
From: Thomas Davison <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, 11 April 2026 12:54 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: CM: Submission – Opposition to Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) – [REDACTED]
Attachments: Planning_Submission_T_Davison_FULL.docx

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached my formal submission regarding the proposed application of the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) to my property at [REDACTED] Margate.

I respectfully oppose the application of the LCZ to this property and instead advocate for the retention or application of the Rural Living Zone (RLZ), which more accurately reflects the existing use, character, and management of the land.

As outlined in the attached documentation, I have provided detailed supporting evidence, including:

- Environmental observations and land management practices
- Outcomes from the tree assessment and site visit
- Planning and zoning considerations
- Personal and financial impacts associated with the proposed zoning change

I would also like to highlight that during the site visit conducted by council representatives, it was noted that there were no significant trees or environmental features requiring protection, and that the property was free from invasive weeds. This reflects the ongoing care and active land stewardship I have undertaken since purchasing the property.

As the landowner, I take my role as a custodian of this land seriously. I have no intention of degrading the environment through clearing or inappropriate use—this is precisely why I chose to live in this area.

I am also concerned about the broader impacts of the proposed zoning, including potential reductions in land value, increased insurance costs, and limitations on future borrowing capacity.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this submission. I would welcome the opportunity to speak further or provide any additional information if required.

Kind regards,
Thomas Davison

Tom Davison [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

Submission to the Tasmanian Planning Commission

Re: Kingborough Draft Local Provisions Schedule – Zoning of [REDACTED], Margate (CT [REDACTED])

Dear Commissioners,

I write in response to correspondence dated 2 April 2026 regarding the proposed zoning of my property at [REDACTED], Margate.

I formally object to the application of the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) and submit that the Rural Living Zone (RLZ) is the appropriate zoning outcome based on site-specific evidence, established land use, and sound planning principles.

1. Procedural Fairness and Lack of Notification

This correspondence represents the first formal notification I have received regarding the proposed rezoning of my land.

I did not receive any direct notification during the exhibition period, nor was I notified at the time of the earlier rezoning to Environmental Living. Discussions with neighbouring landowners confirm a broader lack of awareness across the locality.

This raises significant concerns regarding procedural fairness and compliance with the objectives of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993, particularly in relation to public participation and transparency.

2. Established Residential Use and Development

The subject land is clearly established for residential and associated uses, including:

- A Class 1A dwelling
- A Class 1B visitor accommodation building
- An approved carport under DA-2025-338

These approvals demonstrate that the land continues to be assessed and used within a residential context.

3. Absence of Significant Environmental or Landscape Values

A formal site inspection by Kingborough Council officers confirmed:

- No high conservation value trees
- No threatened flora or species
- The site is largely cleared
- Minimal vegetation within the development footprint

It is also relevant to note that during the site inspection undertaken by Council officers, it was observed that the property did not contain any weed infestations. This condition is the result of ongoing active land management undertaken by myself over many years.

This demonstrates that:

- The land is not in a natural or undisturbed state requiring conservation protection
- Any environmental values present are already responsibly managed without additional zoning restrictions

4. Physical Characteristics and Infrastructure Constraints

The property is significantly modified and contains:

- A 50-metre-wide Aurora Energy easement along the southern boundary with access road.
- Two 12 mt Aurora easement along the eastern boundary
- A Telstra tower approximately 100 meters to the south
- Horseway easement along the entire western boundary
- Constructed dams and cleared building areas

These features fragment the landscape and reduce any claim of intact environmental value.

5. Established Settlement Pattern

The property forms part of an established subdivision with nearby dwellings, sealed road access, and supporting infrastructure. This reflects a rural residential setting rather than a conservation landscape.

6. Historical Planning Intent

The land was purchased in the 1980s from a developer as part of a residential subdivision. The expectation at the time of purchase was clearly for residential use.

The progressive down-zoning of the land represents a significant departure from this intent.

7. Inconsistency with Zoning Methodology

The Ireneinc review identifies inconsistencies in zoning application, lack of localised assessment, and insufficient consideration of RLZ. The application of LCZ to this property reflects those concerns.

8. Appropriate Zoning Outcome

Given the established use, modified condition of the land, and surrounding context, the Rural Living Zone is the most appropriate zoning. It reflects the reality of the land while still allowing environmental management through codes.

9. Personal Impact

The proposed zoning change has significant personal and financial implications, including:

- Increased insurance costs
- Reduction in land value
- Potential limitations on borrowing capacity

As the landowner, I consider myself a custodian of the land and have actively maintained it, including weed control and environmental care.

This process has created considerable stress and uncertainty, particularly due to the lack of notification and clarity.

Conclusion

The application of LCZ to this property is not supported by evidence, planning intent, or fairness.

I respectfully request that the Commission reject the LCZ and apply the Rural Living Zone.

The current proposal does not reflect the reality of the land and, if applied, would impose an unreasonable and inequitable planning burden on the property.

Yours sincerely,
Thomas Davison



NOTES

Date of Desktop Survey:
22/01/2019.

Beating and Horizontal Datum
is GDA94 per SIO 161164.

Horizontal Datum is MGA94 per
SPM 2610, with coordinates of
E 520744.022

N 5232721.045 per the LIST.
All other coordinates have been
treated as plane.

The boundaries shown on this
plan are compiled from
SP40505 & SIO 161164 and,
as such, are approximate only.

This plan has been prepared for the
purpose of defining the Hazard
Management Area.

The building outlines have been
digitised from georectified
imagery. Therefore positional
accuracy of approximately 1.0m.



PDA Surveyors
Surveying, Engineering & Planning

15 Farnham Street
Margate, Tasmania 7100
Phone: 081 23 6238 2101 FAX:
081 23 6238 2041 EMAIL:
pda@pda.com.au

AERIAL UNDERLAY
28 PETTERD ROAD, MARGATE
for T. DAVIDSON

SCALE: MAPS

1 : 1000 (A4)

DATE: 22/01/2019

43369LM - 2

CLIENT: APM

DATE: MK

DATE: 22 JANUARY 2019

