

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 6 April 2026 3:10 PM  
**To:** Terrplan  
**Subject:** Lyneham Section 21 Block 41 part Block 23

**Categories:** OPP, SUBMISSION

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

**Caution:** This email originated from outside of the ACT Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Draft Major Plan Amendment to the Territory Plan 12  
Brindabella Christian College car park  
Lyneham Section 21 Block 41 part Block 23

I wish to register my opposition to this draft proposal.

This matter has been undecided for a very long time, more than 10 years. It started when the previous College ownership took community land and appropriated it for their own use, as a car park. Land management agencies should have acted immediately.

Car use is changing rapidly and the need for this area to be used for car-parking is not well demonstrated and only serves to install on of the lowest forms of land use. Environmental pressures due to climate change will force alternative transport arrangements. Permanent alienation for a carpark will open the way for a building development into the future. The area occupied by the college is clearly inadequate for any plans for expansion. Are we to be subjected to progressive applications for buildings etc over the next 6 few years? This permanent carpark proposal should be stopped in its tracks, and proper planning in this location commenced, hopefully with higher standards.

The area of the community oval taken for the carpark could be viewed as 'stolen' land, with a *post hoc* ratification by Government agencies, through this Draft Amendment mechanism. It sets a precedent that should not be facilitated or tolerated by Government.

This whole saga has been mismanaged by Government and the College, and the community should not be made to be the 'loser'.

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Terrplan](#)  
**Subject:** Draft Plan Amendment 12 – Brindabella Christian College car park – Lyneham Section 41 part Block 23 (DPA-12)  
**Date:** Monday, 6 April 2026 3:29:25 PM

---

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

**Caution:** This email originated from outside of the ACT Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sir/Madam

Dear Territory Plan and Coordination Team

I strongly urge you to reject the proposed amendment (DPA-12) to the Territory Plan.

I appreciate that my submission will fall upon deaf ears as I anticipate that those reading this will not have the spine to do the right thing, yes I am questioning how you sleep at night, but am hoping that you may prove me wrong and not let the BCC get away with theft. Allowing this to happen gives the green light to anyone wanting to steal some land and encourages the BCC to go and steal some more.

The land in question was sub-leased to Brindabella Christian College (BCC) in 2009 after the ACT

Government gave approval for BCC to build over the carpark within its own block. That should never

have been allowed to happen. Since then the conditions of the sub-lease have never been met, and yet

the ACT Government has taken no action.

Prior to the Lyneham Community Association's action in ACAT in 2023 against the ACT Government's

failure to take action against the numerous safety and planning issues with this carpark, all parties

(including BCC) agreed that the car park built by BCC in 2016 was constructed illegally as it had no

development approval, breached the conditions of the sub-lease over the site, and contravened the

Territory Plan zoning.

The amendment DPA-12 only seeks to address the zoning issue in the most minimal way possible. No

information has been provided to give the community confidence that any of the other issues will be

resolved.

The arguments for allowing a carpark on this block in the report supporting DPA-12 are totally

inadequate. The only real justification put forward is that the carpark has been there, first informally and

then illegally sealed, since 2006. The argument offered is "It's being used by the school and therefore it

may as well be made legal".

However, section 215 of the Planning Act 2023 in relation to development applications for development

undertaken without approval points out in subsection (3) that 'the Territory Planning Authority must treat

the application for development approval as if the development was not undertaken.' In

other words, it must assess the development solely on its own merits relative to the state of the land that existed before the unapproved development occurred. In this case, relative to its former use as public open space.

While this provision relates to development approvals, as this Major Plan Amendment (MPA) proposal is clearly the preliminary stage to a proposed DA for this carpark the MPA should be treated in the same way.

Thus the MPA must first establish the need for a carpark on this block relative to its underlying zoning of public open space. In this regard the ACAT process clearly found that the carpark was built by the BCC for its own use because it had built over the carpark on its own land - it was never intended or needed for ancillary parking for the adjacent neighbourhood oval.

The MPA needs to justify with evidence its untested claim that removing the car park would displace these vehicles onto surrounding streets, increasing congestion and risk to children being dropped off at school without a dedicated facility. In this analysis it must also examine alternative options for transport of children to and from school and for staff parking.

Kind regards,

██████████

# Representation for EIS or Territory Plan Amendment Notification - Submission confirmation

Your submission has been successful. Please keep a copy of this receipt for your records.

Date and time

09 Apr 2026 9:59:58 AM

Reference code

M6M6R7Y6

Access Canberra

GPO Box 158  
Canberra City, ACT 2601

Phone: (02) 6207 1923  
acepdcustomerservices@act.gov.au

## Type of representation

### About this form

Use this form to lodge a representation for a current amendment to the Territory Plan or a current Environment Impact Statement during the notification period.

### Application type

Please select the application type:\*

Territory Plan Amendment Notification

## Representor details

Title

Given name\*

Family name\*

Organisation name

Enter at least one phone number: \*

Home phone

Work phone

Mobile

Email address\*

## Application details

Amendment number\*

Provide the details of your representation\*

Dear Territory Plan and Coordination Team,

I write to you as a Lyneham resident and daily user of the Lyneham oval to assert my view that it is your duty to reject the proposed amendment (DPA-12) to the Territory Plan.

Firstly, I should remind you of the facts:

- Brindabella Christian College (BCC) subleased the relevant land in 2009 after the ACT Government gave approval for BCC to build over the carpark within its own block.
- BCC has since then persistently and unashamedly failed to meet the conditions of the sub-lease.
- BCC constructed and sealed the carpark without development approval.
- The ACT Government has failed in its responsibility to enforce the law as it applies to BCC and this site.
- ACAT found against the ACT Government in this regard in 2023.

I should now like to highlight my personal experience of using the oval. I was raised on Longstaff Street in Lyneham and attended Lyneham Primary School. The oval was my daily playground. In 2024, I moved out of Longstaff Street and purchased a house on Lewin Street. I walk my dog on Lyneham oval every day. I think it is fair to say that I understand the value of this particular public space.

Since the construction of the carpark and its driveway, the oval has become more dangerous for people and pets. This is especially the case as the driveway crosses the established footpath and is adjacent to the logical entry point to the oval from the northern end of Brigalow Street. This means that as a pedestrian and recreational user of the oval I am regularly inconvenienced, and at enhanced risk of collision with a vehicle. I note that this reflection is supported by the ACAT finding.

The case put forward by BCC in support of proposed amendment DPA-12 is wholly inadequate. Furthermore, I believe that the framing used in the supporting report is utterly disingenuous. For example, section 1.3 states:

- The car park in the north of the site has been in use for over a decade and has been providing car parking for the area and the adjoining Brindabella Christian College to the north of the site. It was formalised and sealed in 2016 without a Development Application (DA). The car park has been in use to alleviate parking and traffic issues to the local area.

If this is the context they wish to rely on, it is miserably weak:

- Firstly, the carpark was never formalised. Rather, BCC's sublease permitted sports usage, with an ancillary carpark. I note that there was considerable community opposition to this move at the time-opposition that was clearly justified.
- Secondly, the carpark itself contributes to traffic and congestion issues. A carpark naturally attracts vehicles and, as the driveway to the BCC carpark has a narrow entrance that intersects with the footpath, it forms a considerable choke point on a busy artery.

These are only two of the myriad lies upon which the supporting case is based, and the supporting arguments relating to the ACT Planning Context in section 3.0 are so evidently absurd that they should be disregarded.

Lastly, I should like to point out what should be obvious: failure to enforce the law as it applies to public space in the ACT sends a clear message. That is, that businesses and institutions can do what they like with not just impunity, but also the tacit support of the ACT Government and its institutions.

In simple terms, this is theft from the community that has gone unpunished. Failure of the Territory Plan and

Coordination team to undertake its duty will erode trust in the territory's public institutions.

I implore you to reject the proposed amendment DPA-12.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

You may upload any additional supporting documentation or photos.

- Maximum file size is 10Mb.
- A maximum of 5 files can be uploaded.

---

### Disclaimer

Your personal information will be managed in accordance with the *Information Privacy Act 2014* and the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate (EPSDD) **Information Privacy Policy**, which is available for viewing on EPSDD's website.

Copies of written comments will be made available on the authority website unless the submission is withdrawn. Copies of written comments will also be given to the proponent of the development proposal.

If you would not like your comments or a part of your comments to be made available on the website or to the applicant, a request must be made under Sections 502 or 503 of the *Planning Act 2023* (or Sections 411 or 412 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007*). A request for exclusion under these sections must be in writing, clearly identifying what parts of your submission you are seeking to exclude and how the request satisfies the exclusion criteria.

Printed copies of the draft amendment (this document) and background documents are available for inspection and purchase at the EPSDD Customer Service Centre, 8 Darling Street, Mitchell, Monday to Friday (except public holidays) between 8:30am and 4:30pm. Please call **(02) 6207 1923** to arrange a copy for purchase.

[Click here for more information on applying for exemption from the public register.](#)

Territory Planning Authority

Attention: Territory Plan and Coordination Section, CED (480 NBA)

Mitchell ACT 2911

**Draft Plan Amendment 12 – Brindabella Christian College car park –  
Lyneham Section 41 part Block 23 (DPA-12)**

We believe that the proposed amendment (DPA-12) to the Territory Plan should be rejected for the following reasons.

- The car park built by BCC in 2016 was constructed illegally as it had no development approval, breaches the conditions of the sub-lease over the site, and contravenes the Territory Plan zoning. No Government has taken action to address these breaches.
- The Lyneham Community Association in a submission to ACAT in 2023 pointed to the Government's failure to address the numerous safety and planning issues arising from the carpark, which was constructed illegally. ACAT determined that the car park is an unapproved structure, was not designed in accordance with relevant standards had a range of pedestrian safety issues and caused local traffic congestion.
- Section 215 of the Planning Act 2023 in relation to development applications for development undertaken without approval points out in subsection (3) that 'the Territory Planning Authority must treat the application for development approval as if the development was not undertaken.
- Amendment DPA-12 only seeks to address the zoning issue in a minimal way. No information has been provided to give the community confidence that any of the other issues will be resolved.
- The arguments for allowing a carpark on this block are unconvincing. The only obvious justification advanced is that it has been there, first informally and then illegally sealed, since 2006, and is "It's being used by the school and therefore it may as well be made legal".
- Construction of a car park without development approval is an illegal act and should be treated as such. If the amendment is adopted, it will reward illegal behaviour.

- If the amendment is adopted, it will set a dangerous precedent for public land in the ACT. If any user of public land informally or via a sub-lease, can then do as they wish, public confidence in the planning and approvals process will be seriously damaged.

In conclusion

- If this illegal structure is legitimised how will the community be compensated?
- What penalty, financial or otherwise, will the offender pay?
- At the very least, an annual lease fee to be utilised for local community works would be one worthy option.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

5 April 2026

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Terrplan](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Submission Draft Plan Amendment 12 – Brindabella Christian College car park – Lyneham Section 41 part Block 23 (DPA-12)  
**Date:** Thursday, 16 April 2026 5:46:48 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

**Caution:** This email originated from outside of the ACT Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

## Submission – Opposition to DPA-12 (Lyneham Section 41 Block 23)

### Re: Draft Plan Amendment 12 – Brindabella Christian College car park (DPA-12)

I write to oppose Draft Plan Amendment 12 (DPA-12), which proposes to amend the Territory Plan to permit a car park on public land in Lyneham.

#### 1. Key reasons to preserve this urban green space

At the outset, there are several compelling and well-established reasons to retain this land as urban open space:

##### a) Increasing scarcity of inner-urban green space

Inner north Canberra has undergone significant densification in recent years. As redevelopment accelerates, undeveloped green space is becoming rarer, not more abundant. Once converted to hardstand (e.g. car parking), such land is effectively lost permanently.

##### b) Urban heat and climate resilience

Vegetated open space plays a critical role in mitigating the urban heat island effect. Replacing permeable, vegetated land with asphalt contributes to higher local temperatures, reduced thermal comfort, and increased energy demand. This runs counter to climate adaptation priorities.

##### c) Environmental and ecological value

Even modest urban green spaces contribute to biodiversity, stormwater infiltration, and habitat connectivity. Their cumulative value across a suburb is significant, particularly in established areas like Lyneham.

##### d) Public health and wellbeing

Access to nearby green space is strongly linked to physical and mental health outcomes. Open space supports walking, recreation, and passive use, which are essential in higher-density urban environments.

##### e) Irreversibility of change

Approving a car park is not a temporary or easily reversible use. It represents a permanent shift away from public open space toward vehicle-dominated infrastructure.

#### 2. Inconsistency with ACT planning policy and principles

While DPA-12 proposes no zoning change, it effectively undermines the intent of existing policy settings.

#### **a) Undermining the purpose of open space zoning**

The land is subject to planning controls that prioritise environmental protection and public use. Allowing a private car park use weakens the integrity of these controls and sets a concerning precedent.

#### **b) Conflict with compact, sustainable city objectives**

ACT Government policy consistently promotes:

- reduced car dependence
- increased public and active transport use
- compact urban form

Facilitating additional car parking—particularly in a well-serviced inner area—runs counter to these objectives.

#### **c) Precedent risk**

Approving this amendment signals that protected or semi-protected urban green spaces can be incrementally repurposed for private infrastructure. This risks cumulative erosion of the open space network across Canberra.

### **3. Poor planning outcome and lack of necessity**

#### **a) Car parking is a low-value land use in a high-value location**

Inner north land is scarce and strategically important. Allocating it to surface car parking represents an inefficient and outdated planning outcome.

#### **b) Availability of alternatives**

Parking demand associated with a private institution should be addressed within:

- the existing site footprint
- structured parking solutions
- transport demand management (e.g. staggered times, active transport incentives)

It should not be met by appropriating public green space.

### **4. Transport and behavioural impacts**

Expanding parking supply tends to **induce demand**—encouraging greater car use rather than reducing it. This leads to:

- increased congestion in surrounding streets
- reduced safety for pedestrians and cyclists
- undermining of active travel uptake in a highly connected inner suburb

This is inconsistent with contemporary transport planning principles.

### **5. Community equity and access**

Public open space is a shared community asset. Its conversion to effectively serve a single user group (private school parking) raises equity concerns. The broader community loses access and amenity, while the benefits accrue narrowly.

### **6. Conclusion**

DPA-12 represents a short-term, site-specific solution that creates long-term, irreversible impacts. It:

- diminishes scarce urban green space
- conflicts with ACT climate and planning policy

- prioritises private vehicle use over sustainable transport
- sets an undesirable precedent for future encroachment on public land

For these reasons, I urge the Territory Planning Authority to reject DPA-12.

Regards

Local resident

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Submission to the Australian Capital Territory Planning Authority  
**Draft Plan Amendment 12: Brindabella Christian College car park –  
Lyneham Section 41 part Block 23 (DPA-12)**

From [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

---

**Recommendation:** That the ACT Planning Authority reject the proposed amendment (DPA-12) to the Territory Plan concerned with the Brindabella Christian College Carpark.

**Supporting arguments**

- The carpark is illegal
  - It was built without development approval, which is a criminal offence
  - It breaches the conditions of the sub-lease that Brindabella Christian College has over the land.
  - It contravenes the zoning of the area under the Territory Plan.
- The carpark encroaches on public open space (Hewitt Oval), depriving community members of access to the open space to which they are entitled. The area taken by the carpark is a substantial section of the wider area of Hewitt Oval (see below screenshot of satellite map) and may restrict future development of the oval for formal sporting activities. This could be of serious detriment to the population of the inner north, especially as it increases with higher density housing.
- To not reject the proposed amendment would reward activities of Brindabella Christian College that are illegal and contrary to agreed conditions. This is a serious matter for the ACT Government, which should be enforcing the law and not giving favours to powerful private interests that flout the law. To do so sets a dangerous precedent and has the appearance of corruption – or at least weak and incompetent government.

**Pertinent background to the issue**

I understand that the current issue arises out of building work, funded by the Commonwealth under the Building the Education Revolution, which took over land within the BCC lease previously used as a carpark. There were clear failures by both the Commonwealth and the ACT governments concerning the authorisation of this building work, and reportedly compliance failures by BCC. These failures should not be used as an excuse to permit continuing illegality and deprivation of

the community of its rightful facility. However, both levels of government should consider the implications of this case and put in place appropriate legal and regulatory measures to ensure that such serious problems do not occur elsewhere.

I appreciate that the resumption of the carpark into Hewitt Oval would create difficulties for the BCC administration and community. However, it is up to them, working with the ACT and Commonwealth governments, how they resolve those difficulties. This might include reduced enrolments and a reconfiguration and demolition of some buildings.

***Personal background and motivation***

Lyneham is my suburban centre for social gathering, shopping and services. My son attended Lyneham high school and four grandchildren are attending, have attended or plan to attend Lyneham primary and high schools.

While I have a personal connection with the issue, my primary concern is with the implications for the rule of law, the fairness of government decision-making, and the standing of the ACT government.



Satellite map showing Brindabella Christian College and the illegal carpark (centre top), Hewitt Oval and other public open spaces, and Lyneham primary and high schools.

# Representation for EIS or Territory Plan Amendment Notification - Submission confirmation

Your submission has been successful. Please keep a copy of this receipt for your records.

Date and time

17 Apr 2026 4:23:13 PM

Reference code

45GTH3BK

Access Canberra

GPO Box 158  
Canberra City, ACT 2601

Phone: (02) 6207 1923  
acepdcustomerservices@act.gov.au

## Type of representation

### About this form

Use this form to lodge a representation for a current amendment to the Territory Plan or a current Environment Impact Statement during the notification period.

### Application type

Please select the application type:\*

Territory Plan Amendment Notification

## Representor details

Title

Given name\*

Family name\*

Organisation name

Enter at least one phone number: \*

Home phone

Work phone

Mobile

Email address\*

## Application details

Amendment number\*

Provide the details of your representation\*

I have provided a submission via the Lyneham Community Association however wanted to add some additional comments. I am appalled that a group of people, the Brindabella Christian College (BCC), can unlawfully take over public land, and just get away with it with no consequence. I have been a resident of the area for over 30 years and have enjoyed the public space as a place to take my children to play, to go and exercise, to walk the dog, and lots of other things. To have this public space steadily eroded by an organisation who think they can just take it and the government will simply turn a blind eye, then ratify the theft, is unbelievable. Do not let this happen. The land needs to be returned to the people.

You may upload any additional supporting documentation or photos.

- Maximum file size is 10Mb.
- A maximum of 5 files can be uploaded.

---

### Disclaimer

Your personal information will be managed in accordance with the *Information Privacy Act 2014* and the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate (EPSDD) **[Information Privacy Policy](#)**, which is available for viewing on EPSDD's website.

Copies of written comments will be made available on the authority website unless the submission is withdrawn. Copies of written comments will also be given to the proponent of the development proposal.

If you would not like your comments or a part of your comments to be made available on the website or to the applicant, a request must be made under Sections 502 or 503 of the *Planning Act 2023* (or Sections 411 or 412 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007*). A request for exclusion under these sections must be in writing, clearly identifying what parts of your submission you are seeking to exclude and how the request satisfies the exclusion criteria.

Printed copies of the draft amendment (this document) and background documents are available for inspection and purchase at the EPSDD Customer Service Centre, 8 Darling Street, Mitchell, Monday to Friday (except public holidays) between 8:30am and 4:30pm. Please call **[\(02\) 6207 1923](tel:0262071923)** to arrange a copy for purchase.

[Click here for more information on applying for exemption from the public register.](#)

## Submission on Draft Planning Amendment 12

I oppose the approval of the proponent Christian Community Ministries (CCM) initiated Draft Planning Amendment 12 (DPA) that would have the effect of endorsing and formalising the appropriation of community owned green space on part of Block 23, Section 41, Lyneham, by the current owners CCM, of the Brindabella Christian College (BCC).

The DPA seeks to formalise a surface carpark on community owned green space, which is currently not permitted by the PRZ1 zoning for urban open space, and is not owned by the proponent.

This green space was appropriated from the community for private and exclusive use by the BCC in 2006 and has been the subject of ongoing dispute since that date, including an ACAT finding in 2023 that the space must be remediated. This dispute must be resolved definitively by:

- Rejecting this DPA
- The proponent restoring the area in dispute to urban open space as it existed prior to 2006
- The restored urban open space returned to the community

This submission opposing the approval of the DPA rests on three grounds:

- Inconsistency with the Inner North and City District Strategy plan. Nothing in that plan refers to the creation of new parks, and the dilution of urban open space.
- Inconsistency with the relevant themes in the ACT Planning Strategy of a compact and efficient city, supporting liveability and accessibility goals.
- Non-alignment with the relevant priorities in the ACT Minister for Planning's Statement of Planning Priorities 2025-2028 being the enhancement of community infrastructure to meet growing population demand, by providing publicly accessible and available car parking for members of the community when utilising the adjoining oval and urban open space

In addition to failing these planning objectives, the DPA must also be rejected for two non-planning but legal reasons

- Approval of the DPA would conflict with an existing ACAT in 2023 finding that the action was wrong, and must be reversed.
- Approval of the DPA would encourage further illegal land grabs by other bad faith actors

The BCC may claim that they must have this carpark to prevent the cars occupying it illegally, from being parked in other parking spaces around the school including residential streets. This is a disingenuous argument – the school is well served by public transport and with two local service bus stops immediately in front of the BCC campus on Brigalow Street, a few minutes walk from bus stops operating rapid bus services on Mouatt Street, and a five minute walk from a light rail station on Northbourne Avenue.

Not once in the supporting report supplied by BCC and prepared by Richard Nash, Principal Planner of SPACELAB, is public transport or active transport to the BCC campus referenced. Not in writing, or on a map or diagram. This egregious oversight cannot be accidental, but deliberate so as to portray the private vehicle as the sole access for BCC staff.

The Inner North and City District Strategy refers to transport on p.11 *“The Inner North and City District is well serviced for active travel compared to other districts. Projects currently underway will further enhance this with new active travel network connections through Watson and Ainslie into the City Centre.”* Going on to add *“Suburbs in the north of the district are serviced by rapid transit linking Belconnen and Watson through Dickson. The Dickson interchange is an important hub for local bus corridors.”*. Nowhere in this strategy is a call for extra carparks.

That the BCC campus on Brigalow Street may have insufficient car parking for its existing staff, is unfortunate, but entirely self inflicted. From 2006 to 2016 the campus surrendered its own recreation and car parking space for school buildings. The BCC now expect the Canberra community to surrender its community owned green space, permanently. The new owner of the BCC campus was aware of this ongoing legal dispute upon acquisition of the assets of BCEL in 2025. It is not an impost that a private business should impose on the community.

An alternative to formalising the appropriation of community owned green space, would be for the BCC to encourage staff to carpool, use active or public transport or to undertake construction of a car park within its existing Brigalow Street campus boundary, consisting of either a surface car park or a multi level car park provided at their own cost (and not a cost borne by the community, as the appropriation of the urban open space occupied by the non-compliant car park would be).

The Inner North and City District Strategy goes on to say on P.26 that *“As key sites and precincts in Inner North and City District develop, careful consideration will be given to protect and enhance the network of green spaces and waterways (the blue-green network) that protects our environmental and cultural values and enhances their sustainability and resilience to climate change.”* and refers to a map on p.25 showing the block subject to this DPA as being included in this ‘Blue-green network’. This section of the strategy does not refer to surrendering this space for surface car parking, and indeed that purpose appears to go against this strategy.

The proponent claims that the DPA supports the relevant themes in the ACT Planning Strategy of a compact and efficient city, supporting liveability and accessibility goals. Unfortunately nothing in this strategy indicates that urban open space can be appropriated and converted to surface car parking. Nothing in this strategy supports poor decisions by owners of a business (by converting their own car park to buildings) having that perceived requirement met by the community surrendering urban open space. Indeed that strategy encourages planning that supports active and public transport use, and the retention of urban open space and green space.

The DPA also claims the retention of the carpark conforms with the ACT Minister for Planning’s ‘Statement of Planning Priorities 2025-2028’ yet a reading of those priorities shows nothing in the DPA that would meet any of the priorities. Indeed Priority 8 reads:

*‘Priority 8: Protect the environment and enhance the city’s landscape. As Canberra continues to grow, it is important that environmental values are protected and enhanced to achieve the vision of Canberra of a ‘city in a landscape’. The ACT’s District Strategies have identified the importance of environmental and biodiversity connections and the blue green corridors, across our city, with further opportunities to embed living infrastructure into planning policy. To support this the Government will take a landscape approach, including strategic spatial planning to proactively protect and restore key areas of environmental value for the future, both within the urban footprint and on the urban interface.’*

Crucial to this DPA is the proponents intention to not '*proactively protect and restore key areas of environmental value for the future*', but to undertake the complete opposite of this by failing to restore green space.

A key element to the Tribunal decision in 2023 to close the car park and order the sites remediation, is the zoning of the land 'PRZ1 – Urban Open Space' that prohibits a car park as a standalone use in the Territory Plan 2023. As this submission demonstrates, the DPA does not conform with territory planning regulations, it does not satisfy any of the aims or priorities of the 'Inner North and City District Strategy' plan, the 'ACT Planning Strategy' or the ACT Minister for Planning's 'Statement of Planning Priorities 2025-2028'.

With ample alternate options available to the proponent including utilising active and public transport or constructing car parking within their own site boundaries, this DPA must be rejected and the proponent directed to remediate the urban open space and return it to the community.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Terrplan](#)  
**Subject:** DPA-12 Submission  
**Date:** Friday, 17 April 2026 8:15:02 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [why this is important](#)

**Caution:** This email originated from outside of the ACT Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Territory Planning Authority,

I object to DPA-12.

I ask the Authority to reject it.

I am [REDACTED]

I live at [REDACTED]

### **1. DPA-12 would weaken PRZ1 protections**

- The land is PRZ1 Urban Open Space.
- DPA-12 would create a site-specific permission for a car park on that land.
- The Territory Plan says: **“Uses not listed in the table are prohibited.”**  
(Territory Plan, Parks and Recreation Zones Policy)
- A car park is not a normal PRZ1 use.
- This amendment is a special carve-out for a use that does not belong in PRZ1.

### **2. This is not merely incidental parking**

- The Territory Plan already allows genuinely incidental parking associated with parkland and playing fields.
- The Territory Plan Dictionary treats public car parking as a minor use only where it is incidental to the main use of the land.  
(Territory Plan Dictionary)
- DPA-12 is only needed because this car park is not incidental in that sense.
- The proponent’s own material treats it as a separate or **“standalone car park.”**  
(DPA-12 supporting report)
- That is inconsistent with the purpose of PRZ1 Urban Open Space.

### **3. School traffic concerns do not justify changing the Plan**

I accept that school traffic and parking can be difficult.

- But that does not justify rewriting the Territory Plan for public open space.
- A private school's parking needs should be met lawfully and on appropriate land.
- Public open space should not be permanently reduced to solve a private operational problem.

#### **4. Approval would set a bad precedent**

- This is one of my strongest concerns.
- Approval would reward a prohibited use first, and a change to the rules afterwards.
- That would send the wrong message.
- It would tell future proponents that if they take public land first, they may later obtain a retrospective planning change.
- Once this amendment is approved, how could government fairly refuse the next retrospective approval of this kind?
- Future applicants would point to DPA-12 as precedent.
- That would open the door to further land grabs of public open space.

#### **5. Public land should stay public land**

- Lyneham Oval is community land.
- PRZ1 exists to protect urban open space for recreation, access, landscape and community use.
- That protection should mean something.
- Community land should not be carved up, bit by bit, for private parking.

#### **6. The right outcome**

- Reject DPA-12.
- Do not create a site-specific exception for a prohibited use on PRZ1 land.
- Require any parking solution to be found lawfully and on appropriate land.
- Protect Lyneham Oval from further encroachment.

Yours sincerely,





# Representation for EIS or Territory Plan Amendment Notification - Submission confirmation

Your submission has been successful. Please keep a copy of this receipt for your records.

Date and time

17 Apr 2026 11:24:17 PM

Reference code

KWCQBYNZ

Access Canberra

GPO Box 158  
Canberra City, ACT 2601

Phone: (02) 6207 1923  
acepdcustomerservices@act.gov.au

## Type of representation

### About this form

Use this form to lodge a representation for a current amendment to the Territory Plan or a current Environment Impact Statement during the notification period.

### Application type

Please select the application type:\*

Territory Plan Amendment Notification

## Representor details

Title

Given name\*

Family name\*

Organisation name

Enter at least one phone number: \*

Home phone

Work phone

Mobile

Email address\*

## Application details

Amendment number\*

Provide the details of your representation\*

I simply do not understand how the ACT government might not only ignore unethical and illegal behaviour by BCC, but effectively reward it by retrospectively approving their actions. Approval of this amendment would represent a dreadful precedent for other private schools or private bodies to take over public land from people of the ACT with impunity. The amendment and the car park should not be approved. If the government is in a position where it is effectively too late to “unapprove” the existing car park, any approval should come with conditions whereby Brindabella School incurs cost or penalty such as for continued upkeep of the remaining school oval area designated for use by both schools and by the public. The government needs to clearly explain its decisions and the need to prevent such unfortunate actions happening in the future whether by BCC or other such organisations.

You may upload any additional supporting documentation or photos.

- Maximum file size is 10Mb.
  - A maximum of 5 files can be uploaded.
-

## Disclaimer

Your personal information will be managed in accordance with the *Information Privacy Act 2014* and the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate (EPSDD) [Information Privacy Policy](#), which is available for viewing on EPSDD's website.

Copies of written comments will be made available on the authority website unless the submission is withdrawn. Copies of written comments will also be given to the proponent of the development proposal.

If you would not like your comments or a part of your comments to be made available on the website or to the applicant, a request must be made under Sections 502 or 503 of the *Planning Act 2023* (or Sections 411 or 412 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007*). A request for exclusion under these sections must be in writing, clearly identifying what parts of your submission you are seeking to exclude and how the request satisfies the exclusion criteria.

Printed copies of the draft amendment (this document) and background documents are available for inspection and purchase at the EPSDD Customer Service Centre, 8 Darling Street, Mitchell, Monday to Friday (except public holidays) between 8:30am and 4:30pm. Please call [\*\*\(02\) 6207 1923\*\*](tel:0262071923) to arrange a copy for purchase.

[Click here for more information on applying for exemption from the public register.](#)