



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: 017

Submitter: Ian McAuley

Date authorised for publication: 14 May 2026

From: [Laurien Wells](#)
To: [LA Committee - Environment](#)
Subject: Objection to draft amendment 07 (DPA-07) re Braddon Bowls Club (Ian McAuley)
Date: Friday, 8 May 2026 10:44:16 AM

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.

To whom it may concern:

I, Ian Douglas McAuley of [REDACTED] Braddon, would like to express my strong objection to the Draft MajorPlan Amendment 07 (DPA-07) regarding the former Braddon Bowls club.

My concerns regarding this application are as follows:

- The current zoning of this block is CZ6 which should “Provide for the development of entertainment, accommodation and leisure facilities for residents of and visitors to the ACT and surrounding region”. As well as “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”. It is also my understanding that the current Crown Lease specifies this site to be used only for the purpose of a Bowling Club and/or Community use Limited to Child Care Centre. Why would we want to suddenly change a Crown Lease that has existed as a Community Space for over 90 years? If any change away from the stipulations of the current lease it should be for something which benefits the community, such as Aged Care Facilities up to 2-stories in height. This would allow more opportunities for Canberrans to “Age in Place” as the population continues to age.
- If the precedent to allow re-zoning of CZ6 to RZ4 (or other such zoning) begins, 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, to bring it in line with the street and 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.
- Why should a developer be afforded opportunities not available to other Canberran citizens. I am also a resident of Farrer St, can I also change the zoning of my RZ1 block to RZ4, allowing high density apartments on my site to maximise my profits.
- The developers are clearly only wanting to change this zoning to allow them to develop this site with concepts not available under the current CZ6 zoning. That is NOT what this site was intended for.
- If this block on Farrer St is re-zoned, no doubt they will apply for the same process on the Elder St side. The development application for Elder St was met with a barrage of complaints and concerns from residents. This is simply another tactic from

the developers to skirt the rules and allow a high-rise development to maximise their profits without any concerns for the residents in the community.

- Further to the above point 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.
- The developers obviously thought they could purchase a community asset and then develop it into high rise apartments like they have in other parts of the city. If they don’t want to develop the site in a suitable way for its designated CZ6 use, they should sell it to someone who intends to ‘Protect leisure and accommodation uses from competition from higher order commercial uses’. There are plenty of other blocks in the city, or on Lonsdale or Mort St these developers can continue to profit from without the need to place high-rise buildings on a site intended for community use within a residential area.
- 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.
- The Response in the Consultation Report to Comments related to “3.3.1 Anticipated Development and Streetscape Impacts” is highly concerning. The ACT Government’s Policy for this area does NOT include RZ4 zoning for this area. This is clearly 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.
- The Response in the Consultation Report to Comments related to “3.3.1 Anticipated Development and Streetscape Impacts” is concerning. It seems to parrot the comments made by the applicant related to close access to public transport. Does the government consider 1000m to be ‘close’ to public transport, as that is the closest tram stop. Every location in Canberra is virtually 200m from a bus stop?
- The Response in the Consultation Report to Comments related to “3.3.4 Loss of Commercial Zoned Land (CZ6)” is concerning. 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 Consultation Report. As outlined above, a single block re-developed to be RZ4 is NOT consistent with the Inner North and City District Strategy. I implore you to open the Inner North District Plan and District Strategies Plan and look at the maps you have provided to the Canberra community. The area of Farrer and Elder St are

not identified for increased density, nor as change areas. These are your own documents. Similarly look at 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 you are determined to allow the rezoning of a CZ6 space, it should be only allowed with that of the surrounding sites, RZ1. It is impossible to have an appropriate transition between RZ4 and RZ1 with boundary fence which stands at 1.8m tall.

Regards

Ian McAuley

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]