
From: Stewart Ims [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 28 April 2026 7:57 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: CM: LCZ zone submission
Attachments: Kettering sub page 1.pdf; Kettering sub page 2.pdf; Kettering sub page 3.pdf; Kettering sub page 4.pdf; Kettering sub joint letter.pdf

Dear Mr N Heath,
Delegate (Chair)

Please find 4 page personal submission regarding our properties situated [REDACTED] Kettering also provided joint submission with adjoining land owner Mr R McCloy at [REDACTED] Kettering.

Yours Faithfully,
Leonie and Stewart Ims.

April 2026

Tasmanian Planning Commission
Attn: Nick Heath

In response to your letters dated 2 April 2026, we the undersigned are making a formal submission in relation to the proposed RLZ/LCZ split zoning of our properties at [REDACTED] Kettering.

Title:	Address:	Owner:	Signature:	Date:
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Kettering	Ralph McCloy	[REDACTED]	26/4/26
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Kettering	Anna McCloy	[REDACTED]	26/4/26
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Kettering	Stewart Ims	[REDACTED]	26/4/26
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Kettering	Leonie Ims	[REDACTED]	26/4/26

We are requesting that our properties be zoned Rural Living C in their entirety.

What we have in common:

- Our hobby farms are both larger parcels of land 10.88 and 15.68 hectares respectively.
- They comprise a residence, outbuildings, paddocks, dams, etc.
- They are long-established properties which form part of the Saddle Road settlement.
- Properties opposite us and on our western and eastern boundaries are all proposed RLZ. Ours are the two exceptions.
- We both run sheep in our established paddocks.
- The landscape of our properties is a mixture of pasture and bush. Both are protected by the current overlays: Biodiversity, Scenic Landscapes and Waterway and Coastal Protection codes; and the proposed Priority Vegetation and Scenic Protection Area codes. The Waterway and Coastal Protection Code is to remain in place.

We request that the Draft Kingborough LPS be modified to include our properties as RLZ C in line with neighbouring properties on Saddle Road.

We also request that the characteristics which our properties have in common be taken into consideration when assessing our individual submissions.

Yours sincerely,

Ralph McCloy
Anna McCloy
Stewart Ims
Leonie Ims

28th April 2026

This submission is from Stewart and Leonie Ims in regard to our property at [REDACTED] Kettering, requesting our property zone be changed to Rural Living as opposed to LCZ and a split zone. This property has been in the Ims family for 4 or more generations and is one of the few original properties of this size (15.68 H) in the area.

Title numbers for our property are [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

Historically this property has been an apple orchard, chicken farm, pasture land for grazing beef cattle and is currently a sheep run for 50+ merino sheep. This is low intensity grazing and general land management. This use is consistent with the physical characteristics of the site and does not rely on, nor contribute to the conservation objectives underpinning the LCZ. The whole of the property, including areas marked proposed LCZ are used.

Each year the wool clip is sold and this helps pay for the rates, insurance and land tax for the property.

It is our intention to pass this property to our son and his children as a low intensity working concern.

The application of a split zone and LCZ to our property will seriously impact land usage.

I am retiring from my building business and want to concentrate fully on maintaining the property at Kettering. The fences and dams are in place and in good order and with this infrastructure in place I can manage my stock. The sheep have access to the higher parts of the property where there are tracks and the dam, and the trees provide shelter in the heat of summer and the cold of winter. The elevated areas of the property are described as 'scrub', providing open spaces and still providing shelter. The land has been used as orchards and pastures for the last 60+ years, and an application of a split zone will inhibit our plan to continue grazing merino sheep. The entire property has been in continual use for many years and there is lighter vegetation because of the continual grazing.

This is also reducing the catastrophic bush fire risk.

The original home for this property dates back to the early 1900's and adds to the character of [REDACTED]

The exhibited planning scheme amendment fails to meet the requirements of procedural fairness due to inadequate and ineffective notification to us as directly affected landowners.

Our property is demonstrably used for lawful rural purposes, including ongoing low intensity sheep grazing, yet the proposed application of the Landscape Conservation Zone represents a material down-zoning that constrains established and reasonably expected use and development potential. Despite the significance of this change, notification relied primarily on generalised public exhibition mechanisms rather than direct, timely, and intelligible communication clearly explaining the specific implications for our property. As a consequence we were not afforded a fair and reasonable opportunity to fully understand and respond to the impacts within the statutory timeframe. Where a planning scheme amendment has such direct and diverse implications for an actively used rural holding, procedural fairness requires a higher standard of engagement, including clear, property-specific notification at the beginning of exhibition. The failure to provide this has resulted in material prejudice and undermines confidence in the integrity of the process. Accordingly, we submit that the notification process, as it applies to our property, falls short of the requirements of procedural fairness and should be given limited weight in the Commission's consideration.

Our neighbours at [REDACTED] also have been split zoned on both the draft LPS and the Ireneinc report. Our properties are both long established rural living properties and we are both faced with having two thirds of our land areas zoned Landscape Conservation.

Our neighbours property has been established as a flower farm and pasture and orchard many years ago. When our neighbour Ralph McCloy spoke with Adriaan Stander on 8th October 2025 concerning the proposed LCZ he agreed that there was an issue with the proposed zones application to both of our properties. Adriaan Stander said that if we presented our cases to the TPC that the TPC had made some changes to the zones because of the concerns people had. However we were unable to do this because we has missed the cut off date.

There are only a few remaining original properties of our land size in the Kettering area and we feel we have been unfairly treated for having a large property.

Both our properties, ours and Ralph McCloy's, have the proposed LCZ applied to two thirds of our land. This means only one third of our properties are zoned Rural Living which negatively impacts proposed future use of our properties.

Properties on either side of our properties and on the opposite side of [REDACTED] have been proposed RLZ in their entirety in both the draft LPS and Ireneinc report.

Our properties are part of the [REDACTED] Settlement and should be zoned RLZ also.

Also as both our properties have the proposed Scenic Protection Area and Priority Vegetation

Codes we are not able to clear bush or fell trees without the necessary approvals. So these codes are sufficient to protect and manage trees and vegetation on our properties.

Our property and our neighbours have the same elevation and ridge line protection as other properties in the local area of Kettering that have been proposed RLZ. But we are threatened with rezoning when we should be similarly zoned as a matter of fairness.

Our properties have the same overlays, ie the Scenic Protection Code and Priority Vegetation Code and these protect the landscape values thus we should be zoned RL.

There are Fire safety issues with respect to LCZ. We currently regularly cut a fire buffer zone for our neighbour at [REDACTED] This will be affected.

We graze 50+ merino sheep. We cut hay for our own use. We will have limited access to boundary fences. We will be prevented from maintaining existing bush roads and the existing dam on the higher part of the property. We will be unable to proceed with the establishment of water points for sheep in the top paddock, needed for when the dam is dry. The channel has already been dug for water pipes etc. The dynamics of farm management will be affected by the proposed zoning changes and limitations.

We pay rates and land taxes for 15.68 H.

If only a third of our property is zoned RL then we will pay rates and taxes on two thirds of our property which we cannot use.

The application of the Landscape Conservation Zone to our property was not founded on a rigorous, property-specific assessment, but rather on a broad locality-based methodology that applied precautionary assumptions across large areas.

This approach failed to properly consider the actual characteristics and established low-intensity agricultural use of our land, resulting in a zoning outcome that does not reflect on-ground reality. The subsequent independent review which was initiated due to widespread community concern, and the substantial reduction in LCZ-applied properties demonstrate that the original zoning lacked sufficient precision and robustness.

In these circumstances, the inclusion of our property within the LCZ represents an unjustified and disproportionate planning control that is not supported by a defensible site-specific assessment.

Importantly, rezoning to RLZ would not result in the loss of significant environmental values, given the already altered state of the land, and would represent a logical and orderly extension of the prevailing zoning pattern in the locality.

Financially we are concerned regarding our insurance premiums, property devaluation and high land tax with reduced income from our property.

Accordingly, The Tasmanian Planning Commission must correct this deficiency by rezoning all of our property to a more appropriate zone, or at a minimum, requiring a genuine, evidence based, site specific reassessment, to ensure a fair and lawful process, before any LCZ controls are allowed,

Yours faithfully,

Leonie and Stewart Ims.

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Leonie and Stewart Ims.