



Legislative Assembly for the
Australian Capital Territory

Standing Committee on Environment
and Planning

Submission Cover Sheet

Inquiry into DPA-07 - Former Braddon Bowls Club

Submission number: 008

Submitter: Andrew Earl

Date authorised for publication: 14 May 2026

From: [Andrew E](#)
To: [LA Committee - Environment](#)
Subject: Inquiry into DPA-07: Submission (objection)
Date: Thursday, 7 May 2026 1:41:48 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email originated from outside of the ACT Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Andrew Earl

[REDACTED]

To whom it may concern,

I strongly object to the Draft Major Plan Amendment 07 (DPA-07) regarding the former Braddon Bowls club. My concerns are as follows:

- CZ6 zoning should “Provide for the development of entertainment, accommodation and leisure facilities for residents of and visitors to the ACT and surrounding region”. Rezoning this block is in contradiction to “**Protect leisure and accommodation uses from competition from higher order commercial uses**, and encourage activities that enhance the region's economic diversity and employment prospects”.
- I believe the current Crown Lease is specific that this site is to be used only for the purpose of a Bowling Club and/or Community use Limited to Child Care Centre. In my view the commercial interests of one company should not be able change a Crown Lease that has existed as a Community Space for over 90 years? Any changes awa should be for something which benefits the community.
- If the precedent to allow re-zoning of CZ6 to RZ4 (or other such zoning in contradiction to the territory plan) begins, commercial interests will ensure that there will be no community or leisure sites remaining in Canberra. As the Missing Middle legislation is introduced, our Community Spaces should be protected at all costs.
- The surrounding properties along Farrer St, Elder St, and Girrahween St are all RZ1. If any re-zoning is permitted, it should be to convert the CZ6 site to RZ1, not RZ4, which would bring into line with the surrounding areas. As part of the new missing middle reforms, RZ2 will soon permit 3-story dwellings 10.5m high, which are also not representative of the street-scape or amenity of the surrounding area.
- Commercial interests should not be permitted opportunities unavailable to other Canberran citizens. (e.g. RZ1 to RZ4)
- The adjacent development application for Elder St was met with a barrage of complaints and concerns from residents. This appears to be a different approach to get the same outcome and allow a high-rise development to maximise commercial interests with no concern for residents in the community.

- Further, CZ6 zoned developments should “Protect the amenity of nearby residential areas, with regards to noise, traffic, parking and privacy”. If this block is rezoned to RZ4, these considerations would no longer apply.
- This has the appearance of a bad faith takeover of a community asset with the intent of developing it into high rise apartments. This is a poor representation by the ACT government in allowing so many community spaces to be developed for the benefit of a few, while costing everyone in the surrounding area.
- I note the ACT Heritage Council in their response to the Draft Major Plan Amendment 07 – Consultation Report detail that “any future development should provide a sympathetic design response to the local character with regard to bulk, height, scale, setting and materiality.” The only way to ensure this if any re-zoning is permitted is to rezone this block as RZ1 to align with the neighbouring dwellings and local character.
- I note the Response in the Consultation Report to Comments related to “3.3.1 Anticipated Development and Streetscape Impacts”. The ACT Government’s Policy for this area does **NOT** include RZ4 zoning for this area. This is outlined in the Inner North District Policy of the Territory Plan. Similarly the District Strategies Plan released in 2023. The area of Farrer St and Elder St are **NOT** identified as “Change Areas” in the next 0-15 years. They are not identified to be areas of higher density construction. They are retained as RZ1 residential housing.
- I note the Response in the Consultation Report to Comments related to “3.3.1 Anticipated Development and Streetscape Impacts”. It seems to parrot the comments made by the applicant related to close access to public transport. A question for the inquiry is does it consider 1000m to be ‘close’ to public transport (the closest tram stop). Almost every location in Canberra is ~200m from a bus stop?
- I note the Response in the Consultation Report to Comments related to “3.3.4 Loss of Commercial Zoned Land (CZ6)”. While the government has outlined that this block is zoned as CZ6 which does permit commercial activity, it has not considered the specific terms of the current crown lease which stipulates the relevant commercial activities to be exclusively a Bowls Club or Child Care facility. Converting this land into residential will result in a permanent loss of these community/leisure facilities specified in the current Crown Lease.
- The Response in the Consultation Report to Comments related to “3.3.5 Planning Process, Precedent and Strategic Context” is probably the most concerning part of the Report. As outlined above, a single block re-developed to be RZ4 is **NOT** consistent with the Inner North and City District Strategy. These government published “Inner North District Plan and District Strategies Plan” gave the community some surety in the form of very specific maps. The area of Farrer and Elder St are **NOT** identified for increased density, nor as change areas. These are government documents. Additionally the Territory Plan Map provided through ACTmapi - The area discussed is retained as RZ1. Other areas along the Northbourne corridor are clearly indicated as areas of increased density. Therefore, this rezoning amendment is **NOT** aligned with the objectives of these strategies.
- If the government is determined to allow the rezoning of a CZ6 space, it should

be only allowed with that of the surrounding sites, RZ1. It is simple not credible to be able to have an appropriate transition between RZ4 and RZ1 with a boundary fence which stands at 1.8m tall.

I am free to discuss any of the above points.

Regards

Andrew Earl

Resident [REDACTED]