

## **Submission on**

### **Draft Variation to the Territory Plan No. 343**

#### **Residential blocks surrendered under loose fill asbestos insulation eradication scheme**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment further on the above proposed draft variation to the Territory Plan No. 343.

This submission is further to my earlier comments (30 April 2015) provided to the Environment and Sustainable Development Directorate's public consultation process on DV343.

This additional opportunity to comment is opportune in that it has allowed affected residents and the community to have further time to consider all the public debate of the issues and have a better understanding of the problems faced with the proposed Mr Fluffy dwelling demolition program.

The enclosed submission / comments are made as an immediate neighbour to a Mr Fluffy identified residence on a block of over 700 square meters.

Ian Petersons

**Submission on  
Draft Variation to the Territory Plan No. 343  
Residential blocks surrendered under loose fill asbestos insulation eradication scheme**

This variation to the Territory Plan provides the opportunity for the Government to marginally increase the population density of existing suburbs, facilitate the development of more 'efficient' and sustainable housing, quality design and housing more attuned to the differing demographic needs of communities.

**'Housing for the people that want to live there rather than for developers, speculators and investors to make money. Housing for the first home buyers, the small families, single and two person households, the elderly and the *down sizers*'.**

To achieve this there must be consistent regulations for all blocks and not differing regulations just for dual occupancy - minimum block sizes, plot ratios, height restrictions. The designs should meet architectural standards that add to the suburb character. Differing regulations only lead to corruption, favours, different interpretation, so called special case exemptions etc.

There appears to be no justification for allowing the following special provisions for Mr Fluffy blocks:

- Dual occupancies for Mr Fluffy blocks of 700 square meters while on other blocks it is 800 square meters. *'The same for all'*.
- Dual occupancies for Mr Fluffy can build 50 per cent of a corner block while other corner blocks can only build 33 per cent and non corner blocks can build 35 per cent. Is not a 700 square meter block the same whether it is on a corner or in the middle of a street? *Again, 'the same for all'*.
- Dual occupancies for Mr Fluffy on a corner can build 2 storey while dual occupancy on an ordinary block in middle of street only single storey. This provision is particularly savage as the blocks are not only smaller the height of buildings is raised and the 'over shadowing' of existing neighbours is a certainty. *'The same for all'*.

If dual occupancies are to be allowed on smaller blocks, with higher plot ratios then the proper professional design aspect becomes even more important, even mandatory and such developments 'Semi-detached' with a common shared wall.

The issue of timelines has not had much discussion and neighbours need to be given a 'fair go' and the demolition and redevelopment should have a strict enforceable timeline for the rebuild – 'quick as possible'.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment

Ian Petersons 3 August 2015.