
From: Frank & Janet de Hoog [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 4 May 2026 6:47 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: Response to Kingborough LPS letter 2/4/26 Ref: DOC/26/36829
Attachments: Response to TPC letter 4 May 2026.pdf

Dear Linda,
Thank you for your letter 2/4/2026 to our family in regards to the Kingborough draft Local Provisions Schedule (LPS).

Our ref: DOC/26/36829

Please see attached is our submission in response.

Yours sincerely,
Janet de Hoog

3/5/2026

Tasmanian Planning Commission
GPO Box 1691
HOBART
TAS7000

Kingborough draft Local Provisions Schedule - Zoning of Land at Lower Snug

We write in response to the letter (ref: DOC/26/36829) advising that the Irene inc report recommends [REDACTED], Lower Snug be included within the Rural Zone (RZ) under the draft Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule (LPS), rather than remaining in the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) as exhibited.

We previously made a representation on the draft LPS (no133). We understand that as our representation has not yet been heard that it will be heard at a future hearing.

We understand that the letter provides an opportunity to make a further written submission in relation to the Irene inc recommendations, and that we may speak to this submission when we appear before the Commission. We take up that opportunity and submit as follows.

Landowner names: Mitchell and Melissa Knowles
Property address: [REDACTED], Lower Snug, 7054
Current IPS zone: Environmental Living Zone (ELZ)
Draft LPS exhibited zone: Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ)
Ireneinc recommended zone: Rural Zone
Zone sought in this submission: Rural Living Zone D (RLZ)

The landowners of this property is listed in the name of our daughter Melissa and her husband Mitchell Knowles, who live in the house with their family. We own and live in the ancillary dwelling on the property.

We welcome the Irene inc recommendation to move the property away from the Landscape Conservation Zone(LCZ) as exhibited. The LCZ is not an appropriate zone for the property and we are pleased that the review has recognised this.

However, we do not consider the Rural Zone (RZ) to be the most appropriate outcome. We submit that the Rural Living Zone (RLZ) better reflects the existing use, settlement character, and residential intention of our land, and is more consistent with the requirements of section 34 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993(LUPAA), the Section 8A Guideline No. 1—Local Provisions Schedule: Zone and Code Application (the Zone Guidelines), and the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy (STRLUS). We request that the Commission determine that the RLZ is the appropriate zone for my property under the draft Kingborough LPS.

The specific RLZ subcategory we seek is Rural Living Zone D (minimum lot size 10ha). We have no intention to subdivide the property.

Our reasons for requesting this are as follows:

1) Rural Zone does not adequately recognise the residential character of our property

RZ purpose is directed at land in non-urban areas where agricultural use is limited or marginal and where the primary function is rural rather than residential. The RZ does not give priority to

residential amenity and treats dwellings as a discretionary use that must demonstrate compatibility with surrounding rural activities.

2) The Rural Zone purpose does not reflect the primary intention of our land

While our property is rural in setting, its primary existing and intended use is residential—not agricultural or resource-based. The RZ does not give priority to the protection of residential amenity in the way the RLZ does.

Our property contains a home built approximately 30 years ago, with a renovation completed this year (our daughter, her husband and our grandchildren's home), plus an ancillary dwelling (where we live). We have a workshop, vegetable garden and fruit orchard, chickens and a dog. The previous owners had horses. We are currently repairing fences so that we can get some sheep.

3) Our property satisfies the Irene inc criteria for RLZ, not merely RZ

The Irene inc evaluation framework identifies specific suitability indicators for RLZ, including: evidence of residential use; a settlement pattern of 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.

Our property and the surrounding settlement satisfy these indicators, which is why RLZ—not RZ—is the appropriate outcome.

Whilst our surrounding settlement of Lower Snug is consistent with the pattern to be zoned RLZ it is currently proposed to be zoned RZ. This is inconsistent with how RLZ has been applied to other areas such as Oyster Cove, or north of Snug and in many other areas of the municipality.

Lower Snug settlement:

There are 36 properties along [REDACTED] south from the Low Density Residential area in Lower Snug [REDACTED] through to [REDACTED], Lower Snug and including [REDACTED].

36 properties	36 properties
16 are less than 2 hectares 10 are 2 to 3 hectares 4 are 3 to 10 hectares 3 are 10 to 12 hectares 3 are 12 to 15 hectares	3 vacant land 33 properties with a home, most with a shed & hobby farm activities evident 2 of the above have a home but also run a small business
* further details can be provided on request	

One example of RLZ from an area north of Snug:

145 Slattery's Road, Margate, which continues to run as a farm and has 18 titles. 12 of these titles are proposed as follows:

1 has a house, paddock & bush	6.59 ha proposed to be RL D
1 has a cottage and paddock	1.75 ha proposed to be RL C
10 are vacant land, paddock	1.29 ha to 14.3 ha all proposed to be RL C

Many other similar examples could be provided from other areas in the municipality where they are proposed to be Rural Living Zone.

With these properties in Lower Snug fitting the description of Rural Living Zone where residential intention is the main purpose, we question if this area been incorrectly proposed to be zoned Rural?

And we ask that you review the zoning of the Lower Snug settlement.

4) Residential intention is clearly established

The Irene inc framework's first decision point asks whether there is a strategic intention for residential use. With a house and ancillary dwelling which is our residence, our property clearly satisfies this.

5) RZ was applied to resolve fragmentation, not because RLZ is inappropriate

The Irene inc report applies RZ in some localities primarily to avoid fragmented LCZ application and to reflect the Rural Resource Zone under the KIPS2015—not because the land lacks residential character. The modifications table in the Irene inc Locality Report confirms that RZ was considered 'another alternative in place of RLZ' in some instances, not necessarily the preferred outcome where residential character exists. Because our property has residential characteristics, RLZ is more appropriate than RZ even where Irene inc defaulted to RZ for administrative consistency reasons.

We believe that Irene inc may have defaulted to RZ rather than RLZ because our property and the surrounding area was previously zone Rural Resource. However, as noted above in point3) we give evidence that our property and others in our area better suit RLZ.

6) The evaluation framework is not a statutory instrument

Kate Heckelmann (Irene inc) conceded at Day 20 [05:53:00] that the evaluation framework is not a statutory instrument—it is a tool, not a rule. The Commission must assess my property and our surrounding properties against the Zone Guidelines, not the Irene inc framework alone. Where the framework defaults to RZ but the Zone Guidelines support RLZ, the Zone Guidelines prevail.

For the reasons set out above, we submit that:

1. RZ does not adequately recognise the established residential character of my property.
2. Our property and the properties along [REDACTED], Lower Snug satisfies the criteria for RLZ under Zone Guidelines RLZ 1(a) and RLZ 2(b): it is a residential property with larger lots in a rural setting, with a mix of residential and lower-order rural activities, and the primary strategic intention is residential.
3. The appropriate RLZ subcategory for my property is RLZ D, which reflects the existing lot size and settlement pattern and does not create a pathway for 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, without requiring RZ.

We respectfully request that the Commission:

- Determine that the draft Kingborough LPS should be modified to include our property within the RLZ D; and
- Determine that the draft Kingborough LPS should be reviewed to include properties along Channel Highway, Lower Snug as RLZ; and
- If the Commission proposes any alternative outcome, that we be provided with an opportunity to respond before any final determination is made

Yours sincerely,
Janet and Frank de Hoog

[REDACTED]
Lower Snug TAS 7054
[REDACTED]