
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, 3 May 2026 7:45 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: Submission
Attachments: Kingborough LPS submission Ranson.pdf

As attached.

Thank you.

██████████
Snug TAS 7054

████████████████████
Lower Snug TAS 7054

Tasmanian Planning Commission

kingboroughLPS@planning.tas.gov.au

03 May 2026

Dear Ms Graham

We refer to your letter to us, dated 2 April 2026, regarding proposed changes to the planning zones covering our property at ██████████, Lower Snug (Titles ██████████ and ██████████).

These titles are Protected Areas under The Nature Conservation Act 2002. Our property is small – some 16 hectares - yet it hosts natural values of exceptional depth.

Consequently, the land and its natural values should be provided with the greatest protection possible under any new planning scheme. The proposal in the Irene Inc report and in your letters to us that its status should be changed from Landscape Conservation to Rural, is inappropriate. We urge that the property be zoned Landscape Conservation and be contained within a Land Conservation Zone. Meaning that the whole area outlined in blue on page 269 of the Irene Inc report should, in our opinion, be zoned Landscape Conservation rather than Rural.

It surely behoves any planning process to retain and protect what natural values remain in the municipality and designate zones accordingly. The natural values of our property extend to surrounding properties, with some of our neighbours also covenanting or otherwise dedicating land for wildlife, which provides a welcome extension to our covenanted land. In a world of degrading environments, this shared community commitment is important and worthy of support. This does not appear to be reflected in the recommended zoning in the Irene Inc report.

With dismay, we note that the Irene Inc report states that we submitted a representation opposing the LCZ on both of our titles (in representation 198.293). This is absolutely untrue, absurd on its face, and reputationally damaging: Patently, we would never have done so and we ask for the report to be amended accordingly. We made no representation at all, directly or by proxy.

What did happen is that Messrs Caleb and Nathanael Elcock made representations on a large number of properties without reference to the landowners, including on our property. However, they did enjoin Council to contact us so that we had an opportunity to respond, which Council failed to do. Moreover, the Elcocks did not “oppose” the LCZ, they “affirm” it in their submission. The Irene Inc report needs to be corrected for this inaccuracy, too.

https://www.planning.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/825046/Representation-198c-Caleb-and-Nathanael-Elcock-5-December-2024-Part-1.pdf pp 81-84 & 205-208.

Yours sincerely

████████████████████

For Dr Val Ranson & Dr Don Ranson