

REGIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK CONSULTATION



TASMANIAN DEPARTMENT OF PREMIER AND CABINET

yoursay.planning@dpac.tas.gov.au



Australian
Institute of
Architects



Submission issued February 2023

Tasmanian Regional Planning Framework Consultation

INFORMATION ABOUT THE INSTITUTE

- The Australian Institute of Architects (Institute) is the peak body for the architectural profession in Australia. It is an independent, national member organisation with more than 13,000 members across Australia and overseas.
- The Institute's vision is: *Everyone benefits from good architecture.*
- The Institute's purpose is: *To demonstrate the value of architecture and support the profession.*
- At the time of this submission the National President is Shannon Battisson FRAIA and the Acting Chief Executive Officer is Barry Whitmore.

Contact details for this submission:

Australian Institute of Architects
ABN 72 000 023 012
National Office
Level 1, 41 Exhibition Street
Melbourne, Victoria 3000
p: +61 (03) 8620 3905
Tasmanian Chapter Office

Tasmanian Chapter Office
Australian Institute of Architects
1/19a Hunter Street
Hobart, TAS 7000
P: +61 3 6214 1500
E: tas@architecture.com.au

Contact for this submission
Name: Jennifer Nichols | Tasmanian Executive Director
National Email: jennifer.nichols@architecture.com.au

About the cover photo

The Australian Institute of Architects' 2022 Sir Zelman Cowen Award for Public Architecture Bundanon. Kerstin Thompson Architects. Traditional Land Owners: The Wodi Wodi and the Yuin peoples of the Dharawal country. Photographer: Rory Gardiner.

For further information visit: <https://www.architecture.com.au/awards/2022-awards/2022-act-architecture-awards-winners/the-sir-zelman-cowen-award-for-public-architecture-bundanon>

1 INTRODUCTION

About this submission.

This submission is made in response to the Regional Planning Framework Consultation. The submission answers the questions set out in the discussion paper.

Key messages

Key messages in our responses include:

- The general content of the Regional Land Use Strategies (RLUSs) should be outlined in Section 5A or new appended section of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993.
- The Institute supports the proposed legislated purposes and content clauses as well as the inclusion of proposed time horizons and regional policies and strategies to strengthen the social, economic and environmental attributes. We additionally recommend that RLUSs could include First Nations engagement and collaboration and environmental restoration.
- The Institute recommends that the content and purposes of Regional Land Use Strategies are also legislated to make explicit policies or goals to prevent or minimise climate change impacts from natural disaster events.
- Consistency is highly important. There should be a RLUS template and explicit common working definitions and terminology.
- The Institute recommends that the Land Use and Planning Approvals Act, specifies a process around public consultation or hearings for declaring or amending a RLUS that includes all relevant stakeholders.
- A missing piece in the policy framework is an overarching settlement policy for Tasmania. It is important that the three RLUSs are not set in competition with each other to either avoid or attract population growth, associated settlement and residential development and industry. It is also recognised that the hierarchy of settlement in Tasmania is fundamental to an appreciation of landscape values in the state, and that this provides the context for settlement.
- Gaining alignment with other planning cycles would make sense. However, it is also important to consider that some elements of a strategy might require longer time horizons than 5 years.
- Major damage or alteration to the land and ecosystem resulting from a catastrophic event such as flood or fire should be included as a trigger to review or amend an RLUS. Other 'global' indicators include rising sea temperatures and sea level rise.
- A clear process for amending RLUSs should be promoted and readily accessible in the public domain.
- The Institute strongly supports the proposal that structure plan may introduce urban design objectives to strengthen the public realm, objectives for sustainable design or urban landscape character and features, or identify a specific mix of uses to deliver a particular activity precinct. We strongly support that good design outcomes at this level are being contemplated by the Tasmanian Government for the regions. The ability to inform urban design objectives would be made more feasible by establishing a government architect office to provide direct advice and

oversight the development of urban design objectives and landscape character and features. Good design needs to be defined and measurable.

- Structure plans should also pay attention to environmental restoration, not just development. There is a need to approach our human land use with a more “biophilic” intent so that we are cognisant of restoring damaged areas so that the human footprint is minimised. This will actually help to ensure human activities and endeavours are themselves more likely to continue successfully, and to be consistent with the objectives of the LUPA Act set out in Schedule 1.
- Scale responsive to landform and habitation is also critical. The key risk of not addressing these is unmitigated sprawl and destroying the character of locations that have their own intrinsic value in the human experience of what it means to live in Tasmanian landscapes. Scale and design sensibility in planning needs to be visible in all planning decisions.

2 DETAILED RESPONSE

Do you agree that the general content and purposes of the RLUSs should be outlined in the legislation or regulations similar to the TPPs and SPPs?

The Institute's response

The general content of the Regional Land Use Strategies (RLUSs) should be outlined in Section 5A or new appended section of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 similar to the way the contents and of the Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs) are set out in Section 12B of the Act and the contents of State Planning Provisions (SPPs) are set out in Section 14.

To do so will make clearer the legislated standing RLUs contents and ensure consistency between the three Tasmania RLUSs (Northern Tasmania, Southern Tasmania and Cradle Coast)

At present, the purposes vary considerably between the three RLUSs. The purposes need more detail than the way they are specified for the TPPs. Therefore, legislating the purposes needs to be done differently to the way that TPP's purposes are set out in Subsection 12B(1).

The purposes need to delineate the fundamental standing of the RLUSs as a partnership between local government authorities and relevant regional groups (e.g. the Cradle Coast Authority) that has developed the strategy.

The purposes should also state the relationship between the RLUS, State Planning Provisions, Structure Plans, State Planning Provisions and Local Provisions Schedules. For example, the Northern Tasmania RLUS¹ states that,

The preparation of draft Local Provisions Schedules by the planning authorities for each of Northern Tasmania's eight municipal areas will reflect the State Planning Provisions and the planning framework expressed in this RLUS (p.3)

It can be concluded from this the Northern Tasmania RLUS guides the Local Provisions Schedules.

Therefore, the purposes should set out clear terms such as the proposed model subsection (1) clause from the discussion paper quoted below,

(1) The purpose of a regional land use strategy is to set out the policies or strategies that are to be achieved or applied in that region by:

(a) a local provisions schedule; and(p.9, discussion paper)

As also proposed the nominal time horizon should be set out clearly in the purposes (or schedule to the Act) subject to our more detailed feedback below about time horizons.

Clearly setting out the purposes will not only help to make the three Tasmanian RLUSs more consistent, but in doing, so give them a greater mandate. If a dispute arises, then having clarity in the Act about the purposes is important as the RLUS can be understood as having the authority for certain benchmark settings across the state, not just one region.

¹ Northern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy,
https://planningreform.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/615585/Attachment-3-NTRLUS-PDF-document-future-investigation-areas-amendment-June-2021-FINAL.PDF

Do you agree with the suggested contents [for legislated RLUS purposes]?

The Institute's response

With regard to this question, we provide an extract from the discussion paper of what is proposed and other matters that could be considered:

(1) The purpose of a regional land use strategy is to set out the policies or strategies that are to be achieved or applied in that region by:

(a) a local provisions schedule; and

(b) any sub-regional or local land use planning strategies.

(2) A regional land use strategy may relate to the following:

(a) the sustainable use, development, protection or conservation of land;

(b) environmental protection;

(c) liveability, health and wellbeing of the community;

(d) any other matter that may be included in a planning scheme or a regional land use strategy.

Some other matters that could be considered are:

• a consistent time horizon for the RLUSs;

• specifying that the RLUSs may include:

o spatial application of the TPPs, regional or sub-regional policy;

o regional policies and strategies to strengthen the social, economic and environmental attributes specific to the region; and

o identification of any sub-regions or inter-regional relationships;

• that the RLUSs are to be accompanied by:

o any relevant background reports and supporting studies;

o a plan detailing how the RLUS will be implemented including:

- prioritising or staging the release of land for settlement growth;*
- provision of key infrastructure;*
- governance arrangements for implementation; and*
- funding arrangements and prioritisation*

(p. 8-10, *ibid*)

The Institute supports the proposed legislated purposes and content clauses. The 'other matters that could be considered' contain two further content clauses that should be in the legislation. The first is consistent time horizons for the RLUSs. Time horizons are important as they lend some ability to forecast

and future-proof decision making by a range of stakeholders including investors. They also help ensure that all three RLUSs are in lock-step with respect to overarching policies of state or federal government.

The other matter is that of 'regional policies and strategies to strengthen the social, economic and environmental attributes specific to the region' that place human land use in a more wholistic context (p. 9).

Such plans which detail how Regional Land Use Strategies will be implemented ensures that the RLUS are more likely to be delivered or 'deliverable'.

Are there other matters you think the RLUSs could capture?

The Institute's response

Two important matters that RLUSs could include are First Nations engagement and collaboration and environmental restoration.

First Nations engagement and collaboration.

The matter of First Nations engagement and collaboration is not adequately integrated into the three current RLUSs

All three RLUSs do refer to either Aboriginal and/or Indigenous historic, cultural, and heritage values.

The Northern RLUS² makes only passing comment to the Aboriginal community

Strategic Direction G2.3 Promote local character values....

(b) Preserve and protect significant cultural heritage, in particular places significant to the Aboriginal community (p. 11)

The Southern RLUS³ give much more detailed consideration of First Nations heritage and cultural values and identifies that,

The consideration of Aboriginal heritage values in land use planning processes is increasingly topical, and there are challenges to better integration with the system. While legislation aimed at protecting Aboriginal artefacts and relics has existed since the 1970s it is now somewhat out-dated and is not adequately integrated with the suite of legislation that comprises the State's Resource Management & Planning System (p. 36)

and notes that,

Continued engagement with the Aboriginal community is necessary to improve our knowledge of heritage places and values, and to overhaul the State legislation and planning scheme provisions that manage Aboriginal heritage (p. 36, *ibid.*)

It goes on to specify Policy CV⁴,

² Northern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy

³ Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy 2010-2035,
https://planningreform.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0011/667523/Southern-Tasmania-Regional-Land-Use-Strategy-2010-2035.-July-2022.pdf

⁴ CV- Cultural Values

Recognise, retain and protect Aboriginal heritage values within the region for their character, culture, sense of place, contribution to our understanding history and contribution to the region's competitive advantage.

CV 1.1 Support the completion of the review of the Aboriginal Relics Act 1975 including the assimilation of new Aboriginal heritage legislation with the RMPS.

CV 1.2 Improve our knowledge of Aboriginal heritage places to a level equal to that for European cultural heritage, in partnership with the Aboriginal community,

CV 1.3 Avoid the allocation of land use growth opportunities in areas where Aboriginal cultural heritage values are known to exist.

CV 1.4 Support the use of predictive modelling to assist in identifying the likely presence of Aboriginal heritage values that can then be taken into account in specific strategic land use planning processes. (p. 39, ibid.)

We note that sub-policy CV 1.2 refers to partnering with the Aboriginal community.

The Cradle Coast RLUS⁵ is limited in its detail in scope of Aboriginal cultural significance and heritage or partnering with the First Nations community. It recognises that,

The Cradle Coast Region has an extensive geological, flora and fauna, aboriginal, maritime, and historic cultural heritage, representing previous geological, ecological and climate activity, an extended period of Aboriginal settlement, and the more recent 200 years of western occupation (p.34)

and later in the document,

Land use planning processes –

a. Recognise and conserve the importance of natural geological and biological heritage for both indigenous and European communities

b. Recognise and promote understanding of Aboriginal heritage, including places, features, landscapes and items of spiritual and cultural significance and identify measures to consider and resolve values of importance for Aboriginal communities in accordance with statutory requirements (p.134)

However, it also states the limitations of the RLUS Framework,

The Framework does not provide discrete provision for Aboriginal heritage and historic cultural heritage. Rather, it promotes an awareness and protection of the past as important to the contemporary and future identity of all communities on the north-west coast.

The Framework does not specify detailed directions for consideration of Aboriginal heritage, or nominate landforms and sites of cultural value. The Framework is disadvantaged in ability to designate sites of Aboriginal cultural significance. Existing data is not comprehensive or publicly available, and predictive modelling systems have not been widely applied....

⁵ Cradle Coast Regional Land Use Planning Strategy 2010–2030, https://planningreform.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/659410/Declared-Cradle-Coast-Regional-Land-Use-King-Island-11-May-2022.PDF

The Framework has been drafted in anticipation of broader reforms, including legislation to introduce better integration of land use planning with processes to identify, assess, and manage Aboriginal cultural values, and for the management of historic cultural heritage (p. 35)

The Institute recommends that legislated content for Regional Land Use Strategies in the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 specify that the strategies include specific commitments to

- engage, collaborate and develop partnerships with Aboriginal communities to:
 - uphold Aboriginal heritage, including places, features, landscapes and items of spiritual and cultural significance
 - incorporate Aboriginal knowledge and insights to more broadly into land use planning and sustainable development⁶

Sustainable land use.

Subsection 12B(4)(a) of the Land Use and Planning Approval Act 1993⁷ sets out that the contents and purposes of Tasmanian Planning Policies must also

(a) seek to further the objectives set out in Schedule 1;

PART 1 – Objectives of the Resource Management and Planning System of Tasmania sets out that

‘The objectives of the resource management and planning system of Tasmania are –

(a) to promote the sustainable development of natural and physical resources and the maintenance of ecological processes and genetic diversity; and

(b) to provide for the fair, orderly and sustainable use and development of air, land and water; and

(c) to encourage public involvement in resource management and planning; and

(d) to facilitate economic development in accordance with the objectives set out in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c); and

(e) to promote the sharing of responsibility for resource management and planning between the different spheres of Government, the community and industry in the State.

2. In clause 1 (a), sustainable development means managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while –

(a) sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and

(b) safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; and

(c) avoiding, remedying or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.

Therefore, the RLUSs are also an important opportunity to fulfil the brief of the LUPA Act Objectives.

⁶ “Sustainable development” has a specified meaning given in Schedule 1 of the Land Use and Planning Approvals Act 1993.

⁷ Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993,

<https://www.legislation.tas.gov.au/view/html/inforce/current/act-1993-070#JS1@HS1@EN>

The Institute recommends that the content and purposes of Regional Land Use Strategies could more explicitly include environmental protection goals including:

- modelling and monitoring greenhouse gas emissions (GHGEs) imputing both carbon and other GHGEs as well as the carbon emissions abatement through activities such as re-forestation and re-wilding.
- minimising human land use contribution to the sum total of greenhouse gas emissions.
- specific attention to environment restoration not just human land use in the context of development.

Flooding, associated with La Niña since 2021 has impacted every state and territory (including the ACT). Predictions are made of a global sea level rise of 65 centimetres in the coming decades as the Thwaite Glacier melts.⁸ Plans should also clearly articulate how climate change event risks including fire, flooding, and prolonged drought are mitigated or their impacts prevented.

For example, the Northern Tasmania RLUS and the Southern Tasmania RLUS include reasonably explicit strategic goals or directions in relation to flooding and bushfire,

These include the Managing Risks and Hazards policies:

- MRH 1 Minimise the risk of loss of life and property from bushfires
- MRH 2 Minimise the risk of loss of life and property from flooding

and their eight sub-policies.

The Northern RLUS Goal 3: Sustainability includes

- Strategic Direction G3.1 Promote and protect the Region's unique environmental assets and values
- Strategic Direction G3.2 Establish planning policies to support sustainable development, address the impacts of climate change, improve energy efficiency and reduce environmental emissions and pollutants

Beneath each of these sit detailed strategies which respond to preventing and mitigating climate change and broader environmental degradation (e.g. salinity) and climate change event impacts.

The Cradle Coast RLUS while recognising risks and needs for safeguards does not prescribe enumerated specific policies and sub-policies or strategic directions in the same way as the Southern Tasmania and Northern Tasmania RLUSs. As such it makes it more difficult to identify what detailed commitments the strategy places on the region.

The Institute recommends that the content and purposes of Regional Land Use Strategies are also legislated to make explicit policies or goals to prevent or minimise climate change impacts from natural disaster events.

⁸ <https://www.abc.net.au/news/science/2023-02-16/thwaites-glacier-melting-icefin-revolution-sea-level-rise/101970762>

What attributes should be consistent across regions (e.g., terminology, categorisation of settlement etc)? Should there be a template for RLUSs?

The Institute's response

Our review of the three Tasmania RLUSs finds the layouts and terminology inconsistent and therefore difficult to compare. There should be a template and as strategies, the RLUS need to operate to an explicit common working definitions of a

- Framework
- Strategy
- Plan
- The nomenclature of goals, strategic directions, objectives etc

It is important terminology is not weak, imprecise or ambiguous so that councils, state government and communities are clear about what the RLUS is prescribing to be followed through in statutory documents – namely Local Provisions Schedules Structure Plans, as well as the non-statutory policies such as Structure Plans and local strategic planning documents.

Clear terminology means that all stakeholders, including the community, can be clear about expectations and what state and local governments who are primary partners to the RLUSs are being held to account to deliver.

Should the RLUSs be subject to an assessment process by the TPC with recommendations made to the Minister? Should the assessment process include public hearings?

The Institute's response

The Institute supports RLUSs being subject to an assessment process by the Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC) with recommendations made to the Minister.

The LUPA Act, currently does not specify any process around public consultation or hearings for declaring or amending a RLUS. The discussion paper notes that “*The RLUSs have a public interest because landowner rights are impacted by a LPS or a LPS amendment required to be ‘as far as practicable’ consistent with the RLUSs.*” (p. 11)

RLUSs have a much broader public interest than landowners and not all Tasmanians are necessarily landowners. In the 2021 census, 29.9% of all occupied Tasmanian dwellings (not including visitor-only dwellings) were occupied as rental or other non-owned dwellings⁹. Nonetheless, renters may still have interest in planning outcome

s for housing, recreation, heritage, biodiversity and other purposes as local community citizens. Furthermore, Traditional Custodians through the relevant Aboriginal land corporations or association are also key stakeholders whether or not they are land owners, and in relation to broader matters of cultural heritage and significance noted above.

The Institute recommends that the Land Use and Planning Approvals Act specifies a process around public consultation or hearings for declaring or amending a RLUS that includes all relevant stakeholders.

⁹ Not owned outright or mortgaged <https://abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/community-profiles/2021/6>

Should the matters be taken into consideration when assessing a RLUS be similar to the TPPs? Are there any different matters that should be included?

The Institute's response

In 2021 the Institute made a submission to the Tasmania Department of Justice in relation to the scoping paper for draft Tasmania Planning Policies (TPPs). In this submission the Institute provided its views and rationale for three topics to be included in relation to Liveable Settlements:

- Strategic Planning of Existing & Proposed Settlement Areas
- Regional Urban Design Values
- Strategic Planning of Existing & Proposed Settlement Areas

An extract of the submission is provided in Appendix I.

The discussion paper proposes on page 11 that the assessment of RLUS include their consistent with the TPPs. Therefore, we restate that these matters are included when assessing RLUSs.

Of particular note is that the Department of State Growth is currently refreshing “Tasmania’s Population Strategy”¹⁰

A missing piece in the policy framework is an overarching settlement policy for Tasmania. It is important that the three RLUSs are not set in competition with each other to either avoid or attract population growth, associated settlement and residential development and industry. The State Government has the unique privilege and responsibility to ensure that all Tasmanians benefit and that there is an overarching plan that takes into account landscape character, environmental, social and economic considerations.

Should the timeframes for review of the RLUSs continue to reflect the 5 yearly cycle of the other instruments, triggered by the making or amendment of the TPPs?

The Institute's response

As commented above, gaining alignment with other planning cycles would make sense. However, it is also important to consider that some elements of a strategy might require longer time horizons than five years. If a particular element of a strategy (e.g. restoration of a wetland, catchment, forest or other ecosystem, a transport upgrade, residential development or establishment of an industry required a longer time horizon (e.g. 10-15 years) then it is important that a five-yearly review does not majorly shift longer terms strategic directions or policies set out in a plan without showing just cause.

Should any other matters trigger the review of the RLUSs?

The Institute's response

Major damage or alteration to the land and ecosystem resulting from a catastrophic event such as flood or fire should be included as a trigger to review a RLUS. Other ‘global’ indicators include rising sea temperatures and sea level rise

In these situations, intended land uses may need to alter to prevent further human or downstream impacts or to recover damaged areas.

Should the review process for the RLUSs be similar to that of the TPPs and SPPs?

The Institute's response –

¹⁰ In reference to the “Population Growth Strategy” launched in 2015,

It would make sense for the review process for RLUSs to be similar to that of the TPPs and SPPs. We note on page 11 of the discussion paper that TPPs are required to further the objectives of Schedule 1 of the LUPA Act, receive representations during a public exhibition period and consider relevant matters raised at a hearing in relation to a representation.

The Institute does not have view as to whether the same step is required as for the TPPs for RLUSs to be tabled in the Parliament.

Should the LUPA Act provide a specific process for amending RLUSs? Should that process be similar to that of the TPPs?

The Institute's response

A clear process for amending RLUSs should be promoted and readily accessible in the public domain.

Should different types of amendments be provided for, such as a minor amendment of the RLUSs?

The Institute's response

It would be practical for different types of amendments to be provided for, such as a minor amendment of the RLUSs to ensure that small matters do not become roadblocks to the operation of the RLUSs.

What matters should qualify as triggers for amending a RLUS?

The Institute's response.

As noted above major damage or alteration to the land and ecosystem resulting from a catastrophic event such as flood or fire might also qualify as a trigger to amend a RLUS for a specified time period if this provides a protective measure until a review can be performed of longer-term settings.

If more regular reviews are required of the RLUSs, should a request for amendments of a RLUS be provided for, and who should be able to make such a request?

The Institute's response

A request should be able to be made by

- Statutory bodies and corporations such as Infrastructure Tasmania and Hydro Tasmania
- Heritage Tasmania
- Government departments
- Councils
- Recognised Traditional Custodians/ corporations or associations

Do you think the draft structure plan guidelines will assist councils, planners, developers and the community with an understanding of what should be contained in a structure plan and what the structure plans should achieve?

The Institute's response

Draft structure plan guidelines will assist councils, planners, developers and the community with an understanding of what should be contained in a structure plan and what the structure plans should achieve

We note the comment in the Draft Structure Plan Guidelines¹¹ that,

a structure plan may introduce urban design objectives to strengthen the public realm, objectives for sustainable design or urban landscaping features, or identify a specific mix of uses to deliver a particular activity precinct (p. 7)

We strongly support that good design outcomes at this level are being contemplated by the Tasmanian Government for the regions. The ability to inform urban design objectives would be made more feasible by establishing a government architect office to provide direct advice and oversight to the development of urban design objectives and landscaping features. Good design needs to be defined and measurable.

Are there any other additional matters or issues that should be considered for inclusion in the guidelines?

The Institute's response.

Structure plans should also pay attention to environmental restoration, not just development. There is a need to approach our human land use with a more “biophilic” intent so that we are cognisant of restoring damaged areas so that the human footprint is minimised. This will actually help to ensure human activities and endeavours are themselves more likely to continue successfully and to be consistent with the objectives of the LUPA Act set out in Schedule 1. Ready examples include catchment restoration to ensure precipitation is absorbed into ground water systems, which has benefits for agriculture, or forestation to provide wind breaks. Other examples at the urban level include establishing tree canopy and other forms of vegetation that can protect people from wind and heat during warmer weather.

Scale responsive to landform and habitation is also critical. The key risk of not addressing these is unmitigated sprawl and destroying the character of locations that have their own intrinsic value in the human experience of what it means to live in Tasmanian landscapes. Scale and design sensibility in planning needs to be visible in all planning decisions.

¹¹ Structure Plan Guidelines – Draft – November 2022,
https://planningreform.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/684780/Appendix-A-Draft-Structure-Plan-Guidelines-Consultation-Draft-November-2022.pdf

Appendix 1 Extract of submission on Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs)

(Extract of submission to Tasmania Department of Justice from Australian Institute of Architects on Scoping Paper for draft TPPs. 29.10.2021)

While it is appreciated that the policies are aspirational in scope, their role in influencing regional strategies and planning scheme provisions, demand they are based on specific regional understanding and, in the context of anticipated change, the pressing issues that each region faces.

The Institute anticipates the TPPs will be based on rigorous regional strategic planning and modelling, beyond the land-use derived strategies of the recent past. Existing development patterns are not necessarily appropriate moving forward. The issue of population growth should be considered, and with exponentially increasing settlement footprints impacting cultural, environmental, and agricultural landscapes, the Institute recognises that a state-wide settlement policy is long overdue. To adequately respond to the outline topics identified, appropriate resourcing will be needed, ensuring the objectives of the policies are based on thorough analysis and spatial assessment, leading to an integrated strategic vision for the state.

The Institute considers that understanding critical existing landscape values (both built and natural) provides a 'frame' through which urban planning strategies can be developed and architecture and landscape architecture responses can be considered, with the ultimate aim of achieving sustainable and thriving communities.

The Institute would like to make the following suggestions in response to the scope of the proposed TPP topics and issues.

The Institute suggests the addition of three new topics under Liveable Settlements:

1. Regional Landscape Values

These recognise the location of the Liveable Settlements, not merely their physical or built presence. They would identify the landform character of settlement locations and their environmental values, to assist in distinguishing regional identity, to underpin the establishment of Regional Urban Design Values. These are 'urban' spatial values that will for example consider 'scenic protection' and 'landscape heritage' within a settlement context.

2. Regional Urban Design Values

These are values that seek to improve the resilience and ecological integrity of Tasmania's settlements. These would be achieved by thorough analysis and understanding of existing and potential settlement areas, for the purpose of planning sustainable settlement growth and where appropriate, densification. Outcomes would aim to strengthen existing urban areas and establish urban and regional growth boundaries based on measured data, rather than on 'vacant' land availability, through re-assessment and re-determination of appropriate land use. Consideration would be given to such criteria as current and projected populations and demographics, services locations, sustainable transport, appropriate building heights, preservation of environmental, cultural and scenic landscapes (identified in Regional Landscape Values), improving biodiversity and planning for hazards threats etc.

3. Strategic Planning of Existing & Proposed Settlement Areas

This will determine the direction of future development in all areas, including infill development, relevant density, and new subdivision. This holistic and pro-active approach encompasses a breadth of criteria with the aim of achieving sustainable and thriving future communities.

The basis for this would be work undertaken to determine the Regional Landscape Values and Regional Urban Design Values of specific places.

Design values must be included in standards for subdivision for residential, commercial and industrial development to achieve outcomes that contribute positively to the health, wellbeing and living conditions of occupants. Currently, pragmatics such as lot size, frontage width and access to roads and infrastructure services are the determining controls.

Design values may include criteria such as:

- 'the 20-minute neighbourhood', - street hierarchies, reducing vehicle speeds and favouring pedestrians in residential planning,
- Water Sensitive Urban Design Principles (WSUD),
- restoring pre-existing ecologies and waterways, rehabilitating degraded landscapes,
- orientation of streets in response to topography and microclimatic conditions of the specific site (summer cooling, winter wind protection, rainfall etc),
- orientation of lots to maximise passive heating & cooling of buildings,
- reducing radiant heat emissions through controls on landscape cover and landscape design, dwelling typologies and densities,
- community services,
- maximising existing infrastructure,
- adaptive reuse of redundant or underutilised places of local historic heritage,
- health & wellbeing - recreation & open space and connection to nature, community gardens.

The application of these values is not generic, but specific to regions and contexts (i.e. a subdivision or re-development site in Queenstown would be designed differently to a site with the same requirements in Brighton).

The Victorian State Government has published *20-Minute Neighbourhoods: Creating a more liveable Melbourne*, which contains strategies to enhance the liveability of neighbourhoods while accommodating for population growth.

Similarly, the NSW Government Architect has published *Better Placed*, which is: an integrated design policy for the built environment in NSW. It seeks to capture our collective aspiration and expectations for the places where we work, live and play. It creates a clear approach to ensure we get the good design that will deliver the architecture, public places and environments we want to inhabit now, and those we make for the future.