How often do respondents use a planning scheme in Victoria?

- 72% of respondents said they use the planning scheme on a daily basis
- 15% use it weekly
- 87% use the system at least once per week
- Monthly 8%, don’t use 2%, yearly 1%, less than yearly 1%. 

....of these respondents

- over 70% were planners
- 41% local government planners
- 17% planning consultants
- 10% state government planners
- 4% referral authority planners

Other 9%, building and development professional 7%, design professional 5%, doesn’t work in planning or development 5%, academic 1%, legal professional 1%.

The majority have been involved in planning for some time...

- 35% 15+ years
- 19% 10-14 years
- 21% 5-9 years
- 18% 0-4 years
- 7% do not work in the planning and development industry

and typically use the planning scheme in the following contexts...

- 48% Metropolitan Melbourne
- 21% State-wide
- 17% Rural area
- 15% Regional city
Section 2: A modern planning scheme

Do planning schemes need to be reduced in complexity?

72% agreed or strongly agreed that planning schemes need to be reduced in complexity (671/688)

71% found permit triggers were difficult to locate

86% of respondents held the opinion that use of digital platforms would improve useability (671/688)

The majority of respondents agreed that the following changes would increase the effectiveness and efficiency of planning schemes (677/688).

400 votes
Online library of documents

396 votes
Improved order and layout

390 votes
Simpler language

381 votes
Introduction of hyperlinks

346 votes
More graphics, colour and maps

317 votes
Clearer user guide
Section 3: Overcoming over-regulation

When respondents were asked if there are too many minor matters that require a planning permit...

68% agreed or strongly agreed

14% neither agreed or disagreed, 13% disagreed, 3% strongly disagreed and 2% were unsure

(674/688)

The majority of respondents said there should be...

More exemptions for buildings and works within the planning scheme.

62% yes

(669/688)

More ‘as of right’ or permit exempt land uses within the planning scheme.

46% yes

(667/688)

Increased planning permit exemptions for construction and extension of a single dwelling or on a lot.

62% yes

(666/688)

79% considered that the referral process could be improved or made more efficient

15% were unsure, 6% said no.

(676/688)

67% considered that some external referral responses could be effectively implemented as standard permit conditions

20% were unsure, 13% said no.

(669/688)
**Section 4: Actions and recommendations**

Survey respondents provided the following insights, actions and recommendations for VPP reform.

*The Particular Provisions could be changed to make planning schemes more efficient and effective... (664/688)*

- **60%** said yes
- **31%** said no
- **9%** were unsure

**Respondents consider that the following provisions could be relocated within the VPPs... (344/688)**

This may be achieved through relocation of provisions to the table of uses within the relevant zone(s), or as a new exemption under Clause 62 if it meets the requirements.

- Private tennis court (177)
- Satellite dish (170)
- Shared housing (159)
- Crisis accommodation (147)
- Convenience, restaurant, take-away food premises (128)
- Boat or caravan sales (108)
- Heliport and helicopter landing site (84)

*Outdoor Advertising Terms listed in Clause 73 could be improved to provide greater clarity for users... (658/688)*

- **55%** yes
- **37%** unsure
- **9%** no
Section 4: Actions and recommendations cont.

**Top 10 Particular Provisions identified for review by survey respondents (358/688 respondents):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Car Parking (52.06)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Advertising Signs (52.05)</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Native Vegetation (52.17)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Uses with Adverse Amenity Potential (52.10)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public Open Space Contribution and Subdivision (52.01)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Licensed Premises (52.27)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Land Adjacent to a Road Zone Category 1, or a Public Acquisition Overlay for a Category 1 Road (52.29)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shared Housing (52.23)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Specific Sites and Exclusions (52.03)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Easements, Restrictions and Reserved (52.02)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top 10 Overlays identified for review by survey respondents (621/688 respondents):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Overlay</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Design and Development Overlay (DDO)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Heritage Overlay (HO)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Environmental Significance Overlay (ESO)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Character Overlay (NCO)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bushfire Management Overlay (BMO)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Development Contributions Plan Overlay (DCPO)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vegetation Protection Overlay (VPO)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Special Building Overlay (SBO)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Significant Landscape Overlay (SLO)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Parking Overlay (PO)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>