Australian Government
Productivity Commission

Housing supply regulation

Interim report webinar transcript – 30 July 2026

Note: This transcript has been edited for clarity and brevity. Certain words have been modified or omitted, while maintaining the integrity of the original message.

Chair Danielle Wood

Welcome everyone. We will get started.

Welcome so much to this Productivity Commission webinar on our Housing Supply Regulation interim report.

I'm Danielle Wood, Productivity Commission Chair, one of the Commissioners leading this report. Also joined by Alison Roberts, who is the other Commissioner working on the report.

Thank you so much for coming along today.

I'd like to start by acknowledging that I'm joining today on the lands of the Wurundjeri people of the Kulin Nation and pay my respects to their Elders past and present and to all the Elders on the land from which you are joining us today.

So today we are going to give you the highlights package of the interim report that we have just put out on housing supply regulation.

The way that we propose to run it is that Alison and I will talk you through that for the next half an hour, 35 minutes or so.

We do have the Q&A function enabled in the webinar, so if you've got questions as we go, feel free to pop them in and if they're straightforward, one of the members of the team or Alison and I will try and jump in and answer those.

But we'll also have time at the end to go and talk more about any that haven't been answered through that process. So hopefully we can get to any questions that you might have through that process.

So let's get started.

The report, we were asked by the Commonwealth government in late March, I think it was, to inquire into the rules and regulations impacting housing supply with a kind of eye to trying to identify some broad reform directions.

So in scope in that terms of reference were land use controls particularly zoning and land release, anything to do with approvals processes, as well as housing enabling infrastructure.

On the other hand anything kind of on the demand side was out of scope for this review including things like tax settings, workforce issues and then other sort of cost drivers around workforce issues and building material costs.

Also out of scope was National Construction Code and that reflects the fact that there is another review process going on into that at the moment.

So because it was a relatively compressed time certainly by PC standards for an interim report, we haven't done new pieces of kind of modelling or empirical analysis at this stage, although as I will come to that is intended to be done in the next phase of this process.

What we have done for this report is to do a broad scale review of the literature, and there is a lot of it in the housing regulation area.

And as I'll come, I think increasingly empirical literature and understanding of the way in which different planning regulatory constraints are flowing through into supply and affordability. We also consulted really broadly, we've spoken to each of the state and territory governments, local governments, industry and a range of experts. And those latter two groups we held round table discussions with.

We received 100 submissions and 14 brief comments, which is a function that we have on our website to allow people to participate in our inquiries that might not necessarily want to write a full submission.

And you know, what we found I think was a really high standard of those submissions and interactions that we've had. I think it reflects the fact that housing is very much a topic that that a lot of people are doing a lot of thinking on right now.

And the reason why is not really news to anyone. Unaffordable housing sits at the heart of so many of our economic and social challenges as a nation. We present various statistics in the report about the affordability challenge.

We know that it is increasingly hard for people to afford to buy a home and we have the, you know, the statistic around the deposit hurdle. It now takes an average of 11 years to save for a deposit on a median income, more than 13 years in Sydney and that is up from 8 years just a decade ago.

So it is becoming increasingly hard to get into the market. We know if people do manage to get in and they take out an average size mortgage, they'll be paying more in repayments than at any point in in history.

And so we see this flow through obviously to much lower home ownership rates for younger Australians. Increasingly, we also see challenges in the rental market as well and rental affordability and prices are looming large in this discussion as well.

So that is the broad why. As I've inferred before, I think we're really starting to see a lot more literature and understanding of the link between the affordability challenge and the supply challenge.

And there are a number of great papers that we talk about in our work that use real world case studies of planning and zoning changes to try and assess the impact that that it's had on supply and ultimately on affordability.

One example that's been written about very broadly is the Auckland case study upzoning supported across 75% of the Auckland land area. And various studies have suggested that that not just resulted in high levels of supply and particularly things like in townhouses and low-rise apartment buildings, but also a reduction in prices and rents of around 20% compared to where they would be otherwise.

So we think this is a really important lever in the housing price challenge. We of course are focusing then on the kind of broad regulatory environment and how can we translate that to a supply uplift.

Probably worth saying at the outset, we are not a ‘just let the market rip’ housing group and I don't think anyone is suggesting that.

Of course regulation has a really important role to play here. We need to ensure that houses are safe and reasonable quality and liveable. And we also appreciate, you know, a lot of the regulation exists because there are some market failures here, externalities, you know, what I build on my block can have broader implications for the neighbourhood in terms of infrastructure use, in terms of amenities.

And there are some pretty significant information asymmetries as well. A lot of the safety or other features may not be very visible to prospective residents. So we expect that governments provide a minimum standard.

On the other hand, you know, it is clear to us and as I said, coming through very much in the research, that regulation is limiting housing supply in a lot of ways, both through broad scale restrictions on capacity to develop, through complex and slow approvals processes, which can both slow down building and make it less feasible to build.

And just through kind of tying up processes in knots through thickets and rules and requirements, particularly where they're conflicting.

And Alison will talk a little bit more about that.

One of the things we were asked to do in the review is to come up with a set of best practice principles. And I know there is a lot in a lot of people in the planning world that think a lot about this issue and these challenges.

We set an overarching objective that when working well, a housing planning and regulatory system should enable enough housing to meet people's needs in the places where it delivers the greatest net benefit for community.

So we really focused on trying to, build the houses in those areas where people want to live.

Obviously, it's balancing economic, social, cultural, environmental considerations and giving weight to the interests of current and future residents.

And you know, I think a criticism that has emerged is, probably we just haven't thought enough about that future resident piece when we've set up our planning rules over time. And that's created some of the affordability challenges we see today.

So the 4 best practice principles that we advocate for underneath that are: adopting a build mindset. So a shift from no, unless you can meet all these criteria to we want to say yes to buildings as long as certain pieces are satisfied.

Only regulate when necessary. And you know, as I'll come to in a moment, that includes, maybe not setting regulations on things that are very visible to people where they can make clear choices.

Coordination with infrastructure: very big theme, particularly for greenfield developments. And, and Alison will talk more about what that looks like.

And simplicity always an important goal in any regulatory process. But I think people clearly kind of calling out for a process that is easier to navigate.

So what we'll do now is go through each of the three broad reform areas and talk about some of our high-level reform directions, starting with land use regulation.

The kind of top-level conclusion is that poorly targeted land use controls are restricting supply.

What we found across the board is land use controls, you know, restrict whether you can build as well as the commercial feasibility of development.

And I think probably a big theme of the consultation and early work is really the way in which these controls overlap and intersect so that even where you might have changes to residential zoning rules, for example, if there aren't enabling changes to lot sizes and floor space ratios and all the other bits that move with it, it can still constrain development.

Also, a big theme about trying to target changes where things are most commercially feasible to develop. And I'll talk about that in a second and the importance of coordination and strategic planning with infrastructure and Alison will touch on that.

So a really common or important theme that came up a lot within our state and territory consultations and other consultations is the importance of focusing on feasible capacity.

We all know there's a lot of zoned capacity sitting out there already, but of course things are only going to get built where they are commercially feasible.

So two things really that that play into that.

One is the whole set of other planning restrictions can impact on feasibility and that's why we focus on enabling reforms as well as big ticket reforms.

And really the importance of trying to focus reforms in those areas where it is most commercially feasible to build. And something that we're planning for our final report is to try and prioritise reforms based on the potential uplift to commercially feasible capacity.

So moving now to talking about our reform areas, the areas that we have identified as potential priority reforms. And this is an interim report, so we are setting this up absolutely for feedback from people. So really interested to hear people's reactions.

But the areas that we think might be the most significant in supporting an uplifting potential supply, broad scale upzoning, similar to the Auckland example, allowing 3-storey developments.

So townhouses, low rise apartments across most residential land unless subject to heritage or other control, which we'll talk about in a second.

Supporting mid- and high-rise apartments in high demand areas near transport capacity. This is going on in a lot of places already and we think it's a lever that can be more broadly used.

Reducing or minimum reducing or removing minimum lot size requirements. And a very nice study came out just a couple of days before our report looking at experience in Campbelltown, in Adelaide where they had done this. And, and they did see a, a big uplift in approvals, particularly for townhouses and row houses. And that sort of gentle density through changes and minimum lot size requirements.

And allowing housing in commercial zones unless there's good environmental or otherwise reasons for doing that. And this is similar to what's being done in Victoria through the mixed-use zones.

As I said, we think it's important that those reforms be accompanied by enabling reforms, otherwise they won't leverage the potential uplift in feasible capacity.

Some things we're putting on the table, looking more broadly at heritage, I think we all appreciate why we have heritage restrictions and the sort of broader social and cultural benefits of heritage.

But what we did find is heritage protections being used in a very blanket way across our cities. And we have a stat in the report, there's 50 suburbs in in Sydney where more than 50% of the houses are covered by heritage restrictions. And so, you know, much more the targeted cost benefit around heritage. Ditto with neighbourhood character restrictions.

Also removing restrictions on housing types, typologies, these tend to be able to be managed through other restrictions.

We heard stories of, you know, areas, some council areas zoned for medium density, but you're not able to build apartment blocks because of requirements that that all dwellings have to touch the ground.

As I said before, reducing regulations around things that are very visible to people, where they can make fair trade-offs.

Things around, you know, minimum dwelling or bedroom sizes, balcony sizes, storage requirements, you know, obviously things that are nice to have that people may be willing to trade those off for a more affordable place to live.

Similarly, car parking requirements, we know that they are adding a lot to the cost of builds. We know that a lot of them are not actually being used. There are of course potential spillovers with off street parking, but at least in areas where there is good transport connections, we would consider trying to reduce those requirements.

So that is the sort of set of interim reform directions that we have come up with.

We do think there is big potential to increase feasible supply through those, and we'll be doing more work and testing of those following the interim report.

I'll now hand to Alison who's going to talk us through approvals and infrastructure.

Commissioner Alison Roberts

Thanks so much, Dani and hello everyone.

I'll just take us on to the next area.

So, our second of our reform areas is focused on reducing the burden of the approvals process.

Because even if we make the changes that Dani suggested on land use controls, what we don't want to have is then the approvals process coming in and grinding everything to a halt or at least reducing what is feasible as well.

So we know that the approvals process is more than just putting in an application. There are several stages and this adds to making the process expensive. There's holding costs of the land while not being able to build, there's consultant costs for the various referrals and administrative costs.

And these will, these will add up to sometimes reducing feasibility as well or choosing people to abandon development altogether.

So as you can see from that first phase in the chart, there's often referrals for technical or consultant reports required. And these can add to time and delay. In the course of our inquiry, we heard about a variety of different development types, including one approval for a subdivision in a council area. It was just two dwellings, but even that required 30 different reports and plans totalling 60 attached documents.

And so you can imagine the kind of time and cost that that would take. And there's been work done. One study showed that adding an extra year to that pre-construction period, which is the sort of delay you might expect from something like this, reduced feasibility by 2% for mid-rise apartments in Sydney, and that was in 2023.

So, it's not just apartments that we heard about bigger greenfield developments on urban fringes.

We had one example of a developer being told by a council that they needed to build a road over a desalination pipe-track, but then told by another arm of the government that they needed to take out a warranty to protect against damage against that pipe and that was going to cost $100 million dollars.

So, in order to resolve the issue and commence building, it took nearly two years.

And this is an issue even for those of us, any of any of you who've tried to renovate or been fortunate enough to be able to have a place to build a block, to build on even smaller developments can be faced with these challenges.

Another example we were given was of the council requirements on native planting, then conflicting with advice from the local fire authority saying, well no, you've got to have a cleared area. And the challenge there was there's no clear path for who is responsible for resolving that. And so that takes time and again adds to the overall cost of the project.

So not only are there all these stages to work through, but there's also the issue that we observed of inconsistency between councils even within the same states, and then again between the states and territories.

There's also a challenge when it comes to discretionary rules and, and some of the examples in this space you might have seen when we released the report. So, examples talking about the architectural rhythm of the street or 'don't try to be clever with designs'.

Now these are all things that create uncertainty because you don't know what the ruling is going to be.

The other challenge that's been raised is around how some more rigid processes or traditional construction methodology approaches can discourage innovation.

So, in areas where we might want to see increased use of innovation through prefabrication or offsite construction, the standard approvals processes don't readily facilitate this or support it. And these can then add uncertainty and increased costs. It can create challenges of scaling these sorts of approaches. And there are also issues in accessing finance because the build process doesn't follow the more traditional methods.

And this can make people's people can be delayed getting into housing. And all of that comes with cost. We're pleased to see some steps are being taken in this regard to make approvals processes clearer for modular and, and, and prefab housing.

So in this area of approvals, what we say should be done.

And again, as Dani said, we're keen to have feedback on this.

So our reform directions in this area are focused on ensuring that approvals are simple and predictable. And that is by governments resolving some of the trade-offs early through better strategic planning. So, this will help reduce that burden on those who are applying for the development approval.

This means that the government, when they are identifying an area for housing uplift, they can do the planning across the whole area, so developers will already know what is and what isn't allowed out on each lot.

And that means getting those reports upfront. So the bushfire, the flood, the biodiversity reports and also mapping out infrastructure connections, which I'll come to.

And we know this sort of approach can be done. We've included in this in the report a case study be of how in a Sydney growth centre, government strategic planning and coordination of referrals with that clear sequencing made the approvals process much more predictable and efficient.

And then we've identified 3 other reform directions to move approvals towards quicker tiered assessments based on risk.

So, we say here that more simple developments should be assessed through fast-track pathways and these pathways can involve assessment against codified rules.

And importantly where developments narrowly fail to fully comply with what is what is assessable under these, having hybrid assessment options available to them.

We know that most states and territories are working towards a version of this or already have something in place. In New South Wales, for example, more than 40% of approvals for new homes now go through their Complying Development Certificate fast-track pathway, and that provides approvals within 20 days, which is much faster than what I'd outlined before.

Then bigger or more complex developments need to be approved at the state level. So, state significant pathways should have really transparent criteria for inclusion so that people know what the decisions are going to be based on and clearly also who has that decision-making power where there are things to resolve.

And then there are some important enabling reforms to both processes, and that's to have state coordination of referrals using coordination bodies, and these can make better use of AI and other technologies.

We heard about these sorts of processes working well with Queensland State Assessment and Referral Agency or SARA, and that seems to be improving outcomes for people who've interacted with that.

So, moving on to our next reform area, which is delivering housing-enabling infrastructure, it will come as no surprise that this can be a major constraint on quickly delivering new housing because we know that if we release or if new land or upzoned land is released without accompanying infrastructure, that just means more housing on paper. So, the number of homes that can be built but not completed homes if the feasibility isn't there, as Dani outlined.

So often, infrastructure to support housing isn't delayed by anyone single factor, so it can reflect poor planning for infrastructure that doesn't identify housing needs at the time that it's being planned and it doesn't also identify what is required to deliver supporting infrastructure in a timely way.

There's issues of a lack of coordination or a fragmentation of responsibilities between different parties that are involved in the housing provision and the infrastructure provision. And this this can result in a lack of accountability and people not knowing where to go to have things resolved.

Then there can be sequencing issues when funding or planning for infrastructure is reactive to new housing development rather than planned upfront, or when upzoning is not conducted to coincide with the timing of the infrastructure.

And then as I mentioned, the lack of transparency so that developers find out late in the process what is required and it reduces also contestability.

And as you can see on the slide, this can leave lots that have been approved for development unable to actually be developed due to the lack of critical enabling infrastructure.

So, in our report, we've identified 6 supporting principles to guide governments towards best practice delivery of housing enabling infrastructure. And our reform directions reflect these.

So, these are that they should be simple, certain, transparent, consistent, timely and efficient. And I'll talk about how they are applied.

So, our first two reform directions in this area seek to improve housing enabling infrastructure planning. We say here that state, territory and local governments can better coordinate their approaches to strategic planning for infrastructure with their housing objectives by firstly documenting how infrastructure planning is supporting those housing objectives and any interdependencies with other parties such as the infrastructure service providers.

Planning documents need to be kept current. We've seen and heard of examples of where outdated infrastructure plans can be, sorry, and housing plans are not current, can challenge development planning.

And there should be, and this is, this is an important one, consistent approaches across local governments. We, we heard of an example of neighbouring councils in Queensland with 44 variations literally their bordering one another and that can create a lot of challenges and delay things.

Governments can also improve sequencing of infrastructure with new housing by ensuring that the rezoning and the infrastructure planning counts for the lead times of each of them and developing an accountability framework, so it's clear who has responsibility for each level of government and, and the various parties involved, including the infrastructure providers.

So, we know that funding infrastructure, these are often big things, transport, water connections, sewage, power is expensive and it can be challenging. And this was raised to us by both local governments and developers. And it's a growing cost as well.

We've, heard from a survey of local governments that identified that 80% of councils said they couldn't cover some of the costs of infrastructure expenses and 40% said they'd reduced new infrastructure projects due to a lack of funding. The other feedback is also from developers around not knowing the required costs upfront as well.

Now in principle, developers being asked for contributions towards infrastructure should have minimal impacts on the feasibility and the house prices at the end.

And this is because when they’re known, upfront and transparent as we say they ought to be in the principles, the developers should be able to deduct the contribution from what they're willing to pay for the land.

But that's in theory. In practice, we did hear that both the size of the contribution and it's timing and when it's levied, as well as that lack of transparent, creates uncertainty and risk, which then can affect feasibility and whether the homes get built or whether fewer homes get built.

So, in this space, we've identified a further 2 reform directions to better align the contributions with the supporting principles, and we're seeking feedback on these also.

So, the first is ensuring that developer contributions reflect the accurate cost of providing infrastructure. So here, we set out principles for when state, territory and local governments should use developer contributions to pay for infrastructure.

So when a development creates the need for it or will use it, and whether that should be apportioned based on multiple developments or who is going to make use of it beyond the development residence.

We also think that these governments should move their developer contribution frameworks towards that best practice. And that can be done by using upfront estimates of contributions prior to land release and online charge estimation tools. So that will allow people to really clearly see what they're going to be up for.

The other part is to allow more flexibility in allowing payments to be either staged or paid later in the development process. Again, here we talk about consistency, so ensuring there's a consistent approach across local governments in how the charges are administered so that it doesn't vary, bundling contributions where possible. And again, adopting a really transparent and central reporting approach to how funds are collected and progress reports on how those funds are being used towards infrastructure delivery.

I'm now going to hand back to Dani to talk about how these reforms fit together and how we prioritised them and the next steps in terms of moving from our interim to final report.

Chair Danielle Wood

Thank you.

We were, we were asked in the terms of reference to sort of prioritise between these different areas. And really based on the feedback that we've had through the inquiry, we've suggested that the land use control reforms are probably the most significant in terms of boosting potential supply, but really important that they're coordinated with housing enabling infrastructure, which was a very another strong theme.

We think approvals processes, more rational developer contributions, are also important, but alone are unlikely to yield the sort of increases in housing supply that that we need over time.

So, from here the next phase, we are asked in the terms of reference to assess the reforms that states and territories are doing against best practice and the impact on housing supply.

I mean, in our initial conversations, we've been really buoyed by the amount of work that is going on within different states and territories and also local councils on some of these issues.

And there was a question actually from Tim Paul that came in on this about whether we're going to sort of identify exemplary jurisdictions.

We do have some case studies in the report that sort of point to things that have been doing done well in particular places, but we'll be able to build that out through this next phase.

We're also looking to quantify the benefits of recommended reforms, which is really that translation into feasible capacity that I was talking about before, as well as pushing further into implementation.

And just so you have a sense of what that looks like. We now have submissions open for comments on the interim report. So, anyone that has thoughts, feedback, further suggestions on anything that is there, we would really welcome those.

They are open going to say till the end of September, hopefully I have that right.

We are planning a survey of developers, and what we're trying to do there is trying to understand the pain points in the approvals process to make further recommendations on that front.

And all of that is building to the release of a final report in March.

So, thank you everyone for your feedback and engagement to date. If you've been involved, thank you for coming along to hear it. And we look forward to continuing to engage with you.

Maybe we should tackle some of the questions now.

Q&A segment

Tim, I think I've already tackled that one and Reg Wade has a couple of different questions.

So Reg, on the question about whether there's an experienced planner or planning experts on the team.

The answer to that is no. And this is common for the PC. We do inquiries into a broad range of areas. So, we are experienced in code switching between different policy areas.

What I would say is we had really good engagement from Planning Institute came along to our round table and we're fantastic. They've put in a submission. We had a number of submissions from town planning consultancies and obviously met with some local governments including planners as well. And we welcome continuing to engage with the planning community.

And there's the other question Reg has asked is around reconciling the infrastructure capacity question with the broad upzoning.

Really important question. And I think, you know, I didn't go into it, but in the Auckland example, they did a lot of that work upfront sort of testing the capacity for this. And so that that sort of, I use the figure 75% was upzoned and that was based on the areas where it was most appropriate giving existing infrastructure. But I suspect we'll talk a little bit more about that interaction for the final report.

Commissioner Alison Roberts

Yeah, there's quite a few questions I think on developer contributions, and I guess as Dani said, we'll be looking at that for the final. So part of what we were asked to do at this initial stage was to set out the best practice principles and we will be assessing states and territories. That's the next task in front of us to assess performance in across all of those areas.

So some states and territories where they are already doing and are already acting in accordance with those best practice principles in certain areas, we'll absolutely acknowledge that and identify where there are other areas through consultation as well as data. So, yes, that will be a feature of our, of our final report.

Chair Danielle Wood

There is another question about whether we will support making motorbike riders exempt from speeding tickets to reduce the need from parking costs.

I suspect that's a broader cost benefit equation that needs to be thought about, Andy.

But you know, more generally, I think there's really interesting questions around active transport, an alternative to car use in, in some of our suburbs.

But I think that will be a little bit beyond the scope of where we'll be going in this one.

So I think we have answered all the questions I can see.

Am I missing any Alison?

Commissioner Alison Roberts

There's one about many parts of the city's the costs don't stack up due to construction costs for this resale value and has to become more unaffordable for it to be viable for developers. How can deregulating the planning system address this where there's already significant and generous capacity? So that is from Camille.

So I guess it's part of what we're looking at is the multi parts. So it's all of the bits. It's the parts that that Dani talked about at the start about how the land is able to be used and then trying to remove the things that come in and chip away at that viability. So whether it's that there is generous capacity available, but then there's an overlay of heritage or there are restrictions on block sizes or that you can't subdivide or there's other rules.

And then equally, that the approved rules process doesn't become so slow and burdensome that the cost of the development because of how long it's going to take doesn't stack up. So equally doing the upfront planning with the infrastructure costs so there are no surprise costs of some of the examples that are that I outlined.

So that's the sort of thing that we will be looking in further detail at and also doing some work on in between now and when we release our final report in March next year.

Chair Danielle Wood

Great. So, thank you everyone for keeping them coming in.

James McClean has asked a couple, so one around the Victorian infrastructure contribution system. And as Alison said, we will be picking up things that are already being done and we've already heard some of this from the different state governments for the final report.

We're surveying developers largely to be able to try and get a kind of consistent data set and a sense of the pain points.

But we will absolutely be continuing to engage with, with local governments. We weren't proposing to do that via survey, but we absolutely we'll continue to meet with local governments, with the Local Government Association and, and we'll think more about perhaps structured ways to, to give people across the spectrum of local government a chance to input into the process.

Commissioner Alison Roberts

There's a question, sorry, I think I just lost it about the, the Minns government announcement yesterday. I think it's very aligned with the sorts of things we've recommended. And it came out this the day after the Productivity and Equality Commission in New South Wales had released a report also looking at housing feasibility. So that's the sort of thing that we'll be looking at.

And I do note there was another comment, I think it's my, my screen's refreshed, but there was another comment about what about things that haven't flowed through yet.

So, we'll be taking a backward look in terms of performance against targets and also but against the best practice principles. So where reforms have just been implemented that are consistent with that, obviously we'll be acknowledging that.

And then I did see another question about modelling: what would the PC hypothese is possible?

So that's some of the work that we'll be doing between now and final about what these changes could, could potentially deliver.

Chair Danielle Wood

I'm sorry, it's hard to keep up with them all as they come in.

Steve has got a question around viability from the perspective of different development models built to sell versus built to rent.

Interesting. I mean we had, I mean, as I said, we're thinking of doing a kind of a standard cost stack to look at kind of these questions of feasibility. I haven't thought much about how that might look somewhat different across those models.

Obviously build to sell is still by and far the most common model so that would probably be our default, but happy to do some more thinking if you think we might be missing something just focusing on the build to sell side.

Commissioner Alison Roberts

Sorry, I'm also scrolling through.

Yeah, there there's, there's a theme around looking at benefits of regulations as well as the cost. So and the costs of removing planning controls as well as the benefits. I think it was the question. Sorry, my screen’s just refreshed.

So we will obviously in our consultations with states and territories where they have made those decisions, we will obviously be able to get input from states and territories on those sorts of costs and what that what that modelling looks like as well.

Chair Danielle Wood

Question another one from Reg around how much feasible development capacity is enough. And that that actually sort of ties in with the NSW announcement yesterday around 30 years of feasible capacity local governments.

I think we are, we, we won't be answering that question specifically so much as kind of which are the reforms that would give you the biggest uplift in feasible capacity, which may be then up to governments to kind of piece together the, the reforms that will get them to the, the levels that they are looking at.

He's also asked about other constraints to housing development. And that's, you know, a really important question.

As I said at the start, it's not, it sort of sits outside terms of reference. We think we can do a lot through the planning approvals, infrastructure levers, but it's not everything and we're certainly not claiming that we will pick up all of those constraints. But you know those are the things that we've been asked to focus on for this particular inquiry.

But there should absolutely be, continue to be more work on those other things which also flow through into feasibility and capacity to deliver supply.

Commissioner Alison Roberts

There's a question on capped contributions, which is obviously the case in New South Wales and you'll note in our principles, we don't talk about a cab as one of the principles. So came to hear thoughts obviously in submissions on that as well. But that doesn't, that's that hasn't formed part of what we've suggested should be the approach.

Chair Danielle Wood

I think we're at time, I'll very quickly just jump in on Kristal Burry's because she's at the top of the list that I have. She questioned the sort of distributional impacts of opening up choice to purchase smaller apartments and left with negative impacts of less space, lower quality housing.

I mean, my view Kristal is we have to be really clear about the counterfactual here. You know, at the moment, you know, there's a lot of those people can't afford housing at all and they're forced to make other trade-offs, including on location.

We also know, you know, we had an example in the report of a apartment which had won architectural design competitions that was actually too small to meet the design guide recommendations.

So, it doesn't necessarily always translate into poor lifestyle considerations, but you know, genuinely when you have an affordability crisis, allowing people to have a set of more affordable options and, and to make those trade-offs, you know, I would say it's a good thing overall.

Thank you hugely.

I don't think we anticipated anywhere near that amount of questions and we're really appreciative of the level of engagement and you know, so many thoughtful comments and things for us to think about.

As I said, submissions on the report open. We also have a quick comment function on our website.

So if there's anything that you have sort of put up here that you would like us to think about or be aware of, please feel free to use that function as well.

Thank you hugely for your interest and we look forward to staying engaged on the road to the final.

Chair Alison Roberts

Thanks everyone.

END