



DPA-04 Missing Middle Housing Reform

Answer to question taken on notice

Asked by: Ms Fiona Carrick MLA

Addressed to: Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development

In relation to: Mr Fluffy redevelopment outcomes lessons

Hearing: 12 February 2026

Uncorrected: Proof Transcript p. 126-127

Transcript provided: 19 February 2026

Answer Due: 26 February 2026

MS CARRICK: So will you review the Mr Fluffy outcomes?

Mr Bennett: The Mr Fluffy responses have been a key part of how we have informed our demonstration housing project and also the outcomes that we have looked at through the missing middle housing reforms as well. So we have we have looked at that as a reference point to inform where we have landed on some of these reforms and some of the balance here that we are talking about in terms of redevelopment of existing areas has been informed by some of those redevelopment outcomes as well.

MS CARRICK: So can you tell us where some of the Mr Fluffy went wrong that is informed?

THE CHAIR: We are, I think, that is—

MS CARRICK: Take that notice.

THE CHAIR: Yes, do you want that taken on notice?

MS CARRICK: Yes, like, where were some of the shortfalls in the Mr Fluffy that you have picked up on?

THE CHAIR: Yes, so how this system, what the mistakes were there and how this system does not make the mistakes, is that a question you can take on notice?

Mr Bennett: Maybe not framed in the—what were the mistakes, but we can talk about the—

THE CHAIR: Yes, sure. Yes, the lessons learned, sure. The lessons learned.

Mr Bennett: Yes.

Mr Engle: I think Mr Fluffy was s—like, that was under the old planning system, it did not have the same level of design, design focus to it, so they are very different planning controls.

Mr Steel: Also, it was an RZ2 zoning change for Mr Fluffy blocks, whereas this reform is largely focused on RZ1, but also includes RZ2.

MS CARRICK: It did not change it to RZ2, but anyway. It did not change Mr Fluffy's to RZ2. It gave different controls, but they were not the same as RZ2.

Mr Steel: RZ2. I apologise if I have got that incorrect.

THE CHAIR: Do you want that taken on notice? Is that still—yes—

MS CARRICK: Yes, I would like to know what lessons learned you have got out of Mr Fluffy. Like, even though there were different controls, how did it inform—what were the lessons, where were the outcomes, not that great, that informed this reform?

Chris Steel MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

The ACT Government's planning changes for surrendered residential blocks (i.e. Mr Fluffy blocks) as allowed by V343 to the Territory Plan were generally successful in supporting the redevelopment of large residential blocks. It is estimated that about 26-40% of these blocks took up the additional development rights, across different block size ranges. However, it is important to note that these developments occurred under the old rules-based planning system.

Insights drawn from existing dual occupancy developments, including those developed under the V343 rules, as well as other missing middle typologies, helped inform the proposed planning control changes and new design guidance within the Missing Middle Housing Reforms (MMHR). Some considerations from realised examples of missing middle developments that informed the MMHR related to:

- Building Typology - see the guidance in section 3.1 of the draft Missing Middle Housing Design Guide
- General site conditions and suitability
- Block size thresholds and density expectations
- Building siting and setback relationships, including overshadowing and overlooking
- Onsite parking access and arrangements
- Integration of living infrastructure, including planting area and canopy cover requirements
- Unit titling and subdivision considerations.

Given the substantial planning system changes that have been introduced since V343—including V369 (Living Infrastructure), the new *Planning Act 2023* and the new outcomes-focused Territory Plan and the proposed MMHRs—a standalone, retrospective evaluation of V343 is unlikely to provide additional value.

Approved for circulation to the Standing Committee on Environment and Planning

Signature: 

Date: 25/2/26

By the Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development, Chris Steel MLA