
From: Carly Coleman [REDACTED] >
Sent: Wednesday, 6 May 2026 9:05 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: Submission — Kingborough LPS Direction 69 — [REDACTED], Oyster Cove [REDACTED]
Attachments: Submission. Kingborough LPS Direction 69. [REDACTED] Oyster Cove Folio [REDACTED].cx

To the Tasmanian Planning Commission

Please accept our submission as we are new property owners and this zoning issue has just come to our attention. We apologetically request that this late submission is accepted as we are new business owners and residents to the Oyster Cove locality, and we fear this could impact our residential and business investment significantly.

Kindest regards

Carly Coleman and Stuart Edwards
Oyster Cove Chalets
[REDACTED], Oyster Cove

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 and have not previously had correspondence with the Commission. I understand that this letter has been sent to ensure procedural fairness and provides me with a clear opportunity to formally participate in this stage of the process. I take up that opportunity and submit as follows.

Landowner name(s)	Carly Maree Coleman and Stuart Paul Edwards
Property address	██████████, Oyster Cove TAS 7155
Title reference (folio)	██████████
Lot size (approx.)	2.5 hectares
Locality	Oyster Cove
Current IPS zone	<i>Environmental Living Zone (ELZ)</i>
Draft LPS exhibited zone	<i>Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ)</i>
Ireneinc recommended zone	<i>Rural Living Zone B</i>
Position in this submission	<i>Accept RLZ — support and argue correct subcategory B</i>

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.

The subcategory I seek for my property is:

- Rural Living Zone B (minimum lot size 2 ha) — the existing lot pattern in my locality is consistent with lots of approximately 2–5 ha
- Properties in Oyster Cove typically range from 1ha to 10ha. My property is 2ha. This is consistent with RLZ B which has a minimum lot size of 2 ha. Applying RLZB to my property would significantly constrain further subdivision, reflecting the existing settlement pattern.

D1 — The RLZ recommendation is consistent with the Zone Guidelines

D1.2 — Zone Guideline RLZ 2(b) — ELZ land with residential intention

Zone Guideline RLZ 2(b) confirms that the RLZ may be applied to ELZ land where the primary strategic intention is for residential use and development within a rural setting, and a similar minimum allowable lot size is being applied. My property satisfies both elements: the primary intention is residential, and the RLZ subcategory I am seeking applies a minimum lot size that is consistent with or larger than the current lot size.

The primary strategic intention for my property has always been residential and business use — it has been used as a residence since 1920. My property is 2.5ha. The RLZ B minimum lot size of 2 ha is consistent with this existing lot size and does not create subdivision potential.

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.

My property is part of a cluster of approx. 38 residential properties along Manuka Road, each with lot sizes of approximately 1ha to 10ha. Each property contains a dwelling with associated outbuildings, and the area has been a settled rural residential community historically to present. We are a previously approved mixed-use property that has a dwelling, outbuilding and approved accommodation which we hope to continue to develop.

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.

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 B, 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 B 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 42027/1 at 42 Manuka Road, Oyster Cove be included within the Rural Living Zone B in the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule, consistent with the Ireneinc recommendation.

Signed:

CMC and SPE

Carly Coleman and Stuart Edwards

Date:

01/05/2026

