

From: [McCrosen, Samuel](#)
To: [TPC Enquiry](#)
Subject: FW: West Coast draft LPS - Rep 9 [Kim lai]
Date: Tuesday, 16 March 2021 4:36:36 PM
Attachments: [Rep 9 - Final Response 16 March 2021.pdf](#)
[Attachment 1 - A Literature Review of the term 'greyfield'.pdf](#)
[Attachment 2 – Land Tenure Hydro errors.pdf](#)
[Attachment 3 - Skyridge Pty Ltd to GRADCO TAX INV SK 1122.pdf](#)

Hi Samuel

Please find attached our final response to the information provided by the West Coast Planning Authority's information provided in reply to the Commissions post-hearing directives.

Thanks so much for all your assistance through this very complex matter.

We will await the Commission's decisions and abide by them, and whatever the outcome we have really appreciated the Delegates thorough attention to the issues and their kind tolerance of us 'first timers', and for giving us a real sense of having been really listened to.

Regards

Kim

Kim Lai

Project Manager

Greenbuild Tasmania Pty Ltd | FrameWorks 360 |

Affordable Housing | Steel Framing | Industrial & Farm Buildings | Enviro Waste Solutions

T 0429 066 096 | **E** kim@greenbuildtas.com.au | **W** www.greenbuildtas.com.au

81 Barker Road, Harcourt North, VIC 3453 | 12 Farrell Street, Tullah, TAS 7321

This email (including any attachments) contains information which is confidential and may be subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, distribute or copy this email. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete this email. It is your responsibility to check any attachments for viruses and defects before opening or sending them on. Greenbuild Tasmania Pty Ltd or its subsidiaries will not be liable for any virus damage caused by this message. Any views expressed in this email are not necessarily the views of Greenbuild Tasmania Pty Ltd.

Rep 9's response to West Coast Planning Authority's information provided in response to the Commission's post hearing Directions of 19th Feb 2021.

GENERAL RESPONSE

We thank the Commission for its insightful suggestions and questions to the Planning Authority, and we thank the Planning Authority for providing further information in clarification of its position and views.

In particular we note again that we are in full and complete agreement with the Planning Authority's comments re applying the General Residential Zone to the 'land south of Selina Street'. It states,

"1. The Planning Authority has no objection to extend the spatial application to the General Residential Zone to land south of Selina Street."

which we understand to be in accord with its relevant strategic documents.

Therefore the issue re applying the GRZ or a different zone to the land south of Selina Street, appears to come down to a single issue based upon the meaning of the term *greyfield*. This term is a neologism, i.e. a relatively recent or isolated term, word, or phrase that is in process of entering common use, but has not yet an entry or definition in the Macquarie dictionary.

In the Planning Authority's 35F report, it raised the concern that despite this land complying with both Guideline 1 re GRZ, and many aspects of the Planning Authority's relevant strategic documents, and its actual desire to apply this zone, that it cannot apply GRZ due to GRZ 2 [c] which conditions the application of this zone for sites that are either greenfield, *greyfield* or brownfield. In its latest response its position appears to be that it is considered to be greyfield. Therefore we must respond in full.

In their 35F, the Planning Authority stated that the land was greenfield, but at the hearing admitted it was mistaken. It then presented a new position that the land was now *greyfield*, thus GRZ 2[c] was still a preventative. As the hearing was the very first time we understood the Planning Authority's position to be based on the term *greyfield*, without prior notice of this last minute change to the 35F report, we were not able to present any evidence, or properly researched view on our interpretation of the term *greyfield*, except to read into the record one quoted definition. We believe that when seeking to rely upon the meaning of a term that is a neologism that it demands an expert witness to put forward expert evidence. In the absence of such opportunity we submit here an attachment '*A Literature Review of the term 'greyfield' in Australian usage*'. This review is not intended to meet the standards of expert evidence, but given the circumstances, is the best we can offer as we have no desire to delay this hearing. However the literature review does offer a wide range of quoted definitions from experts that may be of use to the Commission in consideration of the meaning and proper application of this term. [Please refer to Attachment 1 '*Literature Review*' so that the following may be more easily comprehensible.]

The Planning Authority's view on the meaning of the term *greyfield*, if accepted, leads directly to a conundrum if applied to the land south of Selina Street, and in terms of deciding which zone to apply leads to an inescapable 'Catch 22'.

That conundrum and Catch 22 is:- That if the land south of Selina Street is accepted as a *greyfield* site by an intuitive reading of the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy definition then Guideline GRZ 2 [c] instructs that it cannot be placed in the GRZ zone. However at the same time if this land was accepted as *greyfield*, then this land is also by that very same definition *urban* land. As urban land the Rural zone also cannot be applied, due to Guideline RZ 1 which instructs that the Rural zone be applied to *non-urban* land. Furthermore RZ 2 sets a further condition for RZ application, which is not met by the Planning Authority's studies, namely an assessment of the agricultural value of the land.

Thus, if *greyfield*, as understood by the Planning Authority, is accepted as a correct classification for this land, then neither the General Residential nor Rural zones may be applied as neither will comply with one or the other of these Guidelines.

We disagree with the Planning Authority's view that this 'catch 22' situation is arrived at due to a failure of the 'authors of the Guidelines' to properly provide a definition of the term *greyfield*. It is our view that there is no fault, nor lack of clarity in any definition of this term as used in any Australian or Tasmanian strategic document or planning ordinance, and that with a full and proper understanding of the term as defined in these documents, and as supported by our literature review, the commission has no need to entangle itself in sorting out any conundrums nor catch 22's, nor is there any need to request the authors of the Guidelines to update those Guidelines with a new definition.

It is our view that the Planning Authority only arrives at this catch 22 situation, due to not sufficiently applying itself to the full and proper understanding of the existing definitions, nor has it applied sufficient clear and reasonable analysis to uncover the implications of that definition. The Planning Authority's perplexity is understandable given that the term is a neologism, and has never previously been used in its own strategic documents nor planning ordinances.

Our view is that the term *greyfield* can be clearly and correctly understood as defined in Tasmanian and Australia wide definitions, and this is demonstrated in our literature review, which shows that the existing Tasmanian definition is entirely correct and consistent and does not propose any new significant to purpose variant meanings. The issue of which zone to apply could be very simply and easily decided – namely the site in question either is, or is not *greyfield* by definition. We just need to understand that definition.

We note the Planning Authority reports that it too has conducted a literature review of the term *greyfield* stating that it finds in its sources 'variation in their definitions', but does not provide any evidence nor references nor materials upon which we can comment. Nor does the Planning Authority offer any single example of what these variations are and why they are conflicting or confusing. We can therefore only refer to our own literature review, and consequent to its analysis we do not accept the Planning Authority's view that there is a failure of the authors of the Guidelines to provide a proper definition. The definition is clear.

Here we will state only one finding in our literature review to suggest our final opinion for consideration by the Commission. Namely one common element in all definitions of *greyfield*, mainland definitions as used in Australian Federal, State and Local Government Planning Strategies, Provisions and Ordinances, the Tasmanian definition, as well as the definition in American common usage is that *greyfield* is a distinctly URBAN phenomena, occurring within the existing urban boundaries of a city or regional town, of a size where there are inner suburbs, middle ring precincts and newer outer suburbs.

The land in question is not urban land. The Planning Authority has clearly and conclusively demonstrated both at the hearing and in its latest responses that the land south of Selina Street, is NOT within the urban boundary of Tullah and is therefore NON URBAN by definition. Therefore it cannot correctly be categorised as a *greyfield* area in regard to the requirement for it to be assessed under GRZ 2 [c]. Consequently there is no constraint on applying the GRZ. The GRZ application is fully and perhaps ideally suited to this area of Tullah due to having a "full range of reticulated services" and such being prioritised in the strategic documents. The Planning Authority also reports there are no other constraints upon this land.

If the Commission is not disposed to find that '*greyfield*' does not apply, then we must enquire of the full conditionality of GRZ 2[c]. When examined, if the site is *greyfield* then it requires it to be

(c) justified in accordance with the relevant regional land use strategy, or supported by more detailed local strategic analysis consistent with the relevant regional land use strategy and endorsed by the relevant council.

It is our view that it is justified in principal by the regional land use strategy, excepting that some outdated details of that strategy related to the growth projections and availability of the 10 and 20 year forward supply of residential land for Tullah, which is the other issue under consideration.

Due to this important issue of whether or not the 10 and 20 year forward supply of residential land required by the regional strategy is met in the Planning Authority's draft LPS, we have provided a detailed analysis and critique of the Planning Authority's latest responses in regard to this. It is unfortunate that we must

adopt the stance of critic and point to flaws and errors, but it must be done. However, we would like to be make clear again that we are only finding errors in facts and figures and methodologies, not in the persons presenting the Planning Authority's views. Such persons are obviously respected professionals acting with highly skilled capacity on behalf of their employers and clients.

SPECIFIC RESPONSES

This section contains Rep 9's specific responses to the Planning Authority's post hearing directives.

Issue	Direction
Supply of land in the General Residential Zone at Tullah	Provide further detail on how the supply of land in the General Residential Zone at Tullah is consistent with the growth requirements specified in the Cradle Coast Regional Land Use Strategy and the West Coast Council Land Use Strategy 2017

Planning Authority points:

PA 1. *'The General Residential Zone is applied to 34.4 ha of land at Tullah (refer to Figure 1) with an estimated 270 properties (excluding road casements). Of the 270 properties, 227 are in private ownership.'*

- Rep 9's response: We accept the Planning Authority's calculations as sufficiently accurate for the purpose of this hearing.

PA 1. *[sic] 'There are buildings constructed on an estimated 223 properties proposed to be zoned General Residential as shown in Figure 2.'*

- Rep 9's response: We accept the Planning Authority's calculations as sufficiently accurate for the purpose of this hearing.

PA 2. *'The West Coast Land Use Strategy considered the supply of residential zoned land for the whole municipal area. There is a 28 year supply of residential zoned land in the municipal area. This supply was calculated from analysis of aerial imagery and a take up rate of 1 lot per year.'*

- Rep 9's response: This was a most unfortunate methodology in that Rep 9 and many other Tullah land owners, Tullah businesses and the Tullah Progress Association would have been delighted to provide significantly more detailed data specific to Tullah if they were included in the consultation process, before it was finalised for public exhibition, or after receiving our submissions on it. If that strategic study could have allowed for collaboration from Tullah stakeholders we believe it would have found that Tullah is indeed exceptional in having a distinct advantage for population growth and an actual extremely limited supply of available residential land. In fact the West Coast Land Use Strategy on page 38, where it considers future land supply, notes the unique position of Tullah in the shire in regard to it having the greatest potential for future residential growth. It summarises:-

"Tullah's proximity to Burnie relative to the balance of the West Coast municipality means that Tullah could potentially be a future location for residential growth."

It is Rep 9's view that demand for residential land in Tullah has, since the date of adoption of this Land Use Strategy, proven to be substantially increased, and that the above statement in the strategic study was correctly predictive. The Planning Authority reports that its records agree with this current increase. We refer to our lodged data and estate agents reports that also demonstrate this fact.

- Another situation arises in relation to the unavailability of documents with apparently highly relevant data to The West Coast Land Use Strategy. On page 6 of that endorsed Strategy it states explicitly that:-

This Strategic Plan should be read in conjunction with the following documentation:

- *Consultation Strategy (May 2017) prepared by Integrated Planning Solutions;*
- *The SWOT Analysis (June 2017) prepared by Integrated Planning Solutions, Essential Economics and Ratio Traffic consultants; and*
- *Economics Assessment Report (July 2017) prepared by Essential Economics.*”

It is most unfortunate that the Planning Authority has lost all copies of these three documents. Furthermore it advises that all of their consultants have also lost all copies, excepting that the primary consultant believes a copy might exist on one of their hard drives, but retrieval may take a few months before being attempted. Access to these documents may have enabled Rep 9 to put forward a more substantial representation. These documents appear at the face value of its own statement to be essential to the reading of the Strategic Plan. In particular:-

- a. The *Consultation Strategy* may have explained the council’s rationale for the lack of consultation with the Tullah community in its ‘fact finding and data collection stage’, or an opportunity to critique that lack of consultation.

Under 1.1 on page 4 of the Land Use Strategy it states the purpose of consultation was to:-

- i. *“ provide direction to further consultation with Councilors, Council staff, community members and other stakeholders on current and future land use directions” and to*
- ii. *“Establish a solid evidence base to justify and build on identified land use planning initiatives and imperatives” and to*
- iii. *“build on the consultation work undertaken as part of the West Coast Community Plan 2025”*

- b. The *SWOT Analysis* may have explained the council’s assessment methodology.

The adopted Strategy informs us that it deals with land supply considerations

“Based on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats analysis for the municipality, a preliminary assessment of the land supply considerations for residential, retail/ commercial and industrial land has been undertaken.” P. 35

The SWOT summary in the adopted Land Use Strategy on pages 35 and 36 makes specific references and comments about *every other town* in the shire, but noticeably says nothing at all about Tullah. If access to the SWOT document had been possible we may have been able to understand why or able to compare it with the Tullah community’s own SWOT analysis.

- c. The *Economics Assessment Report* may have given insight into many matters of interest, and certainly as far as the draft LPS is concerned it relates to the proper assessment of supply and demand for residential, commercial, retail and industrial land in Tullah. In particular it may have clarified why the Planning Authority’s assessment lacks application of any quantitative methodology for assessment of subdivision feasibility. This is particularly important as over 80% of Tullah’s forward supply relies on council’s very optimistic prediction of 50 to 70 lots being created by three major greenfield subdivisions. A proper subdivision feasibility assessment methodology accurately predicts that none of these will occur in the 10 to 20 year forward supply timeframes. It is hard to understand an economics assessment that does not quantitatively consider the economic forces and factors that drive subdivision and the consequent supply of land.

That Land Use Strategy on Page 5, informs that this document was for assessing and determining the factors regarding the supply and demand of land:-

“From an economics perspective, residential, commercial, retail and industrial land was surveyed and analysed to inform the demand and supply assessment. Based on the supply and demand assessments, forecast requirements for additional residential, commercial, retail and industrial land in West Coast was determined for the short, medium and long term.”

Also in the Planning Authority’s response to one specific post hearing directive re assessment of supply and demand for land at Tullah, the Planning Authority informs the Commission that

“ 9. The Planning Authority has no information on the real estate market in Tullah.”

Since it is now admitted that there has been no consideration of factors of supply and demand from what we believe should be an important avenue of proper enquiry, we point to our own data and analysis, including evidence from the estate agent’s reports contained in our representations. The Commission may like to consider if there is any value in our data which demonstrates a severe shortage of supply and a high demand for residential land, as well as assesses the others factors that may have skewed that raw data, such as the long period of time when the vast majority of vacant land in Tullah was sold by council to a single developer without being offered by public auction. This developer subsequently entered bankruptcy and thus the vast majority of land was for over a decade locked up in legal proceedings and not available as a part of supply. Records up to 2013 need to consider that sales data in that period was unreliable due to the fact that the majority of land was locked up in courts and unavailable for purchase. In 2016 two of these lots were presented to market via a rates recovery auction process and over 100 people attended. Please refer to our original representation re the background history of Tullah.

One unfortunate outcome of being denied access to these documents is that many in the Tullah community may have further loss of trust and confidence that the council is making decisions with proper due consideration of this community’s own locally known facts and figures and inputs, and increases its feeling that this denial undermines its hopes and aspirations to be able to actualize its vision as defined in the *West Coast Community Plan 2025*.

As far as Rep 9 is concerned we do recognise and appreciate that the Planning Department and the General Manager’s office have made serious efforts to try to find and provide copies of these lost documents.

Last minute NOTE. We must quickly add at the last moment that today 16th March 2021, the lodgement date, we received correspondence from the council that it has now recovered copies of these documents, but also now rejects our request to view them.

“The General Manager is of the view, they would only be released to the Tasmanian Planning Commission, and only then if they so directed Council to do so, as they are not part of an endorsed Council document.”

Rep 9 does NOT request the Commission to make any such directives unless it believes such is really necessary. Rather Rep 9 will pursue access to the documents for interests and purposes unrelated to this current draft LPS hearing via the *Right to Information Act* processes, as it has found in the past to be the effective way to obtain documents from this council. Please refer to attached email only if really necessary.

PA 3. *‘Recent building records held by the Planning Authority suggest that the take up rate has increased.’*

- Rep 9’s response: We thank the council for its updated information and agree that the uptake rate has significantly increased since its Land Use Strategy was adopted.

PA 4. *‘The Cradle Coast Regional Land Use Strategy on page 67 indicates the growth scenarios and settlement management strategies for the major centres in the Region. Tullah is identified for having a low growth scenario and a stable settlement strategy.’*

- Rep 9’s responses:

- a. We repeat our response to PA 2, and refer to those parts of our representation that reveal high demand for residential land.
- b. The Cradle Coast Strategic document was based on 2011 data. The situation has reversed in the interim. The more recent 2017 WCC Land Use Strategy on page 38 reports that Tullah does not follow the generalized growth trends in the overall shire data.

“Tullah’s proximity to Burnie relative to the balance of the West Coast municipality means that Tullah could potentially be a future location for residential growth.”

This is the reality of this moment, and is indicative that data for Tullah should be considered separately to the overall shire averages. In other words, the application of shire wide averages to Tullah is misleading and faulty.

PA 5. *Clause 4.3.1 (d) is reproduced below states:*

“Match land supply to need and provide sufficient land within the designated urban settlement boundaries of each centre to meet forecast need for a time horizon of not less than 10 years but not exceeding 20 years.”

- Rep 9’s response: We fully agree that Tullah requires a 10 to 20 year forward supply of residential land. The large greenfield sites that council relies upon as the major source of supply of 80 to 90% of that 10 to 20 year period is contrary to the Cradle Coast Strategy of giving priority to using land with already existing infrastructure prior to greenfield development. In Tullah, and the entire West Coast, such greenfield residential land development is totally unviable due to the costs of greenfield development. The Planning Authority’s latest assessment has not used any quantitative method to determine subdivisional feasibility, nor does it recognize that p.86 of Cradle Coast Strategy states-

“The Framework does not advocate all new growth and development is to occur only through infill, redevelopment or conversion (land recycling) to produce significantly higher housing density” p.85 and

“It must be recognised the circumstances of the Cradle Coast Region are such that settlements are unable to sustain growth entirely through raw land releases.” p.85 and

“The Tasmanian Infrastructure Strategy and its related modules have a core outcome to optimise use of existing infrastructure.” p. 86

PA 6. *‘The West Coast Land Use Strategy determined that there was a sufficient supply of vacant lots in Tullah (page 38) and the proposed zoning was in accordance with the Cradle Coast Regional Land Use Strategy.’*

- Rep 9’s response:- We repeat our earlier responses and refer to our submissions showing that there is a severe lack of residential land in Tullah. This study applied the whole shire average to Tullah without noting its own finding that Tullah had the greatest potential for population growth.

Vacant land in the General Residential Zone at Tullah	Provide a response to the submissions made at the hearing by Kim Lai (rep 9), in relation to vacant land currently available for residential use and development on land at Tullah, providing comment on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any potential constraints; • the real estate market in Tullah; and • a vacant land analysis within the General Residential Zone, including the method presented for the calculation of the residential supply of, and demand for, General Residential zoned land in Tullah.
---	---

PA 1. *'The vacant land or land with intensification potential is identified in Figure 2 and excludes vacant land which are road easements and land owned by the Crown. The vacant land shown does not consider whether the lots are available to the market.'*

- Rep 9's response: We respond to this information as a whole with the following general points before responding to some specific points in more detail.

ERRORS IN THE PLANNING AUTHORITY'S ASSESSMENT

1. As we pointed out at the hearing, we still maintain that six of these lots are not private freehold land. The Land Tenure is vested in Hydro Tasmania. These are lot ID's 4, 8, 11, 17, 21, and 28. As our claim apparently needs proof please refer to Attachment 2 for full details obtained from the LIST.
2. We agree that the properties identified as 2, 3, 4, 8, 11, 17, 21 and 29 in Figure 2 are also constrained lots requiring clearing and formal access to a road, thus remove them from the tally of available lots.
3. The analysis is faulty in other respects – the table supplied with the map contains many errors due to the 'examination from the air' methodology. The most striking example of the failure of this methodology is vacant lot ID 5 [CT 10219/217] which the Planning Authority describes as suitable for subdivision to create 4 or 5 of the 70 new residential lots it believes will be made available by subdivision. In fact this lot contains a most prominent building in the active business area in Tullah, namely the Flowers Family Works Office complex, a modern brick building of over 500m2 with the remainder of the land being used for parking, plant and machinery and visitor vehicles. It stands directly opposite the shops and the area now proposed for the Local Business zone. For this reason its owners, the Tullah Progress Association and others in the community have not been able to understand why it is excluded from the Local Business Zone. The Tullah community completely understands the reasons why the Flowers Family or any other future owner will never demolish these offices and subdivide the land into small vacant lots for residential development. As much as the Flowers family have done many things, in terms of personal sacrifice for community benefit, such as permitting public access to the lake facilities over their private property, demolition of their offices is just far too much to expect.

Another example is the identification of lot ID 15 [CT 10219/215] which is owned by Skyridge Pty Ltd, a member of Rep 9. This has always been a heavy duty vehicle park and is periodically leased to companies operating in the area, for example to Gradco Pty Ltd, a road construction company contracted for upgrade works on the Murchison Highway rented this land in 2019 and 2020. [Please see attachment 3 if evidence of this is required.] While this could be subdivided for residential lots, Skyridge calculates that such is an economically unviable action, and intends that it will exercise its continued use rights and continue to operate it as a vehicle park for heavy vehicles. Another 5 lots of the 70 new lots assessed to be available rely upon a local business being willing to cease its existing business activity. They need to be removed from the council's tally.

Another example is lot ID 1 [CT 13925/1] and lot ID 20 [CT 126181/1] both of which are consolidations of previous smaller allotments, most likely because, as mentioned in our previous submissions, 500 to 550m2 lots are not attractive to the current market looking to move out of the city in order to gain more space. This is a definite market demand trend.

- CT 13925/1 consolidates previous CT's 100219/73 & 100219/74
- CT 126181/1 consolidates previous CT's 100219/158 & 100219/159 & 100219/160

There is very little conceivable possibility that an owner who has purchased adjoining lots for the sole purpose of consolidating into a single larger allotment to suit their personal needs, will now be prepared to undertake another significant expense to *reverse* what they have done to create new smaller lots and return them back to the market. Again this would require an owner willing to sacrifice their personal interests and choices re living at Tullah on a suitably sized lot, and relocate their aspirations to live in a lakeside town to an entirely different town. This is far too much to expect of these Tullah property owners.

It is also believed that lot ID 18 [CT 152369/1] is a consolidation, however we do not have the time to obtain the records or to contact the owners to prove which lots this new lot derives from. However this Folio 152369 is not the same folio as lots to either side, and that it is lot 1 on that plan demonstrates that it is not a lot within a multi lot folio.

Just from these examples alone, with lots that have undergone the expensive process of consolidation to meet the specific needs of their owners, it is not valid to count on an extremely unlikely future in which these owners would be willing to reverse the situation at their personal and financial detriment merely to supply smaller less attractive lots to others. Therefore we have to remove a further 8 lots from the council calculations. Other vacant lots in this Table may have also been purchased by adjacent owners living next door to obtain more space for their lifestyles.

GREENFIELD SUBDIVISION FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENTS

The Planning Authority's reliance on 80 to 90% of forward supply to be derived from greenfield subdivisions is far too optimistic, as these cannot occur as demonstrated when applying even the most basic rule of thumb greenfield subdivision feasibility assessment formula.

The Planning Authority's absence of calculations in this regard is viewed by this representation to be a failure to understand or be guided by the Cradle Coast Regional Strategy, and a lack of collaboration with stakeholders to obtain simple practical understandings of the factors, such as economic forces and feasibility assessment calculation methods that very accurately predict the likelihood of a greenfield residential development occurring.

In its most basic rule of thumb form the method of assessing greenfield subdivision feasibility is simple arithmetic.

Current market price per lot x number of lots created
Minus
Greenfield site cost + [per lot development cost x number of lots created]

If the result is negative or in the lower positive area, then it is clearly unviable and a greenfield subdivision will not occur, even when there is massive demand. Example the statewide housing crisis. This is not due to lack of greenfield sites nor due to lack of demand, but due to these sites not passing this basic feasibility test. This formula, if positive, still only indicates that the next step of a more highly nuanced formula should be tested.

Increased demand only increases the current market price aspect of the formula and has to result in a significant positive final result before there can be any incentive to develop a greenfield site. Thus it is accurately predictable that for probably the entire West Coast Shire the market price equivalent at today's rate per lot will need to exceed \$80,000 before a greenfield development such as suggested here as the major future supply for Tullah can realistically occur. This is why one will never find anywhere in Tasmania where any newly created residential lot from a greenfield site, that is not compromised in some manner, with an asking price of less than \$80,000. As time moves forward so too do development costs.

Therefore the Planning Authority's proposal that around 80 to 90% of Tullah's 10 and 20 year forward supply will be actualized from greenfield residential subdivision is, sorry to say, completely fantastic. These 50 to 70 new lots from greenfield sites for the proper forward supply in Tullah is most certainly quantitatively predictable as not going to occur within these time frames.

Even though the three sites to be discussed below are already zoned Residential, in the context of Tullah they need to be understood as an equivalent type of 'raw land release' and careful note should be taken of the statement on page 85 of the Cradle Coast Regional Strategy.

"It must be recognised the circumstances of the Cradle Coast Region are such that settlements are unable to sustain growth entirely through raw land releases."

We opine that this statement is an imperative to carefully consider that the unique circumstances of small settlements such as Tullah cannot meet and sustain growth in demand through raw land releases. These large greenfield sites have for Tullah the exact same issues as raw land releases in larger centres, namely the unviability of relying on them almost entirely to meet growth projections.

Rep 9's view for the commission to consider is that such an approach to assessing the supply of land at Tullah in the given timeframe is at best excessively optimistic, and at the worst highly likely to be a disastrous failure to meet the obligation to make provision for a 10 and 20 year forward residential supply.

It is our strong view that the methods used by the land development industry for calculating subdivision feasibility on greenfield sites will certainly prevail over the Planning Authority's excessively sanguine expectations. These greenfield sites will not be reliable for 80 to 90% of the forward supply. Perhaps another way to bring this fact home would be for the Planning Authority to search its records in an attempt to find any example of a 25 to 50 lot privately initiated greenfield residential subdivision in a small settlement occurring anywhere in the shire.

If we conduct a rough tally here so far, in regard to the number of vacant lots currently available, then we will understand the extremely heavy reliance being placed on greenfield development more clearly. Of the 70 lots the council puts forward as a 28 year forward supply, we have shown that:

- a. 6 of the lot ID's are hydro land
- b. 8 of the lots hoped to be created by subdivision are consolidated lots that will not be reversed by their owners
- c. A further 5 lots hoped to be created by subdivision, are being used for business activities which will continue
- d. A further 5 lots hoped to be created by the demolition of the Flowers Family Works offices will certainly not occur
- e. There are at least a further 5 lots which the planning authority admits are constrained and unviable.

Consequently around 25 lots are to be deducted from the council's tally, leaving approximately 50 remaining lots to be created solely from greenfield subdivisions. This is just not feasible as the following demonstrates.

A closer examination of these greenfield lots and the specific factors that will prevent these three greenfield sites producing a supply of 50 lots in the 10 and 20 year timeframe is as follows:

- a. **Lot ID 16 [100219/214]** is another example of identifying land owned and used by one of the town's largest businesses and employers being calculated as land available for residential subdivision. This lot is owned by the de Villiers who operate the Lakeside Lodge and who are in fact parties to this hearing as a separate representation. For all intents and purposes this is a greenfield lot, having no internal road network, nor infrastructure and services layout on a pattern suitable for residential lots. This lot is intended by its owners to be intensified for business usage in the form of a caravan and camping park and a hotel extension including a boutique brewery and/or spirits distillery, to meet existing demand and encourage more tourism to Tullah overall. The Lodge is a significant employer in Tullah and it is inconceivable that its owners would choose to enter the business of unviable residential land development at the sacrifice of their existing viable business activity and desired expansion.

Furthermore the application of the basic greenfield subdivision feasibility formula to Lot ID 16 [100219/214] returns a result of negative \$2.1 million, further confirming that a greenfield subdivision will not occur on this site in the 20 year timeframe, if ever. The owner will continue to use the land for its business use for which it is highly suitable, with strong prospects for positive future return if so used.

- b. **Lot ID 12 [Ct 100219/218]** is also a greenfield site owned by another local business and employer. It too is without a network of roads or internal layout of service infrastructure. In that regard we repeat the same factors as above that clearly and accurately predict that it will not result in another 24 lot greenfield residential subdivision to be heavily relied upon for the 10 to 20 year forward supply. It returns a greenfield subdivision feasibility result of negative \$1.7 million.

However, also to be noted is that this lot returns a record from the List as a Reserve under the Local Government Act and is believed to be at threat of a Compulsory Acquisition Order, or some other dispute relating to Public Recreation Space. We raised this at the hearing, but as this statement seems to have been dismissed by the Planning Authority, we provide a copy of the LIST record below [accessed 14th March 2021] for the Commission's scrutiny.

Feature	
Property Address	1 FARRELL ST TULLAH TAS 7321
Property ID	7735739
Title Reference	100219/218
Authority	Local Government Authority

LAND TENURE

TEN_CLASS	Local Government Act Reserve
ACT	Local Government Act
FEAT_NAME	
TENURE_ID	11198

- c. Concerning **Lot ID 22 [CT155739/3]** the Planning Authority is to be commended for recognizing that a long strip of this lot acts as the Murchison Highway buffer for the town and is entirely unsuitable for clearing and subdividing into residential lots facing onto the highway contrary to regulations severely restricting creation of new lots directly accessing a highway. It is also a greenfield site and faces the same feasibility issues as ID 12 and ID 15 above, if it were to be subdivided into smaller allotments, however there are some parts as discussed below that may viably produce 3 lots due to the already existing layout of services.

The highway buffer section also contains large mature native tree and shrub species, which is also the habitat for many fauna species. However the wider northern section has a cleared area of around 1 hectare that joins the large car park at 12 Farrell Street and fronts Farrell Street and the Murchison highway at the entrance to Tullah Village. This section is only overgrowth of weedy vegetation, except for a row of mature trees along the drainage channel. It has previously been kept periodically cleared since the time the town was developed as a Hydro village, and will be returned to that cleared state once its zone is settled in this new LPS. In our representation we requested that consideration of its use in conjunction with the car park [CT 100219/220] as they are in the same ownership and considered as one parcel that Local Business Zone is applied to both. We refer to our previously lodged submissions in reference to this.

Both these lots are owned by some same members of the Rep 9 group who have been willing so far to allow public use of this car park for the community to access the Sports Centre and for other community events, and have also committed to not clearing the original highway buffer plantation for the benefit of the community. However, we are not happy to commit to having the large area beside our car park to be retained as it is with weedy overgrowth as a new highway buffer.

There are areas at the east end of each street south of Farrell Street that meet this land, and there is opportunity for adjoining property owners to adhere some of the cleared areas to their existing titles to obtain more usable space. One recent example of this occurring is CT 155739/2. Alternatively there are three areas that could produce 3 suitable residential allotments via a viable subdivision process. Therefore we can add 3 lots to the future supply from a viable subdivision from this large lot. The greenfield subdivision feasibility formula for the remainder of this lot returns a result of negative \$0.65 million. It is correctly predictable that it will not be subdivided for residential lots in the 10-20 year timeframe.

The final tally of lots available for residential use when based on objective assessments employing a quantitative methodology as provided above, is less than 10 lots. Given that the council now agrees that over the past two years that take up rates in the shire have significantly increased, and are especially in demand at Tullah we agree with the Planning Authority's more realistic projection of a take up rate of 5 lots per year for Tullah. Therefore the conclusion is clear – there is in this version of the draft LPS a maximum of a two year supply of residential land at Tullah. Possibly less given that many owners of these lots have no intention of relinquishing their hard found land. This is certainly far less than the Cradle Coast Regional Strategy requires, namely that a minimum 10 to 20 year forward supply be provided through suitable application of a residential zoning.

Green-field, Grey-field or Brown-field	Provide an opinion on whether the land south of Selina Street, Tullah, the subject of representations 3 and 9, is regarded as Green-field, Grey-field, or Brown-field for the purposes of applying GRZ 2 of Guideline No. 1 (and the Cradle Coast Regional Land Use Strategy).
--	--

We refer to our General Response above in regard to this issue, and reiterate that we believe it is easily resolved. We also refer to our *Literature Review* for the definition of the term *greyfield*.

We respond to the Planning Authority's position with the following:-

- a. We agree that the land south of Selina Street is neither greenfield nor brownfield.
- b. We agree that the term *greyfield* is a neologism and not yet defined in an elaborated manner sufficient for some Planning Authority's newly encountering its use to avoid perplexity.
- c. We hold the opposite view to the Planning Authority in that we believe the existing definitions are fully and entirely adequate to the issue at hand.
- d. We are of the opinion that definition of *greyfield* in the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy Glossary is an entirely acceptable definition for the purposes of this hearing,

Greyfield	Underutilised, derelict or vacant residential or commercial sites in an urban environment that are not contaminated.
-----------	--

- e. We specifically seek to point out that *greyfield* sites are URBAN sites. We refer to our review of the definition statements of *greyfield* as used in mainland Australia, the Tasmanian variation and the American definition where all existing definitions of *greyfield* carry the common unvarying element of being strictly limited to URBAN zones.
- f. We add that we rely on the definitions of urban and non-urban as defined in the State Planning Provisions on page 423 of the latest version available to us, and which we believe was also the definition presented by the Planning Authority's representative on screen at the hearing.

Term	Definition
non-urban zone	means land shown on a zone map in the relevant Local Provisions Schedule, as within the following zones: (a) Rural Living Zone; (b) Rural Zone; (c) Agriculture Zone; (d) Landscape Conservation Zone; (e) Environmental Management Zone; (f) Utilities Zone; (g) Open Space Zone; and (h) Future Urban Zone.

urban zone	<p>means land shown on a zone map in the relevant Local Provisions Schedule, as within the following zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) General Residential Zone; (b) Inner Residential Zone; (c) Low Density Residential Zone; (d) Village Zone; (e) Urban Mixed Use Zone; (f) Local Business Zone; (g) General Business Zone; (h) Central Business Zone; (i) Commercial Zone; (j) Light Industrial Zone; (k) General Industrial Zone; (l) Major Tourism Zone; (m) Port and Marine Zone; (n) Community Purpose Zone; (o) Recreation Zone; and (p) any particular purpose zone.
------------	--

- g. We agree that the term's meaning can be clarified by a literature review and supply such a review. We note that the Planning Authority's literature review is unable to identify the underlying common elements in all definitions of *greyfield*, and note that it does not provide any references or material to enable an attempt to understand its inability to make a conclusion.
- h. We disagree that new definitions are required to enable an understanding of Guideline GRZ 2.
- i. When the term is understood correctly as specifically and only relating to urban areas, it becomes very clear why there are instances where GRZ 2 definitely requires further local detailed strategic studies. Such an instance would be the application of GRZ to an urban greyfield shopping strip, i.e. a change from a Commercial or Business zone to Residential, or an area of land around a disused railway station, i.e. a change from a Utilities zone to Residential. Clearly GRZ 2 is applied to avoid problems arising from such instances and the localised problems that may arise with specific area overlays, schools, public transport, public open space amenity, road and traffic issues, issues related to housing density, and the many other variables so important to consider in larger urban zones. Clearly the issue of the land in Tullah is none of these - it is the issue of whether added residential supply is actually required by the adopted strategies and whether the updated data provided here is considered acceptable.
- j. We concede that the Planning Authority has clearly demonstrated both at the hearing, and now again here at point 16, that the land south of Selina Street is NOT urban land. It now confirms

"The extent of the Urban Zone is shown [in] Figure 4 and excludes the land south of Selina Street".
- k. We submit that the land south of Selina Street is also not urban land by the definition in the SPP's, in that urban land is defined there as land that is currently assigned to a specific list of zones, none of which currently apply to the 'South of Selina' land. It does however clearly fit the definition of non-urban land.
- l. Rep 9's view on this issue is that it is very simple and clear that GRZ 2[c] is not an obstacle to applying the GRZ to land south of Selina Street by the following formalised reasoning:
 - a. Greyfield sites are by definition URBAN sites
 - b. The land by definition is NOT an urban site

- c. Therefore it follows that >
 - d. the land is NOT a greyfield site
 - e. therefore GRZ 2 cannot apply.
- m. We also believe that it is valid to point out that if treated in the alternative manner, it appears that would take us down a very tortuous path and end in unsolvable conundrums and inescapable catch 22's as a result of the following:

- a. If the land is deemed to be urban, while in contradiction to the definition of urban, then the Rural zone cannot apply as proposed in the draft LPS. This due to Guideline 1 –

“RZ 1 The Rural Zone should be applied to land in non-urban areas.”

- b. We have no knowledge of the acceptability of determining the land to be urban so it can be classified as greyfield, and preventing the application of GRZ due to Guideline GRZ 2, as well as ***simultaneously*** determining the land to be non-urban thus allowing it to comply with Guideline RZ 1 re applying the Rural zone to non-urban land. We leave such an apparently strange [to us] methodology for the Commission to explain in its decisions, if it decides to endorse the Planning Authority's apparent method.

Alternative zone at Tullah	Provide comment on the viability of replacing any of the General Residential zoned land at Tullah, particularly 37 Farrell Street folio of the Register 100219/214 and 56 Farrell Street folio of the Register 100219/213 with an alternative zone and applying the General Residential Zone to a similar quantity of serviced land south of Selina Street.
----------------------------	---

Insofar as this issue relates to Rep 9, we commend the Planning Authority, and are delighted to read,

“1. The Planning Authority has no objection to extend the spatial application to the General Residential Zone to land south of Selina Street.”

This can be achieved in this current LPS process, and would be a very positive outcome for Rep 9 as well as Rep 3, both of whom sought this zone application. This is a great step towards providing for the 10 year forward supply, as this land is currently at the stage where it returns a small positive result for subdivision feasibility, and as such this will occur far more quickly and reliably than heavy reliance on unviable greenfield subdivisions. This will allow for population growth in Tullah and thus be of support for our community vision towards a more healthy and sustainable community. It will bring employment opportunities and provide some funds towards the development of a new tourist attraction at Tullah. The other flow on effects are numerous and obvious. This removal of objection to a matter desired by the Progress Association's assessment of community aspiration, when initiated by the Planning Authority may also have a very positive effect in restoring some greater degree of community trust and confidence in its council.

However, we do sympathise with the owners of 37 and 57 Farrell Street discussed here, which is the Lakeside Lodge, as an alternative zone more suitable to their intended expansion to include a distillery would have increased employment opportunity and have become a tourist attraction to the town. The owners are very community minded businessmen, operating on a number of tourism sites across Tasmania and we fear that the retention of these lots as Residential may cause them to re-allocate their business expansion funds to their other operations outside of Tullah. This would be a great loss to the Tullah community.

Village Zone	Consider the merits of applying the Village Zone (fully or partially) to the land currently proposed to be zoned General Residential at Tullah and located north of folio of the Register 212236/14 and including folio of the Register 208095/7.
--------------	---

While Rep 9 is not a party to the concerns raised in other representations, we nevertheless, as community members, commend the Commission for this suggestion, and commend the Planning Authority for giving serious consideration to the application of the Village Zone to this part of Tullah. Rep 9 is fully supportive of the Village zone application. If that is possible it will be of great relief to the community and business owners and help restore trust and confidence in the Planning Authority by a significant percentage of the town's people. In particular it would enable a clear pathway for the restoration of the Tullah petrol station, the absence of which is a major issue with residents, businesses and visitors alike. The positive flow on effects will be significant.

CONCLUSION REMARKS

We trust that Rep 9's representations to the Commission are not too lengthy and burdensome to be considered if full. We have tried to enthusiastically and positively engage in this process since the exhibition of the 2017 draft Land Use Strategic Study, where we initially raised these concerns in a representation to council. However the council exercised its right to not hold hearings, nor provide any feedback either verbal or written. It has declined all our invitations to enter into collaborative discussions with us, repeatedly and insistently advising that if we had any real lasting concerns the appropriate place was to make representations to the Planning Commission. Thus we were truly shocked to hear the Planning Authority's very first oral representation at the hearing was that there was not enough time to consider any adjustments to the draft LPS since any time spent on amendments to the draft would require the new draft to be again put through the public exhibition process, and such would interfere with the timelines for completing the transition to the new statewide planning scheme. We truly hope that it does not come down to a consideration of time factors solely, as that could cause a collapse of all remaining trust and confidence in the entire planning and approvals processes.

Finally we seek to acknowledge that we are aware of, and sympathetic with, the Planning Authority's situation, which it shares with other low budget municipalities, of having limits to its funding and time allocations to attend to its statutory planning and approvals obligations, and how that creates a situation where errors can more easily pass unnoticed. Nonetheless the impact of its decisions fall directly on the community and this can have very consequential results, and where these are seen as unnecessarily detrimental and contrary to the community vision and the sustainability and health of the community we must respond as best we are able.

Thank you for your consideration.

‘A Literature Review of the term ‘*greyfield*’ in Australian usage.’

Kim Lai

B.Ed, B.Litt, B.Litt [Hons]

Abstract:

This paper attempts to identify the origins of the term ‘*greyfield*’ in Australian usage, trace its definitions as unfolded over time and analyse these definitions to identify common elements and any variations. It briefly compares these with the dominant definition in America. It concludes that while there are minor variations in the definition statements there are several common elements traceable in all of these definitions and usages.

Introduction:

The term *greyfield* is a neologism and does not yet have an entry in the Macquarie Dictionary, the generally recognised Australian national dictionary. As such the term requires a closer examination to ascertain how the term is defined in Australia, in particular within its usage within the field of Town Planning literature where it is being used in a growing number of Federal government reports, State ministerial strategic plans, and Local Government planning documents. Furthermore once the original and original full definition is located this definition requires analysis to elaborate its implications and assess the degree of consistency the usage of the term has when defined in planning documents that only provide a short form definition. It is also noted that when viewed from an international perspective it is found that the term has variations in meanings. These are identified and contrasted with the current Australian usage.

This examination of the term *greyfield* will demonstrate that there is a full, clear and elaborated Australian definition of the term that is used consistently without variation in Australian academic papers, federal and state planning reports and documents, and local government planning ordinances and strategic studies. In Australian usage this paper’s analysis of the term shows that the core of the definition confines the term to urban residential and commercially zoned sites with existing access to public transport and other already existing urban amenities. The term in every instance examined in mainland Australia refers to existing built environments and middle ring precincts in Australian capital cities. It will also demonstrate that if only using the World Wide Web as a source for the term’s meaning confusion is likely to arise since the majority of the results will return the American definition. With the exception of the state of Tasmania, the Australian mainland definitions can all be traced to the seminal definition of Professor Peter Newton. The Tasmanian definition while of similar common elements appears to derive primarily from the American definition, originating a decade prior to the distinct usage in Australian mainland states. Finally this paper concludes with the opinion that the term *greyfield*, and its definition, meaning and use, as has been developed within Australia, is the way this term should be understood wherever it is used in the Australian context.

Methodology

An initial search of the World Wide Web with the limit of the Boolean operator ‘greyfield AND definition AND Australia’ disclosed that the term was coined in Australia by Professor Peter Newton from Swinburne University of Technology in his 2010 article ‘*Beyond greenfields and brownfields*’ in *Built Environment*.¹ Professor Newton was contacted via email letter with a request for an “impartial and objective professional definition as far as that might be possible.” He chose to respond via a telephone call, the content of which cannot be presented here as it would be hearsay. Nonetheless it ended with Professor Newton saying he would send a list of references in which the term was defined. Thus the method employed here is to extract these definitions from these references. Notably the references included Federal and State planning documents, other academic experts, and local government authorities whose strategic and planning documents also define ‘greyfield’. Beyond these references a search was also conducted to locate where these terms have been defined in Tasmanian sources. These definitions are then compared and their implications analysed in terms of what are the key elements common to each definition. This methodology provides an adequate, though brief and non-exhaustive, basis to identify definitions in use, along with contextual information and some indication as to any variant uses in the 11 years since the term was coined in Australia.

The Definitions:

As mentioned the term was originally coined in the 2010 article by Professor Peter Newton.

“*Greyfields* is a term used here to describe the ageing, occupied residential tracts of suburbs that are physically, technologically and environmentally obsolescent and which represent economically outdated, failing or under-capitalized real estate assets. They typically reside in a 5 to 25 km radius of the centre of each capital city and are service, transport, amenity and employment rich in comparison to the outer and peri-urban suburbs.”²

As well as in a short form.

“Greyfields is a term used here to describe occupied but economically and technologically obsolescent, failing and under-capitalized housing.”³

This article also develops the term greyfield further in using phrases such as ‘greyfield precincts’ and ‘greyfield zones’ and the ‘middle ring heart of the greyfields’, and ‘greyfield landscapes’.

For example:-

“Regeneration of greyfield precincts involves clusters of approximately 20 or more contiguous residential properties deemed to have high redevelopment potential.”⁴

¹ Newton, P. W. (2010). ‘Beyond greenfields and brownfields: the challenge of regenerating Australia's greyfield suburbs’, *Built Environment*, 36(1).

² Newton, P.81

³ Newton. P.88

⁴ Newton, P.82

“production of net new dwellings required from the greyfield zone.”⁵

“only 20% in the ‘middle ring’ – the heart of the greyfields.”⁶

“ developing a workable model and set of processes for urban transformation of greyfield landscapes.”⁷

In this seminal article the core characteristics of the definition of greyfield or greyfields refers to

- a. Physical, technological and environment obsolescence
- b. Occupied urban residential housing precincts
- c. The built environment
- d. Easy access to existing public transport and other amenities
- e. Employment opportunity rich due to location in well established urban areas
- f. Regenerative development aiming at higher density occupation
- g. Occurs in context of discussions about issues related to urban sprawl and the efficiencies of utilising existing serviced sites in contrast to new greenfield developments.

In 2011 Professor Newton with distinguished colleagues from the Swinburne-Monash Research Centre, and RMIT produced a very extensive and exhaustive peer reviewed report for The Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, “*Towards a new development model for housing regeneration in greyfield residential precincts.*”⁸

Here we find greyfield being elaborated into inclusion of both residential and commercial greyfield areas i.e. car parks, failing small urban shopping strips – with the main interest in this study being residential greyfield precincts. These are then further categorized by types of lot relationship patterns and precincts

- a. Consolidated greyfield precincts
- b. Dispersed greyfield precincts
- c. Hybrid greyfield precincts.⁹

A visual example of these greyfield patterns occurs on the same page under Figure 3.

⁵ Newton, P.82

⁶ Newton, P.82

⁷ Newton, P.84

⁸ Newton, P., Murray S., Wakefield R., Murphy C., Khor L.A., and Morgan T. (2011), *Towards a new development model for housing regeneration in greyfield residential precincts*, commissioned by The Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute. Swinburne-Monash Research Centre. Final Report 171.

⁹ Newton, Murray, Wakefield, et al, p.4

Figure 3: Indicative greyfield residential precinct models



The study then focusses upon developing appropriate planning, zoning and development application processes for greyfield regeneration developments.

In this article from the same author and his other senior academic colleagues, we find that all of these terms containing the word greyfield continue the same elements as in the previous seminal Australian definition, with the new elaboration of terminological phrases reflecting ‘patterns within’ rather than variations on the original definition. The exception here is that the term now distinguishes between ‘residential greyfield’ and ‘commercial greyfield’ sites. However both distinctions continue to carry the meaning elements of

- a. Physical, technological and environment obsolescence
- b. Occupied urban residential housing precincts
- c. The built environment
- d. Urban zoned areas [residential and now commercial but not industrial]
- e. Easy access to existing public transport and other amenities
- f. Employment opportunity rich due to location in well established urban areas
- g. Regenerative development aiming at higher density occupation
- h. Occurs in context of discussions about issues related to urban sprawl and the efficiencies of utilising existing serviced sites in contrast to new greenfield developments.

These are the quotes and such for this part above.

“Greyfield residential precincts are defined here as under-utilised property assets located in the middle suburbs of large Australian cities, where residential building stock is failing (physically, technologically and environmentally) and energy, water and communications infrastructure is in need of regeneration. Greyfields are usually occupied and privately owned sites typical of urban development undertaken from the 1950s to the 1970s.”¹⁰

¹⁰ Newton, Murray, Wakefield, et al, P.3

“This research focuses on the informal infill that clusters around two to seven dwellings per development, undertaken mostly by small developers (Phan et al. 2008).”¹¹

Research process

Towards a New Development Model for Housing Regeneration in Greyfield Residential Precincts represents a new research vehicle for the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute. It comprises a series of investigative panels and background papers designed to effect direct engagement between experts from the research and policy communities, and practitioners from the industry and

The term ‘greyfield regeneration’ is used here to denote a new and critical focus for strategic metropolitan planning, requiring the articulation of a new process aimed at more effective triple bottom line transformation of large tracts of our cities.¹²

1.3.2 Greyfield precincts

Unlike brownfields, greyfields usually have no need for site remediation. Furthermore, they predominantly lie between the more vibrant inner city housing market and recently developed greenfield suburbs, and therefore provide greater access to employment, public transport and services than the latter zone. Greyfields have become a key target for intensive redevelopment by the state government planning agencies in their future capital city development strategies.¹³

From page 23 it provides specific definitions in answer for a variety of greyfield precincts

“ 2.4 What is a greyfield residential precinct?”

2.4.1 Consolidated precinct

This precinct type consists of a large parcel of assembled land enabling high-density built outcomes suitable to large-scale development (see Figure 8).

2.4.2 Dispersed precinct

This type consists of small suburban parcels dispersed over a walkable area. Based on current infill development patterns, this model is based on a single developer (as distinct from multiple and mostly small developers as at present) working over a number of non-contiguous sites.

2.4.3 Hybrid precinct

This type of precinct consists of a mixture of stand-alone and aggregated lots, potentially connected with infrastructure and landscaped elements

Another paper by Dr. Shane Murray, a member of the group producing the previous extensive report, also continues the same usage of the definition in the same manner. We could reasonably expect that all further papers by this list of leaders in the field from their

¹¹ Newton, Murray, Wakefield, et al, p.5

¹² Newton, Murray, Wakefield, et al, p.13

¹³ Ibid. P.15

respective universities and research schools to follow in using the term greyfield in accord with the same definitions. There is no requirement to examine all of their publications.

This group from the Swinburne-Monash Research Centre as well as this report has influenced Federal and State Planning where we can continue to examine the progress of its meaning.

Every five years the Federal government commissions SoE reports [The State of the Environment Report] under varying sections. In 2016, the last report date, under the topic, “*Current Urban Planning and Management*”, the topic of greyfield sites in the Australian context became a spearhead for discussion. This report was accessed in its online version therefore it is referenced by its URL and naturally has no page numbering.¹⁴

“In Australia, greyfields have been defined as ‘ageing but occupied tracts of inner and middle ring suburbia that are physically, technologically and environmentally failing and which represent under-capitalised real estate assets’. Unlike brownfields, greyfields typically do not require remediation of pollution.

Greyfields predominantly lie between the central business district and inner-city housing market and the more recently developed greenfield suburbs. They typically provide greater access to employment, public transport and services.”¹⁵

In reporting on trends in the various states it tells us that as of 2016

“More recently, governments have aimed to increase the levels of brownfield or greyfield development, with targets for infill development (Table BLT17) and an increased share of medium-density housing occurring in many inner-city areas. Containing development within existing urban boundaries allows cities to preserve valuable rural land on the outskirts for other uses, such as agriculture, recreation and environmental preservation.”¹⁶

In 2017 the Victorian Government, under Minister for Planning the Hon Richard Wynne, released its *Metropolitan Planning Strategy – Plan Melbourne 2017-2050*.¹⁷ This is a Ministerial Planning Strategy for Victoria, however the discussion of greyfields occurs predominantly in the context of Melbourne and some other larger cities only.

There we find another statement of definition being elaborated using phrases ‘greyfield *site*’, and ‘greyfield *area*’. Again it specifically confines the context to areas within the existing urban boundaries. Notably as with all definitions quoted from reliable sources we do not find any instances of rural greyfield areas. It appears to be contradictory to the definitions examined so far.

¹⁴SoE 2016. Federal Government State of the Environment Report 2016. Accessed 10th March 2017 at <https://soe.environment.gov.au/theme/built-environment/topic/2016/current-urban-planning-and-management>.

¹⁵ SoE 2016. Federal Government State of the Environment Report 2016

¹⁶ SoE 2016

¹⁷ *Metropolitan Planning Strategy – Plan Melbourne 2017-2050*.

“State Policy 2.2.4

Provide support and guidance for greyfield areas to deliver more housing choice and diversity. Greyfield sites are residential areas where building stock is near the end of its useful life and land values make redevelopment attractive. Melbourne has many residential areas that qualify as greyfield sites, particularly in established middle and outer suburbs. These areas often have low-density, detached housing on suburban-sized allotments that have good access to public transport and services. Up until now, the redevelopment of these areas has been generally uncoordinated and unplanned. That must change. Greyfield areas provide an ideal opportunity for land consolidation and need to be supported by a coordinated approach to planning that delivers a greater mix and diversity of housing and provides more choice for people already living in the area as well as for new residents. Methods of identifying and planning for greyfield areas need to be developed. A more structured approach to greyfield areas will help local governments and communities achieve more sustainable outcomes.”¹⁸

When this new definition is sanctioned by a State Government Planning Minister and being written into a State Policy is analysed we note that is fully in accord with the previous definitions though worded quite independently. It is consistent with Professor Newton’s original Australian definition, the definition within the Federal Government’s SoE Report, and retains the same common elements of being urban, residential, an occupied built environment along with a degree of obsolescence and easy access to public transport and other amenity.

Next we can step down as it were and example some Local Government planning and strategic documents of recent date where we find that the term *greyfield* appears to no longer even require extensive definition. This should not be surprising in that suburban municipalities prepare their documents under the umbrella of the State Policy and naturally absorb and assume those definitions. For example in the City of Maroondah Planning Scheme of 31/7/2018 and last updated by GC175 on 18/02/2021¹⁹, the term *greyfield* is used at 16.01-1R along with a statement that understands the category of greyfield consolidation, discussed previously as originating in the report of the Swinburne-Monash Research Centre’s professorial team.

“Strategies

Manage the supply of new housing to meet population growth and create a sustainable city by developing housing and mixed use development opportunities in locations that are:

- Areas for greyfield renewal, particularly through opportunities for land consolidation.”

And under 18.02-1S

Strategies

¹⁸ *Plan Melbourne 2017- 2050*. p.51

¹⁹ City of Maroondah Planning Scheme of 31/7/2018 and last updated by GC175 on 18/02/2021

Ensure development and the planning for new suburbs, urban renewal precincts, greyfield redevelopment areas and transit-oriented development areas (such as railway stations) provide opportunities to promote more walking and cycling.”²⁰

In Tasmania when examining the planning ordinance and strategic plans for the cities of Burnie, Launceston and Hobart it reveals that only the Hobart region uses this term. In particular the *Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy 2010 -2035* [amended 20th Jan 2020] provides a definition.

“Greyfield sites:- Underutilised, derelict or vacant residential or commercial sites in an urban environment that are not contaminated.”²¹

This is the first notable variation in Australia since Professor Newton’s 2010 introduction of the term and at first glance does not appear to be a further unfolding of the meaning as we have just traced throughout the mainland. However upon careful analysis of the context in which it is used in this land use strategy, and analysis of the definition itself it can be understood to be carrying many of the same elements of meaning.

Of note this is the first definition we have uncovered that uses the word ‘vacant’ as a descriptor of the word ‘site’. However when we parse this definition it can only be concluded that the ‘or’ cannot be intended to mean a unique alternative. If taken as a unique alternative we would have to read the definition as having two completely separate optional unique alternatives i.e.

1. ‘a greyfield site is an underutilised, derelict residential or commercial site’
- OR
2. ‘a greyfield site is a vacant residential or commercial site’

Obviously if a greyfield site can be defined solely by understanding ‘or’ to be a unique alternative then as ‘a vacant residential or commercial site’, then every lot in the Southern Hobart region that has not yet been built upon is a greyfield site. Many increasingly absurd statements would then follow on such as

- a. developers are producing new residential and commercial precincts that immediately become greyfield sites.
- b. vacant greenfield sites would also be greyfield sites at the very same moment they are created.
- c. Tasmania would become known as Australia’s greatest *producer* of greyfield sites
- d. Etc etc with ever increasing absurdity.

Therefore it follows that it cannot be taken as a unique alternative.

Fortunately the Tasmanian definition does limit the term to urban environments, or vast areas of the Tasmania’s rural zoned land would also need to be deemed greyfield sites.

However when we examine the context in which the term greyfield occurs in this Tasmanian strategic plan we find that it only occurs within the context of strategies to help contain urban residential growth within the Urban Growth Boundary, as a site able to be considered as a

²⁰ City of Maroondah Planning Scheme of 31/7/2018 and last updated by GC175 on 18/02/2021

²¹ Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy 2010 -2035 [amended 20th Jan 2020] p.102

specialised type of infill development. In fact in that document the term is used in the very definition of infill development.

“Infill Development - Development within existing urban areas through:

- a. Small scale subdivision or unit development on existing residential lots; or
- b. Redevelopment of brownfield or greyfield sites.

To achieve these infill targets an Infill Development Program that identifies key greyfield and brownfield redevelopment opportunities to maximise infill development, without relying upon small scale subdivision and unit development will be required. In this way the amenity of existing residential areas will be better maintained.

It is recognised that the success of this strategy will also require:

- Identification of high density residential opportunities, particularly on greyfield and brownfield sites.
- Cooperation between the public and private sector to develop major greyfield and brownfield sites;”²²

Therefore we are compelled to understand the definition of greyfield in that Southern Tasmania strategic plan to actually mean:-

“Underutilised, derelict [*property whether occupied*] or vacant residential or commercial sites in an urban environment that are not contaminated.”

Or perhaps

“Underutilised, derelict or vacant [*buildings on*] residential or commercial sites in an urban environment that are not contaminated.”

This last possibility would bring the Tasmanian definition into full alignment with the Australian mainland usage, except that it also specifies commercial. However the fact is that vacant commercial buildings and sites such as of or around railways are often given as examples of greyfields in mainland usage so the variation is of very minor consequence.

Therefore the first noted minor variation of meaning occurs in Tasmania. The variation is that the term is there understood also to specifically include *vacant* residential and commercial sites within the urban boundary. However this occurrence in the Tasmanian definition still retains the elements of obsolescence, outdatedness and underperformance vis a vis dereliction, and being intrinsically identified within urban environments in primarily city contexts.

It requires noting here that this Tasmanian definition has similarities with some of the exact same words, meanings and definition of greyfield as commonly used in North America,

²² Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy 2010 -2035 P.92

excepting that the American definition applies primarily or solely to commercial sites. The three words ‘underutilized’ and ‘derelict’ and ‘commercial’ are the very essence of the American definition, which also form the main descriptors of the Tasmanian definition.

The first mention of the term greyfield or greyfields occurs in American usage in the American seminal article, *Incremental Urbanism: The Auto and Pedestrian Reconsidered in Greyfield Reclamation*, by Michael Gamble and W. Jude LeBlanc 2001

“Every city in America has them — aging strips of development that once served as vital commercial corridors during the post-World War II suburban exodus, but which have today fallen on harder times. As many of their functions have been consolidated elsewhere, they are symptomatic of what might “better” be characterized as post-sprawl. To describe such conditions, the Congress for the New Urbanism coined the term *greyfield*. In development jargon, brownfields are contaminated urban sites, and greenfields are previously undeveloped lands. *Greyfields* are the underutilized places in between — often derelict shopping centers and strip commercial sites surrounded by seas of asphalt.”²³

The fact that this American definition also includes specifically the notion of ‘middle ring’ urban precincts between inner urban and outer newer suburbs exactly the same in manner that the definition that is coined in Australia by Newton does clearly and unambiguously means that greyfields are urban phenomena.

Perhaps Tasmania was the first Australian state to use the term ‘greyfields’ within the field of town planning, and did so before the term took on a somewhat distinct Australian definition and meaning and thus has adopted its definition from the only pre-2010 definition available at the time. Perhaps that is the reason why the Tasmanian definition might take its derivation from American dictionary definitions, and it would have occurred before the Australian meaning began to unfold and enter and develop within Australian common usage. Since there is not yet an entry in an Australian national dictionary it remains an unanswered philological question at this time of writing.

Despite not having a clearly identifiable origin the Tasmanian definition carries the same elements of meaning of all other Australian and American definitions.

Conclusion:

The definitions of the terms ‘*greyfield*’ and ‘*greyfields*’ has been examined by identifying the origins of an Australian definition in 2010, and tracing it from its origins in the halls of Australian academia to its current presence and adoption in Federal, State and Local Government planning documents. The Australian usage has also been compared with the American definition.

²³ Gamble M., and LeBlanc W. J. *Incremental Urbanism: The Auto and Pedestrian Reconsidered in Greyfield Reclamation*. Atlanta Georgia 2001. P.1

From this literature review we can identify what we could perhaps call the Australian and international common elements of meaning of the term '*greyfield*'

1. Descriptors of obsolescence and outdatedness and underperformance
2. Are a part of the built environment [except Tasmania and USA]
3. Greyfields are always an urban phenomena - either residential, commercial or both.
4. Greyfields exist in a middle area between inner urban and more newly developed outer urban areas
5. Greyfields provide easier access to existing amenities than outer suburbia-
6. Regenerative development aims at higher density occupation
7. Always occurs in the context of discussion about issues related to urban sprawl and types of infill development efficiencies, of utilising existing sites in contrast to new greenfield developments.

Therefore the term has clear meaning both within Australia and also within the international context and it is the conclusion of the writer that when set in this wide context it would be extremely difficult to identify any one definition as significantly enough departing from the overall elements of meaning to identify any of these definitions of this term as a variant definition. It is recommended that an entry be considered by the Macquarie Dictionary.

REFERENCES

Professor Peter Newton is acknowledged for his kind provision of many of the primary source materials and his enlightening discussion, that inspired the current author to write this paper.

REFERENCES quoted within this paper.

Newton, P. W. (2010). 'Beyond greenfields and brownfields: the challenge of regenerating Australia's greyfield suburbs', *Built Environment*, 36(1).

Newton, P., Murray S., Wakefield R., Murphy C., Khor L.A., and Morgan T. (2011), *Towards a new development model for housing regeneration in greyfield residential precincts*, commissioned by The Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute. Swinburne-Monash Research Centre. Final Report 171.

Shane Murray, *Greyfield Residential Precincts: A New Design Model for the Regeneration of the Middle Suburbs*, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

Gamble M., and LeBlanc W. J. *Incremental Urbanism: The Auto and Pedestrian Reconsidered in Greyfield Reclamation*. Atlanta Georgia 2001. P.1

Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy 2010 -2035 P.92

Metropolitan Planning Strategy – Plan Melbourne 2017-2050.

Federal Government State of the Environment Report 2016.

City of Maroondah Planning Scheme of 31/7/2018 and last updated by GC175 on 18/02/2021

Primary materials provided by Professor Peter Newton as sources of definition and context.

Peter W. Newton (2010) Beyond Greenfields and Greyfields: The Challenge of Regenerating Australia's Greyfield Suburbs, *Built Environment*, 36(1), 81-104;

[Highly cited] Published paper that originally **defines the greyfields**:

"Greyfields is a term used here to describe the ageing, occupied residential tracts of suburbs which are physically, technologically and environmentally obsolescent and which represent economically outdated, failing or under-capitalized real estate assets. They typically occur in a 5–25 km radius of the centre of each capital city and are service-, transport-, amenity- and employment-rich compared to the outer and peri-urban suburbs." (p.81)

Greyfields represent one of the three arenas for urban planning and development; and is critical for distinguishing type of **infill redevelopment** – brownfield vs. greyfield:

P. Newton and S. Glackin (2014) Understanding Infill: Towards New Policy and Practice for Urban Regeneration in the Established Suburbs of Australia's Cities, *Urban Policy and Research* 32, 2, 121-143.

Greyfield Precinct Regeneration is the new planning instrument being introduced for application in the established suburbs of Melbourne. The rationale is found in:

Peter Newton, Stephen Glackin, Lisa Garner and Jennifer Witheridge (2020) Beyond small lot subdivision: pathways for municipality-initiated and resident-supported precinct-scale medium-density residential infill regeneration in greyfield suburbs, *Urban Policy and Research*, 38 (4), 338-356; doi: 10.1080/08111146.2020.1815186

Greyfields video prepared for the Australian Institute of Planners 2019:

<https://vimeo.com/347006829> [peter newton PIA webinar/ video Greyfield infill]

Greening the Greyfields is a 10-year program of research that commenced in 2010 led by Professor Peter Newton, PhD, FASSA that has received significant funding support from: AHURI, CRC for Spatial Information, CRC for Low carbon Living, AURIN, Federal Smart Cities and Suburbs Program, Victorian Government, WA Government, City of Maroonda

In the past 10 years there has been significant academic literature using the greyfields term; eg:

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07293682.2020.1854800>
<https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2019-06/apo-nid243951.pdf>
<https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2019-06/apo-nid243951.pdf>

Government

Federal

<https://soe.environment.gov.au/theme/built-environment/topic/2016/current-urban-planning-and-management>

State

Policy 2.2.4

Provide support and guidance for greyfield areas to deliver more housing choice and diversity.

Greyfield sites are residential areas where building stock is near the end of its useful life and land values make redevelopment attractive. Melbourne has many residential areas that qualify as greyfield sites, particularly in established middle and outer suburbs. These areas often have low-density, detached housing on suburban-sized allotments that have good access to public transport and services. Up until now, the redevelopment of these areas has been generally uncoordinated and unplanned. That must change. Greyfield areas provide an ideal opportunity for land consolidation and need to be supported by a coordinated approach to planning that delivers a greater mix and diversity of housing and provides more choice for people already living in the area as well as for new residents. Methods of identifying and planning for greyfield areas need to be developed. A more structured approach to greyfield areas will help local governments and communities achieve more sustainable outcomes.

Source: *Plan Melbourne 2017- 2050* (p.51)

https://www.planmelbourne.vic.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/377206/Plan_Melbourne_2017-2050_Strategy_.pdf

Local Government

<https://yoursay.maroondah.vic.gov.au/gtg> [City of Maroondah application to State Government]

<https://greyfields.com.au/documents/>

<https://greyfields.com.au/playbook/landowners/>

<https://youtu.be/NYshlt1pRaI?t=49> [Maroondah Senior Planner video]

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7yZeHbwPb0I> [Maroondah Mayor]

Greyfields is a term referenced widely in all municipal planning schemes developed in 2020:

https://planning-schemes.api.delwp.vic.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/463957/Hume_PS_Ordinance.pdf [16.01-1R 09/10/2020 VC169]

https://planning-schemes.api.delwp.vic.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/463974/Moreland_PS_Ordinance.pdf [18.02-1S]

And consultancies:

<https://plan2place.com.au/project/greening-the-greyfields/>

Industry

<https://infrastructuremagazine.com.au/2017/03/20/greening-the-greyfields/>

Attachment 2 – list of CT's of lots that are not Private Freehold tenure.

ID 4

Property Address	MADDEN ST TULLAH TAS 7321
Property ID	3278980
Title Reference	202272/6
Authority	Hydro Electric Corporation

Land Tenure

Feature	
TEN_CLASS	Hydro-Electric Corporation
ACT	Not Applicable
FEAT_NAME	
TENURE_ID	34962

ID 8

Feature	
Property Address	MADDEN ST TULLAH TAS 7321
Property ID	3278980
Title Reference	202271/7
Authority	Hydro Electric Corporation

Land Tenure

Feature	
TEN_CLASS	Hydro-Electric Corporation
ACT	Not Applicable
FEAT_NAME	
TENURE_ID	34962

ID 11

eature	
Property Address	MADDEN ST TULLAH TAS 7321
Property ID	3278980
Title Reference	202273/5
Authority	Hydro Electric Corporation

Land Tenure

Feature	
TEN_CLASS	Hydro-Electric Corporation
ACT	Not Applicable
FEAT_NAME	
TENURE_ID	34962

ID 17

Property Address	MADDEN ST TULLAH TAS 7321
-------------------------	---------------------------

Property ID	3278980
Title Reference	202268/4
Authority	Hydro Electric Corporation

Land Tenure

Feature	
TEN_CLASS	Hydro-Electric Corporation
ACT	Not Applicable
FEAT_NAME	
TENURE_ID	34962

ID 21

Property Address	MADDEN ST TULLAH TAS 7321
Property ID	3278980
Title Reference	202270/8
Authority	Hydro Electric Corporation

Land Tenure

Feature	
TEN_CLASS	Hydro-Electric Corporation
ACT	Not Applicable
FEAT_NAME	
TENURE_ID	34962

ID 28

Feature	
Property Address	MADDEN ST TULLAH TAS 7321
Property ID	3278980
Title Reference	202274/2
Authority	Hydro Electric Corporation

Land Tenure

Feature	
TEN_CLASS	Hydro-Electric Corporation
ACT	Not Applicable
FEAT_NAME	
TENURE_ID	34962

Skyridge Pty. Ltd.

81 Barker Road

Harcourt North

VIC 3453

PH 0429 066 096

EM skyridge@tibastro.com

ACN: 604 353 193

Tax Inv SK 1122

Date: 2/2/2020
To: GRADCO
[RE YOUR TULLAH PROJECT]
Address to be advised

DELIVERY Electronic
[pdf via email to <narmstrong@gradco.com.au>]

DATES	ITEM	AMOUNT
	RENT FOR CAR PARK 40 FARRELL TULLAH TAS	
1-Feb-20	MONTHLY 1 Feb to 1 Mar 2020	\$300.00
	GST	\$0.00
	AMOUNT DUE	<u>\$300.00</u>

PAYMENT DETAILS

BANK WESTPAC
NAME SKYRIDGE PTY LTD
BSB 033 688
ACC NO 515 168
TERMS 30 DAYS NET