



Australian Government
National Capital Authority

Consultation Report

Draft Amendment 86 Revised National Capital Plan (incorporating Draft Amendment 85 West Belconnen Urban Development)

April 2016

Contents

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 1 | Introduction..... | 4 |
| 1.1 | Purpose of report | 4 |
| 1.2 | Background to the National Capital Plan review and Draft Amendment 86 | 4 |
| 1.3 | Structure of report | 5 |
| 2 | Public consultation on draft amendments..... | 6 |
| 2.1 | National Capital Plan amendment process | 6 |
| 2.2 | Public consultation on Draft Amendment 85..... | 6 |
| 2.3 | Public consultation on Draft Amendment 86..... | 7 |
| 3 | Key Issues | 9 |
| 3.1 | Draft Amendment 85..... | 9 |
| 3.1.1 | Cross border jurisdiction | 9 |
| 3.1.2 | Environment | 9 |
| 3.1.3 | Murrumbidgee River and Ginninderra Falls | 11 |
| 3.1.4 | Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces..... | 11 |
| 3.1.5 | Urban consolidation | 12 |
| 3.2 | Draft Amendment 86..... | 13 |
| 3.2.1 | CSIRO Ginninderra | 13 |
| 3.2.2 | Block 10 Section 13 Forrest | 14 |
| 3.2.3 | Anzac Park East and West | 16 |
| 3.2.4 | East and West Blocks..... | 17 |
| 3.2.5 | Land title in the ACT | 18 |
| 3.2.6 | Heritage | 19 |
| 3.2.7 | Technical matters | 20 |
| 4 | Recommended changes | 22 |
| 5 | Conclusion | 25 |
| 6 | Attachments | 26 |
| | Attachment A – Canberra Times public notices for Draft Amendments 85 and 86..... | 27 |
| | Attachment B – Commonwealth of Australia Gazette notices for Draft Amendment 86 | 29 |
| | Attachment C – List of stakeholders for Draft Amendment 86..... | 30 |
| | Attachment D – Summary of submissions to Draft Amendment 85..... | 33 |
| | Attachment E – Summary of submissions to Draft Amendment 86 | 41 |

Attachment F – Schedule of changes 160

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of report

The National Capital Plan (the Plan) is the strategy and blueprint giving effect to the Commonwealth's interests and intentions for planning, designing and developing Canberra and the Territory. The National Capital Authority (NCA) is responsible for administering the Plan for the Australian Government.

One of NCA's functions is to keep the Plan under constant review and propose amendments to it when necessary. The NCA undertakes public consultation on Draft Amendments to the Plan including submitting a copy of the Draft Amendment to the Territory planning authority and publishing a notice in a principal daily newspaper circulating in the Territory.

This report summarises the issues raised during the public consultation process undertaken by the National Capital Authority (NCA) for both Draft Amendment 85 – West Belconnen Urban Development (Draft Amendment 85) and Draft Amendment 86 – Revised National Capital Plan (Draft Amendment 86).

Draft Amendment 85 proposed to alter the land uses of West Belconnen from Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces and Broadacre Areas, to Urban Areas to facilitate urban development. A reconfiguration of the Murrumbidgee River Corridor was also proposed.

Draft Amendment 86 was the culmination of the first stage of a comprehensive review of the Plan and proposed a series of changes, primarily to the format and structure of the document but also some policy change. Draft Amendment 86 included the changes to the Plan as proposed by Draft Amendment 85.

To simplify the approvals process the NCA elected to combine the two proposals. The NCA sought consideration of Draft Amendment 86 only by the Minister for Territories, Local Government and Major Projects as it encompassed the changes to the Plan as proposed by Draft Amendment 85.

1.2 Background to the National Capital Plan review and Draft Amendment 86

The NCA is undertaking a reform process to update the Plan and to amend the planning arrangements between the Australian and ACT Governments. The Plan has not been holistically reviewed since it came into effect in 1990. The Plan reform is intended to achieve four key outcomes:

1. Create a revised and modernised National Capital Plan.
2. Amend metropolitan planning arrangements to provide greater flexibility to the ACT Government to accommodate the growth of Canberra.
3. Reduce duplication and complexity in planning.
4. Ensure continued Commonwealth interest in areas identified as having the special characteristics of the National Capital.

The work has focused on streamlining the shared responsibilities and interests of the Australian and ACT Governments.

In June 2015, the NCA released an Exposure Draft of a revised Plan that proposed key changes relating to:

- the structure and format of the document
- metropolitan planning (matters such as urban form, land use, transport and infrastructure)
- areas identified as having special characteristics of the National Capital (Designated Areas)
- areas where there is a high level of Commonwealth interest but where the detailed planning role is shared between the National Capital Authority and ACT Government (Special Requirements).

The NCA initially prepared an Exposure Draft of the revised Plan to enable discussions with stakeholders outside statutory processes. The NCA sought to understand the public's views before starting the statutory process to amend the Plan.

Key issues raised during public consultation on the Exposure Draft of the Plan related to:

- broad policy matters such as the expression of national interest and national significance, changes to the urban areas of Canberra and the identification of potential future urban areas, and heritage
- the format and structure of the document
- changes to the planning arrangements between the NCA and ACT Government, including the extent of Special Requirements and Designated Areas
- specific policy matters such as those relating to diplomatic missions, Lake Burley Griffin, and building heights.

Public feedback on the Exposure Draft of the Plan informed a number of changes to the revised Plan as proposed by Draft Amendment 86. Key changes in response to public comment related to land use, the General Policy Plan – Metropolitan Canberra, additional governance arrangements for certifying land use proposals, and reinstatement of Special Requirements for Haig and Telopea Parks.

1.3 Structure of report

From this point onwards, the report is structured as follows:

- Part Two outlines the consultation process undertaken for each draft amendment
- Part Three summarises the issues raised during the consultation period on each draft amendment
- Part Four outlines the recommended changes to Draft Amendment 86 as a result of consultation on both Draft Amendments 85 and 86.
- Part Five concludes the report
- Attachments as relevant to each proposal (and which are referred to throughout the body of the report where appropriate).

2 Public consultation on draft amendments

This section outlines the general process for amendments to the Plan, and separately outlines the process undertaken for Draft Amendment 85 and for Draft Amendment 86.

2.1 National Capital Plan amendment process

The process for amendments to the Plan is outlined in **Table 1**.



Table 1 - National Capital Plan amendment process

2.2 Public consultation on Draft Amendment 85

The NCA's consultation process for Draft Amendment 85 ran concurrently with the process conducted by the ACT Government's Environment and Planning Directorate (EPD) for Draft Territory Plan Variation 351 (DV351). Draft Amendment 85 defined the broad land uses for West Belconnen, while DV351 defined detailed land use and planning provisions.

EPD separately prepared a consultation report addressing matters related to DV351 and the Territory Plan.

On 22 May 2015, Draft Amendment 85 and DV351 were released for public comment. A media release was provided to media outlets on 21 May 2015 advising Draft Amendment 85 and DV351 were open for public consultation. Notice was published in the Canberra Times on 23 May 2015 ([Attachment A](#)).

In accordance with the NCA's 'Commitment to Community Engagement (February 2015)' the period for public comment ran for 30 business days, concluding on 6 July 2015.

The NCA wrote to the following stakeholders advising of release of Draft Amendment 85:

Consultation Report – Draft Amendment 86 (incorporating Draft Amendment 85) (April 2016) Page 6 of 164

- Surrounding lease holders
- West Belconnen Residents' Association
- ACT Property Council
- Walter Burley Griffin Society
- Belconnen Pony Club
- Capital Landscape Group
- Ginninderra Catchment Group
- Ginninderra Falls Association
- Yass Valley Council
- Australian Chamber of Commerce
- ACT & Region Chamber of Commerce
- Canberra Business Council
- Belconnen Magpies Sports Club
- Master Builders Association
- Strathnairn Arts Association
- Pace Farms.

NCA and EPD representatives conducted a joint public information session. This session attracted around 20 attendees.

A single point for submission of comments to Draft Amendment 85 and DV351 was established for the public consultation period. Submissions were collated based on the relevance of subject matter to the separate NCA and EPD processes.

On 2 July 2015, the NCA referred Draft Amendment 85 to the Office of Best Practice Regulation. On the same day, the Office of Best Practice Regulation advised no Regulation Impact Statement would be required.

2.3 Public consultation on Draft Amendment 86

On 1 October 2015, Draft Amendment 86 was released for public comment. Consultation activities undertaken met the requirements of the *Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988* (the Act) and the NCA's 'Commitment to Community Engagement (February 2015)'.

A media release was provided to media outlets on 1 October 2015 advising Draft Amendment 86 was open for public consultation. Notices were published in the Canberra Times on 1 October 2015 ([Attachment A](#)) and in the Commonwealth of Australia Gazette on 30 September 2015 ([Attachment B](#)).

In accordance with the NCA's 'Commitment to Community Engagement (February 2015)' the period for public comment ran for 30 business days, concluding on 13 November 2015.

The NCA wrote to 88 stakeholders from government and the community advising of release of Draft Amendment 86, and invited stakeholders to briefing sessions. The list of stakeholders who received notification is at [Attachment C](#).

NCA representatives conducted two open information sessions for members of the public. Each of these sessions attracted around 15 attendees.

The NCA invited the public to have their say in one or more of the following ways:

- Attending a public information session
- Contributing to the discussion online by joining an online forum
- Emailing comments
- Writing to the NCA's Chief Planner.

3 Key Issues

3.1 Draft Amendment 85

The public consultation process for Draft Amendment 85 and DV351 attracted 49 written submissions, with 23 of these identified as relevant to Draft Amendment 85. Submissions relevant to Draft Amendment 85 were those directly addressed to the NCA and/or those addressing the process of Draft Amendment 85 and its effect on the Plan. All submissions were acknowledged by EPD, who coordinated the receipt of submissions for the joint consultation process.

A summary of the key issues raised during the public consultation process and the NCA's response are outlined below. Issues that are not identified in this report are addressed in the ACT Government's report for DV351.

A summary of each submission relevant to Draft Amendment 85 is at [Attachment D](#). Submissions to DV351 are addressed in EPD's Consultation Report.

3.1.1 Cross border jurisdiction

Issue

Submitters outlined a number of potential jurisdictional issues should the West Belconnen area cross into New South Wales. A number of questions were raised in relation to how residents in the NSW area would be serviced by the ACT Government and how these services would be paid for by Yass Valley Council and the NSW Government.

A number of submitters suggested that developing over the border gives the NCA and ACT Government little control over the practical urban boundary. It was argued that the current system with its large buffer to the ACT/NSW border gives the ACT control over its urban edge, as opposed to leaving the decision to Yass Valley council and the NSW Government.

NCA response

The management of cross-jurisdictional issues between the ACT Government, NSW Government and Yass Valley Council are a matter for those agencies. However, the NCA understands that a cross border coordination committee has been established in anticipation of the first possible cross border development expected to occur in around 10 years' time. Further information on this matter is available in the ACT Government's Consultation Report for DV351.

In terms of the 'practical urban boundary' proposed for the West Belconnen urban area, the proposed urban development will be naturally contained by the Murrumbidgee River, a range of hills immediately to the north and the hills and ranges beyond the Murrumbidgee to the west. The landscape buffer formed by the river, the creek and the hills will ensure sufficient control beyond the practical urban boundary. Further commentary on this matter is provided in 3.1.4 – Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces.

3.1.2 Environment

Issue

A number of environmental issues were raised regarding protected flora and fauna on the subject site. One comment advised that the Superb Parrot and Little Eagle utilise large areas of the landscape as feeding territory and urban development at West Belconnen will reduce the area available for this purpose. This may potentially lead to a reduction or shift in these bird populations. The comment went further to indicate that the existing Broadacre land use designation is appropriate for the area as it abuts a major river system and movement corridor for animals and birds.

Submitters raised concern regarding the future alignment of Ginninderra Drive to service the West Belconnen urban development, noting that the road may have negative impacts on Golden Sun Moth habitat.

One commenter suggested that the 'ragged edge' of the proposed urban area provides a smaller area to perimeter ratio which increases edge effects between the urban area and river corridor. Edge effects are defined as the negative influence of a habitat edge on interior conditions of a habitat, or on a species that use interior habitat. Edge effects include weed infestation, pests and could mean vehicle parking and rubbish dumping. It was suggested the urban edge be as smooth as possible to limit edge effects.

NCA response

A total of six bird surveys were conducted between 2008 and 2013 which included targeted surveys for Superb Parrot and Little Eagle. The resulting report was included in the supporting documentation for DV351.

The report found that the Superb Parrot was not breeding in the ACT project area with the woodland in the south used as they move southward to their breeding area. The report identified a Little Eagle nest tree and foraging territory which has resulted in provision of a 200 metre buffer around the nest tree.

The Superb Parrot is listed as Vulnerable under both the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (1999)* (EPBC Act) and the *Nature Conservation Act 2014* (ACT) (NC Act). The Little Eagle is listed as Vulnerable under the NC Act but not the EPBC Act.

The EPBC Act and NC Act ensure consideration of environmentally sensitive matters. It is understood that detailed Territory land use provisions have taken environmental concerns into account. As the site contains species and ecological communities that are listed under Commonwealth and Territory legislation a strategic assessment under part 10 of the EPBC Act will be undertaken. The strategic assessment will run separately to the Plan, the Territory Plan and the Yass Valley Shire Local Environment Plan processes.

Studies for Golden Sun Moth habitat have been undertaken and found that 'it is unlikely that the Golden Sun Moth occurs in the ACT project area'. These studies form part of the supporting material for DV351. Further information is available in the ACT Government's Consultation Report for DV351.

The 'ragged edge' of the reconfigured Murrumbidgee River corridor is defined by detailed environmental studies for the site. The urban edge specified in DA85 allows flexibility for detailed land use provisions to be defined by the Territory Plan. The detailed land use provisions specified by DV351 aim to complement the environmentally significant areas. One example is

the establishment of PRZ1 – Urban Open Space areas at the interface between the Murrumbidgee River corridor and the urban area.

3.1.3 Murrumbidgee River and Ginninderra Falls

Issue

A focus of public comment during the consultation period regarded the ongoing protection of the Murrumbidgee River, Ginninderra Creek and Ginninderra Falls. Numerous submitters outlined their support for the reconfigured Murrumbidgee River Corridor. A number of comments specified a desired protection corridor of 300 metres from the Ginninderra Creek and Murrumbidgee River waterways.

Some submitters outlined the need to protect Ginninderra Falls, and to include the falls in a new 'Ginninderra Gorges National Park'.

NCA response

Along with defining a new urban area for West Belconnen, Draft Amendment 85 proposed to redefine the Murrumbidgee River corridor to align with detailed environmental research which was included in the supporting documentation for DV351. The research has helped to define the habitat of the Pink-tailed Worm Lizard and an area of White Box-Yellow Box-Blakeley's Red Gum Grassy Woodland and Derived Native Grassland (grassy woodland). Both are matters of national environmental significance. The Pink-tailed Worm Lizard is listed as Vulnerable and grassy woodland is listed as Critically Endangered under the EPBC Act.

The definition of these areas has informed the reconfiguration of the Murrumbidgee River corridor in the Plan to protect both environmentally significant species and ecological communities. This reconfiguration has resulted in an additional 80 hectares of land within the Murrumbidgee River corridor within the ACT. Establishing a protective buffer of 300 metres within the ACT portion of the site for the Murrumbidgee River would result in a reduction in the River Corridor buffer proposed by Draft Amendment 85 which ranges from 433 metres to 1,583 metres.

Ginninderra Falls is located outside the ACT. The NCA is unable to influence treatments and detailed planning for Ginninderra Falls and those parts of the Ginninderra Creek which are situated in NSW. The parts of Ginninderra Creek within the West Belconnen project area located within the ACT have been kept within the Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces of the General Policy Plan – Metropolitan Canberra.

Discussions regarding a possible 'Ginninderra Gorges National Park' should be taken up with the appropriate NSW and Commonwealth authorities.

Further discussion regarding the Murrumbidgee River and Ginninderra Creek corridors are supplied in the ACT Government's Consultation Report for DV351.

3.1.4 Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces

Issue

Comments were received regarding the removal of parts of the Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces. It was stated that removal of the buffer between Belconnen and the NSW border will diminish

the NCA's control of the landscape features which give the National Capital its character and setting.

It was stated that this change could mean loss of the landscape setting should the NSW Government or Yass Valley Council decide to develop the area. One suggestion was received that the NSW Government should legislate protections of the hills and ridges to the west of the Murrumbidgee River and Ginninderra Creek corridors prior to proceeding with either Draft Amendment 85 or DV351.

Further comments outlined that the Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces for the area were being removed without sufficient replacement areas. It was also stated that the current buffer zone functions in accordance with the object of the Plan to preserve and enhance the landscape features which give the National Capital its character and setting.

NCA response

The policies of the National Capital Open Space System (NCOSS) seek to protect the '*nationally significant open space framework, visual backdrop and landscape setting for the National Capital*'. In the context of the National Capital landscape setting the existing western edge of the Belconnen urban area is not bound by any geographic features. The existing Hills, Ridges and Buffer Space does not comprise hills or ridges but is instead an administrative buffer between the ACT/NSW border and the Belconnen urban area.

The proposed development into NSW of the West Belconnen urban area is largely along a peninsula of land bordered to the west by the Murrumbidgee River and Ginninderra Creek. The proposal to extend the urban areas along this peninsula to the ACT/NSW border (and later, into NSW itself) is based on the intention that the containment of the urban areas described as a principle of the Plan is achieved by preservation of the hills and mountain range located to the west of the Murrumbidgee River.

The landscape buffer formed by the river, the creek and the hills and mountain range will enhance the rural bushland landscape setting of the National Capital. These areas in NSW have a rural character which is complimentary to the NCOSS in the ACT. The protection of the landscape setting from intensive development is assisted by the remoteness of the area to both Yass (by distance) and West Belconnen (separated by Murrumbidgee River and Ginninderra Creek corridors) making the area difficult to develop without large infrastructure costs. It is therefore deemed that further statutory controls for NSW in line with ACT legislation are unnecessary.

3.1.5 Urban consolidation

Issue

Submitters raised some concern regarding a perceived distortion to the form of the urban area of Belconnen proposed by Draft Amendment 85. It was stated that the West Belconnen area should be separated from Belconnen by a green belt extending from Strathnairn to the electrical substation and the pony club to retain visual geometry.

NCA response

The proposed urban area strengthens the landscape setting of the National Capital while removing the existing buffer space. The proposed urban area provides flexibility for the ACT

Government to zone the site according to safety, amenity and environmental considerations while respecting the National Capital landscape setting.

3.2 Draft Amendment 86

Fifty-one submissions were received in response to Draft Amendment 86. A summary of the key issues raised during the public consultation process and the NCA's response are outlined below. Each submission to Draft Amendment 86 is at [Attachment E](#).

3.2.1 CSIRO Ginninderra

Issue

Concern was raised in relation to the inclusion of the CSIRO Ginninderra field station within Urban Areas. In addition to submissions from individuals, the 'Concerned CSIRO (Ginninderra Field Station) Neighbours Group' provided a petition against the proposal signed by almost 380 people.

Key concerns raised in submissions related to the loss of open space and buffer between the urban areas of Belconnen and Gungahlin. Environmental matters, such as the presence of endangered species and habitats, and compromising ecological connectivity, were also cited as reasons to retain the land as open space.

Submissions asserted that the proposal is inconsistent with objectives and principles of the Plan, including those encouraging urban consolidation and limiting urban expansion, requiring emphasis of the national significance of Approach Routes, and maintaining the landscape character and setting of the National Capital.

A number of people expressed interest in seeing all completed studies determining the suitability of the land for urban development before the land is proclaimed as part of Urban Areas. These studies should include environmental investigations, and health and safety studies given the use of the land since CSIRO's establishment of operations on the site in 1958. Comparisons were made with the West Belconnen proposal, where the public was presented with a planning report and supporting technical studies to inform decision making.

Some submitters provided suggestions for alternative uses of the site, including creating a 'green' community asset by establishing walking trails in the area, and using the land for community/market gardens, wineries, nature reserves and village style development. Another suggestion was made that the site would be ideal for intensive food production to help enhance Canberra's food security and create a new industry which would bring diversification to the ACT economy.

The Canberra Region Aviators Association sought for land to be set aside to allow for the construction of a general aviation airport. The Association advised that this type of facility is not currently available in the ACT, and a second airport for Canberra would allow separation of scheduled jet transport traffic from general aviation activities.

Industry groups and some community groups, including the Housing Industry Association, Real Estate Institute of the Australian Capital Territory, ACT Shelter, and ACT Council of Social Service, expressed support for the change in land use for the CSIRO Ginninderra site.

Support from these groups was based on a number of factors including:

- the proximity of the site to existing infrastructure, employment and services, making it ideal for urban development
- increased land supply in the market may assist in meeting demand and improving housing affordability
- an increased population could support existing businesses and community groups
- economic benefits to the ACT economy through expenditure in the residential building sector.

Those in support of urban development on the CSIRO Ginninderra field station recognised that detailed design and master planning for the site would refine the proposal. This detailed work would result in environmental values of the site being protected, the provision of the types of recreational opportunities proposed by those objecting to the proposal, and objectives of the Plan being upheld.

The Belconnen Community Council supported the change, subject to CSIRO and the ACT Government reaching a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (or similar) to guide the development process. An MOU could address some of the concerns expressed by other sectors of the community such as the provision of infrastructure, the pace at which development occurs, land use, and areas for protection and conservation. The council also noted that a master planning exercise would be useful to express more detailed development intentions for the site.

NCA response

The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.

CSIRO has completed environmental studies, which include ecological investigations, sampling and analysis of soil, sediment, surface water and groundwater. Impacts on matters of national environmental significance may require referral under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. Other relevant studies have also been completed, and the final planning studies and supporting documentation is available on CSIRO's project website at www.ginninderraproject.com.au.

CSIRO has indicated that around 150 hectares of land is unlikely to be developable due to its topography, heritage and ecological values, and will remain as open space. Draft concept plans prepared for CSIRO's initial consultation with the community show large areas of land set aside for open space and nature reserves at the western end of the site, together with smaller parcels of land scattered throughout the site. Linear open spaces providing connectivity between the larger open space areas is also shown. CSIRO's draft concept plan is available on their project website at www.ginninderraproject.com.au.

The NCA has a particular interest in the Barton Highway Approach Route. An open space buffer between the Approach Route has been maintained (that is, the land will remain as Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces) and a visual impact analysis has been undertaken to assist in determining the approach to landscaping in this area. The Plan requires that a Development Control Plan be prepared to guide development on land adjacent to the Approach Route. A DCP will provide detailed requirements regarding matters such as landscape treatment and architectural quality in built form.

Although planning studies have identified the suitability of the CSIRO Ginninderra site for urban use, further detailed planning work will need to be undertaken to determine, for example, the location of infrastructure and services, housing mix, open space, and landscape principles. Industrial development in Canberra is primarily restricted to Hume, Mitchell and Fyshwick (with some industrial type uses in Bruce and West Belconnen); industrial development will not to be part of the land use mix on the CSIRO Ginninderra site.

The NCA does not support the use of this land as a general aviation airport.

The NCA notes support for the proposal to include the CSIRO Ginninderra site within Urban Areas. The benefits advocated by supporters may be realised pending the outcomes of future planning processes.

3.2.2 Block 10 Section 13 Forrest

Strong concern was raised by the Forrest School Parents and Citizens Association Inc. and a number of individuals (primarily those with children at the school) in regard to changing the land for Block 10 Section 13 Forrest from 'Community Facility' to a mixed use zoning. The following points supported arguments against changing the land use of the site:

- The Forrest Primary School out of school hours care, which engages children in outdoor and nature-based activities, currently uses the site for their 'Beyond the Fence' program and would like to continue this arrangement.
- Residents in nearby areas use the site for recreational purposes.
- Development of a hotel or serviced apartments may compromise child safety by introducing a transient population which overlooks the primary school and child care centre. Child safety may also be compromised by increased traffic, particularly those who exceed the current 40km/hour speed limit.
- Surrounding residential areas are experiencing an increase in population, which is likely to increase enrolments and demand for both the child care centre and Forrest Primary School. The site offers an opportunity for the existing education facilities to expand to cater for this demand.
- The site could be used for Deakin Preschool or Manuka Childcare Centre.
- Using the site for expanded education facilities and co-locating child care, preschool and primary school facilities has a number of benefits, including in relation to reducing the number of trips taken by families with multiple children and strengthening community engagement through continuity of association with the facilities.
- Accommodation options are already increasing throughout the area and further hotel/serviced apartments may not be necessary.
- Traffic congestion and parking problems, already evident in the area, are likely to be exacerbated by traffic generated by a hotel or serviced apartments. An assessment would need to be performed to determine traffic and parking impacts resulting from main vehicular access to Block 10 Section 13 Forrest being located off Hobart Avenue.
- There is currently no block separation between Block 10 Section 13 Forrest and adjacent school and child care sites. This raises concerns regarding student safety.
- Building setbacks need to be sufficient having regard to adjacent uses such as the school and child care centre.

- New buildings have the potential to overshadow the school's play areas and potentially some buildings.
- There are no design principles or controls for the sides facing the child care centre and the school. Controls around (for example) balconies facing the school should be considered.

NCA response

The detailed conditions of planning, design and development proposed for Block 10 Section 13 Forrest contain requirements relevant to traffic and parking, and privacy/overlooking, including the following:

- traffic and parking assessments are required to accompany development proposals for the site
- final vehicular access points will need to be agreed by the relevant authorities (Draft Amendment 86 sets out indicative locations only), with a requirement that access layout minimise traffic impact
- car parking must consider view lines and safety
- buildings are to be designed to ensure protection and amenity of surrounding buildings and public spaces, including privacy and overlooking
- landscaping to the rear of the site is to provide a substantial buffer that will afford privacy to those properties.

It should be noted that there is already capacity to develop Block 10 Section 13 Forrest without the changes proposed in Draft Amendment 86. Approval of Draft Amendment 86 proposes to permit Commercial Accommodation (Hotel or Serviced Apartment only), however also proposes to allow Residential or Diplomatic Mission on the site. A proponent may choose to develop one or more of these uses on the site.

The NCA is not responsible for determining whether Forrest Primary School should be expanded, or the relocation of child care centres.

Any works on Block 10 Section 13 Forrest will require Works Approval from the NCA. Major development, such as a new residential building or hotel on the site, will require public consultation in accordance with the NCA's 'Commitment to Community Engagement (August 2015)'. This will enable the community to provide comment at the detailed design stage.

3.2.3 Anzac Park East and West

Issue

Views both supporting and not supporting the proposed increase to building height for the Anzac Park East and West sites were received. The Commonwealth heritage values of the portal buildings as part of the Parliament House Vista were noted by a number of submitters and those opposing the change asserted that taller buildings would compromise the Parliament House Vista Extension and detract from the line of sight to the Australian War Memorial.

Submitters also suggested that given the significant location of the sites, the Australian Government should retain responsibility for the buildings. Disappointment was expressed regarding the current state of the buildings, in particular Anzac Park East.

The National Trust did not object to the increase in building height, but stressed the need for portal buildings to maintain a symmetrical and strong statement at the end of Anzac Parade.

No objection was received to the proposed change in land use for the Anzac Park East and West sites.

NCA response

The decision to divest East and West Blocks was made by the Australian Government following a scoping study process. Divestment will be subject to market testing and will further address the associated heritage and environmental issues, ensuring that adequate protections are in place. The NCA's role is to ensure that a planning framework is in place to guide potential future development on the sites.

Actions associated with the divestment and subsequent development of Anzac Park East and West may require referral under the EPBC Act. This process will assess proposed actions against relevant heritage values.

A change has been made to the way in which permitted building heights for Anzac Park East and West are expressed in the Plan. Draft Amendment 86 proposed a mandatory building height (of RL600) for the part of the site flanking Anzac Parade. The change means that permitted building heights are stated as a maximum (of RL600) and that this is contingent on heritage requirements. This provides for the eventuality that EPBC Act referral outcomes require buildings to be restricted to limits currently in place (approximately 25 metres).

The revised Plan includes provisions requiring detailed conditions of planning and design to be prepared to guide development of the sites. These conditions are to address such matters as built form and materials, heritage, landscape structure and open space, lighting, access and circulation. These conditions will respect the relevant built form features that contribute to heritage values, including the portal function provided by the buildings.

3.2.4 East and West Blocks

Issues

No objections to the change in land use for East and West Blocks were received; however submitters noted that the buildings need an active use (like East Block currently) that respects their heritage value. One submitter was unsure of the proposed uses for the two sites.

One objection was received in regard to leasing the blocks for private interest. It was asserted that this shows a disregard for the Parliamentary Zone.

NCA response

Draft Amendment 86 proposes to permit the following land uses for East and West Blocks: Commercial Accommodation (Hotel, Motel and Serviced Apartment), Community Use, National Association Office, National Capital Use, Office, Parliamentary Use, Place of Assembly; and ancillary uses of Café, Car Park, Child Care Centre, Consulting Rooms, Personal Services Establishment, Retail and Restaurants.

The East and West Block sites will be retained as National Land and will therefore continue to be subject to heritage protection afforded by their listing on the Commonwealth Heritage List.

The decision to divest East and West Blocks was made by the Australian Government following a scoping study process. Divestment will be subject to market testing and will further address the associated heritage and environmental issues, ensuring that adequate protections are in place.

3.2.5 Land title in the ACT

Issue

Shane Mortimer, Guumaal-Ngambri Elder, provided a submission regarding land title, explaining as follows:

'The ACT legislature has no ownership of land title in the 'Territory'. Under s125 of the Constitution it is established to manage land for the Commonwealth, which has 'Radical Title'. The Guumaal National Ngambri People hold 'Allodial Title' to the land known as the Australian Capital Territory. 'Allodial Title' cannot be extinguished and there must be a valid record of exchange for 'Allodial Title' to change hands. There is no such document in existence held by the Crown, Commonwealth, New South Wales or ACT. Therefore, the 'Allodial Title' remains with my People...

As the holder of the 'Allodium', we assert our right to declare that there is no further 'green-fields' development in the Australian Capital Territory. The proposed 'urban' development of former CSIRO occupied land as outlined in Amendment 86 is not to proceed. The land/lease is not for sale, or use for any other purpose, other than carbon abatement through regeneration or perennial native grassland. This stipulation goes for all other ACT 'green-fields' sites. Future development is to be restricted to existing town centres. The site known as Namadgi National Park is not to be transferred to the ACT Legislature's administration. It is the property of the Guumaal Nation Ngambri People.

All future planning is to be undertaken in consultation with the Guumaal-Ngambri People.'

NCA response

Draft Amendment 86 is being progressed under the current legislative environment as understood by the NCA. A series of legislative instruments provide the framework for establishment of the ACT, land management within the ACT, and the planning regime (including amendments to statutory planning instrument), and are described below.

Section 125 of the Australian Constitution states that:

'The Seat of Government of the Commonwealth shall be determined by the Parliament, and shall be within territory which shall have been granted to or acquired by the Commonwealth, and shall be vested in and belong to the Commonwealth, and shall be in the State of New South Wales, and be distant not less than one hundred miles from Sydney.

Such territory shall contain an area of not less than one hundred square miles, and such portion thereof as shall consist of Crown lands shall be granted to the Commonwealth without any payment therefor. The Parliament shall sit at Melbourne until it meets at the seat of Government.'

The effect of this is to provide for the general location of the Seat of Government and establish that the Commonwealth is the owner of all land in the ACT. The *Seat of Government Acceptance* Consultation Report – Draft Amendment 86 (incorporating Draft Amendment 85) (April 2016) Page 18 of 164

Act 1909 formalised the surrender of land by the State of New South Wales for the Seat of Government. This Act also declares that the Territory shall be known as the Australian Capital Territory.

At the time of self-government of the ACT, the *Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988* (the Act) established planning and land management arrangements for the ACT between the Commonwealth and the ACT Government. The Act provides that land used by or on behalf of the Commonwealth may be declared National Land, and managed by the Commonwealth. All other land is Territory Land. The Act vests responsibility for the management and control of Territory Land with the ACT Government.

In regard to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander land rights, the *Native Title Act 1993* (Native Title Act) recognises and protects native title. Native title describes the recognition by the Australian legal system of rights and interests of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to land and waters according to their traditional laws and customs.

The Native Title Act was a result of the historic Mabo decision by the High Court of Australia in 1992. This decision resulted in the High Court:

- rejecting the doctrine that Australia was *terra nullius* at the time of European settlement
- holding that the common law of Australia recognises a form of native title that reflects the entitlement of the indigenous inhabitants of Australia, in accordance with their laws and customs, to their traditional lands
- holding that native title is extinguished by valid government acts that are inconsistent with the continued existence of native title rights and interests, such as the grant of freehold or leasehold estates.

Special procedures for the just and proper ascertainment of native title rights and interests are established under this legislation. A search of the National Native Title Register indicates that that there have been no attempts to establish native title over land within the ACT.

3.2.6 Heritage

Issue

A number of suggestions were made regarding the way heritage protection is expressed in the Plan, including:

- the Plan should recognise the Australian Natural Heritage Charter and/or the Burra Charter as key guiding documents for natural and cultural heritage places within Designated Areas.
- the definition of 'Heritage Place' should be expanded to include heritage places designated by the NCA, including those on the NCA's heritage register maintained under the EPBC Act.
- there needs to be statutory protection of all heritage places on national and designated land, including interiors, landscaping, vistas and views, even if there is no Australian Government interest in them.

Other minor changes to principles for heritage, not substantially altering policy intent, were suggested.

The Lake Burley Griffin Guardians expressed concern that the NCA was not meeting its responsibilities to prepare a heritage register, and sought confirmation that the Plan will conform with the protection of Commonwealth Heritage values according to the EPBC Act. The Guardians also requested that Lake Burley Griffin and its foreshore landscapes be entered in the NCA heritage register and nominated to the National and Commonwealth Heritage lists.

The specific heritage values (either officially recognised or perceived) of particular places were also raised in relation to Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores (refer section 3.2.7 of this report), East and West Blocks (section 3.2.4), and Anzac Park East and West (section 3.2.3).

NCA response

A number of changes to the principles for heritage have been amended and are detailed in Section 4 of this report.

In 2010, the NCA nominated 'Lake Burley Griffin and Adjacent Lands' (which includes the lake itself as well as land managed by the NCA, for example at Yarramundi Reach, Stirling Park and Attunga Point) to the Commonwealth Heritage List. This listing has not yet been successful, however a Canberra National Heritage listing has the potential to encompass areas previously nominated for inclusion in the National and/or Commonwealth Heritage Lists.

Under the EPBC Act, a heritage register is a list of places that a Commonwealth agency owns or controls that sets the Commonwealth Heritage values of each place. The NCA's heritage register identifies those assets with Commonwealth Heritage values administered by the NCA or that the NCA manages on behalf of the Australian Government. 'Lake Burley Griffin and Adjacent Lands' is listed on the register.

In 2011, the Lake War Memorials Forum nominated 'Lake Burley Griffin and Lakeshore Parklands' for National Heritage listing under emergency provisions of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act). The nomination was in response to the World War I and II memorials then proposed for Rond Terraces, with the Lake War Memorials Forum citing the proposal would pose a likely and imminent threat to the heritage values of the place. At the time, the Minister determined that as the memorials proposal would not be an imminent threat.

The Lake Burley Griffin and Lakeshore Parklands nomination is now ineligible for consideration. Under the EPBC Act, the Australian Heritage Council can only assess places for the National Heritage List if the places are on the planned priority assessment list. A nomination becomes ineligible if it has been considered for two consecutive work plans but not included. Lake Burley Griffin and Lakeshore Parklands is recognised as now being ineligible under this criteria, however a nomination ruled ineligible in this way can be re-nominated.

3.2.7 Technical matters

A series of more technical matters were raised in relation to specific policy areas, including:

- Haig and Telopea Parks
- Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores
- West Basin, City Hill and the City to the Lake project
- West Murrumbidgee
- Designated Areas.

Each of these is discussed in detail below.

Haig and Telopea Parks

Multiple submitters expressed support for the NCA's decision to reinstate Special Requirements for Haig and Telopea Parks in response to feedback on the Exposure Draft of the Plan.

The NCA notes this support.

Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores

The protection of Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores continued to be raised as an issue.

The Yarralumla Residents' Association raised concern with some ambiguity with provisions of the Plan for Yarralumla Bay. The bay is recognised as a 'Development Node' and the Plan requires that development is to be limited to small scale concessions associated with recreation and tourism. Concern was expressed that there appears to be little else to guide 'small scale' development, and nothing preventing 'small scale' turning into 'large scale'.

The NCA has previously stated that it supports the idea of a master plan or similar for the Lake and its foreshore areas. Such a framework could recognise areas of heritage and conservation value, identify suitable nodes for development, and ensure that lakeside development is appropriate to the location.

Through the Consultation Report in response to the Exposure Draft of the Plan, the NCA advised that review of Precinct Codes will commence once the new format and structure of the Plan is in place. The 'Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores Precinct Code' will form an early stage of Precinct Code review.

The NCA considers this process the most appropriate to address concerns with Yarralumla Bay, address ambiguities and strengthen the planning policy and design framework for the lake and its foreshores.

Lake Burley Griffin and its foreshores are also addressed under section 3.2.6 of this report.

West Basin, City Hill and City to the Lake

Submitters continued to raise concerns regarding proposals for West Basin and City Hill, including the ACT Government's intentions with the City to the Lake project.

In response to community concerns raised in response to the Exposure Draft, the NCA advised that review of policy for these areas was outside the scope of the current process. The revised Plan is intended to be the first major phase in a comprehensive review process. Material available on the NCA's website advised that the focus of the initial stage of the Plan review was on streamlining the shared responsibilities and interests of the Australian and ACT Governments. Website material further advised that the content of the Exposure Draft was largely derived from existing Plan content, that detailed planning policy was largely unchanged and that review of these policies would form later stages of the Plan review.

Passage of Amendment 86 allows the NCA to better understand the likely timeframes associated with detailed policy review.

West Murrumbidgee

Identifying West Murrumbidgee as a 'potential future urban area' was raised as an issue during public consultation on the Exposure Draft of the Plan, with views both supporting and not supporting the proposal received. Less commentary was received during public consultation on Draft Amendment 86, but opposing views were again expressed.

One submitter to Draft Amendment 86 perceived that urban development in the West Murrumbidgee area would assist in improving housing choice to attract a diversity of people to the district and help maintain the economic viability of the Tuggeranong Town Centre. Another submitter stated that no development should occur as it is contrary to the heritage values of the area including Lanyon, Lambrigg and Pine Island cultural landscape.

Support for the proposal is noted. In regard to impacts on cultural landscapes, the Plan retains provision to ensure that the Commonwealth, a Commonwealth Authority, the Territory or a Territory authority shall not do anything which adversely affects the historic landscape and heritage values of the Lanyon Bowl Area. Any development proposal would need to consider impacts on heritage values of Lambrigg and Pine Island.

Designated Areas (National Convention Centre)

The ACT Government sought to exclude the National Convention Centre site from the Designated Areas. The NCA has adopted this suggestion, leaving the National Convention Centre site the only site adjacent to Constitution Avenue outside of Designated Areas.

Certification of 'Potential Future Urban Areas'

Comment was made that the potential for a 'Potential Future Urban Area' to be certified by the NCA for urban use should not be limited to the ACT Government. It was suggested that the Plan should be amended to refer to 'proponent'.

The NCA has adopted this suggestion, and where appropriate the Plan has been amended to change references to the 'ACT Government' to 'proponent'. This allows for the certification process to be followed in circumstances where the ACT Government is not the proponent.

4 Recommended changes

No changes have been made based on feedback to Draft Amendment 85 – West Belconnen Urban Development.

The following changes have been made based on feedback received during public consultation on Draft Amendment 86, ongoing discussions with stakeholders, and internal review. All changes are also identified in [Attachment F](#), which identifies the origin of each change and provides additional commentary supporting the changes.

1. Block 14 Section 65 City has not been included in Designated Areas.
2. Paragraphs within Section 3.1.2 regarding the certification of potential future urban areas have been amended to change references to the 'ACT Government' to 'proponent'. This allows for the certification process to be followed in circumstances where the ACT Government is not the proponent.
3. Section 3.3 has been amended to read as follows:

For the foreseeable future, urban land in Metropolitan Canberra will comprise:

- *the towns of Canberra Central, Woden/Weston Creek, Belconnen, Tuggeranong and Gungahlin*
- *the villages of Hall, Oaks Estate and Tharwa*
- *Molonglo and North Weston*
- *land at Hume, Mitchell and Fyshwick.*

Areas identified as 'Potential Future Urban Areas' will form part of Metropolitan Canberra following certification by the National Capital Authority of these areas for urban use.

Corresponding change to section 3.3.3 has been made, with the addition of a new clause stating:

Areas identified as 'Potential Future Urban Areas' will form part of Metropolitan Canberra following certification by the National Capital Authority of these areas for urban use.

4. Airport has been reinstated in the Central National Area.

The change reflects the status of the airport as a key gateway and significant asset to the National Capital, and improves consistency of terminology between the National Capital Plan and the Airport Master Plan. The effect of this change relates to how the Central National Area is defined, and does not alter the planning arrangements in place for the Airport. The land remains outside Designated Areas, with an annotation stating that the airport is subject to a Master Plan under applicable legislation.

5. Several changes have been made in relation to Anzac Park East and West:
 - a. The building height limit for Anzac Park East and West has been changed to be stated as a maximum (of RL600) and that this is contingent on heritage requirements. A provision has been added to ensure that the two buildings flanking Anzac Parade will be equal in height (up to the maximum of RL600). This provides for the eventuality that *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* referral outcomes require buildings to be restricted to limits currently in place (approximately 25 metres).
 - b. The portion of the Anzac Park East and West sites subject to the above building height limits has been clarified.
 - c. A requirement has been added that access to the western portion of Block 7 Section 3 Parkes (the land on which Anzac Park West sits) from Block 6 Section 3 Parkes must be maintained. This, in conjunction with specific conditions of sale for Anzac Park West will help ensure continued public access to Commonwealth Park via underpass from the northern side of Parkes Way.
 - d. An additional dot point has been added to the background of the Constitution Avenue and Anzac Parade Precinct Code explaining the national interest in ensuring the ongoing portal function of buildings at the southern end of Anzac Parade.
6. Setbacks for Kings and Commonwealth Avenue have been added.
7. Minor changes have been made to the Australian Institute of Sport Precinct Code.

8. A number of minor changes to heritage principles have been made to clarify intent and more appropriately reflect current practice. The definition of 'Heritage Place' has also been amended. These changes are detailed below:
- a. Clause 2.4.2(d) has been amended to refer specifically to Garden City and City Beautiful concepts, and reads as follows:
Development in the National Capital should seek to achieve harmony between architecture and landscape to give continuing effect to the City Beautiful and Garden City characters of the city.
 - b. Clause 2.4.2(f) has been amended to read as follows:
Vistas to major landscape features shall be protected from and enhanced by development.
 - c. Section 2.4.3 has been amended to read as follows:
Enhance the character of Canberra and the Territory as the National Capital by identifying, protecting, conserving and presenting natural, Indigenous and historic heritage places.
 - d. Clause 2.4.4(b) has been amended to read as follows:
Within Designated Areas, the National Capital Authority may require Heritage (or Conservation) Management Plans to accompany development applications for heritage places which should be prepared to meet requirements equivalent to those in the EPBC Act. The National Capital Authority may require Heritage Impact Statements to accompany development applications for a heritage place.
 - e. Clause 2.4.4(c) has been amended to read as follows:
Development should be consistent with the requirements of any relevant Heritage (or Conservation) Management Plan for that particular place.
 - f. Clause 2.4.4(d) has been amended to read as follows:
The management of heritage places should ensure that their use and presentation is consistent with their heritage values. Heritage places will be presented and interpreted to increase public awareness, understanding and enjoyment of the natural and cultural heritage of the National Capital and its conservation, subject to any reasonable requirements for privacy or confidentiality.
 - g. The definition of 'Heritage Place' in Appendix B has been amended to include places recognised by the NCA as having heritage value, but not formally listed under either Commonwealth or Territory legislation, and reads as follows:
Includes places listed under either Commonwealth or Territory legislation, or those on the NCA's heritage register maintained under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.
 - h. An additional clause has been added under section 2.4.4 stating:
The National Capital Authority will adopt the Australian Natural Heritage Charter and the Burra Charter as key guiding documents respectively for natural and cultural heritage places within Designated Areas.
9. The following has been added to Section 4.6.5, section titled 'Building height' and section 4.7.5, section titled 'Building height and form':
Minimum floor-to-ceiling heights within buildings are to be as follows:

| Location | Minimum floor height |
|---|--|
| <i>Ground floor facing Constitution Avenue and roads where 'Indicative Active Frontages' are located.</i> | <i>6.5 metres floor-to-finished ceiling (mezzanine level permitted over 30% of ground floor).</i> |
| <i>Ground floor (residential)</i> | <i>3.3 metres floor-to-finished ceiling.</i> |
| <i>Ground floor (other uses, including commercial/office use)</i> | <i>3.6 metres floor-to-finished ceiling.</i> |
| <i>Residential (general)</i> | <p><i>2.7 metre floor-to-finished ceiling minimum for all habitable rooms, 2.4 metres is the preferred minimum for all non-habitable rooms, however 2.25 metres is permitted.</i></p> <p><i>For two-storey units, 2.4 metre minimum for second storey if 50 percent or more of the apartment has 2.7 metre minimum ceiling heights.</i></p> <p><i>For two-storey units with a two-storey void space, 2.4 metre minimum ceiling heights.</i></p> <p><i>Attic spaces are permitted, with a 1.5 metre minimum wall height at edge of room with a 30 degree minimum ceiling slope.</i></p> |

The addition of minimum floor-to-ceiling heights in the City Hill and West Basin Precincts will rationalize the descriptions of internal heights to describe floor-to-ceiling heights so as to improve the design quality of development proposals, and provide greater consistency in development controls across precincts.

10. References to the Tourist Information Centre on Northbourne Avenue have been amended to reflect the relocation of the information centre to Regatta Point in 2016.
11. Specific references to Floriade being located in Commonwealth Park have been removed, however the capacity for the event to still be held in the park is not diminished.

Minor formatting changes and edits not affecting policy intent have been made.

5 Conclusion

On 1 October 2015, Draft Amendment 86 was released for public consultation. The public consultation period ran for six weeks in accordance with the NCA's 'Commitment to Community Engagement (February 2015)', concluding on 13 November 2015.

Draft Amendment 86 included the changes proposed by 'Draft Amendment 85 West Belconnen Urban Development', released for public consultation in May 2015. To simplify the approvals

process the NCA elected to combine the two proposals and sought consideration from the Minister for Draft Amendment 86 only.


Twenty-three written submissions were received in response Draft Amendment 85. Based on the issues raised, the NCA recommended no changes to the draft amendment as released for public consultation.


Fifty-one written submissions were received in response to Draft Amendment 86. A series of changes have been made to the revised Plan as proposed by Draft Amendment 86 based on feedback received during public consultation, ongoing discussions with stakeholders, and internal review of the document.

6 Attachments

- A. Canberra Times public notices for Draft Amendments 85 and 86
- B. Commonwealth of Australia Gazette notice for Draft Amendment 86
- C. List of stakeholders for Draft Amendment 86
- D. Summary of submissions to Draft Amendment 85
- E. Summary of submissions to Draft Amendment 86
- F. Schedule of changes to the National Capital Plan following public consultation on Draft Amendment 86

Attachment A – Canberra Times public notices for Draft Amendments 85 and 86

**ACT**
Government
Environment and Planning

**Australian Government**
National Capital Authority

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

The National Capital Authority (NCA) and the Environment and Planning Directorate (EPD) invite public comment on proposed changes to the National Capital Plan and the Territory Plan. The proposed changes seek to expand the urban area of Belconnen.

National Capital Plan

Draft Amendment 85
West Belconnen Urban Development

National Capital Plan Draft Amendment 85 (DA85) has been prepared in accordance with section 23 of the *Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988*.

DA85 proposes to amend land uses of the General Policy Plan (Metropolitan Canberra) to expand the Urban Area of Belconnen to the ACT/NSW border and redefine the Murrumbidgee River corridor.

The draft amendment and background documents are available at www.nationalcapital.gov.au. Hard copies are available on request.

Territory Plan

Draft Variation No 351
West Belconnen Urban Development
Belconnen District

Draft Variation No 351 has been prepared by the EPD in accordance with part 5.3 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007* (the Act).

The draft variation proposes to rezone an area immediately west of the suburbs of Holt and Macgregor for future urban development. The changes includes rezone part of the site to a range of urban zones, introduce a nature reserve overlay to the river corridor, rezone the Transgrid Canberra Substation to a Transport and Services zoning, rezone the Strathnairn Arts Precinct and Belconnen Farm Heritage Precinct to community facility zone, apply a future urban area (FUA) overlay to part of the site, introduce a site-specific structure plan and concept plan into the Territory Plan.

The draft variation is available online at www.act.gov.au/draftvariations, until the closing date for comments. Background documents are available online at www.act.gov.au/draftvariations until the closing date for written comments. Copies of DV351 are available for inspection and purchase at the EPD Customer Service Centre 16 Challis Street, Dickson weekdays between 8:30am-4:30pm. Please call 6207 1923 to arrange a copy for purchase.

Public Consultation

A public information session on Draft Amendment 85 to the National Capital Plan and Draft Variation No 351 to the Territory Plan will be held on: Thursday 4 June 2015 from 6pm to 7pm at Shop 2 (car park frontage), Kippax Fair Shopping Centre, Hardwick Crescent, Holt ACT 2615.

Written Comments

Written comments from the public are invited by **COB Monday 6 July 2015**.

A single point for submitting comments has been established and submissions will be considered by both the NCA and the EPD. Comments should include your name and contact details, and be addressed to the Territory Plan Variation Unit.

Comments can be:

- emailed to terrplan@act.gov.au
- mailed to Territory Plan Comments, GPO Box 158, Canberra, ACT 2601
- delivered to EPD's Customer Service Centre at 16 Challis Street, Dickson

Comments received will be made publicly available 10 working days after the closing date for no less than 15 working days at EPD's Customer Service Centre in Dickson and may be published on EPD's website.

Comments made available will include personal contact details unless excluded under section 411 or 412 of the Act. A request for exclusion under these sections must be in writing, clearly identifying what you are seeking to exclude and how the request satisfies the exclusion criteria.

Section 65 of the Act does not apply in relation to the draft variation so it does not have interim effect. The current Territory Plan will continue to apply while the variation remains in draft form.

The current National Capital Plan will also continue to apply while the amendment is in draft form.



Australian Government
National Capital Authority

National Capital Plan Draft Amendment 86

Open for Public Consultation

The National Capital Authority (NCA) has finalised reviewing the submissions received on the National Capital Plan Exposure Draft and have considered this feedback in the proposal of Draft Amendment 86 (DA86).

The NCA has released DA86, for public consultation and can be viewed on the NCA's Public Consultation webpage.

The consultation report can be viewed on the NCA's website. This report will assist in informing interested parties of the NCA's response to views expressed in the Exposure Draft submission process and to help understand how any changes have been incorporated into DA86.

The NCA welcomes feedback on DA86 by close of business Friday 13 November 2015. Late submissions will not be accepted. Submissions can be made on the NCA's website, via email to plan.review@natcap.gov.au or sent to GPO Box 373, Canberra ACT 2601.

Public information sessions for DA86 will be held on 13 and 20 October 2015 from 5.30 – 7 pm at the National Capital Exhibition, Barrine Dr, Parkes ACT 2600. Attendees should register their interest in attending these sessions via the NCA's website.

Please contact the NCA for further information on (02) 6271 2888.

www.nationalcapital.gov.au

Attachment B – Commonwealth of Australia Gazette notices for Draft Amendment 86



**Amendment of the National Capital Plan
Draft Amendment 86
Revised National Capital Plan**

National Capital Plan Draft Amendment 86 (DA86) proposes to:

- revise and modernise the National Capital Plan, including changing the format and structure of the document
- change metropolitan planning arrangements to provide greater flexibility to the ACT Government to accommodate the growth of Canberra
- reduce duplication and complexity in planning for a substantial portion of Territory Land by removing Special Requirements
- make minor adjustments to areas identified as having the special characteristics of the National Capital (Designated Areas).

DA86 of the National Capital Plan has been prepared in accordance with section 23 of the *Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988* and is now available for public inspection and comment.

The National Capital Authority invites interested people and organisations to provide written comments on DA86 by close of business on Friday 13 November 2015 to:

Andrew Smith
Chief Planner
National Capital Authority
GPO Box 373
CANBERRA ACT 2601
email: plan.review@natcap.gov.au

Copies of DA86 are available from:

www.nationalcapital.gov.au

Further information is available by telephone on 02 6271 2888 or email plan.review@natcap.gov.au.

Attachment C – List of stakeholders for Draft Amendment 86

Submitters to Exposure Draft of the National Capital Plan

1. Conservation Council ACT
2. The Doma Group
3. Duncan Marshall
4. Rob Purdon
5. Canberra Airport Pty Limited
6. Canberra Business Chamber
7. Friends of Grasslands
8. Canberra CBD Limited
9. SHL Development
10. David Mackenzie
11. Pedal Power ACT
12. Australian National Botanic Gardens
13. Reid Residents' Association
14. North Canberra Community Council
15. Australian Institute of Architects (ACT Chapter)
16. Inner South Canberra Community Council
17. Planning Institute Australia (ACT Division)
18. Robyn Coghlan
19. Ginninderra Falls Association
20. Deakin Residents' Association
21. Tuggeranong Community Council Inc.
22. Master Builders Association (ACT)
23. Lake Burley Griffin Guardians
24. Weston Creek Community Council
25. Dianne Firth
26. Friends of the Albert Hall Inc.
27. Australian Garden History Society (ACT/Monaro/Riverina Branch)
28. The Australian National University
29. Ed Wensing
30. Yarralumla Residents' Association
31. Walter Burley Griffin Society (Canberra Chapter)
32. Heart Foundation ACT
33. Knight Frank Town Planning (on behalf of Lend Lease)
34. National Trust (ACT)
35. Property Council of Australia
36. Australian Institute of Landscape Architects

Community and industry groups/organisations

37. Australian Institute of Landscape Architects (ACT Chapter)
38. Gungahlin Community Council

39. Woden Valley Community Council
40. Campbell Residents' Group
41. Engineers Australia (ACT Division)
42. Canberra Urban and Regional Futures
43. ACT Rural Landholders' Association
44. ACT Rugby Union Club
45. Village of Hall and District Progress Association
46. Ginninderra Catchment Group
47. Frog Watch
48. Canberra Birds
49. Capital Woodlands and Wetlands Trust
50. Canberra District Historical Society
51. ACT Council of Social Service
52. ACT Shelter
53. Real Estate Institute of ACT
54. Housing Industry Association (ACT and Southern NSW)
55. Hyatt Hotel Canberra
56. Canberra Croquet Club Inc.
57. St John's Anglican Church
58. Presbyterian Church of St Andrew
59. Southside Community Services Inc.
60. ACT Jewish Community Inc.
61. Forrest Primary School
62. Tuggeranong and Regional Business Forum
63. Mary Lindsay (individual)

Government

64. ACT Government (Head of Service in Treasury and Economic Development Directorate)
65. Capital Metro Agency
66. Department of Finance
67. Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation
68. Defence Housing Authority
69. Land Development Agency
70. Department of Finance
71. Department of Defence
72. Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet
73. Department of the Environment
74. Attorney-General's Department
75. Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
76. Australian Sports Commission
77. Royal Australian Mint
78. Murray Darling Basin Authority
79. National Library of Australia
80. Questacon - The National Science and Technology Centre
81. National Portrait Gallery of Australia
82. National Gallery of Australia

- 83. National Archives of Australia
- 84. Museum of Australian Democracy at Old Parliament House
- 85. National Museum of Australia
- 86. Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies
- 87. Australian National Botanic Gardens
- 88. National Film and Sound Archive of Australia

Attachment D – Summary of submissions to Draft Amendment 85

| <i>Submission No.</i> | <i>Submitter details</i> | <i>Key Points Pertinent to the NCA Process</i> | <i>NCA Consideration</i> |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| 1 | Canberra Airport | The rezoning of this site is in the interest of the ACT community. | Noted |
| | | This proposal will provide significant private investment, reinforce the population of the Belconnen valley, provide diversity to the settlement pattern of the ACT, and provide new and diverse options for affordable housing. | Noted |
| 2 | National Trust, Scott McAllister | The National Trust does not object to the proposal. | Noted |
| | | The only issue is that the controls proposed in the ACT need to be extended into NSW to ensure continuous heritage protection. | This point is addressed in the ACT Government Environment and Planning Directorate's Consultation Report for DV351. |
| 3 | Belconnen Community Council | The BCC registers in principle support. | Noted |
| | | There is some concern regarding the future of Golden Sun Moth habitat in the area and the potential future alignment of Ginninderra Drive. | See 3.1.2 |
| | | BCC noted discussions between the Riverview Group and the Ginninderra Falls Association regarding the width of buffer zones protecting the Murrumbidgee River waterway. | See 3.1.3 |

| | | | |
|---|-------------------|---|-----------|
| 4 | Brendan Boeson | Building right to the ACT/NSW border leaves the ACT little control over future development in the NSW area. The current system with its large buffer to the ACT/NSW border gives the ACT and NCA control over its practical urban boundary. | See 3.1.1 |
| 5 | Rosemary Blemings | These amendments should proceed providing the ecological integrity of the Murrumbidgee River and Ginninderra Creek riverine zones are respected and preserved for conservation. | See 3.1.3 |
| 6 | Doug Finlayson | Mr Finlayson provided a summary of the history of the area, with particular focus on the Murrumbidgee River corridor and the Ginninderra Falls. The summary included comments on the proposal for a Murrumbidgee-Ginninderra Gorges National Park. | Noted |
| | | The submission suggests a corridor of at least 300+or-30 metres wide for both the Murrumbidgee and Ginninderra waterways as a worthwhile target. | See 3.1.3 |
| | | The minimum river corridor would: enable the 180 year heritage of public access and recreational use to be continued; enable the ecology and natural heritage of the area to be conserved as a world class park; and enable the indigenous heritage of the area to be appropriately respected and acknowledged. | See 3.1.3 |
| | | Consistency of standards between the NSW and ACT treatments was also recommended. | See 3.1.1 |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|--|---------------------------------|
| 7 | Robyn Coghlan | Concern has been raised regarding the removal of the urban buffer between Belconnen and the ACT/NSW border. It is argued that removal of the Hills, Ridges and Buffer Space to the ACT/NSW border will remove the NCA's ability to retain the scenic backdrop and defined urban edge of Belconnen. | See 3.1.1 |
| | | An urban area extension to the NSW border should only go ahead if the NSW Government agrees to legislate protection of the hills and ridges to the west of the Murrumbidgee River and Ginninderra Creek Corridors. | See 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3 & 3.1.4 |
| | | Comments were raised regarding a distortion to the form of the urban area were DA85 to proceed. It was outlined that the West Belconnen area should be separated from Belconnen by a green belt extending from Strathnairn to the Electrical substation and the pony club to retain visual geometry. | See 3.1.5 |
| 8 | David Edwards | The submission contained 78 petition signatories opposing the proposal. | Noted |
| | | Mr Edwards gave mention to environmentally sensitive sites and the nearby river system. | See 3.1.3 & 3.1.4 |
| 9 | Jean Geue | Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces enclosing the NSW part of the development complete the series of ridges that enclose the Belconnen suburb. | See 3.1.4 |

| | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| | | Buffers on both sides of the river and the creek should be at least 300 metres from the waterways with no buildings or hard parking spaces in that zone. Most of the buffer should be nature reserve. | See 3.1.3 |
| | | It is incumbent on NCA to uphold the vision of the Griffins, ensure the quality of this development and to protect the biodiversity of Ginninderra Falls. | See 3.1.3 & 3.1.4 |
| 10 | Real Estate Institute of the ACT | REIACT wishes to register its support as the additional green field land will assist with housing affordability. | Noted |
| 11 | Ginninderra Catchment Group | General Support for the proposal. | Noted |
| | | Raised concerns regarding the convoluted nature of the Murrumbidgee River and Ginninderra Creek corridors. The concerns related to difficulty in implementing best practice suburb design. | See 3.1.3 |
| 12 | Jack Kershaw | The ACT border should be extended to include Ginninderra Falls and Gorge areas. | See 3.1.3 |
| 13 | Ginninderra Falls Association | Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces are being completely removed without any replacement areas. | See 3.1.4 |
| | | The current buffer zones preserve and enhance 'the landscape features which give the National Capital its character and setting' in accordance with the Plan. | See 3.1.4 |

| | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| | | To comply with the Plan, Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces must be entrenched in a consistent legislative framework across the border. There should be statutory protection for the hills mountains and Murrumbidgee River set by Yass Valley Council. | See 3.1.4 |
| | | The Yass Valley Local Environment Plan provides only minimal statutory protection for the river, hills and mountains to the west. | See 3.1.3 & 3.1.4 |
| | | The following actions need to occur in relation to the proposed hills, ridges and buffer zone in NSW before DA85 is approved: 1) The landscape buffer area in NSW should be adequately mapped; 2) landholders need to be contacted with agreement sought for purchase; 3) The subject land should be purchased for inclusion in the West Belconnen Conservation area. | See 3.1.4 |
| | | Ginninderra Falls should be part of a new National Park called Ginninderra Gorges National Park. | See 3.1.3 |
| 14 | Barrie Virtue | There should be a sufficient protection zone for the river corridor of the Murrumbidgee and Ginninderra Falls. | See 3.1.3 |
| | | Support for a new Ginninderra Gorges National Park. | See 3.1.3 |
| | | Cross jurisdictional matters require cooperation between the ACT and NSW Governments. | See 3.1.1 |
| 15 | Canberra Ornithologists Group | Broadacre is an appropriate land use for the sites adjacent to the Murrumbidgee River Corridor. | See 3.1.3 |

| | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| | | Provided information regarding habitats of two species; the Superb Parrot and; Little Eagle which are listed as Vulnerable in the ACT. The superb Parrot is listed as Vulnerable under Commonwealth legislation. Both these species utilise large areas of the landscape as feeding territories. | See 3.1.2 |
| 16 | National Health Cooperative | General Support for the proposal. | Noted |
| 17 | ACT Master Builders Association | General Support for the proposal was provided. The ACT MBA see the increase of affordable land for development as a positive step. | Noted |
| 18 | Friends of Grasslands | General support for the proposal, including the approach to reconfigure the Murrumbidgee River Corridor. | Noted |
| | | The reconfigured river corridor will provide additional habitat for the Pink-tailed Worm Lizard and additional protection for grassy woodland. This is welcomed. | See 3.1.2 |
| | | The proposed additional urban area will be contained by the Murrumbidgee River and Ginninderra Creek. The changes will preserve a backdrop of the hills and mountain ranges (West of the Murrumbidgee) for the expanded urban area and will not be inconsistent with the key objectives of the Plan. | See 3.1.1 & 3.1.4 |
| | | While not part of the Plan, this rezoning will be complimented by landscape and rural zoning in NSW along the Murrumbidgee River and Ginninderra Creek, ensuring that the expanded urban area will be buffered effectively. The preservation of the backdrop of hills and the buffer in the NSW part of the proposed development are, in FOG's view, essential if DA85 is to | See 3.1.1 & 3.1.4 |

| | | | |
|----|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | maintain the integrity of the objectives of the Plan. | |
| 19 | ACT Conservation Council | A large new nature reserve is welcomed. The proposed management structure of the reserve is innovative. | Noted |
| | | Although there are reasons for the separate processes, mostly relating to the proposed development straddling the (unfortunately-construed) border between the ACT and NSW, consideration of both parts should be done together. It is one development and measures need to be in place to maintain harmonisation of high-level implementation, particularly for biodiversity. | See 3.1.1 & 3.1.2 |
| | | Yellow Box Red Gum Woodland and Pink Tailed Worm Lizard along with a number of other significant species need to be subject to long term planning and protection. | See 3.1.3 |
| | | The Conservation Council welcomes the range of measures put in place to minimise 'urban edge' impacts. However, the 'ragged edge' of the revised river corridor may prove problematic for as it will mean a smaller area to perimeter ratio for the urban edge which will create more edge effects. | See 3.1.5 |
| 20 | Ecomplish | General support for the proposal. | Noted |
| 21 | Chris Watson | An ideal site for a Life/Biological Centre could be near the Ginninderra Gorge and its falls was proposed. | This area is outside of NCA jurisdiction. |
| 22 | Charny Carny | General support for the proposal. | Noted |
| 23 | Pace Farm | The Pace Farm Crown Lease is incompatible with the rezoning proposal. | This point is addressed in the ACT Government Environment and Planning Directorate's Consultation |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------------|
| | | | Report for DV351. |
|--|--|--|-------------------|

Attachment E – Summary of submissions to Draft Amendment 86

| <i>Submission no.</i> | <i>Submitter details</i> | <i>Comments</i> | <i>NCA response</i> |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| 1 | Canberra Region Aviators Association | <p>This submission related to the reclassification of the CSIRO Ginninderra site and proposed that reclassification of this land be amended so as to allow the construction of a general aviation airfield at the western end of the area.</p> <p>Prior to self-government, it was the National Capital Development Commission's intention to construct a second airport for Canberra to allow separation of scheduled jet transport traffic from general aviation activities. Such separation is standard across the western world and Canberra is by far the largest population centre in Australia that does not have such a facility.</p> <p>A general aviation airport for Canberra would be of the scale of a regional airport such as Bathurst or Cowra.</p> <p>The construction of a second airport for Canberra was delayed as the intention of the NCDC was to construct a major airport at some other site. Gundaroo and Bungendore were considered, leaving Fairbairn for military and general aviation purposes. The reason for this intention was due to terrain clearance by early jet transport aircraft. As the aircraft evolved, the decision was made to extend the runway at Fairbairn and build the general aviation airport at Fassifern in west Belconnen.</p> <p>By the time this decision was made the Fassifern site was</p> | <p>The NCA is not aware of current plans to pursue a general aviation airport in the ACT.</p> <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>compromised by electrical distribution infrastructure. No other site was identified prior to self-government.</p> <p>In 2001 the ACT Government commissioned the Macintyre Maunsell report into alternative sites for a general aviation airfield. Several possible sites were identified, but the only identified site not now compromised by other development is the CSIRO land, the subject of this submission.</p> <p>In 2004 the ACT Government received a submission for an airfield at a site near Williamsdale, adjacent to a site identified in the Macintyre Maunsell report, but not specifically identified.</p> <p>A considerable amount of work was commissioned into the aviation and commercial viability of this site, all of which was overwhelmingly positive. However, following the resignation of Mr Jon Stanhope as Chief Minister the proposal has languished, and in November of 2014 the ACT Government informed me that it would not consider any airfield development on this site. The reasons for this decision are unclear as the preliminary planning work was never undertaken.</p> <p>Over the last twenty years Canberra has lost almost all of its general aviation activity from Canberra International Airport as it has grown. General aviation is simply not compatible with the sort of operation that has developed at the airport. This scenario was predicted in reports from the then Commonwealth Aviation</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>Department in the 1960s.</p> <p>For example, all six flying schools at the airport have now closed and perhaps three quarters of the light aviation fleet has moved to surrounding regional airports such as Goulburn, Cowra and Moruya.</p> <p>The ACT Government commissioned Deloitte Access Economics to produce an economic feasibility study into a general aviation airport in 2011. This report was very positive and determined that in addition to economic activity and opportunity it would run at a profit, if operated similarly to such facilities elsewhere in the country.</p> <p>In light of this background it is important that planning decisions related to this land not be made prematurely.</p> | |
| 2 | Duncan Marshall | <p><i>Section 2.4.2 Principles for urban design and heritage</i></p> <p>Suggests minor changes to principles. In regard to the principle stating that some exceptions to the general height limits of 3-4 storeys in Central Canberra are permitted, suggests the principles which underpin these exceptions are vital to explain.</p> | <p>Clause 2.4.2(g) refers to building heights above the 3-4 storey height limit being permitted where the Plan elsewhere specifically permits this. A number of Precinct Codes allow building height above 3-4 storeys, including in West Basin, City Hill, Constitution Avenue and Anzac Parade, and Barton.</p> <p>Further guidance is given by requiring no building or structure in Central Canberra to be constructed above RL617. This limit is non-negotiable.</p> |
| | | <p><i>Section 2.4.3 Objective two – urban design and heritage</i></p> | <p>The NCA supports this minor change.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Suggests the following minor revision:</p> <p>Enhance the character of Canberra and the Territory as the National Capital by identifying, protecting, conserving and presenting the natural, Indigenous and historic heritage places.</p> | |
| | | <p><i>Section 2.4.4 Principles for urban design and heritage (Objective two)</i></p> <p>Suggests adoption of additional principle referencing the Australian Natural Heritage Charter and the Burra Charter as key guiding documents for natural and cultural heritage places within Designated Areas.</p> <p>Suggests minor revisions to other principles to accurately reflect current practices.</p> | The NCA supports a number of minor changes suggested, please refer to part four of the report. |
| | | <p><i>Appendix B – Definition of Heritage Place</i></p> <p>Definition should be expanded to include heritage places designated by the NCA – including those on the NCA’s heritage register maintained under the EPBC Act.</p> <p>Given the glacial pace of development of the Commonwealth Heritage List, the NCA needs a mechanism to recognise heritage places in a timely fashion to enable their effective consideration as part of planning processes.</p> | <p>The NCA supports updating the definition of ‘Heritage Place’ to include those on the NCA’s Heritage Register. The definition has been amended to read:</p> <p><i>Includes places listed under either Commonwealth or Territory legislation, or those on the NCA’s heritage register maintained under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.</i></p> |
| 3 | Kim Fischer | <i>[This submission also appeared as an article in ‘The Canberra Times’ on 4 October 2015.]</i> | At some stage during the development process the land will be declared Territory Land and the |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>The current draft of the National Capital Plan is a disgrace. It exposes the lie that the Commonwealth has granted the ACT meaningful self-determination over the land within its borders.</p> <p>With just a few strokes of a pen by the National Capital Authority and with no input from the ACT Government, the 701 hectare CSIRO Ginninderra site located between Fraser and Crace will have its zoning changed from 'hills, ridges and buffer space' to 'urban area'.</p> <p>The CSIRO wants to develop an estimated 5000 to 10,000 residences on this site. Since the site is National Land, the NCA will have sole authority over whether the development proceeds.</p> <p>The NCA does not have to seek approval from the ACT Government or reference the Territory Plan. It does not have to align with the ACT's planned land release program or environmental standards. It can literally write its own planning rulebook.</p> <p>At a recent information session, a CSIRO general manager made a big deal of its voluntary consultation with residents and the ACT Government. It's clear where the power lies. Issues such as the cost of upgrading roads and infrastructure can be ignored at the whim of the CSIRO and the NCA.</p> <p>To be fair, the CSIRO has good intentions, wanting to build a little city based on their scientists' ideas of best practice while profiting from it. It's just unfortunate that</p> | <p>Territory Plan will have effect. The timing of this is unknown but needs to occur prior to settlement of properties. Prior to a declaration of Territory Land the ACT Government would have to undertake a Territory Plan variation.</p> <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> <p>In regard to the identification of National Land, this is publically available online through the ACT Government's online mapping service, ACTMAPi.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>current legislation allows them to do this while completely ignoring democratic rights in the ACT.</p> <p>We've been through this story before. In 2005, the Commonwealth unilaterally approved development of office accommodation and goods retailing facilities at the airport – now known as Brindabella Park and Majura Park. For many years afterward, people were forced to commute to these sites on roads lacking capacity and without suitable public transport options.</p> <p>The situation also parallels the Immigration and Border Protection mega-precinct wanted by Secretary Mike Pezzullo, who ignored local impacts because he could. The good news is that a sustained campaign by local politicians and Belconnen residents has led to the Department of Finance requiring an assessment of local impact before any major accommodation changes for public servants take place.</p> <p>The NCA serves an ongoing and important role in our national capital, ensuring that 'the Commonwealth's national capital interests in the Territory are fully protected, without otherwise involving the Commonwealth in matters that should be the prerogative of the Canberra community'.</p> <p>But 25 years after self-government, there is no possible justification for the NCA to be responsible for approving plans for residential property development at a site 14km away from Parliament House in the heart of</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | <p>suburban Canberra.</p> <p>In fact the NCA's entire justification for changing the zoning to Urban Area in the National Capital Plan is, and I quote, that the 'CSIRO requested this change'.</p> <p>It would be laughable if the consequences were not so significant.</p> <p>Most people understand that areas of the ACT with 'special characteristics of the National Capital' are set aside as so-called Designated Areas under the control of the NCA.</p> <p>Commonly viewed by overseas visiting politicians and dignitaries, these areas include the Parliamentary Triangle, Lake Burley Griffin, connections from Parliament to the airport and the main approach routes to Canberra.</p> <p>However, fewer people know that the Commonwealth may also declare any area of the ACT to be needed for Commonwealth use. Once this happens, the area becomes National Land and is no longer under the jurisdiction of the ACT government.</p> <p>The problem is there is no obligation to ever return planning control over National Land to the Territory. National Land status should only exist on land actively used for Commonwealth purposes. Once land is surplus to requirements, Territory planning laws should automatically take effect again (although naturally the</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Commonwealth would retain ownership). Anything else denies ACT residents the right to have the Territory Government they elect managing their affairs.</p> <p>During the consultation phase on the draft National Capital Plan, the NCA can still enable informed debate by publishing a full list and diagram of National Land areas. ACT residents deserve to know this much.</p> <p>It is wrong to assume the interests of the Commonwealth will never align with the interests of the ACT Government and Canberra community. Departments and agencies are just following the rules as they currently exist. However, after 25 years of self-government a thorough review of National Land arrangements needs to take place to ensure the best interests of everyone concerned.</p> | |
| 4 | Stephen and Amber Robey | <p>We would like to express our objections to the rezoning of the CSIRO Ginninderra Field Station to an 'Urban Area'. In January of this year we moved into our newly purchased home in Spence - directly facing the CSIRO open land - with the understanding that this would remain an open and clear space. We were both very taken aback and surprised by the initial communication that the CSIRO property would be requesting a rezoning. One of the key reasons we moved to and purchased a property in this community was because it is an established and older suburb with little room for changes and development. It seems inappropriate to change this area as it provides a welcome buffer</p> | <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | between the very busy and rapidly developing Belconnen area and the huge and extremely dense housing being built in Gungahlin. We would like to formally oppose the change and hope that the community being affected by the potential development be given an appropriate voice in this decision. | |
| 5 | Peter Trickett | <p>Strongly objects to the proposal to reclassify the Ginninderra Field Station site as an urban area. Even if some limited urbanisation of part of this large area were to be considered justified (although this is highly doubtful), is totally opposed to any urbanisation of the area consisting of the range of hills toward the Barton Highway at Hall.</p> <p>As a Fraser resident, looks out toward the grassy uplands every day with a feeling of great pleasure and satisfaction. Considers that urbanising the area would be a disaster. Suggested that the site would make an ideal area for walking trails, which could be enhanced by planting with suitable trees. It would then become a valuable 'green' asset for the community instead of more dreary urban sprawl.</p> | <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |
| 6 | Helen Sims | Registered concern that high quality endangered ecological communities, including Natural Temperate Grassland and Yellow Box-Red Gum Grassy Woodlands occur on the CSIRO land under consideration for land use change. These communities are noted in ACT Action Plans 27 and 28, and both communities are listed under the EPBC Act. Stresses the need to consider connectivity | CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|
| | | to ensure any patches are not isolated by development. Appropriate whole of site environmental analysis and planning of the site should therefore be undertaken prior to change of use. | For further details refer to section 3.2.1. |
| 7 | <p>Concerned CSIRO (Ginninderra Field Station) Neighbours Group</p> <p>This submission was accompanied by a petition signed by almost 380 people.</p> | <p>Opposes changing the land use for the CSIRO Ginninderra Field Station site.</p> <p><i>Contravenes the main objectives of the National Capital Plan</i></p> <p>The proposal is not consistent with Griffin's vision of a national capital comprising satellite towns in a bush setting. This theme is embedded in the Plan which also includes the National Capital Open Space System and provides an intrinsic connection between the landscape and the legacy of Canberra as a planned city.</p> <p>The proposal does not meet the Plan's objective to '<i>maintain and enhance the landscape character of Canberra and the Territory as the setting for the National Capital</i>'. Canberra is renowned for the beauty of its setting with respect to its garden city landscape supported by the backdrop of the surrounding hills, ridges and open spaces. The rezoning would see a diminution of this characteristic with the Barton Highway approach to Canberra looking like any other major city with sprawling urban development. The Plan should protect Canberra from such development rather than encourage it. The proposal would therefore fail to meet the objective of '<i>emphasizing the national significance of</i></p> | <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites. For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> <p>The concept of satellite towns was not the Griffins', but was adopted by the National Capital Development Commission in the 1960s as the preferred strategy to guide and direct the city's long term growth. The policy, published in 1965 under the heading of '<i>The Future Canberra</i>' was to locate future urban growth in separate urban districts or 'new towns', each with its own employment and activity centre.</p> <p>Separation between the districts of Belconnen and Gungahlin will be retained through the provision of landscape buffers on the north-western side of the Barton Highway, and broader buffers on the north-eastern side. Further detailed planning for the CSIRO Ginninderra site will refine the buffer on the north-eastern side.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|----------------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | <p><i>the main approach routes and avenues’.</i></p> <p>The proposals also fails to meet the Plan objective to <i>‘protect the undeveloped hill tops and open spaces which divide and give form to Canberra’s urban areas’</i>. The field station site is zone as hills, ridges and buffer spaces and, in keeping with Griffin’s vision, provides an important buffer between the Gungahlin and Belconnen districts. Rezoning will remove this buffer and merge the two districts. The Plan objectives that <i>‘the hills, ridges and other major open space which form the separation between towns will be kept largely free of urban development’</i> and that <i>‘the planning and development of urban areas will encourage measures through which urban intensification may occur and will be sympathetic to the landscape setting of the National Capital’</i> are also compromised.</p> | |
| | | <p><i>Environmental and Open Space Concerns</i></p> <p>The proposal does not meet the principles added to Part Two of the Plan in relation to environmental sustainability and open space. The first principle is <i>‘to encourage containing urban expansion so as to minimise impacts on valuable natural and rural areas’</i>. Environmentally, the green open space of the site lessens the micro climate heat generated from Gungahlin, which according to CSIRO research is due to the high density of housing. The innate pastoral beauty of the field station landscape, along with cultivated soils, should be preserved and a range of options to meet</p> | <p>The principles referenced do not prevent urban expansion but require consideration of the impacts of creating new greenfield development on valuable natural and rural areas, and opportunities to create efficiencies in the use of infrastructure.</p> <p>(It should be noted that the second principle referenced fully states that <i>‘a substantial portion of new development shall be located within existing urban areas such as town centres and along public transport routes or other strategic</i></p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>community interest should be explored.</p> <p>The second principle states that <i>‘new development to be in existing urban areas’</i>. This principle will clearly be contradicted if the proposed rezoning is allowed to proceed.</p> | <p><i>sites that allow for efficient use of infrastructure’.</i>)</p> <p>The NCA recognises that expansion of Canberra’s urban areas, coupled with infill development and urban consolidation is required to accommodate long-term growth. Development of the CSIRO Ginninderra field station site can take advantage of existing infrastructure and proximity to services. The site prevents a better alternative than other options, such as urban development in the Kowen Plateau (previously identified by the ACT Government in the ‘Canberra Spatial Plan’ as a potential area to accommodate future city growth) or in West Murrumbidgee, although these areas may be required in the much longer term.</p> |
| | | <p><i>Lack of transparency</i></p> <p>The basis for the proposed rezoning is that <i>‘CSIRO requested this change’</i>. This is not a sufficient reason to compromise the planning principles of the Plan. In the event that CSIRO, in conjunction with the private sector, redevelop the site it will not be subject to the planning controls dictated by the Territory Plan. This is not consistent with democratic principles pertaining to other jurisdictions. To allow the rezoning would not meet the objective to <i>‘provide a plan offering flexibility and choice to enable the Territory Government to properly fulfil its functions’</i>. The residents of Canberra will have no say or</p> | <p>Development of the CSIRO Ginninderra field station site is not inconsistent with the requirement to provide flexibility to properly fulfil its functions. The ACT Government has responsibility for state/territory functions such as health, education and the administration of justice as well as local government functions such as roads, libraries and waste collection. The proposed changes to the Plan, including that for the CSIRO Ginninderra field station site do not impinge on the capacity of the ACT Government to fulfil these functions. The ACT Government’s powers in respect of planning and development</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | control as in other jurisdictions. | <p>as offered by the <i>Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988</i> are not compromised.</p> <p>The development of the site may offer opportunities to meet other ACT Government objectives, including those for housing affordability.</p> <p>The NCA's public consultation processes for planning are not dissimilar to those administered by the Territory. Future planning for the CSIRO Ginninderra field station site will offer ongoing public participation opportunities.</p> |
| | | <p><i>Conflict of interest</i></p> <p>It is public knowledge that CSIRO is under funding pressure and proceeds from this site would help fund their operations. This places them in an awkward and conflicted position of using their position as a Commonwealth agency that is the owner of Commonwealth land to bypass usual planning controls over the site.</p> <p>The NCA's Consultation Report in response to consultation on the Exposure Draft of the Plan states that <i>'if the ACT Government wishes to pursue urban development in any area identified as potential future urban area, all due diligence studies will be undertaken, as set out in Part Three of the Plan'</i>. Why has the NCA not applied similar rules to CSIRO? How can the NCA</p> | <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>CSIRO has been and is continuing to undertake all due diligence studies. This includes conducting environmental studies such as ecological investigations, sampling and analysis of soil, sediment, surface water and groundwater.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>simply approve a request from CSIRO without the necessary studies being undertaken and an assessment being made by the NCA in terms of consistency with the Plan? Surely conditions would be attached to any approval for rezoning. The NCA appears to be paying lip service to the Plan, and has not undertaken the necessary work to properly assess such a request for rezoning.</p> <p>No studies have been undertaken with respect to the environment which relates to past activities of CSIRO on the site. In particular, no assessment has been made of their HazChem Register nor have any soil samples been assessed with respect to chemical residues. CSIRO indicates that these studies will be undertaken in 2016 which is outside the consultation period.</p> | |
| | | <p><i>Community feedback on CSIRO's proposal</i></p> <p>A visit to the CSIRO website shows there is considerable interest by the local community in 'retaining green spaces and corridors and continued protection of protected or endangered species'. CSIRO in a recent Canberra Times article was quoted as saying 'that feedback on their consultation with the community clearly shows that the more vocal view was that the site should remain as open space and should not be rezoned'. This shows the strong level of community opposition to the proposal.</p> | <p>In response to Draft Amendment 86, the NCA received a variety views both for and against the proposal for urban development on the CSIRO Ginninderra field station site. Please refer to section 3.2.1 of the report for information on the diversity of views received.</p> <p>The draft concept plan prepared by CSIRO for the site indicates the potential for green spaces and connectivity between these to be part of the plan for the site. Green spaces are likely to encompass environmentally sensitive areas, and impacts on matters of national environmental significance may require referral under the <i>Environment</i></p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | <i>Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.</i> |
| 8 | Real Estate Institute of the Australian Capital Territory | <p>Has for some time been aware of the CSIRO's plan for the redevelopment of the Ginninderra Field Station site as an urban area, principally for residential and ancillary businesses.</p> <p>Delighted at the prospect of seeing this important land developed for housing, particularly if the project extols the virtues of best practice urban development.</p> <p>The current practice employed by the ACT Government to have a high degree of medium density in urban areas is inappropriate, rather, urban areas should provide for a greater percentage of detached housing.</p> <p>The location of the field station is excellent for urban development as most infrastructure requirements are probably in close proximity making development cost effective and timely.</p> | <p>Support for the proposal is noted.</p> <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |
| 9 | National Trust of Australia (ACT) | <p><i>Anzac Park East and West</i></p> <p>Does not object to the minor increase in height or potential changes in use, but reinforces the need for these portal buildings to maintain a symmetrical and strong statement at the end of Anzac Parade.</p> <p>Believes that all land on the lake side of Constitution Avenue needs to be retained as National Land.</p> <p><i>East and West Blocks</i></p> | <p><i>Anzac Park East and West</i></p> <p>Noted. For further details refer to section 3.2.3.</p> <p>Following discussion with the National Trust, the NCA understands that the National Trust feels that it is important that the whole of the National Triangle remain as National Land and full planning control by the NCA.</p> <p>The decision to divest East and West Blocks was</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>These need an active use (like East Block) that respects their heritage value. Alternative uses are considered possible.</p> <p><i>Residential Areas of Forrest and Deakin</i></p> <p>These need to be returned to Territory control and managed in a way consistent with the adjacent residential suburbs.</p> <p><i>West Murrumbidgee</i></p> <p>No development should occur as it is contrary to the heritage values of the area including Lanyon, Lambrigg and Pine Island cultural landscape.</p> <p><i>Telopea Park and Haig Park</i></p> <p>Supports Special requirements to protect the heritage values of Telopea and Haig Parks.</p> <p><i>Protection of heritage places</i></p> <p>There is an urgent need to have statutory protection of all heritage places on national and designated land, including interiors, landscaping, vistas and views, etc. This needs to be resolved with the ACT Government as a matter of urgency or the National Capital Plan amended to ensure all heritage sites are protected, even with no Commonwealth Government interest in them.</p> <p>Adoption of the Burra Charter will assist this process.</p> | <p>made by the Australian Government following a scoping study process. Divestment will be subject to market testing and will further address the associated heritage and environmental issues, ensuring that adequate protections are in place. The NCA's role is to ensure that a planning framework is in place to guide potential future development on the sites. The sites will remain within Designated Areas and under full planning control of the NCA.</p> <p><i>East and West Blocks</i></p> <p>Noted. For further detailed refer to section 3.2.4.</p> <p><i>Residential Areas of Forrest and Deakin</i></p> <p>There are no plans to remove the Deakin/Forrest Residential Area from Designated Areas.</p> <p><i>West Murrumbidgee</i></p> <p>The Plan retains provision to ensure that the Commonwealth, a Commonwealth Authority, the Territory or a Territory authority shall not do anything which adversely affects the historic landscape and heritage values of the Lanyon Bowl Area. Any development proposal would need to consider impacts on heritage values of Lambrigg and Pine Island.</p> <p><i>Telopea Park and Haig Park</i></p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>Noted.</p> <p><i>Protection of heritage places</i></p> <p>The NCA has adopted a definition of 'Heritage Place' that includes those listed under Territory heritage legislation (in addition to those listed under Commonwealth legislation or recognised by the NCA as having heritage value). The intent is that all 'heritage places' as defined under this definition receive the same treatment as those places currently on the National or Commonwealth Heritage Lists. This provides greater heritage protection to heritages places not recognised by the Commonwealth as having heritage values.</p> |
| 10 | Master Builders Association | <p>The Master Builders Association (MBA) believes it is vitally important that the CSIRO land be designated as 'Urban Area'. This large parcel of land is surrounded by existing suburbs, located in close proximity to existing urban services, and is environmentally suitable for urban development. Further, the current use of the land is not utilizing the land to its highest and best use.</p> <p>The supply of land for housing in the ACT is currently not keeping up with demand and the CSIRO land provides a valuable opportunity to provide additional supply to the ACT market. Further, master planning for the site has the opportunity to plan for a diversity of housing types, including a mix of low, medium and high density housing</p> | <p>Support for the proposal is noted.</p> <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <p>options to meet the demand of the ACT's changing demographics.</p> <p>Development of the site for urban purposes will provide valuable economic and social benefits for the ACT. The add</p> | |
| 11 | Forrest School Parents and Citizens Association Inc. | <p>Requests reconsideration of changing the land use for Block 10 Section 13 Forrest and make the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions the appropriateness of a transient population base in a residential setting on and overlooking the school and childcare centre. • Deakin preschool was recently expanded however cannot open at capacity unless Forrest Primary School expands as a result of enrolment processes. • Block 10 Section 13 Forrest would be an ideal setting for Deakin Preschool or Manuka Childcare Centre to move to. • The out of school hours care for Forrest Primary School currently uses the site for their 'Beyond the Fence' program and would like to continue. • The out of school hours program provides care for up to 150 children and would be keen to expand its imprint if possible. • Requests that discussion occur with the Department of Education and training regarding any possible or planned future expansion of | Please refer to section 3.2.2. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | <p>Forrest Primary School to a four stream school prior to any decision being made, especially in light of comments by Joy Burch regarding the value of seamless school transition and the Beyond the Fence program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes the increasing population base as a result of residential developments in Barton, and the number of child care centre offerings in the neighbourhood demonstrate likely future demand on a larger primary school. • Co-locating child care, preschool and primary school facilities has the benefit of minimizing child transport for working families and provides 'continuity' of association/strengthens community ties and engagement. • Notes the increasing accommodation options in the area and questions the need for serviced apartments or a hotel. | |
| | | <p>Traffic congestion and parking problems are already evident in the neighbourhood and these are only likely to increase with a hotel or serviced apartments. The school and members of the community have been engaged in ongoing discussions with the ACT Government regarding traffic, parking and safety issues. If the site remained for community use and the school expanded, the NCA proposed new road access point could be incorporated into a one way pick up/drop off drive through arrangement.</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| 12 | Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation | <p>CSIRO has owned (by Commonwealth leasehold title) the site adjacent to the Barton Highway since 1958 and permanently relocated from its Dickson site in 1962 due to urban encroachment.</p> <p>Since this time, the site has been used for research and experimental farming purposes. It has a small number of buildings with the vast proportion of the site used for grazing.</p> <p>However, as a consequence of Commonwealth Government decisions, and the impacts from the adjacent urban development from the outer Belconnen and Gungahlin suburbs, the site has been underutilised for some time and is no longer considered suitable by CSIRO for these purposes.</p> <p>A new site has been purchased near Boorowa where all current activities will be conducted in the future following a transition period.</p> <p><i>CSIRO's Proposal</i></p> <p>CSIRO's proposal for the future of the Ginninderra site offers many benefits for the Canberra community, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helping meet the ACT's housing needs: There is a current housing shortage in Canberra, particularly in relation to detached dwelling blocks. This site is one of the few remaining sites within the ACT appropriate for significant | <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> <p>The NCA will continue to work with CSIRO as planning for the site continues.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | <p>residential development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best practice environmental sustainability: CSIRO will remain involved in the site long term to ensure the project will deliver a product that has a focus on sustainability and the environment; • Economic development and employment: This land has the potential to create significant economic benefits in the future – including jobs and business opportunities; and • ACT leading the way nationally and internationally: The project will be important in shaping liveable, sustainable and resilient cities in the future. <p>With all of our planning and decisions, we are very committed to being open and transparent with the community which we have demonstrated over the past 3 months and will continue our regular consultation with residents, community groups and local businesses.</p> <p><i>Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces</i></p> <p>The National Capital Plan specifies that Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces are to remain substantially undeveloped in order to protect the symbolic role and Australian landscape character of the Capital, to maintain visual definition and physical containment of the surrounding towns, and to ensure that their landscape, environmental and recreational values become an integral part of the National Capital.</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | <p>CSIRO has been mindful of the National Capital Plan when considering the potential for the future use of the site, particularly noting that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is recognised for its rural landscape, rather than as a Hill or Ridge. When set among the surrounding high points of Mount Rogers and Harcourt Hill the site for the urban area is relatively low level. • The proposal will continue to maintain the landscape character of Canberra and the Territory as the setting for the National Capital. • The proposal will continue to provide a buffer along the Barton Highway corridor that will be further enhanced by additional landscape treatment so as to maintain a physical containment to this part of Belconnen and a buffer between Belconnen and Gungahlin. • The higher points within the site will be landscaped and protected from urban development. • The extension of the urban edge boundary to include the site will provide a natural extension of the existing urban area. <p>Our proposal will not compromise the geometry and intent of Walter Burley Griffin's plan for Canberra.</p> <p><i>Urban Expansion</i></p> <p>The Ginninderra Field Station is located on the current</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | <p>urban edge of Canberra, and urban development will aid the natural extension of Canberra by facilitating population growth directly adjacent to the current suburbs.</p> <p>The site is located midway between the Gungahlin and Belconnen Town Centres and will provide increased catchment expenditure to support the growth of these two large commercial areas.</p> <p>The site is also very well positioned relative to the existing road network and main transport infrastructure, which will aid the development of roads throughout the site.</p> <p>In our community consultations, many community members expressed their interest in maintaining the environmental value of the site, including retaining green spaces and corridors and continued protection of protected or endangered species. CSIRO shares this view and is determined to ensure this environmental value is not only maintained but is a defining feature of future residential living in this area. In this regard, CSIRO also appreciates the strong interest from many community members to have input and the opportunity to influence the shape of a new community. With the world-leading scientific expertise we have within CSIRO, we look forward to working with residents and local groups to meet the community's expectations for a new urban community that respects the environment within which</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>it is located.</p> <p><i>The Future</i></p> <p>The Liveable, Sustainable and Resilient Cities (LSRC) Research Program within CSIRO Land and Water undertakes systems based research to improve the capacity of cities to cope with the pressures of increasing climate variability, population changes, and economic challenges.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the Ginninderra site in Canberra provides a unique opportunity for CSIRO to 'practice what it preaches' with regard to creating liveable, sustainable and resilient cities, and to influence national and international practice around urban design.</p> <p>To have leading edge research and innovative thinking feeding into the design process and have some front line influence on the design and development of a community that can be equipped with the tools to adapt and respond to a changing environment will benefit Canberra for many years to come.</p> <p>The proposed planning policies will aim to pave the way for a water sensitive, ecologically sustainable, urban environment that not only delivers on community needs and expectations but encourages inclusiveness and participation in the community and an active life style.</p> <p>CSIRO is committed to a decision making process in which stakeholders are able to influence the planning</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | and investment choices that affect their communities. | |
| 13 | Friends of Grasslands | <p>Friends of Grasslands (FOG) understands that the CSIRO Ginninderra site will remain National Land and that in due course a precinct code will be developed for the site which will further refine the permitted land uses for the site. FOG is concerned that a blanket change in land use may adversely affect area of remnant box gum grassy woodland and scattered trees which may have high conservation values. Without an environmental assessment it is not possible to assess these potential values. The areas of concern are parts of Blocks 1630 and 1609 Belconnen. FOG's view is that until an environmental assessment is done, parts of Blocks 1630 and 1609 Belconnen should remain as Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces. An environmental assessment would inform the development of a precinct code for the site.</p> <p>Any environment assessment should examine the connectivity values these areas may have with grassland and grassy woodland areas in the north of the ACT. Consideration should also be given to providing a buffer within the CSIRO site to protect the conservation values of Hall Cemetery.</p> | <p>At some stage during the development process the land will be declared Territory Land and the Territory Plan will have effect. The timing of this is unknown but needs to occur prior to settlement of properties. Prior to a declaration of Territory Land the ACT Government would have to undertake a Territory Plan variation.</p> <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |
| | | FOG's request during consultation on the Exposure Draft of the Plan that the provision for extension of Empire Circuit through Stirling Park be removed was acknowledged but did not receive a response. A road through that area of Stirling Park would critically and adversely affect nationally significant species and | The NCA intends to progress detailed policy review of individual Precinct Codes following approval of Draft Amendment 86. The NCA considers that this will provide the best opportunity to consider in detail the land uses for Stirling Park. There are currently no plans to |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>ecological communities in the Park. For this reason FOG asks that the provision for extension of Empire Circuit through Stirling Park be removed from the National Capital Plan.</p> <p>We urge the Authority to consider a change in land use for Stirling Park (including the portion east of Haines Creek) from 'National Capital Use' to 'Nature Conservation Area', or, at the very least, that all of the uncontested lands that form the bulk of Stirling Park become a 'Nature Conservation Area'.</p> <p>FOG's recommendation made during consultation on the Exposure Draft of the Plan for 'Nature Conservation Area' to be a permitted land use listed in the precinct codes for Designated Areas has been set aside on the grounds that a Nature Conservation Area is defined as 'an area declared or intended to be declared under relevant ACT legislation to be a Reserve area ...'. Since, in the NCA's view, it is unlikely that reserves will be established in many precincts, it does not consider it necessary to add 'Nature Conservation Area' to all precinct codes. However, FOG's view is that not listing 'Nature Conservation Area' as a permitted land use in a given precinct code pre-empts any future decision under ACT legislation to create a Reserve area since the Territory Plan cannot be inconsistent with the National Capital Plan!</p> <p>If listing 'Nature Conservation Area' as a permitted land use in all Designated Areas is unacceptable, FOG asks</p> | <p>construct a road as provided for in the National Capital Plan or any other major development proposals.</p> <p>Reserves may still be declared under ACT Government legislation without a specific designated of 'Nature Conservation Area' under the National Capital Plan. The <i>Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) 1988</i> requires the Territory Plan to be 'not inconsistent' with the National Capital Plan. The establishment of a nature reserve would be not inconsistent with other permitted land uses. For example, the definition of 'Open Space' under the Plan refers to land used for conservation purposes.</p> <p>The NCA intends to progress detailed policy review of individual Precinct Codes following approval of Draft Amendment 86. The NCA considers that this will provide the best opportunity to consider in detail the land uses for Stirling Park and Scrivener's Hut.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>that it be listed in the Precinct Codes associated with the Natural Temperate Grasslands at Yarramundi Reach, and the Box Gum Grassy Woodlands at Stirling Park and Scrivener's Hut. These areas contain populations of threatened species and endangered ecological communities that are protected as Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES) under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act and should be protected with 'Nature Conservation Area' status.</p> <p>At the very least, in this revision of the National Capital Plan, 'Open space' should be a permitted land use in the Parliamentary Zone and the Diplomatic (Yarralumla, Deakin and O'Malley) Precinct Codes. Stirling Park and Scrivener's Hut should then be rezoned to 'Open space'. This at least allows recognition of the unique natural values of these two sites.</p> | <p>The NCA is not aware of any major development proposals for these sites. Should a proposal be put forward, relevant processes under the <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> will be required to be undertaken. A land use zoning under the National Capital Plan does not automatically permit that use where matters of national environmental significance are evident.</p> <p>Amendment 80 to the Plan was undertaken primarily to remove the reservation of Yarramundi Reach for the National Museum of Australia, however in doing so also changed the land use to more adequately reflect the capacity of the site for development.</p> |
| 14 | Tuggeranong Hyperdome | <p>The owners of the Tuggeranong Hyperdome are looking to protect the value of their investment and generate potential for future growth. This is unlikely to be achievable without changes to current policy and increased political support.</p> <p>The Tuggeranong Town Centre faces a number of constraints relating to the position of the town centre relative to its catchment, as well as a series of policy directions. Some of these constraints and challenges relate to a smaller catchment population than originally planned (90,000 rather than 150,000), a declining and</p> | <p>Support for potential future urban development in the West Murrumbidgee area is noted.</p> <p>Please also refer to section 3.2.7.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <p>aging population and increased threats posed by the potential expansion of smaller neighbourhood centres.</p> <p>The ability of Tuggeranong to maintain economic viability has been further affected by lack of greenfield residential land to attract young families and first homebuyers into the district, a lack of housing choice to retain younger residents and an ever increasing supply of retain floor space in competing town and group centres. This has had ongoing viability implications for the operators of and within the Hyperdome, who have made substantial investments on the basis of government policy and land release proposals which have not come to fruition.</p> <p>The proposed National Capital Plan presents a way forward for planning in the ACT that will allow relevant Government authorities to respond to the challenges facing the Tuggeranong Town Centre.</p> <p>By rezoning the land west of the Murrumbidgee River so that it is no longer a 'designated area' for the National Capital Authority, the ACT Government will have the capacity to grow Tuggeranong's residential area in the west, bringing a greater population and economic growth to the Tuggeranong region. This growth has the potential to revitalize Tuggeranong by bringing more people and more investment to the Hyperdome and surrounding retail and hospitality district.</p> | |
| 15 | Vjekoslav Bradaric | Objects to the rezoning of Block 10 Section 13 Forrest on | Please refer to section 3.2.2. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <p>the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Child protection</i> – a hotel or serviced apartment will have a significant transient population, which may pose a threat to children. For example, it facilitates an aspirant pedophile monitoring my children in the playground, tracking their movement patterns and swiftly seizing any emerging opportunity to take advantage of this. • <i>Road safety</i> – a hotel will result in increased traffic around the school, including increased violations of the 40km/h school zone by a non-resident population who are not aware of the school zoning, and ultimately pose greater road safety risks to the school population. • <i>Traffic</i> – access to the school will be further impaired due to increased traffic congestion around the area. • <i>After school care</i> – currently uses this land for the Beyond the Fence program. | |
| 16 | Ruth Hyde | <p>Has concerns with the proposal to rezone Block 10 Section 13 Forrest, in relation to the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • road safety, as a hotel will result in increased traffic around the school, including increased violations of the 40km/h school zone by a non-resident population who are not aware of the school zoning, and ultimately pose greater road | Please refer to section 3.2.2. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <p>safety risks to pedestrian and cycling children.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • child protection as a hotel or serviced apartment will have a significant transient population, which may pose a threat to Forrest Primary school children. • traffic access as this could further impair access to the school due to increased traffic congestion around the area. • the school and close residential communities use this public land for recreation. It would be a great loss of open space to the community. <p>New buildings in the area and across Canberra Avenue have already brought considerable traffic to once quiet streets around the school.</p> | |
| 17 | Sally Webster | <p>Objects to the rezoning of Block 10 Section 13 Forrest on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Child protection</i> – a hotel or serviced apartment will have a significant transient population, which may pose a threat to children. For example, it facilitates an aspirant pedophile monitoring my children in the playground, tracking their movement patterns and swiftly seizing any emerging opportunity to take advantage of this. • <i>Road safety</i> – a hotel will result in increased traffic around the school, including increased violations of the 40km/h school zone by a non- | Please refer to section 3.2.2. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <p>resident population who are not aware of the school zoning, and ultimately pose greater road safety risks to the school population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Traffic</i> – access to the school will be further impaired due to increased traffic congestion around the area. • <i>After school care</i> – currently uses this land for the Beyond the Fence program. • <i>Future related building site</i> – the site would be better utilized for a pre-school, or expanded education facility. | |
| 18 | Carleen Jones | <p>Does not support the proposed rezoning of Block 10 Section 13 Forrest. The site should remain zoned as it currently is and should not be rezoned to allow construction of other buildings, in particular a hotel or serviced apartment.</p> <p>It is incumbent upon the ACT Government and NCA to ensure that child protection and safety remains the highest priority, and is not permanently compromised in favour of development or short term revenue considerations.</p> <p>Forrest Primary School plays an important role in the Inner South and has significant potential for enrolment growth, and would benefit from further classroom facilities at the school. The ‘feeder’ pre-school is located off site, providing logistical issues for both families with multiple children and staff supporting both campuses. It makes sense for the associated pre-school to be co-</p> | Please refer to section 3.2.2. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>located onto Forrest Primary School grounds, which then may provide an alternative location for Manuka Childcare Centre which is also in need of another site.</p> <p>Block 10 Section 13 Forrest provides an excellent option for Forrest Primary School's future use, and provides the opportunity to 'future proof' the school.</p> <p>Specifically with respect to the proposed use options for the land under consideration for re-zoning, there are significant concerns due to the adjoining existing services. There are two separate facilities that care for young and vulnerable children - a primary school and an early childhood centre, along with a Jewish religious centre, which is potentially subject to terrorist action in the current security climate. Deliberately placing a hotel with its resultant transient population immediately adjacent to these three services immediately elevates the risk of users of all services, and should not occur. The proximity of the land to the oval and playground of the Primary School and childcare centre provides an ideal location for an aspirant pedophile to monitor children in the playground, track their movement patterns and make a plan to abduct or assault a child, or rapidly seize any emerging opportunity to take advantage of a child due to any lapse in staff supervision.</p> <p>Noting current world events and terrorism activity related to religious and cultural issues, the deliberate proximity of a new hotel or serviced apartment to a</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>Jewish Memorial Centre is similarly of concern and would appear to be a less than ideal choice. Once again, it provides an ideal surveillance location for anyone seeking to monitor the movements of and inflict harm upon a vulnerable minority group using the centre.</p> <p>Additionally, I would submit that given such a re-zoning decision, taken in the current climate, may leave the NCA vulnerable to legal action in the event of an adverse public safety outcome, such legal issues should be thoroughly explored and understood prior to re-zoning action.</p> <p>Road safety aspects are also of concern. A high density commercial building will lead to additional traffic issues in the vicinity of two schools. As it is, access to the two schools is congested around drop-off and pick-up times, and local traffic seeking to use Hobart Avenue is frequently and obviously frustrated during these peak times. Problems with exceeding the 40km/h limit and parking, particularly at peak times, will be exacerbated.</p> <p>Regarding current land use, the school's out of school hours Beyond the Fence program utilizes Block 10 Section 13 Forrest and gets the children outside, away from sedentary activities. Taking this access away from the school would be of great detriment to the children and their development.</p> <p>The recent attempts to relocate MOCCA and remove Telopea Park School sporting facilities met with obvious</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | vocal community disapproval. It is clear that the people of Canberra, and in particular the residents of the inner south area value education, appropriate facilities and child safety. A further incursion on the educational facilities of the area and a compromise of Forrest Primary School and its future needs would be likely to meet with similar public dismay if pursued. | |
| 19 | John Brummell | <p><i>Summary</i></p> <p>Climate change, population growth and peak oil are looming threats to global, national and local food security, even of Canberra. As supplies decrease and prices rise for both food and fuel, people will move towards regionalising and localising food production, processing and retailing. Fortunately aquaculture - related technologies such as hydroponics, aquaponics, fish farming, and possibly algae production offer opportunities to provide increasing amounts of food for growing numbers of people. Time is of the essence, and so it is vital that all stakeholders – scientists, planners, producers, consumers and members of parliaments – understand both the challenges facing the planet today and identify opportunities that offer solutions.</p> <p>It is in that context that the future use of the soil and space of the CSIRO Farm must be considered by the ACT Government and community. The advantages of the site make it very attractive for the establishment of a food production precinct which would enhance Canberra's food security by supplying perhaps 30% of its fresh food</p> | <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> <p>In 2012, the ACT Government commissioned researchers from the University of Canberra and the Australian National University to undertake a preliminary study of issues for the then Environment and Sustainable Development Directorate. The results of this work were published in 'Food in the ACT (2012)'.</p> <p>This report acknowledged the gaps in knowledge regarding food production in the ACT and region, and made recommendations that included identifying land currently available for food production in the ACT and region and ascertaining</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>(vegetables, fish and fruit), at the same time creating a new industry almost the size of the current construction industry and bringing a much needed diversification to the ACT economy.</p> <p><i>Threats to food security and social order</i></p> <p>Australian Governments and the community are in general aware that climate change and population growth are emerging threats to food security but not so aware that drought, population growth and high food prices are already the fundamental causes of the social disorder, civil wars, and mass movements of people in the Middle East, rather than the religious, ethnic and political factors. Closer to our own shores, Prime Ministers of several Pacific Island nations have recently accused Australia of ignoring the dangerous implication for them of rising sea levels.</p> <p>The risk that Australia will not be able to feed all its people may seem decades away at this stage. But the first significant impact on our food security will probably be the flipside of the high prices for Australia's food exports to the rapidly growing numbers of affluent consumers in China and India - namely, much higher domestic food prices : the cost of living could well become a major election issue in future.</p> <p>Another threat to food security is the vulnerability of our liquid fuel supply chain which involves the Middle East and South East Asia. Terrorist attacks or war could</p> | <p>the productivity of the land and its ecological impacts, and developing interactive food maps for the region. Food sensitive urban planning and design guidelines would then provide the starting point for assessing the best use of land in the ACT. The report also provided recommendations in relation to ascertaining the extent of community gardening and urban agriculture, capacity for food swaps, and removing impediments and actively encouraging local food production.</p> <p>Acting on the recommendations of this report would provide a greater understanding of the needs for food production within the ACT, within the regional context. More detailed planning for the CSIRO Ginninderra site may result in opportunities for food production, including market and community gardens.</p> <p>Principles of the Plan recognise the need for protection of the natural environment to improve food security (among other things).</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>see production and transport of food (and other commodities) cease in a day or two. Even if we do escape such a crisis, the response to declining stocks and increasing prices for liquid fuel, will be more localization and regionalization of food production, transport etc. Centralised operations and transport of food will be priced out of the market.</p> <p>Even a cursory examination of the threats to the future of society as we know it should convince most people that we are reaching a crisis point: how can we grow enough food for all and - just as importantly – maintain social cohesion and order by ensuring an equitable distribution of it ? One thing is clear: Every community – village, town, city, metropolis – has to start thinking about how it can enhance its own food security. It will be short-sighted, unrealistic and irresponsible for people to continue to rely on other folk living somewhere else to grow food for us to eat, and to transport it to us.</p> <p><i>The time factors</i></p> <p>There are at least two time factors at work in here :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Most scientific graphs show lines trending upwards until crisis points in say 2040 or 2070, and unfortunately most readers conclude there is no cause for concern until 2040 or later. But trend lines do not always show the inevitable peaks and troughs along the way, which could have disastrous impacts...and which could | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | <p>happen decades before say 2040.</p> <p>b. Urban planners are well aware that major projects, like building a light rail system, or starting up a new major industry such as intensive food production in Canberra, may take 10 to 15 years from conception to final establishment.</p> <p>Either way, time is not on our side.</p> <hr/> <p><i>Food plans for the ACT and region</i></p> <p>While ACT food security may not be on the agenda of most Government and community leaders at this time, a lot of local people have for years been researching and promoting the issue:</p> <p>a. In 2010 science writer and journalist, Julian Cribb, wrote <i>The Coming Famine</i>.</p> <p>b. Also in 2010 Fusion Australia Canberra Office published <i>Grown in the ACT – food security and the future of Canberra</i>.</p> <p>c. The Conservation Council ACT Region has for several years been working on a food policy and plan for the ACT and its region.</p> <p>d. In May 2014 ACT Government Minister Shane Rattenbury convened a roundtable conference of about 40 stakeholders and later issued a Ministerial Statement on food security in the ACT</p> <p>e. Numerous academics and others have produced</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>documents detailing the challenges and the opportunities.</p> <p>f. Meetings of ACT and regional stakeholders, including local landholders and food producers, have attracted in the vicinity of 100 attendees.</p> <p>The material referred to above is readily accessible, and planners and decision makers considering the future of the CSIRO farm are urged to read it.</p> <hr/> <p><i>The future for the CSIRO farm area</i></p> <p>As a city-state which grows only a minuscule amount of its own food, Canberra is in a vulnerable situation. Its potential to grow food via traditional pastoral, agricultural and irrigated operations is very limited – although we should do what we can with that technology! Realistically, however, intensive food production within and around the city using aquaculture-related technologies such as hydroponics, aquaponics, fish farming and algae culture seem to be the most productive technologies to develop at this time. Minister Rattenbury’s Ministerial Statement suggested that the ACT growing 30% of its fresh food (vegetables, fruit, fish) by 2030 would be a reasonable target.</p> <p>It is in that context that the future of the CSIRO farm, and other areas of suitable land not under buildings at this time, should be considered.</p> <p>Advantages of the farm in relation to being largely a food production, processing and wholesale/retail precinct</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Considerable areas of fertile land, with potential for increased productivity with irrigation b. Reasonably flat topography for hydroponic, aquaponics, processing and retail operations c. Intensive food production requires a large labour force. The site offers reasonable access for workers (and customers) living in Belconnen, Gungahlin and North Canberra d. Easy integration with local and interstate traffic networks. e. Potential for water capture and reticulation, and for solar power generation f. Potential for easy incorporation of training, social and commercial amenities for the thousands of workers and customers. <p><i>Economic benefits</i></p> <p>The options here seem to be one-off benefits from sale of residential blocks or the wider and long term benefits of creating an intensive food production industry, or a mixture of both.</p> <p>A food production industry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A hectare of glasshouses is capable of producing \$1 – 1.5 million of food a year, and employing up to 12 people as well as creating more employment in associated operations such as | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>transport and processing.</p> <p>b. (b) To produce 30% of Canberra's fresh food, say about \$1 billion, (the target mentioned in Minister Rattenbury's Ministerial Statement referred to above) would require a total glasshouse area of about 800 hectares, plus space for roads, car parks etc. – <i>creating a new industry almost as large as the ACT construction industry.</i></p> <p>c. Those sceptical that Canberra could achieve such a target might refer to the Costa Group's 30 hectare glasshouse with 200 employees growing tomatoes at Guyra, which is as cold as Canberra. Or to former Liberal leader, John Hewson's plans to establish a food production hub near Bowral on the Southern Highland and export by air to Asia.</p> <p>d. Canberra will be able to draw on the expected influx of refugees to provide much of the labour force, and also the entrepreneurial skills and capital for the new industry.</p> <p>e. (d) Another advantage of an industry producing and selling food locally, is the 'multiplier effect': most of the \$1 billion created in our city would remain here. Currently most of the \$1 billion we spend on fresh food now goes to interstate producers, employees, transport, processing, wholesalers and investors. A new industry of that size would generate many</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--------------|
| | | <p>economic benefits for our community.</p> <p>f. On top of that, food prices are sure to increase under climate change and other pressures, and particularly as prices rise for our exported food. The \$1 billion figure I suggest could double or triple by 2030.</p> <p>g. Sooner or later, a local intensive food production industry will be necessary in Canberra. The CSIRO Farm offers a great location, along with others in and around the City. If we miss this opportunity, the industry will be forced to remote areas say south of Tharwa or to Tidbinbilla where special transport networks would be required for the thousands of workers required.</p> <hr/> <p><i>The folly of the West Sydney Basin</i></p> <p>In the year 2000 a Labor Government in NSW approved the West Sydney Basin be rezoned for residential and industrial development. The area at that time grew 30% of Sydney's fresh food.</p> <p>The new Coalition Government in NSW confirmed that change, with the effect that by 2020 the West Sydney Basin will be producing virtually no food for the rapidly growing Sydney metropolis. History will surely condemn such shortsighted folly. Let us hope that Canberra will be more enlightened.</p> <hr/> <p><i>The ACT and leadership</i></p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|
| | | The ACT Government has a reputation for being more progressive than other administrations in relation on contemporary issues, such as renewable energy, and has been willing to listen to stakeholders in relation to local food security, as demonstrated by Minister Rattenbury's convening of the Roundtable in 2014. A prima-facie case certainly exists for our Assembly members and planners to consider the fortuitous opportunity to enhance our food security via the CSIRO Farm. | |
| 20 | Riverview Projects (ACT) Pty Ltd | As the proponent of the proposed West Belconnen/Parkwood cross-border development, Riverview Projects is taking a close interest in Draft Amendment 86's inclusion of the CSIRO's Ginninderra Field Station site as Urban Area on the General Policy Plan. As near neighbours of the site, appreciate CSIRO's open consultation and look forward to continuing a cooperative relationship with them. In particular, keen to share lessons and ideas with CSIRO's scientists around best practice sustainable urban development. | Noted. CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites. For further details refer to section 3.2.1. |
| 21 | Australian Institute of Landscape Architects (ACT Division) | The ACT Group is generally supportive of the National Capital Plan Exposure Draft. It provides the following comments on the review to ensure that it reflects and retains the integrity of Canberra's landscape as a unique system. | Noted. |
| | | <i>Developing and applying a national interest test</i> The spatial structure of Canberra, the landscape system and the concept of national significance are inextricably | The General Policy Plans for Metropolitan Canberra and the Australian Capital Territory remain key components of the National Capital |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>linked in the ACT. The history of the ACT since Federation binds these concepts to make the city what it is today. However, in giving spatial expression to this, the landscape has acquired other dimensions of interest for the Commonwealth in the nation's capital.</p> <p>Because the spatial structure of the city is in itself nationally significant, the Metropolitan Policy Plan for the Territory must be at the heart of the NCP. This sets out the landscape as system and it is therefore fundamental to keeping the integrity of that system.</p> <p><i>The Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988 (s9) states that the object of the National Capital Plan is 'to ensure that Canberra and the Territory are planned and developed in accordance with their national significance.'</i> Established in legislation, the object of the National Capital Plan maintains the Commonwealths' interest in the ACT.</p> <p>AILA considers that there is scope to establish a clearer test for the application of what is of national significance. When rigorously applied this would support the ability of the NCP to be flexible and respond to contemporary issues and values.</p> <p><i>Valuing landscape systems</i></p> <p>While ever the definition of 'national significance' remains static, tied predominantly to the expression of the Griffin Plan, there is risk that these and other emerging national values will be compromised and lost.</p> | <p>Plan. The National Capital Open Space System also continues to be an integral part of the Plan, recognised spatially in the General Policy Plans, and through written provisions of the Plan. These provisions recognise that the system not only provides a valuable landscape setting for the city, but provides a system of open spaces for recreational and educational use, conservation spaces that help protect the natural environment and environmental qualities of the system.</p> <p>Future stages of the Plan review may provide opportunity to examine more closely a clearer test for the application of national significance.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>The landscape is inextricably meshed to a myriad of urban systems that create Canberra city. In modernising the NCP it is important that this overarching strategic document recognise the integrity of the landscape as a system.</p> <p>The principles that define national significance should not be limited to planning heritage, but articulate the multiple values across the full scale of the landscape, for example environmental services, ecological biodiversity, and recreational opportunity.</p> <p>Adopting through the NCP review a set of principles will ensure the national significance test, when applied to contested areas and projects, allows all stakeholders (the Commonwealth, the ACT Government and the broader community) to 'weigh up' the national significance for now and the future, against current development or city management priorities.</p> <p>Significantly, such robust and repeatable evaluation could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure relevancy and primacy of the NCP without placing undue restrictions on the Territory Plan • integrate assessment issues to inform solutions that allow for change while retaining what is of value and importance nationally • create a more unified and coordinated process to encourage a greater accountability to ACT and | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | federal design and planning processes. | |
| | | <p><i>Regular and routine review</i></p> <p>To remain able to respond to contemporary issues requires a commitment to a regular and routine review process. By establishing a more anticipatory process aligned with the legislated review periods (five yearly) for the ACT Planning Strategy, (as set out in the <i>Planning and Development Act (2007)</i>) the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCA will become cognisant of the contemporary issues the Territory are facing and the evidence of the need for change • Canberra and region community can be more effective and comprehensively engaged in the structure planning • national significance dimension of planning and land management is integrated in ACT government processes, reducing duplication and confrontation • threats to the ACT's landscape structure, through reactive decisions to incremental applications for change, is reduced. | <p>The <i>Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988</i> requires the NCA to keep the Plan under constant review and to propose amendments to it when necessary. There is not currently the capacity to undertake changes to the Act to establish regular legislated review periods.</p> <p>It should be noted that the ACT's <i>Planning and Development Act 2007</i> requires that every five years consideration is given to reviewing the Planning Strategy, rather than an obligation to the review the strategy (similar provisions apply in relation to the Territory Plan).</p> |
| 22 | Simon Ganter | Objects to the rezoning of the CSIRO land in Evatt. | CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p>sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |
| 23 | Andrew Schuller | <p>The justification for increasing permitted building heights for parts of Anzac Park East and West to 35 metres seems to be twofold:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That it will provide greater flexibility for potential refurbishers of the buildings. On a site of this national importance, surely the preferences of developers should not be given priority. • That it might enhance the heritage vista from Parliament House to the War Memorial by marking the 'entrance' to Anzac Parade. Submits that the impact will be negative – a visual distraction from the line of sight up to the War Memorial. <p>Appreciates that the current amendment is to establish a meta-framework within which development proposals for individual precincts can be evaluated as and when they are submitted. But it is dangerous to rule the potential development of West Basin out of consideration in this round of consultation.</p> <p>The immediate plans for developing West Basin will destroy a delightful 'nature strip' along the lakeshore. While the northern shoreline between the two bridges is 'manicured' - and attractively so - West Basin has been left informally 'natural'. To have this stretch of nature so</p> | <p>Please refer to sections 3.2.3 (Anzac Park East and West) and 3.2.7 (West Basin, City Hill and City to the Lake).</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>close to the CBD is an unusual, valuable and refreshing asset which should not be jeopardised.</p> <p>In the longer term plans to erect more multi-storey buildings between New Acton and the lakeshore are also dangerous. Although I consider the new Acton precinct a success it is undeniable that the Nishi Building is a massive visual break in the line of the Black Mountain ridge. This is surely incompatible with the spirit of Griffin's planning concepts for Canberra. To allow more buildings anywhere near this height would, for this section of the lake, bury those concepts for ever.</p> | |
| 24 | Belconnen Community Council | <p>The Belconnen Community Council supports the rezoning of the Ginninderra Field Station subject to CSIRO and the ACT Government reaching an agreement on the timeline and type of redevelopment proposed by CSIRO. Recommends that a binding Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (or similar) be the vehicle for this, supported by a master plan with significant community input.</p> <p>An MOU would have the function of providing certainty to the ACT Government's land release program, and avoid some of the issues that have arisen as a result of the unplanned development that has occurred at Canberra Airport.</p> <p>An MOU could also cover areas of concern to some community members regarding provision of infrastructure, the pace at which development will occur,</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>the areas subject to preservation and protection, potentially protecting some of the natural buffer area, and the possible implications if CSIRO elected to onsell the site to a private developer.</p> <p>A master plan to provide a vision for development, akin to that prepared for West Belconnen could also be useful.</p> <p>Expects that the rezoning will impact on land release programs, infrastructure in the immediate area, transport infrastructure, community facilities and heritage and environmental protection. Land release matters should be discussed between CSIRO and the ACT Government and addressed in the MOU.</p> <p>The development of the CSIRO site will need to provide equivalent facilities to those in surrounding areas, including health care, retail, education and recreation facilities.</p> <p>A contribution to transport infrastructure also needs to occur to ensure that Belconnen avoids the traffic congestion that other residents of Canberra face (such as those in Crace trying to access the Barton Highway). This would include necessary road upgrades and a commitment to public transport facilities.</p> <p>While some residents have expressed the view that the existing zoning should be retained due to its location on the Barton Highway and as an entrance to the nation's capital. Belconnen Community Council does not see this</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>as reason enough for the entire site not to be zoned for urban use. A buffer along the highway could be provided as a landscape and road noise buffer.</p> <p>Environmentally sensitive areas and nearby heritage places could also be linked to provide walking, cycling and recreational space.</p> <p>Suggests that environmental impact reports should be completed prior to the NCA rezoning decision. While the report outcomes may not impact the rezoning, it may impact the scale and nature of the development.</p> | |
| | | <p>Broadly believes that land that is excess to the National Capital Plan should be released to the market and sold (like all other property in the ACT). We would prefer that the land then come under ACT planning controls.</p> | <p>Outside of Designated Areas (those areas identified as having the special characteristics of the National Capital) and National Land (land used or intended to be used by the Commonwealth) is subject to ACT planning control. Under the <i>Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988</i>, the Plan is required to set out the broad land use for the whole of the ACT. The Plan does this through the General Policy Plans for Metropolitan Canberra and the Australian Capital Territory (which covers the majority of the mountain and bushland areas to the south and west of the city). The ACT Government must ensure that Territory planning controls (through the Territory Plan) are not inconsistent with these plans or other relevant principles and policies of the Plan.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | | For all Territory Land (both within and outside Designated Areas), the ACT Government is responsible for administering leases, and determining when land is released to the market. |
| | | Options for development under an 'Urban' zoning can include commercial and light industrial, as well as residential. Believes that large scale commercial development on the CSIRO Ginninderra site would not be appropriate. Clarification regarding commercial intent for the site prior to a rezoning decision would be of community interest. | Further detailed planning work will determine more precise locations for different land uses, including residential, commercial, community facilities and recreation space. Industrial development in Canberra is primarily restricted to Hume, Mitchell and Fyshwick (with some industrial type uses in Bruce and West Belconnen); industrial development would not be part of the land use mix on the CSIRO Ginninderra site. |
| 25 | Christine Coghlan | <p>Does not support the change in land use for the CSIRO Ginninderra Field Station. Supports the NCA's principle that Canberra should have distinct towns separated by open space in order to have a natural landscape setting and fears this will be compromised if the open area between Belconnen and Gungahlin is in-filled with housing.</p> <p>Suggests the well cared for CSIRO land is suited for intensive and broadacre agriculture, which would help assure Canberra's food supply in the future. For example, the site could be used by the farmers who will be displaced from the Molonglo valley. The approach route into Canberra via the Barton Highway would then gradually change from grazing land to farmland to leafy</p> | <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>setbacks for suburbia.</p> <p>Believes this would achieve the NCA's intent for a build up of travellers' expectations of the national capital as an especially symbolic place and would demonstrate a hierarchy of landscape.</p> | |
| 26 | Mike Lawson | <p>As a member of the Lake Burley Griffin Guardians, supports the views expressed in their submission and their recent public comments in media and on their website. Also a member of the Capital Metro community reference group for the City area and therefore involved in community consultations on future light rail in the City.</p> <p>When taken with the ACT Government and Land Development Authority's plans for City to the Lake, Amendment 86 will have the effect of turning substantial areas of the city including public open space into an urban jungle of high rise offices and apartments, with very limited community facilities and parking. By creating a high rise developed landscape, it will kill off a lot of what we love about Canberra, including its open spaces close to the city, Floriade and the public amenity of a natural lake foreshore. Yet this does not have to be so.</p> | Please refer to submission no. 32. |
| | | <p>While understanding the need to overcome the Northbourne Avenue/Commonwealth Avenue speedway around City Hill, the urban design solution surely cannot be to divert traffic through an invasion of 18 storey towers spreading across the cityscape as is currently</p> | Refer to section 3.2.7, 'West Basin, City Hill and City to the lake'. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>proposed. This will only create additional congestion, noise and pollution, as well as turning City Hill into a courtyard for office workers.</p> <p>Griffin envisaged a low to mid-level horizontal city, not a wedding cake on City Hill. Planners should be brave enough to respect this vision and enforce a low level of building height around City Hill and consider the costly but longer term solution of a tunnel for high speed traffic through City Hill from Northbourne to Commonwealth Avenue. This would meet the need to overcome the current isolation of City Hill, allow development on the flat carparks around London Circuit, make the city centre more pedestrian and cycle friendly and divert through traffic away from London Circuit and Vernon Circle.</p> | |
| | | <p>West Basin and City to the Lake proposals do not have any vision for community facilities apart from a boardwalk and replacement for the city pool.</p> <p>Understands the need to bring the city to the lake to overcome the 1960s motor city design obstacle of Parkes Way. City to the Lake offers an opportunity to plan for a pedestrian/cycling low scale nationally significant precinct throughout West Basin, but considers that the plans will instead allow for high rise development, truck and car access, and virtually no parking, while creating a cycling and walking foreshore that will be commercialised and bring pedestrians and cyclists into conflict with traffic.</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | Amendment 86 needs to be much more prescriptive by requiring the development of a precinct master plan for the whole of West Basin before approval of any new development in the area. It also must be much more specific about height limits, building density and quality of design and community facilities, and it must require more public open space than the limited plazas and foreshore boardwalk in the current design. | |
| | | It is important to maintain symmetry on each of the points of the Parliamentary Triangle and all of Anzac Avenue. I do not believe the current Amendment 86 proposal, which includes allowance for tall buildings at Russell and City Hill and a 'portal' between high buildings at the base of Anzac Avenue, provides sufficiently for the need to balance the heights, mass and design of buildings at these three key points. The heights proposed for buildings at the southern end of Anzac Avenue/Parkes Way are too generous and would have the effect of diminishing the Australian War Memorial as seen from the southern side of the lake. As the AWM building and Anzac Parade vista are part of the national estate, this must not be permitted. | Refer to section 3.2.4 of this report regarding building heights for Anzac Park East and West. Taller building elements at the Russell and City Hill apexes were permitted under the Plan prior to the proposal of Draft Amendment 86. |
| | | Draft Amendment 86 should do nothing to prevent the eventual extension of the light rail network to the southern side of the lake. Light rail will transform Canberra and the urban planning industry should do everything they can to make it work for Canberra. | Extension of light rail to the southern side of Lake Burley Griffin would not be inconsistent with the Plan. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| 27 | Belconnen Soccer Club | <p>Appreciates CSIRO's consultation with the local community regarding the CSIRO Ginninderra Field Station proposal. Development and progress in this area would be very positive for the economy and jobs in Belconnen, which would benefit the club's members. At the moment, the community is blocked by fences from having any access to the site. A positive development would give the community the opportunity to enjoy the site more than they can now. CSIRO is a trusted organization in the community with scientific expertise that can ensure that residential development is done in a way that maintains a nice environment with parks and recreation facilities for the community to enjoy.</p> <p>Believes that from a community perspective the development of the CSIRO site would be a positive move. Supports CSIRO in the direction and discussion which they are currently having with Government.</p> | <p>The NCA notes support from the Belconnen Soccer Club for the proposal to include the CSIRO Ginninderra field station within Urban Areas.</p> <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |
| 28 | P.R. Temple | <p><i>Current site</i></p> <p>The CSIRO Ginninderra site is a unique and wonderful buffer zone between two rapidly sprawling urban development areas in Canberra. It is valued by all residents and visitors as a break in the apparent unplanned and uncontrolled urban sprawl in Canberra. Views, wildlife and pristine landscapes are essential in our once proud 'Bush Capital'. As a gateway to our city it is unsurpassed in Australia.</p> <p>Ironically the wonderful CSIRO film of the site shown at</p> | <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>the neighbourhood drop-in sessions and the photographs in the Fact Sheets and Brochures could equally well be environmental advertisements from CSIRO and the community telling NCA and LDA to 'keep your hands off our pristine land'. This land must be protected for Canberra residents and visitors as a National Park and/or an eco-tourism facility or similar recreational pursuits. To allow urban sprawl will be irresponsible.</p> <p>The recently approval of DV351 (without the approval of DA86) surrounding the West Belconnen Landfill Site will create a new West Belconnen suburb of 30,000+ new homes with the loss of access to the fantastic, picturesque and steeply-gorged river corridor. To date, the NSW Riverview development has not been submitted for discussion.</p> <p>Surely at this time, there is going to be a surplus of accommodation in western Canberra? Riverview (ACT) development, together with the 5,500+ new residents and/or residences (as many as Aranda, Cook and Macquarie put together) proposed in the Belconnen Town Centre.</p> <hr/> <p><i>Land use by CSIRO since 1958</i></p> <p>Concerns that the land may not be 100% safe given land use of the site over the last 57 years.</p> <p>Has requested of CSIRO all environmental reports prepared about the site, including a HazCham register of</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | <p>all activities since commencement of operations in 1958, soil sampling, chemical residue tests and seed viability studies, sampling and results. CSIRO has advised that environmental reports have not yet been finalised, but the reports will become public following the Department of Environment's assessment process which will occur some time in 2016.</p> <p>Finds it difficult to comprehend how CSIRO can apply to change the land use without putting all the data, information and facts on the table to allow aspects of the changes to be examined.</p> | |
| | | <p><i>Due process</i></p> <p>In view of the HazChem spraying and applications on this land, would have thought that an EIS and Environmental/Soil residue sampling and Management Plan and 'dispersed' seed evaluation would have been mandatory by both NCA and CSIRO before applying to amend the zoning to 'Urban Area'.</p> <p>An independent environmental study may find that the land is found to be OH&S, unsafe and unsuitable for urban development due to toxic waste and residues.</p> <p>CSIRO has advised that at some stage during the development process the land will be declared Territory Land and the Territory Plan will have effect. CSIRO has already – before approval has been given to sell its Ginninderra site – gone ahead and purchased a new farm at Boorowa. These latter two facts tend to indicate</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>that CSIRO knows more about the land deal than it is willing to share with NCA and the general public.</p> <p>NCA should not even consider the reclassification of CSIRO's land to 'Urban Area' until CSIRO prepares a comprehensive report with 'everything on the table'. This should include a comprehensive report detailing land use over the last 57 years, all environmental considerations, reports and studies of the site and assurances that the land is 100%, OH&S suitable for human habitation.</p> <p>The Riverview Reports (DV351 & NCA DA85) and the wonderful diorama in its Kippax Office are an example of a reclassification proposal worth examining.</p> | |
| 29 | ACT Equestrian Association Inc. | <p>The hills, ridges and buffer areas of the National Capital Open Space System provide many opportunities for trail riding and endurance riding for our members, as well as providing a scenic and restful backdrop to the National Capital urban areas. Some of the ACT Government Horse Holding paddocks, enabling horse agistment close to Canberra suburbs, are located in those hills, ridges and buffer areas.</p> <p>Concerns that Draft Amendment 86 is supporting a change to land use policy to allow CSIRO Ginninderra Experiment Station from 'Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces' to become urban area. Currently a multi-use trail, used by ACT horse riders, is on the verges of Kuringa Drive and Owen Dixon Drive which form part of the boundaries of</p> | <p>CSIRO is cognisant of the proximity of the Bicentennial National Trail to the field station. The Draft Concept Plan for the site prepared for the purposes of CSIRO's initial consultation with the community indicates potential for the trail to be relocated along Hall Creek.</p> <p>Further planning for the site will help determine the location of the trail, as well as more precise land uses for the site, including recreation areas and community facilities.</p> <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services,</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>the Ginninderra Experiment Station. The trail on Kuringa Drive is part of the Bicentennial National Trail.</p> <p>Realises there will be an increase in population in Canberra with an on-going need for residential and commercial development we wish that future development be planned with consideration of the value of open space. In regard to this proposed change there should be adequate allowance within the new urban area to retain a suitable approach route to Canberra. There also needs to be provision for open space within any new suburban area and allowance for community facilities such as community gardens and ACT Government Horse holding paddocks.</p> | <p>and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>. For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |
| 30 | ACT Cultural Facilities Corporation | <p>The Cultural Facilities Corporation is currently working with leading theatre architects and designers to develop a concept design for a major (2,000-seat) new theatre on the site adjacent to The Playhouse, and enclosed by Northbourne Avenue, Vernon Circle and Knowles Place.</p> <p>Believes the new theatre, which will embody very high standards of design, will enhance the City Hill Precinct, including through the opportunity it provides for several prominent areas (for example a fine dining restaurant; cafe; subscribers lounge and wraparound foyer spaces and balconies) to be orientated towards, and have views over, City Hill Park.</p> <p>The requirements of the NCP as currently worded would, however, create challenges for the design of the major</p> | <p>NCA representatives have met with the Cultural Facilities Corporation and their consultant architect to discuss the proposal.</p> <p>The Plan allows for minor building elements above 25 metres on the theatre site, and also allows for the Authority to consider building heights above stated limits provided RL617 is not exceeded.</p> <p>The pedestrian links shown in the Plan are indicative only. Together with the written policies of the Plan, these are intended to show that new development should address pedestrian connectivity (and bicycle movement) within the City Hill Precinct and between the City Hill</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>new theatre in two respects.</p> <p><i>Height of buildings on Vernon Circle</i></p> <p>The Plan provides for building heights generally up to 25 metres above adjacent kerb levels of London Circuit, Vernon Circle and Northbourne, Edinburgh, Constitution and Commonwealth Avenues; landmark buildings to RL617 at certain locations; and the potential for minor building elements that extend building height above 25 metres will be considered where this enhances the architectural quality of the building and fosters energy efficiency, indoor amenity and appropriate urban scale.</p> <p>The challenge for new theatre development is that the current concept design indicates a need for the stagehouse building component of the theatre, incorporating the fly tower, to be 32.5 metres in height in order to ensure full functionality for the new facility.</p> <p>This height is measured from ground level and, given the change in levels between Knowles Place and Vernon Circle, the height above Vernon Circle is expected to be less than this. Also, the height would relate only to part of the building – primarily the fly tower – and this part of the building would be at some distance from the property boundaries.</p> <p>Figure 45 <i>City Hill – Indicative pedestrian links</i> shows an indicative pedestrian link between The Playhouse and City Hill.</p> | <p>Precinct and nearby areas of City.</p> <p>As plans for the theatre progress, the NCA will continue to work with the Corporation to address building height and pedestrian connectivity (among other matters).</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | The current concept design for the new theatre would remove this link as it would connect the new theatre with The Playhouse. This is seen as important to the functionality of the new building, since it would allow shared use of areas such as loading docks and some backstage areas, as well as allowing for the efficient use of staff between the existing and new facilities. | |
| 31 | Robyn Coghlan | <p><i>Statement of Planning Principles</i></p> <p>The Statement of Planning Principles include principles about containing urban expansion and concern for resilience to climate change. Densification of Canberra has seen the loss of green space by concreting over land by buildings, driveways and paved areas, which provides little space for shrubbery or large trees to provide shade.</p> <p>There is little discussion about this creation of a heat island effect and the fact that this will make living in Canberra less pleasant as the climate warms. It will also increase the use of air-conditioning and, accordingly, energy consumption and undesirable emissions. This is hardly going to increase resilience to climate change.</p> | The Statement of Planning Principles contains high level policies to guide development, and which are binding on both the NCA and the ACT Government. More detailed principles and policies within both the National Capital Plan and the Territory Plan provide further guidance around matters such as subdivision and block layout, building orientation, and solar access. |
| | | <p><i>Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces</i></p> <p>Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces are what make Canberra livable. They compensate for the lack of beaches and avoid the urban agglomeration of typical cities. Disappointed to see the NCA facilitating the rezoning of the CSIRO Ginninderra site. It should be expected that the area required for a suitable Buffer Space around the</p> | CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Belconnen district should be defined first and the remainder then rezoned for Urban use. To rezone it all as Urban and later decide what should be reserved as a buffer will inevitably lead to less or total loss of a buffer zone.</p> <p>Likewise, the racecourse and showground (EPIC) both act as a buffer zone between the North Canberra urban district and Mitchell-Gungahlin. Although they are not zoned either as Buffer Spaces or Broadacre, they still perform this function. To rezone them for urban development will create a continuous, uninterrupted urban stretch from Civic to Casey. This might help support light rail but it is bad planning in the Canberra context. Furthermore, the location of both the racecourse and showground were carefully selected to provide easy access from country areas via the Barton and Federal Highways.</p> | <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> <p>The inclusion of areas adjacent to Mitchell reflects the existing Plan provision that this is a future Urban Area and the current use of these areas for urban development such as the racecourse, Exhibition Park in Canberra (EPIC) and Bimberi Youth Justice Centre.</p> <p>The ACT Government is responsible for making decisions regarding any relocation of the racecourse and showground.</p> |
| | | <p><i>Broadacre Areas</i></p> <p>Section 3.6.2 states that 'Broadacre Areas may act as buffers between towns, provide sites for uses which require large land areas or may benefit from or be best located within a non-urban setting, and provide a land bank for future Urban Areas'.</p> <p>There is much propaganda about minimising greenfields development (to justify high-rise densification) but there is no sign that any limit has been assessed as to the amount of ACT land that is appropriate to be urbanised.</p> | <p>Refer to section 3.1 of the report for commentary on the West Belconnen proposal.</p> <p>Any future proposals for development close to the Murrumbidgee would need to demonstrate water quality impacts on the Murrumbidgee River and how negative impacts would be mitigated. Consultation with relevant government agencies would occur as part of any future planning process.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <p>Neither is it clear whether any ultimate population limit has been examined, given the ACT's location in the headwaters of the only drainage basin serving large areas of the nation's productive land.</p> <p>Approval of DA85 will give the go ahead to the West Belconnen proposal, followed, most likely, by NSW's approval of the Riverview section of this proposal. This will set a precedent for further such development along this important, sensitive waterway. In the same vein, the West Murrumbidgee proposal will pose a threat to water quality. Water Sensitive Urban Design is cited as assuring this will not be a problem but WSUD infrastructure is expensive and needs continual maintenance. Living in an area where the streets and gutters are not cleaned and maintained regularly, it is easy to be sceptical about sufficient funds being budgeted every year for the proper maintenance of WSUD.</p> <p>No area near the Murrumbidgee should be considered for urban development. The NCA should enforce scientific and ethical principles to ensure the long-term wellbeing of the Murrumbidgee River system.</p> | |
| | | <p><i>Parliamentary Zone Precinct</i></p> <p>In regard to East and West Blocks, no land use is cited. Disturbed that the sites may be leased to private interest and considers that this shows a lack of regard for the Parliamentary Triangle.</p> | Please refer to section 3.2.4. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p><i>Constitution Avenue and Anzac Parade</i></p> <p>There is no advantage in ‘changing the character of Parkes Way to become a boulevard addressed with prestigious buildings, at grade pedestrian crossings and appropriately scaled road reserves and intersections’. This is typical ‘old city’ thinking and ignores the fact that there will always be a need for road access from the west of Canberra City to the eastern side, especially the airport. Better pedestrian access to Commonwealth Park is definitely needed but not at the expense of traffic efficiency.</p> <p>The land west of Anzac Parade and south of Constitution Avenue should remain for national and/or community uses. All buildings should access Constitution Avenue. This land is critical to the view from Parliament House and the proposal to build a huge football stadium here is excruciatingly bad urban design.</p> | <p>Pedestrian access to Kings and Commonwealth Park from the north side of Parkes Way will need to be balanced with objectives for traffic movement.</p> <p>Land use west of Anzac Parade and south of Constitution Avenue is primarily ‘Land Use A’, which allows for a range of uses, including social/community facility. The Plan since its inception has allowed for a mix of commercial, community and national uses, and changes to land use have reflected the changing nature of the city.</p> <p>The ACT Government is currently considering a potential future stadium in Canberra, however no commitment has been made. Any proposal for a stadium within Designated Areas will be assessed against relevant provisions of the Plan, including land use.</p> |
| | | <p><i>Anzac Park East and West</i></p> <p>These two buildings bookend Anzac Parade and have been willfully neglected by the Australian Government. It is unforgiveable that broken windows on the East Building were boarded up for visitors to see during the centenary commemoration of the Anzac landing this year. Their location means that the Australian Government should retain responsibility for them and have pride in their part in the commemorative vista. The</p> | <p>Please refer to section 3.2.3.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>notion that private ownership under planning controls will maintain the aspect required is wishful thinking and passing the buck.</p> <p><i>Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores</i></p> <p>Disappointed to see that the Lake Burley Griffin and Surrounds map shows the extent to which the lake foreshores have already been alienated. Gradually, the American tradition of exploiting waterside land for the benefit of the few is taking the lake shore away from the majority or, at least, restricting its availability.</p> <p>Just because Griffin's plans show development at West Basin is no reason for Australians to adopt this practice. Waterside lands in Australia have always been reserved for public use. Griffin was American. Beachside property in the USA extends to the high tide mark thus excluding the public. In Australia, the only waterside areas traditionally developed are around ports where industrial activities were necessary. This is an area of policy where Canberrans expect the National Capital Authority to protect public access from the depredations of the hungry development machine.</p> | <p>No changes have been made to the policy intent for West Basin or for Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores.</p> <p>Please also refer to section 3.2.7 of this report.</p> |
| 32 | Lake Burley Griffin Guardians | <p><i>Comments on Consultation Report on the National Capital Plan Exposure Draft</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would have been helpful to know at the commencement of consultation of the Exposure Draft which sections of the Plan were under review. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Material available on the NCA's website advised that the focus of the initial stage of the Plan review was on streamlining the shared responsibilities and interests of the Australian and ACT Governments. Website material advised that the |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|----------------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>2. Comments made in the submission to the Exposure Draft relating to West Basin and City Hill have been marked with the following comment: <i>'Review of detailed policy for West Basin and City Hill is outside the scope of the current process'</i>. Perplexed to learn that reviews of precinct codes and policies had been excluded from this review with no indication of and when reviews would occur.</p> <p>3. Regarding the Guardians' comment on section 4.1.1, two comments were provided which appear contradictory.</p> <p>4. The NCA responded to our comment on the importance of vistas and open spaces, noting that the Plan stipulates the conservation of major vistas and open spaces.</p> <p>The Guardians are dismayed that this policy has not been followed regarding the vistas of West Basin from the most important route of Commonwealth Avenue. We stress that it is almost 10 years since Joint Standing Committee on the National Capital and External Territories approved amendments to the NCP with policies to develop West Basin. This was flawed planning that will adversely impact the parkland space set out in the Griffins' 1911 plan, WB Griffin's 1913 and 1918 plans and established in the prize winning lake construction, by the National</p> | <p>content of the Exposure Draft was largely derived from existing Plan content, that detailed planning policy was largely unchanged and that review of these policies would form later stages of the Plan review.</p> <p>2. Please refer to comments in response to point 1. above. Review of Precinct Codes has not been excluded from the comprehensive review of the Plan, however were not part of the first major stage of the review. Passage of Amendment 86 allows the NCA to better understand the likely timeframes associated with detailed policy review.</p> <p>3. The general policies for the Central National Area may be reviewed as future stages of the Plan review (i.e. detailed policy review). Implementation of recommendations from previous reports and investigations may be part of the material relevant to the policy review and inform changes to this policy.</p> <p>4. Refer to section 3.2.7 of this report. Please note that the Joint Standing Committee on the National Capital and External Territories did not approve the 'Griffin Legacy' amendments to the National Capital Plan. The responsible</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Capital Development Commission.</p> <p>Building height limits and mass along the west side of Commonwealth Avenue will be so great as to create a lop-sided southern exposure from Capital Hill and will destroy the vistas to the Brindabellas from Commonwealth Avenue Bridge. As well, building heights in West Basin, on Parkes Way and Commonwealth Avenue are not protected from encroachment to the maximum allowed, because the wording of the plan does not specify the maximum number of floors permitted above natural ground level. This will permit the ACT Government to build 25 metre high apartment and office towers around and on top of Parkes Way while offering little scope for public open space in West Basin. The building estate concept appears to be in a style similar to Kingston Foreshore with crowded in buildings, inadequate and poorly thought out public spaces, and poor parking, but having buildings at a greater height and with more overshadowing.</p> <p>The development proposal of 6-8 storey-high buildings will impact vistas across the lake from Commonwealth Avenue recognised in the NCP as one of the Griffins' grand avenues. It will also obliterate public parking required for sizeable</p> | <p>Minister (then Minister for Local Government, Territories and Roads) had this responsibility under the <i>Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988</i>. The amendments went through the relevant statutory process involving public consultation, Ministerial approval and Parliamentary scrutiny.</p> <p>5. The NCA's heritage register is available on the NCA website at www.nationalcapital.gov.au. Where relevant, development proposals must consider heritage values of places, and may require referral under the EPBC Act.</p> <p>6. The General Policy Plan identifies the area between Pialligo Avenue and the Molonglo River as a 'Potential Future Urban Area' only, based on outcomes of the ACT Government's Eastern Broadacre Planning Study. A strategic assessment is currently being undertaken for the Eastern Broadacre area which will consider a broad range of social, economic and environmental constraints and opportunities and consider recent ecological, contamination, and heritage studies. This study will help refine potential development areas.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|----------------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>events in Commonwealth Park and alienate valued public parkland forever. Regardless of the concept having been agreed by Parliament in 2006, they are flaws in the NCP and must be addressed.</p> <p>The whole West Basin development should be put on hold until the NCA and ACT Government have engaged in a thorough and proper public consultation about the entire precinct, not just the piecemeal approach based on vague artists drawings which has been a feature of planning in this area to date.</p> <p>The proposed NCP Amendment 86 must provide for master planning of precincts as a pre-requisite for development such as in West Basin.</p> <p>5. The NCA responded to comments on section 2.4 with the following: <i>'Listing of heritage places is the responsibility of other agencies and is outside the scope of the National Capital Plan'</i>.</p> <p>While this is correct regarding Commonwealth Heritage Listing, under the EPBC Act 1999, the NCA, as a Commonwealth agency, has the responsibility of preparing its own heritage register and the identification and management of heritage values of Commonwealth properties. Seeks confirmation that the Plan will be in</p> | <p>The Plan still contains general planning principles and policies for the Molonglo River corridor (under Part Three).</p> <p>7. Refer to section 3.2.7 of this report.</p> <p>8. This point is addressed later in the NCA's response to the Lake Burley Griffin Guardians submission.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>conformity with the protection of Commonwealth heritage values according to the EPBC Act 1999.</p> <p>6. Regarding comment on section 3.1.5 General Policy Plan Metropolitan Canberra, the submission referred to planned development near the Molonglo River near Oaks Estate and Piallago given that the Guardians is concerned for water quality in the Molonglo River and existing heritage sites in the area. This comments did not refer to the Majura Valley development, and the Guardians is opposed to the removal of special requirements on the Molonglo River area.</p> <p>7. Regarding comment on sections 3.3.1-3.3.2, the NCA states that comments on West Basin and City Hill are outside the scope of the current process.</p> <p>The proposal for a component of the commercial/business part of the city in West Basin is flawed. Civic has organically spread to the north with well advanced plans to go even further. New works along Constitution Avenue will allow Civic to spread further eastward. Its business model is already suffering and is threatened by extension to West Basin that is not in the interests of Civic and future generations of Canberra citizens.</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Despite having no specific heritage listing, Lake Burley Griffin is nationally significant and its lakeshore landscape is a critically important waterfront landscape that encircles the Lake and consolidates the Lake's beauty. The West Basin landscape space holds great potential for future landscape improvements that could be priceless additions to the Lake's value. West basin is essentially a necessary open and parkland space for use by Canberra citizenry and its visitors, now and in the future, not to be sacrificed.</p> <p>8. Appreciates the proposals for a master plan for Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores, however the Precinct Code area is at odds with a whole of Lake Master Plan and any ensuing management plan.</p> | |
| | | <p><i>Introduction</i></p> <p>Supports the purpose of the plan in establishing matters of national significance as broadly described in the dot points. Stresses support for the second dot point and note that all of the lakeshore landscape should be safeguarded for National Capital character and setting. Although supportive of the third dot point, more care is required in defining the key elements of the WB Griffin 1918 plan: these have been seriously distorted with regard to Lake Burley Griffin in versions of the Plan and the consolidated Plan 2014.</p> | <p>The revised Plan provides a 'line of sight' between the high level matters of national significance and objectives, and more detailed policy. Respect for the Griffins' plan and conservation and enhancement of key landscape features are broad matters, while detailed policy in the Plan further supports these objectives.</p> <p>The dot points identifying matters of national significance are replicated in 'Part One – The National Significance of Canberra and the Territory'. This part also describes the rationale for identifying Designated Areas, noting as a</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>The Lake broadly reflects the 1918 WB Griffin vision but its reality and detail came long after Griffin through the 1964 NCDC plan which allowed Griffin's vision to shine through. The NCDC work that established the Lake and landscape is an outstanding landscape design and construction achievement. It received an award in 1986 and that plan should be neither obfuscated nor diminished.</p> | <p>primary factor that <i>'Griffins' strong symbolic design for Canberra Central has given the National Capital a unique and memorable character'</i>. This part further identifies four main elements to the Griffins' design. The NCA has responded to the Lake Burley Griffin Guardians suggested changes to these points below.</p> |
| | | <p><i>Objectives of the National Capital Plan</i></p> <p>Supports these objectives and notes that the second dot point has a direct link to section 2.4.4 and comments regarding this section.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | | <p><i>Section 1.2 Designated Areas</i></p> <p>The four main elements of Griffins' design as set out are appropriate but should include the land and water axes that are a fundamental component of the urban structure. As well, an expansion of the fourth dot point is noted.</p> <p>Recommendation: include the following amended statements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a geometric plan with land and water axes and a central triangle formed by grand avenues terminating at Capital Hill, the symbolic centre of the nation • a system of urban centres connected by radial avenues and a low level horizontal urban form at | <p>As noted above, the revised Plan provides a 'line of sight' between the high level matters of national significance and objectives, and more detailed policy.</p> <p>To date, the four dot points identifying the four main elements of Griffins' design have been robust in guiding identification of Designated Areas and subsequent policy. Detailed policy of the Plan refers not only to the land water axes, but other minor axes as well.</p> <p>No changes have been made to this section.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | Civic Centre. | |
| | | <p>There is continual use of the term 'Lake Burley Griffin and its Foreshores'. There is no definition for the term 'Foreshores' in the appendix of the plan nor in the PALM Act. It could mean just the land water interface or include all the lakeshore landscape. A definition is required.</p> <p>Recommendation: The term 'foreshores' be defined to mean all of the public lakeshore landscape encircling the Lake, between Lake waters and established property and roadway boundaries.</p> | <p>The Plan identifies Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores as comprising Lake Burley griffin and the areas of central parkland and open space surrounding it. These areas include Grevillea Park, Black Mountain Peninsula and Yarramundi Reach on the northern foreshores, and Bowen Park, Weston Park, Lennox Gardens and Yarralumla Beach on the southern foreshores. Other key sites included in the Precinct include the Governor-General's estate, and the National Zoo and Aquarium. This description is at section 4.12.1 and depicted in the figure titled 'Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores Precinct Location'. The NCA considers this sufficient in defining 'Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores' for planning purposes.</p> |
| | | <p><i>Section 2.3.3 Principles for environmental sustainability and open space (Objective one)</i></p> <p>The landscape of the Griffins' design for the Nation's Capital was to invoke an environmental quality which is a key feature of Canberra's character. Conserving and enhancing this landscape setting is important in retaining the character of the National Capital.</p> <p>In this context, the health of the Lake waters is paramount. The manifold uses to which it is put, particularly recreational uses, are directly dependent on</p> | <p>The NCA reiterates its advice that water quality and management of Lake Burley griffin is outside the scope of the Plan. The Plan is not a management tool for the lake, this is addressed in the Lake Burley Griffin Water Quality Management Plan 2011.</p> <p>The NCA, ACT Government and other stakeholders are on a working group to address water quality in the Molonglo catchment.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>good quality and healthy water that sustains a diverse and healthy ecology. Methods of monitoring, remedying and prevention of poor water quality are lightly touched upon in the Precinct Codes for Lake Burley Griffin and Jerrabomberra Wetlands on the Lake's eastern shore.</p> <p>The Guardians appreciate that the ecological communities, threatened flora and fauna species, water catchments and water quality of this Designated Area are to be protected and supported by sustainable resource management.</p> <p>The Guardians noted comments in the Consultation Report and we appreciate that a water quality management plan exists (2011). However we believe lake water health is critical to the functioning of the Central Canberra and the Designated Area and we reiterate our recommendations that relate to the comments made on the Exposure Draft:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Guardians want to see the strong physical and ecological interdependence between Lake Burley Griffin and Jerrabomberra Wetlands emphasised much more definitely in the NCP and in a way that precludes any management or development in either that will impact even lightly on the other. 2. The Guardians want to see much more strength behind the statements relating to the maintenance of a robust and sustainable ecology both in the water column and the riparian | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>surrounds of the Lake and connecting water bodies and water courses.</p> <p>3. The Guardians want to see the problem of poor dilution and aeration in partially closed embayments addressed much more forcibly in the Plan.</p> <p>4. The Guardians urges that pollutant transport in urban runoff be addressed a good deal more positively than noted in the Plan.</p> | |
| | | <p><i>Section 2.3.4 Principles for environmental sustainability and open space (Objective two)</i></p> <p>As stated in our comments on the Exposure Draft, the Guardians believe landscape views and vistas are an environmental value and major attributes of Designated Area, particularly the vistas and views of the Lake and across the Lake, of the mountains, from the inner hills and to the inner hills. We do not believe the comments in the Consultation Report address the protection of important vistas, view-sheds and viewpoints.</p> <p>The Guardians does not agree with the NCA comment in the Consultation Report that vistas are enhanced by development. There examples in Canberra where significant vistas have been channelled and reduced by retaining walls destroying view scope and visual movement to the terminus, demonstrating the failure of that principle.</p> <p>Recommendation: insert 'major vistas, view-sheds,</p> | <p>The NCA does not support the change suggested by the Guardians. A number of major vistas and viewpoints around the city include views to urban areas. For example, the viewshed from vantage points at Mount Ainslie, Black Mountain and Red Hill contain considerable urban areas. The landscape is integrated with these urban areas, and the landscape setting of the city will continue to be of key importance (as required by the Plan).</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | viewpoints' into principle 'a'. a. The hills, ridges, major vistas, view-sheds, viewpoints and other major open spaces will be kept largely free of urban development so they can form a natural backdrop to the National Capital. | |
| | | <p><i>Section 2.4.2 Principles of urban design (Objective one)</i></p> <p>Principle 'f' can adversely enable development damaging to landscape features. More specific vista, view-shed and viewing point protection in open space areas are required. This may require research and could form part of the Lake Burley Griffin and Lakeshore Landscape Master Plan.</p> <p>The principles set out in 2.4.2 are all about development. Existing developed and undeveloped open space parklands are vital, particularly in the central area of Canberra.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove 'enhanced by development' f. Vistas to major landscape features shall be protected. 2. More specific comments on the protection of vistas and view sheds are needed in the Plan. 3. Insert a new principle. Retain and protect open space park areas within the city, particularly all of the Lake Burley Griffin lakeshore landscape. | <p>In response to the three recommendations proposed by the Guardians:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The NCA does not accept the Guardians recommendation to alter clause 2.4.2(f), as 'development' may refer to a range of works, including building works but also landscape works. More detailed policies of the Plan provide greater direction about the type of 'development' permitted (for example, where land uses permit building activity or are restricted to uses more compatible with open space). 2. The structure of the revised Plan is such that the principles in Part Two of the Plan are broad, overarching principles. Detailed conditions of the Plan provide more specific policies, for example the provisions of the City Hill Precinct Code recognise the importance in connecting significant main avenues and vistas. 3. Introducing new policy for Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores pre-empts the outcomes of any review of the planning |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p data-bbox="600 456 1287 521"><i>Section 2.4.4 Principles for urban design and heritage (Objective two), a, b, c & d</i></p> <p data-bbox="600 545 1287 1032">The Guardians strongly supports the principles and notes the link to our Part 1, Comment 4 and the NCA comment made in the Consultation Report. Having all the heritage places in the Designated Area considered as Commonwealth and their values protected is a major improvement to the existing fractured heritage management. These principles will have the consequence of the NCA including in its Heritage Register expanded heritage reports on Lake Burley Griffin and Lakeshore Landscapes as well as the Parliament House Vista landscape including the entire National Triangle and City Hill. In addition the Register should include Commonwealth and Kings Avenues, noted as major Griffin elements.</p> <p data-bbox="600 1057 825 1081">Recommendation:</p> <p data-bbox="600 1105 1287 1203">Insert additional words – ‘augment the NCA heritage register’ – to cover the NCAs full obligation under the EPBC ACT 1999.</p> <p data-bbox="600 1227 1287 1367">b. Within Designated Areas, the National Capital Authority will augment the NCA Heritage Register and may require Heritage Management Plans for heritage places to meet the requirements of the EPBC Act 1999.</p> | <p data-bbox="1308 329 1913 427">framework for the area. The master planning work needs to be completed first.</p> <p data-bbox="1308 456 1913 659">As noted, the NCA has obligations under the <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> to maintain a heritage register. It does not consider that this ongoing responsibility needs to be replicated in the National Capital Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="1308 683 1913 821">The definition of ‘Heritage Place’ has been expanded to include those places on the NCA heritage register. Please refer to sections 3.2.6 and 4 of this report.</p> <p data-bbox="1308 846 1913 1195">The NCA undertook an assessment of ‘Lake Burley Griffin and Adjacent Lands’ and in 2010 nominated the place for the Commonwealth Heritage List. No decision on the listing has been made, however ‘Lake Burley Griffin and Adjacent Lands’ is on the NCA’s heritage register. The NCA notes recent advice from the Lake Burley Griffin Guardians that they propose to renominate Lake Burley Griffin and Lakeshore Landscape to the National and Commonwealth Heritage Lists.</p> <p data-bbox="1308 1219 1913 1357">A Canberra National Heritage Listing is likely to encompass both the National Triangle and a significant portions of Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores, however the listing remains</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>The National Capital Authority may require Heritage Impact Statements to accompany development applications associated with a heritage place.</p> <p>The NCA Heritage Register to include entries for (i) all of Lake Burley Griffin and lakeshore landscape and (ii) all of the National Triangle including the Constitution Avenue and all of Commonwealth and Kings Avenues.</p> | unresolved. |
| | | <p><i>Section 3.2.5.3 Policies for River Corridor</i></p> <p>Notes that 'Lanyon' rather than 'Lanyon Bowl' remains in the text.</p> <p>Recommendation: Lanyon Bowl shall be maintained as an important cultural resource providing for public access and use consistent with its national significance.</p> | <p>The policy referring to Lanyon being maintained as an important cultural resource providing for public access and use consistent with its national significance is unchanged. In this context, Lanyon is taken to refer to Lanyon Homestead complex given public accessibility to this cultural heritage facility. Public access to the whole of the Lanyon Bowl area is not available.</p> <p>Additional policy also remains specifically for Lanyon Bowl, requiring that the Commonwealth, a Commonwealth Authority, the Territory or a Territory authority shall not do anything which adversely affects the historic landscape and heritage values of the Lanyon Bowl Area.</p> |
| | | <p><i>Section 3.2.1 Urban Areas</i></p> <p>Has the name 'Civic' been officially changed to 'Canberra Central' or is Canberra Central a different place? Item 3.5.1 Refers both to 'Canberra Central' and 'Canberra</p> | <p>Under the <i>Districts Act 2002</i>, land in the ACT is divided into districts. Districts may subsequently be divided into divisions (which are effectively suburbs) or blocks. Divisions may then be divided</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>City' perhaps Canberra City is really 'Civic'. 'Civic Centre' was the name proposed by Walter Burley Griffin and it later became known as the Central Business District of Canberra.</p> <p>Recommendation: Define Canberra Central, Canberra City and Civic Centre.</p> | <p>into sections, and finally sections may be divided into blocks.</p> <p>'Canberra Central' is a district and encompasses the Inner North and Inner South areas of Canberra. 'City' is a division within Canberra Central. Other examples of divisions within the district of Canberra Central include Turner, Braddon, Yarralumla and Deakin.</p> <p>'City' is effectively what has previously been termed Civic (a term the NCA acknowledges is still used). The Plan has, however been updated to reflect legal nomenclature.</p> |
| | | <p><i>Section 4.1.1 General Policies for the Central National Area</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protect the Griffins' vision 2. Building on Griffins' Vision 3. Revitalise the vision with Growth in the Central National Area 4. Link the city to the Central National Area 5. Extend the City to the Lake <p>The Guardians has the utmost respect and admiration for the Griffins' 1911 plan and subsequent 1913 and 1918 plans. We note that that there are a number of elements that are successful interpretations of components of the 1918 WB Griffin plan, importantly Capital Hill and Lake Burley Griffin. The Guardians also acknowledges the massive contribution in design and</p> | <p>Review of the General Policies for the Central National Area may form future stages of the Plan review.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | <p>execution that developed physical expressions from the Griffins' visionary plan for the lake that should not be overshadowed.</p> <p>The long list of generic policies under the guise of protecting the Griffins' vision, building on the Griffin vision, revitalising the vision, are aspirational but their origin is questionable. They propagate spurious theories that have been perpetuated since the Griffin Legacy and the subsequent Plan amendments. It is time that the entire set of policies is reviewed. For example the design styles described as 'Garden City' and 'City Beautiful' are regurgitated in every planning document without question and although they may be associated with some aspects of the Canberra plan those styles do not cover most of central Canberra particularly the Lake precinct, not as it was planned by the Griffins nor in its actual physical form. The Griffins' style was more brilliant and original particularly with its environmental and topographic influences.</p> <p>The planning arising from these policies appears to be a grab bag of ideas that are cherry-picked policies to justify development that is destroying Canberra's beauty and most valued features, originating from the Griffins' vision.</p> <p>It is impossible to respect and support this collection of generic policies such as 'enhancing lake-based tourist facilities and experiences' when the other sections of this plan propose alienating public lake landscape to be filled</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>with strata-titled multi-storeyed buildings that damage vistas from the most significant avenue and destroy public use of the park space. What evidence is there that the public wants a 'vibrant, interesting and lively' lakeshore ('vibrant' meaning the same as 'lively' is used 10 times in the report)?</p> <p>Many people want visual and free access to a tranquil and beautiful lakeshore.</p> <p>Recommendation: The general policies need to be reviewed. While many are satisfactory there are many policies made that are assumptions. All of these policies need to be based on evidence including new evidence that has emerged from research on Walter Burley Griffin and the Griffins work during the last decade.</p> | |
| | | <p><i>Section 4.6 City Hill Precinct</i></p> <p>Recognizing that City Hill is Griffin's symbolic and geographical corner completing the National Triangle and is a gateway to the Central National Area. The Guardians is concerned that the Plan has set a structure for development of City Hill that envelopes the Hill in concrete structures with concrete towers dispersed around it. Such a development proposal is antithetical to the Griffin's vision and intent.</p> <p>While review of a detailed policy for West Basin and City Hill is outside the scope of the current process, these and other comments about the impact of large buildings on vistas to and from the Lake directly involve the Lake. The</p> | <p>As the NCA has previously advised, review of detailed policy for West Basin and City Hill is outside the scope of the current process.</p> <p>Material available on the NCA's website advised that the focus of the initial stage of the Plan review was on streamlining the shared responsibilities and interests of the Australian and ACT Governments. Website material advised that the content of the Exposure Draft was largely derived from existing Plan content, that detailed planning policy was largely unchanged and that review of these policies would form later stages of the Plan review.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Guardians therefore makes the point that they cannot be separated in the context of the Lake's significance to the National Capital concept.</p> <p><i>Section 4.6.3 Objectives for City Hill</i></p> <p>One of the objectives should be to maintain the role of City Hill in Griffin's central geometry as a visual icon and apex of the National Triangle.</p> <p>Despite, the NCA's comments on the City Hill aspect of the Guardians' submission to the Exposure Draft, that it is 'outside the scope of this planning process', the Guardians is questioning why? We are registering our intense concern particularly for the proposed 'gateway' buildings at the corners of London circuit and all the major avenues.</p> <p>The Guardians notes that the planning for City Hill ignores the NCP policies such as 1.a, 2.a, 2.d., 2.h., and demonstrates a complete contradiction to the potential expressed in WB Griffin's designs for a low-level horizontal city.</p> <p>The Guardians' is opposed to the general height of buildings being at 6-8 storeys that will block even the views of the tops of trees and the flagpole.</p> <p>The Guardians is vehemently opposed to the gateway buildings on Commonwealth and Northbourne and Constitution Avenues. The buildings will significantly block vistas to and from City Hill from public areas</p> | <p>Review of Precinct Codes has not been excluded from the comprehensive review of the Plan, however were not part of the first major stage of the review. Passage of Amendment 86 allows the NCA to better understand the likely timeframes associated with detailed policy review.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>around the Lake the everywhere except the centre of the avenues. The gateway buildings on Constitution Avenue and Commonwealth Avenues will be harmful to the vistas of and from the proposed convention design by Massimiliano Fuksas with gently undulating form reflecting the topography — a thoughtful and charming design that would be a welcome relief to what has become unimaginative city architecture.</p> <p>There is concern that reducing traffic flow in Vernon Circle will force increased traffic into London Circuit and along Constitution Avenue.</p> <p>Recommendation: Best practice urban and landscape design should be pursued to conserve the iconic value of City Hill landmark. The 'gateway' building proposals should be deleted from the plan. The buildings around Vernon Circle should be 4-6 levels.</p> | |
| | | <p><i>Section 4.7 West Basin Precinct Code</i></p> <p><i>Section 4.7.2 Background</i></p> <p>Promulgating a Griffin vision for West Basin development lacks veracity. Although Griffin had two buildings of undefined height in the area now West Basin, he did not have a neighbourhood of densely packed buildings and instead had an expanse of open space. This area is needed as City space.</p> <p><i>West Basin</i></p> <p>The Guardians is very concerned about the proposed</p> | <p>As the NCA has previously advised, review of detailed policy for West Basin and City Hill is outside the scope of the current process.</p> <p>Material available on the NCA's website advised that the focus of the initial stage of the Plan review was on streamlining the shared responsibilities and interests of the Australian and ACT Governments. Website material advised that the content of the Exposure Draft was largely derived from existing Plan content, that detailed planning policy was largely unchanged and that</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>West Basin development as part of City to the Lake (Cttl). The development will be seriously detrimental to Canberra's most important Avenue — Commonwealth Avenue and its viewsheds.</p> <p>The proposed development is contrary to General Policies for the Central National Area 4.1.1. 1.a.,1.c., 2.a., 2.b., 2.d. , landscape spaces), 3.a., 3.d. The intention of the development is blatant exploitation for strata titled revenue, packaged in 'Griffin spin'.</p> <p>The proposed development of West Basin ignores Griffin policies with the exception of the proposed foreshore promenade that follows a segment of the Griffin arc. Allowing the packing in of buildings behind the foreshore is hostile to Griffin's open space area and defies the concept an open space.</p> <p>The development is intended as a revenue base justified without basis by falsely interpreting Griffin at the expense of open space. The proposed development (the 'West Basin Estate') should be abandoned in favour of open space, allowing only the buildings that provide the services necessary to support it or consideration of a national cultural building. This entails the removal of Land Uses A and B and the invasion of public open space shown in Figure 53, p136.</p> <p>The proposed West Basin forced development doesn't work for Civic which has an enclosed character deliberately constructed without connectivity with the</p> | <p>review of these policies would form later stages of the Plan review.</p> <p>Review of Precinct Codes has not been excluded from the comprehensive review of the Plan, however were not part of the first major stage of the review. Passage of Amendment 86 allows the NCA to better understand the likely timeframes associated with detailed policy review.</p> <p>Please note that Figure 67 was introduced into the Plan through Amendment 61 (gazette in 2006). The figure was amended by Amendment 79 to remove the pedestrian bridge linking Acton Peninsula to the Parliamentary Zone at Lennox Gardens. The Exposure Draft of the Plan contained the same figure (as Figure 64).</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | <p>Lake. The Civic principle will be the loser as the current (historic) centre of Civic will be conflicted by the City to the Lake (CttL) or, City to West Basin. Figure 67 page 149 (not present in previous editions of the Plan) clearly shows the distortion of the city's urban form with the satellite city component at West Basin and the urban impact into the Lake parkland space as well as the strip of mid rise buildings along Commonwealth avenue blocking vistas.</p> <p>Recommendation: Further research is needed to resolve the conflicts between the respective commercial and retail areas of West basin and Civic. All building structure proposals at West Basin should be stopped.</p> <p>Recommendation: If the buildings proposed for the public open space in West Basin cannot be disallowed by this planning process then alternative legislation may be required to reject the policies and precinct descriptions that are allowing the development.</p> | |
| | | <p><i>Anzac Parade Buildings Height and Form</i></p> <p>The Portal Buildings are listed in the Commonwealth Heritage list as part of the Parliament House Vista extension with values thus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background buildings in a monumental style that functioned both as symbols of government and Australian unity. • For their associational history with the NCDC and Canberra's post WWII development under the | Refer to section 3.2.3 of the report. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | <p>NCDC reflecting the need for emphasising the formal composition of Griffin's plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They carry the Canberra tradition of stripped classical architectural style. <p>As strong handsome symmetrical buildings, the buildings contribute to Anzac Parade vista rather than detract from it. The buildings should not be reconstructed as high bookends to Constitution Avenue. At those expanded heights they will be visual distractions on Anzac parade and detract from the significant land axis vista terminus, the Australian War Memorial. Further, they will disrupt the view of Parliament House from Mount Ainslie.</p> <p>It is important to maintain the identity of the points of the Parliamentary Triangle and the symmetry of Anzac Avenue. Recognising that tall buildings are at Russell and at City Hill, a 'portal' of high buildings at the base of Anzac Avenue may detract from the structural height integrity of the base of the triangle by creating a height bump in the building form level.</p> <p>The heights proposed for buildings at the southern end of Anzac Avenue/Parkes Way is too generous and would have the effect of diminishing the Australian War Memorial as seen from the southern side of the lake. As the AWM building and Anzac Parade vista are national treasures, this must not be permitted.</p> <p>Recommendation: The most desirable outcome would</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>be it the buildings could be refurbished for new uses. If that is not possible the buildings should still remain as 25m high buildings, retain their symmetrical strong portal image in plan, scale, form and not be reconstructed as 35m high buildings. They should remain sitting in a park-like landscape.</p> <p>There is a need to balance the heights, mass and design of buildings at these the key points the vertices of the National Triangle so that the land axis intersection does not appear as a mid point hiatus in the triangle geometry.</p> | |
| | | <p><i>Section 4.12 Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores Precinct Code</i></p> <p>The Guardians welcomes that the NCA is proposing a Master Plan for Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshore landscapes as set out in the Consultation Report at Item 3.3.4. The proposal suggests that the review of Precinct Codes will commence once the new format and structure of the Plan is in place, and the 'Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores Precinct Code' will form an early stage of Precinct Code review.</p> <p>The purpose of the plan is to identify character, quality and the relationship of components of the Lake. All of the significant landscape that is used by the public containing the bike path and walking paths, the developed parks, the wetlands and narrow landscape strips that encircle the Lake, strongly contribute to</p> | <p>The National Capital Plan is a planning document rather than a management document. A number of matters of concerns to the Lake Burley Griffin Guardians are more appropriately addressed through management plans. The nature of planning and land management in the ACT also means that the ACT Government may have responsibility for areas considered by the Guardians as appropriately forming part of Lake Burley Griffin and its foreshore land. Other areas may form part of other Precincts within Designated Areas (such as Jerrabomberra Wetlands) – a review of the Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores Precinct Code may necessitate changes to other parts of the Plan.</p> <p>The NCA undertook an assessment of 'Lake Burley Griffin and Adjacent Lands' and in 2010</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Canberra's beauty, vistas to and from the lake and public use that must be included in the master plan delineation. Therefore the delineation of the Lake Burley Griffin Foreshores Precinct of Figure 111 is not an appropriate base for a master plan and consequently any Management Plan as most of the significant lake landscape is excluded.</p> <p>Management plans involving management strategies will extend over a large area comprising many diverse land uses and often complex situations, probably requiring a nest of plans. The Guardians stand firm on the concept of a 'whole of Lake' Master Plan and this includes recognition of the Lake as the receiving point for all discharge from its total catchment, no trivial matter.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Guardians strongly insist that a review of the Lake Burley Griffin Precinct Code that must be linked with consideration of whole of Lake Master Plan framework.</p> <p>Recommendation: The entire Lake and its foreshores landscapes should be entered in the NCA Heritage Register and nominated to the Commonwealth Heritage List and the National Heritage List. The heritage values should form the basis for the master plan and protection policies.</p> | <p>nominated the place for the Commonwealth Heritage List. No decision on the listing has been made, however 'Lake Burley Griffin and Adjacent Lands' is on the NCA's heritage register. The NCA notes recent advice from the Lake Burley Griffin Guardians that they propose to renominate Lake Burley Griffin and Lakeshore Landscape to the National and Commonwealth Heritage Lists.</p> |
| 33 | Canberra Airport | In finalising Draft Amendment 86, the Commonwealth's interests and intentions for the planning, designing and development of the future National Capital should be | Noted. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>amplified and should acknowledge a role for the NCA in Canberra Joint Organisation and the broader South East and Tablelands Region of NSW.</p> <p><i>Majura Valley</i></p> <p>Majura Valley is already home to a diverse range of industry, infrastructure, employment, land and facilities supporting education and research, tourism and leisure, Defence operations and Canberra Airport.</p> <p>Expects that the ‘potential future urban’ status of Majura Valley will deliver more employment land, including new tourism and destination retail and it appears to acknowledge the advanced investigations by the ACT Government in regard to Eastern Broadacre planning.</p> <p>Section 3.3 does not include the Majura Valley in the list of location identified ‘<i>for the foreseeable future, urban land in metropolitan Canberra...</i>’. Questions whether this is an error given plans for the area and suggests that it should be included.</p> <p>The growth of Canberra Airport passenger and freight operations will see benefits flow through the region, but major benefits will reside close by in the Majura Valley, North and South Canberra and Queanbeyan. While DA86 sets the planning framework for future urban growth in the valley, it is difficult to see where the amendment deals with objectives and principles to expand this diverse employment zone or how future aviation and freight growth at the Airport is acknowledged. This</p> | <p>Majura Valley is identified as a ‘Potential Future Urban Area’, with no certainty that urban development will proceed. Additional commentary and policy in the Plan will assist in clarifying the status of potential future urban areas (noting that Majura Valley is not the only area recognised as being a ‘potential future urban area’). The relevant paragraph of section 3.3 has been amended to read:</p> <p><i>‘For the foreseeable future, urban land in Metropolitan Canberra will comprise:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the towns of Canberra Central, Woden/Weston Creek, Belconnen, Tuggeranong and Gungahlin</i> • <i>the villages of Hall, Oaks Estate and Tharwa</i> • <i>Molonglo and North Weston</i> • <i>land at Hume, Mitchell and Fyshwick.</i> <p><i>Urban land may also comprise areas identified in the Plan as a ‘Potential Future Urban Area’, subject to certification by the National Capital</i></p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>growth should be acknowledged in the context of Part Two.</p> <p>Questions why, given current narrative considering corridor options for High Speed Rail opportunities to Civic and the Airport, indicative routes are not included in the Plan in a similar way to the then future Majura Parkway corridor.</p> | <p><i>Authority.'</i></p> <p>Clause 3.3.3(a) has also been updated to reflect the above change.</p> <p>The Plan does not refer specifically to the growth of any major industry, instead providing guiding principles related to infrastructure, employment and economy.</p> <p>Future passenger and freight growth to be acknowledged in the context of Part Two in regard to productivity, Sustainability, Liveability and Accessibility.</p> <p>The Authority has sought to better understand current investigations into High Speed Rail, including the rationale behind the indicative route alignment and station location before supporting their inclusion in the National Capital Plan.</p> |
| | | <p><i>Canberra Airport</i></p> <p>Aviation and non-aviation investment in the Airport ensures that it is ready for growth. The Airport is the major public transport gateway to the National Capital Region, and adjacent to the intersection of two major rapid transport corridors servicing public transport, commuters, interstate and regional passengers and freight.</p> <p>The Airport is readily accessed by ground transport, and</p> | <p>The NCA supports exploring the potential for Majura Parkway to be identified as an Approach Route given its function as a major route from North Canberra to Central Canberra and subsequent connection to the Monaro Highway.</p> <p>This would need to be explored in conjunction with relevant stakeholders, including the ACT Government.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>the quality infrastructure and place-making at the Airport aligns with sentiments in the Plan to enhance the sense of arrival for visitors to the National Capital, and to ensure that the traveler is immediately aware of the special symbolic and functional significance of the national capital.</p> <p>Suggest that Majura Parkway should be identified as an Approach Route given it will be the freeway link between the Monaro and Federal Highways and the de-facto Monaro Highway extension connecting with the Federal Highway.</p> | |
| | | <p><i>How is Canberra Airport described in Draft Amendment 86?</i></p> <p>Concerned with how the Airport is described and considered in the Draft Amendment. The Airport is endeavoring to have the Airport embedded into the ACT and NSW region land use, transport and economic planning document. This includes consideration of the Airport in the context of compatible land use, appropriate transport links and economic development strategies.</p> <p>The following matters should be considered.</p> <p><i>The Airport is not included in the Central National Area</i></p> <p>The Airport should be reinstated into the Central National Area boundary consistent with the current Plan and with the proposed notation stating 'Airport subject</p> | <p>The NCA will reinstate Canberra Airport within the Central National Area, noting that this will not change the planning arrangements in place for the airport.</p> <p>The NCA does not support including Canberra Airport with Urban Areas. While some uses at Canberra Airport may be urban in nature, including the extensive office development and shopping precinct, the primary use of the site is for aviation operations. Broadacre Areas serve a range of functions, one of which is to provide sites for land uses that require large sites for their operation or which would benefit from a non-urban setting. The NCA considers the Airport's operations meet this criterion and is most appropriately located within a non-urban land use</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>to Master Plan under applicable legislation’.</p> <p>Reasons for doing so include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Airport is a key gateway and significant asset now, and into the future, to the National Capital. • Although NCA does not now have works approval for Airport development, as it did prior to 13 May 2007, the Airport and NCA have regular and fruitful consultations and a collaborative focus on Airport development remaining consistent with the Plan. • As required by the Airports Act, planning terms and definitions within the 2014 Master Plan are aligned with the Plan. <p><i>The Airport is zoned as part of the Broadacre area</i></p> <p>The IKEA site has recently been zoned urban, and other parts of the Majura Valley are recognised as potential future urban, however the Airport remains zoned as Broadacre.</p> <p>Suggests the Airport should be zoned urban consistent with the adjacent IKEA site, with an additional overlay to permit Airport. This would also require the addition of a definition for airport, although ‘Public Transport Facility’ could perhaps be expanded to include Canberra Airport.</p> <p><i>The airport is included in the list of Defined Activity Centres</i></p> <p>Section 3.5.3(c) seeks to limit the location of public</p> | <p>category.</p> <p>Policy 3.5.3(c) only encourages public sector office employment to be located in the City and Town Centres. There is no mandatory requirement for this to occur, as evidenced by the establishment of public sector offices in other locations, including the airport. No change is proposed to this policy. Other Australian Government policy is also relevant in determining the location of Government offices, including the Department of Finance’s property management framework.</p> <p>The NCA does not consider the Plan to be the relevant framework to determine the curfew-free status (or otherwise) of Canberra Airport. The Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development has responsibility for administering legislation relating to aviation environmental issues and noise policy. Decisions regarding curfews should be made by the Department and relevant portfolio agencies.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <p>sector office employment by encouraging the location of such employment in the City and Town Centres. This approach appears inconsistent with facilitating competitive markets forces, tenant location preference and best value outcomes to the Commonwealth. There is already evidence this has been set aside as government offices are already located in Barton/Forrest, Parkes, Russell and Canberra Airport.</p> <p>Suggests the caveat should be removed, or if retained it would be reasonable and practical to endorse the current development precincts by including the above four 'Defined Activity Centres' as supported for public sector office employment. Preference is for the former option.</p> <p><i>Aviation operations</i></p> <p>There is no reference to the domestic and soon to be international airport operations.</p> <p>Suggests that policy to protect the curfew free status of Canberra Airport to maintain a logistical competitive advantage for the Territory and Region. For example: 'The Canberra Airport will be protected to maintain its curfew free status having regard to the approved Master Plan and the Australian Government's National Airports Safeguarding Framework'.</p> | |
| 34 | North Canberra Community | Concerns with the proposal to increase permitted building heights for Anzac Park East and West. Changing the height and form (to RL 600) of these Commonwealth | Please refer to section 3.2.3. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | Council | <p>Heritage Register listed-buildings, i.e. the Portal Buildings East and West, has the potential to compromise the Parliamentary Vista Extension.</p> <p>The heritage citation refers not only to the importance historically, culturally and architecturally of these buildings but also the scale, form and horizontal dimensions integral to the vistas. Increasing the height allowable for the buildings, or future buildings, opens up the possibility of a very different and more obscured vista along the land axis interrupting the view to landscape backdrop of the inner hills of Central Canberra.</p> <p>The North Canberra Community Council requests that there should be no height change to these buildings or any buildings likely to be constructed within their vicinity.</p> | |
| | | <p>Concerns in relation to landmark buildings up to RL617 being restricted to the corners of main avenues intersecting with London Circuit. While it is a relief to hear that there is to be some restriction to RL617 landmark buildings again there is a significant issue with vistas and, of course, the obvious 'height creep' that such a precedent will set.</p> <p>The Australian ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance 2013 (the Burra Charter) states that conservation requires the retention of an appropriate setting. It would appear that there has been no thorough</p> | <p>The policy referring to landmark buildings up to RL617 being restricted to the corners of the main avenues intersection with London Circuit was introduced through Amendment 59 to the Plan, gazette in 2006.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>impact assessment undertaken using the Burra Charter process or any similar methodology.</p> <p>The North Canberra Community Council recommends an impact assessment using internationally recognised principles and practices before landmark buildings up to RL617 are erected on the corners of the main avenues intersecting with London Circuit.</p> | |
| | | <p>The North Canberra Community Council notes that, in the explanatory 'Statement of planning Principles' there is some protection under the <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> and any subsequent legislation for Commonwealth Designated Areas. There is also a statement regarding heritage places and values.</p> <p>Therefore, it is surprising that considering the significant changes suggested to the National Capital Plan there appears to have been no reference to the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) or Australia ICOMOS and their principles and methodologies. While Canberra is not designated a world heritage site, as a planned national capital any future planning impacting on Canberra's sweeping vistas, horizontal and low scale of building stock and the major axis determined in the Griffin Plan should be major considerations.</p> <p>The North Canberra Community Council recommends that major changes to the National Capital Plan should be considered with due recognition to international</p> | <p>A number of changes to heritage principles have been made to clarify intent and more appropriately reflect current practice. The NCA is currently meeting its obligation under Commonwealth environment and heritage legislation and the principles in the revised Plan offer greater heritage protection to places listed under Territory legislation and recognised on the NCA's heritage register.</p> <p>An additional principle has been added to the Plan stating '<i>The National Capital Authority will adopt the Australian Natural Heritage Charter and the Burra Charter as key guiding documents respectively for natural and cultural heritage places within Designated Areas</i>'. This acknowledges these documents as leading practice standard for natural and cultural heritage management in Australia.</p> <p>The principles of the Plan provide the framework for the NCA to require heritage or conservation</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | excellence in heritage management and that heritage impact assessments be provided as part of these change processes. | management plans, and Heritage Impact Statements to accompany development proposals for heritage places. |
| 35 | Yarralumla Residents' Association | <p>Main issue with both the Plan Exposure Draft and Draft Amendment 86 is inadequate enforcement of the Plan. Aware of breaches of the Adelaide Avenue Development Control Plan, and challenges to the status of Yarralumla Bay as an aquatic recreation hub.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Amendment 86 still includes in section 4.1.1 of the Amendment (General Policies for the Central National Area) over 40 high level concepts and descriptors with very general terminology that would make any assessment so highly subjective and qualitative that consistent interpretation and legal application/enforcement will not be practicable. b. Understands that the ACT Government has management responsibility under the ACT Planning and Land Management Act for ensuring that developments are not inconsistent with the National Capital Plan. Clearly, that enforcement is not occurring to the degree needed to provide public confidence in the planning and development of the national capital. c. Considers that the enforcement provisions of the ACT Planning and Land Management Act should be strengthened, but understand this is outside the scope of this revision of the National Capital | <p>The policies contained in section 4.1.1 are general in nature and provide a qualitative guide for decision-making. The general policies are underpinned by further detailed policies in the Precinct Codes.</p> <p>The NCA notes concern with the current level of enforcement within the ACT. The Association is correct in stating that review of the <i>Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988</i> is outside the scope of the current process.</p> <p>The NCA understands that the Association's concerns primarily relate to enforcement by the ACT of Development Control Plan provisions for Adelaide Avenue. Territory Land subject to Special Requirements are areas where the Commonwealth maintains a strong interest in planning and design outcomes, but where the Territory has been provided a high level of planning responsibility (including the development assessment role). Changes to the <i>Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988</i> would most appropriately address any deficiencies in the current arrangements, however this is outside the scope</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Plan.</p> <p>d. Still considers it an NCA responsibility to monitor and evaluate the effective implementation of the National Capital Plan in line with its stated goal of protecting the national interest in the planning, development and heritage of the National Capital. Recommends that the National Capital Plan include a section under Governance spelling out the requirement and mechanism for an ongoing transparent process of monitoring and evaluation to ensure effective implementation of its provisions.</p> | <p>of the current process.</p> |
| | | <p>Figure 112 in the Draft Amendment shows Yarralumla Bay as a 'development node' and that <i>'development is to be limited to small scale items that help recreation and tourism...'</i>.</p> <p>Given existing provisions relating to Yarralumla Bay as an aquatic recreation hub, and current challenges to these provisions, what confidence can the public have that the proposed 'small scale' development referred to will not turn out to be 'large scale' development in conflict with the aquatic recreation focus?</p> | <p>The NCA has previously supported the idea of a master plan or similar for the Lake and its foreshore areas. Such a framework could recognise areas of heritage and conservation value, identify suitable nodes for development, and ensure that lakeside development is appropriate to the location.</p> <p>Through the Consultation Report in response to the Exposure Draft of the Plan, the NCA advised that review of Precinct Codes will commence once the new format and structure of the Plan is in place has. The 'Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores Precinct Code' will form an early stage of Precinct Code review. The NCA considers this process the most appropriate to address concerns with Yarralumla Bay, address ambiguities and</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | | strengthen the planning policy and design framework for this area. |
| | | <p>With respect to section 2.3 on sustainability and section 2.4 on livability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The amendment does not address previous suggestion that the wording of section 2.3 should retain the wording from the existing Plan on environmental protection. b. Section 2.4 does not bring across the existing Plan heritage section that could improve precision and clarity of the section. | <p>The NCA considers that the revised principles afford environmental protection and appropriately require consideration of resource consumption and waste, water security and water quality, energy and food security, soil quality and resilience to climate change.</p> <p>Protection is still afforded to matters protected under the <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i>, including ecological communities and threatened flora and fauna.</p> <p>A number of minor changes to heritage principles contained in section 2.4 of the revised Plan have been made to clarify intent and more appropriately reflect current practice. Please refer to part 4 of this report.</p> |
| | | The Draft Amendment still does not require a formal amendment to the Plan for the development of future urban areas, however notes that there are additional requirements for obtaining certification of proposals. | Draft Amendment 86 clarified the process and requirements for certification of potential future urban areas. An additional change has been made to changes references in this section from 'ACT Government' to 'proponent'. This allows for the certification process to be followed in circumstances where the ACT Government is not the proponent. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | Pleased to see provisions for areas adjacent to Canberra Brickworks and environs remaining the same. | Noted. |
| | | Pleased to see reference to the requirement for preparation of conservation management plans, including for Stirling Park, Government House, Westbourne Woods, and the Canberra Incinerator in Yarralumla. | The Plan does not name specific places requiring heritage or conservation management plans. The Plan does however, provide the NCA the framework to require management plans to be prepared for heritage places. Please note that the definition of 'Heritage Place' in Appendix B has been amended to include those places recognised by the NCA as having heritage value (in addition to those places formally listed under Commonwealth or Territory legislation). |
| 36 | ACT Rural Landholders Association | <p>Suggests an alternate approach in which before the Draft Amendment proceeds to Parliament for consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specifically promote the social and cultural opportunities of non-urban residents of the 'Territory' alongside those of 'Canberra'. This will at a minimum require the identification and inclusion of a paragraph stating the prehistory of the ACT and connection to the region in Part 1 of the Plan. This paragraph should include reflection on the views of rural and indigenous communities and their national significance. 2. Specific additional new strategic objectives, utilising the five themes, that address the current deficiencies with this Amendment and the Plan are required in Part Two. The changes are required under general matters principle | <p>The NCA has previously stated that a program of policy review would commence once the revised format and structure of the Plan was in place. Review of rural policy will form one part of this review. This would allow changes to the Plan to be developed holistically and in conjunction with other relevant stakeholders, including the ACT Government.</p> <p>The NCA would welcome a collaborative approach to this review with the ACT Rural Landholders Association.</p> <p>The NCA supports changes suggested by the Rural Landholders Association to allow 'proponents' to seek certification of 'potential future urban areas'. Paragraphs within Section 3.1.2 regarding</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>2.1.2 should be recast to recognise more than just the city and its landscape.</p> <p>3. Redress the social inequity the Plan has imposed on non-urban communities. Introducing inclusionary decision making in regard to urban boundary alterations and land development can be provided by changes to Part 3 and 3.1.2 in particular to enable land owners to be consulted by the NCA and to have an equal participatory opportunity to any other developer of the 'Territory'.</p> <p>4. Section 3.1.2 potential future urban areas presumption that only the ACT Government is able to undertake urban expansion is in error. The NCA should replace all reference to 'the ACT Government' in section 3.1.2 with 'the proponent'.</p> <p>5. Provide for non-urban strategic planning direction, planning principles and objectives that focuses on connection to land, the rural economy, rural innovation, community health and well-being and support these with key strategic initiatives in Parts One and Two and relevant land use guidance and definition in Part Three.</p> <p>6. The Rural Landholders' Association would welcome the opportunity to develop these policies collaboratively with the NCA.</p> | <p>the certification of potential future urban areas have been amended to change references to the 'ACT Government' to 'proponent'. This allows for the certification process to be followed in circumstances where the ACT Government is not the proponent.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| 37 | ACT Shelter | <p>Offers broad support for plans by CSIRO to open up sections of its Ginninderra field site to mixed use development, including affordable housing.</p> <p>Despite some recent tapering off of historical high median weekly asking rents in the ACT, significant numbers of Canberrans on low-moderate incomes struggle to find affordable housing that meets their needs.</p> <p>Believes enabling appropriate mixed use development on the site that provides for affordable housing, some commercial and community infrastructure and retention of tracts of open space and environmental corridors could deliver the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an increase in the supply of affordable, appropriate safe and secure housing • stimulus for economic diversification and growth in the ACT during a period of contracting public expenditure • new jobs for Canberrans • the opportunity to pursue and showcase innovative development incorporating principles of environmental sustainability and livability on a mixed use site • the potential to harness the expertise of CSIRO to capitalize on the 'liveable cities' agenda being pursued by the Australian Government • the opportunity for significant community input | <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>into a potentially large scale innovative and new development in the ACT.</p> <p>Offers broad support for any changes that will lead to an increase in the supply of affordable, accessible, safe and secure housing for Canberrans who need it.</p> | |
| 38 | Esme Bracken | <p>In regard to the rezoning of the CSIRO Ginninderra field station, has concerns regarding the impact on the environment and wildlife, particularly in the area adjacent to Halls Creek. This matter is of key concern to most people.</p> <p>The Halls Creek corridor sustains wildlife including a number of bird species that live between the creek and the CSIRO side of the fence line. This area also has a large number of trees providing shelter for the bird life.</p> <p>Edlington Street is frequented by magpies, kookaburras, galahs, cockatoos, currawongs, wattlebirds, willy wagtails, sparrows, finches, and wrens. The numbers of many bird species are reducing as the urbanisation of rural land increases, and as the 'Bush Capital, believes it is imperative that we keep some open or green spaces with trees, for our wildlife. Whilst CSIRO have identified areas they consider should not be developed for urban use, the Halls Creek area does not appear to be one of these areas. The area along the creek may be ideal as a public park or open space area.</p> <p>Many residents have built or purchased homes because of the rural aspect and relaxed lifestyle, or to help with</p> | <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <p>health problems, with the understanding that the Ginninderra Field Station would remain for rural use only.</p> <p>Realistically, as population increases, so to will the need for additional land to enable Canberra to develop homes for future generations. Hopes that any future development for the CSIRO farmland takes into account the need for green spaces, particularly for the future of our bird and wildlife. Suggestions have been made to CSIRO, for the use of the rural land, and include market gardens, community gardens, nature reserves, wineries, village style development with adequate trees.</p> <p>Fears that the land could be sold off to developers only motivated by money, Chinese investors, or become row upon row of apartments, akin to those buildings along Flemington Road between Gungahlin and Mitchell.</p> <p>Hopes that CSIRO stand by their commitment to oversee the future development of the Ginninderra Field Station and that consultation occurs between the Federal and State Governments, to enable responsible and appropriate land development.</p> | |
| 39 | Shane Mortimer | The ACT legislature has no ownership of land title in the Territory. Under s 125 of the Constitution it is established to manage land for the Commonwealth, which has 'Radical Title'. The Guumaal Nation Ngambri People hold 'Allodial Title' to the land know as the Australian Capital Territory. 'Allodial Title' cannot be | Please refer to section 3.2.5. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | <p>extinguished and there must be a valid record of exchange for 'Allodial Title' to change hands. There is no such document in existence held by the Crown, Commonwealth, New South Wales or ACT. Therefore, the 'Allodial Title' remains with my People. Guumaal-Ngambri People have owned and occupied the land since the beginning of time. Since colonial arrival in 1821, our recorded matrilineal connection to country is indisputable. Our 'Allodial' entitlement is to everything below the ground to the core of the earth and everything above the earth to the stars. Hence our interest in what you are planning to do with out Guumaal Nation Ngambri Land.</p> <p>As the holder of the 'Allodium', we assert our right to declare that there is to be no further 'green-fields' development in the ACT. The proposed 'urban' development of former CSIRO occupied land as outlined in Draft Amendment 86 is not to proceed. The land/lease is not for sale, or use for any other purpose, other than carbon abatement through regeneration of perennial native grassland. This stipulation goes for all other ACT 'green-fields' sites. Future development is to be restricted to existing town centres. The site known as Namadgi National Park is not to be transferred to the ACT Legislature's administration. It is the property of the Guumaal Nation Ngambri People.</p> <p>All future planning is to be undertaken in consultation with the Guumaal-Ngambri People.</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| 40 | Louise Youngman | <p>Does not support the proposed rezoning of land adjacent to Forrest Primary School. Thinks it would be a disgrace to have a hotel or serviced apartment overlooking a childcare centre and school, where a transient population of strangers coming and going, could put the children in danger.</p> <p>The school uses the land for a Beyond the Fence program, and the children have access to additional space around this area, supervised, which adds to their overall space and is why many parents choose this school.</p> <p>There are already serious traffic risks to the children around this area, and adding in new businesses would only add to the problem. Traffic is already congested at peak times.</p> | Please refer to section 3.2.2. |
| 41 | Walter Steensby | <p><i>General theoretical and methodological comments</i></p> <p>The Draft Amendment uses the term 'Sustainability', a term misunderstood in many professions. It is perhaps thought of as achievable by setting a lower rate of growth which is imagined to secure permanent future prosperity. It does not; no rate of growth can be sustained forever.</p> <p>Conventional economic analysis appears incapable of recognising this limitation and therefore never admits it into its calculations. Instead, it ignores it and, propelled by both political wishful thinking and economic blindness, focusses on the short-term rather</p> | <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--------------|
| | | <p>than the long. Many decades of observation of the behaviour and attitudes of politicians, economists and businessmen lead many to conclude that they are quite willing to destroy assets because they believe:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. technology will always save us 2. the market will always supply demand 3. demand will always create markets 4. the market mechanism can be perfect and waste nothing 5. competition for resources can achieve their perfect allocation 6. energy inputs and wastes (the laws of thermodynamics) are ignored in economics 7. anyway, we've got to do <i>something</i> soon which mandates the destruction 8. there are no limits to growth. <p>We readily see evidence and proof of these beliefs and practices in Sydney and Melbourne where prime agricultural land on the urban periphery is constantly sacrificed for yet more housing. This is reckless and foolish short-term thinking.</p> <p>The nature of the financial and economic system under which we operate is exponential in nature: to continue in operation it must grow by a greater proportion tomorrow than it did today. To make a simple analogy, if the world economic system were a motor vehicle, it would have a two-speed gearbox: full speed ahead, or collapse. The system requires the input of resources</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | <p>(especially capital) in accelerating amounts.</p> <p>DA86 in part is providing one of these resource inputs.</p> <p>The world economic system is not growing, in spite of constant mainstream media assertions to the contrary, and we are writing cheques on the future which may not be capable of payment.</p> <p>The nub here is that the CSIRO is being defunded for a variety of reasons, more than some of them ideological, and the costs of this are being externalised onto Canberra residents and taxpayers.</p> | |
| | | <p><i>Agricultural potential of the field station land</i></p> <p>Canberra and the region are developing a regional food economy and the field station has much to offer in this regard.</p> <p>When looking at the large green buffers within the Canberra urban region, to turn over the entirety of the Gininderra Field Station is out of keeping with the general distribution of green spaces. DA86 contains solid planning principles, including in relation to containing urban expansion to minimise impacts on valuable natural and rural areas, locating growth in existing urban areas, protecting the natural environment and encouraging sustainable resource management. Questions how development of the Ginninderra field station will contribute to meeting these principles.</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| 42 | Planning Institute of Australia | <p>Reiterates recommendations made in to the Exposure Draft:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the NCA consult further with the Territory community to revise the National Capital Plan to integrate with the ACT Planning Strategy and Territory Plan to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establish clear guidelines and policies to protect the national significance of the Capital • shift responsibility for metropolitan planning to the Territory • clarify administration and implementation of the National Capital Plan • provide clear land use and development controls covering the whole Territory (outside of National Land and the Parliamentary Zone), to be administered by the Territory in consultation with the NCA where appropriate. 2. Amendments to the PALM Act should to be considered to apply consistent expectations, and a consistent development management regime to National Land, Territory Land and Designated Areas. 3. The intent of the PALM Act requirement for the National Capital Authority to 'keep the Plan under constant review and to propose amendments to it when necessary' should be honoured. 4. To enable it to undertake effective oversight of planning within the Territory, the NCA board | <p>The NCA undertook consultation on both an Exposure Draft of the revised Plan and Draft Amendment 86. Both processes provided opportunity for community comment and consultation. Peer assistance was sought in the preparation of the Plan. Consultation occurred with Australian Government agencies and the ACT Government prior to public release of the Exposure Draft and has been ongoing since this time.</p> <p>The <i>Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988</i> requires that the Plan contain a number of elements. The Plan is required to establish broad land use policy for the whole of the Territory, with the recognition that outside of Designated Areas and National Land, the ACT Government has detailed planning responsibility. Provisions of the <i>Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988</i> ensure that the Territory Plan is not inconsistent with the National Capital Plan.</p> <p>Review of legislation is outside the scope of the current process. To expand board numbers requires legislative amendment. (It should be noted that the NCA board currently consists solely of representatives from the ACT.)</p> <p>Draft Amendment 86 is not the final step in reviewing the Plan. If approved, the amendment</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>should be expanded to include additional representation from the Territory, and the surrounding region of NSW.</p> <p>5. Similar to previous Peer Reviews convened by the NCA for its major plans, a peer review panel should be convened to assist the NCA with further development of the Plan, test best practice and evidence basis for changes to assist the NCA in meeting its objectives for the Plan.</p> | <p>will put in place a new format and structure, with a rolling program of detailed policy review to follow. Review of detailed policy and future amendments to the Plan will involve public participation and may offer opportunities for peer review panels or similar.</p> |
| 43 | ACT Council of Social Service Inc. | <p>The ACT Council of Social Service is a peak body for community organisations and the interests of people living with disadvantage and poverty in the ACT. With the vision and goals of the organisation in mind, the ACT Council of Social Service Inc has taken a keen interest in changing land use and development in the ACT.</p> <p>Welcomes CSIRO's engagement with the community, which has demonstrated a commitment to understand the community's priorities for urban development and the critical gaps in social and economic infrastructure that a development on the Ginninderra site could contribute to addressing. These critical gaps are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provision of adequate affordable, accessible housing close to urban amenities and employment opportunities • provision of accessible, affordable, fit-for-purpose public transport that meets the needs of people beyond the 9-5 commute, especially for low income households and those people | <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>who do not drive and/or do not own a private vehicle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to work outside of the public sector, and diversification of employment opportunities both in types of work and in locations of work across the ACT. <p>A critical factor in all urban development in the ACT is respect for and sustainability of environmental values. Retaining those parts of the Ginninderra site with high environmental value as protected ecosystems is valued by ACTCOSS and our partner organisations. However, we believe it is possible to combine urban development with protection of ecosystems and provision of high amenity green spaces for residents to enjoy.</p> | |
| 44 | Conservation Council ACT Region | <p>Requests that previous comments on the National Capital Plan Exposure Draft be taken into account.</p> <p>Does not support changing the land use policy of the CSIRO Ginninderra site from 'Hills, Ridges and Buffer Spaces' to 'Urban Areas'. It is not in the national interest, Canberra's interest or environment interest that this occur. The change in land use for the entirety of the are would be in breach of the NCA's conservation role which includes the <i>'conservation and enhancement of the landscape features which give the National Capital its character and setting, and which contribute to the integration of natural and urban environments'</i>.</p> <p>CSIRO has stated that around 150 hectares of the land is</p> | <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>unlikely to be developable due to its topography, heritage and ecological values, and will likely remain open space.</p> <p>This 150 has not been explicitly recognised anywhere, and it is not appropriate to change this area to 'future urban area' and then to later go back to identify environmental values.</p> <p>The CSIRO proposal should also take account of broader environmental factors including nearby areas especially with regard to ecological connectivity including wildlife corridors and riparian areas along Ginninderra Creek.</p> <p>As a general position planning in Canberra, including for the CSIRO, should start with working out what areas might be suitable for urban development, before we start planning the urban development, and then undertake investigations to establish what environmental values are to be protected.</p> | |
| 45 | Inner South Canberra Community Council | <p>Pleased that many comments made by groups and individuals during consultation on the National Capital Plan Exposure Draft have been taken on board, for example the decision to reinstate Special Requirements for Haig and Telopea Parks. However, disappointed that other suggestions were not taken up, including those relating to the Murrumbidgee and Molonglo River Corridors.</p> | Noted. |
| | | <i>Comment from Oaks Estate Progress Association</i> | The Light Industrial zoning is a provision of the Queanbeyan Local Environmental Plan. The |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>The Plan refers to approach routes the National Capital and nominated specific roads subject to Special Requirements. There has been a failure however, to recognise the railway entrance to Canberra, in particular the Queanbeyan Station/Oaks Estate junction. This is for many people, their first glimpse of Canberra, being the first urban part of Canberra seen from the train. The appearance of the south portion of the village of Oaks Estate gives the impression of Canberra having industrial shanty-towns on its edge. The current master plan for Oaks Estate to allow industrial development along the entire Oaks Estate side from the train station will exacerbate this problem.</p> <p>The Plan should recognise the railway as a designated approach into Canberra, and impose the same development restrictions as other designated main approaches. This issue will become of increased significance with proposals for high speed rail, or other proposals to increase rail journeys into Canberra.</p> | <p>Master Plan prepared by the ACT Government's Environment and Planning Directorate identified this land use due to its proximity to the Master Plan study area. The ACT Government does not therefore, have the capacity to change the light industrial zoning.</p> <p>Land use under the Territory Plan for Oaks Estate is restricted to residential use (RZ1), mixed use (CZ5), and non-urban zonings. (Draft Variation 328 to the Territory Plan proposes to vary the land use of the block containing the Oaks Estate community hall, from PRZ1 Public Open Space to CFZ Community Facility Zone.)</p> |
| | | <p><i>Comment from Oaks Estate Progress Association</i></p> <p>The Plan designates Tharwa, Hall and Oaks Estate as villages, but does not provide any further clarification. The NCP should provide some guidance on the need to protect the character of the outlying villages of the nation's capital. This would include requirements that all planning and development instruments should</p> | <p>The National Capital Plan refers to the villages of Hall, Oaks Estate and Tharwa in the context of identifying urban land in Metropolitan Canberra. The Plan identifies the extent of the urban boundary of the villages, however all three villages are outside Designated Areas and therefore the detailed planning responsibility for</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | recognise the special 'national capital village' status of the three villages, and impose requirements that those planning and development instruments define and protect the village character. This would also be in accordance with the need to protect the character of the approach routes into Canberra, given that Hall and Oaks Estate are both on major approach routes. | these areas resides with the ACT Government. |
| | | The ISCCC supports the Yarralumla Residents' Association (YRA) concerns about inadequate enforcement of the Plan, noting the examples provided by YRA in relation to inadequate enforcement of the National Capital Plan. In particular, we strongly support the YRA proposal that the NCP include a section under Governance spelling out the requirement and mechanism for an ongoing transparent process of monitoring and evaluation to ensure effective implementation of its provisions. | Please refer to submission no. 35. |
| | | The ISCCC supports the view of the Friends of the Albert Hall Inc, as expressed in their written response to the Exposure Draft and in subsequent discussions with the National Capital Authority, for there to be a 'location specific' land use for Albert Hall and its Heritage Precinct that includes provision for civic, cultural and community use of the Hall. | The NCA discussed this matter with Friends of the Albert Hall Inc. and it was subsequently agreed that the current land use provisions are satisfactory. |
| | | The ISCCC is concerned that the NCA has apparently accepted the adoption of major changes to the shape of | Amendment 61, gazetted in 2006, introduced provisions to allow the reclamation of Lake Burley |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>the West Basin of Lake Burley Griffin, as part of the City to the Lake scheme.</p> <p>It is a matter for concern that the Authority appears to have made selective use of Griffin's 1918 plan to justify the reshaping of West Basin, while ignoring the heritage of Griffin's more important idea of reserving adjacent land for public recreation.</p> <p>This selective reliance on the Griffin heritage is clearly a means of expanding the area of dry land available for the City to the Lake scheme, and therefore is seen to be bowing to development interests and ignoring the public interest by accepting the alienation of valuable public parkland.</p> <p>Any suggestion that the proposed promenade and reclamation of land in West Basin is restoring the Griffin vision can be seen as an attempt to enable public parkland to be alienated for development purposes. A false heritage argument is not a good look for the future of the City to the Lake scheme, and should be dropped. The objectives of the City to the Lake scheme can be met without having to reshape West Basin.</p> <p>The ISCCC considers that flawed and partial reliance on the Griffin heritage to justify a marginal expansion of the City to the Lake scheme does not reflect well on that scheme, or the NCA. We have therefore come to</p> | <p>Griffin to establish a waterfront promenade and reflect the geometry of the 1918 Griffin Plan.</p> <p>Amendment 61 (and related 'Griffin Legacy' amendments) followed an extensive research and policy development process. Amendments to the Plan were undertaken in accordance with the <i>Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988</i>, including public consultation, Ministerial approval, and disallowance in both Houses of Parliament.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | the view that the reshaping of West Basin cannot genuinely claim to respect Griffin, and therefore should not proceed. | |
| | | The ISCC agree with the concerns expressed by the Forrest P&C submission in relation to the proposed transfer from Community Use to Mixed Use of Block 10 Section 13 Forrest. We are disappointed that the proposal to rezone Block 13 was made without any prior apparent community consultation. | Please refer to section 3.2.2. |
| | | <p>There are a number of other issues about the Plan and the role, functions and resourcing of the NCA that the ISCCC will take up at a political level, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the lack of any champion within the Commonwealth Government or Parliament generally for Canberra's national capital role • the chronic lack of Commonwealth for the funding of the NCA which has in recent years undermined its ability to properly carry out its core functions • while the members of the Authority board each provide valuable contributions in their own right, there is a heavy Canberra-based focus which dilutes the ability of the board to reflect national capital interests • political interference in relation to certain key national capital matters. For example, the process adopted with respect to the proposal to | Noted. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | allow urban development in West Murrumbidgee was secretive and opaque without any apparent community consultation. Work undertaken by the NCA on this matter for the Government has to our knowledge never been made public. | |
| 46 | National Archives of Australia | <p>Understands that the change in land use for East Block means that the site and building can be used for a broader range of purposes including commercial use, should the National Archives choose to move to alternative premises in the future.</p> <p>Notes that under the current provisions of the Plan that existing buildings in the Parliamentary Zone will be used as anchors for new development that have a compatible function and that East Block has been included in one of six campuses formed in the Zone. Existing policy references the importance of maintaining a balance between the 'working political functions of the seat of Government and the national cultural institutions'.</p> <p>Further reference to the National Archives of Australia and any future expansion of it and the National Gallery of Australia notes that this 'should occur on sites adjacent to the present locations of these national institutions' and any 'long-term requirements for new cultural institutions should also be accommodated in the proposed campuses'.</p> <p>We support this approach in light of the Government's</p> | Noted. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | decision to test the property market to test investor interest in four Commonwealth properties, which includes East Block. Whatever the outcome of this decision with regard to investor interest and in consideration of the future location of the National Archives of Australia, a substantial and continuing public presence in the Parliamentary Zone is an imperative to ensure ongoing access to the archival recourses of the Commonwealth by a broad Australian audience and Australian government agencies. | |
| 47 | Department of Finance | <p>Figure 71 'Indicative urban structure' does not take account of the existing physical structures on the land. The re-configuration of the blocks in Russell to match the pattern described in Figure 71 would adversely impact on titling, services, etc.</p> <p>Finance would like the opportunity to work with the NCA to reach a better outcome, particularly in view of the possible extension of the ACT Government's proposed Light Rail project (Light Rail) into the Russell precinct. While this has the potential to further complicate the configuration of National Land blocks and affect access/egress, their future management, development potential and value, it also affords us the opportunity to revisit the proposed block structure with a view to achieving a more realistic outcome.</p> <p>Further, Finance notes that Draft Amendment 86 proposes further changes to the inter-town public transport system which sees its proposed route</p> | <p>Figure 71 is indicative only. The potential route to Russell would be generally consistent with the intent of these drawings, and the general policies for Constitution Avenue which foreshadow light rail and require the integration of public transport priority in the design of the avenue.</p> <p>The General Policy Plan – Metropolitan Canberra shows the Inter-town Public Transport System. The route shown is indicative only and provides broadly for a public transport route to run along the route described by the Department of Finance. No specific detail is shown in regard to an alignment through Russell.</p> <p>The indicative route is consistent with the ACT Government's transport planning objectives for its 2031 Frequent Network as identified in 'Transport for Canberra (2012-2031)'.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>extending along Constitution Avenue, Kings Avenue, Brisbane Avenue, Wentworth Avenue and then down Canberra Avenue to Queanbeyan. If Draft Amendment 86 is approved in its proposed form, the Light Rail alignment through Russell will be considered to be consistent with the National Capital Plan.</p> <p>The change is considered premature at this stage. The Finance Minister is yet to be consulted on the impacts that the Light Rail alignment through Russell will have on Commonwealth land, and the Commonwealth is yet to reach an agreed position on the route.</p> <p>Consequently, Finance does not support the proposed change to the inter-town public transport route in the Central National Area. Finance would prefer that the proposed route remain as shown in the Exposure Draft. Once Ministers have been consulted and the Commonwealth has reached an agreed position, if necessary a future minor amendment can be made to the National Capital Plan to facilitate the alignment of Light Rail through Russell.</p> | The Plan does not prescribe the mode of transport. |
| 48 | Australian Sports Commission | Provided suggested changes to the Australian Institute of Sport Precinct Code. | The NCA has adopted a number of changes proposed by the Australian Sports Commission. The NCA will continue to work with the Commission as necessary to update the Australian Institute of Sport Precinct Code to reflect the long term aspirations of the Commission for the site. |
| 49 | Peter Tzanetos | Supports reducing the influence that the NCA has on | Noted. |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| | | outer parts of Canberra. Suggests that the NCA should be left to deal with the Parliamentary Triangle and everything else left up to local government authority. | |
| 50 | Housing Industry Association | <p>Supports rezoning of CSIRO Ginninderra site. Support is offered for a number of reasons including (but not limited to)s:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Requirement for land supply in the ACT:</i> land supply in the ACT, particularly to support affordable housing, should become a priority. 2. <i>Suitability of the land (whole or part) for residential development:</i> the site is adjacent to existing infrastructure and arterial roads, however some works will be required to prepare the site for development. Some land will not be developed for reasons relating to topography and other matters, however this will allow for conservation and recreation areas to be included as part of the development, as well as incorporating some of the values and commitments of CSIRO to sustain parts of the site for environmental purposes and the ongoing management of nursery and dispersal areas. <p>There will also be opportunity to provide a variety of housing types, including to cater for those entering the market and those looking to downsize.</p> | <p>Support for CSIRO Ginninderra is noted.</p> <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>CSIRO have identified that the site is not currently fully utilised and the amendment will allow for new, more dynamic opportunities, therefore maximizing the value of the site. This value will benefit CSIRO as well as community and industry.</p> <p>3. <i>Economic benefits</i>: There will be economic benefits that flow on to the surrounding community and industry. HIA has been involved in independent economic research which found that for every \$1.00 of productivity spent in residential building, the wash through effect (for example through contractors, suppliers, designers and landscapers) led to a multiplier effect of \$5.00 through the community.</p> <p>CSIRO has also advised that any profits made from the project will be reinvested into CSIRO research facilities and programs.</p> <p>4. <i>CSIRO commitment to long-term involvement with scientific expertise in sustainable and liveable cities</i>: HIA understand that CSIRO have a long term involvement with particular expertise in creating sustainable and liveable cities. This will result in the support of CSIRO throughout the development of the site as well as being able to tap into its resources and objections to meet their long-term strategies which results in true engagement and commitment to the overall</p> | |

| Submission no. | Submitter details | Comments | NCA response |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>project.</p> <p>5. <i>CSIRO commitment to both the community and industry:</i> the use of CSIRO resources and commitment to community and industry will result in innovative and sustainable housing outcomes.</p> | |
| 51 | ACT Government (Environment and Planning Directorate) | The ACT Government would prefer that the CSIRO Ginninderra site be identified as a 'Potential Future Urban Area' at this stage. The ACT Government would also prefer that planning arrangements for the National Convention Centre site remain as they currently are. | <p>The proposal to include the National Convention Centre site in Designated Areas has been reversed, however all other land adjacent to Constitution Avenue has been included within Designated Areas.</p> <p>CSIRO Ginninderra remains within the Urban Areas. The CSIRO Ginninderra site presents an opportunity for greenfield development that can make use of existing infrastructure and services, and provides a more suitable alternative to cater for the growth of the city than other greenfield sites.</p> <p>For further details refer to section 3.2.1.</p> |

Attachment F – Schedule of changes

| <i>Proposed change</i> | <i>Reference/section of Plan</i> | <i>Source/comments</i> |
|---|--|--|
| 1. Block 14 Section 65 City has not been included in Designated Areas. | Figures titled: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Designated Areas' • 'Designated Areas Precincts' • 'Land use for the Constitution Avenue and Anzac Parade Precinct' | This change is a result of discussion with the ACT Government. |
| 2. Canberra Airport has been included in the Central National Area. | Section 4.1 'The Central National Area'. | <p>This change is a result of the submission from and subsequent discussions with Canberra Airport. The change reflects the status of the airport as a key gateway and significant asset to the National Capital, and improves consistency of terminology between the National Capital Plan and the Airport Master Plan.</p> <p>The effect of this change relates to how the Central National Area is defined, and does not alter the planning arrangements in place for the Airport. The land remains outside Designated Areas, with an annotation stating that the airport is subject to a Master Plan under applicable legislation.</p> |
| 3. Minor changes have been made to recognise that 'potential future urban areas' may form part of urban land in the foreseeable future. | Section 3.3 and clause 3.3.3(b) | The change adequately acknowledges that potential future urban areas may form part of Urban Areas. |
| 4. References to the 'ACT Government' in the process for seeking certification of | Section 3.1.2 'Potential Future Urban | |

| Proposed change | Reference/section of Plan | Source/comments |
|--|--|--|
| land use changes within 'potential future urban areas' has been amended to refer to 'proponents'. This allows for the certification process to be followed in circumstances where the ACT Government is not the proponent. | Areas'. | |
| <p>5. Several changes in relation to Anzac Park East and West have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The building height limit for Anzac Park East and West has been changed to be stated as a maximum (of RL600) and that this is contingent on heritage requirements. A provision has been added to ensure that the two buildings flanking Anzac Parade will be equal in height (up to the maximum of RL600). This provides for the eventuality that <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> referral outcomes require buildings to be restricted to limits currently in place (approximately 25 metres). b. The portion of the Anzac Park East and West sites subject to the above building height limits has been clarified. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Constitution Avenue and Anzac Parade Precinct Code, section 4.8.5 'Detailed Conditions of Planning Design and Development', Building height and form. Figure titled 'Constitution Avenue and Anzac Parade – Indicative building height and form'. b. Section 4.8.5 'Detailed Conditions of Planning, Design and Development', Building height and form. c. Section 4.8.5 'Detailed Conditions of Planning, Design and Development', Public transport, access and circulation. | These changes are a result of ongoing discussions with the Department of Finance regarding the divestment of Anzac Park East and West. |

| Proposed change | Reference/section of Plan | Source/comments |
|---|---|-----------------|
| <p>c. A requirement has been added that access to the western portion of Block 7 Section 3 Parkes (the land on which Anzac Park West sits) from Block 6 Section 3 Parkes must be maintained. This, in conjunction with specific conditions of sale for Anzac Park West will help ensure continued public access to Commonwealth Park via underpass from the northern side of Parkes Way.</p> <p>d. An additional dot point has been added to the background of the Constitution Avenue and Anzac Parade Precinct Code explaining the national interest in ensuring the ongoing portal function of buildings at the southern end of Anzac Parade, as follows: <i>There is a national capital interest in...balanced building massing at the sites at the southern end of Anzac Parade is maintained as far as practicable and is reinstated as a result of any redevelopment of those sites, to ensure the portal</i></p> | <p>d. Section 4.8.2 'Background'</p> | |

| Proposed change | Reference/section of Plan | Source/comments |
|---|---|---|
| <i>function of the buildings on the Anzac Parade frontages of those sites is maintained for the benefit of the Parliament House Vista.</i> | | |
| 6. Changes have been made to the Australian Institute of Sport Precinct Code. | Australian Institute of Sport Precinct Code | These changes have been made in response to comments from the Australian Sports Commission during public consultation on Draft Amendment 86. |
| 7. Minor changes to heritage principles have been made to better express the NCA's approach to heritage management. The definition of 'Heritage Place' has also been amended to include places on the NCA's heritage register maintained under the EPBC Act. | Part Two Statement of Planning Principles, objectives for urban design and heritage. Appendix B | These changes are in response to submissions made to Draft Amendment 86. |
| 8. Setbacks for Kings and Commonwealth Avenue have been added. | Detailed conditions of planning, design and development for the Central National Area, section 4.1.2(13). | These changes have been made to reflect outcomes of Kings and Commonwealth Avenue Masterplan. |
| 9. The minimum floor-to-ceiling heights applicable to the Constitution Avenue and Anzac Parade Precinct have been extended across the West Basin and City Hill Precincts. | City Hill Precinct Code, section 4.6.5, section titled 'Building height' and West Basin Precinct Code, section 4.7.5, section titled 'Building height and form' | The addition of minimum floor-to-ceiling heights in the City Hill and West Basin Precincts will rationalize the descriptions of internal heights to describe floor-to-ceiling heights so as to improve the design quality of development proposals, and provide greater consistency in development controls across precincts. |
| 10. References to the Tourist Information | Signs General Code, section 4.20.3, | This change is a result of internal review of the |

| <i>Proposed change</i> | <i>Reference/section of Plan</i> | <i>Source/comments</i> |
|---|--|---|
| Centre on Northbourne Avenue have been amended to reflect the relocation of the information centre to Regatta Point in 2016. | 'Tourist and radio identification signs' and 'Tourist information signs | revised Plan. |
| 11. Specific references to Floriade being located in Commonwealth Park have been removed, however the capacity for the event to still be held in the park is not diminished. Policy permitting events and access restrictions in Commonwealth Park (as well as other open space areas around the lake) is retained in the Plan. | Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores Precinct Code, section 4.12.5, section titled 'Parkland recreation' | This change is a result of internal review of the revised Plan. |