
From: Klasina Abetz-Visser <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, 25 April 2026 9:05 AM
To: Kingborough LPS; Eric.Abetz@depac.tas.gov
Subject: Landscape Conservation Zoning
Attachments: letter 25042026.odt; Submission to Kingborough Council re.docx

Dear Sirs/Mesdames

-Attached is a letter explaining my position on the Landscape Conservation Zoning, and my previous submission which explains my position in greater detail.

Yours sincerely
Klasina Abetz-Visser

[REDACTED]
KAOOTA TAS 7150

Ph. [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

25 April, 2026
Klasina Abetz-Visser
[REDACTED], Kaoota, Tas 7150
PH: [REDACTED]

Dear Sirs/Mesdames

I agree with IreneInc that part of this property is properly zoned as Rural.
The remainder is zoned Landscape conservation.

I would like to draw your attention to my previous submission, whose aim was to demonstrate the very vulnerable situation of the Tasmanian bush in my area. The only areas where “bush” is thriving, is where I have fenced out wallabies and pademelons. The rest has deteriorated markedly in the eleven years I have been on this property. I strongly suspect the overabundance of herbivores to be a pivotal issue. I have attached my previous submission for your perusal.

To maintain “landscape values”, which are undefined by the documents presented by Council but which I assume include things like lack of erosion, maintaining some sort of vegetative cover, and maintaining waterways, finance and energy need to be expended. On public land, this is covered by a paid workforce, and public moneys. On private land both energy and finance will not be expended unless there is benefit to the landowner. Council cannot expect private landowners to expend finance for no benefit particularly in financially straitened times.

I can see that the general public would like native bush to cover many of the hills around Kingborough. However, designating those areas “Landscape Conservation” is unlikely to have that effect in the current fauna environment. I foresee erosion, canopy loss, and greater water runoff happening. Any vegetative cover, whether native or not, will hold soil, increase water retention, improve soil structure.

More bylaws could be instigated to force landowners to expend finance and energy at pain of fines. A simpler solution would be to allow landowners benefit from their own private land. This can be done by zoning only **public land** as “Landscape Conservation”. “Rural Living” could best describe private land that is particularly vulnerable to erosion, vegetative loss, canopy loss and water runoff.

I would urge you to seriously reconsider designating any private land as “Landscape Conservation”. To do so will only increase the degradation of those areas, not alleviate it.

Yours Sincerely
Klasina Abetz-Visser