
From: td.agouzoul [REDACTED] >
Sent: Friday, 1 May 2026 6:17 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: Kingborough LPS - [REDACTED] Snug
Attachments: TPC Letter 28 Sproules Rd Snug.pdf; Figure 1 Site Location.pdf; Figure 2 Vegetation Communities on site.pdf; Image 2 Biodiversity Inputs for Snug Conningham.pdf; Sproules Rd Flora of conservation Significance.pdf; Snug Tiers Settlement by lot - MAP A.pdf; Snug Tiers Living Intent - MAP B.pdf

To Tasmanian Planning Commission

Please find attached my submission for [REDACTED], Snug.

Kind regards
Tim

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

Name	Timothy Agouzoul
Date	01/05/2026
Property Address	██████████ Snug
Requested Zone	Rural Living Zone

To the Tasmanian Planning Commission,

Hello, my name is Tim. Thank you for the chance to speak about my property at ██████████ Snug.

I object to its rezoning under the Kingborough Draft LPS to both the originally proposed Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) and the Irenelnc review to LCZ/Rural split zone. Applying LCZ or LCZ/Rural split zoning is inconsistent with section 34 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (LUPAA), the LPS Section 8A Guideline No. 1, and the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy (STRLUS).

Rural Living Zone (RLZ) Rural Living C would be more suitable. I respectfully ask the Commission to apply this zone, in line with the original purchase, zoning allowances, and the site's current or future residential use. RLZ is also proposed for adjoining properties at ██████████

██████████ is a 7.596ha property which is largely cleared, and has two large well-established driveways close together off ██████████. It is approximately 60% cleared with a large building site already constructed. **Please see attached Figure 1 Site Location (this shows my block situated in the middle of a white area clearly outlined for residential use) and Figure 2 Vegetation Communities on site showing cleared areas.** We purchased the property in the middle of 2019 with a current development/building/plumbing approval for a considerable sized dwelling. For your notes the approval number through Kingborough Council is BA/73-2017.

At the time of our purchase the septic system, driveways, a large building site excavation, gates, private power pole and underground power/phone to building site were all completed.

It was always our plan to build a home and subdivide a small acreage block, to assist our children to stay in the local area. They would otherwise be forced to move away due to the outrageous cost of rents and property ownership. It was Covid that took its toll on our business in 2020 that has temporarily halted the building program. However we have used the property as storage, and the children and I have collected firewood, camped and generally spent quality time exploring the property and enjoying the beautiful view from the building site and beyond.

I believe the proposed split zoning is not suitable for a block of this nature, firstly as the LCZ is very restrictive to the owner by way of maintenance and the ability to look after the land without breaking rules/laws. Also, the proposal stops the Northern cleared area from being used for anything but conservation. On top of the LCZ issues the Rural zoning does not seem appropriate for the area, considering the original Sproules estate/farm/homestead has been subdivided and the blocks have almost all been built on, resulting in no commercial farming activities in the Sproules Rd area.

The property is obviously more suited to a Rural Residential Zoning not only because Kingborough Council has already approved a sizeable dwelling, but the property itself is mostly cleared and surrounded by other well-established dwellings with people and local families residing in them. It is a nice area and the people up in the Tiers genuinely want to be there and look after it. They are seeking a Rural Residential Lifestyle, which is two minutes from Snug Village and all of its amenities/school/shops etc.

I would also like to add that locally the old timers all refer to, and remember the area as Baden Sproules HOME. He lived there for decades and survived the 1967 bushfires which left the area as ash and burnt stumps. In fact, it was the Sproule's home since approximately the 1850's.

The conservation zone could possibly be better used in an area that hasn't already been a residential home/community for the best part of a century and a half. Old time Channel locals have told me IXL jam had people living and producing fruit and harvesting large quantities of firewood for Hobart in the very same area almost a hundred years ago.

POSSIBLE FINANCIAL ISSUES WITH LCZ

I would also like it to be known that I have sought both legal and real-estate advice on the matter and have been informed by both parties that a change to LCZ would mean a definite reduction in value. As the block forms a large part of my superannuation this will have a massive effect on us financially.

ENVIRONMENTAL/BIODIVERSITY INPUT – 28 SPROULES RD

Another reason that we believe RLZ is more appropriate is the simple fact that [REDACTED] does not have any particular or extraordinary wildlife, tree, plant, insect or anything else that needs to be protected by a different zoning. Everything on the property is already covered by the current overlays.

I would also like to take this opportunity to inform all concerned that during the DA for [REDACTED] there was an extensive environmental study undertaken by SFM Environmental Solutions, and there were no threatened or endangered flora or fauna 'of conservation significance' on the property. It is also recorded that neither forest community on the property are listed as priority communities under the Tasmanian Regional Forestry Agreement.

Further to that please find attachments

1. "BRAM" map which clearly shows [REDACTED] having no threatened species listed at all.
2. Page 10 SFM Environmental Solutions report for DA.

While I agree that Tasmania's landscapes should be protected, I believe it can be done best through RLZ as it has been done historically through ELZ and Rural Residential zonings. Rezoning to LCZ would harm our continuous use of the land as allowed when purchased.

LCZ DOES NOT COMPLY WITH LUPAA ZONE GUIDELINES

Section 34 of LUPAA says the Commission must check if the LPS meets the Act's criteria, including zone guidelines. LCZ 4(a) states that LCZ should NOT be used where the land's **'priority is for residential use and development'**. The guidelines say LCZ is not for large residential lots 'characterised by native vegetation cover and other landscape values.'

My property is currently zoned Environmental Living (ELZ). The **primary use and strategic intention of the land is and has always been residential.**

LUPAA guidelines also state LCZ is not a replacement for ELZ. The priorities don't match: ELZ Living priority permits dwellings, but LCZ prioritises conservation with discretionary dwellings.

In correspondence with the Planning Authority, the TPC noted that the LCZ "appears to have been used ...to replace ELZ", a policy or strategy shift which should be 'comprehensively justified'. Neither the draft LPS nor Irenelnc's review has provided detailed, site-specific reasons for changing my land's priority. They based their decision on general landscape values and rural settlement judgments, neither had community input.

LCZ DOES NOT COMPLY WITH LUPAA OBJECTIVES

LUPAA Schedule 1, Objective (b), aims for 'fair, orderly, and sustainable' land use. Applying LCZ conflicts with this objective. It is unfair to remove permitted residential use; applying LCZ represents a **net reduction** in existing land use rights. The clear majority of Tasmanian councils moving to the Statewide Planning Scheme applied the LCZ

sparingly or not at all. Only a few used it moderately or heavily. Most councils (such as Tasman) translated ELZ directly to the Rural Living Zone, yet Irenelnc chose as their model three councils that applied LCZ heavily.

Many councils, including Kingborough in 2019, recognised that LCZ could lower property value, affect insurance and finance, and prevent future dwellings on empty blocks – not meeting the goal of sustainable development that supports communities to provide for their **social, economic** and cultural well-being...' (clause 1 (a), Schedule 1 – Objectives).

RLZ IS THE APPROPRIATE ZONE

RLZ Guideline RLZ 1(a) suggests the RLZ should be applied to residential areas with larger lots used for residential and lower order rural activities, while prioritising residential amenity. This fits my property.

RLZ Guideline RLZ 2(b) states RLZ may be applied to ELZ land where the primary strategic intention is for residential use in a rural setting and a **similar** minimum allowable lot size is being applied. My property's size of 7.596ha aligns with RLZ C with a minimum lot size of 5 ha.

THE IRENEINC EVALUATION PATHWAY (DECISION TREE)

Irenelnc uses a decision tree to decide zones. On Day 2 of the review hearing, the Commission was told that it's a tool, not a rule [Kate Heckelmann, 05:53:00], and alternatives can be used with good evidence. Even so, applying the evaluation pathway correctly, my property meets the RLZ criteria rather than LCZ.

EVIDENCE OF STRATEGIC INTENT FOR LIVING

Both the original LPS and Irenelnc's report lack clear definitions of "primary strategic intent." They ignore existing rural-residential settlements, historical land use, cultural attachment, community ties, and intergenerational living. Neither STRLUS nor the Kingborough Strategic Plan restrict rural living growth. Past land allocations, subdivision approvals, and development applications show that residential use is the 'strategic intent' of the land.

The review for my locality (Snug/Coningham) is stated as generally meeting strategic intent for living. As stated above [REDACTED] has already been approved for a residential dwelling and the DA numbers provided. This clearly shows that the block was and is intended for residential use. It already has all the infrastructure built and in place and is essentially ready to build a main dwelling and hopefully subdivide a small block off for the children.

EVIDENCE OF RURAL LIVING SETTLEMENT

Irenelnc's review states that the Snug Tiers community meets the 'strategic intent for living' because there is 'evidence of residential uses scattered throughout'. However, Rural Living Settlement status has been mostly denied, with the report citing a 'lack of consistent subdivision pattern with lots of the size which would contribute to a rural living settlement'.

This assessment appears biased, primarily due to two judgments. First, it favours smaller lot sizes, disregarding RLZ subcategories that limit subdivision of lots under 20ha and also minimises development on larger lots through needs of access and services (note: there is NO maximum lot size in RLZ).

Secondly, the 'consistent pattern' is only recognised if it resembles urban cul-de-sacs or road clusters, ignoring rural and lifestyle properties that are naturally sited around topographical features, inherited large lots, or purchased with future rural living in mind. For example, in Snug Tiers there's a clear pattern of large lot subdivision facing into the valley, on a Northwest to Southeast alignment, around the topography.

These biases also overlook the fact that residents live just minutes from Snug township, where they shop, support local businesses, send children to school, recreate, and work. The reliance on a desktop analysis, which can't see beyond tree canopies and often lacks on-the-ground insight, leads to subjective judgments about rural settlements. For example, the Irenelnc report notes that three adjoining properties on Snug Tiers Road display 'a consistent pattern of rural living,' as does my property, yet it is still proposed to be LCZ/Rural Zone.

Without applying rural living settlement criteria consistently and with ground-truthing, the evaluation then fails to consider whether landscape values can be managed through planning codes **nor recommends any other outcome than LCZ**, unless the area has no landscape values, which is unlikely given its rural nature and the subjective, non-consulted definition of 'landscape values'. In no version does it recommend a Rural/LCZ split zone.

Homeowners in my area **strongly disagree** with Irenelnc's narrow assessment. We can demonstrate that the Snug Tiers community meets all three rural living settlement characteristics:

1. A pattern of **at least** 10 smaller blocks, **generally** between 1–15 ha, with a consistent lot pattern. The **attached map (a)** shows my property among 41 others in Snug Tiers, with lot sizes from 0.18ha to 29.89ha, the majority between 1ha and 15ha, a pattern established since the early 1800s. All properties can be managed by available RLZ lot sizes, access and services, to minimise subdivision potential. Our settlement at Snug Tiers adjoins property proposed for RLZ at [REDACTED]
2. A pattern of 'detached dwellings and outbuildings', which Irenelnc admits is "generally met, as many lots have identified residences and cleared areas". As you can see from the **attached map (b)**, you can see that dwellings and outbuildings are located on nearly every property in my community. This also includes properties with development applications or strategic plans for living on empty blocks.
3. Visual evidence of rural activities such as 'clearings, grazing and hobby farming etc'. Irenelnc states that "some residential uses are associated with farming", yet at the review hearing, it was clarified that the criteria list is only an example. My property shows clearly a building site, established formed driveway, fire tank and massive cleared areas and pasture that haven't changed since the 1960's when Baden Sproule LIVED THERE.

ASSESSING LANDSCAPE VALUES

The STRLUS CV 4.1 states that **community consultation** should determine landscape values. Irenelnc admits in review hearings that they didn't consult. This means the assessment of whether properties meet 'landscape values' is now entirely based on the Planning Authority's judgment.

Irenelnc's choice of dictionary terms 'hilly places' and 'bushland,' and focus on tree-centric descriptions, i.e.: 'predominantly bushland,' 'allotments set within native bushland,' 'dwellings are ... nestled into vegetation,' and 'bushland backdrop' are the main basis for our locality's landscape values.

This overlooks the value of other features like waterways, fields, foraging areas, and the importance of varied terrain (grasslands, clearings, open areas, trails) for different species habitat. Such diversity is vital for a healthy rural or biodiverse landscape and aligns with evidence that people prefer varied scenery, including homesteads, sheds, and domestic animals.

The lack of consultation and reliance on terminology that favours the Planning Authority's narrow definition results in a flawed or biased assessment:

1. Large areas of bushland and vegetation alone do not justify LC zoning. As confirmed at the TPC review hearing on 14/4/26, "LCZ is not for managing vegetation—that is the role of the Natural Assets Code", which applies to all properties. Irenelnc stated that for properties in our area proposed RLZ, overlays will likely (and logically) protect the natural values they identify.
2. Describing dwellings and large lots around topography as 'scattered' implies no strategic planning or intent, which is untrue. Anyone who has ACTUALLY BEEN THERE AND WALKED ON THE GROUND WITH A PAIR OF EYES CAN SEE IT IS A RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY WITHIN SPITTING DISTANCE OF SNUG TOWNSHIP. They may appear scattered to someone who lives in a townhouse in Hobart looking at Google Earth!!

3. Biased reasoning: noting large vegetated spaces on rural properties (and comparatively less dwelling area, as set by development criteria) is worded in the report as though this is a choice or evidence that OUR preference was conservation over living: "integration of residential use ... is largely within a small proportion of a parcel", "the remaining natural setting reinforces the area's natural values".
4. Owning private property in natural settings doesn't mean residents prioritise landscape conservation over residential amenity. Irenelnc implies this repeatedly, both in review references to "built form" being "secondary to the natural landscape" and, in hearings, that lots in bushland reinforce or "contribute" to the area's "natural values". Snug Tiers residents purchased homes in natural areas because they **value the contribution this makes to their Rural Living**, not to add to Kingborough's undefined scenic or "landscape values".
5. Irenelnc relied on overlays in a desktop assessment to identify landscape or environmental features across the locality, ignoring the challenges of topography and identifying these (i.e., through the tree canopy) by aerial images alone. Evidence-based alternative reports or maps of individual properties' natural settings are needed. A proper consultation process with the land owners, "THE RATEPAYERS" would have very quickly shown Irenelnc a very different "view" of the area and its features. Amenity to the land owners appears to have been ignored completely.
6. The scenic protection overlay is broadly applied to properties over 100m above sea level. The photos used in the report, sourced from realestate.com, are aerial shots intended for sale and don't accurately reflect what is seen from local roads, towns, or waterways. Even Irenelnc admits that in the locality "bushland, landform, and ridgeline features ... remain visually intact," and the reality is that the siting of homes on Snug Tiers means they cannot be seen from these vantage points.

SPOT ZONING, SPLIT ZONING AND FRAGMENTATION

The TPS aims to prevent spot zoning, yet Irenelnc suggests a Rural/LCZ split zone on my property, which could cause mismatched zone priorities and land use. It's also **more logical** that the rural activity forms part of an **overall Rural Living community pattern**. There is arguably less fragmentation created by leaving one spot zoned Rural property within an RLZ settlement, than proposing multiple restrictive split zonings, such as mine.

Irenelnc have also shown that their application of this method is inconsistent. For example, a large lot of 108.84ha at 2274 Channel Highway is split zoned Rural/RLZ and abuts ELZ, RLZ, and Low Density Residential zones, while smaller ELZ parcels have been denied RLZ at all.

I have not suddenly intensified my rural activities to a level that would justify the Rural zone on part of my property, rather this seems to be an effort to link me to a nearby Rural zoned lot. My location next to this previously spot zoned rural property either shows previous zoning errors or more likely, that a lot showing intense rural activity is better matched to adjacent living zones like ELZ or RLZ.

BALANCING LANDSCAPE VALUES AND LAND USE

In their S35F report, Kingborough council states that applying the Rural Living zone to rural residential areas **may** "risk that the predominant land use pattern and characteristics of the area could be eroded over time...". This ignores the long-standing rural living nature of the area and the fact that rezoning to LCZ/Rural would significantly restrict ongoing private land use, **absolutely guaranteeing** a change in "character and amenity".

The report notes a "medium/high" risk of RLZ uses in this locality but doesn't specify what those risks are, how **likely** they are considering the topography, vegetation, and existing settlement patterns, or whether they could be managed through overlay codes, SAPs, or other mechanisms. Irenelnc acknowledged that future reviews could

At the review hearings, Kate Heckelmann admitted there are **no land uses** that would impact landscape values which aren't already managed by building codes or overlays. This suggests overlaps through stricter zoning isn't necessary because landscape "values can be appropriately **managed through the application and operation of the relevant codes**" (Kingborough LPS guidelines, RLZ 4b).

Assuming LCZ is the only way to protect generic 'landscape values' ignores existing land management, bushfire mitigation efforts, biodiversity initiatives, and conflicts with the intent of the evaluation pathway of **balancing** landscape protection with existing land uses. It is illogical to rezone properties to LCZ to 'protect' the landscape that we've proven we can already care for on our own.

IreneInc suggest that LCZ zoning near Snug Recreation Area is necessary to provide connectivity to the EMZ and act as a buffer between living zones. Not only have National Parks (EMZs) already been put aside for state management, nearly every other Tasmanian council placed other living zones: Rural Living, Residential, Rural, Agricultural, and even Industrial zones next to National Parks or EMZs. It is also contradictory to the placement of Low Density Residential lots beside Coningham's EMZ reserve.

Rural Residential owners provide a significant free workforce to manage areas on the interface of bush, coast, country and town. They need to be able to continue to mitigate natural disaster, care for native species, maintain trails, carriage ways and fire access, and remove invasive pests, which is at risk in the LCZ, and even Rural zones. Our efforts help protect biodiversity, reduce financial and disaster risks, and improve resilience and food security for all - work that cannot be replaced by council staff or State Parks and Wildlife service.

SUMMARY

Throughout the LPS process, Kingborough Council has failed to consult the community and has not followed the objectives of LUPAA, which emphasise fair land use and community involvement. Their focus on environmental protection seems aimed at removing private land rights, risking long-term harm to residents' well-being and creating potential future financial and legal challenges.

I appreciate the TPC taking heed of the concerns within this letter and respectfully ask for rezoning properties from ELZ to more restrictive zones to stop. Specifically, I request that the TPC direct my property to be zoned from the ELZ to the Rural Living Zone C, with environmental priorities managed by existing natural values codes.

Yours sincerely,

Tim Agouzoul

Kettering 7155

01/05/2026




Figure 1 Site location





Figure 2 Vegetation Communities on site


0 50 100 Meters



1:4000

Map printed 12/9/2006





SNUG TIERS SETTLEMENT - LOT SIZE



SNUG TIERS RURAL LIVING STRATEGIC INTENT

3.2.2 Vegetation surrounding the subject site

The subject site is bordered by vegetation analogous to that on the subject site. These forest communities are typical of this region and are not unique in the locality.

3.2.3 Flora of conservation Significance

No threatened flora species listed on either the *Tasmanian Threatened Species Protection Act 1995 (TSP Act 1995)* or the *Commonwealth Environmental Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act 1999)* were recorded on the subject site during the current field investigations.

A search of the Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife service natural values report revealed fourteen “*threatened species*” listed on the *TSP Act 1995* and *EPBC Act 1999* that have been recorded within 5km of the subject site. These species, their habitat and likelihood of being on the subject site is listed in Table 1. A full list of plants recorded during the site assessment is provided in appendix B.

Neither forest community on the property are listed as priority communities under the Tasmanian Regional Forestry Agreement (RFA).




Image 2: Biodiversity Inputs for Snug/Cunningham