



Australian
Institute of
Architects

TAS

ABN 72 000 023 012

The Royal Australian Institute of Architects
trading as Australian Institute of Architects

1/19a Hunter Street
nipaluna/Hobart, Tasmania 7000

P: (03) 6214 1500

tas@architecture.com.au

architecture.com.au

State Planning Office
Department of State Growth
GPO Box 536
Hobart TAS 7001

27 February 2026

By email to: haveyoursay@stateplanning.tas.gov.au

Re: Housing Land Supply Amendment Bill 2026 – Constructive Planning Concerns and Alignment with LUPAA Section 8A and Schedule 1

To whom this may concern,

The Tasmanian Chapter of the Australian Institute of Architects (the Institute) would like to thank the State Planning Office for the opportunity to provide a constructive response to the proposed amendments to the Housing Land Supply Act 2018 (HLS Act) and the draft Housing Land Supply (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2026 (HLSB 2026)¹.

The Tasmanian Chapter is committed to helping create a positive future for our state that benefits all Tasmanians. The Institute advocates for the built environment, and works to shape policies, foster collaboration, and promote design excellence that benefits society as a whole. Strategic planning and coordination are critical components in this, and the Institute advocates for this in all decisions related to planning. We support the updating or removals of cited policies and outdated Acts in the HLSB 2026.

The proposed changes to the Special Planning Order (SPO) primarily streamline administrative processes between the SPO and the Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC), reducing procedural burden without materially altering the documentation required for a Housing Land Supply Order (HLSO). The intent of the Act is to accelerate approvals, not to lower planning or urban design standards. This creates an opportunity

¹ [Housing Land Supply Act Amendment 2026 | Planning in Tasmania](#)

to strengthen how good urban outcomes are embedded within the existing HLSO framework, without adding new layers of assessment.

In particular, the process could more clearly reinforce consistency with Regional Land Use Strategies and the forthcoming Tasmanian Planning Policies to prevent peripheral sprawl and ensure growth occurs near centres, services, and transport. A simple “15-minute access check,” minimum net density targets in serviced areas, baseline lot mix requirements, and concept layouts demonstrating connected street networks would help avoid car-dependent expansion. Supporting measures such as a template Urban Design Guide, State–Council Memoranda of Understanding, and early servicing coordination with infrastructure providers would improve consistency and delivery outcomes while maintaining the streamlined intent of the reforms.

The intent of accelerating affordable and social housing delivery is strongly supported. However, it is equally important that reforms do not unintentionally embed structural urban sprawl outcomes, infrastructure inefficiencies, environmental risk exposure, or architectural mediocrity that undermine the Objectives of the Resource Management and Planning System² set out in Schedule 1 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (LUPAA)³.

This submission identifies:

1. Additional considerations to build upon the Institute’s submission (2025) *Urban Growth Boundary*⁴ (UGB) against Schedule 1⁵ objectives and Section 8A Guidelines⁶.
2. Risks associated with advancing infrastructure works prior to the Parliamentary disallowance period.
3. Statistical support for urban densification as a cost-reduction strategy.
4. Risks relating to Crown and Homes Tasmania land development sequencing.
5. Environmental and biodiversity reinstatement timeframes.
6. Constructive recommendations to ensure architectural and urban design quality aligned with sustainable development principles.

Schedule 1 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 establishes the core objectives of Tasmania’s Resource Management and Planning System, including:

- Promotion of sustainable development;
- Fair, orderly and sustainable use and development of land;
- Protection of ecological processes and genetic diversity;
- Efficient use of existing infrastructure;

² [Resource management and planning system | Planning in Tasmania](#)

³ [Australasian Legal Information Institute \(1993\) Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993](#)

⁴ [Tasmanian Chapter, Australian Institute of Architects \(2025\) Urban Growth Boundary](#)

⁵ [Australasian Legal Information Institute \(1993\) Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993](#) Schedule 1

⁶ [Australasian Legal Information Institute \(1993\) Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993](#) 8a Guidelines

- Shared responsibility between state and local government.

The Institute submission to the UGB review identified baseline urban design considerations including: strategic site analysis, solar orientation, avoidance of agricultural land, protection of sensitive environments, infrastructure connectivity, amenity provision, access to public transport and services and 30-Minute City⁷ principles. Our response to the HLSB 2026 articulates the need for the Minister's transitional provisions to build upon this with explicit articulation or mapping impact of the future urban Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) scenarios⁸ (Climate Change in Australia) post habitation under for updates to the relevant planning scheme(s) (from Schedule 1):

- Long-term infrastructure maintenance liabilities of greenfield expansion,
- Carbon lock-in from low-density transport-dependent suburbs,
- Fiscal burden transfer to future ratepayers,
- Redevelopment of under-utilised inner urban land,
- Brownfield renewal before fringe release,
- Cost comparison between greenfield infrastructure extension and infill servicing.
- Urban heat island mitigation,
- Bushfire interface risk,
- Floodplain intensification,
- Water-sensitive urban design integration.

The Insurance Council of Australia (ICA) notes that around 98% of Tasmania's land is prone to bushfire, is under insured due to the public insurance models⁹ that are being adopted by the Government and accelerating changing state of risk due to climate change. They advocate for the immediate planning of infrastructure and housing **outside** of risk zones which aligns to recommendations from the CSIRO¹⁰ which note '*Outer urban areas of cities stand out as watchpoints. These areas are particularly susceptible to adverse impacts because of their circumstances (location, demographics, proneness to hazards).*'

Currently there is work being done by two separate research bodies: the Climate Change Authority¹¹ and a partnership between Engineers Australia with Standards Australia (Climate Resilient Infrastructure Design Guidance) to improve recommendations for urban related land use policy and it would be worthwhile the Tasmanian Government reviewing this upon release to ensure land use is planned in accordance with recommendations from the ICA¹². These mitigate a risk that expedited rezonings achieve zoning compliance but not sustainable urban outcomes – housing is only part of the ongoing concern and can't effectively be rolled out without the resilient and well-planned infrastructure needed. No explicit architectural design quality benchmarks are mandated;

⁷ <https://www.pwc.com.au/publications/pdf/30-minute-cities-may17.pdf>

⁸ [Greenhouse gas scenarios](#)

⁹ [State-run insurance would expose Tasmanians to financial risk – Insurance Council of Australia](#)

¹⁰ [NCRA Climate risks | Australian Climate Service Website](#)

¹¹ [Roundtable highlights urgent need for climate science that can inform decision making | Climate Change Authority](#)

¹² [Building a more resilient Australia: Policy proposals for the next Australian Government](#)

however, the following could be used to address the unknowns of the Future Climate Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) scenarios¹³ to create a trajectory for the Minister using good design to embed resilience into land planning.

- Urban design performance metrics,
- Biodiversity net gain embedded framework,
- Transport mode share targets imposed.

Recent data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, Urban Development Institute of Australia, Planning Institute of Australia and Property Council of Australiaⁱ shows that fringe greenfield development carries significantly higher infrastructure costs than infill. Per-dwelling infrastructure provision can be 20–40% more expensive on the urban edge due to extended roads, utilities and transport networks, with trunk infrastructure in some jurisdictions exceeding \$100,000 per lot. Lower densities also increase per capita transport costs and long-term servicing liabilities, as well as increasing the cost of rebuild post consecutive hazard events.

By contrast, medium-density infill leverages existing infrastructure, reduces road and sewer extensions, and avoids duplicating major facilities such as schools and hospitals. This evidence supports a densification pathway consistent with the Schedule 1 objectives of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993, particularly the efficient and economically sustainable use of infrastructure.

Even Crown lands that are not formally reserved can hold ecological and social value, including remnant vegetation, habitat connectivity, informal recreation, and agricultural buffers. These functions are critical given the National Climate Risk Assessment highlights biodiversity loss, land-use change, and ecosystem fragmentation as key climate risks. The Insurance Council of Australia also stresses planning that avoids environmental hazards and long-term liability from poorly sited development, noting that loss of peri-urban buffers can increase climate, disaster, and insurance costs¹⁴.

These outcomes conflict with Schedule 1 objectives of sustainable development and efficient resource use as urban sprawl generates:

- Higher car dependency,

¹³ [Greenhouse gas scenarios](#)

¹⁴ **Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water.** (2024). *National Climate Risk Assessment first pass assessment report*. Australian Government. <https://www.dccceew.gov.au/climate-change/publications/ncra-first-pass-risk-assessment>

Insurance Council of Australia. (2025). *Federal election platform 2025* (Policy report). https://insurancecouncil.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/21226_ICA_Federal-Election-Platform-Report_2025_Final.pdf

Environmental Defenders Office. (2025, October 31). *EPBC Act reforms make it to parliament – EDO's first impressions*. <https://www.edo.org.au/2025/10/31/epbc-act-reforms-make-it-to-parliament-edos-first-impressions/>

- Increased household transport costs,
- Greater municipal maintenance liabilities,
- Reduced walkability and public health outcomes,
- Infrastructure duplication.

Institute recognises the need for the Government to find efficiencies in their own approval processes as demonstrated in the workflow diagram within the consultation pack and cautions that even in smaller windows of approval and adoption times, early clearing, roadworks, or trenching before adequate Parliamentary and technical review risks of habitat loss, disruption of Aboriginal cultural sites, and ecological fragmentation. Such actions may be irreversible if disallowance occurs. The Environmental Defenders Office warns that staged works weaken oversight and undermine biodiversity offsets¹⁵. Precautionary sequencing aligns with climate risk management and fiscal prudence whereas premature vegetation clearing can occur in as little as weeks and must be recognised in accelerated HLS processes. Guidance from the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects¹⁶ further indicates:

- Mature native canopy restoration can take 20–50 years,
- Grassland ecosystem reinstatement may take 10–20 years,
- Complex forest structure recovery may exceed 80 years,
- Soil ecology restoration is often multi-decadal.

To align the HLS Amendment Bill with Schedule 1 objectives, the following are recommended to improve the consistency and quality of HLSO:

1. Housing Land Supply Order (HLSO) to clearly demonstrate consistency with Regional Land Use Strategies and the coming Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs), with the intent that growth happens near existing centres, public transport and services rather than in peripheral greenfield areas.
 - 1.1. Transition the current HSLO to have mandated components of precinct plans to prevent rezoning outside the urban growth boundaries.
2. All new developments embed Urban Design Performance Standards
 - 2.1. Include a simple mandatory “15-minute access check” for HLSOs to confirm walking access to essential services, transport routes, and open space, preventing isolated fringe development without adding assessment steps.
 - 2.2. Immediate site performance: Establish clear built-form and environmental benchmarks within the HLSO process, including solar access, passive design performance, minimum 30% tree canopy, water sensitive urban

¹⁵ [EDO submission on the Nature Repair Market Bill - Environmental Defenders Office](#)

¹⁶ Australian Institute of Landscape Architects. (2022). *Climate positive design policy position statement*. AILA. Australian Institute of Landscape Architects. (2023). *Nature-based solutions and biodiversity advocacy statement*. AILA.

- design, and demonstrated biodiversity net gain through measurable ecological improvement.
- 2.3. Site context and street integration: Require compliance with 30-Minute City access standards and concept layouts that demonstrate connected street networks and active frontages. A concise, template-style Urban Design Guide should support consistent street design and neighbourhood integration.
3. Density First Principle should be mandated
- 3.1. With standard HLSO conditions requiring minimum net residential density targets in serviced areas to counter low-density sprawl to lodged within existing planning DA processes, including comparative lifecycle cost modelling of infill densification, brownfield redevelopment, and greenfield expansion.
- 3.2. Require a baseline lot-mix schedule (e.g. a percentage of small lots + medium-density sites) so subdivisions don't default to detached-only patterns that expand urban footprints.
- 3.3. Mandate that HLSO include concept layouts that identify a connected street network, pedestrian/cycle links, and integration with surrounding neighborhoods to avoid car-dependent sprawl rather than enabling rezoning without any design thinking attached.
4. A Disallowance Safeguard Clause to prohibit irreversible works
- 4.1. Such as clearing or major earthworks, until the expiry of a review period, protecting against premature development.
5. Governance of program:
- 5.1. Assessment of surplus inner urban land, government-owned infill sites, and vertical mixed-use potential before considering greenfield expansion.
- 5.2. Encourage State/Council Memoranda of Understanding (MoU's) that set shared expectations for street design, density, and staging outside statutory pathways, so planning authorities can apply consistent conditions at DA stage without slowing rezoning and encourage a collaborative alignment between Councils, who will ultimately take ownership over the subdivisions and Homes Tasmania who plans and develops them.
- 5.3. Recommend Infrastructure Providers and Homes Tasmania undertake a standard Servicing Impact meeting with standardised reporting outcomes presented in the HLSO Report to identify infrastructure upgrade requirements early.

Together, these measures would promote sustainable, liveable, and ecologically responsible urban growth in line with the Bill's objectives.

The HLS Amendment Bill offers a chance to modernise housing delivery and efficient processes within parliamentary approvals. However, without embedded safeguards, it risks driving low-density expansion that conflicts with Schedule 1's sustainability goals.

Prioritising density, infrastructure efficiency, biodiversity, and architectural quality will:

- Lower housing costs,
- Reduce public spending,
- Improve community outcomes,
- Protect future generations,
- Strengthen climate resilience,
- Better align development with Tasmania's statutory planning objectives.

The Institute commends the Department for undertaking consultation and welcomes continued policy dialogue.

Kind regards,



Daniel Lane
President, Tasmanian Chapter
Australian Institute of Architects



Jennifer Nichols
Executive Director, Tasmanian Chapter
Australian Institute of Architects

The Australian Institute of Architects (Institute) is the peak body for the architectural profession in Australia. It is an independent, national member organisation with over 14,500 members across Australia and overseas. The Institute exists to advance the interests of members, their professional standards and contemporary practice, and expand and advocate the value of architects and architecture to the sustainable growth of our communities, economy and culture. The Institute actively works to maintain and improve the quality of our built environment by promoting better, responsible and environmental design. To learn more about the Institute, log on to www.architecture.com.au.

ⁱ Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2024). *Building approvals, Australia* (Catalogue No. 8731.0). <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/industry/building-and-construction/building-approvals-australia/latest-release>

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2024). *Regional population, 2023–24 financial year* (Catalogue No. 3218.0). <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/population/regional-population/latest-release>

Australian Institute of Landscape Architects. (2022). *Climate positive design policy position statement*.

Australian Institute of Landscape Architects. (2023). *Nature-based solutions and biodiversity advocacy statement*.

CSIRO. (2020). *Ecosystem restoration and resilience research findings*. CSIRO Publishing.

Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water. (2022). *National standards for ecological restoration*. Australian Government.

Environmental Defenders Office. (2024). *EPBC Act reforms have passed! 10 next steps to ensure stronger federal environment laws*.

Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth).

Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (Tas).

Planning Institute of Australia. (2022). *Infrastructure and density policy statement*.

Planning Institute of Australia. (2023). *Planning for housing supply and affordability policy position*.

Property Council of Australia. (2023). *Development feasibility and infrastructure cost analysis*.

Property Council of Australia. (2024). *Housing supply and affordability report 2024*.

Society for Ecological Restoration Australasia. (2021). *National standards for the practice of ecological restoration in Australia*.

Urban Development Institute of Australia. (2022). *Infrastructure charges report*.

Urban Development Institute of Australia. (2023). *State of the nation: Housing and infrastructure report 2023*.