



**ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
8 NOVEMBER 2022, 6.30pm
EASTLAKE FOOTBALL CLUB, 3 OXLEY STREET GRIFFITH**

DRAFT MINUTES

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING: 6.30PM TO 7.30PM

1. Welcome – Marea Fatseas, Chairperson

The Chair acknowledged the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet, the Ngunnawal and Ngambri people, and their elders past, present and emerging. She welcomed attendees, including government representatives, and members of the ISCCC, other representatives of residents groups, members of the public.

Apologies

Senator David Pocock, Peter Cain MLA, Rachel Stephen-Smith MLA, Leo Dobes Griffith Narrabundah Community Association, Gary Kent-Public Officer, Ian Dudgeon, Peter Moore Kingston and Barton Residents Group, Nick Swain Kingston and Barton Residents Group, Tim Field Red Hill Residents Group

2. Minutes of the 2021 Annual General Meeting were accepted

Moved John Bell, Seconded Beatrice Bodart-Bailey CARRIED

3. Chair's report

The Chair spoke to her report which will be made available on the ISCCC website. See www.isccc.org.au

Highlights included:

- Marea came back into the Chair role in March 2022 after the retirement of Gary Kent, and pending the election of a new Chair at this AGM. She thanked Gary Kent for his very significant and long term commitment to the ISCCC since its establishment in 2010. She also thanked our former Treasurer David Johnstone who was a very valued and longstanding member of the ISCCC Committee, and who also retired during the course of the year. Thanks to Ann Forrest for stepping in as Deputy Chair and John Edquist as Treasurer pending this AGM. Marea also thanked Kathie Potts Secretary and Deb Price the Assistant Secretary, especially for assisting with hybrid in-person/online meetings, the ISCCC Committee and subcommittees, Ron Fraser for assisting with the new ISCCC constitution, and Sue Ross the Reviewer of the ISCCC's financial accounts.
- It was acknowledged that the work of the ISCCC could not take place without the support of the eight member residents groups. This is in addition to much other valuable work undertaken by these groups for residents of their suburbs.
- COVID restrictions continued to be a challenge in the 2021-22 financial year, but we adapted and held our committee and public meetings in-person, online or as hybrid in-person/online meetings. The hybrid meetings created the most challenges and are still a work in progress.
- The ISCCC has continued to build on several other communication channels, including a large email list, communication through the eight inner south suburban residents groups and their networks, occasional City News supplements, our Twitter site with over 1200 followers and Facebook page with over 900 followers. We share posts with other Facebook pages such as the Kingston and Barton Residents Group Facebook site that has over 1600 followers. We've been reaching out to a range of other community organisations and groups as well.
- Particular highlights were efforts to improve planning and development. A major piece of work in late 2021 was the development of the ISCCC's Inner South Canberra District Planning Strategy that set out what we had heard from our member residents groups and from a 2019/20 survey of inner south residents about how they would like their district to develop.
- Reviewing the ISCCC's constitution to ensure that it is consistent with the latest model rules of the Associations Incorporation Act was also a major piece of work during the year.



Inner South Canberra Community Council

- Protecting and enhancing the Inner South's living infrastructure is also critical to the future liveability of the inner south, and to its resilience in the context of a warming climate. Our survey of inner south residents in 2019/20 found that what they value most about where they live is the treescape/vegetation and open green spaces. So the ISCCC has participated actively in ACT Government consultation processes about making adequate provision for green space on developed and redeveloped residential blocks, and about protecting and enhancing the urban forest.
- The ISCCC worked with member residents groups and other stakeholder groups to have a say on major precinct scale developments and proposed infrastructure in the Inner South, including in relation to Light Rail Stage 2, East Lake, Dairy Road, Kingston Arts Precinct, Canberra Brickworks and Forestry Precincts in Yarralumla.
- During the year, the ISCCC was represented on several stakeholder groups:
 - The Combined Community Councils
 - ACT Environment and Planning Forum
 - Brickworks Community Panel, and
 - Kingston Arts Precinct Community Panel.
- The ISCCC's submissions during financial year 2021-22 reflect the above key issues:
 - Canberra Brickworks Redevelopment Environmental Impact Statement (July 21)
 - ACT Planning System Review and Reform Project (July 2021)
 - Raising London Circuit (Dec 2021)
 - Forestry Place Development (Aug 2021)
 - Works Approval Application Blocks 1151 and 864 WestonCreek-Construction of Independent Living and Aged Care Facility (Sep 2021)
 - Assembly's Planning Standing Committee decision not to hold an Inquiry into Draft Variation 369 to the Territory Plan (Dec 2021)
 - Crematorium Symonston (May 2022)
 - Planning Bill (June 2022)
 - Urban Forest Bill (June 2022)
- The Chair thanked the ISCCC's member residents' groups for all their input to these submissions, as the ISCCC could not respond to the many and varied issues affecting the inner south without the contribution of our member groups.

Moved David Denham, Seconded Melissa Bennett CARRIED

4. **Financial report**

The Treasurer, John Edquist spoke to the Financial Report. The report as at 30 June 2022 was available in hard copy. It was noted that the opening balance at 1 July 2021 was \$11,227.89. Total income was \$13, 221.00. This was mostly comprised of the ACT Government Grant of \$12,821.00. Total Expenditure was \$12, 846.11. Key items included several City News ISCCC pages \$4,950, support for Residents Groups' communications \$3475.96, Insurance Policy \$2004.53, expenses associated with the Inner South Canberra Strategy \$949.32, Website and Internet Services \$251.88 and Zoom fees \$144.00.

Moved Richard Johnston, Seconded Anne Forrest CARRIED

5. **Special Resolution to ratify the amended Constitution:**

John Bell spoke to the special resolution to ratify the amended constitution. The ISCCC had a constitution that was not consistent with the latest model rules of the Associations Incorporation Act. The working party started



Inner South Canberra Community Council

with the Old Constitution and adapted it to the model. The main changes included the regulation of conflicts of interest and dispute resolution, expanding the duties of office bearers and privacy.

John Bell moved the special resolution 'That ISCCC members agree to adopt the revised constitution circulated with this agenda with the minor change to the word 'regulations'. Seconded Marea Fatseas CARRIED

6. Elections to office bearing positions:

The meeting chair invited John Bell to be returning officer for the nomination of Chair and remaining positions.

John Bell and the Secretary confirmed the names of the nominees, as follows:

Chair: Marea Fatseas

Deputy Chair: Anne Forrest

Secretary: Kathie Potts

Treasurer: John Edquist

Assistant Secretary: Deb Price

Ordinary Member: Tim Field

It was noted that the following positions remain vacant.

- Public Relations officer
- Webmaster
- Ordinary Member (1)
- Assistant Treasurer (optional)

It was noted that more ordinary member vacancies would be available when the new Constitution comes into effect.

John Bell proposed that the nominated people be accepted. Seconded Melissa Bennett CARRIED.

The Chair invited the attendees to express interest in the vacancies. There were nil offers.

9. Appointment of Public Officer

Marea Fatseas nominated Kathie Potts as the Public Officer, Seconded Beatrice Bodart-Bailey CARRIED

10. Appointment of Reviewer of ISCCC financial accounts

Marea Fatseas nominated Sue Ross as the Reviewer of the ISCCC financial accounts, Seconded John Edquist CARRIED.

11. Interest in sub-committees. Hugh Dakin indicated that he would be willing to be a member of the Planning subcommittee.

12. Accept the nominees of residents' groups for Committee membership.

Due to the timing of AGMs and Annual Meetings not all Groups could announce their Committee Representatives. As soon as possible they are to be advised to the Secretary for inclusion in the ISCCC Annual Return with their date of appointment deemed to be at this AGM.



The Committee Representatives available to date are:

- Yarralumla Residents Association: Steve Foley and Peter Pharaoh
- Oaks Estate Residents Association: Fiona MacGregor

13. Next Meeting

a. Annual General Meeting: 14 November 2023 7:00pm

GUEST SPEAKERS ON PROPOSED NEW PLANNING SYSTEM: 7.30PM TO 8.30PM

13. Present Shane Rattenbury MLA, Rebecca Vassarotti MLA
Apology Rachel Stephen-Smith MLA

14. Presentation on District Strategies and the New Territory Plan by Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate officials. Ben Ponton Director-General and Matthew Kamarul, Project Director

Ben Ponton spoke to the presentation. He highlighted that tonight's presentation was not a detailed workshop on content but rather talking about key concepts. Points made included:

- it was important to develop the Planning Bill before the Territory Plan
- The Planning Bill, the Territory Plan and District Strategies are the three pillars of the new system
- Achieving as much flexibility as possible is being sought. They are trying to keep assessment requirements to the minimum. There are certain elements that are non negotiable assessment requirements that are quantitative.
- Outcomes focussed-less prescriptive. The aim is to promote greater flexibility, innovation, creativity and design excellence
- The District Strategies are lengthy. They toyed with stripping them back but they include a lot of data and analysis.
- They have identified 9 strategies and would like feedback on the boundaries including the East Strategy.
- Regarding the Territory Plan, in early engagement they found some provisions important to the local areas were also important to all Canberrans.
- An extract of the Inner South District Strategy provisions has been included in the Territory Plan.
- The proposed Territory Plan includes supporting material. They have moved away from Codes to Policies.
- They need to work more on the Design Guides to show people what a good outcome is. They will use community feedback.
- Moved away from Codes to District Policies. They would ask proponents to look at District Policies first for the areas they are developing their concept for, to think about the area and outcomes articulated in the policy. They want proponents to think about how their building will contribute to Canberra and the wellbeing of the Community.
- Zones have been retained.
- The Supporting report is a good summary of what has been included in this presentation.
- The presentation gave some suggestions as to what areas feedback could be provided on. These included: character of the Inner South in the context of a Growing Canberra; the proposed, possible and potential areas



of change, centres that are proposed for the first cabs off the rank. Not very much work has been done in the possible and potential areas. They would like feedback from communities about whether it is worth devoting more resources to these areas. See Slide 10.

- There are pop ups on 21 November.

15. Presentation by Richard Johnston, retired Urban Planner, President of Kingston and Barton Residents Group. Richard spoke to his paper. This is provided at [Attachment A](#).

16. Questions and Answers

The Chair commented that timing for consultation, with a deadline of 14 February, was not realistic and that the ISCCC would be talking to MLAs about the need for an extension of time.

Q. Why is ACTPLA proposing to remove Pre DA Consultation?

A. This was in response to feedback from the Community. The main reason was because it was outside legislation. We are free to have pre DA consultation reinstated if this is suggested by feedback.

Q. How are you going to deal with and mitigate the urban heat island effect?

A. The Bill talks about climate strategies. They flow through to the District Strategies and the Territory Plan. We are looking at how this can be dealt with at the Precinct level.

Q. Why doesn't the new ACT Planning Bill mention the Environment in the Object?

A. There are relevant references in sections under the Object, but feel free to make a submission on the concerns.

Q. It is still not defined how outcome focused is going to be assessed.

A. It is qualitative. It is a requirement that it is to be consistent with the Design Guides.

Q. Has consultation taken place with the First Nations people?

A. Yes, consultation is ongoing with relevant groups.

Q. Who is going to regulate the regulator? It appears that there are going to be a lot of discretionary decisions.

A. This is not complete discretion. There is a lot of detail in the Design Guides. There are still third party rights of review that will require an amendment to legislation.

Q. In Empire Circuit, Forrest, there is a plan to build a multi-unit development in a RZ1 zone.

A. Not across the details and not appropriate to comment on individual DAs.

The Chair commented it would be good for us to all get across the new zoning policy and what it means e.g Build to Rent will be permitted in RZ1.

Other Business

17. Close 8.30pm



THE ACT PLANNING BILL Sept. 2022, DRAFT ISC DISTRICT STRATEGY AND TERRITORY PLAN –
Comments by Richard Johnston 8.11.22

THE PLANNING BILL 2022

I'm a qualified architect and town planner and very experienced in statutory planning work in the ACT including the last time the planning legislation and Territory Plan was comprehensively overhauled in the 'Noughties', after Labor got back into power.

The result of that work (*Planning & Development Act 2007* and *Territory Plan 2008*) was in my view overly complicated and I have always supported simplifying the planning system where appropriate.

However, in my view all this new stuff is MUCH WORSE.

In my detailed analysis of the *Planning Bill* (which I am submitting to the PTCS Committee Inquiry) I noted that the government's own *ACT Planning Review and Reform Working Series Listening report (17 December 2021)* identified three 'key feedback themes', which were said to be 'consistently prominent' across the four 'stakeholder' meetings:

1. **"Confidence, certainty and clarity"** – "important to both community and industry",
"Clear rules and processes are preferred"
2. **"Trust and transparency"** – "Building trust in the planning system should be a priority",
"Transparency across the planning system, including decision making, was valued by all participants"
3. **"Consultation"** – "Community consultation is an important aspect of restoring trust in planning system"

There is NOTHING in the Bill that responds to these three 'key feedback themes'. *Clear rules and processes* are abandoned, in favour of nebulous '*desired outcomes*' with no *certainty*.

There is NO improvement in *transparency*. Planning decisions will continue to be made behind closed doors, by the planning authority. The Legislative Assembly retains minimal oversight, generally only over Territory Plan variations on which it MAY conduct (no doubt under-



resourced) 'Inquiries'. It is given NO role in regard to the Strategic Plan or District Strategies or the 'Draft Design Guides', 'Draft Technical Specifications' and 'Draft District Specifications', which are provisions removed from the Draft Territory Plan.

Community consultation provisions are still poor. There is now a statement of nine 'considerations' listed in the Bill – but these are much inferior to other well established 'consultation principles'. Unlike these, the Bill seeks to 'balance' *community views* with those of *other stakeholders* (eg. developers?). And, the Bill STILL REMOVES the current requirement for 'Pre-DA Community Consultation', supposedly because it "wasn't working".

All this seems to reflect the current planning authority's disinterest in *Building (or restoring) trust in the planning system*. Perhaps it also reflects the current government's apparent disregard for proper, open processes?

BUT one of the most alarming aspects of the Bill is the way it strips out virtually all requirements about the CONTENT of the territory plan.

Section 48 of the Bill says the territory plan is to set out "*the policy **outcomes** to be achieved by the plan; and requirements and **outcomes** against which development proposals are assessed.*" Nothing about zones including objectives, development tables and codes, as currently required.

In assessing a DA the decision-maker is required (s.183) to consider: "*(a) any applicable desired outcomes in the territory plan*". No mention of being "consistent with the relevant code" and the "objectives for the zone". How can the community, the ACAT, or even an applicant, deal with this?

This all seems to be designed to give the planning authority enormous discretion in crafting the Territory Plan and dealing with development proposals, while limiting the ability of the community to comment on compliance with clearly defined "rules and criteria".

But, as we have heard, a whole bunch of new planning documents have just been released (early November) for public comment over the summer holiday period.

DRAFT DISTRICT STRATEGIES



The *Draft Inner South District Strategy* appears at first sight to be a very substantial document, running to 156 pages. However, on closer examination, only a relatively small part of the document specifically relates to the Inner South Canberra District.

In fact they give the game away because there is a separate 4 PAGE 'SUMMARY' which seems to include most of the content for the Inner South.

[SUMMARY p.1] *"The Strategy is a vision for how we live, work, play and care for community in the Inner South."*

[SUMMARY p.2] There are "5 big drivers" (oddly, not the same as the 5 'themes' from the current *ACT Planning Strategy*) with 9 "Directions for Inner South". There is very little in the 'Directions' about "how we live" (eg. housing and neighbourhood character), but THREE references to 'light rail'.

[SUMMARY p.4] "a full list of the initiatives for the Inner South" – 30 in all. A lot of these are probably OK, but again little discussion about housing and neighbourhood character and the very last 'initiative' includes: *"contribute to meeting district demand, including infill development around the future light rail corridor where appropriate."*

[Contrast this with the ISCCC's *Inner South Canberra District Planning Strategy 2021 – 28* pages and 96 specific *PROPOSED ACTIONS*.]

However, the *Draft Inner South District Strategy* is not a 'statutory' document, ie. not part of the Territory Plan. Could it just be a vehicle to push the government's political agenda, eg. on light rail and urban intensification?

A fairly small part of the *District Strategy* is distilled into *DISTRICT POLICIES*, which are *Part D* of the *Draft Territory Plan*.

DRAFT TERRITORY PLAN

The current Territory Plan 2008 seems cumbersome enough, but it's reasonably straightforward and at least we are familiar with it! It consists of zones (with 'objectives'), associated Development Codes, Precinct Codes and General Codes, all with both 'rules' (only a few 'mandatory') and 'criteria'.

The new *Draft Territory Plan*, which is supposed to be simpler and clearer, is anything but! Its primary components are:



- **District Policies** – contain “Policy outcomes” which are said to be “derived from the Inner South District Strategy”. [There are **ONLY 8 “desired policy outcomes”**, incl. “**Deliver Stage 2B of the light rail.”**]

District Policies also include “Assessment requirements”. These are “mandatory development controls for specific areas”. [They are probably derived from the ‘rules’ in relevant Precinct Codes. But: “**Localities that are not listed do not have assessment requirements.**”]

They also include “Assessment Outcomes”. [These are qualitative but only cover limited areas, and are presumably derived from ‘criteria’ in the relevant Precinct Codes.

They refer to:

“1.the stated policy outcomes [presumably those from section 1.3?]”

“2.the applicable design guides (Urban Design Guide and/or Housing Design Guide)”

“13.the assessment outcomes in the following table.” [64 in all!]

- **ZONE POLICIES** [eg. “RESIDENTIAL ZONES POLICY”. Contains:
 - Land Use Table
 - Policy Outcomes
 - Assessment requirements
 - Assessment outcomes [includes rather vaguely worded references to the ‘Urban Design Guide’ and the ‘Housing Design Guide’]
- **OTHER POLICIES** - “Other policies are necessary to guide the orderly development of land in the ACT.” [The only policies apparently available at this stage are for ‘Subdivision’ and ‘Lease Variation’.]
- **Supporting material**

“Supporting materials **do not form part of the Territory Plan** but may be ‘called up’ by policies within the Territory Plan.” [These are mentioned under some “Assessment Outcomes” but not others. Their status in development assessment seems very unclear.] There are ‘Draft Design Guides’, ‘Draft Technical Specifications’ and ‘Draft District Specifications’, apparently containing the residual ‘rules’ and ‘criteria’ from the current CODES.



Draft Design Guides

“1.PURPOSE OF EXPLANATION OF INTENDED EFFECTS”

[This, and the following sections about Draft Design Guides, (36 pages) I found almost completely unintelligible.]

“5.KEY COMPONENTS OF HOUSING DESIGN GUIDE”

“Proposed Design Criteria” and “Intended Effect” under 5 ‘THEMES’ [6 pages of general waffle, with repeated references to “higher density urban living”]

Draft Technical Specifications

TS1 – RESIDENTIAL

[Appears to contain a lot of the ‘rules’ from the current Residential Codes, but these are no longer to be part of the territory plan, so cannot be reviewed by the Assembly or relied on by the community.]

There are 7 other draft Technical Specifications for different kinds of development.

Draft District Specifications

DS4 - INNER SOUTH

“The following district specifications could be referred to when demonstrating compliance with the Territory Plan.” [Unfortunately most suburbs have the note: “There are no specific development and site controls for this locality.”]

This all seems to me to be incredibly complex, confusing, unclear, and biased against proper engagement of the ACT community. A fundamental omission from the information available is a supporting report, such as would be required for a “major plan amendments”, under section 59 of the Planning Bill. Such a report should identify specifically what changes are being made to the current Territory Plan and why. Conveniently, and no doubt deliberately, the ‘Transitional’ arrangements under the Planning Bill (s.605) omit division 5.2.2 which contains section 59. Without a detailed supporting report no-one (possibly except for the planning authority) has any hope of fully understanding what changes are being proposed and why.

On the face of it the draft Territory Plan just takes the current one and moves all the bits around. It still has a whole bunch of quantitative controls (ie. ‘rules’) – SO WHAT EXACTLY IS THE POINT OF ALL THIS?