

---

**From:** Angelo Kessarios <akessarios@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 4 May 2023 1:57 PM  
**To:** TPC Enquiry  
**Subject:** Response to RMCG s comments  
**Attachments:** Adobe Scan 04 May 2023 (1).pdf; Adobe Scan 04 May 2023 (4).pdf; Adobe Scan 04 May 2023.pdf

**Categories:**

I am providing my response to comments to representation 381

4 5 23

## TASMANIAN PLANNING COMMISSION

REF: DRAFT HUON VALLEY LOCAL PROVISIONS SCHEDULE

TITLE REFERENCE: 107966 / 4

REPRESENTATION: 381

I AM WRITING TO PROVIDE A RESPONSE TO THE COMMENTS MADE BY THE PLANNING AUTHORITY'S ENGAGED EXPERTS RMCG IN RELATION TO REPRESENTATION 381.

THIS BLOCK OF LAND HAS ALWAYS BEEN A RESIDENTIAL BLOCK OF LAND. THE ORIGINAL HOUSE THAT BURNT DOWN IN THE 1967 BUSH FIRES BELONGED TO THE NATION FAMILY, HENCE THE NAME "NATION ROAD".

THIS LAND HAS NOT BEEN USED FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES OR BEEN ASSOCIATED WITH AGRICULTURAL USE FROM NEIGHBOURING TITLES ANY TIME IN HISTORY.

IT CANNOT SUPPORT AGRICULTURAL USE, AND WILL NEVER BE ABLE TO SUPPORT AGRICULTURAL USE IN THE FUTURE, DUE TO THE QUALITY AND SIZE OF THE LAND.

I BOUGHT THIS LAND AS A RESIDENTIAL BLOCK 22 YEARS AGO. THE PLANNING SCHEME AT TIME PERMITTED THE REBUILDING OF THE HOUSE ON THIS SITE.

THE STATE REVENUE OFFICE TASMANIA HAS ALWAYS ASSESSED THE LAND VALUE OF THIS BLOCK, THE SAME AS A RESIDENTIAL BLOCK OF LAND. THE VALUATION BEING EXTREMELY HIGH, MEANS I HAVE BEEN PAYING HIGH RATES AND LAND TAX ALL THESE YEARS, WITH THE IDEA I CAN BUILD ON THIS SITE.

ZONING THIS BLOCK AGRICULTURAL LAND, TAKES AWAY EVERYTHING FROM ME, AND AS A SEPARATE TITLE IS COMPLETELY WORTHLESS IF I CHOOSE TO SELL IT.

IN RESPONSE TO THE RMCG COMMENTS MADE IN RELATION TO MY REPRESENTATION. FIRSTLY COMMENT MADE AS THE "TITLE BEING MAPPED A CLASS 5 LAND AND IS LIKELY FARMED IN CONJUNCTION WITH A LARGER TITLE WHICH BORDERS IT TO THE SE AND NE AS WELL AS OTHER LAND FURTHER TO THE NE".

IN RESPONSE TO THAT, THIS BLOCK IS AN ACRE IN SIZE AND HAD ONLY BEEN USED AS A HOUSE SITE, WITH THE ORIGINAL FOUNDATIONS REMAINING. THE BLOCK HAS NEVER BEEN FARMED OR CAPABLE OF DOING SO WITH ANY NEIGHBOURING TITLES, OR BEEN ASSOCIATED WITH THOSE TITLES.

SECONDLY THE RMCG COMMENT THAT THE TITLE IS PARTIALLY COVERED IN THREATENED VEGETATION.

IN RESPONSE TO THAT, I PLAN TO RETAIN AS MUCH OF THAT VEGETATION AS POSSIBLE ON THIS SITE.

THIRDLY THE RMCG COMMENT THIS TITLE BEING RECOGNISED AS HAVING NEGLIGIBLE AGRICULTURAL VALUE AND COMPARING IT WITH AN ADJACENT TITLE TO THE NW AS BEING SIMILARLY LIMITED FOR PRODUCTIVE USE BY SIZE AND THREATENED VEGETATION.

IN RESPONSE TO THAT, THE ADJACENT TITLE HAS THE SAME THREATENED VEGETATION, BEING GUM TREES.

HOWEVER THE ADJACENT TITLE HAS FERTILE, WELL DRAINED SOIL, ITS OWN WATER SUPPLY BEING A DAM AND IS 2.5 ACRES IN SIZE AND IS REGARDED AS BEING A HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE GRAZING BLOCK.

I FIND IT INACCURATE THAT THESE TWO BLOCKS ARE BEING COMPARED SIMILAR, WHEN THERE COMPLETELY DIFFERENT.

I WELCOME A SITE INSPECTION BY THE TASMANIAN PLANNING COMMISSION TO CONFIRM THAT.



FOURTHLY, RMCG COMMENTS COMPARING THE TWO TITLES THE SAME, TO AVOID SPOT ZONING THESE TWO TITLES ARE APPROPRIATELY ZONED AGRICULTURE.

IN RESPONSE TO THAT, I TOTALLY DISAGREE BECAUSE THE TWO TITLES ARE COMPLETELY DIFFERENT AND CAN NOT BE COMPARED IN ANY WAY AS BEING SIMILAR, AS MENTIONED IN MY THIRD RESPONSE.

AS FOR THE SPOT ZONING, MY BLOCK HAS NO AGRICULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS WHATSOEVER AND HAS NEVER BEEN ASSOCIATED AGRICULTURAL USE, OR SURROUNDING TITLES.

I DONT BELIEVE THERE WOULD BE ANY CONFLKT OF ZONES AS THE SURROUNDING TITLES ARE USED FOR GRAZING PURPOSES ONLY, AND THAT LAND IS ONLY SOTED FOR THAT PURPOSE.

ALSO THERE ARE A NUMBER OF SPOT ZONES THAT EXIST IN THE AREA ALREADY, BEING LIGHT INDUSTRIAL, RECREATION, GOLF COURSE. LAWN CEMENTARY, FUNERAL HOME.

I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO MAKE AN ORAL STATEMENT TO THE COMMISSION AS WELL.

REGARDS  
ANGELO KESSARIOS