

**From:** [Andrew North](#)  
**To:** [Sorell Council](#)  
**Subject:** Local Provisions State Planning scheme  
**Date:** Monday, 9 August 2021 7:15:18 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[Sorell Local Provisions ANorth submission.docx](#)

---

Please find attached my representation on the local provisions.

Thankyou

**Andrew North**

Principal Ecologist



Ph. 03 6231 9788

Mob. 0409 535 538

163 Campbell St, Hobart, TAS. 7000

## covid-19 controls

To help alleviate some client concerns, North Barker would like to confirm that measures are in place within our business to minimise any disruptions that may be caused by the current covid-19 event and to ensure our staff remain safe while engaged with their work.

In terms of reporting deliverables, staff are utilising home offices as much as possible for desktop based tasks, and maintaining limited external physical contact with non-essential persons. To that effect, it is anticipated that tasks such as reporting, data management and mapping will continue as normal.

In relation to field duties, we are fortunate that most field tasks are equivalent to physical isolation in low risk environments. We have internal policies in place to enable multi-person jobs to be undertaken while maintaining recommended levels of social distancing, such as placing limits on passenger loads in cars and accommodation. Unless it becomes a government mandate that our staff cannot travel to sites to execute field tasks, it is anticipated that we will be able to continue this aspect of our work as normal.

Keep safe and well!

[www.northbarker.com.au](http://www.northbarker.com.au)

[www.bushfireplan.com.au](http://www.bushfireplan.com.au)



**Tasmanian Planning scheme  
Sorell Local provisions  
Public Submission  
Andrew North 8 August 2021**

I am writing this from the perspective of resident in Bream Creek but also as a professional ecologist with extensive experience of the TASVEG mapping system and its limitations as a primary tool for informing a Priority Vegetation layer.

- Agricultural Zone / Rural Zone

Method of assessment retained a lot with >50% priority vegetation as Rural. Otherwise, no impediment to being allocated to Agriculture. This is flawed as the importance of the priority value may not be dictated by area but by qualitative measure. Eg swift parrot nest is localised but of critical significance.

Application of Agriculture Zone as applied in Sorell not appropriate as land often not primarily used for agricultural use e.g. nature conservation (conservation covenants) or small properties used for small business (non agriculture).

Consequence of zoning rural land to agriculture could limit opportunities for small businesses not related to agriculture but of rural nature.

I submit that almost land zoned Agriculture should be zoned Rural or Environmental Management where extensive tracts of forest especially where they include land in conservation covenants.

- Natural Assets Code

Exclusion of priority vegetation considerations from Agriculture Zone is flawed. Naïve to think other State processes fill the gap. These are limited to specific activities such as large in stream dams or triggers that require a Forest Practices Plan.

Significant priority vegetation in Agriculture Zone will be excluded for any regulation resulting in potentially significant scales of vegetation loss. To suggest these are not significant is flawed given these scales of removal would in some cases trigger the EPBC Act for matters of national environmental significance. It doesn't make sense that Council would not be able to consider vegetation removal when assessing a planning application for an activity which could potentially be in breach of the EPBC Act. Any matter of national environmental significance is undoubtedly also of State significance through a hierarchical logic of significance. So not appropriate for Council to be unable to consider this impact. These other State processes when in the few situations they apply do not always include opportunity for public to make a representation. So, public excluded from process.

Recognising these limitations it is not appropriate to apply Agriculture zone where priority natural values are of such prominence in the landscape.

Application of Priority Vegetation Area layer to determine when C7.6.2 can apply is flawed as it relies on a Regional Ecosystem Model heavily reliant on vegetation mapping layer (Tasveg) which is frequently inaccurate or unreliable. This is demonstrated in the significant improvements made with each update (now at version 4 on The List). There are many examples where vegetation mapping is incorrect either because of the incorrect mapping unit allocation to a patch or because the patch is not mapped at all. TasVeg should be used inform contextual loss but not as a determiner at a property level when the Vegetation clearance provisions need to be considered.

This will lead to perverse outcomes where the actual priority value is not captured in the overlay and so is not required to be addressed.

A Priority vegetation layer should be live and able to accommodate changes to mapping or listing of new priority values in other legislation. It should be required to be adjusted every update of Tasveg.

priority vegetation	means native vegetation where any of the following apply: (a) it forms an integral part of a threatened native vegetation community as prescribed under Schedule 3A of the <i>Nature Conservation Act 2002</i> ; (b) is a threatened flora species; (c) it forms a significant habitat for a threatened fauna species; or (d) it has been identified as native vegetation of local importance.
priority vegetation area	means land shown on an overlay map in the relevant Local Provisions Schedule, as within a priority vegetation area.

Considering the priority Vegetation Area overlay fails to capture significant values listed as priority vegetation it should not be used to determine when the C7.6.2 applies. Accepting that the State Planning scheme cannot be amended the only reasonable outcome to ensure development affecting priority vegetation can be regulated is to amend the Priority Vegetation Area overlay to extend to all areas of the municipality or (less preferable) to all areas of native vegetation mapped on TASVEG layer within the municipality.

- Scenic Protection Overlay.

If landscape is of genuine significance then it would make more sense to utilise Landscape Conservation Zone.

This overlay is not effective for controlling vegetation clearance based on scientific value and does not compensate for the inability to apply Vegetation Clearance provisions of the natural Assets Code in the Agriculture Zone.

- Environmental Management Zone

23.1.1 To provide for the protection, conservation and management of land with significant ecological, scientific, cultural or scenic value

This should capture the entirety of Marchwiell Marsh which is one of the largest saltmarshes in southern Tasmania and of State significance. It primarily supports a vegetation type which is listed on the Commonwealth EPBC Act as vulnerable. Not appropriate to be used for agricultural use from which it is slowly recovering. The current boundary follows a so called "historic foreshore reserve" which makes no sense.