
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 1 May 2026 10:02 AM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: Submission to TPC regarding DOC/26/368829
Attachments: Submission to TPC regarding DOC2636829.pdf

Hello Nick

Attached please find my submission and response to your letter dated 2 April 2026 in regards to the Tasmanian Planning Scheme Kingborough draft Local Provisions Schedule with the abovementioned reference number.

Should you require any clarification to my submission, please do so in writing to my residential address noted in the attached.

Kind regards
Susan Lenz

[REDACTED]
Margate Tasmania 7054

Tasmanian Planning Commission

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

GPO Box 1691

Hobart TAS 7000

Regarding REF: DOC/26/36829

Property Location: [REDACTED] Margate Tasmania 7054

Title: [REDACTED]

To the Tasmanian Planning Commission, I write in response to the letter dated 2 April 2026 (ref: DOC/26/36829) advising that the Ireneinc report recommends my 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. I previously made a representation on the draft LPS. I understand that my representation has not yet been heard and will be heard at a future hearing. I understand that this letter provides me the opportunity to make a further written submission in relation to the Ireneinc recommendations. I take up that opportunity and submit as follows

Landowner name(s) Susan Lenz

Property address [REDACTED] Margate Tasmania 7054

Title reference [REDACTED]

Lot size (approx.) 2.3330 ha

Locality Margate

Current IPS zone - Environmental Living Zone (ELZ)

Draft LPS exhibited zone - Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ)

Ireneinc recommended zone - Rural Living Zone (RLZ) Subcategory B

Position in this submission - Accept RLZ

I welcome and support the Ireneinc recommendation that my 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. I 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.

- The subcategory I seek for my property is Rural Living Zone B (minimum lot size 2 ha)—the existing lot pattern in my locality is consistent with lots of approximately 2–5 ha
- My property contains a house / dwelling constructed in the 70's, with shed / outbuildings. The primary use is residential. There are also hobby animals / small orchard / a vegetable garden / pasture. This is precisely the mix of residential and lower-order rural activities described in RLZ.
- The primary strategic intention for my property has always been residential. It has been used as a residence since its initial construction in the 70's. My property is 2.3ha. The RLZ [subcategory B] minimum lot size of 1.4ha is consistent with this existing lot size and does not create subdivision potential.
- My property is 2.3ha. Under RLZ [B] with a minimum lot size of 10 ha, no subdivision is possible. I do not intend to subdivide and the pattern of lots that would result is consistent with surrounding properties.

While I 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:

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.

The Zone Guidelines (Section 8A Guideline No. 1) state explicitly that the LCZ "is not a large lot residential zone" and "is not a replacement zone for the Environmental Living Zone in interim planning schemes." The guidelines state that the LCZ "provides a clear priority for the protection of landscape values, with residential use largely being discretionary." Applying a zone with this purpose to land primarily used and intended for residential purposes is, by the guidelines' own terms, inappropriate.

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.

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.

- 'The Ireneinc report recommends RLZ subcategory B for my property. I agree with this recommendation because my property adjoins and is surrounded by existing RLZ / Rural

Zone land. My property is consistent with and should be treated the same as the surrounding land.

- Ireneinc recommended full ELZ to RLZ transitions for Margate. No questions were asked about these recommendations at the hearing, though this does not indicate acceptance by the Commission. My property shares shared characteristics with surrounding parcels in Margate. Consistent treatment supports the RLZ recommendation for my property.

For the reasons set out above, I 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 [B], which reflects the existing pattern and density of development in my locality under Zone Guideline RLZ 3, and significantly constrains 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

I respectfully request that the Commission:

1. Adopt the Ireneinc recommendation and include my property within the RLZ [specify subcategory B] in the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule; and
2. Not revert to the exhibited LCZ, which is not supported by the site-specific evidence for my property
3. I request that the folio of the Register [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] Margate be included within the Rural Living Zone [B] in the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule, consistent with the Ireneinc recommendation .

Signature

Dated

1/5/26