
From: Gary Oliver <dr@well.com>
Sent: Thursday, 21 March 2024 8:30 AM
To: TPC Enquiry
Cc: Brady Paul; Brady Paul
Subject: Fwd: Huon Valley Draft LPS - Directions Schedule from 21 Feb 2024 - DIRECTION 2
Attachments: L240320_51924BP - Representation to TPC.pdf

Good morning

One thing I did not pickup last night when reviewing the drawings was showing that the eastern bush is used also as permanent winter and inclement weather grazing paddock just the same as the area marked A. My neighbour reminded me he has fed cattle apples there.

I have copied this to Brady Paul at PDA to amend the drawing asking him to add a label showing this and send it directly to you. He can also amend the other label as per my email last night.

Sorry for my careless in not noticing these oversights

I remain available if there are any further queries on mobile 0419 914 111

Again, my thanks to the Commission for its work

Sincerely
Dr Gary R Oliver

From: "Gary Oliver" <dr@well.com>
To: "tpc" <tpc@planning.tas.gov.au>
Cc: "Brady Paul" <brady.paul@pda.com.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 20 March, 2024 7:04:18 PM
Subject: Fwd: Huon Valley Draft LPS - Directions Schedule from 21 Feb 2024 - DIRECTION 2

Good evening

Attached is a copy of the submission forwarded on my behalf from Brady Paul this afternoon

In reading through I see one point needs amplification.

The drawings and commentary refer to the emergency and heavy vehicle thoroughfares along the external eastern boundaries. It should have also described their other function as cattle lane ways for quick movement between paddock subdivisions.

I would appreciate your adding this to the submission as this conveys the correct intention that they are in frequent use and are essential to livestock operations.

I also am available if there are any further queries on mobile 0419 914 111

Again, my thanks to the Commission for its attention to detail

Sincerely
Dr Gary R Oliver

From: "Brady Paul" <Brady.Paul@pda.com.au>
To: "tpc" <tpc@planning.tas.gov.au>
Cc: "Gary Oliver" <dr@well.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 20 March, 2024 4:52:16 PM
Subject: Huon Valley Draft LPS - Directions Schedule from 21 Feb 2024 - DIRECTION 2

Good afternoon,
As invited by the Commission last month, please see the attached response.
This is in reply to the updated mapping by the Huon Valley Council as requested under Direction #2.
If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Yours kindly,
Brady.

Regards,



Brady Paul Registered Land Surveyor, Bgeom
Huonville Office Manager | Senior Surveyor

Phone: +61 (03) 6264 1277
Brady.Paul@pda.com.au
11/16 Main Street, Huonville TAS 7109

Our Ref: 51924BP
L240320_51934BP - Representation to TPC

20th March 2024

Tasmanian Planning Commission
144 Macquarie Street
HOBART 7001

Dear Commission Panel,

Re: 129 Jetty Road, Waterloo

I write to you on behalf of Gary Oliver who has asked that I prepare this document to voice his desires with respect to the dual zoning proposal and the proposed mapping put forward by the Huon Valley Council for his late wife's title in Waterloo. In preparing this submission I have discussed the key issues with several planners within PDA to ensure the concerns raised are canvassed appropriately, due to the time restrictions however, they were unable to prepare this submission themselves. I will keep this response concise and thank you kindly for your time to consider this submission. Gary also wishes to acknowledge your recognition of the concerns he has expressed in the previous public hearings that he has attended. He is very appreciative of your consideration.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact the writer.

Yours faithfully,
PDA Surveyors, Engineers & Planners.

Per: 

Brady Paul
SENIOR REGISTERED SURVEYOR
Email: brady.paul@pda.com.au

HOBART:

C.M. Terry, BSurv (Tas.), M.SSSI (Director)
H. Clement, BSurv (Tas.), M.SSSI (Director)
M.S.G. Denholm, BGeom (Tas.), M.SSSI (Director)
T.W. Walter, Dip. Surv & Map (Director)
M. Westerberg, M.E.M., M.I.E. AUST., C.P.ENG. (Director)
A. Collins, Ad. Dip. Surv & Map, (Senior Associate)
D. Panton, B.E. F.I.E. AUST., C.P.ENG. (Consultant)

KINGSTON:

M.M. Stratton, BSurvSpSc, GradDipLandSurv (Tas.) (Associate)
A.P. (Lex) McIndoe, BSurv (Tas.) (Consultant)

LAUNCESTON:

L.H. Kiely, Ad. Dip. Civil Eng, Cert IV I.T. (Senior Associate)
J.W. Dent, OAM, B. Surv (Tas.), M.SSSI (Consultant)

BURNIE/DEVONPORT:

A.W. Eberhardt, BGeom (Tas.), M.SSSI (Director)
D. Menger (Senior Associate)

OFFICES ALSO AT:

- 6 Freeman St, Kingston, TAS 7109 (03) 6229 2131
- 127 Bathurst Street, Hobart, TAS 7000 (03) 6234 3217
- 3 Franklin St, Swansea, TAS 7190 (03) 6130 9099
- 3/23 Brisbane St, Launceston, TAS 7250 (03) 6331 4099
- 6 Queen Street, Burnie, TAS 7320 (03) 6431 4400
- 77 Gunn St, Devonport, TAS 7310 (03) 6423 6875

A) Gary's desire:

Gary's preferred zoning for his properties under the new Scheme are as follows:
(In order of descending priority)

A.1) Zone the entire property as "Agricultural"

Given that he uses the entire property for agricultural purposes to run his cattle business, his desire is for the entire title to remain zoned as Agricultural. This is a continuation of the current zoning under the Interim Scheme and was the zoning initially proposed by the Council for the Statewide Scheme.

A.2) Zone the entire property as "Rural"

Gary feels very strongly against the title becoming split zoned for both planning and commercial reasons. It is understood that Council wishes to provide for a Priority Vegetation Overlay on this title and that C7.2 discourages this overlay from existing on land zoned as Agricultural. If his wish to have the entire title zoned as Agricultural is deemed not to be an option, Gary would prefer that the titles were wholly zoned as Rural to avoid the need for a split zone. Being zoned as Rural would allow for the current agricultural use to continue although allowing some additional rural industries and businesses. It is noted that this would need to include the title FR 52375/1 which is situated in the centre of FR 168260/1 and forms part of the overall property (Property ID: 3322857).

A.3) Use the more appropriate zone boundary.

If options 1 and 2 are to be rejected by the Commission and it is deemed that a split zone is the only option, Gary would like the zone boundary to be created in a way that covers only the area required for the overlay. That is, to zone the majority as Agricultural and only have the land covered by the overlay to be zoned as Rural. Attention is drawn to the concerns Gary has about the mapping proposed by Council as highlighted on the following page.

B) Garys mapping concerns:

B.1) Council's proposed use of imprecise and changing features for the zone boundary.

It is noted that the Council have gone directly against the intent of Practice Note #7 issued by the Tasmanian Planning Commission. Section 2.4 of that document states:

*[Council should] Minimise the use of zone boundaries that do not align to the cadastral parcel boundaries or road centrelines. Where use of other zone boundaries is necessary for planning reasons, the zone boundaries **must** be based on features that are identifiable on the ground. Avoid using datasets with variable spatial accuracy, currency or attribute accuracy to underpin zone boundaries (such as geology, Tasveg, threatened species, etc). [My emphasis added]*

Council has clearly adopted the edge of the clearing for their proposed zone boundaries in their latest response, directly against this requirement. The zone boundaries appear to be based on the edge of the clearing with one line being simplified slightly by straightening the line. Nevertheless, the straightened line is still based on the prominent edge of the clearing.

This is the Commission's own advice, so I won't labour this point excessively. Not only does this create problems for the ongoing maintenance of mapping systems, but it also erodes the purpose, validity and effectiveness of the zone boundary by connecting zone boundaries to features that can't be determined on the ground with any accuracy and which change position over time. I'm sure the Commission (and also the Council) are well aware of how problematic this can be for the implementation of the Planning Scheme in the future. Even if the zone boundary is being defined by measurements from the cadastre, this is just a workaround that does not negate all the issues caused.

B.2) The mapping is not representative of the current plans in place.

Gary believes the mapping proposed by the Council in their latest response is still inaccurate. He highlights that the mapping provided by Council is not representative of the approvals and plans he has for the near future of the property and will impact his ability to maintain and utilise the land.

Gary has invested in professional consultants to conduct recent studies and reports to determine the best way to manage the land and improve his business. This includes forest practices plans and the identification of nuisance species amongst the undergrowth on the property for management and removal. Gary has conducted his business with due diligence under professional advice and has gone through the correct process to acquire valid permits. He has started implementing these strategies and is now concerned that his plans and investments are at risk of being lost or undermined by Council's failure to recognise them in their proposed mapping and ultimately the proposed zoning.

Please see attached plan 51924BP-2 which has been prepared to highlight Gary's proposed overlay mapping. This adjusted mapping takes into consideration the following:

- i) Mapping by Council from its recent response.
- ii) Work conducted recently by professionals to obtain forest practices permits etc.
(It is noted that these works were conducted onsite and not using remote sources.)
- iii) Ongoing works that are progressing under these permits.

It is noted again how a split zone boundary can become irrelevant when based on features such as vegetation and why this should be avoided, as highlighted already under point B.1.

B.3) Use the more appropriate zone boundary.

Should the Commission decide to go against Gary's wishes under points A.1 and A.2 and determine that a split zone is required, it would then be ignoring its own advice as outlined in point B.1 and strengthened in B.2. If this is to be the final decision, it is requested that the zone boundary should only cover the area that is required for the overlay. See plan 51924BP-3 which, similarly to the recent Council mapping, uses the definition of the overlay to define the zone boundary. Using this proposed mapping will at least result in the zone boundary being more representative of the ground conditions in the near future as outlined in B.2 and will at least somewhat reduce the issues raised in B1.



NOTES

It is noted that the background satellite image in this plan is outdated and is for context only.

This plan has been produced to support a representation to the commission against the planning scheme changes proposed by the Huon Valley Council.

This plan has been produced per the direction of Gary Oliver and is not based on any survey.

E				
D				
C				
B				
A				
REV	AMENDMENTS	DRAWN	DATE	APPR.

SURVEYOR	GEOCIVIL
DRAWN	CHECKED
BP	BP
DATE	18 March 2024

PROPOSED OVERLAY ERROR CORRECTIONS
 129 JETTY ROAD
 WATERLOO
 FOR GARY OLIVER

SCALE	PAPER
1:4000	(A3)
JOB NUMBER	DRAWING
51924BP-2	



NOTES

It is noted that the background satellite image in this plan is outdated and is for context only.

This plan has been produced to support a representation to the commission against their proposed planning scheme changes.

This plan has been produced per the direction of Gary Oliver and is not based on any survey.

See also plan 51924BP-2 for further mapping and justification of overlay extents.

E				
D				
C				
B				
A				
REV	AMENDMENTS	DRAWN	DATE	APPR.

SURVEYOR	GEOCIVIL
-	-
DRAWN	CHECKED
BP	BP
DATE	
18 March 2024	

PROPOSED ZONING AS LAST RESORT
129 JETTY ROAD
WATERLOO
FOR GARY OLIVER

SCALE	PAPER
1:4000	(A3)
JOB NUMBER	DRAWING
51924BP-3	