

From: Committees
Sent: Monday, 7 December 2009 9:14 AM
To: Derigo, NicolaT (LA)
Subject: FW: RZ3 and RZ4 zoning submission

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

From: Kristen Krippner
Sent: Sunday, 6 December 2009 10:32 AM
To: Committees
Subject: RZ3 and RZ4 zoning submission

committees@parliament.act.gov.au,

Dear Ms Derrigo,

Please find enclosed our submission to the Standing Committee on Planning, Public Works and Territory and Municipal Services - RZ3 and RZ4 zoning in North Canberra and the moratorium in Section 47.

As residents of Section 47 for four years we value the sense of community, streetscapes and 'feel' of this area of Turner.

We believe that Section 47 Turner is entitled to special planning consideration on the following grounds:

The heritage issues surrounding this area of Turner arising from its intact original and coherent character remained unresolved due to lack of funding of the required research by the government.

Once areas with strong heritage values like Section 47 are subject to two storey redevelopment (as per current RZ3 zoning) they are lost forever. Witness the northern end of McLeay St Turner. North Canberra has too few original areas remaining. Indeed, Section 47 provides an interesting comparison with the more substantial homes of Reid and the Tocumwal precinct of O'Connor.

With garden city planning principles underlying the streetscapes, low site coverage by existing 1950's brick cottages, many large garden trees, wide nature strips, and relationship to Haig Park Section 47 provides a large area of green space vital to the amenity of residents in nearby multi level unit developments.

Following the existing moratorium on redevelopment Section 47 has remained

intact with only one recent modern building. Few areas in North Canberra have this low level of redevelopment.

Whilst we understand the Government's desire to increase residential densities close to town centres, we believe that mixing multi storey, multiple one bedroom apartments (as is the case in 11 Forbes St) with single storey cottages cannot not work. Government policy of promotion of higher densities is also at odds with the planning for increasing large 'temporary' cars parks on current open spaces in Turner (i.e. Section 25).

Turner has an abundance of multi storey developments why must the entire area of the suburb close to Civic consist of nothing else? Surely there is space for small sections of detached original residences?

We believe retention of Section 47 in its current form, i.e. detached cottages, will make this part of Turner more interesting as well as providing accommodation options for families close to Civic. We would argue for Section 47 to be residential zoning.

Please note: Our arguments are NOT based on personal financial gain. Our property could be worth much more as a redevelopment opportunity rather than as a detached residence.

In regard to the wider issues of RZ3 and RZ4 we believe the existing height limits, front, rear and side setbacks should be retained. Whilst there are problems with rear set backs, trees and powerlines, some separation is essential as rear yards are often the most private parts of any residence.

We believe that whilst the attempt to boost development south of Macarthur Ave by restricting development to the north was well intentioned this has not achieved its goal and should be abandoned.

We do not support the mix of detached houses and multi storey development in the one section. To accommodate a mix of housing options entire sections should be zoned either RZ3/RZ4 or residential. This provides certainty that the amenity of detached residences in a residential section will not be compromised. A one size fits all approach does not work. Merely zoning by distance from Northbourne

Ave is too simplistic.

Yours faithfully,

Jim Garvey

Kristen Krippner