

**Inner Melbourne Action Plan**  
**Briefing Report**  
**Action 5.3 Integrating Public Housing Estates**

---

**Purpose**

1. To update the Committee on the Project Brief, goals, scope, deliverables, timeframe and budget for this new project.

**Background**

1. Office of Housing (OoH) developments can considerably impact local governments through the modifications of public spaces and by way of increased demand for social services and community facilities as many housing tenants have complicated and multiple needs.
2. Action 5.3 of the IMAP seeks: *"to work with the Office of Housing to redevelop public housing estates so they better integrate with adjacent areas"*.
3. There has been a record of poor coordination and communication between state and local government during the initial planning stages of social housing developments. The Office of Housing (OoH) is criticised for excluding local government out of the essential consultation stages. In some instances local governments may be criticised for requesting unfair or unrealistic developer contributions.
4. Local governments are not the responsible authority for OoH projects. The Minister for Planning considers and approves applications. Consequently, OoH projects are not subject to the same level of scrutiny – and negotiation – as private residential developments.
5. There have been some recent improvements with OoH now preparing Social Impact Assessments (SIAs) for new developments; however, these assessments are not necessarily provided to Councils in advance of the release of Master Plans for the Housing Estates.

**Discussion**

6. The Project Team believes the IMAP Councils can leverage better outcomes from OoH developments by: researching current and best practice models within which state government can work in partnership with local government; and implementing an advocacy strategy to influence key decision-makers and realise a change in practice.
7. It is proposed that a consultant be engaged to: review the means by which State Government engages with Local Governments, as well as local stakeholders, in the master planning and implementation phases of Office of Housing (OoH) developments; and work with representatives of IMAP to develop advocacy positions and strategies.

## Proposal

8. The work program will include:

- a. Analysing the rigour of State Government Social Impact (SIA) Assessments with consideration given to the adequacy of (actual and proposed) State Developer Contributions relative to the identified social impacts.
- b. Examining State Government consultation and engagement practices, considering:
  - i. At what stages are discussions held with Local Government? Are these pre or post master planning or more iterative?
  - ii. Who is being consulted within Local Governments (Officers, Councillors) as well as externally (agencies, business, community, etc.)?
  - iii. What are the forums for dialogue with Local Government and others? (e.g. workshops, committees or working groups, submissions and informal communications)
  - iv. How is intelligence and data being shared between these levels of government and to a lesser degree, local stakeholders?
- c. Case studies of positive and negative exemplars of OoH developments considering processes, outcomes and legacy issues.
- d. Facilitating a meeting with IMAP Officers to develop a suite of advocacy positions and canvass the optimal means by which to advocate to State Government decision makers.
- e. Drafting a "working" positions paper and advocacy strategy.
- f. Present the working documents before the IMAP Committee.

## Outcomes

9. Local Governments should be engaged more formally, deeply and at an earlier stage of the OoH developments, with the same level of scrutiny and negotiation applying to social housing as currently with private.
10. This project will result in the articulation of IMAP Councils' expectations of State Government and a comprehensive strategic framework to manage and respond to OoH developments.
11. Improved dialogue between State Government agencies (particularly OoH) and the IMAP Councils will result in better land use, infrastructure and service outcomes for our communities.

## Budget

12. The IMAP budget has made provision for this project: \$15,000 in 2011/12

### Project Team

13. Members of the Project team are as follows:

City of Yarra (Lead Council)	Ross Goeman, Manager Community Planning & Advocacy Malcolm McCall, Community Planning Coordinator
City of Stonnington	Karen Watson, Executive Manager Sustainable Futures Connie Gibbons, General Manager Social Development
City of Port Phillip	Vanda Iaconese, General Manager Cultural & Community Development Simon Smith, Coordinator Social Planning Michele Leonard, Manager Community Development
City of Melbourne	Ian Hicks, Manager Community Planning Jane Foley, Manager Community Services

### Timeframe

14. The proposed timetable for this work is as follows:

Finalise consultant brief (Project Team meeting)	20 February 2012
IMAP Committee approval	24 February 2012
Advertise Project	1 March 2012
Award contract	Mid March 2012
Project inception meeting	Mid - Late March 2012
Draft Report Phase 1 due	27 April 2012
Facilitated Workshop	4 May 2012
Working Documents Submitted	11 May 2012
Report back to IMAP Committee meeting	25 May 2012 (Agenda closes 16 May)
Final Reports Submitted	8 June 2012

### Recommendation

15. That the IMAP Implementation Committee approve the attached Consultant Brief and confirm the budget of \$15,000 for this work to be commenced in the 2011/12 financial year.

**CONSULTANT BRIEF**  
**IMAP ACTION 5.3**  
**INTEGRATING PUBLIC HOUSING ESTATES**

---

**Establishing broad protocols, an advocacy strategy & case studies for social housing developments**

**Cities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Yarra and Stonnington Research Area**

## **1.0 PROJECT PURPOSE**

The Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) Committee constitutes the Mayors and Chief Executives of the Cities of Port Phillip, Yarra and Stonnington and the Chairman of the Future Melbourne (Planning) Committee and Director of City Planning and Infrastructure of the City of Melbourne.

The Committee seek to leverage better community outcomes from Office of Housing developments through a strategic research and advocacy program that includes:

1. Establishing the suite of issues that the OoH and other agencies should consider when master planning new social housing development proposals
2. Identifying the best frameworks (such as SIAs) for synthesising, analysing and reporting on the information
3. Documenting when and how State Government engages local stakeholders in the master planning and implementation phases and how this could be improved, and
4. Using the findings to draft a positions paper for the IMAP Committee to be submitted to the Premier and relevant Ministers.

This research and advocacy program could lead to Local Governments being engaged more formally, deeply and at an earlier stage of the development process, leading to better land use, infrastructure and service outcomes for our communities.

## **2.0 BACKGROUND**

### **2.1 GENERAL**

THE Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) adopted in December 2005 is a collaborative project between the cities of Melbourne, Stonnington (west of Kooyong Road), Yarra and Port Phillip. The group has worked together on projects which strengthen the liveability, attractiveness and prosperity of the Inner Melbourne Region. A map of the IMAP area is shown in Figure 1.

Strategy 5 of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan is: "*Plan to accommodate 90,000 more dwellings by 2030.*"

The IMAP Councils have been involved in advocacy to establish an affordable housing overlay in the Victorian Planning Scheme, have established the Affordable Housing website, and are involved in a research project investigating Community Land Trusts as a mechanism for increasing the supply of affordable housing for key workers.

The Action Plan responds to the demands of *Melbourne 2030* (and its updates) - the State Government's blueprint for managing sustainable growth and change across metropolitan Melbourne.

Figure 1



## 2.2 SETTING THE SCENE

The development of social housing is a responsibility of the State Government. The Office of Housing undertakes the planning and construction of new and renovated social housing in metropolitan Melbourne and, as a result, is the landlord of a large population of tenants in the city.

The location, scale and design of this housing has a significant impact on the streetscape, services and local community. The new and existing tenants increase population density and place a number of demands on their local area services. As the land and development is owned and undertaken by the State Government, all planning and consultation is undertaken by the Office of Housing.

Local government sees itself as a key stakeholder in the planning and development process in their municipality. However, whereas Councils receive applications and determine the consultation and outcome

of private planning applications in their municipality (with some exceptions in the CBD area and those called in by the Minister), State Government housing developments do not fall into this same process.

Recently the Office of Housing has undertaken to do more Social Impact Assessment work as part of their planning process to identify the impact of the new development and assess the needs of new residents. However the quality and their level of engagement still needs to be established and proven. It remains to be seen if this makes the process more robust in terms of the provision of services and amenities for these new communities and their integration into the established population. Councils still largely remain an observer through this process, however, should the Government fail to address the social services, amenity and community demands appropriately in the planning stages, the impact of this shortfall can come back onto Councils to provide for the disadvantaged population.

The IMAP Councils believe the Office of Housing has a responsibility that extends beyond its role as developer and landlord. State Government's social housing developments create a concentration of disadvantaged residents in the community. The Office of Housing needs to ensure schools, open space, social services; public transport - a wide range of social infrastructure and services - exists in the precinct to service the needs of their tenants. To achieve this balance, the IMAP Councils want to increase their dialogue with the Office of Housing to reach agreement on the support infrastructure required in the community around one of these new developments during the early consultation and planning stages. Councils want to be consulted more and to be part of the process identifying the capacity of the precinct to accommodate these residents.

### 2.3 CONCERNS WITH THE CURRENT APPROACH

The current planning approach by the Office of Housing causes a number of concerns to local government:

- Councils appear to be seen as only one of a number of stakeholders by the Office of Housing and not as a key partner in the process - despite providing a number of key services
- The process undertaken by the Office of Housing appears to be less vigorous than Councils themselves undertake to finalise a development application in terms of managing adverse effects
- The process for determining social impacts is truncated and fails to provide sufficient time for research, negotiation and a considered response from local government
- Some Councils have a limited experience with this type of development and would benefit from a standardised strategic approach utilised by all Councils which would ensure their requests to the Office of Housing are reasonable, comprehensive and wide ranging and able to be accommodated by the process.
- The Office of Housing doesn't appear to deal with each Council on an equal basis.
- The Office of Housing seems to be unaware of what information regarding the proposal is expected by Councils for all new developments

From the Office of Housing's perspective, the following may be occurring:

- Councils are seen as too demanding, and that their requests are too extensive
- It is unclear what information they need to provide to Councils to get the best response, and as a result, consultation with Councils becomes a negative experience
- Office of Housing may be unaware of the sort of support services the Councils currently fund. It is possible that this is not communicated through to the Office of Housing and therefore they are unaware of the extent that their development is impacting on the Council.

## 2.4 CONTEXT

The project area is the IMAP Inner Melbourne region and includes the municipalities of Melbourne, Yarra, Port Phillip and part of Stonnington.

## 3.0 PROJECT SCOPE AND ELEMENTS

A Principal Consultant is to conduct the program of work outlined below.

Yarra City Council will lead and manage the project in conjunction with Project Control Group formed of Officers from the four IMAP Councils.

The Principal Consultant is expected to manage and coordinate the work of any sub-consultants if required. The Inner Melbourne Action Plan supports tertiary student Work Integrated Learning opportunities and encourages the use of tertiary students in research activities, analysis and evaluation in this task.

### Phase 1: Research

Review the model by which State Government engages with Local Governments, as well as local stakeholders, in the master planning and implementation phases of Office of Housing (OoH) developments, including:

1. Analyse the rigour of State Government Social Impact (SIA) Assessments with consideration given to the adequacy of (actual and proposed) State Developer Contributions relative to the identified social impacts.
2. Examine State Government consultation and engagement practices, considering:
  - a. At what stages are discussions held with Local Government? Are these pre or post master planning or more iterative?
  - b. Who is being consulted within Local Governments (Officers, Councillors) as well as externally (agencies, business, community, etc.)?
  - c. What are the forums for dialogue with Local Government and others? (e.g. workshops, committees or working groups, submissions and informal communications)
  - d. How is intelligence and data being shared between these levels of government and to a lesser degree, local stakeholders?
3. By way of case studies, review positive and negative exemplars of OoH developments focussing on the process involved, local outcomes and legacy issues.

4. Submit a report from Phase 1.

#### Phase 2: Consultation

Work with representatives of IMAP to develop advocacy positions and strategies:

1. Facilitate a meeting with Officers to develop a suite of advocacy positions and canvass the optimal means by which to advocate to decision makers.
2. Draft a “working” positions paper and advocacy strategy.
3. Present the working documents to the IMAP Committee of CEOs and Mayors.
4. Submit final positions paper and advocacy strategy.

**Note:** The principal components of this project are expected to be developed to a concept proposal and clearly labelled Draft and For Discussion Purposes only.

### 3.3 CONSULTATION

If key stakeholders need to be engaged, a Consultation Strategy should be prepared to provide constructive and efficient input into this project and to provide a basis for the further stages of the project if implemented.

### 3.0 TIMEFRAME

The proposed timetable for this work is as follows:

Finalise consultant brief (Project Team meeting)	20 February 2012
IMAP Committee approval	24 February 2012
Advertise Project	1 March 2012
Award contract	Mid March 2012
Project inception meeting	Mid - Late March 2012
Draft Report Phase 1 due	27 April 2012
Facilitated Workshop	4 May 2012
Working Documents Submitted	11 May 2012
Report back to IMAP Committee meeting	25 May 2012 (Agenda closes 16 May)
Final Reports Submitted	8 June 2012

### 4.0 SUBMISSION REQUIREMENT

This submission is seeking a suitably qualified Principal Consultant to oversee the project. The submission should outline (the following should form part of the submission):

- Proposed response to Methodology
- Project plan



- Scope and fees
- Response to each key project element and objective
- Relevant key experience of each consultant
- Identification of any sub consultants required and their role and budget

The Principal Consultant will be responsible for the preparation of project briefs for any sub consultants required to complete the project in consultation with Council. The Principal Consultant is also responsible for the management of the sub-consultants.

#### 4.1 KEY DELIVERABLES

The key project elements are outlined in section 3.2. The deliverables can be developed in tandem and include:

- A draft report on all stages of the project for comment
- A final report for the Inner Melbourne Action Plan Implementation Committee

#### 4.2 REPORTING PROTOCOLS

The Principal Consultant must report to Council (Project Manager) every two weeks on the status and progress of the Study and identify any management issues as they appear.

#### 4.3 PROJECT REVIEW

There will be opportunities to review the tasks and consultant input as the project progresses at the end of each key deliverable or stage.

#### 4.4 OUTPUTS AND PRODUCTS

All reports should be prepared in a format that is compatible with Microsoft Word (in Arial 11 point font). Photographs, maps and drawings shall be of a suitable quality to enable reproduction, including B&W copies. Any electronic maps should be prepared in a format that is compatible with electronic GIS (ESRI, MapInfo, and GeoX).

The following quantity of reports is required:

- At least one electronic copy of every draft and final report.

#### 4.5 SOURCES

In all cases, sources of information should be fully documented. All sources of information, documentary or oral, to be listed. In respect of source material privately held, the name or contact details of the owner should be given, but only with the owner's consent.

#### 4.6 PRESENTATIONS, MEETINGS AND CONSULTATION

The consultant/s will be required to attend:

- select project group meetings as requested by the lead Council;
- select meetings with Government agencies/external agencies;

- a presentation session before the IMAP Committee of Executives and Mayors.

Meetings, workshops and briefing will be held at Council facilities. The Council will bear all room hiring and catering costs for meetings held on Council premises.

#### 4.7 PROJECT PROGRAM

A detailed work program will be required to determine how key stages of the project will be delivered on time, namely:

- Draft report by 27 April 2012.
- Final Report by 11 May 2012 for May IMAP Implementation Committee meeting.

#### 5.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA

- Capacity for community planning and social infrastructure research and analysis
- Demonstrated relevant experience and expertise on community planning and public sector projects
- Availability of key personnel during the course of the project and ability to deliver on time.
- Value for money and fee

#### 6.0 DUE DATE FOR SUBMISSIONS

Submissions from interested parties must be received at the office of Yarra City Council by **4.00pm** on **Monday 12<sup>th</sup> March 2012**.

**Please address all submissions to:**

Malcolm McCall  
Community Planning Coordinator  
City of Yarra  
PO Box 168  
RICHMOND  
VIC 3121  
**FAX:** (03) 8417 6666  
**EMAIL:** malcolm.mccall@yarracity.vic.gov.au