
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 4 May 2026 8:03 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Cc: TPC Enquiry; Kingborough LPS
Subject: Submission Kingborough LPS Direction 69 - [REDACTED] GORDON
Attachments: Direction 69 Submission [REDACTED].pdf

Dears Sirs,

Please find attached our submission for our property at [REDACTED], Gordon as per the Kingborough LPS Direction 69.

Regards

Heather Glasscock - [REDACTED]
Jennifer O'Brien

WRITTEN SUBMISSION TO THE

TASMANIAN PLANNING COMMISSION

Kingborough LPS — Direction 69 / Ireneinc Report

PART A — PROCEDURAL OPENING

To the Tasmanian Planning Commission,

We write in response to the letter dated 2 April 2026 (ref: DOC/26/36829) advising that the Ireneinc report recommends our property be split between the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) and the Rural Zone (RZ) under the draft Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule (LPS).

We previously made a representation (Representation 270) on the draft LPS and that representation has been heard and as yet no decision has been received.

The Ireneinc Report has not read our previous submission and erroneously summarises our objection as "opposes LCZ". We understand this letter provides me the opportunity to make a further written submission in relation to the Ireneinc report recommendations. I take up that opportunity and submit as follows.

PART B — PROPERTY DETAILS

Landowner name(s)	Heather GLASSCOCK Jennifer O'BRIEN
Property address	[REDACTED] GORDON
Title reference (folio)	Vol [REDACTED] folio 1 Vol [REDACTED] folio 3 Vol [REDACTED] Folio 5
Total lot size (approx.)	2.489ha - Vol [REDACTED] 4.48ha - Vol [REDACTED] 5.069ha - Vol [REDACTED]
Locality	Gordon (Channel Region)
Current zone (IPS)	Rural Zone / Environmental Living Zone (ELZ)
Ireneinc recommended zones	Split: Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) + Rural Zone (RZ)
Split boundary description	Property consist of three titles the zoning change one complete title. 'The LCZ applies to the western scrub portion (approx. 5 ha) above our cleared paddocks. The RZ applies to the cleared portion (approx. 7 ha) used for residential /grazing use.'
Approx. area in LCZ	5.069 ha — western vegetated portion
Approx. area in RZ	7 ha — eastern cleared portion (over two titles)
Zone sought in this submission	Full Rural Living Zone (RLZ) across the entire property.

PART C — STATEMENT OF POSITION

We do not accept either zone recommended for our property. The split between LCZ and RZ does not appropriately reflect the character or lawful use of our land. We submit that the Rural Living Zone (RLZ) is the correct zone for our entire property under section 34 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (LUPAA), the Section 8A Guideline No. 1 — LPS Zone and Code Application (the Zone Guidelines), and the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy (STRLUS).

We make this submission on two grounds that apply to the whole property:

1. The LCZ portion: The LCZ is not appropriate for the portion of our property recommended for LCZ. The landscape values on that portion, to the extent they exist, can be adequately managed through the Natural Assets Code (NAC), the Priority Vegetation Area (PVA) overlay, the Scenic Protection Code (SPC), and the minimum lot size of the RLZ. LCZ is not required.
2. The Rural Zone (RZ) portion: The RZ does not adequately recognise the residential character of our property. The RZ treats dwellings as a discretionary use and is directed at land where agricultural use is the primary purpose. The RLZ better reflects the existing and intended use of the cleared and settled portion of our land.

We request that the Commission determine that the RLZ applies to our entire property under the draft Kingborough LPS.

The RLZ subcategory we seek is:

- **Rural Living Zone B (minimum lot size 2 ha)**
- this subcategory prevents any further subdivision and directly addresses any landscape value concern about the western portion of our property

PART D — GROUNDS FOR THIS SUBMISSION

D1 — The split zone recommendation is not appropriate for this property

The split creates practical problems that full RLZ would avoid

A split zone boundary across a property creates practical difficulties for the landowner. The LCZ portion restricts uses and development in ways inconsistent with the way the land has been used. It reduces the value and utility of the land without a corresponding planning benefit, because the landscape values Ireneinc has identified as justifying LCZ on one title are not meaningfully different from the landscape values on the RZ part.

'The proposed LCZ boundary bisects our property. Any future works on the western portion — including [maintenance of fencing and vegetation clearing for fire access would require a discretionary permit under LCZ. This is disproportionate given that the Rural Zone portion, which has essentially the same character, does not require that level of approval.'

D2 — The LCZ portion should be Rural Living Zone, not LCZ

D2.1 — Landscape values on the LCZ portion are manageable by existing codes

Zone Guideline LCZ 4(b) provides that the LCZ should not be applied where landscape values can be appropriately managed by the Natural Assets Code or the Scenic Protection Code. At the Day 20 hearing, the TPC panel found at Kettering West [02:33:54] that the Priority Vegetation Area overlay does the landscape-protection work — not the zone. Where PVA applies to our property, LCZ is not needed to protect vegetation values. Our property has a similar location, elevation and vegetation levels as the properties mentioned in Kettering and other settlement down the Channel region and is covered by the same proposed Scenic Protection Code and Priority Vegetation Codes. These controls, combined with the RLZ minimum lot size of [2 ha], provide adequate protection for any landscape values without requiring LCZ.'

D2.2 — RLZ B eliminates the subdivision risk on the western portion

A key reason Ireneinc applies LCZ to vegetated or elevated portions of a split property is concern about subdivision potential — the risk that an RLZ minimum lot size would allow the land to be further subdivided, intensifying development into areas of landscape value. The application of RLZ B (minimum lot size 2 ha) directly addresses this concern. Under RLZ B, no further subdivision of our property would be possible, regardless of which portion is considered. This eliminates the subdivision risk cited for LCZ without imposing the full restrictions of that zone. All three titles are consistent with the existing rural living settlements in this area as discussed with the TPC in our previous submission and representation.

D3 — The RZ portion should be Rural Living Zone, not RZ

D3.1 — The RZ does not recognise the residential character our property

Zone Guideline RZ 1 provides that the RZ should be applied to land in non-urban areas where agricultural use is limited or marginal, and that requires a rural location for operational reasons. The cleared portion of our property does not satisfy this description — its primary existing and intended use is residential, not agricultural. The Rural Living Zone (RLZ), which gives priority to the protection of residential amenity in a rural setting, is more appropriate.

In the Kingborough Councils Tasmanian Planning Scheme (Rural Living Areas) Fact Sheet Rural Living Zone is described as:

“The Rural Living Zone is the predominant residential zone in the municipality’s rural areas. It facilitates residential use or development on spacious lots within a rural environment. The zone is prevalent in areas such as Leslie Vale, Sandfly, Allens Rivulet, outer areas of Margate, Kettering, Woodbridge, Middleton Gordon, and a couple of smaller coastal settlements on Bruny Island.”

Our property and all neighbouring properties are precisely the mix of residential and lower-order rural activities that the Rural Living Zone is designed for.

D3.2 — RLZ is consistent with the surrounding zoning pattern

Zone Guideline RLZ 2(b) confirms that RLZ may be applied to ELZ land where the primary strategic intention is for residential use in a rural setting. The cleared portion of our property sits within a broader rural living settlement area. Applying RZ to this portion creates an inconsistency with surrounding RLZ properties that have the same residential character.

D4 — Consistency with comparable properties in this locality

Other properties in our locality with similar physical characteristics — a mix of cleared settled land and native vegetation — have been recommended for full Rural Living Zone without a split. Where those properties share the same combination of features as our whole title, there is no reason our property should be split while theirs is not, in their overview of RLZ Ireneinc report itself states should be avoided!

Interestingly it also state in its Part B Zone Evaluation of the Gordon Zone that ***“no rural living settlement characteristics identified”*** although a basic review of surrounding properties and their usage demonstrates a completely different reality

Address	Lots Size	Proposed Zoning	Status
166 Kregors Rd	5.0ha	LCZ	
166 Kregors Rd	4.4ha	Rural	
166 Kregors Rd	2.4ha	Rural	Dwelling
183 Kregors Rd	5.7ha	Rural	Dwelling
171 Kregors Rd	3.9ha	Rural	Dwelling
71 Kregors Rd	7.8ha	Rural	Dwelling
36 Cliffords Rd	1.9ha	Rural	
40 Cliffords Rd	1.7ha	Rural	Dwelling
9 Kregors Rd	2.3ha	Rural Living B	
50 Massey St	7.9ha	Rural	Dwelling
55 Massey St	2.5ha	Rural	Dwelling
39 Massey St	4.0ha	Rural Living B	Dwelling
35 Massey St	2.3ha	Rural Living B	Dwelling
25 Massey St	2.2ha	Rural Living B	Dwelling
9 Massey St	1.8ha	Rural Living B	Dwelling
4960 Channel Hwy	2.3ha	Rural Living B	Dwelling
4936 Channel Hwy	1.4ha	Rural Living B	Dwelling

D5 — The Ireneinc evaluation framework supports RLZ, not a split

Kate Heckelmann (Ireneinc) confirmed at Day 20 [05:53:00] that the evaluation framework is a tool, not a statutory instrument. The Commission must assess our property against the Zone Guidelines. Where the Zone Guidelines support RLZ for the whole property — because the residential character is established, the lot size prevents subdivision, and existing codes manage landscape values — a split outcome is not required by the Zone Guidelines, even if Ireneinc has recommended one.

The Ireneinc LCZ Review report itself acknowledges that split zoning is a last resort, used only where one part of a title clearly meets LCZ criteria and the other clearly does not. That is not the case here — as set out above, neither portion of our property meets the criteria for LCZ or RZ over RLZ.

D6 — Locality-specific inconsistency (Attachment A)

A formal comparison of the Ireneinc evaluation across localities is attached to this submission as Attachment A. That document identifies localities where properties with similar characteristics to mine — including a mix of cleared residential land and vegetated upper portions — were recommended for full Rural Living Zone without a split.

We request that the Commission have regard to Attachment A, and in particular the comparison rows identified above, which show that the split zone recommendation for our property is inconsistent with the outcome applied to similar properties elsewhere in the municipality.

We also request that commission evaluate similar property in our direct vicinity for example 25, 35, 39 Massey Street Gordon that are proposed RLZ which like ours are small to medium sized properties that like ours enjoy a rural residential environment.

PART E — LOCALITY-SPECIFIC CONTEXT

GORDON

Characteristic	Gordon (LCZ bulk) — Outcome: LCZ retained	Kettering East & Oyster Cove — Outcome: Full RLZ
Ireneinc landscape value description	D'Entrecasteaux Channel coastal setting; bushland; southern end of ridgeline corridor (extending north through Middleton, Flowerpot, Birchs Bay, Woodbridge to Kettering)	Scenic landscape; coastal interface; bushland; dwellings integrated into natural setting — same Channel coastal language used throughout the Channel Region
Settlement characteristics found	Western parcels: rural activities (grazing, farming). LDRZ strip: small coastal residential. LCZ bulk: variable lot sizes	Yes — consistent rural living settlement throughout; lots 1–10 ha along Manuka Road
Lot sizes	Western Rural Zone: larger rural. LDRZ: small. LCZ bulk: variable	1–10 ha
SPA coverage	Likely significant coastal coverage	Partial
PVA / NAC overlay	Yes	Yes
Risk rating applied	Medium-high — LCZ	Medium — full RLZ
DP6 — codes manage landscape values?	Ireneinc did not reach this conclusion for the LCZ bulk — southern anchor of the bushland corridor cited	YES — codes and min lot size; full RLZ
Key differentiator cited	Southern anchor of the D'Entrecasteaux Channel bushland corridor; connection between channel coastal landscape and terrestrial bushland	Consistent settlement pattern; existing blocks already fully used; codes manage values
Mapping correction	Crown land at Kregors Road corrected from LCZ to EMZ at Day 2 [04:07:57] — Ireneinc confirmed the correction	—

In the TPC hearings many points (as listed below) have been raised regarding the blanket application of LCZ and the failure of the Council and the Ireneinc evaluation to consider RLZ as an alternative zoning. The map correction that was also highlighted in Gordon on Day 2 (04:07:57) is actually a correction from LCZ to EMZ this is been applied to a disused quarry, of absolute no landscape or environmental significance

1. The evaluation framework is not a statutory instrument [Day 2, 05:53:00]

Kate Heckelmann (Ireneinc) confirmed the framework is a tool, not a rule. The Commission must apply the Zone Guidelines (Guideline No. 1) and section 34 LUPAA, not the Ireneinc framework alone.

2. Risk ratings are judgement calls, not thresholds [Day 2 guide]

Low/medium/high risk ratings were accepted only as a rule of thumb. Challenge them with property-specific evidence — a medium or high risk rating does not decide the outcome.

3. Priority Vegetation Area overlay does the landscape-protection work [Day 2, 02:33:54]

At Kettering West, the panel drew out the position that the PVA overlay, not the zone, does the landscape-protection work. Where PVA overlay applies to your lot, LCZ is not necessary.

4. Visible rural activity is NOT required for RLZ [Day 2 guide]

This applied at Howden, Albion Heights, and Kingston West without challenge. A property does not need to show active farming or grazing to qualify for RLZ.

5. Council's 16 March resolution is not binding on the TPC [Day 2, 06:45:48]

Chair Heath explicitly set Council's 'least restrictive alternative' resolution aside. The Commission decides on section 34 LUPAA criteria.

6. Kettering East & Oyster Cove as primary comparable locality [Day 2, 02:04:40]

The largest LCZ retreat of the day — full ELZ → RLZ at medium risk. Cite for any Channel region property with similar lot size and residential settlement character.

7. Coordinate with neighbours [Day 2 — Chair Heath]

Chair Heath explicitly invited collective submissions organised by locality. A collective submission with multiple landowners plus individual parcel variations is viable and welcomed.

8. Fragmentation avoidance applies in all localities [Ireneinc Locality Reports]

Ireneinc explicitly applied fragmentation avoidance across all localities. Where your LCZ lot is isolated within a predominantly RLZ or Rural Zone area, cite this principle.

9. Council's 85% → 75% LCZ reduction history [Ireneinc LCZ Review]

The TPC itself found Council's initial LCZ application inconsistent with the Zone Guidelines. The progressive reduction shows the initial LCZ was not well-founded. This historical context applies to all localities.

10. Future rural living settlement review acknowledged [Transcript, 03:05:16]

Ireneinc acknowledged that a future rural living settlement review may reconsider current decisions, and that short-term risks are not definitive. This supports accepting a less restrictive zone now.

PART F — CONCLUSION AND RELIEF SOUGHT

For the reasons set out above, we submit that:

3. The split zone recommendation — LCZ for part of our property and RZ for the remainder — does not correctly reflect the character, use, or zone guideline criteria applicable to either portion of our land.
4. The LCZ portion should be Rural Living Zone, not LCZ. Landscape values on that portion, to the extent they exist, can be managed by existing codes and by the minimum lot size of the RLZ subcategory we are seeking. LCZ is not required by Zone Guidelines LCZ 1–4.
5. The RZ portion should be Rural Living Zone, not RZ. The primary existing and intended use of that portion is residential. RZ does not give priority to residential amenity and is not appropriate for a portion of land that contains or is ancillary to an established dwelling in a rural setting.
6. Rural Living Zone B is the correct zone for our entire property. Under this subcategory, the minimum lot size is 2 ha which eliminates / significantly limits the possibility of further subdivision, directly addressing any concern about intensification of landscape values on the vegetated portion.

We respectfully request that the Commission:

Apply the Rural Living Zone B to our entire property (Vol [REDACTED])

- in the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule; and
- Not apply a split zone recommendation across this title, as neither portion of the property meets the criteria for LCZ or RZ over RLZ under the Zone Guidelines.

We request that the folio of the Register: Vol [REDACTED]

Vol [REDACTED]

Vol [REDACTED]

At 166 Kregors Road GORDON, in the Channel Region, be included in its entirety within the Rural Living Zone [B] in the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule.

Signed:

[REDACTED]

Heather Glasscock:

Date: 04/05/2026

[REDACTED]

Contact phone:

Contact email:

[REDACTED]

Signed:

[REDACTED]

Jennifer O'Brien:

Date: 04/05/2026

ATTACHMENT A

Inconsistency Analysis — Ireneinc Zone Evaluation

PART 1 — SUBMISSION IDENTIFICATION

Submission reference	Heather GLASSCOCK Jennifer O'BRIEN [REDACTED] GORDON — Direction 69
Property title reference	[REDACTED]
Locality	Gordon (Channel Region)
Submission template used	Template TS6 — Contest Split LCZ, seeking full RLZ
Date of attachment preparation	4 May 2026

PART 2 — PURPOSE OF THIS ATTACHMENT

This attachment has been prepared to support the written submission identified above. It provides comparative analysis of the Ireneinc zone evaluation framework as applied to the landowner's locality, compared against one or more similar localities that received a different — and more favourable — zone outcome using the same or very similar evidence.

The purpose is to demonstrate to the Commission that the Ireneinc recommendation for this locality is inconsistent with the outcome produced by the same evaluation framework applied elsewhere in the municipality, and that there is no clear reason to treat this locality differently from the similar localities identified.

This attachment should be read alongside the written submission, in particular the arguments set out in Part D (D7 — Inconsistency in the Ireneinc evaluation framework) and Part E (Locality-Specific Context) of that submission.

PART 3 — HEARING EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THIS ANALYSIS

The following statements from the Day 19 and Day 20 TPC hearings directly support the use of a comparative inconsistency analysis as evidence in a submission:

Speaker and timestamp	Statement and relevance
Delegate Rohan Probert [01:07:48]	Comparing Tinderbox East (LCZ) with Howden (RLZ): 'They are very similar if you only look at the description of the landscape values... one we say they can be managed and the other one we say they can't be managed. What we really need to say is the difference between those two.' This statement acknowledges that the Ireneinc framework produced inconsistent outcomes from very similar evidence, and that the difference between localities needs to be clearly explained. This analysis does exactly that for this locality.
Delegate Dan Ford [02:33:54]	At Kettering West: effectively forced the concession that the Priority Vegetation Area (PVA) overlay does the landscape-protection work, not the zone. This is

	directly relevant where PVA applies to the subject property and LCZ has been recommended — the same logic that produced RLZ at Kettering West Groombridges applies.
Kate Heckelmann (Ireneinc) [05:53:00]	Conceded that the evaluation framework is a tool, not a legal requirement. Submissions can move away from it if supported by good evidence. This confirms that identifying inconsistencies in the framework's application — as this analysis does — is a legitimate basis for a submission.
Chair Nick Heath [06:45:48]	Confirmed that the Commission will decide on the basis of section 34 LUPAA criteria (Zone Guidelines and LPS criteria), not on the basis of Council's position or the Ireneinc framework alone. The Zone Guidelines require consistent application of zone criteria — inconsistency of the kind documented in this attachment is therefore directly relevant to the Commission's assessment under the law.

PART 4 — MOST RELEVANT COMPARISONS FOR THIS SUBMISSION

The following table identifies the specific comparisons within the attached Inconsistency Analysis that are most directly relevant to this submission. The full comparative tables for this locality appear in the pages that follow.

20. Gordon [Channel Region]

Ireneinc outcome: LCZ bulk; LDRZ coastal strip; Rural Zone (western parcels with rural activities). Ireneinc recommendation at Day 20: with one mapping correction — crown land at Kregors Road corrected from LCZ to EMZ [04:07:57].

Characteristic	Gordon (LCZ bulk) — Outcome: LCZ retained	Kettering East & Oyster Cove — Outcome: Full RLZ
Ireneinc landscape value description	D'Entrecasteaux Channel coastal setting; bushland; southern end of ridgeline corridor (extending north through Middleton, Flowerpot, Birchs Bay, Woodbridge to Kettering)	Scenic landscape; coastal interface; bushland; dwellings integrated into natural setting — same Channel coastal language used throughout the Channel Region
Settlement characteristics found	Western parcels: rural activities (grazing, farming). LDRZ strip: small coastal residential. LCZ bulk: variable lot sizes	Yes — consistent rural living settlement throughout; lots 1–10 ha along Manuka Road
Lot sizes	Western Rural Zone: larger rural. LDRZ: small. LCZ bulk: variable	1–10 ha
SPA coverage	Likely significant coastal coverage	Partial
PVA / NAC overlay	Yes	Yes
Risk rating applied	Medium-high — LCZ	Medium — full RLZ
DP6 — codes manage landscape values?	Ireneinc did not reach this conclusion for the LCZ bulk — southern anchor of the bushland corridor cited	YES — codes and min lot size; full RLZ
Key differentiator cited	Southern anchor of the D'Entrecasteaux Channel bushland corridor; connection between channel coastal landscape and terrestrial bushland	Consistent settlement pattern; existing blocks already fully used; codes manage values
Mapping correction	Crown land at Kregors Road corrected from LCZ to EMZ at Day 2 [04:07:57] — Ireneinc confirmed the correction	—

Zone outcome for Gordon (LCZ bulk)	LCZ retained	⚠️ INCONSISTENCY: The Gordon LCZ bulk is the southern anchor of the channel corridor argument used consistently from Woodbridge south. The same Kettering East inconsistency applies — coastal setting, bushland, scenic values, but different zone outcome. The mapping correction at Day 20 also shows the TPC will correct errors, including zone boundary errors, if raised.
------------------------------------	--------------	---

PART 5 — PROPERTY-SPECIFIC DIFFERENTIATION

1. Our lot is 5 ha — consistent with the 1–5 ha range accepted for RLZ at Howden, and within the range for which Ireneinc found codes manage landscape values adequately.
2. Our lot is predominantly cleared with an existing dwelling — it does not display the elevated vegetated ridgeline character cited as the basis for LCZ retention.
3. Priority Vegetation Area overlay applies to my lot — consistent with Kettering West, Groombridges and Kettering East and Oyster Cove where the TPC found PVA does the landscape-protection work.'
4. Our lot(s) are consistent with other RLZ properties in the Gordon precinct such as Massey Road,

PART 6 — VERIFICATION AND PRIMARY SOURCES

All comparisons in this attachment can be verified against the following primary source documents, which are publicly available:

- Ireneinc Locality Baseline and Alternative Zone Evaluation (available on the TPC website)
- Ireneinc LCZ Review and Findings Report (available on the TPC website)
- TPC Day 20 hearing recording — Kingborough Council YouTube channel (available until midnight 19 June 2026)
- Section 8A Guideline No. 1 — LPS Zone and Code Application (available on the TPC website)

PART 7 — DECLARATION

I confirm that:

1. This attachment has been prepared to support a formal written submission to the Tasmanian Planning Commission in relation to the Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule (Direction 69).
2. The comparisons contained in this attachment are based on publicly available Ireneinc reports and TPC hearing records, and I have made reasonable efforts to ensure accuracy.
3. We are the owners of the property identified in Part 1 above.

Signed:  Heather Glasscock:	Date: 04/06/2026  Contact phone:
Contact email: 	
Signed:  Jerrime O'Brien.	Date: 04/06/2026.