

2025

**THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE
AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY**

ELEVENTH ASSEMBLY

**Standing Committee on Environment, Planning, Transport and City Services - Report No 1 -
Inquiry into Planning (Territory Priority Project) Amendment Bill 2025**

Government Response

**Presented by
Chris Steel MLA
Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development**

**Yvette Berry MLA
Minister for Homes, Homelessness and New Suburbs
September 2025**

Introduction

The ACT Government is committed to increasing the supply of public, social and community housing as part of its response to the National Housing Accord and National Planning Reform Blueprint. Under the Growing and Renewing Public Housing Program the ACT Government is targeting the delivery of 400 new public housing homes and renewal of 1000 public housing properties by 2026-27. The 2024-25 ACT Budget included \$46 million to continue the delivery of the Program for the purchasing of properties and construction of new public housing homes. The ACT Government also provides ongoing support to registered community housing providers to develop the community housing sector in the ACT. Notably, the Suburban Land Agency (SLA) is working with the ACT Government to develop a pipeline of community housing sites and dwellings to continue to support the community housing sector in the ACT, in accordance with the SLA's Housing Strategic Action Plan (Nov 2023).

The Planning (Territory Priority Project) Amendment Bill 2025 was presented in the Assembly on 5 February 2025, and referred to the Standing Committee on Environment, Planning, Transport and City Services (the Committee). At its meeting on 19 February 2025, the Committee resolved to undertake an inquiry into the Bill and the amendments which the Bill proposes. The Inquiry commenced on 19 February 2025. The Inquiry received 38 submissions and held two public hearings on 14 and 15 April 2025. The Committee heard from experts, peak bodies, advocacy groups, individuals and the Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development and the Minister for Homes and New Suburbs. The Committee's report makes a range of comments and conclusions, summarised by five recommendations. The principal recommendation of the Committee is that the Assembly does not pass the Bill. Additional recommendations cover a range of items associated with the administrative processes, associated resourcing and technical barriers to declaring public, social and community housing as Territory Priority Projects. The recommendations, comments and conclusions are outlined and addressed in this Government Response.

The ACT Government notes that the Bill is intended to provide increased certainty about construction times and fast track delivery of these critical projects by avoiding lengthy delays through ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal (ACAT) appeals, or through the TPP declaration process, that can take months to complete. Through the Bill the ACT Government is recognising the importance of public housing and public health facilities that provide significant benefit to the people of the ACT.

ACT Government Response to the Standing Committee on Planning, Transport and City Services - Report No. 1 – Inquiry into the Planning (Territory Priority Project) Amendment Bill 2025

Recommendation 1

The Committee recommends that the Assembly not pass the Bill.

Government Response: DISAGREE

In making this recommendation, the Inquiry Report makes a range of conclusions and comments, which are summarised into four themes below. A response is provided to each theme.

Theme 1: The existing criteria are sufficient for declarations to be made on a broad range of developments

The Inquiry Report highlights that there is already an ability to declare public housing as Territory Priority Projects (TPP) using the criteria under section 218 of the *Planning Act 2023* (the Act). In making this comment, the Inquiry Report references the note in section 218(1)(c) and specifies that public and community housing are intended to meet the criteria. The Inquiry Report also highlights that insufficient evidence is provided to outline that a TPP declaration is not able to be given for the public housing program.

Section 218 enables the Chief Minister and Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development to declare a **development proposal** be a TPP, whereby they are satisfied it meets **all** of the following:

- a) would achieve a major government policy outcome that is of significant benefit to the people of the ACT; and
- b) would substantially facilitate the achievement of the desired future planning outcomes set out in the ACT Planning Strategy, a relevant District Strategy, the Territory Plan or any relevant zone; and
- c) is for significant infrastructure, or significant facilities (**including community, social and public housing projects of any scale**), that are of significant benefit to the people of the ACT; and
- d) has been the subject of sufficient consultation.

The Act specifically limits the application of section 218 to only development proposals. Development proposals is a defined term in the Act which means “a proposal for development, whether or not in a development application”. This means that a TPP declaration is limited to separate development proposals and a declaration is not legally able to be given to a program of work, such as the public housing program, without specific development details. The compounding effect of this is discussed further at Theme 3 below.

Importantly, a development proposal must meet all of the criteria in the Act (i.e. (a) to (d) inclusive) for a TPP declaration to be given. A practical example is provided in Theme 2 below to demonstrate the shortcomings of the compounding nature of this provision.

Finally, the note in section 218(1)(c) confirms that community, social and public housing projects of any scale are considered to be “significant facilities”. Despite this, these development types must also be “a significant benefit to be people of the ACT” in order to satisfy the second half of criteria (c). In practice, this has meant that public housing developments, despite this note, have been unable to meet the full criteria for a TPP declaration to be given. This is discussed in more detail in Theme 2 below.

Theme 2: The TPP declaration criteria is untested

The Inquiry Report outlines that there are no examples of developments that have failed to meet the TPP declaration criteria and, as such, their effectiveness is unknown.

This is incorrect. As was outlined in the Government Submission on the Inquiry, since late 2023 when the Act commenced, requests have been received from Housing ACT and ACT Health regarding potential TPP declarations for public housing and public health facilities, including:

- seven development proposals for public housing of different sizes (between 9 and 30 dwellings) in various suburbs; and
- a new public health centre in Griffith.

Each of the seven public housing development proposals were considered for a TPP declaration; locations of and the Application for Declaration as a TPP for each of these proposals were provided in the [response to QON 12 from this Inquiry](#). The process did not proceed after it was found that the developments did not meet the criteria. An example assessment of a public housing development proposal is provided in Table 1 below to illustrate the deficiencies of section 218 in these cases.

Table 1: Example assessment of an individual public housing development proposal (less than 30 dwellings)

TPP declaration criteria	Example assessment
a) the development proposal achieves a major government policy outcome that is of significant benefit to the people of the ACT; and	NOT SATISFIED While the delivery of additional public housing is a policy outcome for the ACT Government, a single development of less than 30 dwellings could not be considered to be of a significant benefit to all people of the ACT.

TPP declaration criteria	Example assessment
b) would substantially facilitate the achievement of the desired future planning outcomes set out in the ACT Planning Strategy, a relevant District Strategy, the Territory Plan or any relevant zone; and	SATISFIED A number of outcomes and initiatives through the ACT Planning Strategy, a relevant District Strategy, the Territory Plan seek to promote and deliver social and affordable housing.
c) is for significant infrastructure, or significant facilities (including community, social and public housing projects of any scale), that are of significant benefit to the people of the ACT; and	NOT SATISFIED While the public housing project is a significant facility, in accordance with the Act, a single development of less than 30 dwellings could not be considered to be of a significant benefit to all people of the ACT.
d) has been the subject of sufficient consultation under section 218 (3).	NOT APPLICABLE Should the development proposal have been found to have met the three criteria above, it would have been placed on community consultation which would enable this criteria to be met.

In the case of public health facilities, the Inquiry Report suggests support of the importance of their development, outlines that as they can meet the criteria under section 218 to be declared a TPP the proposed amendment to section 216 is not recommended to proceed.

While it is correct that public health facilities, particularly major facilities like hospitals, are more likely to meet *all* of the criteria in section 218 of the Act, this interpretation overlooks the practical intent of this Bill. The inclusion of public health facilities in the amendment is not a reflection of their eligibility alone, but a considered response to address the identified inefficiencies of the current TPP declaration process — particularly the cumulative administrative and legislative timeframes that can delay delivery by up to 20 weeks.

The Bill proposes to provide a streamlined ‘default’ pathway for developments widely acknowledged as essential and beneficial to the ACT community. In this context, the suggestion from the Inquiry Report that formal inclusion is unnecessary, misunderstands the Bill’s intent to provide delivery certainty, reduce duplication, and ensure critical infrastructure is not delayed by process inefficiencies that add limited value when the public interest is already clear.

The relative inefficiency of the TPP declaration process when compared to the ‘default pathway’ is discussed further at Theme 3 below.

Theme 3: The TPP declaration process is untested and unknown

The Inquiry Report outlined that as a TPP declaration has not been given to date, the declaration process is untested and therefore the inefficiencies cannot be known.

Notwithstanding the Inquiry Reports view, evidence shows public housing developments are disproportionately delayed by ACAT appeals and the Inquiry Report acknowledges the existing mechanism of appeal negatively impact delivery of critical public housing developments.

As was outlined in the Government submission to the Inquiry, regardless of the motive of appellants, appeals of already approved DAs for public housing, based on both planning and non-planning grounds, have been delaying or even preventing much needed public homes from being built in the ACT.

This is shown in the significant overrepresentation of public housing DAs in ACAT appeals. Since 2019-20, approximately 3.5% of appealable DA decisions were appealed in ACAT. In the same period, public housing DAs made up only 4% of all DAs lodged but made up 15% of appeals. This amounts to the delivery of 108 public housing homes being delayed by more than a year on average.

Appeals of public housing projects have also been clustered in certain districts of Canberra with nearly 95% of these being isolated to the Inner North and Inner South districts. This is affecting the ability to deliver Canberra's long held 'salt and pepper' approach to achieve socio-spatial equality, in building public housing across the Territory, including in well-located areas close to services and closer to the city.

Further to this, in summarising the responses to [QON 03](#) and [QON 04](#) of this Inquiry, which provided further information on the assessment timeframes and outcome for 16 separate public housing DAs considered through the ACAT process since 2019, respectively:

- the number of working days for the ACAT process was comparable or greater than the number of days to decide the DA for over two thirds of these DAs; and
- for the four DAs whereby the ACAT matter was dismissed, on average it took 77 days to go through the ACAT process.

The Authority also provided an average estimated cost of their minimum time spent in relation to an individual ACAT matter as \$12,000 - \$13,000 per matter (provided in response to [QON 18](#) of this Inquiry).

Through the Bill, the Government is addressing a structural barrier to equitable, efficient housing delivery and removing procedural mechanisms that have, in some instances, been used to mask socio-spatial discrimination.

As outlined in Theme 2 above, there have been several public housing developments that were put through the initial steps of the TPP declaration process. While these projects did not proceed further as they were found not to satisfy the criteria in the Act the steps involved in the declaration process are known, as they are largely outlined in the Act.

The full TPP declaration process is outlined on the Planning website at <https://www.planning.act.gov.au/professionals/our-planning-system/territory-priority-project>

In summary, the process is as follows:

1. A request is sent to the Minister for Planning and Sustainability, with a range of supporting information including:
 - a. location details

- b. a description of the proposal
 - c. indicative site plans (if available)
 - d. a statement of claims against the TPP criteria under section 218 of the *Planning Act 2023* (the Act).
2. The Territory Planning Authority complete an initial assessment of whether the proposal meets the required TPP declaration criteria under the Act.
 3. The Authority provides the Minister with advice on their assessment.
 4. If the Minister is satisfied that a TPP declaration for the project has merits and meets the criteria of the Act, a proposed TPP declaration is subject to 15 working days of community consultation.
 5. Following community consultation, all comments are considered.
 6. The Authority provides further advice and a summary of consultation comments to the Minister and the Chief Minister. Here they may jointly declare a project as a TPP.
 7. The TPP declaration is presented to the Legislative Assembly where, within 2 sitting days, the Assembly may, by resolution, approve or refuse the declaration.
 8. If approved by the Assembly or no action is taken in the 2 sitting days, the TPP declaration commences.

These steps, accounting for the time for the statutory consultation period and the administration for formal review, approval, tabling and subsequent review, would take 15-20 weeks to complete. These steps and indicative timeframes are also outlined in [Attachment 1](#).

Notably, Attachment 1 also displays that the amendments proposed as part of the Bill will result in potentially 20-52+ weeks of efficiencies in the delivery of public housing and public health facilities.

In this context, the Inquiry Report's view that the TPP process is untested, fails to consider available evidence for improving process and delivery outcomes as they relate to these essential facilities.

Theme 4: The aim of the Bill is to avoid scrutiny to increase public housing stock.

The Inquiry Report clearly outlines there is broad support for increasing public housing stock in the Territory. The ACT Government agrees and supports these comments. However, it is noted that other comments and conclusions in the Inquiry Report seem to contradict this. It also states that there is no evidence that shows that appeals on public housing developments are a significant cause of low public housing stock.

The Bill has been introduced as it recognises the principal importance of public health facilities and public housing developments and to embed the critical importance of timely delivery when such developments are identified. Specifically, the Bill acknowledges and addresses the shortcomings of the TPP declaration criteria and process for public housing and public health

facilities developments, as discussed in Themes 2 and 3, by using an established mechanism, which is used for light rail, that allows developments to be automatically considered a territory priority under the planning system.

Specific to public housing, the removal of third-party appeal rights helps address the unfortunate social stigma public housing and public housing tenants often face, which manifest in third party appeals of new housing projects.

The Inquiry Report speculates the Bill presents a choice between waiving appeal rights following consultation and oversight or scrutiny by the Legislative Assembly versus waiving appeals rights without consultation and Assembly oversight. While the Inquiry Report expresses support of developing more public housing and them being given priority, this conclusion outlines that the priority cannot be given without case-by-case consideration by the Assembly and community, which will result in 20-52+ weeks of delay (see [Attachment 1](#)).

For clarity, and in response to concerns raised during the Inquiry about government failures in planning oversight, projects classified as TPPs will still be subject to full DA processes, including entity referrals, public notification, and assessment against the requirements of the Planning Act, including the Territory Plan. Importantly, consultation during the development assessment process remains intact and development applications public health facilities and public housing projects will still remain subject to standard public consultation requirements under the planning system, ensuring transparency and opportunity for community input. Only the post-approval litigation pathway is affected. The inclusion of public housing and health facilities under the TPP framework reflects their strategic value and time sensitivity, not a departure from sound planning or governance.

While community concerns about past decisions, such as referenced with Brindabella Christian College (BCC), warrant consideration, the BCC case is not directly relevant to the intent or operation of the Bill and is not an example of planning outcomes resulting from a lack of oversight or weak process, rather it reinforces the Government's commitment to continuously improving development and planning processes and strengthening integrity frameworks. The Bill does not amend or override any provisions that govern development assessment, building standards, or compliance enforcement.

Submissions to the inquiry, excerpts of which are included in the Inquiry Report, mischaracterise the Bill as a means by which to limit or negate oversight and concerns are expressed that removing appeal rights would lead to reduced accountability. However, the Bill does not diminish elements of the compliance framework that ensures planning integrity. The Bill does not remove or weaken compliance obligations, nor does it limit regulatory enforcement or post-approval monitoring. Instead, it streamlines the administrative pathway for essential public infrastructure, while maintaining rigorous compliance oversight.

Notwithstanding the Government acknowledges that the Planning (Territory Priority Project) Amendment Bill 2025 and the removal of these third-party ACAT appeals, engages the right to a fair hearing under Section 21 of the *Human Rights Act 2004* by limiting third-party appeal rights, this limitation is carefully targeted, proportionate, and demonstrably justified under Section 28

of the Act. The removal of appeals is confined to a specific class of development that delivers clear benefit to members of our community, where the public housing growth and renewal program as whole provides a significant public benefit and is essential to fulfilling the ACT's obligations under the National Housing Accord and the National Planning Reform Blueprint, as outlined in Recommendation 5 below. The Government considers the limitations proposed by the Bill are entirely reasonable, necessary, and consistent with the broader objective of realising socio-economic rights and the public interest.

The Bill provides a targeted and specific amendment to include public housing and public health facilities only under an existing automatic TPP mechanism. No broader reform to appeal rights has been proposed, and any such future consideration would be subject to separate consideration. The Bill is a measured policy response to clearly identified delivery delays for projects of high public value, not a signal of intent to change the ACT's broader appeal framework.

Recommendation 2

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government introduce legislation that addresses the technical barriers to declaring public, social and community housing as Territory Priority Projects, noting that the ACT Government agreed that section 218 of the Planning Act 2023 can already be used to declare public health facilities as Territory Priority Projects.

Government Response: AGREE IN PART

Amend section 218 to address technical barriers

As outlined in Theme 1 and 2 of Recommendation 1, the technical barriers to declaring public, social and community housing projects using the criteria under section 218 of the Act are already known.

Expanding the 'default pathway' for a Territory Priority Projects was specifically designed to address problems with the criteria in s218 for the public housing program as a whole, where individual projects would otherwise be ineligible under the 'declaration pathway'.

It is noted that changes to the criteria alone will not address the inefficiencies in the TPP process which would increase project delivery timeframes, when compared to the outcome of the amendments proposed as part of this Bill. More detail is available in Theme 3 of Recommendation 1 and at Attachment 1.

The exemption of public health facilities and public housing proposals from third-party appeals is also not a novel proposition, and at a national level has already been implemented across the majority of states and territories. This is outlined in the response to [QON 01](#) of this Inquiry. When considering the broader reforms to the approval and assessment of public, social and affordable housing implemented by other jurisdictions (outlined in the response to [QTON 08](#) from the public hearing on 15 April 2025) what is being proposed by this Bill could be considered conservative in comparison.

Consider community and social housing

The Inquiry Report recommends that amendments be considered to allow more community and social housing be considered a TPP under the 'declaration pathway'.

Noting previous explanation on how the 'declaration pathway' is not fit for purpose for public or community housing projects, the Government will consider amendments to include community and social housing as being automatically considered TPPs under the 'default pathway' similar to that proposed for public housing under the Bill.

As was outlined in the Government Response on the Inquiry, the ACT Government is open to the inclusion of community and social housing being considered a TPP, and recognises the value of these developments, particularly in the context of supply, however, amendments to formally enable this requires further policy work, particularly to understand the extent of ACAT appeals and their impact on community housing providers, and to avoid potential ghosting activities, whereby a private developer could establish a 'community housing entity' to avoid third party appeals, and not actually deliver community housing.

The ACT Government agrees as part of consideration of this recommendation to consult across government and with the local community housing industry through the Community Housing Industry Association (CHIA) and ACT Council of Social Service (ACTCOSS) to determine other barriers that may exist around including community housing as TPPs. The Government will progress this consultation recognising declaring community and social housing as TPPs may not represent the best pathway to delivery outcomes for non-government providers and in this context, needs to understand the scope of limitations to inform the best reform approach.

Recommendation 3

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide ACAT with additional resources to facilitate the monitoring and publication of data on planning appeals heard by ACAT, and engage with all the issues raised about ACAT's role as an appeals body in the planning system and develop constructive proposals to address these.

Government Response: NOTED

The ACAT will be consulted in relation to opportunities for additional resourcing and process improvements surrounding appeals data.

Consultation with ACAT may consider the anticipated benefit to the community from additional monitoring and publication of relevant ACAT planning appeals data. The ACAT's standard practice of considering all data requests against the criteria established by the ['Protocol for the release of data relating to the operations of the ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal \(ACAT\)'](#) and its associated criteria, as outlined below, may also be considered:

- whether the same or similar data is publicly available
- whether extraction or collation of data has significant resource implications for ACAT
- the legitimate interests of the requestor; and the public interest in releasing the data.

It is important to note recommendations provided by the Committee Report appear to hinge on a view ACATs processes as they relate to third-party appeals may be streamlined, or reduced in

timeliness, if resourcing, including through the ability to gather and provide data more readily was available. Information contained in the Inquiry Report is almost universal in accepting ACAT appeals in the context of public housing, have been overrepresented by specific geographical regions in Canberra, have led to timely delays, and in one specific example, an inordinate cost to the development proponent. While reforms to ACAT as recommended by the Committee, may address some resourcing gaps, they do not appear to serve as way to underscore the community need for additional public housing facilities unencumbered by inefficient, or as identified, at times, vexatious appeals.

The Inquiry Reports focus on ACATs resourcing and reporting processes also misrepresents the role of appeals and underplays the existing accountability mechanisms within the ACT's planning framework. Government agencies are subject to internal and statutory scrutiny, including compliance checks, design review panels, and public consultation under the DA process. Third-party appeals have become increasingly used to delay or oppose otherwise compliant developments, especially in relation to public housing—where non-planning grounds (such as perceived impacts on neighbourhood character or property values) are frequently cited.

The Bill, through the designation of public housing and health facilities as TPPs seeks to reduce the negative outcomes stemming from ACAT appeals and in doing so, lessen any perceived or actual resource burden ACAT may have experienced in recent years.

Recommendation 4

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government allocate sufficient resources to Housing ACT and the Planning Authority and come up with effective processes to ensure that any administrative load posed by the need to declare public, social and community housing and public health facilities as Territory Priority Projects can be effectively managed.

Government Response: NOTED

As discussed in the response to Recommendation 1, the existing TPP declaration process is primarily time intensive, rather than resource intensive. While some administrative resources are required to administer the steps of the declaration process, most time is subsumed in the processes surrounding public consultation and presentation to the Legislative Assembly – which is influenced by the Assembly's sitting calendar, and in some instances may lead to a delivery program dictated largely by the Assembly's sitting pattern rather than community need.

As introduced at Theme 1 of Recommendation 1, a TPP declaration under the existing process is limited to separate development proposals and a declaration is not legally able to be given to a program of work, such as the public housing program, without specific development details. When this is considered alongside the historical number of development applications lodged by Housing Act (see the response to [QON 11](#) of this Inquiry) and the number of public housing developments which are planned to be delivered through the Growing and Renewing Public Housing and Social Housing Accelerator Fund (see the response to [QON 16](#) of this Inquiry) alone, it is evident amendments proposed by the Bill represent the most efficient and effective process to consider public housing and public health facilities as TPPs. Furthermore, it does so in a way

retains accepted and unanimously agreed principles of public consultation without the increased inefficiencies created by existing mechanisms.

Recommendation 5

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government identify areas where the development application process can be streamlined.

Government Response: NOTED

The ACT Government is improving the development application process through several initiatives, including those outlined below.

The ACT Government, through National Cabinet, have agreed to the National Housing Accord and National Planning Reform Blueprint. This includes several planning, zoning, land release and other measures that seek to improve housing supply and affordability over five years from 1 July 2024. This includes a specific commitment to create an accelerated development and approval pathway for eligible developments, including social and affordable housing.

It is noted that the Bill was one action the ACT Government proposed to take under the Blueprint to streamline approval processes to support the rapid delivery of social and affordable housing, that is being opposed by the Committee.

National Planning Reform Blueprint Planning, zoning and land release measures to improve housing supply

Measure 6

Create accelerated development pathways and streamline approval processes for eligible development types, particularly in well-located areas, including to support the rapid delivery of social and affordable housing.

It is noted that the Bill was one action the ACT Government proposed to take under the Blueprint to streamline approval processes to support the rapid delivery of social and affordable housing, that is being opposed by the Committee. The ACT Government will report on the reforms being undertaken to achieve this measure, including reforms to social and affordable housing approval pathways and will note the Committee's position in opposing the actions taken.

The ACT Government has also recently created the City and Environment Directorate (CED) by amalgamating Access Canberra, Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS) and Environment Planning Sustainable Development Directorate (EPSDD). The new Directorate seeks to provide streamlined customer service and efficient operations that align planning, transport and environmental care. One of the specific goals of CED is to deliver faster and more streamlined decision making in relation to development proposals and a streamlined approach to entity referrals.

Additionally, early this year, it was announced that the ACT Government will work with the building and construction sector on a *Construction Productivity Agenda for the ACT*. This initiative aims to create a more efficient and effective planning and building system by looking at issues holistically. A key objective is to identify and implement practical measures that support our goal

of enabling 30,000 new homes by 2030, including potential process and policy improvements. The ACT Government have commenced and will continue this work through the Planning and Construction Industry Chief Executive Reference Group.

The ACT Government has also developed the ACT Planning System Evaluation Framework 2024-29 to support the ongoing implementation of the new outcomes-focused planning system, which is available on the planning website and will be implemented over the next five years. An in-depth analysis and evaluation of the process to decide development applications is the first major evaluation under the ACT Planning System Evaluation Framework 2024-29, and is currently underway.

ACT Government Response to the Standing Committee on Planning, Transport and City Services - Report No. 1 – Inquiry into the Planning (Territory Priority Project) Amendment Bill 2025 – Dissenting Report

A Dissenting Report by Ms Caitlin Tough MLA was included as Attachment E to the Committee Report. The Dissenting Report notes the following:

“[Ms Caitlin Tough MLA] agree[s] to recommendations 3 and 5 so far as they provide a means of improving the efficiency of the overall planning system and streamlining the DA process for all development applications regardless of whether they apply to public housing, public health, or any other development.”

The recommendations included in the Dissenting Report are provided below.

Dissenting Report - Recommendation 1

That the Assembly pass the Planning (Territory Priority Project) Amendment Bill 2025

Government Response: AGREED

Please refer to response provided for Recommendation 1.

Dissenting Report - Recommendation 2

That Territory Priority Projects be expanded to include housing projects by the community and social housing sector.

Government Response: AGREED

Noting previous explanation on how the ‘declaration pathway’ is not fit for purpose for public or community housing projects, the Government will consider amendments to include community and social housing as being automatically considered TPPs under the ‘default pathway’ similar to that proposed for public housing under the Bill.

Please refer to response provided for Recommendation 2.