
From: Michael Cullen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, 4 May 2026 11:57 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: Submission for [REDACTED], Neika, 7054 (PID: [REDACTED])

To whom it may concern,

I'm writing to you regarding a letter I received from your office around the proposed rezoning in the Kingborough municipality - in particular regarding my property at [REDACTED], Neika, 7054.

I'd like to start by thanking the Tasmanian Planning Commission for this opportunity to provide feedback as I had been previously unaware that the rezoning was happening and had missed the opportunity to provide feedback to the Kingborough Council directly.

As I have not been involved in a process like this before, the below represents my understanding of what is required for a submission. If more information or reasoning is required, I would be more than happy to provide additional details, please reach out to me via email or mobile phone.

Proposed Zone Change

Per the letter from the TPC, the current zoning for this property is Environmental Living Zone (ELZ) and is proposed to move to Land Conservation Zone (LCZ).

In my view, this is **not** the most appropriate choice for the following reasons:

Reason 1

The zones have different underlying intent and stated philosophies.

Fundamentally, the ELZ is a residential zone with protections for natural values, aligning with the historical use of the property whereas the LCZ zone flips the intent, ensuring landscape and natural values take precedence over residential use.

This is highlighted in the independent report produced by Irenelnc where it states:

"The LCZ is not a replacement zone for the ELZ in interim planning schemes. There are key policy differences between the two zones.

The LCZ is not a large lot residential zone, in areas characterised by native vegetation cover

and other landscape values. Instead, the LCZ provides a clear priority for the protection of landscape values and for complementary use or development, with residential use largely being discretionary"

In addition;

"This is with the exception of the Environmental Living Zone (ELZ), which is a zone that has been provided for under the Interim Planning Scheme arrangements, but has been removed from the suite of zones available under the TPS."

"The LCZ is a new zone that has been introduced to the suite of zones available under the TPS, however this zone is noted that this zone is not intended to replace the ELZ but is instead intended as an alternative zone in which landscape and natural values take precedence over residential use"

Reason 2

The current allowed uses will be unduly restricted, impacting my young family's future plans that we have recently invested a significant portion of our life savings into.

With this change, a number of uses requiring no permit (e.g. minor utilities and home childcare) will move to being "permitted" uses and currently permitted uses (e.g. visitor accommodation) will be moved to "discretionary" with further constraints on building envelopes etc.

This represents additional hurdles to overcome when pursuing these usages, which come at significant time and monetary cost to the property owner on each occasion.

It also constrains minimum lot sizes significantly, and effectively removes the ability to divide the lot in future, despite the large property size (approx 97 acres).

Reason 3

The property will be protected by a number of code overlays which I believe, in conjunction with an appropriate zone such as Rural Living Zone (RLZ) will meet the intent of conserving natural landscape and scenic values while simultaneously aligning with my desire to appreciate and share this special place with my extended family and as a safe place to learn and hopefully one day teach, my aboriginal cultural practices.

Proposed Code Overlays (LPS):

C7.0 Waterway and Coastal Protection Area

C7.0 Priority Vegetation

C8.0 Scenic Protection Area

C13.0 Bushfire-Prone Areas

C15.0 Landslip Hazard

Proposal:

I propose that the Rural Living Zone (RLZ) be considered as a more appropriate alternative to the current LCZ proposal for the reasons I have listed above.

This aligns with the following intent outlined in the Irenelnc report:

“The Zone Guidelines identify that the purpose of the Rural Living is to:

11.1.1 To provide for residential use or development in a rural setting where:

(a) services are limited; or

(b) existing natural and landscape values are to be retained.

11.1.2 To provide for compatible agricultural use and development that does not adversely impact on residential amenity.

11.1.3 To provide for other use or development that does not cause an unreasonable loss of amenity, through noise, scale, intensity, traffic generation and movement, or other off-site impacts.

11.1.4 To provide for Visitor Accommodation that is compatible with residential character”

This would be consistent with other properties in the area that have been deemed RLZ and with other submissions from community members.

Alternatively, I note that as part of the Irenelnc review, at least one nearby property was split into two zones, LCZ and RLZ which I would be interested to explore although in conversation with council this seemed less preferable than a singular zone.

Thank you again for providing the opportunity to give feedback and I look forward to engaging with the Commission in the coming months.

Kind Regards,
Michael Cullen

