

Draft New Territory Plan and Inner South District Strategy
Implications for inner south residents
ISCCC Public Forum 7 February 2023

Reports from Breakout Groups

Griffith and Narrabundah – Group 1

- The rapid transit bus routes need to go through all the shopping centres, but especially Red Hill and they need to have greater consultation with the community and bus users in developing timetables and plotting routes.
- Further development is increasing the heat island.
- The new territory plan must be objective, must be measurable. There needs to be a right of appeal, it needs to be transparent, evidence based, it needs to have a level of compliance, it needs to be assessable, it needs to have a community focus and it has to be designed for the change in climate.
- There is a need to ensure that heritage is maintained across the Inner South.
- The group does not want to see further expansion of RZ 2 areas and wants RZ 1 to remain in its current form with its current definitions.
- The group doesn't want any 'yellow' urban infill in Griffith. It is considered that Griffith has already given a lot of urban infill.
- Old Narrabundah urban infill needs to comply with urban design for climate change.
- New developments must include public housing.
- The group raises the questions "How will the ACT government transparently measure community consultation? How will we know that we have been heard? What weight will be given to the government's draft legislation and how will this occur? How will they give feedback to the community?"
- The ACT government needs to use the ISCCC's Inner South District plan for planning matters and neighbours must be able to have a say on knock down rebuilds.
- Non complying certifiers must be held accountable.

Griffith and Narrabundah-Group 2

- If the government wants comments on this, they need to produce maps which people can read and understand. The diagrams are very vague.
- The new plan seems to totally ignore concerns that people have about the existing plan, for example about knock down/ rebuilds.
- If there are no planning rules that are incorporated in the plan and legally enforceable, it's just a waste of time. It will be a free-for-all creating planning free zones.
- The question was raised "How do we influence the government?" It seems to be that there is no way to genuinely influence the government.
- The new plan seems to ignore climate change. There's no requirement for passive solar orientation in any new developments. There is weak support for more trees, but less than

hoped and less than was in the draft legislation. There are no requirements for solar panels, or electric car recharging points etc.

Kingston and Barton

- Focused on particular issues in Kingston and Barton.
- The future of the Canberra Railway Station is very critical to sensible planning in the whole East Lake urban renewal area. It is not something that seems to be given any priority at the moment.
- Another specific issue is planning for EV charging, particularly for apartment buildings. It is understood that the government is going to give some subsidies, possibly starting this year, for individual apartment buildings to provide charging facilities. But there are all sorts of questions about this in practice. Is there enough electricity supply to the area to satisfy what could be a pretty major increasing demand? Where are the charging facilities to be placed? The apartment buildings aren't designed to cope with these for general use.
- Open Space is an issue of concern. If Kingston and Barton are to grow substantially in population, there is going to be a need for more open space.
- There is a need to protect Jerrabomberra Wetlands as a major metropolitan scale resource.
- Improving vehicle access to the area is necessary if there is going to be more development in the area. Roads are already under much strain. There are no specific provisions in the draft strategy. What is planned, for example, for the intersection of Canberra Avenue and Majura Parkway, which is a complete mess at the moment?
- There will be a substantial need for new and improved access roads for East Lake. There is nothing in the draft strategy about that.
- There are questions around the removal of the causeway substation. This is related to the broader issues around the East Lake development. There is concern about where the new underground cables are going to go and what impact that will have on the Jerrabomberra Wetlands.
- The government is reducing the number of car spaces available in buildings. There is a need for improved public transport in the urban renewal areas.

Red Hill

- There is difficulty with the time allowed to provide comments. The 3 March deadline is very early given the community was only asked in November 2022.
- The government is not providing full information for consultation. The maps are tiny. How can they be used and interpreted. Ministers should be upfront explaining these things and addressing community needs.
- If the overriding guidance is community, it has been overlooked.
- The community includes the future community who would perhaps be the younger generation who would like more residences and the group is respectful of that.
- At the same time, liveable suburbs require good quality built environment and green open space. We need to be respectful of nature and heritage. The government has not addressed community concerns on this matter.

- There is a need for genuine First Nations consultation.
- The public green space and the private green spaces all contribute to that green space. The dual occupancies reduce that private green space opportunity. Could we rethink the Government's proposed reduction from 30% to 24% planting area on residential blocks and argue that that's not compatible with the climate change issues that we're facing?
- Car park requirements in Red Hill are an issue. The Red Hill shops are already full.
- There are random proposed high density hot spots in the Government's Sustainable Neighbourhoods map (Fig 36 in Draft District Strategy). There is a high-density blob above Nelson Park.
- The setback 'promises' were not kept in the Parks development.
- The community is the whole of Canberra. How can these blocks be randomly selected? What is the formula? Who is making decisions?
- The group wants an "evening out" (balancing out) of areas/blocks for high density.
- It appears that developers can now make their own rules.
- There is a concern about the infill increasing noise levels
- The Parks Development comprises 3% land with 20% residences. The colours on the Government's available maps spread the high-density opportunities.

Oaks Estate

- Oaks Estate residents want to be part of the Inner South District.
- Oaks Estate is already a forgotten part of Canberra.
- Oaks Estate has significant heritage sites and value to wider Canberra.
- There was no consultation at the consultation workshop RMC. It was a sales pitch only.
- There is a call for more free bulk billing medical practices and walk-ins.

Deakin, Forrest and Yarralumla

- The hallmark of this process is that it is developer driven and to increase income for the ACT Government, it's not community driven.
- There is a total lack of readable maps to be used to make reasonable comment. The maps are not sufficiently detailed at the street level. People can't understand what these maps mean for them and can't have a sensible debate.
- There is no rationale for the areas identified as urban core, urban centre and general urban. What are the criteria?
- What does investigation area mean in practice and when are we likely to get clarity on this.
- The community has no faith in ACTPLA to make decisions in the interests of the community.
- There is a need for more detailed requirements for development to reduce the level of discretion for ACTPLA.

- Technical requirements should not be outside the plan. They need to go into the legislation and be measurable and transparent especially on the controversial area of knock down and rebuilds.
- Solar access is critical to a liveable house.
- When approvals are done, they need to be done in a reasonable time frame.
- The maps don't show what is already happening in all the various zones and where there is already overdevelopment or existing facilities.
- It was noted that in heritage areas a residence cannot be varied but can be pulled down.
- There is a real concern that government is acting as if the new plan is already in place with the current decisions being taken on developments outside the rules.
- There is a great demand for townhouses rather than high-rise. Preference was expressed that developments outside RZ 1, should be for townhouses and not high-rise developments.
- Residents feel that the government is not listening.

Heritage

- The challenge is to protect heritage in the context of the government's wish to intensify.
- The definition of heritage does cover the built environment, not solely environmental. The view is that the documentation relates principally to environmental heritage. The group feels very strongly that the built heritage is an extremely important part of heritage.
- The heritage register and its future needs to be decided and carefully considered.
- The current heritage rules, in the group's opinion, are excellent. They're clear, professional, and comprehensive. There are very good rules and legislation, very professionally done, very clear and admirable, and they should be maintained.
- In addition to proper oversight of the current heritage rules, the group favours the preservation of the streetscape and character of the heritage precincts. The most important element of heritage areas is the streetscape and the character of these precincts as one moves around them.
- Retaining a proper permeable surface minimum ratio is essential.
- Improving buyer awareness of heritage areas amicably is a high priority.
- There is a plea for a helpful, sympathetic heritage unit to work amicably and promptly with buyers.