
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 30 April 2026 7:49 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: Submission – Response to Direction 69 and Irenic report Property Address: [REDACTED], Neika TAS
Attachments: [REDACTED].jpg; Neika.heic; [REDACTED]
Neika.heic; [REDACTED] Neika.heic; [REDACTED] Neika.heic

To Whom It May Concern

We strongly object to the proposed rezoning of our property at [REDACTED], Neika to the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ), and request that the property be included in the Rural Living Zone. This property is more aligned with Rural Living as we have green pastures as shown in the attached photos.

Our property is approximately 10 acres and is our primary residence. It is actively and consistently used for rural living purposes, including the keeping of sheep and chickens. These animals are a fundamental part of how we manage the land, supporting pasture control, productivity, and day-to-day rural land stewardship along with the management of fire hazard reduction. This is an established rural-residential property, not passive or conservation-dominant land. We have a PIC that enables us to keep livestock: PIC Number MAKB1296 from bio security Tasmania.

The property also has a long-standing personal connection. Doug has visited this land since childhood and later had the opportunity to purchase it to realise a rural living lifestyle. This reinforces the property's identity as an occupied rural home rather than land intended for conservation zoning. Raising our 4 children here in a rural environment where they enjoyed mini bike riding, we had horses for many years as did the residents prior to us, this is something we wish to repeat with our grandchildren in the coming years.

Historically, the land was cleared and operated as a small fruit farm, prior to this it was farmed. This agricultural legacy remains evident, and the property is clearly a modified rural landscape rather than intact natural bushland. One of the borders of the property has a stone wall made by the old timers from all of the stones they gathered to make pastures. We also have an extensive and large vegetable garden.

A significant and ongoing Erica (spanish heath) weed infestation exists across the property, requiring continuous active management, along with fox gloves and thistles. This level of intervention is inconsistent with the intent of the Landscape Conservation Zone, which is generally applied to land with higher ecological integrity and stable environmental values. Management of this weed is an ongoing and timely effort.

From a planning perspective under the Tasmanian Planning Scheme, zoning must reflect the **dominant existing use, site characteristics, and realistic future function** of land.

The **Landscape Conservation Zone** is intended for land where environmental or landscape values are the primary planning purpose. That is not the case here.

The **Rural Living Zone** is specifically designed for:

- residential occupation in a rural setting
- low-intensity agricultural use
- hobby farming and livestock (including sheep and poultry)
- established rural lifestyle properties

This accurately describes our property.

We also note relevant planning principles for rural residential land in bushfire-prone areas such as Neika:

- properties require ongoing vegetation and fuel management to maintain safety
- landowners must be able to actively manage hazards, including weeds and fuel loads
- zoning should not restrict practical land stewardship required for bushfire preparedness
- access and defensible space maintenance are essential components of safe rural occupation

Importantly, planning guidance also makes clear that:

- Rural Living Zone is appropriate where residential use is combined with small-scale rural activity
- Landscape Conservation Zone should only apply where conservation or landscape values are clearly dominant
- zoning should reflect existing settlement patterns rather than reclassifying established rural homes into conservation zones

In this case, the combined factors of:

- established residential use
- active livestock (sheep and chickens)
- historical agricultural clearing and fruit farm use
- significant ongoing weed management
- and long-term rural living occupation

clearly demonstrate that the Rural Living Zone is the correct and appropriate zoning outcome.

We therefore request that our property be excluded from the proposed LCZ and instead subject to reassessment for Rural Living Zone classification.

We purchased this property as a rural holding, we use and manage the land as a rural lifestyle property. The proposed application of the Landscape Conservation Zone represents a significant and disproportionate shift, introducing constraints that would materially impact our current use and future intentions.

After 23 years of residing on and actively managing this land, we are deeply concerned that this rezoning would limit our ability to continue the rural lifestyle we have established. This property is not simply a dwelling; it represents our long-term way of life, investment, and future. We respectfully submit that it is

unreasonable for such substantial changes to be imposed without appropriate recognition of existing use, history, and the lived reality of the property. Zoning should support and reflect how land is genuinely used, not override it in a way that places established rural livelihoods and futures at risk.

Please see supporting photos that reinforce the use of our property

If you wish to discuss anything further please give us a call

Yours Sincerely

Doug McDonald

[REDACTED]

Melissa McDonald

[REDACTED]









