

The Standing Committee on Planning, Public
Works and Territory and Municipal Services
ACT Legislative Assembly

26 February 2010

Dear Ms Porter and Other Committee Members

Inquiry into the RZ3 and RZ4 residential redevelopment policies in inner north Canberra

We wish to submit the following points to the Committee for their consideration:

- The majority of residents in Section 47 do not want to see RZ3 redevelopment in the section. The moratorium on redevelopment in Sections 47 and 63 should be extended, or the section rezoned to RZ1 or RZ2.
- The sections covered by the moratorium occupy a very small percentage of the overall RZ3 and RZ4 redevelopment area in the inner north, so allowing this area to be exempted from the RZ3 redevelopment requirements would have a negligible effect on the urban consolidation outcomes. Moreover, since the moratorium has been in place, no other sections in the RZ3 and RZ4 redevelopment areas have sought the same exemption. Therefore, the moratorium has not created a precedent that others wish to follow.
- The environmental sustainability objectives of the urban consolidation policy will fail unless the built environment allows for community sustainability. Community sustainability in turn depends on creating the right mix of housing space to reflect the variety of households that exist in any 'natural' community (ie, a mix of accommodation to suits the needs of singles, and couples, and families, and the elderly). Without the sustainability of the community, the resident population becomes transitory, and Turner becomes a place people live in until they can afford the type of housing they really prefer.
- Recent data suggests that this is already occurring. 2006 ABS data showed that in Turner, 38.4% of people had lived at a different address the previous year. This is the second highest proportion of persons who lived at a different address a year ago of any well established suburb in Canberra. Only Kingston, at 40.9%, was higher for an established suburb. While this in part reflects the increase in housing in this area, it also indicates a high turnover of residents within this suburb.
- Recent development in Turner has concentrated on one and two bedroom apartments, and while most people with families still find single detached dwellings the most appropriate housing type for their needs. However, the type of redevelopment

occurring is not offering them viable alternatives. This is unfair to those families who wish to live close to the city and to good schools, such as Turner Primary School and Lyneham High School.

Data comparing the Census statistics in Turner from 2001 to 2006, presented in the table below, show compellingly that there has been a great deal of redevelopment over the last nine years since the RZ3 and RZ4 policies have been in place. Much of the new housing is investor driven (more than 50% of private dwellings in Turner are rental properties) and accommodates people without children.

Characteristic	2001 ABS census data*	2006 ABS census data*	% difference
Total persons	1,852	3,010	63%
Total Families	390	627	61%
- With children	244	218	-11%
- Without children	134	386	188%
- Other families	12	23	92%
Household composition			
- Family household	382	626	64%
- Lone person h/hold	264	576	118%
- Group household	96	214	123%
Total private dwellings	885	1797	103%
- Separate house^	403	397	-1%
- Semi-detached row or terrace house	46	90	96%
- Flat, unit or apartment	370	1,097	196%
Tenure type (private)			
- Proportion fully owned or being purchased	35%	32%	-3%
- Proportion rented	56%	59%	3%

**Data for Turner, ACT, derived from ABS QuickStats.*

^In 2001, separate houses represented 48.4% of all dwellings in Turner. In 2006, they represented 25.1%. These proportions compare to around 75% of dwellings being separate houses in Australia overall.

In summary, by exempting Section 47 from redevelopment, this area will continue to provide an appropriate housing option for families. Moreover, the ongoing certainty that no redevelopment can occur will encourage more families with young children into the area, thus promoting the sustainability of the local school and encouraging a population cohort who are prepared to live, not just invest, in the area and are strongly engaged in the future of the local community. However, residents should be allowed to rebuild a single residence on their block if they so wish, as all other ACT leaseholders are able to do.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to make our submission to the Review. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss it with members of the Committee.

Yours sincerely

Mary-Julia Diethelm and David Abbott