

Inner Melbourne Action Plan
Progress Report
Action 5.3– Integrating public housing estates

Purpose

1. In February 2012 the IMAP Implementation Committee approved the brief for Action 5.3. The brief has gone out for Expressions of Interest from 4 suppliers. Only one has responded. It is clear from the response and subsequent discussions that the \$15,000 budget for this project is inadequate to undertake the work proposed.
2. The purpose of this report is to request approval for the budget to be increased to \$30,000 so that the work can be completed. Note that this is less than the price received. It is expected that the project will be further negotiated and refined to come within the indicated budget.

Background

3. Under Action 5.3, the Committee seek to leverage better community outcomes from Office of Housing developments through a strategic research and advocacy program that includes:
 - a. Establishing the suite of issues that the OoH and other agencies should consider when master planning new social housing development proposals
 - b. Identifying the best frameworks (such as SIAs) for synthesising, analysing and reporting on the information
 - c. Documenting when and how State Government engages local stakeholders in the master planning and implementation phases and how this could be improved, and
 - d. 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.

The Research brief

4. Phase 1: Research
 - a. 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:
 - b. 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.
 - c. Examine 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?
- d. By way of case studies, review positive and negative exemplars of OoH developments focussing on the process involved, local outcomes and legacy issues.
- e. Submit a report from Phase 1.

5. Phase 2: Consultation

- a. Work with representatives of IMAP to develop advocacy positions and strategies:
- b. Facilitate a meeting with Officers to develop a suite of advocacy positions and canvass the optimal means by which to advocate to decision makers.
- c. Draft a "working" positions paper and advocacy strategy.
- d. Present the working documents to the IMAP Committee of CEOs and Mayors.
- e. Submit final positions paper and advocacy strategy.

Recommendation

6. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **approve** an increase in the budget for Action 5.3 from \$15,000 to \$30,000 to enable completion of this project.