

Dear Chair

If possible I would like you to raise one other issue with the Committee as an additional part of my submission - a further comment on the Inner North Precinct Code .

In the Code, at part A - General Development Controls, under Element 1, Rule R1 states:

"Dual occupancy development is not permitted where the additional dwelling is located to the rear of the block behind an existing dwelling or a new dwelling."

My comment is this: dual occupancies on larger blocks are an integral part of any planning process that wishes to increase the housing density of a residential area, and are really the only way (if the new dwelling is built behind an existing dwelling) to preserve the character of an area, which is, we are told, one of the stated aims of the Inner North Precinct Code. To forbid such developments outright ("This is a mandatory requirement. There is no applicable criterion") is extremely self-contradictory.

I understand that the forbidding of such developments may be related to insurance issues with regard to any common areas, which I acknowledge could be a problem, but it does seem to be using a sledge-hammer to crack a nut. I expect there also may be some bias against the battle-axe blocks that result from such developments.

I also understand from news reports that future dual occupancy developments will require true subdivision of the block, and that there will be separate title and separate services required for the two smaller blocks. This would require separate insurance as well, and would solve the problem neatly. If this is correct, then the rule forbidding a dual occupancy development from being built behind an existing dwelling should be removed immediately.

Yours sincerely

Maurice Austin

30 September 2009