
From: Et_van <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, 28 April 2026 4:25 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: CM: Submission ref DOC/26/36829
Attachments: [REDACTED], Blackmans Bay.pdf

Good afternoon,
Please find attached our submission for [REDACTED], Blackmans Bay.
Kind Regards,

Eric and Tanya Van Der Laan

>
>

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 remains within the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) under the draft Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule (LPS).

I did not make a formal representation during the public exhibition period and have not previously had correspondence with the Commission regarding the draft LPS. I understand that this letter has been sent to ensure procedural fairness and provides me with a clear opportunity to formally participate in this stage of the process. I understand that making a submission does not confer a right to be heard, but that the Commission may decide to invite me to discuss the matters raised.

I take up that opportunity and submit as follows.

Landowner name(s)	Eric Jeffrey Van Der Laan and Tanya Marris Van Der Laan
Property address	[REDACTED] Blackmans Bay TAS 7052
Title reference (folio)	[REDACTED]
Lot size (approx.)	1.01ha
Locality	Kingston and Kingston Beach
Current IPS zone	Environmental Living Zone (ELZ)
Draft LPS exhibited zone	Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ)
Ireneinc recommended zone	Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) — unchanged
Zone sought in this submission	Rural Living Zone (RLZ) — A

I submit that the application of the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) to my property is not consistent with the requirements of section 34 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (LUPAA), the Section 8A Guideline No. 1 — Local Provisions Schedule: Zone and Code Application (the Zone Guidelines), or the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy (STRLUS).

I request that the Commission determine that the Rural Living Zone (RLZ) is the appropriate zone for my property under the draft Kingborough LPS.

The specific subcategory I seek is:

- Rural Living Zone A (minimum lot size 1 ha) — reflecting the existing lot pattern in my locality

GROUND'S FOR SUBMISSION:

The Commission is required by section 35L(2) of LUPAA to assess whether the LPS meets the LPS criteria, which includes compliance with the Zone Guidelines. The Commission confirmed at the Day 20 hearing that it will decide on the basis of the LPS criteria set out in section 34 of LUPAA and explicitly noted that Council's position — including its 16 March 2026 resolution favouring the 'least restrictive alternative' — is not binding on the Commission [Transcript, Day 20, 06:45:48]. I submit that the application of LCZ to my property does not comply with the Zone Guidelines as demonstrated below:

The Zone Guidelines prohibit LCZ where priority is residential (LCZ 4(a))

Zone Guideline LCZ 4(a) provides that the LCZ should NOT be applied to land where the priority is for residential use and development, instead indicating that the RLZ should be referred to. The Zone Guidelines further note explicitly that 'the LCZ is not a large lot residential zone, in areas characterised by native vegetation cover and other landscape values.'

My property has been used for residential purposes throughout the period it has been zoned Environmental Living Zone (ELZ) under the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015. During my tenure, the primary use and strategic intention of the land is and has always been residential.

Our property contains a dwelling constructed in 2000, has been continuously occupied as a residence, and is serviced by town water and sewerage. There is no evidence to suggest the primary use is other than residential.

Any landscape values present can be managed without LCZ

Our property has an area of 1.01 ha. This is consistent with the RLZ A minimum lot size of 1 ha and does not provide for further subdivision under that subcategory.

Where landscape values are present on or near my property, I submit that they can be appropriately managed through the application of the relevant overlay controls, without the need for LCZ. The TPC panel acknowledged on Day 20 [02:33:54] that the PVA overlay and SPC do the landscape-protection work in many cases, removing the justification for LCZ in those areas.

Ireneinc itself acknowledged in the LCZ Review report that a future rural living settlement review may reconsider current RLZ decisions, and that any short-term risk is 'not something that's a definitive or a risk that can't be mitigated with future action' [Transcript, 03:06:18]. This acknowledgement of residual risk mitigation further supports the appropriateness of RLZ rather than LCZ for my property.

The Ireneinc Locality Report for Kingston and Kingston Beach does not identify any specific landscape values on my title. The landscape value assessment is made at locality level without reference to the characteristics of my individual property.

Analogy to accepted RLZ localities

The Ireneinc report recommended full ELZ to RLZ transitions for a number of localities, including Kettering East and Oyster Cove, Howden and Blackmans Bay, Albion Heights, and Tinderbox West. No questions were asked about these recommendations at the hearing, though this does not indicate acceptance by the Commission. The characteristics of those localities — established residential settlement, lots generally between 1 and 15 ha, mixed residential and rural activities, limited evidence of significant landscape values requiring LCZ protection — are shared by our property.

Our property in Kingston and Kingston Beach locality is directly comparable to properties in Albion Heights and Bonnet Hill where RLZ was recommended. Both areas share similar characteristics and there is no principled basis on which to treat my property differently.

The Ireneinc evaluation framework, applied correctly to my property, supports RLZ

The Ireneinc report applies an evaluation pathway (decision tree) to determine the appropriate zone. The Commission was told at Day 20 of the hearing that this framework is not a statutory instrument — it is a tool, not a rule [Kate Heckelmann, Transcript Day 20, 05:53:00]. Representations can depart from it with good evidence. However, I submit that even applying the framework as intended, my property satisfies the criteria for RLZ rather than LCZ.

The first decision point in the Ireneinc evaluation pathway asks whether there is a strategic intention for residential use. The report identifies visual evidence of existing residential use and known strategic intention as the relevant indicators. Our property clearly satisfies this criterion.

Our property contains established dwellings and associated outbuildings including sheds/garages; gardens, cleared areas, a chicken coop, fruit trees, vegetables and fencing. Aerial photography over a period of 26 years confirms the consistently residential character of the property.

The TPC panel's own statements support RLZ for properties like mine

The following exchanges from the Day 19 and Day 20 TPC hearings directly support the argument that the RLZ is more appropriate than the LCZ for my property. These statements were made by TPC Commissioners and are on the public record.

The evaluation framework is not a statutory instrument:

Kate Heckelmann (Ireneinc) conceded at Day 20 [05:53:00] that the evaluation framework is not a statutory instrument — it is a tool, not a rule. The Commission is not bound by its application in any individual case and must assess my property against the statutory criteria in section 34 of LUPAA and the Zone Guidelines.

Risk ratings are judgement calls, not defined thresholds:

At Day 20, the low/medium/high risk ratings applied by Ireneinc to LCZ recommendations were described as judgement calls, not defined thresholds. Ireneinc's position was that these ratings are a rule of thumb only [Day 20 guide]. The Commission has not yet determined what weight to give these ratings. Where the risk rating applied to my locality is medium or high, this is not a determinative finding — it is an assessment that can be challenged with site-specific evidence.

Visible rural activity is not required for RLZ:

The TPC panel confirmed at Day 20 that visible rural activity is not a prerequisite for RLZ. This was applied consistently across multiple localities including Howden, Albion Heights, and Kingston West [Day 20 guide]. Properties need not demonstrate active farming or grazing to satisfy the RLZ criteria — residential use in a rural setting is sufficient.

Council's approach has been historically inconsistent

The Ireneinc LCZ Review report documents a significant evolution — and inconsistency — in Council's approach to the application of the LCZ to ELZ land. At the time the draft LPS was first submitted to the TPC in 2020, approximately 85% of ELZ parcels were proposed for LCZ. The TPC noted that this approach was often inconsistent with the Zone Guidelines and that 'often when assessing particular sites the zone proposed does not seem to match these

criteria or those of Guideline No.1.' By the time of public exhibition the proportion had been reduced to approximately 75%, with the balance transitioning to RLZ, RZ, and other zones. This history demonstrates that the initial presumption in favour of LCZ was not well-founded and that the LCZ application has been progressively narrowed as the evidence base has been tested. The Ireneinc report represents a further iteration of this process, but where the evidence specific to my property supports RLZ, the LCZ recommendation should not be allowed to stand.

Inconsistency in the Ireneinc evaluation framework

When comparing Kingston and Kingston Beach locality to Bonnet Hill and Albion Heights, it shows that Ireneinc applied near-identical landscape value descriptions and settlement findings to both localities yet recommended LCZ for Kingston and Kingston Beach and RLZ for Bonnet Hill and Albion Heights.

During day 2 of the Kingborough LPS Hearing [04:17:00 – 04:25:00] LCZ inside the Urban Growth Boundary (Kingston and Kingston Beach / Baron Hill locality) was flagged as STRLUS-inconsistent; accepted as anomalous for this process only.
Rural Living A zoning is suitable for our property as it balances the primary residential use with environmental protection, and strategic objectives within the UGB.

Conclusion and relief sort

For the reasons set out above, I submit that:

1. The application of the LCZ to my property is inconsistent with the Zone Guidelines (Guideline No. 1) and does not satisfy the requirements of section 34 of LUPAA.
2. The LCZ is prohibited by Zone Guideline LCZ 4(a) where, as here, the priority of the land is residential use.
3. The Rural Living Zone satisfies the criteria in Zone Guidelines RLZ 1(a) and RLZ 2(b) and is the appropriate zone for my property.
4. Any landscape values identified in the locality can be appropriately managed through existing overlay controls without resort to LCZ.

I respectfully request that the Commission:

- Determine that the draft Kingborough LPS should be modified to include my property within the Rural Living Zone A
- If the Commission proposes any alternative outcome, that I be provided with an opportunity to respond before any final determination is made.

Signed: [Redacted]

Date: 28/4/26

Full name:

ERIC VANDERLAAN

TANYA VANDERLAAN

Contact email / phone: