



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PLANNING, TRANSPORT, AND CITY SERVICES
Ms Jo Clay MLA (Chair), Ms Suzanne Orr MLA (Deputy Chair),
Mr Mark Parton MLA

Submission Cover Sheet

Inquiry into the Territory Plan and other associated documents

Submission Number: 028

Date Authorised for Publication: 11 January 2024

Inquiry into the Territory Plan

Background:

I own a RZ1 block of land 906m² in Ainslie, it currently has a 100m² 1950s built small cottage and large amount of tree's, bushes and green life around it.

Future Plans:

I was excited by the New Territory Plan allowing multiple dwelling and unit titles of the block. I have since engaged an Architect and reviewing potential design options although based on the new requirements have hit some limitations:

Point 1 – Lease Variation Charge:

The codified LVC ranges from \$63,444 to \$315,000 increasing from previous \$20,000 to \$30,000 maximum on eligible blocks. First land owners have already paid their stamp duty and ongoing rates/taxes. A lease variation charge when they are effectively adding more land to assist the Government with land supply as they can not keep up with demand should not be a cash grab, should it be incentivised with grants of incentivized fees waived?. This also destroys feasibility of any development. Assuming the main dwelling and trees are all perfectly positioned and a new 3 bedroom house can be added on 400m² of an existing block:

Design, DA, BA, Approvals, \$40,000, Construction \$500,000, Miscellaneous \$25,000

Lease Variation Charge \$80,000 assuming low end of scale

Land Value inner North 1,600 x 400m² - \$640,000

Costs – Total Estimate - \$1,285,000

This property would be worth an estimated \$1,250,000 – meaning there is a net loss of \$35,000 resulting in no benefit to the land owner.

Point 2 – 40% Built Up Area:

Recent subdivisions such as Throsby shows majority house coverage and minimal tree or green space allocation. While this is not ideal, the new Plan has substantially changed from previous that decreases land value by not being able to use it. Further restricting houses to 40% creates problems with:

1. Limits size of dwelling resulting in less space and potential less occupants.
2. Encourages basement or multi-storey construction that increases costs, increases skilled labour requirements, increases materials and increases safety risks with more working at heights. In an already stretched construction market operating over capacity – bad idea.

Image 1 – Throsby Development ACT



Point 3 – Tree and Green Requirements:

While most would agree the setup of Throsby is not ideal in terms of trees and greenery. The current proposed requirement are too onerous and offer no flexibility with strict requirements.

When starting to plan on unique block shapes, with existing buildings, trees and infrastructure there needs to be more flexibility in removing existing trees and replacing them in more suitable locations while also not being so demanding on new and large tree requirements. The changes from the previous subdivisions to current is too great and de-valuing block potential.

Image 2 – Ainslie Example of block shapes and difficulties noted above

