

29 July 2021

Caroline Lindus
Consultant Planner
ERA/Sorell Council/Community Engagement
47 Cole St
Sorell TAS 7172

SORELL COUNCIL

2 - AUG 2021

RECEIVED

Dear Ms Lindus,

RE: Queries — Sorell Council Local Provisions Schedule and State Planning Provisions

A meeting was held recently at Dunalley regarding proposed changes to the State Planning Provisions (SPP) as described in the Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) for Sorell. As a land owner in Sorell, I believe some of the changes will impact me directly, and ask to receive some clarification on the issues discussed and changes proposed regarding rural and agricultural land.

Based on what was said at the meeting I got the impression that putting a single-dwelling residential building on a Rural Zone title would become restricted. I note the following:

- Under Section 20.2 of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme SPP — Residential, if for a single dwelling and not restricted by an existing agreement under section 71 of the act — listed under discretionary
- Under Section 10.2 Appendix 2 (zone conversion) of LPS — Addition of "new standard requiring dwellings to have frontage with access to a road maintained by a road authority or have right of way frontage – prohibits dwellings relying on Crown reserve roads". Also see Section 20.4.3 in SPP for further detail on requirements
- Section 10.2 Appendix 2 of LPS lists changes in an added (+) or removed (-) although the change from permitted single dwelling to discretionary is not listed

Questions are as follows; prior to the most recent LPS was a single-dwelling on a rural zone property under the permitted classification? Under what provisions are these discretionary decisions made (they don't seem to be outlined in the SPP)? Are there other inclusions in proposed changes that will prevent single-dwelling residential on Rural Zone titles? And is there any different treatment for amalgamated titles with regard to the same issue? Given the amount of time and money spent on surveying, legal services and documentation to obtain titles under the provision that residential dwellings were permitted (unrestricted) — will there be compensation provided or ways to recover these costs?

Section 10.2 Appendix 2 of the LPS (part Rural Zone) states removal of "boundary reorganisation standard but you can still have a boundary adjustment". What is the difference between these two changes? Will boundary adjustments be allowed under the LPS? And if so do they come under the subdivision conditions for lot design under Section 20.5 of the SPP? e.g. designation of minimum lot sizes.

Boundary adjustments provide a means to successfully operate and expand farms. Examples include:

- Expansion by purchasing neighbouring house and land titles whereby the property may be adjoined to the farm property, and boundary adjusted, so that the title can be retained for the house on the balance lot

-
- Work with neighbours to make use of natural barriers such as rivers to keep stock — this is of particular importance in low-lying areas where fences may be frequently damaged in flood events requiring expensive and time consuming repairs
 - Re-arrange titles to take advantage of opportunities for unworkable land e.g. moving a title forward to an appropriately accessible area for other uses such as rural storage, with the potential to sell on to increase farm operational income
 - Make use of existing neighbouring areas and expansions, e.g. rural living, while still maintaining the farm size and function. As an example, two sizable farm lots (titles) that adjoin and neighbour a rural living zone — the opportunity to retain the size and features in one farm lot e.g. dams, while keeping the smaller title (located in an unworkable area with appropriate access to roads/infrastructure) for potential rezoning to rural living to e.g. provide a house lot title for a family member. This is something that has been a long standing tradition for farming families, but opportunities seem to be diminished now with the current and proposed rules and regulations that are heavily geared to property developers

Finally, as the land owner of Mount Garret, I am interested in discussing the recommendations in the LPS with regard to the Eastern Growth Corridor being zone Agriculture. I note the following:

- On page 145-146 the LPS notes that the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy (STRLUS) does not support the residential expansion into this area
- Part of Mount Garret falls under the recommendation that its zoning of future urban growth be modified to agriculture
- As a result, the adjacent land, which is designated rural also be zone agricultural to remove the split zone

I wish to discuss the statutory process and time-frames around making a submission to the LPS. I am also interested in any recommendations on what submissions should contain to make my case e.g. agricultural reports on viability of the land (I have a report), viability from an economic viewpoint to farm the land (relative small area compared to other farms in the region), and/or personnel/companies who can assist in process/preparation of the submission. Given the short time-frame under which we have to make representations (deadline 16 August), I ask for, and would appreciate, a quick response.

Yours Faithfully,

David Newitt

