
From: Tamieka Groombridge [REDACTED] >
Sent: Sunday, 3 May 2026 5:28 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: Kingborough LPS Direction 69 – Support RLZ [REDACTED] Oyster Cove
Attachments: Adkins Groombridge Kingborough LPS Submission in support of RLZ.pdf

To the Tasmanian Planning Commission,

I write in response to the letter dated 2 April 2026 (ref: DOC/26/36829) advising of the zone change for my property.

Please see the attached written submission in support of the recommendation to be transferred to Rural Living Zone.

Regards

Tamieka Groombridge

Knowledge Manager

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]



I'm not available on Thursdays.

All other days you can get me between 7.30am to 5pm AEST.

Confidential

Stephen Adkins & Tamieka Groombridge

[REDACTED]
Oyster Cove
TAS 7150

01 May 2026

Tasmanian Planning Commission
GPO Box 1691
Hobart
TAS 7000

Kingborough draft Local Provisions Schedule – Zoning of Land at Oyster Cove

Thank you for your letter of 2 April 2026, ref DOC/26/36829. We appreciate the opportunity to forward our submission. Our title is [REDACTED] at [REDACTED], Oyster Cove.

1. Position

We welcome and support the Ireneinc recommendation that our property be included within the **Rural Living Zone (RLZ)** under the draft Kingborough LPS. The RLZ is a significantly more appropriate zone for our property than the exhibited **Landscape Conservation Zone (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.

The subcategory We seek for our property is Rural Living Zone B (minimum lot size 2 ha) as the existing lot pattern in Oyster Cove is consistent with lots of approximately 2 to 5 ha

2. Description of the land

- Lot size: approximately 2.5ha
- Tenure: private freehold
- Existing use: established dwelling and associated outbuildings

- The dwelling has been approved and in continuous residential use since approximately 2005

The land and dwellings are therefore long-established as a residential holding and forms part of an existing pattern of rural-residential settlement development in the Oyster Cove area.

3. Suitability for RLZ

The characteristics of the land align closely with the purpose of RLZ:

- The land is already used for residential purposes
- It is of a size typical of rural lifestyle properties
- It is not used, nor well suited, for primary production
- It forms part of a locality that is clearly established as a dispersed residential environment

RLZ appropriately recognises and supports this established land use pattern.

In addition, the RLZ framework allows for consideration of lot size and subdivision standards appropriate to the locality. While outcomes depend on applicable minimum lot size provisions and constraints, the zone provides a structured and transparent basis for assessing such matters, consistent with the characteristics of the land.

At Oyster Cove, the landscape is a mix of open paddocks, partly cleared blocks, light bush plus numerous dams.

4. Inappropriateness of LCZ

While the landscape values of the area are acknowledged, they are not clearly defined and therefore, the application of the LCZ is not considered appropriate for this land:

- The land is not an undeveloped or pristine landscape; it contains a long-standing dwelling and associated development
- The surrounding locality includes numerous existing dwellings on similar lots, indicating an established residential character and settlement pattern
- LCZ is primarily intended for areas where protection of largely intact landscape values is the dominant consideration

In this context, applying LCZ would not accurately reflect the existing use or character of the land.

5. Bushfire risk and vegetation management

Our property is subject to the Bushfire-Prone Areas overlay, which requires the provision and ongoing management of defensible space around the dwelling.

Contemporary bushfire research, including guidance from the **CSIRO**, emphasises the importance of maintaining appropriate separation between buildings and hazardous vegetation, together with active fuel load management to reduce radiant heat and flame exposure.

This reinforces that the land must be capable of accommodating:

- Vegetation clearance in proximity to the dwelling
- Ongoing management of fuel loads
- Separation distances between structures and vegetation

RLZ provides a more appropriate framework for balancing these requirements with established residential use. By contrast, the LCZ places greater emphasis on vegetation retention, which may create tension with effective bushfire risk management in an already developed residential setting.

Zoning should not encourage the spread of invasive weed species (for example, Lantana Radiata Pines, Gorse, Broom and Spanish Heath). All plants can burn, so managing weed species will lower overall fuel loads. Bushfire-resilient residential land use inherently involves managed vegetation clearance and spacing, which must be accommodated within the applicable zoning framework.

The LCZ's purpose is vegetation retention and therefore as per its design it's extremely restrictive when it comes to vegetation removal. In a rural settlement with many families already living in 'the bush', to mitigate the very real possibility of bushfire, we need to be able to appropriately manage our land. This includes doing so without the constant need to apply to Council and pay for permission to protect our biggest asset. When maintained appropriately, the land within our rural communities provide a fire break to the greater Kingborough municipality particularly the more urbanised areas.

6. Consistency with planning principles

Zoning should reasonably reflect the:

- Existing use and development of land
- Established settlement pattern

- Realistic capability of land

RLZ achieves this by:

- Recognising established residential use
- Allowing for reasonable ongoing use and development
- Operating in conjunction with applicable codes and overlays (including bushfire, priority vegetation, and hazard management)
- Applying subcategories for minimum lot sizing to prevent urbanisation

These controls provide appropriate environmental and risk management without the need for more restrictive zoning.



7. Conclusion

RLZ represents a more accurate and appropriate planning response for this land than does LCZ.

It reflects the long-standing residential use of our property, the character of the surrounding area, and provides a balanced framework for future management, including bushfire safety requirements.

We therefore respectfully request the Commission adopt the Ireneinc recommendation and apply RLZ to our land. We also hope the Commission reflect on the above submission and consider RLZ where appropriate for the wider community who are currently still being proposed for LCZ or RZ.

Kind regards,



Stephen Adkins & Tamieka Groombridge