

From: "Peter Dingemane" <PDingemane@cbmgroup.com.au>
Sent: Mon, 30 May 2022 16:20:15 +1000
To: "Huon Valley Council" <hvc@huonvalley.tas.gov.au>
Cc: "Brendan Mitchell" <Brendan@mitchellplasticwelding.com>; "Greg Partridge" <gpartridge@mitchellplasticwelding.com>
Subject: LPS Huon Response, obo Brendan Mitchell
Attachments: 20220530 Huon LPS - response MPW B Mitchell.pdf

RE; LPS Huon; response to exhibited proposed LPS.

Thankyou for the opportunity to submit this response to the proposed LPS on behalf of Brendan Mitchell.
CBM appreciate the opportunity to assist with this process, be great to be copied into correspondence.

Many thanks
Peter Dingemane



Peter Dingemane Design & Project Manager

CBM Sustainability Group

51 York St, PO Box 1971 Launceston Tas 7250 Australia

P: 61 3 6332 6988 | E: pdingemane@cbmgroup.com.au

Leaders in Sustainable Development



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This email is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose or use the information contained in it. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately by return email and delete the document. CBM is not responsible for any changes made to a document other than those made by CBM or for the effect of the changes on the document's meaning. CBM accepts no liability for any damage caused by this email or its attachments due to viruses, interference, interception, corruption or unauthorised access.

MEMO

TO General Manager
Huon Valley Council

FROM Brendan Mitchell
9 Kyles Rd
CASTLE FORBES BAY, TAS 7116
via CBM Sustainable Design

DATE 30/5/22

RE Response to Proposed LPS and State Planning Scheme

It is great to see the Huon Valley moving on with planning reform, we in business and industry are very keen to see planning simplified and understand that the new State scheme is intended to deliver that.

We write this submission as response the proposed new scheme as advertised. This response is somewhat last minute however going forward we will have CBM sustainability group is assisting, we ask they be included in correspondence. As discussed with council a more detailed submission developed with assistance of our consultants with them will be provided in due time.

There are several challenges with that we can see when reviewing the proposed mapping against the state scheme. We understand that the transition is generally to be like for like from the current planning scheme into the new State Scheme, but it is important to also consider things that should be changed as we move to a new scheme. Other challenges relate to mapping, the expansion of overlays linked to the new codes can result in a restriction of use not always intended or desired.

A broad issue we have identified is the application of Agricultural Zone for any property that has arable land. The criteria originally used for mapping the existing Significant Agricultural Zone when the interim scheme came in, may not be the same as what is intended for the new Agriculture Zone today. Especially where sites and actual use do not reflect the zone purpose of the Agriculture Zone, more appropriate zones should be considered. The intent of the agriculture zone is to protect productive land, it primarily does this by restricting uses. This may be appropriate for large scheme productive farmland areas, land that is connected to irrigation or land of specifically high agricultural value but doesn't fit well to smaller properties especially those that have, or have potential for, varied uses. It is a general comment that Rural zone is a fairer zone for land that has varied use, it manages the same key interest of protecting arable land but does not prohibit all else. Surely Agriculture zone should be used sparingly and carefully. It is specifically for land that is reserved for the production of food, that is the zone purpose. Rural Zoned land also is productive in agriculture but can create space for diversity in use within the landscape and in the context of local community and industry.

Similarly, the translation of Agriculture zone to properties that may be better defined as Rural Living should be questioned. Protection of food producing land is not achieved by applying the zone, much opportunity is lost for properties that are not broad acre farms. Our property at 9 Kiles Rd is set amongst

other similar properties ranging from 1 ha to 10 ha; the local cluster of rural living homes, some with a house paddock, may be better zoned rural if not rural living.

Specifically, we note discrepancies with zoning for our factory site 4015 Huon highway at Castle Forbes Bay. The new scheme proposes zoning that is historic rather than a planning zone reflecting the use and the manner in which the site is developed. The site is a discrete title with a significant built facility that supports industry, primarily agriculture and aquaculture, but others as well. The 1.5ha site is neither Rural nor Agricultural in scale, use, or the way it is developed. A long time ago the site and buildings held produce, but agriculture changed, the facility was no longer needed for that function. Subsequently the site was redeveloped as workshops for supporting industry, the diversification of irrigation and aquaculture has allowed the business to prosper, and the facility improve. The site is commercial/ light industrial in nature and should be zoned as such, it loses its purpose if reserved for agriculture. To be zoned appropriately won't inhibit the site continuing its role in supporting agriculture and aquaculture. To be zoned according to the way it is developed and is used ensures the investment in, and the output of, this productive site is not inhibited by planning but supported.

In respect to other properties and the scheme in general, we have yet to fully consider the effect of the proposed LPS. We thank council for confirming that further comment is welcomed beyond this submission. We do however note that the natural assets code is extensively mapped with layers applied depending on zoning. The coastal refugia overlay appears to exclude residential zoned land but is triggered everywhere else. The way the code as written prohibits nearly all use, it seems to be purposed to create a new nature reserve area, much of which will be on private land. By example, our property at 4013 Huon Hwy has most of its future usable area subject to this overlay. The overlay will prohibit nearly all future development or use, and only based on a current land contour. This is regardless of appropriate land use, good planning or design. The proposed LPS mapping has freehold titles in Environmental Management the zone assigned to national parks and reserves. This does not seem correct when the scheme provides Landscape Conservation, Low Density Living or Village for such purposes. Our land parcel PID 5268444 at Cockle Creek is subject to this question.

We trust that council in preparing the LPS for the new scheme has considered the need for growth in our municipality and land availability. The state scheme has clear provisions, yet it may be that the zones as mapped are more based on history of planning schemes rather than vision for the Huon. We encourage council to move strategically to support diversity and flexibility in land use and development, we have a choice how to map the state planning provisions to our municipality, we should do so in a way that avoids restriction on industry and community.

Trusting there is an opportunity to discuss. Our hope is that the LPS process supports us all moving in the direction we want our Municipality to grow.

Kind regards

Brendan Mitchell
MPW