

The Committee Secretary
Standing Committee on Planning, Environment, and Territory and Municipal Services

DV 343 Residential blocks surrendered under the loose fill asbestos insulation eradication scheme.

Dear Sir

Please refer to my submission to the Directorate on DV 343.

Essentially, my concerns are about **equity and the local environment**.

DV 343 is inequitable.

It is inequitable to permit, as the DV does, some blocks in some residential zones to have multiple dwelling rights, and not others (those not affected by the Mr Fluffy problem).

As well, in most situations, **dual or more occupancies** (the dumbed down idea of incongruously having houses in established backyards) **destroy the local suburban environment**, whether they be in RZ2 or RZ1 zones.

The low-impact "secondary dwelling" provision is the solution to both the equity and environmental problems.

Dual occupancies should be discontinued everywhere (except maybe on corner blocks), including on cleared "Mr Fluffy" blocks, with **secondary dwellings becoming the main methodology for suburban "densification"**.

Associated **revenue** for government, generally and for the Mr Fluffy block costs, can be obtained by permitting **separate titles for all secondary dwellings** (not available at present), and calling in lease-change fees and rates on them.

Current planning controls for secondary dwellings (notably, a maximum floor area of 90 square metres) need to remain.

Yours faithfully

Jack Kershaw FRAIA