

Mr A G Barwick,
301 White Beach Road,
Or
PO Box 741,
NUBEENA. TAS. 7184.

PHONE 0409 932 933

13TH March 2021.

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Submission to Tasmanian Planning Scheme – Tasman Draft LPS.

As the owner of four parcels of land in the White Beach area, I wish to have input into the Tasman Draft LPS.

PID 2200006, CT 168111/1, 123.9 ha Noyes Road, White Beach, zoning Rural.

I received a copy of a letter from Conservation Landholders Tasmania requesting that all conservation covenanted land in the Tasman Municipality, including mine, be rezoned from Rural to Landscape Conservation.

I object to this requested blanket rezoning in the strongest terms regarding my property. I have future plans for this property as permitted under its existing Rural zone. This property has been zoned Rural as long as Planning Schemes have been in existence. I do not want its zoning changed! Conservation Landholders Tasmania do not speak for me, I have not asked them to include my land in this blanket request, they do not represent me, they have no idea of my future plans, nor should they. Their opinions are not required nor appreciated. To be blunt they can keep their noses out of my business and my land. Also please note that 22% of my land, 27.3 ha is not subject to a conservation covenant, this portion of the land is required and included in my future plans and must remain in the Rural zone, together with the whole title. If this land is rezoned from Rural to Landscape Conservation, can I claim compensation for the loss of future income making potential and the devaluing of my land?

PID 2200014, CT 144778/1, 21.5 ha, Noyes Road, White Beach, zoning Rural.

This property is a parcel of Rural zoned land that cannot be utilised for primary production purposes. It is worthy of noting that the two blocks to the North have been rezoned Rural Living and yet mine remains as Rural, one must ask why my property remains Rural? The Rural Living zone appears to be underutilised across the whole new planning scheme, even though it states clearly that the Rural Living zone should be utilised as a buffer zone between primary production and residential areas. This title has always been well below the 40 hectare minimum required for the Rural Resource zone and I believe it would be more appropriately zoned as either Rural Living or Environmental Living.

PID 9593543, CT 175928/1, 30.08 ha, Noyes Road, White Beach, Tasman's proposed zoning Rural Living. Commission's zoning Rural Resource.

Tasman Council in fact recommended that this property be zoned Rural Living which is entirely appropriate given that the Rural Living zone should be utilised as a buffer zone between primary production and residential areas. The Planning Commission refused this. Currently this property adjoins a Rural Living zone and a Low Density Residential zone.

The family historically ran stock on this property however due to constant dog attacks it was rendered unviable. Currently, this property has 21 neighbours and soon to increase even further, rendering it entirely unsuitable for primary production due to noise complaints, smells, etc. It is becoming increasingly more

expensive to maintain this property solely for the neighbours benefit with fire hazard reduction practices. I cannot run stock on this property to assist in fire hazard reduction, for the reasons noted. This title is well below the 40 hectare minimum required for the Rural Resource zone.

PID 6010584, CT 48654/1, 9.226 ha, 301 White Beach Road, White Beach, Tasman's proposed zoning Low Density Residential. Commission's zoning Rural Resource.

Again, the Council recommended that this property be appropriately zoned as Rural Living. This property is adjoined by Low Density Residential zoning on the Lagoon Subdivision side boundary and holiday units on the other side boundary and small lots along the front/White Beach Road boundary. It isn't used for rural purposes and hasn't been used for rural purposes for at least 50 years, if ever, and more importantly couldn't be used for rural purposes because of our neighbours. One wonders how many noise and smell complaints Council would receive if I decided to run cattle, sheep or pigs on the property, pigs are my wife's preference. I currently have 16 neighbours, one of those has 9 habitable dwellings (White Beach Holiday Units) on their property, so I have 25 neighbours. In the past Council received noise complaints when I repaired machinery used for primary industry during normal business hours, which is a permitted use in this zone. There is nothing stopping me from doing this on my property at any time, day or night, under the Rural Resource zone. It is becoming increasingly more expensive to maintain this property solely for the neighbours benefit with fire hazard reduction practices. I cannot run stock on this property to assist in fire hazard reduction, for the reasons noted and sheep killing dogs. This title has always been well below the required 40 hectare minimum for the Rural Resource zone. It is inconceivable to me that this property is appropriately zoned as Rural Resource. In my opinion, it is entirely appropriate that it be zoned Low Density Residential.

Given this property is surrounded by houses and the recent developments along the road from us and other areas in White Beach the continual refusal to rezone this property by the Tasmanian Planning Commission can only be considered as pure bloody mindedness or perhaps even personal.

PID's 220014, 9593543 and 6010584 will never meet the required standard for a Rural Resource zone, so why are they zoned Rural Resource? Although all of these properties are zoned Rural Resource, as they are not suitable for primary production I cannot receive any tax relief for any of these properties, for example; GST free materials or services for fencing or to build a waterhole, reduced registration on my tractor used almost exclusively to slash the properties for fire hazard reduction and land tax exemptions.

As I understand it, when moving to a new planning scheme the mission is to most closely meet the old zoning with the new in areas such as minimum land sizes, criteria, etc. How can the Planning Commission transfer old Rural zones with legitimate 10 and 20 hectare minimums into 40 hectare minimums and yet under their new rural zone the criteria states that the area of land must be large enough to support rural based commercial enterprise. They have just created 100's of subminimum lots in the Tasman Municipality that cannot support a rural based commercial enterprise. Will the Planning Commission/State Government compensate me for effectively rezoning my properties into highly inappropriate and unsuitable zones?

Tasman traditionally comprises small acreage titles, this has been the case since day dot, there isn't any broad acre (in the true sense of the word) farms and there isn't any Class A Agricultural Land in Tasman. I believe the farmers we have in Tasman should be allowed to farm and a rural zone is entirely appropriate in these cases. For the Commission to insist that small titles surrounded by houses and small lot subdivisions remain as Rural Resource is entirely inappropriate. I'd be lucky to grow a rat on the properties I own and I'd be condemned to constant complaints (as would the Council) from my neighbours about my rat growing activities/ventures. The major problem is that the new Rural Resource zone with a 40 hectare minimum is entirely inappropriate for most titles in the Tasman Municipality and yet the Planning Commission are insisting that the Council must fit a square peg into a round hole. It doesn't work and it won't work!

The history of both PID 9593543 and 6010584. Back in the Laugher/Graham days, so I guess around fifteen years ago, Merv Graham led myself, my wife and my parents-in-law (RB and RJ Skeggs) along a very long, winding and expensive garden path to ultimately a rezoning refusal. Merv Graham required every conceivable report to accompany our rezoning applications for both of these properties. We therefore commissioned and paid good money after bad for; subdivision proposals; test holes dug for septic tank assessments; flora and fauna assessments; Aboriginal heritage assessments; and a traffic impact assessment for the WHOLE of White Beach Road, unheard of back then and now!

These reports would be on Council's files under the property files or for 301 White Beach Road in mine and my wife's name and for Noyes Road (back then) in my parents-in law's name.

The Tasmanian Planning Commission refused these rezoning applications. The excuse given was that the Council needed to implement a White Beach Structure Plan before any rezonings would be approved for the White Beach area. The Council produced a White Beach Structure Plan approximately 8 to 10 years ago. What's the Planning Commissions excuse now?

It is my understanding that the Tasmanian Planning Commission haven't approved any rezoning applications in the Tasman Municipality for approximately 20 years, other than a couple of rezonings Tasman Council managed to have added in the Tasman Interim Planning Scheme.

My rhetorical questions are, why has the Tasman Municipality been forced to stagnate for the last 20 years by the Tasmanian Planning Commission? What is the Commissions hidden agenda for Tasman? Who is big brother? Who's calling the shots regarding Tasman's future at the Commission/State Government? Is it the Commission's/Government's mission to ensure that Tasman stagnates or goes backwards? Does the Commission/Government hope that if Tasman Council cannot increase their rates base, then in the future we'll cry out for amalgamation? Is it the case that the last one off the Peninsula should turn-off the lights?

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Barwick