

Table 1 COMPARISON OF DRAFT MULTI-UNIT CODE PROPOSED IN DV306 AND CURRENT CODE

Proposed	Current	Change	Comments
R1 minimum block size for dual occ in RZ1 = 800. Mandatory. SD blocks only.	R3: similar rule	Specifically applies to single dwelling blocks, whereas this rule currently applies to all sites	If the block has not been leased or used for single dwellings it's exempt so this rule is silent for former non-residential land
R2 minimum block size for dual occ in RZ2 = 700. Mandatory. SD blocks only.	R11: similar rule except that 800 applies	Reduces notional area per dwelling from 400 to 350 and specifically applies to single dwelling blocks, whereas this rule currently applies to all sites	Increases number of sites available plus sets no minimum for non-residential sites, which encourages more dual occ in RZ2, potentially doubling density. No figures provided as to how many sites this frees up for redevelopment.
R3 no new apartments in RZ1, RZ2. Mandatory. SD blocks only.	R2b, R10b: similar rule except that a "standard block" has a slightly different meaning from a "single dwelling block"	Specifically applies to single dwelling blocks so this covers smaller blocks that aren't covered now	No likely change, but this is a restriction that has questionable merit, favouring townhouses with small footprints vs shared facilities and therefore preventing large houses being converted to apartments thus encouraging demolition.
R4 lease & dev conditions loosened by proposed Code	Nothing	Establishes a link and grants discretion as to which conditions will be enforced, citing "intent"	Rule is not mandatory so C4 potentially relaxes a long list of conditions that previously applied. Dilutes the effect of the L&D conditions and opens up disputes about their enforcement.
R5 One 3BR unit required per original block in all multi-unit developments in all zones, but does not apply to supportive	Nothing	Forces development to include at least one 3BR unit per block	Rule is draconian and there are many ways it can be abused. Many households with or without children may prefer 2

Proposed	Current	Change	Comments
housing. Mandatory. SD blocks only.			good-sized bedrooms rather than three small ones, so if the target market has a preference it is irrational to add cost in the way of additional framing and windows that can always be removed later, adding further cost that's borne by the occupant. Although retaining 3BR housing stock is a good idea in general, to do it in this way imposes extra costs and is likely to have unintended consequences
R6 Max plot ratios for dual occ in RZ1 set by formulae that allow up to 32.5%, falling as block size increases, and max for new unit = 17.5%. Mandatory. SD blocks only.	R8, R9: similar rule	Minimal	Plot ratio for dual occ is substantially less than for single dwellings and falls as block size grows so the 32.5% rule discourages redevelopment in RZ1 on larger blocks especially, diminishing the potential of dual occ to contribute to higher densities. For example max GFA is 260 sqm on an 800 block if dual occ, 400 or more for a single house so any large house would have to be demolished to enable dual occ to proceed while granting much less total floor area
R7 Max plot ratios for dual occ in RZ2 either 50% or 35% depending on whether both	R15, R16: similar rule	Minimal	Lowering the notional area in R2 extends the effect of this to more sites. Note that 50% plot

Proposed	Current	Change	Comments
units have street frontage or not and max for a new unit = 17.5%. Mandatory. SD blocks only.			ratio means high site coverage if either is a single storey dwelling, and running a driveway to the rear of blocks changes the percentage of a site left unpaved. Once corner blocks are taken up, the impetus to redevelop for dual occ is likely to drop substantially shifting the focus to other forms of multi-units such as triples and townhouses
R8 For large blocks (over 500) in RZ2-RZ4 max plot ratio = 50, 65 or 80%. Mandatory. SD blocks only.	R15, R20, R24: similar rule except the rule currently applies to all block sizes and types	Omits RZ1 and only applies to blocks over 500 that are “single dwelling blocks”	Why is there no max plot ratio given for RZ1 ¹ or for blocks under 500 in RZ2-RZ4 or former non-residential or sites originally used for apartments in these zones? The effect of this rule is to allow uncontrolled floor areas on smaller blocks in these zones and therefore increase the likelihood of excessively high site coverage
R9 For non-single dwelling blocks in RZ1-RZ3 max plot ratio = 65% and in RZ4 = 80%. Mandatory. However rule does not apply to blocks in RZ1 approved before the Code starts or the former B1 and B8 policy	R15, R20, R24: rule currently limits plot ratio to 50% on all “standard blocks” in RZ1 and RZ2; RZ3 is capped at 65% now	Treats RZ1 and RZ2 as if they were RZ3 where they were originally either non-residential or for apartments and applies to all blocks of any size. Also, RZ3 and RZ4 non-standard blocks not now caught by a plot ratio	The effect of this rule varies depending on the zone but it allows higher yields in RZ1 and RZ2 than 50% for particular sites, making those more attractive to redevelop. This opens up neighbourhood

¹ The draft single dwelling code contains R1, a mandatory rule that max plot ratio = 50% for large blocks (over 500) but removes any plot ratio for smaller blocks

Proposed	Current	Change	Comments
areas if they had a holding lease.		maximum would be	disputes in RZ2 especially by encouraging significantly larger, bulkier developments on land such as some church land or where apartments were originally allowed by a lease, that are likely to be viewed as inconsistent with surrounding and future development
R10 Max number of units per block in RZ1 = 2. Excludes supportive housing. Mandatory. SD blocks only.	R2: similar rule	Minimal change	Preserves the status quo in RZ1 by capping the unit yield at double what is there now, enabling dual occ
R11 Max number of units per block for supportive housing in RZ1 = sliding scale so 1 per 600, 2 per 850, 3 per 1100 etc. Mandatory. SD blocks only.	C259-R261: Different rules and criteria that limit max plot ratio to 35% now	Plot ratio control is replaced by variable dwelling control with lesser threshold than for dual occ and per unit requirement of 250 after the first	Enables more redevelopment for supportive housing and by setting less stringent controls eases their introduction across the ACT. Supportive housing is defined to include aged persons units, community housing, older persons units, rooming house, university college This has the effect of encouraging the amalgamation of blocks for higher unit yields.
R12 Max number of units per block in RZ2 = variable sliding scale so 1 per 700, 2 if between 700 and 1050, extra 1 per 350 until site exceeds 2350 then extra 1 per 250. Mandatory. SD blocks only.	Nothing	Introduces a density control for RZ2 that is strongly supported by the community generally, but is regarded as a backward step by the AIA, AILA and PIA	The absence of a unit density control in the current Code is an anomaly so correcting this will reduce the rate of disputes. The interpretation of the zone's objectives is a contested area, which highlights the need to

Proposed	Current	Change	Comments
			review this zone in particular and clarify where it sits in the gradation of zones and what its purpose is
R13 Max number of units per block in RZ2 capped at 3 if street frontage =20m or less. Mandatory. SD blocks only.	R10a: similar rule	Minimal change	
R14 Max number of units per block in RZ2 increases if all are adaptable units. Mandatory. SD blocks only.	Nothing	New initiative	Encourages redevelopment that is 100% adaptable housing by conferring same benefit as for supportive housing in RZ1. Facilitates housing suited to aged and disabled with impaired mobility. If this is NOT tenanted by intended residents the parking standards may not be adequate because the current Code is out of date
R15 Max number of units in single bldg in RZ2 = 4. Mandatory. SD blocks only.	Nothing	Limits the number of units but not the actual size of a building and prevents rows such as terrace housing	Terrace housing is an efficient response that's well liked in other cities and is preferable to clumping units at the rear of a site without any street frontage. Balancing the wish to retain a pattern of spacing between buildings with the relationship to the street is important and there are particular stretches where terrace housing could be ideally located. This provision needs further review, it is the outermost units and parking

Proposed	Current	Change	Comments
			arrangements that will impact most on neighbours so rather than restrict the number of units it's vital to manage the interface.
R16 Max 2 storeys in RZ1 and restricts attics and basement car parking directly above or below. Mandatory. SD blocks only	R5: similar rule	Minimal change	Restricting attics and basement car parking is neither sensible or desirable. Attics that require minor changes to the roof line are an efficient use of space that adds visual interest to a property and basement car parking enables much better use of a site. Neither impinges on the public realm and both have benefits.
R17 Dual occ in RZ1 that is detached and to the rear is limited to 1 storey and cannot have basement car parking. Mandatory. SD blocks only	R6: similar rule	Minimal change	Preventing basement car parking means that the garage takes up valuable space and therefore the building's bulk and site coverage is greater than it would otherwise be
R18 Max storeys in RZ1 = 2 on non-single dwelling blocks. Mandatory.	R5: similar rule	Minimal change	Covering the most common residential zone with a mandatory 2 storey limit prevents diverse responses to sloping sites and household needs – height and building envelope controls are sufficient to deal with the vertical form so prescribing the number of storeys stifles innovation
R19 Max storeys in RZ2 = 2 not including rooftop plant screened	R13: permits both an attic and a basement in addition to 2	Reduces flexibility by removing the dispensation for an attic or a	Retaining flexibility with attics and basements makes more

Proposed	Current	Change	Comments
from the street. Mandatory	storeys but does not mention rooftop plant	basement but allows for rooftop plant to be visible from adjoining properties	sense
R20 Same rule as above limiting dev to 2 storeys in RZ3 but NOT mandatory	R18: mandatory rule that limits dev to 2 storeys but allows flexibility in the case of attics or a basement	criteria C20 changes this into a discretionary control, 2 storey appearance facing the street could mean 3 or 4 storeys facing adjoining properties	This is likely to generate much more neighbourhood dispute especially in established inner suburbs where moratorium on RZ3 was recently lifted