

---

**From:** Elise M [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Thursday, 23 April 2026 9:38 AM  
**To:** Kingborough LPS  
**Subject:** CM: Submission for rezoning [REDACTED] Kettering TAS  
**Attachments:** Elise and Mathew McCaskie Zoning Submission.docx

Hello,

Our submission is attached, thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Elise McCaskie  
m: [REDACTED]

**To:** Tasmanian Planning Commission

**Subject:** Further submission on Ireneinc recommendations

**Property:** [REDACTED], Kettering TAS 7155

Dear Commissioners,

We are the owners of [REDACTED], Kettering, currently zoned *Environmental Living*. We make this further submission in response to the Ireneinc review recommending that the land be rezoned to the *Rural Zone* under the draft Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule.

We acknowledge that the recommendation to remove the land from the *Landscape Conservation Zone* addresses earlier concerns and represents an improved outcome. However, for the reasons set out below, we submit that the *Rural Zone* is not the most appropriate zoning for the land and that the *Rural Living Zone D* better satisfies the intent of the *State Planning Provisions* and *TPC Guideline No.1*.

### **Existing conditions and settlement pattern**

The subject land forms part of an established rural living area characterised by lawful residential use on large lots with a mix of residential occupation and lower order rural activities. This settlement pattern is long established and readily observable.

The land is not used for agricultural production of local or regional significance and does not function as land that requires a rural location for operational reasons. Having regard to existing use and development pattern, the land exhibits the characteristics described for the *Rural Living Zone* rather than the *Rural Zone*.

*TPC Guideline No.1* directs that zoning decisions be informed primarily by existing settlement pattern, lot size and actual land use. When applied to Whittons Road, these criteria support a *Rural Living* outcome.

### **Ireneinc justification based on adjoining zoning**

We understand that the Ireneinc review recommends the *Rural Zone* for Whittons Road properties on the basis of consistency with adjoining Rural zoned land, particularly [REDACTED], and in order to avoid isolation or fragmentation of other zones.

While consistency of zoning is a relevant consideration, it is not determinative where land exhibits a different character and function. The [REDACTED] properties constitute a settled rural living locality and do not operate as part of a rural production area. Applying the *Rural Zone* primarily to align with adjoining land would not reflect the existing conditions of the site itself.

*Guideline No.1* requires that zone application be grounded in the characteristics of the land under consideration, rather than adjacency alone.

### **Amenity implications of the Rural Zone**

The *Rural Zone* framework does not adequately reflect the established residential amenity of the [REDACTED] area.

The *Rural Zone* provides for greater building heights and reduced minimum boundary setbacks relative to the *Rural Living Zone*, and places emphasis on facilitating a wide range of uses that require a rural location for operational reasons. In an established residential context, these provisions raise amenity considerations that are material to zone suitability.

The *Rural Living Zone*, by contrast, explicitly prioritises the protection of residential amenity from impacts such as noise, traffic, scale and intensity. This focus better aligns with the existing use and expectations of residents in the locality.

### **Suitability of Rural Living Zone D**

The subject land has an area of approximately 55 acres, or 22 hectares. This exceeds the minimum lot size associated with Rural Living Zone D.

*TPC Guideline No.1* expressly contemplates the application of the *Rural Living Zone* to land formerly zoned *Environmental Living* where a comparable minimum lot size is applied. The size of the land is therefore consistent with the application of *RLZ D* and demonstrates that such zoning would not facilitate intensified subdivision or urban style development.

Application of *Rural Living Zone D* would recognise the existing low density rural residential character of the land, retain large lot sizes, and allow environmental and landscape values to be managed through the applicable planning codes and overlays, without introducing the broader range of uses contemplated by the *Rural Zone*.

### **Guideline No.1 considerations**

We note the concerns raised in the KLUB evaluation regarding the decision-making methodology in the Ireneinc review, particularly the treatment of “primary strategic intention”. Guideline No.1 does not elevate this concept to a threshold test, but requires it to be considered alongside objective criteria such as settlement pattern and lot size.

When these objective criteria are applied to the [REDACTED] locality, they support the application of the *Rural Living Zone* rather than the *Rural Zone*.

### **Requested outcome**

For the reasons above, we respectfully request that the Commission:

- does not adopt the recommendation to rezone [REDACTED], Kettering to the *Rural Zone*; and
- applies the *Rural Living Zone D* as the most appropriate and guideline-consistent zoning for the land.

Yours sincerely,

Elise and Mathew McCaskie

Owners

[REDACTED]

Kettering TAS 7155