

From: Anthony Crook  
Sent: Thursday, 11 February 2010 11:44 AM  
To: Committees  
Subject: Submission to standing committee on planning

Dear Chair,  
please find below my comments on the residential redevelopment policies in inner north Canberra.

General comments on the area Section 47 and 63 blocks 12-21,

I want to add to the considered well written submission by Emil Bulum to the planning committee.

I live at 22 Condamine St (Block 12 Section 63) and though am in a slightly different section (West blocks of Section 63), I am subject to the same moratorium. I have almost identical thoughts for the future of the area, including the townhouses, micro parks and landscaping. Holder St is definitely a wonderful street and some effort should be made to maintain the high quality. A well designed plan along similar lines to Emil's proposal would be a wonderful idea.

I could not underline Emil's sentiments about ensuring 110m<sup>2</sup>+ townhouses enough. I think there are far too many 1 bedroom places in Turner already. Whilst they appeal to investors for short term rental accommodation, I do not believe a suburb can ever feel like 'home' with a large proportion of short term rentals. I note that there is already a similar example in the territory of a requirement for large apartments. 'The National' in Barton was planned in a way to ensure the average apartment size would be 120m<sup>2</sup>. Whilst that is a 6 story development, a similar covenant could be placed on 2-3 story developments.

An increase in density from 1 house per block to 3-5 townhouses would allow for a significant increase in the number of households in the area whilst maintaining character. Down the track (perhaps that could be another 30 years), if a further density increase is warranted then higher density apartments could be revisited by re-zoning land to be able to replace 4 townhouses with a 12-16 apartments. Again this could be done as a 3-4 fold increase in density rather than a 10 fold increase. I believe it is essential to provide sensitivity to existing residents with high quality amenity without locking in the land use for all time.

Specific comments relating to the moratorium on my own block (Block 12 Section 63)

I believe the original intention of the moratorium to pause development and assess the outcome of surrounding developments has been successful. This standing committee has been assembled at an appropriate time to further reflect on the land use in a city that has grown 12% since 1999 it was first proposed.

I make a point that whilst the moratorium was well intentioned, having such a moratorium on just 10 houses in my section is silly. I now have a 2 story apartment development directly next door and yet I was prevented from building a

single new dwelling for myself on my block. Please do not make me suffer the indignation of living next door to a medium density development with several balconies overlooking my backyard whilst being unable to build a new house to accommodate the intrusion.

I have read a submission by the Turner Primary School. Their submission indicates grave concerns relating to parking and bus access along Hartley Street. I witness the parking situation each day. There is a calamity each school day beginning at 8:45 and 2:50 and lasting around 20 minutes. This is the only time of day there is any problem on Hartley St. The school is the direct cause of any parking problems on Hartley St and these concerns should be addressed by appropriate parking provisions for the street with follow up policing. To blame residential development is ludicrous as there is rarely more than a few cars parked on the street at any one time outside of school drop off and pick ups.

I second Emil Bulum's comments for my own block also. I wanted 3-4 townhouses on my 950m2 block instead of 11 'mixed 1 and 2 bedroom' apartments indicated to me as appropriate by agents. I believe there is a need to be sensitive to the school as well as maintaining higher street appeal and public amenity. I took a look at the zoning requirements and it seems that such a plan for townhouses would not be allowed under the current RZ3 planning rules. The current zoning seems confusing with Units plans and territory plans having conflicting messages so forgive me if I am in error. A set of 2 story townhouses built north/south on my block would allow only 1 townhouse to front the school and therefore would not change the overall feel of the street facing the school (Hartley St).

Kind regards,  
Anthony Crook