



Australian Government
National Capital Authority

CONSULTATION REPORT

Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct Issues Paper

February 2018

Contents

1	Introduction and purpose	3
2	Consultation	3
3	Key Issues	4
3.1	Neighbourhood character	4
3.2	Landscape	5
3.3	Setbacks	8
3.4	Previous approvals and compliance	8
3.5	Public domain.....	9
3.6	Status and clarity of guidelines	9
3.7	Subdivision, block amalgamation and strata titling	10
3.8	Driveways and verge crossings	10
3.9	Heritage.....	11
3.10	Environmental sustainability and climate change	11
3.11	Impact of development on adjoining properties	12
3.12	Plot ratio and site coverage	12
3.13	Transition zones	13
3.14	Density and dwelling type.....	13
3.15	Architecture	14
3.16	Hedges and fences	15
3.17	Public consultation.....	15
3.18	Other matters	16
4	Conclusion.....	18
	Attachment A – Submissions received in response to Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct Issues Paper	19
	Attachment B – Proposed Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct Guidelines incorporating recommended changes.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
	Application	Error! Bookmark not defined.
	Objectives.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
	Block amalgamation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
	Building height	Error! Bookmark not defined.
	Plot ratio.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
	Architecture	Error! Bookmark not defined.
	Setbacks	Error! Bookmark not defined.
	Landscape	Error! Bookmark not defined.
	Vehicle access	Error! Bookmark not defined.
	Hedges and fences	Error! Bookmark not defined.

1 Introduction and purpose

The Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct, located south of Capital Hill, is an example of twentieth century 'Garden City' planning concepts. Residential development in the precinct began in the 1950s and was one of the first residential subdivisions in the inner south of Canberra, following development of the Garden City areas of Blandfordia 4 Precinct, Blandfordia 5 Housing Precinct, and Forrest Housing Precinct. The area was well established by the time Parliament House was completed on Capital Hill in 1988.

Its Garden City origins have resulted in the area being largely characterised by single homes in a garden setting on large blocks. The precinct is the only residential area of its kind subject to detailed planning control by the National Capital Authority (NCA).

Over the past 10-15 years, redevelopment of the area has seen changes to the form and scale of development, with an increase in multi-dwelling units (duplexes, townhouses and apartments). New dwellings are typically larger, with increased hardscape and subsequently decreased soft landscaping. The NCA has embarked on a review of relevant provisions of the National Capital Plan (the Plan) to ascertain whether current planning and design controls are still adequate to guide the outcomes expected for the precinct.

The first phase of the NCA's investigations into the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct resulted in the preparation of an Issues Paper for public consultation. The Issues Paper identified matters directly relevant to the precinct, but also examined a number of strategic issues which are relevant to other areas of the city, or the city as a whole. The Issues Paper identified potential policy responses to address the key issues identified.

In releasing the Issues Paper for public consultation (refer to Section 2 of this report for details), the NCA sought feedback on:

- a. the characteristics of the neighbourhood valued by the community
- b. the proposed policy responses to the identified issues
- c. whether other matters should be addressed.

The purpose of this paper is to summarise the consultation process undertaken by the NCA in relation to the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct Issues Paper, identify the key issues raised during the consultation process, and respond to the issues raised by stakeholders.

2 Consultation

On 8 April 2017, the NCA released the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct Issues Paper for public consultation. The public consultation period ran for seven weeks, concluding on 26 May 2017. The Issues Paper was available on the NCA's website, and hard copies were available on request.

Key activities during the public consultation period included:

- On 8 April 2017, a public notice was published in *The Canberra Times*.
- On 10 April 2017, the NCA wrote to the ACT Government's Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate to advise them of the release of the paper.
- The NCA wrote to stakeholders, including community groups, industry, and special interest groups, to advise them of the release of the paper.
- A letter was hand-delivered to all dwellings in the precinct, including multi-unit dwellings fronting State Circle, to advise residents of the release of the paper. All residents were invited to attend a meeting with NCA officers to discuss the paper.

- On 27 April 2017, the NCA conducted a meeting with residents to discuss the paper. Approximately 20 residents attended.
- Interviews with print and broadcast media.
- Other meetings with stakeholders were conducted on request.

3 Key Issues

Thirty-seven submissions were received in response to the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct Issues Paper. Each submission is set out in [Attachment A](#). This section identifies the issues raised in submissions, and the NCA response to the issues.

The NCA has elected to prepare a draft amendment to the National Capital Plan (the Plan) (refer section 3.6 of the report). The policy changes identified throughout sections 3.1 to 3.18 reflect the propositions in the draft amendment.

3.1 Neighbourhood character

Comments

Multiple submitters commented on the current character of the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct, and also on the preferred future character of the area. Many of these submitters noted that the area is characterized by single dwellings on large blocks (or a principle residence with a granny flat or smaller second dwelling) and varied setbacks. It was generally accepted that increased density is appropriate in some areas of Canberra, however a number of submitters suggested that the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct is not such a location given its national significance and special character.

A number of submitters requested that any policy developed by the NCA should promote a single dwelling per block, noting that in some circumstances (such as corner blocks) more than one dwelling may be suitable. Other submitters appeared not to have a direct concern with multiple dwellings on a block, but recommended that any policy implemented should require a particular land size per dwelling. Suggestions in this regard ranged from 500m² to 1000m².

Other general comments concerning neighbourhood character were made, with submitters noting that character must consider all aspects of development and its context – not just the streetscape, but built form, number of dwellings per block size, setbacks, landscaping, and characteristics of properties which adjoin a site. The proximity of the precinct to Parliament House and other national institutions requires that the NCA mandate high standards of planning, design and landscaping.

NCA response

The NCA agrees that the location of the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct warrants high standards of planning, design and landscaping. Existing provisions of the Plan, and those proposed for the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct are intended to deliver these standards. These provisions also ensure that development considers more than just site context, but neighbourhood characteristics and context as well.

The NCA supports assertions that a single dwelling per block appropriately reflects the national significance and values of the precinct. A single dwelling per block will also assist in retaining the predominant dwelling form in the precinct. The draft amendment proposes to identify residential blocks (with the exception of those fronting State Circle) in the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct as 'Single Dwelling Housing'. The Plan defines 'Single Dwelling Housing' as '*any area of residential land used for the purpose of a single dwelling only*'.

Block amalgamation remains unsupported by the NCA.

3.2 Landscape

Comments

A strong theme arising during public consultation was trees and landscaping in the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct, including the role of the NCA in determining what individual landholders can do on their blocks, trees in the urban environment, and trees on public land such as road verges. Contrasting views were received in regard to many elements of the theme, including from residents within the precinct itself, demonstrating that there is no cohesive view within the community.

Some submitters were of the view that the proposed guidelines are too onerous, particularly in regard to quantitative mandates on retention of trees, potential tree size and height, canopy cover, and planting area. Several submitters objected to the NCA being able to tell individuals what they are permitted to do in terms of landscaping on their own blocks. This was often accompanied by the opinion that there is already sufficient landscaping on verges and in public areas to uphold the 'Garden City' character of the precinct. The following are examples of comments from those objecting to the proposed landscaping guidelines:

- Proposed policies concerning trees are overly prescriptive and detract from owners' rights to design and develop their own garden.
- Large trees can cause damage or pose a danger in residential areas, and require significant maintenance.
- Some tree species planted in private gardens have proven to be unsuitable for the Canberra climate, are pest species, are short lived, or restrict the growth of other trees and vegetation. There should be no requirement to retain such trees.
- Trees twice the height of proposed development may be difficult to achieve on some sites, and should not be required.
- Allowing developers to remove and replace trees may help with optimizing dwelling siting, including enhancing solar access.
- Large trees are often not suitable for residential blocks and can potentially drop large amounts of leaves thereby blocking drainpipes and gutters, damage house foundations and infrastructure, and drop branches.
- Large trees are more appropriate for verges and nature strips, rather than home blocks.
- There is already an abundance of 'planted area' within the precinct (for example, Lodge Park, the median strip of Melbourne Avenue, parklands around Parliament House, and nature strips).

In some cases, those objecting to the proposed policies suggested alternatives, such as allowing for tree removal if a new tree was planted elsewhere on site, or allowing for slow growing but long lived species with generous canopies. Others offered examples of alternative garden styles that are attractive yet would not meet the proposed landscaping guidelines (such as the Japanese pebble garden at 14 Melbourne Avenue).

The contrasting view was that policies to protect and enhance the existing landscape in both public and private domains is vital if the character of the precinct and its Garden City values are to be retained. The benefits of large trees and extensive greenery were appreciated, including the role of landscaping in mitigating the heat island effect, reducing storm water runoff, attracting wildlife, and promoting tourism. The NCA's proposed approach to landscape was recognised by some as being generally consistent with that of other jurisdictions, both in Australia and overseas.

One submitter proposed that the 40% planting area requirement needs to be tightened to ensure that landscape areas do not become restricted to the rear of the property and therefore not contribute to the garden feel of the precinct. Another requested that permeable surfaces for vehicle parking and garden paths should be included in the 40% planting area.

Several people sought clarification about what the NCA means by 'soft landscaping', 'large established trees' and 'canopy coverage', and whether planting areas can include synthetic grass.

NCA Response

The NCA's overriding consideration is whether planning and design policies will result in the quality, character and permanence desired for the nationally significant precinct. The NCA will therefore continue to uphold policy regarding landscape treatments on private blocks. A number of changes to the proposed landscape policies can assist in responding to submitter concerns, primarily in regard to reducing the number of quantitative standards originally proposed.

In regard to landscaping between the building line and front property boundary, a minor change would assist in clarifying that where redevelopment of a block is proposed, soft landscaping must be provided between the building line and the front property boundary. The clause is not intended to require existing soft landscaping to be retained. The draft amendment proposes the following clause:

A composition of soft landscaping must be provided between the building line and the front property boundary (or boundaries in the case of corner blocks). Soft landscaping may include trees, shrubs, grass, and garden beds. Hard surfacing, other than for pathways and driveways, should be avoided.

Variations to the policy concerning the retention of large trees to enable a variety of solutions to be offered while still meeting the intent for landscaping may assist in addressing concerns that the provisions identified in the Issues Paper is too onerous. Amendments to this policy to remove references to 'large' trees would recognise that all trees have a role to play in achieving the desired landscape character. The draft amendment proposes the following clause:

Established trees should be retained where possible and information submitted to the National Capital Authority demonstrating that construction activities will not result in significant adverse impacts to those trees. The National Capital Authority will consider tree removal where an Arborist report demonstrates that:

- *a tree is in ill health or in decline;*
- *a tree poses a threat to resident or public safety;*
- *a tree is pest species or unsuitable for the Canberra climate;*
- *a tree is restricting the growth of other vegetation; and/or*
- *site and building design can be optimised by the removal of trees.*

In these circumstances, the NCA's preference is for new trees to be planted elsewhere on site. The combination of new and existing trees should be capable of providing at least 15% canopy coverage of a site when trees are mature.

The policy requiring new trees to be planted that are capable of reaching twice the height of proposed buildings is not considered necessary having regard to the comments received from stakeholders. The NCA understands that this may be difficult to achieve on some blocks. The policy requiring a minimum of 15% canopy coverage may be modified (as described above) to refer to trees providing such coverage at maturity. This recognises that reasonable canopy coverage can be achieved in many ways. For example, some slow growing species may provide excellent canopy coverage in a timeframe longer than ten years.

Provisions requiring soft landscaping between the front property boundary and any building will ensure that planting areas are not restricted to the rear of the property. The NCA will not consider permeable surfaces such as driveways and paving in the calculation of planting area. The draft amendment proposes the following clause:

Not less than 35% of total site area should be for planting area. Planting area means an area of land within a block covered by trees, grass or lawn (not including synthetic

turf), garden bed, shrubs (including hedges) and the like. Planting area does not include any area covered by buildings (including basement), swimming pools, vehicle parking or maneuvering areas (whether permeable or not), or any other form of impermeable surface.

The NCA proposes that a requirement be introduced that where redevelopment of a block is proposed, landscape plans are to be prepared by a registered landscape architect. This will ensure that, for example, species proposed are suitable for the Canberra climate, have sufficient room to grow to maturity, and offer other benefits.

The following are explanations of terms used:

1. Soft landscaping – includes trees, grass or lawn (not synthetic), garden beds, shrubs (including hedges).
2. Large established trees – a large tree that has reached expected mature growth in terms of height, girth, and canopy. It should be noted that reference to 'large' trees has been removed from the policy. Reference to 'established' trees has been retained, with the term meaning a tree that has reached expected mature growth in terms of height, girth and canopy.
3. Canopy coverage – refers to the proportion of land covered by the projection of tree crowns. Crowns are treated as opaque, and where patches are evident they are considered part of the crown and included in canopy coverage calculations.

In regard to trees in the public domain, please refer to Section 3.5 of this report.

The draft amendment proposes the following policies for landscaping:

Proposals for redevelopment of a block must be accompanied by a landscape plan prepared by a registered landscape architect.

A composition of soft landscaping should be provided between the building line and the front property boundary (or boundaries in the case of corner blocks). Soft landscaping may include trees, shrubs, grass, and garden beds. Hard surfacing, other than for pathways and driveways, should be avoided.

Established trees should be retained where possible and information submitted to the National Capital Authority demonstrating that construction activities will not result in significant adverse impacts to those trees. The National Capital Authority will consider tree removal where an Arborist report demonstrates that:

- *a tree is in ill health or in decline*
- *a tree poses a threat to resident or public safety*
- *a tree is pest species or unsuitable for the Canberra climate*
- *a tree is restricting the growth of other vegetation; and/or*
- *site and building design can be optimised by the removal of trees.*

In these circumstances, the National Capital Authority's preference is for new trees to be planted elsewhere on site. The combination of new and existing trees should be capable of providing at least 15% canopy coverage of a site when trees are mature.

A minimum of one tree should be provided in the private open space of each dwelling.

Trees should be chosen to contribute to energy efficiency by providing substantial shade in summer, especially to west facing windows, and admitting winter sunlight to outdoor and indoor living areas, especially to the north.

Not less than 35% of total site area should be for planting area. Planting area means an area of land within a block covered by trees, grass or lawn (not including synthetic turf), garden bed, shrubs (including hedges) and the like. Planting area does not

include any area covered by buildings (including basement), swimming pools, vehicle parking or maneuvering areas (whether permeable or not), or any other form of impermeable surface.

3.3 Setbacks

Comments

A number of submitters were of the opinion that a front setback of six meters is not consistent with the existing character of the area, and that variation in setbacks would maintain this characteristic and provide interest in the streetscape. In most cases, this observation was followed by the suggestion that where redevelopment of a site is proposed, existing front setbacks should be retained (or if front setbacks are already less than that required, then the proposed front setback be applied).

Submitters noted that including a provision to retain front setbacks would be consistent with the requirements for the Garden City heritage precincts, such as the Forrest Housing Precinct which adjoins the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct.

NCA Response

The front setbacks identified in the Issues Paper are a continuation of current policy (which has been in the Plan since its inception in 1990 and successfully implemented in the precinct). Consistent front setbacks can assist in visually unifying a streetscape, help to spatially define the width of a street, and contribute to the character of the public domain. Differentiation can be provided through architectural style, building materials and façade treatments, and landscape.

The Forrest Housing Precinct is listed on the ACT Heritage Register, along with other Garden City suburbs in Canberra. The Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct has not been recognised in the same way and the NCA does not consider the required setbacks for these areas relevant in determining setbacks for the precinct. The required front setbacks accommodate front gardens which contribute to the character of the precinct.

The draft amendment proposes that the following clause be added to the setback provisions of the Plan to clarify that building setbacks to Main Avenues (Melbourne and Hobart Avenues) are 10 meters:

Regardless of the above [in referring to all preceding setback provisions], all buildings must be set back a minimum of 10 meters from any property boundary adjacent to a Main Avenue.

3.4 Previous approvals and compliance

Comments

Some submitters expressed concern with the NCA's consideration of previous proposals in the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct. Several examples of approvals granted by the NCA were provided, with submitters suggesting that the approvals are not consistent with the provisions of the Plan, and do not appropriately reflect the character of the area. A number of these submitters were of the view that the NCA does not give due regard to the Garden City qualities of the precinct, particularly when assessing multi-dwelling proposals.

Concern was also raised that recent ACT Government approvals do not appropriately respond to the characteristics of the area, such as a recently approved seven-storey hotel in Forrest. Submitters questioned whether the NCA can influence the ACT Government and require Garden City values to be upheld.

Comment was made that while some issues are quantified in the Plan, such as building height and setbacks, there are other, more subjective matters such as garden design and architectural quality. It was questioned who decides whether a proposal is consistent with provisions concerning these matters.

Several individuals sought to understand what the NCA's powers are in relation to compliance, and whether the NCA could issue fines, penalties and the like where development has not been given approval, or where development has been approved but undertaken inconsistently with approved plans.

NCA Response

The *Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988* (the Act) sets out provisions relating to the approval of works in Designated Areas. Notably, no works are to be undertaken in Designated Areas unless:

- a. the proposal to undertake the works has been submitted to the NCA
- b. the NCA has approved the works in writing
- c. the works are in accordance with the Plan.

Each application for works submitted to the NCA is subject to assessment by officers with qualifications in urban planning, architecture, landscape architecture and the like, with approval granted by a delegate of the Authority. Where approval is granted, the delegate must be satisfied that a proposal is not inconsistent with the Plan. In each example provided by submitters, the assessment and decision determined that this was the case.

Where works have been undertaken without approval, or where approval has been granted but works have not been undertaken in accordance with approved plans, the NCA does not have the legislative capacity to apply fines or penalties. To afford the NCA this power would require legislative change.

Development on Territory Land outside Designated Areas requires approval from the ACT Government.

3.5 Public domain

Comments

A number of submitters called upon the NCA to undertake works in the public domain, and subsequently perform required maintenance. For example, submitters suggested that the NCA should re-plant street trees, maintain nature strips and road verges, attend to street lighting, and construct and maintain footpaths.

Parking in the precinct was also raised by submitters, with concern that increases in population have resulted in unsafe situations whereby it is difficult to navigate streets with cars parked on either side. Safety issues are also evident as a result of a lack of footpaths.

Some submitters suggested that the NCA should take over the management and maintenance of trees in public areas of the precinct to ensure a higher standard of landscape maintenance.

NCA Response

The planning and land management roles in the precinct are undertaken by the NCA and ACT Government respectively. The NCA is responsible for detailed planning of the precinct, including the development approval role. The ACT Government is responsible for managing public land in the precinct, such as the verges and nature strips. This responsibility includes maintenance of landscaping, regulation and enforcement of parking, and provision and maintenance of assets such as street lighting.

3.6 Status and clarity of guidelines

Comments

Several submitters requested that the proposed guidelines be incorporated into the Plan via an amendment. This would provide certainty as to the status of the guidelines.

Comment was made that the terms ‘should’ and ‘generally’ are used consistently throughout the proposed guidelines, and that greater certainty could be provided by use of terms such as ‘must’ or ‘not permitted’. Where provisions are intended to be discretionary, further clarification should be contained in the guidelines as to what circumstances would warrant a departure from the provision.

General commentary was received that the proposed guidelines are overly restrictive, and that greater flexibility should be provided to respond to individual site conditions and proposals. Greater flexibility is also likely to allow innovation in outcomes that still meet the stated objectives.

NCA Response

The NCA will progress an amendment to the Plan. An amendment to the Plan offers the opportunity to reframe the policy as mandatory requirements where relevant (for example, through the use of terms such as ‘must’).

This report examines the full range of matters raised during public consultation. A number of potential policy changes are identified, including in response to suggestions that greater flexibility should be offered. The draft amendment process offers further opportunity for community engagement and comment.

3.7 Subdivision, block amalgamation and strata titling

Comments

Subdivision and strata titling were not addressed in the guidelines, and one submitter suggested that these matters need to be addressed as it is occurring. Comment was also received that block amalgamations should not be permitted outside of what is permitted for those fronting State Circle.

NCA Response

Subdivision by a units plan has occurred in some instances where multiple dwellings on a single block exist. In these cases, the block itself has not been subdivided and dwellings do not have separate title. Unit titling (known as strata titling in some other jurisdictions) is subject to ACT legislation.

The NCA does not support block amalgamations for the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct, with the exception of blocks fronting State Circle. This is evidenced by existing policy in the Plan. The draft amendment proposes the following policy regarding this matter:

In order to maintain subdivision patterns, block amalgamation is not permitted.

3.8 Driveways and verge crossings

Comment

Opposing views were received regarding verge crossings. On the one hand, a number of comments received indicated support for the proposal as this was viewed as a way of limiting impacts on street trees and verge landscaping. The contrasting view sought reconsideration of the proposed policy on the following grounds:

- current verge crossings may not be of a sufficient width to allow two vehicles to pass, which is not practical for multi-unit developments or even multi-car single dwelling households
- many properties in the precinct already have *porte cochere* style access (and therefore two verge crossings), which provides for easy movement of vehicles and parking
- the proposed policy is overly restrictive and may not produce desired outcomes for quality development.

It was noted that the minimum and maximum widths of verge crossings is not provided. It was subsequently questioned whether it is intended that the 3.6 meters specified for driveway width is also the maximum width for verge crossings. If so, this provides only a narrow verge crossing for medium density developments.

Concern was raised that the requirement for landscaping to effectively hide driveways from the street will create a pedestrian hazard as planting will block the view of exiting vehicles from the footpath.

NCA Response

The Issues Paper effectively proposed no increase in the number of verge crossings. Where properties already have two verge crossings, there will be no required change to this arrangement.

In regard to the relationship between driveways and landscaping, the proposed policy is for the two to be integrated, not for driveways to be hidden. The NCA will consider the need for view lines and safety in its assessment of proposals.

Verge crossings (the section of driveway between the public road and property boundary) are subject to the ACT Government's Design Standards for Urban Infrastructure.

The boundary of the ACT heritage listed Forrest Housing Precinct extends to the boundary of blocks fronting National Circuit. That is, the verge adjoining blocks on National Circuit between Hobart and Melbourne Avenue is part of the Forrest Housing Precinct. The verge crossing requirements set out in the guidelines are not inconsistent with the requirements for verge crossings for the Forrest Housing Precinct.

3.9 Heritage

Comments

The National Trust referred the NCA to previous ACT Government reports and investigations into Garden City values and principles. Notably, the National Trust suggested that the ACT Government's 'Garden City Values and Principles (2008)' is valid and should be applied to the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct (and even more broadly across the city).

NCA Response

The NCA recognises the importance of this precinct and its contribution to the understanding of the Garden City design principles. The proposed amendment to the National Capital Plan will provide the legislative framework that ensures these principles are considered for all new development.

3.10 Environmental sustainability and climate change

Comments

Multiple submitters recognised that the urban heat island effect is a significant issue, and that tree canopy cover and other vegetation is vital for reducing urban temperatures in summer. These submitters welcomed proposals to retain existing trees, mandate a 'planting area' not covered by buildings or hardscape, and inclusion of a canopy coverage target.

Comment was also made that the proposed policies for the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct are environmentally unsound and flawed. This view was based primarily on the assumption that large blocks with large gardens and lawns, often occupied by a single family, involve massive water consumption per head. It was suggested that dual occupancies and subdivisions reducing the size of blocks will create more environmentally sustainable blocks. This will also have the benefit of providing opportunities for the elderly who have lived in the area for many years to downsize while remaining in place.

NCA Response

The NCA notes the support for policies concerning planting areas and tree retention. Section 3.2 of this report addresses changes in regard to these policies.

The NCA recognizes that dual occupancies and subdivisions resulting in increased densities has a number of benefits to city growth and urban management. The NCA also has an obligation to uphold

the national significance of the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct, and considers that the policies proposed by the draft amendment appropriately recognize this significance.

3.11 Impact of development on adjoining properties

Comments

A number of questions were raised in relation to the impact of proposals on adjoining properties, including:

- Could a proposal be fully compliant with guidelines, but not take into consideration impacts on adjoining properties?
- Does a neighbour have any recourse?

It was suggested that there needs to be something that requires all proposals to have regard to the impacts on neighbouring properties, including existing structures and the usability of open space areas.

NCA Response

The NCA agrees that new proposals must demonstrate that neighbouring properties are not significantly adversely impacted by the proposal. The 'Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct Code' and the 'Design and Siting General Code' of the National Capital Plan are applicable to proposals in the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct. The Precinct Code's objectives for development fronting State Circle refer to the need to protect the residential amenity of rear neighbours in terms of privacy, sunlight access and provision of a landscape buffer. The General Code identifies that the provisions for detached houses are to both provide for the amenity of the occupants of the house and the maintenance of adjoining houses. These principles are adopted in the assessment of all residential proposals in the precinct.

However, more explicit policies concerning consideration of neighbouring properties could benefit neighbouring properties where redevelopment of a block is proposed. The draft amendment proposes the following:

Proposals must demonstrate consideration of overshadowing and privacy of neighbouring properties, including both dwellings and open space.

New development must be located and oriented to maximize visual privacy between buildings on site and for neighbouring properties.

New development must ensure that building separation does not impact on the solar access of neighbouring properties.

The NCA's 'Commitment to Community Engagement (August 2015)' and the National Capital Plan set out requirements for consultation with adjoining lessees and the public. Once a determination has been made, a lessee does not have an opportunity to appeal the NCA's decision.

3.12 Plot ratio and site coverage

Comments

Of those who commented on plot ratio, there was general support for retaining a maximum plot ratio of 0.4. Frequently, support for this plot ratio was accompanied by support for the 40% planting area. It was however, questioned whether minor variations to these quantitative standards would be considered on merit.

Other commentary received in regard to plot ratio and site coverage included a suggested maximum site coverage of 30 per cent.

NCA Response

The NCA notes the general support for maintaining a plot ratio of 0.4, and for a 40% planting area. Plot ratio is intended to place an upper limit on the amount of building development on a site, and flexibility in applying this plot ratio is not supported.

Comments regarding the proposed planting area are addressed in section 3.2 of the report, and changes in response to these comments identified.

The NCA considers that prescribing a maximum site coverage is not required given plot ratio and landscaping provisions.

3.13 Transition zones

Comments

A number of submitters suggested that the blocks in Section 3 Deakin and Section 6 Forrest be exempted from the proposed policy. This area could form a 'transition zone' from the higher density apartments fronting State Circle to low density residential.

NCA Response

The NCA board does not support the concept of a transition zone.

3.14 Density and dwelling type

Comments

The issue of density and dwelling type garnered significant commentary and a variety of perspectives.

Section 3.1 of this report notes that a number of submitters support policy aimed at retaining a single dwelling, or perhaps a principle residence with second smaller residence, per block. These views are at odds with the submitters who noted that there is already strong demand for higher density housing (such as townhouses) in inner Canberra suburbs and typically supported this style of development (provided aesthetic qualities in regard to green space, gardens and trees are preserved). The NCA's attempts to increase density by permitting townhouses and duplexes, while ensuring the high quality of the built environment and retaining the Garden City feel, were also recognised and supported.

Those advocating for increased density presented the following views:

- The NCA needs to ensure that there is capacity for higher density living in the area, as this would provide opportunity for more people to live in the area and provide dwelling types for those who do not want a large garden to maintain.
- The area is well served by public transport, restaurants, cultural institutions, Lake Burley Griffin, bushland and parks. The area needs to provide housing for people other than families; single people, young couples, downsizers, etc., need to be catered for in the form of smaller dwellings such as townhouses.
- From a natural resource management and sustainability perspective, it makes sense to increase residential densities, with energy efficiency and greenscape a priority.
- Canberra cannot continue to expand, and each area needs to contribute to achieving higher density living. Increasing densities can help reduce pressure on greenfield areas and the need to construct new infrastructure.
- The precinct and other inner suburbs should not be homogenous landscapes of large, expensive, single dwellings.
- Increasing densities allows more people to experience the benefits of living in a central location, including the opportunity to readily cycle to work or use public transport.
- Increasing densities can increase the vibrancy of suburbs and support commercial centres.
- The NCA's objective to encourage a variety of housing types is aligned with community demand. NCA needs to ensure then, that development conditions do not stymie different dwelling types.

- The Australian Government's latest budget promotes things like implementing housing supply targets, reducing barriers for downsizers. These measures are designed to impact housing affordability. The NCA, as a Commonwealth entity, should be promoting higher density and infill rather than designing guidelines that make this more difficult to achieve.

One submitter suggested that the rapid infill of land, establishment of large buildings and constant turnover of residents in an area or precinct discourages the formation of connected communities that are able to protect their amenity and create precincts that inspire and nurture their occupants and visitors. Rapid infill also establishes a level of development that is hard to undo or re-do should superior solutions to different needs be presented.

NCA Response

The policy proposed in the draft amendment acknowledges the special characteristics of the Deakin/Forrest Residential precinct related to its development as a suburb with garden city qualities. The precinct is of such a scale that modest increases in density are unlikely to result in significant change to overall city density. Other areas of the inner city would be more appropriate in accommodating infill development and increased densities.

The draft amendment proposed by the NCA includes a requirement that for sites other than those fronting State Circle, a single dwelling only is permitted.

3.15 Architecture

Comments

Multiple comments relating to the proposed architectural provisions were received, along with requests for clarification regarding the provisions.

In relation to the proposed size of dwellings, one submitter suggested that the minimum dwelling size should be 150m² for a three bedroom dwelling. Clarification was also sought that the proposed 120m² would not apply to subsidiary buildings on the same title such as granny flats and pool houses. Yet another submitter commented that mandating dwelling size is unnecessarily restrictive.

In regard to building design and materials, the following comments were received:

- while very low cost buildings of low architectural value are not desirable for the precinct, it is not considered appropriate for the NCA to mandate very high cost architecture and finishes
- good building design should be high priority, as should sustainable design (solar access, modern building technology, as tree planting alone is not enough)
- with the construction of modern townhouses and units, the architectural history of the precinct and Canberra generally is being lost.

NCA Response

The Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct is within Designated Areas (those areas identified as having the special characteristics of the National Capital). As such, the NCA expects the highest quality of development to reflect the prestigious character of the area. This expectation is set out in the Plan and the guidelines, however the NCA does not mandate any particular building materials or finishes.

The NCA supports comments that sustainable design should be a priority, however does not wish to prescribe particular design solutions. The draft amendment proposes the following policy that offers examples of how sustainable design could be encouraged:

*The design of buildings should demonstrate a high standard of sustainable design.
Design responses could include:*

- *living areas oriented to the north*
- *design eaves and awnings to provide shade for windows during summer*

- *select building materials and colours which absorb less heat in summer*
- *insulate walls, ceilings, floors and roof spaces*
- *use smart glass or other technologies on north and west elevations*
- *install photovoltaics on buildings to generate electricity.*

A number of precincts within Canberra have been heritage listed under ACT legislation in recognition of (amongst other things) particular architectural styles and characters reflecting Canberra's growth and development. Individual properties are likewise listed. The Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct, and properties within it, are not listed on any heritage register. Analysis of the precinct suggests that there is no unifying architectural style or building materials, even amongst older dwellings. The NCA does not consider it appropriate to prescribe particular architectural styles or characteristics for the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct.

The proposed 120m² minimum per dwelling allows for sufficient area to ensure the layout of rooms are functional, well organized and provide a high standard of amenity. The minimum size requirement will not apply to pool houses and other subsidiary buildings.

3.16 Hedges and fences

Comments

The following comments were received in relation to hedges and fences:

- higher fences, up to 2.2 meters in height, should be permitted where there is an adjacent two storey building
- existing fences should not be impacted by change in policy
- where a development application is approved for a new development, the developer should be required to construct new fences at their cost on shared boundaries (this comments was made having regard to a previous experience where a developer proposed new rear boundary fences but did not ultimately provide them).

NCA Response

Existing hedges and fences will not be impacted by the proposed policy. There is no requirement for property owners to replace existing fences if they don't meet the new policy. The trigger for hedges and fences to meet the new requirements will be where redevelopment of a site is proposed, or replacement or construction of new hedges or fences is proposed.

The NCA does not mandate who pays for the cost of new fencing. Private property owners who share side or rear fences are each responsible for half the cost and maintenance of a basic urban fence (although other fence types can be erected if allowed and neighbours agree on the design and cost beforehand). Relevant ACT legislation applies (the *Common Boundaries Act 1981*).

Policy concerning side and rear boundary fences could allow for fences greater than 1.8 meters in height, subject to consideration by the NCA. Such policy could read as follows:

Side and rear boundary fences and gates should:

- *not extend forward of the building line*
- *be a maximum of 1.8 meters above ground level*
- *be timber paling, timber lattice, brush or open mesh metal railing.*

Proposals for fences and gates alongside and rear boundaries in excess of 1.8 meters in height will be subject to special consideration by the National Capital Authority.

This change is generally consistent with existing policy in the National Capital Plan for detached houses.

3.17 Public consultation

Comments

One submitter expressed disappointment in the NCA's consultation process on the Issues Paper. The submitter recommended that for public consultation of the sort required for the Issues Paper, where only a small number of residents are affected, the NCA should notify all residents directly via email or letter. A public notice/advertisement should also have been used, and sufficient time given for people to respond to the paper. Notice on the NCA's website only was not considered sufficient.

Community groups such as the Inner South Canberra Community Council, Deakin Residents Association, and Forrest Residents Group advised that many residents are often unaware of proposed developments in the precinct, and therefore miss out on the opportunity to provide comment. This could be resolved by the NCA notifying residents' groups who could then disseminate information to residents.

NCA Response

The NCA employed multiple techniques to notify the public of the release of the Issues Paper, including:

- a public notice in the Canberra Times on 8 April 2017
- direct notification via letter or email to stakeholders, including community groups, industry, and special interest groups
- a letterbox drop to all dwellings in the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct to advise residents of the release of the paper
- interviews with print and broadcast media.

Other activities undertaken during the public consultation process included:

- a meeting with residents on 27 April 2017, attended by approximately 20 people
- other meetings with stakeholders as requested.

The public consultation period ran for seven weeks, concluding on 26 May 2017. The NCA considers this sufficient time for stakeholders to prepare submissions.

The NCA supports the suggestion that residents' groups be directly notified of proposals and will vary public consultation processes accordingly.

3.18 Other matters

Comments

The following is a list of other issues raised during the public consultation process that do not readily fit within any of the other topics listed above:

1. The guidelines developed by Eric Martin and Associates provide a more comprehensive set of guidelines for the area.
2. It would be good to see the NCA's proposals rolled out to other areas of the ACT.
3. The guidelines should clarify that the policies apply to redevelopment of properties, rather than modifications or extensions to existing dwellings.
4. There is concern that after significant consultation undertaken on Amendment 39 to the Plan, the NCA wishes to pose even more restrictions on home owners.
5. The Issues Paper states that quantitative standards are accompanied by performance standards and that compliance with quantitative standards will not necessarily result in Works Approval unless the performance standards have been met. This wording is very unclear and does not reference relevant standards. Performance standards need to be spelt out in the guidelines to avoid ambiguity.
6. The potential for light rail to run close to the precinct is not mentioned and should be considered before finalizing planning policy for the precinct. The precinct is ideally located to take advantage of opportunities offered by light rail, such as increasing density near light rail stops, and increasing activity generally along the corridor. The objectives and detailed policies

outlined in the Issues Paper appear at odds with these opportunities, with an overriding sense that the concern is with protecting and retaining existing character. Light rail presents an opportunity to increase residential density, height, scale and intensity to capitalize on the significant investment in light rail.

7. In regard to diplomatic uses:
 - a. It is unclear which diplomatic sites the guidelines apply to. Generally, diplomatic development should have to abide by the same requirements as other similar structures in the precinct. Exemptions should only be for essential and specific purposes, such as security measures.
 - b. The site of the Malaysian High Commissioner's residence should be included in the area subject to controls. It is for residential use, not a diplomatic mission.

NCA Response

The following points address each of the individual matters raised above:

1. Many of the guidelines suggested by Eric Martin replicated relevant provisions for ACT heritage listed Garden City precincts. The Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct does not have all the same characteristics and has not been recognised in the same way through heritage listing. The NCA formulated some of the proposed guidelines for the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct based on Dr. Martin's suggested guidelines, however also considered the uniqueness of the Deakin/Forrest Precinct and the NCA's intent for the area.
2. The NCA is not responsible for the detailed planning of the majority of residential areas in Canberra. Planning for these areas is undertaken by relevant agencies within the ACT Government. The ACT Government's Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate provided a submission to the Issues Paper (refer to submission number 31), indicating that the NCA's Issues Paper will provide a useful resource in any future review of the planning controls for Garden City residential precincts in other parts of the city that the ACT Government has planning control over.
3. The proposed amendment clarifies the type of development to which the proposed policy applies.
4. Amendment 39 to the Plan, approved in 2005, primarily introduced detailed planning controls for the sites fronting State Circle. The majority of provisions relevant to other blocks within the precinct did not vary. In any case, review of planning policy is an ongoing process to ensure that desired outcomes are being met and that policy reflects contemporary considerations.
5. The reference to the relationship between quantitative standards and performance standards in the Issues Paper was in the context of describing the current setback provisions of the Plan relevant to the Deakin/Forrest Issues Paper (this relationship also exists for other provisions of the Plan where quantitative standards are provided). The statement did not refer to the proposed guidelines.
6. The NCA recognises that changes in city form can support light rail. However, light rail is not the only consideration in determining planning policy for the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct. The proposed policies in the draft amendment recognizes the national significance of the precinct, including the location and relationship of the precinct with Parliament House, The Lodge and other nearby residential areas.
7. In regard to diplomatic uses in the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct, the proposed land use map identifies the land use policy for all blocks. This means that 'Malaysia House' is subject to the guidelines. Sites identified for 'Diplomatic Mission' are subject to other provisions of the National Capital Plan in recognition of their unique status. Built form provisions for these sites are not dissimilar to current requirements for the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct.

4 Conclusion

The Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct Issues Paper was released for public comment between 8 April and 26 May 2017. Thirty-seven submissions were received in response to the paper.

This report highlights the often contrasting views within the community. On the one hand, some residents feel that the NCA, through the Plan, imposes or is proposing to impose, unnecessary restrictions and inconveniences on residents. Other members of the community indicated support for the NCA introducing new controls to guide planning and design as the precinct changes.

The NCA's overriding consideration is whether the policies proposed for the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct will result in development of the quality, character and permanence desired for the nationally significant area. Having regard to this, responses in the report typically uphold the NCA's capacity to control all matters of planning and design at the individual block level, including landscaping.

This report identifies that a draft amendment to the Plan will be prepared to give statutory effect to the NCA's proposed policies. The draft amendment will be undertaken in accordance with relevant provisions of the *Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988*. The draft amendment may incorporate similar policy to that identified in the draft guidelines and in this report (refer to Section 3).

Attachment A – Submissions received in response to Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct Issues Paper

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
1	David Campbell on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Owners Corporation UP3259 (17-19 State Circle)	<p>Raised concerns with on-street parking, street lighting, un-watered nature strips, broken footpaths and big trees that perhaps shouldn't have been kept.</p> <p>In the wider precinct, key concern relates to on-street parking and the difficulties in driving safely with often only a very narrow corridor between parked vehicles on both sides.</p> <p>Advised that the Issues Paper incorrectly identified 17-19 State Circle as containing 57 units, rather than 63 units.</p>	Please refer to Section 3.5 of the report.
2	Ash and Deanne Bassili	<p>The Issues Paper incorrectly identified Block 4 Section 2 Deakin as having a 'multi-use proposal'. The applicant raised concern that identifying the site in this way could have a material impact on the ability to sell the property, which was listed for sale at the time of making the submission. Concern was raised that potential buyers may shy away from purchasing the property knowing it is designated for 'multi-use'.</p> <p>The introduction to the report states that the area subject to report has Garden City origins, which has <i>'resulted in the area being largely characterized by single homes in a garden setting on large blocks. The precinct is the only residential area of its kind subject to detailed planning control by the National Capital Authority'</i>. It should be obvious to anyone – not just those that have chosen to make the neighbourhood their home – that these are the characteristics, in combination with other amenities and conveniences, which attracted home owners to the community. It is also unclear how the existing regulations and decision made do not fully support, protect or enhance these unique qualities. Given the pattern of multi-use dwelling decisions already made and are under consideration, there is seemingly little or no consideration with respect to retaining the 'Garden City origins'. This is a product of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to restrict and/or localise the multi-use application approvals. They are seemingly scattered throughout the area covered in the study as presented in Figure 3 of the report. • Where Approved Single Dwellings have been granted, there appears to be no restriction on what can be developed. A case in point is 6 Canterbury Crescent. This dwelling matches 	Please refer to Sections 3.2, 3.4 and 3.11 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>nothing in this community and is seemingly completely out of place. While it serves as the Myanmar ambassador's residence, it is an imposing structure that does not match any other dwelling in the area and suggests that almost anything can be approved. It is very hard to see how a decision to approve what has been built honours the intent of 'respecting character' or 'respecting the bulk, form and architectural style of surrounding development'. Does not believe that this building height was considered in the approval process. This simply cannot be supported or defended. It is simply too tall for neighbouring structures - especially the adjacent lots.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The same lack of consideration to any 'norms' is reflected in approvals granted to 6 Somers Crescent where townhouse developments have been approved that do not reflect the 'Garden City origins'. <p>More importantly, some of the regulations actually put some owners at a disadvantage when marketing their properties. While it is clear that multi-use dwellings are acceptable, lots with large established trees are actually disadvantaged as the trees are protected - discouraging developers who wish to pursue multi-unit dwellings. This in and of itself suggests that only certain lots may actually pursue this option and will in the end leave a random mix of multi-use and single dwellings that will in the end continue to erode the 'Garden City' nature of the area and result in a lack of integrity to the neighbourhood. We have had developers tell us that we cannot pursue a multi-unit dwelling on our lot because of the presence of mature trees. This is a significant economic restriction on us that restricts us from potentially seeking to develop a multi-use dwelling approval in order to develop housing that more suits our needs and remain in the area.</p> <p>Another point which we believe is worthy of consideration is the current requirement of not less than 40% of total site for planting. This requirement is too ambiguous and not tight enough. In many cases, this is restricted to small areas somewhere in the rear of the property that is not visible from the street and has no impact on the Garden City feel for the neighbourhood.</p> <p>In closing, it is not clear to me that notwithstanding that an application could be fully compliant with all these regulations how the impact on a neighbour's lot is taken into consideration. If an owner elects to design and develop a plan for multi-use or townhouse dwellings that are completely compliant with suggested regulations but pose a detrimental impact on a neighbouring</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		property, what recourse does that neighbour have? Should there not be something attached to all the proposals that suggests that all proposals must be designed with regard to the impact on neighbouring lots, structures and the impact on the usability of these so as not to adversely affect their use and marketability of adjacent properties?	
3	Robert McMahon	<p>Greatly alarmed to read that the ACT Government has recently given approval to a seven storey hotel in Forrest in place of the two storey Italian Club. The ACT Planning head has spoken of the approval as an expression of 'confidence in the city'. What bunkum. Another justification was that a multi-storey building (the DHS HQ) was 'just across the road' and, so, another multi-storey tower would make no difference. The 'just across the road' description failed to note that it fronted Canberra Avenue with all of its multi-storey buildings.</p> <p>Without wanting to be political, and appreciating that you cannot comment, raised concern that the ACT Government has found itself in a fiscal quagmire thanks to much ill-thought out largesse over the years. It now seeks to fill that gap by approving inappropriately high-density and revenue-generating developments wherever it can. Plans to build a multi-storey tower on top of the hill at Curtin shops fits this bill. So does the perilously close development of Manuka Oval.</p> <p>As a newish (12 years) ACT resident, I'd like to press on you the community's support for pushing back on these daft ideas. Once these developments occur, the beauty, amenity and feel of Canberra will be lessened forever. I love Canberra for being a convenient and well-planned city in a semi-rural setting, not just a collection of ill-thought out, opportunistic developments destined to date poorly.</p> <p>If you are able please to critique very carefully plans by the ACT Government affecting Forrest, Deakin and other establishment suburbs. Their retained character lies as testament to the ideals of this city. The ACT Government, ruled from the northern suburbs, seemingly has no care for this.</p>	Please refer to Section 3.4 of the report.
4	Richard Cumpston	<p><i>There should be no obligation to retain large established trees</i></p> <p>Large trees in the study area were the results of individual planting decisions made by householders 40-60 years ago. Many of these trees have since died, or proved unsuitable for their locations. Gum trees are too hazardous for domestic blocks, and many European trees such as</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.2 and 3.5 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>poplars are now recognised as having much shorter life times in Australia. Any obligation to retain an established tree may severely limit the future uses of a block, or make it unsaleable.</p> <p><i>There should be no requirement for new trees capable of reaching heights twice the proposed height of buildings</i></p> <p>The issues paper not that the majority of blocks had a single dwelling, with heights varying between single and two storeys. Over the past 10-15 years, there has been an increase in multi-dwelling units (duplexes, townhouses and apartments). With higher plot ratios and taller buildings, it is unrealistic to mandate trees capable of reaching heights twice the proposed heights of buildings.</p> <p><i>The National Capital Authority should be responsible for planting street trees, and ensuring their maintenance</i></p> <p>Some street trees, such as those in Talbot Street, are starting to die. The National Capital Authority should be committed to maintaining <i>'mature, consistent street tree plantings'</i>.</p> <p><i>Footpaths should be provided in all streets</i></p> <p>Increasing development has brought with it increasing vehicle and pedestrian traffic. Some of the pedestrians are elderly locals, and some are children on the way to school. The absence of footpaths in Somers Crescent and Talbot Street (for example) is a failure to provide necessary services. The National Capital Authority could be legally liable for injuries or deaths to pedestrians.</p>	
5	National Trust of Australia (Australian Capital Territory)	<p>In considering the Issues Paper, the Trust refers to the following two documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Land (Planning and Environment) Act 1991</i> – Report No. 15 Standing Committee on Planning and Environment, 29 April 2003 • Garden City Values and Principles, ACTPLA 2008 <p>The Trust welcomes the opportunity to provide comment on this paper but we have focused the broader considerations rather than the specifics of the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct.</p> <p>The creation of Canberra as the capital of our nation was founded on ideals of the founders, which still have currency. Unlike other cities Canberra is unique because it is the symbol and outcome of</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.9 and 3.18 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>Federation, the site of landmark decisions and movements for change and a place of ongoing national commemorations</p> <p>Through a visionary town plan, Canberra has grown to be one of the world's great twentieth century cities. The Garden City concept is a fundamental element of Canberra's DNA. The Trust agrees that the design of the city cannot be frozen and there must be an ongoing process of evolution that blends the natural and built environment.</p> <p>However the Trust shares the increasing community concern that the inherent values and principles of our Garden City are being progressively eroded. This is becoming apparent not just in the older areas but the city as a whole. We believe this is occurring through building approvals that don't have proper regard to form and/or appropriateness and is being compounded by inadequate monitoring and auditing of development. We are concerned that the city is starting to lose its unique character and beginning to look like any city anywhere. This view was again confirmed through our very recent dealings with the developers of a major inner city site.</p> <p>This trend must be addressed through development that contributes to our understanding of our Garden City heritage through more sympathetic site and architectural design considerations.</p> <p><i>Neighbourhood characteristics valued by the community</i></p> <p>The basic goal of our community is timeless and is equally valid now as it was in the 19th century when the Garden City concept was first developed. The community still wants a living environment that is safe and healthy and still values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appreciation of the beauty of nature and a high level of residential amenity. • Access to services, facilities and commerce. • Access to safe, pleasant housing as well as the opportunity for social interaction and the opportunity to participate in the community. <p>At the same time though the community now has a heightened concern that the urban environment is both environmentally and socially sustainable and expects climate change to be addressed.</p> <p><i>Proposed policy responses</i></p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>In this regard we believe it is instructive to consider the report of a review in 2003 of the Standing Committee on Planning and Environment which resulted in the introduction of the Garden City provisions as a variation to The Territory Plan. The report states that a simpler framework needs to be developed that is easily understood and interpreted when laid side by side with other planning documents. Consultation was extensive and there were over 700 submissions. The review was the result of community concern that still has not been abated.</p> <p>Consequently in 2008 the ACT Planning and Land Authority promulgated design considerations to provide advice to developers, and to the community, on how redevelopment, in the Residential Core Areas of Canberra's older suburbs, can be designed to be complementary to the residential character and amenity of these suburbs.</p> <p>This publication sets out the relationships between</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Street • The Block • The Dwelling. <p>We believe this document is still valid and should be applied in the Precinct and more widely across Canberra.</p>	
6	Eric Martin	<p>While the Issues and Policy Response Paper is a reasonable document we have some concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The front set back of six meters is not in keeping with the area and it needs to be assessed as to the original set back if the character is to be maintained. 2. There are lots of 'should' and generally 'not permitted' when a greater certainty is required. We suggest mandatory and discretionary controls which are clearer. What would influence a change from a 'should' or 'where other details will be permitted' is not defined. These need to be clarified. 3. The document is not strong enough or clear enough on all details and when you cannot appeal, then this leaves it open to interpretation or manipulation and potential abuse. 4. The site coverage is not mentioned and we suggested 30%. 5. Sub-division and strata titling is not mentioned. This needs to be addressed as it is occurring. 	Please refer to Sections 3.9 and 3.18 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>We believe that the detailed assessment and guidelines we prepared is a more comprehensive set of guidelines for this area and should be adopted.</p> <p><i>Supplementary comments</i></p> <p>The Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct, and all inner conservation areas and suburban areas in Canberra, have the character of a principal residence and sometimes a granny flat or a smaller second dwelling. The change to this only occurs where planning, zoning and policies have permitted multi-unit development.</p> <p>In the subject area of Deakin/Forrest, the multi-unit development in State Circle is accepted, but the rest of the area has special values that need to be respects if this character is to be maintained.</p> <p>The details in the earlier submission will be achieved and are probably fairer and better implemented if the planning guidelines for the area include the requirement to maintain a principal residence but could permit a secondary residence if the other planning controls suggested are maintained.</p>	
7	Bob and Charlotte Nattey	<p>Support comments of fellow resident and neighbour, generally as follows:</p> <p>Properties contiguous with the three storey, high density developments on State Circle should be exempted from the proposed conditions. That is, properties on the north side of Canterbury Crescent and Somers Crescent. This may form a transition zone between the high density development and the lower density sections within the precinct.</p> <p>Particular concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 'planting area' ratio of 40%, based on review of recent development, is restrictive in the property owners rights to build quality development. 2. The proposal in relation to canopy trees which may not align with the desire of individual owners to design their own gardens and protect their properties from damage. <p>In the precinct the streetscape is portrayed by the large nature strips, the large trees on the nature strips and the front fence line. Space behind the fence line should generally be at the discretion of the owner.</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.2, 3. 5, 3.8, and 3.13 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>Previous representations have been made by the Deakin/Forrest community opposing the construction of higher density, multi-storey apartment blocks along State Circle. Recent higher density development has been approved on the north-eastern corner of Melbourne Avenue and Somers Crescent. Some residents are thus faced with higher density development on both their rear and side property boundaries, yet the policy responses proposed in the Issues Paper seek to limit the capacity for these residents to develop their properties to a similar degree.</p> <p>Do not agree with the proposal to limit driveways to properties to single point of entry/exit. Many of the properties in the area already have in and out driveways and they fit and sit perfectly well with the landscape. This issue is further affected by the recent imposition of no parking, at any time, restrictions on the northern side of Canterbury Crescent, resulting in social visitors, service and trades people parking in and blocking the single driveway, or parking in a hazardous position. While parking may not be part of the NCA's responsibility it nevertheless has a serious impact on the integration of the community and the landscape.</p> <p>Not opposed to progress or change in general, however the Issues Paper appears to want to be prescriptive to an inordinate amount of detail that is not wanted or needed.</p> <p>It would improve the landscape of the area if the street trees in Canterbury Crescent that haven't been cared for as long as can be remembered, were cared for as well as the gardens and trees on owners properties.</p>	
8	Forrest Residents Group #1	<p>The FRG acknowledges the efforts of the NCA to date. THE FRG has appreciated opportunities to discuss its concerns and possible policy approaches with the NCA, and welcomes the discussion paper as a valuable step towards improving policy.</p> <p>The FRG understands that the purpose of the planning system is to guide, rather than prevent, change in an area, and supports development that complements and enriches its surroundings. The FRG has carefully considered the Discussion Paper's proposals and has decided to comment only on those matters which it considers essential to achieving this outcome, noting that this response is flavored by the NCA's recent decision to approve WA100130 (47 National Circuit), notwithstanding previously conveyed concerns.</p> <p>A definition of character is <i>'the qualities of a place that makes them different from others'</i>. The characteristics of the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct, as documented in the Discussion Paper,</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.6 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>refer to large residential blocks occupied by single dwellings. The FRG considers this to be a fundamental characteristic, and is concerned that this has been ignored in the NCA's consideration of character as applied to WA100130 (refer to Submission 1.3, page 12 of the Consultation Report). Development outside this pattern would neither complement nor enrich the area. The FRG considers the decision to approve WA100130 contrary to this intent.</p> <p>The FRG does not contest the fact that Canberra is facing density pressures, and that additional density should be accommodated in appropriate locations. However the FRG contends that the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct is not an appropriate location by reason of its character and national significance. The FRG recommends policy that promotes single dwelling development per block. The FRG recognises that there are a limited number of circumstances where more than one dwelling may be appropriate – for example on corner blocks where each dwelling can maintain its own frontage. The FRG also acknowledges some prior precedence for multiples dwellings per block. It recommends the adoption of a minimum area of 1000m² per dwelling to reflect this, but only where policy allows consideration of more than one dwelling per block.</p> <p>The FRG shares the NCA's view that generous yet varied setbacks are a key character of the locality. The FRG is concerned that a six meter setback for single storey dwellings will be interpreted by developers as a minimum requirement, resulting in a loss of diversity. The additional 1.5 meters required for two storey dwellings is unlikely to deliver sought after variety in the street scene.</p> <p>The FRG proposes policy that requires all new development to maintain the existing front setback. Where an existing front setback is less than six meters, new development must achieve a minimum six meter setback.</p> <p>The FRG is particularly pleased with the proposed approach to landscaping, although suggests that terms such as 'large established trees' and 'canopy coverage' require further explanations.</p> <p>The FRG appreciate the administrative and legislative constraints that have led to the NCA proposal to adopt the provisions as supplementary guidance. However this creates an uncertain legal status. The FRG seeks confirmation that the supplementary guidance will be uplifted into the National Capital Plan as soon as process allows, and within a maximum 18 month timeframe.</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
9	Dennis and Poppy Martin	<p>Has read the letter submitted to the National Capital Authority by Knight Frank Town Planning on behalf of the Forrest Residents Group and endorse its content.</p> <p>Has also been notified of the NCA's approval of 47 National Circuit as a battle-axe dual occupancy. This approval has allowed one dwelling behind another dwelling (which has the effect of one dwelling per 700m²). This is clearly uncharacteristic of the area.</p> <p>Considers that the NCA failed in its duty in that approval process by misunderstanding and thereby erroneously confining the natural meaning of 'character'. By setting an unacceptable precedent the NCA should go back to the drawing boards to remedy its error.</p> <p>Invites the NCA to acquaint itself with the most basic considerations on this subject which were dealt with in case like <i>Sterling Projects Pty Ltd v The Hills Shire Council</i> [2011] NSWLEC 1020.</p> <p>In relation to the subject matter at hand it seems that the key issues are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Front setbacks need to be as per the existing dwelling or a minimum six meters; whichever is the greater. • One dwelling per 1000m² noting that the existing character of the area as defined by the NCA is that the majority of blocks have a single dwelling. The NCA also comments that residential blocks are typically large ranging in size from 1050m² to 3832m². NCA clearly believed this to be a fundamental element of the character of the area. This is also supported in the Martin report. • The character of the area must include all elements and aspects and the wider context of the site i.e. The characteristics of the properties which adjoin the site note just the streetscape e.g. built form, number of dwellings per block size, canopy setback, landscaping, etc. • The need for a far clearer definition within the guidelines of canopy and landscaping requirements. Sterling Projects establishes that 'guidelines should provide an appreciation of neighbourhood character and good site analysis are key factors to producing quality development'. 	Please refer to Sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4.
10	Caroline Le Couteur	Would like to congratulate the National Capital Authority for explicitly addressing climate change adaptation in the Issues Paper. Climate change is a reality that we are already living with.	Please refer to Sections 3.2 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>Regardless of how fast we mitigate climate change, it is too late to avoid all of its impacts and adaptation is therefore critical.</p> <p>One of the major adaptation issues for urban areas is the urban heat island effect. As the Paper identifies, tree canopy cover and other vegetation is important for reducing urban temperatures in summer. Many new developments in Canberra are being built with no room on the block for large canopy trees, which locks in a permanent heat problem. This is happening both in new suburbs, where large houses consume almost all of the block, and in existing suburbs where small dwellings are being replaced with very large dwellings, with the loss of almost all existing vegetation.</p> <p>Welcomes the Authority's proposed approach of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring protection of existing trees • requiring retention of a substantial proportion of blocks as a 'planting area' not covered by buildings and driveways • inclusion of a canopy coverage target. <p>If this approach proves successful in the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct, it could be rolled out to other parts of the ACT, making a contribution to the retaining – and expansion – of our tree canopy cover.</p>	
11	<p>James Koundouris on behalf of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D & A Koundouris • T & D Koundouris • E & G Koundouris • P & H Joseph 	<p>The submitters support the comments made by Knight Frank Town Planning on behalf of the Forrest Residents Group, but would like to reiterate three key issues.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Front setbacks need to be as per the existing dwelling or a minimum of six meters; whichever is the greater. 2. One dwelling per 1000m². The existing character of the area is defined by the NCA in the statement that <i>'the majority of blocks have a single dwelling'</i>. The NCA also makes the comment that residential blocks are typically large ranging in size from 1050m² to 3832m². Submitters believe this is a fundamental character of the area. This is also supported in the Martin report. Draws attention to recent NSW Land and Environment Court decisions including <i>Sterling Projects Pty Ltd v The Hills Shire Council</i> [2011] NSWLEC 1020 where the Commissioner said in its consideration of compatibility with neighbouring character: 	<p>Please refer to Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.18 of the report.</p>

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Character is not limited to a consideration of streetscape but includes the wider context of the site, in particular the characteristics of the properties which adjoin the site (predominantly detached two storey houses on large allotments). The length of the proposal (including its intrusion into a green zone) is uncharacteristic of the area. <p>Submitters assert that the character of the area includes all things not just the front streetscape e.g. built form, number of dwellings per block size, driveways, canopy setback, landscaping. The case above is just one of many which demonstrate the way in which character should be used in assessing applications. Submitters believe that if this planning and environment court definition and application of character was applied to the development application at 47 National Circuit it would not have been approved as the built form and the simple fact that there is one dwelling behind another dwelling (which has the effect of one dwelling per 700m²) is out of character for the area.</p> <p>3. Canopy and landscaping requirements need to be better defined within the guidelines.</p> <p>The submitters also support the supplementary comments made by Eric Martin. Dr Martin defined and confirmed that the meaning of 'principal residence' is that each block developed (outside the State Circle planning zone) has a principal primary single dwelling on the block with the possibility of a granny flat/secondary residence.</p>	
12	Cory McPherson	There is a strong demand for people wanting to downsize in the Forrest and Deakin area. The National Capital Authority needs to ensure that the area allows for higher density living in the form of townhouses to cater for the changing nature of the community. Downsizers do not want extensive gardens and lawns to maintain.	Please refer to Section 3.14 of the report.
13	Stephen and Helen Jagers	<p>We are broadly supportive of the initiatives in the report in balancing the special characteristics of the precinct with the legitimate economic interest of crown lessees to undertake sensible and sympathetic redevelopment including multi-dwelling developments.</p> <p>We strongly support the requirements for a minimum dwelling size (although think the minimum should be higher) and a 40% planting area (with some modification of the definition).</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.15, and 3.16 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>In our view the restrictions on multi dwelling development should go further restricting development to no more than one dwelling per 500m² of land.</p> <p>As a general comment the paper should clarify that these requirements, particularly in relation to architecture, apply to redevelopment of properties rather than modifications or extensions to existing dwellings.</p> <p>Our submission in relation to each of the issues raised in the paper is set out below.</p> <p><i>Building height</i></p> <p>We support no change to the maximum permitted building height.</p> <p><i>Plot ratio</i></p> <p>We support this proposal to restrict the plot ratio to 0.4. It appears this has not uniformly been enforced in the past (for example 73 National Circuit and 3-5 Melbourne Avenue).</p> <p><i>Architecture</i></p> <p>We generally support this principle. However this needs to be balanced with the reasonable interest of a crown lessee in developing their land. While very low cost building of low architectural value is not desirable in this precinct, we do not consider it appropriate for the NCA to mandate very high cost architecture and finishes.</p> <p>In relation to minimum size of dwellings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minimum size should be greater than 120m². We suggest at least 150m² for a three bedroom residence. In addition to a minimum size specification per dwelling we submit that there should be a limit on the number of dwellings on each block. For example, we consider there should not be more than one dwelling per 500m² of land. We consider the proposal for 8 dwellings at 9 Melbourne Avenue to be inappropriate and damaging to the precinct. Multi-unit developments of the kind at 3-5 Melbourne Avenue are, in our view, inconsistent with the objectives in the draft report. • We would appreciate clarification that the 120m² specification would not apply to subsidiary buildings on the same title such as 'granny flats' and pool houses. 	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p><i>Setbacks</i></p> <p>We agree with the position in relation to setbacks.</p> <p><i>Landscape</i></p> <p>We agree, generally, with the position on landscapes. However, where a site already exceeds the 15% canopy coverage, non-significant trees should be able to be removed without additional consent.</p> <p>In our view permeable surfaces for vehicle parking and gardens paths should be included in the 40% planting area.</p> <p><i>Vehicle access</i></p> <p>We agree with this approach.</p> <p><i>Hedges and fences</i></p> <p>In our view higher fences (2.2 meters) should be permitted where there is an adjacent two storey building. Further, existing fences should not be impacted by this change.</p> <p>We further submit that where a development application is approved for a new development, the developer should be required to construct new fences at their cost. We note that while this was promised by the architect in relation to 6 Daly Street, no new fences at the rear boundary were constructed.</p>	
14	Stuart Shepherd	<p>The Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct is well serviced by public transport, restaurants, cultural institutions, Lake Burley Griffin and surrounding bush and parks. The area needs to provide housing for people other than families. Single people, young couples, downsizers, should be catered for in the form of smaller dwelling types such as townhouses.</p>	<p>Please refer to Section 3.14 of the report.</p>
15	Janine Hunstone	<p>Forrest and Deakin are aesthetically beautiful, which is unarguable. But as natural and inevitable renewal takes place, it would be great to see smaller more manageable properties available, which are of a quality befitting the nature of these suburbs. Personally think that as long as the aesthetic quality in regard to green space/gardens and trees are preserved or reinstated, think that providing medium density dwellings with small gardens would be a huge benefit to the area. They are both desirable areas, but such large blocks are out of reach to most people, and also pretty</p>	<p>Please refer to Sections 3.2 and 3.14 of the report.</p>

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>difficult to maintain with busy lifestyles. Medium density options would allow more people to live in the area, as well as people wishing to downsize in their later years having the opportunity to stay in the areas they love.</p> <p>Submitter's background is in natural resource management and sustainability. From this aspect it makes even more sense to infill older suburbs with medium density housing, with energy efficiency and greenscape a priority.</p>	
16	Aaron Clarke	<p>The Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct needs to have higher density living rather than just having 2000-3000 square meter single dwelling blocks. Canberra cannot continue to expand forever so higher density in this area is necessary. The rules should not make it too hard to allow for higher density building in the area.</p> <p>This area of Canberra needs to contribute to higher density living required now and into the future.</p>	Please refer to Section 3.14 of the report.
17	Name withheld	<p><i>Variety of housing types and sizes</i></p> <p>Personal experience that there is a strong demand for townhouses in Canberra, and specifically in the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct. People want:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to downsize but stay in their local community • to live in the area without having to maintain a huge garden • community living in a complex where neighbours look out for them and help maintain their outdoor spaces. <p>Analysis of the demographic and dwelling profile of the suburb of Forrest supports the notion that there is strong demand, and low supply of a variety of dwelling types in the suburb. Around 45% of Forrest residents are classified as young independent, maturing dependent, older independent, smaller sized households (i.e. single or couple households) and yet only around 11% of dwellings provide an alternative to a large single dwelling or small apartment living.</p> <p>The National Capital Plan provides that one of the objectives of development conditions is to provide for a variety of housing types and sizes. This objective clearly aligns with the community demand, and should remain unchanged.</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.2, 3.8, and 3.14 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>The <i>Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988</i> requires that the development conditions/planning guidelines implemented by the NCA must comply with the National Capital Plan. In finalizing these guidelines, the NCA should ensure that the guidelines do not – whether intention or error – stymie the achievement of the variety of housing types and sizes outlined in the National Capital Plan objectives.</p> <p>If the development conditions/planning guidelines make it impossible to design for a variety of dwelling types then the proposed planning controls would be in breach of the objectives of the National Capital Plan. To be consistent with the Plan, the guidelines should be such that they promote dwellings other than single dwelling or dual occupancies.</p> <p>The Federal Government in its latest budget is promoting infill and higher density by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. working with the States and Territories to deliver planning and zoning reform that speeds up development b. releasing Commonwealth Government land for residential development c. implementing housing supply targets with the States and Territories d. reducing barriers for downsizers. <p>These measures are designed to impact on housing affordability.</p> <p>The NCA, as a Commonwealth entity, should also be promoting infill and higher density living in the Precinct rather than designing guidelines that make this more difficult to achieve.</p> <p>There are a number of specific elements of the proposed guidelines that will make it impossible or very difficult to design to, to provide a variety of dwelling types. These elements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The driveway requirements proposed in the Paper favour single dwelling houses particularly the requirement that driveways should be a single-vehicle width between the front boundary and building line and driveways should integrate with front planting to reduce the visibility of the driveway from the street. As the proposed guidelines do not enable a passing bay or driveway greater than 3.6 meters between the front boundary and the building line they do not promote other varieties of dwelling. Hedges as encouraged in the proposed Guidelines will help to shield wider driveways from street view but wider driveways and more extensive driveways are essential for multiunit 	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>housing particularly multi-unit housing that does not include basements as part of the scheme.</p> <p>b. A requirement that one canopy tree should be provided in the private open space of each dwelling puts multi dwelling to a higher standard than single residences when a single residence can occupy exactly the same footprint as multi dwellings.</p> <p><i>Trees</i></p> <p>To maintain the garden-like amenity of the area, the guidelines reflect the NCA's desire to protect existing trees in the area. However, the current framing of the guidelines does not give sufficient detail to how this outcome might be achieved. It is unreasonable that the NCA seek to protect all existing trees. Specifically, our view is that the guidelines should explicitly state that it is not the NCA's intention to protect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • weeds or pest trees • unhealthy trees • trees that lack form • trees that pose a risk of damage to life, property or utilities • trees that are overcrowded or restrict the growth of other trees • short lived trees. <p>The guidelines have a narrow focus on large trees, but rather should encourage a variety of trees and tree sizes to support local amenity.</p> <p>The guidelines provide no indication as to how the NCA would seek to resolve potentially conflicting outcomes. For example, trees should be able to be removed if the building design requires their removal, so long as large and preferred species trees are planted elsewhere on the block. A strict rule that makes it impossible to remove trees will prevent a lot of dwelling types. It will also foster an unwillingness for people to plant medium to large trees for fear they must be retained permanently and limit their future ability to extend or rebuild on their property.</p> <p>To resolve the potentially conflicting objectives of retaining trees and enabling design that supports a range of dwelling types, the NCA should look to the ACT Government's tree protection regime that allows for removal of significant trees in certain circumstances.</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p><i>Landscaping</i></p> <p>The proposed guidelines unfairly benefit those properties who have already rebuilt on their blocks. Many of these blocks have large homes, extensive driveways, pools and extensive area of hard surfaces. These blocks of land have removed large numbers of trees and reduced the amount of “soft landscaping” in the precinct. These blocks often rely on neighbouring blocks with original dwellings and gardens to provide privacy and soft landscaping vistas without having had to do the same on their block. This is unfair and not equitable in our view. Undeveloped blocks should be afforded the opportunity to develop their blocks. The community responsibility for providing landscaping, privacy and large trees should be shared by all properties, not just those which are still largely in their original form.</p>	
18	Bill Taylor	<p>As a long term Canberran and committed ‘south-sider’, would like to put forward the view that it is important that we plan for a variety of housing types in our inner suburbs.</p> <p>Suburbs like Deakin and Forrest need to have sufficient numbers of townhouses and units in addition to larger free-standing dwellings. This type of development allows more of our population to enjoy the benefits of living in the inner city. It gives more of us the opportunity to cycle to work or take advantage of public transport. It also brings increased vibrancy and vitality to our inner suburbs and their commercial areas.</p> <p>Please don’t allow our inner suburbs to be a homogenous landscape of large, expensive, single dwelling block – available only to the wealthiest Canberrans.</p>	Please refer to Section 3.14 of the report.
19	Name withheld	<p>Believes the Paper falls short of providing confidence and clarity to investors and developers that will be the future residents and custodians of the precinct. On one hand, it appears that the NCA is aware of the local and regional importance of urban renewal and urban consolidation in the precinct because of its central location. But on the other hand, the paper flags some overly restrictive and inflexible measures that will restrict opportunities for developers to make great new medium density housing.</p> <p>Commends the Authority for recognising that the precinct can play a role in increasing housing density in the centre of Canberra. For obvious reasons, increasing density there will reduce pressure on greenfield developments and associated infrastructure. Furthermore, the Authority’s tally of recent and pending developments in the precinct is indicative of the strong demand for</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.2 and 3.8 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>medium density in that part of (the centre) Canberra. Awash with public green space, the area is ideal for medium and/or high-density housing.</p> <p>The paper sets out a series of sensible provisions for new trees, including the selection and placement of deciduous trees to maximise shade in summer. However, the requirement to retain all existing trees is not in the long-term interests of the precinct's residents. That provision appears to ensure the survival of, for example, trees identified by the ACT Government as 'pest plant species'.</p> <p>Furthermore, the provisions around trees prevent developers from designing an ideal, from-scratch tree plan for the development – a plan in which <i>all</i> trees meet the sensible standards that the issues paper requires of <i>new</i> trees. In the medium and longer term, this would certainly achieve energy savings and lead to far better living environments in the precinct. Many existing trees will not meet the 'new tree' standards. Why retain, for example, evergreen trees on the north sides of new residences that block winter sun and provide no shade in summer?</p> <p>Allowing developers to remove and replace trees provides not only for the optimal placement of appropriate trees, but also the optimal design and placement of dwellings, access roads and services. This approach need not prevent developers from meeting the requirement for ...'The combination of existing and new trees [to] be capable of providing at least 15% canopy coverage of a site within 10 years of development' (p11). Why not ensure that all of the 15% meet the standard for new trees?</p> <p>Finally, the minimum and maximum widths of verge crossings are not provided. Is there a reason for this? Is it intended that the 3.6 meters specified for driveway width at the front boundary is also the maximum width for verge crossings? If so, it is unusual to see such a narrow limit for medium density developments. By relaxing this provision slightly, the NCA could allow for more generous, safer driveways with a negligible impact on the streetscape. Behind the boundary, the limit on impermeable surfaces provides a strong incentive for developers of medium density housing not to go overboard with driveways.</p>	
20	Ian Grigg	Many residents who live in the precinct are concerned the Issues Paper needs to more comprehensively cover other aspects.	Please refer to Sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.18 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>These other important aspects are covered very extensively in two documents which have been submitted collectively to the NCA on behalf of many residents in the Deakin/Forrest area.</p> <p>First – the email and hand-delivered letter dated 23 May 2017 on behalf of the Forrest Residents Group. In particular this letter emphasised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retention of existing frontages on all new residential development in the precinct. 2. 1000m² per residential dwelling to preserve the residential nature of the area and foliage retention. <p>These two critical elements would substantially preserve the Garden City aspects of the Griffin Plan.</p> <p>Second – the submission to the NCA from Eric Martin and Associates dated 24 May 2017 on the issue of ‘principal residence’. This needs to be included in the detailed planning rules for the area. It is a very important and critical element to our submissions.</p> <p>It is now at a critical crossroads for developments in the Designated Areas of Deakin/Forrest. Thus it is imperative that the NCA adopt these guidelines as a matter of urgency.</p>	
21	Peter Jansen	<p>I am a resident of the subject area.</p> <p>Existing housing backing on to State Circle have suffered a significant loss of privacy and residential amenity due to the multi-unit developments on State Circle. The gradual redevelopment of the properties backing onto State Circle should be allowed for a maximum of two storey townhouse development.</p> <p>The existing nature strip streetscapes are potted with resident planted trees which are not in keeping with the original plantings and are in many cases a blot on the streetscapes.</p> <p>The idea that driveways should be limited in width is commended however limiting them to single car width, of 3.6 meters, would cause significant problems particularly for two car households which most are.</p> <p>The benefit of tree canopies is significant, however the trees need to be of an appropriate type for residential areas and not likely to cause danger to residents or their property.</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.2, 3.8, 3.13, and 3.15 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>In most areas of Australia minimum distances for trees from dwellings apply with the ability of owners to remove trees within those distances.</p> <p>The ability of a property owner to remove trees within a specified distance from their dwelling and / or a specified type of tree should apply. For example sweet Gum trees should be allowed to be removed from anywhere on a residents land whilst London Plane Trees should be allowed to be removed within a certain distance from dwellings. Perhaps a condition of approval for removal is that another more suitable tree being one which adds to tree canopy within 10 years is planted in a more suitable location.</p> <p>With regard to any redevelopments whether dual occupancy or more they need to be of a much higher standard of design and landscape than we have seen to date.</p>	
22	Jim and Anne Bain	<p>Summary</p> <p>Following a review of the Issues & Policy Response Paper we submit that blocks in Section 3 Deakin and Section 6 Forrest be included with the contiguous blocks on State Circle and the existing arrangements be retained (known as Amendment 39 to the National Capital Plan finalised in March 2005). This means those blocks would be exempted from the proposed changes as set out in Attachment A of the NCA Issues & Policy Paper.</p> <p>Of the 13 blocks in these two sections, four have already been developed and two are occupied by embassies. The restrictive NCA proposal would therefore only apply, unfairly, to the remaining seven blocks.</p> <p>Blocks in Section 3, Deakin and Section 6 Forrest would be part of a transition zone from the 3 storeys, high density, 0.8 plot ratio developments on State Circle.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Amendment 39 to the National Capital Plan concerning the Deakin/Forrest residential area was originally proposed by the National Capital Authority (NCA) in April 2002. There was a lengthy consultation period on Amendment 39 including a hearing and a subsequent statement by the Joint Standing Committee on the National Capital and External Territories in March 2004.</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.2, 3.5, 3.8, 3.10, 3.13, and 3.14.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>Subsequently the NCA sent a new Draft Amendment 39 to the Minister for Local Government, Territories and Roads which was approved in May 2005. The long consultation period of 3 years addressed many issues and, once finalised, residents believed that there would be a long period of stability for the area to develop.</p> <p>We are concerned that after this 3-year consultation, the NCA wish to amend the planning provisions by adding further restrictions on block owners in the precinct.</p> <p>Comments on specific NCA responses [references below are to sections of the Issues Paper]</p> <p>2.1 Neighbourhood character</p> <p><i>Proposed policies a and b:</i> no comment</p> <p><i>Proposed policy c:</i> this response is overly prescriptive and detracts from the block owners' rights to develop their own garden. Large trees are generally not appropriate for residential blocks.</p> <p>In particular, large trees planted on residential blocks can potentially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drop large amounts of leaves, blocking gutters and downpipes • Can be dangerous when branches drop • Damage house foundations • Damage sewer, gas and water pipes • Damage driveways and paved areas • Block out views • Block out the sun in winter • Cannot be planted under or near power lines or other easements typically at the rear of blocks and • Do not allow for growth of smaller plants and shrubs underneath the tree <p>Examples of all these concerns are readily available within the precinct.</p> <p>Large trees are suitable for nature strips and it is suggested that the NCA coordinate with the ACT Government to promote the planting of appropriate trees on precinct nature strips where this has not already been done.</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p><i>Proposed policy d:</i> See comment in c. above. In addition, it should be noted that there are a multitude of ways to achieve energy efficiency in a home and it is overly restrictive on home owners to prescribe a technique for achieving energy efficiency.</p> <p><i>Proposed policy e:</i> See comments in c. and d. above.</p> <p><i>Proposed policy f:</i> The response is overly restrictive in terms of achieving quality developments and allowing home owners to exercise their individual preferences.</p> <p>There is an abundance of 'planted area' within the precinct.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature strips in Canterbury Cres are 7.5m wide. In our case where the block size is 1,730 sqm the nature strip (excluding the crossover) is equivalent to 12% of the area of our block. The NCA are proposing a further 40% on top of this 12%. • The Lodge park is a further 20,000 sqm of 'planted area'. • The 37.5m median strip in Melbourne Avenue is 'planted area' and • There are extensive parklands surrounding Parliament House. <p>In Canterbury Crescent and Somers Crescent car parking is required to be off-street because of 'No Parking' on one side of the street and a '2 hour' limit during business hours on the other side of the street. The 40% 'planted area' requirement would further restrict opportunity for resident and visitor parking in the precinct.</p> <p>In view of the large amount of 'planted area' in the precinct and the street parking restrictions the NCA should decrease the required 'planted area' from 40% to a more acceptable percentage of, say, 20%. Preferably, this requirement should be deleted.</p> <p>Of the 13 blocks in Section 3, Deakin and Section 6, Forrest that back on to the three-story, plot ratio of 0.8, high density developments on State Circle four have already been developed and a remaining two are occupied by embassies. The restrictive NCA proposal would therefore only apply, unfairly, to the remaining seven blocks.</p> <p>A transition zone from the contiguous State Circle blocks would be appropriate.</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>Realistically it is the vegetation on the nature strip and front fence line which determines the streetscape, rather than the overall 'planted area'.</p> <p>2.2 Climate change adaptation</p> <p>The precinct covers 74 blocks. While we agree that the precinct should have an appropriate degree of soft landscaping the additional Climate change adaption policy applicable to this small number of blocks is an unnecessary restriction on an owners' desire for quality development.</p> <p>2.3 Density</p> <p><i>Proposed policy a:</i> Higher density residential development is supported although the restrictions on floor area are again unnecessarily restrictive.</p> <p>3.1 Landscape</p> <p><i>Proposed policies a to f (in relation to landscaping):</i> See comments in section 2.1 and 2.2 above.</p> <p><i>Proposed policies a to g (in relation to hedges and fences):</i> No further comment except that the additional regulations would restrict the opportunity for quality development.</p> <p>3.2 Building siting</p> <p><i>Proposed policies 1 to d:</i> The building siting should be as per the existing National Capital Plan and not changed.</p> <p>3.3 Building height</p> <p>[No comments made.]</p> <p>3.4 Architecture</p> <p><i>Proposed policies 1 to c:</i> No comment on this NCA response.</p> <p>3.5 Vehicle access</p> <p><i>Proposed policies 1 to d:</i> The response is restrictive and may act against quality development of the property.</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
23	Master Builders Association (ACT)	<p>Master Builders ACT supports, what we believe are shared objectives, with the National Capital Authority and ACT Government in relation to the urban development of Canberra, namely that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new development will increasingly become focused on the renewal of established areas of Canberra and decreasingly be reliant on greenfield expansion to accommodate our growing population • new development should demonstrate high standards of design and building quality • The construction of light rail stage 1 (and future light rail stages) presents unprecedented opportunities and challenges which will provide a lasting positive impact on the urban form of Canberra. <p>When reviewing the Issues Paper it is notable that there is no reference to the proposed light rail stage 2 route options, both of which are adjacent to the precinct. This is possibly due to the release of the Issues Paper occurring slightly prior to the ACT Government's release of the light rail stage 2 route options. Nevertheless, the light rail route is a significant external factor that should be considered before finalising the planning controls for the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct.</p> <p>The benefits of light rail on adjacent residential areas is well established. In summary, the construction of light rail will provide a focus for new urban development, it will provide opportunities for increasing residential density around stops and development activity more broadly along the route, and it will necessarily change the urban form, scale and bulk of buildings along the corridor.</p> <p>The Deakin/Forrest Residential precinct is ideally located to take advantage of these benefits. The precinct is adjacent to the light rail stage 2 corridor; all of the precinct is within a short walk to the proposed stage 2 corridor; and much of the precinct will be within walking distance of the proposed stops at Deakin or Barton.</p> <p>While the Issues Paper acknowledges the opportunity for a mix of housing types to be built in the precinct, the overriding nature of the Objectives are to 'retain' and 'protect' existing character. This is at odds with the opportunity presented by light rail stage 2, that is, to increase residential density, height, scale and intensity to capitalise on the significant investment in light rail.</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.2, 3.8, 3.12, and 3.18.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>The opportunity to achieve even modest residential densities in the precinct is also impacted by many of the detailed Provisions. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • block amalgamation is generally not permitted • plot ratio must not be greater than 0.4 • side setback requirements • large, established trees should be retained • not less than 40% of total site area should be for planting area • driveways should be a single-vehicle width (<3.6m). <p>In combination these Provisions constrain residential development in the precinct. Without some flexibility in their application to individual development proposals, the Provisions will not achieve the stated objectives for the precinct. In essence, the objectives give with one-hand, and the Provisions take with another.</p> <p>In conclusion, Master Builders ACT suggests that the Objectives of the Issues Paper be reviewed to incorporate and recognise the opportunity that light rail stage 2 provides to the precinct.</p> <p>Further, we suggest that the Provisions be reviewed to ensure that they will meet the Objectives, and that the Provisions are applied with some flexibility to take into account the specific circumstances of individual projects and individual site characteristics.</p>	
24	Housing Industry Association Limited	<p>HIA supports the Authority's intention to review sections of the National Capital Plan (the Plan) relevant to this precinct to determine if they are still adequate to guide development outcomes expected for the precinct.</p> <p>Recent redevelopment in the area has resulted in changes to the built form which has seen an increase in multi-dwelling units such as duplexes, townhouses and apartments. The requirements of the Plan should reflect the changing character of the precinct's built form.</p> <p>HIA notes the special significance given to the Deakin/Forest precinct which is situated between State Circle and National Circuit as the only suburban residential area within the Territory that comes under the planning jurisdiction of the Authority. Given the Authority has a special interest to ensure development surrounding, and in proximity to, Parliament House is of the highest design quality, its consideration of urban design and architecture in its planning role is appropriate.</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.2 and 3.8 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>A key issue we have identified in our review of the issues paper is consistency between the objectives found in Attachment A and aspects of the site planning and design criteria which may unintentionally prevent the achievement of appropriate design outcomes.</p> <p>For example, the requirements for large canopy trees to be provided in the private open space of each dwelling may not be practical or achievable in all circumstances at the time of a development taking place. However, it may be achievable within a medium to long term time frame.</p> <p>This approach has been recognised by the ACT Government along the Northbourne Avenue corridor and surrounding suburbs where a selective large tree removal program is now in place and residents understand that over time tree replacement can ultimately achieve the desired outcome and retain the original intention of the city's design plans.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to allowing alternative solutions such as provision of equivalent planting in communal landscaped areas within and surrounding development sites.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed requirements for vehicle access should also be appropriate for multi-dwelling units, given that they may be an appropriate dwelling form in the precinct. Single width driveways between the boundary and the building line limit the ability for two vehicles to pass when entering and leaving a multi-unit development site.</p> <p>As stated above, if this is the likely development type to occur in this area, the design standard should reflect this. The requirement for landscaping to effectively hide the driveway from the street risks creating a pedestrian hazard as planting will block the view of exiting vehicles from the footpath.</p> <p>The final form of the planning provisions should ensure development permitted under the Plan is capable of being practically designed to meet these standards and effectively delivered on the ground.</p>	
25	Christine Rafter	<p>I am adding my voice to those supporting that Eric Martin's proposition be included in the Issues and Policy paper.</p> <p>There is great benefit not only to the local residences but to 'a Garden City' tourism factor.</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.2, 3.15, and 3.18 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>When larger blocks with their unique older homes are bulldozed and a larger footprint is built instead, a few things happen which concern me:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less gardens so more water runoff. For example we suffer when it rains heavily - the water runs down the footpath of Melbourne Avenue and then into our garage. A neighbour behind us in Dominion Circuit, has disconnected their down pipes as the rainwater came down the street, up their drainpipes and into their ceiling! We have tried to alleviate our particular problem by putting in several drains across the driveway and a slight rise to slow the water down but they don't cope in a really heavy downpour. And these are just our examples. With less garden for the water to sink into, more residences will suffer flooding. • We lose our architectural history. Canberra is only just over a hundred years old but if we replace all the older suburbs with apartments and town houses, we lose our sense of history of our city, the architecture and the incredible Walter Burley Griffin's Plan of a Garden City. • The birds and wildlife disappear with less trees and bushes. We have bower birds who visit! • The value in maintaining a Garden City makes it a destination worth visiting for tourists and enticing people to live here and then making them happy they did. 	
26	Deakin Residents' Association	<p>The objects and purposes of the DRA are 'to enhance the residential, suburban, social and environmental qualities of Deakin, consistent with Garden City planning principles'. A key focus for the DRA is retaining Deakin's garden-suburb environment.</p> <p>We note that the focus of the NCA paper relates to a relatively small number of residential properties 'on the area generally bound by Canterbury Crescent, National Circuit, Hobart Avenue and blocks fronting State Circle', although the area outlined in Figure 2 of the document shows blocks on State Circle itself are not included.</p> <p>DRA agrees that this Paper represents an opportunity to determine whether current planning and design controls remain adequate to guide the future of this precinct and for consideration of policy responses to significant emerging and strategic issues in the zone. We understand that, had the proposals now foreshadowed in the NCA's Paper been in force, some of the recent</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 3.7, 3.8, 3.17, and 3.18 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>developments/redevelopments which have taken place, and which have been controversial, would not have been approved.</p> <p>These comments are based largely on discussions at the NCA briefing provided on 27 April 2017, inspections by Committee members of relevant developments in the zone as identified in Figure 3, and developments in adjacent areas (Arthur Circle, Bougainville Street/Empire Circuit, Hotham Crescent), and consultation with and feedback from local residents, particularly property owners in Canterbury Crescent.</p> <p>DRA broadly supports the thrust of the strategic directions and proposals outlined in the Paper, as these are consistent with the objects and purposes of the DRA, subject to the comments provided below.</p> <p>At the 27 April meeting, it was stated that the main changes relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • building to planting ratio • site coverage including driveways • amount and use of land available for soft landscaping. <p>Plot Building to Planting Ratio</p> <p>DRA supports the NCA's proposal to maintain the existing plot ratio that limits building on residential sites in the zone to a maximum of 0.4 (alongside a new 40% area of soft landscaping).</p> <p>At the same time we note that one resident of the area, questioned whether the 0.4 plot ratio/40% soft planting limit was too restrictive, given the significant amount of public parkland already in the area, particularly around The Lodge and Parliament House and that current parking restrictions in, streets such as Canterbury Crescent, (no parking on one side and 2 hour parking on the other during weekdays) put pressure on residents to provide extra parking on their property. While generally supportive of the NCA's position, the DRA suggests that any individual request for a <i>minor</i> variation to the 0.4 building/40% soft planting ratio could be considered on its merits.</p> <p>Other residents felt that it was not the 0.4 plot ratio that was a problem but rather the number of dwellings on a block. These residents proposed that the current ratio should be maintained but be accompanied by a limit on the number of dwellings allowed to be established on a block. This would curtail motivation to remove trees to maximise development. An option for containing an</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>unacceptable density in multi-unit developments is to require a ratio of (say) a maximum of one residential dwelling per 600m² of land. This would serve to enhance the 'Garden City' concept of the precinct.</p> <p>Local residents also considered that amalgamations outside of what is allowed under Amendment 39 relating to State Circle should specifically be disallowed. This would deter the construction of 'concrete jungle' edifices, reducing the prestige of this historically significant area as well as adversely affecting amenity for neighbours and increasing traffic congestion, noise and parking.</p> <p>Soft Landscaping</p> <p>The NCA's Paper makes a new proposal that not less than 40% of the block must be set aside for soft planting. We understand that is to deal with previously inexact language about soft planting requirements in the zone. This is a welcome new development.</p> <p>The Paper also recommends and DRA supports a range of measures proposed by the NCA to strengthen the current landscape requirements of the Plan. Along with proposals for setting quantitative controls to provide certainty in respect of the extent of soft landscaping to be provided across a site, these include encouraging hedges in lieu of fences, and limiting the amount of hard surfaces to reduce stormwater run-off. Limitations would also be placed on the number of driveways.</p> <p>DRA notes that increased flexibility for dual occupancy siting would also potentially increase significant planting opportunities. The narrow corridors between dual occupancy dwellings to provide separation can be wasted areas with overshadowing, insufficient space for significant plantings and privacy concerns. It is suggested a range of imaginative and creative proposals for dual occupancies be considered to maximise the area for and benefits of soft landscaping and options for canopy trees surrounds, to enhance the 'Garden City' concept.</p> <p>The Paper proposes limitations to the number of driveways. It is suggested that two driveways be allowed only if needed for direct access to existing above ground garages.</p> <p>While mandatory increased requirements on soft landscaping may aid preservation, it can add interest to consider different approaches, for example, the Japanese style pebble garden at 14 Melbourne Avenue.</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>Trees</p> <p>Trees are a major focus of the Plan. The Paper proposes that large, established trees should be retained, that new trees, capable of reaching heights twice that of the proposed building should be provided as part of all proposed redevelopment proposals and each plot should have at least one canopy tree. It also proposes new and existing tree should cover 15% canopy coverage of a site within 10 years of development. This is consistent with the need to preserve essential green infrastructure in this zone close to the Lodge and Parliament.</p> <p>We understand that where adverse impacts or safety concerns may arise in relation to existing or proposed trees, advice will be sought from suitably qualified arborists or horticulturalists. In DRA's view it will be important for the NCA to ensure that such people provide genuine independent advice and are not merely sympathetic nominees of builders or developers. The NCA should also obtain photographic evidence of tree cover on the block before and after development with developer penalties for trees that should not have been removed.</p> <p>DRA notes that street trees are an important feature of the NCA precinct landscape. However, responsibility for them rests with the ACT Government rather than the NCA or individual landowners. This can result in inaction or neglect. For example, residents commented on some street trees in Canterbury Crescent which are severely deformed and where branches fall unexpectedly (see Figure 1).</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		 <p data-bbox="571 917 1120 949">Figure 1: Deformed trees that need attention</p> <p data-bbox="571 965 1724 1077">DRA recommends that the NCA works closely with the ACT Government to repair or replace unsightly or dangerous trees. Canterbury Crescent is an important connecting street from Parliament House to the Lodge and often serves as a loop street for tourist buses.</p> <p data-bbox="571 1093 1724 1308">One individual resident of the area considers that the provision of canopy trees should be at the discretion of individual landowners. This same resident recommended that the preferred location for canopy trees was on wide nature strips where roots and leaves do not interfere with buildings, pavements and utility services. However, the DRA believes the NCA's proposal is laudable and consistent with the Garden City principles supported by DRA and that the outcome of the NCA proposals will be desirable on both aesthetic and environmental grounds.</p> <p data-bbox="571 1324 716 1356">Compliance</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>DRA has some questions about compliance matters. While issues such as building height, setbacks and siting of buildings are easily quantified, others such as architectural appropriateness or status of soft landscaping and garden design are more subjective and less so. Who will decide on and monitor such things?</p> <p>Performance Standards</p> <p>The Paper states that quantitative standards are accompanied by performance standards and that compliance with quantitative standards will not necessarily result in Works Approval unless the performance standards have been met. This wording is very unclear and does not reference relevant standards. DRA notes that performance standards are spelt out in the NCA's Design and Siting Code Design and Siting General Code but they need to be spelt out explicitly in the Paper to avoid ambiguity.</p> <p>Diplomatic Missions</p> <p>DRA understands that proposals outlined in the Paper do not apply to some Diplomatic Missions, particularly in the Somers Crescent area. It is unclear whether other Diplomatic Missions, for example the residence and chancery of Cambodia and the residence of the Myanmar Embassy on the opposite side of Melbourne Avenue, are similarly included.</p> <p>DRA considers it important to spell out what restrictions, if any, do apply to the development of diplomatic premises in the NCA zone. DRA considers there should be in principle adherence to the same requirements as other similar structures in the zone. Exemptions should only be granted where the Diplomatic Missions can show that they are essential, such as for security reasons, or the need/wish for structures to reflect their national and international significance.</p> <p>Advice on Proposed Developments/Redevelopments</p> <p>Many residents expressed concern that they were largely unaware of proposed developments/redevelopments in the precinct area. This means that they are missing out on the opportunity to comment prior to any approval being granted. We understand the NCA is looking at this issue. One possibility would be for DRA and Forrest Residents Group to be advised of any proposals to allow them to then pass this information on to members/residents.</p> <p>Wider Application</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>The NCA's Paper states that many of the proposals outlined in it would be applicable to other parts of Canberra. DRA strongly agrees. There is no reason to suggest that, while technically the precinct ends at, for example National Circuit, such proposals should not be replicated in other parts of Deakin. Recent developments and proposed redevelopments in nearby parts of 'Old Deakin', for example 34 Melbourne Avenue, are a case in point.</p> <p>Equally, many of the newer developing suburbs in Canberra, for example, West Belconnen, Tuggeranong and Molonglo, where there almost no trees and concrete pavements and lack of nature strips abound, could benefit from the application of these principles.</p> <p>DRA believes it is regrettable that the Office of responsible ACT Minister, Mick Gentleman, has indicated the ACT Government will not be considering or taking up any proposals put forward in this Paper by the NCA, on the grounds that the ACT Government has 'its own Plan'.</p>	
27	Carolyn Norrie	<p>The development of this paper reflects the importance of preserving the amenity of this residential area, one of the most historic areas of Canberra and in close proximity to Parliament House.</p> <p>In particular I would like to support these measures mooted in your paper:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40 per cent soft landscaping • large canopy trees • the greater of 6 metres or existing street set-backs. <p>All of these measures help maintain the current leafy environment in this area, which is highly valued by existing residents, while still allowing appropriate redevelopment to meet current housing needs.</p> <p>They will also help to prevent and/or mitigate the heat reflecting issues that arise from higher levels of building coverage.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to support the recommendations in the report prepared by Eric Martin and Associates.</p> <p>As a Forrest resident I believe that it is essential that local voices speak up for the protection of the overlay area, as we pay the price when inappropriate development is put in place by property</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.18 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		speculators who make their money and walk away. This plan goes a long way towards protecting the local environment to the benefit of the community.	
28	Margaret Atcherley	<p>First and foremost as a Forrest resident who lives close to the Precinct, I strongly support the 40 per cent soft landscaping proposal as a minimum requirement. People who do not live in Forrest or Deakin may well be happy for us to broil in summer and freeze in winter, however, I think it important with the onset of more severe weather extremes brought on by climate change that we start now to provide as much environmental protection as we can. Minimising the use of tarmac, which reflects, retains and radiates heat, is important. In contrast to hard concrete and bitumen surfaces, trees absorb the heat and act as a shelter from heat coming from above while keeping heat in winter closer to the ground. I believe that ultimately green cover, including canopy trees, will prove to be the simplest and cheapest solution to mitigate the effects of climate change around the world.</p> <p>Secondly, a minimum of one canopy tree per 1000m² or part thereof seems to me to be a modest requirement by government for residents to meet, given that citizens only lease their land and never own it outright. I do think that an arborist who is familiar with Canberra conditions could be engaged to provide a list of 100 or so species of trees that might be considered by landholders as suitable as a 'canopy tree' in this environment. Concern over gutters and pathways clogged with leaves are common issues anyway and most can solve this by hiring a contractor for around \$100 to \$200 a year to clean their gutters.</p> <p>Thirdly, I should like to alert the Board to the fact that other jurisdictions are considering similar provisions to the ones set out in your Paper. The state of Victoria is looking at setting a minimum landscaping ratio that includes trees (35% or 40% have been suggested). The city of Barcelona, Spain, is looking to 'retro-fitting' an urban forest to combat increasing temperature extremes in that city. Clearly the retrofitting approach is the most expensive way of achieving a natural protection from climate change, usually involving removal of some existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Fourthly, I fully support the expert advice provided by Eric Martin and Associates in their report provided to the NCA by a group of concerned residents. This report was clearly and thoroughly researched and carefully drafted to reflect the contemporary concerns of most residents in the Precinct as well as recognising the heritage value of the Precinct and many of its buildings. While</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.2, 3.2, 3.14, 3.15, and 3.18 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>sensitive to different demands, this report is also practical and the recommendations are straightforward to implement before too many changes occur in the area.</p> <p>Fifthly, and not of least concern, must be the proximity of the Precinct and adjoining suburbs to Parliament House and the various national institutions that lie in the Parliamentary Triangle. It is not sufficient to enable residents or developers free reign in an area that provides the immediate environment for the Australian Parliament. This important area is often accessed by visitors to the Parliament from Australia and abroad. In this context, the whole inner Canberra area desirably should reflect the best that the nation can offer, not just a sufficiency. Accordingly, high standards of planning, design, use of building materials and construction methods are imperative.</p> <p>Lastly, it is important that we consider what the future holds. How will cities look in 50 or 100 years? What will be the demands on our Parliament? Will national security concerns retreat or increase? What will the demographics of Australia look like? Rapid infill of available land, establishment of large buildings and constant turnover of residents in an area or precinct, discourage development of connected communities that are able to protect their amenity and create precincts that inspire and nurture their occupants and visitors. Rapid infill also establishes a level of development that is hard to undo or re-do should superior solutions o different needs be presented. 'Less can be more' in regard to this kind of rapid development, particularly in a precious, nationally recognised environment.</p>	
29	Name withheld	<p>The issues paper emphasizes the national significance of the Deakin/Forrest Precinct due to its proximity to Parliament House. The precinct was developed in the late 1950s with single houses on large blocks. At the time the population of Canberra was about 40,000 and the site for a new parliament house was undecided. It is unrealistic to expect that there would not be change in the residential mix in the precinct as Canberra's population increased rapidly (now in excess of 390,000). There storey apartments on State Circle were approved by the NCA following Amendment 39 of the National Capital Plan in 2005. Townhouse development in the precinct has also been approved. The issues paper indicates that current approaches to urban planning suggest that locations close to major employment areas, the city and major transport routes should be utilized for higher density development to help reduce urban footprints and make better use of infrastructure. It seems to me that the crux of the issues paper is to allow an increase in the density</p>	<p>Please refer to Sections 3.2, 3.8, 3.13, and 3.15 of the report.</p>

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>of development (e.g. townhouses, duplexes) while ensuring the high quality of the built environment and retaining the green 'Garden City' landscape of the area.</p> <p><i>Design quality of built environment</i></p> <p>Good design of the built environment should be prime consideration in granting approval for redevelopment in the precinct. Energy efficiency is an important component of good design and it contributes to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and limiting man-induced climate change. It is now possible to design highly efficient energy houses for the Canberra climate. With appropriate solar access and using modern building technology, including insulated floor slabs, insulated walls and roof and triple glazing an energy efficiency rating of nine can be achieved. High energy ratings are not achievable simply by appropriate tree planting allowing solar access in winter and shading in summer. For example, our double brick house has excellent solar access but an energy rating of 0 or 1. Other aspects of good quality design are included in Section 2.4 of the Issues Paper.</p> <p><i>Landscape</i></p> <p>I support retaining the Garden City quality of the precinct and an appropriate degree of soft landscaping, but cannot agree with the proposal that new trees, capable of reaching twice the height of proposed buildings should be an essential component of development proposals. Large trees with big canopies may be suitably located on large blocks but are mostly not appropriate for smaller blocks. The planting of new large trees is not required to retain the Garden City nature of the precinct.</p> <p>An evergreen tree can contribute to a lower inside temperature on hot days but it has severe disadvantages for solar access in a Canberra winter. A large deciduous tree that drops a mountain of leave in autumn means a hazardous annual operation of gutter cleaning or the prospect of water damage due to gutters full of leaves and blocked drainpipes. Large trees on Canberra's clay soils with extensive shallow roots can cause considerable and costly damage to building foundations, sewage and storm water drainage lines and in-ground watering systems. Falling branches may cause considerable damage to a building. Large trees should not be planted under overhead power lines. Large trees also can be detrimental to maintaining an established garden landscape.</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>There are many small trees with small canopies that are more suitable for Canberra gardens. Colourful small trees, combined with shrubs, annual and perennial plants and lawns characterize the gardens of the Deakin/Forrest precinct and are responsible for its 'Garden City' nature. Examples of colourful small trees seen in the precinct are: Japanese maple, dogwood, crab apple, crape myrtle, magnolia, some species of acacia and several prunus species.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the proposal that existing and new trees should be capable of providing at least 15% canopy coverage of a site within 10 years of development. Substantial reasons against the requirement of new large trees are provided above. The requirements could also severely militate against good design and is not needed to retain the 'Garden City' nature of the precinct. The proposals that all large trees should be retained would severely and unfairly disadvantage a leaseholder who planted many large trees on his/her block many years ago and now wishes to redevelop the block. Unless the lease-holder receives permission from the NCA to remove one or more of the trees the block may not be able to be redeveloped for townhouses.</p> <p>Green space</p> <p>The issues paper proposes that not less than 40% of total site area should be for planting. I assume from the wording that green synthetic grass cannot contribute to the green space even though it is a permeable surface. This needs clarification. Forty percent of the site area for planting is excessive and considerably more than what is needed to retain a garden nature of the precinct. Mandating a landscape area of 40% could militate against good planning of the built environment and the best siting of townhouses on a block. It could favour two storeys over single storey townhouses. I generally support the setback provisions (front, rear and side), the building height restrictions and the policy on hedges and fences. I strongly support a composition of soft landscaping between the building line and the front property boundary. I contend that the Garden City image of the Deakin/Forrest precinct is due to the views of front gardens from the streetscape and the large trees planted on the verge. The soft area of the verge should be considered when determining a reasonable proportion of a site for planting.</p> <p>The large residential site of the Malaysian High Commissioner is located in the precinct and should be included. It is for residential use. It is not the site of the Malaysian diplomatic mission.</p> <p>Drive and verge crossings</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>The requirements for driveways and verge crossings including their colour and material are too restrictive. I am appalled by the suggestion that verge crossings surfaced in materials other than bitumen should be considered for replacement. An aged concrete crossing in neither bright nor reflective and it is compatible with the concrete in the street kerbs and gutters. Most of the Blocks on Somers Crescent have more than one verge crossing and many of the crossings are more than single vehicle width at the kerb. I am under the impression that verge crossings are the responsibility of the ACT Government.</p> <p>Section 3, Deakin and Section 6, Forrest</p> <p>I wish to refer to the letter of 15 November 2006 from a number of residents of Section 3 Deakin and Section 6 Forrest to Mr. Todd Rohl, then Managing Director, Planning and Urban Design, NCA. The residents proposed a change in development conditions with a plot ratio of up to 0.6 for the blocks of Section 3 Deakin and Section 6 Forrest other than those fronting State Circle. A number of reasons were presented for the change including improved equity for the residents of the blocks of Section 3 Deakin and Section 6 Forrest and greater coherence in future development of the blocks with developments on State Circle. The NCA decided for no change in the maximum plot ratio for the blocks on the basis that it would be inconsistent with the National Capital Plan objective for Deakin/Forrest of 'maintaining the principal residential character of the area'.</p> <p>The three storey development of apartments on State Circle has substantially changed the residential character of the area and substantially reduced the amenity and privacy of the near neighbours on the north sides of Canterbury Crescent and Somers Crescent. The blocks on State Circle are excluded from the Issues and Policy Response Paper. For equity reasons and consistent planning of the areas between State Circle and Canterbury Crescent/Somers Crescent, it is logical that any development proposal for blocks of Section 3 Deakin and Section 6 Forrest should not be subject to the landscape proposals of the Issues and Policy Response Paper. An exclusion zone for the area would not be inconsistent with 'maintaining the principal residential character of the area'.</p>	
30	Brand and Peta Hoff	<p>We understand and support the broad aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to preserve the character of the area • to restrict developments to the current guideline of a principal residence 	Please refer to Sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to continue to have a frontage in keeping with the character of the area • to restrict the block size to 1000m² per single residence • to insist on trees and garden coverage in keeping with character of area. <p>Concerned about development at 9 Melbourne Avenue, given the rumour that the developer wishes to replace the house with a series of apartments. We are seriously concerned about potential high rise blocks of apartments being built in Forrest.</p> <p>We support the NCA's scrutiny of the proposal to ensure that it fits in with the character of Forrest.</p> <p>We support the review of NCA Planning Policies and that they be strengthened to preserve a very unique area of Canberra.</p>	
31	ACT Government Environment Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate	<p>The Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate (EPSDD) supports the strategic issues outlined in the Issues Paper for this important 'Garden City' residential precinct in Deakin/Forrest, which is one of the few of its kind in the ACT. The paper will provide a useful resource for consideration in any future review of the planning controls of the Territory Plan for Garden City residential precincts in other parts of the city that the ACT Government has planning control over.</p> <p>EPSDD also supports the more detailed planning and design principles proposed in the paper to strengthen the requirements of the National Capital Plan and guide development of the buildings, landscape and public places in the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct. This will allow redevelopment of the precinct to occur, while ensuring the protection of the characteristics that are valued by the community in this important part of our city.</p>	Noted.
32	Inner South Canberra Community Council	<p>The Inner South Canberra Community Council (ISCCC) commends and supports the National Capital Authority's initiative in developing a comprehensive set of provisions and guidelines for future development in the precinct.</p> <p>It is encouraging to see that these provisions draw on principles relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Garden City and neighbourhood character • climate change adaptation and resilience • density aligned with high quality design 	Please refer to Sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.5, 3.10, 3.14, 3.15, 3.17, and 3.18 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> energy efficiency. <p>As a peak organization for residents' groups in inner south Canberra, the ISCCC will focus in this submission on broad principles and issues. We will leave feedback on specific provisions of the Issues Paper to the relevant ISCCC member organisations, the Deakin Residents Association (DRA) and the Forrest Residents Group (FRG), who have consulted with and represent the residents in those suburbs, and have prepared separate, excellent submission.</p> <p>The NCA is seeking feedback on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> those characteristics of the neighbourhood valued by the community the proposed policy responses to the identified issues whether other matters should be addressed. <p>Below are the ISCCC's comments on these issues.</p> <p>a. Those characteristics of the neighbourhood valued by the community</p> <p>Over a decade ago, the ACT Government funded the development of Neighbourhood Plans for inner Canberra suburbs, and those Plans addressed community values.</p> <p>Community consultation in developing the Deakin Neighbourhood Plan in 2003 found, inter alia, that <i>'one hundred percent of the respondents to the Householder Survey liked the suburb's tree-lined streets. The majority of people also highly value the abundance of mature trees, parks and green spaces'</i>.</p> <p>A Values Survey conducted in developing the Neighbourhood Plan for Forrest found that residents <i>'valued, above all else, its Open Space and Environment, in terms of the amount of open space, mature trees and the diversity of plants, birds and native animals. Also highly valued is Housing, which is generally of a low density and the built environment that is visually attractive; Character, in particular the peace and privacy, safety and community feeling; and Location, specifically its centrality to other parts of Canberra'</i>.</p> <p>The DRA and FRG submissions on the Issues Paper indicate that residents still highly value their suburbs' Garden City character of mature trees, parks and green spaces.</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>As part of its response to the Legislative Assembly's report on Draft Variation 306 to the Territory Plan in 2013, the ACT Government indicated that it would incorporate statements of desired character into suburb precinct codes in consultation with the community. This has not been implemented yet, but the Neighbourhood Plans, the DRA and FRG submissions, and the NCA's Issues Paper play an important role in articulating valued characteristics of Deakin and Forrest.</p> <p>b. The proposed policy responses to the identified issues</p> <p>i. The Garden City and neighbourhood character</p> <p>As indicated above, both the community consultations undertaken in 2003/4 and the DRA and FRG submissions indicate that residents in these suburbs highly value the Garden City principles. These principles, as reflected in the proposed NCA provisions for the Deakin/Forrest residential precinct, merit continuing support. Aligned with this, development adjacent to heritage areas should complement and be sympathetic to the character of those areas.</p> <p>ii. Climate change adaptation and resilience</p> <p>The NCA issues paper addresses the importance of climate change adaptation and resilience.</p> <p>The paper's proposals for maintaining soft landscaping, including through a minimum 15% canopy coverage of a site within 10 years of development, and retention of not less than 40 percent of a total site as planting area, are commendable and entirely consistent with public policy trends.</p> <p>Both federal and ACT climate change adaptation strategies call for the development and implementation of urban planning strategies that will increase green infrastructure in pursuit of greater resilience to climate change impacts such as higher temperatures and more frequent heat waves.</p> <p>The National Climate Resilience and Adaptation Strategy 2015 highlights that:</p> <p><i>'People living in large cities can be more susceptible than non-urban dwellers to the effects of heatwaves because of the urban heat island effect, caused by the prevalence of heat-absorbing materials such as dark coloured pavements and roofs, concrete, urban canyons trapping hot air, and a lack of shade and green space in dense urban environments. The increasing intensity and frequency of heatwaves, combined with the urban heat island effect, could have serious implications for human health. Some local councils have put in place measures to address this, such</i></p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p><i>as the City of Melbourne's Urban Forest Strategy, which aims to increase canopy cover from 22 to 40 per cent by 2040 which could help reduce urban temperatures. Urban forests and greening also provide habitat for biodiversity, improve wellbeing, support management of storm water.'</i></p> <p>In Victoria, there is now a requirement also for residential blocks larger than 650m² to have at least 35 percent of that area allocated to garden.</p> <p>The City of Sydney Development Control Plan (2012) requires that 'trees capable of providing at least 15% canopy coverage of a site within 10 years from the completion of development'.</p> <p>The ACT Climate Change Adaptation Strategy 2016 points out that inner Canberra suburbs with high tree cover have consistency lower temperatures in summer than new outer Canberra suburbs with low tree cover. The ACT Government is developing a strategy to enhance living infrastructure in Canberra, including targets for urban tree canopy cover.</p> <p>Internationally, there is a massive trend towards increasing tree cover in major cities. For example, Barcelona in Spain has set a target of doubling the number of trees in the city.</p> <p>As a Commonwealth Government agency, the NCA must adhere to Commonwealth legislation and policies, including in relation to the National Climate Resilience and Adaptation Strategy. Applying such policies to a small precinct within walking distance of Parliament House will demonstrate commitment to their implementation.</p> <p>Given the high existing quality of the urban forest and green infrastructure generally in Deakin and Forrest, it would be unacceptable to countenance a deterioration of that infrastructure at a time when other cities in Australian and globally are going the other way. Once gone, it would be much more complex and costly to retrofit green infrastructure back into the landscape in future.</p> <p>iii. Density aligned with high quality design</p> <p>There are growing demands for increased density, including to enable ageing in place. It should be possible through the application of the provisions proposed by the NCA in relation to quality design and green infrastructure to achieve both greater density while enhancing rather than diminishing the character and liveability of the Deakin/Forrest residential precinct.</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>The ISCCC supports the NCA's proposal to retain existing plot ratios, setbacks and building heights, as well as proposals to limit the amount of hard surfaces to reduce storm water run-off.</p> <p>iv. Energy efficiency</p> <p>The NCA's proposed provisions and guidelines should enable enhanced green infrastructure in the precinct, while facilitating higher energy efficiency by influencing the location and type of green infrastructure, for example deciduous trees providing shade in summer and solar access in winter.</p> <p>c. Other matters</p> <p>Responsibility for maintenance of street trees rests with the ACT Government, and there are concerns amongst residents that more active tree maintenance is needed. Like the DRA and FRG, the ISCCC would like to see the NCA work closely with the ACT Government to improve the condition of the urban forest.</p> <p>Appropriate compliance mechanisms must be in place to ensure adherence to the provisions proposed in the Issues Paper. As noted by the DRA, performance standards are spelt out in the NCA's Design and Siting General Code. They need to be spelt out explicitly in relevant provisions to avoid ambiguity.</p> <p>The ISCCC also supports the DRA and FRG suggestion that they be advised of any proposals for redevelopment of blocks in the area so that relevant information may be passed on to their members and other residents.</p> <p>The ISCCC agrees with the DRA and FRG that there is merit in considering the relevance and application of many of the Issues Paper proposals to other parts of Canberra. This is a useful issue to consider in relation to the implementation of the Commonwealth and ACT Government climate change adaptation strategies and the current Housing Inquiry by the ACT Assembly.</p>	
33	Tui Davidson	<p>As a Forrest resident who lives close to the Precinct, I strongly support the 40 per cent soft landscaping proposal as a minimum requirement.</p> <p>I fully support the expert advice provided by Eric Martin and Associates in their report provided to the NCA by a group of concerned residents. This report was thoroughly researched and carefully drafted to reflect the contemporary concerns of most residents in the Precinct as well as</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.2, 3.14, and 3.18 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>recognising the heritage value of the Precinct and many of its buildings. This report is also practical and the recommendations are straightforward to implement before too many changes occur in the area.</p> <p>I consider the proximity of the Precinct and adjoining suburbs to Parliament House and the various national institutions that lie in the Parliamentary Triangle to be an important factor, and we should be showcasing the beauty of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned at the progression and style of infill (maximising land use by multi-unit developments with less soft landscaping). According to AllHomes, Barton is now about 12% houses, Forrest 55% and Deakin 77%. The beautiful garden setting is disappearing as are the heritage houses, and it is an important part of the setting for the Parliamentary area and NCA controlled land.</p>	
34	Karen Fogarty	<p>A neighbour recently brought to my attention the Issues and Policy Response Paper. I am disappointed by the lack of public consultation and awareness of this paper. Primarily the paper only affects a very small number of residential blocks and as such, in my view, a better consultation would have at least been the Issues Paper provided to each resident by way of letter or email and adequate time to respond. With the public consultation simply being noted on a website is not sufficient consultation and I assume that it was backed up by an advertisement.</p> <p>I, as a long term resident, wish to ensure that the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct maintains its 'Garden City' residential character with primarily single residences in a garden setting.</p> <p>My comments are only related to the residential amenity of Canterbury Crescent, Daly Street and National Circuit. I acknowledge the need for increased density in the city region but the density should not come in place of detracting from the primarily residential quality of these streets. Importantly, these residential streets are not suitable for multi-townhouse developments that have occurred in Somers Crescent. I believe that the current planning restrictions that should be imposed should achieve the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a consistency with the planning guidelines in similar areas that applies in the current Territory Plan. I note that high density in the Territory Plan are limited to designated areas which are primarily in the streets surrounding shopping centres or on transport corridors. There is no shopping centre nearby to these streets. 	Please refer to Sections 3.2, 3.7, 3.14, and 3.17 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • residential single dwelling is strongly supported. • a plot ratio of 0.4 should be retained because of the significant single residences in the area • dual occupancy should only be permitted within the suggested guidelines • there should be no amalgamation of blocks and no exceptions as amalgamation would: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. destroy the streetscape b. create traffic problems (as demonstrated with Somers Crescent development) c. be inconsistent with Territory Planning, as any development is not in the vicinity of a shopping centre. • significant trees, particularly those on, or in the vicinity of, nature strips, should be protected and preserved, in keeping with the important 'Garden City' concept • the area is nationally and culturally significant with the Lodge, the Prime Minister's official Canberra residence, located between Canterbury Crescent and Adelaide Avenue and visitors and dignitaries using the Canterbury Crescent access between the Lodge and Parliament House. <p>There should be direct consultation with actual residents and not simply notice on a website which residents, particularly the elderly, may not be familiar with, or are unable to access. I note that the NCA would be familiar with many of the residences email addresses and perhaps maybe all residents should be contacted and contact details obtained.</p>	
35	Forrest Residents' Group #2	<p>We believe that the Paper is particularly important at this time because of accelerated urban redevelopment in the inner south of Canberra.</p> <p>It is clear that some provisions in the National Capital Plan (NCP) have been insufficiently detailed to effectively protect valued aspects of the Precinct. We agree that these provisions need clarification with practical suggestions and regulations to ensure that they provide the desired outcome for the city and residents. The NCA Paper goes a good way to ensuring that many key provisions are better defined and strategies are outlined that can be applied to improve outcomes for this important area of the city adjoining the Parliamentary Triangle.</p> <p>Those aspects of the Forrest environment that have most value to our residents include the location near the centre of the city and the proximity of the area to the various national institutions</p>	Please refer to Section 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.17, and 3.18 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>that characterise the national capital. Of additional value to residents in contributing to the quality of life in the suburb are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the mature trees and streetscape • the size of residential blocks in relation to building size • the soft landscaping on residential blocks • the quality of buildings in the area (which includes design, height, inset and materials) • the heritage value of the area in relation to original Griffin and Weston plans for the city and its garden environment. <p>For the FRG, each of these concerns applies equally to the suburb as a whole and to the specific area covered by the Precinct. In this regard we see the Paper as an important initiative that we would seek to use as an exemplar for further development of the suburb as a whole. In this regard, we also commend the Eric Martin report on the Precinct that set out a range of criteria for application in the area.</p> <p>Accordingly, we would like to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum 1000m² block for each principal residence in any further redevelopment of the Precinct. • Preservation of current set-backs and height restrictions (height of two storeys or around 11 meters and insets being the greater of current insets or 6 meters). <p>The submission prepared on our behalf by Knight Frank provides a fuller explanation of why these aspects are important, particularly to residents who reside in the Forrest part of the Precinct.</p> <p>These key issues aside, we also strongly support NCA suggestions for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of a building to planting ratio (we believe that the minimum 0.4 ratio proposed in the paper is appropriate). • Provision of at least one large canopy tree per block. We would suggest that this be extended to a minimum of one large canopy tree for every 1000 m2 or part thereof. • Site coverage including driveways; with the number of driveways limited and where possible retained in their current positions to protect existing street trees. 	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount and use of land available for 'green infrastructure' to protect against climate change, including effects of storm water and to protect local fauna. We do not consider that the public spaces provide sufficient green infrastructure to ensure this outcome and that it is important (and will be increasingly so) to have adequate soft landscaping on blocks. We also do not consider artificial grass to be within the definition of 'soft landscaping'. <p>Trees are a major focus of the NCP and the FRG agrees with this being a high priority. The FRG notes that while street trees are an important feature of the NCA precinct landscape, responsibility for them rests with the ACT Government rather than the NCA or individual landholders. The FRG would like to see responsibility for trees within the precinct lying with the NCA to ensure that their maintenance is not neglected. The past history of Canberra Avenue is a reminder of what can occur when trees are not properly maintained and valued.</p> <p>We are aware that there is a common believe that more compact cities are more cost effect and energy efficient, however, we are also aware that the availability of land for domestic garden use can increase urban green biomass and reduce the effects of heat radiation from hard surfaces at a time when extremes of temperature are becoming more common. Use of composting, solar energy and water collection available to residents with land can significantly reduce many of the deleterious effects of urban living, while providing an environment for birds, small marsupials, amphibians, such as frogs and insects such as bees. Strategies to promote recycling, composting, rain water storage and use of solar energy can mitigate many of the effects of urban sprawl and arguably provide a more sustainable model for urban living than all but the best urban density models.</p> <p>Like the DRA, FRG are concerned that concepts such as 'architectural appropriateness' or status of 'soft landscaping and garden design' be better clarified and that processes for monitoring these aspects are clear and consistent. We support the view that an independent assessment should be used to judge the success of, or compliance with, these standards for any development. 'Independent' in this context being 'independent of the developer concerned'.</p>	

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>We also support the DRA suggestion that they and the FRG are advised of any proposals for redevelopment of blocks in the area so that relevant information may be passed on to members/residents.</p> <p>The Draft Paper states that many of the proposals outlined would be applicable to other parts of Canberra. Like the DRA, the FRG strongly agrees with this suggestion. The benefits of wider application of well-considered guidelines and standards include greater consistency in building and landscaping across the suburb and the city. This would not preclude suburbs having their own distinctive identity but would help to ensure that suburbs with clear identities retain those and newer suburbs have the opportunity to develop differently. This approach provides choice while both protecting heritage in key areas and promoting innovation and modernity. Clearer development guidelines can also benefit developers and householders.</p> <p>Clearly, we also regret that the office of the responsible ACT Minister, Mick Gentleman, has indicated the ACT Government will not be considering proposals put forward by the NCA in the Paper, on the grounds that the ACT Government has 'its own Plan'. We will continue to argue for a more consistent approach to inner Canberra, particularly for Forrest.</p>	
36	Name withheld	<p>The proposals in the review are environmentally unsound, socially unsound and fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>Many of the blocks are extremely large.</p> <p>They are the preserve of the very wealthy, creating a socially undesirable wealthy enclave.</p> <p>Huge blocks with very large gardens including large lawns, occupied by a single family, involve massive water consumption per head and are environmentally unsound.</p> <p>Contrary to the proposals, dual occupancies and subdivisions reducing the size of blocks, creating environmentally more sustainable blocks and providing opportunities for the elderly who have lived in the area for many years to downsize should be encouraged.</p>	Please refer to Sections 3.10 and 3.14 of the report.
37	Gai Brodtmann	<p>The purpose of this submission is to pass on the views conveyed to me by Canberrans of the inner north and south regarding the philosophy and principles outlined in the Issues Paper.</p> <p><i>Characteristics of the neighbourhood valued by the community</i></p>	Please refer to Sections 3.1, 3.10, and 3.18 of the report.

No.	Submitter name	Submission	NCA response
		<p>A number of people have approached me concerned with development they consider inconsistent with Walter Burley Griffin's; Garden City Plan, including developments in Forrest, Deakin, Griffith and Narrabundah.</p> <p><i>Response to the identified issues</i></p> <p>I welcome the discussion on the neighbourhood character, climate change adaptation, and design quality aspects outlined in Section 2 of the Issues Paper. I would like to see a more detailed explanation as to the rationale behind the position regarding density in Section 2.3.</p> <p>I also welcome many of the issues discussed in Section 3 of the Issues Paper on Site Planning and Design, particularly the use of soft landscaping to assist in defining the scale of the street and the neighbourhood character.</p> <p>I note the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct is the only suburban residential precinct in the ACT that is governed by the planning jurisdiction of the National Capital Authority. I have had many conversations with the community who believe the 'Garden City' principles should be extended past the Deakin/Forrest Residential Precinct and into the older suburbs of the inner north and inner south of Canberra.</p> <p>To achieve this, the NCA could consider a unified approach with the ACT Government to extend the 'Garden City' principles that apply to Deakin and Forrest to the surrounding older suburbs. I would appreciate any advice the NCA could provide regarding this proposal.</p>	