
From: PRICE FAMILY <inlet.farm@bigpond.com>
Sent: Thursday, 1 June 2023 6:33 PM
To: TPC Enquiry
Subject: Representation PID 2939062

Categories:

Good afternoon Tasmanian Planning Commission,

I would like to make the following representation regarding the new TPS in relation to Inlet Farm, 65 Wilmot Road (Lot 59 Wilmot Rd) Huonville (PID 2939062).

The following are my concerns:

The Priority Vegetation Report contains an area overlay that is not consistent with the actual ground coverage, much of the land has been cleared prior to our ownership in 1999, the cleared areas were likely achieved 80-90 years ago, if not longer. What negative Impact do these incorrectly sized overlays have on our livelihood if they're left unchallenged. The relevance of the species being protected is also challenged, I would suggest a field verification be conducted.

The Tasmanian Planning Scheme Consultation Map is poorly represented by the zoning overlay colours, this has caused mis interpretation of our zoning allocation in respect to our property. What was thought to be the new Rural Living Zone is simply remaining Rural. The Rural zoning is inconsistent in part with surrounding properties that share the same height datum above the 100Yr indicator. Are different zonings options for landowners being considered, would zoning options be offered in owners best interests, and not just HVC interests. We have been subjected to considerable effort to change zonings by HVC, their intentions are not always clear or in our best interests as the land owners, quite the opposite resulting in potential substantial financial losses.

We now have two dual zonings titles, Rural/ Light Industrial and Rural/ Environmental Management (EMZ). Are the intention for subsequent sub-divisions being considered and who will pay for them, noting that HVC have increased many fees up to 147% for development, is this to capitalise on the pending results of the TPS, surely this can't be attributed to poor performance (cost overruns) of the planning staff that HVC as they would have us believe. In consideration of our investment the Light Industrial zoned land cannot be realised without the ability to sub-divide. Why should a boundary adjustment be the preferred method going forward. HVC Planning Dept. insist that both zones being applied for sub-division are required to meet all of both zoning sub-division criteria, why? This is counterintuitive with the intent of the Huon Valley Land Use Development Strategy & Growth Strategy.

We have previously zoned Riparian land and privately owned Public Open Space that is now intended as EMZ, a change from Public Open Space to Environmental Management Zone concerns me, what are the positive and negative impacts on our uses and control over our land. The new EMZ is also applied inconsistently across adjoining land owner holdings? HVC

have long desired access through our land to establish walking tracks, EMZ gives the impression that public recreation should prevail over the intention of the previously zoned "Riparian Strip" (Crown Reserve), my understanding is that this strip existed to protect the river edges from erosion or other mankind destruction. I note we have a new section of land earmarked as EMZ past the house along Waltons Inlet, why would this be and what are the protections for our amenity as the land holders. This appears to extend the HVC owned Recreation Zone, previously intended Riparian strip land. This is not a Crown Reserve. Is this consistent with other local government land grab policies i.e. % of land or Cash donation! Will the TPS override this blackmailing activity.

I look forward to your reply

Kind regards

Karl Price
Inlet Farm Huon Valley
0437224098