



Legislative Assembly for the
Australian Capital Territory

Standing Committee on Environment
and Planning

Submission Cover Sheet

Inquiry into the use of controlled activity orders

Submission number: 001

Submitter: JD Monk

Date authorised for publication: 6 August 2026

From: [REDACTED]
To: [LA Committee - Environment](#)
Subject: FORMAL SUBMISSION - Inquiry into the use of controlled activity orders
Date: Saturday, 25 July 2026 2:30:12 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.

I wish to make a submission relating to your Legislative Assembly Committee consideration of an -

Inquiry into the use of controlled activity orders

I am JD Monk, resident at [REDACTED].
[REDACTED]

I have read the Committee's Terms of Reference ('ToR').

I wish to comment upon Reference d) as follows, particularly in relation to the on-going DPA-12 process -

ToR: "d) Action taken under Chapter 12 of the Planning Act 2023 and enforcement of lease conditions in relation to:

* Brindabella Christian College carpark"

Considering your ToR: "g) Any other relevant matters", it seems likely that your Committee may potentially be distracted by a "Lyneham Community Association" (LCA) inspired write-in campaign, probably related to that self-appointed Association's long-standing and implacable opposition to the creation of the referenced "carpark".

Lest you might be so distracted, I wish to unequivocally ENDORSE the formal DPA-12 Submission to the Planning Minister, so recently made.

Related to my own endorsement of the DPA-12 public consultation process, as well as of the final unamended Submission recently put to the Minister, please note that I see NO need to associate that formal Planning process with any 'controlled activity order'.

Specifically, I endorsed the Draft submission made public before its being put unamended to the Planning Minister in the DPA-12 process. (Numerically, I may well be in the Minority.)

My DPA-12 personal submission has Reference Code [REDACTED] of 20 March 2026.

In accordance with your general Guidelines, I shall not re-state my broad objections to the LCA lobby, and I shall not repeat my own Planning considerations of my supporting that draft DPA-12 submission.

Key to the debate is that the BCC's many students come from a far larger Canberra

catchment area than Lyneham's Primary or High School students. They need to get to the BCC safely, mostly by private transport. And, of course, BCC staff have to park their cars somewhere locally.

Suffice it to say that the wholly negative NO-to-DPA-12 Campaign by LCA and their (essentially 'nimby'?) lobby of anti-BCC carpark advocates, have apparently missed the essential point that the DPA-12 PLANNING reconsideration is entirely reasonable, as well as duly and appropriately methodical in leading towards the essential Development Application (DA) yet ever to be made about the BCC carpark.

What I would observe associated with DPA-12 and your current ToR considerations, is that the whole formal ACT Planning process is quite enigmatic for ordinary residents. Also, of course, the LCA dragged the BCC carpark debate into the ACAT, and a formal Supreme (?) Court review of that outcome is now running in parallel with DPA-12 plus the yet-to-be-made reformulated BCC carpark DA.

My own submission about DPA-12 specifically noted the necessity for the yet-to-be DA to address many unresolved road-safety issues. That is, including, such safety issues as were flagged by the ACT Government expert before the ACAT, but which were regrettably lost-sight-of by the ACAT in the ridiculous decision to put 130 parked cars back out into lower-Lyneham streets.

Thus I would assert that not only ordinary residents cannot readily grasp ACT Planning processes - it seems that 'legal minds' have had such associated difficulties, as well.

Where this places your Committee's deliberations, I suggest, will be to studiously leave the Brindabella Christian College carpark plenty of leeway.

That saga has been an example of mistaken DA events overtaking by muddled thinking and bias (and it seems allegedly some misinformation self-interestedly peddled by the former owner-managers of the College ?).

To the extent that any controlled activity order might reasonably be exercised over the BCC carpark,

I submit that it will be far better formally resolved by a combination of the sequel to the DPA-12 Ministerial process, further informed by the Court's forthcoming ruling over the former ACAT deliberations, and the goodwill of the new Owners of Brindabella Christian College towards the Lyneham community.

Thank you,

JD Monk
25 July 2026