
From: Mark Rapley [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 1 May 2026 2:02 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Cc: Development@kingborough.tas.gov.au; TPC Enquiry
Subject: KC Draft Planning Scheme | Further Representation #55 | Written Submissions
Attachments: Kingborough Draft Planning Scheme | Representation #55 | Paul Rapley | Written submissions for hearing 20 October 2025; PID [REDACTED] - Further Representation - 55.pdf

To Whom it may concern,

Please have regard to the **attached** further representations made on behalf of Paul Rapley.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

Mark Rapley (SC)

[REDACTED]

KINGBOROUGH DRAFT LPS

FURTHER SUBMISSIONS IN RESPONSE TO IRENIC REPORT

REP #55 | PAUL RAPLEY

**PID [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] Woodbridge TAS 7162 (the
Property)**

**PROPOSED ZONING CHANGE FROM ENVIRONMENTAL LIVING TO
RURAL**

1. Background.

These representations are prepared in response to correspondence dated 2 April 2026 from the TPC to the Landowner / current owner, Paul Rapley, and are in addition to the representation filed with the TPC on 14 October 2025.

As was the case with the initial representation, this representation is made in conjunction with and in support of:

1. representation and submissions #430, in so far as it makes reference to the impact of the proposed rezoning of the Property upon its financial value and the cost of insurance; and
2. representation and submissions #4 in so far as it relates to a directly neighbouring property which shares a majority of issues; and
3. representation and submissions #63 in so far as it makes submission that are relevant to the issue of access to the Property.

For completeness, and in the event of the need for an appeal, to the extent that representations #430, #4 and #63 have been updated by further submissions / representations then those further representation are also adopted.

2. Substance

- It is owner's primary submission that the Property ought to be zoned Rural Living not Rural which is the recommended zoning in the Ireneinc Report.
- The owner requests that the relevant members of the TPC conduct a view / site visit prior to determination and consideration of the representations in relation to the Property.
 - This request / application is made on the basis that it is **not appropriate**, due to the unique location and features of the Property and neighbouring properties, for the TPC to make a remote / "desk top" determination without first visiting the Property.

Those features include:

- the topography.
 - the access.
 - the cleared versus non-cleared areas of land.
 - the presence of environmental weeds.
- Further, this request is made in the context of the submission that Ireneinc (and Council before that) seem, on the face of its own documentation, not to have properly assessed the "landscape" against the relevant criteria.

In addition to each of the previous representations referred to above and previous representations made by the Owner, the Owner further represents:

- (a) that a zoning of Rural will cause an unreasonable anomaly as between the current use of the neighbouring properties, which is in fact residential (coupled with hobby farms and short stay / rental accommodation), and the current use of the Property, which is presently vacant, but highly suitable for a residence when compared to the neighbouring properties.
- (b) given the rules associated with "access" to properties zoned Rural Zone, if zoned as such the Property it will, by de facto, amount to a prohibition of a dwelling being built on the Property, for which it is clear from the Property's characteristics it is better suited than many of the neighbouring properties which have existing dwellings. In short, Rural zoning will be highly prejudicial to the monetary of the Property – to the extent it is hard to envisage what if any value would remain.

(c) Finally, in repetition of the conclusion stated in representation #68 the owner submits Rural Living Zone:

- a. reflects the established rural-residential use.
- b. aligns with the physical characteristics of the land.
- c. accommodates existing Crown road access.
- d. avoids extinguishing several existing land uses.
- e. preserves reasonable subdivision expectations.
- f. is consistent with the methodology presented to the Commission
- g. in relation to the Property:
 - i. promotes the future active management of it in a manner consistent with the current uses of neighbouring properties and to their benefit (e.g. bushfire and environmental weed management).
 - ii. promotes the future active management of it in a manner consistent with the broader channel community (e.g. bushfire and environmental weed management).

Filed: Friday, 1 May 2026.