

From: Greg Beeton <gregbeeton3048@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, 2 August 2021 4:37 PM
To: Development Services
Cc: Greg Beeton
Subject: Response -draft LPS FI

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Greg Beeton
0400509353

Wish to confirm that EMZ is appropriate for the private land on Shearwater rookery outer islands. However rookery protection is needed from the impacts of commercial accomodation on such 'outer islands'.

EMZ appears to recognise 'Fauna' and has direct reference to 'Nature and conservation Act 2002'. I am unsure how this act is interpreted for other Zones. Your proposed planning zones offer no distinction between 'rookery land' and 'non rookery land' on outer islands.

For all islands that are 'Shearwater rookery islands' the Environment Management Zone appears most appropriate and would be consistent. It appears to mirror the existing LPS of 'Environmental Management and Recreation Zone with the Ecological Sensitive and Visually Sensitive Overlays. These islands need to be protected and valued. It is Council responsibility. Why not a special status for Shearwater rookery land as configured for 'aboriginal managed land'?

The fact that under 'planning provisions' an Owner of the land cannot build a house on 100 acres of private rural land but a developer maybe able to build 'Visitor Accomodation' on any small portion of land, Is a very questionable planning anomaly for 'Outer Islands'

Tourist accomodation (Visitor Accommodation) on 'Shearwater rookery islands' of the Furneau Group should not be permitted. Particularly on small islands so close to Lady Barron and the Flinders Island coastline. Such accomodation does nothing for Tourism infrastructure on Flinders Island and can only be detrimental to the environment. Fire risk from irresponsible visitors is an unacceptable risk during Summer.

An owner of any authorised 'Visitor Accomodation' is unlikely to be required to demolish the visitor accomodation facility (only permitted to be built for that specific purpose) should it cease to operate. 'visitor Accomodation' should not be an excuse for otherwise 'prohibited building'.

Similarly accomodation rates can be set so high that effectively it operates as 'not visitor accommodation'. Some developers build facilities for the sole purpose of either making a profit (on selling to a third party) or for self satisfaction. By this I mean their longer term intent is not to operate 'Visitor Accomodation', or maintain standards.

There are many examples in Tasmanian National Parks of specific purpose buildings that are not required to be removed despite becoming dysfunctional and derelict. This is not acceptable on Furneau Outer Islands.

Greg Beeton
27 Franklin Parade
Lady Barron