
From: David Tottle [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 30 April 2026 11:28 AM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: LPS submission [REDACTED], Tinderbox
Attachments: Tottle submission.pdf

Hi TPC,

Please find attached our personal submission in regards to [REDACTED]

Tinderbox.

Regards

David Tottle and Kym Weatherley

--

Mobile: [REDACTED]
Mail: [REDACTED] - Blackmans Bay - TASMANIA 7052

David Tottle and Kym Weatherley
[REDACTED] EAST
Tinderbox TAS 7054

30 April 2026

Tasmanian Planning Commission
kingboroughlps@planning.tas.gov.au

To the Tasmanian Planning Commission,

I write in response to the letter dated 2 April 2026 (ref: DOC/26/36829) advising that the Ireneinc report recommends my property remains within the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) under the draft Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule (LPS).

I did not make a formal representation during the public exhibition period, however I understand that the Commission has received correspondence from me or on my behalf in relation to the draft LPS. I understand that this letter provides me the opportunity to formally participate in this stage of the LPS process by making a written submission. I understand that making a submission does not confer a right to be heard, but that the Commission may decide to invite me to discuss the matters raised.

I take up that opportunity and submit as follows.

PART B — PROPERTY DETAILS

Landowner name(s)	David Tottle and Kym Weatherley
Property address	[REDACTED], Tinderbox TAS 7054
Title reference (folio)	[REDACTED]
Lot size (approx.)	2.25ha
Locality	Tinderbox Road EAST
Current IPS zone	Environmental Living Zone (ELZ)
Draft LPS exhibited zone	Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ)
Ireneinc recommended zone	Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) — unchanged
Zone sought in this submission	Rural Living Zone (RLZ) — specify subcategory below

PART C — STATEMENT OF POSITION

I submit that the application of the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) to my property is not consistent with the requirements of section 34 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (LUPAA), the Section 8A Guideline No. 1 — Local Provisions Schedule: Zone and Code Application (the Zone Guidelines), or the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy (STRLUS).

I request that the Commission determine that the Rural Living Zone (RLZ) is the appropriate zone for my property under the draft Kingborough LPS.

The specific subcategory I seek is:

- Rural Living Zone B (minimum lot size 2 ha) — reflecting the existing lot pattern in my locality

The predominant lot size in [REDACTED] is approximately 2.25ha, consistent with RLZ and in our case as RLZ(B).

PART D — GROUNDS FOR THIS SUBMISSION

D1 — The LCZ does not comply with the Zone Guidelines (Guideline No. 1 / s.34 LUPAA)

The Commission is required by section 35L(2) of LUPAA to assess whether the LPS meets the LPS criteria, which includes compliance with the Zone Guidelines. The Commission confirmed at the Day 20 hearing that it will decide on the basis of the LPS criteria set out in section 34 of LUPAA and explicitly noted that Council's position — including its 16 March 2026 resolution favouring the 'least restrictive alternative' — is not binding on the Commission [Transcript, Day 20, 06:45:48]. I submit that the application of LCZ to my property does not comply with the Zone Guidelines as demonstrated below.

D1.1 — The Zone Guidelines prohibit LCZ where priority is residential (LCZ 4(a))

Zone Guideline LCZ 4(a) provides that the LCZ should NOT be applied to land where the priority is for residential use and development, instead indicating that the RLZ should be referred to. The Zone Guidelines further note explicitly that 'the LCZ is not a large lot residential zone, in areas characterised by native vegetation cover and other landscape values.'

My property has been used for residential purposes throughout the period it has been zoned Environmental Living Zone (ELZ) under the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015. During my tenure, the primary use and strategic intention of the land is and has always been residential.

The property contains a dwelling constructed in approximately 1973, has been continuously occupied as a residence, and is serviced by TasNetworks and Telstra. There is no evidence to suggest the primary use is other than residential.

D1.2 — The LCZ is not a replacement zone for the ELZ (Zone Guidelines note)

The Zone Guidelines state expressly: 'The LCZ is not a replacement zone for the ELZ in interim planning schemes. There are key policy differences between the two zones.' The TPC itself noted this in its post-lodgement correspondence with Council, observing that the LCZ 'appears to have been used quite extensively to replace the ELZ' and that 'application of the LCZ could signify a shift in council policy or strategy, which generally ought to be comprehensively justified.'

No such comprehensive, site-specific justification has been provided for my property. The Ireneinc report applies the LCZ to my property on the basis of generalised locality-level landscape values, not on the basis of demonstrated landscape values specific to my title.

The Ireneinc Locality Report for [REDACTED] it does not identify any specific landscape values on my title. The landscape value assessment is made at locality level without reference to the characteristics of my individual property.'

D1.3 — The RLZ is the appropriate zone under the Zone Guidelines (RLZ 1 and RLZ 2(b))

Zone Guideline RLZ 1(a) provides that the RLZ should be applied to residential areas with larger lots where the existing and intended use is a mix between residential and lower order rural activities, with priority given to the protection of residential amenity. This description accurately characterises my property.

Zone Guideline RLZ 2(b) further provides that the RLZ may be applied to land within the ELZ in an interim planning scheme where the primary strategic intention is for residential use and development within a rural setting and a similar minimum allowable lot size is being applied. My property satisfies both elements of this criterion.

My property has an area of 2.25 ha. This is consistent with the RLZ [B] minimum lot size of [2] ha and does not provide for further subdivision under that subcategory.'

D2 — The Ireneinc evaluation framework, applied correctly to my property, supports RLZ

The Ireneinc report applies an evaluation pathway (decision tree) to determine the appropriate zone. The Commission was told at Day 20 of the hearing that this framework is not a statutory instrument — it is a tool, not a rule [Kate Heckelmann, Transcript Day 20, 05:53:00]. Representations can depart from it with good evidence. However, I submit that even applying the framework as intended, my property satisfies the criteria for RLZ rather than LCZ.

D2.1 — My property has a strategic residential intention

The first decision point in the Ireneinc evaluation pathway asks whether there is a strategic intention for residential use. The report identifies visual evidence of existing residential use and known strategic intention as the relevant indicators. My property clearly satisfies this criterion.

My property contains an established dwelling, associated outbuildings including a large garage/shed, and large garden cleared areas with fruit trees and a formal fully fenced formal rose garden. The property is fully fenced and has also been fenced into various paddocks to allow the rotation of sheep, consistent with our present rural living zoning and rural residential lifestyle. Aerial photography over a period of 50 years confirms the consistently residential character of the property.

The below photo was taken in 1981 and clearly shows our property which is very cleared of vegetation and includes our residence.



D2.2 — My property has the characteristics of a rural living settlement

The Ireneinc framework identifies rural living settlement characteristics as: at least 10 smaller blocks generally ranging in size between 1–15 ha with a consistent lot pattern; a consistent pattern of detached dwellings with associated outbuildings; and visual evidence of rural activities (cleared areas, hobby farming, grazing etc.). The Ireneinc report's own locality baseline confirms that the broader settlement in which my property sits displays these characteristics.

My property is situated within a cluster of over 100 properties along [REDACTED], with almost all lot sizes ranging from approximately 1ha to 10ha. The settlement pattern is consistent and has been established since the 1970's. Neighbouring properties also contain detached dwellings with associated rural activities including hobby farming, grazing, orchards, sheds, vegetable gardens and open grassed areas.

The settlement pattern and residential feeling is highlighted the commonality of property size and close proximity of driveways and residences.

D2.3 — The identified landscape values can be managed outside of LCZ

The Ireneinc evaluation framework requires consideration of whether identified landscape values can be appropriately managed outside of LCZ, specifically through the Natural Assets Code (NAC), the Scenic Protection Code (SPC), or a Specific Area Plan (SAP). The Commission itself accepted this argument in relation to Kettering West at Day 20, where the panel effectively found that the Priority Vegetation Area (PVA) overlay does the landscape-protection work, not the zone [Transcript, Day 20, 02:33:54].

The property is predominantly cleared, cultivated and developed. There is limited native vegetation on the title. The landscape values identified in the Ireneinc locality baseline relate to the [REDACTED] which is located [distance/direction] from my property and does not characterise my title.

D2.4 — The RLZ subcategory provides for limited or no further subdivision

The Ireneinc framework identifies as a key RLZ suitability indicator that the transition 'would result in limited/no further subdivision' and that 'a similar minimum allowable lot size is being applied.' Applying RLZ [B] to my property achieves this outcome, as the minimum lot size under that subcategory is consistent with the existing lot size and does not create a viable subdivision pathway.

My property has an area of 2.25ha. Under RLZ [B], the minimum lot size is 2ha. Subdivision of my property under this subcategory would not be possible, addressing any concern about intensification.'

D3 — The TPC panel's own statements support RLZ for properties like mine

The following exchanges from the Day 19 and Day 20 TPC hearings directly support the argument that the RLZ is more appropriate than the LCZ for my property. These statements were made by TPC Commissioners and are on the public record.

D3.1 — The evaluation framework is not a statutory instrument

Kate Heckelmann (Ireneinc) conceded at Day 20 [05:53:00] that the evaluation framework is not a statutory instrument — it is a tool, not a rule. The Commission is not bound by its application in any individual case and must assess my property against the statutory criteria in section 34 of LUPAA and the Zone Guidelines.

D3.2 — Risk ratings are judgement calls, not defined thresholds

At Day 20, the low/medium/high risk ratings applied by Ireneinc to LCZ recommendations were described as judgement calls, not defined thresholds. Ireneinc's position was that these ratings are a rule of thumb only [Day 20 guide]. The Commission has not yet determined what weight to give these ratings. Where the risk rating applied to my locality is medium or high, this is not a determinative finding — it is an assessment that can be challenged with site-specific evidence.

The Ireneinc report rates the transition of land in Tinderbox East to RLZ as medium/high risk. I submit that this rating does not accurately reflect the characteristics of my individual property for the following reasons: Low level eg 75m above sea level, the residence is lower than the tree line behind our residence and is well below the 'Scenic Landscape/management area'.

D3.3 — Visible rural activity is not required for RLZ

The TPC panel confirmed at Day 20 that visible rural activity is not a prerequisite for RLZ. This was applied consistently across multiple localities including Howden, Albion Heights, and Kingston West [Day 20 guide]. Properties need not demonstrate active farming or grazing to satisfy the RLZ criteria — residential use in a rural setting is sufficient.

D3.4 — Analogy to accepted RLZ localities

The Ireneinc report recommended full ELZ to RLZ transitions for a number of localities, including Kettering East and Oyster Cove, Howden and Blackmans Bay, Albion Heights, and Tinderbox West. No questions were asked about these recommendations at the hearing, though this does not indicate acceptance by the Commission. The characteristics of those localities — established residential settlement, lots generally between 1 and 15 ha, mixed residential and rural activities, limited evidence of significant landscape values requiring LCZ protection — are shared by my property.

My property in Tinderbox East is directly comparable to properties in Howden where RLZ was recommended. Both areas share the following characteristics: lot sizes, settlement pattern, proximity to existing RLZ, absence of significant landscape values. There is no principled basis on which to treat my property differently.

D4 — Council's approach has been historically inconsistent

The Ireneinc LCZ Review report documents a significant evolution — and inconsistency — in Council's approach to the application of the LCZ to ELZ land. At the time the draft LPS was first submitted to the TPC in 2020, approximately 85% of ELZ parcels were proposed for LCZ. The TPC noted that this approach was often inconsistent with the Zone Guidelines and that 'often when assessing particular sites the zone proposed does not seem to match these criteria or those of Guideline No.1.' By the time of public exhibition the proportion had been reduced to approximately 75%, with the balance transitioning to RLZ, RZ, and other zones.

This history demonstrates that the initial presumption in favour of LCZ was not well-founded and that the LCZ application has been progressively narrowed as the evidence base has been tested. The Ireneinc report

represents a further iteration of this process, but where the evidence specific to my property supports RLZ, the LCZ recommendation should not be allowed to stand.

D5 — Any landscape values present can be managed without LCZ

Where landscape values are present on or near my property, I submit that they can be appropriately managed through the application of the relevant overlay controls, without the need for LCZ. The TPC panel acknowledged on Day 20 [02:33:54] that the PVA overlay and SPC do the landscape-protection work in many cases, removing the justification for LCZ in those areas.

Ireneinc itself acknowledged in the LCZ Review report that a future rural living settlement review may reconsider current RLZ decisions, and that any short-term risk is 'not something that's a definitive or a risk that can't be mitigated with future action' [Transcript, 03:06:18]. This acknowledgement of residual risk mitigation further supports the appropriateness of RLZ rather than LCZ for my property.

PART E — LOCALITY-SPECIFIC CONTEXT

The [REDACTED] was subdivided some 50+ years ago, most down to mostly 2.25ha – 5ha. This was clearly conducted to create small rural farm residential blocks. Almost all have been built on, some dating back to the last 60's. Ours was built in 1973. It is clear the initial intention was to create a rural hamlet.

PART F — CONCLUSION AND RELIEF SOUGHT

For the reasons set out above, I submit that:

1. The application of the LCZ to my property is inconsistent with the Zone Guidelines (Guideline No. 1) and does not satisfy the requirements of section 34 of LUPAA.
2. The LCZ is prohibited by Zone Guideline LCZ 4(a) where, as here, the priority of the land is residential use.
3. The Rural Living Zone satisfies the criteria in Zone Guidelines RLZ 1(a) and RLZ 2(b) and is the appropriate zone for my property.
4. Any landscape values identified in the locality can be appropriately managed through existing overlay controls without resort to LCZ.

I respectfully request that the Commission:

- Determine that the draft Kingborough LPS should be modified to include my property within the Rural Living Zone [specify subcategory A/B/C/D];
- If the Commission proposes any alternative outcome, that I be provided with an opportunity to respond before any final determination is made.
-

I request that the folio of the Register [REDACTED] at [REDACTED], Tinderbox be included within the Rural Living Zone [C] in the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule.'

Signed:

Date: 26 April 2026

[REDACTED]

Full name: David Tottle and Kym Weatherley

Contact email / phone: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

PART G — ACRONYMS / TERMS USED IN THIS SUBMISSION

Acronym/Term	Meaning
ELZ	Environmental Living Zone
Ireneinc report	Review of the LCZ Kingborough (Review of the Methodology and Zone Application and Locality Baseline and Alternative Zone Evaluation)
LCZ	Landscape Conservation Zone
LPS	Draft Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule
LUPAA	Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993
NAC	Natural Assets Code
PVA	Priority Vegetation Area
RLZ	Rural Living Zone
SAP	Specific Area Plan
SPA	Scenic Protection Area
SPC	Scenic Protection Code
STRLUS	Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy
TPC	Tasmanian Planning Commission
Zone Guidelines	Guideline No. 1 — Local Provisions Schedule: Zone and Code Application