

Dear Mr. Ramsay, Linda and Samuel (as well as other TPC representatives).

It has taken me some time to write this response after my hearing on Tuesday 25 July 2023. The first thing I would like to apologise for was the length of my presentation – unfortunately it is the result of quite a lot of trauma, restless nights and fear of having my rights taken away yet again.

After presenting my case I came away devastated. In particular, the last representation on that day highlighted every inconsistency I had attempted to put forward. It showed clearly the inconsistency of the council's response to my representation and much more. I sat listening to the many suggestions for whatever zoning these people wanted yet my hearing wasn't given any consideration by Clare or Rong and in fact, it was as if they had totally ignored anything I put forward to counterargue the forced zoning. This I'm referring to was representation 70, Jacinta and Denis Cantwell, in Steeles Road, a title of more than 20 hectares – first and foremost. (This was Clare's main argument for not granting me RLZ – the size of my titles). Rep 70 was a 20 plus hectare title and had been given approval for a 3-block subdivision. It is a long distance from the township, without services, a very wooded area with substantive wildlife – an area which was originally used by the Melerkerdee people of our region for hunting, gathering and bush tucker. I would say three times the distance from the township of my 314 Lymington Road property and 9 times the distance from Cygnet of my Jetty Road property. The difference in these properties compared to mine clearly highlights the lack of understanding of what rural is, the changing pace of our community, developing township and where land should be more available. THERE ARE A NUMBER OF PROPERTIES GIVEN SUCH APPROVALS.

My arguments were:

- 1) Prior Council advice had landowners consolidate land into larger, more manageable lots (for Council), to reduce rates and taxes.
- 2) This, in hindsight enabled Council to consider a change in zone type that often diverged from what was historically used, intended and even currently used.
- 3) Poor or lack of adequate, strategic land use strategy by Council has meant that Ad hoc land use has thrived, causing conflict and disorder. I highlighted the many inconsistencies of zonings to allow for land to be split all around my properties, directly across the river and further south from the township. Many kilometres away from the township in far more rural areas than mine.
- 4) I highlighted the development of neighbouring properties which has severely impacted my use of the land as rural and the cost financially this has had on cropping or trying to make a living off the land.
- 5) The number of airbnb's around my titles and their impact if I am to stay solely rural zoning.
- 6) A RLZ will not impact the property or surrounding properties. I have spoken to an agricultural consultant who has advised me that the land of this size as well as the soil type would not be viable for income through farming practices. This confirmation adds to the strength of my argument that there is no benefit to me

to keep the large-scale size lot rather it would be more beneficial to our community as smaller acreages allowing for 'boutique' industries.

- 7) Change of schemes, despite similarity in zone names, has significantly reduced land utility/use. This has had the result of down-zoning through definition in many cases. 4. Whilst lawful in terms of LUPAA, Council has not engaged with sufficient community consultation and matters of natural justice.
- 8) I was never advised of the change to 'temporary' rural resource zoning. The way this was implemented without knowledge, and it's cost to me and my family should be seen as illegal. Once I became aware, I contacted council planning who informed me that I was now no longer able to split my land into 30 acre blocks (I was prior to this). Their advice was now that my property (especially at 314 Lymington Road being close to 100 acres – would need to stay that size, therefore my chance of any splitting of land had been taken away). Others who knew about the temporary zoning changes, split titles to 30 acres and have now been able to split again as the titles were under the '20 hectare size' that Clare consistently uses in defence of her zoning belief. As stated in my rep in front of you all, this to me is theft, nothing less. I demand that some form of rectification or compensation is considered.
- 9) There are many cases where properties have been zoned RLZ that are less suited/connected to utilities, greater distances from Township boundaries et al.
- 10) Council has been aware of many cases where landowners have provided information and evidence over the years to adequately inform a robust Land Use Strategy. It appears that Council have consistently ignored the needs of both the individual landowner and that of the Community.
- 11) Council have failed to consider the interrelated sense of place, and identity that landowners, particularly those who have been here for generations have with their land and their histories that are fostered from within it.
- 12) Council have engaged in a manner that disrespects the lived experiences of the Huon Being, Huon Beings that ultimately should be empowered and enabled to live a life of purpose and meaning. A life that honours and respects the past and history in order to provide for a future.
- 13) This future cannot be divorced from land and their respective custodian.
- 14) The significant cost to me and my family by taking away any opportunity to provide for myself or my family while increasing the property values for rates and land tax purposes cannot be divorced without appropriate compensation/restitution. As stated at my hearing, this is and was my superannuation – my way of giving my children and their children a chance of a future, a chance to have a home and live in an area that is 'home' to them. No-one should have the right to take this away from us.
- 15) In Essence, this has highlighted Huon Valley Council's ad hoc development and lack of strategic planning. Why should I be penalised through systematic down-zoning creep where others have been allowed to develop?

I attempted to highlight many issues in my original representation. I am attaching this some of which I didn't read out but as it includes very personal information about family, I ask that it not be put on public record.

Although I don't think this was heard at the end of my hearing, in relation to my property at 314 Lymington road – I am happy to have a split zoning to maintain the rural nature of the property towards the top half of the title. Myself, my children, grandchildren have a right to a place to call home – by forcing rural zoning it will mean they have no opportunity to stay in the area that has been part of our family and heritage for generations and beyond. I need to urgently build an appropriate sustainable, duplex home to stay on the land and have ability to be cared for if needed in my later years.

I request and plead that you consider the circumstances of my representation, the fact that there are such inconsistencies about sizes of blocks, location, even spot zoning. There are many examples where spot zoning has been allowed in the past, various zoning changes within an area.

Please consider the impact the zoning changes have on my future.

Kind regards

Bernadette Dean