
From: jacki healey <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, 25 April 2026 11:07 AM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: Submission-Kingborough LPS Direction 69 property address [REDACTED]
Blackmans Bay
Attachments: T5_Accept_RLZ_Argue_Subcategory (Repaired).docx

[REDACTED]

To whom it may concern, please accept my submission for my property at [REDACTED]
Blackmans Bay. Title reference [REDACTED]

Thank you
Jacki Healey

WRITTEN SUBMISSION TO THE

TASMANIAN PLANNING COMMISSION

Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule — Direction 69 / Ireneinc Report

TEMPLATE T5

Ireneinc recommends RLZ
Accepting RLZ — arguing correct
subcategory

HOW TO USE THIS TEMPLATE

PART A — PROCEDURAL OPENING (select one variant)

VARIANT A3 — LETTER 6 (NON-REPRESENTOR WHO CONTACTED TPC, RLZ RECOMMENDED)

To the Tasmanian Planning Commission,

I write in response to the letter dated 2 April 2026 (ref: DOC/26/36829) advising that the Ireneinc report recommends my property be included within the Rural Living Zone (RLZ) under the draft Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule (LPS), rather than remaining in the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) as exhibited.

I did not make a formal representation during the public exhibition period, however I understand that the Commission has received correspondence from me or on my behalf in relation to the draft LPS. I understand that this letter provides me the opportunity to formally participate in this stage of the LPS process. I take up that opportunity and submit as follows.

PART B — PROPERTY

Landowner name(s)	Jacqueline Healey
Property address	
Title reference (folio)	

Lot size (approx.)	1.8 hectares
Locality	Blackmans Bay
Current IPS zone	Environmental Living Zone (ELZ)
Draft LPS exhibited zone	Landscape Conservation zone (LCZ)
Ireneinc recommended zone	Rural Living Zone (RLZ)
Position in this submission	Accept RLZ – support and argue correct subcategory (A/B/C/D)

PART C — STATEMENT OF POSITION

I welcome and support the Ireneinc recommendation that my property be included within the RLZ under the draft Kingborough LPS. The RLZ is a significantly more appropriate zone for my property than the exhibited LCZ.

I make this submission to: (1) provide the Commission with property-specific evidence supporting the RLZ recommendation; (2) identify the most appropriate RLZ subcategory for my property; and (3) ensure the Commission does not revert to LCZ at the final determination stage.

RLZ Subcategory Reference Table

The RLZ has four subcategories with different minimum lot sizes. Under Zone Guideline RLZ 3, the appropriate subcategory must reflect the existing pattern and density of development within the rural living area or be supported by strategic justification. The table below summarises the options:

Subcategory	Min. lot size (acceptable solution)	Performance criteria	Typical use context
RLZ A	1 ha	8,000 m ²	Smaller rural lots with established residential settlement
RLZ B	2 ha	1.4 ha	Medium-sized rural residential lots, some subdivision potential
RLZ C	5 ha	4 ha	Larger rural residential lots, limited subdivision
RLZ D	10 ha	8 ha	Large lots, ELZ transition where no further subdivision intended

The subcategory I seek for my property is:

- Rural Living Zone A (minimum lot size 1 ha) — the existing lot pattern in my locality is consistent with lots of approximately 1–2 ha

PART D — SUPPORTING EVIDENCE AND ARGUMENTS

The arguments below provide the Commission with positive evidence supporting the RLZ recommendation and your preferred subcategory. Work through each pillar and insert property-specific evidence in the amber boxes.

D1 — The RLZ recommendation is consistent with the Zone Guidelines

D1.1 — Zone Guideline RLZ 1(a) — residential character with rural activities

Zone Guideline RLZ 1(a) provides that the RLZ should be applied to residential areas with larger lots where the existing and intended use is a mix between residential and lower-order rural activities, with priority given to the protection of residential amenity. This accurately describes my property.

— My property contains a dwelling constructed in 1993 with 3 small sheds, an attached garage and a greenhouse. The primary use is residential. It also has a fully fenced courtyard and a fully fenced dog exercise area. There is some grassland. This is precisely the mix of residential and lower order rural activities described in RLZ1 (a).

D1.3 — Zone Guideline RLZ 3 — subcategory selection

Zone Guideline RLZ 3 provides that the differentiation between RLZ A, B, C and D should reflect the existing pattern and density of development within the rural living area, or be supported by further strategic justification. My preferred subcategory — RLZ [A] — directly reflects the existing lot size pattern in my locality.

D2 — Property-specific evidence supporting RLZ

D2.1 — Established residential settlement

The Ireneinc framework identifies the following as indicators of rural living settlement characteristics: at least 10 smaller blocks generally ranging in size between 1–15 ha with a consistent lot pattern; a consistent pattern of detached dwellings with associated outbuildings; and visual evidence of rural activities. My property and the surrounding settlement display all of these characteristics.

D2.2 — Landscape values can be managed within RLZ

Zone Guideline RLZ 4(b) provides that the RLZ should not be applied where land contains important landscape values identified for protection and conservation, unless those values can be appropriately managed through the application of the relevant codes. The TPC panel confirmed at Day 20 [02:33:54] that the Priority Vegetation Area (PVA) overlay and Scenic Protection Code (SPC) do the landscape-protection work in many cases, removing the need for LCZ. Any landscape values present on or near my property can be managed in this way.

D2.3 — No further subdivision is intended or enabled

The Ireneinc framework and Zone Guidelines both flag the risk that RLZ could enable subdivision that would intensify development and affect landscape values. The RLZ subcategory I am seeking addresses this risk directly. Under RLZ [A/B/C/D], the minimum lot size of [X] ha means that subdivision of my property would [not be possible / produce only a very limited number of additional lots], consistent with the intent of Zone Guideline RLZ 2(b) which contemplates applying RLZ D (10 ha minimum) to prevent further subdivision where appropriate. *with this limited subdivision potential] and the pattern of lots that would result is consistent with surrounding properties.'*

D3 — The LCZ should not be reinstated

While I support the RLZ recommendation, I am concerned that the Commission may revert to LCZ rather than adopting Ireneinc's recommendation. I place the following matters on the record.

D3.1 — LCZ was historically over-applied and inconsistently justified

The Ireneinc LCZ Review documents that the TPC found Council's initial LCZ application was often inconsistent with the Zone Guidelines and with surrounding land. The exhibited LCZ for my property was part of a blanket application covering approximately 75% of ELZ parcels — an approach the TPC itself queried repeatedly. Ireneinc's recommendation to apply RLZ to my property is the product of a more rigorous, property-level analysis that should be preferred over the exhibited LCZ.

D3.2 — The Commission is not bound by the exhibited LCZ

Chair Nick Heath confirmed at Day 20 [06:45:48] that the Commission will decide on section 34 LUPAA criteria and is not bound by Council's exhibited position or by Council's 16 March 2026 resolution favouring the 'least restrictive alternative'. The Commission is therefore free to adopt the RLZ recommendation, and I urge it to do so.

D3.3 — The evaluation framework is not a statutory instrument

Kate Heckelmann (Ireneinc) confirmed at Day 20 [05:53:00] that the evaluation framework is a tool, not a statutory instrument. The Commission may adopt, modify, or depart from Ireneinc's recommendations as it sees fit under section 34 LUPAA — but where Ireneinc's analysis supports RLZ and is consistent with the Zone Guidelines, as here, the Commission should adopt it.

RELIEF SOUGHT

For the reasons set out above, I submit that:

1. The Ireneinc recommendation to include my property within the RLZ is correct and is consistent with the Zone Guidelines (Guideline No. 1) and the requirements of section 34 of LUPAA.
2. The exhibited LCZ was not appropriate for my property and should not be reinstated. The RLZ recommendation reflects a more rigorous analysis and should be adopted.
3. The most appropriate RLZ subcategory for my property is RLZ [A/B/C/D], which reflects the existing pattern and density of development in my locality under Zone Guideline RLZ 3, and [does not allow / significantly constrains] further subdivision.
4. Any landscape values in the broader locality can be appropriately managed through existing overlay controls — NAC, PVA overlay, and SPC — in combination with the lot size controls of the RLZ subcategory.

I respectfully request that the Commission:

- Adopt the Ireneinc recommendation and include my property within the RLZ [specify subcategory A/B/C/D] in the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule; and
- Not revert to the exhibited LCZ, which is not supported by the site-specific evidence for my property.

I request that the folio of the Register Title [REDACTED] at [REDACTED], Blackmans Bay be included within the rural Living Zone C in the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule consistent with the Ireneinc recommendation.

Signed: Jacqueline Healey _____	Date: 25/04/2026 [REDACTED]
--	--

Full name: Jacqueline Healey	██████████ Contact email / phone:
---------------------------------	--

LODGEMENT: Email your completed submission to tpc@planning.tas.gov.au with the subject line: 'Submission — Kingborough LPS Direction 69 — [your property address]'. Include your title reference in the body of the email. The deadline is midnight Monday 4 May 2026.

TPC	Tasmanian Planning Commission
Zone Guidelines	Guideline No. 1 — Local Provisions Schedule: Zone and Code Application