

24 April 2025

Chair
Legislative Council Select Committee
Inquiry into Victorian Planning Provisions Amendments VC257, VC267 and VC274

via email: [REDACTED]

Inquiry into Victorian Planning Provisions Amendments VC257, VC267 and VC274

Dear Chair,

The Urban Development Institute of Australia, Victoria (UDIA) welcomes the opportunity to make a submission as part of the Legislative Council Select Committee's Inquiry into Victorian Planning Provisions (VPP) Amendments VC257, VC267 and VC274.

About UDIA

The Urban Development Institute of Australia, Victoria (UDIA) is a not-for-profit research, advocacy, and educational organisation supported by a membership of land use and property development entities, across the private sector and Victoria's public service. UDIA Victoria is committed to working closely with industry, local, state, and federal government; key housing sector stakeholders; and the community.

UDIA is a signatory to the State Government's Affordability Partnership, focusing on meeting the objectives of Victoria's Housing Statement, which aims to build a significant number of new homes over the coming years. UDIA Victoria is dedicated to establishing the right policy, regulatory, and taxation settings to enable the residential development industry to build great housing for the growing number of people who choose to call Victoria home.

We apply a rigorous, research and evidence-based approach to developing policy advice for decision-makers at all levels of government. UDIA research tracks market trends, construction costs, regulatory changes, and prevailing economic conditions, providing a comprehensive picture of Victoria's development industry.

Background

A consistent, transparent and reliable planning system is crucial to providing certainty to the urban development industry and underpins the efficient and cost-effective delivery of new housing.

In Victoria, planning reform has the capacity to create tens-of-thousands of jobs over the next decade, and accelerate planning approvals of new dwellings, by up to 6-months on average.

The current planning system is well-known to be inefficient and in dire need of substantive reform. Better Regulation Victoria's Planning and Building Approvals Process Review examined many of these inefficiencies, finding the economic cost of ranges from \$400 to \$600 million per year – approximately 2 per cent of Victoria's construction sector's \$33 billion value.

Furthermore, planning and zoning is a significant contributor to housing affordability by determining how efficiently and cost-effectively new homes can be built. Restrictive planning practices, such as limiting land to single-family homes or imposing overly prescriptive density controls, constrains supply by preventing the

construction of more diverse housing types, including apartments, townhouses, or medium-density dwellings. Such limitations reduce the availability of housing options, escalating prices as demand outstrips supply – especially in well-located areas close to employment centres and amenities.

Delivering more diverse housing in Melbourne’s established suburbs has been an aspiration of successive government’s strategic planning policies for decades. However, most of all new homes have historically been delivered in Melbourne’s growth areas. Challenging planning approval processes have been a significant contributor to this trend.

Onerous and uncertain planning approval processes contribute substantially to development delays, increased holding costs, and overall financial risks. Complex, lengthy, or discretionary approval procedures also deter investment, particularly in markets where financial viability is already marginal due to economic pressures. These costs are invariably passed onto homebuyers, compounding affordability issues. Streamlining planning regulations and introducing greater flexibility and clarity into zoning provisions are essential measures to improve housing affordability and supply.

UDIA has been extensively involved in planning reform work and is actively consulting with Department of Transport and Planning (DTP) (and, before that, DELWP) to provide industry insight into the planning systems to ensure the reforms are workable and will achieve better industry and community outcomes.

UDIA supports the recent introduction of planning amendments **VC257**, **VC267**, and **VC274**, as part of a broader housing reform agenda under *Victoria’s Housing Statement* – this is an important step towards improving housing affordability and supply in established suburbs.

Each amendment introduces new planning processes to improve predictability for developers and the community, while accelerating approval timelines. However, we also recognise there are important issues to consider to ensure these reforms are implemented successfully and deliver desirable outcomes for industry and the community.

Our submission outlines the key changes in each amendment and highlights some considerations UDIA wish to bring to the Committee’s attention.

Amendment VC257 – Housing Choice & Transport Zone and Built Form Overlay

Housing Choice and Transport Zone (HCTZ)

A new residential zone (Clause 32.10) designed to facilitate diverse, higher-density housing in areas around designated activity centres and other well-serviced locations (within 800m of a major centre). The HCTZ will replace existing general/neighbourhood residential zones in these catchments to allow increased building heights and housing types. The zone sets different mandatory height limits for “inner” vs “outer” catchment areas (up to 4–6 storeys in inner catchments, and 3–4 storeys in outer areas, with slightly taller allowances on larger sites). These height caps give clarity on development potential. Notably, the usual planning permit processes (including notice and third-party appeal rights) still apply in the HCTZ, similar to other residential zones.

Built Form Overlay (BFO)

A new overlay control (Clause 43.06) to be applied to the commercial core of activity centres, the BFO sets detailed built form requirements, such as maximum building heights, setbacks, floor area ratios, overshadowing controls, wind effects, landscaping, and even “public benefit uplift” provisions for bonus development rights. Developments that meet the BFO’s specified standards (some of which may be mandatory) can be fast-tracked. The BFO makes such proposals exempt from notice and third-party review, effectively streamlining the permit approval for compliant projects. (Local BFO schedules can choose to “switch on” notice/appeals for certain matters if needed.) The BFO is intended to facilitate higher-density development in activity centre cores, in line with structure plans, by codifying the preferred built form upfront.

These new tools are initially being rolled out in ten pilot Activity Centres across Melbourne, including areas like Broadmeadows, Camberwell Junction, Chadstone, Preston–High Street and Ringwood. In these pilots, land in the surrounding residential catchments will be rezoned to HCTZ (replacing current zones), and the Activity Centre core will be covered by a BFO schedule reflecting the local structure plan. Together, the HCTZ and BFO create a framework to allow more housing around transit-oriented centres while managing built form transitions (HCTZ providing a transition in scale around the core, with the BFO focusing the tallest growth in the core. The policy intent, as stated by the government, is to “support housing growth in and around activity centres and other well-serviced locations” and in doing so “provide certainty to communities, landowners and the development industry” with a “streamlined assessment process” for qualifying developments.

Predictable built form outcomes

By establishing clear height limits and development standards via the HCTZ and the BFO, the amendment provides the community and the development industry a much more certain understanding of what can be built.

The HCTZ height matrix (tiered by inner/outer catchment and site size) defines allowable heights in advance, replacing case-by-case discretionary heights. This provides greater certainty about development potential on any given site, reducing speculative ambiguity. Likewise, the BFO codifies design controls (heights, massing, etc.) that reflect an adopted vision for the centre, offering developers a deemed-to-comply envelope within which proposals can proceed with confidence of support, rather than negotiating design outcomes from scratch. The codification of design controls would have a positive impact on the price of the end product, benefitting home owners.

Streamlined approvals for compliant projects

A major efficiency gain comes from the BFO’s fast-track permit pathway. If a development application within a BFO meets all the specified standards, it is exempt from advertising and cannot be appealed by third parties. This removes two of the biggest and costliest sources of delay in the Victorian system (notification periods and VCAT appeals) for projects that meet the requirements.

The result should be faster approvals for policy-compliant projects in activity centres. The HCTZ/BFO framework thereby incentivises the development industry to design within the guidelines (to gain a quicker, more certain outcome), and gives objectors less grounds for challenge when proposals align with the strategic plans for the respective precinct.

Focus on transit-oriented development

By channelling growth into well-serviced catchments, the amendment improves the orderliness and efficiency of urban development. It ties higher-density housing to locations with good access to existing jobs, transport and services, leveraging infrastructure capacity and avoiding rezoning in less suitable areas. This alignment with transit-oriented development principles means planning resources (and subsequent infrastructure upgrades) can be more efficiently targeted. In the long run, concentrating development in designated precincts can simplify planning because fewer applications in these areas will need extensive strategic justification – the strategy is already in place. This supports not only faster processing, but also more certainty that housing supply will materialise where it's planned. The government has identified 50 Activity Centres to accommodate 300,000 additional homes over 10 years as part of its housing targets, indicating the HCTZ/BFO model is central to meeting those targets.

Other considerations

UDIA Victoria supports VC257 as a mechanism to unlock housing in appropriate locations with greater certainty, but wishes to raise the following considerations.

- **Implementation and Local Tailoring**

Getting the details right in implementation is critical. While VC257 created the HCTZ and BFO in the planning provisions, the local schedules that apply these controls to each activity centre are still to be finalised at the pilot sites. For instance, Boroondara Council notes that for Camberwell Junction (one of the pilots), the local BFO schedule translating the council's structure plan had not been released as of late February.

UDIA urges timely finalisation and exhibition of these local schedules. Any delay in applying the zone/overlay on the ground could stall the intended housing projects. Moreover, UDIA advocates that the local variations truly reflect agreed structure plans and don't introduce onerous additions that undermine the intent. Consistency and cooperation with councils in drafting these schedules will be important – clear state guidance may be needed to prevent local deviations that reintroduce uncertainty or complexity.

- **Infrastructure and services alignment**

A consistent industry message is that upzoning must be met with investment in infrastructure. Councils like Boroondara have expressed "*profound concerns*" that the reforms were advanced without clear plans for funding the necessary upgrades to public open space, schools, transport, utilities and other services to support the higher populations. UDIA echoes that concern and stresses that this infrastructure provision is the responsibility of the state government.

To truly realise the benefits of VC257, the government should ensure that infrastructure funding and planning keep pace with the housing growth in these centres. Without this, there's a risk that streamlined approvals could lead to local infrastructure strain, which in turn could provoke community backlash or council resistance. UDIA recommends the State establish a parallel infrastructure planning program or commit budget resources to these priority precincts so that new development is accompanied by adequate amenities (in line with the "*20-minute neighbourhood*" goals).

- **Community acceptance and public consultation**

UDIA acknowledges that limiting third-party appeal rights (even in a targeted way) can be controversial. While the HCTZ does *not* remove notice/appeals for general applications, the BFO in core areas will curtail objector input on many large projects.. UDIA stresses the importance of continued community engagement, including involving local stakeholders and clearly communicating the benefits of the plan (such as more housing choices and affordability in their area). Consultation will support the community to understand of the benefits of these changes. UDIA supports the certainty these tools bring.

- **Pilot program and broader rollout**

VC257's success will hinge on the pilot Activity Centres. UDIA supports a measured rollout, urging the government to monitor outcomes in the 10 pilots (in terms of permit processing times, housing yields, design outcomes, etc.) and then rapidly extend the HCTZ/BFO model to other suitable locations if it proves effective. A concern is that if the pilot phase drags on or if only a handful of centres benefit, the impact on overall housing supply will be limited. UDIA recommends establishing a clear timeline for scaling up to the 50 Activity Centres and providing appropriate resources to expedite this. We also caution against a one-size-fits-all approach to planning of all nominated Activity Centres. While standardisation is supported, some flexibility in schedules will be necessary to respect distinct local conditions (for example, heritage areas within some catchments). Striking the right balance between local context and state-level consistency is an implementation challenge to manage.

Amendment VC267 – Townhouse and Low-Rise Apartment Code

Deemed-to-Comply Pathway for 3 Storey Housing

The amendment modifies Clause 55 (ResCode for two or more dwellings) to include a set of “deemed-to-comply” standards for townhouse and low-rise apartment developments. If a planning application meets all the prescribed standards, it will be processed on a code-assess basis – meaning it is exempt from objector appeals and cannot be challenged by third parties. In effect, compliant proposals must be approved without the delays of VCAT review. The goal is a “faster and more predictable permit process” for medium-density housing. Importantly, if a proposal seeks to vary one or more standards, the usual notice and review rights would still apply.

Updated Design Standards in Clause 55

VC267 revises several key standards in Clause 55 to be more enabling of development and to incorporate contemporary design considerations. Notable changes include reduced front setbacks (minimum now 6 instead of 9m, which simplifies and often shortens setbacks); reduced private open space requirements for each dwelling (from 40m² minimum to 25m² at ground level); introduction of tree canopy requirements (at least 10 per cent of site area as tree canopy on sites up to 1000m², and 20 per cent for larger sites) to improve landscaping outcomes; a refined site coverage allowance that varies by zone (e.g. up to 65 per cent site coverage in General Residential Zone, 70 per cent in Mixed Use/HCTZ, slightly higher than previous 60 per cent); and relaxed overlooking rules (windows of bedrooms no longer subject to strict screening rules). Additionally, some apartment-style internal amenity standards (such as minimum room dimensions and room depth ratios) are now extended to all multi-dwelling developments to ensure liveability.

Perhaps most significantly, the neighbourhood character and local policy objectives in Clause 55 are removed under the new code framework, meaning council planners will focus on compliance with numeric standards rather than subjective character outcomes for code-assessed projects.

Four-Storey Apartment Standards

VC267 also introduces Clause 57, a set of development standards specifically for 4-storey residential developments (which often fall between low-rise and high-rise categories). Clause 57 provides updated benchmarks for matters like neighbourhood character integration, building massing, external amenity (e.g. overshadowing, overlooking) and sustainability features (e.g. provisions for green infrastructure, solar panels, natural ventilation). Unlike the Clause 55 changes, the 4-storey standards do not offer a deemed-to-comply pathway. They function more as performance standards that applications will be assessed against, still with normal notice and appeal rights. However, Clause 57 explicitly prevents local variations on certain standards (like setbacks, landscaping, permeability), to maintain consistency. Together, the revised Clause 55 and new Clause 57 form a core part of addressing “missing middle” housing supply.

Consistency across multiple municipalities

UDIA supports VC267, with one immediate benefit being the reduction of council-by-council variation. Previously, different municipalities could tweak ResCode standards via schedules (e.g., setting different open space or setback requirements), and “neighbourhood character” policies in local planning schemes could lead to varying interpretations of what is acceptable. Townhouse developers are often small businesses or individuals, so excessive red tape can be both costly and prohibitive for this type of development. Amendment VC267 limits local variations for these types of developments. This enhances certainty for the development industry which no longer needs to navigate a patchwork of local standards – a design that meets the code in one suburb should, in theory, be acceptable in another.

It also makes the system more transparent and accessible to the public, with a single reference code. By reducing inconsistency, the amendment fosters a fairer and more predictable environment for investment in townhouses and low-rise units.

Deemed-to-comply improves certainty and predictability

The introduction of “*deemed-to-comply*” standards greatly improves the certainty and predictability of planning approval processes for proponents and the community. If an applicant designs a development that satisfies all the Clause 55 standards (as revised), the planning outcome is almost guaranteed – the proposal cannot be refused on discretionary grounds nor dragged into lengthy appeals by objectors. For the development industry and mum-and-dad builders, this dramatically reduces risk. It shifts the planning of medium-density projects from an uncertain negotiation to a rule-bound process. Knowing that compliant projects face no appeal gives the development industry confidence to proceed with more ambitious medium-density projects, which in the past were often seen as high-risk due to VCAT challenges in established suburbs. For local communities and councils, it also means clear expectations. Developments up to 3 storeys that respect these standards will go ahead, which may encourage communities to focus input on the creation of the standards rather than each individual permit. Overall, this mechanism is expected to speed up approvals – by cutting out the objection/appeal delay, compliant proposals can be permitted in statutory timeframes, freeing up resources to handle more complex planning issues.

Streamlined Decision-Making & Reduced Subjectivity

By providing clear numeric standards and stripping out subjective criteria like “neighbourhood character”, VC267 simplifies the assessment process. Planners will spend less time debating qualitative judgments like whether a design complies with “neighbourhood character” and more time checking quantitative compliance. This yields efficiency in two ways:

- **Time savings**
Assessments become more checklist-driven, which is faster; and
- **Reduced disputes**
Clear rules mean fewer grounds for argument between applicants and council (or at VCAT) about whether a standard is met.

Under the new code a front setback is simply 6m; previously, it might be “the average of the two adjoining houses”, which was often contentious. Moreover, applying apartment-style standards for internal amenity to all multi-dwelling projects ensures a basic quality without needing prolonged debate on a case-by-case basis.

This reform is also consistent with the objectives of the National Housing Accord and the state’s Housing Statement to deliver “faster approvals and more housing supply in well-located areas.”

Encouraging middle-ring intensification

VC267 makes it more attractive to build medium-density housing, including townhouses, duplexes, triplexes, and low-rise flats, in existing suburbs.

By prescribing non-controversial standards like setbacks, open space, site coverage, and providing a reliable pathway for compliant projects, it lowers barriers that previously disincentivised small-to-medium scale developers. This is expected to lead to more proposals advancing – boosting housing supply in established areas. From a certainty perspective, it also means councils and communities can expect a steady, manageable level of incremental change.

Code-compliant developments creating new homes in appropriate locations will be one of the biggest contributors to more stable housing growth in the long-term. Gentle density also provides additional housing options that preserve some of the qualities of detached dwellings..

Other considerations

- **Design outcomes and neighbourhood character**

Removing the subjective “neighbourhood character” test for code-assessed projects is an important and necessary step towards improving planning certainty. Neighbourhood Character has frequently been weaponised to impede the delivery of all types of development typologies and scales. UDIA emphasises that the new standards themselves (heights, setbacks, etc.) inherently account for character in a consistent way.

- **Legibility and accessibility of new standards**

The success of a code-based system depends on all parties understanding the rules. UDIA recommends DTP issue clear practice notes and training for council planners and industry professionals about the new Clause 55 and 57 requirements. Some of the standards are novel and involve new technical detail, such as tree canopy requirements. Similarly, integrating the new functional layout and sustainability features may require guidance and further industry input. Early confusion or inconsistent interpretation by different councils could undermine the overarching goal of ingraining consistency.

- **Maintaining council compliance with code intent**

Another practical risk is that councils might be uncomfortable with losing discretionary control and could seek ways to slow code-assessed projects by arguing non-compliance on minor issues or imposing additional conditions. UDIA encourages the close monitoring of council processing of code applications and intervene if the spirit of the reform is being circumvented. We also recommend the establishment of target timeframes for code assessments (since there are no notification periods, a decision should theoretically be quicker) and measure performance. If certain councils add unwarranted delays, further action or support may be needed.

- **Transitional provisions to support industry adjustment**

UDIA supports the introduction of transitional provisions. Some developers might have designs in progress that now need adjusting to meet the new standards. There could be a short-term slowdown as the industry recalibrates designs to the new code. We request that decisionmakers adopt a pragmatic approach to applications; including allowing amendments to pending applications to leverage the new provisions. Additionally, UDIA notes that while 3-storey projects benefit from no appeals, 4-storey projects still face existing hurdles. This could inadvertently discourage 4-storey proposals, which often yield greater housing. UDIA is advocating for extending a deemed-to-comply paths, with suitably stringent standards, to 4-storey developments. This would ensure the policy doesn't inadvertently cap development at 3 storeys in places where greater heights may be more desirable.

Amendment VC267 – Precinct Zone

Special Purpose Zoning in specified precincts

The PRZ is intended to be applied to areas identified for substantial change and renewal, including Suburban Rail Loop (SRL) station precincts. By applying a Precinct Zone, an entire area can be brought under one tailored zone, replacing the myriad of individual zones and overlays that might otherwise apply. We understand that the purpose of the PRZ explicitly is to “facilitate substantial change, public benefits and a new urban form” that reflects the strategic role of the precinct.

Embedded Framework Plan and Masterplan Requirements

A hallmark of the Precinct Zone is that each zone schedule must incorporate a “use and development framework plan.” This is structure plan for the precinct, embedded in the planning scheme. The framework plan will delineate sub-areas, land use expectations, key infrastructure and public space locations, and built form guidance. In addition, the schedule can include master plan requirements, including stipulating that a master plan be approved for a large site before permits can be granted. In practice, this means that upfront strategic planning is done within the zoning control itself, rather than relying on external reference documents.

Public Benefit Uplift Incentives

Recognising that precinct-scale redevelopment should contribute to infrastructure and community needs, the PRZ includes provisions for public benefit uplifts. A schedule can outline specific public amenities, including affordable housing, new public open space, community facilities, or infrastructure contributions) and provide an incentive, including additional building height or floor area for developments that deliver those benefits. This provides a framework for negotiating extra development rights in exchange for including amenities etc.

Streamlined Approval and third-party appeal rights

Crucially, any permit application that is consistent with the Precinct Zone schedule (and its framework plan/masterplans) is exempt from notice and review – meaning no third-party objections or appeals are allowed for in-scope developments. The logic is that the community and stakeholders will have been consulted during the precinct planning stage; once the zone and plan are in place, individual developments conforming to that plan shouldn’t be relitigated. This offers a high degree of certainty: developers can invest in large projects knowing that if they follow the precinct requirements, they won’t be subject to appeal delays. It also significantly streamlines the approval process within these precincts, as permits become more of a tick-the-box exercise against the precinct plan. (If a proposal seeks to vary from the plan, presumably it would require a rezoning or an amendment to the precinct plan itself, which is a higher bar.)

Faster, Coordinated Approvals

The revocation of third-party appeals for proposals conforming to precinct plans is expected to increase certainty. Similar to the rationale for the low-rise code, it means once the rules are set collectively, individual applications that follow them will not face lengthy delays as a result of objection. This is especially important in precincts likely to see multiple high-value developments, including SRL station precinct. Under PRZ, compliant projects can be approved relatively quickly, focusing authorities’ attention on assessing technical compliance and design excellence rather than debating height or subjective issues. This not only speeds up individual projects but can accelerate the overall intensification of the precinct. Projects can proceed in parallel without waiting for sequential rezonings or dealing with as many site-by-site objections. From a process standpoint, combining zoning and overlay controls into one Precinct Zone means fewer separate planning steps. That streamlining is efficient for planners and developers, demanding less administrative

overhead. Essentially, the heavy lifting is done in the planning phase; afterwards, development is more routine, akin to how greenfield Precinct Structure Plans are intended to operate in growth corridors.

Integrated Consideration of Public Benefits and Infrastructure

Traditionally, securing affordable housing contributions or new parks in a redevelopment area might require ad hoc Section 173 agreements or case-by-case conditions, leading to inconsistent outcomes and lengthy negotiation processes. The Precinct Zone allows these expectations to be built into the plan from the start. A predictable incentive framework is more efficient than one-off negotiations, and more transparent to the industry. However, it is critical that planning controls appropriately consider development economics and the potential impacts on feasibility these requirements can have. If there is not suitable consideration paid to these factors, they will have the perverse outcome of stifling and disincentivising development in these key priority precincts.

Other considerations

- **Timely and consultative precinct planning**

Developing the framework plan and schedule for each precinct will require extensive work. UDIA will be keen to see that the State government dedicates the necessary resources to plan these precincts expeditiously. Any delays to drafting or approving PRZ schedules could delay the housing and economic benefits that underpin projects like SRL.

UDIA also stresses the importance of collaboration with industry, local government and the community. While the State will drive SRL precinct plans, involving councils can help integrate local knowledge and avoid duplication of planning efforts. There is some concern that if councils feel bypassed, they may resist or not cooperate in implementation. A partnership approach, formalised through precinct working groups, including the development industry and community representatives, could improve public support and ease implementation.

- **Scope and flexibility**

UDIA encourages decisionmakers to build flexibility into Precinct Zones to allow them to respond to evolving market conditions. While a fixed plan gives certainty, too-rigid plans can become outdated or stifle innovation and evolution. If economic conditions change the feasible mix of uses may also change. The PRZ should be able to adapt without undue delay.

UDIA recommends that precinct plans be subject to periodic review or have built-in flexibility so they remain economically viable. Additionally, UDIA queries how the Precinct Zone interfaces with existing planning controls if a precinct overlaps areas with heritage value or other constraints. Our concern is to prevent a situation where the new zone's intent is hampered by latent controls. Clear guidance on the hierarchical relationship of PRZ schedules to other scheme provisions will be critical.

- **Public Benefit Contributions and project feasibility**

While UDIA is not opposed to incentivises for the provision of public benefits, we caution against setting the bar unrealistically high. If a precinct plan demands too much affordable housing or costly infrastructure from each developer, it could deter investment and slow down development.

UDIA implores decisionmakers to pay due consideration viability testing of any public benefit uplift schemes. Before finalising the PRZ schedule, appropriate economic modelling must be conducted to ensure that the incentives adequately offset the cost of the public benefits required. Successful value-capture models strike a balance and government must work with industry when formulating these provisions to ensure they are practical.

Community engagement and public license

Large precincts often involve significant changes which can alarm existing communities if not managed appropriately.

UDIA encourages government undertake comprehensive community and industry engagement when developing each precinct plan. Engagement should focus on demonstrating the benefits of precinct activation. Additionally, phasing of development and interim measures, like ensuring early delivery of some public benefits, can help demonstrate the merit.

Conclusion

UDIA views Amendments VC257, VC267, and VC274 as positive reforms that align with the objectives of delivering more housing, more quickly, in the right places. These changes collectively move Victoria's planning system toward a more certainty-oriented, efficient framework, where clear rules and strategic plans guide development.

UDIA has publicly welcomed the focus on faster approvals and development around Activity Centres, recognising that untangling planning red tape is an important step to getting projects moving to deliver much-needed homes. By enabling greater housing diversity, from townhouses to transit-oriented apartments, these amendments will help address some of the hurdles to delivering housing in Victoria.

UDIA advocates that the Victorian Government and Parliament ensure these reforms are implemented in full, which includes adequately resourcing the implementation, including, coordinating infrastructure, amenities and service delivery to match the upzoning.

Planning reform cannot solve the housing crisis alone – it must be complemented by broader measures (such as investment in infrastructure, and improvements to the development pipeline like managing construction cost escalation and addressing prohibitive taxation and regulatory barriers).

UDIA Victoria thanks the Select Committee for its consideration of this submission and looks forward to further opportunities to engage with the Parliament of Victoria on these important issues.

Further discussion

Please do not hesitate to contact UDIA CEO, Linda Allison, [REDACTED] or Director of Policy, Jack Vaughan, at [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Chief Executive Officer
UDIA Victoria