

## ATTACHMENT 7 – RLUS Compliance Statement

Policy	Policy Statement	Compliance Statement
<b>Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity</b>		
BNV 1.1	Zones that allow intensive development are not applied where native vegetation is to be protected	The LPS zones do not significantly increase in size and do not extent into areas of important vegetation.  There are existing areas of GRZ or LDRZ that have priority vegetation. In these zones the SPP is only applicable to subdivision.
BNV 1.2	Protect significant biodiversity values and adopt a 'avoid, minimise, mitigate' approach	The LPS provides a priority vegetation area.
BNV 1.3	Provide for biodiversity offsets	The SPP does not expressly provide for offsets. Council has no offset policy but offsets can nevertheless be considered on a case by case basis.
BNV 1.4	Allow for local variability in the management of biodiversity	The Regional Ecosystem Model used in the priority vegetation area allows for consideration of local and endemic biodiversity values.
BNV 1.5	Require construction environmental management plans	An issue for development control.
BNV 1.6	Provide for climate refugia	The LPS provides an overlay for refugia. The overlay is applied in a manner consistent with Ministerial Guideline No. 1.
BNV 2.1	Avoid or minimise the clearance of threatened native vegetation communities unless the harm is minimal or the benefits are significant	The priority vegetation area includes all areas of threatened native vegetation communities. The LPS is compliant with this policy to the fullest extent possible under the terms of the SPP.
BNV 2.2	Minimise clearing of important habitat	The Regional Ecosystem Model specifically incorporates habitat for threatened species.
	Advise developers of other relevant legislation	An issue for development control.
BNV 3.1	Include requirements to have buildings setback from reserve issues	An SPP issue.
BNV 4.1	Consult NRM based organisations	Has occurred and will continue to occur through the LPS approval process.
BNV 5.1	Provide for weed management	An issue for development control.
BNV 6.1	Improve knowledge of geodiversity values	Not a planning scheme issue.
BNV 6.2	Protect geodiversity values	All known geodiversity values (unique rock or formations) and contained within public land.
<b>Water Resources</b>		
WR 1.1	Adopt the State Policy on Water Quality Management	See section 2.4.3
WR 1.2	Apply water sensitive urban design principles	The SPP have little consideration of water sensitive urban design. The policy will be pursued outside the permit process and principally via Stormwater System

		Management Plans.
WR 1.3	Protect riparian areas	An issue for development control. The SPP provisions adopted the current interim planning scheme riparian buffers.
WR 1.4	Require construction environmental management plans in the riparian zone	An issue for development control.
WR 2.1	Hydro lakes	Not applicable
WR 2.2	Public access along waterways	Not a zoning issue.
WR 2.3	Minimise clearing of riparian vegetation	Riparian vegetation is a specific component of the Regional Ecosystem Model used for the priority vegetation area.
WR 2.4	Allow recreation and tourism development adjacent to waterways where impact is minimal	An issue for development control.
WR 3.1	Reduce barriers to rainwater tank use	A building control issue. It should be noted though that rainwater tanks used internally require pumps which can affect amenity through excessive noise.
The Coast		
C 1.1	Minimise clearance of coastal native vegetation	The LPS zones do not significantly increase the need to remove coastal native vegetation.
C 1.2	Maximise growth within existing settlement boundaries	The LPS zones provide for consolidation of existing settlements consistent with the structure plans.  The provision of the Village Zone at Swanwick and Coles Bay will re-introduce the ability to consider multiple dwellings to make more efficient use of limited land availability.
C 1.3	Avoid development of mobile landforms	An issue for development control.
C 1.4	Zone undeveloped land in the coastal area Environmental Management, Recreation or Open Space unless the land is required for rural resource or urban purposes.	Within the coastal area, the LPS proposes to apply every zone used. The zones used have regard to the current planning scheme, existing use and development and township structure plans. This policy is achieved in full through the zones proposed.
C 2.1	Address coastal hazards	This is achieved via the SPP and overlays in the LPS.
C 2.2	Avoid exacerbating current risk from coastal hazards	The LPS includes overlays on coastal hazards which manage development within existing settlements. The LPS avoids any new urban based zones in areas subject to coastal hazards.
C2.3	Identify areas for landward retreat of coastal hazards	A coastal refugia overlay is provided for. Significantly more work is required outside the planning system to further this policy.
Managing Risks and Hazards		
MRH 1.1	Mitigate bushfire risk in the earliest possible stage of development	The SPP includes a bushfire hazard prone areas code.
MRH	Design subdivision roads	The SPP includes a bushfire hazard prone areas

1.2	to provide safe exit in a bushfire	code.
MRH 1.3	Do not restrict clearing around existing dwellings	The SPP includes exemptions for such purpose.
MRH 1.4	Ensure planning schemes or building regulations provide bushfire mitigation measures	The SPP includes a bushfire hazard prone areas code.
MRH 1.5	New development in bushfire prone areas must have regard to native vegetation	The priority vegetation area will apply to some forms of buildings that are also subject to the SPP bushfire prone areas code.
MRH 1.6	Develop and fund a program for regular compliance checks	No a planning scheme consideration.
MRH 2.1	Mitigate flood risk in the earliest possible stage of development	<p>There is no available mapping flooding caused by rivers and accordingly there is no consideration of this issue in the LPS. For some locations, there is some overlap on this issue with coastal inundation which is provided for within the LPS</p> <p>Orford and Swansea do suffer flooding and a key part of future Stormwater System Management Plans will be to ensure the stormwater network can handle 1 in 100 year rain events of the future. This is the accepted engineering design level for overland flow.</p> <p>The 2016 flood event was cause by a particularly acute rain event that was significantly greater than a 1 in 100 year rain event.</p>
MRH 2.2	Provide development controls for flood prone areas	See above
MRH 3.1	Prevent further development in declared landslip areas.	There are no declared (i.e., via Building Act 2016) landslip areas in the municipal area.
MRH 3.2	Require development to be responsive to land instability.	The LPS adopts landslip hazard mapping.
MRH 3.3	Development in areas of land instability must not cause an undue risk to occupants or the public	This is principally regulated via the building system.
MRH 4.1	Require consideration of contaminated sites	<p>The LPS does not include an overlay of contaminated sites. This is an optional component and is not essential for the relevant SPP provisions to apply to any use or development proposal.</p> <p>There are known contaminated sites which are under the remediation notices from the Environment Protection Authority.</p>
MRH 5.1	Manage risks of dispersive soils	There are no known areas of dispersive soils in the municipal area.
MRH	Manage risks of acid	Under the SPPs acid sulphate soils must be managed

5.2	sulphate soils	via construction environmental management plans.
Cultural Values		
CV 1.1	Support review of Aboriginal Relics Act 1975	Not a relevant planning scheme consideration.
CV 1.2	Improve knowledge of Aboriginal heritage places	Not a relevant planning scheme consideration.
CV 1.3	Avoid development in areas known to have Aboriginal cultural heritage values	Known areas of Aboriginal cultural heritage values are most typically within the Environmental Management Zone. On private property, these values must be managed under the relevant legislation. The LPS does not increase the risk of such values being harmed as there is limited change to zonings proposed from the zones of the interim planning scheme.
CV 1.4	Support the use of predictive modelling	Not a relevant planning scheme consideration.
CV 2.1	Support review of Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995	Not a relevant planning scheme consideration.
CV 2.2	Promote nationally adopted tiered approach to management of heritage values	Not a relevant planning scheme consideration.
CV 2.3	Ensure local planning authorities regulate places of local values	The LPS proposes to continue to recognise and protect local heritage places
CV 2.4	Protect heritage precincts	There are no identified heritage precincts within the municipal area.  Any consideration of heritage precincts would require expert advice and consultation with residents.
CV 2.5	Apply the Burra Charter	This is relevant to the SPP which provides the criteria to evaluate works to heritage places.
CV 2.6	Standardise listing criteria	As a transitional arrangements, heritage places can be listed without the full descriptions that are expected under the SPP.
CV 2.7	Allow adaptive reuse of heritage places	This is provided for by the SPP.
CV 3.1	Ensure heritage studies are fully transparent	Not a relevant planning scheme consideration.
CV 4.1	Develop an agreed set of criteria for determining the relative significance of important landscapes and key landscape values	Not a relevant planning scheme consideration. This is important work that requires progress at a regional level.
CV 4.2	Protect regionally significant landscapes	The LPS includes scenic landscape area and corridors based on the 1994 planning scheme. Consideration of other areas is constrained by CV 4.1.
CV 4.3	Protect Greater Hobart skylines	N/A
CV 5.1	Protect places of archaeological potential	The LPS does not list any places of archaeological potential. Archaeological values do exist as evident by the ANU

		<p>digs at the Triabunna barracks. Archaeological potential generally corresponds to local or State listed properties.</p> <p>Any broader consideration of identifying places of archaeological potential would require expert advice and consultation with owners.</p>
CV 5.2	Manage soil disturbance in places of archaeological potential	N/A
<b>Recreation and Open Space</b>		
ROS 1.1	Adopt Tasmanian Open Space Policy and Planning Framework 2010 hierarchy of open space	This is not a relevant planning scheme consideration. It is relevant to the management of open space assets and development of open space strategies.
ROS 1.2	Adopt Tasmanian Open Space Policy and Planning Framework 2010 classification of open space	This is not a relevant planning scheme consideration. It is relevant to the management of open space assets and development of open space strategies.
ROS 1.3	Undertake a regional open space study	This is not a relevant planning scheme consideration. The study has not occurred.
ROS 1.4	Undertake local open space studies	<p>This is not a relevant planning scheme consideration. The study has not occurred. Council continues to develop open space connectivity for walking. An area of open space does need to be identified at south Swansea given the number of subdivisions occurring in the area.</p> <p>The SPP does not include any consideration of public open space design within subdivision. This is a significant omission that may constrain the ability to implement any local study.</p>
ROS 1.5	Ensure well connected provision of walking and cycling trails	This is not a relevant planning scheme consideration.
	Adopt the 'Healthy by Design' principles in subdivision design	This is implemented, to some extent, in the SPP.
ROS 2.1	Avoid unnecessary duplication of recreational facilities across the region	This is not a relevant planning scheme consideration.
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>		
SI 1.1	Protect the Royal Hobart Hospital	N/A.
SI 1.2	Ensure social infrastructure matches community needs	This is not a relevant planning scheme consideration.
SI 1.3	Provide well located and accessible social infrastructure	The LPS applies the Community Purpose Zone to major facilities. Social infrastructure can be provided within the Local Business Zone and Village Zone as well.
SI 1.4	Identify areas for social	Sufficient opportunities exists to provide social

	infrastructure in urban growth areas and activity centres	infrastructure in activity centres under the Local Business Zone.
SI 1.5	Provide multi-purpose, flexible and adaptable social infrastructure	This is not a relevant planning scheme consideration.
SI 1.6	Co-locate and integrate social infrastructure	This is not a relevant planning scheme consideration.
SI 1.7	Allow aged-care facilities to develop where necessary	Aged care facilities are a residential use and can be considered in most zones.
SI 1.8	Provide flexibility to allow the aged to continue living in communities	A diverse range of residential options can be considered in the General Residential Zone including ancillary dwellings.
SI 1.9	Adopt Crime Prevention through Environmental Design	The is a relevant consideration for the SPP.
SI 1.10	Recognise that building control provide for disability access	This is not a relevant planning scheme consideration.
SI 2.1	Ensure a diversity of housing choice	The is a relevant consideration for the SPP.
SI 2.2	Provide for social housing	The is a relevant consideration for the SPP.
<b>Physical Infrastructure</b>		
PI 1.1	Preference growth where infrastructure is under-utilised	<p>The application of the General Residential Zone and Low Density Residential Zone has occurred in consultation with TasWater to ensure that the zoned land can be developed.</p> <p>There are some areas of Low Density Residential Zone where sewer, water or stormwater services are inadequate and cannot be upgraded on a cost effective or efficient basis.</p>
PI 1.2	Allow small scale energy facilities	The is a relevant consideration for the SPP.
PI 2.1	Use infrastructure to delivery planned growth and encourage compact urban form	<p>The major infrastructure issues in the municipal area are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improvements to the Great Eastern Drive / Tasman Highway to provide a safer road network for residents and visitors</li> <li>- Planning for mitigation or relocation of major roads due to projected sea level rise, particularly at Orford</li> <li>- The provision of reticulated sewer to Coles Bay</li> <li>- The provision of boat trailer parking at boat ramps and marina's, particularly Coles Bay</li> <li>- The provision of car parking for visitors to Coles Bay</li> <li>- Stormwater capacity issues, particularly at Orford and Swansea</li> </ul> <p>It is considered that the LPS has proposed zones that will not place unreasonable pressure of these issues. Where necessary, subdivision potential has been</p>

		constrained pending resolution of stormwater issues.
PI 2.2	Coordinate, prioritise and sequence infrastructure provision	This is not a planning scheme consideration.
PI 2.3	Identify and protect future infrastructure corridors	Future infrastructure corridors are not identified within the LPS on the basis of an absence of identified need.
PI 2.4	Use demographic and dwelling forecast information in the regional strategy to inform infrastructure planning	The STRLUS is out of date and should not be used for such purposes.
PI 2.5	Develop a regionally consistent approach to developer charges	<p>Value capture includes developer charges (i.e., headworks charges) and other mechanisms. Infrastructure Australia has published guidance on value capture - <a href="http://infrastructureaustralia.gov.au/policy-publications/publications/files/Capturing_Value-Advice_on_making_value_capture_work_in_Australia-acc.pdf">http://infrastructureaustralia.gov.au/policy-publications/publications/files/Capturing_Value-Advice_on_making_value_capture_work_in_Australia-acc.pdf</a></p> <p>There is no regionally consistent approach to value capture.</p> <p>Council has required contributions to external works (road or stormwater) where required. Value capture may be an important component of future Stormwater System Management Plans.</p>
PI 2.6	Protect electricity generation and transmission infrastructure	The LPS includes an overlay to protect transmission infrastructure. There are no major electricity generation infrastructure in the municipal area. The Triabunna sub-station does have capacity to accommodate relatively large generation through a solar farm or other large scale infrastructure.
Land Use and Transport Integration		
LUTI 1.1	Preference urban expansion close to existing transport corridors	Not applicable outside of Greater Hobart.
LUTI 1.2	Allow higher densities near transport corridors	Not applicable outside of Greater Hobart.
LUTI 1.3	Encourage above ground level residential development in activity centres	The is a relevant consideration for the SPP.
LUTI 1.4	Consolidate residential development into key settlements	The LPS provides for compact settlement form.
LUTI 1.5	Locate major trip generation near public transport and higher order activity centres	Not applicable outside of Greater Hobart.
LUTI 1.6	Maximise road connections between existing and potential	This a relevant consideration for the SPP.

	road	
LUTI 1.7	Protect major regional transport corridors	The SPP includes a road and rail asset code which provides consideration of new or intensified access to major road. The LPS includes a Road Attenuation Area to major roads to address potential noise issues.
LUTI 1.8	Provide buffers to major roads	The LPS includes a Scenic Landscape Corridor and Road Attenuation Area to the Tasman Highway / Great Eastern Drive.
LUTI 1.9	Car parking requirements should encourage public transport	Not applicable outside of Greater Hobart.
LUTI 1.10	Facilitate ferry transport on the Derwent River	Not applicable outside of Greater Hobart.
LUTI 1.11	Encourage walking and cycling as alternative modes of transport	Not a relevant planning scheme consideration.
LUTI 1.12	Provide end of trip amenities to encourage cycling	This a relevant consideration for the SPP.
<b>Tourism</b>		
T 1.1	Protect authentic and distinctive local features and landscapes	<p>The LPS proposes to re-introduce scenic protection provisions from the 1994 planning scheme.</p> <p>As noted in the cultural values section, the STRLUS identifies the need for regional audit and approach to landscape management, including classification and evaluation of important landscapes. This work would facilitate further identification of landscapes for consideration in the LPS. A number of planners in the southern region support the regional audit as a priority issue.</p> <p>Many key features of the municipal area are found on public land in national parks and foreshore reserves. These areas are in the Environmental Management Zone or Open Space Zone.</p>
T 1.2	Identify and protect regional landscapes	See above.
T 1.3	Allow tourism in rural areas	This is a consideration for the SPP.
T 1.4	Allow holiday homes to be used for short-term accommodation	This is a consideration for the SPP.
T 1.5	Allow tourism related mixed use developments in business areas	This is a consideration for the SPP.
T 1.6	Recognise that not all tourism uses will be able to be provided for in the scheme due to their innovative nature	The meaning of this policy is unclear. Tourist Operation and Visitor Accommodation is permitted or discretion is all zones where those uses could exist (i.e., not industrial or utilities). More to the point, given the importance of tourism why should or would tourism be too hard to manage through the scheme. No other industry has that approach.
T 1.7	Allow tourism to be	This follows T 1.6. See above comment.

	considered through s43A process	
Strategic Economic Opportunities		
SEO 1.1	Hobart port facilities	N/A.
SEO 1.2	Sullivan's cove	N/A.
SEO 1.3	Southwood	N/A.
Productive Resources		
PR 1.1	Provide consistency in management of agricultural land	<p>The Agriculture Zone is applied consistent with the Ministerial Guidelines.</p> <p>There are some elements of the Agriculture Zone which may undermine a consistent approach. The SPP allow for subdivision to excise existing dwellings and visitor accommodation buildings in a manner resembling many older/previous planning schemes in Tasmania. The current planning scheme is too restrictive on subdivision for agricultural purposes, however the SPP is too enabling of subdivision that does not serve agricultural purposes.</p>
PR 1.2	Provide separation between sensitive use and agricultural land	This is an issue for the SPP.
PR 1.3	Allow ancillary activities to diversify income to farmers	This is an issue for the SPP.
PR 1.4	Limit subdivision to that necessary for agriculture	See PR 1.1.
PR 1.5	Minimise use of prime agricultural land for plantations	N/A.
PR 2.1	Tailor subdivision standards to suit sub-regions	This is an issue for the SPP.
PR 2.2	Minimum lot sizes to suit main agricultural output in sub-region	This is an issue for the SPP.
PR 2.3	Ensure conversion of agricultural land to residential is driven by settlement strategies rather than viability	The draft LPS does not propose any conversion of agricultural land.
PR 2.4	Facilitate down-stream processing	This is an issue for the SPP.
PR 2.5	Allow tourism and commercial use that protects long-term agricultural potential	This is an issue for the SPP.
PR 2.6	Ensure sensitive use does not fetter agriculture	This is an issue for the SPP.
PR 3.1	Apply a rural zone to extractive industry	The draft LPS applies the Rural Zone to existing significant extractive industries. Extractive industries

		are also discretionary in the Agriculture Zone which provides for new resources to be developed.
PR 4.1	Provide for shore facilities for aquaculture	Pending TPC determination of Spring Bay Seafoods rezoning.
	Identify key marine farming areas	This is not a relevant planning scheme consideration.
PR 5.1	Apply a rural zone to forestry	Existing land under private timber reserves or under ownership of Sustainable Timbers Tasmania is within the Rural Zone, unless surrounding by Agriculture Zone.
PR 5.2	Recognise the forest practices system	This is not a relevant planning scheme consideration. It should be noted through that the Regional Ecosystem Model has been used in the forest practices system and includes data and modelling prepared by the Forest Practices Authority. Biodiversity protection between the land use and forest practices system could and should be more closely aligned and the REM is a positive step.
PR 5.3	Provide for plantations	Land more suitable for forestry is included in the Rural Zone.
PR 5.4	Manage land use conflicts at plantations and native forests	This is an issue for the SPP.
Industrial Activity		
IA 1.1	Ensure industrial land has appropriate topography and infrastructure	The draft LPS brings forward all existing industrial areas with only a minor reduction in the size of the zone near the Bicheno waste transfer station.
IA 1.2	Criteria to establish new areas	N/A
IA 1.3	Provide a 30 year supply of industrial land and protect future expansion areas	<p>Based on update of industrial land and strategic analysis at the regional level, there is sufficient land for 30 year supply in the existing zoned areas.</p> <p>However, this does not consider any locational needs of future projects that may require industrial areas to be established.</p> <p>In this regard, it should be noted that existing Light Industrial Zone responds to specific sites and uses. Most of the Light Industrial Zone is effectively a spot zone and the municipal area lacks any form of industrial park. Many existing Light Industrial Zone sites are therefore more constrained by land use conflict (sometimes at all four boundaries of the site), size and cost-effective provision of infrastructure.</p> <p>It is also appropriate to note that most industrial type activities are associated with agricultural use that can be accommodated in the Rural Zone or Agriculture Zone.</p> <p>Any future review of structure plans or Vision East should consider industrial zoning on a whole of municipal area basis.</p>

IA 1.4	Provide a 15 year supply of industrial zoned land	See IA 1.3.
IA 1.5	Provide 5 year supply of subdivided industrial zoned land	See IA 1.3.
IA 1.6	Use best available information to assess supply	See IA 1.3.
IA 2.1	Identify significant, strategic industrial zones	The Freestone Point Road Light Industrial Zone is a strategic industrial zone through the colocation of aquaculture related uses.
IA 3.1	Take into account environmental values	See IA 1.3
Activity Centres		
AC 1.1	Implement activity centre network	All commercial areas are provided for within the Local Business Zone consistent with the Activity Centre Network of the regional strategy.
AC 1.2	Ensure zoning marches the role of the activity centre	See AC 1.1.
AC 1.3	Discourage out-of-centre development	N/A.
AC 1.4	Promote a greater emphasis on activity centres	This is not directly an issue for the planning scheme.
AC 1.5	Encourage high quality urban design and pedestrian amenity	This is an issue for the SPP through the development standards for the commercial based zones.
AC 1.6	Encourage a mix of uses in activity centres	<p>The SPP Local Business Zone allows for a diverse range of land uses.</p> <p>The Village Zone at Swanwick and Coles Bay is to encourage a more diverse range of land uses that can be accommodated within the two small Local Business Zone areas whilst not attempting to distort the primacy of the Local Business Zone in the area.</p>
AC 1.7	Improve public transport	This matter is outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme.
AC 1.8	Encourage new development to reinforce the strength and individual character of urban areas	The SPP provides an uniform approach to development standards. The structure plans do identify urban design elements to pursue.
AC 1.9	Active street frontages	This is an issue for the SPP through development standards for commercial based zones.
AC 1.10	Activity centres should encourage local employment	The uses possible in the Local Business Zone cater likely commercial activities in activity centres.
AC 1.11	Cambridge Park	N/A.
AC 1.12	Provide 10-15 years growth of activity centres	<p>In terms of each Local Business Zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Orford has potential for growth along the Esplanade. In the future, the zone could be expanded into intervening and adjoining</li> </ul>

		<p>residential properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Triabunna has potential for growth through existing vacant lots. As noted elsewhere, the zoning of the marina &amp; surrounds requires review to ensure that this part of the activity centre has appropriate opportunities for growth.</li> <li>- Swansea has limited potential for growth. The structure plan did recommended expansion of the Local Business Zone in a strip fashion along Franklin Street. That should be pursued as a specific rezoning proposal when appropriate.</li> <li>- Bicheno has potential for growth through existing vacant lots.</li> <li>- Coles Bay has limited potential for growth due to the small size of the zone. There is one vacant lot and one lot with potential to be developed in the future.</li> </ul>
AC 2.1	Primary Activity Centre (Hobart CBD)	N/A.
AC 2.2	Primary and Principal Activity Centre	N/A.
AC 2.3	Primary and Principal Activity Centre	N/A.
AC 2.4	Encourage structure and economic development planning for all activity centres	Township structure plans address these issues.
AC 3.1	Encourage walking, cycling and public transport	This is not directly an issue to the development of the LPS.
AC 3.2	Primary and Principal Activity Centre	N/A.
AC 3.3	Primary and Principal Activity Centre	N/A.
AC 3.4	Primary and Principal Activity Centre	N/A.
AC 3.5	Allow flexible approaches to car parking in activity centres	Council has a cash in lieu of car parking policy.
<b>Settlement and Residential Development</b>		
SRD 1.1	Implement growth management strategies for settlements	<p>The LPS has regard to the growth management strategies and does not exceed the growth targets for each settlement. The targets provide a percentage range of increase in dwellings from 2010 to 2035.</p> <p>The growth management targets were intended to guide expectations around likely growth needs for settlements. They are not based on detailed analysis. They have been interpreted as absolute limits on growth and restricted otherwise sound residential zonings.</p>

		<p>If interpreted as absolute limits the growth management strategies are flawed and problematic. As one example of flaws, the Orford growth management strategy ignores any consideration of the Solis development plan.</p> <p>A number of solutions have been identified and presented to the Planning Policy Unit.</p>
SRD 1.2	Manage growth through a hierarchy of strategy, structure plans, subdivision control and development control	Each settlement has a structure plan in place.
SRD 1.3	Restrict rural living zone to certain cases	The draft LPS does not significantly alter the Rural Living Zone.
SRD 1.4	Increase rural living densities to an average of 1ha	A 1ha minimum lot size is proposed for the Rural Living Zone. This is the smallest minimum lot size allowable under the SPP, and as such the 'average' will not be achieved.
SRD 1.5	Achieve 15 dwellings per hectare (net) in the General Residential Zone	This is an issue for the SPP through the setting of subdivision standards for the General Residential Zone.
SRD 1.6	Only use the Low Density Residential Zone where there are land constraints or existing character	The LDRZ is applied to unserviced and under-serviced areas at Spring Beach, Orford and Triabunna. Further detail is provided in section 6.
SRD 2.1	Greater Hobart Settlement Strategy	N/A.
SRD 2.2	Greater Hobart Settlement Strategy	N/A.
SRD 2.3	Greater Hobart Settlement Strategy	N/A.
SRD 2.4	Greater Hobart Settlement Strategy	N/A.
SRD 2.5	Greater Hobart Settlement Strategy	N/A.
SRD 2.6	Greater Hobart Settlement Strategy	N/A.
SRD 2.7	Greater Hobart Settlement Strategy	N/A.
SRD 2.8	Greater Hobart Settlement Strategy	N/A.
SRD 2.9	Greater Hobart Settlement Strategy	N/A.
SRD 2.10	Greater Hobart Settlement Strategy	N/A.
SRD 2.11	Greater Hobart Settlement Strategy	N/A.