

Draft Variation to the Territory Plan No 343
Residential blocks surrendered under the loose fill asbestos insulation
eradication scheme

Dear Sir/Madam,

I strongly oppose DV343 for the following reasons:

1. DV343 breaches ACT Territory Plan strategic principal 1.3¹.
DV343's sole purpose is to increase revenue when these blocks are re-sold. It ignores social and environment objectives and thus breaches the Plan's goal to balance these factors.
2. DV343 breaches ACT Territory Plan strategic principal 2.5.
Changing the zoning rules for blocks without regard to their proximity to commercial centres or major roads is in direct contradiction of the Plan's objective to have lower density as you move away from centres/major roads.
3. DV343 is "unplanning".
The application of zoning changes to random blocks around the city cannot represent a "planned" response. No city planner would ever deliberately choose to group these blocks together for a zoning change.
4. DV343 is unfair to neighbours.
DV343 is unfair to the neighbours of the re-zoned blocks, who purchased their blocks with the reasonable expectation that the area would be predominantly low density single dwellings.
5. DV343 is financially unfair.
DV343 zoning changes cannot be accessed by non-Fluffy blocks. Why can the ACT Government re-zone these blocks and yet owners of other similar blocks will not have access to these same zoning changes? DV343 should change the zoning rules for all RZ1 blocks, not a random subset of them (or not at all).
6. DV343 is financially unfair (part 2).
DV343's purpose is to help the ACT Government recoup the costs of the Fluffy asbestos

¹ Territory Plan Statement of Strategic Directions <http://www.legislation.act.gov.au/ni/2008-27/copy/74258/pdf/2008-27.pdf>

demolition program. However, DV343 changes are denied to Fluffy homeowners who choose to demolish and rebuild themselves. It is blatantly unfair that the ACT Government has access to improved resale value when private owners (in exactly the same situation) do not.

For the reasons listed above I recommend that the Government abandon DV343.

Yours sincerely

Peter Evans

14 Aug 2015