

Farrer, ACT 2607

27 March 2009

Ms Nicola Derigo
Secretary
Standing Committee on Planning, Public Works and Territory and Municipal
Services
ACT Legislative Assembly
London Circuit
Canberra, ACT 2601

Dear Ms Derigo

Draft Variation to the Territory Plan No. 288 (Lyons)

Thank you for the opportunity to present our views on the above draft variation in relation to the parts of the variation affecting Blocks 3 and 4 Section 69 and Block 8 Section 47 in Lyons. Our opposition to Draft Variation No. 288 is set out below.

Height of Buildings

We oppose the proposal for the maximum height of the buildings in the Lyons development (the former Burnie Court site) being raised from three-storeys to six-storeys (to be allowed over the entire site) and the proposal for a ten-storey tower building on the corner of Melrose Drive and Launceston Street. If approved, the proposal would change Lyons from being a low to medium density suburb to becoming high density in character.

It is inappropriate to have a ten-storey tower building and six-storey buildings located in a suburb. Buildings of that size are more appropriately located in a town centre. While the site is across from the Woden Town Centre with its high-rise buildings, it is not part of the Town Centre. A single ten-storey building on the corner of Melrose Drive and Launceston Street and six-storey buildings in the development will be incongruous with the surrounding low-rise residential area.

The maximum building height on the site in our view should be limited to four-storeys.

Impact of overshadowing

Another reason why we oppose DV No. 288 is that the proposed ten-storey tower building located on the northern aspect of the site, and the six-storey

buildings will overshadow a significant proportion of the other buildings on the site, and at certain times of the year much of the open space for residents.

An additional impact is that the ten-storey tower block and six storey buildings will overlook single storey residences in the surrounding area, significantly reducing their privacy and amenity.

Sustainability

The overshadowing will also impact on solar access of residences located within the enlarged shadow zone. This means units that are in the shadow of the taller buildings in winter will require additional energy for heating.

It also means the mandatory requirement of R86 of *Residential Zones—Multi Unit Housing Development Code*, which requires all residential units in an estate to be capable of achieving minimum solar access requirements, will not be met.

The fact that DV No. 288 does not comply with the sustainability principles, especially with basic environment and solar energy principles is another reason why the Variation should not be approved. High-density and high-rise buildings are significantly less environmentally sustainable than low and medium density development.

Conclusion

We oppose Development Variation No. 288 to the Territory Plan for the reasons set out above. We believe developments should be congruous and sympathetic to the surrounding area, be pleasant places for people and environmentally efficient. Sadly, this is not always the case in the Woden area and in Canberra in general.

Yours sincerely

(signed)

Eric Yates

Valerie Yates

