
From: Alex de Vries [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 4 May 2026 2:17 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: Submission — Kingborough LPS Direction 69 — [REDACTED] Tinderbox
Attachments: Submission — Kingborough LPS Direction 69 — [REDACTED] Tinderbox.docx

Hi TPC,

Please find attached my submission to the Kingborough LPS Direction 69 for our property at [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Tinderbox.

Regards,
Alex.

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 be included within the Rural Living Zone (RLZ) under the draft Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule (LPS), rather than remaining in the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) as exhibited.

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. I take up that opportunity and submit as follows.

Landowner name(s)	ALEXANDER JOHN DE VRIES AND RUTH ALICE DE VRIES
Property address	██████████ TINDERBOX TAS 7054
Title reference (folio)	██████████
Lot size (approx.)	2.06HA
Locality	TINDERBOX (WEST)
Current IPS zone	Environmental Living Zone (ELZ)
Draft LPS exhibited zone	Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ)
Ireneinc recommended zone	Rural Living Zone (RLZ) — [subcategory ??]
Position in this submission	Accept RLZ — support and argue correct subcategory A or B

I welcome and support the Ireneinc recommendation that my property be included within the RLZ under the draft Kingborough LPS. The RLZ is a significantly more appropriate zone for my property than the exhibited LCZ.

I make this submission to: (1) provide the Commission with property-specific evidence supporting the RLZ recommendation; (2) identify the most appropriate RLZ subcategory for my property; and (3) ensure the Commission does not revert to LCZ at the final determination stage.

The subcategory I seek for my property is Rural Living Zone A or B — the existing lot pattern in my locality is consistent with lots of approximately 2 ha – thus suiting either subcategory.

Our property contains a house constructed in the 1980s, along with a shed and outbuildings, a veggie garden and fruit trees. The primary use is residential. We also have some chickens, dogs and many wallabies, paddymelons, native hens, and bandicoots. This is precisely the mix of residential and rural activities described for the Rural Living Zone.

Our property borders over 50 ha of farm land – a large cattle farm right next door. Around 30m from where I am now there is a herd of cows grazing in a paddock. If this isn't the definition of rural living, I don't know what is.

The primary intention for our property has always been residential – we bought it to raise our family with enough space around them to enjoy the outside world. Our property is around 2 ha, which is at the larger size lot size for this area. It has been used as a residence since the 1980s, and we wish to continue to live here unencumbered by the LCZ.

My property is within a Scenic Protection Area. The Natural Assets Code applies to native vegetation on my title. The combined effect of these overlay controls and the RLZ minimum lot size provides adequate management of any landscape values without the need for LCZ.

While I support the RLZ recommendation, I am concerned that the Commission may revert to LCZ rather than adopting Ireneinc's recommendation. I place the following matters on the record.

The Ireneinc LCZ Review documents that the TPC found Council's initial LCZ application was often inconsistent with the Zone Guidelines and with surrounding land. The exhibited LCZ for my property was part of a blanket application covering approximately 75% of ELZ parcels — an approach the TPC itself queried repeatedly. Ireneinc's recommendation to apply RLZ to my property is the product of a more rigorous, property-level analysis that should be preferred over the exhibited LCZ.

Chair Nick Heath confirmed at Day 20 [06:45:48] that the Commission will decide on section 34 LUPAA criteria and is not bound by Council's exhibited position or by Council's 16 March 2026 resolution favouring the 'least restrictive alternative'. The Commission is therefore free to adopt the RLZ recommendation, and I urge it to do so.

Kate Heckelmann (Ireneinc) confirmed at Day 20 [05:53:00] that the evaluation framework is a tool, not a statutory instrument. The Commission may adopt, modify, or depart from Ireneinc's recommendations as it sees fit under section 34 LUPAA — but where Ireneinc's analysis supports RLZ and is consistent with the Zone Guidelines, as here, the Commission should adopt it.

For the reasons set out above, I submit that:

1. The Ireneinc recommendation to include my property within the RLZ is correct and is consistent with the Zone Guidelines (Guideline No. 1) and the requirements of section 34 of LUPAA.
2. The exhibited LCZ was not appropriate for my property and should not be reinstated. The RLZ recommendation reflects a more rigorous analysis and should be adopted.
3. The most appropriate RLZ subcategory for my property is RLZ [A/B/C/D], which reflects the existing pattern and density of development in my locality under Zone Guideline RLZ 3, and [does not allow / significantly constrains] further subdivision.
4. Any landscape values in the broader locality can be appropriately managed through existing overlay controls — NAC, PVA overlay, and SPC — in combination with the lot size controls of the RLZ subcategory.

I respectfully request that the Commission:

- Adopt the Ireneinc recommendation and include my property within the RLZ specify subcategory A or B in the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule; and
- Not revert to the exhibited LCZ, which is not supported by the site-specific evidence for my property.

Signed:

Alexander John de Vries

Date:01/05/2026