
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 4 May 2026 8:29 AM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: LPS Submission
Attachments: Creef [REDACTED]_LPS Submission.pdf

Good Morning

Attached is our submission for the Tasmanian Planning Scheme Kingborough draft Local Provisions Schedule.

Regards

Peter Creef

[REDACTED], Allens Rivulet

To the Tasmanian Planning Commission
Email: KingboroughLPS@planning.tas.gov.au

Overview

We write in response to your letter dated 2 April 2026 (ref: DOC/26/36829) advising that the Ireneinc report recommends that our 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.

We did not make a formal representation during the public exhibition period as we were unaware of the exhibition and therefore that our property had been proposed by the Kingborough Council to be zoned as LCZ. We appreciate the opportunity to now participate in this process.

We support the Ireneinc recommendation that our property be included within the RLZ under the draft Kingborough LPS. The RLZ is a significantly more appropriate zone for our property than the exhibited LCZ.

We make this submission to: (1) provide property-specific evidence that supports the RLZ recommendation; and to (2) justify why we believe our property should not be reverted back to the LCZ at the final determination stage.

Please note: In addition to our individual submission herein, we are also a signatory to the Collective Allens Rivulet / Margate Submission Solution.

Property details

Landowner name(s)	Kim & Peter Creef
Property address	[REDACTED] Allens Rivulet, TAS 7150
Title reference (folio)	[REDACTED]
Lot size (approx.)	3 hectares
Locality	Allens Rivulet
Current Interim Planning Scheme (IPS) zone	Rural Resource Zone (RRZ)
Draft LPS exhibited zone	Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ)
Ireneinc recommended zone	Rural Living Zone (RLZ) (No subcategory specified)
Position in this submission	Accept RLZ

Statement of position

As stated above we support the Ireneinc recommendation that our property be in the RLZ as it is a significantly more appropriate zone for our property than the LCZ. In the case of our property, the Ireneinc report appears to have involved a more rigorous, property-level analysis than was previously applied.

The Ireneinc report did not specify a Rural Living Zone subcategory. Other proposed RLZ properties, of a similar size to ours, in our immediate area / road have been proposed by Kingborough Council to be zoned as Rural Living Zone C. For consistency and recognising that there is no reticulated sewerage system available in Allens Rivulet (Zone Guideline RLZ 11.5.3), we therefore also seek RLZ subcategory C. Applying RLZ (C) to our property would not allow further subdivision and would reflect the existing settlement pattern.

Supporting evidence

The Ireneinc report's RLZ recommendation for our property at [REDACTED] Allens Rivulet meets the Tasmanian Planning Scheme zone guidelines for the RLZ.

In our situation it also: (1) resolves the fragmented application of the LCZ for our property which was surrounded by similar property sizes exhibited as RLZ, (2) recognises the similarities between the RRZ in the Interim Planning Scheme and existing RLZ in terms of settlement pattern, and (3) acknowledges the settlement pattern in our area is reflective of rural living.

Residential use of our property and rural activities

- The primary use of our property is for residential purposes with some lower-order rural hobby activities including:
 - some pasture,
 - two small dams,
 - vegetable garden,
 - seasonal agistment of horses when on 'summer sabbatical' from a nearby equestrian centre.
- Our property contains a house that is over 30 years old (1994), as well as several small sheds associated with the house and the existing lower-order rural hobby activities.

Established residential living settlement

Our property is approximately three hectares and is part of a cluster of similarly sized established residential dwellings along [REDACTED] which includes seven residential dwellings that are within approximately 500 metres of our dwelling.

The Ireneinc report specifically highlighted three areas in Allens Rivulet (highlighted in yellow in the image below), which included our property, that had been exhibited as LCZ, but they recommended to be RLZ.



The Ireneinc report confirmed evidence of a residential living settlement in our area in Allens Rivulet, stating that (the highlighted properties in yellow, which included ours): (1) contributed to the broader rural subdivision pattern with lot sizes generally between two and five hectares but ranging up to seven hectares, (2) the properties predominantly have existing residential uses and associated development occurring, and that (3) rural activities are evident in parcels within the extent of the locality.

Landscape values on our property can be managed within RLZ

The Ireneinc report stated that the above-mentioned highlighted properties in Allens Rivulet, including ours, had landscape values consistent with that anticipated in a rural living settlement within the region. We agree with the Ireneinc's conclusion that our property has characteristics that are consistent with other RLZ land and that it can be reasonably managed in the same way and therefore presents a low risk when zoned RLZ.

Our property is subject to the following code overlays:

- Waterway and coastal protection area
- Priority vegetation
- Scenic protection area
- Bushfire prone area
- Landslip hazard

The above code overlays, in particular the priority vegetation and the scenic protection overlays, mean that any landscape values identified for protection and / or conservation on our property can be managed through the application of the codes. The combination of the code overlays and the inability for subdivision on our property when zoned RLZ (C) will provide adequate management of landscape values without the additional need for the more restrictive LCZ.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I submit that:

1. We agree with the Ireneinc report's recommendation that our property be included within the RLZ and that we understand that this recommendation is consistent with the zone guidelines and the requirements of section 34 of LUPAA.
2. The exhibited LCZ was not appropriate for our property. The RLZ recommendation reflects a more rigorous analysis and is therefore more appropriate.
3. The most appropriate RLZ subcategory for our property is RLZ (C) which reflects the existing pattern of exhibited zoning in our area and does not allow for further subdivision.
4. Any landscape values on our property can be appropriately managed through the existing overlay controls (waterway and coastal protection area, priority vegetation, scenic protection area, bushfire-prone area and landslip hazard) in combination with the lot size controls of the RLZ C subcategory.

We therefore request that the Commission adopt the Ireneinc recommendation and include our property within the RLZ (C) in the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule.

Regards,

Kim and Peter Creef

Signed:

[Redacted signature area]

Date: 03 / 05 / 2026

Emails:

[Redacted email address]

Phone:

[Redacted phone number] (Peter)
[Redacted phone number] (Kim)