

# 30-Year Greater Hobart Plan Implementation

## Consultation Summary

March 2023



Greater Hobart  
Committee

Four Cities. One Hobart.



### **Copyright notice and disclaimer**

Copyright in this publication is owned by the Crown in Right of Tasmania, represented by the Department of State Growth.

Information in this publication is intended for general information only and does not constitute professional advice and should not be relied upon as such. No representation or warranty is made as to the accuracy, reliability or completeness of any information in this publication. Readers should make their own enquiries and seek independent professional advice before acting on or relying upon any of the information provided.

The Crown, its officers, employees and agents do not accept liability however arising, including liability for negligence, for any loss resulting from the use of or reliance upon information in this publication.

Images used within this publication remain the property of the copyright holder. Images courtesy of the Tasmanian Government.

This publication was produced by the Department of State Growth.

© Greater Hobart Committee March 2023

Contact: <https://www.greaterhobart.tas.gov.au/home>

# 30-Year Greater Hobart Plan Implementation

## Summary of consultation

On 24 August 2022, the Greater Hobart Committee endorsed the draft Greater Hobart Plan implementation arrangements to be refined after a period of targeted consultation with key stakeholders and peak bodies.

The consultation period commenced in mid-September 2022 and was conducted through individual meetings between the Department of State Growth (State Growth) and key stakeholders.

## Who did we consult with?

Over 35 peak organisations and key stakeholders were invited to meet and discuss potential implementation of the 30-Year Greater Hobart Plan (GH Plan).

Individual meetings on implementation of the GH Plan were held with the following stakeholders:

RACT	All Urban Planning
Bicycle Network Tasmania	TasNetworks
HIA	JAC Group
Hobart Airport	The House Family Office
Cycling South	NBN Co
Engineers Aus/Transport Australia	University of Tasmania
Metro Tasmania	TasWater
Housing Alliance lutruwita Tasmania	Relevant government agencies
Australian Institute of Architects	

## What did they say?

### Key themes

A range of key themes emerged from the consultation meetings, including:

- **Housing density** – there are considerable challenges associated with infill housing
- **Housing affordability** – with a focus on opportunities to increase supply of housing
- **Land-use planning** – effective management of the urban growth boundary

- **Service capacity** – support for land-use and infrastructure planning coordination
- **Public transport** – opportunities to incentivise take-up of public transport
- **Active transport** – support for greater focus on active transport
- **Continuous engagement** – general support for ongoing engagement

## Housing density

Consultation participants expressed general support for the GH Plan's objective of increasing infill development and limiting urban sprawl.

Several participants called for greater clarity on areas identified for growth, both within the existing urban growth boundary (UGB) and greenfield areas outside the UGB.

Several participants highlighted the complexities associated with infill development, which lead to higher costs and reduced margins, including:

- community objections and the resulting delays
- higher purchase price of land
- heritage and other planning constraints
- contamination
- higher construction costs
- difficulty securing a sufficiently large site to justify development.

As such, these participants advocated for incentives to encourage infill development, including:

- stamp duty concessions for buying off the plan
- structure plans and specific area plans for development areas
- delay in payment of headworks charges
- infrastructure bonds
- waiving application fees for multi-residential developments in growth areas
- car-parking policies and a reduction on carparking requirements
- a state-wide multi-unit development code
- general reduction in planning barriers.

## Housing affordability

A number of participants noted that land banking is a major issue for housing affordability and increasing density. As such, they advocated for strategies to discourage land banking and drip-feeding the market to drive up prices, such as vacancy taxes.

Other strategies suggested to address the housing shortage and affordability included tax concessions for those who offer housing as social housing or build to rent, addressing capital gains tax and negative gearing, and limiting short-stay accommodation.

It was noted that renters and non-homeowners, particularly those living with a disability or otherwise marginalised, should be given a voice in decisions regarding planning and housing.

## Land use planning

Many participants expressed support for a structured and periodic review of the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy (STRLUS) and the UGB.

Participants also called for greater clarity and consistency from councils regarding planning pathways, decision-making processes, indicative growth areas and council expectations.

Regarding adjustments to the UGB, participants identified the following factors for consideration:

- access to amenities and services (including health and education);
- efficient use of existing infrastructure;
- proximity to transport corridors and routes;
- existing commitments to transport infrastructure;
- natural values and sense of place;
- geographical and topographical constraints; and
- consistency with existing Government planning and strategies.

The importance of considering freight routes in strategic planning was also raised, as well as the need for an updated industrial land strategy.

## Service capacity

Service providers advised that they generally undertake upgrades as required, and where there has been a commitment to development, to reduce the risk of funding upgrades which are not utilised.

In terms of power supply, capacity constraints can in some instances be addressed through switching supply from neighbouring substations. However, where this is not possible, new substations or substation upgrades may be required which are costly and often involve land acquisition and easements.

In terms of digital infrastructure, there was support for a legislative requirement that telecommunications be part of the development process in the same way as water and power, to reduce digital disadvantage.

## Public transport

Several participants identified the need for better integration between public transport and active transport, such as the ability to take bicycles onto buses and ferries, and bike storage at public transport terminals/stops.

There was support for a reduction in car-parking requirements to incentivise infill, but the need for commensurate public transport improvements was noted.

Several participants highlighted the need for greater incentives for commuters to switch to bus transport, including:

- Dedicated bus lanes
- Green light sensors for buses
- Real time tracking

- More direct routes to hubs and the city
- Common ticketing system
- Improvements to bus stops to increase safety

Many of these factors will assist in improving reliability of service, which has been raised as an issue.

It was noted that funding is required to increase frequency and to switch to electric/hydrogen buses, including funding to upgrade and increase the size of depots.

It was suggested that strategies be implemented to incentivise developers to make provision for public transport as part of developments, as this is not currently a planning requirement.

### **Active transport**

A number of participants voiced support for active transport considerations in planning schemes, such as developer contributions to shared footpaths, footpaths on both sides of the street, bike parking and storage, meaningful greenspaces and incentives to contribute to active transport infrastructure.

It was stated that additional funding is required for active transport networks, including the development of design standards or guidelines for AAA active transport infrastructure.

It was also suggested that incentives by way of legislated physical activity targets would assist the shift towards active transport.

### **Continuous engagement**

It was noted that considered and continuous engagement with Tasmanian Aboriginal organisations is important going forward.

Several participants expressed a desire for continued consultation and engagement throughout the implementation of the Plan.



# Greater Hobart Committee

Four Cities. One Hobart.