
From: S W <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, 27 April 2026 3:48 PM
To: Kingborough LPS
Subject: CM: Submission supporting proposed Rural Living zoning for [REDACTED]
Kettering
Attachments: [REDACTED] submission.pdf

Thank-you for the letter inviting us to make a submission about proposed zoning changes to our property.

We're pleased to be able to share our views in the attached document.

Kind regards,

Samuel Wearne & Olivia Chen

Date: 27-4-2026

The Tasmanian Planning Commission

RE: Submission in response to proposed re-zoning of our property

Property details:

- **Title:** [REDACTED]
- **Address:** [REDACTED], Kettering
- **Exhibited:** Landscape Conservation
- **Proposed:** Rural Living
- **Summary:** We support proposal for Rural Living zoning.

To the Commission,

Thankyou for the opportunity to share our views on the proposed rezoning of our property, [REDACTED] Kettering.

We purchased the property last year and missed the opportunity for engagement until now. When we purchased the property, we noted the Council proposed a new zoning category, which largely retained the conditions and focus on residential amenity under the previous zone of Environmental Living. When we saw the rejection of the Council's work and the proposed inclusion of our property under Landscape Conservation, we reviewed those conditions-. We were concerned, confused and surprised when trying to make sense of it- we are pleased to see the correction and arguments by Irenic to recommend a more suitable zoning would be Rural Living- which we feel is much more appropriate.

In our view, Landscape Conservation zoning would be a very poor fit. The description of that zone ignores our primary use and reason to own the property- that is, as a place to live. It is ill fitted to the site and is inconsistent with current and past conditions. For example, LC seems well suited to much larger spaces of land that have a primary social value and function as a space (or potential space) for conservation, not residential living. Our property is a relatively small lot (less than 2.5ha), is heavily modified, and has been used as a residence for decades. We have two really nice rammed earth buildings onsite with established gardens –but neither would conform to the strict descriptions of building heights and finishes that are outlined in the LC zone (22.4.2-A5). In short, the descriptions and conditions of LC zoning don't read as relevant to our context – they introduce lots of confusion, concern and uncertainty about what we currently have here, what is and isn't allowed, and what is relevant from that zoning. When I first saw the LC proposal, I called the Council to clarify if the lot size and primary function descriptions meant Kingborough Council was seeking to acquire and consolidate small land holdings, like ours, over time and undertake a large restoration program to create a new conservation zone. Council confirmed this wasn't the case, and that others had similar confusion. If that is not the aim, then the LC zone seems inappropriate.

The Rural Living Zone - or even the Councils initial proposal for a Coastal and Bush living zone- are a much better reflection of our property's features, context and our use of it. For example, while the buildings and the history of modifications to the property don't fit the LZ zoning, we think they are really tasteful and add to the area's beauty, environmental and cultural value- our gardens, buildings, and lifestyle that sees us use our bush block are fitting to the site, and are very complementing to the what we see all along [REDACTED] - neighbours who similarly balance semi-rural living in ways that showcase great design and

are sensitive to the local residential uses and to nature. We maintain a long track, a large garden, an orchard, and the house is in a large man-made cutaway. We have shipping containers for storage and a cabin that has been used by many prior owners for guest accommodation- a great way to share the beautiful area and our way of life with more people. Most of the properties next to us are largely cleared and used for residences with some small scale grazing that is sensitive to nature. Uphill, large sections of our block include nice trees and open bush. It's a beautiful space for us to walk through, camp in and for our children to have adventures in. We love the ecology but lots of it is significantly modified –eg two small dams, and quite a few non-native trees. It's beautiful but it's far from untouched nature requiring strict conservation protection– and trying to do so, we think, stands to impact the way we use and value the area, and amplify bushfire risks. We have limited services here, so we're largely self-dependent, with rainwater tanks, grey water and septic systems and the dams serve as back ups and emergency water if we were ever to use it. We're keen to continue using all of our block for recreation, including via the walking tracks around our property that link up to our neighbours, so we can enjoy and manage the property well. Prior landowners have managed timber on the property for bush fire, and ecology, and sourced wood from that for use. I think done a great job of helping native flora and fauna, and the area is regenerating, showcasing a nice harmony between human residents and nature. In addition to what we do proactively, the property's conservation values are already being protected, I believe, through existing controls on the property (this includes a biodiversity code overlay -to be replaced with a priority vegetation overlay that can protect remnant bush that we also love and moved here to be part of). We feel with Rural Living there are already controls around how to live there responsibly, including via the approvals that would be required for any new development activity.

Rural Living reflects why we're here, what we have, what we do, and what's been loved about this area for many many years by people who live here and visit. We are happy to become part of a residential community on small blocks that are active in trying to live well here. We live here because we like and love nature- including gardens and the nearby farms, and the bush. We do lots of work from our home office, and we hope to raise our kids here with hands on experience in the garden, bush and rural living. We actively consider how can live here well, and responsibly with nature. We value zoning that lets us manage block and live here like the prior zoning fostered. The Rural Living zoning recognises that people who live rurally can love and care for nature and we think it provides a clear, logical and fitting zone for what we have, and how we live here- and how the prior landowners have lived here over for at least 3 decades.

We are very supportive of the proposal and Irenic's reasoning for our property to be zoned as Rural Living. The conditions there feel much more appropriate- they reflects the conditions of the area as it is, our use of it and how it has been used for at least 30 years. We encourage you to adopt it.

Thanks

Samuel Wearne and Yi-Chen Chen



Landowners.