

UDIA (VICTORIA) ADVOCACY MEMO

PLAN MELBOURNE 2017-2050



| KEY ELEMENT | UDIA ADVOCATED FOR | DID WE GET IT? | HOW |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Aspiration of 70/30 development rather than set target | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The industry was looking for the target of 70/30 to be abandoned in Plan Melbourne. UDIA advocated for the 70/30 target to be considered an aspiration from which policy settings within the established areas should facilitate. | Yes | <i>Plan Melbourne 2017-2050</i> has amended this target to an aspirational scenario of a 70/30 split between development in established and greenfield areas |
| Increased densities within established areas | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UDIA has been looking for recognition that there needs to be more encouragement to councils for development in established areas The established areas have the greatest capacity for good public amenity and need to be utilised | Yes | New policies within Plan Melbourne seek to better facilitate higher densities within established suburbs, including within Neighbourhood Residential and General Residential zones |
| Housing affordability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing affordability has been an increasingly pressing issue in Victoria, and the government has needed to provide stronger policy and more finance towards alleviating the situation UDIA has long been urging the government to recognise the cross-industry interest in providing affordable housing for Victorians | Yes | The government has provided a detailed and extensive plan to tackle the issue of housing affordability, involving the industry and trialling its new mechanisms on government-owned land |
| Development in growth areas to be sequenced | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There has been consistent delay with the infrastructure that was intended to accompany greenfield land released by the government UDIA has advocated for government focus on supplying the infrastructure to improve quality and accessibility to some of these amenity-starved communities | Maybe | Direction seeks to stage and sequence development within growth areas, however, policy generally focusses on aligning infrastructure investment with the delivery of new communities. UDIA is concerned that the measures might focus on limiting or adding unnecessary costs to development |

UDIA (VICTORIA) ADVOCACY MEMO

PLAN MELBOURNE 2017-2050



| | | | |
|---|--|---------------|---|
| Capture and share value uplift from land rezoning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UDIA has emphasised that any value capture mechanism needs to be very carefully implemented, and we have made clear that simply rezoning land is not a value capture mechanism as it does not create any value | Almost | <i>Plan Melbourne 2017-2050</i> includes a new policy that encourages value capture in strategic development areas that require significant investment infrastructure. However, the measures proposed do not capture value when and where it is created |
| Mandatory heights | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UDIA has been advising against the implementation of mandatory height limits, particularly in Residential Growth Zones These areas are better served by discretionary height limits, as mandatory heights can be overly prescriptive and do not align with the government's objective of encouraging higher density living in Melbourne's established areas | No | Councils will have the ability to set a mandatory height limit at the discretionary height limit |