
From: Heather Gluyas <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, 26 April 2026 3:50 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Cc: Alan Gluyas
Subject: CM: Submission in relation to Kingborough Draft LPS
Attachments: Submission in relation to the recommendations in the Ireneinc Report as submitted by the Kingborough Planning Authority -H & A Gluyas 26 April 2026.docx

To whom it may concern,

Please find attached the submission from Heather and Alan Gluyas requesting a change from LCZ to RLZ as per the recommendation of the Ireneinc report.

Please feel free to contact us at this email address or the mobile number below if you wish to discuss this further or have any questions.

Kind regards,
Heather Gluyas

Dr Heather Gluyas
Mobile: [REDACTED]

Submission in relation to the recommendations in the Ireneinc Report as submitted by the Kingborough Planning Authority: Heather and Alan Gluyas 26 April 2026

We, Heather and Alan Gluyas, are the owners of [REDACTED]. Kettering 16, PID# [REDACTED], CT# [REDACTED].

Following the public exhibition of the Kingborough Draft Local Provisions Schedule (LPS), we noted that Kingborough Council (KC) proposed rezoning our property from the Environmental Living Zone (ELZ) to the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ). We were concerned about this proposal because we did not feel the LCZ constraints were justified. We were also concerned that Kingborough Council made no attempt to notify us of its intention to rezone to LCZ. We made a representation (Rep. 198.27) to the Tasmanian Planning Commission (the Commission) regarding the proposed LCZ, requesting that it be reviewed in favour of Rural Living Zoning (RLZ).

We have recently received correspondence from the Commission notifying us of the Ireneinc Report review of zones applied to properties zoned ELZ. We found the report very thorough and objective. It provided us with clarity on the process to date and on the KC's justification for classifying our property as LCZ.

It is our understanding that the KC justification for applying LCZ in the 2024 draft LPS (pg. 43-48 Ireneinc report V1) was based on the need to protect and conserve landscape values. Moreover, KC proposed that if an RLZ were applied to our property, the additional potential uses allowed by the RLZ would have detrimental impacts on landscape values. The additional uses allowed by the RLZ are: subdivision of property into smaller lots; grazing; general retail and hire; resource processing; and vehicle fuel sales and service (pg. 47 Ireneinc Report V1).

After analysing KC's decision-making regarding LCZ classification, the report authors presented an in-depth discussion of why RLZ could have been utilised for many properties KC proposed for LCZ zoning. This discussion led to the development of an evaluation tool to determine whether properties zoned LCZ from the ELZ would be better suited to the RLZ than to the LCZ. We recognise that this is an assessment tool not recognised by the Commission, but it does provide an objective framework to inform our argument for an RLZ for our property.

Of particular note to us was the Zone evaluation by the authors of the report, using objective descriptors, for the area on Kettering Point where our property is located (Ireneinc Report: Version 1.1, Section 3.5.2.1, Pg 285- 288).

The subsequent recommendation made from this evaluation for the area of Kettering Point was that *"...there are sufficient mechanisms in the planning scheme to provide for the appropriate management of existing landscape values which exist on these parcels of land that the RLZ could be an appropriate alternative zone..."* (Ireneinc Report: Version 1.1., Section 3.5.2.2, Pg 289).

As this evaluation and recommendations were applied to the Kettering Point properties as a whole, we take this opportunity to use the Ireneinc evaluation pathway specifically applied to our property [REDACTED], located on the Kettering Point.

Submission in relation to the recommendations in the Ireneinc Report as submitted by the Kingborough Planning Authority: Heather and Alan Gluyas 26 April 2026

- Is there a strategic intention for any residential use to occur? **Yes.** Our property is 1.142 hectares and has a house and a shed (both built in 2011). We have a small orchard and vegetable garden. The primary use is residential and fits the descriptor of RLZ(A). We share a drive with two other residences (both proposed low-density residential zones).
- Does the area include state- reserved land? **No**
- Does the area have characteristics of rural living settlement? **Yes.** We are part of a group of properties of various sizes and densities on the Southerly aspect of Kettering Point, ranging from 1 – 10 hectares, where the priority is for residential use. The immediate residential area on the Northern side of Kettering Point (proposed low-density housing) is also of a similar size and nature.
- Are identified landscape values present? **Yes.**
- Can identified landscape values be appropriately managed outside of LCZ? **Yes.** These are currently managed under a Part 5 agreement under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993. This limits activity on significant sections of our land, including clearance and protection of native vegetation.
The risks identified of additional land uses by an RLZ on our property: subdivision into smaller parcels of land, grazing, general retail and hire, resource processing, and vehicle fuel sale and service, are invalid. The topography of the land, the access (a long, steep shared drive off Ferry Rd), and the size of the property (1.142h) make it unrealistic to subdivide or undertake any of the other activities KC identified as risks to the landscape values of our property. Moreover, on our property, noted previously, also negates this risk.

Summary

We do not agree with this KC proposal to Zone our property to LCZ. We feel our property is more suited to an RLZ(A) classification as per the criteria listed in Guideline No.1 Local Provision Schedule (LPS) Zone and code application (pg. 6: 2025). We feel the KC did not recognise that our property meets the primary criteria of the RLZ(A) being primarily for residential use...where existing and intended use is a mix between residential and lower order rural activities (e.g. hobby farming), but priority is given to the protection of residential amenity (pg 6: 2025 Guideline 1.LPS). Additionally, the KC failed to recognise that there are strategies to manage the landscape values for our property and to recognise the exclusion criteria in Guideline no.1. Local Provision Schedule (LPS): Zone and Code Application, which explicitly state “ The Landscape Conservation Zone should not be applied to: (a) land where the priority is for residential and development “ (pg 12;2025)

We therefore request that the Commission accept the Ireneinc Report recommendation that our property at [REDACTED], Kettering, be rezoned as a Rural Living Zone.

Heather and Alan Gluyas (26 April 2026)

