



# **PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA**

## **TRANSCRIPT**

### **HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

### **ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A**

Hon. Kerry Vincent MLC

**Tuesday 2 June 2026**

#### **MEMBERS**

Ms Helen Burnet MP (Chair)  
Mr Marcus Vermey MP  
Mr Dean Winter MP  
Dr Rosalie Woodruff MP

#### **OTHER PARTICIPATING MEMBERS**

Ms Brown  
Mr Jaensch  
Mr Bayley  
Mr O'Byrne  
Ms Rosol

## **IN ATTENDANCE**

### **HON. KERRY VINCENT MLC**

Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Local Government, Minister for Housing and Planning

### **Housing and Planning portfolio**

#### **Anthony Reid**

Director Construction and Housing

#### **Shane Gregory**

A/Secretary, Department of State Growth

#### **Ben Wilson**

Chief Executive Officer, Homes Tasmania

(Can be called)

#### **Sean McPhail**

A/Director, State Planning Office, Department of State Growth

#### **Richard Gilmour**

Director Community Infrastructure, Homes Tasmania

#### **Jessemy Stone**

Director Housing Policy and Programs, Homes Tasmania

#### **Scott French**

Principal Business Analyst, Homes Tasmania

### **Ministerial Staff**

#### **Tim Lovibond**

Chief of Staff

#### **Victoria Matterson**

Senior Adviser

#### **Adele Fenwick**

Senior Adviser

# PUBLIC

## Housing and Planning

**The committee met at 4.00 p.m.**

**CHAIR** - I welcome everybody to this committee. The time now being a little after 4 pm, the scrutiny of the Housing and Planning portfolio will now begin. I welcome the minister and other witnesses to the committee. I invite the minister to introduce persons at the table for the benefit of Hansard, please.

**Mr VINCENT** - Thank you. On the right, I have the acting secretary of DSG, Shane Gregory, and beside me here, Dr Anthony Reid [inaudible 4.07.41]. On my left-hand side, I'll allow Ben to introduce his staff.

**Mr WILSON** - Ben Wilson, interim CEO of Homes Tasmania, and Jessemy Stone, who's our director of Housing Policy and Program.

**CHAIR** - Minister, the committee has agreed that opening statements should be tabled rather than read. Would you like to table a statement before we begin questions?

**Mr VINCENT** - No, that's fine.

**Ms BROWN** - At the November 2025 budget Estimates, 43 properties were reported under the Rapid Rehousing program whilst the most recent dashboard figures say that there is only 40 properties now in the program. Can you tell the committee what's happened to those three properties?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'll ask Mr Wilson to assist me on that.

**Mr WILSON** - Under the program, similar to the Private Rental Incentive Scheme, we do have a number of leases that come in and out of the program. At the moment, that's currently where the program numbers are sitting. Not to say it couldn't get back to those numbers if there were additional properties to come in from open market.

**Ms BROWN** - Okay. What are you actively pursuing to up those figures?

**Mr WILSON** - Similar with the Private Rental Incentive Scheme, we have Loreto Community Housing as our community housing partner in relation to those. We are running a number of programs and initiatives to try and bring private rental properties into that portfolio where we can.

**Ms BROWN** - So, is this a new initiative? Or is this something that you've currently been doing for  $x$  amount of time, because obviously that model is not working? Is there any new initiatives that you're implementing to boost those numbers?

**Mr WILSON** - There're certainly in relation, there's no set new initiatives outside of the Rapid Rehousing or the Private Rental Incentives Scheme. It's about us working with our particular community housing provider who delivers that service on behalf of us to try and increase the numbers. It is open to, obviously, commercial market opportunities for rental portfolio to be brought into the mix to make those properties available.

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - I might say, it's something pretty important because it allows us for that, as the title says, rapid rehousing when we do have extraordinary circumstances where we need to utilise that, so we need to make sure we have got numbers available.

**Ms BROWN** - But right now we don't.

**Mr BAYLEY** - We very much welcome the decision to disband Homes Tas and bringing it back into government. You've announced Building Tasmania, or the Premier did in his state of the state address.

There've been numerous questions of you in parliament and you have been really upfront. but there is scant detail, as it stands at the moment, in terms of exactly what this is going to look like and the exact operational plans that sit behind the transition of getting Homes Tasmania into Building Tasmania. There doesn't also seem to be any sort of funding in the Budget to pay for the transition. Can you talk us through where we're at with the transition, when it can be expected, if it's going to cost money and how that's going to be funded?

**Mr VINCENT** - We certainly are working through it. I think I've been using the terms internally that we put the skeleton together and we're starting to put the flesh on the bones, which has largely sat with the acting secretary to do a lot of that work.

Because we have an active situation with Homes Tas and we've made some adjustments into the way that's administered and how we're focusing on that, we don't have to rush it in on 2 July when Building Tas is formed. We want to work through that properly. Obviously, the crisis housing situation is an area of work that we're very sensitive to and we want to get that structure right first. So it'll be a transition over the next six to 12 months.

But for a little bit more detail on that, I will ask the acting secretary to fill in a little bit more on those points to satisfy your question.

**Mr GREGORY** - We have been doing all the preparatory work and planning to commence the establishment of Building Tasmania. Building Tasmania is essentially a restructuring of the Department of State Growth. As the minister said, we are working to get the skeleton in place, so the basic structure of Building Tasmania. We'll look to have that in place within the Department of State Growth for 2 July. So, that structure will be there. At that time, DSG will become known as Building Tasmania, and we will still, at that point in time, retain all of the other functions that currently sit within DSG because moving those out takes a little bit of time and working through.

About the middle of August, the Climate Change Office will transfer out to NRE Tasmania and then we will continue working through all the planning and getting ready to move all the other functions out, which will essentially occur in December of this year. That's the current plan. The functions related to the arts, Creative Tasmania and so on, they'll move out.

**Mr BAYLEY** - What about the ones coming in, in terms of Homes Tas? That's what we're interested in.

## PUBLIC

**Mr GREGORY** - To bring Homes Tasmania in, we're looking to create space and move the others out. So, 3 December is our target at the moment to move out the functions that won't be in Building Tasmania and to move Homes Tasmania's functions in.

There are some other functions related to the delivery of capital works for other departments that we'll look to start to transition in about September and that'll be a progressive piece of work that will happen over a reasonable period of time. The minister's talked about the transition occurring over six to 12 months. We won't bring in all of the capital delivery projects from, for example, DECYP, the Department of Health and so on, all in one hit.

What we are looking to have in place on 2 July is the basic structure. Initially that will have a transport services group, which is the current group that sits within State Growth, minus the construction element. There will be an infrastructure strategy and planning group, which is a rearrangement of the current strategy, housing, infrastructure and planning group, again minus any delivery component. Then we'll have a construction services group that will be progressively built up to deliver all of the construction activities for government.

Then on 3 December we'll bring in the Homes activities, which will create a housing services group, minus the delivery component of work. So the specific construction activities that are currently undertaken directly by Homes Tasmania will move into our construction services group. Then within that we'll have a building construction, housing construction, civil construction group.

**Mr BAYLEY** - In terms of operational efficiencies, obviously there's been much talk about 250 jobs within State Growth, and the savings are all laid out in budget paper 4. What are your expectations in relation to Homes Tas-related capacity and efficiencies as they shift across? Are we expecting capacity to be reduced there because of the cuts or the operational efficiencies?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'll let the acting secretary talk to that. But from my point, as the minister responsible, I'd like to think and believe that my thought patterns on my years in business will allow for an efficient system of operation having all the construction in one area, and all the strategic and planning in another area, and have them siloed up a little bit better. I guess the numbers of people in or out isn't quite as relevant in my mind at the moment as the efficiencies that we want to build into delivering the programs. Having said that, I will go to the acting secretary a little bit more on the numbers.

**Mr GREGORY** - The key outcome we want to achieve is to bring all of the construction together into one system, one approach. At the moment, if you look across government, each department deals with its capital projects in different ways and interacts with industry in different ways. Some of the programs are small, some are large. We lose some efficiency there. We do our procurement in different ways. That doesn't help us in terms of how we engage with industry. That's one of the key things we are looking to achieve out of this change is to bring all of that together, get some efficiencies, basically do all of our capital delivery using the best practice that we have across government and looking to improve again.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Is that the main space for envisaged savings in Homes Tasmania? Or are there other areas?

## PUBLIC

**Mr GREGORY** - What we'll find is that there are some efficiencies to be gained. At the moment, every department, including Homes Tasmania, has for example, a procurement team that deals with procurement. There'll be some efficiencies gained by bringing those functions together. I'm talking about capital program procurement. There'll be some efficiencies gained through that process. Every entity has a group that runs some sort of project management system. Again, by having one we'll gain efficiencies there.

That's what we're really seeking to achieve through the creation of Building Tasmania, bringing together all those loose arrangements into one place. And when you bring all of those together, we won't need the same level of resources to do it in one place as we do doing it across six or seven different entities.

**CHAIR** - Mr O'Byrne, do you want to have two questions and we'll just rotate, if you're happy to do that?

**Mr O'BYRNE** - This is a moment in time. I'll reflect on [inaudible 4.18.02] I get told [inaudible].

**CHAIR** - I know, I've learned a lot from Committee B.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Thank you, Chair. Well played. I support you in your very judicious ruling.

**Mr BAYLEY** - And you get the next two after that? Is that how that works? That's what you're proposing?

**CHAIR** - Yeah.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Anyway, I've now got seven questions in my head.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Do we all get that?

**Mr O'BYRNE** - No.

Minister, thank you. I must admit, not having notes in front of you, well played. Good luck with that. Let's see how we go with the next few hours. Just a question around Building Tasmania. You've talked a massive game about it. At one stage it felt like it would solve world hunger.

**Mr VINCENT** - Not quite.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - This is the most bit of detail that we've had in terms of the structure. There's a 250 goal on State Growth to lose as staff, so 250 people need to go. We understand from yesterday DECYP people are coming across, potentially. We understand that there will be other public servants from other departments moving in and out. There is no money in your budget for redundancies.

When are we going to get to see actual details so we can understand the detail of it and consult with the community sector and those housing providers? And how are you going to fund that kind of restructure when, in some respects, you've got a crisis in housing, you're

## PUBLIC

bringing more people in to deal with the building, yet you've got to lose 250 staff? I know some people are moving to DPAC, but that sounds really messy to me. On 10 April, the Premier, in a press release, said:

Following weeks of stakeholder engagement, key details of Building Tasmania have been finalised.

Well, we haven't seen that. Could you respond to that broad question?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yeah, certainly. As, technically, my involvement comes in on the end of the month, or 2 July, it's largely been with the acting secretary to work through the, you could say, the pulling apart of DSG to start with, and then how it comes together again in all the different components. As a relative newcomer to this place, it's been interesting, some of the little bits and pieces that were in DSG. I've been adding my thought patterns, as the acting secretary has needed that input, into various areas on how I could see the different construction areas working. But for the finer details, I will ask the acting secretary.

**Mr GREGORY** - Government has released functional diagrams and we have also, within the department, provided briefings both to members of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly. We've had a couple of briefings talking around the functional structure.

The functional structure with Building Tasmania largely reflects what the organisational structure will look like. We are doing some more detailed work now on what that organisational structure looks like, where the various groups will sit, looking at what are the key positions in that structure. Obviously, we need to be communicating that with staff as the first port of call before we start communicating it broader than that. But we'll be looking to do that very soon in order to have some consultation with staff before we move to an implementation in July. But essentially, the functional structure I've talked about, which we have communicated to staff and through the briefings, is reflective of the organisational structure.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - So, there's no budget allocation -

**CHAIR** - You've had your two questions.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Minister, could you give us an update as to when the KPMG report on Homes Tasmania is to be released?

**Mr VINCENT** - I certainly can. And it's probably the appropriate moment now to table that report -

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Didn't know that was going to happen.

**Mr VINCENT** - How fascinating. There you go. It is something that I have obviously been asked in parliament and we have been working through a lot of that. From when the report came out was just as the Premier made the announcement on Building Tas. And when that first came out, I think one of the questions I did answer from the floor was about us going back to KPMG to reassess. It wasn't a major reassessment. They could run their eye through it, I think, it was over a fortnight period just to make sure that the idea of Building Tas would not overly interfere with the way they had written their report.

## PUBLIC

Since then, we've been working through different aspects of the report. There are some of the 15 recommendations in that report that Homes Tas had already been worked on. Things like the submissions to the HAFF (Housing Australia Future Fund) rounds and various other ports like that. The CFO of Homes Tas had been working through some of the financial situations. I can't say I'm an expert in that area but obviously there'll be some changes in that area, or potential for some broadening out of the way Homes is financed with a broader range of things that we would like to look at over the next 12 to 18 months.

It was probably not of the same importance as we were going through the changes that it did have a couple of months beforehand. It's pretty important, though, to still get out there and be open to everybody about what's in that report. It wasn't a disaster by any means towards Homes Tas. There were some very good points in there. There were some sensible recommendations in the report. There was a few financial ones that are fairly obvious, to be able to look at different ways of looking at various properties or different ways of funding and different organisations. And we've already seen that with the federal government stepping up to help states co-fund a lot of these housing projects, which is good.

I did just mention before we came into here about how progressive and sensible the federal minister Clare O'Neil is in those collaborations about ways forward. I was at Minco (ministerial council) on Friday. I had to be pretty quiet because I still wasn't feeling well so I just sat there and listened, which probably had its good points about it. But the fascination was no state had a magic bullet.

I had the financial report in front of me and I was trying to compare some of the things that KPMG said against what other states were - and I don't mean to sound loose with this, but they're playing around with different parts of their planning scheme and looking at different projects and what switched people on, whether they were young people or crisis care or first-home buyers. It was a little bit different to each state. And it was pretty obvious that a lot of the problems that came around are some of the experience that, even though we're a much smaller state and you feeling embarrassed about the numbers sometimes until you convert it back to a per head of population, and realise we're all the same about infrastructure and things like that.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Sorry, minister, I just want to ask where is the report going to be available to the public?

**CHAIR** - I think the minister's going to table this.

**Mr VINCENT** - I'm just going to table that now. We have that report to table here now.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Apart from here, is it on a website?

**Mr VINCENT** - DSG website as of now.

**CHAIR** - You have your three questions, Ms Brown. You had your one question, Mr Jaensch.

**Ms BROWN** - Thank you, Chair, for that clarification. On the KPMG report, you just mentioned that there were some sections that you wished to have reassessed. Were any parts rewritten from that request?

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - No, there wasn't. KPMG tabled a letter when they handed the report, from memory, that said that although a few things, as in a lot of the financials, would be slightly different under government control - as bringing it back into government, I mean, there was nothing that they felt where they needed to change their report at all. It was still as it stood with just a clarification that, obviously, some of those finer points might just be slightly different.

**Ms BROWN** - Are you committed to all of the recommendations that are in the KPMG report?

**Mr VINCENT** - I saw nothing in that report that we couldn't work through sensibly to make sure that those things happened. Like I said, quite a few of those things were obvious from day 1 had been already highlighted and been worked on through Homes Tasmania. Several of them are subjects that have been raised by a lot of people, including our own teams, that needed to be looked at as fine-tuning from the Crawford report. And it was complementary in a lot of ways. We'll still obviously have, as Building Tas forms up, to readdress some of those and a lot of that will be around the future financing. But a lot of the other things are what I would call a day-to-day part of the internal workings of what Homes Tas needs to do to deliver.

There was a very interesting one there about defining what's an affordable home. That's quite interesting because when I came into this role before Christmas, we were looking at units around the high \$600,000, say \$690,000. We are now negotiating with people at below \$500,000 for some of the units with a different sort of construction technique. In Queensland, they talk about an affordable unit being \$1.1 million to \$1.4 million in a high rise. It's very hard, even when you're talking to, say, Shelter Tasmania or the Salvation Army on what a definition of an affordable home is. And that's one of the recommendations: to find out, to work it out. When I've spoken to quite a few groups and listened on the Minco, everybody's battling with how you define that class: to a dollar or to a standard or to a need?

So, there's a few things that are awkward but, other than that, they're all doable.

**Ms BROWN** - Going back to the Rapid Rehousing program, we've spoken about three of the properties leaving the program because of the lease ending. Can you provide any information on what was done to try and retain those properties in the program, and if there are any other properties with their leases scheduled to end?

**Mr VINCENT** - Sorry, just the first part of that? The properties involved?

**Ms BROWN** - The properties that have left the program, that three that we discussed.

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, sorry. Yes.

**Ms BROWN** - What was done to try and retain them? And then, of the 40 that are remaining in the program, how many of them have leases that are subject to end soon, in the next six months or so?

**Mr VINCENT** - Through my own office, we've had a phone call this week to inquire about putting two places onto the list. I just remembered that as well. So I put them in contact with the correct people to do it. Although it's slowed, there are still people starting to realise that they can go onto that list.

## PUBLIC

**Mr WILSON** - In relation to the three specific properties, I'd have to take that on notice and happy to do so. I guess just understand the program, it does roll on a two-year lease arrangement, so there would be leases in place across that 40 portfolio that would be at very varied stages, as well as what it would be under the Private Rental Incentive Scheme. As far as actually understanding those numbers of what's coming off and on, I'd have to take that on notice.

**CHAIR** - Excuse me, the minister needs to take that on notice. Are you happy to take that on notice, minister?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Mr VINCENT** - Chair, if I could just add with the different recommendations, we have already, and Homes Tas have already started working through some of those recommendations quite some time ago. I think I touched on that. But they are already working on a lot of that.

**Mr BAYLEY** - I'm interested in Homes Tasmania's debt and also cross-checking with some of the KPMG report. Of the total debt, are you able to inform the committee how much has been allocated to the construction or delivery of new-built social and affordable housing, versus how much has been allocated to financial assistance schemes, including first home owner schemes?

**Mr WILSON** - Of the liability of the \$546 million debt at the moment, I can inform that \$388 million of that has been allocated to construction of new dwellings and \$158 million of that has been allocated to financial assistance schemes such as your first home owner and MyHome scheme.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Thank you. In terms of the debt and the transition to Building Tasmania, the budget papers are clear that it gets assumed or subsumed into the general government sector debt. Does that mean it will be serviced from the general government sector and also it will be ultimately repaid from the general government sector? And have you got the figures in relation to how that's going to be paid down over time?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, there is figures on the debt paid down over a number of years. I'll just check with Mr Wilson there. There is a program of paying down the debt over a large number of years.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Was that in the Budget? I don't think I saw that in the Budget.

**Mr VINCENT** - I think it might be in some information here, and what residual we'll be left with if everything stays the same as the present years. Now, obviously, we're going to be working through some other issues on the long-term financing of Homes Tas various areas, but there is a fair amount we need to swing back in there that we need to work through.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Are you happy to take that on notice?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes.

## PUBLIC

**Mr BAYLEY** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - In 2023, the government set a target of 2000 social homes by 2027. We're only six months shy of 2027. I'm interested to know what progress has been made and how many houses have been built?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, we'll get that figure on how many have been built. The program is starting to accelerate. Just of the last few hours, I think, we've just found out that our building applications are up by 40-odd per cent in Tasmania, against the national average of 9.8 per cent, which is encouraging after a flat period, and coming off that flat period. A lot of the work that Homes Tas and I guess it's fair to say in the room that we have all had various levels of criticism about the last few years of Homes Tas. But what we have seen is a lot of work they're doing is starting to come to fruition to accelerate that. I will hand it on Mr Wilson on a bit more detail on the 2000 homes.

**Mr WILSON** - I can report as of April 2026, we've delivered 700 social housing dwellings towards the 2000 target, and 76 towards our part of the supported accommodation. But I will note that towards our target of 10,000, we have so far delivered 2207 since that target was set.

**CHAIR** - I've also been talking to you since you've been minister about increasing the density through the northern suburbs transit corridor. I would see that as a huge boon for increasing the number of houses and so forth through there. Given this fairly low production of houses - and we haven't got nearly enough homes for Tasmanians in need, can you please update the committee on what progress has been made in updating the area plan so that the potential for the site through the transit corridor isn't squandered?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, certainly. And part of that is the showground development out there, where they're a little bit behind where they'd like to be. But through the whole corridor there, the funding was given to the Glenorchy City Council and it was responsible for the development of the corridor plan, in consultation with the City of Hobart. It was a \$500,000 grant to enable the work, funded by the Department of State Growth. A steering committee, comprising representatives from the Hobart and Glenorchy city councils, Homes Tas and DSG are working closely together to oversee the development of the corridor. RDA (Regional Development Australia) have also been involved because obviously we want to make sure that it comes through.

There's still a lot of community conversation in regards to engagement with some of the landowners out there. I know a couple that have spoken to me when I've been out in that area are concerned about the height and the density at the showground. So it's a change of what they need to understand and to get used to.

With discussions on the rapid bus network, we are fully aware of the corridors out that way, and the potential to be within 500 metres of a corridor and needing that higher density. If you take that into the Brooker or the rail corridor or the main road, it gives a fair scope for a lot of area out there. Part of that also needs to be to look at how the use of industrial land out that way may be able to transition as people move out to Brighton, and to free up some larger tracts of land that would do it.

## PUBLIC

It's been quite interesting, once again, listening to a lot of the other states where there is a lot of talk about the cost of high density and medium density, which I found very interesting because other states have a lot more of it in their metro areas, of course. There is a lot of conversation about the cost savings of being around the three, four, five storeys, and the cost escalation once you go above five. If you think about Tasmania and greater Hobart, and most of our metro areas, three, four, five storeys fit quite well in most areas. I see that as a sensible development.

Also, when you're talking to the builders, we need to lift the qualifications of more builders in Tasmania to be able to do that height of building. There is a very limited number at the moment. So, we've been also having discussions around a lot of builders increasing their scope of work from being normal residential stuff to be able to take on multiple projects of a certain size. It obviously adds more to the ability for pricing and so forth, like that, but also the options that we have around Launceston, Devonport, Burnie, Hobart of being able to increase that density.

**Mr JAENSCH** - You mentioned being at the Minco recently and hearing what's going on in other states. Clearly, all jurisdictions will have challenges with housing. But how does Tasmania compare to some of the other states and nationally when it comes to growing social housing stock?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yeah, it's been a very interesting conversation, even talking with the federal minister on the 100,000. There's hasn't been a rush to take it up. South Australia jumped in. We certainly did because we saw it as a great advantage. But some of the other states are really grappling with the cost of infrastructure into new areas at the moment.

But our figures are quite high compared with the national average. The national average is 5.4 per cent and we've been running at 14.8 per cent.

**Mr JAENSCH** - That's growth?

**Mr VINCENT** - That's growth on our numbers, the number of social and affordable rental homes. That's between '21 and 2024-25. If we can continue to accelerate like I see Homes Tas doing, especially now Mr Wilson's in the seat of CEO and focusing on delivering more, and some of those projects coming online, I am, as I have answered in the House a couple of times, optimistic about the next 12 months to two years of a good acceleration in these areas.

In listening and talking with other counterparts around Australia, we are doing very well against the averages. It is increasing. There are a lot of challenges on costs now and a lot of challenges on the interest rates. And having a family that's in that age bracket, I'm fully aware of the pressures within people, friends of my family, and everything like that, and I understand all that. That's why I welcome the federal assistance on some of these programs so that we can keep it going so we're not having these peaks and troughs all the time.

**Ms BROWN** - We've discussed in the House that when people are escaping family and sexual violence, they're not automatically put as the highest priority. Is that something that you will change to make sure that women and children, or victim/survivors escaping dangerous homes, can have a greater shot of seeking a roof over their head?

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - Certainly, I'd like to do more in that area. I've been talking with a lot of the different people involved in that area. Now, obviously in the immediate situation, there are a lot of very good people that jump in straight away to make sure those people have - sometimes it does get awkward, depending on the mix of the children and the age of the children involved. We've learnt that in the last couple of months with a couple of extraordinary situations that we've had to flex. And that's where sometimes rapid housing comes into play because it gives you a little bit more flexibility.

The issue seems to be a little bit further on when you go to actually move them into a more permanent situation, that there is categories. I do have an enormous amount of faith in Anglicare on the way they manage Housing Connect because they do prioritise things very well, as I understand it. I think I did mention that on Easter Thursday when I was with the Premier and Marcus Vermeij, the networking night that we had there. It was a part of the conversation that I had with SASS (Sexual Assault Support Service) and a few other providers there, that there'd need to be a greater concentration in that area. And it is something that is foremost in my mind because I have had recent personal experience in that area where that short to medium to long-term transition is vital for the benefit of all.

When you read Anglicare's report into homelessness's effect on children, there's a big thing about the stability of the children to cope with some of those pressures in that situation. And that's pretty vital. The more you can move them into a stable environment, the quicker the children have an opportunity to positively respond, or not drop off with a lot of their schoolwork or their social work or their sporting work. So it is an area that I'd certainly like to see more happening.

**Ms BROWN** - Are you dedicated to making sure that more does happen in that space?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'm dedicated to every part of my Housing portfolio. I certainly am.

**Ms BROWN** - As part of that dedication, would you be willing to commit to a strategy focused on women and children escaping family violence.

**Mr VINCENT** - What I would commit to is working with some very good people that are already in those areas to finding out what the better solution is. There's a lot of strategies out there now, there's a lot of different groups focusing on different areas.

**Ms BROWN** - There's no government-focused strategy in this space, though.

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, we rely on very good people in those areas. I'm not trying to push this away at all. I'm just trying to find a better way than just saying 'we have a strategy'.

**Ms BROWN** - But they would help in consultation with that strategy.

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, they would. But I am very committed to working with the professional people that are in those areas to make sure that we've got the best amount of focus on that area that I possibly can.

**Mr BAYLEY** - A couple of weeks ago there was a pretty disturbing report, I'm sure you would agree, on the ABC, I think it was, around the condition of some Homes Tasmania

## PUBLIC

premises. We had mould infestations, inadequate rain-soaked carpet, cockroach infestations that ate through a stove. I know that my office has been -

**Mr VINCENT** - Wiring on the stove. Big cockroaches that ate the stove.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Wiring on the stove, sure thing. But this is a serious issue. We've had our representation to my office of people who have been without a stove for many months, for example. I have some questions around the tenancy commissioner and repair orders.

But before I go there, I want to speak to the Budget. There is a line item in the Budget with a million-dollar figure for this current year for the social housing maintenance fund. The explainer says:

This deliverable will support the maintenance and upgrade of social housing properties, supplementing the government's existing allocation for housing maintenance.

What is that existing allocation for housing maintenance? And do you see all houses being brought up to scratch once that million-dollar top-up has been expended, or should we be seeing more in the forward Estimates?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'll certainly refer to the CEO in a moment for a bit more detail on the Budget side of things. I'd just like to clarify or point out, on maintenance work, there's two different sides to the maintenance issues. There's your day-to-day maintenance issues of damage or minor repairs, which are relatively easy and quick to fix. Then you have a different category again, in the middle, of mould or deterioration, or older buildings that need attention.

A lot of that is being taken care of with a lot of the energy-efficiency and upgrade work. So when a family moves out and the home is at that point of being judged whether you spend  $x$  amount of money to upgrade it or you probably, in some instance, in the future might be able to scrap it and use the size of the block to build more. That's the second part.

The third part of the maintenance is when somebody moves out and major rework needs to be done. So, sometimes it's very hard. We spend approximately \$34 million on maintenance every year, but it does fall into a few different categories there. I'll just make you aware of that because even now with some of the major repair work, you need to remove carpets. We, for the last, I think it is, four or five months, have been doing drug testing once people move out on the carpet and the plaster. And sometimes the house has got to be stripped and redone, and insurance gets involved.

**Mr BAYLEY** - What testing? Drug testing?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes.

**Committee member** - Meth?

**Mr VINCENT** - Meth, into the carpets and into the plaster. Some houses have to be totally stripped, which is a totally different maintenance issue to, say, mould or a deterioration of water or a leakage of a roof, or things like that.

## PUBLIC

**Mr WILSON** - Just to clarify, I guess, in relation to financial considerations for maintenance spend for this financial year through to March. \$30.39 was spent on maintenance and to clarify that \$18.3 million was spent on general maintenance. I will say \$7.5 million was spent on energy efficiency measures, and that was linked to -

**Mr BAYLEY** - How much was that sorry?

**Mr WILSON** - \$7.58 million was spent on energy efficient measures through the portfolio. And that was linked to the Commonwealth program that had a co-contribution. So, there was an uplift in relation to the upgrade of energy efficiency works on a number of properties to seek and to take full maximum outcome of that Commonwealth program. \$3.52 million was spent on landscaping and then we also had a number of buildings that require essential maintenance services.

**Mr BAYLEY** - So, \$18.3 million spent. What would you ideally spend? Is it a matter of how much you can get out the door, or is that constrained by budgetary elements?

**Mr WILSON** - Certainly from the \$18.3 of the general maintenance works, no. That's consistent with what we'd see through the portfolio. You know, if we look at the total work orders that were raised during the period, there was 21,000 work orders, and 12,000 of those were towards responsive maintenance matters.

**Mr BAYLEY** - How many of those work orders were ordered by the tenancy commissioner?

**Mr WILSON** - Through you, minister, I'd have to take that on notice.

**CHAIR** - Are you happy to have that taken on notice, minister?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, I am. It's not something that I -

**Mr BAYLEY** - If I may, Chair, there's one more that just -

**CHAIR** - You've had about three questions, Mr Bayley, so we'll move back to Mr O'Byrne, who's got two questions.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - In February this year, there were 5408 people living on the waiting list for social housing. The average wait time for priority applicants was 85 weeks. With this in mind, looking at the budget papers this year, you have a target of 5400 applicants, which is a very similar number to the current figure. Where did that number come from? Is that waving the white flag in terms of the waiting list?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'm not sure where that figure comes from.

So, we're referring to the performance information table, which has a projection of 5400 applicants.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Yep, so, that's the question.

**Mr VINCENT** - Projection, not target. Different.

## PUBLIC

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Where has that number of 5400 applicants come from? What's the thought behind it, given we've already exceeded that? Essentially, it's rounding down of the current waiting list, which is 5400 people. What does that say about government's ambition around the waiting list for housing?

**Mr VINCENT** - I can say on the waiting list, and I have said this in the Chamber before, that it's very hard to be optimistic about dropping it under the present world circumstances that are affecting and putting pressures on all parts of the community.

We presently build in Tasmania, I think, 2300 homes a year. I think nationally they'd like us to do about 5000. There is just no possible way we can get to that with the amount of trades and that we presently have. All states are in the same sort of category. And the pressures that are on families at the moment, in all honesty, hand on heart, I wish I could say I could reduce that number. All I can do is work with everybody in the industry to increase the number of dwellings, as we are. And we are seeing that scoping up, the number of properties, the number of blocks being developed, the amount of federal assistance to help us.

But I can see those pressures continuing for some time yet. So, as much as I'd like to be optimistic and put in targets, I don't think that's achievable at the moment, other than we need to commit more to it and make sure that we do everything we possibly can in all areas, from crisis, social and affordable. I'd certainly like to see more encouragement for first home buyers so young people have the burning ambition again to own an own home. But I have to be honest about the reality of the numbers and the pressures that are on a lot of families these days.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - I don't doubt your personal commitment to this, but we had a housing department which was overseeing the numbers go upwards, northwards. We then went to Homes Tasmania, which from day one I did not support. I triggered the Crawford review, and we've seen the KPMG report. And I did a quick scan of it. It's pretty damning. What hope have you got, what hope can you provide people who are on that list at the minute when your own budget papers basically - well, I don't think that's a real figure. That can't be what you're trying to achieve. That's just a number to fill the line in the Budget because that's essentially eight people less than what we're on now. So you can understand why people get pretty sceptical about some of this stuff.

**Mr VINCENT** - I think one of the big things, Mr O'Byrne, that we need to understand is the changes in the industry to help us get to a point: 83 or 84 per cent of all the requests now are for one- or two-bedroom. It's over 50 per cent that are one-bedroom; it's about 33 to 34 per cent that are two-bedroom, and the rest detachable. Everywhere else around Australia, the detachable homes are declining and the units are increasing. In Tasmania, we are still building more detachable houses, the normal three- and four-bedroom, than we are units. A lot of that comes from, as I touched on a few questions ago, about the builders with the mentality of just building normal homes, and I'm not knocking them for that at all.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - No. But that's been known for a while.

**Mr VINCENT** - It has been, but changing that within the industry - and I did touch on the point of the price reduction in the number of units. Mr Wilson and Homes Tas have been doing an enormous amount of work with quite a few building companies from around the state to increase the output on a lot of the land that we have available so that we increase the numbers for virtually the same amount of dollars on those lands to turn out a lot more so that we can

## PUBLIC

have a go at reducing that number. We have got a lot of land under development at the moment, which I'll ask Mr Wilson to touch on in a sec. I've talked about the acceleration, and that's what I'd like to see continue so that we can have a positive effect on those numbers.

**Mr WILSON** - I guess just to touch on a number of key projects that we've been working on: Housing Australia Future Fund round 3, stream 3, which is states and territories, we have put a bid in for 582 properties under that stream. We put an EOI in a month ago and we've just slowly been allocated to go to the next stage under those. So we have been working in early engagement with the builders' panels, class 1 and 2. To put that in perspective, we've awarded around 600 projects that are anticipated through that scheme and other schemes in recent months to fast-track the opportunities so that when we do have a successful outcome with the Housing Australia Future Fund, we have projects that are actually ready to go and hit the ground running. There's been a lot of work around engagement and bringing that forward.

There's also been a lot of work around the delivery of our stage 2 HAFF round, and also working with the community housing provider sectors as well. And also bringing underutilised land to the table to put forward under these schemes. There has been a lot of active work and that's reflected, I guess, in our future capital program for the next financial year.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Minister, it was great to see that you, the Premier and the Prime Minister were out recently at the Derwent Barracks at Dowsing Point, announcing an agreement for the future of that parcel of land involving housing. I understand there's a lot of steps to go through. But what, realistically, is the potential of that site to deliver supply? And what are the next steps from here to deliver that?

**Mr VINCENT** - In all my years around the building industry in Tasmania, I've never seen a site with so much potential. And even federally around a lot of others, we have starting up a new subdivision like Ellenbrook in Western Australia or Casey in Victoria. This is of national significance as well. I think that's why the federal minister and the Prime Minister were just as excited as the Premier to be involved in that.

Depending on the density and how it's split up, the potential of that site is around that 1000 places now. Obviously, with Wilkinsons Point there and right next to the Bowen Bridge, direct access to the Brooker Highway and east and west Derwent, the potential is huge for such a significant site. You're 2 kilometres away from the centre of Glenorchy, 7 kilometres away from the centre of Hobart. That's a rare opportunity.

But there's an enormous amount of work to be done there first. Before we can do a lot of our work, we can start to think initially about it and that will be part of what Building Tasmania will do. The other part is what the Defence and the RSL have to arm-wrestle about relocation of some of the staff that are there. And there's a lot of different things. When you get onsite there, there's a lot of things happening there. I don't want to argue with anybody that carries guns, but the military are still in control of the site. There's certain things there like the Men's Shed that fit enormously with the community that need to be still integrated in with the community.

Having spoken to a couple of the residents in those old established areas there, they're very passionate about what they'd like to see. I think when you have a site as big as that, 31 hectares, it allows you to dream a bit on what you can actually do. So, instead of a developer coming in and just plonking as many places as they can onto a site without regard to how that

## PUBLIC

community might work, because 1000 homes will eventually create a community of somewhere between 3000 and 5000 people. That's a significant amount of people. So, your green space, your walkways, how it interacts with the river, the ferry services, how it works with other community groups in that area, how the impact is going to be felt on sports things around that area. And that's all important.

We have got two to three years to work through that and make sure that that does work right for the greater Hobart area, as well as for the government and for the federal government because they are a partner in this with us.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Is there a commitment for a component of that to be social and affordable housing?

**Mr VINCENT** - There certainly is. We certainly want the percentages to be right. There is a great opportunity there because of the geography of the site, the way the sun comes up and round, facing that way for a mix of houses there and a mix of community that's going to balance things out. And, of course, when you're able to - and this is what Homes Tas work on a lot, it's almost like an 80:20 split. If you can sell 80 per cent to - of affordable places, you end up being able to keep a certain amount of social and affordable homes for those in greater need.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, minister, as interesting as that is, it's well and truly time.

**Ms BROWN** - Just on the back of that question, you were talking about the ratio of how many social houses versus how many affordable houses. Will it be that 80:20 split?

**Mr VINCENT** - Look, I don't know exactly because we're a long way from having that designer part of it done. We had some renders to give an indication on how it might fit. We have actually had architectural firms contact us to say, 'I've got ideas about it'. So, there's a lot of different thought patterns on how it can be and to maximise that land space. But what I have noticed, in reading a fair bit, is that Homes Tasmania find around that 80:20 split does work in the balance in the community and the affordability of it all.

A lot of consultation to go on with the community on how it will all work and fit, but we've got time to work through that after the federal government, Defence and RSL work through some of the more immediate issues. Have you any more thoughts on that split of the 80:20 that I mentioned?

**Mr WILSON** - It is consistent across what we are performing across a number of subdivisions now and into the future. It is a model that's proven from the financial viability to support the outcomes that we want to achieve as well. It's certainly a benchmark that's proved beneficial in the past.

**Mr VINCENT** - If I could just add to that. In some of the consultation that we've had with communities - I won't name the communities, but there is pushback sometimes of having the social housing there. If you can get that balance right and they intermingle, it's not as noticeable as some of the subdivisions from 20, 30, 40 years ago. That balance is very important to making the community work within itself as well.

**Ms BROWN** - You touched on before about the need for more tradespeople in construction to make these houses pop out of the ground. I want to talk about women in

## PUBLIC

construction. The NAWIC (National Association of Women in Construction) report, 'Not-so-little things affecting women in construction' on micro-aggression across the construction industry, that report says that 88 per cent of respondents they spoke to have said that they have experienced this in Australia. What protocols are you putting in place to ensure that this is getting stamped out so women feel comfortable on the construction side?

**Mr VINCENT** - At the recent dinner in Launceston, which was attended by a couple of your party colleagues as well, it was quite interesting because they had a forum upfront on stage talking about it. And it was a slap in the face, the comments still received by a lot of the women in the area. Some didn't worry, some did, but it was obviously disturbing to nearly all of us males in the audience [inaudible 5.03.07].

Obviously, it's a big thing that is slowly changing and they acknowledge that it is slowly changing. Facilities, all sorts of different aspects of the day-to-day change that there is in the workforce now. A lot of the older gentlemen out of the construction industry were some of the ones that were switched on to making those changes. But most companies I spoke to during the evening and after had programs in place to address a lot of those issues. So there was a big move. If you look at the CCF (Civil Contractors Federation), they take this extremely seriously and pump a lot of time and resources into making sure that the industry is kept alive and vibrant by promoting a lot of the women to come into the industry in all trades and all facets of the industry. There is a lot of commitment to make sure that balance does get right.

**Ms BROWN** - Are you able to tell me the ratio of female construction workers and male construction workers?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'd have to take that on notice to find that out. I'm more than happy to.

**Ms BROWN** - You kind of touched on it. My original question was if you could outline what government was doing to encourage female participation - not necessarily business, but from a government perspective.

**Mr VINCENT** - A lot of that comes under minister Mr Ellis's training and TAFE, and what he does with the jobs hubs and everything like that. But also the funding back to organisations like HIA (Housing Industry Association), Master Builders had a lot of work back done through the jobs hubs. Our old colleague, Andrew Hyde, has a direct involvement in a lot of recruiting, training and facilitating for that situation. I think everybody's switched on that we need everybody participating in this. I know Mr Ellis has regular meetings and funding to make sure the courses are there for those that need to have them.

As I said, I've seen first hand CCF doing enormous amount of work in this area. I'll just ask the CEO. You would notice different things in the building industry and from Homes Tasmania on this as well?

**Mr WILSON** - One of the things I can comment around, particularly in our class 1 and 2 builders panels, there are a couple of builders in that that do have female in construction hiring strategies as part of their business. We obviously are very much supportive of those outcomes and very much aware of some of those builders that are performing in that space and encouraging around that opportunity for females in the construction sector.

## PUBLIC

We certainly feel that there's more to be done. There definitely is. But we are seeing that some of our participants that are delivering some of our programs have got strategies in place within their own businesses.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Just to finish off on the conditions and repair orders, and so forth, obviously we would all hope and expect that the government is a model landlord. But we do know that residents repeatedly have to take their concern to the Residential Tenancy Commissioner. This was the additional question I was just seeking you to take on notice before. How many complaints on the condition of public houses are currently outstanding with Homes Tasmania? Is that something you can answer now or happy to take on notice?

**Mr WILSON** - Unfortunately I can't answer that now but, through you, minister, happy to take that on notice.

**CHAIR** - Are you happy to take that on notice, minister?

**Mr BAYLEY** - Thank you. Last year in this committee, the former CEO acknowledged some of the challenges in the private rental market and started to describe a bit of a knock-on effect: people are struggling to get accommodation in the private rental market, they maybe fall through that system into, and put pressure on the public housing system. Hence, we've got the housing waitlist that's growing ever longer, 5500-plus people waiting 104 weeks. I want to ask you about short-stay accommodation, which I guess has an impact in that space. But also to you, as minister for Planning.

There's 500 whole homes have been lost in Tasmania in the last year; around 4719 in total. I'm not going to say every single one of them could or would have been a long-term rental, but absolutely the evidence is that many of them were long-term rentals. You've got experts like Professor Peter Phibbs and advocacy groups like Shelter Tas, the Tasmanian Council of Social Service (TasCOSS), the Tenants Union. Everyone's pleading for government to take action. The Hobart City Council is now trying to address it by virtue of application fees and doubling rates. But there's some pretty simple planning fixes in this.

Is this issue a concern to you, minister? And if it is, what are you prepared to do about it, because it does look like a planning fix is the best possible option when it comes to dealing with short stays?

**Mr VINCENT** - There's a couple of things. I disagree with what you said about everybody screaming out for that. There are, certainly in Hobart we know there's been an effect there. But in most towns, say up and down the east coast, it's a lot of holiday homes or shacks that are being utilised. That would supplement the incomes for people while they're not there. So we're not seeing that sort of pushback from areas outside of, say, Hobart.

**Mr BAYLEY** - We are a little bit, to be fair, like some of the tourism sector in terms of hiring staff, finding accommodation for staff.

**Mr VINCENT** - Involved with that and certainly not experiencing, as you put it, that amount of pushback. But it is recognition that some of those have been affected.

It's an area that I'm quite concerned about and, over the last few days, have been swapping some text messages, again, with my federal counterpart because it's a area where a lot of mums

## PUBLIC

and dads used to have rental homes. I'm not sure whether it's because superannuation now is a good return on their money why they're not owning rentals any more. But I have made sure over the last couple of months, I've spoken to pushing 25 to 30 people that I know that used to have rentals that do not have them any more.

**Mr BAYLEY** - What are they now? Short stays? My question was around short stays.

**Mr VINCENT** - No, none of them are short-staying. They have just moved out of the rental market for a lot of different reasons, some financial, some because they didn't want the heartache of repairs and everything like that. Only two or three of them have gone to short stay, and one of them turned it back into a full-time rental.

I've just been talking on the reason why because we're not seeing rentals available because a lot of mum-and-dad investors aren't having that as an investment towards their retirement any more. There's a couple of different reasons why and I am trying to figure that out to increase the rental markets. Because if you look at whether it's the federal government or any state government, it is a bottomless pit of what we'd need to keep up with that 5400 number all the time.

**Mr BAYLEY** - On short stays specifically though, minister, that was my question.

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, coming back to the short stays, thank you. Fair point. There is already provisions under the planning scheme for councils to change their LPS's (Local Provisions Schedules), is it?

**Mr BAYLEY** - Applying through the planning commission?

**Mr VINCENT** - Apply and do that through the planning commission to do that. They can actually do that now. But they have not chosen to do so because, like I said, a lot of them don't see it as the issue that it is in Hobart. Hobart's had a couple of failed attempts at bringing in different measures and probably need to sit down with the SPO (State Planning Office) and work through how they could do that more effectively.

But recognise the concern and, Chair, if it's all right, I could bring Sean up from the State Planning Office to discuss that a little bit more so that we get the right information for you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Mr VINCENT** - Sean, can you just introduce yourself as you sit down there, please?

**Mr McPHAIL** - Certainly. Sean McPhail, acting director of the State Planning Office. I can add a bit more around City of Hobart's proposals at various times about changing the requirements around short-stay accommodation. And I think that the first attempt related to under the interim planning scheme, so that was a different planning regime, obviously different legislation to what we operate now. There was, I guess, a legal impediment to that actually occurring. That impediment isn't there under the Tasmanian Planning Scheme or the legislation that applies to it. I understand that City of Hobart made another attempt as part of their draft LPS assessment process. I think that was not progressed basically because it was a last-minute addition into the process. It wasn't part of the exhibited draft LPS and there were concerns

## PUBLIC

around that not having the full consideration of the various interested parties that may have been involved, and it was best actually to put through a separate process.

There is an opportunity for councils to put forward amendments to their LPS that can modify, substitute or add to the state planning provisions. And there's particular criteria around doing that where there are particular, I guess, qualities of the land or particular issues they're trying to address that may be different to how the state planning provisions work. That's a process which is put forward by the council and assessed by the Tasmanian Planning Commission through that normal LPS amendment process.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Can you tell us how many years the City of Hobart has been trying to progress these changes in relation to short stay, minister?

**Mr VINCENT** - Sean, if you've got any information on that?

**Mr McPHAIL** - I'm not sure off the top of my head, but I might have some details here exactly when the City of Hobart first started.

**CHAIR** - You could always ask the former minister. He might know.

**Mr JAENSCH** - I'm thinking Battery Point.

**Mr McPHAIL** - It certainly relates back to when the interim planning scheme was in effect, so I don't have the exact dates of when that -

**CHAIR** - Minister, do you recognise that the City of Hobart has been totally frustrated by the issue around reining in short-stay accommodation? And it seems like there have been many attempts to try and rein this in. What is your government doing to ensure that councils have that opportunity to have that jurisdiction over short-stay accommodation in residential areas?

**Mr VINCENT** - Well, Hobart's had a couple of failed attempts where they probably haven't sought the right advice from the State Planning Office at the time.

**CHAIR** - I don't think you can blame the council completely.

**Mr VINCENT** - The rules are there already. The laws are there already that they can operate under. So, I do not know the reasons why they haven't chosen to communicate better with the State Planning Office. Certainly, Sean can discuss that.

**CHAIR** - That's pretty rich.

**Mr VINCENT** - Well, they've also knocked back a lot of high-rise buildings that could have had units in them as well. Councils are under their own jurisdiction a lot to be able to do what they have there. The systems have been there. There's been a lot of communication on this. I've only been in the role a short time, but I do appreciate that this has been going on as an issue for a long time, especially for Hobart, because we're not getting that feedback from other councils anywhere.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - I find it extraordinary that you are blaming the capital city council for these failings.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Minister, we understand that for many of the people who are accessing housing services, that housing is not their only unmet need. With crisis accommodation, in particular, what's being done to ensure that there is also access to wraparound services for people with a range of complex needs.

**Mr VINCENT** - Good question. Wraparound services are showing up to me as a vital part of what a lot of the different specialty organisations do. And I've had a lot of conversations with them to make sure their focus stays on not just dealing with the immediate issue that they have before them, but to make sure that they either link up with other organisations that are able to do that wraparound service or, if they're large enough organisations like some are, to make sure that they have follow-up. So, when you meet a person into a certain situation, you also follow up to make sure that care factor continues on.

But we are seeing with a lot of the facilities, like the Hobart Women's Shelter, where we were up there with the opening of the new units, that they are actually building units now - and I say units as in complexes, whatever word you want to put onto it, or homes that people want to be actually there and in. There is a lot of children's support there, there is playground support, there are rooms when they need to be talking to the parents that the children can go and play in that they feel comfortable in, and they don't feel like they're in an awkward interview situation. That complements how relaxed the people are and comfortable they feel in those places, which leads then to cooperating a lot better and being a lot more open about the wraparound services.

So we're seeing the dynamics of just giving people a room change from quite sterile situations of 10 to 15 years ago now to quite caring situations. When you go to a place like, say, Bethlehem House - and I've been back there a few times now and been there for evening meals, and to see how the interaction is with their workshop underneath and how they have some of the more senior people there that have been there for a while actually go out and do outreach to make sure the people that have moved on are doing well and staying on track with the different situation.

We're seeing a whole different sort of facility develop now, even in the way they do their evening meals and how they interact with food and purchasing food, and making different dishes and learning. There are a lot more things coming into when you develop a facility now than just having a room and a common area, how those people interact in that. That's stood out big time. With the newer facilities, we are seeing that working in an extremely positive way for everybody right through the whole system.

**Ms BROWN** - The 2024-25 Budget allocated \$600,000 to the Rapid Rehousing program. In the 2025-26 forward Estimates, there was \$900,000 for the Rapid Rehousing Boost Fund. That money was for a whole range of assistance. Can you provide some information about how that money was spent and if it was exhausted in both those budget years?

**Mr VINCENT** - I haven't got all those details. I would have to refer to Homes Tasmania for that.

**Mr WILSON** - To clarify, the money does go towards the two programs, the Rapid Rehousing and the Private Rental Incentive Scheme.

## PUBLIC

**Ms BROWN** - Ok. Do you want to provide those details?

**Ms STONE** - I can add to that, minister. When you ask has it been exhausted, basically the money enables the leases, so it provides a budget for us to enter into new leases. Any money that has not been exhausted carries through to the program.

**Ms BROWN** - Can you provide the information of what it was spent on? It was for the leases, but surely it wasn't all spent on just the leases alone?

**Ms STONE** - Loreto Community Housing is the provider, so the money goes towards the rental gap for the market price and the affordable price. That's a large amount of the money, and the incentive payment to landlords. And there's coordination money of one FTE to run the two programs.

**Ms BROWN** - How much is the incentive to landlords?

**Mr WILSON** - The incentive to the landlord does change in each region and does change per bedroom type as well. Through you, minister, I can take that on notice and provide that information if you'd like.

**CHAIR** - Minister, are you happy to take that on notice?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, I am.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. It has to come from you.

**Mr VINCENT** - Sorry.

**Ms BROWN** - In the Rapid Rehousing program, I assume they're still two separate programs. They're not rolled into one?

**Mr WILSON** - They are one program and formed into one contract with Loreto Community Housing to deliver both aspects of that.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Just going back to short stay, I hear you explaining the circumstances in regional Tasmania. I'm not sure I agree. We do hear of tourism businesses and hospitality businesses struggling to attract staff because they can't find places to live. I do think there's a rental challenge there. I also acknowledge that perhaps most of the Airbnb's in some areas were once upon a time holiday houses, or still are holiday houses, and they're being short-stayed out.

I take from your response, in terms of pointing to the process, that you're supportive and encouraging councils to go down that line of seeking local planning provision changes to give them more powers to address short stay in their areas, should they choose?

**Mr VINCENT** - Should they choose, yes. The provisions are there and we're happy - it's a provision that they can use if they choose to, to control that environment.

I know a lot of councils have had issues with - and I think we're starting to see this through the increase in the information on the dashboard - the number of places that are probably there to the number of places that haven't officially applied to be a short stay. There's still probably

## PUBLIC

is some variations there that councils don't seem overly concerned about. Some are working through it as they have time. But the option is for them to use the planning scheme as it sits to do something.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Have you had advice, or have you sought advice, on other mechanisms? There was some discussion some time ago of Planning Directive 6, I think it was, as a mechanism to basically give blanket capacity for councils to address short stay in their area according to their needs and wishes. Have you sought advice, and have you considered and ruled out doing something like that?

Obviously, going through a planning scheme change is expensive and time-consuming for the council, it ties up the planning commission. It's quite a resource-intensive process, particularly if we're going to do it around 29 councils. Not to say they will, but if they did.

Have you sought advice and considered a change that you can make to give councils that power? And if not, why wouldn't you consider that?

**Mr VINCENT** - I won't say that I've considered it personally. My focus has probably been elsewhere, although it is a regular discussion because it's in the papers all the time and it's coming up through mainly Hobart City Council, of course. So it has been a part of the conversation. It also has raised into several parts of the national network of conversation as well. But I don't believe that there's been any other conversation about doing anything differently at this point in time, to be honest.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Is it something you'd be willing to take advice on and consider?

**Mr VINCENT** - Always happy to consider. I've never not happy to consider and look at all aspects as best I possibly can.

**Mr BAYLEY** - It does seem like a less resource-intensive way to deal with it.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Minister, in the first two rounds of the Housing Australia fund, Tasmania performed terribly in terms of Homes Tasmania's ability to access that fund. I understand the optimism around the next round, but that's all it is at the minute - optimism. Why did we do it so badly in the first two rounds, and what's changed?

**Mr VINCENT** - I would not even try and answer that question otherwise I might have to handball over.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - I think at Estimates you have to answer.

**Mr VINCENT** - It's not something that I am across or familiar with, so I will ask for a bit more advice from Homes Tasmania on that.

I can say, though, that I've had a lot of conversations coming into the role, and the federal government, with most of the funds that I've seen, have been very sensible and honourable in the way that they have allocated a correct proportion of funds to Tasmania on a national basis of 2 to 3 per cent.

## PUBLIC

**Mr O'BYRNE** - I'm more talking more about Homes Tasmania's performance within that, though.

**Mr VINCENT** - I will ask the CEO to expand on that, please.

**Mr WILSON** -. I will touch on the Homes Tasmania performance under our current round, if I can. We have had very, very early engagement with the sector to secure opportunities and work with building partners, which we didn't do in rounds 1 and 2.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - So that's the key feature, that was a key part of the problem in round 1 and 2?

**Mr WILSON** - I wouldn't necessarily say that was a key feature. But I guess what we have done by doing that, and particularly in this current climate, is understand very clearly our cost base and how we respond to that and put our best foot forward in relation to that program.

We have - and just touching, I guess, rounds 1 and 2, there were 618 homes allocated to Tasmania through that, albeit the majority of those were through community housing providers. We are providing support and leverage for them to deliver those programs as Homes Tasmania as well.

So, the 582 homes submitted under round 3, we are confident on those. They are an allocation that's been put forward to Tasmania as a state and territory allocation under stream 3. We have had significant early engagement. We have brought our cost base down considerably, so our average build cost, including contingency and escalation over the duration of the program, is \$436,000 per dwelling. That's including both Class 1 and Class 2 buildings which have traditionally been quite a bit higher. There's been a lot of work going into early engagement, early D&C (design and construct) opportunities throughout the sector, and also identifying key sites and key areas of demand, and a significant spread across Tasmania in relation to those opportunities that we're putting forward.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - In terms of the Crawford report, it said that Homes Tasmania lack the skills and capability to adequately evaluate and manage housing projects. KPMG has an oblique reference there, more from my early reading of that, present company aside, Mr Wilson, how is this new Building Tasmania going to deal with that when, effectively, just moving people in and out?

**Mr VINCENT** - I understand that, and some changes are already made in Homes Tas to drive that focus onto constructions of dwellings a lot more than probably in the past. And that is a vital part of what we want to do with Building Tasmania. And also make sure that we have the right people in place. And as we go back to putting that flesh on the skeleton terminology that I've used a fair bit, we want to make sure that we bring in people that are able to deliver those projects. Already we've seen the CEO with his experience in this area have a different level of communication with private contractors at the different house builders and that.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - I did make that acknowledgment.

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes. So, we have seen a change in that area and that's a vital part of how we set Building Tasmania up. But also about how we utilise the skills on the subdivision

## PUBLIC

work or the delivery of larger projects with the private enterprise in partnership, instead of it just being Homes Tas.

I think we've started to see a sizeable transition through Mr Wilson's guidance in that area, and we hope to continue that and, of course, we will be achieving that with all effort and increase that capacity. But that also includes on how the acting secretary will set the structure up for people to come in that have more deliberate knowledge on deliverables in the construction area, not just in Homes Tas, but also in various other aspects of construction and civil work, to alleviate some of the issues that we have experienced as a government in recent years.

**Mr JAENSCH** - It's great to hear that the first lots at the Huntingfield housing development have now settled, and that's been a long journey. Congratulations. Can you give us an update on what's happening next, and what we can expect in terms of delivery of social and affordable housing in that context? And the ones that have settled so far, where are they? Are they open market or are they guided to affordable housing purchases?

**Mr VINCENT** - I will hand over to the CEO in a sec because it's very much his little baby at the moment. But I was going to bring bells and whistles in today, especially for Mr O'Byrne because I understand there was two broke ground today.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - It has taken eight years.

**Mr VINCENT** - There is a lot of work doing there. I think it is a project that we can learn a lot from over that eight years. And if we don't, we're fools to ourselves, simple as that. We acknowledge those issues. They are multiple issues across many different facets of delivering that project. But like anything in life, you do learn from it. We have seen the acceleration. That is, we got that first stage done and there was a lot of situations that held it up, but now we are seeing a couple of different steps.

We do need to adjust a few things to do with the titles which will come up shortly. Mr Wilson, would you like to expand on where we are with the first 33, and then the next lot coming on board, please?

**Mr WILSON** - With the first 33, six lots have settled. As the minister indicated, we have a number of those that are actually commencing onsite as we speak and over the coming couple of weeks. There are another 19 contracts that are committed to and working through settlement at the moment. And we are working with one key builder around some of the development at the front that we will support, proceeding with that.

The 33 lots are very much underway and, working through, I guess the key has been around future stages and how we bring them on, and how we look to maximise, I guess, value for money in that. And also look at how quickly we can actually bring on those stages.

We have just gone to - about to go out to market with another stage that's coming on, which is referred to as 1E, which is 13 lots. That's part of what's currently under construction. And we're working with the current contractor on site around what we call stage 1D, which is a further 42 lots that we're looking to bring in and fast-track through by the end of this year. Importantly, we also are about to engage in 1C, which is another 49 lots. So that'll see, hopefully, around 133 of the lots come through between now and next year, in 2027.

## PUBLIC

**Mr JAENSCH** - Of the ones that are coming on now, where do they fit in the mix of housing types, lot sizes and densities that were planned into that development?

**Mr WILSON** - There's a mix in stage 1A. I can say in stage 1A, which is the 33 lots that we're referring to, are all being targeted towards private ownership. There has been a number of those taken up through the MyHome program, which is great to see.

As we progress through the additional stages, you'll see a mix of social and affordable housing coming to those, as well as private ownership. At the moment the houses that we've got are dual-access terrace-type houses that have been developed in the first 33 lots.

**Ms BROWN** - Back onto the Rapid Rehousing program, you mentioned that it has been now wrapped into the private incentive program. When did that happen, and how do they operate now?

**Mr WILSON** - It's my understanding that that occurred three years ago through a review of the program. Given that we had the single provider in Loreto operating both, we've built that into the one contractual obligation. Obviously, there's separate KPIs around both of those programs that are in place.

I will just add, you were asking earlier in relation to the breakdown of the incentive, it is publicly available as well, so we can provide that as well.

**Ms BROWN** - From my understanding, that information is only for one- to two-bedroom homes. Is that the extent of that?

**Mr WILSON** - The incentive payment, correct. Yes.

**Ms BROWN** - What is being done to get more homes into the Rapid Rehousing aspect of the program?

**Mr WILSON** - Linking both of those - and they both have been part of a program that we have. You may or may not have seen some marketing campaigns that have been done around that with Loreto Community Housing and ourselves trying to bring private landowners and make the awareness of the program available to those investors to bring forward their properties to make available under the program. We have been doing some marketing campaigns that have been ongoing for a period of time with Loreto and ourselves around trying to attract private investors that have residential investment properties to bring them into the program and be aware of the incentives that are attached to those in their benefit.

**Mr BAYLEY** - I'm interested in vacant housing. The April '26 dashboard shows that the average turnaround time for re-tenanting vacant homes at Tas properties was 41.6 days on a rolling 12-month average. And that's been increasing, rising from 37.4 days in April 2025 to 41.6 days in April 2026. The dashboard itself acknowledges that this trend reflects the challenges in a tight tradesperson market. Obviously, we've got well over 5500 people now on the housing register and a median waitlist of over 100 weeks. Every day a vacant property sits vacant is really significant. I'm interested in what specific steps you and Homes Tasmania are taking to reduce turnaround times and what the target is in relation to turnaround time.

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, certainly. Good question. An area we've done a fair bit of work on, which I'll ask the CEO to expand on. First up, the dashboard. We're changing the significance and the readability of the dashboard over the next couple of months so that it can find different categories a lot easier. You said 41 days. I was about to say I thought it was 38, so it probably has increased that little bit. But the complexities that I talked about before of some of the maintenance that now needs to be done, as well as the energy efficiency, is probably throwing that number out a bit. That's why I tried to define the different sorts of maintenance and that. I will ask the CEO to expand on the maintenance side of things a bit, please.

**Mr WILSON** - I guess one of the areas that is noted in the dashboard is around the challenging and tight market for tradespeople. I will comment. And just further to the minister's comments around our methodology in engaging maintenance contractors. So we have gone from a head contractor model more recently in southern Tasmania and most recently in northern Tasmania, where we've actually come to and eliminated that head contractor model and put that as a direct sourced, through ourselves and with a number of maintenance contractors that have responded to that, which has given us a significant pool of contractors. That we envisage these timeframes and ability and access to those trades directly, we'll see a reduction in those timeframes moving forward.

**Mr BAYLEY** - How many properties were vacant and awaiting re-tenanting at the end of April 2026? And what's the total number of lost tenancy days, so to speak, this represents annually?

**Mr WILSON** - Through you, minister, I'd have to take that on notice if that was okay.

**CHAIR** - Are you happy to take that?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, certainly.

**CHAIR** - Minister, I'm pretty shocked by your response in relation to the planning mechanisms that Hobart City Council have tried to use and now have available to them. We know that there's been a huge drop in rental availability. I think it's halved, according to an Anglicare figure over, is it 10 years?, which was released earlier this year. How long do you think, through this planning mechanism, it might take for the City of Hobart to have those changes? If they're successful, how long do you think it might take?

**Mr VINCENT** - Because that's technical side of things for the State Planning Office, I'll ask Sean to answer that.

**Mr McPHAIL** - Obviously, the process that it takes, or the time it takes, will depend on the complexity of the proposal put forward. There's a process which is set out in the legislation and that's generally around about a six- to eight-month process to undertake that. I imagine there'd probably be a fair bit of interest from the community in a proposal to change their provisions to do with short-stay accommodation, so that would need to be worked through and, obviously, there'd be a number of submissions and hearings that would be involved in that process as well.

**CHAIR** - So it still could take quite some time. I've just got a question still on short stay. According to the new Consumer, Building and Occupational Services (CBOS) short-stay dashboard, there are now 9669 individual properties in the short-stay market in Tasmania. Of

## PUBLIC

these 4719 are secondary residences, i.e. whole homes or non-hosted properties. Shelter Tas and its members are concerned about the impacts of the growing numbers of short-stay accommodation properties in Tasmania, as you're well aware, while residents and key workers who power this city are unable to find homes. There is a clear solution here, which is to amend the state planning system. I'm just curious as to why, why you won't do this, why this won't occur?

**Mr VINCENT** - As I've said to Mr Bayley, happy to look at suggestions in this area. But as I've also said, in my relatively short time in this ministry, I have been aware that there are planning provisions that could be used there that haven't chosen to be used fully for various reasons. But happy to continue discussions on that, Chair.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Minister, we've had some discussions about this before, so you won't be surprised that I'm raising it here because this is my chance to do so, on matters that are important to me. I welcome the move to bring Homes Tas back closer to government's core responsibilities. We've spoken, and you described at the outset, about the structuring and the focus on buildings and project management, supply and volume, and getting those skills right.

Where, in the new architecture of Building Tas, are the people? We've got to work on the assets and the supply of housing, but the people we're housing, particularly young people, have very complex needs and need to be connected to lots of other parts of government services that know them and that they rely on. How are we building that into the new model?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, there's a separation of responsibilities there and we have had a lot of time on the phone discussing what I call the care factor and the hand-on-heart situation here. And it was a big part of what my chief-of-staff and I discussed when this was put forward: how you do it better so it's not the same. And that is, obviously, that it is very hard to have a CEO of just Homes Tas that is able to have the ability to concentrate on construction as well as the hand-on-heart compassionate side of what their responsibilities are. There is a separation of that coming into Building Tas, where it will have its own focus on the services, home services, wraparound services and everything associated with that.

Now, it was also a point that a lot of the peaks and people that deal in this area brought up and discussed, both personally with me and I think with the acting secretary as well, as he moved around. And our arm wrestling or discussions, however you'd like to put it, with the sector helped us form up that a concentration of having services in a separate area with a lot more focus, and just that separation so that we could focus a lot more in that area, seemed to be appropriate and sensible. So we will be aligning that different to the construction side of things. There's a little bit more work to be done but I can assure you, working closely with the sector, that is a very big focus indeed.

**Ms BROWN** - What is Tasmania's share of the National Housing Accord target?

**Mr VINCENT** - We'll take it on notice, thank you.

**Ms BROWN** - Thank you. I have a series of questions: Do you know if we're currently on track to meet our share of the target?

**Mr VINCENT** - We'll just check on that. We will double-check this for you but, from the information that I have here now, the Tasmanian target is 1400 social or affordable homes,

## PUBLIC

proportionate to the population, working on 2 per cent that they do. We have been funded to deliver 618 under the HAFF rounds 1 and 2, with an additional 582 coming online in 3, which brings us up to just on that number. So, they are working on the 1400 numbers to make sure we end up with that amount, from the information I have available.

We've still got to get the 582. We're at 618 at the moment, and 582 is in the ability for HAFF 3. Am I reading that right? Yes, so the 618 is correct with 1 and 2, and the 582 is what we're expecting to hear on for 3, which brings us up to the 1400.

**Ms BROWN** - What is the timeline for those stages?

**Mr VINCENT** - I shall ask the CEO for an indication on that.

**Ms BROWN** - Can I ask what the timeline is, and if we're on track to meeting it?

**Mr WILSON** - The final timeline is by June 2029 for the delivery. And that would include the 582 that we're currently working through with Housing Australia. As far as are we on track to deliver under rounds 1 and 2, yes, we are. Some of those are properties that we are delivering and some of those are properties we are supporting community housing providers to deliver. And we are certainly on track to achieve those under those targets.

**Ms BROWN** - Will those numbers be pulled into the 10,000 -

**CHAIR** - We'll go to Mr Bayley.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Minister, earlier this year the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI) published a quite disturbing report into trauma on the frontline protecting housing, so basically frontline workers dealing with the housing waitlist and others. The trauma that's inflicted upon them from some of the challenging situations that they have to deal with. AHURI found 98 per cent surveyed observed clients or tenants under the influence of alcohol or drugs. Death, suicide and self-harm was raised or spoken about with 95 per cent while 96 per cent had experienced trauma because of verbal aggression and threats. This is clearly an issue across all frontline service delivery. The housing space is not immune, nor is Tasmania. Tasmania was part of this survey. What are Homes Tas, your department and you doing specifically to support frontline workers on the housing crisis in relation to their health and needs?

**Mr VINCENT** - Before handing over to Ben, I've seen this even in our own ministerial office, the pressures that are put on my two people, and the situations and the dramatic situation they have to deal with. It does play on your mind. I know personally it does with me. Very much so. We've had to make sure, my chief has had to make sure that the staff are okay with how they're dealing with, and work through various situations with them. You do see that at all levels of dealing with these situations, and -

**Mr BAYLEY** - It's probably exacerbated by a sense of inability to really help as well.

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, that inability is something you have trouble dealing with at times. I know Ms Brown and I have talked about this with various tenants as well that we go out to see, and how it does play. I will ask for a bit more information directly from Homes Tasmania.

## PUBLIC

**Mr WILSON** - I guess there's a couple of components around that. We have the Housing Connect system and front door, where they are dealing with a lot of people in crisis. And certainly, we rely on external providers to assist us in that forum, so the Anglicares. And I know that certainly they have strong commitments to their staff and trauma-informed training, and a range of things that are there to support their staff in delivering their day-to-day job. And not taking away from the pressures and the challenges that they see continually on a daily basis.

Also, from a tenancy services perspective, so internally within Homes Tasmania, our tenancy service officers are impacted by some of the trauma that you mentioned, as well as the community housing providers as well. We certainly, you know, encourage and work closely with them around trauma-informed training support that we can provide to them, and internally ourselves as well. It's certainly not lost on us, the pressure that our staff are under.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Is this something that manifests amongst your staff? I won't ask you about third-party providers, but in terms of the tenancy services staff, is it something you're observing? Do you have elevated rates within that cohort of your staff on workers compo, or with complaints or concerns in relation to their safety, and having to take leave? Is there data that you can table or present to us around the impact of some of this frontline trauma?

**Mr WILSON** - I'm not seeing increases from a workers compensation perspective, but certainly happy to provide, through the minister, if you'd like, on notice, in particular that area of our business. We do have some strong management practices across there, the regional managers, a whole range of things that provide numerous amounts of support to our tenancy officers. And they do, there is certainly a significant amount of safety protocols that we adhere to and support with our tenancy officers, and processes and procedures that we have internally to protect them in the workplace.

**CHAIR** - Minister, you're happy to take that on notice?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, very much so.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - I've been getting some inquiries the last couple of days around young first home buyers who get access to the stamp duty relief, which ends on June 30. There's growing concern and a level of criticism that, essentially, Homes Tasmania has been slow in providing the details to the mortgage providers. I haven't got any specific examples and I won't share them publicly, but a number of people are contacting me about that.

Could you respond to that in terms of what your understanding is of that process?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, it is due to finish on 30 June. I know that. I have had brief discussions with the Treasurer, in between his heavy workload over the last week, in regards to that. I've also had some issues come across to me on titles and various other small issues to do with that. I will ask Mr Wilson for a little bit more guidance on that matter as far as Homes Tasmania is concerned.

**Mr WILSON** - I have been meeting regularly between our team and our provider in Bank of us to ensure that the processes are in place to ensure that we don't have anyone that slips through the gaps in relation to that.

## PUBLIC

We are guided by some set timeframes that these deals need to follow through on. And that's, as an example, to proceed with a MyHome deal through a partner builder. There are timeframes that they've got to actually work through their pricing mechanisms and ensure their fixed prices are correct. So, there are some set industry timeframes that we're certainly communicating through.

If there are individual circumstances that I'm not aware of, then I'm certainly happy to take those and see what we can do. But we are having regular meetings between ourselves in our area of administering the program and particularly with Bank of us to ensure that we support as many people through in this period of time.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Have you got a line of sight as to how many applicants or potential applications are in process? Obviously, every day that goes closer to 30 June, there's a number of first home buyers who - I mean, this will be a significant challenge to them being able to settle.

**Mr WILSON** - I certainly do have a line of sight for that. I don't have that information on me. I'm happy to provide that on notice.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Just as an extension, what's the usual period of time between you receiving the documentation and it getting completed?

**Mr WILSON** - When you refer to 'the documentation' are you referring to -

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Once it comes across your desk.

**Mr WILSON** - For a house and land package, the average turnaround time is around 115 days for a house and land package. That goes through all of the processes in relation to the builder has a set period of time for them to put forward their fixed-price contract, work through all their selections with the owner and form that into a fixed price.

For existing homes, that process is a lot less than that. And then for existing newly built homes that are currently being delivered on ground, again, that process is slightly less again.

**Mr O'BYRNE** - When you say, 'slightly'?

**Mr WILSON** - We are talking 70 days.

**CHAIR** - Minister, are you happy to take that on notice?

**Mr VINCENT** - Certainly.

**CHAIR** - If you wouldn't mind, just say for the record that you would take it on notice when Mr Wilson suggests that, please?

**Mr O'BYRNE** - Chair, I'm not asking him to take it on notice. I got enough, thanks.

**CHAIR** - Oh, you have your answer. All right. You don't need to take it on notice. Withdraw that one.

## PUBLIC

**Mr JAENSCH** - Same area. Home ownership is an important part of the government's overall housing strategy. Can you please give us an update on where the home ownership initiatives around MyHome and Help to Buy, et cetera, are tracking? An update on numbers and your projections for that part of the overall strategy?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, we've been seeing a constant growth of over 300 in the MyHome category. There was some criticism towards us about not jumping into the Help to Buy system, There were some differences in the eligibility there that we tried to sort out, but now we have both of them working. Actually not - Help to Buy will be coming online before Christmas with the legislation now to allow that to happen.

But we have seen a gradual increase in the numbers over the last four years. And we're at 1060 that have taken up MyHome now. That's 60-odd in the last couple of months, I think, that have continued to add to it.

I have been out and met quite a few people that have been involved with this, and it's great to see young people or people that are starting their life over again after divorce or whatever, be able to do this sort of thing, and the effect on the children once again being able to be in a stable environment because of the equity share and the low deposit. So it has allowed a lot of people into that. I expect that to continue.

I do want to have more discussions federally about the level and the caps that they have in place because it does seem to be, with the lifting of prices and everything, that it's probably \$100,000, to use a round number, out of whack to where it probably needs to be with the Tasmanian market at the moment. So, we need to have a little bit more flexibility built into that, so that it can continue to perform for us. But it has been a very solid approach towards getting people into a home, with that equity share and low deposit. It's been one of the better schemes I've seen.

**Mr JAENSCH** - As we're in budget Estimates here, for the Tasmanian scheme for the Tasmanian Mortgage Equity Scheme, when we're making provision for that, for the number of units or cases we can handle, but the state's contribution is captured in equity. Where does that go, in terms of the state's balance sheet, or the accounting for it?

**Mr VINCENT** - It certainly sits -

**Mr JAENSCH** - It's not a grant, is it?

**Mr VINCENT** - No, it certainly sits with Holmes Tasmania, so I'll ask Ben to expand on that.

**Mr WILSON** - It sits within our capital program, and our annual forecast is reflected in that for the coming financial year of, I think 380 transactions is what we're forecasting, which is traditional around where the program been sitting over the last 12 months.

**Mr VINCENT** - It's up to 12,126 now on the latest update from about 1006 it was an old number that I had in my mind.

**Ms BROWN** - So this is for the -

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - My Homes.

**Ms BROWN** - Oh you were talking about - right, sorry.

**Mr VINCENT** - Sorry to interrupt.

**Ms BROWN** - Quite okay. Thank you for committing to check those numbers, because I have a feeling that they are not quite right, because my understanding is that it's over 5000 homes over the five years in the -

**Mr VINCENT** - Oh, with 1400 we were talking about?

**Ms BROWN** - The 1400 -

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes.

**Ms BROWN** - Of the National Housing Accord, my understanding that it was over 5000, and that we are not on track to meeting those figures. As of March, we were the worst performing state in the nation against the Housing Accord targets and we weren't expected to meet that target until September 2033. So, I'm trying to get an understanding on, if you say, Mr Wilson, that we are on track to meeting them, what's changed since March from being the worst performing to now being on track?

**Mr WILSON** - Yes, it's our understanding that the target is 1400. So, as I have indicated, happy to take that on notice and get clarification around that, and just in relation to your concern around are we delivering those -

**Ms BROWN** - If we're on track to deliver those.

**Mr WILSON** - Oh, if we're on track to deliver those. I think I'd answer that previously based on the 1400, that 618 HAFF one and two are jointly either delivered by us directly, a number of those are under construction coming near to completion, and we have a completion of 30 June 2029, under what we understand of the 1400. Also, we have partnership there with Community Housing providers, who are reporting constantly, monthly, around their tracking. We have no reason to believe whatsoever that they wouldn't meet their obligations, and then coming to the HFF round three, the 582 that we have put up, have been clearly identified as projects that we are very comfortable to deliver within the time frame by 30 June 2029.

**Ms BROWN** - So, of those dwellings, will they be added to the 10,000 new social and affordable homes target under your government?

**Mr VINCENT** - As far as I know they're part of the 10,000 target.

**Mr WILSON** - That is correct, they're part of the 10,000 target. Their projects, as I said, that have either been delivered, or being delivered by Homes Tasmania, or in partnership where Homes Tasmania is providing support for the delivery of these, through the Community Housing Provider sector.

**Ms BROWN** - Minister, Mr Bayley touched on the current maintenance, and of our social homes, and so I was just wondering if you could provide a breakdown of the homes, the

## PUBLIC

backlog of homes, that are requiring maintenance by region, as well as dwelling type. Be it unit one-bedroom, two-bedroom, three-bedroom, etcetera.

**Mr WILSON** - I don't have that information on hand. I could certainly, the information I provided earlier around the 18.34 million of general maintenance, I can tell you that 9.75 million was spent in northern regions, and 8.5 million was in southern. As far as maintenance logs and work orders, I'd need to take that on notice through you, minister.

**CHAIR** - Are you happy to take that on notice, minister?

**Mr VINCENT** - Very happy to take that on notice. Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Minister, information we received under a right to information request shows that there's plans to lease 15 units for health workers at the Macquarie Point site over time in that housing part of that site. The lease only extends for 10 years, not for the life of the site, and it's clearly not ownership by Homes Tasmania. Can you just unpack for me: What's the intention in terms of the ownership and lease arrangements for the health worker accommodation at Macquarie Point?

**Mr VINCENT** - Thank you. I'm not across that as Macquarie Point is under minister Abetz, but I would take it on notice and find out regarding the housing there as I am not across that, sorry.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Thank you. Can I ask, well perhaps, through you, has there been conversations between Homes Tasmania and the Health department, and potentially Mac Point Development Corporation, in terms of the Health department's needs for essential workers and what's appropriate from the Health department's perspective in terms of the length of tenure and the lease arrangements and the like?

**Mr WILSON** - Through you, minister, I can say I haven't had conversations with Department of Health around those requirements.

**Mr VINCENT** - I will take both parts of that on notice and get the right answer there for you.

**CHAIR** - Minister, just in regard to your response to my question about short-stay earlier. I'm not sure if you got the advice from the State Planning Office, but whoever it was, would you table the advice that you have provided about how a council should go about being able to refuse short-stay permit applications, and you said 'what they could be doing but aren't,' or would you be prepared to provide a briefing to myself and a representative from the Hobart City Council as to what they should do if you're not going to table this advice?

**Mr VINCENT** - Very happy to have a discussion. As I suggested with the SPO on that, I don't think I've had written a brief on that. It's been verbal. So I'm more than happy to have a briefing and discussion point on that.

**CHAIR** - So you don't want to table it?

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - No, if it was a briefing, we would be happy to do the briefing.

**CHAIR** - Okay, thank you. We'll go to Mr Jaensch, and after this round we'll take a 10-minute break.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Thank you. Minister, the Australian Government's 100,000 homes program: what are the opportunities in that for Tasmania, and how does it help us to achieve our targets in in this state?

**Mr VINCENT** - Just thinking whether I should say on microphone what I was about to say, but it's been very good for us because some of the other states haven't jumped at it as quickly as what we have.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Don't give it all away.

**Ms DOW** - I'm more curious to know what you were going to say now. I think you should say what you were going to say.

**Mr VINCENT** - I was going to say it's been very good for Tasmania because we have had the opportunity to move into this area very quickly. We put it out to councils to suggest what they were. We work very closely, and my chief worked very closely with the federal member for Lyons regarding this; I was off with my knee replacement at the time, so he took the lead with Rebecca on this.

We moved very quickly on it. We had I think about 27 council applications come in. Some weren't quite ready to move with it, but the three that were selected and went forward were part of us having that approval, which will see about 4000 homes in Tassie, and about 2100 dedicated to first-home buyers ,at both Meander Valley, near Hadspen, Brighton, which is a potential for about 400, and Sorell, in Sorell East, which is the other side of the bypass there, which would -

**Mr JAENSCH** - That's more than our population share, isn't it? Just quietly.

**Mr VINCENT** - We've done well to start with, and we were in Canberra having discussions on this before it was announced as well, and they are good at evening out the numbers, but it is also potential for us to do a lot more on that. We've seen the commitment from the federal government towards increasing those numbers. We're in for a fair share at the moment, but I think that sort of program will roll out.

The beauty of that program is that it is unlocking land where a lot of developers can't afford to move in and do the head works and everything. It'll break the barrier. I think there is some way forward for us, both in my ministries as well as the government, to look at how infrastructure can be funded into some of these greenfield areas, as long as it fits with our planning of the urban growth and the land use strategies. We don't want to be breaking into rural ground, of course, but there are quite a few sites around the state where substantial numbers of houses can be increased.

There is a lead-time to this and we're talking about 2032 all up, but there is a lot of excitement from the councils because they see that as their future growth areas. There is also a lot of developers that are willing to work in and cost-share on if they already have some of that

## PUBLIC

land on cost sharing on a lot of the infrastructure and the reports that need to be done to start with. It's a bit like Dowsing Point. It is an exciting time, but a lot of planning and work needs to go into producing those numbers.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. If we can stop the broadcast and we will be back at 6.18 p.m. A 10-minute break. Thank you.

**The committee suspended from 6.08 p.m. to 6.18 p.m.**

**CHAIR** - Welcome back after the break. We're up to Ms Brown for questions.

**Ms BROWN** - Minister, how many Housing Australia Future Fund (HAFF) funded homes are included in the government's 10,000 homes target?

**Mr VINCENT** - Good question. I couldn't give you a number on that, so I'll have to seek some advice from Homes Tasmania to see if the HAFF is - obviously there are 1400 there that we know now are a part of it.

**Mr WILSON** - As part of our target under the HAFF homes, HAFF rounds 1 and 2 have 618 homes and then 582 for HAFF 3 are all to be counted towards the target. Obviously, we're waiting on a successful outcome of 582, but we are anticipating them to be delivered and be part of the target.

**Ms BROWN** - I'm sorry, can you just tell me how many are completed?

**Mr WILSON** - Of the 618 under HAFF rounds 1 and 2 that are currently completed, I don't have that on hand, and through you, minister, I'm happy to take that on notice.

**Mr VINCENT** - Are they under construction?

**Mr WILSON** - Yes.

**Mr VINCENT** - We'll take that on notice on exactly the number. I'll clarify that.

**Ms BROWN** - Of those that are completed, under construction, and in the pipeline, can you provide information of where they are located? A breakdown of where they are located?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, we'll be able to do that as part of that question on notice. That's been fascinating to learn in the short time of - where some of the demands are around the state and how Homes Tasmania works to cater for that. That also works in now with questions like, are there bus services there, are there employment opportunities there and things like that as well. We're learning a lot out of those numbers. Just as a side note.

**Ms BROWN** - Can you provide information on how much the Tasmanian Government is expected to co-fund towards the HAFF projects?

**Mr WILSON** - Under the different programs, there are different funding mechanisms. In relation to the funding that's directly proportional to our deliverables versus our support of community housing providers, they are varied in the funding outcomes and obligations. I don't

## PUBLIC

have those dollar figures in front of me right now, but through you, Minister, I'm happy to take that on notice as well.

**DEPUTY CHAIR** - I think we'll move to Mr Bayley now.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Forgive me if I missed this and it was asked earlier, but I want to go to the housing register and the 5533 applicants on the register waiting over 100 weeks to be housed. I'm interested in the details regarding exactly what is the makeup of what sits behind those applications? How many of them are single people? How many of them are couples? How many children are involved? I appreciate it may not be something you can deliver for us right here and right now, but I'm very happy for it to be taken on notice. But I would like confirmation that you understand the extent of the question.

**Mr VINCENT** - We will just check with our Homes Tasmania people there because some of that information is available, I believe.

**Mr WILSON** - We do have a breakdown if it's of assistance to you in relation to those on the list that are looking for one-, two-, three-, and four-bedroom properties. In relation to the make-up of the list, if you could just give me one moment. In relation to age brackets: of the 5507 active applicants on the housing register, the reflection of the age bracket between 25-54 is 3105 applicants. Temporary living situation, there are 3567 applicants. Outside of those breakdowns, we're certainly happy to take it on notice and provide you some further detail.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Do you have the data? I assume within each application there's information there about how many children, what ages they are, and so forth. Are you able to give us as much detail as you can in terms of what sits behind each of those applicants?

**Mr WILSON** - We have household data in relation to -

**Mr BAYLEY** - In relation to what they're seeking.

**Mr WILSON** - Correct.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Who they're seeking, each of those applicants are seeking to accommodate.

**Mr WILSON** - Yes. Happy to take that on notice.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Great.

**CHAIR** - Are you happy with that, minister?

**Mr VINCENT** - Very much so. The information is becoming a lot more accurate with the new Housing Connect coming online, the new portal, which will give a lot more information as well in months to come.

**Mr BAYLEY** - They are waiting a time of 89 weeks for priority housing. Apart from building more homes, what are some of the constraints in bringing down that wait-time, the

## PUBLIC

actual length of wait-time as opposed to the size of the list, the 5507 people? What are some of the constraints that mean that the average wait-time to be housed flexes one way or the other?

**Mr WILSON** - Obviously, you have your general market conditions of housing and the affordability and space and general outcomes there. New supply supported by Homes Tasmania through Commonwealth Government initiatives and our own initiatives and CHPs. As we've talked about, the 1200 under the Housing Australia Future Fund, there's a range of initiatives that, hopefully we'll see a significant injection of new supply, which we have been working very heavily on. New supply is a factor. Market conditions are a factor, but we're certainly forming part of that make up of our 10,000 target around what can be delivered in that social housing space to try and see reduction in that wait-time.

**CHAIR** - Minister, I have a question around the State Planning Office and the funding. It's been a significant frustration for me, and I'm sure many planners for many years, as to the less-than-adequate funding of the State Planning Office to perform its strategic and policy functions. In the Budget, the State Planning Office funding drops even more, from \$2.20 million in 2025-26 to \$1.49 million in 2026-27 and then a further drop to \$850,000 in 2027-28, which is one third of that initial funding. How will the government complete the significant planning reform program underway and further work required to resolve the well-documented remaining issues with our planning system with such a savage cut in the State Planning Office?

**Mr VINCENT** - Some of that cutback in the first year is in relation to some projects that have actually finished. I will ask the assistant secretary there in regard to the reflection of the machinery changes there to explain that please to the committee.

**Mr GREGORY** - The operational efficiencies that have been applied to the Department of State Growth related to the machinery government change, but machinery of government change was announced in the middle of the Budget preparation. The operational efficiencies have been provisionally allocated to portfolios. We don't expect that that will necessarily be where the operational efficiencies do come from. We're working through a number of things that we were doing anyway around reducing leasing footprints, some general improvements around use of technology and so on, which we've captured in the budget papers. But the broader operational efficiency that will come from the establishment of Building Tasmania and the machinery government changes have really got to be worked throughout the next 6 to 12 months.

What we are saying is the operational efficiencies in the budget papers have to be allocated against outputs. They are provisional and I would expect that some of those will change as we work our way through, and we'll see operational efficiencies delivered through other mechanisms along the way. That is where we sit at the moment in terms of knowing exactly where those operational efficiencies will come from.

**CHAIR** - It's pretty fundamental to have a robust planning advice mechanism from the State Planning Office. I'm wondering, minister, how this reduction compares to other states and jurisdictions? They must have bigger planning offices. How do you compare?

**Mr VINCENT** - Correct. I'm not sure exactly, but I will ask Sean for a bit more advice on that. Some of the other state planning officers I know have a lot of other roles that are incorporated into the State Planning Office as well.

## PUBLIC

Sean and I have had several robust discussions about making sure the staffing is right. I have continued to have discussions with Mr Gregory as well, about making sure we get that balance right in there. They have been operating a few short of what they should have been for various staffing reasons, so Sean is fully aware that I would like to see that in a much more balanced position so we can deliver because one of the frustrations coming from the world of local government was a lot of the work we've been doing wasn't going anywhere. Certainly, I don't think it's wrong in saying a lot of pressure came to bear to get some of the planning things looked at and done and that'll continue to happen.

I might ask Sean for a bit more clarification on where we sit with other regions and also where he feels comfortable with his staffing numbers at the moment.

**Mr McPHAIL** - I don't have any particular details on how we compare with other jurisdictions. In terms of other jurisdictions, there are a lot that have departments that have broader roles and link in with other parts of planning related things, like infrastructure and things. I think that's where the State Planning Office (SPO) in shifting over to state growth initially and then coming into Building Tasmania is part of that work to bring all those things into connection, into synergy, so I think there are a lot of efficiencies and things that can work in that space.

In terms of the SPOs operating, there's always a need for more and there's always an interest for more in terms of improvements in the planning system. The team that we have is a highly specialised team that has worked very well over a number of years, but we'd obviously like to see how we can better integrate into and work with the new Building Tasmania structures so that we can continue the reforms that we have to complete, but also get on with making sure that the system that we have operating works well and that we all get better and we can collaborate across local government as well. That's the key thing; so much of planning is across that jurisdiction that we need to work together to make things come together as they need.

**Mr VINCENT** - I might just add that we've been talking to quite a few of the local government planners in different areas around the state to understand some of their frustrations as well as builders and everybody else. This has painted a picture for us, along with my own quite open frustrations, with all the bits of the planning scheme and the interpretation. We do know, and it has certainly been expressed, that in the new structure of Building Tasmania focus is needed to deliver the planning scheme, that we need to deliver what we need to for Tasmania.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Along similar lines, what are some of the reforms that you have programmed ahead for our planning system as a whole, minister?

**Mr VINCENT** - I open up with saying the planning system is regarded as one of the better ones in Australia with all the bits and pieces that are there. And I say 'bits and pieces' because so much has been added in overlays and different mechanisms and having had 14-years' experience with it, you only know what you know from what you dealt with in your council area. Somebody from a large metro area would have a different sort of experience altogether. Bringing all that together, there are so many different parts of the planning scheme that most of us even with a fair bit of knowledge have trouble understanding the mechanism behind it.

I think we're at a point now where we have so many different planners at all levels of private enterprise, consultants and local government looking at developments that are pushing

## PUBLIC

some of the boundaries and everything like that, so they're not sure how to interpret a lot of things. What we need to do is bring things together in a way that is going to make sense with everybody. Bring it together in a way where you can understand where you need to go to get that information, or if you have a situation where you're not sure of the development, you can sit down with the appropriate people and get some guidance on where you need to go with that.

The big thing that's causing a lot of frustration and time delay is the interpretation by so many different people at all levels. We have to eliminate some of those quite simple complexities.

We're also seeing some overlap between the overlays and where you need to adjust the planning scheme when - instead of having to adjust it through 29 different councils, through the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act*, we need to have a blanket so the overlay is there and it's one adjustment for the state. We need to match up, and through LOGBMP, there are certain things in there that we can take out of that and put into the land use strategy and strengthen that and alleviate a few other things. It's not that we must change anything massively. But to bring around a tidier scheme that people can understand a lot more, so that things like everybody saying about how AI can help with this, that can actually help in some areas, will be a much smoother transition whether you're a mum and dad, a small developer, or a large developer, or a council.

**Mr JAENSCH** - And just for you and also for Hansard, I'll ask another question about LOGBMP and you can explain what it is.

**Mr VINCENT** - I'll actually, might refer to -

**Mr JAENSCH** - I'm happy to do that in a separate question.

**CHAIR** - You've missed out on the next round, I think, Mr Jaensch. We'll go to -

**Mr JAENSCH** - I'm being punished now for trying to help.

**CHAIR** - Sorry, I should have picked up on that jocularly. Ms Brown.

**Ms BROWN** - Thank you, Chair. Back to my questions around the HAFF projects. Minister, is the co-funding fully provided in this budget for the HAFF projects?

**Mr VINCENT** - I believe it is.

**Mr WILSON** - I can answer that, through you, minister. Yes, the capital delivery budget for the 582 homes that we are envisioning and hoping to get is accounted for within this budget.

**Ms BROWN** - Can you tell me that cost?

**Mr WILSON** - I would have to take that on notice, through you minister, to get the exact cost associated with the program.

**Mr VINCENT** - Happy to provide that.

## PUBLIC

**Ms BROWN** - Thank you. Minister, the Budget says Homes Tasmania must absorb the ongoing operating, maintenance and tenancy-management costs of HAFF dwellings. What is the annual cost of those obligations?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'm seeking some advice on this, is that an average per dwelling is it?

**Mr WILSON** - Look, they have been, we have, again, happy to take this, if you're happy to take it on notice, minister, happy to provide that information for that individual project.

**Ms BROWN** - Thank you. What happens if Homes Tasmania can't keep up with the financial obligation, and if there is any financial penalties, funding lost or risk of future Commonwealth funding, if anything's missed, whether it be timelines missed or of funding delays?

**Mr VINCENT** - Certainly my overall answer to that was as it moves into Building Tasmania, there'll be obviously a lot of work done on all aspects of Homes Tasmania's financials, but just ask the CEO for any clarification on how that might be at the moment.

**Mr WILSON** - Could I just clarify you are referring to the Housing Australia Future Fund program itself in relation to meeting the KPIs of that?

**Ms BROWN** - Yes. To the heart of my question; sorry, I know it was very long winded. The heart of my question is: are there any financial penalties, or risks, of not getting any future Commonwealth funding in these projects, if there are timelines that are missed?

**Mr WILSON** - So just answering, under the Housing Australia Future Fund, if we were to miss a milestone on a particular project, we would potentially have to forfeit the availability payment that would be coming in over 25 years to support that project. It would be down to an individual project and program default. Would that have an impact on future Commonwealth opportunities? I would think not. I think this is very much looked at as an individual project and commitment from Homes Tasmania with the Commonwealth around the KPIs under the Housing Australia Future Fund requirements.

**Ms BROWN** - Are we currently at risk of not meeting any of those milestones -

**CHAIR** - We'll go to Mr Bayley now.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Minister, I'm just interested in unpacking a little bit about the financial review that you've tabled and released today. We've done a little bit of analysis and one of the things that it's identified is that 15 per cent, some 329 new social housing dwellings, delivered between October 2020 and September 2025 don't meet the Silver Liveability Standard under the National Construction Code, a standard that most other Australian states and territories have adopted as a minimum. Can you explain why this is, and has Homes Tasmania, and will Building Tasmania, adopt the liveability standards under the National Construction Code, as occurs in many other places?

**Mr WILSON** - Through you, minister. Thank you for the question. We have a very clear objective to meet the code wherever we're appropriately able to achieve that. In some of those developments you're referring to there, the topography of site may not enable us to meet the code 100 per cent in relation to access. Where that is the case, we are still delivering the

## PUBLIC

internals of the property at a silver-level liveability standard, but unfortunately some of the development sites, that you can appreciate, in Tasmania, we're not dealing with flat level blocks of land -

**Mr BAYLEY** - So, it's largely accessibility issues?

**Mr WILSON** - It is, yes. Of our requirements, when we do put programs out, there are set requirements around energy efficiency that we look to achieve, liveability standards obviously is a high priority for us on our delivery programs for obvious reasons around accessibility options for future tenants and current tenants. But unfortunately, I would say in Tasmania, the challenge sits around the costs-base versus the outcome on some challenging sites that would prohibit us from achieving the 100 per cent of the liveability standard guidelines.

**Mr BAYLEY** - I'll leave that there. Thank you. In terms of responding to this, there's been a number of different recommendations, many of them look positive. Can you outline the government's next steps and timelines in terms of responding specifically to the recommendations? Have you already made decisions on which recommendation - how you're going to respond to each of the recommendations?

**Mr VINCENT** - No, we have not because we're working that into a lot of the planning around Building Tasmania, except for the ones that Homes Tasmania are able to work on now. There are a couple there that suggest what we just touched on there -

**Mr BAYLEY** - That are about governance and stuff?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, but there's also about looking at some of the properties that we have, and I take that as - and I've already raised this with both the board and with the CEO, about the cost of some of the awkward sites that we have available and the amount of money that we spend getting out of the ground up to a level area. We may be better off to look at selling those sites and using the money on flatter, so we get more units and better bang for our buck.

There are quite a few things in there we're working on already and looking at. There will be others that we will roll into how Building Tasmania goes with that. But we haven't got a timeline on date by date yet, at this stage.

**CHAIR** - Minister, it's a tough market for housing. It's hard for the government to get social and affordable housing out of the ground. One of the planning changes that could assist here is to mandate inclusionary zoning, which is a much more effective way of getting these houses out of the ground rather than Development Assessment Panels (DAP), which have proved very unpopular and have failed twice to pass the parliament.

Many of the housing stakeholders and peak bodies have recommended this occur. Mandatory inclusion rezoning schemes are perceived to be fairer, as they apply to all redevelopment and can be factored in upfront to the price paid for land. South Australia is an example of where it has been very effective at increasing the number of social and affordable housing there. Minister, why aren't you actively considering this for reform, noting that you have previously said you could consider any option to fix the housing crisis.

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - Thank you. I'll seek some information from Sean on that.

**Mr McPHAIL** - Certainly. Through you, minister. I think mandatory inclusionary zoning is something that's been raised a number of times through various reforms. There are changes that could be made in the planning system, but I think there's a much broader program that needs to be looked at in terms of whether - how that would operate in Tasmania and how you would do that. That's getting well beyond what I can really advise on. But certainly, in terms of various mechanisms that we operate at the moment that sort of go into that sort of inclusion rezoning side of things, is the housing land supply order process; that rezoning process in which it vests land with Homes Tasmania, that enables a proportion of land to be developed for social and affordable housing. That is one mechanism that is used at the moment. But I think there's a much broader program that would need to be looked at in terms of how that it would operate in Tasmania, particularly with the economics of building houses in Tasmania compared to certain other jurisdictions as well.

**CHAIR** - Minister, you and I have had this kind of conversation before, with my interest in getting more housing through that transit corridor of the northern suburbs in Hobart. Because it's a policy position, would you consider using that as a pilot project in some form or another. It might be Dowsing Point, for argument's sake. But looking at having a model to test how inclusionary zoning might be effective in Tasmania?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, we are looking at a few different ways when we have areas, a greenfield area, that we can plan and scope it much better to make more efficient use of the land. But I am more than happy to revisit what you've just suggested and have another look at that and how it might work.

**Mr JAENSCH** - How will the government's \$900 million housing and homelessness investment support communities across Tasmania?

**Mr VINCENT** - It is certainly going to give us the confidence over the forward Estimates to be able to continue on with the program we have. Now, we know there's a lot of the changes coming up with already what the federal minister's working in partnership with us on. So, it is a changing playing field. But what it's done for me in this Budget - and it is a tough time we're in, is to make sure we've still got our base there to work from.

Then, with things like the 100,000 homes, where there is potentially an added input from the state government, the support will need to be built into future years about those additional programs. And, of course, we want to work in partnership with everybody.

So the big benefit of that amount of money, and still being there over the next few years, is it does give us the confidence to set Homes Tas will continue on their pathway of delivering. And with a lot of the land, housing supply, whatever they've got, well, they've got the confidence now to continue to plan those to have an increased number of places on them.

As these others come on board, we'll have to make adjustments to that budget and we're quite open that it is a very awkward period for us at the moment in that transition of what you project and what you can't project. But what we have learnt in the last month or so is there is enormous potential to do a lot more in partnership with the federal government to deliver more homes. So, this gives us a good base to start from.

## PUBLIC

**Ms BROWN** - Of the \$900 million housing figure that was just mentioned, can you provide a breakdown of that funding. Is some of it federal funding, some of it through different funding streams?

**Mr VINCENT** - Some of it is through grants, but some of it's through other revenue, like rental income. Combined together, that's what Homes Tas have got to put back into their building and construction side of things. So, that's why I specifically mentioned in the last question about extra funding being needed if we go to extra programs and things like that.

We have got a breakdown each year of that. Yeah, the budget includes continued investment into supporting the wraparound service in the most needed cohorts. There's over \$50 million a year out of that funding that goes towards those crisis and emergency needs including Jireh House and McCombe House.

**Ms BROWN** - Sorry, the question was about the funding streams that make up that \$900 million. So, is that solely Tasmanian government money, or is that through federal contributions as well?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'll ask for clarification from the CEO. Happy to take that on notice to get the proper breakdown for you because it does come into different categories. So we'll take that on and get that accurate for you.

**Ms BROWN** - Thank you, I appreciate that. I just thought I'd jump on that whilst I was thinking of it.

Coming back to what I was talking about in the previous round with the HAFF projects, you mentioned that if we were to miss a milestone that we would be potentially at risk of penalties. Are we currently at risk of any penalties?

**Mr VINCENT** - No, we're not.

**Mr BAYLEY** - The Joint Select Committee on Energy Matters has handed down its interim report and there's a number of recommendations in there that pertain to housing, including potentially, public housing. One is around reviewing relevant legislation in the area of minimum and energy efficiency standards for rental properties to meet contemporary standards. I acknowledge that's not your responsibility, but upgrading the social housing stock to meet contemporary standards would be. The other was to work with the Australian government to develop a targeted strategy to substantially increase rooftop solar and battery penetration in Tasmania, including on public housing stock.

My question is in relation to those two recommendations. Have you engaged with this report yet? And what are your thoughts around upgrading the public housing stock to meet contemporary energy efficiency standards and potentially rolling out rooftop solar across appropriate public housing in Tasmania?

**Mr VINCENT** - Only due for me being away for a few days last week, I didn't engage in that report, even though I was there the day that it was tabled, so I am familiar that it was tabled. We have a program now where we're doing a lot of solar and the energy rating of the homes. I will seek clarification from the CEO on where they look at the energy efficiency of the houses.

## PUBLIC

**Mr WILSON** - A couple of things I'll touch on there, and did bring it up earlier in relation to our maintenance expenditure, is taking advantage of the Commonwealth funding in relation to energy efficiency upgrades. And that has been inclusive of solar upgrades as well.

I guess the thing I'll comment in relation to that is particularly around our energy efficiency requirements of our new construction coming forward. And that is to exceed the NCC requirements to 7-star energy rating, so we are leading in that space in relation to that. And, obviously, where we can be looking at, during our maintenance programs, some better outcomes for energy efficiency - whether that be energy-efficient measures or solar, et cetera, we're certainly exploring that. But certainly, our focus is around our new builds and taking advantage of the Commonwealth funding that was available to see some upgrades for our existing stock.

**Mr VINCENT** - Of that \$7.58 million, \$5.15 million of that was through the Social Housing Energy Performance Initiative (SHEPI), which is the federal program for energy efficiency.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Right. Are you able to provide the data on the number of houses that have had which particular treatments in terms of these programs and energy efficiency and/or solar upgrades?

**Mr WILSON** - Yes, certainly. Through that SHEPI program, we're certainly - if you're happy to, minister, take that on notice and respond with a list of upgrades and what has occurred throughout that program?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'm more than happy to take it on notice.

**Mr BAYLEY** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Minister, the government announced a review and long-overdue overhaul of subdivision legislation under the *Local Government (Building and Miscellaneous Provisions) Act* at the beginning of last year. At the time, this was welcomed by key stakeholders in the development industry. When will work commence on this important reform?

**Mr VINCENT** - I will just seek some advice from Dr Reid because we had a brief discussion on this the other day. I will just read from the minutes here:

The SPO has completed an audit under all provisions of the act to identify potential options and the need for further advice on the operation of some parts. The complexity of the task in reviewing -

And this is the, how do you say that?, the LGBMP which does stand, just for the records, the *Local Government (Building and Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1993*.

**Mr JAENSCH** - There you go. I thought it was an obscure kayaking term.

**Mr VINCENT** - Yeah.

And the range of stakeholders [inaudible 6.55.05] suggested that a staged approach will likely be the greatest success.

## PUBLIC

I'm not sure whether, Sean, you'd like to add to that.

**Mr McPHAIL** - As you pointed out, we have undertaken an initial audit of the legislation just to look to see what the various components are, because there's various components to do with the approval of a permit for subdivision through to the sealing of plans which is, I guess, the post-approval part where it leads to the issuing of titles. But there's also other bits in there that step outside the Planning portfolio as well. There's bits to do with local government, superannuation and various other things, and a few archaic things that have probably been left over from previous planning regimes from more than 30 years ago.

So, in terms of reviewing it, as you pointed out, minister, it's a big project and there's been failed attempts over various points in the last 30 years. In terms of doing it, it needs to be broken up into stages and really looking at how you can incorporate those things that are needed into existing legislation, into existing planning scheme provisions as well, which we've started already doing through the work that we're doing on the Improving Residential Standards project, looking at how we incorporate more of the planning considerations from log bump into the subdivision component, particularly around residential, which is the most common types of subdivision. Obviously, that will help us be able to work out how we deal with the rest of it.

But there's very components in there that you either keep and improve, or it's no longer required, so it's a matter of sort of slotting into the various locations where it needs to go. And involvement of a few different portfolios and a few different departments as well, given the level of roles that that it has across various things.

**CHAIR** - It might take a quite a while, I suppose. My second question is around Dowsing Point. I know that we discussed this earlier this evening, but I didn't get any sense of any timeframe in relation to delivering housing or subdivisions there.

Can you tell the committee how much the government or Glenorchy City Council or, indeed, the federal government will be up for infrastructure costs to make the housing project deliverable? Is there remediation work to be done? Is there's stormwater? Is there the possibility of inclusion rezoning?

**Mr VINCENT** - There is a lot of different work. There is not a timeframe in place yet because it still sits with the Department of Defence to work its way through. Costings or analysis of the site has not been taken yet. There is at least, I would think, two years' worth of work to still be done by the federal government and the Department of Defence to work through that.

During that time, we will start to understand things a little bit more, but it is very early days at this stage and only a general announcement. Cost of land or what needs to be done has not been analysed yet, but as that comes across through the timeline over the next 12 months or two years, Building Tas will start to work through a lot of those analysis before we start to go out to community so that we have a better idea on how the project will be scoped.

But there's still an enormous amount of work to be done by the federal government and the Defence Department, so it doesn't sit right in our quarter yet.

**CHAIR** - Sio, that second part of the question around whether the local council will have to chip in with much of the work to make good?

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - There has been just very overarching discussions about the clean-up of the site sitting with the federal government because it is a military site. Had a very brief discussion with the CEO of Glenorchy council and with the mayor on the day in regards to making sure they're involved as we work through the whole process.

But that's, once again, very early days. It's an open book at this stage. But there is a lot of work to do. The site lends itself to the development perfectly, but there's not a great deal of homework behind that at this stage.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Before we go to Mr Jaensch, I welcome Ms Rosol. And also just to let the committee know that we'll be finishing at 8.19 p.m., so we're almost on the home straight. But not quite.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Planning and the planning process is part of the supply challenge of getting housing on the ground here and around the country. In a discussion a couple of minutes ago, there was reference to improving residential standards as one of the areas of planning that we can look to in order to streamline that process some more and to assist with delivering more housing. Can you unpack that a bit for me?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, I had to unpack it for myself, to be honest, over the last couple of months because it was something I wasn't aware of when I moved into the role. I was fully focused, as in my previous life as a mayor, in the in the last period about the land use strategies being the be all to end all. Now I've learnt about residential standards. When you start to unpack it and it covers off on things like the apartment code heights, car parking density, subdivision size.

Subdivision size is going to be vital for what we do in the future because where we talk normally about 425 square metre being the small blocks now in a lot of subdivisions, if we're going to go to modular build homes and two-bedroom units, people don't want that to be on a 750 or even a 450 metre block. How we can utilise a cluster of 200 or 250 square metres, whatever may be appropriate, will be very important in amongst this to drive the standards on subdivisions that we can actually apply easily. Then, when you're planning your subdivision out, or in a few big ones that Homes Tasmania will be looking at, and if we go back to Huntingfield, it might be that certain areas are there have clusters of people that come together, so it just looks like a nice little communal area instead of just a smaller unit thrown in in amongst things. To get that balance right.

**Mr JAENSCH** - To reduce the land component of the cost?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yeah. So it looks good community-wise, fits in well with everything there, and they have that mixture of blocks. It's the same as when you're doing a subdivision and you plan for a couple of larger parcels that you can put multiple units on. It's the same sort of mentality, but we've never gone down to that low level of how we can accommodate this new market of one and two-bedroom dwellings a little bit differently. That all fits with the improved residential standards which we're working on at the moment.

**Ms BROWN** - Minister, the government funded a feasibility work for the North West Women's Shelter for them to create a proposal of 26 units, core and cluster proposal. It's now

## PUBLIC

sitting on the desk of government. Is this something that you put forward to consideration for the Treasurer in this budget?

**Mr VINCENT** - We've not directly to the Treasurer for that specific thing. I'll swing to Homes Tasmania because they have been doing a lot of work on that. It went off and a design was done that was way above what fits with the money available for Tasmania and for an individual project, so there's been a fair bit of open discussion, and your federal counterpart, Anne Urquhart, has been kept up to date and has been part of that process, as well as quite a few northern politicians as well in that area.

Homes Tasmania - and I've had a few conversations - have had a lot of input in with the CEO to make sure that we find a better site. As I touched on before with Mr Bayley about sites being very expensive to get out of the ground and then do things properly, it was our feeling that the site that we thought was going to be alright didn't turn out to be quite what we expected, and they are my words. We have now sought a better site in the Devonport area where we can do it and will likely end up with a much better outcome for them. For more specific details I will ask the CEO to just elaborate a little bit more on that.

**Mr WILSON** - Thank you, minister. Just to clarify, we have been working very closely with them, obviously understanding their original business case. To the minister's point, we have been working around an alternate site which is going to be a much more cost-effective outcome from a capital development perspective. I will note that we have been working very closely with the Commonwealth about securing what we call National Housing Infrastructure Fund (NHIF) Crisis and Transitional (CT) funding and -

Sorry about the long-worded - but we have been successful under a number of individual properties that we're delivering through that scheme. This proposal that is currently still sitting with Commonwealth. I can tell you that we are actually meeting with, and have been meeting with, the North West Women's Shelter and their design representatives on a fortnightly basis and progressing quite rapidly around this new opportunity so that we can respond through and we have been keeping the Commonwealth updated that there will be a new proposal coming forward over the coming months

**Ms BROWN** - It's great to hear that you're committed to making this happen. If this is escalating rapidly, what timeline would you put on something like this moving forward? When would we see people in that proposal?

**Mr WILSON** - To break that down into stages, we very much have an appetite to have an updated response, proposal and business case through to the Commonwealth government in the next 60 days. That is what we're targeting right at the moment. It would depend on the outcome of that, and what support the Commonwealth Government could come forward with. If that was to fund the entirety of the project, that's fantastic. If it's not, then we would need to work through how that additional funding could be supported through Homes Tasmania and the government. We're very much at that first stage in the business case and I'm really excited that we found an alternative site that we think is going to produce a much more cost-effective development. It is too early to say as to when construction would commence and when occupancy would be available.

**Ms ROSOL** - Minister, we know that of homeless people in Tasmania, 40 per cent of them are under the age of 25, but the Housing Tasmania Strategy Action Plan only mentions

## PUBLIC

young people once. What consideration have you given to the needs of young people when planning to address the housing crisis and where do they feature in your plans for building the 10,000 homes?

**Mr VINCENT** - Certainly, we have an extended program and new units that we're building in Burnie with Youth2Independence which is what I find to be an amazing program.

I have visited their site, dealt directly with Andy and others on those sites. I have met with several of the participants in Devonport. I have been involved in securing some employment for those people and seeing one of them move out into their own independent living away from that. I've seen the benefits of the program. I've seen what's involved and the actual impact and I have sat in the units talking to the young people about what their story is, and we talk about hand-on-heart moments. It certainly was for me.

I stay in regular contact with two of those people just to make sure that I'm still across their journey. I see that as a major growth for us, because it ticks all the boxes of bringing somebody in from an awkward situation, putting him into their own supervised care, and then being able to develop them to be standalone people in the community. I want to keep that expanded. I make no secret of that. I'd like to see those sorts of units on a fairly large domestic old block, as you call it in Devonport. They have six units. Now, if a similar situation occurred, the possibility would be closer to 8 to 10. We also learned other little things: making sure the power requirement is to each individual unit, so they learn to utilise the power they're using independently so it's not a generalised thing so they learn about that. I've already started discussions about how we can do that better. The young people also raised the need for better insulation on the floor so you don't hear the sound of walking in the little units. It was amazing the little things that make a difference to them, especially in that younger bracket.

I have been to visit some of the more crisis-care places as well where they work off six to eight people. Once you get over eight people it becomes an awkward area where you are not able to show the proper attention to the people being cared for, or the home becomes too overpowering.

I have been to both male, female, and mixed establishments to see what we need to do to extend them. There are a couple of programs where I have had open discussions with the CEO about finding other premises so that their services are expanded. It is something I've injected myself into because of the youth and their ability, and I think with my knowledge of how the jobs hubs around Tasmania work, I'd really like to see a program where we can try and get these same young people into employment as well. That is something that I am focused on.

**Ms ROSOL** - Thank you. I really appreciate that answer. I think what you're focused on there is young people who are in more difficult situations and struggling with homelessness, which was not what my question was about.

Thinking more broadly about the young people, rather than just the young people who are in crisis, we know that housing is difficult for everybody and there are children staying at home for longer and longer because they can't afford to leave home. The issues for young people in housing are broader than just those for young people who are experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness.

For that reason, stakeholders have called for years for a dedicated child and youth homelessness action plan so that there can be better coordination of homelessness services - a

## PUBLIC

kind of planning for all young people in housing. Is that something that you would be willing to commit to doing? Like preparing a child and youth homelessness action plan or more broadly a housing plan for children and youth? I understand you might need to work with the minister for Children and Youth on that, but is that something that you would consider taking on and developing as a separate standalone housing action plan?

**Mr VINCENT** - I would be more than happy to take advice from some of the peaks in that area, and I have been working pretty closely with them, obviously, on some of these areas. I think the more we can coordinate that - and I did touch on earlier in this briefing that I really want to see the coordination of some of the peaks in these areas, so that wrap-around services work for everybody. I'm more than happy to look at anything, and especially with any other minister on how we can deliver that. The gentleman down the end, Mr Jaensch, is a regular phone caller to me after hours to talk about exactly this issue, whose heart is still very much in this area as well. I don't get to escape it.

I'm happy to look at anything like that because the more we can get these programs and have some of these people that do step outside of that and be mentors or - I talked about the confidence of young people to want to own their own home again - and where we used to aim when I first came into carpentry at owning a three- or four-bedroom home or stepping up over a couple of homes - we know this one- and two-bedroom gives the ability for people that have got a job and an income to start off smaller and get through it. We have to build that confidence into the market, and I have had discussions with your federal counterpart about that exact subject over the last couple of days.

**Ms ROSOL** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Minister, I'm curious to know - for people who speak languages other than English, or particularly the migrant community who are also finding it difficult to find social and affordable housing - and I'm sure that every MP in this room has the challenge of trying to find some solutions for many of their constituents - but given the issues around family and domestic violence in multicultural communities, as well as in the broader community, and the different types of housing needs, can you just describe how your agency works to find solutions for them?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'll certainly ask for some guidance on that from Homes Tasmania. It's not an area that I have put myself into, to be honest, at this stage. I've been concentrating on the whole picture and probably not some of those categories, but I -

**CHAIR** - You have a large responsibility, minister.

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes. I haven't struck too much of those situations at this stage. Obviously, it's part of it. I will ask for some guidance from Homes Tasmania. Thank you.

**Mr WILSON** - Through you, minister, and thanks for the question. In accessing housing there, our Housing Connect providers and Front Door services do work with organisations like the Migrant Resource Centre on a daily basis and regular basis there. From Homes Tasmania's perspective, we also support the Migrant Resource Centre with accommodation options as well. There are things that are in place to certainly be supporting that from Front Door and an accessibility perspective for housing.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - Again, looking at those larger than the standard two- or three-bedroom houses? Are you looking at larger housing arrangements?

**Mr WILSON** - I couldn't answer that, specifically. I'd have to take advice there from Front Door as to what the demands are that are coming through for that.

**CHAIR** - Do you think you could take that on notice, minister, please?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, we could. I was just looking at a brief here regarding Housing Connect and some of the work they do. In talking with Dr Chris Jones, there's a fair bit of excitement about what the portal will be able to produce in the future; there is a lot more data for us to enable us to break things down a lot more. They are looking for that as well. It makes it easier, and we don't like to categorise people in any shape or form because they're all individuals, but it's very important for us to be able to have that breakdown. I'm sure they will have a lot of the data and information on how they do it now, because they do have very detailed information on the size of the homes required, the reasons they need it or co-dependent people that may be living in there. Lots of conversations come to mind at the moment that would indicate they'd be able to supply some good information there.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Minister, the development system in our state has lots of different moving parts to it - the developers themselves and builders and planners, surveyors, engineers, draftspeople, all those. What do we do to support that system so that everyone stays up to date and it works together and they're on the same page?

**Mr VINCENT** - I guess this is where I say that I've had a lot of frustrating conversations with a lot of those different people privately and in my office regarding everybody being an expert on the planning system. But I have quite openly said to anybody who's willing to listen to me about the planning system is that everybody's got a 10 per cent blame in this, whether it's the government, whether it's councils, whether it's developers or mums and dads. A lot of that is about putting in a lot of incomplete paperwork or incomplete developments. There are lots of different reasons for it. Ignorance is one thing, but sometimes it's done on purpose just to try and slip something past council officers, which then means the council officer gets the blame for stopping the clock for more information - people pushing the boundaries. I did touch on earlier about getting back on track, so everybody understands where they have to be with this.

I think the big thing in planning is: if we're going to support the system, we have to appreciate what it is and respect it and start to understand, because if we want to go outside that it creates time delays, because you are pushing the boundaries. If you wish to do your homework with your local council planner or your designer, in a lot of cases your architect or whoever else, because if you do tick the boxes it's a much easier process for everybody involved. I think at the moment everybody's too quick to blame somebody else. But all the way through the process, that I can see, there is all of us have got issues in the game that we need to tidy up on right through the whole process.

That's where a lot of my concentration, as I answered earlier on, will be to try and have everybody understand and move towards getting things done in a proper way because it takes the pressure off everybody in the system. If it's a mum and dad, they should not have the frustration when they're trying to build a simple home for themselves or their children, in

## PUBLIC

having to have all this incomplete and difficult timelines to adhere to. If we all play the game, it gets a lot easier.

**Ms BROWN** - Coming back to the North West Women's Shelter - I'm pleased to hear that you're committed to that. You will be committed to that regardless of if you have federal funding or not? Or is this solely dependent on if you are able to obtain federal funding?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'd seek clarification on that. But yes, we do need federal funding for the size of those sorts of developments. We are still working with an extension, say, to their Ulverstone property to improve the numbers over there. It wasn't big, but it certainly helped a little bit. There are little things that Homes Tasmania does along the way that sort of goes unnoticed, where they still work in to do different things or something else might come up in the meantime. It's a bit like we did with Anglicare at Prospect, where we helped them refurbish the existing facility and move the people out into a motel while it was being done. But in this case, I think for the size of what we want to do there, we would definitely need federal assistance. We have spoken, initially, I'm not familiar with recent discussions, but we did speak with the CEO about how we can make sure the design allows for stages, or additions in the future. We do try to think broadly about how you build a complex and not have to do it all in one big hit. But I'm not sure whether Homes Tasmania can expand on what they're looking at there?

**Mr WILSON** - The work that we are doing with the North West Women's Shelter is around the staged approach. It does provide opportunity for expansion into the future at whatever point that may take place. With the scope of what we're doing, and very much trauma-informed design to make it a fit-for-purpose complex is what we're looking at the moment. We are looking at a capital program that consolidated their operation into one area because they are operating through a number of our properties within the north-west, so we're looking at the best efficient model from operational costing perspective to get them the best complex with a provision to expand that. The site that we're looking at with them does have provision for expansion into the future if that is to come to fruition.

**Ms BROWN** - Will you be seeking 100 per cent federal funding or would there be in 80/20 split, or what do you think the appropriate ratio of funding would be?

**Mr WILSON** - We are working, given the program that's available, with the Commonwealth and the fact that we are re-doing the business case and looking to trim a lot of the construction costs down, we are looking upfront to see 100 per cent contribution from the Commonwealth to assist the program if we can. If that is something that Commonwealth are not able to support, we are certainly having that conversation around what they can support; then we will come back and look at what the gap is and how that potential can be supported.

**Mr VINCENT** - The federal member is across this and I do keep her up to date on a semi-regular basis as new information comes to hand.

**Ms BROWN** - Sure. Can you provide me information about how many crisis accommodation beds are available in Tasmania at the moment, and by region?

**Mr VINCENT** - I will seek that information.

**Mr WILSON** - I don't have that on me at the moment. We certainly do have that information, and if you're happy, minister?

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - Certainly happy to take on notice.

**Ms ROSOL** - Minister, you spoke earlier about some of the different housing that's provided to young people around the state, and they are funded through the housing output. Because of that focus on housing, I think many of those services have struggled to provide the wrap-around support because they've been funded for the housing but not necessarily for the staff and the workers to support young people. Margaret Crawford, in the Homes Tasmania review, recommended assessing the risks associated with funded staff-to-client ratios in youth refuges and other settings because the sector representatives were arguing that current funding creates a staff safety risk and doesn't meet child safety standards.

There was a recommendation there from Crawford that the board be comprehensively briefed on the risks arising out of the commission of inquiry, but also those risks that we're hearing about from the services. Have you completed an assessment of funded staff-to-client ratios in youth refuges and other crisis accommodation settings?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'll ask for some information there from Homes Tasmania because I know this has been a point of discussion that they've had with a couple of different organisations. Before I hand over, I might say one of the biggest issues that we have to deal with is, even when you build a new road, you have to build an extra bit of maintenance in your maintenance budget and same when we extend a service or add a service, there is also an amount for running that service forever and a day. It gets very awkward because you don't always get assistant funding with that, so it comes straight out of the state's back pocket. Therefore we always try and make sure that's right. That's why we've been talking with the peaks about getting those wrap-around services and their concentration of staff right, but I will ask for Homes Tasmania to expand on that because I know they've had some very meaningful discussions in this area.

**Mr WILSON** - We certainly are aware of some of the concerns, and I guess it comes down to single worker-to-worker models. There are some examples that we've looked at more recently from a youth housing perspective, just to touch on that, around delivery of five cluster homes that are supported through Catholic Care. With those, we have some 10 shared homes that have been made available that have softer touch points on the clientele that are in the shared home versus the cluster home. We are looking at models on how we can best support some of those staffing outcomes, but it's certainly a policy perspective from government as to where we go to in relation to the worker ratio under the programs, but certainly, we're working very closely with - our partners are delivering those to ensure that their staff are appropriate and safe and certainly continue in those conversations.

**Ms ROSOL** - I think what I heard there was that there hasn't been a formal assessment, but you're in consultation with stakeholders and talking it through with them.

I noticed in the Budget that there's youth housing funding being provided through DECYP and it's a key deliverable through DECYP rather than through the housing output. I think that goes some way to addressing these issues because some of those organisations that are funded are providing those wrap-around supports, like Karinya. I'm just interested to know how that will work administratively if it's housing support, but it's also wrap-around support and it's being funded through DECYP but it's Housing - what's the administrative arrangement there and how's that I guess being worked out across the?

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, thank you. Very good question. That's something that Mr Jaensch has had a lot of discussions with me regarding this very thing, as we have internally, too, because some of the things, depending on the issues with the children that you need to deal with, can sit better with one area than the other. It is one of those matters that is awkward or hard-to-balance sometimes. But some do, we say, sit there; most sit here, with Homes. I'm not sure whether Homes would like to anything to that, but it is something we're very conscious of so that nobody slips through the cracks.

I'm in conversation, once again with Mr Jaensch, on this to make sure that people don't slip through the cracks. That is one of the hardest things, because once they move out of your care it's very hard if they you need to give them further guidance if they've slipped off the radar. I'm not sure that Homes Tasmania has a lot more on that area?

**Mr WILSON** - Not a great deal, minister. I will comment that there have been a lot of examples where we've worked across agencies in relation to that. We've had assets available and working with them around who provides the support services or NDIS services or a range of things around that. We have played an active role in particularly looking at asset allocations to support cross-agencies around that.

**Ms ROSOL** - Is there a memorandum of understanding that is developed in those situations?

**Mr WILSON** - There is an MOU in place in relation to the NDIS housing - is that correct?

**Ms STONE** - With the NDIS? Is that what you're referring to or you mean with DECYP?

**Ms ROSOL** - Well, I was particularly referring to youth in this situation.

**Ms STONE** - Yes, there's a surface-level agreement with DECYP.

**Mr WILSON** - Yes, a surface-level agreement with DECYP.

**Ms ROSOL** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Minister, I want to go back to that Anglicare snapshot - the rental affordability snapshot - it's pretty sobering reading. From the report, it says:

Rent growth is outstripping incomes for the first time in the 20-year history of the Rental Affordability Snapshot. Median rent on a room in a share house is now unaffordable for low-income, single households, including those on the minimum wage. The lack of affordable rental properties is continuing to drive up demand for social housing and force Tasmanians into homelessness.

Of the 770 properties listed, which was down 9 per cent in that 12 months, less than half the number of properties that were available 10 years ago, and there were zero properties affordable for solo-parent families receiving Single Parenting Payment or JobSeeker, young Tasmanians receiving Youth Allowance, single Tasmanians receiving JobSeeker and Tasmanians receiving disability support pension. What, minister, are you doing in your

## PUBLIC

capacity to come up with solutions out of this dire situation that so many people find themselves in?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, it is very difficult and it's hard to adjust. It's very sobering and we've already touched on it earlier in the evening, about the fact that more and more economic pressures are going to come to bear. We have committed to expanding, in the same way that the federal government and all other states have, the supply of social and affordable homes with multi-year construction programs now. It's just very simple: we have to build more places. Unfortunately, we don't see the - it's a different sort of lifestyle now for a lot of young people, and concentration is not on building their own place. A lot can't afford to. Some can. There's more pressure on retired people and parents now that can't afford to always help their children into a place. It's very much a changing dynamic. It really comes back to if all of us, as parents or investors in the community, can't take up the gap, the only place to go is the federal and state governments. So we have to commit to ongoing programs of acceleration of building all these different styles and types of homes.

We've done an enormous amount of work over the last few months in talking to upgrading builders, as I touched on before. But also to building firms about increasing the type of build and the - not mod homes, but modular building systems, so we can do it quicker with greater numbers in the appropriate areas. That does take some money to set up and finance an operation like that, but there are people in the state that are moving very quickly to do that. So, the acceleration of homes is where we're concentrating on to maintain a sensible price so the government can afford to keep replicating this year-on-year spend that's needed.

But you just can't build homes. The average time of building a home now has changed from - on a conventional home, it's gone from six months to nine months over the last 10 years. I'm not sure why or the reason for that. I don't fully understand that nine-month blowout. And we know the cost since 2014 has increased by 88 per cent. They are just some of the factors affecting it, whether you're a mum-and-dad investor or whether you're a government person in the cost of the homes.

One of the big things that I am proud of is the movement between the negotiations of Homes Tas and several building firms into working in partnership to figure out how we can build more homes at a more affordable rate.

**CHAIR** - In the situation where I've got a spare room, I've had somebody who's working at Dark Mofo staying with me. He's from Amsterdam. His parents have been living in social housing. It's amazing, on Instagram if anybody wants to see it. And he will be guaranteed a house when he gets back in a few years' time. He will be guaranteed a house, which is not something that we can say in Tasmania. So, I implore you, minister, to do what you can in the time that you have in your role.

**Mr VINCENT** - I guarantee you that I am.

**CHAIR** - I know, but this is a dire situation for far too many young Tasmanians. And older Tasmanians too.

**Mr JAENSCH** - The government has recently undertaken a strategic flood-mapping project to understand where risks of flooding are likely to be, how to manage it and how to manage the risk of it. How will this influence our planning scheme?

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - It's going to be very interesting. There's a couple of different areas of flood mapping. Councils, I think, five years ago had to make sure they had their flood mapping done for all their major residential areas, which really helped in determining housing developments, on the height of the floor and other issues to prevent major flooding of the house.

We now have the State Emergency Service also involved in flood overlays. One of the biggest problems there with a lot of these overlays, we've got to make sure the authorities, in that case SES, have the ability to keep them up to date.

What we have noticed recently is that some of the flood-prone areas, when they are a large development and then all of a sudden you start to build houses, the time lag between upgrading the flood levee can affect each of the individual houses being built doing flood reports. That's something, to the credit of my staff in the office, have been working flat-out over the last couple of weeks to understand.

But the good side of whether it's natural hazards, whether it's landslip or whether it's flood, is it's going to give us information that is vital on where to build, not to build areas that will stop people losing everything in years to come when they find out they've got a problem.

It's very hard to put a blanket over all that, but the information we need to do and the strategies we need to have behind some of these new areas is a full understanding of how we can do that smarter and better, and make sure the floor heights are right or the wind factor's right, or that it's not in a landslip area, the geotech is okay. Once you do that for a region and have that understanding, it allows for subdivisions to happen on a much more sensible basis. But we have to make sure that information is updated as we go along.

The State Planning Office is now working with the SES to update the flood-prone areas overlay and, as I said, we need to make sure that that is continued to be updated as required.

**Mr JAENSCH** - This is also a matter that was raised in the Trowbridge report, regarding insurance and minimising risk through having better information and strategies to deal with it. We can embed that in the planning scheme too, can't we?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, certainly need to embed some of those things. Bushfire overlays are just vital with insurance companies now. And you can mitigate as long as you understand what the issue is and what you have to do to understand that. So many people buy a parcel of land without understanding some of the issues involved. All of us probably know of examples like that. So, the better we can get those overlays with the State Planning Office and have them there is the more information as you go to buy a block of land before you put all your hard savings into it. Or it might even be Homes Tas in taking on a parcel of land where they think they can build 50 or 60, but there may be restrictions. All that will help, if we get it right, to determine and make it easier for people.

**Ms BROWN** - How many additional crisis beds are funded in this Budget?

**Mr VINCENT** - Very good question. I'd have to seek that from Homes Tas.

**Mr WILSON** - We don't have any additional that have been funded in this Budget.

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - That would be done in discussions with the individual peaks and bodies that are doing that care, from where I sit in discussions. Not that I'm directly involved with the funding of those. That comes back through Homes Tas on what they need at the various times.

**Ms BROWN** - The Budget says demand on these services is rising. And so, it is disappointing that there is no extra funding for crisis accommodation - for extra beds, sorry. How many people are staying in crisis accommodation longer than intended because there is no permanent housing available?

**Mr VINCENT** - I haven't got that at hand, and I might have to take that on notice and check on it, unless Homes Tas have got it. Happy to take that on notice to get that accurate for you.

**Ms BROWN** - Thank you. Do you accept that people are staying in crisis accommodation longer because there is no permanent housing to go to, or there is a lack of it, rather?

**Mr VINCENT** - There's always opportunity. I haven't had any comment from the peaks direct to me, unless Homes Tas had. But we know the situation is deepening and the situation is there, so just accept that.

**Ms BROWN** - Thank you for accepting that.

**Ms ROSOL** - Another question around youth housing. Are you able to give figures for the funding in the Budget for youth housing over each of the years of the forward Estimates, please? So, out of the funding that you have planned for housing in total, how much of that is for youth housing?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'm not sure that I've seen a figure where it's broken up into youth, so I might just have to seek some more advice.

**Mr WILSON** - I guess, the reference to youth housing, obviously we're delivering a substantial amount of new social and affordable housing that is not excluded from youth accessing that. When you look at the break-up there, we are delivering, as an example, a number of one-bedroom dwellings that may be suited to youth. And, obviously, that's administered through the Housing Connect and the front-door system. I guess, to have a specific target around that, it is very much taken as part of the overall delivery program of the social affordable housing we're looking to get on the ground to take.

**Ms ROSOL** - Clarifying the question, how much for homelessness services, specifically housing services for young people? Is that something that is set out separately in the Budget?

**Mr WILSON** - Through you, minister, I'm happy to take that on notice to give you a breakdown of that in relation to the funding that we're providing for the services that we're providing in the youth space, if you'd like.

**Ms ROSOL** - Thank you.

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, because once again, the various peaks that are funded by Homes Tas sit in direct communication back to Homes on that.

## PUBLIC

**Ms ROSOL** - I think Mr Bayley touched on this before he left. But I'm just going to the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute's final report into workplace trauma on the social housing and homelessness frontline. It found that 59 per cent of surveyed frontline workers had been physically assaulted and nearly half were living with symptoms consistent with post-traumatic stress disorder, which is quite a disturbing figure.

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, Mr Bayley did touch on this before.

**Ms ROSOL** - Hopefully I'm not doubling up on his questions, but he's suggested that there were still questions to ask here. Can you advise what specific funding's been allocated in the Budget to address occupational health, safety and trauma support for frontline workers employed under Tasmanian government housing and homelessness service contracts?

**Mr WILSON** - As we did touch on earlier, whilst there may not be any specific individual funding for that, our work that we are doing with frontline workers in Housing Connect is understanding have they've undertaken trauma-informed training, a range of safety mechanisms for our own tenancy team and the community housing providers that also administer tenancy obligation and frontline services across the social housing affordable space. Have they undertaken trauma-informed training in relation to their safety? Is there two-worker policies in relation to site visits? And a range of things like that, that we continue to work with our own internal team and external providers that are at frontline in that position.

**Mr JAENSCH** - The rapid bus network strategic business case was released earlier this year. How will land use planning support that critical infrastructure project?

**Mr VINCENT** - It's fair to say this has been touched on by the Chair earlier on that it is vital. And it was interesting: I used the terminology before that we believe 500 metres on the sides of the corridor is an appropriate area for people to walk. It's interesting on the mainland that's a kilometre. So yeah, they walk twice as far as us.

But we know that mentality - that if you're in a regional area, you want to park outside the shop you go to. In metro areas, it's about 500 metres that people are willing to walk. So, that's the mental anguish. Now, obviously we can go outside that if the land and the blocks are appropriate, and that's the sort of thing we're working on because even when you look at the bus network and some of the adjustments we're making on that, we do not want the bus services to be a spider running all over the suburbs. We need more deliberate runs so people know where they're going and get there in an efficient time. and that's the beauty of the rapid bus using that corridor and then being able to move off to the left or the right into that area to be able to drop people off.

So, it's going to make a big difference out through the northern suburbs. I think it's going to even help change the way the restaurant strip out there works. And I keep thinking of places like Lygon Street that are just a hub of activity. And I think we can see a whole different lifestyle develop around some of these corridor strategies.

The big thing for me - and I have touched on this in conversation with the Chair, is the growth of our satellite Brighton, Sorell and Huon areas versus the growth of Hobart, and how we concentrate on those amount of people coming in. That's a whole different conversation, but we also have to realise if they're coming in from northern suburbs to Glenorchy, the

## PUBLIC

mechanisms of that corridor use needs to be to cater for that, as well as the growth in density around that area. But that also allows for concentration of community assets of sporting, community organisations and everything else that fit with that. This is where Dowsing Point, if we can continue on that program of success there, will allow us to plan a community that fits with some of these corridor strategies like the rapid buses network. It is exciting to think through it.

**Ms BROWN** - How many women and children escaping family violence sought housing or homelessness support in 2025 to 2026?

**Mr VINCENT** - I wouldn't have that direct number here. Just looking to the CEO?

**Mr WILSON** - If we could take that on notice?

**Mr VINCENT** - We certainly can provide that. I thought we had it, but we didn't.

**Ms BROWN** - You may need to take this on notice as well. How many of those people were not able to be safely accommodated when they required it?

**Mr WILSON** - In 2024-25, there were 6817 that were turned away from shelters.

**Ms BROWN** - Can you repeat that number, sorry?

**Mr WILSON** - 6817.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Is it unique individuals or is it occasions?

**Mr WILSON** - Occasions.

**Ms BROWN** - Did Jireh House and McCombe House request more funding than what was provided in this Budget?

**Mr WILSON** - There is money in the Budget, but it is a reduction from last financial year. As far as whether they requested any further, I can't comment on that. I don't know whether you're aware, Jessie?

**Ms STONE** - That would be through their community consultation, through the Budget process.

**Ms BROWN** - They asked for less money? Is that what you just said?

**Mr WILSON** - I can't confirm that. I can't confirm whether they requested additional money.

**Ms BROWN** - Well, they wouldn't have. How many additional workers are funded through Jireh House and McCombe house allocations?

**Mr WILSON** - Through you, minister, I'd have to take that on notice.

**Mr VINCENT** - Thank you. Yeah, happy.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - You'll take that on notice? Thank you.

**Ms ROSOL** - Going back to the frontline workers and the trauma they experience, in the answer before there was a lot of mention made of training for frontline workers. Training is good because it prepares frontline workers for what they might experience. But it's not the same as support for them after having experienced traumatic or violent incidents. I guess the question still stands around what funding is available for supports for them.

Has the government modelled or costed any changes to funding agreements to ensure that provider contracts adequately cover workforce wellbeing obligations? And if so, what's the estimated cost?

**Mr VINCENT** - It's not something that's come across my desk at this point in time, so I would refer it to how Homes Tas handle that in the people they look after.

**Mr WILSON** - We haven't allocated any additional funding in relation to the points you just raised.

**Ms ROSOL** - I want to turn to disability and ageing in place accommodation standards. In the Homes Tasmania review, Crawford recommended that the government be clear about who is responsible for meeting accommodation standards for properties that house people with a disability and older adults who require modifications to age in place. I note that stakeholders have made complaints about unresponsiveness to modification requests. Has the government resolved this accountability question and publicly communicated about where the responsibility lies?

**Mr VINCENT** - Certainly, a lot of the requests that I see as a minister on letters that we have from a lot of the members of the House do cover off on modifications to homes for various disabilities. That could be with the people ageing or new disabilities, or people looking for something as a requirement. I have seen an enormous amount of work being done by Homes Tas in that area. But that's just from the letters that I sign and send back out. I will hand that over to the CEO.

**Mr WILSON** - We have provided some clarity, particularly around our head lease models that have NDIS participants that are within those properties, that it is our responsibility for those modifications, and that's our process in that space.

**Ms ROSOL** - Thank you. What's the current backlog of modification requests from NDIS participants in Homes Tasmania properties? And what's the average waiting time?

**Mr WILSON** - Through you minister, I would have to take that on notice. I haven't got that to hand.

**Mr VINCENT** - Thank you. Happy to take that on notice.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Chair. I have a question I think you'll like and I'm happy to share it with you. We, together, can ask the minister how he is incorporating considerations of climate change in land use planning.

**CHAIR** - Well done. Thank you.

## PUBLIC

**Mr VINCENT** - That's been very interesting. Planning in some of my other ministries like bridges and roads has been quite interesting on how that works with culverts and heights of roads, and the information they go into. Touching on the flood mapping, we have situations now where we used to think that a one in 50 or one in 100 was enough, so we're scoping in what happens when there's a lot more there. There are a lot of settlements of collocating houses, jobs and services through mixed uses so that you are not just spreading out with the urban spread that we're actually putting people in. There's a lot more about, in the planning team, now in the principles around the protecting of natural land and environment values to mitigate the impact of climate change. There is controlling urban development on hazardous land, that we touched on a bit with the overlays before, and reducing exposure to climate risks such as flooding and landslip.

Certainly, the investment into individual homes and, on a larger basis, of communities and Tasmania as a whole about renewable energy. And sustainable building design is becoming a very big thing now in a lot of different ways and areas. And it's interesting to see that quite a few architects are actually advertising very heavily in using sustainable building design. The densities are certainly important for us to take advantage of where we are now. So once again, we're not spreading ourselves out everywhere. So, there are a lot of different parts of climate change that are naturally becoming part of how we look at urban design and also everyday lives now that we didn't even think about 20 years ago.

**Ms BROWN** - we circle back to the funding to Jireh House and McCombe House? You said it was a decrease from last year. Can you explain that?

**Mr WILSON** - The operational funding was \$100,000 for Jireh House and \$200,000 for McCombe House to expand the safe-place-of-service component at each site. This is lower than the fixed-term funding provided the previous financial year and represents a reduction of \$50,000 for Jireh House and \$250 for McCombe House.

The previous higher funding levels supported recent service expenses, including different service capacity. And we're currently working with both organisations on transitional planning to understand the implications of the reduced funding profile and supported continuity of care services.

**Ms BROWN** - Minister, why has this reduction happened?

**Mr VINCENT** - I think that was explained there and that they are negotiating it, but working their way through it. That is the limit of my knowledge on this, I'm sorry. We'd have to get more detail for you on that.

**Ms BROWN** - Were you aware of this reduction prior to seeing it in the Budget?

**Mr VINCENT** - I don't believe so.

**Ms BROWN** - Will you be seeking this to be reinstated at the next budget?

**Mr VINCENT** - It depends on what those negotiations were held in relation to the programs they had, or [inaudible 7.56.22]. I think he used that they were increase for other things in previous years. We'd have to have a look at it, and I'm happy to have a look at anything

## PUBLIC

like that. It just doesn't get chopped. There's conversations taking place. I'm happy to have a look at it, though.

**Ms ROSOL** - I'm coming back to the disability and ageing-in-place modifications. I know that you didn't have the information available on the backlog of modification requests that there are at the moment, but I'm assuming that there is a backlog given that that question's been taken on notice. Is funding allocated in this Budget to address the backlog?

**Mr WILSON** - To answer your first question, yes, there is works in progress and we'll provide an update in relation to that on what we took earlier. And we are confident that the budget that we have put forward, particularly around our maintenance portfolio there, has allowed for the projected modification requests that would be coming under the program.

**Ms ROSOL** - I have some questions around tenant health and duty of care. The Homes Tasmania factsheet places the responsibility for mould prevention squarely on tenants. What data does the department hold on the number of Homes Tasmania properties currently affected by damp, condensation or mould? And how has that number trended over the past three years?

**Mr WILSON** - Through you, minister. I'm happy to take that on notice and get that information broken down and, in particular, outline the trends of how that's tracking.

**CHAIR** - I have a question on the back of Mr Jaensch's, actually. It stirred me up.

**Mr JAENSCH** - We're a great team.

**CHAIR** - Maybe. We've just passed legislation which was amended in the upper House in relation to the National Construction Code. There was the wish by the government to put a stop on that. Also, your predecessor, Mr Ellis, made significant incursions into the urban growth boundary and there has been numerous delays in the development of the regional land use strategies. I'm concerned about some of those really important components that address climate change. You've talked about some, but are you really serious about addressing climate change through planning?

**Mr VINCENT** - Certainly are. It's an essential part of everything that we do from, as I said before, roads to buildings. And it's something that everybody's fairly conscious of these days.

The delays with the land use strategy, the southern Tasmania land use strategy, at the moment sits with the planning office or the TPC?

**Mr McPHAIL** - It sits with us.

**Mr VINCENT** - The SPO. When I came into the role, it was fairly obvious that both the north and the north-west were lagging behind where we were expecting them to be. So, very strict timelines I've put on that, which is 30 June. Otherwise, it comes straight back into the planning office to proceed with that fairly quickly. We have been having discussions with Sean about various elements of that. But it is a key part of what we need in the planning system that is overdue and we are working flat out to make sure that that is done.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - I noticed your announcement with, was it Ms O'Neil, in relation to the housing. Again, there could have been an opportunity to do that in the northern suburbs to introduce housing there. Housing and transport costs increase as you move out of major cities. Again, there are the environmental costs. How's that, signing up to have more houses out of fringes of the city, really addressing climate change?

**Mr VINCENT** - It's certainly using greenfield sites, and not spreading out the boundaries -

**CHAIR** - I think that might be.

**Mr VINCENT** - That both the TPC and the SPO, and the people that working through the land-use strategies have been fairly tight in their contingents on controlling. That's been the awkward bit for some of our rapidly growing regional areas in understanding some of those constraints that are put on them. It has also been a point of contention with quite a few developers that might be speculating on land for subdivisions that don't necessarily fit with the planning provisions anymore or the planning policies - is it? What's the last one we're just about to bring in there - policies, thank you. Just getting mixed up between the different titles, on what, and will be, looked at as areas. We are confining the focus of what is needed. Some of those areas - and you touched on public transport - that council needs to look at now, whether it has the connection to various things in the community that are going to make that work, and public transport is a big part of that, and other community services are that also. There have been some examples that have tested that a little bit in a few outlying areas, where adjustments to our thinking need to happen.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Minister, in terms of the housing challenge, again, we've talked about the role of planning in it, we've talked about development of the industry, there are also new technologies, and ways of building houses, like modular and prefabricated housing. What role can they play, do you think? What's their place in the scheme of things?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yeah, we've got to have a bit of a bet each way on some of these things. There has certainly been a technology change in materials and lightweight building products, whether it's in bricks or concrete, and all other things like that, or even the hemp products that are available now. There is also a push towards tiny homes and kit homes that are imported, where the standard's not quite there, or isn't there.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Yeah.

**Mr VINCENT** - You have to remember it might be convenient to throw somebody into it, I'll use that terminology loosely, because they jump at something like this, and then five years later, it's not appropriate or is falling apart and not correct because the materials -

**Mr JAENSCH** - They get sick of the stairs.

**Mr VINCENT** - that's built of, are not suitable for the climate here in Tassie. But there are amazing advances in technology now in some building products that we need to look at.

## PUBLIC

But there has also been a massive amount of change in the technique of building homes, and the products you build it out of. I think that's an area that needs to be looked at, to minimise our footprint in a lot of these areas. Even with modular homes: we presently have two, maybe three contractors that are acceptable to Homes Tasmania in terms of the quality of homes. But that has rapidly changed. They are about to have another look at the tender system, at how you can get them; if you can imagine, we could end up with quite a few around the state that don't have to transport very far then, they're close and handy.

The technology in that area is changing enormously, seen a few different film clips on different companies using different materials to build things quicker and efficiently. That can be in relation to climate also, but there is an amazing amount of technology that's changing in that area, to make it quicker and more efficient. We just have to make sure that it is of the standard, and we don't just jump at something because it's convenient. It still has to fit with building codes; it's still got to fit with our environmental standards here, and to do with the weather changes, as we do have four seasons in Tasmania, where it's little bit different in some of the other states. A lot of work is being done on that, but there are a lot of very good people putting forward sensible ideas. There are a few that are putting forward some ideas that, you can see where they're going with it, that might not quite be right at the moment to accept. We have to keep an open mind to some of this, but the building change is happening rapidly. A lot of things are happening in Europe and other countries that are helping us accelerate the pattern.

The other thing is the way we build places is changing rapidly in so many different ways. There are a lot of things that we have to be across because even what I thought was perfectly right before I come into this ministry in dealing with a lot of friends in this game 12 months ago has changed almost 90 degrees already in 12 months.

**CHAIR** - Ms Brown. We'll try and get through at least another round.

**Ms BROWN** - Minister, just on the back of Mr Jaensch's great questions.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Another partnership now, that's fantastic.

**Ms BROWN** - Oh well, we'll keep that aside, thanks. Minister, what factors have contributed to the delay in the delivery of the Housing Connect portal and platform from the original expected go-live date of 30 June 2024 to the current anticipated date of September 2026?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yes, I certainly - Jess and Ben are across this pretty well, but I have had a couple of meetings in my short time in the role. A lot of that was to do with the being able to get the right data into the system. There were some initial hold ups, which I'm sure they'll expand on, and then to be able to transfer all the data in so that it was effective for Anglicare to be able to utilise. That was the summary that I had given to me. But I will ask them for a little bit more detailed advice. Thank you.

**Mr WILSON** - Yeah. Thank you, minister. In relation to that, additional work was required to ensure any solution would support longer-term operational needs, reporting requirements, integration with participating service providers. This included refinement of the system functionality, extensive user testing, data mitigation activities and sector readiness planning as well. The original scope was reviewed and was further expanded to ensure that the

## PUBLIC

system and particularly the backend database, et cetera, could be supported under the new Housing Connect platform.

**Ms BROWN** - What was the original budgeted cost for the Housing Connect portal and platform?

**Mr WILSON** - Through you, minister, if I could take that on notice?

**Mr VINCENT** - Yeah, happy for that to go on notice.

**Ms BROWN** - What is the current estimated cost and how much of this increase that has been attributed to the project's delays?

**Mr WILSON** - Again, through you, minister, if I could take that on notice?

**Mr VINCENT** - We could expand that out to cover all those things to do with the portal, that's no worries at all.

**Ms BROWN** - Thank you.

**Ms ROSOL** - I just want to come back to mould and damp and condensation in Homes Tasmania houses. Given that in the fact sheet from Homes Tasmania, the sheet acknowledges that mould can make tenants sick, what's the government's clinical or health-based threshold that would trigger Homes Tasmania to take responsibility for remediation rather than leaving it to the tenant?

**Mr WILSON** - In relation to threshold - through you, minister - if I could take that on notice to come back?

**Ms ROSOL** - Thank you. How many tenants have contacted Homes Tasmania in the past financial year specifically about mould or damp conditions, and of those, how many have resulted in a maintenance or remediation response by Homes Tasmania, and what was the average response time?

**Mr WILSON** - Yeah, through you, minister. Again, that information is available, but I need to take it on notice to respond.

**Mr VINCENT** - Happy for that, regarding the mould and the numbers involved with it, yes.

**CHAIR** - Anything else, Ms Rosol?

**Ms ROSOL** - Oh, I think that was my two questions.

**CHAIR** - Okay, well go to Mr Jaensch.

**Mr JAENSCH** - No, I'm going to sit out this round and wait for you to come around, and I'll maybe join in on someone else's question, even things up a bit.

**CHAIR** - Well done. Ms Brown.

## PUBLIC

**Ms BROWN** - Minister, we spoke about the energy efficiency upgrades to social housing. Can you provide insight into what matrix or criteria was used to pick which homes were first in line to receive those upgrades?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'll have to refer that to Homes Tasmania.

**Mr WILSON** - Through you, minister. I would have to take that on notice. I wasn't part of the program at the time.

**CHAIR** - They'll take that on notice?

**Mr VINCENT** - Very much so, yes.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Ms BROWN** - Then has the government done any modelling or measurement of actual bill reductions through this initiative?

**Mr VINCENT** - It's not something that I've been involved with. I'm not sure that Homes Tasmania have?

**Mr WILSON** - No, look, we haven't done any modelling. We haven't done any testing on what it's increased the energy efficient levels of the homes to. But obviously I understand that the works that have been carried out have been done to industry standards in relation to roof replacements, with insulation barriers and a range of things that you'd see in modern NCC requirements of new construction.

**Ms BROWN** - Okay. Is this something that you think you'll be testing in the future to get a firmer understanding of how well this project is working?

**Mr VINCENT** - I can answer that by saying a lot of the older stock that we have are homes - we need to look at how much you spend on it to bring it up to an energy-efficient standard because, depending on the age and where the home is or the circumstances, it may be better off to do something different, as in, depending on the block of land, remove the home and instead of putting a lot of money into it and it can be in the vicinity of \$28,000 to \$38,000, I think, with some of the work to be done. Whether you look at that home differently - obviously we have to take stock of a lot of that ageing stock and just see where it fits. You don't just want to be for the sake of putting solar panels on or double-glazed windows or making it energy efficient. There needs to be a lot more work done on that, especially with the older stock. I do believe Homes Tasmania are looking at different parts like that.

**Ms ROSOL** - Still sticking with mould in Homes Tasmania houses: the fact sheet from Homes Tasmania recommends ventilation, extractor fans and keeping windows open as the primary prevention methods. How many Homes Tasmania properties currently lack functioning extractor fans in kitchens or bathrooms and is funding allocated in this budget to address that gap?

**Mr VINCENT** - Not that I know specifically, but I will refer that to Homes Tasmania.

## PUBLIC

**Mr WILSON** - I can answer, just in relation to the numbers; I'd have to take that on notice to come back, through you, minister. But certainly we have vacates that occur, those sort of upgrades are undertaken during those periods of time. It does form part of our maintenance expenditure for the forward Estimates to include and incorporate upgrades to reduce mould issues in dwellings where we can look at it from an asset perspective.

**Ms ROSOL** - Thank you. Many older social housing properties in Tasmania have poor insulation, single-glazed windows in inadequate heating, all of which increase condensation risk. How much of the \$900 million Housing budget is specifically allocated to retrofitting existing social housing stock for energy efficiency and moisture control?

**Mr WILSON** - Look, through you, minister, I haven't got an asset allocation there. I think some of the concerns that you raised there, and coming to the minister's point earlier in relation to the existing stock, is there is sometimes limitations on how far you can go with energy efficient upgrades to get the best performance out of those existing stock.

To your point around ventilation and a range of things like that, again, there are challenges that sit in relation to the existing stock around that. But I don't have the specific budget breakdown of part of the \$900 million in relation to what would go towards that. I think that original question, not sure whether you were in the room or not, was taken on notice I think to get a breakdown of that \$900 million.

**Ms ROSOL** - I missed the earlier bit, but I'm curious, energy efficiency is not repairs as such, but it's improving the quality of the housing and so what consideration do you give to energy efficiency in improving energy efficiency in Homes Tasmania housing?

**Mr WILSON** - Through you, minister. As explained, we have taken full advantage of the Commonwealth initiative to look at opportunities to co-fund that and it's seen a significant \$7-million-plus investment over the last period around that, which has been a large push from Homes Tasmania to look at those upgrades and those existing properties.

**Mr JAENSCH** - I've heard the minister refer a few times to cases where he's been able to come to agreements or make use of federal government initiatives that line up with ours. I think it's important that everyone's working together and leveraging that, what would you say, Minister, have been the advantages that we've been able to secure for Tasmania from your interactions with the federal programs?

**Mr VINCENT** - I think the advantage is that each state has the same issue that Tasmania has. The federal government is committed to ensuring that, as much as possible, those partnerships, whether it's maintenance, whether it's energy efficiency - of the \$7.5 million, I think \$5.35 million of that was federal money - or whether it's immediate housing projects under HAFF, or after HAFF 3 it finishes, but I'm sure there'll be another version pop up after that.

Whether it's 100,000 homes or whether it's the \$2 billion into infrastructure assistance to get more blocks going, I think what we can see there is that the federal government and states have said it's not one single issue for us all. We all have to be on the same page, working with skin in the game to make these things happen. We have a very good federal minister in Minister O'Neill who is committed to making sure this partnership happens properly and

## PUBLIC

professionally. We're certainly seeing that influence in my short time in the ministry, and I welcome that input because we all have part of this to fix.

**Mr JAENSCH** - Takes one to know one too, minister.

**CHAIR** - Alright. We have got one minute for the last question.

**Ms BROWN** - Minister, when will the legislation be tabled in parliament to change Homes Tasmania back into government?

**Mr VINCENT** - I'll just refer that exact thing to, you still awake there? You've had a quiet night, so far, to the acting secretary.

**Mr GREGORY** - Through you, minister. We're just working our way through that and what actually needs to be done in terms of the legislative change, but to facilitate Homes Tasmania coming back into the department in December, it would have to be sort of September I think September, October. We need to just work our way through that timeline.

**CHAIR** - Yes, that is time. The time for scrutiny has expired. I'd like to thank you, minister and members of staff. The next portfolio to be scrutinised before the committee is Local Government at 9.00 a.m. tomorrow. So, thank you everybody for attending and please end the broadcast.

**The witnesses withdrew.**

**The committee adjourned at 8.19 p.m.**