
From: Vince Sorrentino <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, 24 April 2026 9:03 AM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: CM: TPC submission for RLZ
Attachments: Planning%20Submission.pdf.pdf

To Whom it may concern,

Please find attached my submission via PDF attached.

I will provide the reference number from Caleb & Nathanael Elcock. KCLPS-260419-D52-4

Thank you,
Vincenzo & Jennifer Sorrentino

WRITTEN SUBMISSION TO THE

TASMANIAN PLANNING COMMISSION

Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule — Direction 69 / Ireneinc Report

PART A — PROCEDURAL OPENING (A3)

To the Tasmanian Planning Commission,

We write in response to the letter dated 2 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 the Commission has received correspondence from us or on our behalf in relation to the draft LPS. We understand that this letter provides us with the opportunity to formally participate in this stage of the LPS process. We take up that opportunity and submit as follows.

PART B — PROPERTY DETAILS

Landowners: Vincenzo Sorrentino & Jennifer Joy Sorrentino

Address: [REDACTED], Blackmans Bay

Title Reference: [REDACTED]

Lot Size: 2.079 ha

Locality: Blackmans Bay

Current IPS Zone: Environmental Living Zone (ELZ)

Draft LPS Exhibited Zone: Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ)

Ireneinc Recommended Zone: Rural Living Zone (RLZ)

Position: Accept RLZ — support recommendation and argue correct subcategory

PART C — STATEMENT OF POSITION

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

We make this submission to:

1. Provide the Commission with property-specific evidence supporting the RLZ recommendation;
2. Identify the most appropriate RLZ subcategory for our property; and
3. Ensure the Commission does not revert to LCZ at the final determination stage.

RLZ SUBCATEGORY

The appropriate subcategory for our property is:

Rural Living Zone B (minimum lot size 2 ha).

Our property is 2.079 ha. The minimum lot size under RLZ B is 2 ha, which aligns directly with our existing lot size and does not create subdivision potential.

The existing pattern of development in our locality supports this classification. Properties along Estuary Drive and the surrounding area typically range between approximately 2 ha and 3 ha. Our property is consistent with this established pattern.

Applying RLZ B reflects the existing density and settlement structure and ensures that further subdivision is either not possible or highly constrained, maintaining the character of the locality.

PART D — SUPPORTING EVIDENCE AND ARGUMENTS

D1 — Consistency with Zone Guidelines

RLZ 1(a) — Residential character with rural activities

Our property has been used as a residence since approximately 1984. It contains a dwelling and associated outbuildings and is used primarily for residential purposes, with typical rural-residential activities. This is consistent with the intended application of RLZ.

RLZ 2(b) — ELZ land with residential intention

The primary strategic intention for our property has always been residential use within a rural setting. The RLZ B minimum lot size of 2 ha is consistent with our existing lot size and does not introduce subdivision pressure.

RLZ 3 — Subcategory selection

RLZ B reflects the existing lot size pattern and density in our locality. The surrounding properties form a consistent rural-residential cluster, and our property aligns directly with that pattern.

D2 — Property-Specific Evidence

Established rural residential settlement

Our property forms part of a cluster of approximately 10 residential properties along Estuary Drive, each generally between 2 ha and 3 ha in size. Each property contains a dwelling and associated outbuildings. The area has functioned as a settled rural residential community since approximately 1984.

Landscape values can be managed without LCZ

Any landscape or environmental values in the locality can be appropriately managed through existing planning controls, including the Natural Assets Code (NAC), Priority Vegetation Area (PVA) overlay, and Scenic Protection Code (SPC), where applicable. These controls, combined with RLZ B lot size provisions, provide sufficient protection without the need for LCZ.

Subdivision is not enabled

At 2.079 ha, our property cannot be subdivided under RLZ B (minimum 2 ha), or would be extremely limited in any theoretical scenario. We do not intend to subdivide. The RLZ B classification therefore maintains the existing pattern without intensification.

D3 — The LCZ Should Not Be Reinstated

The exhibited LCZ is not appropriate for our property.

- The LCZ was broadly applied and does not reflect the established residential nature of our land or surrounding properties.
- The RLZ recommendation reflects a more detailed, property-specific assessment and should be preferred.
- RLZ better aligns with the actual use, development pattern, and strategic intent of the locality.

ADDITIONAL CONTEXT (PRACTICAL IMPACTS UNDER ELZ)

Our experience developing on the property under the ELZ highlights the practical implications of overly restrictive zoning:

- Construction of a residential deck required extensive approvals, environmental assessments, and associated costs
- We were required to enter into Part 5 agreements and make biodiversity offset payments
- Bushfire compliance requirements (including BAL ratings and fire management planning) added further complexity
- Environmental constraints were applied even where the relevant vegetation or values were not present on site

These experiences demonstrate that environmental and landscape matters are already heavily regulated through existing frameworks and do not require the additional overlay of LCZ to achieve appropriate outcomes.

PART E — CONCLUSION AND RELIEF SOUGHT

For the reasons set out above, we submit that:

1. The Ireneinc recommendation to include our property within the RLZ is correct and consistent with the Zone Guidelines and section 34 of LUPAA;
2. The exhibited LCZ is not appropriate and should not be reinstated;
3. The correct subcategory is RLZ B, reflecting the existing pattern and density of development and constraining further subdivision;
4. Any landscape values can be appropriately managed through existing overlay controls in combination with RLZ provisions.

REQUEST

We respectfully request that the Commission:

- Adopt the Ireneinc recommendation and include our property within the **Rural Living Zone B** in the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule; and
- Not revert to the exhibited LCZ.

We specifically request that:

Folio [REDACTED] at [REDACTED], Blackmans Bay be included within RLZ B.

Signed:

Vincenzo Sorrentino
Jennifer Joy Sorrentino

Date: 23/04/2026