
From: Lyn Hellewell [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, 4 May 2026 12:47 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: Formal Submission re Ireneinc Report for [REDACTED]
Attachments: KingboroughLPS_InconsistencyAnalysis_Margate&Electrona.docx; RLZ_Document_[REDACTED].docx; Collective_Cover_Submission_Template-1.docx

Please find my Formal Submission, an Attachment (A) to the Submission and a Collective Submission attached.

Regards

David Athol Hansson

[REDACTED], MARGATE

Title: [REDACTED]



COLLECTIVE SUBMISSISON

PART 1 — SUBMISSION IDENTIFICATION

Locality	Margate & Electrona
Submission type	Collective cover submission — Direction 69 / Ireneinc Report
Number of signatories	6
Lodgement date	4 May 2026
Contact person for this group	Calum Shackcloth

PART 2 — SIGNATORIES

The following landowners are parties to this collective submission. Each signatory has also lodged their own individual submission addressing their specific property.

Full name	Property address	Title reference	Zone proposed (Ireneinc)	Zone sought
Charles Duncan Shackcloth and Calum Shackcloth	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	LCZ	RLZ
Andrew Charles Murphy	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	LCZ	RLZ
David Athol Hansson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	LCZ	RLZ
William Mark Shackcloth	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	LCZ	RLZ
Owen Geoffrey Whitton	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	LCZ	RLZ
Christopher Sharman	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	LCZ	RLZ

PART 3 — PURPOSE OF THIS SUBMISSION

We are a group of neighbouring landowners in the Margate & Electrona locality. We have each received a letter from the Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC) advising that the Ireneinc report has recommended a zone for our property as part of the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule (LPS).

We are lodging this collective submission to present our shared position to the Commission. Our properties share a common settlement character and landscape context, and we believe the same zone outcome is appropriate for all of them.

Each of us has also lodged an individual submission using the appropriate individual template. Those individual submissions contain the property-specific evidence for each title. This collective submission is not a substitute for those individual submissions — it sits alongside them.

PART 4 — SHARED CHARACTERISTICS OF OUR PROPERTIES

The properties listed in Part 2 share the following characteristics. We ask the Commission to have regard to these shared characteristics when considering each of our individual submissions.

4.1 — Settlement pattern

Our properties form part of an established residential settlement along [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. The pattern of development includes approximately 20 residential lots, most of which contain a dwelling. This settlement has existed in its current form for over 40 years. The properties are along two single roads and a cul-de-sac and form a contiguous group.

4.2 — Typical lot sizes

Lot sizes in our group range from 2 ha to 17 ha, with a median of approximately 3.86 ha. These lot sizes are consistent with the Rural Living Zone (RLZ) B minimum lot size of 2 ha.

4.3 — Existing uses

The majority of allotments in our area contain existing dwellings used as permanent residences, with the remaining property owners all intending to build in the future. The majority of properties in this cluster also include various rural activities related to grazing, gardens, outbuildings etc. None of the properties are used for commercial agriculture or resource extraction.

4.4 — Landscape and vegetation character

Our properties are all predominantly a mixture of cleared areas and patches of native vegetation. The vegetation on our titles does not include significant native vegetation that would require LCZ to protect it. The landscape character is rural/residential with pockets of regrowth that have been allowed to grow since the 1967 bushfires. Any vegetation values present are already protected by overlay controls such as Priority Vegetation Area, Biodiversity, Scenic Landscape and Waterway & Coastal Protection Codes.

4.5 — Overlay controls

The following overlays apply to all of our properties: Scenic Protection Area (SPA), Priority Vegetation Area (PVA), Biodiversity, Waterway & Coastal Protection Code. These overlays already protect landscape values — they are relevant to the argument in Part 5 below.

4.6 — Proximity to existing Rural Living Zone or Rural Zone land

Our properties are all in close proximity to properties already zoned Rural Living Zone (RLZ) under the draft LPS. The existing RLZ land to the South (i.e. the rest of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] all the way into the Margate town centre) has similar lot sizes, settlement character, and landscape values to our properties.

PART 5 — SHARED ARGUMENTS

A — Our properties satisfy the Zone Guidelines for the zone we are seeking

Zone Guideline RLZ 1(a) provides that the RLZ should be applied to residential areas with larger lots where the existing and intended use is a mix between residential and lower-order rural activities (such as hobby farming), and where priority is given to residential amenity.

Zone Guideline RLZ 2(b) further provides that the RLZ may be applied to land within the Environmental Living Zone (ELZ) in an interim planning scheme where the primary strategic intention is for residential use and development within a rural setting, and a similar minimum lot size is applied.

Our properties satisfy both criteria. The shared characteristics described in Part 4 above demonstrate that our properties have an established residential settlement pattern, lots of a size consistent with RLZ subcategories, and a primary use and intention that is residential.

B — Comparable localities support the same outcome for our properties

The Tasmanian Planning Commission is required under section 34(2)(g) of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (LUPAA) to ensure that the spatial application of zones is, as far as practicable, consistent and coordinated. This means the Commission must consider whether our locality has been treated the same way as localities with similar characteristics elsewhere in Kingborough.

We submit that the area that contains the stretch of [REDACTED] from the junction with [REDACTED] to where the recommended LCZ zone begins at [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] to where the recommended LCZ zone begins at [REDACTED] is the most comparable locality to ours. It immediately joins our locality.

Like our properties, properties in the area adjoining ours (described above) have similar lot sizes of 2–5 ha, established dwellings, similar landscape character and similar overlay coverage. Irene inc recommended [RLZ / Rural Zone] for this area, and that recommendation was not challenged at the Day 2 hearing. There is no clear basis for treating our locality differently. We request that the Commission apply the same reasoning here.

D — The Ireneinc evaluation framework is a tool, not a legal rule

Kate Heckelmann of Ireneinc confirmed at the Day 2 TPC hearing [05:53:00] that the evaluation framework used to produce the zone recommendations is a tool, not a statutory instrument. It is not the legal test the Commission must apply. The legal test is the LPS criteria set out in section 34 of LUPAA, which include compliance with the Zone Guidelines (Guideline No. 1). The Commission is not bound by the Ireneinc framework or its outputs.

We submit that if the Commission applies the Zone Guidelines directly to the shared characteristics of our properties, as set out in Part 4 above, it will find that [RLZ / Rural Zone] is the appropriate zone. Any departure from the Ireneinc recommendation in our favour is well within the Commission's proper exercise of its statutory role.

E — The Commission decides on its own assessment, not on Council's position

Chair Nick Heath confirmed at the Day 2 hearing [06:45:48] that the Commission will decide this matter on the basis of the LPS criteria set out in section 34 of LUPAA. He explicitly noted that Council's position — including its 16 March 2026 resolution favouring the 'least restrictive alternative' — is not binding on the Commission. The Commission will reach its own independent assessment based on the evidence before it, including the evidence in this submission and in each of our individual submissions.

PART 6 — COLLECTIVE REQUEST

We collectively request that the Commission:

- Determine that the draft Kingborough LPS should be modified to include each of the properties listed in Part 2 within the Rural Living Zone (RLZ) (subcategory A,B,C or D according to each individual submission) rather than the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) or other zone currently proposed for those properties.
- Have regard to the shared characteristics and shared arguments set out in this collective submission when assessing each of our individual submissions.
- Organise the hearing for our locality so that our group can present collectively as well as individually, as Chair Heath invited at the Day 2 hearing [06:55:53].

PART 8 — DECLARATION AND SIGNATURES

The signatory below acts as a representative for the group, with their permission, and confirms that:

- This submission has been prepared to support a formal written submission to the Tasmanian Planning Commission in relation to the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule (Direction 69).
- The information in this submission is, to the best of my knowledge, accurate.
- I am the owner or authorised representative of the property identified against my name in Part 2.
- I have also lodged, or will lodge by the deadline, a separate individual submission addressing my specific property.

Full name: Calum Shackcloth Address: [REDACTED], MARGATE Title Ref: [REDACTED]	Signature: [REDACTED] Date: 3 May 2026
--	---

25 April 2026

To the Tasmanian Planning Commission

Your Reference: DOC/26/36829

Owners: David Athol Hansson

Property Address: [REDACTED], MARGATE

Title Reference (folio): [REDACTED]

Lot Size (approx): 3.13ha

Locality: Margate/Electrona

Current IPS zone: Environmental Living

Draft LPS exhibited zone: Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ)

Ireneinc recommended zone: Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ)

Zone sought in this submission: Rural Living Zone B (RLZ B)

I write in response to your letter dated 2 April 2026 advising that the Ireneinc report recommends that my property remain 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.

As a precursor to my submission, it should also be noted that I acknowledge that the term "landscape values" is not specifically defined by the Tasmanian Planning Scheme (TPS), leading to uncertainty, with the Council stating there are "no specific tools or descriptions for assessment". Further, "It is not evident that a consistent approach has been taken in establishing the extent of localised values in all localities across the region" [Response to

Direction 69, March 2026, pg 54) and that landscape values have not been defined or agreed in consultation with the community as required under the [Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 \(LUPAA\)](#).

I submit as follows:

I purchased my property in 1984 but, previously to the 1967 bushfires, it had been part of the extensive small fruits farm worked and inhabited by my Mothers' family, the Minehans, since the late 19th century. My mother grew up on this property. My fathers' family, the Hanssons, were established in the timber industry working out of the Margate Hills at the top of [REDACTED] since about the same time.

This land is not merely a scenic backdrop to be managed primarily for conservation. It is my history and it is my home.

At the time I purchased it, most of the land was small, scrubby regrowth. I have chosen to selectively keep some areas from regenerating to be used for rural activities. Fenced areas have, over the years, supported various livestock.

In planning terms, this all points toward a zone that recognises and manages long-term rural-residential use rather than one whose principal objective is landscape protection.

I was, until recently, unaware of the scope and potential effect of the proposed zoning changes that would affect my property. The subsequent psychological strain, stress and worry that this potential rezoning has placed on me cannot be underestimated.

The change to LCZ is not the most appropriate planning outcome for this land. Under the current Interim Planning Scheme, the Environmental Living Zone (ELZ) is intended to provide for residential use or development in areas where natural and landscape values are to be retained, including places where services are limited and where land may adjoin rural activity. It is therefore a residential zone with a landscape-conscious setting. By contrast, the State's own fact sheet says the LCZ is generally applied where the *main purpose* of the zone is the protection of landscape values, such as large bushland areas or land of important scenic value.

I submit that the better strategic fit for [REDACTED] is RLZ because this Zone is specifically intended to provide for residential use or development on large lots in a rural setting where services are limited, while also requiring that use and development respect the natural landscape. In other words, Rural Living is not a free-for-all. It is a zone that

already anticipates rural-residential occupation while still expecting the landscape to be respected.

Council's own comparison material reinforces this distinction. It describes the LCZ as a zone that focuses on landscape protection and only allows other compatible uses, whereas the RLZ supports rural-residential use and includes retention of natural and landscape values in its purpose. That comparison shows the central policy question is not whether the land has some landscape value, because many rural-residential properties do, but whether the primary planning purpose of the land should be conservation or rural-residential living. For this property, the more appropriate primary purpose is rural-residential living.

The proposed LCZ also appears too blunt for this parcel. Council's own Landscape Conservation material says that, although it generally seeks to avoid spot-zoning and split-zoning, there are circumstances where the characteristics of the land or its use mean that applying one zone to an entire cadastral parcel is "not logical or appropriate". That is an important admission. It recognises that the strategic mapping exercise cannot replace site-specific judgment. Where a property has an established residential history and an ongoing rural-living function, it is entirely open to Council and the Commission to conclude that LCZ is not the right planning tool for that parcel.

There is also locality-level evidence that the current LCZ pattern around [REDACTED] is not beyond reconsideration. In Council's section 35F report, the broader area including [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] is specifically identified as an area where Council proposed the Kingborough Bushland and Coastal Living Zone as an alternative to the Landscape Conservation Zone. This is important because it shows Council itself has accepted that, in this locality, LCZ may not be the only or best planning response. I believe, therefore, that there is a strong basis to consider whether a genuinely established rural-residential property in this setting should instead be recognised through the RLZ.

The Ireneinc evaluation framework requires consideration of whether identified landscape values can be appropriately managed outside of LCZ, specifically through the Natural Assets Code (NAC), the Scenic Protection Code (SPC), or a Specific Area Plan (SAP). The Commission itself accepted this argument in relation to Kettering West at Day 20 of the Hearing, where the panel effectively found that the Priority Vegetation Area (PVA) overlay does the landscape protection work, not the Zone [Transcript , Day 20, 02:33:54].

My property is within a Scenic Protection Area and has Waterway & Coastal Protection and Biodiversity overlays and, under the new plan, will also have Priority Vegetation. These overlay controls provide adequate management of any landscape values present, without the need for the more restrictive LCZ.

A Rural Living outcome would better preserve planning continuity. The current Environmental Living purpose already combines residential use with retention of landscape values. The jump from that framework to Landscape Conservation changes the policy centre of gravity: residential living moves from being the expected function to something secondary to landscape protection, building a home becomes potentially discretionary rather than permitted. Rural Living is a more balanced transition because it continues to recognise residential use on large rural lots with limited services, interface with rural land, and respect for natural landscape.

Importantly, rezoning to Rural Living would not leave the land unprotected. The Rural Living Zone still requires use and development to respect the natural landscape, and the land can continue to be managed through any applicable codes and overlays in the new scheme. Put plainly, LCZ is not the only way to protect landscape values. Where landscape values can be appropriately addressed through a residential large-lot zone and applicable codes, imposing LCZ is unnecessarily restrictive and does not represent the most suitable or proportionate planning response. Council's 2026 independent review expressly notes that the review process included consideration of whether landscape values might be appropriately managed under a different zone such as RLZ, rather than requiring LCZ.

The RLZ cluster (the lower half of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and a large portion of the Nierinna area), which begins a hundred metres down the road from my property, and those surrounding it was recommended for Rural Living Zone because codes manage landscape values and the settlement pattern is consistent with rural living. I strongly dispute the claim that [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] and beyond does not display a clear rural living settlement plan, that there are fewer residential lots and that there is a less consistent pattern than my close neighbours who are zoned to remain RLZ.

A formal inconsistency analysis has been prepared and is attached to this submission as Attachment A. This analysis compares the landscape value descriptions, settlement characteristics, lot sizes and SPA coverage, PVA/NAC overlay coverage, and risk ratings applied by Ireneinc to this locality against one or more similar localities that received a more favourable Zone outcome using the same or near-identical evidence.

The analysis draws on the following key statements from Day 20 of the TPC hearing:

- Commissioner Rohan Probert [01:07:48] directly identified that landscape descriptions for Tinderbox East and Howden are near-identical yet produced opposite zone outcomes, asking Ireneinc to identify the actual difference between those two. This principle applied to the inconsistency documented in Attachment A for this locality.
- Commissioner Dan Ford [02:33:54] forced the concession that the PVA overlay does the landscape protection work, not the zone. This principle applies as the PVA overlay is present on my property.
- Kate Heckelman (Ireneinc)[05:53:00] state that the evaluation framework is “a tool, not a rule”. It is not a statutory instrument and submissions can depart from it with good evidence.

For these reasons, I believe that the more appropriate zoning outcome for [REDACTED] is Rural Living. That outcome would better reflect:

1. the property’s long-established use by me since 1984;
2. the existing planning character of the land under the Interim Scheme’s Environmental Living framework;
3. the purpose of the Rural Living Zone as land for large-lot residential use in a rural setting with limited services; and
4. Council’s own acknowledgement that universal application of LCZ to a parcel is not always logical or appropriate, and that parts of the Van Morey Road locality warrant a non-LCZ alternative.

I respectfully request that the Commission:

- Determine that the draft Kingborough LPS should be modified to include our property [REDACTED] at [REDACTED], Margate within the Rural Living Zone B; and that
- If the Commission proposes any alternative outcome, that I be provided with an opportunity to respond before any final determination is made.

Signed:

Date:

David Athol Hansson

Attachment A - KINGBOROUGH LPS - INCONSISTENCY ANALYSIS PER LOCALITY

MARGATE & ELECTRONA (Channel Region)

MARGATE & ELECTRONA Margate & Electrona (RLZ cluster) — Outcome:
(LCZ-Van Morey Road) – RLZ
Outcome: LCZ retained

Ireneinc landscape value description	significant natural landscape values and scenic landscape values'; elevated; SPA-covered; prominent views from Channel	RLZ cluster: 'landscape values consistent with that anticipated in a rural living settlement; contributing to overall scenic character' — landscape values PRESENT but found manageable
Settlement characteristics found	Limited — has fewer residential lots; not a clear rural living settlement pattern	Yes — recognizable subdivision pattern; lots 2-7ha; residential uses and rural activities
Lot sizes	Larger lots on less consistent pattern	2-7ha — consistent with RLZ C
SPA coverage	YES — significant SPA coverage on elevated areas	Partial — same general area
PVA/NAC overlay	Yes	Yes
Risk rating applied	High elevated lots)	Low - Medium
DP6 — codes manage landscape values?	NO — SPA coverage does not negate the elevated prominence and visual significance at this specific location	YES — codes and min lot size manage values; consistent with adjoining RLZ land
Key differentiation cited	Elevation, SPA coverage, visual prominence from Channel; no clear rural living settlement pattern	YES — codes and min lot size manage values; consistent with adjoining RLZ land