

Your local voice



www.westoncreek.org.au
info@westoncreek.org.au

PO Box 3701
Weston Creek ACT 2611

Telephone **(02) 6288 8975**

The Manager Planning,
Environment, Planning and
Sustainability Development Directorate,
16 Challis Street
DICKSON. ACT. 2602

31 May 2018

EPDCustomerservices@act.gov.au

Submission in relation to Development Application No 201833492

Block 17 Section 3 Phillip

The Weston Creek Community Council [WCCC] would like to offer the following comments in relation to this Development Application.

This proposal is to be built in the Woden Town Centre that we also call ours along with the Woden Valley Community Council. Our Council is concerned with the overdevelopment of the Town Centre and the apparent “no holds barred” with any development.

Council is very concerned that there is no consideration by the planners of congestion, public spaces and community facilities for the Woden Town Centre and the Woden Community. The comparison between the Precinct Plan for Woden when compared with Belconnen is chalk and cheese. In Belconnen there is a range of building heights and open spaces yet Woden continues to grow higher and higher with virtually no open space. I have personally called it for years “the future Hong Kong of Canberra”.

In relation to the development specifically, the height needs to be reduced from a maximum of 48 metres. This should be reduced to a maximum of 24 metres given the location. It significantly overshadows the Bellerive Retirement Village which is an unacceptable outcome.

The development also proposes some 425 one bedroom apartments in the complex. This is over 50% of the number of Apartments proposed of some 798 apartments in total. Our Council would certainly prefer to see more 2 and 3 bedroom apartments in the complex if the aim of the Government’s developments are to encourage apartment living as an alternative to stand alone housing. A ratio of this scope would do little to encourage families to live here and there are no 4 Bedroom apartments listed in the documents that I can locate.

The development falls short in providing sufficient car parking places as required under the current Regulations with the documents stating 918 will be provided while 984 are required.

Clearly 984 needs to be the minimum number of car parking places provided and Council would expect that there should be more given the commercial activities being proposed in the buildings.

The Traffic Report argues that Residential parking is allocated on **expected market demand**, not on the car parking requirements in the Code [though the Report does say that there is no minimum residential parking requirement for developments in the CZ2 Zone in a Town Centre] – how flawed is this requirement.

This is an issue for Government and planners to correct as there must be a requirement for car parking. One would have to question why it is not the same as the requirement for car parking outside of Town Centres.

As such, only one car park space per apartment is included in this proposal. The Report also states that visitor parking is included in this parking number and no additional places are required or provided. Wouldn't it be good if every development adopted this position and said we don't need to provide any additional parking for visitors – basically someone else will or there will be public parking nearby. Yet the Public Parking nearby this proposed development is not open on weekends when one would think this would be the time when most visitors would come.

Indeed, the Report estimates that there will only be demand for 843 places and that therefore the 912 places provided will exceed the demand for both the commercial residential requirements. The Report goes on to state that this qualifies the site for dispensation even though it already meets the calculated demand. Council cannot agree with this assertion and “best guess” at demand. Surely the Code requirements are a better indicator of what the demand would be.

The application also asks for a lease variation to remove the maximum gross floor area restriction yet nowhere in the application can Council find any reference to what this actually means. Perhaps if the applicant had presented at a Woden Valley Community Council Public Meeting this question could have been answered. In the absence of any information in relation to this Council cannot accept any request to remove this restriction.

In summary, Council objects to the Application on the following matters. Height, overshadowing of neighbouring buildings, a lack of detail on why the lease variation should be agreed to, the lack of sufficient parking provided in the development with no provision for visitor parking and a question over the split of apartments actually meeting the Government's policy of family living.

Tom Anderson
Chair
Weston Creek Community Council