

Karl Smith

27 August 2015

Committee Secretary  
Standing Committee on Planning, Environment and Territory and Municipal Services  
[committees@parliament.act.gov.au](mailto:committees@parliament.act.gov.au)

Dear Mr Finlay

I welcome the opportunity to make a submission to the Committee's inquiry into Draft Variation to the Territory Plan No. 343: *Residential blocks surrendered under the loose fill asbestos insulation eradication scheme*.

I would like to add my voice to the over 100 comments objecting to the draft variation during the previous consultation phase before the end of May 2015. Although the proposed changes are characterised as "modest" in the explanatory statement to the draft variation, in my view the proposed changes would not be small or limited to those residents of the RZ1 zones who live nearby the surrendered blocks. Having had the opportunity to go through the [List of Affected Properties](#) (the List) now made public, in my view it is clear that the proposed changes to dual occupancy and separate unit titling would have a disproportionate impact on the neighbouring blocks adjacent to the surrendered residential blocks, especially in those locations where the blocks have been clustered in particular streets and neighbourhoods.

To estimate how many neighbouring properties could be impacted by speculative dual occupancy development on the surrendered blocks I went through the List to determine which of the properties would be impacted by the draft variation (that is properties not rural or heritage listed, in the RZ1 residential suburban zone and over 700 square metres). Assuming all such blocks are at some point surrendered I found some 753 blocks in the RZ1 zone that could be subject to separately titled dual occupancy redevelopment. Using the ACT Mapping function I tallied up the number of adjoining blocks in the RZ1 zone to determine the number of neighbouring blocks, coming to a total of 2722 households. This only gives an estimate of immediate neighbours sharing a fence line and does not take into account topography, neighbours in line of sight, or other neighbours across the road or in the street - all who may object to their neighbourhood amenity also impacted by dual occupancy development.

For those members of the committee interested in the breakdown of surrendered blocks by electorate, the numbers are as follows, from most to least impacted: Murrumbidgee (407 blocks in 18 suburbs, with 1474 neighbouring households impacted); Ginninderra (193 blocks in 16 suburbs, 668 neighbouring households); Kurrajong (110 houses in 15 suburbs, 413 neighbouring households), Yerrabi (22 houses in three suburbs, 89 neighbouring households) and Brindabella (21 houses in the one affected suburb, 78 neighbouring households).

I assume the Environment and Sustainable Development Directorate and/or the Asbestos Response Taskforce are in a position to quickly correct and to confirm how many neighbouring properties adjoin the exact number of surrendered blocks amenable to either subdivision or separately titled dual occupancy development. My back of the envelope calculations may be a little fluffy, so I may also ask Peter Jansen, President of the ACT Ratepayers and Property Owners' Association (and former Liberal Party candidate) to verify these figures.

I understand it has been estimated that this variation would produce an average 25% uplift in value for surrendered blocks. In my view, it follows that is more likely than not that at some stage future lessees will seek to maximise their return by redeveloping these blocks as separately titled dual occupancies. Given that they may not be immediately developed as such, in my view it would be prudent to be able to easily identify the location of these "Claytons" RZ2 blocks within the RZ1

zones. I think it would be an unfortunate outcome for an innocent purchaser of a property in the suburban residential zone to suddenly find separately titled dual occupancies being knocked up around them, after having bought into an RZ1 zone in good faith.

I have come to this view despite my being a former homeowner and resident of an affected block, possibly because of the sorry history of non-disclosure in relation to the previously remediation programme. In my view, arguments about needing to erase the stigma from remediated blocks are spurious. Far better to work out how to cleanse our lungs of any amosite fibres ...

Yours sincerely,

Karl Smith