

From: Clarence General Mail User
Sent: Tue, 17 Mar 2020 07:26:51 +1000
To: City Planning; Dan Ford
Subject: FW: Clarence Draft LPS written representation
Attachments: JeniferandDavidBrownClarenceLPS.pdf

From: David and Jenifer Brown <rochesbeach@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, 16 March 2020 7:03 PM
To: Clarence General Mail User <clarence@ccc.tas.gov.au>
Cc: rochesbeach@gmail.com; Kimberley Neville <kimberley.nev@gmail.com>
Subject: Clarence Draft LPS written representation

Dear Ian Nelson - General Manager,

Please find attached our written representation for the Clarence draft local provision schedule. Can you send a reply, so we know you have received it, thank you.

Yours sincerely,
Jenifer and David Brown

Dear Ian Nelson,

We want to make a representation regarding the Clarence City Council's decision to keep a 'like for like' translation of the former Clarence Planning Scheme 2007 (CPS2007) and the current Clarence Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (CIPS2015), in the draft Local Provision Schedule (LPS). Lot sizes in the draft LPS are still subject to a 2ha minimum for subdivision. However, there is scope within the relevant planning documentation to reduce the minimum for the Rural Living Zone to 1ha - we will outline these points below.

Who we are

We are landowners and residents at 76 Nowra Road, Roches Beach. We purchased our 2.1ha land in 1978 and subsequently built our current home. We are now in our mid 70's and early 80's, and find the size of our property to be unmanageable between the two of us. We do not want to move but it will be inevitable if we are unable to subdivide, as maintaining a 2ha property is no longer the same simple task as when we were younger. We still want to live in our community and on our land here. This is our home, it is where we raised our children and grandchildren, and where we remain active in our gardens. We want to maintain the semi-rural outside lifestyle that endeared us to Roches Beach. Reducing minimum lot sizes to 1ha would provide opportunities for older Australians such as ourselves to continue accessing this lifestyle.

It has been suggested to us in our meetings with the Clarence City Council, regarding our desire to stay on our own land by the possibility of subdivision, that older Australians will move out of their family homes and downsize. We want to challenge this idea as it is not inclusive - inclusivity is a key theme in the planning documentation. We know that we are not alone in the Acton Corridor in wanting to live out our lives on our family land.

Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy

The Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy (STRLUS) states the aim to (p.A-11): 'provide for the aged to continue living within their communities, and with their families, for as long as possible by providing appropriate options and flexibility within the planning scheme'. For us, and other landowners in the Acton Corridor, this flexibility in the planning scheme may come through a reduction in minimum lot sizes for the Rural Living Zone, as this is a manageable sized lot to maintain for older active residents. A reduction in the minimum lot size would also mean that more people are able to enjoy a semi-rural lifestyle, due to there being an increased availability of suitable land at a more affordable price (eg. the cost of a 1ha lot versus the higher cost of a 2ha lot).

The settlement and residential policy (p.95-6) also aims to provide sustainable development of communities which are capable of meeting projected demands - of which one such way is to 'increase densities in existing rural living areas to an average of 1 dwelling per hectare, where site conditions allow'. This latter policy statement is not a throw away line within the

STRULUS. There is a consistent message throughout the document to use land more efficiently by increasing living density, and maximising existing services and infrastructure, with the purpose of promoting sustainable use and development (eg., p.84). An increased efficiency of land would also provide more rates to distribute to the Clarence community.

Differentiation between rural living zones

The *Guideline No. 1 Local Provisions Schedule (LPS): zone and code application* states:

"The differentiation between Rural Living Zone A, Rural Living Zone B, Rural Living Zone C or Rural Living Zone D should be based on:

- (a) a reflection of the existing pattern and density of development within the rural living area; or
- (b) further strategic justification to support the chosen minimum lot sizes consistent with the relevant regional land use strategy, or supported by more detailed local strategic analysis consistent with the relevant regional land use strategy and endorsed by the relevant council"

Our land has been zoned as Rural Living Zone B, based upon a 'like for like' translation of the CPS2007 and CIPS2015. We question this decision, because it does not reflect the existing pattern and density of development within the corridor, as there are lots within this area that are below the 2ha minimum - for example lots within our own street and lots on the adjoining Kirra Road. We acknowledge that the subdivisions on Nowra Road for instance, occurred under a previous scheme. However, they still form part of the existing pattern and density in the area and thus need to be taken into consideration when determining Acton Corridor as A or B. The established pattern of development in this area, is that there are lots with a minimum of 1ha, and lots with a minimum of 2ha. If this is the case, we wonder why the council has decided to designate the Acton Corridor as Zone B.

The *Tasmanian Planning Scheme Rural Living Areas Fact sheet 6* states that the Tasmanian Planning Scheme (TPS) aims to provide clarity and consistency for rural living areas. Furthermore, on the TPS reform website it says 'the Government has been undertaking planning reform to ensure planning in Tasmania will be simpler, **fairer** and **more efficient**.' IF, the differentiation between Rural Living Zone A and B is based upon this existing pattern and density of development, we question the decision not to allow other landowners the opportunity to subdivide to 1ha - how is this fair?

It has been acknowledged to us by the council in previous attempts to reduce the minimum lot size to 1ha, that no detailed local strategic analysis has been undertaken for the Acton Corridor. We wonder at what stage one might be undertaken, and if there is a possibility to do one to further inform the process of the LPS.

Final thoughts

We are aware that you will receive letters affirming your decision to not reduce the Rural Living Zone lot size to 1ha, perhaps because of the perceived impacts this may have on the lifestyles of Acton Corridor landowners. However, not all landowners will want to subdivide, and some lots will not meet the requirements for subdivision. Furthermore, change in this area will be progressive and will not happen instantaneously - the option to subdivide does not mean all landowners, who may wish to subdivide, will do so immediately.

As long term residents, we have seen vast changes in the area over the past four decades. These changes have not negatively impacted us, and nor has the increase in people altered the semi-rural lifestyle we enjoy. It is still peaceful and quiet, and we see people out riding their bikes, exercising and spending time with their dogs and families. Hence, we see no reason why a 1ha lot minimum could threaten the distinct landscape character and lifestyles of landowners in the Acton Corridor.

Thank you for taking the time to consider the ideas and justifications we have shared in this letter. We would like to share one final thought from the *Tasmanian Planning Reform* website, which states: 'planning provides a forum for our aspirations: what we want our society, our settlements, our infrastructure, our landscapes to look like, and how we want them to function.' It raises the question, how are we planning to meet the needs of an aging population, currently and in the medium to long term? And what choices can the council make to allow older Australians to continue living on their land if there is flexibility within the planning scheme to make it so.

As stated above, reducing minimum lot sizes in the Rural Living Zone to 1ha would provide opportunities for older Australians such as ourselves, now and in the future, to continue accessing this healthy and active, semi-rural lifestyle.

Yours sincerely,
Jenifer and David Brown