



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY
STANDING COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND URBAN SERVICES

Report No.78 August 2001

THE DRAFT VILLAGE OF HALL MASTER PLAN

Recommendations:

The committee recommends:

(1) that the *Draft Village of Hall Master Plan* be revised to incorporate the following elements and that, once revised, **the document be closely discussed with Hall residents prior to being speedily finalised:**

- the buffer zone between Hall and any future development in Kinlyside should be at least 500m
- there should be no direct vehicular road link between Hall and Kinlyside
- detailed and comprehensive attention should be given to the issues of traffic, parking and safety in Victoria Street
- the proposed subdivision of land in the Village (on its north-western side) should not take place
- to the maximum extent possible, the consideration of further Development Applications in Hall should take close heed of these recommendations

(2) that this committee's successor in the new parliament elected on 20 October 2001 should closely monitor the progress of finalising the Hall Village Master Plan.

Table of contents and page number

I. Issue	2
II. What the committee did.....	2
III. What the committee heard	2
IV. The committee's conclusion.....	5

I. Issue

1. On 22/6/01 the committee decided to seek a public briefing by officials and by representatives of the Hall Progress Association on progress of the Hall Village Master Plan.
2. This decision reflected members' awareness of some concern by the Hall community about two matters: the time being taken to finalise the Master Plan, and certain aspects of the proposed Master Plan itself.

II. What the committee did

3. The committee wrote to the Minister for Urban Services to request his agreement to officials briefing the committee in open session. The committee thanks the Minister for agreeing to our request.
4. A public hearing on the Hall Village Master Plan took place on 18/7/01 when the following person addressed the committee:
 - PALM (Dr Cooper and Mr Lewis); and
 - *Village of Hall and District Progress Association Inc.* (Mr Crombie, President; Mr Morris, Treasurer; and Mr Hayes).
5. The committee thanks these people for making time available to publicly brief members on the progress of the Master Plan.

III. What the committee heard

6. PALM commenced a review of Hall Village in mid 1998 and produced a draft Master Plan in January 2000. However, it could not be progressed until two additional factors were taken into account, namely, this committee's inquiry into 'proposals for the establishment of rural residential development as a land use' [Report No.57 presented on 28/11/00], and the Heritage Council's review of the heritage precinct of Hall. The latter was completed in September 2000; and the government's response to this committee's report was presented on 27/2/01.¹
7. In early May 2001 PALM released (with the Heritage Council) the *Draft Village of Hall Master Plan* and *Proposed Interim Heritage Place Register for Hall Village Precinct* for public comment.
8. The current boundary of Kinlyside is approximately 350m from any residential dwelling in Hall. PALM is considering whether a larger buffer zone would

¹ Mr Lewis (PALM) *Transcript*

improve the goals of appropriate ‘visual separation and rural activities and the question of recreational activities’.²

9. In relation to a road from Hall to Kinlyside, PALM has not finalised its position. However, if a road was to be built, PALM envisages ‘a less engineered, rural type road: one lane either way, gravel shoulder, no lights, maybe an equestrian/cycle path that runs along with it’.³

10. PALM assured the committee of its intention to work with the local community to resolve outstanding issues.⁴

11. The Hall Progress Association told the committee that, in relation to the Draft Master Plan:

The development of a Master Plan was at the initiative of the Association [which] wrote to... PALM on 2/3/98 forwarding the terms of reference for our own ‘Hall strategic planning’ process, and requesting that a small amount of Precinct Planning funds might be allocated to assist us with this task... [However, PALM] recommended the development instead of a Master Plan, which carried the advantage of recognition within the Territory Plan... [And PALM indicated that it might be done within six months]... In the event, it has taken three years.

Our singular motivation was to end the ‘ad hoc’ and incrementalism that had come to characterise planning and development for Hall, and to provide a stable framework for managing the interface with Kinlyside...

Hall is a village of 120 houses and 400 people, occupying a few square kilometres. It is of course precious to us, and has a special place within the ACT. Given the size of the task, the processes for developing the Precinct Plan and the Master Plan have been extraordinarily slow, wasteful, and in certain respects, ineffective..⁵

We welcome the recognition of the distinctive characteristics of the village history, setting and character. We also welcome most of the proposals in the draft that propose standards and guidelines for future development...

[There are] four major [unresolved] issues—the proposed subdivision, the road link to Kinlyside, the specification of the buffer zone, and traffic, parking and safety in the main street.

The subdivision proposal is strongly rejected. No cogent arguments are advanced in support of it, and it would destroy a very highly valued bushland area.

The proposal for a road link to Kinlyside is also strongly opposed. Such a road would inevitably exacerbate traffic and parking problems in the main street and in residential areas. It would also vitiate the buffer zone...

The draft document does not satisfactorily specify the buffer zone. The area that has been identified within a ‘rural buffer’ is inadequate. The government

² Ditto

³ Ditto

⁴ Dr Cooper (PALM) *Transcript*

⁵ *Briefing from the Village of Hall and District Progress Association* dated July 2001 pp.11-12

has agreed that the buffer should be specified before development of any sort occurs in Kinlyside. This has yet to be done.

The ability of the Master Plan to deal comprehensively with traffic and parking issues was pre-empted by two Development Applications that have been approved in the past few weeks... [There is a need for] an overall plan. This work still needs to be done...

The draft document [is] excessively long, poorly structured, repetitive, and in a number of respects out of date.⁶

12. The Association added:

In view of the amount of time already spent on the development of a Hall Master Plan, we are particularly keen that the matter be resolved in the life of this government...

13. Further on the buffer zone, the Association stated:

We have been very, very clear for a long time that a 'buffer' means **no direct road access between the village and Kinlyside**. We are also strongly of the view that the 'adequacy' of the buffer should be given an objective basis, and that our proposal for a minimum width of 500 metres is well founded.⁷

Our idea of a buffer was something what would separate us from the development in the Kinlyside Valley. The idea of a buffer with a hole in the middle... to add a fourth road connection in and out of the Village... that might bring traffic going from the Kinlyside development out to Yass or off down the Wallaroo Road, through the village, across the places where horses move in the Village now, was never, in our wildest imaginations... [viewed as] part of a buffer... [It] violates [the] integrity [of the Village].⁸

[There should be] a minimum separation between the village and any future development in Kinlyside of 500m. This takes into account the need to minimise and manage not only visual but acoustic, vibrational and artificial light intrusion...

We believe that connections **other** than road—cycleway, pathway, equestrian path—would be more productive... than more people driving into and through the village...

We welcome proposals for walking and riding trails in and through the buffer zone, and in particular the prospect that the Bicentennial Trail might be given a new route out of the ACT via Halls Creek valley.⁹

14. The Association considers that a buffer of 500m represents an appropriate compromise between one view favouring 1000m and the view contained in the current Draft Master Plan.¹⁰

⁶ *Briefing from the Village of Hall and District Progress Association* dated July 2001 p.2

⁷ Correspondence from Alastair Crombie (President, Village of Hall and District Progress Association Inc.) dated 23/7/01 [emphasis in original]

⁸ Mr Crombie *Transcript*

⁹ *Briefing from the Village of Hall and District Progress Association* dated July 2001 p.8, p.6 and p.9 respectively

¹⁰ Mr Crombie *Transcript*

15. In relation to further subdivision within the Village, the Association stated:

The Village now is the size and shape that it should be and it should be left.¹¹

IV. The committee's conclusion

16. The committee is concerned about the length of time being taken to prepare a Master Plan for Hall. The committee sympathises with the wish of the Hall Progress Association for resolution of the matter in the life of the current parliament.

17. In 2000 this committee, when examining proposals to establish a 'rural residential' type of landuse, recommended as follows:

- *That the Hall Master Plan (incorporating wide community input) be finalised before a decision is made about the nature of residential development (of any type) in Kinlyside; that the Master Plan incorporate a more substantial buffer zone between the village and any further residential development; and that the Territory Plan be amended (by way of a draft Variation) to formally establish and protect the buffer zone.*¹²

18. The committee continues to hold the view set out in this recommendation of Report No.57. It is important to get the Hall Master Plan right not only for the residents of the village itself (and for all Canberra citizens with respect to protecting the heritage value of the area) but also for progressing the planning of Kinlyside.

19. Against this background, the committee considers that the *Draft Village of Hall Master Plan* should be revised to incorporate the following elements and that, once revised, the document should be closely discussed with Hall residents prior to being **speedily finalised**:

- the buffer zone between Hall and any future development in Kinlyside should be at least 500m
- there should be no direct vehicular road link between Hall and Kinlyside
- there should a more detailed and comprehensive attention paid to the issues of traffic, parking and safety in Victoria Street
- the proposed subdivision of land in the Village (on its north-western side) should not take place
- to the maximum extent possible, the consideration of further Development Applications in Hall should take close heed of these recommendations.

Harold Hird MLA (Chair) - 7 August 2001

¹¹ Mr Crombie *Transcript*

¹² Standing Committee on Planning and Urban Services, Report No.57, p.31