

KIN-S4.0 Kingborough Coastal Settlement SAP (Gordon Precinct)

Context

- Clear distinction between coastal settlements north of Snug and south of Snug, with different development patterns evident across these areas.
- **Coastal settlements north of Snug** have established growth expectations and consolidation, resulting in more **urbanised characteristics** and higher levels of service provision.
- **Coastal settlements south of Snug face growth challenges** due to limited services and a more dispersed, non-urbanised pattern.
- Smaller settlements characterised by dwellings on larger lots, often vegetated and typically without connection to reticulated services.
- The southern settlements are strongly influenced by expansive, high-value views across the D'Entrecasteaux Channel, which shape their development pattern and landscape qualities.
- This distinction supports a tailored planning approach to protect these differing characteristics, **aligning with STRLUS policy directions**.
- Require planning controls calibrated to **realistic development expectations** and constraints, which cannot be effectively achieved under the standard provisions of the TPS.



Settlement considerations

- LDRZ historically applies to smaller settlements outside the UGB.
- STRLUS identifies a **very low growth scenario for Gordon** and other SAP precincts.
- The Kingborough Land Use Strategy (2019) indicates that future growth at Gordon will consist of **limited infill subdivision opportunities**. It also indicates that existing LDRZ is excessive.
- The Draft LPS submitted to the TPC in 2020 proposed the Rural Living Zone for this precinct.
- The minimum lot size and site area per dwelling provisions are intended to largely **maintain the development pattern established under KIPS2015**.
- This approach avoiding unplanned intensification and **aligning with STRLUS** until further strategic work is completed.



Onsite servicing

- The Kingborough Coastal Settlement SAP area, including settlements such as **Gordon**, is **largely unsewered**, with only limited, site-specific access to reticulated sewerage.
- These areas contain particularly constrained sites with physical limitations affecting the viability of on-site wastewater treatment, and the **controls are intended to set realistic development expectations aligned with these constraints**.
- There are multiple **unresolved cases of system failure**, leading to disputes between landowners and installers, highlighting ongoing risks and management challenges.
- While subdivision standards require new lots to accommodate on-site systems, the **absence of equivalent provisions for development** under the TPS creates approval risks.
- This gap can lead to approvals at planning stage that later prove **unviable at Plumbing Permit stage**, reinforcing the need for early, integrated wastewater assessment.
- The SAP responds by reinforcing a 2,500m² minimum lot size and **introducing clear wastewater provisions, ensuring development outcomes are practical**, reducing cumulative environmental risk and providing clearer expectations for landowners and developers.

Character and tree protection

- The SAP provides for the protection and **reinforcement of the character of Woodbridge**, ensuring that development responds to and enhances the existing village setting.
- **Retention of vegetation is a key mechanism to maintain the visual identity**, rural qualities, and sense of place that define Gordon.
- At the same time, vegetation provisions are intended to support environmental protection and ecological functions, including habitat continuity and landscape resilience.
- The STRLUS policy BNV 1.4 aligns with this approach by promoting consistent regional vegetation management while allowing for local responses that reflect specific local character.

BNV 1.4 *Manage clearance of native vegetation arising from use and development in a manner that is generally consistent across the region but allowing for variances in local values.*

Statutory compliance

Consideration under s32(4) of LUPAA

Social

- Protects a distinct coastal settlement character and lifestyle that differs from more urbanised settlements in the LDRZ and is highly valued by the community.
- Requires a place-specific SAP to manage design, scale and character outcomes that cannot be achieved through the SPPs.

Economic

- Aligns development with limited infrastructure and servicing capacity, unlike fully serviced urban areas, ensuring efficient and realistic development outcomes.
- Justifies a SAP to avoid unintentional development outcomes enabled by SPPs and provide certainty for landowners and developers in constrained coastal settings in the LDRZ.

Environmental

- Addresses heightened environmental sensitivity beyond typical Tasmanian contexts in the LDRZ.
- Necessitates a SAP to introduce targeted wastewater, stormwater, vegetation and design controls not available in the SPPs, ensuring protection of environmental values and public health.

Statutory compliance

LUPAA objectives

- **Promotes the sustainable use** and development of land by aligning density and form with infrastructure capacity and site constraints, ensuring development is practical and long-term viable.
- Supports the **protection of environmental quality and natural resources** through targeted controls for wastewater, stormwater and vegetation management.
- Furthers orderly **and coordinated planning by managing growth in a manner consistent with settlement strategies** and avoiding unplanned intensification under the SPPs.
- **Enhances public health and amenity** by ensuring development can be adequately serviced and does not result in off-site impacts or environmental harm.
- Recognises and **protects the social and cultural values of communities**, including coastal character, heritage qualities and established settlement patterns.
- Provides a **fair, certain and efficient planning framework** by setting clear, locally responsive standards that reflect the unique constraints and attributes of the coastal settlements

Translation considerations for Gordon

Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015

- Subdivision provisions in the LDRZ require a min lot size of **2,500m²**
- **Multiple dwelling development is prohibited** in the LDRZ.
- Environmental protection applied through the application of the **Biodiversity Protection Area Overlay and associated code**.
- Local Development Code provides a **building height limitation of 5m in coastal proximity** (flexibility available under the performance criteria).
- Stormwater management through the **Stormwater Code**.

Tasmanian Planning Scheme (standard provisions)

- Under the SPPs, minimum lot size requirement reduces to **1,500m²** (1,200m² under performance criteria)
- **Multiple Dwellings possible** (1,500m² site area per dwelling and 1,200m² under performance criteria)
- **Priority Vegetation Overlay only applies to subdivision** in the Low Density Residential Zone.
- Building height remains 8.5m in both the ELZ and Village Zone VZ, consistent with KIPS 2015, with no reduction for buildings in coastal proximity as provided under the Local Development Code.
- **No Stormwater Code**

Comparison of provisions

Provision	LDRZ in KIPS2015 (Section 12.0)	LDRZ in the SPPs (Section 10.0)	KIN-S4.0 Kingborough Coastal Settlement SAP
Minimum lot size requirement	2,500m ²	1,500m ² or 1,200m ² under performance criteria	2,500m ² or 2,400m ² under performance criteria
Multiple dwellings	Prohibited	Site area ≥1,500m ² per dwelling with services, otherwise ≥2,500m ² . Performance criteria provide additional flexibility.	Site area ≥2,500m ² per dwelling or ≥2,400m ²
Services	Onsite facilities required if no reticulated system.	Onsite facilities required if no reticulated system.	Requires suitable land for onsite detention.
Building height	Max 8.5m; coastal areas limited to 5m	Max 8.5m; no reduced coastal height requirement	Maintains 8.5m; coastal areas limited to 5m (with discretionary flexibility under performance criteria)
Visual impact	No specific controls	No specific controls	Requires materials/colours with reflectance ≤40% and no bold/bright colours.
Cut and fill	No specific controls; subdivision guidance to minimise	Same as KIPS2015	Cut/fill limited to ±1m from ground level
Vegetation management	Managed via Biodiversity Protection Area Overlay and code.	No equivalent controls; overlays limited in application (only applies to subdivision)	Introduces vegetation controls to retain important vegetation with flexible allowances.
Collision risk	Addressed via Biodiversity Code mitigation strategies	None	Includes provisions to minimise bird collision risk (standard permit condition)

Concluding remarks

Drafting and mapping considerations

- Council acknowledges the representation made by Gray Planning and notes the commentary particularly in relation to drafting matters.
- Council is open to considering recommendations from the TPC to refine the drafting of the SAP, particularly to simplify and improve clarity provisions.
- While this SAP attracted limited representations, broader feedback on other SAPs has highlighted the need for simpler, more user-friendly controls, which Council supports.
- Differences between SAP mapping and the Priority Vegetation Area Overlay are acknowledged.
- Council recognises the need to refine mapping and definitions to improve consistency and transparency.