
From: Scott Headlam <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, 4 May 2026 10:21 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: Re: Kingborough draft Local Provisions Schedule letter dated 2 April 2026
Attachments: TPC_Submission[REDACTED]_4May2026.pdf

Dear Commission,

Please find attached our further written submission in response to your letter dated 2 April 2026 (ref: DOC/26/36829) regarding the proposed zoning of our land at [REDACTED] (Title: [REDACTED] under the Kingborough draft Local Provisions Schedule.

We support the recommendation in the Ireneinc Report that our land be zoned Rural Living Zone, and our submission sets out our preference for the RLZ A sub-zone.

Kind regards,
Anna and Scott Headlam

Anna Headlam and Scott Headlam

[REDACTED]
Bonnet Hill, TAS, 7053

4 May 2026

Tasmanian Planning Commission
Level 3, 144 Macquarie Street
Hobart TAS 7000

By email: KingboroughLPS@planning.tas.gov.au

**Re: Kingborough Draft Local Provisions Schedule – Further Written
Submission in Response to TPC Letter dated 2 April 2026 (Ref: DOC/26/36829)
– Land at [REDACTED] (Title: [REDACTED])**

Dear Commission,

We are the owners of the land at [REDACTED] (the Land), comprising approximately 9.3 acres. We write in response to the Tasmanian Planning Commission's (Commission) letter dated 2 April 2026, which notified us of the report prepared by Ireneinc Planning and Urban Design (Ireneinc Report) and invited us to provide a further written submission regarding the proposed zoning of our land under the Kingborough draft Local Provisions Schedule (LPS).

1. Support for the Ireneinc Report Recommendation

We welcome and support the recommendation in the Ireneinc Report that our land transition to the Rural Living Zone (RLZ), rather than the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) as proposed in the exhibited draft LPS.

We consider the LCZ to be an inappropriate zone for our land, which has long-established characteristics consistent with rural living rather than landscape conservation. The Ireneinc Report's recommendation to apply the RLZ correctly reflects the existing character, use, and setting of our land, and we are grateful for the Commission's process in affording us this opportunity to comment.

2. Preferred Sub-Zone: RLZ A

In agreeing with the recommendation to apply the RLZ, we respectfully request that the Commission give consideration to applying the RLZ A sub-zone to our land, being the sub-zone that provides for the smallest minimum lot size within the Rural

Living Zone. We submit that RLZ A is the more appropriate sub-zone in the circumstances, and we set out our reasons briefly below.

If the Commission considers that RLZ A cannot be supported, we submit in the alternative that RLZ B (or such other sub-zone as is consistent with the existing character and development pattern of the locality) would be an appropriate and acceptable outcome, and we would support any such classification over the LCZ.

3. Grounds in Support of RLZ A

We acknowledge that the LPS Guidelines require that the sub-zone applied must reflect the existing development pattern and density of the locality, or be supported by strategic justification consistent with the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy (STRLUS). We do not seek to create new subdivision opportunities beyond what the applicable sub-zone would ordinarily permit, and we make this request in the following context:

(a) Lot size consistency: At approximately 9.3 acres (approximately 3.76 hectares), our land is of a size that we understand is broadly consistent with, or proximate to, the lot sizes applicable under the RLZ A sub-zone in nearby localities within Kingborough. We respectfully invite the Commission to confirm the prevailing lot sizes in our locality when determining the appropriate sub-zone.

(b) Existing use and character: Our land has characteristics consistent with a rural living setting. Application of RLZ A would accurately reflect the existing character of the land and its surrounds.

(c) Consolidation of existing rural residential areas: We note that the STRLUS, while not supporting the creation of new rural residential areas, does encourage the consolidation of existing ones. Our land sits within what we understand to be an established rural living locality, and RLZ A would serve to consolidate and accurately reflect that existing pattern.

(d) Future use flexibility: RLZ A, by providing for a smaller minimum lot size, would afford a degree of future flexibility that is consistent with the orderly and appropriate use and development of the land, without undermining the landscape and amenity values of the area. We are not seeking to maximise subdivision potential, but simply to ensure that the sub-zone applied does not unnecessarily foreclose reasonable future uses that may be appropriate to consider in due course.

4. Further Information

We are willing to provide any further information that the Commission considers relevant to the determination of the appropriate sub-zone for our land. We are also happy to attend any hearing or meeting as directed by the Commission.

We thank the Commission for its consideration of this matter and for the opportunity to provide this further submission. We respectfully request that the Commission:

(a) confirm the recommendation in the Ireneinc Report to apply the Rural Living Zone to our land at [REDACTED]; and

(b) where consistent with the LPS Guidelines and the prevailing development pattern of the locality, apply the RLZ A sub-zone to our land; or, in the alternative, apply RLZ B or such other sub-zone as the Commission determines to be appropriate.

Yours sincerely,

Anna Headlam and Scott Headlam

Owners, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]