

- **How do you think the Living Infrastructure requirements are playing out at Ginninderry?**

We've not seen Living Infrastructure, play out on the ground, as The first stage of Macnamara will settle in January 2024. We have modelled the impact of on-block living infrastructure provisions of multi-unit blocks in Macnamara in each analysis the dwellings on the block have dropped from 2-5 blocks, depending on the block size and shape to accommodate living infrastructure. To achieve a similar yield in Macnamara EDP2, higher residential zones have been utilised.

In terms of the subdivision policy in the new Territory Plan. At maturity, Macnamara will achieve 24% canopy cover. The Ginninderry Project has strived to add as many trees in the street and open spaces, but has not been successful in achieving 30% tree canopy over the estates. Moving to a compact city, smaller verges and blocks are proposed in new estates.

Has there been analyses to understand if new estates can meet diversity in blocks sizes, including compact blocks, and meet TCCS standards in new estates?

This policy does not take into consideration one one-third of the Ginninderry development is protected in perpetuity with the Ginninderry Conservation Corridor, none of this conservation land is attributed to the estate open space provision. New estate need to take into account environmental considerations and approval, which was not the case in 'old Canberra', therefore, additional is given to open space.

- **Is affordable housing being addressed in the Territory Plan? Should we be looking at smaller blocks, housing diversity (eg terrace housing) and block consolidations as a way of delivering affordable housing. (Affordable – people who are key workers, teachers, emergency services)**

The on-block living infrastructure controls are contributing to increased costs, larger terrace products are required to accommodate the same block sizing or single dwellings need to increased to 2 storeys to achieve the same single-storey footprint, increasing in costings for scaffolding. In 2019, we applied DV369 to our turn-key terrace house (Alto 2), block area area of 114m<sup>2</sup> increased to 151m<sup>2</sup> to accommodate DV369. The Alto 2 house and land package (turn-key ready) was sold in 2019 for \$447,340. Applying the additional land required of 37m<sup>2</sup> at \$950 per metre, the additional cost to the total house and land package is \$482,490. An additional \$35,150 to the flexi house and land package.

In applying 2023 escalation the construction cost and land costs for the same turn-key product, the cost is projected as \$680,000.

The old Territory Plan and new Territory Plan do not support single-residential terrace housing. Ginninderry has advocated for a terrace housing code. Ginninderry has also advocated for a Ginninderry-specific policy to create a Ginninderry site-specific policy within the Belconnen District Policy, to deal with compact housing typologies, and to have code to support innovative housing choices.

The new Territory plan provides for percentages in provisions block to zones.

The question around block consolidation, to me sits within an existing suburb context.

Block consolidation is a mechanism by which we've seen small pockets of gentle urbanism within old Canberra. That is a solution. The new Territory Plan has taken the other policy path of adding an additional 30m<sup>2</sup> to a second dwelling on block to the existing planning controls to a dwelling on RZ1 with the opportunity to subdivide. This policy locks blocks up for an additional circa 50 years and with a subdivision, this does not increase density in real terms, but further sterilizes the RZ1 zoning and does not allow gentle urbanism through the opportunity of block consolidation. Greenfield developments are having to work harder for this City with higher residential zoning to make up for inner suburbs sterilized zoning policy.

- **You have said that new development should incorporate new social and affordable housing. How should this be done – is mandatory inclusionary zoning one way of doing that?**

It's important for the ACT Government to recognise that the 'affordability thresholds', is not in line with the market cost of construction and deliverables. Ginninderry cannot meet the Government 'affordability thresholds', so these need to be reviewed.

For the most part, Ginninderry makes a relatively modest development return on these flexi living products which is not a sustainable business model for broader application by industry.

Ginninderry has a women's vulnerable housing initiative, (built-to-rent-to-own) the site allowed for 18 dwellings, to get the housing scheme to stack up, with the cost of construction we needed to increase the yield, initially, 24 dwellings were tested, however living infrastructure and the car parking provisions meant that it was not possible to meet these provisions, 22 dwellings will now be built for vulnerable women. This site is co-located with a local shops, did the development need those missing couple of car parking spaces? Were the couple of additional trees worth it to the site in addition to 600ha of Conservation areas and estate open space provisions?

In terms of social housing, the ACT Government can absolutely affect this change. The GJV sells land to Housing ACT at a market rate. In looking at this issue, there's currently no zoning mechanism for social housing. However, there's a pathway forward to restrict the use in the Crown lease to 'social housing'. This mechanism would mean that members of the public aren't aware of which specific blocks are earmarked in a suburb of social housing as it wouldn't be publicly notified in the DA assessment.

In discussions with the Government and industry, as there is no definition for 'social housing' in the Territory plan and valuers don't have a way to recognise the value. Creating a definition of social housing in the new Territory Plan would allow a valuation under a specific use. Acknowledging, that there's a definition for 'supportive housing', but it's an encumbered definition as you have to provide additional services that must be delivered onsite. As a government JV, land cannot be discounted, however, a definition for 'social housing' is not discounting the land, it's its own use, and the land value should be significantly less/or a nominal value as ACT Government is the provider, with a rationalisation of land value for social housing, that would mean ACT Housing should be able to deliver a greater volume of social housing.

ACT Government, could provision that EDPs are to make x% of blocks available to Housing ACT, as long as Housing ACT has the capacity and funds to take these blocks on.

This information has been provided to answer the questions within the current levers, leaving out the federal taxation system applied to land.

**\*\* Inclusionary zoning is a land use planning intervention by government that either mandates or creates incentives so that a proportion of a residential development includes a number of social or affordable housing dwellings.**

If the Government wants to move to inclusionary zoning, it would have to be up-to-date with the industry and understand the real construction costs'.

social housing, by changing the mechanisms to sell land at the real cost of that land. It's worth noting, that the besides Ginninderry's 'flexi-living' terrace product, the GJV sells the land only, as the GJV is beholden to ACT Housing as to how many blocks of land they are willing to buy. Suggest it would be a discussion with ACT Housing, as to how many greenfield blocks, they have the capacity and funds to take on each year between the new estates in the ACT.

- **Does the Territory Plan promote housing diversity? How should it?**

My experience of the old Territory Plan was that it didn't and similar commentary for the new Territory Plan, although have not seen how it will be administered, but the policy is not supportive of housing diversity.

We advocated that the Territory Plan include a Ginninderry-specific District Policy and for our Master plan to be recognised in the Territory plan. The majority of Belconnen is delivered while the Ginninderry Project is a greenfield development. In having specific controls at Ginninderry, this would assist us in delivering specific precinct outcomes like terrace housing or interlocking housing concepts. While we have delivered these housing models to date, they were not supported in the old Territory Plan, and they were extremely challenging and time-intensive to get through planning.

There is no compact code (under 250m<sup>2</sup>), or terrace style code proposed in the new Territory Plan. It is my view, that we'll continue to have the same issues, where the Ginninderry Project is trying to deliver a range of housing choices and innovation under the new Territory Plan, however perhaps, the new Territory Plan will be administered differently, and the Planning Authority will overwrite entities.

- **Is greenfield development still appropriate??**

All Australia Cities are working through their policy spilt, between infill and greenfield development. We cannot continue to develop greenfield development as we have in Australia.

Within the Ginninderry Project, while we understand it's technically a greenfield development, we are thinking of the project with its future lifecycles and development and its connective within Canberra.

While Ginninderry to date, has prominently been developed as single residential housing, we are future-proofing the suburb with higher residential zones, so that development isn't sterilized like old Canberra and remains RZ1, so that we don't continue to have this continued imbalance of sterilising greenfield development, even after going through a major planning reform.

- **Is the term 'bush capital' a relevant consideration in the new Territory Plan and at Ginninderry?**

This is interesting, depending how you feel about the term, personally, I'm not fond of it, as people and community can get stuck on an idea and idolise it, so therefore we cannot progress and see and new future, unfortunately, the new Territory Plan has reflected these community views, with no mechanisms, in old Canberra to increase density where the most services and amenities are located to accommodate Canberra's growth.

The Ginninderry Development has considered Canberra's heritage and it was at the forefront of mind in the recent Master Plan refresh. If we're talking about the bush capital like old Canberra then no. Ginninderry delivers a range of block sizes, and diversity in housing mix, including micro-block sizes, and one-third of the area is preserved for nature conservation and enhancement, unlike old Canberra with large blocks of RZ1 land, large verges large exotic trees, and no regard to native or cultural preservation. Granted, Old Canberra, the Garden City is visually appealing.

However, the city is at a nexus, if the old bush capital is held onto, it's a very unequal future, as it's not just about delivering housing choices now, besides a residential house, with the cost of housing, simply, it's not affordable, and as a City we won't meet the growing population challenges.

Ginninderry is delivering a 21-century subdivision, fit for a 21-century community, respecting the past while, delivering a suburb that is climate resilient that respects the landscape, heritage and cultural values and natural environment.