

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL
TERRITORY**

DRAFT VARIATION TO THE TERRITORY PLAN

- **The Draft Territory Plan**

**REPORT NO.12 OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PLANNING,
DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

May 1993

Resolution of Appointment –

(Minutes of Proceedings, 2nd Assembly, 27 March 1992)

‘the following general purpose standing committees be established to inquire into and report on matters referred to it by the Assembly or matters that are considered by the committee to be of concern to the community...

‘a Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure to examine matters related to planning, land management, transport, economic development, commercial development, industrial and residential development, infrastructure and capital works, science and technology...

‘if the Assembly is not sitting when the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure has completed consideration of a report on draft Plan variations referred pursuant to section 25 of the *Land (Planning and Environment) Act 1991* or draft Plans of Management referred pursuant to section 204 of the *Land (Planning and Environment) Act 1991*, the Committee may send its report to the Speaker, or in the absence of the Speaker, to the Deputy Speaker, who is authorised to give directions for its printing and circulation.’

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Mr David Lamont (Presiding Member)

Mr Trevor Kaine (Deputy Presiding Member)

Mr Tony De Domenico

Ms Annette Ellis

Ms Helen Szuty

Secretary : Mr Rod Power

RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT

Note: While this is a list of the eleven principal recommendations made by the Committee, Attachment A to the Committee's report outlines in specific detail all of the recommendations made by the Committee in relation to the draft variation known as the Draft Territory Plan. It is necessary to read all of Attachment A, as well as this report, to fully appreciate the outcome of the Committee's consideration of the Draft Territory Plan.

Recommendation One: *The Committee endorses the draft Variation known as 'The Draft Territory Plan' as it has been amended by this Committee – the amendments being shown on the green pages contained in Attachment A. The Committee notes that the changes to the Territory Plan Map that flow from this endorsement are listed in Appendix D of this report. In endorsing the draft variation (as amended), the Committee is recommending that the Government adopt Attachment A as the Territory Plan.*

Recommendation Two: *The Committee recommends that the Government continue studies such as the 'Canberra in the Year 2020 Study' as part of a process to ensure the development of a strategic plan for a population in excess of 400,000 people.*

Recommendation Three: *The Committee recommends the Government institute action against any person in breach of the land use provisions applying to, and about, the group centres, in particular Manuka and Kingston. This reflects the Committee's determination not to authorise variations to permit commercial activity beyond the present boundaries.*

Recommendation Four: *The Committee recommends that the Government and the ACT Planning Authority take particular note of the traffic problems associated with any proposal for development on the block of land bordering Lhotsky Street, Tillyard Drive and Ginninderra Drive in Charnwood Group Centre (Block 97).*

Recommendation Five: *The Committee recommends that the legislation applying to planning and building be amended to enable the ACT Planning Authority to approve and set conditions in relation to energy efficiency and to enable the Building Controller to enforce compliance with approved plans.*

Recommendation Six: *The Committee recommends that the guidelines bearing on the final Territory Plan, and any further guidelines developed in the future, be disallowable instruments pursuant to the Subordinate Laws Act 1989.*

Recommendation Seven: *The Committee recommends the Government promptly completes the Heritage Register.*

Recommendation Eight: *The Committee recommends the Government prepare a substantive paper on the urban consolidation issue.*

Recommendation Nine: *The Committee recommends that the Land (Planning & Environment) Act be amended to allow public notification of single house design and siting application to be in form of a letter served on neighbours, by post or otherwise, and a sign placed on the site, as the only forms of notice required.*

Recommendation Ten: *The Committee recommends that the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning be asked to initiate the preparation, as a matter of urgency, of amendments to the Land (Planning & Environment) Act to give effect to a streamlined notification and review of the decisions process for design and siting, land use and leasing applications, to coincide with the introduction of the new Territory Plan.*

The amendments should make provision for appeals to go to a new Planning and Land Appeals Board appointed by the Minister to operate along the lines indicated in this report.

Recommendation Eleven: *To avoid confusion and duplication of effort, the Committee recommends that in the case of urban renewal, applications for both lease variation and design and siting should be submitted concurrently.*

REPORT NO. 12 – STANDING COMMITTEE ON PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

DRAFT VARIATION TO THE TERRITORY PLAN

• The Draft Territory Plan

I. BACKGROUND

1. A variation to the Territory Plan is a change to the land use policies applying to specified areas of the ACT. The draft variation process involves extensive consultation, public notification and report writing by the ACT Planning Authority, which then makes a detailed submission to the ACT Executive.
2. Sections 25 and 26 of the ACT's *Land (Planning and Environment) Act 1991* require the Executive to refer draft planning variations to an appropriate Committee of the Assembly for report, and for the Executive to then have regard to the Committee's recommendations before approving any variation. The Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure is the appropriate committee to handle such variations.
3. On 1 December 1992 the Committee received from the Minister for Environment, Land and Planning the draft variation and background papers relating to the Draft Territory Plan. The Minister referred the documents to the Committee for its consideration and for subsequent report to the Assembly; and he requested the Committee examine the Draft Territory Plan without undue delay.
4. At a private meeting of the Committee on 11 December 1992, the Presiding Member expressed the hope that the Committee would be in a position to report to the Assembly in May 1993. The Committee is pleased to meet this tight deadline.
5. In February 1993 the Committee decided to set aside at least twelve dates in March and April for examination of the Draft Territory Plan. On 3 March the Committee resolved to call for public comment on the Draft Plan, with Members stressing that the Committee wanted to hear from those persons and organisations who made a submission to the ACT Planning Authority about the draft Plan (as earlier exhibited) and who remained dissatisfied with the response of the Planning Authority to the issues raised in their submission.
6. In making this decision the Committee was conscious of the extent of consultation by the ACT Planning Authority with the community, as borne out in the background papers accompanying the Draft Territory Plan. A full list of the documents comprising or accompanying the submission to the ACT Executive on the Draft Territory Plan includes:
 - Annexe A: Submitted Draft Plan being recommended for approval (amended Written Statement and Map);
 - Annexe B: Draft Plan as released for consultation (exhibited Written Statement and Map);

- **Annexe C:** Report on consultation and on the issues raised in written submissions, and including an index to the submissions;
- **Attachments to Annexe C, namely:**
 - Appendix 1: Copy of the first submission by the National Capital Planning Authority;
 - Appendix 2: Copy of the second submission by the National Capital Planning Authority;
 - Appendix 3: List of persons and organisations to whom copies of the Draft Plan were distributed;
 - Appendix 4: List of seminars and workshops;
 - Table 1: Response to the National Capital Planning Authority's submissions;
 - Table 2: Response to public submissions on principles and policies;
 - Table 3: Response to public submissions on general issues;
- **Annexe D:** Documentation of changes made to the Written Statement and Map;
- **Annexe E:** List of background papers provided in accordance with s.24(1) of the *Land (Planning and Environment) Act 1991*, namely:
 - Planning Report (released with the Draft Plan);
 - Submission by Conservator;
 - Summary of responses to consultation issues;
 - Issues Papers (15);
 - Reports on issues consultations (4); and
- **Annexe F:** Summary of compliance with the requirements of the *Interim Planning Act 1900* and the *Land (Planning and Environment) Act 1991*.

7. The Committee believes that it has steered the right course between too greatly opening up a renewed period of public comment and too restrictively confining that public comment. To call for submissions on every element on the Draft Plan would likely see the Committee inundated by the approximately 1000 submissions already received and processed by the ACT Planning Authority in earlier periods of public consultation. By requesting members of the public to advise the Committee where they thought the planners had inadequately dealt with their submissions, the Committee intended to act as a check on the ACT Planning Authority and to provide people with a further opportunity to air their concerns.

8. Advertisements appeared in the *Canberra Times* on Saturday 6 March, the *Canberra Chronicle* on Tuesday 9 March and the *Valley View* on Wednesday 10 March 1993. The Committee requested that the public comment on the Draft Territory Plan by the last day of March 1993. The Committee then aside three days for public hearings on the Draft Territory Plan.

9. The first public hearing was held on Tuesday 6 April 1993 in Belconnen. This was the first time that a committee of the ACT Legislative Assembly had formally taken evidence outside the Assembly building in Civic, and demonstrated the wish of the Committee to facilitate the appearance of witnesses, especially on local issues – at the Belconnen hearings, the Committee heard from a number of organisations concerned about developments in the Belconnen area.

10. The second public hearing was held on Tuesday 20 April 1993 in the Assembly building in Civic. The object of this hearing was to hear public comment on the general policies and principles underlying the Draft Territory Plan. The third public hearing was held in the same venue on the following day and provided the opportunity for senior officials of the ACT Planning Authority (including the Chief Planner) to respond to issues raised by the public. The Committee considers it to be very important to have the planners' response to issues raised by the public on the public record.

11. Appendix A lists the witnesses appearing before the Committee.

12. The public made over 40 submissions to the Committee and all have been authorised for publication.

13. Appendix B lists the submissions.

14. In the course of considering the Draft Territory Plan, the Committee held numerous private meetings with government officials. As well as officials of the ACT Planning Authority, the Committee was briefed by officials of the Department of the Environment, Land and Planning (Lands Division) and the ACT Housing Trust.

15. The Committee is conscious of the fact that the Draft Territory Plan is the most significant draft variation to come before it and the largest it is ever likely to consider. The Draft Plan is intended to replace over 1100 policies of the old National Capital Development Commission (NCDC). These policies have been used as an interim measure to provide a planning policy framework since the abolition of the NCDC and the introduction of self-government.

16. The Commonwealth's *Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988* provides for laws to be made by the ACT Legislative Assembly to establish a Territory planning authority to prepare and administer a Territory Plan. The Assembly's own *Land (Planning and Environment) Act 1991* complements the Commonwealth legislation. The Committee believes that it is entirely appropriate to replace the NCDC policies by a distinctively Canberran planning document which responds to our community's needs as well as being readily available, simple to use and with clearly stated objectives and policies. Of course, the Committee acknowledges the need for the final Plan to be consistent with the National Capital Plan, as is required by Commonwealth legislation.

II. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

17. The Committee wishes to thank the dedicated staff of the ACT Planning Authority, especially the Chief Planner (Mr Tomlins) – who comprehensively briefed the Committee for many hours and prepared detailed material in response to Members' requests at very short notice. The Committee continues to be impressed with the expertise and integrity of staff of the ACT Planning Authority, and acknowledges that the four year process to develop the Draft Territory Plan has involved an unequalled degree of community consultation.

18. Also, the Committee thanks the persons who made submissions on the Draft Plan and those persons who appeared before the Committee as witnesses. The Committee's recommendations reflect the opinions of those witnesses in many cases.

III. SUBMISSIONS

19. The Committee has found it useful to compile a summary of the key points made in the submissions. The summary is indicative only and is not intended to draw out every aspect of each submission. The summary is shown in Appendix C.

20. The Committee considers the public has brought the following matters to its attention through the submissions:

Matters of a general nature:

- the concept of an 'urban village';
- the extent of residential three-storey development;
- third party appeals;
- design and siting codes;
- urban consolidation;
- the treatment of 'collateral requirements' in the final Plan, such as the various guidelines;
- the strategic nature of the Territory Plan;
- the identification of environmentally sensitive areas;
- the extent of broadacre land use; and
- the use of maps and diagrams in the Plan, including overlay maps.

Matters of a specific nature:

- the nature of Gungahlin Town Centre;
- the extent of commercial/industrial land use provision in Mitchell, and traffic access to Mitchell;
- the nature of further development in Civic, including the degree to which employment should be encouraged, the degree to which residential development should be encouraged, and design and siting requirements;

- the need to complete the ACT's heritage register;
- the overlapping nature of responsibilities between the ACT Planning Authority and the National Capital Planning Authority;
- urban open space that is excluded from public land;
- land use policies about Lake Ginninderra;
- the appropriate boundaries of Latham District Park;
- land use policies about Canberra Railway Station;
- the designation of the CSIRO site at North Belconnen as industrial;
- land use policies in Lawson;
- land use policies in Pialligo and Fyshwick (including the area occupied by the Goldenholm Dairy), Kaleen (Section 75 Block 4), Giralang Hill, Hughes (Section 57 Block 2; Section 58; and Section 28 Block 5 (Webster Street)), and Campbell (between Holmes Crescent and Fairbairn Avenue);
- land use policies along Canberra Avenue from Jerrabomberra Avenue to State Circle;
- provision for north Canberra main road links;
- rural leases;
- recognition that land use policies in Oaks Estate are being reviewed;
- the role of the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure in the planning process.

IV. ORAL EVIDENCE

21. As well as material brought to the Committee's attention in the way of submissions, some additional matters arose out of the three days of public hearings. These matters include the following:

- a planning appeals board;
- betterment tax;
- land use policies on the Belconnen peninsula (Section 159);
- 'defined' land;
- the wording of the Foreword to the submitted Territory Plan.

V. STRUCTURE OF THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT

22. The Committee has structured its report on the Draft Territory Plan in two parts. The first part is the present document which outlines the Committee's consideration of the Draft Plan and includes a set of recommendations. The first and most important recommendation is that dealing with the Written Statement: Annexure A submitted by the ACT Planning Authority to the Executive.

23. In considering the Planning Authority's Annexure A, the Committee has made a number of changes which it recommends the Executive consider. Pages where substantive changes occur have been printed on green paper. The location of the text changes are identified by a line in the margin. It should be noted that some green pages have changes on both sides of the page. The Committee has called the altered Annexure A 'Attachment A' to this report, in order to differentiate the Committee's document from that originally submitted by the ACT Planning Authority.

24. Attachment A is a compilation of changes made by the Committee of its own initiative (including changes made following representations to the Committee by members of the public) and changes that have come from the ACT Planning Authority as it reviewed the original document and/or as new information came to hand since the Draft Territory Plan was prepared. An example of such new information is clarification by the National Capital Planning Authority of where the Draft Plan should be reworded to reflect decisions of that body. Another example of new information is the incorporation of changes made as a result of variations to the Territory Plan approved since the Draft Territory Plan was released. The Committee has accepted that such updates should be incorporated in the amended Draft Territory Plan and they are shown in the green pages of Attachment A.

25. A summary of the changes to the Territory Plan Map arising out of the Committee's considerations is at Appendix D of this report.

26. The following section describes the changes made by the Committee. The layout of the section corresponds to that in the Draft Territory Plan: an Introduction; Part A dealing with general principles and policies; Part B listing specific objectives and policies; Part C dealing with certain other policies; and the set of Appendices.

VI. AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAFT TERRITORY PLAN RECOMMENDED BY THE COMMITTEE

Introduction

27. The Committee considered the Territory Plan Map in the submitted Draft Territory Plan documentation was cumbersome and not user friendly. The Committee has requested that more readable maps accompany the final Territory Plan. The ACT Planning Authority assured the Committee that the final Map will be stored on computer and will be reproduced in a variety of forms at different scales.

28. The Committee considered the submitted Plan was deficient in that it did not describe the sub-regional planning context which affects decisions about planning in the ACT, especially long-term decision making. The Committee requested detailed briefings on the sub-regional context and then resolved to incorporate the material in the amended Plan.

29. The submitted Draft Plan contained a heading under Part C: 'Other Policies' dealing with C4: 'Clearance Zone Policies'. Essentially, the material under this subheading related to clearance zones around a number of activities in the Territory. In light of the Committee's decision on energy efficiency guidelines (see later in this section), it was considered appropriate to change the heading of this subsection to 'Environmental Planning Policies' – which covers policies relating to environmental planning.

Part A: General Principles and Policies

30. The Committee was dissatisfied with use of the word 'strategic' in this section, because it conveyed a more long-term and broader sense of planning than was borne out by the text. Indeed, the original Draft Territory Plan report submitted by the ACT Planning Authority specifically stated: 'The Draft Territory Plan is not a strategic plan, rather, it provides a focus for day to day decision making on land use proposals...'. The Committee acknowledges that the term 'strategic' is not used in the *Land (Planning and Environment) Act 1991*, whereas the term 'planning principles' is: clause 7 of the Act states that 'The Plan shall set out the planning principles and policies for giving effect to its object...' The 'object' is defined as 'to ensure, in a manner not inconsistent with the National Capital Plan, that the planning and development of the Territory provides the people of the Territory with an attractive, safe and efficient environment in which to live, work and have their recreation'.

31. The Committee is convinced that a 'strategic' plan for a population in the ACT beyond the 400,000 level (presumed in the current document) is required, and it looks forward to the contribution being made to the preparation of such a document by the 'Canberra in the Year 2020 Study' currently underway.

32. The Committee felt that the section entitled 'Metropolitan Structure' had not been fully developed. In particular, the Committee felt that additional descriptions were needed for town centres, group centres, local centres and suburbs. These descriptions have been added to the text.

33. Also, the Committee felt that additional comments needed to be made about residential areas, specifically emphasising the amenity for residents and their capacity to express their views when assessing development proposals which have the potential to change the character of the environment in which they live. The additional comments have reinforced the view that the shape and structure of residential areas will be related to the natural and cultural features and that public housing will continue to be located throughout the city. Locations for higher density housing will be preferred adjacent to town centres, principal public transport routes, and group and local shopping centres.

34. In the section dealing with transport and access, the Committee felt it was important to elaborate on the importance of extending the peripheral parkway system, primarily to minimise traffic on internal road systems through town centres and residential areas.

35. Part A of the submitted Plan included a section under A3: 'Implementation Policies' dealing with land use controls. The Committee agrees with the revised view of the ACT Planning Authority that this section is more usefully placed in each land use policy described in the Draft Territory Plan. This ensures that key information is brought together where the land use purposes are outlined. Thus each schedule of land uses now contains the following clause (or words like it): 'Notwithstanding the

provisions of this schedule, land may be used for temporary uses, minor uses and uses ancillary to the principal use of the land, provided there is no conflict with the objectives' of the relevant section.

Part B: Land Use Policies – General

36. The Draft Plan states that 'performance controls' apply to a number of land uses and that these controls consist of two items: 'objectives' and 'performance measures'. The latter are 'values which are considered to satisfy the relevant objective so that generally no further evidence of performance is required'. However, the Authority is still able to consider proposals which do not meet the performance measures but 'the associated applications are subject to the public notification and third party appeal provisions' set out in Part VI of the *Land (Planning and Environment) Act 1991*. The Committee requested that the performance measures shown in each land use performance control should be highlighted in italics, indicating that if the particular measure is not met then automatic notification and appeal provisions apply. The amended pages throughout the document reflect this change.

Part B: Land Use Policies – B1: Residential Land Use Policies

37. The Committee considered the general description of residential land use policies at the head of this section should acknowledge the existence of growing numbers of blended and extended families, together with the ongoing demand for traditional detached housing forms. An additional sentence along these lines is now contained in the amended document.

38. The Committee agreed with the revised view of the ACT Planning Authority that controls over residential land use should extend to the protection of significant streetscapes, and accordingly a subsection to this effect is contained in the amended document.

39. The original Draft Territory Plan made no reference to energy efficiency ratings as being a necessary part of controlling residential land use. The Committee considers this deficiency should be remedied in the final Plan and hence has inserted a new subsection headed 'Energy Efficiency Ratings'. The insert stipulates that a four-star rating will be required from 1 July 1995 in order to obtain approval for the external design and siting of a new building. Where special circumstances can be shown to apply, then the Planning Authority can permit a building of lesser rating.

40. The Committee's amendment provides for the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning to determine the energy efficiency ratings to apply, the methods to be used in calculating the ratings and the special circumstances in which an exemption may be given. This allows the Government to respond to changes in national standards (once they are introduced) or other developments.

41. The Committee's amendment is a significant one requiring careful consideration by the Executive before it is adopted, which should only follow extensive consultation with the building industry and the community.

42. In order to control the nature of residential blocks that are subdivided, the Committee recommends that the Authority be able to refuse a development proposal for a subdivision not part of an integrated development for the block.

43. In the area specific policies applying to low rise residential development, the Committee notes the need to incorporate a variation to the Territory Plan approved since the original Draft Plan was prepared, namely, that for the Barton Cafe.

44. In the area specific policies applying to medium and high rise residential development, the Committee wishes to draw attention to the Kingston/Griffith Redevelopment Area. The wording contained in Attachment A removes an historic anomaly which permitted tower developments to be considered along Wentworth Avenue and facing Telopea Park; this is no longer the case (and the National Capital Plan is being amended accordingly).

45. In relation to recent controversy about a third tower development in Kingston, the changes made above do not remove the requirement for any proposal for a further tower to be the subject of the draft variation process – which would see it eventually come before this Committee for detailed scrutiny.

Part B2: Commercial Land Use Policies – B2A: Civic Centre

46. In relation to land use policies in Civic Centre, the Committee considers the 'Objectives' should refer to the desirability of buildings in Civic retaining a high level of design consistency and compatibility of colour and external materials. This change is inserted in the amended document.

47. The wording of the clause relating to community and recreational uses has been amended to clarify its meaning: the Committee considers it is important to make provision for mandatory preliminary assessment where proposals would have the effect of depleting the range of community or recreational facilities available within the Civic Centre. A similar clause has been inserted elsewhere in the document in relation to other commercial land use policies.

48. In the section dealing with building colour and construction, the Committee was convinced by representations to it that no useful purpose was served by retaining the phrase 'in the Authority's view'.

49. Notwithstanding some representations to it, the Committee is not convinced of the need to alter the performance measure expressed as 'maximum proportion of ACT jobs in Civic Centre [to be] 20%'. The Committee heard evidence from the ACT Planning Authority that considerable development can occur in Civic within this employment constraint.

50. In relation to the area specific policies for Precinct b2: Northbourne Avenue office area (Braddon Sections 18 and 19), the Committee considered it desirable to insert a control dealing with building colour in order to make the control applying to this area similar to that applying elsewhere in Civic.

51. In relation to the area specific policies for Precinct b5: McKay Gardens, Turner, the Committee saw no justification for separately classifying this area as b5 in contrast to the area adjacent to it, which is shown as b3. The Committee therefore has recommended deletion of the b5 schedule (which applied only to this small portion) and its incorporation into the b3 schedule.

52. In relation to area specific policies for Precinct c: Braddon mixed services area, the Committee has recommended two changes. The first is to delete the term 'lower order' and insert a more understandable expression. The second is to add a control restricting residential use to other than ground floor, in order to ensure that the predominant use of the area remains 'mixed services'.

Part B2: Commercial Land Use Policies – B2B: Town Centres

53. The Committee requested that maps of the town centres be reorganised so that each map was placed alongside its accompanying text, and this change is shown in the amended document.

54. Also, the Committee was dissatisfied that no mention of the Gungahlin town centre was contained in the submitted Draft Territory Plan. This omission has been redressed in the amended document.

55. The text accompanying the Gungahlin map has been inserted at the Committee's request. It makes specific mention of the possibility of an urban village in the town centre: it 'may be developed wholly or partly in a mixed use and integrated manner in the form of an urban village', possibly extending to the adjoining suburbs of Franklin and Harrison. The Committee is aware that any detailed proposal for Gungahlin town centre will be the subject of a variation to the Territory Plan, which will provide the opportunity to identify the principles and policies for its development. The Committee supports the notion of an urban village.

56. In the area specific policies for Precinct b relating to the business area, the Committee is of the view that higher residential populations in the town centres is a desirable feature allowed for in Attachment A. The Committee considers the land use control should explicitly refer to the fact that shops should serve not only the local workforce but also the residents of the town centres. This change is particularly relevant in the context of an urban village.

57. In the area specific policies for Precinct c relating to mixed services areas, the Committee has again amended the objective to delete the term 'lower order' and has substituted 'relatively low rent commercial activities'.

58. In the area specific policies for Precinct d relating to car parking, the Committee agrees with an addition suggested by the ACT Planning Authority to the land use controls covering a service station, namely that the maximum gross floor area devoted to retail sales (excluding the sale, hire or display of automotive goods) shall not exceed 150m².

Part B2: Commercial Land Use Policies – B2C: Group Centres (Dickson, Kingston, Manuka and 'Other')

59. The Committee notes that the ACT Planning Authority has made a small change to the boundary of Precincts b1 and b4 in the Kingston group centre, in order to reflect the Territory Plan Map.

60. In relation to the group centres, the Committee is particularly anxious to place on the public record its determination in the future to reject any planning variations intended to increase the boundaries of the commercial areas, especially with respect to Manuka and Kingston.

61. In relation to Kippax in the 'Other' group centres, the Committee again notes that the ACT Planning Authority has made a small change to the boundary of Precinct b to bring the map in Attachment A into line with the Territory Plan Map.

62. In relation to the Charnwood group centre, the Committee wishes to record its concern about traffic problems that would be associated with any proposal for development on the block of land bordering Lhotsky Street, Tillyard Drive and Ginninderra Drive (Block 97). The Committee requests that the Government and the ACT Planning Authority take particular care in considering development proposals in this area.

63. As noted in the preceding section, the Committee has deleted the term 'lower order commercial activities' where it appears in the Precinct c objectives and substituted 'relatively low rent commercial activities'.

Part B2: Commercial Land Use Policies – B2D: Local Centres

64. The Committee requested the insertion of a map of Hall village to accompany the text dealing with site specific policies.

Part B2: Commercial Land Use Policies – B2E: Corridors and Office Sites [Note: the term 'corridor' in this context refers to selected major avenues and approach routes to Canberra, as identified in the National Capital Plan.]

65. As it has done elsewhere, the Committee requested that site specific maps be placed alongside their accompanying text in order to improve the readability of the final document.

66. In relation to the Canberra Avenue corridor, the Committee notes that the status quo position is shown on the site specific map but that a draft variation to the Territory Plan may be prepared in the future in relation to the southern side of Canberra Avenue between State Circle and Manuka. If and when such a draft variation is prepared, it would come before the Committee only after the ACT Planning Authority has made a recommendation to the Executive.

67. In relation to the Deakin office site, the Committee questioned the ACT Planning Authority about the land use restrictions proposed on an area of land in Strickland Crescent near John James Memorial Hospital (Section 35, Block 27). Attachment A now simply notes that only health facilities shall be permitted on this block.

68. The site specific map for Bruce has been amended to incorporate changes flowing from the variation to the Territory Plan approved earlier this year which enables residential development on part of the site.

Part B3: Industrial Land Use Policies

69. The Committee requested that block numbers be inserted on the site specific map of Fyshwick (west)/Griffith, and the revised plan also incorporates minor changes to Precinct c along Canberra Avenue to bring the map into line with the Territory Plan Map.

Part B4: Community Facility Land Use Policies AND Part B5: Restricted Access Recreation Land Use Policies AND Part B8: Entertainment, Accommodation and Leisure Land Use Policies AND Part B9: Urban Open Space Land Use Policies

70. As before, the Committee requested the provision of site specific maps where these were not included in the submitted Draft Territory Plan.

Part B10: Broadacre Land Use Policies

71. The Committee's changes again include the provision of site specific maps to accompany the text but a more significant change in this section is the widening of land use controls applying to small agricultural enterprises in Pialligo and Symonston. Following representations to the Committee, a further three purposes have been added to the list of purposes for which land may be used. They are 'nature conservation area', 'outdoor recreation facility' and 'parkland'. The addition of these purposes allows for more flexible land use in the areas.

72. In the case of Symonston, the Committee has agreed with the ACT Planning Authority that the land use 'produce market' should be deleted as it is inconsistent with the National Capital Plan.

73. The Committee agrees with a further change suggested by the ACT Planning Authority in relation to these areas, namely, that the subdivision of existing leases shall generally not be permitted. This reflects a desire to retain the existing character of the areas, which may be diluted if smaller blocks are generally permitted.

74. Again as a result of representation to it, the Committee has agreed to widen the range of land uses allowed in the area marked for horticultural activities in Pialligo, to include the same three land uses noted above.

Part B11: Rural Land Use Policies

75. Representatives of the ACT Rural Lessees Association observed that it was no longer appropriate to regard rural leases as forming a land bank that might be required for urban and other purposes in the future. This is in line with the National Capital Plan which provides for the rural areas of the ACT to be retained and utilised on a sustainable yield basis. Accordingly, the Committee has amended this section of the submitted Annexure A to delete such references in the Draft Territory Plan.

Part B12: Hills, Ridges and Buffer Areas Land Use Policies AND Part B13: Rivers Corridors Land Use Policies

76. The Committee's amended document again incorporate site specific maps.

77. In relation to Part B13 relating to river corridors and specifically relating to the Goldenholm Dairy at Fyshwick, the Committee heard representations about the deleterious effect of any land use uncertainty on the financial viability of the Dairy. The Committee has therefore added a new section dealing with the Dairy which provides that the intensive agricultural landscape character of the area is to be retained.

Part B14: Mountains and Bushlands Land Use Policies AND Part B15: Plantation Forestry Land Use Policies

78. The Committee has added site specific maps.

79. In relation to plantation forestry, the Committee sees no need to provide for consideration of replacing forestry production. The Committee notes that any forestry production in a new area would require a draft variation to the Territory Plan to be prepared, and hence would come before the Executive and the Committee.

Part C: Other Policies

80. The Committee is aware that all land shown as Urban Open Space on the Territory Map is reserved as public land except those areas indicated in the maps enclosed in this section of the submitted Draft Territory Plan. The Committee acknowledges that the status of public land confers a greater degree of certainty that any particular open space area will be protected indefinitely, than does the mere designation of urban open space. It is also the case that the designation of public land requires the development of a management plan by the appropriate government body. It is therefore not surprising that a large number of the representations made to the Committee concerned these areas; accordingly, the Committee has examined each affected area very carefully.

81. In the Belconnen town area, the Committee considers that two sites formerly the subject of site specific policies should be redesignated. The first site is the area to the west of the lake bordered by Sutherland Crescent and Morell Street (Sections 154 and 155). This land was initially shown as being excluded from public land; in the Committee's view, it now should be reclassified as public land given its significant potential for community and recreational use. On the other hand, the land to the east of the lake bordering Ginninderra Drive (Section 159) is recommended for urban open space but not public land – this reflects its potential for varied community uses.

82. In the Evatt area, the Committee considers that the portions of urban open space shown in Levine Street (Section 89, Block 3) and that bordering Kellway and Jacobs Streets (Section 12, Block 1) should be reserved as public land. This reflects their recreational and landscape value.

83. The ACT Planning Authority recommended that areas alongside Ginninderra Drive between Florey and Melba (Sections 113 and 114, Florey and Section 67, Melba) should be excluded from public land. Upon inspection and discussion, the Committee considers that part of the Melba area adjoining Ginninderra Creek should be designated as public land. This reflects the Committee's view that it is important to retain a useful corridor along the Creek for its landscape, recreational and environmental value.

84. In the MacGregor area, the Committee considers the land to be excluded from public land should be confined to that bordering Handcock and Ballow Crescents (Section 105). The uncertainty that has hung over the areas of urban open space fronting the extension of Ginninderra Drive and those on the western side of MacGregor has been removed by the approval of the West Belconnen variation to the Territory Plan; hence there is no need to exclude them for being declared public land.

85. The Committee heard extensive representations in relation to the exclusions from public land suggested by the ACT Planning Authority for Latham District Park. The Committee has been convinced by the arguments put forward to justify the declaration of most of Latham District Park as public land because of its significant recreation and landscape value. The Committee considers that all of the area bordering Florey Drive should be so preserved.

86. There remains a relatively small portion of the Park which the Committee considers does not warrant declaration as public land, namely, that to the south of the Park toward the corner of Florey Drive and Southern Cross Drive (Section 129).

87. In the Campbell area, the Committee considers the land to the south of Fairbairn Avenue (adjoining Cresswell Street: Section 60 Block 3) should be designated as public land because of its landscape importance in relation to the War Memorial and Anzac Park.

88. In relation to the Turner area, the Committee considers the separate portions of open space land in McCaughey Street, Bent Street and Watson Street should be preserved as public land – with the exception of the land at the southern tip of Watson Street adjoining Barry Drive (currently used as a car park), whose landscape value does not warrant (in the Committee's view) designation as public land. The Committee acknowledges that the other areas are heavily treed and have significant scenic and/or recreational value.

89. In Lyneham, the Committee adjusted the open space land that was excluded from public land to reflect the fact that an existing playing field needs to be preserved.

Part C: Other Policies – C4: Environmental Planning Policies

90. The Committee considers the new heading of this section is more appropriate than the former heading of 'Clearance Zone Policies', given the importance of energy efficiency measures outlined earlier in this report.

Appendix 111.1: Residential Design and Siting Code for Single Dwellings in the ACT AND Appendix 111.2: Residential Design and Siting Code for Multi-Dwelling Developments in the ACT

91. The Committee has amended the design and siting proposals outlined in the submitted Draft Territory Plan in response to three factors. The first follows the receipt of detailed comments from industry. The second involves various urban design considerations arising out of recent residential developments. The third factor is based on the Committee's view that improvements can be made to the objections and appeals process. In all its considerations, the Committee has sought to maintain the integrity of the existing and developing urban culture which is the mainstay of Canberra's uniqueness as an Australian city.

92. The Committee's changes include a summary diagram outlining the performance measures providing exemption from notification. Where design and siting applications do not conform to these performance criteria, third party appeals are able to be lodged as of right. The Committee's specific recommendations relating to the appeals process are elaborated in a later section of this report.

93. The changes made by the Committee include setbacks to major roads and provisions relating to garages and carports. The Committee also recommends changes to lower floor setbacks which should improve the flexibility of house design (including in relation to solar orientation). The Committee recommends removal of the old requirement for a six metre setback to other side or rear boundaries, and the insertion of a three metre setback (with a setback of 1.5 metres on only one side boundary). Any structure within these setbacks (with minor exceptions such as to permit fencing) would have to be publicly notified. Also, the Committee has added a new section dealing with group developments, which is in response to community concern about the sameness of some streetscapes in newer residential areas.

Appendix V: Heritage Places Register

94. The Committee heard representations from some members of the public that the delay in completing the Register is affecting some planning decisions; also, that it is impossible to assess the heritage aspects of the Territory Plan until the register is in place. The Committee urges the Government to complete the Heritage Register promptly.

Appendix VI: Definition of Terms

95. The Committee requested some changes to the definition of terms to improve the clarity of the document.

VI. ADDITIONAL MATTERS ARISING OUT OF THE COMMITTEE'S CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT TERRITORY PLAN

Energy Efficiency Controls

96. The Committee acknowledges that the current legislation controlling design and siting relates to the external design and siting of buildings and not the interior fit-out. Consequently, the ACT Planning Authority currently lacks the legislative authority to take into account insulation and other mechanisms required to achieve a stipulated energy efficiency rating when considering plans for approval. Legislative change may also be required to ensure that the Building Controller, in monitoring the construction of a building, is able to enforce the incorporation of the approved devices.

97. The Committee recommends that the legislation applying to planning and building be amended to enable the ACT Planning Authority to approve and set conditions in relation to energy efficiency and to enable the Building Controller to enforce compliance with approved plans.

98. In relation to the methods used to calculate energy efficiency ratings, the Committee was advised that one star of a five star rating may be considered to be due to internal fittings (such as pelmets and other furnishings). In calling for a four star rating system to be introduced into the ACT from 1 July 1995, the Committee is indicating that it is prepared to award one star to all building applications in recognition of the contribution of internal fittings to meeting energy standards.

Guidelines

99. The Committee is concerned about the number and status of guidelines that bear on the Draft Territory Plan. The Committee requested a list of these guidelines, which is reproduced at Appendix E. The Committee recommends that these guidelines, and any further guidelines developed in the future, be disallowable instruments pursuant to the *Subordinate Laws Act 1989*.

Urban consolidation

100. The Committee heard representations about the inadequacy of references in the submitted Draft Territory Plan to the extent and rationale of urban consolidation. The Committee requested a list of published documents and papers relating to this issue and it is shown in Appendix F. The Committee acknowledges community concern about urban consolidation and recommends the Government prepare a substantive paper on the issue.

North Watson

101. A specific instance of urban consolidation is that being considered for North Watson, which was the subject of representations to the Committee. The issue is not directly relevant to the Written Statement accompanying the Draft Territory Plan and so is not referred to in the preceding section. However, the Committee acknowledges that a draft variation for North Watson has been prepared by the ACT Planning Authority, which has requested public comment on the proposal. Following consideration of the responses, the Authority intends to submit the draft variation to the Government for its approval. If and when the matter comes before this Committee, it is intended to hold public hearings on the variation – possibly in the Watson area. In no manner has the Committee determined a view on such a draft variation.

Planning Appeals

102. A number of concerns have been raised about the current planning appeals system, following the introduction of new requirements under the *Land (Planning and Environment) Act 1991*.

103. Community and environmental groups have talked about the implied costs and formality of the system reducing their ability to use it effectively. Builders are reluctant to use it because of the delays which involve them in onerous penalties associated with holding costs ('justice delayed is justice denied').

104. It is clear to the Committee that the majority of complaints relate to disagreements which are matters of fact rather than matters of law. People are unhappy with decisions which result in their views being blocked, their privacy reduced or their amenity reduced in other ways. Alternatively, applicants wish to contest a refusal by the Authority which relies on these arguments. The Committee considers that these and related matters – which include urban design controls and the appropriate land use and carparking provision – are best decided by an expert appellate body operating in an informal setting. This would encourage the proponents, objectors and planners to make direct representations rather than requiring them to be represented. It would also facilitate a cheaper and more expeditious process.

105. The Committee is recommending that the residential design and siting codes in the submitted Draft Territory Plan be modified to allow formal rights of objection and subsequent appeal on a wider range of development proposals, particularly those close to the side or rear boundaries of a block.

106. The Committee recognises that those modifications will impact on structures such as garages or carports, which are often located close to such boundaries. However, they are also a significant cause of conflict between neighbours. There is already an informal requirement for consultation with neighbours, but in cases where certain minimum standards are met there is no right of formal objection or subsequent appeal. This situation is anomalous and would be overcome by broadening the class of applications subject to formal notification procedures.

107. The building industry has made representations to the Committee requesting, *inter alia*, that rights of 'third-party' objectors be reduced rather than increased and that encroachments into required boundary setbacks be allowable as of right, by permitting a building to achieve an average setback. The Committee does not object to the latter concept in principle and supports more innovative approaches to design including the angling of buildings on blocks in order to take greater advantage of solar access.

108. However, it considers that there may be situations where a neighbour could be affected and therefore such encroachments should be subject to the notification, objection and appeal processes.

109. However, if the number of applications subject to notification and possible third-party appeal is expanded, it will be necessary to consider ways of streamlining the process, which already appears to be unnecessarily lengthy and cumbersome. Otherwise the time and cost associated with simple applications such as garages or carports could be prohibitive.

110. Streamlining the process: At present, under Part VI of the *Land (Planning & Environment) Act* – which sets out the processes to be followed in handling applications for approval of all 'controlled activities', including the external design and siting of buildings – notification of an application requires an advertisement in a daily newspaper, letters to be posted to all lessees of adjoining places and a sign to be erected in a conspicuous place on the site. In most cases related to single house blocks it is the immediate neighbours only who are affected, so the newspaper advertisement (costing around \$200) is mostly unnecessary.

111. The Committee recommends that the *Land (Planning & Environment) Act* be amended to allow public notification of single house design and siting applications to be in the form of a letter served on neighbours, by post or otherwise, and a sign placed on the site, as the only forms of notice required.

112. The current process, and prescribed times, for handling design and siting applications requiring notification, is as follows:

Step 1 – checking of application, rectification of problems (two weeks)

Step 2 – notification by applicant (this is time allowed for the applicant to actually organise notification, it does not include the public comment period (step 3), and can be greatly reduced by the applicant acting quickly) (four weeks)

Step 3 – public comment period (three weeks)

– administration re public comments (one week)

Step 4 – assessment, report, decision by ACT Planning Authority (two weeks)

– letters to applicant, objectors and others previously notified (one week)

Step 5 – period to lodge appeal by objectors (two weeks plus a further week until decision takes effect) (three weeks)

Step 6 – appeal process (The Administrative Appeals Tribunal process involves an application, a preliminary conference, a hearing and a subsequent decision together with various legal processes for information exchange etc, all of which can take several months. There are also application fees and possible legal and other costs.) (? weeks)

113. There is not much scope for reducing steps 1–5 above, although there seems no reason why the public comment period (step 3) could not be initiated by the applicant at the same time as the application is lodged, eliminating steps 1 and 2. This would put the onus on the applicant, instead of expecting the Planning Authority to fix any defects in the application. Indeed, if the applicant does his or her homework and ensures that the proposal has the support of neighbours before lodgement, the likelihood of objection and appeal will be greatly reduced.

114. The greatest potential otherwise for streamlining appears to be in Step 6, the appeal process. A much quicker and cheaper review process, such as the former ACT Design and Siting Review Committee or the former Victorian Planning Appeals Board, should be possible. Attached is an extract from the *Buildings (Design and Siting) Ordinance 1964* setting out the composition, etc of the Design and Siting Review Committee (prior to the repeal of those sections of the Ordinance and replacement with an appeal to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal)..

115. Features of the Design and Siting Review Committee were:

- three person committee, appointed by the Minister;
- one representative of the National Capital Planning Committee (now defunct), the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, and (usually) a town planner;
- provision for deputies of members to attend hearings and exercise the powers and functions of members;
- appeal may be lodged within 14 days after the decision on the application (or otherwise at the discretion of the Minister);
- the Committee had power to summon witnesses, require production of documents and take evidence on oath; and
- the Committee could dismiss an appeal or direct that approval be granted or vary the conditions or direct that an application be amended.

116. Such a review board could be appointed by the Minister for Environment, Land and Planning and could be a mixture of expert and lay people. The review board should be directed to be informal, to limit legal representation to essential instances, to hear and decide matters at one sitting as far as possible and to meet as frequently as necessary to provide a very efficient process, which disposes of cases within 21 days of the notification of an appeal.

117. The Committee does not consider that the appeal board needs the power to summon witnesses, but there should be no legal representation except in special circumstances and subject to the agreement of the board. The Committee considers this constraint is essential to ensure that there is no tendency for procedures to become more legalistic over time as they appear to have done in other jurisdictions. The Review Board's decision should be appealable on matters of law only.

118. The Committee recommends that the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning be asked to initiate the preparation, as a matter of urgency, of amendments to the *Land (Planning & Environment) Act* to give effect to a streamlined notification and review of the decisions process for design and siting, land use and leasing applications, to coincide with the introduction of the new Territory Plan.

119. The amendments should include provisions for appeals to go to a new Planning and Land Appeals Board appointed by the Minister to operate along the lines indicated in this report.

120. Combined Applications: The Committee is concerned that there is confusion in the mind of the community as to whether the issues being considered relate to:

- a variation to planning policy
- a variation to the lease
- a design and siting matter.

121. The Committee believes these issues should be clarified. Variations of the Territory Plan which are matters of policy formulation should be subject to Assembly consideration and should be considered by the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure.

122. On the other hand, lease variations and design and siting appeals are questioning the implementation of policy and should be subject to review on merits to an appeal board.

123. Members of the community have expressed concerns that when asked to comment on lease variations, they are given only vague ideas or crude sketches indicating possible development proposals which are not formalised until the design and siting application is submitted.

124. To avoid confusion and duplication of effort, the Committee recommends that in the case of urban renewal, applications for both lease variation and design and siting should be submitted concurrently.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

125. The Committee has taken into account the matters raised in submissions, oral evidence and private briefings in coming to its recommendations on the Draft Territory Plan.

Recommendation One: *The Committee endorses the draft Variation known as 'The Draft Territory Plan' as it has been amended by this Committee – the amendments being shown on the green pages contained in Attachment A. The Committee notes that the changes to the Territory Plan Map that flow from this endorsement are listed in Appendix D of this report. In endorsing the draft variation (as amended), the Committee is recommending that the Government adopt Attachment A as the Territory Plan.*

Recommendation Two: *The Committee recommends that the Government continue studies such as the 'Canberra in the Year 2020 Study' as part of a process to ensure the development of a strategic plan for a population in excess of 400,000 people.*

Recommendation Three: *The Committee recommends the Government institute action against any person in breach of the land use provisions applying to, and about, the group centres, in particular Manuka and Kingston. This reflects the Committee's determination not to authorise variations to permit commercial activity beyond the present boundaries.*

Recommendation Four: *The Committee recommends that the Government and the ACT Planning Authority take particular note of the traffic problems associated with any proposal for development on the block of land bordering Lhotsky Street, Tillyard Drive and Ginninderra Drive in Charnwood Group Centre (Block 97).*

Recommendation Five: *The Committee recommends that the legislation applying to planning and building be amended to enable the ACT Planning Authority to approve and set conditions in relation to energy efficiency and to enable the Building Controller to enforce compliance with approved plans.*

Recommendation Six: *The Committee recommends that the guidelines bearing on the final Territory Plan, and any further guidelines developed in the future, be disallowable instruments pursuant to the Subordinate Laws Act 1989.*

Recommendation Seven: *The Committee recommends the Government promptly completes the Heritage Register.*

Recommendation Eight: *The Committee recommends the Government prepare a substantive paper on the urban consolidation issue.*

Recommendation Nine: *The Committee recommends that the Land (Planning & Environment) Act be amended to allow public notification of single house design and siting application to be in form of a letter served on neighbours, by post or otherwise, and a sign placed on the site, as the only forms of notice required.*

Recommendation Ten: *The Committee recommends that the Minister for Environment, Land and Planning be asked to initiate the preparation, as a matter of urgency, of amendments to the Land (Planning & Environment) Act to give effect to a streamlined notification and review of the decisions process for design and siting, land use and leasing applications, to coincide with the introduction of the new Territory Plan.*

The amendments should make provision for appeals to go to a new Planning and Land Appeals Board appointed by the Minister to operate along the lines indicated in this report.

Recommendation Eleven: *To avoid confusion and duplication of effort, the Committee recommends that in the case of urban renewal, applications for both lease variation and design and siting should be submitted concurrently.*

David Lamont
Presiding Member

20 May 1993

APPENDIX A: LIST OF WITNESSES
(in alphabetical order)

Note: The Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure held three public hearings on the Draft Territory Plan. These hearings were held on 6 April 1993 (at Belconnen), 20 April 1993 and 21 April 1993 (both in the Legislative Assembly building, Canberra City). The dates shown below are the dates on which the witness appeared before the Committee.

ORGANISATION	WITNESS	DATE
ACT Heritage Council	Mr Martin	30.04.93
ACT Planning Authority	Messrs. Tomlins and Calnan, Ms Burton	21.04.93
ACT Rural Lessees Association	Messrs. Adams and Anderson, Dr Killen	06.04.93
'Australians for an Ecologically Sustainable Population'	Messrs. Brophy and O'Connor, Ms Goldie	20.04.93
Belconnen Community Council	Messrs. Henry, Minto, Griffin-Warwicke and Watson	06.04.93 20.04.93
Canberra Business Council	Messrs. Hedley, Jordan and McCann, Ms Barry	20.04.93
Conservation Council of the SE Region and Canberra (Inc.)	Messrs. Falconer and Dalglish	20.04.93
Flamen Nominees Pty Ltd	Mr Priest	20.04.93
Friends of Latham District Park	Messrs. Best, Brownrigg, Terran and Stanford	06.04.93
Ginninderra Community Council	Mr Handley	06.04.93 20.04.93
Giralang Community Action Group	Mr Griffin-Warwicke	06.04.93
Goldenholm Dairy Pty Ltd	Mr Stuart	06.04.93
Hughes Residents Association	Mr Eyles and Ms Campbell	20.04.93
Lake Ginninderra	Mr Evans	06.04.93
Master Builders Association	Messrs. Bryant, Johnson, Martin and Purdon	20.04.93

MBA Land and Mitchell– Gungahlin Chamber of Commerce	Messrs. Winnel and Martin	06.04.93
‘Save the Environment at Taylor’	Mr and Mrs Harris	20.04.93
Turner Residents Association	Dr Dickins	06.04.93
Watson Community Association	Messrs. Dunstone and Evans, Ms Smith and Dr Nash	20.04.93

INDIVIDUALS

Messrs. Fisk and Gatsby	06.04.93
Ms Howitt	20.04.93
Mrs Vey	20.04.93

APPENDIX B: LIST OF SUBMISSIONS

Argyle Consultants Pty. Ltd
Barton Residents Association
Belconnen Community Council
Mr H Best
Canberra Business Council Inc.
Canberra Community Action on Acton
Conservation Council of the South-East Region and Canberra (Inc.)
Mr S J Fisk
Flamen Nominees Pty Limited
Friends of Latham District Park
Giralang Community Action Group
Goldenholm Dairy Pty Ltd
Heritage Council
Ms M Howitt
Hughes Residents Association
Huntly Pastoral Company
Mr B Katz
Mr E D L Killen
Master Builders' Construction and Housing Association of the ACT
Air Vice Marshall R Noble AO (Retired)
North Canberra Protection Group
Oaks Estate Progress Association
Mr Gus Petersilka
Rural Lessees Association
Mr R Smith
Mr M E Stanford
Mr L Teran
Turner Residents Association
Mrs L Vey
Mr C Watson
Watson Community Association

APPENDIX C: SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

The following summary of submissions on the Draft Territory Plan indicates the main points that the Committee believes were raised in the submissions. The Committee hopes that the authors of the submissions will bear this qualification in mind when considering the adequacy of the descriptions. Where quotations are used, they are of course taken from the text of the submission.

The submissions are treated in alphabetical order by name of the organisation or individual who made the submission.

Argyle Consultants Pty. Ltd. considers the final Territory Plan should make reference to the concept of an urban village. Argyle Consultants considers such reference is particularly important in relation to the future suburbs of Harrison and Franklin (to be released shortly) and the Gungahlin Town Centre. Argyle Consultants criticises the Draft Territory Plan for showing Gungahlin Town Centre as having 'the same land use designation as the other Town Centres'.

Argyle Consultants considers the final Plan should facilitate Mitchell's role as a commercial/industrial adjunct to Gungahlin and state: 'To force local services to operate from Belconnen, Civic or Fyshwick will not help create efficiency'. They say that more should be done to promote traffic access 'to and through Mitchell'.

Argyle Consultants considers the final Plan should designate a greater number of areas for 'more intense development' of the type being encouraged in Kingston/Griffith, parts of Turner and Forrest, and the three-storey 'B1' area.

Argyle Consultants considers the final Plan should restrict the present 'unrestrained exercise of third party appeals'.

Argyle Consultants considers the residential design and siting code in the Draft Territory Plan is 'too rigid' in the areas of 'rear setbacks for single and multi-dwellings and carpark location for multi-dwellings'. Argyle Consultants call for 'averaging of setbacks' and for a change in the minimum rear setback from six metres to a lesser amount.

Barton Residents Association considers the final Territory Plan should not refer to the aim of 50 percent of new housing to be provided by urban redevelopment.

Belconnen Community Council considers the final Territory Plan should preserve 'the boundary environs of Lake Ginninderra' for 'community open space'.

Mr H Best considers the final Territory Plan should preserve the present boundaries of Latham District Park as open space, especially as the urban population of West Belconnen will increase 'with the West Belconnen urban development along with proposals for urban development of the Belconnen Golf Course'.

Canberra Business Council Inc. states the Draft Territory Plan will facilitate 'better infrastructure management and urban consolidation'. However, the Business Council expresses concern about 'a lack of focus on the economics of city development and management'. The Council supports an increase in the proportion of overall employment that is located in Civic from the present maximum of 20 percent to 25 percent. Also, the Council considers the 'design and siting restrictions on building heights [in Civic] are set at too low a level to enable development' – for example, the 45° setback of buildings to main pedestrian areas is opposed, as is the failure to permit plant-rooms above building height limits (subject to specified safeguards). The Council notes that the ACT Government would obtain increased revenue by facilitating city development (in the way of betterment charges, land tax and general rates).

Canberra Business Council considers that 'parts of Ainslie and Yarralumla (at least)' should be designated for denser residential development, along with Kingston/Griffith, parts of Turner and Forrest and the three-storey 'B1' area in the Draft Plan. The Council supports an urban village concept in Gungahlin.

Canberra Business Council considers more attention should be paid to the wording and purpose of certain 'collateral requirements that are given the 'statutory status' of the Plan', such as 'planning guidelines' [clause 2.4 page 26 of the Draft Territory Plan], 'the Authority's view' [clause 2.3(e) page 44], 'comprehensive design standards' [clause 4.2(c) page 55], 'materials and finishes specified by the Authority' [clause 4.2(c) page 55] and 'the Authority's Parking and Access Guidelines' [clause 4.5(b) page 58]. The Business Council states that 'unless a proposal is consistent with those requirements, applicants (or third parties) cannot appeal against a refusal or a development condition based on those requirements'.

In relation to public notification and third party appeals, Canberra Business Council considers the word 'and/or' should be added after each criterion specified in the land use policies; this would clarify the question of 'whether a proposal must meet one or all of the criteria before being excluded from third party appeals'.

Canberra Business Council remains concerned that 'mischievous third party objections' to residential planning matters are too readily permitted by the Draft Territory Plan. The Council is concerned about a rear setback (for residential development) of six metres, and also is concerned about carport setbacks.

Also, Canberra Business Council states its opposition to the requirement for an environmental impact assessment for a building with a gross floor area in excess of 7 000sqm; observes that the absence of a heritage register makes it difficult to gauge the impact of heritage requirements on planning issues; and calls for political action to sort out the dual coverage of development controls in Civic between the ACT Planning Authority and the National Capital Planning Authority.

Canberra Community Action on Acton opposes any provision in the final Plan for commercial and residential development of the open space on Acton Peninsula and the West Basin area.

Conservation Council of the South-East Region and Canberra (Inc.) considers the Draft Territory Plan 'lacks strategic vision'; also, that the Draft Plan is not 'a cohesive and comprehensible document' without the incorporation of all relevant guidelines. The Conservation Council calls for 'the establishment of impartial and independent arbiters' in relation to planning matters, especially in regard to 'the assessment of particular development proposals and environmental assessments': in short, an 'independent Planning Appeals Tribunal'. In the view of the Conservation Council, the Draft Territory Plan is 'a consolidation of planning policies' but not 'a strategic plan for the future'.

The Conservation Council considers the final Territory Plan should contain a map showing the ACT's 'environmentally sensitive areas... with reference to descriptive notes or a table of locations'. Further, the Conservation Council considers the ACT Planning Authority should be required to undertake an 'independent environmental impact assessment' of any changes having 'the potential to impact, in part or in whole, on areas of environmental concern'.

The Conservation Council states the Map included in the Draft Territory Plan 'is faulty and of a scale in many cases inadequate for meaningful understanding of its implications'. The Conservation Council cites the mapping of Tuggeranong Pine Plantation as an example. The Council calls for the final Map(s) to 'be available in overlapping sections of the whole'.

The Conservation Council considers the final Plan should outline the means by which specified population targets would be achieved. The Council is concerned that the Draft Plan 'does not seem to take account of anticipated growth of Queanbeyan nor of its interconnection with Canberra, nor does it address how to interrelate with over-the-border development along the corridors to the north-east and north-west'. The Council notes that: 'If Queanbeyan were now considered in this structure, the configuration would logically become an 'X' or an '8' Plan'. The Council calls for identification of the 'circumferential interconnections to the line haul routes of the X configuration'.

The Conservation Council supports the general objectives for the Industrial Areas but considers 'the allowance of extensive commercial use (Area B) [in Fyshwick and Mitchell] completely breaks down the objective for the individual town centres to be the focal point of community activity and employment'. The Council favours industrial land use and not a commercial land use in the area around Canberra Railway Station. Also, the Council considers the CSIRO site at North Belconnen should not be used for commercial land uses but should be retained for industrial land use.

The Conservation Council considers the Draft Territory Plan over-provides for three-storey residential development. Also, it calls for staged development of each three-storey residential precinct. The Conservation Council considers the final Plan should contain separate design and siting codes for medium and high-rise residential development and for cluster housing on large sites.

The Conservation Council is critical of the Draft Territory Plan for not mentioning infill (urban renewal). The Council calls for a Government paper on the policy and program applying to infill and redevelopment.

The Conservation Council is critical of the overly large list of 'areas of open space land use policy not reserved as public land'. Also, the Council is critical of the wide provision for broadacre uses and calls for more detailed investigation of the worth of sites in this category. The Council considers the Draft Territory Plan is deficient in identifying Lawson as residential (except for a strip of land along Lake Ginninderra). The Council considers Lawson should be designated as an investigation area pending clarification of the worth of its grassland and the protection of the endangered moth *Synermon plana* and its associated wallaby grass plant community.

The Conservation Council considers the final Territory Plan should provide for consideration of the John Dedman Community Option and the extension of Ginninderra Drive. The Council notes that the latter transport use is contained within the National Capital Plan. The Council is critical of certain areas of Kaleen and O'Connor that are designated as 'subject to review'.

The Conservation Council considers that provision should continue to be made for horticultural use in parts of the Dairy Flat, Pialligo and Woolshed Creek areas.

Mr S J Fisk considers the final Territory Plan should not provide for urban infill until rate payers are 'asked whether they are willing to pay higher rates to retain their open space'. Also, Mr Fisk considers the final Territory Plan should retain as open space the area at Kaleen Section 75 Block 4 (part).

Flamen Nominees Pty Limited is concerned about 'major deviations and changes from the original draft' of the Territory Plan. The submission states that the company's leases at Pialligo are changed from rural to broadacre; that 'large parts of the leases have now been included in the Molonglo River Corridor'; and that 'greater restrictions [are] placed on the land use which will be allowed under the new arrangements'. The submission expresses concern that 'the planners are using this as a method of stopping any form of development in the area'.

Friends of Latham District Park consider the final Territory Plan should preserve all of the present boundaries of Latham Park as open space. An important reason for such preservation is stated to be the value of the native grassland ecosystems within the Park.

Giralang Community Action Group considers the final Plan should not provide for any housing on the Giralang Hill.

Goldenholm Dairy Pty Ltd considers the final Territory Plan should provide for 'a long term 50 year lease with no withdrawal clause' over the site of Goldenholm Dairy at Fyshwick (it being noted that the Draft Plan provides for only 'a one to ten year short term lease'). Goldenholm Dairy notes that the viability of the Dairy is adversely affected by the short term lease provision.

Heritage Council considers the final Territory Plan should provide greater acknowledgement of 'heritage interest and heritage values' in all land use areas.

Ms M Howitt considers the final Territory Plan should improve the 'appeal rights of existing residents when they are confronted with urban infill'. She notes: 'It appears there is reasonable consultation after the developer formulates a concept or indicative plan but after that stage residents have no more say if further changes fall within concept guidelines and design and siting rules laid down by the Authority. They cannot comment on these changes of the final plan. In other words, they see a plan not the plan. This does not seem right.'

Hughes Residents Association considers the final Territory Plan should encourage 'developers...to liaise more closely with the local community on suburban development proposals (particularly infill)'. Also, the Association considers the final Plan should designate Hughes Section 57 Block 2 and Hughes Section 58 Block 1 (part) as public land; and that Hughes Section 28 Block 5 (Webster Street) should be designated as open space/buffer area.

Huntly Pastoral Company considers the final Territory Plan should provide for the preservation of the Huntly grazing property as a working property and exclude it from 'land that is likely to be required for urban development in the medium term' (10-25 years).

Mr B Katz supports the rural policies of the Draft Territory Plan except for the provision allowing a three month withdrawal clause for rural lessees. He notes that such a clause 'degrades' the value of investing in a rural lease and hence leads to a non-economic use of land – for example, land that once carried stock and that was looked after by a pastoralist may end up becoming a drain on the public purse for its upkeep and management.

Mr E D L Killen (Managing Director, Cinema Center Services Pty Limited, operating the Sundown Village Motel at Symonston) supports the inclusion of a land use permitting mobile homes in the Territory Plan [see B10 of the Draft Plan dealing with broadacre land use policies for Area 10E (p210)]. Mr Killen notes that this type of land use facilitates the provision of affordable housing.

Master Builders' Construction and Housing Association of the ACT (MBA) states that the Draft Territory Plan is 'a marked improvement over the plethora of former NCDC policies'. Nonetheless, the MBA calls for changes to the design and siting requirements applying to detached houses and multiple dwellings in order to permit timber courtyard walls (not just brick) and to allow zero lot boundary for habitable rooms for at least 15m on one boundary (preferably that facing south, south-east or south-west). Also, the MBA calls for street parking to be included in the total calculation of requirements for multiple dwellings.

In relation to dual occupancy sites, the MBA calls for performance measures for setbacks to be the same as those applying for single dwellings. In relation to medium density developments, the MBA considers the encroachment provisions in the Draft Plan are too restrictive and should be amended.

The MBA opposes any amendment to the submitted Plan to require that carports be set back one metre behind the building line.

The MBA considers the final Territory Plan should spell out the requirements of the Department of Urban Services for garbage handling matters and for road widths and turning circles. Also, the MBA considers the Plan should incorporate the ACT Subdivision Code, when amended; the Association observes that builders 'need a subdivision code showing minimum road widths and verges to accompanying Design and Siting'.

The MBA supports a greater use of diagrams in the Territory Plan.

Other matters raised by the MBA include the reinstatement of commercial uses along Canberra Avenue from Jerrabomberra Avenue to State Circle; call for a time limit of 40 days on development proposals meeting the prescribed requirements, failing which the proposal is deemed to comply; and removing from the final Plan 'the long list of factors which may be used by the ACT Planning Authority to oppose a development proposal that otherwise meets the principles and policies of the Draft Territory Plan' – the MBA states these factors 'should be reduced to performance standards or not used'.

Air Vice Marshall R Noble, AO (Retired) considers the final Territory Plan should preserve the bush land from Holmes Crescent to Fairbairn Avenue, Campbell.

North Canberra Protection Group calls for the incorporation into the Territory Plan of two major roadworks in north Canberra: the extension of Ginninderra Drive to Northbourne Avenue and the construction of the John Dedman Parkway according to the 'community option' view contained in the response of the Commonwealth Government to the *Report of the Joint Committee on the National Capital on Gungahlin's Transport Links*.

Oaks Estate Progress Association considers the final Territory Plan should clearly mention 'that the Territory Plan in relation to Oaks Estate [is] subject to review' by the ACT Planning Authority.

Mr Gus Petersilka calls for the final Territory Plan to stipulate that major new construction in Civic should require 'a mix of retail, office space and one and two bedroom apartments'; further, that 'developers should be encouraged to redevelop the older buildings around Garema Place and Petrie Plaza' and that 'there should be no further intrusion on the parkland and other open spaces around the Civic area'.

Rural Lessees Association supports the movement toward urban consolidation. The Association considers the final Territory Plan should 'guarantee the continuation of a rural element within the ACT landscape' by ensuring that rural land is held under long-term leasehold (at least 50 years), except for certain areas 'already earmarked for urban/commercial development, such as Gungahlin and Symonston'. The Association notes: 'What is unsatisfactory about the Draft Territory Plan and policies is that on the one hand they extol the virtues of preserving rural land as a setting for the city and dictate high standards of land conservation but on the other they neglect to provide guarantees of the former or incentives to rural lessees to carry out the latter'.

Mr R Smith considers the final Territory Plan should preserve Latham District Park in its present boundaries.

Mr M E Stanford considers the final Territory Plan should provide for the preservation of Latham District Park 'in its natural state for the enjoyment of future generations'.

Mr L Teran considers the final Plan should retain as open space the land in Latham District Park, the Ginninderra Creek corridor and the foreshore of Lake Ginninderra. Also, he considers the final Plan should preserve the 'native forest' at Ginninderra Heights.

Turner Residents Association considers the final Territory Plan should discourage any further office development in Civic, as well as provide for improvements in the appeal system.

Mrs L Vey considers the final Territory Plan should preserve the whole of Latham District Park as 'public land – open space'.

Mr C Watson considers the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure should hold more meetings in public to discuss significant planning matters.

Watson Community Association considers the final Territory Plan 'should contain specific reference to (unique) policies for urban renewal. These policies should ensure that development proposals may only proceed after a full and objective analysis of the financial, social and environmental costs and with a clear understanding of potential impact on the overall strategy for the future development of the ACT'. The Watson Community Association considers the North Canberra Area Strategy should be addressed in the final Plan.

APPENDIX D

TERRITORY PLAN - MAP CHANGES

The following schedules summarize map changes that have been made to the submitted plan. The major categories of changes include:

- Amendments to Land Use Policies as a result of the public land review

- Variations gazetted and draft variations released or withdrawn

- Correction of errors or the adoption of recommended changes to Land Use Policies

**PREVIOUSLY EXCLUDED LAND TO BE RESERVED AS PUBLIC
LAND IN URBAN OPEN SPACE**

Division	Section	Block
Belconnen	144 150 154 155	4pt 2pt, 5 2pt 2pt
Campbell	60	3pt
Evatt	89 12	3pt 1pt
Fisher	40	39
Latham	124 143 144 147 148	1pt 4pt 1pt 2,3 3pt
Lyneham	44	10pt
Macgregor	106 112 113 114	2 1 2,4 1
Melba	67	1pt,3pt (adjacent to Kingsford Smith Drive)
O'Connor	91 79	1,5,6,7 39pt,41pt
Turner	25 66 67	2,6 5,8 4

**OTHER MAP CHANGES RESULTING FROM
THE PUBLIC LAND REVIEW**

NAMADGI NATIONAL PARK

Various Areas	Various areas within and north of Namadgi National Park changed from Public Land Nature Reserve to Public Land Special Purpose Reserve. Part Block 139 Paddys River changed from Mountains & Bushlands to Rural and removed from Public Land. Block 217 Corin Forest Ski Area removed from Public Land. Public Land boundary moved west to meet the Namadgi boundary and include Block 11 Cotter River.
----------------------	---

MURRUMBIDGEE RIVER CORRIDOR

Gigerline Nature Reserve	Nature Reserve extended further north to the ridge line to meet the new boundary for Outwardbound. Nature reserve also extended to meet the northern boundary of Section 12 Block 3 Tharwa.
Bullen Nature Reserve	Nature Reserve extended further south between the rural edge and the pine forest edge and included in Public Land.
Stoney Creek Nature Reserve	Two areas excluded from the Nature Reserve, as shown in the Murrumbidgee River Corridor Draft Management Plan 1993 p107. The northern exclusion extends to the boundary of Block 442. Public Land boundary follows Nature reserve boundary.
Cotter Dam	Area along north east edge of Cotter Dam changed from Nature Reserve to Special Purpose Reserve and remains Public Land.
Woodstock Nature Reserve	Part of the Nature Reserve east of Uriarra Road, Block 28 Coree, changed from Nature Reserve to Special Purpose Reserve and remains Public Land.
Lower Molonglo	Two areas adjacent to Lower Molonglo added to Special Purpose Reserve and included in Public Land as indicated in the Lower Molonglo River Study, Barrer 1992.
Black Mountain	Nature Reserve and Public Land boundary extended to include the piece of land on the edge of Barry Drive opposite Section 81 Block 1, O'Connor.
Bruce Ridge	Nature Reserve and Public Land boundary extended to include the piece of land along McArthur Avenue, part of Section 98 Block 3, O'Connor.

**OTHER MAP CHANGES RESULTING FROM
THE PUBLIC LAND REVIEW**

CANBERRA NATURE PARK

Cooleman Ridge	The boundary altered between the Special Purpose Reserve and the Nature Reserve. The areas remain Public Land.
Gossan Hill	Parts of the Nature Reserve adjacent to residential development changed from Hills Ridges and Buffer Areas to Urban Open Space. The areas are part of Section 4 Block 17 Bruce and remain Public Land.
Jerrabomberra Wetlands	The boundary of the Nature Reserve on the northern side of the Molonglo River changed to follow the southern edge of the Lake Burley Griffin cycle path. North eastern boundary altered to follow the western edge of Dairy Flat Road and includes Section 67 Block 1 Fyshwick. Areas are included in Public Land.
Isaacs Ridge	Various amendments have been made to Section 593 Block 6 Isaacs to reflect land use and management strategies. An area to the north changed from Hills Ridges and Buffer Areas to Urban Open Space and included in Public Land. Existing pine plantations excluded from Public Land. The area between the pine plantations changed from Nature Reserve to Special Purpose Reserve and remains Public Land.
Mount Painter	The access easement to Coulter Drive along the north-western boundary removed from Public Land
Mount Pleasant	Part of Section 117 Block 1 Campbell changed from Nature Reserve to Urban Open Space. The area remains Public Land.
Tuggeranong Hill	Section 681 Blocks 3-7 include aboriginal sites and have been changed from Urban Open Space to Nature Reserve, Hills Ridges and Buffer Areas. The sites remain Public Land.
Wanniassa Hills	The eastern boundary between Public Land Nature Reserve and Public Land Special Purpose reserve altered to extend the Nature Reserve slightly to the east and now follows the reservoir access trail.

MAP CHANGES DUE TO VARIATIONS GAZETTED AND DRAFT VARIATIONS RELEASED OR WITHDRAWN				
Suburb	Section	Block	Map Changes	Variation Status
Barton	17	4	Add Area Specific Policy A8 to Residential to allow Lachlan Court Cafe	FINAL gazetted 21/8/92
Braddon	22	6-9	Remove Variation Overlay and add Area Specific Policy B1 to permit 3 storey development	FINAL gazetted 18/12/92
Bruce	33	3,4	Change from Commercial E to Residential B1 to allow for 3 storey residential development	FINAL gazetted 27/1/92
Duffy/Holder	55,56, 58,48		Add Variation Overlay	DRAFT
Griffith	78	33,34, 39,40	Remove Variation Overlay	DRAFT withdrawn 25/3/92
Gungahlin	Nicholls Gold Creek		Remove Variation Overlay Add Defined Land Overlay Change Land Use Policy Areas as shown in Variation	FINAL gazetted 18/12/92
Holt (Golf Course)	98	5	Add Variation Overlay	DRAFT
Kingston	7p,8p		Remove Variation Overlay	DRAFT withdrawn 24/3/92
Lyons	41	1p	Add Variation Overlay	DRAFT
North Watson	72,79,80		Add Variation Overlay	DRAFT
Tuggeranong South - parts Condor, Banks & Gordon			Add Variation Overlay	DRAFT

**MAP CHANGES DUE TO VARIATIONS GAZETTED AND DRAFT
VARIATIONS RELEASED OR WITHDRAWN**

Suburb	Section	Block	Map Changes	Variation Status
West Belconnen			Remove Variation Overlay Add Review Overlay to Hills Ridges & Buffer Areas as shown in Variation Add Defined Land Overlay to Urban Area Change to Land Use Policies as shown in Variation Add A4 Overlay to allow for Special Residential Development	FINAL gazetted 18/12/92

**MAP CHANGES DUE TO ERRORS OR AMENDMENTS
TO LAND USE POLICIES**

Suburb	Section	Block	Map Changes	Reason
Ainslie	107	1	Change from Residential to Urban Open Space.	The site is a gazetted Park
Belconnen	154part, 155part, 159part		Remove Area Specific Policy 9B Exclude Section 159 from Public Land Include Section 154,155 as Public Land	Based on Committee recommendations
Bluett's Pine Plantation	Western Edge		Change from Hills Ridges and Buffer Areas to Plantation Forestry	Recommended by ACT Forests
Evatt	95	1	Change from Residential to Community Facility	To allow for future church use and protect the heritage importance of possible burial sites
Forrest	34	part	Change Area Specific Policy from A6 to B4	To reflect boundary as shown in variation
Forrest	35	part	Remove Area Specific Policy A6 from part of the site	To reflect boundary as shown in variation
Fyshwick	52	2	Add Area specific Policy 13E - existing Dairy	To protect the landscape quality of the surrounding area
Giralang	48		Change from Residential to Hills Ridges and Buffer Areas	To consider site as part of Hills Ridges and buffer Area Review
Greenway	54	1	Change from Commercial to Community Facility	To allow for the Tuggeranong Community Centre

**MAP CHANGES DUE TO ERRORS OR AMENDMENTS
TO LAND USE POLICIES**

Suburb	Section	Block	Map Changes	Reason
Holder	47	1	Change from Community Facility to Hill Ridges and Buffer Areas	To be consistent with the National Capital Plan
Hughes	28	5	Change from Residential to Urban Open Space Exclude from Public Land	In recognition of landscape value and to provide opportunity for further review
Hughes	57	1	Change from Hills Ridges and Buffer Areas to Urban Open Space and include as Public Land. Boundary to follow Designated Area.	Site excluded from nature reserve and managed as Urban Open Space
John Dedman Parkway			Add the option to route John Dedman Parkway west of the AIS an Review Overlay	To show the community option for the John Dedman Parkway
Kaleen	75	4	Change from Residential to Urban Open Space Include as Public Land	Ancillary open space
Kaleen	76	2pt	Remove Review Overlay east of John Dedman Parkway	To be consistent with the National Capital Plan
Kambah - Gleneagles Estate			Move public land boundary east of Gleneagles Holding Lease	To exclude Gleneagles Estate Holding Lease from Public Land

MAP CHANGES DUE TO ERRORS OR AMENDMENTS TO LAND USE POLICIES				
Suburb	Section	Block	Map Changes	Reason
Kambah	530,532		Change from Residential to Urban Open Space Include as Public Land	Ancillary open space
Kowen Pine Plantation - Eastern Area	Southern Boundary		Adjust Plantation Forestry Land Use Policy to reflect plantation boundary	Recommended by ACT Forests
Kowen Pine Plantation - Eastern Edge	South of Kings Highway		Adjust Plantation Forestry Land Use Policy to reflect plantation boundary	Recommended by ACT Forests
Kowen Pine Plantation	Areas adjacent to Kings Highway		Adjust Plantation Forestry Land Use Policy to reflect plantation boundary	Recommended by ACT Forests
Kowen	Open Rural Land	71,73	Adjust Plantation Forestry Land Use Policy to reflect plantation boundary	Recommended by ACT Forests
Monash Drive through Campbell			Change from Residential to Urban Open Space Exclude from Public Land	Ancillary open space
Narrabundah	75		Change from Open Space to Community Facility	St Aidan's Uniting church
Stromlo			Add 13B Area Specific Policy	Overlay was omitted from map
Turner	38	9,10	Change from Residential to Community Facility	To reflect existing church use

APPENDIX E: GUIDELINES BEARING ON THE TERRITORY PLAN

CURRENT STANDARD PRACTICES, GUIDELINES, ETC.

Engineering, Environmental and Building

"Guidelines on Engineering and Environmental Practices, Roads and Bridges" NCDC December 1988.

"Guidelines on Engineering and Environmental Practices Lighting of Traffic Routes, Minor Streets and Carparks" NCDC July 1981.

"Technical Paper No. 37 Cycleways" NCDC Sept 1983.

"Guidelines on Engineering and Environmental Practices Hydraulics" NCDC January 1987.

"Guidelines on Urban Erosion and Sediment Control Practices" NCDC/ACTA February 1988.

"Building Code of Australia".

"Guidelines for Erosion and Sediment Control on Building Sites" EPS August 1989.

"Urban Erosion and Sediment Control" EPS November 1989.

"Design Manual for Urban Erosion and Sediment Control" NCDC July 1988.

"Gross Pollutant Trap Guidelines", April 1992.

"Water Supply and Sewage Standards", ACTEW 1992.

"Guidelines on Planning for Traffic Noise" NCDC February Edition No. 2, NCDC October 1982.

Landscape

"Landscape Design and Construction Guidelines for Canberra and the ACT - December 1991", ACT Landscape, Department of Urban Services.

"Gungahlin Landscape Policy Plan Report".

"ACT Draft Playground Design Manual - August 1989", ACT Landscape, Department of Urban Services.

"Play Without Pain", Child Accident Prevention Foundation of Australia, Melbourne, 1983.

"Draft Australian Standard for Playgrounds and Playground Equipment" - July 1991 (To be AS 2155).

Specifications

"Basic Specification Volume 1 Roads, Hydraulic Services Landscape Edition No. 1", ACT Public Works 1991.

"Basic Specification Volume 4 Traffic Signals", Edition No. 1, ACT Public Works 1991.

"Concrete for Major Structures" NCDC January 1987.

Procedures

"Guidelines on Land Development Procedures", Department of the Environment, Land and Planning, December 1990.

"Land Development Procedures Manual, Hydraulic Services, Edition 1" ACTEW April 1989.

"Land Development Quality Assurance, Issue No. 3" April 1991, City Services Group, Department of Urban Services.

"Surveying Requirements for Private Enterprise Development Subdivisions" AUSLIG, May 1989.

Guidelines in Preparation

Energy
Flora and Fauna
Microclimate
Air Quality
Contaminated Sites
Noise Management
Urban Land Capability
Erosion and Sediment Control
Water Quality
Engineered Waterways
Gross Pollutant Traps
Water Pollution Control Ponds
Floodplains
Site Rehabilitation
Municipal Services
Urban Edge Planning
Location Guidelines for Community & Recreation Facilities
ACT Code for Residential Development - Subdivision
Protection of Significant Streetscapes
Parking & Access Guidelines

APPENDIX F

PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS AND PAPERS RELATED TO URBAN CONSOLIDATION

Metropolitan Canberra Policy Plan/Development Plan - Urban Consolidation (1986)

Towards a New Territory Plan for the ACT - Key Issues for Discussion pp 15-16 (Sept 1990)

Towards a New Territory Plan for the ACT - Housing Issues pp 20-23 (Oct 1990)

Draft Territory Plan - Planning Report pp 49-50 & pp 91/94 (Principles) (Oct 1991)

Draft Territory Plan p 47. & p 53 (Principles) & Residential PLUZ pp 60-71 (Oct 1991)

Budget Strategy Statement p 13 (June 1992)

Budget Speech 1992-1993 p 17

Environmental Budget Statement 1992-1993 pp 3-7

Territory Plan Report on Consultation Annexe C pp 14-17 (Nov 1992)

Territory Plan Report on Consultation Table 3 pp 263-265 (Nov 1992)

(also general issues in sections on Housing pp 98-102; Land Development pp 134 136; Quality of Life pp 189-192)

Submitted Territory Plan - Principles pp 6-8 & Residential Policy pp 23-35 (Nov 1992)

Land Development Program