Green Star Communities

Stage 1

CONSULTATION REPORT

October 2010

green building council australia

greenstar

Summary

On Monday 22nd February 2010 the Draft Green Star Communities National Framework was released for stakeholder comment. The draft framework represented the GBCA's progress on the Green Star Communities project and is the first in a two stage process that will result in the development of a rating tool and certification scheme for communities demonstrating best practice sustainability attributes.

Stakeholder feedback was sought over a five month period (March - July 2010) via a range of feedback mechanisms ranging from structured workshops to an online discussion forum. The feedback was collated and reviewed by the project's Technical Reference and Steering Committees. The draft framework was subsequently refined and reviewed by stakeholder committees established to oversee the progress of Stage 1.

During the consultation process there more than 180 organisations consulted in an active manner, either by way of workshop participation, briefings or stakeholder meetings. Also, it is anticipated that a large number of stakeholders passively engaged through the GBCA website, downloading the draft document and reading the numerous articles published via media and industry publications.

Key issues identified during the consultation process included:

- General agreement that the five principles presented are satisfactory in their coverage of sustainable community issues.
- The suggestion of combining the Liveability and Place Making principles due to their lack of differentiation.
- The suggestion that Governance is the 'glue' that binds all the principles together and should be integrated, rather than being a separate principle.
- In Economic: resilience rather than prosperity, include reference to affordability, consider business synergies and supply chain opportunities, economic effectiveness rather than efficiency.
- In Environment: Cultural heritage should be moved to another principle, restorative rather than enhancing, establish business case for green infrastructure systems, encourage environmental education and awareness.
- In Place Making: 'attractive' is too subjective, place strengthening rather than place making, places for economic development, densities for all family types, place making and liveability overlap.
- In Liveability: socio-economic diversity needs to be represented, communities need to be resilient and adaptable, employment helps liveability, where's the emotion, joy, happiness, tolerance and vibrancy?
- In Governance: needs to be outcomes focussed, different for different stages and different people, legacy is important, its future generations and stakeholders, implementation is key.

These and other issues raised during the Stage 1 consultation phase are discussed further in this report.

1 Introduction

This consultation report presents the results of the consultation process associated with the GBCA's Green Star Communities Stage 1 draft framework. The consultation process was designed to engage with a range of stakeholders on a number of levels. This process was informed by the consultation objectives listed below.

2 Consultation Objectives

There were three key objectives the GBCA identified for the consultation process, which were to:

1. Raise awareness of the Green Star Communities Project;
2. Communicate the purpose, scope and content of the draft framework and seek feedback; and
3. Seek feedback from Government and industry on what they need in a sustainable communities rating tool.

3 Stakeholders

The consultation process was designed to ensure maximum engagement with a range of stakeholders whose feedback on the draft framework was considered important and highly valuable. The key stakeholder groups targeted and their interests are summarised below.

Stakeholder Group	Interests Represented
Commonwealth Government	The Commonwealth Government has established a range of urban planning initiatives for our major cities and continues to develop public policy across a range of sustainability issues relevant to Australia
State Government	State Governments throughout Australia establish and fund major regional planning initiatives across growth management, infrastructure delivery, housing, climate change and transport issues.
Local Government	Local authorities are responsible for planning our local communities, neighbourhoods and many precincts and places. They are responsible for guiding and approving development at a city and community level.
Industry Practitioners	The private sector is often responsible for the planning, design, research, funding, construction and maintenance of our communities. Developers, consultants, researchers and financial institutions play a critical role in the evolution of our communities.
Representative Bodies	There are a range of peak national bodies that represent the interests of both public and private sector members across the disciplines of architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, planning, environmental practitioners, social services providers and engineering. These bodies are often responsible for setting professional standards, undertaking research and establishing best practice standards
Steering Committee and Technical Reference Committee for the Green Star Communities Draft Framework	The two committees established to help guide and draft the framework were selected to represent a range of interests. The committee's are made up of stakeholders from all of the above areas and represent a range of interests.

4 Consultation Activities

Based on the interests of the above stakeholders, a range of activities were undertaken to meet the consultation objectives. The focus was to engage actively and directly with stakeholders through workshops, meetings and briefings, however a dedicated project website was also established to enable people to passively participate and provide feedback. An overview of these activities is provided below:

- **Stakeholder workshops:** a structured three (3) hour workshop was delivered in Melbourne, Adelaide, Perth, Sydney Canberra and Brisbane. Between 15 and 40 participants were invited to each workshop to provide feedback on the draft framework and present ideas on what they would like to see in the proposed Green Star Communities rating tool.
- **Briefings:** formal briefings were provided to individuals and groups from interested organisations (industry bodies, government and private sector companies). These briefings ranged from individuals through to large groups participating in industry conferences and seminars. Copies of the framework were provided (via hard copy, soft copy or on the website) and stakeholders encouraged to provide feedback. Letters were also sent to key political representatives briefing them on the project and inviting their participation.
- **Meetings:** meetings with interested stakeholders were held throughout Australia with those who expressed interest in knowing more about the draft framework and wanted to influence the proposed tool. Meetings were held with individuals and groups face to face and via teleconference.
- **Project website:** a dedicated microsite was established for the Green Star Communities project and included regular updates of the Stage 1 process, articles, an online discussion forum and documents for downloading.
- **Technical Reference Committee (TRC):** the TRC represented a wide range of stakeholders and assisted in guiding the technical of the Stage 1 framework. They were also active in scoping the framework, its objectives and aspirations. The organisations represented by the TRC also provided feedback on the draft framework.
- **Steering Committee (SC):** the SC represented a number of national interests and organisations and primarily provided high level input from a national perspective of government and industry. The SC provided a review function, assessing the output of the TRC and making recommendations to the GBCA on the direction of the Stage 1 framework.

Stakeholder Workshops

Stakeholder workshops were held in the following cities:

- Melbourne – Wednesday 24th February
- Adelaide – Friday 12th March
- Perth – Tuesday 16th March
- Sydney – Wednesday 24th March
- Canberra – Wednesday 14th April
- Brisbane – Tuesday 20th April

The organisations represented at these workshops are indicated in **Appendix A**.

Briefings

Briefings were undertaken in large and small group formats as well as one-on-one briefings with political advisors and other industry stakeholders. A standard presentation was used for most briefings and presentations which outlined the project background, project objectives, process and timeframes for Stage 1 and 2 as well as the key components of the draft framework. The organisations represented at these briefings are indicated in Appendix A.

Letters were also sent to a range of State Government political representatives managing portfolios that are considered relevant to the Green Star Communities project. These stakeholders were invited to become involved in the project, and generally responded to the GBCA expressing their support and interest to be updated on progress. The representatives who received letters are indicated in Appendix A.

Meetings

Meetings were held with approximately 40 organisations throughout the consultation phase. Meetings provided an opportunity for stakeholders to understand the background to the project, the methodology and what the draft framework seeks to achieve. These meetings were usually with 1-2 representatives from the organisations which enabled detailed discussion and questions and answers. The organisations who accepted a meeting request are indicated in Appendix A.

Project Microsite

The project microsite went 'live' when the draft framework was released at the Green Cities 2010 conference. This site is dedicated to information about the project, and includes regular project updates, downloadable and printable versions of the draft framework, e-newsletters and case studies of projects that have applied the draft principles. At the time of writing this report over 450 visits had been made to the microsite and 230 downloads were made of the draft framework document.

A discussion forum was linked to the site and contained a range of questions covering a range of issues relating to the framework and the proposed tool. To date there has been little feedback through this medium, and its effectiveness will be reviewed at the end of Stage 1.

5 Consultation Outcomes

The table in Appendix A identifies the organisations consulted and how they were engaged during the consultation process. These organisations attended workshops, received a project briefing or requested a meeting to learn more about the project. All stakeholders were invited and encouraged to review and comment on the draft framework.

The key stages of the consultation process and steps in moving from a draft framework to a final framework are summarised in **Figure 1** overleaf.

Figure 1: Key steps in the Stage 1 consultation process

Project Scoping (Nov 09)
TRC established. Six (6) meetings held (Nov 09 – July 10)
Steering Committee established. Three (3) meetings held (Jan 10 – July 10)
Draft framework prepared for industry consultation
Draft framework released Feb 10
Stakeholder consultation activities (Feb 10 –July 10). Activities included: National workshops x 6 Meeting + briefings x 65 Conferences + seminars x 9 Written submissions x 12
Feedback assessed by GBCA, reviewed by TRC and responses identified (June 10)
Framework assessed by GBCA, reviewed by TRC and responses identified (June 10)
Final stakeholder comments incorporated Into final framework document (July 10)

The detailed comments provided by the organisations consulted during the workshop activities are listed in **Appendix B**. The comments received by stakeholders generally fell into two categories; (1) comments relevant to the Stage 1 framework and (2) comments relevant to the Stage 2 tool development process. Appendix B allocates each comment to the relevant category. This categorisation was undertaken collaboratively with the TRC.

This consultation report responds to the Stage 1 comments only. A summary of the feedback comments relevant to the Stage 1 framework are provided below in italics. The feedback has been organised under 'General' and 'Principle' heading. The feedback and responses are provided in the following format:

It was suggested that.....

GBCA Response:

General

The principles must be glued together.

GBCA Response: This is an excellent comment and was partially reflected in the guidelines provided at the back of the draft framework document where steps for implementation were provided. The concept of integration between the principles has been further reinforced in the final framework in the introductory section of the document 'about this framework'. In this section of the final framework discussion id provided which relates to the importance of an integrated approach to applying the principles to projects and plans.

Dot points under the principles are broad, which is good.

GBCA Response: Agreed, the principles have been developed at a high level to enable future definition in the tool development stage.

Principle 1: Liveability

Liveable communities are also resilient and adaptable, to allow communities to evolve and grow over time.

GBCA Response: This issue is already addressed in the principle.

Lifestyle, education, universal access, tolerance, density, transport, socio-economic needs are issues that need to be in this principle or reflected in a stronger way.

GBCA Response: Many of these suggested comments were reviewed by the TRC and have been included in the final framework, including education, tolerance, density related issues, transport and socio-economic needs. Comments relating to lifestyle are partially reflected in the first dot point issue and the universal access issues being addressed in Principle 4 Design Excellence.

Engagement is a process and not an outcome; this should be reflected in Principle 1.

GBCA Response: This issue has been amended in Principle 1 to reflect its intent of community cohesion, diversity and tolerance. Principle 5 discusses engagement as a process in the context of governance and transparency.

Liveability and place making are seen as the same and should be combined.

GBCA Response: The TRC did not wish to combine the two as they are fundamentally different in their relevant issues and potential solutions. The final framework reflects the differences between these two principles more clearly with a range of changes. These include the renaming of Principle 4, minimising duplication of key concepts and being clearer in the wording.

Include private open space which can contribute to the liveability of a community.

GBCA Response: Both Principles 1 and 4 address this issue at a high level, and it is proposed that further detail would be considered as part of Stage 2.

Liveable communities must be connected and integrated with the natural environment.

GBCA Response: Whilst this issue may contribute to liveability, this issue is represented in Principle 3.

'Inclusive and Cohesive' should be used instead of 'Connected and Cohesive'.

GBCA Response: The final framework reflects this suggested change.

There should be more focus on health and fitness.

GBCA Response: Healthy communities and promoting healthy activities is reflected in this principle and will be further defined in Stage 2.

The needs of the community should be presented rather than assuming affordability of what the community wants.

GBCA Response: The issues underpinning Principle 1 that relate to this feedback have been refined in the final framework. The final framework reflects this issue under the new subheadings of 'providing diverse and affordable living' and 'building community adaptability'.

Engagement is repeated in Principle 5, is this duplication?

GBCA Response: The engagement issues identified in Principle 1 differ from those in Principle 5. The final framework now reflects in Principle 1 community inclusiveness and the importance of fostering cohesion, tolerance and respect under the heading of 'fostering inclusiveness and cohesiveness'.

Access to employment and affordability needs to be highlighted in this principle.

GBCA Response: Affordability is already addressed in this principle; however employment is not and is provided for in Principle 2.

What is the role of education?

GBCA Response: The inclusion of education within the five principles was considered important by the TRC and it was agreed by the TRC that 'education and learning' should be included in Principle 2.

Perhaps it should be 'affordability and diversity' rather than 'diverse and respectful'.

GBCA Response: The TRC agreed with this suggestion and the final framework has included a new heading 'providing diverse and affordable living'.

Resilience should be included within the 'resilient and adaptable' subheading.

GBCA Response: The TRC agreed that resilience was missing from the dot points under this sub heading, and concluded that the work resilience should be dropped from the subheading as the issues around adaptability adequately reflected the intent.

Economic Prosperity

Perhaps affordability should be highlighted here as well.

GBCA Response: Whilst affordability is strongly connected to economic prosperity, the TRC considered it more of a social issue than an economic one. It has thus remained in Principle 1 and we have not included it in Principle 2.

There should be more focus on long term economic prosperity.

GBCA Response: Whilst these words (long term economic prosperity) are specifically included in the principle, there are a number of other issues identified in the principle that support long term economic prosperity, such as education and learning, ongoing investment in sustainable business opportunities and providing new business opportunities to enhance innovation.

Get rid of words such as promote and encourage.

GBCA Response: These words are suitable for a visionary document that consists of national principles and the document has not changed to reflect the suggestion.

Needs a green jobs focus or is any economic development good?

GBCA Response: Establishing green infrastructure systems and jobs has been included in the final framework. This is also supported by a range of other issues that closely align with green jobs issues. This includes creating a diversity of jobs, enabling ethical and sustainable investment, encouraging business innovation, encouraging greater resource efficiency and investing in sustainable infrastructure.

Better representation of connectedness – transit in and to other precincts.

GBCA Response: This issue is addressed in Principle 4, however elements are provided in Principle 2 through the inclusion of issues relating to greater urban management and efficient infrastructure.

Creating economic resilience rather than prosperity.

GBCA Response: The suite of issues that have been identified for this principle collectively have the potential to build economic resilience in a community. Whilst the words 'economic resilience' have not specifically been used, the TRC believe the concept is well represented through the issues that already exist.

Change the last dot point to 'investing in infrastructure...' to read 'community management' rather than 'urban management'.

GBCA Response: Whilst this comment is valid, there are differences between the meanings of 'urban' and 'community'. Community picks up a diversity of issues which could relate to social, economic and environmental factors. This dot point specifically used the word 'urban' as the intend relates to major urban elements such as transport, communalisations and building related infrastructure which is more narrowly focussed than the broader idea of community. As such this dot point has not changed.

The last issue relating to efficiency needs to be clarified.

GBCA Response: This issue and the two dot points underneath it have been amended to better reflect the intent. It includes both efficiency and effectiveness and now includes specific reference to lifecycle approaches to resource use and reduces lifecycle costs.

What about business synergy opportunities.

GBCA Response: issues such as business synergy and industrial ecology are not specifically mentioned, but both concepts are embedded within the dot point issues throughout the principle, include reference to resource efficiency, effective management practices, investment in innovation and green infrastructure systems and business connectivity.

Education leads to economic prosperity, this should be included.

GBCA Response: Agreed, this has been reflected in the final framework with the inclusion of a new dot point relating to education and training.

Environmental Quality

Cultural and archaeological points should not be in this principle; it should potentially go under another principle.

GBCA Response: Agreed, cultural and archaeological resources has been moved in the design excellence principle, however reference to cultural heritage values remains in Principle 3 within the context of landscape and natural heritage values.

Biodiversity should be considered, as well as land contamination.

GBCA Response: Agreed, promoting biodiversity and reference to land contamination is now included within the first set of dot points.

Food production and security should be given more focus.

GBCA Response: The TRC agreed that this issue should be added to this principle and as such has been included in the final framework under the 'reducing ecological footprint' sub heading.

Reconcile materials and resource efficiency under the 'reducing footprint' heading.

GBCA Response: Agreed, this issue is now represented in the dot point relating to resource efficiency in a lifecycle approach.

Adapting isn't allowed for.

GBCA Response: This issue has been introduced into the adaptation sub heading in Principle 1, where there is reference made to adapting to environmental changes.

Communication and education should be a new dot point.

GBCA Response: Agreed, this issue has been introduced as the final dot point in this Principle.

Biomimicry and positive development language should be introduced into the framework.

GBCA Response: Frameworks and models such as biomimicry, positive development, one planet living and ecological footprint are widely supported as approaches to development and have not been identified specifically in the final framework given the diversity of these approaches. It is recommended that the TWG consider the reference to such approaches during the Stage 2 tool development process.

The word 'environmental quality' may not necessarily represent the full intent of the issues in this principle and should be reconsidered.

GBCA Response: Agreed, the TRC determined that 'environmental responsibility' was a more suitable description. Other options that were considered included balance, management, enhancement, outcomes and restoration.

Need to pick up the relationship with density.

GBCA Response: This is a very important issue and the TRC decided to incorporate it into the new 'effective planning' dot point in Principle 4. It was considered that Principle 4 was the most appropriate location for a reference to density, given that the impacts of density can be both positive and negative and are not restricted to environmental impacts.

Need to consider regional variations.

GBCA Response: This is an important point and will be addressed by the TWG during the Stage 2 tool development process.

What is the relationship of these issues with consumption and lifestyle ecofootprint and need to facilitate sustainable lifestyle choices.

GBCA Response: Agreed, these are important issues. The final framework has included additional dot points in this principle that relate to educating community and individuals about the collective impacts of consumption and resource savings. Additionally, Principle 5 has included additional dot points relating to sustainable culture and behaviour.

Where does scenic amenity fit in?

GBCA Response: Natural heritage values are discussed in the first dot point of this principle and contribute in part to landscape and scenic amenity. Principle 4 further discusses landscape assets and quality. Detailed issues relating to scenic value would be further considered by the TWG in the Stage 2 tool development process.

The dot point relating to emissions is too vague and should specifically mention greenhouse gas emissions reduction.

GBCA Response: Agreed, the final framework acknowledges the specific importance of greenhouse gas emissions reduction and has been amended to reflect this.

Place Making

The word 'attractive' should be reconsidered, too difficult to define.

GBCA Response: Agreed, this has been refined in the final framework and now is represented by the subheading 'creating desirable places'.

Need to balance spatial place making vs process place making.

GBCA Response: Agreed. The place making principle has been renamed 'design excellence', and includes a range of dot points that cover both spatial, outcome and process issues relevant to place making.

'Great' places is difficult to define and should be reworded.

GBCA Response: Agreed, the terminology 'great places' has been replaced with 'places for people', which more appropriately reflects the intent of the principle.

'More compact' is vague, more compact to what?

GBCA Response: Agreed, this terminology has been removed in the final framework and has been replaced with more appropriate wording relating to 'planning for considered density, mixed use and connectivity'.

Place making and liveability cross over significantly.

GBCA Response: This issue was also raised as part of the feedback on Principle 1. The place making terminology in Principle 4 has been replaced in the final framework with the heading 'design excellence', which reflects the broader planning and design intent. Revised subheadings within Principle 4 also provides a clearer definition between the two principles, thus reducing cross over and duplication.

Desirable, functional, distinct, vibrant, stimulating and memorable are important words not represented in this principle.

GBCA Response: Agreed, these are all important words that reflect the intent of the excellence in design principle. These words and concepts have been introduced into existing and new dot points within this principle in the final framework document.

Land use needs to be optimised for the present and future but not necessarily efficient, as this is too subjective.

GBCA Response: Agreed, this dot point has been amended in the final framework and is now included under the new subheading 'adopting effective planning practices'. Under this new subheading there are a series of issues addressed such as establishing integrated planning frameworks, planning for considered densities and land uses and establishing clear design outcomes.

Allow aging and growing older, universal access needs to be embedded in this principle along with cross cultural and diverse age groups.

GBCA Response: Principle 1 identifies issues relating to 'environments for all ages' which includes both internal and external environments. Principle 4 does include reference to providing flexibility and adaptability in planning and design. Therefore no specific reference has been made to universal access and is likely to be further considered by the TWG in the Stage 2 tool development process.

Urban Governance

Performance evaluation and feedback loops are important to governance.

GBCA Response: Agreed, the final framework incorporates a revised dot point that identifies systems for assessing performance and continually improving.

Need to align with engagement under Principle 1.

GBCA Response: The final framework includes refined dot points on engagement in both Principle 1 and 5. They have been amended to specifically relate to the relevant elements of engagement for building community vision and cohesion (Principle 1) and stakeholder ownership and capacity building (Principle 2).

The word 'urban' is not appropriate, suggested this principle be shortened to just 'governance'.

GBCA Response: Whilst the framework is not intended to necessarily restrict any particular community areas (ie. urban, peri urban, rural etc), the 'urban parts' of all of these areas was a focus area. The TRC and Steering Committee discussed this comment and length and the final framework has a revised title for Principle 5 – Demonstrating Visionary leadership and strong governance.

Governance should be embedded across all principles.

GBCA Response: Agreed in principle; however in practice this will be achieved through the definition of clear standards in the proposed tool and the associated support mechanisms provided by the GBCA to foster an integrated approach to applying the principles and the tool (eg. training and capacity building).

Good planning, shouldn't this subheading go into Principle 4.

GBCA Response: Agreed, the final framework has placed 'good planning' into Principle 4, however Principle 5 does have a revised group of dot points under the sub heading of 'implementation' which does respond to the issue of good planning in part.

Need to include 'adaptable' within the definition of governance.

GBCA Response: Agreed, adaptable governance structures are necessary to ensure appropriate arrangements are provided for each individual project. The final framework has amended the supporting statement/definition which underpins the Principle.

Delivering real outcomes is the fundamental issue, making sure responsibilities are clear and outcomes are assessed against objectives.

GBCA Response: Agreed, the final framework has additional dot points relating to the development of practically enforceable standards of ownership, accountability, delivery and feedback mechanisms.

Educational elements need to be incorporated.

GBCA Response: Agreed, the final framework incorporates dot points relating to awareness raising and providing education opportunities to enable more sustainable practices.

6 Next Steps

This consultation report provides an overview of the consultation activities and outcomes relating the Stage 1 Green Star Communities framework. The GBCA's commitment to industry and government engagement through Stage 2 of the project will continue, and a new program of consultation activities will be prepared in the coming months. The GBCA will maintain relevant information associated with the project on the Green Star Communities microsite, which also welcomes stakeholder feedback at anytime.

APPENDIX A – Stakeholder organisations consulted

It should be noted that many other organisations not listed here were invited to participate in activities and comment on the draft framework but were not available to participate or declined the offer.

Organisation	Engagement Activity		
	Workshop	Briefing	Meeting
AECOM	⊙		⊙
ACT Planning Authority	⊙		
Alpine Nurseries		⊙	
Australian Conservation Foundation			⊙
Australian Council of Social Services		⊙	
Australian Green Development Forum	⊙		
Australian Industry Group	⊙		
Australian Green Infrastructure Council	⊙		
Australian Institute of Architects		⊙	⊙
Australian Institute of Landscape Architects	⊙	⊙	⊙
Australian Jockey Club/Randwick Racecourse			⊙
Australian Local Government Association			⊙
Australian Unity		⊙	
Australian Sustainable Built Environment Council			⊙
Architectus	⊙		
Ark Resources	⊙		
Atterra Design		⊙	
Arup	⊙		
Aurecon			⊙
Bankstown City Council			⊙
Barangaroo Delivery Authority			⊙
Belmont City Council		⊙	
BioRegional (UK)		⊙	
BlueScope Steel			⊙
Brisbane City Council	⊙	⊙	⊙
Brookfield Multiplex			⊙
Built Environment Industry Innovation Council			⊙
Building Research Establishment (UK)			⊙
Built Ecology	⊙		
Built Environs	⊙		
Business Outlook and Evaluation	⊙		
Business Southbank	⊙		
Bicycle Victoria			⊙
Cameron Chisholm Nicol		⊙	
Canada Green Building Council		⊙	
Capital City Committee		⊙	
Cardno	⊙		
Caroline Pidcock Architects	⊙		

Organisation	Engagement Activity		
	Workshop	Briefing	Meeting
CBRE	⊙		
Cedarwoods	⊙		
Centre for Subtropical Design	⊙		
Chandler Consulting Services			⊙
Christina Harding Landscape Planning & Design		⊙	
CISCO		⊙	
City of Adelaide	⊙		
City of Hayford		⊙	
City of Joondalup			⊙
City of Melbourne			⊙
City of Onkaparinga	⊙		
City of Perth		⊙	
City of Stirling	⊙		
City of Sydney			⊙
City of Whittlesea	⊙		
City Smart		⊙	
Clinton Foundation			⊙
Clouston Associates	⊙		
COAG Reform Council			⊙
Coda Studio	⊙		
Commerce Queensland		⊙	
Committee for Melbourne			⊙
Consult Australia	⊙		
Context Landscape Design		⊙	
Coordinated Landscapes		⊙	
Council of Capital City Lord Mayors			⊙
Cox Rayner		⊙	
Creating Communities	⊙		
CSIRO	⊙		
Curtin University	⊙		
DBI Design	⊙		
Decisions X Design		⊙	
Deike Richards	⊙		
Delfin	⊙	⊙	⊙
DEM		⊙	
Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation (QLD)	⊙		
Department of Environment and Resource Management (QLD)	⊙		
Commonwealth Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and Arts			⊙
Department of Health (NSW)			⊙
Department of Health (VIC)			⊙
Department of Housing (WA)		⊙	
Department of Infrastructure and Planning (QLD)	⊙		⊙

Organisation	Engagement Activity		
	Workshop	Briefing	Meeting
Department of Innovation, Industry and Regional Development (VIC)		⊙	
Department of Planning (WA)			⊙
Department of Planning and Community Development (VIC)			⊙
Department of Planning and Local Government (SA)	⊙		⊙
Department of Planning (WA)			⊙
Department of Public Works (QLD)		⊙	
Department of Premier and Cabinet (S)A			⊙
Department of Premier and Cabinet (QLD)			⊙
Department of the Chief Minister (NT)		⊙	
East Perth Redevelopment Authority			⊙
EcoLateral	⊙		
Ecological Development Union International			⊙
ENERGEX	⊙		
Engineers Australia			⊙
Enviro Development	⊙		
Environmental Partnership		⊙	
FAHCSIA	⊙		
Fitzgerald Frisby Landscape Architecture			⊙
Flinders University		⊙	
Floth	⊙		
Frasers Property		⊙	⊙
GeoLINK		⊙	
GPT Group			⊙
Grattan Institute		⊙	
Griffith University			⊙
Grocon			⊙
Growth Areas Authority	⊙		⊙
Growth Management Queensland			⊙
GHD	⊙		⊙
Go Mango Architects	⊙		
Gold Coast City Council	⊙		
Group GSA	⊙		
Hassell	⊙	⊙	⊙
Hawaiian		⊙	
Heart Foundation		⊙	
Hornery Institute	⊙		⊙
Housing Affordability Programme (QLD)			⊙
Housing NSW			⊙
ICLEI			⊙
Infraplan	⊙		
Infrastructure Australia			⊙
Infrastructure Partnerships Australia			⊙
Insites	⊙		
James Cubitt Architects	⊙		

Organisation	Engagement Activity		
	Workshop	Briefing	Meeting
Jane Irwin Landscape Architecture		⊙	
Jensen Planning + Design		⊙	
Knox City Council			⊙
Knight Frank	⊙		
Ku-ring-gai Council		⊙	
LAB	⊙		
Landcom (NSW)			⊙
Land Management Corporation (SA)	⊙		
Landlink		⊙	
Landcorp (WA)	⊙		⊙
Lat 27	⊙		
La Trobe University		⊙	
Land Development Agency (ACT)			⊙
Leighton	⊙		
Lend Lease	⊙	⊙	⊙
Leo Jensen Consulting	⊙		⊙
Local Government Association of Queensland			⊙
Major Projects Victoria	⊙		⊙
Macquarie Bank			⊙
Macquarie University			⊙
McGregor + Coxall	⊙		⊙
MD Consultants	⊙		
MECU	⊙		
Meinhardt			⊙
Melbourne Water	⊙		
Midland Redevelopment Authority			⊙
Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability (QLD)		⊙	
Mirvac	⊙		⊙
Monash University		⊙	
Moreton Bay Regional Council		⊙	
Morphosis	⊙		
Multitech Solutions	⊙		
Municipal Association of Victoria			⊙
Murdoch University	⊙		
National Australia Bank		⊙	⊙
National Lifestyle Villages		⊙	
Norman Disney Young	⊙		⊙
Northrop	⊙		
NSW Office of Clean Energy	⊙		
NSW Premier's Council for Active Living			⊙
OCULUS		⊙	
Office of Economic Development (SA)	⊙		
Organica Engineering			⊙
Palladium Group	⊙		⊙
Parramatta City Council			⊙

Organisation	Engagement Activity		
	Workshop	Briefing	Meeting
Parsons Brinkerhoff	⊙		
Philips Marler		⊙	
Pidcock Architecture and Sustainability	⊙		
Planning Institute of Australia	⊙		⊙
Port of Brisbane			⊙
PPS		⊙	
Property Council Australia	⊙		⊙
Qld Government Architect	⊙		⊙
QLD Health	⊙		
QLD Office of Climate Change	⊙		
QLD Office of Clean Energy	⊙		⊙
Queensland University of Technology	⊙		
Residential Development Council			⊙
Riverview Group	⊙		
Rock Development Group			⊙
Rose Norton Lawyers	⊙		⊙
RPS Group	⊙		
Sarkissian Associates Planners			⊙
Satterly		⊙	
SA Water	⊙		
SBE	⊙		⊙
Site Image		⊙	
SKM	⊙	⊙	⊙
SMEC		⊙	
Southbank Corporation	⊙		⊙
South East Queensland Council of Mayors			⊙
Springfield Land Corporation			⊙
Stirling City Centre Alliance		⊙	
Stockland	⊙		⊙
Sturt Associates		⊙	
Sue Barnsley Design		⊙	
Sustainability Victoria			⊙
Sydney Harbour Foreshore			⊙
Sydney Olympic Park Authority			⊙
Syrinx	⊙		
Tamala Park Regional Council	⊙		
Thinc Projects		⊙	
Tompkin MDA		⊙	
Tract	⊙		⊙
Turf Design Studio		⊙	
Umbaco Landscape Architects		⊙	
University of Adelaide	⊙		⊙
University of Melbourne			⊙
University of South Australia			⊙
University of Western Australia			⊙

Organisation	Engagement Activity		
	Workshop	Briefing	Meeting
Urban Design Alliance			⊙
Urban Development Institute of Australia			⊙
Urban Insites	⊙		
Urban Land Development Authority (QLD)			⊙
Urbis			⊙
URS		⊙	
US Green Building Council		⊙	
Veolia	⊙		
Vicurban	⊙	⊙	⊙
Village Well	⊙		⊙
Waverely Council		⊙	
Western Australia Local Government Association			⊙
Western Australia Planning Commission		⊙	
Woodhead			⊙
WorleyParsons	⊙		

Briefing letters were sent to:

- The Hon Troy Buswell, Minister for Housing and Works Western Australia
- The Hon Tony Kelly, Minister for Planning New South Wales
- The Hon Stirling Hinchliffe, Minister for Infrastructure and Planning Queensland
- The Hon Simon Corbell, Minister for Environment, Climate Change and Water ACT
- The Hon Paul Holloway, Minister for Development and Planning South Australia
- Premier Mike Rann Department of Premier and Cabinet
- The Hon Justin Madden, Minister for Planning Victoria
- The Hon Gavin Jennings, Minister for Environment and Climate Change Victoria
- The Hon Michelle O'Byrne, Minister for Environment Tasmania
- The Hon Lisa Singh, Minister Assisting the Premier on Climate Change Tasmania
- The Hon Frank Sartor, Minister for Climate Change and the Environment New South Wales
- The Hon Kate Jones, Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability Queensland
- The Hon Karl Hampton, Minister for Natural Resources, Environment and Heritage Northern Territory
- The Hon Donna Faragher, Minister for Environment Western Australia
- The Hon John Day, Minister for Planning Western Australia
- The Hon Jay Weatherill, Minister for Environment and Conservation South Australia
- The Hon Gerald McCarthy, Minister for Lands and Planning Northern Territory
- The Hon David Llewellyn, Minister for Planning Tasmania

APPENDIX B – Stakeholder feedback categorisation

The table below contains the original comments that were provided by stakeholders in the national workshops. These comments were copied from butcher's paper and response sheets that were used to gather feedback. Comments were categorised into their relevance for either Stage 1 or Stage 2

Principle	Feedback	Response
Liveability	Proximity to transport as well as transport within	
	Transition Towns- create 'Strong' and 'Resilient' communities - Currently focus on resilient 'Built form' not the actual community	
	Meeting Human needs 'now' and into the 'future'	
	What is community- How do you measure?	
	Where is the Joy?	
	Education	
	Diverse + respect- More about environment i.e. connections to other communities	
	Maybe roll- Liveability + Place making together	
	Connectivity as other principal	
	Include Private open space which can contribute to the liveability of a community	
	Affordability (Housing)	
	Potentially including too much which could lead to dumbing down end result	
	Important that resilience and adaptability is emphasised. To allow communities to evolve and Change	
	Need to include accessibility- Universal access	
	CPTED principle	
	Allow for Lifestyle choice	
	Want to be in an accessible location (really important)	
	Consider that communities aren't just where people live	
	Balance between work, play, learn in any community- or at least be connected to it.	
	Also a community which creates accessibility	
	Query engagement here vs. under Urban governance	
	transport really needs to come first	
	"inclusive & Cohesive" rather than " connected and cohesive"	
	creating communities for people is really important- stopping people from being overwhelmed and staying inside!- Also under governance. Not only through design but also through process	
	Should be more of a focus on health and fitness- bike riding for example, allowing people to walk.	
	Health should be separate from "safe"	
	Reduce car dependency- be more pointed	
	Reducing need for people to drive. Don't encourage driving through design. Promote alternative methods of transport	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	Access to facilities	
	Give Community a "walk score"	
	Look at incorporating shared facilities (tool Shed) and promote interaction	
	Affordable - What does affordable really mean - Improving affordability should be the focus	
	Engaging the focus should be a capacity building for everyone to be involved and understand the capacity/ constraints of creating sustainable communities - Rather than engage use 'empower'	
	Is first point 'engagement' a repetition of 'community engagement' under 'Urban Governance	
	Is there enough distinction between two categories 'liveability' and 'place making', a possible distinction could be between social (liveability) and physical/spaicial(place making)	
	Role of education?- Signposting, engaging children in sustainability	
	5 Principles- reword "Design Great Place"- Encourage Innovation & Excellence	
	Integration of socio-economic groups needs & housing	
	connectivity- creating cohesion between different groups	
	how do we interpret "liveable"	
	Creation of "diversity"- is this liveable - homogenous - creation of utopia- cultural clustering and blending	
	Price is deciding factor?	
	Driver is the "public" space not the "private space"	
	key critic	
	Rename "engaged" not engagement	
	Clearly evident need for higher density/ increased living population in place making	
	Stronger focus on transportation	
	Key criteria for liveable: i.e. schools/ Shopping centres/ transport/ community centre	
	Overlap with Place making	
	Diverse	
	Affordable- integrating needs of diverse socio-economic groups	
	How do we get right shared, community space	
	Not- homogenous mix to be forced	
	Diverse- ages/ wealth do not always mix naturally	
	"engaged"- Not engagement	
	Replace Engagement with "Engaged"	
	Open Space and public realm? Increasing population and density	
	Common Space, public vs. private	

greenstar

Principle	Feedback	Response
	Space availability to promote interaction between community	
	Proximity to employment and education facilities	
	Capacity to adapt needs to be reflected	
	Needs of the community should be presented rather then assuming affordability is what the community wants. Different people have varying needs	
	General happy with this element	
	need to define the difference between liveability and place making - what goes into which section and what goes into both	
	what about lifestyle	
	how do we make the development space - need a coordinated strategic approach	
	need to be able to measure liveability	
	carbon is one metric but precincts need to include a broader range of metrics some of which can be hard to measure	
	ensure that the design promotes the desired lifestyle - cross cultural, cross age group, different community sectors, provide support and amenities	
	some of the descriptions mean different things to different people - how do you measure this?	
	ensuring everything in the community is available - social equity	
	promote tolerance	
	is liveability sustainable?	
	liveability (functionality) vs. place making (character)	
	diversity is a long term outcome - it is mixed use, social housing, key worker and affordable housing	
	density - need liveable densities - Notting Hill	
	need diverse housing stock and tenure	
	balancing needs of people	
	TOD - economies of scale	
	struggle with the difference between liveability and place making	
	natural environment should be integrated and connected	
	access to food - food bowls	
	access to local education should be listed under 'affordable'	
	place making enables liveability to happen	
	recognised that the same issues fall under more than one principle	
	crime - feeling of safety and security - should be healthy, safe and secure communities	
	animals and pets - allow choices/infrastructure	
	boundary between principles - need clear terms to define liveability	
	what makes a good community?	
	access to employment is part of liveability - needs to be included in definition or in the bullet points (make it part of 'connected and cohesive')	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	is engagement part of place making rather than liveability?	
	walk ability and cycling to be promoted	
	the principles must be glued together	
	liveability and place making are very connected - should they really be divided in separate principles?	
	engagement is a process not an outcome, language must be clear (process or outcome)	
	the success of place making could be measured in liveability	
	inclusiveness should be included 'for all' as a principle for creating a place - access and well-being for all	
	liveability should be about outcomes	
	engagement should be authentic engagement - power with instead of power of community	
	socio-economic diversity' instead of affordability, affordability is a subset of socio-economic diversity	
	Visibility/ Functional- Don't jump out of dot points but are kind of there within other points	
	Transport- Good that it is incorporated in multiple areas	
	6 dot points are on the right track	
	How do you break down the fence/ enclave culture of neighbourhoods- how do you get community focus? Challenge- development codes inhibit connectivity privacy vs. community	
	Dot points are broad, which is a good thing	
	Important that convenience is included	
	Possibly needs more around ' Diverse & Respectful' - mix of style/ size of land etc - public education factor missing	
	Overlaps across the framework- needs to reconcile across "place making" & "liveability"	
	Some divisions between liveability & place making should be defined	
	Perhaps it should be "affordability & diversity" not "Diverse & Respectful"	
	Overlap with Place making	
	Incorporation of CPTED principles	
	Resilient & Adaptable- reflective of me needs of changed circumstances i.e. disability: Wheel chair access	
	"Providing" Inclusive" environments for all ages	
	Over lap with place making?	
	Look at Maslow's hierarchy	
	make food production more of a priority?- debate at length.. - is access to affordable food the real issue	
	Aroid a physical determinist position in the guidelines - focus on social values c.f designers values- needs more research	
	Access to services not only retrofit brown fill but providing upfront delivery in green fill	
	Fun place/ great place- Enjoy living here- A place residents want to be in	
	Indentifying thresholds- this density corner shop- aspirational -scale appropriate	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	Also target local councils? To ensure these things are deliverable on ground	
	Resilience into definition	
	short term, mid term, long term	
	Transport (Sustainable)	
	Infrastructure	
	Diverse and respectful? Vulnerable parts/ groups- disabled	
	Creating broad ownership- meaningful engagement	
	Re: Engagement Quality -Create meaningful engagement that influences decision-making & broad ownership	
	Diverse and Respectful: Who is community -Planning for vulnerable parts of community e.g. children, old people, disabled people, low income groups	
	Healthy + Safe - Child friendly- liberated A whole lot of other issues Re: interaction +connection - experimental rich environment Interaction Diverse setting Exploration	
	Long term affordability	
	Health + Safe and Driver - Providing experientially Rich environment	
	Ability to Adapt to change	
	Headline Issue- other issues sit within this framework- Robustness for Future	
	Generally- Good	
Economic Prosperity	Small Business/ creative industry - Incubation as a category- need to provide range of spaces for self feeding business	
	Efficiency.. And reduce lifecycle costs and impacts	
	Feedback and open reporting on financial outcome to inform future projects	
	Define what project brings to the city at a global scale- Does is address gaps in city infrastructure or have negative affect on existing capacity	
	Should incorporate disadvantaged groups- more specifically	
	Capacity building & skills development- (Green Heading)	
	What is the inherent sense of purpose	
	Question- Systems thinking as a Principle?	
	Efficiency and Effectiveness	
	Interesting that this is a departure from what we normally think about for sustainable buildings	
	Very Important!	
	More of a focus on "effectiveness" rather than "efficiency"- There should be more of a focus on long term costs, not just upfront development costs	
	Consider the long tem costs and payback costs in any development consideration- financial modelling	
	Need to have a consideration of a system approach- "local" is not always the best answer	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	from an infrastructure approach- don't just consider impact on the site e.g. Perhaps power generation is actually better off site	
	Perhaps affordability should be highlighted here as well?	
	This framework should just make you look at it	
	Make Lifecycle assessment more explicit for all parties- residents, building owners, council	
	Drawing a boundary will be important for employment opportunities if there are local opportunities outside the boundary. May need different boundaries for different principles	
	More focus on long term economic prosperity	
	Foster business incubators for small businesses	
	Business and their location to be staged in the new development early on e.g. Business need to be in before residents move in	
	Planning at sub-division/district level needs to support economic diversity, in terms of creating different sized spaces (e.g. Pre-versus post-war commercial development)	
	Economic prosperity in community should link with others to foster prosperity more broadly	
	Efficient and sustainable infrastructure should be considered over the long term (in terms of affordability)	
	Would help if bullet points were supported by examples to clarify meanings	
	bullet point under Investment- referring to investments needs to be modifies to describe " Business generation"- Also word enabling inappropriate suggest "Facilitating"	
	Get rid of- encourage, promote etc words	
	Local focus may not be sustainable	
	"Local" - lots of people to not have local jobs	
	Good to see economic basis	
	National basis of prosperity	
	Green Jobs focus or is any economic development good?	
	Employment: What scale is it aimed at; at what point does economic community rely on connectivity - other precincts?	
	Better representation on connectedness- transit in + to other precincts	
	Access to basic economic resources- water, energy, telecoms is critical to ongoing economic...???	
	Do we need to redefine 'economic prosperity' away for terms of production and consumption, instead- better use of space for living standards rather than conversion of resources to economic consumables	
	Community definition cannot be rigidly applied to one economic purpose; must be flexible to earn change- but still build or compact adv	
	Local jobs??	
	Define "local"- impact to community? Focus on regionalism	
	Local- rely on international manufacturing	
	Local jobs- invest/ your job invests into local economic forum	
	Economic basis is a valid tool	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	no reference to "green" style jobs	
	Symbiotic relationships need to be recognised to ensure elements able to feed off one another.	
	Skills, new skills leading to new jobs	
	Link between jobs/ living/ food supply creating a circular metabolism	
	Creating economic resilience rather then prosperity	
	Again, how do you benchmark this within a 'Green' objective	
	Change word in last point- Investing etc " urban" change to "community"	
	Question- how do all of these things/ elements compliment each other?	
	local traders that build profit back into the community - generally there are many internationals/large traders in new developments	
	locally owned supply chains - important to consider boundary requirements	
	these criteria are generally picked up in spatial planning	
	the 'shopping centre' model may lock out the small traders and possibly discourage this	
	include an additional issues under 'Economic' principle - socio-economic diversity in ownership and tenure of non-domestic property (retail, office etc)	
	under 'employment' include the word 'local' for access to jobs	
	what is 'key economic infrastructure'?	
	clarification needed on efficiency bullet points	
	what about business synergy opportunities?	
	liveability encompasses economic and environmental	
	the word 'inclusion' is not evident	
	affordability should be here	
	is prosperity just economic - it is also growth and liveability - is it just about consumption?	
	The 'Economic' principle needs to be balanced with principles 1 and 3 (liveability and environmental)	
	future proofing as an economic indicator	
	is economic prosperity the same as affordability?	
	needs to link to employment centres close by	
	is it about ensuring the community is resilient? - resilient to changes within and overtime, changes to factors outside the development	
	needs to consider paradigm shifts - e.g.. Home ownership, infrastructure models of ownership, internal investment and community ownerships (e.g.. Community banks etc)	
	new investment/ownership models help us rethink ways of evaluating economics to incorporate future changes	
	Economic Plan that looks at what might be feasible in the future	
	new look at the phasing of infrastructure in the development - schools and PT stations from the start	
	Prosperity - sustainable prosperity rather than economic viability	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	promoting community ownership	
	this needs to set the framework rather than define what should be in all developments	
	integrated business case for infrastructure - account for all modes e.g.. Water, energy waste etc	
	stimulate new economic models	
	needs to recognise and dovetail with existing tools used by developers/project managers viability etc	
	education leads to economic prosperity - opportunities to build community capacity need to be included	
	employment opportunities throughout construction and operation	
	procurement and where skills come from - support for local people	
	job creation, protection of workforces versus attracting/importing skills	
	opportunities to incorporate new tools, processes such as LCA	
	expanding simple economic analysis to include and recognise a broader set of metrics/externalities	
	costing of infrastructure to address split incentive barriers	
	is economic diversity recognised?	
	is affordability reflected?	
	Bringing Business/ jobs back into the residential- access to services	
	Re-crediting the village	
	Emission cross over- travelling/ car use with services embedded in towns	
	Diversity of Industry = sustainable adaptable town	
	Multiple clusters of industry	
	Government (i.e. PS needs to support this model)	
	Collective responsibility to bring in diversity of industry	
	Providing infrastructure i.e. broadband	
	Local supply chains- measurable	
	Investing in up skilling/learning separate point- stand alone as different.	
	Investment- Sustainable & ethical- very loaded, what aspects, whose definition?	
	Need to facilitate future growth- is this the sustainable infrastructure?	
	Include technology considering affordability & future proofing e.g. building materials, connectivity)- Add to principal 1- liveability comments	
	Not all communities based an economic 'success"	
	Broad statements	
	Self containment V access to jobs	
	"Facilitate access" to employment	
	Growing value of community e.g. personal value (nonce prices) - but paradox with housing affordability interests	
	Transport? Where is this addressed	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	Employment: " Encouraging the production of procurement of local food, goods & services"	
	Local living Economics	
	Last dot point under ''efficiency' remove stop :)	
	Challenges: Proximity to workplace from home is not a key driver	
	The scale of assessment here is city-regional- not local	
	Focus: Local Prosperity?/ Local vitality	
	Challenge: Shift to off-site, off-community work places	
	Focus on: Choice, diversity, opportunities	
	Inclusion of regional context is good- important to look at economic outcomes across scales	
	Providing connections to existing infrastructure is important i.e. In a way that " Knits into & builds existing Capacity"	
	Looking at interconnection of scales of development is a key to understanding how sustainable a community is, or can be..	
	Efficiency/ Innovation - Needs to look at how the economic prosperity generated by a particular development enables/ enhances existing community capacity	
	Maybe Consider continuity- i.e. not displacing existing employment & Continuity in the form reinvestment overtime	
	don't need word efficient in describing efficient infrastructure/ insert dot point	
	happy to see that growth at all cost is not identified as necessary	
	Encourage Green Skills/ Jobs	
	Trade offs (affordability vs. liveability)	
	Diverse opportunities (Quality of employment)	
	Access to jobs	
Environmental Quality	More of a focus on reducing car dependence	
	promote most sustainable form for density	
	There may be conflict between this and many planning controls	
	Cultural and archaeological asset point should not be here. Should potentially be under place making or another principle	
	Renewable energy should be strongly considered	
	Consider the term "restorative" communities from an environmental tool- such as "Living Building Challenge"	
	What about a more holistic overview- such as overall air quality on the site	
	What about noise? Emission to atmosphere	
	Resource efficiency and effectiveness? Embodied energy and water	
	Biodiversity should be considered, land contamination	
	Focus on indigenous species, native, promote local biodiversity	
	Food production and security should be more of a consideration	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	Need to go beyond "enhancing" environment	
	Renewal, growth resilience, better than static terminology. To acknowledge changing nature of environment	
	Needs metrics e.g. State of Environ reporting tools would be useful as a base level for reporting	
	Crossover between archaeology, cultural heritage etc with place making	
	Description missing: Cultural heritage, but should it be there in the first place?	
	Cultural heritage needs to be in liveability category	
	Biodiversity needs to be explicitly converged. A global priority that deserves its own section	
	The term "encouraging" means little would remove focus on GREATER more specific.- Applies also to term of "promoting"	
	Reconcile "materials" and "Resources efficiency" under reducing footprint	
	Brownfield sites given preference to sustainable communities over the development of Greenfield sites	
	Needs to include a desire to reduce footprint first then further reduce impact	
	Building capacity- seek benefits of integrating services and resource management at the largest scale that also benefits that community or precinct (e.g. installation of renewable energy by the developer/ agency that benefits a community)	
	Principle 3- Inherently should be restructured to focus on "sustainability" not just environmental- as no responding to greater area	
	regional consideration missing- water sensitive urban design?- Utilise synergy between aed	
	Be careful of "environment" as only one aspect of sustainability i.e. The driver of projects and communities	
	Do we always need to "restore"- we moved onto bigger and better things sometimes	
	How will we look at it through the same lens?	
	Restoring ecosystems are unrealistic objective	
	How do these lead to environmental/ green outcomes? Or indeed does it block or constrain it?	
	Growth can't occur if the goal is to reduce emissions to land, water and atmosphere	
	Adaptation isn't allowed for	
	Regional Variation requirement	
	Require a more sustainable focus	
	Regional Variation	
	Enhancement: Should be more then harm minimisation- biometry should drive zero net emissions- reducing emissions implies still emitting- Balancing emissions might be a better term	
	Should section refer only to 'National' environment -archaeological/ cultural should 6 parts of place making- more community asset than natural asset	
	"Encouraging greater resource efficiency is a very loose phrase	
	process: integrated design	
	reducing footprint: promote efficient green building design	
	resource allocation that is 60th - efficient and effective	
	protecting the community against adverse environmental impacts (eg. Climate change etc)	
	promote use of natural systems, use ecosystem services	

greenstar

Principle	Feedback	Response
	reducing footprint, what about going positive - restoring, positive contribution. Perhaps 'enhancement' could be the heading	
	footprint should be more than just carbon	
	Eco-footprint should go beyond buildings and infrastructure, should include food and lifestyle, and should be defined based on impacts of community	
	impacts of constructing, living, demolishing to be included	
	the boundary of the assessment is very important, suggest boundary to be around the actual environmental impacts and around where control lies and around the control of the community	
	should be linked to reality including environmental impacts - not best practice - actual emissions etc	
	should include hardware, physical systems such as cogeneration and black water treatment	
	should include the software, education programs and management etc	
	new bullet point (or part of reducing footprint) about communication/education programs to promote awareness of end users	
	integration of systems and scales	
	does not really cover infrastructure	
	needs to include the studies required (e.g. Flora and fauna, soil contamination, water quality etc). Need a thorough understanding of site	
	has to connect infrastructure with the impact on the environment	
	principal of integration, integration of supply chain into the site (a less traditional procurement system)	
	need to think about innovation and collaboration	
	aims to bridge the gap between the current ecosystem and the desired ecosystem	
	promote the creation of resources to be fed back into the ecosystem	
	include biomicry language, ie. Taking back to the natural systems	
	has to be adaptable, cope with changes to the natural systems due to climate change	
	does cultural heritage fit here? Existing sites with existing heritage need to be maintained	
	need to define 'sustainable'	
	sustainable transport - ? language	
	question whether 'Quality' is the right word - may be 'balance'?	
	need to pick up on relationship with density (population growth and environmental impact)	
	cultural heritage - is this the right place for it?	
	consumption - generation, what's the relationship?	
	we like the principle description	
	Introduction of domestic animals	
	Gold courses, swimming pools?	
	Rehabilitation- is this sufficiently implied?	
	Relationships with local indigenous communities	
	Ecological enhancement, protection, development?	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	Water Management	
	Waste Management- localised	
	Prioritising native plantings	
	Noise emissions	
	Promote Positive Development i.e.- going beyond sustainability	
	Quality'- use a more positive term e.g. Enhancement- apply this as a filter to entire doc	
	Resource efficiency? E.g. Food mites- how to trade this -maximise discussion of this info into the community (to start with)	
	Develop scaled approach to review: local-city-global..	
	Focus on infrastructure as well	
	Promoting Lifestyle	
	Needs to discuss "facilitating a positive lifestyle choice for a more sustainable lifestyle"	
	Conserving & Celebrating cultural heritage & Archaeological it also is a "place band" is relevance	
	Consider natural habitat upfront- i.e. no net loss of bio diversity	
	Beyond Construction measurement- life stage	
	Natural attributes of the projects context considered an asset not a constraint	
	Use of technology/ e.g. building materials	
	Materials footprint	
	Embedded footprint of materials (What it is made from, where it comes from)	
	Principle Statement good	
	Dot points good, once again broad, but cover everything	
	Where does scenic amenity fit in?	
	Promoting environmental landscapes that communities can interact with, whether a view they are looking at an area they are hiking through or a tree they are sitting under	
	Too vague- Should it say "GHG Emission' specifically e.g. reducing GHG Emissions	
	No firm goal- maybe a stronger link should be developed between framework & tool benchmarks	
	Does this guide apply to building a house or how people use the house once it is built	
	Contains a larger number of measurable parameters	
	Protecting, restoring, "creating" and enhancing	
	No link to contribution to sustainability	
	Complexity of scales in any sort of framework	
	Connectivity of the environmental enhancement	
	Connectivity across scales	
	Some confusion about the difference between "Restore" & "enhance"	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	Is there a need for feedback & behavioural considerations? - Yes the communications systems far greater efficiency- also for better behaviour	
	Dragging ecosystems into urban planning	
	Conservation areas/ protection (not building on particular sites)	
	Connection to nature	
	Species perspective?	
	Self-sufficient units	
	Planning from human perspective	
	Circular approach to resource use	
	avoiding sprawl	
	reducing footprint	
	efficient use of land	
	Some scaling may be required about finding right scale	
	reduce per capita land use	
	Minimise non-renewable resourcing	
	can a Greenfield development be sustainable - do they fit under the definition?	
Place Making	Conflicts with many requirements are already in place.	
	really need to consider RELEVANCE to local area	
	"Connection" should really be "integration"- other communities around the site	
	Need to place a strong focus on site focus	
	What is attractive? How do we define it?	
	May be different word to attractive. Difficult to capture the essence of what you mean	
	Perhaps use the word "creation" or "appropriate design"	
	Perhaps also need to consider design appropriateness	
	consider identity of place	
	could accessible be under liveability	
	Qualitative & quantitative elements	
	Challenge to practically implement	
	Need planning framework to embed these principles	
	Sepp 65 design panel to determine 'place making'	
	Community engagement essential to create sense of ownership	
	Also engagement process of designers, planners	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	Innovation	
	Community' can't be prescribed	
	Must connect to existing communities	
	A lot of cross over between place-making and Liveability	
	Communities evolve over time	
	Prince Henry and Rouse Hill potential to be successful communities	
	identify site boundary that defines 'a community'	
	Is this an overarching tool that other GS tools feed into	
	Can determine potential, but not actual success of community	
	Place making should be Inherent and 'Good Design'.	
	Place 'Strengthening'	
	Renewal	
	Context- Vision History and Future	
	Discussion around Process, product and Place making	
	Need to have Governance ongoing strengthening	
	Process more important- than in building and individual principles	
	Should be overarching	
	May not assess 'outcomes' just 'process'	
	Global vs. Local- How do we express the local Charters and form including public realm be expressed spatially through design	
	Need to be more clarity between this principal and liveability	
	Need to reflect site-responsive, i.e. new communities response to the local environment and biophysical limitation/ characteristics	
	Overlapping with other principles	
	Needs to focus a 'sense of place'	
	Places that allow businesses to grow	
	Appears to be a higher order principle	
	Place making focus is on Spatial?	
	Need to delete Great places	
	Should "Cultural heritage" be in Place Making	
	"encouraging", "Supporting" are inappropriate	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	"more compact"- Compared to what?	
	"Local" values/ needs- difference between Brownfield and Greenfield site	
	Cross over in key principles- Place making vs. Liveability	
	Differentiation between Physical attributes and behavioural	
	This is about Urban design- pick up on existing standards 30 year plan WSUD EnviroDev	
	Devil in detail- measurement and weighting will be problematic	
	Word that is missing- activate	
	Connected/ accessible- the same? Or a micro-scale of 'connected'	
	Is 'connected' an economic term? Incorporates non-transit terms also -food miles - telecoms -overcoming local shortcomings through transit social media	
	Place making seems to imply inner city- so not applicable to peri-urban?	
	Accessible: Public space, Multi-use 7 is a 'blank canvas' to enable people to create their own community character	
	Peri-urban areas don't have these areas- needs a different treatment	
	Connected: Must be firmed up- must drive rather then first ' recuperate' relationship for communities	
	Place making needs to reflect multifunction	
	focus should be desirable not attractive	
	Place making was lost, now needs to be remodelled to be readjusted	
	Spatial Identity?	
	Loss of corner shops in neighbourhoods	
	increasing density in strategic locations	
	responding to context and climate	
	Driver	
	What makes a "place"- is multifunctional- looking for Desirable- functional, attractive (advantage of desirable), meeting needs	
	need 3 or more resources to go to a "places"	
	Statement item 3 under "attractive" needs to be relocated as primary function of creating a place	
	Comfort conditions	
	Functional	
	Attractive- A subset of "meeting needs"	
	Multifunctional	
	Across the day and night- what makes it work?	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	"Desirable" as a heading (instead of attractions) with sub points such as: -Functional.... - Attractive....	
	instead of 'supporting…', use creation of sense of place, reinforcing a sense of place	
	need to acknowledge the evolution of place within the bullet point	
	bullet points need to have the words: vibrant, stimulating and memorable	
	is this really separate to liveability?	
	place making includes the sense of distinction, identity, created by the community	
	needs to incorporate the value of landscaping (e.g.. The value of trees)	
	land use needs to be optimised for now and the future but not necessary efficient - this is too subjective	
	cross cultural and cross age groups need to be included - i.e.. Diverse use of public spaces	
	cultural and heritage response	
	what is already there or would be - connectivity	
	universal access - allows age and growing older	
	providing the kind of spaces in med/high density developments for all ages, types of families	
	promote community	
	needs the support mechanisms to ensure/guide the use of the spaces (design, systems, businesses, communications, community facilities, welcome programs, events)	
	needs some sort of facilitation at least at the start	
	design enabling identity	
	great' places in the title needs to be more descriptive	
	successful places are safe, life, activity	
	efficiency of land and place = effective	
	PEOPLE	
	attractive = to who?	
	feels good	
	legibility	
	perhaps it does not matter what a sustainable community looks like? - it is the outcomes and the measurements that matter	
	the principles are 'must-haves'	
	place making is the glue between the principles	
	having a number of principles may create a 'silo' situation	
	danger in the principles be restrictive of innovation and we might get 'one' type of development	
	place making is about the people rather than the physical structures	

greenstar

Principle	Feedback	Response
	a bit difficult to assess how good the principles are when it is not clear what type of 'areas' they apply to	
	the people that make up the community should organise the community-cultural context	
	organic development of places and governance may be prohibited by too many rules etc	
	need diversity in physical built form, cultural/ethnicity	
	accessible - walking/public transport/cycling	
	connected to adjacent areas	
	connection is both physical and emotional	
	interaction with place - enable/encourage interaction between people	
	pride/sense of ownership	
	place making is subjective	
	places need to be safe	
	Needs to be tightened e.g. 'adaptable' is too similar to 'resilience'- under another principle	
	Context- is missing from place making - i.e. identity & uniqueness - reflect, preserve & enhance the unique qualities of a location Perhaps "connected" should be "identity"	
	Reconcile the sub-element ' connectivity' in liveability with "connected" in Place making	
	Should discuss neighbourhood structure	
	Public places/ open spaces should be mentioned in the wording	
	Cultural and native heritage- what makes a place unique?	
	Local employment	
	Active transport	
	Integrating demographics through the provision of appropriate facilities	
	Inclusion of recreational space	
	Continued ongoing community management & input	
	Attractiveness	
	Emphasise a place's unique qualities & specific identity	
	There is 'tension' between local values & encouraging diversity	
	Change 'encouraging densities" to "optimising & Choice	
	It's about access to 'choice' (e.g retail by foot)	
	map 'lands' of 'energy'/ diversity	
	Add 'identify' to start if first dot point	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	At human scale	
	Appropriate densities/ critical mass	
	Accessibility- possible concern offer idea of ' compact' being applicable to all areas/ localities -definition of 'compact' e.g. urban vs. rural	
	Connected- Also needs to consider connectivity within the community	
	Not only 'support' a sense of community but need to 'create' the sense of community- Create and Support sense of community	
	Connected - replace first dot point with " Establishing + Supporting connections + relationships with neighbouring communities and the region as a whole	
	Note: Place making + Liveability cross-over	
	Attractive Designing interest + engagement in a place diverse - reasons to be there	
	Accessible - Accessible to people of diverse backgrounds + social groupings= social equity/inclusion	
	Communities: - Situated in great places - ability to share places - Public places needed to make community - Choice	
	Privacy within public/open spaces	
	Best Indicator is how spaces / places are used	
	Time lag to measure	
	How connected do people want to be?	
	Ownership	
	"Sustainable Communities are a result of natured from great places."	
Urban Governance	How can this apply nationally with different planning regulations/ codes?	
	Issues with Strata laws	
	Who has responsibility for establishing/ delivering these outcomes	
	How is this assessed at different stages of this development	
	Who is the document for?	
	Transparent and accountable- it is important to make sure your outcomes actually happen	
	It is important to set realistic outcomes at the start of the project rather than set unrealistic aspirations	
	Stakeholders should include financers, investors, people that are actually going to live there etc Community, industry, government- include maintenance- This is why performance evaluation is important	
	There should be more of an emphasis on the future users of the site. Property is about people (Such as explaining the waste Management system to them)	
	Incorporate a feedback loop to allow what works and what doesn't and pass it on to others that are developing	
	Space User engagement is very important- Could consider charging language to engagement.	
	Need to align with engagement under the liveability principle	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	We see this as a moving from a project tool through to implementation	
	Tiers of governance across a project	
	How do we measure these?	
	Process of development should be transparent	
	Scoring must be continuous as project dynamics often shift GFC/ State- Local Ownerships Cub site etc	
	Heading Should be broken into 2	
	Program Governance- Government Infrastructure (Social & Political Physical)- This should be embedded in all principles	
	Trying to do both- afterwards- Project. Leaving mechanisms/ Infra for the community	
	Vision- Ever Evolving	
	Build and Empower	
	Promoting is not a word that should be used in a framework. It doesn't mean much.	
	Unclear how this point is to be answered if this framework is going to be used to develop a rating tool	
	Relevance depends on audience	
	Title: Considers none than a specific project. Urban governance applies to aspects other than the project. Title needs to reflect components, e.g. Community Engagement, Consultation and decision making	
	Definition: "Good Governance". Word "good" is not a proper description	
	Who is this tool being targeted to? This may raise questions as to how these governance principles will be implemented	
	What is the timeframe for this principle? Particularly performance	
	How will maintenance of facilities/ services/ amenity etc be guaranteed? How to maintain the community benefit?	
	How will behaviour be encouraged/ fostered? (Need to focus on effective behaviour change programs e.g. Living Smart)	
	Good Planning- should this go into place making?	
	Question Where does this relate to creating 'green' precinct- This is more implementation	
	We found this tricky and unclear where it fits	
	As is represents 1 of 5 principles we are concerned it is a bit loose	
	Scenario planning could be included	
	Is it about creating the community or about the community running itself? I.e. is this a tool for implementation?	
	Remove Urban from title	
	Does this apply to 'Cities' only or also to 'regional' areas- need to define what urban includes	
	New heading ' implementation or Delivery' with sub points such as- clear roles and responsibilities-Advocacy	
	Remove Urban from Title- who relates to this i.e. regional areas	
	Policies of local framework need to be applied	
	Needs to be broader- how does it make decisions?	
	Heading: Implementing/ "operating" governance,	
	Missing heading "Delivery"- Making decisions to ensure they are workable	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	- if not working trialled tested & reframed	
	Missing item: Allocation of clear roles and responsibilities (Adaptable)	
	adequate resources to implement- need personnel to delivery	
	"Community" governance rather than "Urban Governance or just Governance	
	Do we have a range of community sizes	
	Governance is ongoing as well as initial	
	Operational governance- maintain framework	
	Clear roles and responsibility	
	Community engagement and participation - consider a cultural engine, the Charles Landry model	
	Seattle has a department of Neighbourhoods	
	governance, what is the hierarchy, the collective, top-down?	
	governance sits outside of TBL and form and space, but encapsulates it all	
	is the face/mode of governance changing? - changing through social cohesion and informed participation	
	its about leadership and champions	
	need to promote timeliness and transparency	
	need democratic decisions and framework to support this	
	promote partnerships within communities and beyond boundaries	
	need a 'fair' and balanced contribution from stakeholders	
	how do we deal with recourse? - natural justice.	
	dispute resolution (mechanics/processes)	
	should be about enabling good governance (not just promoting it) and sustainable behaviour	
	cross sectoral governance is important	
	the term 'urban governance' is not understood - what is it and what are the desired outcomes? - may be its cross community engagement in decision making relating to the community	
	what would be in the master plan or program that would achieve this principle?	
	does this relate to the physical components of the community? Like building an office for the community council, e.g.. A community hub	
	this should be on a local/neighbourhood scale	
	how to achieve this for 'new' developments where the community is not there yet	
	urban governance should/will happen over time but could be supported by the developer	
	the definition of governance should have an emphasis on 'active' rather than 'good' governance	
	need to include a bullet point about ownership	
	include 'adaptable' within the definition of governance	
	need to ensure governance model fits place outcome	
	does governance apply for the whole project lifecycle? - from planning, design, construction, maintenance, measurement etc	

Principle	Feedback	Response
	how do we apply/set boundaries for governance - depends on the development characteristics, need to determine what is right for the project - needs to be transparent and accountable.	
	governance in many forms - online, community forums etc	
	may need temporary governance frameworks which will change over the life of the project	
	many different components and models - but need to include responsibilities, areas to be covered, stakeholder engagement process/plan, methodology to make information available, communications strategy	
	outcomes focussed	
	behaviour change	
	flexibility to deal with changes in design, geographic location, stakeholder needs etc - cannot be one type fits all - needs to allow for best practice to feed in	
	ability to adapt overtime - climate change, changes in technology	
	review process needs to be built in, development phases over lifetime of project	
	feedback loop/continual improvement - governance and the overarching principles available	
	long life-time governance needed	
	Define Governance such that it reflects the values of its community (context)	
	Evaluate content against overlap with other 4 principles	
	Performance measures will be highly contestable nationally	
	Should the P be performance based	
	inter-gen equity?	
	P' to be flexible with changing demographic conditions- Adaptive Processes	
	Behavioural patterns are critical	
	Governance is an 'enabler'	
	Devolving some responsibilities of local government to private industry for some services - Greater sense of public involvement - do this with good partnerships including local residents - lower risk activities	
	Good planning & capacity building of stakeholders to partner - add the community capacity comment in "community engaged" to "good planning" & add some commentary around stakeholders learning to work together	
	Ongoing Community benefit	
	Challenges -how to enact - consensus - how to maintain consistencies across industry - difficult to modify behaviour	
	Dot points good	
	Issue- not telling what people should do but instead tell them 'Why'- Educate	
	Once again- Educational element needs to be incorporated	
	Possible second dot point under "Sustainable behaviours" is ' celebration of success/ story telling'	
	Social Marketing/ Centre of Excellence	
	Constant education of the key benefits required	

greenstar

Principle	Feedback	Response
	Education, Education, Education!!! - of decision makers, industry, community ' What this mean to you?'	
	How do you implement Urban Governance?	
	It's a bit vague- new & existing communities would have completely different needs & requirements in terms of Urban governance - Does not really provide guidelines for existing/ revamped communities	
	Should cover the role of democracy in planning	
	Reconcile the intersection between sustainable behaviours & individual footprints	
	Format or informed governance?	
	Potential for conflict of opinions in existing community scenarios. i.e. the wants & needs of the developer could be opposing to the wants and needs of an existing community	
	Do these models work? Can the be tested/ reviews in conjunction with exiting sustainable communities to see how workable these solutions would be.	
	Ongoing monitoring & Evaluation	
	Urban Governance- replaced by "Governance" so it can adapt to all communities	
	Requirement for fabric and it's performance	
	Replace dot point (2) on transparent and accountable- Establishing effective models for governance, decision making, performance "Measures" , evaluation and communication over the lifecycle of the community	
	Adaptability (lo political/ ideological/ technological change)	
	ability to adjust goals	
	Process rather than outcome	
	no defined end points	