



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

---

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND CITY SERVICES

Jo Clay MLA (Chair), Suzanne Orr MLA (Deputy), Mark Parton MLA

Submission No 7 -

Ms Julie Esdaile Bray

Inquiry into DV 365 -

Housing Choices

Received - 22/04/21

Authorised - 06/05/21

## Submission to the Inquiry into Draft Variation 365 Housing Choices - Boarding Houses and Cohousing

I would like to express appreciation that an inquiry into DV 365 has been called, as I strongly believe the recommended variation is flawed.

Specifically, regarding Boarding houses:

1. The Draft Variation does not address the fact that there are a couple of different kinds of boarding house, which should be treated differently. The NCC details Class 1b and Class 3 boarding houses based on scale.
2. It is good to see that boarding houses have been retained in RZ1, but reducing the number of bedrooms to 4 is a regressive step as far as the provision of affordable housing is concerned. For the sake of both neighborhood and tenant amenity, an appropriate regulatory system needs to be developed (in conjunction with other government agencies and community organisations), not a restriction of capacity from a planning perspective. The ACT does not currently have a suitable regulatory framework.

Specifically, regarding Cohousing:

1. The main innovative feature of DV365 was that no arbitrary dwelling limit was to be imposed on cohousing developments, but scale would be limited by plot ratio and site provisions. This feature was removed from the recommended version with no clear rationale given, and this would remove the capacity for cohousing to provide affordable options. The provision for no dwelling limit should be reinstated, perhaps with better design guidelines.
2. DV365 prohibits cohousing in RZ1. Apparently the rationale is that this would be addressed under the wider Territory plan review, but this also limits both the affordability and availability of land for cohousing. A better approach is that applied to boarding houses currently, of one per section in RZ1. Affordable housing is needed now - waiting for the Territory Plan Review to be finalised is also a regressive step.
3. Cohousing is suited to much smaller blocks, and should be permitted on smaller blocks in all zones, using plot ratio and site provisions to limit scale.
4. To remove the possibility of developers taking advantage of cohousing provisions, there should be a requirement for all cohousing developments to be led by residents. This policy needs discussion and development.

Thank you again for the opportunity to submit to this inquiry.

Jules Esdaile Bray,

