
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, 2 May 2026 11:54 AM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: Submission - Kingborough LPS Direction 69 - [REDACTED], Sandfly
Attachments: TPC Submission_[REDACTED] Sandfly.pdf

Further to your reference, DOC/26/36829, please find attached our formal submission for [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], Sandfly, title reference [REDACTED] to be considered by the Commission.

Please return email to acknowledge receipt.

Kind Regards,
Alan Honychurch

2 May, 2026

Alan Richard Honychurch

Sandfly TAS 7150

Phone:

Tasmanian Planning Commission

Level 3, 144 Macquarie Street

Hobart TAS 7000

Via email: KingboroughLPS@planning.tas.gov.au

To the Tasmanian Planning Commission,

I am writing in response to the Commission's correspondence of 2 April 2026, which advises that the Irene Inc Direction 69 report recommends my property be retained within the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) under the draft Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule (LPS).

I note that I did not make a formal representation during the public exhibition period, as I was not aware at that time that my property was proposed for LCZ classification. Since then, I have provided correspondence to the Commission regarding the draft LPS, and I understand that this present stage of the process allows for written input to be considered as part of the ongoing assessment. I acknowledge that the provision of a written submission does not, in itself, create an entitlement to be heard, but that the Commission may determine whether further engagement would assist its deliberations.

In that context, I set out the following submission for the Commission's consideration.

PROPERTY DETAILS

Landowner name(s)	Alan Richard Honychurch
Property address	[REDACTED], Sandfly
Title reference (folio)	[REDACTED]
Lot size (approx.)	64.91ha
Locality	Sandfly & Kaoota
Current IPS zone	Environmental Living Zone (ELZ)
Draft LPS exhibited zone	Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ)
Irene Inc recommended zone	Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) — unchanged
Zone sought in this submission	Rural Living Zone D

1. Introduction and Strategic Position

This submission is made in response to the proposed application of the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) under the Draft Tasmanian Planning Scheme to land within the Sandfly / Kaoota locality.

The subject land is a 64.91 hectare rural holding containing a permanently occupied dwelling that has been established for approximately **35 years**, together with outbuildings and an established hobby farming operation that has been

conducted continuously over that period. The representor submits that the proposed LCZ zoning represents a **mischaracterisation of the land's function, history, and strategic role**.

When assessed objectively, the land not only fails to meet the threshold for Landscape Conservation Zone designation, but positively and demonstrably satisfies the intent and purpose of the Rural Living Zone (RLZ).

2. Actual Function and Character of the Land

In practical and functional terms, the land operates as a **rural living property**, not conservation land. It supports permanent residential occupation alongside semi-rural activity and active land management on a daily basis.

The landscape has been shaped by decades of lawful and ongoing use, including pasture improvement, fencing, access tracks and agricultural infrastructure. This modification is neither incidental nor peripheral. It is fundamental to how the land functions and to its role within the surrounding settlement pattern.

The defining planning question is therefore not whether the land contains environmental values, but **what the land is actually for**. In this case, the land exists to support rural living and small-scale rural production, which is precisely the planning role contemplated by the Rural Living Zone.

3. Duration and Continuity of Use as a Determining Factor

The subject land has supported a stable and continuous pattern of residential occupation for approximately **35 years**, together with ongoing hobby farming and active land management. This duration is material and well exceeds the timeframe of any single planning scheme or zoning iteration.

From a planning perspective, land that has accommodated a dwelling and been continuously occupied and managed for more than three decades cannot reasonably be treated as latent or prospective conservation land without disregarding its established and legitimate role within the settlement pattern.

If continuity of use is accepted as a valid planning consideration—as it must be—then the subject land cannot logically be grouped with land that is undeveloped, lightly used, or strategically reserved for future conservation or rehabilitation outcomes.

3.1 Historical settlement context

The settlement pattern along [REDACTED] reflects its origins in the post-World War II period, when land in this locality was allocated under returned servicemen settlement arrangements intended to support permanent occupation and productive rural land use. Historical information indicates that **Les Talbot, a returned World War II serviceman, was granted land in this area**, contributing to the establishment of residential and rural use along what is now [REDACTED]

The subject land has continued to perform this settlement function, including the establishment of a dwelling that has been in place and permanently occupied for approximately **35 years**. This history is relevant in planning terms, as the land was not set aside for landscape conservation purposes but has long supported residence, land management and rural activity. The spatial pattern of development established through this post-war settlement framework has persisted over time and continues to inform the character and function of the locality, which exhibits attributes consistent with rural living rather than conservation-focused land. Viewed in this context, the application of the Landscape Conservation Zone does not align with the historical purpose, long-standing use, or established settlement role of the land.

4. Comparative Pattern of Development and Adjoining Land Use

The subject land forms part of a broader landscape of large rural living allotments characterised by:

- Dispersed dwellings
- Outbuildings and rural infrastructure
- Hobby farming and small-scale rural use
- A mix of cleared working land and vegetated areas

It is also relevant to note that the delineation of the Landscape Conservation Zone in this locality appears to align with an administrative boundary rather than with any change in land use function or settlement pattern. In particular, LCZ application effectively commences at the point where the Council-managed road terminates and a Crown reserve road begins. This transition does not, of itself, indicate a shift to conservation land nor provide a sound planning basis for LCZ designation.

The Crown reserve road has provided established access to occupied rural living properties at the end of [REDACTED] for over twenty years and forms part of a long-standing residential access network. Its status as Crown land has not altered the functional role of the surrounding land, which continues to operate as rural living land with permanent occupation and active management. Drawing a zoning boundary at this point conflates land tenure with land use function and produces an artificial outcome that is disconnected from on-ground reality and settlement logic.

Many adjoining and nearby properties share these characteristics and are not proposed for LCZ application. **The subject land is not anomalous within this pattern, having supported a dwelling for approximately 35 years as part of the same rural living settlement context.**

4A. Zone Application Guidelines, ELZ Replacement, and Lack of Parcel-Specific Justification

The Zone Application Guidelines state expressly that the Landscape Conservation Zone is **not a replacement for the Environmental Living Zone**, and that the two zones give effect to materially different policy objectives. ECZ/ELZ was intended to accommodate residential use in environmentally sensitive rural settings, whereas LCZ is reserved for land whose **primary planning function is landscape conservation**.

The Commission itself has previously observed that the Landscape Conservation Zone “*appears to have been used quite extensively to replace the ELZ*”, and has cautioned that such an outcome may reflect a broader policy shift by Councils that requires **clear and defensible strategic justification**. No parcel-specific justification of that kind has been provided in relation to the subject land.

In this case, the Irene Inc assessment relies on landscape character described at a **broad locality scale**, rather than on any demonstrated landscape value attributable to the subject title. The locality-level reporting for the [REDACTED] area does not identify:

- any mapped or described landscape element on the subject land;
- any distinctive landform, vegetation community, or scenic landmark specific to the property; or
- any functional role played by the land in maintaining landscape integrity beyond that of the surrounding area.

As a result, the recommendation for LCZ appears to be founded on **associative characteristics**, such as elevation or a generalised vegetated context, rather than on evidence that the land itself performs a primary conservation role. This is directly contrary to the Zone Application Guidelines, which require zoning to respond to the **actual attributes, condition, and function of land**, not to its inclusion within a broadly described landscape area.

This approach risks treating LCZ as a **default successor to ELZ**, rather than as a zone requiring independent justification derived from the intrinsic qualities of the land. The Guidelines do not support such a use of LCZ.

The zoning outcome is further undermined by the manner in which the LCZ boundary has been drawn. In practice, LCZ application in this locality commences precisely at the point where the Council-managed section of [REDACTED] terminates and a Crown reserve road begins. This administrative transition does not, in planning policy or principle, establish land as having a primary landscape conservation purpose.

The Crown reserve road has provided established access to residences at the upper end of [REDACTED] for more than twenty years and functions as part of an existing rural living access network. Its Crown status has not altered, constrained, or redefined the longstanding pattern of permanent occupation and active land management that exists beyond the end of the Council-maintained road. Reliance on the presence of a Crown reserve road as justification for LCZ application improperly conflates land tenure with land use function.

The result is an **artificial zoning boundary** that aligns with where Council road responsibility ceases, rather than where residential settlement ends or where any demonstrable shift in landscape character or conservation function occurs.

This method of boundary delineation lacks site-specific planning rationale and reinforces that the LCZ recommendation is not founded on intrinsic landscape values of the subject land, but on an arbitrary administrative distinction unrelated to statutory zoning criteria or the Zone Application Guidelines.

Further reinforcing the absence of any genuine transition in land use or settlement function is the provision of essential infrastructure. Electricity reticulation extends along the full length of [REDACTED], including the Crown reserve section, providing connection capability to properties at its termination. The presence of this infrastructure is a clear indicator of an established and intended rural living settlement pattern, rather than a remote or conservation-focused landscape interface.

In planning terms, the availability of reticulated power is a fundamental characteristic of serviced residential land and is inconsistent with the application of a zone intended to prioritise conservation outcomes over development. Its existence confirms that the LCZ boundary does not reflect a change in servicing, accessibility, or land use function, but instead follows an administrative boundary that has no bearing on the strategic planning merits of the land.

5. Comparative Application of the Irene Inc Evaluation Framework

The Irene Inc LCZ evaluation framework provides a structured basis for determining whether land is suited to Landscape Conservation Zone designation or whether an alternative zone is more appropriate. When applied rigorously and consistently, the framework leads to a clear conclusion in this case.

Importantly, the application of this framework to Sandfly & Kaoota must be considered alongside how **the same framework was applied to Kettering East & Oyster Cove**, which received a full Rural Living Zone outcome that was expressly accepted by the Commission during the Day 2 hearing.

5.1 Landscape Descriptions and Settlement Integration

In the Irene Inc materials, the landscape value descriptions for Sandfly & Kaoota—including the [REDACTED] cluster—and for Kettering East & Oyster Cove are substantively similar. Both localities are described as elevated bushland settings with scenic values, comprising a mix of cleared and vegetated land, and characterised by dwellings integrated into a natural landscape context.

Notably, the descriptive language applied to the [REDACTED] / [REDACTED] settlement closely mirrors that used for Kettering East & Oyster Cove, particularly in relation to residential integration within bushland landscapes rather than disruption of them.

5.2 Recognition of Rural Living Settlement Patterns

In both localities, Irene Inc expressly identified established rural living settlement patterns. In Sandfly & Kaoota, a defined rural living cluster along Pregnall's Road and Talbots Road was recognised. In Kettering East & Oyster Cove, a consistent rural living settlement pattern was identified across the locality.

In each case, residential use was accepted as an established and legitimate component of the landscape, rather than an intrusion into conservation values.

5.3 Lot Size and Development Scale

Lot sizes within the identified residential clusters are also comparable. The [REDACTED] cluster includes allotments generally within the 2–8 hectare range, while Kettering East & Oyster Cove contains predominantly 1–10 hectare lots, with the majority between 2 and 7 hectares.

This overlap places both localities squarely within the range that Irene Inc identified as capable of being appropriately managed through Rural Living Zone controls, rather than requiring Landscape Conservation Zone designation.

5.4 Overlay Coverage and Risk Assessment

Both localities are subject to Priority Vegetation Area and Scenic Protection overlays to a comparable extent. In Kettering East & Oyster Cove, Irene Inc expressly concluded that these overlays, together with minimum lot size

requirements and standard development controls, were sufficient to manage landscape values and supported a full RLZ outcome.

The same overlay framework applies to the [REDACTED] area of Sandfly & Kaoota. Importantly, Irene Inc applied a medium landscape risk rating to Kettering East & Oyster Cove and nonetheless recommended RLZ for the locality—a recommendation that was accepted by the Commission following examination of overlay performance during the Day 2 hearing.

5.5 Inconsistent Outcome for Comparable Land

By contrast, Sandfly & Kaoota was divided, with the [REDACTED] settlement acknowledged as suitable for RLZ while surrounding land was placed within LCZ, largely on the basis of perceived fragmentation and larger lots beyond the settlement pattern.

This distinction does not explain why land within the [REDACTED] settlement itself—recognised by Irene Inc as a rural living cluster—should be treated differently from Kettering East & Oyster Cove. In both cases, Irene Inc accepted that existing controls are capable of managing landscape values and that residential settlement does not undermine landscape character.

The comparative application of the same framework therefore demonstrates an inconsistency in outcome rather than a principled distinction. No site-specific justification is provided for subordinating residential use in the [REDACTED] settlement when it was not considered necessary in the comparable locality.

6. Why Rural Living Zone Is the Correct and Intended Outcome

The Rural Living Zone is expressly intended to provide for residential use in a rural setting while allowing for small-scale rural activity and ongoing land management. The subject land meets this purpose unequivocally. RLZ would:

- Recognise the established residential and operational reality of the land
- Support continued land stewardship and hobby farming
- Maintain reasonable development and land-management rights
- Operate alongside overlays that already address environmental constraints

This is not a compromise position; it is the **most accurate classification of the land's role within the planning system.**

7. Consequences of Incorrect LCZ Application

These consequences are particularly acute given that the land accommodates a dwelling that has existed and been occupied for approximately **35 years**, with associated land management obligations and expectations consistent with permanent residential use.

In addition, as bushfire risk increases under a changing climate, the interaction between zoning controls and bushfire management obligations becomes an increasingly material planning consideration. Effective bushfire mitigation may require vegetation clearance beyond minimal exemption thresholds to achieve defensible space and asset protection outcomes consistent with contemporary bushfire standards.

Within the Landscape Conservation Zone, such clearance—despite being necessary for public safety—may still be subject to discretionary assessment against landscape values. This creates regulatory tension between bushfire risk management objectives and conservation-first controls. By contrast, the Rural Living Zone more coherently accommodates necessary land management associated with residential occupation, including bushfire mitigation, while relying on overlays to address vegetation and visual impacts.

Where land supports permanent residential occupation and active management, a zoning outcome that complicates or delays necessary bushfire preparedness measures is neither proportionate nor strategically sound, particularly where existing overlay controls are capable of managing any residual landscape considerations.

Applying LCZ would introduce unnecessary constraint and uncertainty, potentially affecting routine maintenance, agricultural infrastructure, and long-term planning for the property. These consequences are foreseeable and disproportionate given the limited additional conservation benefit achieved. Such outcomes weigh strongly against LCZ designation where a more appropriate zoning outcome exists.

8. Requested Outcome

The representor respectfully requests that:

- The **Landscape Conservation Zone not be applied** to the subject land; and
- The land be zoned **Rural Living Zone (RLZ)** to accurately reflect:
 - Long-standing residential occupation, including a dwelling established and occupied for approximately 35 years
 - Established hobby farming use
 - Modified rural landscape character
 - Logical and consistent treatment with comparable localities and adjoining properties

9. Closing Statement

This submission does not seek special treatment but rather **correct classification**. When the Irene Inc evaluation framework is applied consistently across localities, the [REDACTED] settlement area of Sandfly & Kaoota is materially comparable to Kettering East & Oyster Cove in landscape character, settlement form, overlay coverage and risk assessment.

The acceptance of a full Rural Living Zone outcome in that locality reinforces that **RLZ is also the appropriate zoning outcome here**, and that the proposed LCZ designation is not the product of a defensible planning distinction.

In those circumstances, retaining LCZ over the subject land would require the Commission to depart from both its own accepted comparative outcomes and the expressed intent of the Zone Application Guidelines.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Alan Honychurch