

## Tasmanian Planning Policies – Scoping Paper Submissions

<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
61	Claire Bookless	Managing Lawyer - Tasmania	Environmental Defenders Office
62	Ben Rea		Tasmanian E-Bike Adventures
63	Lachlan Kranz	Acting Director Environment and Development Services	Huon Valley Council
64	Barry Williams	Industry Relations & Policy Manager	Cement, Concrete and Aggregates Australia
65	Danny Sutton	Chief Executive	Colony 47
66	Fiona Brine		
67	Ian Jones	Environmental Planning and Policy Specialist	Hydro Tasmania
68	Kim Evans	Secretary	Department of State Growth
69	David Ridley	Chair	No Turbine Action Group
70	Tim Bullard	Secretary	Department of Education
71	Alice Flockhart	State Manager Tas	National Disability Services
72	Brian Corr	President	Hobart Not Highrise Inc
73	Tanya Alkinson	Establishment Manager	Wintringham
74	Rosanna Coombes	CEO	NRM North
75	Neil Noye	Director City Planning	Hobart City Council
76	Jenny Lau	Preventing Extinctions Program Leader	Birdlife Australia Discovery Centre
77	Dr Helen Hutchinson		
78	Catherine Nicholson		
79	Julie Ryan	Executive Policy Officer	Carers Tasmania
80	Daryl Connelly	Director Community Services	Central Coast Council



**Environmental  
Defenders Office**

**Submission in response to Tasmanian Planning  
Policy Scoping Paper**

**22 October 2021**

## **About EDO**

EDO is a community legal centre specialising in public interest environmental law. We help people who want to protect the environment through law. Our reputation is built on:

***Successful environmental outcomes using the law.*** With over 30 years' experience in environmental law, EDO has a proven track record in achieving positive environmental outcomes for the community.

***Broad environmental expertise.*** EDO is the acknowledged expert when it comes to the law and how it applies to the environment. We help the community to solve environmental issues by providing legal and scientific advice, community legal education and proposals for better laws.

***Independent and accessible services.*** As a non-government and not-for-profit legal centre, our services are provided without fear or favour. Anyone can contact us to get free initial legal advice about an environmental problem, with many of our services targeted at rural and regional communities.

Environmental Defenders Office is a legal centre dedicated to protecting the environment.

### **Submitted to:**

Department of Justice  
Office of the Secretary  
GPO Box 825  
HOBART TAS 7001

***By email only:*** [haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au](mailto:haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au)

### **For further information, please contact:**

Claire Bookless  
Managing Lawyer – Tasmania  
Environmental Defenders Office Ltd

Ph: (03) 6223 2770

EDO thanks Jarin White and George Grover for their research and assistance in the preparation of this submission.

## Introduction

The Tasmanian Planning Policies (**TPPs**) will provide overarching guidance and direction of both Regional Land Use Strategies and the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.<sup>1</sup> The TPPs may relate to the following:<sup>2</sup>

- (a) the sustainable use, development, protection or conservation of land;
- (b) environmental protection;
- (c) liveability, health and wellbeing of the community; and
- (d) any other matter that may be included in a planning scheme or a regional land use strategy.

Given their strategic importance and potential scope, it is vital that the TPPs adequately reflect and respond to the key issues facing Tasmania at this turbulent time, including the extinction and climate crises.

In this context, EDO welcomes the opportunity to comment on Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping Paper (**Scoping Paper**). The following submission responds to the proposed scope and structure of the TPPs. A summary of EDO's key recommendations in response to the Scoping Paper is outlined below.

**Recommendation 1:** EDO's recommendations on TPP topics and issues outlined in **Appendix 1** be adopted.

**Recommendation 2:** An overarching climate change TPP be created which links to statutory GHG emissions reductions targets, climate risk assessments, and sectorial plans, and provides clear guidance on how these are to be implemented through Regional Land Use Strategies and the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.

**Recommendation 3:** Replace the proposed "Economic development" TPP with a "Sustainable Development" TPP.

**Recommendation 4:** Ensure the issues covered by the Sustainable Development TPP align with the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

**Recommendation 5:** TPPs include performance measures to provide a clear mechanism to measure the achievement of the TPP objectives.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, s 12B(1)

<sup>2</sup> *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, s 12B(2)

## 1. Scope of proposed TPPs and issues

EDO provides the following general comments as to proposed TPP topic, with specific recommendations on the proposed TPP topics are provided in **Appendix 1** to this submission.

**Recommendation 1:** EDO's recommendations on TPP topics and issues outlined in **Appendix 1** be adopted.

### *Planning for climate change*

Anthropogenic climate change is having significant impacts in Australia and across the globe. The annual global temperature in 2019 was 1.1 degrees Celsius (°C) warmer than pre-industrial conditions.<sup>3</sup> Australia's average annual temperature has warmed by around 1.5°C since 1850,<sup>4</sup> and the best available science tells us that average temperatures are projected to rise further. Australia is already experiencing the impacts of climate change, which include increasing temperatures, the warming and acidification of oceans, sea level rise, decreased rainfall in southern parts of the country and increased and more extreme rainfall in the north, longer dry spells, greater number of extreme heat days and the long-term increase in extreme fire weather.

In the future, it is projected Tasmania will experience higher average temperatures all year, with more hot days and warm spells and harsher fire-weather. Tasmania will also experience sea level rise, an increase in extreme rainfall events and flooding, but a decrease in rainfall in spring and with the possibility of less rain in autumn and summer.<sup>5</sup>

The contribution of urban development to greenhouse gas (**GHG**) emissions and its vulnerability to climate change impacts is well established. As Caparros-Midwood, et al. (2019) observed:<sup>6</sup>

*... urban areas are already responsible for approximately 70% of global greenhouse gas emissions and new urban development must reduce greenhouse gas emissions if the Paris Agreement to limit global warming are to be achieved. There is an urgent need for urban development to reduce resource consumption and emissions, whilst also enhancing resilience to climatic risks such as flooding and heatwaves. (Citations omitted)*

It is therefore critical that land use planning policies effectively address these issues:<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>See World Meteorological Organisation, *WMO confirms 2019 as second hottest year on record, 15 January 2020*, accessed at <https://public.wmo.int/en/media/pressrelease/wmo-confirms-2019-second-hottest-year-record>

<sup>4</sup> See CSIRO, *Response to Notice to Give Information 21 April 2020 for the Royal Commission into National Natural Disaster Arrangements*, 21 April 2020, accessed at <https://naturaldisaster.royalcommission.gov.au/system/files/exhibit/CSI.500.001.0001.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> CSIRO, *Climate change in Australia - Projections for Australia's NRM regions*, accessed on 29 April 2021, accessed at: <https://www.climatechangeinaustralia.gov.au/en/climate-projections/future-climate/regional-climate-change-explorer/clusters/>

<sup>6</sup> Caparros-Midwood, Dawson, Barr, "Low Carbon, Low Risk, Low Density: Resolving choices about sustainable development in cities", *Cities*, Volume 89, 2019, Pages 252-267, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.02.018>

<sup>7</sup> Hurlimann, Moosavi & Browne, "Urban planning policy must do more to integrate climate change adaptation and mitigation actions", *Land Use Policy*, Volume 101, 2021 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.105188>

*... it must be acknowledged that past and current urban planning activities have resulted in climate change impacts and path dependency. Thus, significant changes to the status quo of urban planning activities are required in many locations across the world to achieve the goal of limiting warming to 1.5°C but also to avoid the risk and harm attributable to even this amount of warming. (Citations omitted)*

In Tasmania, much more must be done through land use planning to both mitigate GHG emissions and adapt to climate change risks.

Based on the available data, Tasmania has achieved net zero GHG emissions for the past four reported years.<sup>8</sup> However, we note that this achievement is entirely attributable to the carbon stored in forests (otherwise referred to as the land use, land use change and forestry sector (**LULUCF**)).<sup>9</sup> Reliance on the LULUCF sector alone to mitigate Tasmania's GHG emissions is risky as it is vulnerable to rapid change, for example through changes to land use practices arising from policies such as the Agri-Vision 2050 and Rural Water Use Strategy,<sup>10</sup> relaxing of planning scheme restrictions on vegetation clearing, and the "reinvigoration" of the forestry sector<sup>11</sup>. Furthermore, reliance on the emissions reductions from the LULUCF sector masks our failure to reduce GHG emissions in other sectors. For example, Tasmania's population, and its associated GHG emissions in transport, stationary energy, and waste, are expected to increase by 2050.<sup>12</sup> Point Advisory has modelled that if Tasmania continued on a "business as usual" path, its emissions could sharply increase to 2050.<sup>13</sup> This modelling underlines the need for the Tasmanian Government to take urgent action to mitigate GHG emissions across all sectors. Land use planning controls provide the best opportunity for such action to be taken.

Tasmania has been taking steps towards planning to adapt to a rapidly warming climate. For example, the Tasmanian Planning Scheme contains codes for Coastal Erosion Hazards, Coastal Inundation Hazards, Flood-Prone Areas Hazards, and Bushfire-Prone Areas. However, more could be done to plan for Tasmania's future under different climate warming scenarios. For example, the mapping for the Coastal Erosion and Coastal Inundation Codes is based on

---

<sup>8</sup> Australian Government, *State and territory greenhouse gas inventories: annual emissions*, accessed on 21 October 2021, at: <https://www.industry.gov.au/data-and-publications/national-greenhouse-accounts-2019/state-and-territory-greenhouse-gas-inventories-annual-emissions>

<sup>9</sup> Tasmania Climate Change Office, *Tasmania's Greenhouse Gas Emissions 2021 Factsheet*, accessed on 29 April 2021 at [http://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0004/575392/TCCO\\_Fact\\_Sheet\\_-\\_Tasmanias\\_Greenhouse\\_Gas\\_Emissions\\_-\\_2021.pdf](http://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/575392/TCCO_Fact_Sheet_-_Tasmanias_Greenhouse_Gas_Emissions_-_2021.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. See also DPIPWE (2019) *Tasmanian Sustainable Agri-Food Plan 2019-23*, accessible at <https://dPIPWE.tas.gov.au/agriculture/tasmanias-agri-food-plan>

<sup>11</sup> See <https://tas.liberal.org.au/securing-tasmanias-future-growing-forestry-jobs>

<sup>12</sup> Jacobs, *Discussion Paper on Tasmania's Climate Change Act: Independent Review of the Climate Change (State Actions) Act 2008* March 2021 at p 18, accessed at:

[https://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/divisions/climatechange/Climate\\_Change\\_Priorities/review\\_of\\_the\\_climate\\_change\\_act](https://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/divisions/climatechange/Climate_Change_Priorities/review_of_the_climate_change_act)

<sup>13</sup> Point Advisory (2021) *Net Zero Emissions Pathway Options for Tasmania - Background Paper*, accessed on 26 April 2021 at

[http://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0011/573095/net\\_zero\\_emissions\\_background\\_Paper\\_-\\_Final.pdf](http://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0011/573095/net_zero_emissions_background_Paper_-_Final.pdf) at under a "high business as usual" rate outlined in table 1 on p 6.

analysis undertaken by the CSIRO using data from the fifth Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report.<sup>14</sup> Further expert analysis of Tasmania's likely coastal erosion and inundation risks should be commissioned based on the sea-level rise information in the sixth IPCC report. Likewise, further investigation of the interaction between coastal inundation and estuarine flooding,<sup>15</sup> and mapping of Tasmania's flood risks in future climate scenarios is required.<sup>16</sup> As to the SPP provisions, these could be significantly strengthened to, for example, prevent vulnerable development and uses in high-risk bushfire prone and coastal erosion and inundation areas, and actively plan for managed retreat from high-risk locations.

Although the Scoping Paper acknowledges the overarching importance of land use planning in Tasmania's response to climate change, it proposes to address climate change across relevant planning policies on different topics. While the implementation of climate change considerations into each of the policies allows for climate-related factors to be considered in a broad range of areas, the failure to provide an overarching planning policy for climate change risks that an inconsistent approach may be taken in some policies to GHG mitigation and climate change adaptation.<sup>17</sup> It also exacerbates the risk that potential synergies and conflicts between mitigation and adaptation goals, or indeed between those goals and other objectives of the TPPs, could be overlooked.<sup>18</sup>

While the EDO is supportive of the inclusion of climate change across all TPPs, it strongly recommends there be an overarching climate planning policy which:

- Explicitly recognises the soon-to-be legislated GHG emissions reduction target, and any
  - Climate Action Plan (**CAP**),
  - State-wide climate risk assessments (**CRA**), and
  - sector-based emissions reduction and resilience plans (**Plans**) created under the *Climate Change (State Actions) Act 2008*; and

---

<sup>14</sup> Tasmanian Climate Change Office, "Coastal Impacts" webpage accessed at [https://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/divisions/climatechange/climate\\_change\\_in\\_tasmania/impacts\\_of\\_climate\\_change/coastal\\_impacts](https://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/divisions/climatechange/climate_change_in_tasmania/impacts_of_climate_change/coastal_impacts); and Tasmanian Planning Commission, *Guideline No. 1 Local Provisions Schedule (LPS): zone and code application*, June 2018 accessed at [https://www.planning.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0006/583854/Section-8A-Guideline-No.-1-Local-Provisions-Schedule-LPS-zone-and-code-application-version-2.pdf](https://www.planning.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0006/583854/Section-8A-Guideline-No.-1-Local-Provisions-Schedule-LPS-zone-and-code-application-version-2.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> See discussion of this in Office of Security and Emergency Management, *Coastal Hazards Package: Summary of Consultation*, undated, accessible at [https://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/divisions/osem/coastal\\_hazards\\_in\\_tasmania](https://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/divisions/osem/coastal_hazards_in_tasmania)

<sup>16</sup> There is currently no state wide mapping of flood prone areas, Tasmanian Planning Commission, *Guideline No. 1 Local Provisions Schedule (LPS): zone and code application*, June 2018, at p 51 accessed at [https://www.planning.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0006/583854/Section-8A-Guideline-No.-1-Local-Provisions-Schedule-LPS-zone-and-code-application-version-2.pdf](https://www.planning.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0006/583854/Section-8A-Guideline-No.-1-Local-Provisions-Schedule-LPS-zone-and-code-application-version-2.pdf)

<sup>17</sup> For a discussion of how this has occurred in Victoria, see Hurlimann, Moosavi & Browne, "Urban planning policy must do more to integrate climate change adaptation and mitigation actions" (2021) *Land Use Policy* 101 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.105188>

<sup>18</sup> See Hurlimann, Moosavi & Browne, "Urban planning policy must do more to integrate climate change adaptation and mitigation actions", *Land Use Policy*, Volume 101, 2021 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.105188>

- Provides clear guidance on how GHG emissions reduction target, the CAP, CRA and Plans are to be implemented, where appropriate, through Regional Land Use Strategies (**RLUS**), State Planning Provisions (**SPPs**) and Local Provision Schedules (**LPSs**).

**Recommendation 2:** An overarching TPP on climate change be created which links to statutory GHG emissions reductions targets, risk assessments, and sectorial plans, and provides clear guidance on how these are to be implemented through RLUS and the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.

### ***Sustainable development***

The TPPs must seek to further the objectives of the *Land Use Planning and Approval Act 1993*, including the Resource Management and Planning System (**RMPS**) objectives.<sup>19</sup>

The RMPS objectives 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.*

“Sustainable development” is then further defined as:

- ... 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.*

While none of the proposed TPPs expressly deals with sustainable development, one of the key proposed TPP topics is “Economic development”. Given that paragraph (d) of the RMPS objectives expressly notes that the “facilitation of economic development” must be “in accordance with” the objectives outlined in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c), it is clear that economic development should only be facilitated where it is sustainable and encourages public involvement in the management of our shared resources.

---

<sup>19</sup> *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, s 12B(4)

For this reason, EDO considers a more appropriate TPP topic would be “Sustainable Development” to reflect the RMPS objectives and ensure economic, social and environmental considerations are appropriately balanced. Such an approach is consistent with the Premier’s Economic and Social Recovery Advisory Council (**PESRAC**) recommendation for a “consistent and coordinated government approach to sustainability”, and with its observation that the Government should “influence, encourage and incentivise the adoption of sustainable development practices in business and non-government organisations through...Tasmania’s planning and resource management system”.<sup>20</sup>

Furthermore, having a Sustainable Development TPP would provide a practical vehicle to apply the PESRAC’s recommendation to align Government policies and strategies with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.<sup>21</sup> Aligning the Sustainable Development TPP with the UN Sustainable Development Goals would still allow the TPP to deal with issues including industry and business, tourism, agriculture and mining, but would ensure that they are addressed in the broader context of sustainability such as by incorporating sustainable design and innovation etc.

**Recommendation 3:** Replace the proposed “Economic development” TPP with a “Sustainable Development” TPP.

**Recommendation 4:** Ensure the issues covered by the Sustainable Development TPP align with the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

## 2. Proposed structure of TPPs

The Scoping Paper proposes that the TPPs include the following components:

TPP Topic	The name of the particular topic covered by the TPP
Issue	Sets out the particular issue(s) under the TPP Topic
Objective	Describes the broad intent of what the issue aims to address
Strategies	Describes how the objective will be achieved – there may be multiple strategies
Implementation Statements	Describes how each individual strategy will be delivered into the planning system, either through strategic planning such as regional land use strategies, or through statutory planning in the Tasmanian Planning Scheme (State Planning Provisions and Local Provision Schedules)

EDO considers that the proposed structure would be improved by providing another component called “performance measures” which provide a clear mechanism to measure the achievement of the objectives outlined in the TPP.

<sup>20</sup> Premier’s Economic & Social Recovery Advisory Council, *Final Report*, March 2021, Department of Treasury and Finance at p 69, accessed at [https://www.pesrac.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0011/283196/Final\\_Report\\_WCAG2.pdf](https://www.pesrac.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0011/283196/Final_Report_WCAG2.pdf)

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

For example:

- (a) if one of the objectives of the Environment Protection TPP is to “maintain biodiversity”, the TPP should provide clear performance measures for the achievement of that objective, such as “no net reduction of threatened native vegetation communities”, and/or “habitat for listed endangered species is identified and protected”;
- (b) for an objective in the Liveable Settlements TPP that “development be planned and contained within existing settlements along Tasmania’s coastline” a performance measure might be “no new urban subdivisions outside of existing or planned settlements identified in RLUS”;
- (c) for an objective in the Sustainable Development TPP of “facilitating sustainable economic development and employment opportunities in Tasmania’s West Coast”, a performance measure might be “an increase in employment in the West Coast region”.

While there would be no sanction for the failure to meet the performance measures in the TPPs, if they were not achieved it would prompt reflection and discussion about why that is and whether Implementation Statements and Strategies should be updated or varied to seek to achieve that outcome, or if external processes outside the planning framework require attention. In this way, the provision of performance measures will enable meaningful review and reporting on the implementation and effectiveness of the TPPs, as required under section 12I of the LUPA Act.

**Recommendation 5:** TPPs should include performance measures to provide a clear mechanism to measure the achievement of the TPP objectives.

## Appendix 1 – EDO recommendations on specific TPP topics and issues

TPP Topic	Issues (to be addressed under each TPP Topic)	EDO Recommendations
Environmental Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biodiversity – flora and fauna habitat protection, weed management, fire management</li> <li>• Waterways and wetlands – water quality</li> <li>• Catchment management</li> <li>• Coastal processes and landforms</li> <li>• Applying the precautionary principle</li> </ul>	<p>EDO is supportive of this proposed TPP topic and the issues identified. However, it <b>recommends</b> that this TPP also address the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conservation – which would address Tasmania’s national parks, reserves and land subject to conservation covenants or Part 5 agreements.</li> <li>- Rehabilitation &amp; restoration – which would provide for how historical and future adverse effects on the environment could be remedied, consistent with paragraph (c) of the definition of sustainable development in the RMPS objectives.</li> <li>- Air quality – to address the National Environmental Protection (Ambient Air Quality) Measure (which is a State Policy).</li> </ul> <p>EDO further considers that the issue of “soil quality” proposed to be addressed in the Hazards and Risks TPP, may more comfortably sit within the Environment Protection TPP.</p>
Hazards and risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural hazards – bushfire</li> <li>• Flooding</li> <li>• Landslide</li> <li>• Sea level rise coastal inundation and erosion</li> <li>• Acid sulphate soils</li> <li>• Man-made hazards – emissions, contaminated land, soil quality/risks</li> </ul>	<p>In light of the fact that many hazards are being exacerbated by anthropogenic climate change and other activities, EDO <b>recommends</b> the proposed separation of hazard issues into “natural hazards” and “man-made hazards” be abandoned as it is artificial and unnecessary.</p> <p>EDO further <b>recommends</b> that this TPP include “extreme heat and heatwaves” as an issue to be addressed as these are likely to become more common in future as a result of climate change.</p>
Economic Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industry and business</li> <li>• Tourism</li> <li>• Agriculture</li> <li>• Mining and minerals</li> </ul>	<p>EDO <b>recommends</b> that this TPP topic should be amended to “Sustainable Development” and link the issues to be addressed to relevant UN Sustainable Development Goals as per the discussion in part 1 of our submission above.</p>

TPP Topic	Issues (to be addressed under each TPP Topic)	EDO Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use and development in the coastal zone</li> </ul>	
Liveable Settlements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planned and contained settlements</li> <li>• Pleasant places to live – amenity and avoiding land use conflicts</li> <li>• Integrating land use and transport</li> <li>• Health and wellbeing – recreation and open space opportunities</li> <li>• Community – health services and education</li> </ul>	<p>Access to affordable and sustainable housing is a critical feature of environmental justice and liveable settlements. However, despite being required under Action 2 of <i>Tasmania's Affordable Housing Action Plan 2019-2023</i>, dated March 2019,<sup>22</sup> affordable housing issues are notably absent from the issues addressed by the proposed TPP.</p> <p>EDO <b>recommends</b> that affordable and sustainable housing is included as an issue to be addressed under the Liveable Settlements TPP.</p>
Heritage Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aboriginal heritage</li> <li>• Cultural heritage</li> <li>• Landscape heritage – scenic protection, including tourist routes</li> </ul>	<p>EDO supports the integration of Aboriginal Heritage into the Heritage Protection TPP. However, the consultation draft Aboriginal Heritage TPP circulated in 2017 failed to provide any tangible guidance or strategies for the recognition or protection of Aboriginal Heritage through the land use planning process. Likewise, there is a complete absence of any recognition of and protection for Aboriginal Heritage in the SPPs.</p> <p>While EDO understands that the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1975</i> is currently under review, it <b>recommends</b> the Tasmanian Government to take this opportunity to ensure that the TPPs trigger consideration of Aboriginal Heritage in planning decisions and integrate a process for the Tasmanian Aboriginal community to exercise free, prior and informed consent for any development or use that has the potential to adversely impact Aboriginal heritage.</p>

<sup>22</sup>Accessed at [https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0027/31698/TAH\\_Action-Plan-2019-2023.pdf](https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0027/31698/TAH_Action-Plan-2019-2023.pdf)

TPP Topic	Issues (to be addressed under each TPP Topic)	EDO Recommendations
Infrastructure to support the economy and create liveable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airports / Sea ports / Railways</li> <li>• Roads, car parking, cycleways and walkways</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• Telecommunications</li> <li>• Electricity and energy</li> <li>• Irrigation, water, sewerage and stormwater</li> <li>• Waste management</li> </ul>	<p>EDO is generally supportive of a TPP covering infrastructure, however, it <b>recommends</b> that the TPP be titled “Infrastructure to support a <i>sustainable</i> economy and create liveable communities”, as this would better align to the RMPS objectives, take account of PESRAC’s recommendations and the UN sustainable development goals. It would also allow for the issues addressed under this TPP to better reflect this overarching objective. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Roads, car parking, cycleways, and walkways” might instead be “sustainable transport”;</li> <li>• “Electricity and energy” might instead be “sustainable energy”;</li> <li>• “Waste management” might instead be “circular economy”.</li> </ul> <p>These changes would be more than just semantic. They would ensure that consideration of infrastructure issues is framed towards the transition towards more sustainable practices and that the social and environmental impacts of these activities be properly taken into account in planning decisions.</p>
Public engagement in planning processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation</li> <li>• Strategic planning</li> <li>• Ongoing review</li> </ul>	<p>EDO is supportive of a TPP covering public engagement in resource management and planning. However, it is unclear what is intended to be covered the issue of “ongoing review”. If it is intended that “ongoing review” will address the review of the TPPs, this may be unnecessary if EDO’s recommendation for all TPPs contain performance measures to facilitate their ongoing review and improvement is adopted.</p> <p>Some of the principal ways the public may be engaged in the planning process is through the exercise of appeal and civil enforcement rights. EDO therefore <b>recommends</b> that these issues also be addressed in this TPP, together with the issue of transparency and access to information to ensure that the public can be informed about resource and planning issues that affect them.</p>



Department of Justice  
Office of Strategic Legislation and Policy  
GPO Box 825  
HOBART TAS 7001  
Web [www.justice.tas.gov.au](http://www.justice.tas.gov.au)  
By email: [haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au](mailto:haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au)  
22 October 2021

To Whom It May Concern,

**RE: Scope/Content and Structure of the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs)**

Thankyou for the opportunity to provide feedback on the scope of the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies.

I agree with PMAT Planning Matters Alliance Tasmania that the scope of topics must include climate change and protection of our natural cultural and brand assets.

As a Tasmanian and a sustainable tourism business owner  
<https://tasmanianebikeadventures.com.au/>

I believe that to address the current challenges and realise the opportunities for future Tasmanian generations the following planning topics need to be considered and incorporated.

- Human Health and Well-being
- Tasmanian Cultural and Natural Brand Values
- Ecological restoration of systems and processes that will insure biodiversity cultural identity and climate change resilience

- Scenic Landscape Protection
- Best practice design and research
- Sustainable Transport infrastructure
- Monitoring, evaluation and reporting

As a tourism operator I am particularly concerned that Tasmania's scenic landscapes, soundscapes and view-fields are protected.

*The landscape values of the State remain a major drawcard for the State's tourism industry and these landscapes should be managed as a key component of tourism infrastructure. PMAT*

I have actively participated in the T 2030 Policy and strategy process for the future of Tasmanian Tourism.

During industry and community consultation initiated by the Tasmanian Government in 2019 I articulated the need for a planning scheme that preserves Tasmania's brand assets.

Attached to this email is a T2030 reflections document.

I fully support the Planning Topics by the Planning Matters Alliance below.

*Human Health and Wellbeing TPP,  
Ecological Restoration TPP,  
Scenic Landscape Protection TPP,  
Good Design TPP,  
Sustainable Transport and Mobility TPP  
Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting TPP.  
Human Health and Well-being TPP*

*Given its overarching importance, Sustainability Planning might however, be the best approach.*

*Ecological Restoration TPP The restoration and rehabilitation of degraded land is an important tool in dealing with climate change impacts and loss of biodiversity.*

*This policy is seen as additional to an Environmental Protection Policy as it focuses with improving degraded land to reduce climate change impacts and reverse biodiversity loss rather than just protecting remaining values.*

*Environmental restoration has the capacity to increase habitat area for native species, improve water quality by reducing runoff and providing natural filtration, provide linkages between areas of intact vegetation, provide natural pest control, engaging people with nature and empowering them to be part of repairing the environment. It would also help raise the standards of conservation land management across Tasmania.*

*An Ecological Restoration TPP would also help further the objectives of the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration (2021 – 2030), which aims to prevent, halt and reverse the degradation of ecosystems on every continent and in every ocean. We should also be aiming for ecological integrity and resilience across the landscape – known as landscape continuum. The Society for Ecological Restorations published the National Standards for the Practice of Ecological Restoration in Australia, should also be incorporated into all land use across Tasmania. Scenic Landscape Protection TPP It is suggested that a new ‘Scenic Landscape Protection’ TPP topic be included.*

*The 2003 State of the Environment Report for Tasmania is still relevant today as it made the following statements about Tasmania’s scenic landscapes. These demonstrate the importance of our scenic landscapes to our natural values, economy and well-being: #PlanningMatters 11 ‘Scenic landscape includes the properties of the land, such as landform, landcover and land use, arising from a number of natural and cultural processes. Landscape has much to contribute to the debate on sustainable development in Tasmania because it is integrated and people focussed.*

*Maintaining the condition of scenic landscape values is important for Tasmania because: – There are strong cultural ties to landscape and feelings for the visual beauty of the mountains, lakes, coasts and forests of Tasmania are a common bond among people. –*

*The landscape values of the State remain a major drawcard for the State's tourism industry and these landscapes should be managed as a key component of tourism infrastructure. –*

***Landscape values have an association with environmental and natural resource quality: the values that people typically appreciate in a landscape are often also important ecologically. In other words, protecting landscape values can also help to protect a range of other environmental services.’ ‘Tasmania's***

*landscape is highly diverse and noteworthy for its spectacular beauty—shaped by geological forces, influenced by extremes of climate, mantled in a range of vegetation types and modified by the activities of humans. Landscape has much to contribute to the debate on sustainable development in Tasmania because it is integrated (it spans land tenures and land uses) and people focussed (we all enjoy a good view).*

*The condition of scenic landscape values is important for Tasmania because of the following. → Protecting landscape values can sometimes help to protect a range of other environmental services. Landscape values often have an association with environmental and natural resource quality: [They also provide for connectivity being natural areas which are important for gene flow and protection/enhancement of biodiversity].*

*The values that people appreciate in a landscape are often also important ecologically. → There are strong cultural ties to landscape and feelings for the visual beauty of the mountains, lakes, coasts and forests of Tasmania are a common bond among people. → There are links between healthy landscapes and healthy lifestyles through the recreational opportunities they provide. → The landscape values of the State remain a major drawcard for the tourism industry and these landscapes should be managed as a key component of tourism infrastructure.*

*‘Landscape inventories—linked to planning and development controls—provide the means to plan to avoid or lessen the impacts on landscape values arising from changes to the ways society uses or manages its land resources.’  
#PlanningMatters 12 Good Design TPP Tasmania should include an integrated design policy for the built environment.*

In conclusion please take the time to read the document **T2030 reflections Ben Rea** this links this conversation on planning policy with the ongoing Tourism Planning process.

Yours sincerely,

Ben Rea



TASMANIAN  
— E-BIKE —  
ADVENTURES

Mobile

Email

Website: <https://tasmanianebikeadventures.com.au/>

Instagram #tasmanianebikeadventures

Dear Anne, Alex and Nat,

Thank you for the opportunity to attend the T2030 forum at Bangor. I'm inspired to be participating in this hugely important opportunity to get Tasmania's tourism future right.

T 2030 as a visioning process and plan has the potential to be an effective driver in aligning government policy and leadership on what underpins our visitor economy and way of life. As John Fitzgerald has stated tourism should genuinely support Tasmania's "social and economic value".

It was heartening to hear Luke Martin articulate his vision for Tasmania as be a beacon for sustainable tourism. This echoes the famous quote by pioneering Tasmanian adventurer and conservationist Olegas Trachanas.

"Tasmania can be a shining beacon in a dull, uniform and largely artificial world"

I passionately believe in a vision for Tasmania as a beacon for sustainable tourism and through establishing my business Tasmanian E bike Adventures have worked to embody values that align with this vision. <https://tasmanianebikeadventures.com.au/>

Sustainable tourism is an area of expertise that has been the focus of my professional career. I have studied and worked in the field both at home in Tasmania and abroad. My introduction to nature tourism began with a sea kayaking expedition to the Queen Charlotte Islands in Canada back in 1992. As a 20 year old this three month expedition shaped my path. I was educated by the First Nation community and experienced through immersion the tourism value of wilderness. in 1996 I returned to the Queen Charlottes to work as a sea kayak guide.

In 2017 I undertook a private study trip to Haida Gwaii (now known by the traditional name) during the international year of sustainable tourism. My purpose was to examine management systems and practice that maintain the values of Gwaii Haanas National Park World Heritage site. On my return home to Tasmania I convened a panel of tourism experts to discuss the topic at a community forum held at UTAS. Natalie Hayes from Destination Southern Tasmania attended the event which is also documented on Facebook as a live stream if you are interested in examining the discussion.

My intention in following up after the Bangor workshop is to share my reflections on the T2030 conversation and discuss the key actions that I believe need to be addressed.

I firmly believe that all Tasmanians are the custodians and brand protectors of our unique island and that as a business I have the responsibility to lead and demonstrate sustainability values.

If we genuinely have a vision for Tasmania as a wellbeing and environmental tourism destination, we must maintain our authenticity by protecting the special environmental and social values that underpin our brand. Our unique landscapes, soundscapes and significant

viewfields. To achieve this, it is essential to have effective mechanisms to empower such a vision.

I feel the T2030 process has the unique opportunity to define the community values that can underpin this vision for tourism in Tasmania. If we can succeed in defining it I feel we are on our way to achieving it.

As a professional educator with a BA in outdoor Education, learning and understanding have been my path into tourism. The Bangor T2030 workshop clearly identified the themes of sustainability and education as central to industry's leadership priorities for tourism over the next decade.

From my perspective sustainability is underpinned by education.

We create value in our tourism economy and community by understanding, maintaining and protecting authenticity in our brand, the product, people and places that define our unique island home Tasmania.

Education is a vehicle for community empowerment if we are clear in our goals and have a shared vision. I believe that we will only achieve truly sustainable tourism if we give visitors meaningful experiences while keeping locals onside. We can do that by clarifying our values and vision, consistently aligning our decisions with them, and ensuring the benefits of tourism are widely shared in the community.

T2030 needs a holistic approach led by industry and government and shared by the community. This is where I feel the conversation now needs to focus.

How do we empower Tasmania through sustainable tourism?

The agency for empowerment in this movement comes from the community however we are reliant on government both local and state through the legislative framework in place to ensure the T2030 process can effectively empower the industry to achieve a sustainable vision.

There were a number of conversations at the T2030 workshop around the need for government leadership and resources to create the necessary infrastructure to sustainably manage the visitor economy. Road safety was highlighted for the Tasman region as a priority.

The key message I want to highlight is the fundamentally important role that the yet to be implemented Tasmanian Planning Scheme will play as a mechanism to achieve sustainable tourism. The Tasmanian Planning Scheme will create the future of every inch of Tasmania. The scheme is a critical tool for managing our brand and tourism experience— but it currently fails to address and protect the reasons why people live and visit here. Government policy is the best vehicle we have to articulate vision for tourism. This should protect the quality of the visitor experience, rather than simply facilitating the quantity of

visitors. Visitor numbers needs to be based on a rigorous assessment of carrying capacity and infrastructure / service costs, rather than aspirational accounting.

T2030 is a plan and the planning scheme is a vitally important mechanism to achieve it. Yes, education is important however without a planning scheme that protects and manages Tasmania's unique natural values and the social amenity this process will not have a mechanism to achieve its plan.

At this point in time we require effective planning to protect the environmental landscape and soundscape values that underpin our visitor economy and protect our destination values. Tasmania's east coast currently highlights this priority as with development contention as a result of planning challenges. Cambria Green the Friendly Beaches proposed extension of Freycinet Resort <https://www.freycinet.com/> and tourism pressure on Coles Bay all highlighting this challenge.

Ultimately it is sustainable visitor numbers and how people are managed at the destination that will protect place values and the experience of both guests and locals. Our capacity to achieve this will shape our ability to attract the high yield market targeted by Tourism Tasmania.

Come down for Air is a great brand campaign that highlights Tasmania's uniqueness and authenticity.

I would argue that this needs to be partnered with effective strategies to control over tourism and the degradation of experience values.

Without a plan in place to counter mass tourism the impact of direct international flights and continued visitor growth is highly likely to compromise the opportunities presented by our environmental tourism brand. In an age where nature is the balance to an increasingly artificial world Tasmania can be a beacon only if we avoid the light from going out.

Strategies to limit numbers need to be bold, targeted and measurable. Without addressing this wicked problem T2030 will present a lost opportunity and fail both the industry and the wider Tasmanian community.

Defining a visitor number cap to protect the natural values and visitor experience of travelers to our Parks and special places needs to be discussed. It is already in place on the Overland Track and is has been effectively implemented in other destinations facing similar challenges. E.g. Gwaii Haanas Canada, Bhutan and Palau.

If we are to successfully compete and attract the high yield traveler, the Raw Urbanites and Erudites identified by Tourism Tasmania we must plan and protect our destination values now. Price will only work as an instrument if we represent value and T2030 is our opportunity to define our value and educate our community and visitors of this.

Ultimately protecting our special places is our greatest challenge and opportunity.

In a complicated island community like Tasmania this requires leadership and a process to resolve conflict. We need to build a bridge of understanding between elements of the community with opposing views on the management of the natural wild landscape and cultural and environmental resources that we all share.

Conflicts such as the Sumac in the Tarkine, ending the moratorium on harvesting of high conservation value forests and the expression of interest process that enables developments such as helicopter tourism at Lake Malbena in the TWHa are brand challenges. With leadership the 2030 process can assist to navigate through this cross road and develop a community vision built around values that protect Tasmania's tourism brand.

To be sustainable the behavior of the visiting tourist needs to align with the values of the host. There is much work to do and this is where the 2030 opportunity gives me cause for optimism.

I would like to offer my support to the T2030 process and offer my assistance to Tourism Tasmania and Destination Southern Tasmania in creating what I hope can be an inspiring plan.

Yours sincerely,

Ben Rea



Mobile

Email

Website: [Tasmanianebikeadventures.com.au](http://Tasmanianebikeadventures.com.au)

Instagram #tasmanianebikeadventures



# HUON VALLEY COUNCIL

40 Main Street, Huonville  
PO Box 210, Huonville 7109  
hvc@huonvalley.tas.gov.au  
ph: (03) 6264 0300  
ABN: 77 602 207 026

Enquiries:

Department of Justice  
Office of the Secretary  
GPO Box 825  
HOBART TAS 7001

22 October 2021

## **SUBMISSION ON THE SCOPING PAPER FOR THE PROPOSED TASMANIAN PLANNING POLICIES**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission to the Tasmanian Planning Policy (TPP) topics.

In response to the questions posed in the scoping paper, yes, we agree to the broad scope of the proposed TPP topics but note that it could be increased slightly.

I have attached a list of topics, based on the Victorian Planning Provisions. You may be able to modify some of the already proposed TPPs, and/or add a couple more.

Of particular interest to Council are policies on climate change, stormwater management, and residential amenity, which do not seem to be on the existing list.

While climate change issues will need to be incorporated into several of the policies, it is Council's position that there remains a need for a specific policy on climate change, its existing and future impacts, and mitigation and adaptation measures.

The proposed template is a good starting point for providing guidance on what the TPPs should achieve.

Should you wish to discuss this submission, please contact Council's Planning Officer, or via the email address listed above, who will be happy to assist.

Yours sincerely

**LACHLAN KRANZ  
ACTING DIRECTOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

Encl.

1. **Settlement**
  - Managing growth
  - Supply of land
  - Structure planning
  - Sequencing development
2. **Planning for Places**
  - Activity centres
  - Growth areas
  - Peri-urban areas (urban / rural interface)
  - Coastal areas
  - Regional and local places
  - Distinctive areas and landscapes
3. **Environmental and Landscape Values**
  - Protection of coastal areas (covered by State Policy?)
  - Water bodies and wetlands
  - Protection of scenic areas
4. **Natural Resource Management**
  - Biodiversity and native vegetation
  - Sustainable agricultural land use
  - Protection of agricultural land (covered by State Policy?)
  - Forestry and timber production
  - Water catchment planning and management
  - Protection of irrigation
  - Renewable energy
  - Earth and energy resources
  - Resource exploration and extraction
5. **Environmental Risks**
  - Climate change – hazards, adaptation, mitigation, and emissions reduction
  - Coastal and floodplain inundation
  - Coastal erosion
  - Bushfire
  - Stormwater management
  - Soil degradation
  - Dispersive soils
  - Erosion and landslip
  - Contamination and potentially contaminated land
  - Salinity
  - Air quality
  - Water quality (covered by State Policy?)
6. **Amenity** (of existing residents and the future occupants of infill development)
  - Land use compatibility
  - Noise – incl. entertainment venues and licenced premises
  - Residential access to sunlight
  - Residential privacy
  - Public open space
7. **Built Environment and Heritage**
  - Urban design
  - Higher density development
  - Subdivision design
  - Design for rural areas
  - Building design

- Vehicle and bicycle access
- Healthy neighbourhoods
- Neighbourhood character
- Protection of cultural and built heritage
- Aboriginal cultural and built heritage

**8. Housing**

- Housing supply
- Housing affordability
- Accessible housing
- Rural residential development
- Community care accommodation including residential aged care

**9. Economic Development**

- Diversified economy
- Core industry and employment areas
- Innovation and research
- Commercial
- Business
- Industry
- Industrial land supply
- Sustainable industry
- Agricultural land supply
- Tourism
- Agri-tourism
- Coastal and maritime tourism and recreation

**10. Transport**

- Integrated transport and land use planning
- Movement networks
- Sustainable personal transport
- Public transport
- Road system
- Car parking
- Ports
- Freight

**11. Infrastructure**

- Water supply, sewerage, and drainage
- Energy supply
- Renewable energy infrastructure
- Pipeline infrastructure
- Community infrastructure (incl. health, education, and social and cultural facilities)
- Major hazard facilities
- Emergency services
- Development infrastructure
- Infrastructure design and provision
- Telecommunications
- Waste and resource recovery

# Submission

---

## Scoping Paper for the Draft Tasmanian Planning Policies

---

CCAA is the peak body for the heavy construction materials industry in Australia. Our members operate cement manufacturing and distribution facilities, concrete batching plants, hard rock quarries and sand and gravel extraction operations throughout the nation.

CCAA membership consists of the majority of material producers and suppliers, and ranges from large global companies to SMEs and family operated businesses. It generates approximately \$15 billion in annual revenues and employs approximately 30,000 Australians directly and a further 80,000 indirectly. We represent our members' interests through advocacy to government and the wider community; assistance to building and construction industry professionals; development of market applications; and a source of technical and reference information.

Cement, concrete, stone and sand are the critical building blocks for Tasmania's vital construction industry, employing 19,500 workers and contributing 57.4% of Tasmania's taxation revenue base. These products are derived from extractive and processing operations in every region in the state.

**CCAA fully supports the urgent introduction of the Tasmanian Planning Policies to sustainably develop, secure and protect critical extractive industry resources to build Tasmania.**

### Background

In June 2015 CCAA wrote a letter to the then Minister for Planning detailing our support for the rapid introduction of the Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPP) to guide the development of critical extractive resource planning and protection for the state.

A series of draft TPPs were provided as examples to accompany the proposed amendments to the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*. CCAA made a submission **supporting** the proposed *Land Use Planning and Approvals Amendment (Tasmanian Planning Policies) Bill 2017*.

As part of the overall Land Use Planning Reform project the Planning Policy Unit was tasked with assisting the Planning Authorities with preparing their Local Provisions Schedules (LPSs) that are to be integrated with the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.

Regrettably little progress was made on the finalisation of the TPPs during this time. This has resulted in examples of zone changes that directly affect extractive operations which could have been avoided if the Extractives Industry section of the Economic Development TPP had been used as guidance.

Some six years later, CCAA again welcomes the opportunity to comment on a scoping paper for the draft TPPs and we continue to support their urgent implementation.

The Planning Policy Unit is now tasked with helping the Planning Authorities and Planning Commission to review the Regional Land Use Strategies (RLUSs). There is again a risk that the RLUSs will take precedence and will be reviewed without the benefit of the TPPs as was the case with the LPSs. This will again put critical extractive resources needed to sustainably build Tasmania at risk of sterilisation.

**It is essential that further work on strategic planning in Tasmania is undertaken under the guidance of the TPPs and CCAA urges their immediate implementation.**

## **Tasmanian Planning Policy of special interest to the Construction Materials Industry**

### **Economic Development – Extractive Industries**

The heavy construction materials industry in Tasmania has an entirely local supply chain. The sand, gravels, aggregates and cement are all manufactured locally. This ensures an affordable and sustainable supply of local construction materials for the community. An entirely local supply chain of construction materials underpins every aspect of Tasmanian society.

There are aspects of development in Tasmania which are of special interest to our industry:

Our industry supplies concrete and gravels to critical government infrastructure as well as industrial, commercial and residential development. CCAA estimates that as much as a third of the cost of this infrastructure comes from construction materials. A major cost factor in supplying heavy construction materials is cartage from the source to the market.

There are extractive operations, both existing and new, which will be important for future development in Tasmania. These Strategic Resource Areas (SRAs) are fixed by geology, sympathetic land use zoning, feasible access routes and proximity to market. They have the potential to secure supply of critical construction materials if they are identified, mapped and protected under the TPPs, RLUSs and LPSs.

The Strategic Resource Areas are typically small, set in a rural environment and surrounded by attenuation buffers to ensure that the operation is not fettered by sensitive uses. At present there is little understanding within planning authorities that these areas exist and that by allowing encroachment, the local community, region and state can permanently lose access to these natural assets. A higher cost and less reliable resource then needs to be secured from a greater distance away thereby impacting on the total cost of housing and infrastructure for local communities.

The Consultation Draft of the Tasmanian Planning Policies April 2017 included an Economic Development Tasmanian Planning Policy which included the following sections:

- Industry, Commercial and Business
- Agriculture
- Tourism
- Extractive Industries

The Extractive Industries section had the stated objective *“To protect existing and potential extractive industries to facilitate economic growth and support efficient infrastructure and urban development”*. The section went on to describe strategies to achieve the objective.

CCAA has previously stated our support for the Extractive Industries section of the Economic Development Tasmanian Planning Policy.

The Scoping Paper for the Draft TPPs document has changed and broadened the proposed policies covered and the Economic Development TPP which now includes:

- Industry and business
- Tourism
- Agriculture
- Mining and minerals
- Use and development in the coastal zone.

The title Extractive Industries directly relates to a use that is included in the Use Classes table 6.2 of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme, whereas mining and minerals has a more generalised meaning which although mining is included as one example in the definition of Extractive Industries along with quarrying the direct correlation is lost.

**CCAA recommends that the specific reference to Extractive Industries be retained.**

Following is an example of how the **Extractive Industries** section of the Economic Development Tasmanian Planning Policy might be presented.

<b>Tasmanian Planning Policy: Economic Development</b>	
<b>Issue: Extractive Industries</b>	
<b>Objective:</b> To protect existing and potential extractive industries to facilitate economic growth and support efficient infrastructure and urban development.	
<p><b>Strategy:</b></p> <p>Separate strategic resource deposits and operations from sensitive uses to prevent conflict:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise the protection of key resource areas and deposits, including areas of known mineral resources and strategically important construction materials (e.g. sand).</li> <li>Identify and protect regionally and locally significant sources of construction materials, particularly in close proximity to urban areas.</li> <li>Ensure that land accessible for mineral exploration is capable of being developed for mineral extraction or processing taking into account required attenuation.</li> <li>Protect existing extractive industries from encroachment by residential and other incompatible uses.</li> <li>Enable the provision and protection of supporting infrastructure for extractive and related resource industries so that access can be facilitated and maintained.</li> </ol>	
<b>Implementation into strategic planning</b>	<b>Implementation into statutory planning</b>
<p><b>RLUS</b> to use strategic resource mapping to identify areas with strategic resource development potential.</p> <p><b>Local Planning</b> is to respond to the specifics of the RLUS</p>	<p><b>SPPs</b> to provide attenuation code which requires appropriate separation distances between extractive industry land use, potential extractive industry land use and sensitive land use.</p> <p><b>LPSs</b> to apply zones to cluster areas where appropriate.</p> <p><b>LPSs</b> to apply attenuation buffer overlays where they are unique to the identified operation.</p>

Accounting for Carbon in the provision of infrastructure

**TPP Topic**

**Infrastructure to support the economy and create liveable communities:**

This policy area should take a full life cycle approach to accounting for carbon in construction. Most sectors have developed or are developing sector-based roadmaps that embrace the adoption of new technologies and innovation to drive decarbonisation. Policies directed at infrastructure should incentivise such investment as a measure to reduce carbon emissions.

The **Waste Management** section within this TPP should consider a move towards a circular economy as a strategy to reduce waste.

- The use and further development of construction products with proven re-use and recycling management pathways should be incentivised through policy initiatives.
- Regulators should partner with industry to facilitate waste management through product cycling by removing regulatory barriers and hurdles to the fast and effective incorporation of waste into new products.

## Submission from Colony 47 to the Tasmanian Planning Policies Consultation Paper

### Executive Summary

Colony 47 welcomes the opportunity to provide a submission in response to the Tasmanian Planning Policies consultation paper.

Colony 47 believes Tasmania's planning system needs to incorporate Social and Affordable Housing as a specific topic to ensure that the housing needs of all Tasmanians are considered when planning our future communities.

The existing framework of generic planning for residential settlements does not provide for the category of social and affordable housing, which is an essential ingredient of creating diverse and thriving communities.

If social and affordable housing is included in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies*, then Tasmania will have the vital planning mechanisms to ensure everyone can have the home they need.

Colony 47 is particularly interested in creating opportunities for young Tasmanians and we believe that the *Tasmanian Planning Policies* can play a critical role in ensuring that young Tasmanians have access to safe, affordable housing.

For young Tasmanians this is particularly important as access to affordable housing enables pathways to education and employment opportunities.

By including social and affordable housing into the planning for residential settlements, we keep sight of the need to provide young Tasmanians with the tools required to realise their hopes and dreams and to become contributing members of the broader Tasmanian community.

In the context of the recovery from the COVID pandemic, we know that there is a need for an intergenerational approach to investments as governments commence the process of budget and balance sheet repair.

It is important to recognise that young Tasmanians have been one of the most disadvantaged groups in the short term as we have responded to the pandemic through impacts to education, vocational training and employment.

It is also important to recognise that they will also be the group who will be faced with addressing the budgetary and social repair in the years ahead.

On that basis, Colony 47 feels strongly that social and affordable housing needs to be included in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies* so that young Tasmanians are not further disadvantaged.

### **About Colony 47**

Colony 47 is Tasmanian owned and operated large and agile social enterprise that has worked in the Tasmanian community for nearly 50 years.

Colony 47 is one of the largest providers of integrated youth services in Southern Tasmania. We work at a state and national level to provide innovative services that help young people to access housing and education, develop vocational and life skills, find employment and build meaningful family relationships.

Colony 47 is a specialist provider of community driven solutions that support young Tasmanians and Tasmanians who are seeking access to social and affordable housing.

Colony 47 is committed to creating positive change in our community by addressing the barriers to housing, education and employment that are faced by people in our community, and providing them with safe, fit for purpose and affordable housing and support networks.

We are working to create transformative, positive, and impactful change for young Tasmanians, their friends, family and the community.

We are committed to ensuring that nobody is left behind and that young Tasmanians are supported to achieve their goals in life.

We work to achieve tangible, positive change by working with young people and those at risk of homelessness, from the early intervention stage through to crisis support and everything in between.

We are independent and support Tasmanians from all walks of life.

We also work collaboratively with a range of other organisations to ensure that Tasmanians are supported.

We are community owned and operated and our services are independent of faith and belief systems and open are accessible to everyone.

From our pioneering beginnings in 1973 until today, Colony 47 has been at the forefront of identifying and addressing the complex needs of socially isolated and vulnerable Tasmanians.

We know from experience and research that whilst the roots of disadvantage run deep in our community our role is to support individuals and families to take opportunities that lead to better lives.

Colony 47 is the lead agency for Housing Connect in southern Tasmania and works collaboratively with many other service and housing providers to put the keys in the hands of Tasmanians who are seeking access to social and affordable housing.

Colony 47 is also one of the largest providers of integrated youth services in Southern Tasmania.

To meet the needs of young Tasmanians, Colony 47 works at a state and national level to provide innovative services that help young Tasmanians to access housing and education, develop vocational and life skills, find employment and build meaningful family relationships.

### **Why Social and Affordable Housing?**

The Social Action Research Centre Rental Affordability Snapshot 2021 showed that for young Tasmanians on youth allowance, there were zero affordable options listed for single dwellings or share house options.

That is, this year there were no affordable properties for young Tasmanians to rent through the private rental market.

Through our Housing Connect program we have seen an increase of young Tasmanians seeking support due to being priced out of the private rental market.

These are young Tasmanians who have previously been able to afford a private rental, they have successfully self-managed and sustained their rental, but due to changes in the market (rent increases) they have been priced out and can no longer afford to live in the community where they are connected.

These young Tasmanians are usually studying and working and have lived in a rental property close to their employment and educational facilities.

Young Tasmanians are not alone in this dilemma, we have also seen an increase in low-waged individuals and families seeking assistance due to being priced out of the private rental market.

Social and affordable housing is vital because it provides safe and stable homes for people who cannot afford to rent in the current private rental market and who cannot obtain home ownership. This includes many young Tasmanians.

Social housing includes both public and community housing. By including social and affordable housing in all new developments we ensure that no one is left behind.

Social and affordable housing are described in the *Tasmanian Affordable Housing Strategy 2015-25*:

**Social housing:** is a broad term used to capture both housing provided by the government (public housing) and non-government organisations (community housing) with below-market rent prices.

**Affordable housing:** refers to rental homes or home purchases that are affordable to low income households, meaning that the housing costs are low enough that the household is not in housing stress or crisis.

Social and affordable housing is delivered by not-for-profit organisations and the State Government, who provide affordable rental homes for people on lower incomes, using an income-based rent model (no more than 30% of income).

This housing remains as an asset in the social housing system in the long term.

To improve the delivery of quality affordable homes on an economic model that is different from mainstream residential development, the *Tasmanian Planning Policies* need to include a specific category for social and affordable housing.

The need for social and affordable homes is increasing across Tasmania, and the waiting list for social housing in Tasmania is growing.

As at August 2021, there are 4 367 applications for social housing, and this number keeps going up.

Young Tasmanians represent approximately 25% of people on the social housing register.

When securely housed in homes appropriate to their needs, Tasmanians have a greater opportunity for increased economic and social participation.

This is especially true for young Tasmanians who require housing close to education and employment opportunities.

## **The Challenge for Young Tasmanians**

Colony 47 currently provides, through its Transition to Work service, education, vocational training and employment support services for approximately 500 young people in Southern Tasmania.

This service provides youth development coaches to support young Tasmanians to address barriers to achieving education and employment outcomes.

The youth development coaches regularly report that one of the major barriers to employment experienced by young Tasmanians is that they are homeless and couch surfing with friends and other families in the community.

The lack of a fixed address makes it very difficult to focus on education and employment outcomes when the first order of business for the individual each day is being able to find a roof over their head that night.

To ensure a sustainable and prosperous future we need to guarantee that future planning takes young Tasmanians into consideration.

The availability of social and affordable housing that is specifically designed to meet the needs of young Tasmanians to support them in the achievement of their education and employment goals is critical.

## **Case Study**

Jeremy was previously a resident at Colville Place and has spent time at other shelters. Jeremy was supported by Colville Place to rebuild his relationship with family, re-engage and continue to engage in school, engage in positive relationships, obtain Centrelink income and budgeting support, build a resume and apply for jobs.

Jeremy left Colville Place in 2020 to move into a rented room through his dad's friend.

After 6 months, Jeremy was kicked out of accommodation by his dad and accessed accommodation at Launch Crisis Accommodation for a short time before he then started couch surfing.

Jeremy joined Colony 47's Transition to Work program and completed a skill building program with Centacare Evolve Housing's Build Up Tassie Program.

Jeremy identified that this was an exciting opportunity but expressed concern that where he was currently couch surfing was challenging due to his friends using illicit drugs and they were not supportive of him working towards his goal to be a builder.

Jeremy then successfully secured a plumbing apprenticeship through Centacare Evolve Housing building projects for St Joseph Affordable Homes in January 2021. Jeremy identified needing secure accommodation to assist him to successfully complete his apprenticeship.

Jeremy's Housing Connect Support coach advocated on Jeremy's behalf to Centacare Evolve Housing for a unit. In May, Jeremy successfully secured a unit through Centacare Evolve Housing.

Jeremy is now living in his own unit and is continuing to complete his apprenticeship.

Jeremy said he is thankful for the support he received from Colony 47 and Centacare Evolve Housing in being able to have his own home.

## **PESRAC**

The Premier's Economic and Social Recovery Advisory Council (PESRAC) recommended that the State Government should develop a comprehensive Tasmanian Housing Strategy and drive practical actions to deliver more sustainable housing market outcomes across Tasmania for all Tasmanians.

PESRAC recommends that the strategy should encompass:

- population growth and settlement planning;
- ageing and shifts in household composition;
- land availability;
- the interface between public and private markets;
- taxes;
- approvals and permitting;
- sustainable housing - energy and water efficiency;
- construction workforce availability; and
- alignment of essential social and economic infrastructure.

Tasmania's housing system was already in crisis before the global pandemic; COVID-19 has only worsened the situation.

As outlined above there are many components required to bring the housing system to a state of repair; ensuring that social and affordable housing is included in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies* is an essential first step.

## The Impact of Short Stay Accommodation

While the inclusion of social and affordable housing in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies* is our main priority, we also note the growth in short stay accommodation is one of the factors contributing to the housing crisis in Tasmania.

More and more residential properties are converted to short stay accommodation in all regions of Tasmania.

The growth in short stay accommodation means that it will continue to impact current and future housing and community needs.

We suggest that it is appropriate to include short stay accommodation in the scope of the *Tasmanian Planning Policies*.

## Recommendations

The *Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping paper* does not mention social and affordable housing or short stay accommodation. This needs to change.

We urge you to update the draft *Tasmanian Planning Policies* to include social and affordable housing and short stay accommodation.

There have been several states that have designed and implemented specific planning policy initiatives to support the inclusion of a prescribed amount of social and affordable housing options within large scale developments.

Colony 47 believes that the inclusion of social and affordable housing in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies* will support the creation of additional social and affordable housing options and will help to ensure that disadvantaged groups, such as young Tasmanians, are included in the vision for future communities.

We recommend that:

- social and affordable housing is recognised in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies* as a **topic** in its own right under the **Liveable Settlements** heading
- short stay accommodation is added as an **issue** in the **Economic Development** section

When social and affordable housing is named in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies*, decision-makers and planners will be able to plan appropriately for the housing needs of the whole community, especially young people on lower incomes who need affordable homes close to education and employment opportunities.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the consultation on the *Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping Paper*.

We urge you to include social and affordable housing in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies* as an essential step towards ensuring that our young people, and all Tasmanians, have the homes they need.

For further information, please contact

Didi Okwechime, Manager – Housing Solutions

Email:

Regards

Danny Sutton  
Chief Executive  
Colony 47

**References:**

[Rental Affordability Snapshot 2021 - Anglicare Australia](#)

[https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0014/30254/AHS\\_Strategy\\_Final.pdf](https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0014/30254/AHS_Strategy_Final.pdf)

[https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/housing/tasmanian\\_affordable\\_housing\\_strategy/reporting](https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/housing/tasmanian_affordable_housing_strategy/reporting)

[https://planningreform.tas.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/628239/Tasmanian-Planning-Policies-and-Overview-Consultation-Draft-April-2017.pdf](https://planningreform.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/628239/Tasmanian-Planning-Policies-and-Overview-Consultation-Draft-April-2017.pdf)

<https://cbos.tas.gov.au/topics/housing/short-stay-accommodation-act>

[Premier's Economic & Social Recovery Advisory Council Final Report \(pesrac.tas.gov.au\)](#)

Department of Justice  
Office of Strategic Legislation and Policy  
GPO Box 825  
HOBART TAS 7001

Web [www.justice.tas.gov.au](http://www.justice.tas.gov.au)  
By email: [haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au](mailto:haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au)

22 October 2021

To Whom It May Concern,

**RE: Scope/Content and Structure of the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs)**

I am a member/subscriber of several community groups in Tasmania, and wholeheartedly support the Planning Matters Alliance Tasmania submission on this topic, in its entirety. I have added some further comments and details on the proposed scope of the TPPs (topics and issues) as follows.

**In General**

TPPs (and RLUS documents) need to explain the principles they are based on; listing benefits, measures (how to achieve outcomes) and defined outcomes (eg SMART targets), illustrating where and how the principles may be delivered through the available mechanisms.

TPP language is to be definitive and quantitative where at all possible, to ensure accurate interpretation, effective enforcement, avoid loopholes and assist with clarity of the TPPs. For example, unspecific words such as 'minimise' or 'unreasonable' are insufficient to achieve TPP aims and outcomes.

**Liveability** (based on State of Place Report and website, Place Score)

- LGAs in Tasmania receive the lowest liveability ratings so the current planning system is not working well.
- LGA's with a lower SEIFA score are more likely to be experiencing lower levels of liveability. How can we ensure that resource investment will result in an increase in liveability for those who need it most?
- Residential development needs local businesses that provide for daily needs.
- The #1 attribute of an ideal neighbourhood is where 'elements of the natural environment' are retained or incorporated into the urban fabric as way to define local character or uniqueness. In the 2021 Australian Liveability Census 73% of respondents selected this as being important to them. That is a significant consensus.
- The importance of ten of our liveability attributes have changed substantially since Covid-19. More people are selecting nature, the outdoors and its care, as well as accessibility of local amenity as being important in their ideal neighbourhood. These changes have stabilised since 2020 when the reality of living with Covid-19 first hit.
- *Up-to-date quality data on Tasmanian liveability attitudes and aspirations should be regularly collected and acted upon through the TPS, as a part of public engagement in planning processes.*

**AUSTRALIA - TOP 3 LIVEABILITY STRENGTHS**

CF	STRENGTHS	PX
6	Local businesses that provide for daily needs	7.6
5	Access to neighbourhood amenities	7.6

4 Sense of personal safety 7.3

#### AUSTRALIA - TOP 3 LIVEABILITY PRIORITIES

CF	PRIORITIES	PX
10	Protection of the natural environment	6.6
2	General condition of public open space	7.0
9	Quality of public space	6.8

CF: Care Factor - what is important to the community (eg top 10 valued attributes)

PX: Place experience score (current experience) 1-100

#### TOP 3 LIVEABILITY STRENGTHS (UNDER 25'S)

CF	STRENGTHS	PX
10	Connectivity	7.7
10	Access to neighbourhood amenities	7.7
5	Walking/jogging/bike paths that connect housing to communal amenity	7.6

#### TOP 3 LIVEABILITY PRIORITIES (UNDER 25'S)

CF	PRIORITIES	PX
7	Things to do in the evening	5.4
9	Sustainable urban design	5.8
7	Sustainable behaviours in the community	6.2

More than 22,000 ideas were collected revealing the aspirations Australians have for their local area - this is what they asked for:

1. *More and better active transport (walkable and cycle-friendly). More, well-connected, wider, well-maintained and well lit footpaths* with even surfaces that are enhanced by bike lanes to ensure a safe and enjoyable experience away from traffic. There is no Australian capital city council area where 'Ease of driving and parking' is a liveability priority, but connectivity and ease of getting around is.

2. *Greener neighbourhoods with more open space.* More specifically, they desire more and/or better parks and more vegetation around their neighbourhood (1,457 individual requests for more street trees). Urban trees must be protected.

3. *Keep it well maintained and safe.*

#### **Environmental Protection and Biodiversity** (based on den Exter SPP NAC Draft Review v1.0)

In the last two decades, there has been increasing evidence of the need for ecosystem and landscape scale approaches due to the interconnectedness of the natural systems that generate the ecosystem services (including species habitat) which support our communities and economies. Ecosystem and landscape [it's not just about scenery] scale approaches require greater planning and coordination, as well as [accurate] data, and a thorough analysis of the trade-offs that must be made between competing land uses and values. *This all must be done through the TPPs.*

Of significant concern, the 5-yearly State of the Environment Report for Tasmania was last published in 2009 (mandated five-yearly in the State Policies and Projects Act 1993, so leaving this government open to legal action). As at November 2020 there were 681 species of flora and fauna (now 721) listed under the Threatened Species Protection Act 1995. There were also 38 threatened native vegetation communities listed in Schedule 3A of the Nature Conservation Act 2002. The system to date has not provided protection and the situation is worsening. *The TPPs must provide clear protection, defragmentation and conservation of Tasmania's natural communities.*

"The conservation of Tasmania's outstanding fauna and flora must move beyond a narrow focus on threatened species alone. The present species by species approach is driven by current legislation, but is too slow, too expensive and largely ignores the important roles that all native species play in the environment." Dr Peter McQuillan, 2010.

The following points must also be rectified through the TPPs:

- The NAC purpose ignores the RTLUS, disproportionately focuses on minimisation and does not acknowledge other stages in the mitigation hierarchy, notably avoid, mitigate and offset. This approach is inconsistent with other regulators, the objectives of LUPAA, the precautionary principle and the regional land use strategies and does not reflect current accepted best practice. The SPPs are drafted to only require the decision-maker to have regard to these matters in the exercise of the power or function, not to require them to exercise the relevant power or function so as to achieve result. *The performance criteria should be amended to require substantive biodiversity outcomes, not just procedural consideration.*

For example, the SPPs fail to include performance criteria which establish explicit impact thresholds or define what level of impact is acceptable for the different types of priority vegetation, fail to enable consideration of cumulative impacts and, fail to identify patches of vegetation or sites where loss is unacceptable and clearing is not an option. *The TPPs must require these performance criteria.*

- The NAC is also limited to the protection of priority vegetation in a few specified zones (*the TPPs must require that NAC zone limitations should be removed, especially in agriculture and urban zones*) and does not enable consideration of other biodiversity or natural asset issues including not involving vegetation clearing (such as collision risk and disturbance to threatened species during breeding seasons). Restricting application of the Code to the zones listed exempts important and extensive patches of threatened native vegetation and significant threatened species habitat from the Code altogether. Allowing clearance and conversion of any threatened native vegetation, wherever it occurs, is in direct conflict with the NCA, EPBC and the Forest Practices Act 1985 and Regulations.

In addition, mapping in Tasmania is inadequate (based on desk-top data) at development scale, though driving planning, and so needs to be supported by quality accurate data. *This must be required by the TPPs.*

- It is noted that the Natural Heritage Strategy for Tasmania 2013–2030: Securing our Natural Advantage, prepared by DPIPW, provides the direction for nature conservation programs managed by DPIPW through to 2030. The Strategy is described as 'taking a coordinated, strategic landscape approach to conservation and management, including strategic planning and assessment'. However it was reported in 2019, during submissions to the Inquiry into Australia's faunal extinction crisis, that the Strategy was never implemented.

**Summary of Weaknesses & Threats to Biodiversity in Tasmania**, to be addressed by the TPPs include:

- Statewide Tasveg data and mapping inaccuracies and inadequacy, lack of species data, onground assessment and landscape-scale planning (eg NAC zoning restrictions).
- Lack of monitoring and enforcement.
- Lack of transparency, independence (particularly the TPC) and community involvement – excessive Ministerial discretion.
- Threats posed by climate change, currently and into the future, including increased wildfires.
- Indeterminate language used in legislation and TPS (ie aspirational only).
- Lack of integration in Tasmanian environment-related legislation eg creating loopholes and exemptions. Lack of horizontal and vertical integration eg between government departments and between different levels

of government.

- No fundamental requirement to prioritise protection over economic and social outcomes.

In addition, the fact that there has been no State of Environment reporting for Tasmania for the last decade has resulted in a lack of information about the environment, affecting the standard of planning decisions.

Fiona Brine

22 October 2021

Brian Risby  
Director  
Planning Policy Unity  
Department of Premier and Cabinet

Dear Brian,

#### **TASMANIAN PLANNING POLICIES (TPPs) SCOPING PAPER**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 'Scoping Paper for draft TPPs'. Hydro Tasmania welcomes the government's commitment to the development of a high-level policy framework that addresses important land use planning matters to ensure a sustainable future.

As you would be aware Hydro Tasmania has a broad and significant footprint in the Tasmania landscape, not only as Australia's largest water manager and renewable energy generator, but in managing natural, cultural, and built resources of significance to the Tasmania community. As such we have an acute interest the development of a contemporary and responsive planning system, and the establishment of a planning policy framework that promotes Tasmania's unique natural advantages in the renewable energy sector.

In this context, we would like to indicate our broad support for the draft scope of the Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs). However, we feel that opportunities exists to refine a number of matters and also align more closely with other policy commitments and expectations of the Tasmanian Government. Our response to both specific questions in the discussion paper and other matters is included as Attachment A to this letter.

We look forward to collaborating with you on the project and would be pleased to provide further detail on any of the matters raised in our submission. If you wish to discuss these or any other matters, please do not hesitate to contact me on

Yours sincerely,

Ian Jones  
Hydro Tasmania

## Attachment A

### General comments

While we are generally supportive of the structure of the TPPs and the topics and issues, consideration should be given to aligning the Tasmanian Planning Policies to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), as a coherent global framework that seeks to achieve a more sustainable future. While the SDGs are intended to be achieved by 2030, they provide a holistic summary of the elements which contribute to planning and building of sustainable communities. Adoption of the TPPs with the relevant SDGs, will allow for the clear alignment with other government and private sector objectives and outcomes under a common nomenclature and set of targets.

Incorporation of SDGs into strategic planning is not novel in Australia; a recent example is Victoria's new *Guidelines for Precinct Structure Planning*, which interlinks the SDGs with planning principles. Similarly, the Tasmanian Government's recent commitment to the recommendations from the Premier's Economic & Social Recovery Advisory Council (PESRAC) demonstrates clear linkages to the aspects covered by the SDG. In addition, the PESRAC report clearly recommends alignment of its Sustainability Vision with the SDGs<sup>1</sup>, and support for government wide adoption of the SDGs. As such it is recommended that the purpose and objectives under each TPP recognises the SDGs, and respective goal statements, allowing the TPPs to remain relevant over the long-term.

### Q.1 Do you agree with the proposed scope of the TPPs topic/issues?

While Hydro Tasmania broadly agrees with the scope of the topics and issues as presented and their alignment with the objectives of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1999* (LUPAA), we have some suggested refinements for the topics and scope of the issues that are encompassed under each topic.

### Environmental Protection

Hydro Tasmania supports the inclusions of a TPP on environmental protection as a key tenant of the policy framework. Planning policy should seek to protect the health of our natural environment (including the various ecosystems, habitats and species that it supports), and identify and conserve areas which are of value. Further, the TPP should reiterate the importance of ecologically sustainable development goals that have been established across the national and international agreements, such as the SDGs outlined previously.

It is recommended that consideration is given to the inclusion of 'biodiversity offsets' in this topic due to the current fragmentation of existing policy governing offsets across the RMPS.

With regard to water quality management and catchment management, we feel that further consideration needs to be given to how 'water quality' and 'catchment management' may be addressed in a TPP, and what it is seeking to achieve. This is particularly relevant as the most significant impacts on water quality may be facilitated by the direct impacts and operations associated with processes authorised under the *Water Management Act 1999* and other related water use laws and rights.

As such, consideration should be given to how water quality or catchment management issues can be effectively addressed through the TPPs.

### Economic development

While Hydro Tasmania is supportive of the issues included within the scope of the Economic development TPP, we feel there are a number key industries missing from the current list that are key to the state's economic activity and future development opportunities.

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.premier.tas.gov.au/site\\_resources\\_2015/additional\\_releases/state\\_of\\_the\\_the\\_state\\_address](https://www.premier.tas.gov.au/site_resources_2015/additional_releases/state_of_the_the_state_address)

In particular, we recommend the inclusion of 'Renewable energy generation and storage' as an issue that needs to be specifically address in this topic. This position is supported by the governments Tasmanian Renewable Energy Action Plan<sup>2</sup> which sets a goal of 200% of renewable energy by 2040, and include consideration of further National Electricity Market interconnection, pumped hydro-electric storage, wind, solar, and hydrogen storage options. While 'electricity and energy' is identified within the 'Infrastructure to support the economy and create liveable communities' topic, this topic seems to be focussed on the supply or distribution of electricity and does not recognise the broad economic development opportunity afforded by renewable energy development or storage opportunities (i.e. pumped hydro, wind energy development and hydrogen storage).

Similarly, while irrigation is also included in the 'Infrastructure to support the economy and create liveable communities' topic, it does not adequately represent economic development opportunity and alignment to broader value adding that can flow from irrigation. As such we would recommend the inclusion of a 'primary production (irrigation)' issue within the economic development TPP.

### **Infrastructure to support the economy and create liveable communities**

The inclusion of a TPP addressing the need for the provision of infrastructure and utilities is supported considering the intended aspects to be covered under this TPP, we would recommend that this TPP is renamed as 'Utility and infrastructure provision'.

Having regard to the 'electricity and energy' issue, it is unclear as to what aspect of electricity an energy is intended to be covered by these issues. The nature of the TPP topic implies the provision or distribution of electricity to communities which does not adequately address the need for new or alternative forms of electricity generation. As identified in our response to the economic development TPP, we feel that it would be appropriate to include the 'Renewable energy generation and storage' in the economic development TPP and separate supply of electricity and energy.

In addition, we note that irrigation has been aligned with stormwater, sewerage and water supply. However, the development of irrigation projects is primarily an economic development activity that is undertaken on a significantly larger scale than stormwater management, and it is likely to result in significant changes to the use of land. As such, we recommended that 'irrigation' be removed as an issue here, and included in the Economic development TPP.

### **What other topics and/or issues do you think the TPPs should cover?**

None.

### **Do you agree that climate change should be integrated into all relevant TPPs?**

Yes. Hydro Tasmania is supportive of climate change being address as sensitivity analysis applied to all relevant TPPs, and the application of appropriate adaptation and mitigations strategies.

### **Do you think that the proposed template is appropriate and a useful way of providing guidance on what the TPPs should achieve?**

Yes. The example structure of the TPPs provides a clear and concise basis upon which priorities and change strategies can be implemented through both the Regional Land Use Strategies and, State Planning Provisions and Local Planning Schedules. However, this template may benefit from incorporating a list of documents/policies that inform the proposed Objectives or Strategies of the TPPs.

---

<sup>2</sup>[https://renewabletasmania.tas.gov.au/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0008/275876/Tasmanian\\_Renewable\\_Energy\\_Action\\_Plan\\_December\\_2020.pdf](https://renewabletasmania.tas.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/275876/Tasmanian_Renewable_Energy_Action_Plan_December_2020.pdf)

## Department of State Growth

Salamanca Building, Parliament Square  
4 Salamanca Place, Hobart TAS 7000  
GPO Box 536, Hobart TAS 7001 Australia  
Phone 1800 030 688 Fax (03) 6233 5800  
Email [info@stategrowth.tas.gov.au](mailto:info@stategrowth.tas.gov.au) Web [www.stategrowth.tas.gov.au](http://www.stategrowth.tas.gov.au)  
Our Ref: D21/274483



The Hon. Roger Jaensch MP  
Minister for Local Government and Planning  
Department of Justice  
Office of the Secretary  
GPO Box 825  
HOBART TAS 7001

Via email: [haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au](mailto:haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au)

Dear Minister,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scope of the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies.

The Department of State Growth supports development of the Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs), recognising the important role the TPPs will have in informing strategic land use planning, including the planned review of the State Planning Provisions and regional land use strategies.

In addressing key themes and issues, the Department also recognises the ability of the TPPs to improve planning outcomes in specific policy areas, including infrastructure, transport, resources, and economic development.

The Department has reviewed the draft Scoping Paper, focusing on the key topics and issues that will comprise the TPPs. The Department's comments, as these relate to the Agency's portfolio interests, are included in Attachment I. The Department supports the proposed TPP template.

We understand there will be future opportunities to provide input and comment on the content of supporting objectives, strategies and implementation measures.

In relation to how climate change is addressed within the TPPs, we support an approach that captures this issue within relevant TPP topics, as opposed to a standalone policy.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact Patrick Carroll, Principal Land Use Planning Analyst

Yours sincerely

Kim Evans  
**Secretary**

22 October 2021

## **Attachment I – Department of State Growth comments on the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies**

### **Include transport as a separate topic**

Transport is currently included within the *Infrastructure to support the economy and create liveable communities* topic, together with other economic infrastructure such as energy and irrigation.

Given the significance of the transport system to the Tasmanian economy and community, it is recommended Transport is included as its own topic, covering transport infrastructure, services, modes, safety and sustainability. It should also address the close relationship between transport and land use planning.

The following specific issues are suggested for inclusion -

- Ports and intermodal hubs
- Road and rail networks
- Passenger transport (including public and active transport)
- Integrated transport and land use planning

If a separate topic is not supported, it is still recommended that the above issues are incorporated within the TPPs as ones that more appropriately represent the nature and operation of the State's transport system than those currently included within the draft TPPs. For example -

- The draft TPPs recognise 'cycleways and walkways.' This should be broadened to address Active Transport, covering infrastructure linkages and networks (location and design), safety, signage and end of trip facilities.
- Airports, sea ports and railways are currently included as a single issue. These would be better separated into 'Ports and intermodal hubs' (nearly all of Tasmania's intermodal hubs are located at a port), with rail considered alongside the road network, as a linear infrastructure asset.

The issue of 'Integrated transport and land use planning' is currently included within the Liveable Settlements topic. It is suggested this issue is better located under a Transport topic, reflecting its broad scope, which extends beyond liveability and settlement strategies. For example, integrated transport and land use planning covers -

- Protection of infrastructure corridors and assets from incompatible uses,
- Integration of public transport services and active transport networks with residential areas, and
- Location of industrial estates and intermodal hubs in areas with good access to the existing strategic freight network.

## **Liveable Settlements - Planned and contained settlements**

This topic is very broad and may be better identified as a series of related issues that highlight the issues and opportunities associated with creating and maintaining liveable settlements. Key issues could include -

- The supply and location of housing, including the greater promotion of infill development.
- Housing affordability, diversity and design, ensuring a range of housing types are available to meet changing household needs.
- Increase housing opportunities close to existing activity centres, public transport services and active transport networks.
- Ensuring subdivision design supports public transport access and walking and cycling connections.
- Maximising the use of existing infrastructure and services.

## **Economic Development**

The following two issues are suggested for inclusion under this topic -

- Industrial land – Recognise and protect key industrial precincts and sites, including urban, intermodal and heavy industrial sites.
- Forestry – This is a key economic activity for Tasmania and should be recognised within the TPPs.



22<sup>nd</sup> October 2021

**Department of justice**  
**Office of Strategic Legislation and Policy**  
**GPO Box 825**  
**Hobart TAS 7001** Department of Justice  
[www.justice.tas.gov.au](http://www.justice.tas.gov.au)  
email: [haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au](mailto:haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au)

Dear Manager

**RE: Scope/Content and Structure of the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs)**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Tasmanian Government's Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping Paper for draft TPPs.

I respond on behalf of NTAG (No Turbine Action Group Inc) of the Central Highlands. NTAG's goal is to support renewable energy in the right location and keep the Central Highlands unique.

You may be aware the Government is proposing about 89 wind farms the size of Granville Harbour wind farm in the Tasmanian landscape – 30 in the Central Highlands/Midlands, 46 in the North-West and 13 in the North-East. These wind farm turbines will be at least 240m high and, in the wrong place, and under the current policy settings, will adversely impact both the Tasmanian Brand and Tasmanian communities. This is illustrated by the proposal for a Wind Farm at Stanley and the proposed 47-turbine Wind farm at St Patricks Plains at the Steppes Historic Site on the Central Plateau.

Our experience is that developers seek to maximise their returns under tokenistic consultation practices, to the detriment of the local community and the environment, and because out-of-date planning is being applied to a tidal wave of new renewable energy developments. Tasmania is at a tipping point that will change the Tasmanian way of life forever and TPPs can help get it right.

Therefore NTAG welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Scoping Paper for draft Tasmanian Planning Policies. Our views are:

- Up-to-date and strategic State-wide policies are needed for Tasmania's Resource Management and Planning System as they provide the framework (shape or backbone) of the System.
- This framework needs to include proper community consultation mechanisms to develop a social licence to operate as well as penalties for not developing such a licence. The carrot and the stick. By way of example, connection by turbines to the grid should only occur when a social license to operate has been developed with the community. Community engagement is more than a developer ticking a box or a website or holding a public meeting as is the current practice.
- Transparency and timeliness should be a cornerstone requirement of all policies. The days of late and inappropriate responses are over and this should be reflected in policy frameworks. Try

finding out how many Wedge -tailed eagles have been killed by turbine blades in Tasmania and you will experience the problem!

- High arching strategic policies are needed such as protecting the Tasmanian Brand as well as ethical essentials; e.g. truth in announcements rather than Polly spin.
- Tasmanian Planning Policies need to specifically adopt a big picture policy strategic approach to renewable energy as a matter of priority because it is the biggest land-use change to hit Tasmania. For example - adoption of zoning for no turbines (like Victoria's Great Ocean Road); and no taxpayer subsidies for wind farms like the \$300M so far incurred by Hydro and Aurora for Cattle Hill and Granville Harbour Wind Farm's onerous offtake agreements imposed by the Premier. Big picture policies are needed that have private investors hitting their hip pocket rather than taking it from the public health system.
- TPP's should be signed off by the Tasmanian Parliament just as State Policies need to. TPPs should not be a sidestep for Ministers and the Government to avoid a range of views on strategic issues. The Government is keen on 'Team Tasmania' and this needs to be applied to TPPs.

We trust these views are helpful in developing a strategic approach on strategic policies for the good of Tasmania.

Please contact me if you require any further information or clarification on these matters.

Yours sincerely

David Ridley  
Chair NTAG

Department of Education

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

GPO Box 169, HOBART TAS 7001 Australia

[OfficeoftheSecretary@education.tas.gov.au](mailto:OfficeoftheSecretary@education.tas.gov.au)

Ph (03) 6165 5757



File no: **DOC/21/171265**

20 October 2021

Office of the Secretary

Department of Justice

Email: [haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au](mailto:haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au)

## **DRAFT TASMANIAN PLANNING POLICIES (TPPs)**

Thank you for your letter regarding the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies review being undertaken by the Department of Justice.

The Department of Education (DoE) has welcomed the opportunity to provide input into the review of the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies. DoE's Asset Management and Planning team have reviewed the information you provided and are supportive of the draft policies.

If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Mr Craig Grace, Manager Asset Management and Planning by telephone or or via email at

Tim Bullard  
SECRETARY

By email to [haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au](mailto:haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au)

October 2021

**Submission from National Disability Services to the Tasmanian Planning Policies consultation paper.**

National Disability Services (NDS) is Australia's peak body for non-government disability service organisations, representing over 1200 non-government service providers. Collectively, NDS members operate several thousand services for Australians with all types of disability. In Tasmania, NDS works closely with disability service providers to advocate and support them across areas of concern for disability service providers and people with disability. Housing for people with disability is an overlooked critical area of need within the broader concern about affordable housing shortfalls in Tasmania. Accessible disability specific accommodation is a significant shortage in the current housing market, and one that if addressed would significantly improve the lives of Tasmanians with disability.

A crucial purpose of Tasmania's planning system is that all Tasmanians will have adequate and appropriate housing that meets their needs. The existing framework of generic planning for residential settlements does not provide for the category of social, affordable and accessible disability housing, which is an essential piece of our diverse housing mix. If social, affordable and accessible disability housing is included in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies*, then Tasmania will have the vital planning mechanisms to ensure everyone can have the home they need.

social, affordable and accessible disability housing is vital, because it provides safe and stable homes all Tasmanians, including those with disability, those with low income, and those who fall into both of those categories. In order to support Tasmanians with disability, a range of accommodation options should be available, to allow them choice and control over their living arrangements.

Social housing includes both public and community housing. Disability accessible accommodation is not one size fits all, and should include multiple models, just as the wider housing market offers.

**The *Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping Paper* does not mention social and affordable housing. It does not include any reference to disability or accessibility housing.**

We recommend that:

- social, affordable and accessible disability housing is recognised in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies* as a **topic** in its own right under the **Liveable Settlements** heading
- short stay accommodation is added as an **issue** in the **Economic Development** section

The need for social, affordable and accessible disability housing is increasing across Tasmania, and the waiting list for social housing in Tasmania is growing. As at August 2021, there are 4 367 applications for social housing, and this number keeps going up.<sup>1</sup>

When securely housed in homes appropriate to their needs,  
Tasmanians have a greater opportunity for increased economic and

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/housing/tasmanian\\_affordable\\_housing\\_strategy/reporting](https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/housing/tasmanian_affordable_housing_strategy/reporting)

social participation. Land use planning is critical to the development and delivery of a diverse range of housing, consistent with the changing needs the Tasmanian community.<sup>2</sup>

When social, affordable and accessible disability housing is named in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies*, decision-makers and planners will be able to plan appropriately for the housing needs of the whole community, especially people on lower incomes who need affordable rental homes.

While the inclusion of social, affordable and accessible disability housing in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies* is our main priority, we also note the growth in short stay accommodation is one of the factors contributing to the housing crisis in Tasmania. More and more residential properties are converted to short stay accommodation in all regions of Tasmania.<sup>3</sup> The growth in short stay accommodation means that it will continue to impact current and future housing and community needs. We suggest that it is appropriate to include short stay accommodation in the scope of the *Tasmanian Planning Policies*.

Disability accessibility should have a place in any vision for the future of our society.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the consultation on the *Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping Paper*. We urge you to include social, affordable and accessible disability housing in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies* as an essential step towards ensuring that all Tasmanians have the homes they need. It will bring a vital planning focus to this essential housing sector.

---

<sup>2</sup>[https://planningreform.tas.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/628239/Tasmanian-Planning-Policies-and-Overview-Consultation-Draft-April-2017.pdf](https://planningreform.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/628239/Tasmanian-Planning-Policies-and-Overview-Consultation-Draft-April-2017.pdf)

<sup>3</sup><https://cbos.tas.gov.au/topics/housing/short-stay-accommodation-act>

**The *Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping paper* does not mention social, affordable and accessible disability housing or short stay accommodation. This needs to change. We urge you to update the draft *Tasmanian Planning Policies* to include social, affordable and accessible disability housing and short stay accommodation.**

For further information, please contact

Alice Flockhart

State Manager Tasmania



**Department of Justice  
Office of Strategic Legislation and Policy  
GPO Box 825  
HOBART TAS 7001**

By email: [haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au](mailto:haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au)

22nd October 2021

**From: Hobart Not Highrise Inc.**

**RE: Scope/Content and Structure of the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPP's)**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the state Government's Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping Paper for draft TPP's. The TPP's will influence the future of Tasmania by shaping the planning system in the years ahead.

Hobart Not Highrise Inc. [HNH] has been active for a number of years supporting people's strong desire to protect Hobart from inappropriate development. Hobart has over 2,000 properties that are heritage listed, plus 40 heritage precincts.

Hobart's places of cultural significance (historic, social, spiritual, and aesthetic) were put in place by previous generations, are enjoyed by the present generation, with an obligation to protect and pass to future generations. This is really important. It's a matter of respect for the time and effort of the past, protecting, enhancing, and passing to the future. We have no right to destroy what we should be caring for.

View-lines are important – views of the mountain, the water, the cenotaph. Leigh Woolley has identified 15+ view-lines in Hobart that should be protected.

Streetscapes are important. Stick a highrise tower in the middle of a street and everyone loses, except the developer. "*A skyscraper is a machine that is designed to turn land into money.*" [from '*The 99% Invisible City*' by Roman Mars & Kurt Kohlstedt, 2020, p191]

There's a place for highrise towers but it's not in the middle of Hobart. Highrise towers destroy heritage, view-lines, and streetscapes. We believe that a location (maybe more than one), outside Hobart, should be identified for highrise buildings, similar to what Paris did back in the 1950's with 'La Defense'.

La Defense - located outside the City of Paris – is Europe's largest purpose-built business district, with 180,000 daily workers, 3,500,000 sq.m. office space.

Paris, the most visited city in the tourist-world, has a policy in place since the late 1950's to protect it's streetscapes, view-lines, and heritage. Apart from one

aberration, the French Railways tower in Montparnasse, there are no skyscrapers in Paris.

Paris is just one example of many cities around the world that have strong laws to protect their heritage areas.

HNH's objectives include:

- a) To conduct activities that:
  - i. promote and protect Hobart as a unique, human-scale, historic heritage city; and
  - ii. protect Hobart's heritage, view-lines, and streetscapes, using absolute maximum height limits as one mechanism to achieve these outcomes.

The 2019 HNH Poll of Electors in the City of Hobart showed huge support for preserving Hobart's heritage, streetscapes, and viewlines, with absolute maximum building heights as one of the measures to provide this protection - a crystal clear message from 13,950 CoH electors – 88% of those who voted.

Public concern has not wavered over many years. HNH has had a petition with more than 7,600 signatures and three packed public meetings, all supporting a low-rise city with more protections on heritage buildings, view-lines, and streetscapes. Also, a Mercury poll and another poll by local young architects, showed that the majority of residents do not want high-rise towers.

Our numerous heritage precincts, the mountain, and the waterfront, are what locals love and tourists flock to enjoy. Hobart is doing just fine without high-rise towers. HnH supports former Premier Hodgman's statement: "Hobart is a low rise city and should remain that way."

**HNH asks that the TPP's include 'Heritage Protection' to protect Hobart's heritage, streetscapes, and viewlines, with absolute maximum building heights as one of the mechanisms to ensure this protection. It follows that other heritage areas be given the same protection.**

Residents would be really pleased if this was done. And all the people involved in the planning process – owners, developers, architects, city planners, elected members, members of the public – would have certainty.

Brian Corr  
President, Hobart Not Highrise Inc.

By email to [haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au](mailto:haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au)

22<sup>nd</sup> October 2021

**Submission from Wintringham to the Tasmanian Planning Policies consultation paper**

Wintringham is a not-for-profit specialist homelessness service. Wintringham has over 30 years of experience providing a range of outreach, housing, community and residential aged care services to older people who have experienced homelessness, financial and social disadvantage. We work in the Southern region of Tasmania and provide accommodation and support to people aged over 50 years.

A crucial purpose of Tasmania's planning system is that all Tasmanians will have adequate and appropriate housing that meets their needs. The existing framework of generic planning for residential settlements does not provide for the category of social and affordable housing, which is an essential piece of our diverse housing mix. If social and affordable housing is included in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies*, then Tasmania will have the vital planning mechanisms to ensure everyone can have the home they need.

Social and affordable housing is vital, because it provides safe and stable homes for our clients. Social housing includes both public and community housing. The private rental market is not suitable for many older people. Our client group most often live alone, reliant upon the aged pension, and cannot afford accommodation in the private rental market. We are regularly contacted by people who are paying 60% to 80% of their income on rent; this means they have to choose between essentials like heating, medication and food. It can be difficult to get modifications to private properties, such as grab rails, or ramps. These modifications are essential in enabling people to continue living safely in the community, and preventing hospitalisations or premature entry into aged care.

Access to safe and affordable housing should be a key foundation to any community. Older people are becoming homeless because of a lack of affordable housing in Tasmania, with women aged over 50 the quickest growing group. Affordable and suitable accommodation leads to improved outcomes for the individual, and also leads to better outcomes for the community.

**The *Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping Paper* does not mention social and affordable housing.**

We recommend that:

- social and affordable housing is recognised in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies* as a **topic** in its own right under the **Liveable Settlements** heading
- short stay accommodation is added as an **issue** in the **Economic Development** section

Social and affordable housing are described in the *Tasmanian Affordable Housing Strategy 2015-25*:

Social housing: is a broad term used to capture both housing provided by the government (public housing) and non-government organisations (community housing) with below-market rent prices.

Affordable housing: refers to rental homes or home purchases that are affordable to low income households, meaning that the housing costs are low enough that the household is not in housing stress or crisis.<sup>1</sup>

Social and affordable housing is delivered by not-for-profit organisations and the State Government, who provide affordable rental homes for people on lower incomes, using an income-based rent model (no more than 30% of income). This housing remains as an asset in the social housing system in the long term. To improve the delivery of quality affordable homes on an economic model that is different from mainstream residential development, the *Tasmanian Planning Policies* need to include a specific category for social and affordable housing.

The need for social and affordable homes is increasing across Tasmania, and the waiting list for social housing in Tasmania is growing. As at August 2021, there are 4 367 applications for social housing, and this number keeps going up.<sup>2</sup>

When securely housed in homes appropriate to their needs, Tasmanians have a greater opportunity for increased economic and social participation. Land use planning is critical to the development and delivery of a diverse range of housing, consistent with the changing needs the Tasmanian community.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0014/30254/AHS\\_Strategy\\_Final.pdf](https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0014/30254/AHS_Strategy_Final.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/housing/tasmanian\\_affordable\\_housing\\_strategy/reporting](https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/housing/tasmanian_affordable_housing_strategy/reporting)

<sup>3</sup> [https://planningreform.tas.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/628239/Tasmanian-Planning-Policies-and-Overview-Consultation-Draft-April-2017.pdf](https://planningreform.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/628239/Tasmanian-Planning-Policies-and-Overview-Consultation-Draft-April-2017.pdf)

When social and affordable housing is named in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies*, decision-makers and planners will be able to plan appropriately for the housing needs of the whole community, especially people on lower incomes who need affordable rental homes.

While the inclusion of social and affordable housing in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies* is our main priority, we also note the growth in short stay accommodation is one of the factors contributing to the housing crisis in Tasmania. More and more residential properties are converted to short stay accommodation in all regions of Tasmania.<sup>4</sup> The growth in short stay accommodation means that it will continue to impact current and future housing and community needs. We suggest that it is appropriate to include short stay accommodation in the scope of the *Tasmanian Planning Policies*.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the consultation on the *Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping Paper*. We urge you to include social and affordable housing in the *Tasmanian Planning Policies* as an essential step towards ensuring that our clients, and all Tasmanians have the homes they need. It will bring a vital planning focus to this essential housing sector.

**The *Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping paper* does not mention social and affordable housing or short stay accommodation. This needs to change. We urge you to update the draft *Tasmanian Planning Policies* to include social and affordable housing and short stay accommodation.**

For further information, please contact

Tanya Atkinson  
Establishment Manager – Tasmania

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://cbos.tas.gov.au/topics/housing/short-stay-accommodation-act>



22 October 2021

Department of Justice  
Office of the Secretary  
GPO Box 825  
Hobart, TAS 7001

### **Written submission – Scoping Paper for the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies**

To whom it may concern:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the scope of the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs) .

The Northern Tasmanian Natural Resource Management Association Inc., (trading as NRM North) is one of three formally recognised natural resource management organisations in Tasmania. NRM North is a not-for-profit organisation undertaking natural resource management in the northern region of Tasmania. We do this through developing programs that recognise the need to balance the environmental, economic, and social needs of the community; providing leadership to ensure the sound management of the region's natural resources; and promoting partnerships with all stakeholders to determine appropriate investment and cost sharing strategies.

This response to the Scoping paper for Draft TPPs has been prepared by NRM North in two parts – 1) a response to the brief Scoping paper released in September 2021; and 2) comments on the Tasmanian Planning Policies Overview and suite of policies consultation draft that was prepared in April 2021 and provided as supplementary material to the September Scoping paper. We note that there are differences in these two documents in terms of the scope of issues to be addressed and the way in which Draft TPPs are structured.

### **Scoping paper September 2021**

#### **Environmental protection**

NRM North believes that the focus on environmental protection is too narrow and doesn't reflect a modern, best practice approach to sustainable development where opportunities to enhance and improve environmental values through good planning and development are sought. This enhancement of values is key to reversing trends in declining biodiversity and

the effects of past environmental degradation as well as a fundamental component of building resilience to climate change.

### **Biodiversity**

NRM North recommends that:

- flora and fauna habitat protection also include improvements to habitat condition and extent;
- weed management also include pests and diseases/pathogens and related climate change impacts that are expected to increase the stress on native species and preference introduced weeds, pests and diseases; and
- given the fragility of alpine ecosystems and the expected impacts of climate change on these areas, alpine area management needs are explicitly considered. The potential for development and tourism activities adjacent to or within alpine areas to impact on alpine ecosystems should be acknowledged and risks avoided, minimised, or mitigated where necessary.

### **Waterways and wetlands – water quality**

NRM North feels that the focus on water quality is too narrow and recommends:

- flow regime or water quantity related issues be addressed including the magnitude, frequency, seasonality and timing of low flows and flushes necessary for ecosystem health within aquatic, riparian and floodplain environments; and,
- an acknowledgement of climate change related impacts including from changes in natural processes such as rainfall and evaporation as well as those that occur because of actions to adapt to climate change impacts such as increased reliance on irrigation water which has the potential to impact significantly on flow regimes (eg. through reversed seasonality, impacts on water temperature and changes in low flow regime and the frequency and timing of flushes).

### **Coastal processes and landforms**

NRM North recommends that:

- coastal processes and landforms includes estuaries and should consider subtidal and intertidal processes and habitats;
- the principles of integrated coastal zone management are incorporated throughout strategies affecting the coastal zone;
- climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation are considered, particularly provision of coastal refugia and areas for retreat of intertidal habitat and vegetation, the role of natural environments in protecting against sea level rise and storm surge, and mitigating against the impacts of changes in pH and water temperature.

### **Issues not considered**

NRM North finds that there are a number of Issues that do not currently appear to be addressed within this section or elsewhere and recommend that the following be included:

- floodplain management – applying the principles of integrated floodplain management.
- native vegetation management.
- alpine area management.
- drainage practices in agricultural lands including the construction of artificial drainage networks, drainage of wetlands and construction of tidal levees; and
- erosion and protection of soils. Erosion includes wind and water erosion, hillslopes, gullies, streambank and coastal erosion. NRM North recommends the inclusion of strategies related to urban and agricultural areas as well as development of infrastructure such as stormwater systems, roads, telecommunication, or electricity networks.

### **Hazards and risks**

NRM North recommends that the section on hazards and risks supports climate change adaptation principles for regional land use planning, development approvals and rezoning. This will mean that all hazards and risks should be considered under both current climate and using climate change projects and should preference activities that avoid risks rather than those that minimise or mitigate risks.

### **Flooding**

NRM North recommends that:

- flooding include riverine flooding as well as urban flooding from peak events.
- the inclusion of strategies and systems such as water sensitive urban design to reduce the impact of high intensity storm events on urban flooding; and
- the appropriate use and management of floodplains to allow natural floodplain processes; and
- avoidance of practices that lead to off-site impacts including exacerbated flood risks or stream erosion in other areas.

### **Sea level rise**

NRM North recommends this section include:

- storm surge as well as coastal inundation and erosion.
- Any impacts on changes in groundwater levels associated with increased sea levels should be incorporated; and
- inundation as these have the potential to significantly impact on infrastructure and interact with other hazards such as contaminated lands.

### **Issues not currently considered**

NRM North finds that salinity is not included and recommend that salinity especially urban salinity should be considered with strategies considering infrastructure design, clearing and vegetation management, permeability or urban areas, and avoidance of both onsite and offsite impacts including on water quality and aquatic ecosystems.

### **Economic development**

NRM North through many of its programs support economic development but feels it must be undertaken in a sustainable way. Our organisation recommends strategies for economic development that include protection and enhancement of environmental, social and cultural values.

### **Issues not currently considered**

NRM North finds that the following topics or Issues do not currently appear to be addressed and recommend the inclusion of:

- aquaculture as a key economic activity in the State; and
- climate change action plan priorities to advance renewable energy capability and grow a climate ready economy; and
- opportunities associated with being a green energy supplier and the potential for Tasmanian agriculture and forestry to monetise carbon offsets and develop economic opportunities associated with carbon sequestration.

### **Liveable settlements**

NRM North recommends that water sensitive urban design is included as a fundamental component of planning for liveable settlements.

NRM North recommends:

- designs consider water quality and quantity as well as address urban flood risk;
- the inclusion of strategies to:
  - increase permeability of existing and new urban areas (eg. including through permeable paving),
  - water capture and reuse at the source (eg. rainwater tanks), and
  - design of green space with multiple benefits to include options such as swales, wetlands, bioretention systems and raingardens; and
- investment in Infrastructure to support the economy and create liveable communities.

### **Irrigation, water, sewerage, and stormwater**

The inclusion of stormwater in this section appears to indicate a focus on the stormwater network and a 'pipes' approach to stormwater management. NRM North recommends a more wholistic approach to stormwater management and water supply that includes using

water sensitive urban design principles, reflected under creating liveable settlements and linking to issues under environmental protection and enhancement noted earlier.

### **Climate change**

NRM North agrees that climate change is incorporated across multiple TPPs but would like to emphasise the importance of considering both climate change mitigation through reduced emission and carbon sequestration as well as strategies that enable communities and natural systems to adapt to a changing climate. The current Tasmanian Climate Change Action Plan focuses heavily on emissions with fairly narrow consideration of climate change adaptation and resilience.

NRM North recommends mitigation strategies include offsets/carbon sequestration as well as emissions. The strategies should promote activity that captures opportunities which enable farmers, local government, and business to offset their emissions, sell offsets and which capture multiple benefits by build economic advantage (renewable energy and unique opportunities for developing a carbon economy) along with climate resilience and environmental improvements. These could be driven from improved soil carbon, riparian revegetation, protection and increased extent and condition of native vegetation and wetland restoration.

NRM North recommends that adaptation strategies are considered in terms of:

- reducing risks through good regional land use planning, eg. allowing for coastal refugia and buffers, good floodplain management, reducing impact of intense events on urban flooding through WSUD and design standards for stormwater networks; and
- environmental protection and enhancement of environmental values – building resilience through habitat protection and creation connected corridors for species movement and retreat, maintenance of natural flow regimes including water temperatures and pH.

## **Tasmanian Planning Policies Overview and suite of policies consultation draft, April 2021**

### **The Scope of the TPPs (Page 4)**

We note that this list appears to be inconsistent with that in the Scoping paper. The list included under ‘Environmental protection’ in the Scoping paper is not included. Other recommendations provided for the issues to be considered in the scoping paper above are relevant to this section of the Overview.

## Economic Development

### General comments

NRM North recommends

- all subsections reflect within their objective, ‘sustainable’ development. Currently only the section on agricultural land considers sustainability as part of its objective.
- strategies within each section incorporate avoiding, minimising or where necessary mitigating impacts on environmental values, both on and off-site, where possible; and
- climate change is considered both in terms of enabling mitigation activities through reduced emissions and capturing carbon sequestration opportunities as well as adaptation to avoid risks under a changed climate. This is particularly important for the agricultural development section.

### Extractive industries

NRM North notes that this section does not consider any issues around end of life and site rehabilitation for either existing or future extractive industries. NRM North recommends including strategies to minimise offsite impacts and risks both during the extractive process and post end-of-life for the site.

## Settlement and liveable communities

### Urban development

NRM North recommends that this includes:

- water sensitive urban design for water quality, quantity, and urban flood risk;
- climate change including enabling reduced emissions and adaptation through improved planning and urban design, to build community resilience to a changing climate;
- protection and enhancement including improved condition and extent of native vegetation in urban and peri-urban areas;
- biodiversity in urban and peri-urban areas; and
- floodplain management to reduce flood risks (both now and under a changed climate) as well as for environmental and community values.

### Community open spaces

Community open spaces provide an opportunity for creating multiple benefits.

NRM North recommends that the objective for community open spaces include the protection and enhancement of environmental values and building climate resilience. These areas can be used to reduce urban heat, can incorporate water sensitive urban design features, allow for buffers which reduce risks of sea level rise or floods on hard infrastructure and community assets, provide areas for retreat and refugia under a changing climate and can be an important component of protecting and enhancing urban biodiversity and native vegetation. Planning open space areas to capture these multiple

benefits is part of an integrated approach to coastal zone management, integrated floodplain management and climate change action planning.

### **Housing**

NRM North recommends that strategies under housing include building climate change resilience to address issues such as urban heat which can impact on vulnerable communities. Housing that provides for natural cooling and heating reduces energy use and costs to households, reduces the vulnerability of communities to more frequent and higher intensity heatwaves as well as potentially reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

## **Cultural and natural heritage**

### **Aboriginal heritage**

NRM North believes that the approach to protection of Aboriginal heritage reflected in the overview document is too narrowly focused on relics and sites which does not reflect a best practice approach to managing for Aboriginal values.

*“Indigenous people have a culture that relates to the land and sea in a holistic way that also includes connections to powerful and significant places. However, the emphasis that is now put on management of discrete sites can overlook and diminish Indigenous connections to the environment as a whole.”*

Indigenous Working Group Workshop, Melbourne<sup>1</sup>

NRM North recommends that the connection of the Aboriginal community to Land, Sea, and Sky Country be reflected through the TPPs with strategies focused on protecting and restoring indigenous uses, values and connection to Country. Our organisation further recommends that this policy be co-designed with members of Tasmanian Aboriginal communities.

### **Natural heritage**

As was the case with the Scoping document, NRM North believes that a focus on protection and conservation without emphasis on enhancement and improvement is likely to see continued degradation of Tasmania’s natural heritage.

NRM North recommends that the objectives include enhancement of environmental values through improved condition and extent of habitat, improved water quality etc., and a stronger focus on protecting specific assets using strategies that enhance environmental values in peri urban and urban landscapes.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Oceans Office (2002). Sea Country – an Indigenous perspective, The South-east Regional Marine Plan Assessment Reports

NRM North recommends:

- Strategy 3.2 which is narrowly focused on land identified for conservation purposes, include native vegetation management much more holistically as part of a landscape approach to natural values particularly in peri urban and urban areas and agricultural landscapes.
- Strategy 3.4 explicitly consider floodplain processes and functions and intertidal and subtidal habitats be considered as part of management of the coastal zone.
- Impacts on water quality, changes in flow regimes and tidal flooding are addressed in urban, peri urban and agricultural areas.

## Hazards and risks

### Natural hazards

NRM North recommends:

- With Increased frequency and intensity of heat waves presenting a significant natural hazard under climate change , strategies should be included that reduce the impact on vulnerable communities and human health as well as on environmental systems.
- Erosion include not only coastal and riverine erosion but also hillslope and gully erosion, and wind erosion as well as erosion from building sites in urban areas.
- Maintaining adequate groundcover to reduce erosion risk as it will become increasingly difficult under a changing climate with longer dry periods, higher temperature and evaporation and increased intensity of storm events.
- strategies address soil and erosion control in urban areas during development and building phases.
- Natural hazards are planned for under both current climate conditions and projected climate change scenarios.

Some actions to address the risks associated with natural hazards can increase the risk of hazards off-site or induce significant off-site impacts (eg. sea walls can increase coastal erosion elsewhere, flood protection levees can increase downstream flood risks). NRM North recommends that strategies encourage actions that work with natural processes to mitigate risks.

### Risks to Water and Soil Quality

NRM North recommends that this section include risks to water quantity including impacts on flow regimes, and the objective include building resilience to climate change, for example by increasing soil carbon.

## **Emissions, Hazardous Uses and Contaminated Land**

NRM North recommends that strategies include remediation of sites, both in terms of historic contamination as well as planning for remediation of current and future contaminated sites.

## **Transport and Infrastructure**

### **Integrated Transport and Land Use Planning**

NRM North recommends that the objective include facilitation of a healthy lifestyle as well as enabling a move to a low carbon economy/reduced emissions through support for alternative transport such as bike paths, walkways and electric vehicle recharge stations.

We recommend the following strategies are included:

- subdivisions and inclusion of walkways and bike paths; and
- enhance tourism values through integrated transport options such as cycleways and rail trails.

### **Ports and intermodal hubs**

NRM North recommends that design and management of sea ports consider the principles of integrated coastal zone management and include consideration of risks to environmental values in the coastal and marine zone, addressing risks and hazards associated with climate change such as sea level rise and storm surge and biosecurity risks.

### **Energy**

NRM North recommends that this section reflects principles in Tasmania's Climate change adaptation plan including development of renewable energy and reduced emissions from transport and business.

### **Waste and resource Recovery**

NRM North recommends that this section consider strategies to manage and mitigate hazards associated with legacy issues from existing and historic waste disposal sites.

### **Water Supply, Waste Treatment and Urban Drainage**

NRM North recommends that section 7.4 include:

- encouraging retrofit of WSUD where possible especially for brownfield development;
- urban drainage be considered as part of a more wholistic approach to water sensitive urban design; and
- drainage in agricultural and peri-urban areas be addressed somewhere within the TPPs given their potential to impact on water quality and supply.

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to review the scope of the draft planning policies and provide a submission.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me on

Regards,

Rosanna Coombes  
**CEO**



City of **HOBART**

*Enquiries to:*

22 October 2021

Department of Justice  
Office of the Secretary  
GPO Box 825  
HOBART TAS 7001

**Via Email:** [haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au](mailto:haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au)

## **FEEDBACK ON THE SCOPING PAPER FOR THE DRAFT TASMANIAN PLANNING POLICIES**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the scope of the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs).

The following comments have been considered at the City Planning Committee Meeting of 18 October 2021, however will not be considered by full Council until 25 October 2021. The minutes from those meetings will be submitted when available, and will provide official endorsement of the following comments, as amended by the Council resolution.

- In general, the TPPs should set aspirational policies that clearly support best practice planning outcomes. They should not be drafted simply to reflect existing 'policy' imbedded in the standards of the State Planning Provisions (SPPs). The TPPs should have no regard to the existing SPPs.
- The policies should be prepared in close consultation with specialists in the relevant fields and be based on up-to-date information and data.
- The proposal to integrate climate change into various relevant topics is supported.

It is recognised that climate change will significantly impact and affect land use across Tasmania. Most recent economic modelling shows climate change-related disasters will cost Australia \$73bn a year by 2060 regardless of actions to reduce emissions.

Climate impacts will result in increased and intensified natural hazards, exhibiting characteristics that have not been experienced before (such as extreme wildfires), whilst others will recede and disappear (such as frosts necessary for horticulture).

Flexibility and whole hazard responses will be required to enable planning to accommodate cascading, concurrent and concatenating events and to support resilience across communities and inevitable retreat pathways.

Climate change impacts have social, cultural and economic ramifications. It will drive patterns of behaviours and resultant land use as communities adapt to stressors and shocks as the climate shifts. Climate gentrification will drive inequalities, exposing those with less capacity to greater hazard.

To more meaningfully integrate climate change into the Resource Management and Planning System (RMPS) and ensure a holistic response, climate change considerations should be clearly stated as an objective under Schedule 1 of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* (LUPAA).

- Sustainable design features and materials should be encouraged through the TPPs.
- Generally, the TPPs should ensure a greater emphasis on place-based planning. They should include clearly articulated urban design principles based on national best practice.
- Some topics and issues overlap (for example wetlands and waterways, coastal processes and catchment management being separate to hazards such as flooding and sea level rise). It is unclear how these will work in conjunction with each other, particularly where they may contradict each other.
- Under the 'environmental protection' topic:
  - Biodiversity will need to include threatened species and threatened vegetation, loss of habitat and species extinction and the impact of climate change.
  - Waterways and wetlands should be under the catchment management issue, integrating water quality, flooding, pollution and ecology. Groundwater should also be covered.
  - Coastal processes and landforms should take account of all details included in the State Coastal Policy.
  - The 'precautionary principle' should be applied to all policies, not just under this topic.
- Under the 'hazards and risks' topic:
  - Bushfire needs to be a stand-alone issue, not grouped with other 'natural hazards'.
  - Loss of food security should also be included.
- Under the 'economic development' topic:

- It is not clear what industries are targeted under 'industry and business' – will this include major employers such as hospitality, health and education? What about manufacturing?
- Does 'agriculture' include forestry?
- Under the 'liveable settlements' topic:
  - Affordable housing and social housing are issues that warrant specific and individual attention. They should not just be subsumed in the 'planned and contained settlements' issue.
 

It is noted that legislative change is likely required to enable effective planning mechanisms such as inclusionary zoning. The TPPs should set a clear direction on this.
  - Developer contributions should be addressed, to ensure a consistent and coordinated approach.
 

Zoning uplift contributions should also be covered, including contributions to public infrastructure such as transport systems if rezoning increases development potential. This would help address additional transport requirements and stressors on the existing transport system.

It is noted that legislative change is likely required to enable effective planning mechanisms. The TPPs should set a clear direction on this.
- Under the 'heritage protection' topic:
  - 'Cultural heritage' would be a better topic name.
  - Any policy on cultural heritage needs to ensure it covers all aspects of cultural heritage value, in line with the Burra Charter (The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, 2013).
  - The TPPs should make clearer connections between the planning framework and Aboriginal ideas of Country and acknowledge the history of dispossession.
  - Best practice contemporary statutory protection for Aboriginal cultural values should be enabled.
- Under the 'infrastructure to support the economy and create liveable communities' topic:
  - Social infrastructure needs to be included here, if not covered under the 'liveable settlements' topic.
- Under the 'public engagement in planning processes' topic:

- Only 'consultation' is mentioned in the issues, which is not as suggestive of a two-way process as the term 'engagement'.
- Short stay accommodation (particularly entire home listings) and the associated impacts on housing should be considered by the TPPs. It is unclear where this fits, as it relates to both tourism and settlements.
- The TPPs should include specific policy guidance on commercial use and development in protected areas.
- Though it may not be fully in the remit of the TPPs, It would be beneficial to coordinate a review between local government, state government and infrastructure providers around infrastructure in transport and movement corridors. This includes what is underground, on the surface and in the airspace of these corridors, and clarity about the rights and responsibilities around maintenance, replacement and impacts of services provision in the road and street network.
- The TPP template format is broadly supported, although other implementation methods should be facilitated, such as legislative change. This is particularly relevant for issues such as developer contributions and inclusionary zoning.

It should also be made clear under the TPPs what other legislation, State Policies or National Environment Protection Measures may also be applicable to the topic.

In the example template provided for Hazards and Risks, it notes the maps for sea-level rise will be taken from the 'State prepared maps' – these should now be reviewed to ensure the data underpinning the TPPs are up to date and reliable.

- While it is noted that the State Policies are not restricted only to Tasmania's land use planning system (the RMPS), these are outdated and should also be reviewed. The TPPs could have been a good opportunity to update and better integrate the State Policies into the RMPS.

More generally, it would be preferable for the highest levels of the RMPS to be addressed first. It is almost 30 years since the RMPS came into effect, indicating the whole system is due for a comprehensive review.

Setting intermediate policies without reviewing out-of-date higher order State Policies and legislation risks resulting in a set of planning policies that do not support a sense of integrated state-wide strategic planning.

- The drafting of the content of the TPPs needs to be done in close consultation with local government and other stakeholders, prior to formal public consultation by the Tasmanian Planning Commission under LUPAA.

The process undertaken by the NSW government in implementing a new State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) for Design and Place is an example of a co-designed process that generated meaningful and transparent

engagement with stakeholders. A statement of intent was issued to stakeholders (including local government planners) for consultation on the scope and detail of the policy, to ensure early engagement in technical aspects of the policy: <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/-/media/Files/DPE/Reports/DP-SEPP-Explanation-of-Intended-Effect-Final-2021.pdf?la=en>

If you have any queries relating to this matter, please contact \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_

Yours sincerely

(Neil Noye)  
**DIRECTOR CITY PLANNING**

22 October 2021

Department of Justice  
Office of the Secretary  
GPO Box 825  
HOBART TAS 7001

By email only: [haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au](mailto:haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au)

**Submission to the Tasmanian Planning Policies Draft 2021.**

BirdLife Australia welcomes the opportunity to comment on the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies.

BirdLife Australia is an independent non-partisan grassroots charity with over 200,000 supporters throughout Australia. Our primary objective is to conserve and protect Australia's native birds and their habitat. Our organisation is the national partner of BirdLife International, the world's largest conservation partnership.

BirdLife Australia has played a major role in the conservation and monitoring of Australia's bird life throughout our almost 120-year history. We have invested in long-term threatened bird conservation programs, often in partnership with other organisations and communities, bringing together research, education, on-ground remediation, advocacy and campaigning. The organisation relies on thousands of volunteers and citizen scientists who play a key role in delivering our bird conservation programs.

Our core programs adopt a long-term, multi-species and landscape scale approach to conservation for Coastal Birds, Woodland Birds, Mallee Birds and others. Our Key Biodiversity Areas program does the same for sites of recognised global importance for birds and biodiversity more broadly.

Our attached submission contains recommended amendments and additions to the Tasmanian Planning Policies .

Should you have any questions or require more information please contact Erin Farley, BirdLife Australia Campaigns Manager, on [redacted] or [redacted]

Yours sincerely,

Jenny Lau  
Preventing Extinctions Program Leader  
BirdLife Australia

**BirdLife Australia**  
Suite 2-05  
60 Leicester Street  
Carlton VIC 3053  
T 03 9347 0757  
F 03 9347 9323  
[info@birdlife.org.au](mailto:info@birdlife.org.au)  
[birdlife.org.au](http://birdlife.org.au)

ABN 75 149 174 774

Supporting the environment  
100% Recycled paper



TPP/Strategy/Objective	Comment	Recommendation
<p><b>TPP</b> - Economic Development – Agriculture <b>Strategy</b> - 3.3 - Allow the development of utilities and extractive industries which require the location for operational reasons, having regard to both the amount of land alienated from agricultural production and minimising the impacts on the surrounding environment.</p>	<p>Impacts to nature and biodiversity should be avoided in the first instance.</p>	<p><b>Amend Strategy 3.3</b> to: Allow the development [...] and avoiding the impacts on the surrounding environment, and in particular, habitat for threatened species.</p>
<p><b>TPP</b> - Economic Development – Agriculture</p>	<p>The impacts on biodiversity are not addressed by potential land conversions for agricultural use.</p>	<p><b>Incorporate an additional Strategy:</b> Ensure that land that provides critical habitat for threatened species is not converted to agricultural use.</p>
<p><b>TPP</b> - Economic Development – Tourism <b>Strategy</b> - 4.4 - Enable and prioritise tourism development that capitalises on Tasmania’s significant natural and cultural heritage values</p>	<p>In line with the Cultural and natural heritage TPP, land use planning should support ecologically sustainable development.</p>	<p><b>Amend Strategy 4.4</b> to: Enable and prioritise tourism development that capitalises on Tasmania’s significant natural and cultural heritage values and incorporates ecological sustainable development.</p>
<p><b>TPP</b> - Settlement and liveable communities – Urban development <b>Strategy</b> - 1.5 - Encourage quality, innovative architecture and urban design that...</p>	<p>Connecting people with nature improves environmental, social, and cultural outcomes. A strategy focused on nature-based solutions is warranted.</p>	<p><b>Add to Strategy 1.5:</b> g) incorporates biodiversity sensitive urban design.</p>
<p><b>TPP</b> - Settlement and liveable communities – Community open spaces</p>	<p>Connecting people with nature improves environmental, social, and cultural outcomes. A strategy focused on nature-based solutions is warranted.</p>	<p><b>Incorporate an additional Strategy:</b> Development and management of natural areas incorporates biodiversity sensitive landscape design.</p>
<p><b>TPP</b> - Cultural and natural heritage – Natural heritage <b>Objective</b> - To assist in the protection of, and minimise adverse impacts on waterways, coasts, the</p>	<p>The protection of terrestrial ecosystems is not reflected in the TPP’s objectives.</p>	<p><b>Amend Objective</b> to: To assist in the protection of, and minimise adverse impacts on terrestrial ecosystems, waterways, coasts, the marine environment and sites of geoconservation significance,</p>



marine environment and sites of geoconservation significance, their natural processes and environmental values		their natural processes and environmental values.
<b>TPP</b> - Cultural and natural heritage- Natural heritage <b>Strategy</b> 3.2 - Consider impacts from land use and vegetation clearance on land identified for conservation purposes and, in particular, on land adjacent to reserves	Impacts to biodiversity should be avoided in the first instance.	<b>Amend Strategy</b> 3.2 to: Avoid impacts from land use and vegetation clearance on land identified for conservation purposes and, in particular, on land adjacent to reserves
<b>TPP</b> - Cultural and natural heritage- Natural heritage	In line with Strategy 3.3 which incorporates buffers in waterways and wetland, buffer zones are warranted to protect conservation areas on land.	<b>Add strategy:</b> Incorporate buffers between development and land identified for conservation purposes.

**From:** [Have Your Say](#)  
**To:** [Planning Unit](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Submission on the Scope/Content and Structure of the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs)  
**Date:** Friday, 22 October 2021 4:58:21 PM

---

---

**From:** Helen Hutchinson  
**Sent:** Friday, 22 October 2021 4:28 PM  
**To:** Have Your Say <HaveYourSay@justice.tas.gov.au>  
**Subject:** Submission on the Scope/Content and Structure of the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs)

Department of Justice  
Office of Strategic Legislation and Policy  
GPO Box 825  
HOBART TAS 7001  
Web [www.justice.tas.gov.au](http://www.justice.tas.gov.au)  
By email: [haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au](mailto:haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au)

22 October 2021

**To Whom It May Concern,**

**RE: Scope/Content and Structure of the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs)**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Tasmanian Government's Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping Paper for draft TPPs which is out for public comment between the 8 September and 22 October 2021. Strategic statewide policies are the missing component of the Resource Management and Planning System and are critical as they provide the intention of the planning system.

I agree with PMAT that while it would be preferable to develop State Policies (SPs) rather than TPPs we do welcome efforts to develop strategic policies. Having two strategic layers is also confusing. It would be beneficial for you to explain the relationship between the SPs and TPPs. And, at the same time, for the Tasmanian Government to dedicate more resources to community education and engagement regarding the importance of the TPPs, and why it is critical for the community to have their say on the TPPs.

The TPPs, although creating another layer of complexity to the planning system, are important as they will influence the future of Tasmania by shaping the planning system. I understand that the Tasmanian Planning

Policies will set out what we **need**; the Regional Land Use Strategies will show where that need should be located and the Tasmanian Planning Scheme will outline how this may be achieved and provide the appropriate zoning in the Local Provisions Schedule. It would be useful to further provide a definition of '**need**' .

Guaranteed public consultation should also be part of any new legislative framework for the development of the Regional Land Use Strategies. Presently, there is no guarantee of public comment on these critically important strategies. Another concern is that holistic integrated planning is not possible in Tasmania as key land uses are currently exempt or partly exempt from Tasmania's planning laws. For example mining, dams, forestry (public and private land) and aquaculture sit wholly or partly outside the planning system. It is obvious that a holistic attitude is required as all these parts are interdependent with other planning developments.

An integrated assessment process is necessary across all types of developments (including mining, forestry, aquaculture, dams and tourism developments) on all land tenures (including reserved land (e.g. national parks), public land allocated to timber production (formerly known as state forest), and the marine environment) which includes consistent provision of mediation, public comment and appeal rights.'

I understand that, nationally, Tasmania allocates the lowest amount of resources for strategic planning. Simply placing documents on a website and advertising in local papers, is not enough to create community engagement and discussion on such critically important policies for Tasmania's future well-being. It will be difficult for the Tasmanian Government to state that the TPPs reflect a 'collective' vision (as stated in the media release *Giving Tasmanians an opportunity to help set the direction of future planning policies*, September 2021), if the community does not understand the planning system, where the TPPs fit into that system, let alone not engaging with their development.

As public engagement is a key part of the planning process (including TPP development) perhaps this process should be one of the first to be developed.

I look forward to an adequate period of public consultation on this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Helen Hutchinson



Virus-free. [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)

**From:** [Have Your Say](#)  
**To:** [Planning Unit](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Submission re Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPP's) Scoping Paper  
**Date:** Friday, 22 October 2021 5:01:10 PM

---

---

**From:** Catherine Nicholson  
**Sent:** Friday, 22 October 2021 4:47 PM  
**To:** Have Your Say <HaveYourSay@justice.tas.gov.au>  
**Subject:** Submission re Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPP's) Scoping Paper

To Whom it May Concern,

I welcome the scoping paper as it shows the commencement at last of some focus on strategic planning and policies to give direction to the Statewide Planning Scheme, even though the Statewide Planning Scheme is well advanced and is been rolled out across the State with no strategic policy settings to give guidance on its implementation. Closing the barn door well after the horse has bolted!

I make the following comments regarding the structure, topics, and topic issues and how climate change should be dealt with in the proposed TPP's;

### **Structure of TPP's**

1. I support the statement that the TPPs will articulate the fundamental vision and principles upon which all planning decisions and future changes in land use will be based. I point out though that because a number of critical land uses activities such as mining, forestry, dams and activities in national parks or either totally are partially exempt from the land use planning system, the ability for these TPPs to achieve integrated assessment of use and development and development impacts is immediately compromised.
2. I support the general structure of the TPP's as described.

### **Scope and Topics**

1. I endorse the comments of Planning Matters Alliance Tasmania (PMAT) in relation to the scope and topics that should be part of the TPP's. in particular the need to focus Economic Development on Sustainable Economic development with the aims of adopting circular economy principles which minimise pollution and waste. I also support their call for 6 new TPPs. Tasmania's 'clean green image' has become a fundamental part of the branding of Tasmania and policies centred around these 6 topics would help ensure the clean and green is real and not just marketing hype.
2. I would like to see the precautionary principle - once a fundamental principle of the RMPAT objectives, being re enforced and embedded in land use decision making through being referenced in the TPP's. Of recent years, decisions around land use have begun to adopt the 'adaptive management' approach. This sounds good and can be an important element of the ongoing management of activities but it also can result in a 'lets wait till we have a problem and then figure out what if anything can be done attitude', as evidenced by how the salmon farming in Macquarie harbour

was managed. Meanwhile serious and perhaps irreversible damage to the environment can occur, along with a severe dent to Tasmania's clean green image.

RMPAT objectives still include the need to 'avoid, remedy and mitigate' impacts. I would like to see 'avoid' rather than 'mitigate and remedy' being more focused on.

3. I support PMAT's call for a Monitoring Evaluation and Reporting TPP and their rationale for such, including the need to update and continue with the State of the Environment Reporting. Without such reporting we cannot get a clear understanding of the impacts our land use activities and decisions are having on the State's natural, cultural and physical assets over time.
4. I support the issues that should be included in the 6 new topics as suggested by PMAT. Of particular relevance to planning schemes is the suggested TPP relating to Liveable Settlements. This is a central part of what planning schemes are designed to deal with and the 15 liveability values as described should form the basis for all of the standards around designing new urban areas and retrofitting development in existing areas.
5. Public Engagement in Planning Processes are described in the various pieces of legislation relevant to planning but are such a critically important part of the planning process that I support PMATS suggestion of a specific TPP that reenforces transparency, fairness and independence in land use planning decisions at all levels of decision making. In my experience of working as a decision maker in the planning system, the community may not always like or agree with a decision been made by an independent Planning Commission or Tribunal, but all parties generally accept it, if they feel it was a transparent, fair and independent process. If it is seen to be a compromised process with undue political pressure or lobbying by influential interest groups, it creates huge community disquiet and a long term distrust and unease with the planning system, and undermines public trust in it.

### **Should Climate Change be integrated into all relevant TPP's?**

1. Absolutely, but it is such a critical issue it needs to be a State Policy and I support the PMAT call for this to occur as well as the need for legislated greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Catherine Nicholson



By email to [haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au](mailto:haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au)  
October 2021

## **Submission from Carers Tasmania to the Tasmanian Planning Policies consultation paper**

Carers Tasmania is the peak body supporting carers throughout Tasmania. We represent, support and advocate for the estimated 80,000 family and friend carers in Tasmania. A carer is a person providing unpaid support to a family member or friend who may have a disability, mental illness, chronic or life limiting condition, alcohol or drug dependence or may be frail and aged.

As well as representing carers through the peak body activities, Carers Tasmania – through its service arm Care2Serve supports Tasmanian carers throughout their caring journeys. Each journey is a diverse experience with varying levels of care and support required. Care2Serve provide a range of services, funded under the Commonwealth National Carer Gateway program.

We are pleased to have the opportunity to provide feedback on the Tasmanian Planning Policies consultation paper and would like to highlight that a key purpose of Tasmania's planning system is to enable all Tasmanians to have adequate and appropriate housing that meets their needs. The existing framework of planning for residential settlements does not provide for the category of social and affordable housing, which is an essential piece of our diverse housing mix. If social and affordable housing is included in the Tasmanian Planning Policies, then Tasmania will have the vital planning mechanisms to ensure everyone is able to access appropriate housing.

Social and affordable housing is important because it provides safe and stable homes for those in the community. In the Tasmanian community, it is estimated that one in six people are carers. Social and affordable housing is a method of supporting people on lower incomes to access affordable and secure homes. In Tasmania, many people struggle to afford the high costs associated with private housing and carers tend to face increased financial challenges as an impact of their caring role. Many carers are not able to engage in paid work, either at all or on a basis that would provide them the financial capacity to rent privately, and therefore find themselves in receipt of payments such as the Carer Payment and Carer Allowance.

The National Carer Survey 2020 found that in Australia, only 35.8% of carers reported as undertaking paid employment. Furthermore, the survey also found that most households had a gross income of less than \$50,000 per year and received some form of Government income support.<sup>1</sup> Tasmania has been found to have greater levels of socio-economic disadvantage than the rest of Australia. The median individual weekly income in Tasmania is \$573 compared with \$662 nationally and the median household income is \$1100 in comparison to \$1734 nationally.<sup>2</sup> The combination of low income and the extra costs often associated with caring can make it difficult for carers to afford private housing.

The Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping Paper does not specifically mention social and affordable housing or short stay accommodation.

We recommend that:

**Social and affordable housing be recognised in the Tasmanian Planning Policies and**

**Short stay accommodation be added as an issue in the Economic Development section of the Tasmanian Planning Policies**

Social and affordable housing are described in the Tasmanian Affordable Housing Strategy 2015-25:

*Social housing: is a broad term used to describe both housing provided by the government (public housing) and non-government organisations (community housing) with below-market rent prices.*

*Affordable housing: refers to rental homes or home purchases that are affordable to low-income households, meaning that the housing costs are low enough that the household is not in housing stress or crisis.<sup>3</sup>*

In Tasmania, social and affordable housing options are delivered by not-for-profit organisations and the State Government, providing affordable rental homes for people with lower incomes, using an income-based rent model which charges no more than 30% of income for rent.

---

<sup>1</sup> Carers NSW (2020). Carers NSW 2020 National Carer Survey: Summary report.

<sup>2</sup> Australian Bureau of Statistics, "Census of Population and Housing: General Community Profile, Australia, 2016, Cat No 2001.0

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0014/30254/AHS\\_Strategy\\_Final.pdf](https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0014/30254/AHS_Strategy_Final.pdf)

The need for social and affordable homes is increasing across Tasmania, and the waiting list for social housing in Tasmania is growing. In August 2021, there were 4,367 applications for social housing, with this number increasing as time goes on.<sup>4</sup> Alongside the financial barriers that carers face, Carers Tasmania and Care2Serve often hear from carers who require specific information, assistance, and referrals to enable them to access social housing.

If social and affordable housing is named in the Tasmanian Planning Policies, decision-makers and planners will be able to plan appropriately for the housing needs of the whole community, including people on lower incomes, many of whom may be carers who live within Tasmania.

While the inclusion of social and affordable housing in the Tasmanian Planning Policies is a priority, we also note that the growth in short stay accommodation may be a contributing factor to the housing crisis in Tasmania. Many residential properties throughout Tasmania are converted to short stay accommodation premises.<sup>5</sup> The growth in short stay accommodation is likely to continue to impact current and future housing and community needs. We suggest that it is appropriate to include short stay accommodation in the scope of the Tasmanian Planning Policies.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the consultation on the Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping paper. We encourage you to include social and affordable housing in the Tasmanian Planning Policies as an essential step towards ensuring that all Tasmanians, including Tasmania's carers have opportunity to access the homes they need.

The Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping paper does not mention social and affordable housing or short stay accommodation. We encourage you to update the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies to include social and affordable housing and short stay accommodation.

For further information, please contact:

Executive Policy Officer  
Carers Tasmania

---

<sup>4</sup> [https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/housing/tasmanian\\_affordable\\_housing\\_strategy/reporting](https://www.communities.tas.gov.au/housing/tasmanian_affordable_housing_strategy/reporting)

<sup>5</sup> <https://cbos.tas.gov.au/topics/housing/short-stay-accommodation-act>

22 October 2021

Our ref.: dc:dl  
Doc. ID: 405313

Department of Justice  
Office of the Secretary  
Via [haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au](mailto:haveyoursay@justice.tas.gov.au)

To whom it may concern,

**Re: Submission to the Tasmanian Planning Policies Scoping Paper.**

Council notes that while the Tasmanian Government previously developed a number of draft Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs), the purpose of the scoping paper is to see feedback on the proposed TPP topics, issues and template, not the draft policies, which will be subject to further work. Council's response to the Scoping Paper is provided below:

*Question 1. Do you agree with the scope of proposed TPP topics?*

Council agrees that the topics identified on page 9 of the Scoping Paper are appropriate.

*Question 2. Do you agree with the scope of the proposed TPP issues?*

Council agrees that the issues identified on page 9 of the Scoping Paper seem appropriate, but believes that additional input from subject matter experts (i.e. aligned to each TPP topic) should be sought to review the identification, categorisation and prioritisation of these issues. In relation to the topic 'Liveable Settlements', we believe that sustainable living, housing affordability and social inclusion / social cohesiveness, should be identified as issues. Sustainable tourism should also be addressed by the TPPs, as should waterways and wetlands, including the character of riparian edges and coastal refuges, which are often on Crown land and a source of disputes.

*Question 3. What other topics and/or issues do you think the TPPs should cover?*

Please refer to the above response.

*Question 4. Do you agree that climate change should be integrated into all relevant TPPs?*

While we accept the rationale for climate change not being a TPP topic in its own right, we wish to stress the importance of climate change in relation to TPP development, and welcome further information or discussions in relation to how climate change is best addressed through the TPPs and how the current draft TPPs should be revised to adequately reflect climate change.

*Question 5. Do you think that the proposed template is appropriate and a useful way of providing guidance on what the TPPs should achieve?*

Council believes that integration and consistency in TPP development, will be key to their successful application. For example, the 'Economic Development' TPP should be developed in such a way that it also delivers against the objectives of or is at least consistent with, the objectives of the 'Environmental Protection' TPP. In order to achieve this, further consideration should be given to the TPP template and any associated guidance document.

A review of the TPPs and their impact on councils and other stakeholders, should be undertaken within one year from the time that implementation commences.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely

Daryl Connelly  
DIRECTOR COMMUNITY SERVICES