
From: Strutt, Hayley [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, 3 May 2026 2:48 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: Submission- Kingborough LPS Direction 69 - [REDACTED] Oyster Cove
Attachments: Accept_RLZ_Strutt.docx

Good afternoon,

Please see attached our letter supporting the switch to Rural Living Zone for our property title number [REDACTED]

Regards,

Hayley and Rowan Strutt

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE AND DISCLAIMER

The information in this transmission may be confidential and/or protected by legal professional privilege, and is intended only for the person or persons to whom it is addressed. If you are not such a person, you are warned that any disclosure, copying or dissemination of the information is unauthorised. If you have received the transmission in error, please immediately contact this office by telephone, fax or email, to inform us of the error and to enable arrangements to be made for the destruction of the transmission, or its return at our cost. No liability is accepted for any unauthorised use of the information contained in this transmission.



Please consider the environment. Do you really need to print this email?

To the Tasmanian Planning Commission,

We write in response to the letter dated 2 April 2026 (ref: DOC/26/36829) advising that the Ireneinc report recommends our 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.

We previously made a representation on the draft LPS with our neighbours. We understand that my representation has not yet been heard and will be heard at a future hearing. We understand that this letter provides me the opportunity to make a further written submission in relation to the Ireneinc recommendations, and that we may speak to this submission when we appear before the Commission. We take up that opportunity and submit as follows.

Landowner name(s)	Rowan and Hayley Strutt
Property address	██████████ Oyster Cove Tas 7150
Title reference (folio)	██████████
Lot size (approx.)	1 ha
Locality	Oyster Cove
Current IPS zone	<i>Environmental Living Zone (ELZ)</i>
Draft LPS exhibited zone	<i>Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ)</i>
Ireneinc recommended zone	<i>Rural Living Zone (RLZ) — [subcategory to be specified]</i>
Position in this submission	<i>Accept RLZ — support correct subcategory (A/B/C/D)</i>

STATEMENT OF POSITION

We welcome and support the Ireneinc recommendation that our 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.

We 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.

RLZ Subcategory Reference Table

The RLZ has four subcategories with different minimum lot sizes. Under Zone Guideline RLZ 3, the appropriate subcategory must reflect the existing pattern and density of development within the rural living area or be supported by strategic justification. The table below summarises the options:

Subcategory	Min. lot size (acceptable solution)	Performance criteria	Typical use context
RLZ A	1 ha	8,000 m ²	Smaller rural lots with established residential settlement

RLZ B	2 ha	1.4 ha	Medium-sized rural residential lots, some subdivision potential
RLZ C	5 ha	4 ha	Larger rural residential lots, limited subdivision
RLZ D	10 ha	8 ha	Large lots, ELZ transition where no further subdivision intended

The subcategory I seek for my property is:

- Rural Living Zone is my preference; I have no intent to subdivide and would be happy with whatever RLZ category deemed appropriate for my lot zone. Approx 1ha.

D1.1 — Zone Guideline RLZ 1(a) — residential character with rural activities

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 accurately describes our property. Our property contains a house constructed in approx. 1986 with a shed, garage and various existing outbuilding such as a garden shed and animal shelters. The primary use is residential. There are also a large, enclosed garden, orchard, chicken coop, duck coop and pasture area previously used for grazing horses. This is precisely the mix of residential and lower-order rural activities described in RLZ1 (a).

While we 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.

D3.1 — LCZ was historically over-applied and inconsistently justified

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.

D3.2 — The Commission is not bound by 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.

D3.3 — The evaluation framework is not a statutory instrument

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, we 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 or D, whichever is deemed appropriate and reflects the existing pattern and density of development in my locality under Zone Guideline RLZ 3, and does not allow 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.

We respectfully request that the Commission:

- Adopt the Ireneinc recommendation and include my property at [REDACTED], Oyster Cove within the RLZ in the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule; and
- Not revert to the exhibited LCZ, which is not supported by the site-specific evidence for our property.

Signed: Hayley and Rowan Strutt Full name:	Date: 2/5/2026 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Contact email / phone:
--	---