

## CASE STUDIES (CURRENT & PROPOSED TERRITORY PLAN)

This slide shows the components of the Territory Plan, both **CURRENT** and **PROPOSED**, which are relevant to **DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT**.

In order to understand how this may work, I have done three **CASE STUDIES** based on current DAs I have recently assessed. These are:

1. A three-unit 'supportive housing' development in RZ1 Zone Griffith
2. Two 4 storey apartment buildings in RZ5 Zone Griffith
3. 4 storey commercial building in CZ2 Zone Kingston

I won't have time to go through all these, but my summary of this is:

### CASE STUDY #1:

The **CURRENT 'Griffith Precinct Map & Code'** applies, but this is quite brief and there are no relevant controls.

Under the **DRAFT PLAN**, you have to wade through **37 PAGES** of the '**INNER SOUTH DISTRICT POLICY**' (maps and 'Land use table', 'Policy outcomes', 'Assessment requirements', 'Assessment outcomes' and 'Development compliance provisions'.) Having done all that there appears to be **NOTHING** relevant to this proposal.

I note however that 'Development compliance provisions' states: "Where a proposed development complies with a relevant provision in the **TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS** and a **TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION** comprehensively addresses the outcome [um, which 'outcome'?), further assessment regarding those specific provisions will not be required". This is really weird, as these **TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS** are 'SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS', sitting outside the Plan and apparently able to be **VARIED AT WILL** by the planning authority

There are eight **TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS**. The only one relevant to this proposal appears to be **TS1 RESIDENTIAL (28 PAGES)**. Apparently a whole lot of 'rules' from the **CURRENT RESIDENTIAL CODES** – but **NOTHING ABOUT SOLAR ACCESS (to living rooms) or PRIVATE OPEN SPACE (minimum dimensions).** **AND THESE CAN BE USED TO AVOID FURTHER ASSESSMENT!**

There are also **DISTRICT SPECIFICATIONS** [Not referred to in the Draft Plan?]. Apparently nothing relevant to this proposal, but again they say they can be

used to avoid further assessment [eg. 'Demonstration housing' on a specific site in Forrest and the 'Manor House' in Griffith].

Most of my assessment in CASE STUDY 1 was done under the RZ1 SUBURBAN ZONE provisions and the *MULTI UNIT HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CODE*. 'PART E1: RESIDENTIAL ZONES POLICY' from the DRAFT PLAN would apply.

The current Residential Zone 'OBJECTIVES' have been roughly translated across into the proposed 'ZONE POLICIES – POLICY OUTCOMES'. But note that the current Zone Objectives contain the wording: "predominantly single dwelling" and "Protect the character of established single dwelling housing areas". The proposed 'Policy outcomes' OMIT THOSE WORDS.

Under the current *MULTI UNIT HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CODE* the critical provisions for this proposal were: PRIVATE OPEN SPACE, PLANTING AREA, CANOPY COVER, SOLAR ACCESS and CAR PARKING (to be consistent with the *desired character*, eg. no parking in the *front zone*). The only reference to these important matters in the DRAFT PLAN appears to be under the rather vaguely worded 'ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES', which refer you to another SUPPORTING DOCUMENT, the *HOUSING DESIGN GUIDE*, which unfortunately is not yet available for public scrutiny [WILL IT EVER BE?]

Again, the 'development compliance provisions' contain the same references as above to *TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS*.

I think you would agree that all this seems incredibly cumbersome and difficult to navigate. [What ever happened to Ben Ponton's boast of reducing the Territory Plan to ONE PAGE?]

Similar concerns apply in my other CASE STUDIES, notably:

CASE STUDY #2 [RZ5]:

The current ZONE OBJECTIVE "d) Ensure development and redevelopment is carefully managed so that it achieves a high standard of residential amenity [etc] is OMITTED, to be replaced by POLICY OUTCOME: "The fundamental desired outcome for the RZ5 zone is to facilitate development or redevelopment of sites to achieve high density housing" [ie. the MORE THE BETTER and damn the consequences?]

**CASE STUDY #3 [CZ2]:**

**I have lots of questions over the wording of the 'ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES'.  
I intend to put all those into my submission on the DRAFT TERRITORY PLAN.**