Shared data and digital foundations** | • Fund the Greater Hobart land release and infrastructure monitoring program, prioritised under the 30-Year Plan but still unfunded, tracking approvals, subdivisions and completed dwellings on consistent definitions.<br>• Sustain the infrastructure capacity mapping as a live regional dataset, resolving the water and sewerage capacity gap and putting it in councils' hands.<br>• Specify and deliver the digital planning outcome councils and industry need: find the rules that apply to a site, lodge once, track progress across every agency; planning data open and machine-readable.<br>• Instrument Macquarie Point and specify the architecture once, for affordable replication in Rosny Park, Glenorchy and Kingston.<br>• Deliver technology-adoption and digital skills programs through council business networks, the Jobs Hubs and education partners.<br>• Also serves as the pilot of the Strategy's proposed rolling mechanism on land supply. | • Priority 3: improved access to higher-quality public datasets; technology adoption and digital skills (p28).<br>• Priority 4: improved regional data and projections; rolling land supply mechanism (p32).<br>• Decision-making principles: measuring outcomes, not activity (p12). | Lead: joint, GHCP and the Department, with Infrastructure Tasmania and the State Planning Office.<br>Partners: four councils, TasWater, TasNetworks, RDA Tasmania, LGAT, Treasury, industry and education partners.<br>Status: method designed and dashboard built. Funding is the missing element. Built once for statewide reuse, and available to Launceston and the North-West. |
| **5. Macquarie Point and the working waterfront as demonstration precinct** | • Aligns the precinct master planning already underway: the Macquarie Point Development Corporation precinct work, the TasPorts Macquarie Wharves and Sullivans Cove master plan, | • Priority 1: coordinated investment facilitation for major projects and precincts (p20). | Lead: Tasmanian Government with the Macquarie Point Development Corporation; GHCP as regional partner on benefit-sharing and precinct alignment. |

| Proposal | What it involves | Strategy alignment | Lead, partners and status |
|---|---|---|---|
| | and the CSIRO Battery Point site planning, with councils at the table as planning authorities.<br>• Used as a strategic lens across all five GHCP focus areas rather than as a single project.<br>• 30-Year Plan: precinct planning, land use protection for port and gateway functions, and infrastructure sequencing tested at scale.<br>• Housing: precinct workforce demand used to demonstrate medium-density typologies, modern methods of construction and infrastructure sequencing.<br>• Transport: precinct access planned as regional infrastructure, covering ferry expansion, the Rapid Bus Network business case, port freight and heavy vehicle routing, and event-day operations that leave a permanent network uplift.<br>• Sport and culture: precinct venues and programming connected to regional planning, together with the public-facing Antarctic and Science Precinct commitment.<br>• Economic development: procurement that grows Tasmanian supplier participation, and a clear economic narrative connecting the stadium, the Antarctic gateway and the science precinct. | • Priority 4: housing, land readiness and infrastructure sequencing as economic enablers; community benefit arrangements (p31).<br>• Priority 6: coordinating economic priorities, infrastructure investment and land readiness (p40). | Partners: four councils, TasPorts, CSIRO, Homes Tasmania, State Growth, event and cultural bodies.<br>Note: member councils hold a range of views on individual precinct elements. The shared position is that committed investment should now return region-wide value. |
| **6. Medium-density housing and enabling infrastructure demonstration** | • Councils, industry and utilities working together on delivery barriers: planning consistency, headworks and development costs, infrastructure sequencing and feasibility.<br>• Test site for the infrastructure pricing and developer contribution approach, and for incentives directing supply to well-located land.<br>• Explores modern methods of construction and the construction skills pipeline, including a possible partnership with the Melbourne Polytechnic Future of Housing Construction Centre of Excellence. | • Priority 4: housing supply, land readiness and infrastructure sequencing treated as economic enablers (p31).<br>• Priority 6: infrastructure pricing and developer contribution approach, consistent with the Future of Local Government Review (p40).<br>• Priority 5: construction workforce capability (p36). | Lead: GHCP (focus area 2), with the Department and Homes Tasmania.<br>Partners: four councils, TasWater, TasNetworks, HIA/MBA and developers, Melbourne Polytechnic.<br>Status: workstream already underway; ready to be adopted as the Strategy's demonstration site. |

# Appendix B: Detailed comments on the consultation draft

*Consolidated comments from GHCP member councils, and from Sorell Council as an adjoining growth council, against the directions and potential initiatives on which views were sought. Page references are to the Consultation Draft.*

| Strategy reference | GHCP comment | Raised by |
|---|---|---|
| **Overall strategic direction**<br>Private investment, productivity, innovation and workforce participation | Supportive of the Strategy and its strategic direction, particularly the focus on increasing private investment, productivity, innovation and workforce participation. | Clarence |
| **Planning reform**<br>Referenced throughout the draft | The principal area of interest from a local government perspective. Planning, land use and regulatory review are raised repeatedly, suggesting the government is opening the door to planning reform. Councils are not opposed, but support depends on what is actually proposed. We ask to be engaged on the scope of any reform before it is settled. | Clarence |
| **Integrated pathway for major investment**<br>Priority 1, p19 | Agreed that splitting building matters from planning matters under the State Planning Provisions has kicked the can down the road for developers. A return to an integrated system, allowing all relevant matters to be considered at one time, would be an improvement.<br>Concern that the passage appears to treat heritage and environmental values as "complicating" outcomes. This conflicts with the essence of the Strategy, which promotes the economic value Tasmania derives from its unique qualities, including its clean and green status. We recommend rewording so the problem identified is process fragmentation, not the values being protected. | Glenorchy |
| **Economic Future Act: "faster to yes, or faster to no"**<br>Priority 1, p19 | It is unclear why larger projects should be subject to a clearer (or less stringent) assessment than smaller projects, nor why the process for smaller investors should be more complex than for larger ones. Any streamlining of requirements or processes should be justifiable at all scales, or if anything more stringent for larger projects that carry greater potential impact. | Glenorchy |
| **List of potential initiatives**<br>Priority 1, p20 | Several initiatives are difficult to comment on meaningfully, being quite vague as to their intention. A further round of engagement with councils is sought once initiatives are more fully defined. | Glenorchy |
| **Coordinated investment facilitation system**<br>Priority 1, p20 | Generally supportive of a coordinated investment system that simplifies delivery of larger projects by helping proponents navigate approvals. This needs to be a front door rather than a back door approach, so that the usual approval standards and processes still apply, particularly consultation with councils and local communities. The system should help navigate approvals, not water them down. | Glenorchy |

| Strategy reference | GHCP comment | Raised by |
|---|---|---|
| **More predictable and faster rezoning pathways**<br>Priority 1, p20 | Strongly support clear timeframes for amendments through the Tasmanian Planning Commission, but the TPC must be properly resourced to deliver them. | Hobart |
| **More predictable and faster rezoning pathways**<br>Priority 1, p20 | It is unclear why the term "predictable" is used. LUPAA clearly identifies the pathway for rezoning. Predictability implies the outcome is known, that is, predetermined, whereas the purpose of an assessment is to determine whether a proposal is appropriate (see STRLUS and the Tasmanian Planning Policies for scope). How is rezoning to be made more predictable without undermining the purpose of assessment?<br>On "faster": additional support and resourcing for the TPC could bring hearing dates closer to the time a council lodges its report on representations. | Glenorchy |
| **Streamlining planning assessments with councils and industry**<br>Priority 1, p20 | Local government commits to working with the State to address all parts of the development services system to support further development. The City of Hobart has been calling for a working group to enable this in a systematic and properly prioritised way. The State Planning Office must be properly resourced for this to occur. (See recent CEO correspondence and action 3.10 of the City of Hobart Housing Action Plan.) | Hobart |
| **Streamlining planning assessments with councils and industry**<br>Priority 1, p20 | Support an appropriate review of the State Planning Provisions, noting the State Planning Office has been seeking to achieve this for some time but appears under-resourced.<br>Concerns remain about "streamlining" planning by separating it from other regulatory requirements such as building, pushing matters that could have been resolved at the planning stage to the building stage, and potentially back again, with no benefit to the customer. | Glenorchy |
| **Ongoing review of statutory, regulatory and procedural barriers**<br>Priority 1, p20 | Supported, consistent with the comments above. It is noted that the effort to create a single permit for new business appears to add, rather than remove, layers of effort for new business. We would welcome working through that experience with the responsible agency. | Hobart, Glenorchy |
| **Improved access to higher-quality public datasets**<br>Priority 3, p28 | Strongly supported. Councils are both major users and major generators of the data involved, and would participate readily in the design of this initiative. | Hobart, Glenorchy |
| **Continuing to reduce red tape**<br>Priority 3, p28 | Support the reduction of red tape, consistent with the comments on regulatory barriers above. However it is unclear where the focus of this initiative lies, and further clarity is requested. Cumulative burden arises across State and local requirements together and is best identified from live cases. | Hobart, Glenorchy |
| **Improved regional economic, development, liveability and demographic data**<br>Priority 4, p32 | Supported. Greater Hobart offers to pilot this work for the functional region. | Glenorchy |

| Strategy reference | GHCP comment | Raised by |
|---|---|---|
| **Rolling mechanism on land supply; accelerating strategic land-use planning**<br>Priority 4, p32 | It is unclear what this initiative seeks to achieve in respect of "accelerating the pace of strategic land use planning". If the intent is to appropriately resource the State Planning Office and the TPC to undertake and assess strategic planning work, it is supported. | Glenorchy |
| **Accessibility and currency of workforce and labour market data**<br>Priority 5, p36 | We call for a Tasmanian Government workforce plan. There is a shortage of skilled workers in the housing sector which is not being addressed, and it directly limits the housing supply on which the Strategy's regional and investment ambitions depend. | Hobart |
| **Infrastructure pricing and developer contribution approach**<br>Priority 6, p40 | Strongly support, and support implementation of developer contributions. Noting action 1.3 of the City of Hobart Housing Action Plan, which calls for the State Government to join the Inner City Housing Supply Incentive Policy, an available starting point.<br>The framework should be developed collaboratively with councils from the outset, rather than presented for comment once designed. | Hobart, Glenorchy, Clarence |
| **Infrastructure pricing and developer contribution approach**<br>Priority 6, p40 | More information would be useful on the levers to incentivise supply of new housing and development in well-located areas. These incentives will likely need to be significant to counterbalance market tendencies to develop land on the urban fringe.<br>Incentives should not be tied to an oversimplification of planning assessment and approvals that fails to account for relevant site constraints, such as vegetation and heritage. | Glenorchy |
| **Local government as a delivery partner**<br>Throughout | The Strategy should explicitly recognise local government as a strategic delivery partner in economic development. Councils are not only planning authorities; they also undertake strategic land use planning, deliver enabling infrastructure, facilitate development, support housing growth and create investment-ready communities. | Sorell* |
| **Governance and implementation**<br>Throughout | The Strategy would benefit from a clear implementation framework identifying lead agencies, delivery partners, governance arrangements, performance measures and annual public reporting. Strong implementation will be as important as the strategic direction itself. | Sorell* |
| **Investment readiness**<br>Throughout | Consider adopting "investment readiness" as a guiding principle throughout the Strategy, recognising that successful investment depends on coordinated planning, enabling infrastructure, workforce capability, serviced land and effective collaboration across government. | Sorell* |

| Strategy reference | GHCP comment | Raised by |
|---|---|---|
| **Coordinated investment facilitation**<br>Priority 1, p20 | Support the proposed investment facilitation model. The "front door" should coordinate agencies and councils rather than create an alternative approvals pathway. Early engagement with councils will improve project outcomes and reduce delays. | Sorell* |
| **Planning reform: scope**<br>Priority 1, p20 | Planning reform should address the entire development system, including referral agencies, infrastructure providers, digital systems and application quality, rather than focusing solely on local government assessment processes. | Sorell* |
| **Development-ready land**<br>Priorities 1 and 4, pp20, 31 | The Strategy should distinguish between zoned land and development-ready land. Across many municipalities, infrastructure servicing capacity is now a greater constraint on housing and industrial land supply than land availability. | Sorell* |
| **Regional partnerships**<br>Priority 4, p31 | Regional collaboration varies across Tasmania. The Strategy should establish clearer governance arrangements, defined roles, measurable outcomes and ongoing local government participation in regional partnerships. | Sorell* |
| **Regional advocacy**<br>Priority 4, p31 | Regional advocacy frameworks should align with the Economic Diversification and Investment Strategy, to provide a consistent evidence base for infrastructure advocacy and regional investment priorities. | Sorell* |
| **Regional industries**<br>Priority 3, p26 | While focusing on major service sectors is appropriate, the Strategy should also recognise productivity opportunities within agriculture, aquaculture, forestry and food production, which remain critical to many regional economies. | Sorell* |
| **Digital connectivity**<br>Priority 3, p27 | Digital connectivity should be recognised as essential economic infrastructure. Regional connectivity gaps continue to constrain productivity, business growth and service delivery, and should remain a priority for coordinated State and Commonwealth investment. | Sorell* |
| **Workforce attraction**<br>Priority 5, pp35-36 | Workforce capability should be considered alongside housing, transport, childcare, health services and liveability. Attracting and retaining workers requires a coordinated whole-of-government approach. | Sorell* |
| **Regional employment services**<br>Priority 5, p35 | Support continued advocacy for place-based employment initiatives, including regional employment service models that connect local employers with local workforce opportunities and respond to regional labour market needs, for example the Glenorchy, Brighton and Sorell Jobs Hubs. | Sorell* |

| Strategy reference | GHCP comment | Raised by |
|---|---|---|
| **Infrastructure governance**<br>Priority 6, pp38-40 | The Strategy references Infrastructure Tasmania, government businesses and other strategic frameworks but provides limited explanation of how these organisations will coordinate delivery. Greater clarity regarding governance, responsibilities and accountability would strengthen implementation. | Sorell* |
| **Enabling infrastructure**<br>Priority 6, pp38-40 | The Strategy should explicitly recognise transport, water and sewer, energy, telecommunications and stormwater as enabling economic infrastructure that underpins housing delivery, industrial land development and private investment. | Sorell* |
| **Economic Future Act**<br>Priority 1, p19 | The consultation draft refers to the proposed Economic Future Act without sufficient explanation. The final Strategy should clarify the purpose, implementation status and relationship of the proposed legislation to existing planning and economic development frameworks. | Sorell* |
| **Strategic direction: delivery settings**<br>Vision and goals, p10 | The Strategy's focus on private investment, productivity, innovation and workforce participation is supported; these are the right foundations for lifting long-term economic resilience. The final Strategy would be strengthened by identifying practical delivery settings where these goals can be implemented, measured and refined through coordinated investment, workforce and productivity initiatives. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |
| **Strategy implementation and delivery**<br>Decision-making principles, p12 | While the Strategy provides strong decision-making principles and priority areas, there is limited discussion of place-based implementation. Consideration could be given to identifying demonstration environments where investment attraction, workforce, innovation and infrastructure initiatives can be coordinated, evaluated and scaled. This would strengthen the Strategy's commitment to measurable outcomes and cross-agency coordination. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |
| **Place-based economic development**<br>Strategy on a page, p15 | The Strategy identifies important sectoral and statewide priorities but gives limited consideration to place-based economic development. Cities, precincts and strategic employment centres play an important role in concentrating talent, investment, knowledge and infrastructure. Consideration could be given to the role of place-based economic development as a mechanism for delivering productivity, investment and workforce outcomes. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |
| **Coordinated investment facilitation system**<br>Priority 1, p20 | Strongly support the proposed coordinated investment facilitation system for major job-creating projects and precincts. To be effective it will require clear points of accountability, early advice for proponents, coordinated regulatory pathways, infrastructure sequencing, and transparent reporting on barriers identified through the development facilitation process.<br>The following are specialisations of Hobart that should be a focus: Antarctic research and the blue economy; creative technology and events; the night-time and visitor economy; and health and medical research. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |

| Strategy reference | GHCP comment | Raised by |
|---|---|---|
| **Innovation ecosystems and collaboration infrastructure**<br>Priority 2, p22 | The Strategy appropriately recognises research capability and commercialisation; however, comparatively less attention is given to innovation ecosystems and collaboration infrastructure. Internationally, innovation performance is increasingly linked to the strength of networks connecting researchers, entrepreneurs, investors, industry and government. Consideration should be given to how innovation precincts, cluster development and cross-sector collaboration mechanisms contribute to productivity, business formation and investment attraction. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |
| **Creative industries and economic diversification**<br>Priority 2, p22 | The Strategy identifies several sectors of comparative advantage but provides limited discussion of creative and cultural industries as drivers of innovation, talent attraction, productivity and place competitiveness. Consideration could be given to recognising the role of creative industries within Tasmania's future economic diversification agenda. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |
| **Research-industry interface and commercialisation**<br>Priority 2, p24 | Support. Commercialisation could be strengthened through practical mechanisms that connect researchers, entrepreneurs, industry partners, investors and customers, including stronger founder support, investor readiness, industry challenge programs, procurement pathways, and support for early-stage and scaling businesses to access capital, markets and customers. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |
| **Commercialisation and business formation**<br>Priority 2, p24 | Further consideration could be given to founder capability, entrepreneur development and pathways that support individuals to move from research, industry expertise or community-identified challenges into new business creation. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |
| **Innovation beyond technology**<br>Priority 2, p24 | The Strategy appropriately focuses on technology and commercialisation; however, innovation can also occur through service design, social innovation, community partnerships and new delivery models. Consideration could be given to recognising broader forms of innovation that improve participation, workforce outcomes and community resilience. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |
| **Circular economy and resource productivity**<br>Throughout | The Strategy contains limited reference to the circular economy despite its potential contribution to productivity, business innovation and economic diversification. Circular economy initiatives can create new markets, reduce input costs, improve resource productivity and support business growth across sectors including construction, manufacturing, food systems and resource recovery. Consideration should be given to recognising the circular economy as an economic development opportunity alongside environmental outcomes. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |
| **Public datasets as economic infrastructure**<br>Priority 3, p28 | Improved access to public datasets is strongly supported. Public data should be considered economic infrastructure that enables investment confidence, business decision-making, planning efficiency and market transparency. Consideration could be given to identifying priority datasets with high economic value and establishing consistent governance arrangements for their use. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |

| Strategy reference | GHCP comment | Raised by |
|---|---|---|
| **Housing supply, land readiness and infrastructure sequencing**<br>Priority 4, p31 | Strongly support the recognition of housing supply, land readiness and infrastructure sequencing as economic enablers. Workforce participation, business growth, migration attraction and project delivery are increasingly constrained by housing availability and infrastructure capacity.<br>Future monitoring should include indicators that track housing supply and land readiness alongside workforce and investment outcomes, recognising the influence of housing availability on workforce attraction, participation, business growth and project delivery. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |
| **Community benefit framework**<br>Priority 4, p31 | The Strategy references wider economic and social benefits and community benefit arrangements. Consideration could be given to establishing a consistent framework for assessing public value outcomes associated with major investments, including workforce pathways, local procurement, capability development and broader economic participation. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |
| **Talent attraction and retention**<br>Priority 5, p34 | The workforce focus is supported. Consideration could be given to a stronger emphasis on talent attraction and retention, including graduate retention, founder attraction, researcher attraction and skilled migration outcomes. These groups make disproportionate contributions to innovation, business formation and economic growth. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |
| **Investigating 'cost stacks' and different or innovative financial models for unlocking development, especially higher density infill.**<br>Priority 6, p40 | This is kind of captured, but the idea of a wide-ranging look at this, including what is done elsewhere in Oz and overseas is needed. So maybe it can be more explicit (ie. Regulation, approval process, compelling reasons to invest are not the only issue to unlocking capital – the long-term investment vehicles sometimes are). | Brighton* |
| **Sustainable / circular economy opportunities**<br>Priority 2, p24 | The Strategy identifies opportunities to create new sources of value in areas where Tasmania can compete. Resource recovery and circular economy industries represent an existing but under-recognised opportunity for Tasmania to diversify its economy. The State is uniquely positioned to develop new industries based on recovered materials streams, including glass, organics, timber, textiles, plastics and construction materials. Supporting innovation around resource recovery should be recognised as an economic diversification opportunity rather than solely an environmental outcome. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |
| **Sustainable / circular economy opportunities**<br>Priority 2, p24 | The Strategy talks extensively about attracting investment but says very little about where raw materials for new industries will come from.The Strategy should recognise that clean, reliable secondary material streams are economic development assets. Improved collection, sorting and processing infrastructure can provide local businesses with access to feedstocks that support advanced manufacturing, construction products, packaging, organics processing and other circular economy enterprises. | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |
| **Sustainable / circular economy opportunities**<br>Priority 2, p24 | The Strategy would be strengthened by recognising circular economy and resource recovery as economic development opportunities. Tasmania's waste streams represent an underutilised source of feedstock for advanced manufacturing, construction, agriculture and export-oriented industries. Supporting | Hobart (Econ. Dev.) |

| Strategy reference | GHCP comment | Raised by |
|---|---|---|
| | improved resource recovery, material quality and market development would help attract private investment, diversify the economy, improve productivity, and create new regional employment opportunities while reducing reliance on imported materials.<br>Councils operate some of the State's most significant resource collection and recovery infrastructure and represent an important partner in enabling circular economy industries. Investment in improved resource recovery systems, material quality and data visibility can help create the conditions for private investment and innovation using recovered materials. | |

** Sorell Council and Brighton Council are adjoining growth councils, not GHCP members. GHCP works with Sorell and Brighton under its Strategic Plan, and their comments are included here in full because they bear directly on the Strategy and are supported by the Partnership.*