
From: Circe Alditheral <parosserem@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, 26 June 2023 3:12 PM
To: TPC Enquiry
Subject: Draft Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs) community member comments

Categories:

Feedback for the exhibition of the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies - March 2023:

While I am a bit critical in these short comments (and not relevant), I am supportive of changes that may be positive for the development of active travel standards in Tasmania as well as increased population density within our urban & rural centres.

1.0 Settlement 8

1.1 Growth.....10

"5. Actively address impediments to infill development, particularly in the major urban centres." (p11)

— The principles are good, but if Tasmania reforms the planning system (e.g. abolish current Euclidean-style zoning overlays in regional strategies/provisions — take note from New Zealand's declining rents post-2016) to allow this to take place organically, less effort is required as people will naturally make the best choices (demand, guided by people-focussed standards for supply — there need not be massively conscious planning for each step to fit every projection). Because if the current system remains, the authority could continue to just allocate horizontal areas of land to cater to expected growth (further from services, to the detriment of agriculture & environment) in a rigid system, which fails the principles.

1.2 Liveability.....12

Some statements are relatively non-committal (e.g. "promote", "encourage"), whereas the government has a key role to play in these provisions & standards to ensure consistency, not just stand by the status quo expecting liveability. The built-form standards for instance can solidly influence lifestyle choices that are most liveable, economic, & sustainable within new and existing places that people live. A better default should also be letting people in a community choose what uses are compatible with local communities, such as allowing rather than denying most uses (like shops; mixed-use) and letting responses treat them to best suit local situations as it happens; we create very few examples & intensify small areas by being fear-based.

Another thing is that we restrict local, but we have double-standards, like road noise which is harmful to people's health (& against our brand & natural therapy) but normalised. On accessibility to sun, we also make it less convenient to be outside in that sun by making less human-scaled environments, focussing on private domains (which is often just being inside the house) & having few good accessible public spaces and 'third places' which are easy to get to, spend time in, & rest between activities.

1.5. Housing16

"5. Encourage higher density housing in suitable locations that:" (p16)

— This is still a suboptimal method of telling the market & demand what to do, rather than let cities fill that spontaneity that creates automatically vibrant settlements; neighbours & third-parties do not need the power to deny the fluidity of change (when instead communities can be a part of that change) which is what this document is planning for.

"d) the potential impacts associated with increased residential density and land use conflict can be managed;"

— Density is not a negative to be managed, it is just like any housing with tradeoffs (of all densities of people within an area — of course it should be higher where demand is highest because people want to live there and will deliberately make that choice for that reason); you have appropriate standards (e.g. construction) to make sure "bad" outcomes aren't created in any area.

1.6 Design.....17

"7: b) provides a convenient, efficient and safe road network" (p18)

— a part of the problem with car-dependence is that when it is designed as the default, most convenient mode, it costs other vulnerable modes which are much more efficient & safe for urban transport networks — this does not happen when those safer

modes are treated as the default, because vehicles do not need exclusive design to move on them (accessibility), it is just that AAA is safer for everyone to zero detriment. Default active modes → help public transport → which helps drivers.

2.0 Environmental Values 19

All the environmental, climate, & industry land uses significantly benefit from not being consumed by sprawl which is only created as an offset to the demand for housing which is made illegal in high-demand existing areas. Saving the air above cities does not come at no cost when our land is traded away for subsidised high-carbon development that fails humans. Density also increases the amount of readily-accessible public & green spaces to be enjoyed, with even site coverage provisions keeping private green space — it also means there is a real spectrum of housing choice, from higher to lower densities than are currently available, all while everyone can choose the lifestyle that suits them best in a much more functional urban & rural environment.

2.4 Landscape Values.....24

Much less footprint & cost for each resident, who would be a much closer part of both the cities/settlements we have & the landscape values (to really experience).

4.0 Sustainable Economic Development 34

Urban planning (and zoning reform on its own) has such a huge impact on all of this — currently we enforce an additional layer of isolation within our own lives, such as that suburbia (with unnecessary car-dependence) and horrendous land-use (to be as wasteful as possible for everything), mandating low-productivity uses and unusable social infrastructure that makes every economic process way harder. Land is valuable, we don't have to constantly deal with the problems we create (housing crisis, efficacy of social services, maintenance of infrastructure). This is a serious all-reaching problem for every facet in Tasmania (& the Anglosphere) and urgently needs to be put behind us, with the simplest question of 'why not?'

4.4 Tourism.....39

A lot of the Tasmanian brand has to do with being better-acclimated to our unique landscape, as well as old-worldly charming (human-scale & focussed; basically, why so many Australians visit Europe — it's good land-use & economically rational, while also being a massive draw for locals & beyond; because why should humans build something that isn't good for humans?).

4.7 Business and Commercial42

You get actual market competition & diversity by removing the huge distortions from telling people what's best for them on a blanket basis — these are developers/builders, local businesses, and people choosing to live & establish places on a wide choice spectrum (build a shophouse on a public transport corridor lot which has been subdivided, or buy a bit of semi-agrarian land for a small cottage). Each agglomeration also becomes more self-sufficient by reducing paralysing costs for benefits.

5.0 Physical Infrastructure 45

Physical infrastructure planning must consider the many factors influencing why, where and when infrastructure is provided, for example, demographics, economics, climate, and technological change and how the infrastructure is currently or likely to be used. Land use planning has a direct impact on infrastructure efficiency, safety and performance. (p45) — Again, the way we do this has to change, because we often create self-fulfilling prophecies of bad/adverse outcomes (like expecting car-use/traffic generation through lack of holistic accessibility/safety standards) — infrastructure can be done much different by starting from a good baseline of Sustainable Safety (AAA, e.g. Dutch-style), so that instead of representing significant social costs, to create significant social benefits (such as those healthy modes which require cheaper spending, cause less damage, & add significant broader benefits). There are so many unreasonable costs everyone pays (especially those who can least afford to) from depending on a mode that is not fit for most trips which can be functionally replaced by viable alternatives (parking reform must come).

"• better sharing of road space to support increased uptake of more sustainable transport modes." (p46)

— the e-bike transition has some of the highest opportunity here in Tasmania.

5.1 Provision of Services.....46

Need to consider that planners often hear only from the voices who object, not from the community who actually benefits (because they're satisfied & have no need or less time/ability to give any feedback). Part of renewal programmes & tactical urbanism, is that significant social infrastructure can be delivered in well-used or highly-visible areas to demonstrate a degree of seriousness about improving people's lived experiences — for example, trading expensive car parking with a much less stressful (easier to navigate) fun-to-be-in public realm, or turning a desolate stretch of asphalt into the residential social space for connection of all ages & nature.

"14. Where appropriate, promote service corridors that support the co-location of physical infrastructure, including roads, to service use and development." (p47)

— and yes, you can move so much by using much less space, just by better allocation/land use; corridors like laneways and residential streets that are only used occasionally for transport can be used in diverse ways if that space represents a public space by design.

5.2 Energy Infrastructure.....48

"4. Contribute to improved energy efficiency through urban design and urban settlement pattern, and support for the use of alternative transport modes." (p48)

— every form of pollution also is reduced, as well as each point of waste, like food waste (e.g. much easier errands/trips that can be done whenever & responsively, which follows through health, community).

5.3 Roads.....48

"To plan, manage and maintain an integrated road network that supports efficiency, connectivity, travel reliability and safety." (p48)

— we need fewer roads & "stroads" and more streets! Those are the multimodal networks we should be basing from the get-go, including from people's doors to inter-urban networks (also rail, that's very efficient and produces sustainable profit, so our freight & transport can be rail-based by designing around PT rather than cars, like station catchments that aren't cut at every opportunity by roads for no reason).

5.4 Passenger Transport Modes.....49

"1. Support integrated land use and infrastructure and network planning that increases mode choice to access employment and essential services and encourages community participation in different modes of transport." (p49); "5. Provide an active transport network within key urban areas that is integrated across State and local government networks, and which includes dedicated infrastructure, appropriate signage, and end of trip facilities."

"6. Encourage public transport corridors to be supported by active transport networks and bus stops that are safe, accessible and provide for better passenger amenity." (p50) — This should be ensured; no harm comes from this strong link, because a weak chain is not capable.

"11. Recognise carparking as a key travel demand management measure, and appropriately manage carparking provision to support a modal shift."

— yes the mode shift is a two-pronged holistic strategy: transitioning infrastructure in real terms from design standards (faster priority rollout & gradual renewal programmes that built back better) to make sure everyone has viable alternatives, while also critically managing the extent of high-expense (to society) low-community-benefit land uses that become less necessary as we eventually stop being dependent on a single mode and reach a nice sustainable balance where everyone is catered to & costs to provision more equitable/choice-based ('if you want to pay for this service' not everyone in society or in adding to the costs of every product).

5.5 Ports and Strategic Transport Networks.....50

Urban logistics become much more fluid on an individual & broad basis with slower/safer roads, but more efficient & un-congested movement networks (and for businesses, people are customers, each one that comes with greater ease — if some modes are more efficient and doable, like most currently but are prevented due to lack of safety, then you free up idle spaces that would otherwise be dead for accessible spaces & deliveries).

We can plan to increase the comprehensiveness of our rail networks, when comparing the costs/benefits to road freight.

6.0 Cultural Heritage 52

6.1 Aboriginal Cultural Heritage.....54

6.2 Historic Cultural Heritage.....55

Landscape & location are a significant part of our 'potential heritage', as architecture is a form of art that responds to many inputs to create a unique sense of place (we can simultaneously have good public realms with a local imprint) — so, certain types of existing built heritage (while important to allow future generations to legitimately engage with) shouldn't come at the cost of other potential which could also be regionally critical & human-scale (much of the heritage & vernacular we love today would also be illegal today). Also we use zoning as a form of creating museums out of neighbourhoods so that they lose what makes them special & create significant costs to preserve by preventing natural change & becoming socially/financially exclusive (infill would have happened in the past as a value & can be done well to allow people & real day-to-day interaction).

Thank you,
Circe Aldith.