
From: Chris Ashworth [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, 3 May 2026 3:26 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Cc: Pattie Ashworth
Subject: Planning submission: C M and P P Ashworth
Attachments: Planning submission.pdf

To the Tasmanian Planning Commission,

We write in response to the letter dated 2nd April 2026 (ref: DOC/26/36829) advising that the Ireneinc report recommends our property be included within the Rural Living Zone (RLZ) under the draft Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule (LPS), rather than remaining in the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) as exhibited.

We did not make a formal representation during the public exhibition period; however, we understand that we have been given the opportunity by the Commission to make a formal submission in relation to the recommendation made in the Ireneinc report. We take up this opportunity and submit as follows.

Property Details:

LANDOWNER: CHRISTOPHER MARTIN ASHWORTH AND PATRICIA PROCTOR ASHWORTH.

PROPERTY ADDRESS: [REDACTED] MARGATE.

TITLE REFERENCE(FOLIO) [REDACTED]

LOT SIZE: 6.6396 HECTARES.

LOCALITY: MARGATE/ELECTRONA.

CURRENT IPS ZONE: ENVIRONMENTAL LIVING ZONE(ELZ)

DRAFT LPS EXHIBITED ZONE: LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION ZONE.

IRENEINC RECOMMENDED ZONE: RURAL LIVING ZONE(RLZ).

We welcome and support the Ireneinc recommendation that our property be included within the RLZ under the draft Kingborough LPS. The RLZ is the appropriate zone for our property rather than the exhibited LCZ.

Our land was zoned rural when we bought it in 1980 as a small hobby farm and we have lived here ever since. The primary use is residential. There are cleared areas where sheep have been grazed, a large vegetable garden, home garden and a dam. Our property exists as an extension of an existing rural residential settlement along Nierinna Rd, McGowan's Rd and Tabor's Rd where most of the lots were subdivided thirty or more years ago into approximately 2ha lots. Our land exhibits similar rural living settlement characteristics in terms of pattern of land use.

Our lot adjoins other lots on the northern and eastern sides which have already been proposed to be included in RLZ. On the western side, our neighbours have also been recommended to be included in RLZ by the Ireneinc Report. Our lot is of similar characteristics to these lots.

Our property is within the Priority Vegetation Area and Scenic Protection Area Code mapping so this provides appropriate management of the vegetation.

The RLZ has four subcategories. The existing pattern and density of development in our locality is consistent with RLZ B, lots of approximately 1-5 ha. Our lot is 6.6 ha. with limited subdivision potential and is consistent with RLZ B or RLZ C.

The Ireneinc. Report has recommended that our property should be in the Rural Living Zone and not the Landscape Conservation Zone. To support this we would like to emphasize the following:

Under Section 8A LPS Guidelines.

LCZ 4: The LCZ should not be applied to:

1. (a) land where the priority is for residential use and development (see RLZ);

This section of Zone Guidelines also includes the following notes to be considered in the application of the zone in a planning scheme:

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.

Our property is inconsistent with LCZ as the primary use is residential in a large lot residential area.

We submit that the Ireneinc Report recommendation to include our property within RLZ is correct and consistent with the following Rural Living Zone Guidelines:

1. Residential area with larger lots where the existing and intended use is a mix between residential and lower-order rural activities, with priority given to the protection of residential amenity.
2. RLZ may be applied to ELZ land where the primary strategic intention is for residential use and development within a rural setting.

In conclusion, we respectfully request that the Commission adopt the Ireneinc Report recommendation and include our property, Title Reference(Folio) [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Margate, within the **Rural Living Zone** in the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule.

Additionally we request that our property, Title Reference(Folio) [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Margate, be included in **Rural Living Zone B** in the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule.

Signed

Christopher Martin Ashworth

[REDACTED]

3/5/2026

Patricia Proctor Ashworth

[REDACTED]

3/5/2026