
From: The Conry Family [REDACTED] >
Sent: Wednesday, 29 April 2026 10:23 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: Submission — Kingborough LPS Direction 69 — [REDACTED], Margate
Attachments: Contest LCZ Seek RLZ CONRY.pdf

Dear Sir/Maam,
Please find attached our submission for Title Reference [REDACTED]
Your sincerely,
Sean and Yvonne Conry

TASMANIAN PLANNING COMMISSION

Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule — Direction 69 / Ireneinc Report

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 and have not previously had correspondence with the Commission regarding the draft LPS. I understand that this letter has been sent to ensure procedural fairness and provides me with a clear opportunity to formally participate in this stage of the process. 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.

PROPERTY DETAILS

Landowner name(s)	SEAN HAMILTON CONRY AND YVONNE MELANIE CONRY
Property address	[REDACTED], MARGATE TAS 7054
Title reference (folio)	[REDACTED]
Lot size (approx.)	4.09ha
Locality	Margate
Current IPS zone	Environmental Living Zone (ELZ)
Draft LPS exhibited zone	Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ)
Ireneinc recommended zone	Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ)
Zone sought in this submission	Rural Living Zone (RLZ) — B

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 as well as the size of my land (4.09ha).

GROUNDNS 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.

We purchased our land in 2017 as it was subdivided specifically to be used as residential land. We built our residence on it and has been our family home ever since. We are connected to the electricity grid for our residential needs. As you can see from the below image, our home is complete with a large 1000m² lawn for our children to play as well as our cleared driveway, workshop, water tanks, etc.



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.

Our property is rock and clay, being made up of stringy bark regrowth. It was logged extensively until 1960, and a significant fire came through in 1990. It does not contain any unique, protected or valuable landscape value, but is made up of young regrowth of the most ubiquitous vegetation in the state.

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.

Given the 4.09ha size of our land, the Rural Living Zone B is the appropriate zoning. The shape and contour of our land does not practically allow subdividing or building any further residences. We have no intention of subdividing as has not been possible under our current Environmental Living zoning since purchasing the land for the intention of living on it and enjoying the rural aspect and space.

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 carport and workshop, and a cleared fire safety zone around the dwelling as well as 2 acres of fenced area, established lawns and gardens. The above aerial photograph confirms the consistently residential character of the property

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.

On [REDACTED], all the properties, ranging from 0.19ha to 25ha, have residences on them and is a community where people live, work and socialise. Numbers 1,3,5,16 are all slated to stay Rural Living Zone, and they are no different from the rest of the blocks on [REDACTED] regarding their usage as residential blocks as they have been from the mid 1980s.

In addition, part of my land is a declared Private Timber Reserve (PTR) under the Forest Practices Act 1985 and is actively managed for timber production, including small-scale hobby sawmilling and firewood collection. This represents ongoing low-intensity primary production associated with rural residential use and demonstrates that the land is managed for productive outcomes rather than conservation as the dominant purpose.

It is noted that the Ireneinc review states that PTR status does not dictate the underlying zoning and that zoning should instead be based on land characteristics. While this is acknowledged, assessing individual land characteristics from a desktop survey does not adequately assess the existing use, management and individual characteristics of the property.

Section 20(7) of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 provides that planning schemes cannot prohibit or restrict forestry operations on PTR land. While forestry operations are exempt, applying the LCZ to the remainder of land use creates an inconsistent planning outcome.

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].

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.

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 on [REDACTED] is directly comparable to other properties on [REDACTED] (Numbers 1,3,5 and 16) where RLZ was recommended. Both parts of the street 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 — Consistency and fragmentation arguments

D4.1 — Fragmented LCZ application should be resolved in favour of the surrounding zone

The Ireneinc report itself identifies avoidance of fragmented LCZ application as a key principle. The report notes that areas where only 2–3 LCZ-zoned properties are surrounded by Rural Zone (RZ) or RLZ land should be modified to resolve the fragmentation. Where my property is located within or adjacent to an area predominantly zoned RLZ or RZ, the application of LCZ creates exactly the kind of spot-zoning that the Ireneinc framework seeks to avoid.

My property is surrounded to the north by properties zoned RLZ and Rural Zone under the draft LPS.

D4.2 — Inconsistency with comparable properties

The Zone Guidelines require that the spatial application of zones be, as far as practicable, consistent with and coordinated across the LPS. Where neighbouring properties with substantially similar characteristics have been recommended for RLZ, the application of LCZ to my property is inconsistent and not supported by evidence of any material difference.

D5 — 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.

D6 — 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.

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 B];
- 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], Margate be included within the Rural Living Zone [B] in the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule.

Signed:



Full names: S [REDACTED] Yvonne Coffey

Date:

29/04/2026

Contact email:



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