

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

Dear Sir / Madam,

I strongly object to the Draft Variation 343 and I do not support changes to the planning permission for any RZ1 Mr Fluffy blocks.

I am disappointed that the Environment and Planning Directorate (EPD) recommend that DV343 be approved, particularly as the large majority of the submissions do not support the variation (100 of the 124 submissions), and the EPD'S responses to residents' concerns have not adequately addressed the issues raised.

Submissions from people who have or are living in affected suburbs, and who would be directly affected by the proposed draft variation, should be given greater weight than industry submissions that are likely to be influenced by profits. The committee should make its deliberations on the basis that a larger number of residents oppose DV343 than the number of objections submitted to the EDP. Consider people over dollars.

Especially, I do not support changes to the planning permission for the Fluffy blocks in my near neighbourhood. That includes homes in the area surrounded by Binns St., Shakespeare Cr, Dunbar St & the western footpath joining Dunbar to Binns. My home is the last home on the western end of Binns St., No. 11.

The proposed changes would negatively impact on my quality of life & the value of my block. The proposed changes would encourage higher density dwellings in what are now quiet residential areas, where choice of residences have been made for their limited traffic, noise and plenty of space to move.

The proposed changes would also create inconsistencies with current RZ1 zones, as there would be additional planning permission for some RZ1 blocks but not for others. Any review of planning provisions for RZ1 zones should be undertaken as part of a Strategic Review of Housing to ensure that there are not different planning permissions within suburban zones. Existing RTZ1 zoning permission should be preserved.

The EPD should consider whether other planning changes could allow the Government to raise revenue to offset the costs of the Asbestos Eradication Scheme, without the resultant differences in planning permissions within suburban zones. This short term revenue raising measure ignores social and environmental objectives, and does not adequately consider the long term consequences on the amenity and integrity of Canberra's oldest suburbs. It will negatively affect the garden city character of these suburban areas because dual occupancy dwellings will be built closer to existing neighbours, and there will be less garden area on the blocks themselves. The DV343 would be unfair to the neighbours of the proposed rezoned blocks, who purchased their blocks with the reasonable expectation that the area would be predominantly low density dwellings. This negativity will impact on my ability to continue growing all of my own vegetables, berries and 11 fruit trees.

Responses to Planning Merits does not explain why it is appropriate to change the planning permission of some blocks based on the roof insulation in these premises. Elsewhere, planning permissions are based on amenity factors – proximity to town centres, transport, etc.

Allowing greater development on random RZ1 blocks undermines the integrity of the whole Territory planning system. If the ACT Government considers the the planning changes to the RZ1 Fluffy blocks to be consistent with the RZ1 Zoning objectives, then why are neighbouring RZ1 blocks not allowed to access the same planning permissions ? If the proposed changes are not consistent with the Zoning Objectives, then the ACT Government should abandon them.

If the standard RZ1 sliding scale plot ratio is considered necessary to protect the RZ1 zone in all other cases, how is the case of a Fluffy home any different ? The ACT Government should not ignore the rules that apply to all other developers in the RZ1 zone.

Please maintain the integrity of this special piece of the A.C.T., as I will be rebuilding here as soon as possible.

Enough nightmares have been unexpectedly forced upon us as Fluffy owners, and there is no need to extend them further with this proposed rezoning scheme.

Recommendation

As I strongly object to the proposed variations to the Territory Plan DV343 for RZ1 Fluffy blocks, I recommend that the ACT Government abandon the proposed changes.

Regards,

Pamela McKay