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Introduction

The Australian Sustainable Built Environment Council (ASBEC) is the peak body of key organisations committed to a sustainable built environment in Australia.

ASBEC’s membership consists of industry and professional associations, non-government organisations, and academic and government observers who are involved in the planning, design, delivery and operation of our built environment, and are concerned with the social and environmental impacts of this sector.

ASBEC has a key role in shaping aspects of housing policy including the costs and choices faced by residents living and working in our cities and centres.

Housing is a complex policy area that is fundamental to the built environment. It goes beyond individual housing issues and links to the sustainable functioning of cities and regions - impacting related issues such as transport and movement, infrastructure, health, well-being, quality of life and spatial inequality.

The objective of this paper is to outline how the operation of the built environment can best contribute to the supply of diverse housing that supports affordable living outcomes.

The Vision

Housing is integral to health, wellbeing and economic outcomes for all Australians. Housing policy has a significant effect on the lives of Australians, because it influences the connectivity and proximity of housing to other land uses, including transport, employment, community services such as hospitals and schools, and recreational activities. It is also a significant contributor to economic activity, being responsible for many thousands of jobs both directly and indirectly.

Housing affordability is defined and measured in a variety of ways. For ASBEC, affordability means enabling people to make a housing choice that suits their needs within their available budget – regardless of whether it involves renting, ownership or having options as they age.

From the perspective of the built environment, housing policy should support affordable living outcomes – recognising that the direct rental or mortgage payments are not the only costs that the households incur. Other expenses such as the consumption of utilities or the cost of transport significantly impact overall affordability.

To support affordable living outcomes, housing policy must promote the provision of diverse dwellings to cater for needs at all stages of life, and encourage density in the right places, with improved access to jobs and services. This requires:

- Long term alignment between population growth and housing supply, with periodic targets integrated into adopted planning policy.
- Strategic planning for accessible centres to link residential concentrations with jobs and services, reducing the costs of transport and vulnerability to social exclusion.
- Cost effective and timely delivery of urban infrastructure integrated with strategic planning, including: public transport, roads, community facilities and utilities for greenfield and urban infill areas.
- The adoption of best practice design principles to functionally enhance the sustainability and resilience of the built environment, with high quality urban design ensuring creating a sense of place.
- Improved sustainability of buildings, including minimum standards for the energy performance of new and existing buildings, which recognise whole of life costs.
- Continuous reform of land use planning and processes, to encourage supply of diverse housing where it ensures equivalent incentives for detached dwellings and a diversity of medium density housing types that promote design quality and sustainability.
- Ensuring the market operates efficiently to supply housing for all market segments, including the availability of housing stock that meets the needs of very low to moderate income earners.
- Regulatory frameworks that encourage innovation and efficiencies in the housing supply chain, such as modular construction, pre-fabrication and bringing new products to market more cost efficiently.
The Urgency

Australia’s population is growing strongly and settling increasingly in our biggest cities. Infrastructure Australia estimates that 75% of our population growth to 2031 will occur in our four largest cities. Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Perth are expected to collectively grow by around 45% over this time.

Affordable living is already a significant issue for new and existing households in Australia - particularly those in the strong economic centres of Sydney and Melbourne - and will worsen if the supply of diverse housing in suitable locations is not improved. This is evidenced by the VAMPIRE Index – assessing factors such as income, mortgage repayments, the cost of petrol, and the degree of car dependence, demonstrating that high vulnerability is concentrated in outer and fringe suburban areas.

The Challenges

Australia faces challenges in the provision of housing that is accessible, of suitable design and which provides for sustainable and affordable living for our diverse and growing population.
Planning for Housing Diversity and Supply

Potential home owners and renters are increasingly demanding choice in size, location, proximity to employment and amenity, but there is limited capacity in many city strategies and local statutory plans to deliver inner city density, middle ring urban renewal and new greenfield land development to meet this demand. An effective, functioning planning system is vital to efficient supply. Ensuring that the supply of new housing and land meets demand is an urgent challenge as there remains significant deficits in housing supply across many market segments. This is particularly felt by those on very low to moderate incomes.

Delivering Growth Infrastructure to Support Social Inclusion

An alienated community, unable to access adequate housing with access to jobs and services, carries costs for individuals in terms of health and wellbeing, and high costs for society in terms of welfare dependency and reduced labour productivity. The challenge is to deliver more housing in places that are accessible, as well as integrating new greenfield housing into the urban fabric.

There is a need and community expectation for increased housing densities to be accompanied with improved urban amenity. This places pressure on our ability to integrate the strategic planning, funding and delivery of economic and social infrastructure to support growth.

Sustainability and Innovation Measures to Reduce Costs

Sustainability and energy performance is integral to delivering more affordable living and more resilient communities. The absence of a nationally consistent residential ratings framework means that sustainability and reduced whole of life costs cannot easily be factored into decision making. Our building energy performance standards lag behind our international peers. Some regulations can stifle innovation and add costs in instances where more innovative design or construction techniques could be adopted.

Best Practice Design

Best practice building and urban design principles are not consistently embedded in planning frameworks across different jurisdictions, impacting on the quality, sustainability, biodiversity and resilience of our neighbourhoods, precincts, towns and cities. Poor design increases the costs of accessing services and reduces amenity.

Effective Community Engagement

Effective engagement with communities must be undertaken, to help understand community needs and highlight the importance and benefits of housing supply, diversity and density. Growth should bring opportunities for improved amenity and lower living costs.
Addressing the Challenges

Planning for Housing Diversity and Supply

The challenge: Potential home owners and renters are increasingly demanding choice in size, location, proximity to employment and amenity. Consumer preferences are changing and there is a trend towards higher density living with greater amenity. However, there is limited capacity in many city strategies and local statutory plans to deliver inner city density, middle ring urban renewal and new greenfield land development to meet this demand.

An effective, functioning planning system is vital to efficient supply. Ensuring that the supply of new housing and land meets demand is an urgent challenge as there remains significant deficits in housing supply across many market segments, especially at prices affordable to very low to moderate incomes.

Recommendation One: Incentives for reform to boost supply to achieve planning outcomes

The Federal Government should work with states and territories on implementation of an incentives-based model to improve housing supply, in terms of volume, type and location.

Incentives can drive planning reform where payments are used to encourage best practice planning, zoning and infrastructure provision to deliver diversity of high-quality, low-cost-of living housing in line with population growth. These incentives should be informed by best practice planning measures including the adoption of supply targets, an inclusionary zoning model code for development starting with government land, and the provision of social housing and affordable housing.

State and Local Governments need to understand emerging housing demands in terms of diversity and quantity and extrapolate relevant housing supply trends to devise housing policies to drive local plans and infrastructure investment strategies.

Recommendation Two: Place outcomes and housing diversity targets in City Deals

State government regional, district and local plans should be premised on meeting housing needs derived from anticipated population growth and demographic change in the medium and long term. They should include medium and long range housing supply targets and the means to achieve them.

Embed housing targets, informed by indicators that encompass diversity, location, urban design outcomes, proximity to employment and amenity, in all future City Deals negotiated by the Federal Government as a condition of funding.

Recommendation Three: Simplified assessment for medium density and adaptable housing

State governments to assign the majority of routine housing, industrial and commercial applications to an assessable process that delivers medium density and promotes high quality outcomes from master plans. To ensure community support and trust in the process there needs to be effective engagement on the development and implementation of good design guidelines (see section below on effective community engagement).
Funding and Delivering Growth Infrastructure

The challenge: The availability of funds and the ability to plan, sequence and deliver infrastructure to enable new settlement is often the limiting factor for the expansion of housing supply. Good infrastructure planning and development in Australia is inhibited by: the politicisation of plans and decisions; funding and finance constraints; narrow business case analysis; lack of foresight; inefficient procurement processes; and ineffective community engagement.

Long-term infrastructure financing, planning and delivery are vital to link the places where people live, work and socialise. Provisioning of infrastructure needs to be better tied to the supply of new housing - particularly significant public transport infrastructure to maximise affordable living outcomes.

Long term strategic planning is also vital to achieving fair, liveable and productive growing cities and centres. Strategic plans must guide the distribution and diversity of housing stock and ensure adequate provision of transport and services, and for access to employment locations into the future. The questions of who pays for enabling infrastructure, and in what mix, is important in how the planning outcomes embedded in an infrastructure plan are achieved. A transparent process involving community, government and property stakeholders is needed to arrive at a position for apportioning the funding investment. There should be comprehensive infrastructure funding and delivery plans for identified growth or renewal areas. These plans should be underpinned by a transparent funding mix, with clarity around the respective contributions of the public and private sectors.

Recommendation One: 30 Year Infrastructure Plan

Infrastructure Australia should lead the development of a transparently evaluated 30 Year Infrastructure Plan, through effective engagement with state, territory and local governments, community and business. Integrated land use and infrastructure planning outcomes (linked to housing needs) should inform the adoption of funding priorities at a national, state, regional/local scale, and growth precinct/corridor scale, informing state and local council budgets. Infrastructure Victoria’s 30-year strategy and South East Queensland’s Infrastructure Plan offer best practice models.

Infrastructure projects seeking federal funding should be considered in the context of the 30 Year infrastructure, as well as subject to rigorous business cases that test the right funding solutions suitable to that project.

A National 30 Year Infrastructure Plan should also provide clear guidance on recommended value capture mechanisms.

Case Study: Infrastructure Victoria’s 30-Year Infrastructure Plan

Victoria’s existing strategic land use plans and settlement strategies were a key input for determining Victoria’s most important infrastructure challenges, and the best solutions for meeting them, as part of a 30-year investment strategy.

Infrastructure Victoria’s strategic plan will inform future land use plans and opportunities for housing - which in turn will inform revisions of the infrastructure strategy and its priorities.

For example, in addition to shaping population growth, key drivers behind Plan Melbourne’s polycentric city approach are increasing productivity and attracting investment. Infrastructure Victoria’s Strategic Plan addresses these needs with urban intensification, transport infrastructure and pricing proposals and social housing provision to better enable workforce participation and drive Victoria’s changing, globally integrated economy.

While the Victorian strategy represents good practice in addressing identified ‘needs’ it could go further and respond explicitly to place outcomes identified in land use strategies.

Recommendation Two: Integrated infrastructure planning and prioritisation to deliver strategic planning outcomes – including affordability, liveability and environmental and social sustainability

Strategic land-use planning and infrastructure planning must be integrated – each informing the other, working off the same data sets to achieve the same planning outcomes for the region or precinct.

These plans must demonstrate how land-use and infrastructure will be integrated to deliver connected, liveable cities that support affordable and liveable outcomes.

The timing and sequencing of rezoning, utility provision and the delivery of key economic and social infrastructure must be incorporated in an integrated growth plan to achieve the timely supply of the range of housing stock needed to meet the desired land use outcomes. Best practice models should be incentivised to encourage state and territory to accommodate growth in urban renewal areas and ensure greenfield areas are linked to employment, transport and amenity.

A well-researched foundation policy on social sustainability, with productivity outcomes, would provide a basis for sound regional planning. For example, planning on the concept of a ‘30 minute city’ would allow settlement, economic and infrastructure proposals to be tested against a performance benchmark, linked to access to jobs and services.

Recommendation Three: Enable housing growth through broader cost-benefit analysis for infrastructure

Governments should work collaboratively with each other and with the private sector to release new funds for infrastructure investment based on independent, transparent advice supported by broad cost-benefit analysis. This would enable infrastructure to unlock potential housing development opportunities beyond the scope of single development proposals.

State and Commonwealth funding sources such as the former Housing Acceleration Fund (HAF in NSW) and the recent National Housing Infrastructure Facility (NHIF) are important for this purpose. These should be included in each jurisdiction and be an element enabling City Deals.

Recommendation Four: Embed existing frameworks into planning strategies

Embed the use of existing frameworks to evaluate planning strategies and infrastructure strategies to better inform infrastructure needs and priorities such as the ASBEC Resilient and the Built Environment – Infrastructure Fact Sheet or the Rockefeller Foundation’s 100 Resilient Cities initiative.

Recommendation Five: Fund feasibility studies for infrastructure priorities

Enable Infrastructure Australia to provide funding to states and territories to prepare feasibility studies and business cases that address the infrastructure priorities driven by population growth, housing supply and broader community needs. Planning and governance principles (below) should guide the infrastructure prioritisation process, rather than infrastructure projects being conceived and assessed in a vacuum:

- Planning for place outcomes identified in the strategy adopted
- Long term, integrated infrastructure plans linked to the planning strategy
- Options to achieve planning outcomes for places identified – and project alternatives derived subsequently
- Full project business cases published for project evaluation - including wider triple bottom line assessment and consideration of spill-over effects
- Community engagement in plan and option development - and post completion reviews of outcomes.
Sustainability and innovation to reduce whole-of-life and construction costs

The challenge: The concept of affordable living extends beyond just the purchase of a house, to whole of life costs. Sustainable features in the design and operation of new and existing housing stock will determine the operational costs of the dwelling. ASBEC’s National Framework for Residential Ratings calls for a nationally consistent rating framework for housing sustainability, consisting of three key elements: minimum regulatory performance standards for new buildings; benchmarks for market comparison of best practice sustainability performance; and communication messages explaining the value of sustainability features to renovators and homebuyers.

Affordable living can be promoted through infill development where existing infrastructure, services and amenities are established. However, construction costs tend to be higher for developments in established locations. New construction methods and materials can significantly reduce the cost of these developments such as modular construction, but the construction sector is conservative in its adoption of new methods. Regulators and government bodies have the potential to encourage adoption of new methods by ensuring that regulatory standards support their use in the delivery of new housing.

Additionally, climate change is expected to exacerbate existing environmental challenges – quality housing stock will be crucial in a future of more frequent and intense extreme weather events, such as heatwaves and floods, especially among the most vulnerable members of society.

Recommendation One: Minimum performance standards
Governments, in partnership with industry, should explore improved minimum performance standards for new buildings covering building energy, thermal comfort, water efficiency, and other sustainability issues, and an industry-agreed trajectory for future upgrades of the energy provisions in the National Construction Code. These standards should provide a consistent approach across all compliance options and jurisdictions.

Governments, in partnership with industry, should explore minimum energy performance standards for rental properties and existing buildings.

Recommendation Two: Market comparison of best practice
States and territory governments to work with industry to develop a pathway towards a consistent ratings disclosure at point of sale and lease, including a repository of rating information (compliance and performance) for rating re-use, analysis and communication of value across all jurisdictions.

Recommendation Three: Market engagement
Governments should work with industry to develop an approach to increasing public awareness and understanding of the framework, and communicating the benefits of sustainable housing.

Case Study: Josh’s House
Josh’s House is a NatHERS 10-Star family home built in 2013 in the Perth suburb of Hilton. The project demonstrates that highly energy efficient homes can be built with conventional materials and trades for a comparable cost to that of similar sized dwellings. Josh’s House was designed to be net zero energy and highly water efficient (incorporating rainwater harvesting and greywater use), but it also addresses other aspects of sustainable living which are often overlooked. This includes good indoor air quality, universal access, as well as productive gardens incorporating intensive food production and engaging outdoor play spaces for children.

In partnership with the Cooperative Research Centre for Low Carbon Living, Josh’s House is used as a ‘Living Laboratory’ to demonstrate the day-to-day operational performance of a sustainable house and to verify that it fulfils its intended design while being occupied. A comprehensive monitoring system has been installed to collect real-time data from a multitude of instruments. The results verify that the sustainable 10-Star house is performing as designed, exporting net surplus electricity to the grid and using 90 per cent less mains water than the Perth average.

Further information on the project, including open source design documentation and performance data can be found at www.joshshouse.com.au

Recommendation Four: Compliance
State and territory governments to work with industry to act on the findings of the National Energy Efficient Building Project to improve compliance with energy efficiency requirements in the National Construction Code, build skills and industry capacity and lower compliance costs.
Case Study: Nightingale Housing (Melbourne)

Nightingale Housing operates and exists to support, promote and advocate for high-quality housing that is ecologically, socially and financially sustainable. Acknowledging the stresses that exist in Australian communities, it works with architects, project managers and purchasers to build social cohesion, maintain fossil fuel free operations, and increase neighbourhood contributions while delivering affordable housing options.

The Nightingale model is maintained through five key consideration areas:

**Affordability** - Designed to reduce operation and maintenance costs through removal of unnecessary inputs (e.g. marketing activities & display) with covenant on resale to ensure affordability is passed on.

**Transparency** - Project costs are transparent to investors and purchasers, and there is transparency within governance and the decision-making processes.

**Sustainability** - 100% fossil fuel free building operations, a minimum 7.5 star NatHERS thermal rating, water harvesting and productive gardens.

**Deliberative Design** - Meaningful and informed participation from future home owners across the duration of project, from design through to settlement.

**Community Contribution** - Contribution back to the local urban community through the creation of connected communities, active street frontages, fine grain and tactile pedestrian experience for passers-by, and engagement with tenants who can provide ‘third spaces’.

See: [http://nightingalehousing.org/](http://nightingalehousing.org/)

Recommendation Five: Third party verification

State, territory and local governments commit to achieving and requiring best practice buildings and urban design supported by third party verification, wherever practical, in those projects where they have development control.

Case Study: Partnership to Deliver Collaborative Training for Modular Construction

Modular construction has been linked to benefits in housing quality, environmental performance and construction productivity. However uptake in Australia has been relatively low and slow. The key challenge is that adoption requires extraordinary levels of collaboration in order to succeed.

A three year $0.5M national study on collaboration in residential supply chains using modular construction is currently being undertaken. Professor Kerry London of Western Sydney University leads her research team in partnership with Metricon, Frasers Property, Master Buildings Association Victoria and FMG Engineering on the Australian Research Council Linkage grant.

This project does not go over old ground about the potential benefits of modular construction, nor does it launch into motherhood statements about transforming the housing sector. Instead the team explored five very different case studies to understand what makes for success in collaboration in modular construction.

Case studies were located in Victoria, Tasmania and South Australia. They were exemplars of different types and scale of modular construction including; prefabrication of components, systems for medium density housing and entire houses, exploding the myth that modular is only for ‘the big end of town’.

The rigorous analysis has resulted in the development of training materials that link modular construction success with enabling collaborative practices. The team is developing a new Collaborative Practice Training Framework which will be offered to companies through the MBAV Leadership Simulation Training Centre.

The work has garnered interest all over the world and has been showcased in the UK, South Africa, Malaysia and Canada. This is one example of a research project conducted under the auspices of the Australian Housing Supply Chain Alliance. The Alliance includes the above four industry partners as well as Housing Industry Association, Boral and CSR, and their charter is to conduct research for cultural and behavioural change right across the residential urban development chain.


Recommendation Six: A trajectory for future upgrades of energy performance standards

Governments should establish an industry-agreed trajectory with targets for future upgrades of the energy provisions in the National Construction Code, as noted in the National Energy Productivity Plan, providing a clear opportunity to deliver higher performing buildings, and catalyse innovation, investment and market transformation in the sector by providing a strong regulatory signal of the direction for future standards. Reviews of national or state level building regulations must encourage the adoption of innovative methods or materials.
Best Practice Building and Urban Design

The challenge: Best practice building and urban design principles are not consistently embedded in planning frameworks across different jurisdictions, impacting on the quality, sustainability and resilience of our neighbourhoods, precincts, towns and cities. Poor design increases the costs of accessing services and reduces amenity.

Creating Places for People: An Urban Design Protocol for Australian Cities (the Protocol) is a collaborative commitment to best practice urban design in Australia. It is championed by peak community and professional organisations, businesses and all three levels of government. Urban design is both a process and an outcome of creating localities in which people live, engage with each other, and participate in the physical place around them. Creating Places for People does not take a 'one size fits all' approach. It provides broad principles that take into account the unique characteristics of a location, people’s experience and well-being; and encourages excellence and collaboration in the design and custodianship of urban places. The Protocol establishes twelve broadly agreed principles for quality urban places in the Australian context, such as: physical and social connection; safety; and custodianship. These principles can be applied to any project or location—whether it is in a large capital city, regional centre or rural town.

Recommendation One: Prioritisation of good urban design
All governments should deliver best practice urban environments through a renewed commitment to adopt and champion Creating Places for People: An Urban Design Protocol for Australian Cities.

All master plans and major development proposals for new and infill development should have regard to and be evaluated against the relevant principles of the National Urban Design Protocol.

Recommendation Two: Best practice sustainable precinct design tools
Precinct master planning should be informed by sustainable design principles to promote walking, cycling and active community spaces, to reduce living costs by improving health, wellbeing and access to services. As best practice, planning systems should encourage no net biodiversity loss.

Case Study: Renewal SA, Tonsley Innovation District, SA
When Tonsley’s masterplan was being developed back in 2012, the South Australian Government set a clear brief for the site. The former manufacturing park was to become a sustainable centre for innovation and productivity, drawing workers, developing high-value industries and contributing to the state’s economic success. Fast forward to 2015 and Tonsley Innovation District was Australia’s first mixed-use urban redevelopment to be awarded 6 Star Green Star – Communities certification.

To achieve these goals, Tonsley needed to incorporate the right mix of uses, and to facilitate connections between people, businesses and educational institutions. Adaptive reuse of existing infrastructure helped to do this by creating a central hub of activity for the community and plenty of opportunities for social and commercial interaction.

While planning Tonsley, the project team created a Site Wide Built Form Development Manual and site-specific Urban Design Protocol to ensure all buildings adhere to the sustainability and liveability vision for the site – and in doing so has set new benchmarks for sustainable urban renewal in Australia.

The former Mitsubishi Main Assembly Building (MAB) was retained and re-purposed, preventing the loss of approximately 90,000 tonnes of carbon emissions in its original construction. Once complete the MAB will house a range of flexible modular pod tenancies occupied by small to medium businesses from the high-value manufacturing sector while incorporating retail outlets, meeting areas, education spaces and a number of forests and plazas.

Education and research are true cornerstones of the Tonsley Innovation District masterplan, with Flinders University and TAFE SA signing up as anchor partners in the development.

Tonsley’s masterplan also incorporates approximately 11 hectares of residential space which will eventually be home to around 1,200 people. Creating homes will ensure the district remains active outside of business hours, and give the opportunity for those who work or study at Tonsley to live close by. The train station is at the doorstep of the residential area, with new electric trains meaning faster, more frequent and cleaner journeys to the city. The result? Fewer transport emissions and a cohesive community identity.

Over the coming years, Tonsley will become firmly established as an economic growth engine for South Australia as the district reaches a critical mass of industry, research, education and commercial activity collocated on the site.

Recommendation Three: Design quality standards
High quality building design is important to high levels of amenity and best practice sustainability; particularly in the context of density.
Best practice building design should be encouraged by state and territory governments and supported with guidance tools.

Case Study: Apartment Design Guide - Tools for improving the design of apartment development
The Apartment Design Guide is a resource to improve the planning and design of residential apartment development in NSW.
This Apartment Design Guide aims to help to achieve better design and planning for residential apartment development, by providing benchmarks for designing and assessing these developments.
It is designed to:
- deliver better quality design for buildings that respond appropriately to the character of the area, landscape setting and surrounding built form
- improve liveability through enhanced internal and external apartment amenity, including better layout, apartment depth and ceiling heights, solar access, natural ventilation and visual privacy
- deliver improved sustainability through better traffic and transport solutions, greater building adaptability and robustness, improved energy efficiency and water sensitive urban design
- improve the relationship of apartments to the public domain including streets, lanes and parks
- deliver design guidance and assist in the provision of more diverse housing mix and choice
- support councils in developing planning controls and master plans through improved guidance.
The Guide has responded to challenges, advances and innovations across a range of social, economic, environmental and sustainable development fields as well as aesthetic and technical changes and opportunities.
Effective Community Engagement

The challenge: Infill development faces a number of challenges, including community opposition from existing residents who are concerned that any new development – particularly those of medium and high densities that may change the character of their suburbs, increase congestion and have a perceived impact on property values.

There has been a failure to recognise community concerns that increasing growth will be accompanied by falling amenity if there is insufficient consideration of future community infrastructure needs. State and local governments have not fully appreciated this when engaging communities on the importance of housing diversity and the need for new supply in existing areas. This adds significant holding costs onto new housing as complying development proposals are refused, restricted or subject to legal challenges by the local community.

Recommendation One: Involve community and adopt community engagement principles
State and local government should actively invest in best practice engagement with local communities when developing strategic plans, to enable community views to be taken into consideration. Community engagement in earlier stages of the planning processes will minimise costly, late-stage public backlash to complying development. Adoption of a set of planning principles to guide engagement with investment in engagement processes can build needed trust.

Recommendation Two: Scaled participation
Community participation methods (and the reasons given for planning decisions) should be appropriate, having regard to the significance and likely impact of the proposed development. The nature of engagement should be determined in advance.

Recommendation Three: Referral processes
Strengthen referral processes to reflect strategic plans and include pre-lodgement discussions with consent authorities to ensure balanced consideration of positions when approving infill developments (the reasons given for planning decisions should have appropriate regard for the significance and likely impact of the proposed development).

Case Study: Community-led Neighbourhood Renewal Pilot Projects
Resilient Melbourne, as part of the 100 Resilient Cities global program – pioneered by the Rockefeller Foundation, has developed Melbourne – and Australia’s first urban resilience strategy to mitigate the acute shocks and chronic stresses that impact metropolitan Melbourne, today and in the years ahead.

An action within the Resilient Melbourne Strategy called the Community-led Neighbourhood Renewal and Development pilot program, aims to meaningfully involve people in making decisions about their built and natural environment. This program will trial a range of participatory development models that emphasise citizen and stakeholder engagement in the decision-making process while monitoring and evaluating the impact this approach has on communities.

The approaches being tested will go beyond the often one-dimensional process of consultation, focusing instead on involving communities directly in decision-making about their future living environments. This action seeks to foster stronger and more cohesive communities, empowering people with the opportunity to be involved in decisions impacting directly on their life.

As part of their participation in the pilots, property companies and their partners will:
• Test a range of tools and frameworks, both existing (such as Green Star Communities, Eco-districts) and new, to collaborate and share in decision making.
• Measure results and report on their findings, working in conjunction with academic and other partners.
• Contribute to a body of publicly available guidance on participatory planning across Melbourne.

Additional Resources

ASBEC and its members have a strong interest in sustainable, productive and liveable cities and regions – of which housing policy is a fundamental part.

This is why ASBEC and its members have commissioned research and championed ideas including:

- **Low Carbon, High Performance**, a report which provides detailed modelling of potential emissions reductions from the building sector, setting out a policy roadmap towards 2050.
- The **National Framework for Residential Ratings**, which outlines a pathway for a nationally consistent approach to residential ratings.
- **Resilience and the Built Environment Factsheets** on Housing, Infrastructure and Cities, to provide foundational resilience information to built environment decision makers, to help embed resilience thinking into their decision-making and begin a discussion with stakeholders and supply chains.
- The **Investing in Cities** policy platform, advocating for policies that maximise the value of our cities and protect the ‘liveability’ for which Australia is world-famous.

Contact

For more information please contact the Australian Sustainable Built Environment Council

02 8006 0828 | admin@asbec.asn.au
5/104 Commonwealth Street, Surry Hills NSW 2010