

From: Stephen Eedy
Sent: Tue, 5 Apr 2022 18:02:18 +1000
To: Huon Valley Council
Subject: FW: MY SUBMISSION REGARDING REZONING
Attachments: DOC050422.pdf

Refer attached.

Thanks
Steve Eedy

Stephen Eedy - Ashdon Hall Pty Ltd
215 Esperance Coast Road
Surges Bay, TAS 7116

P.O. Box 48, Franklin, Tas 7113

21st March 2022

Huon Valley Council,
40 Main Street
HUONVILLE, VIC

Dear Sir/Madam,

SUBMISISON - 215 ESPERANCE-COAST ROAD, SURGES BAY

I wish to make a submission in relation to the proposal to change the zoning of our property from Environmental Living (HVCIPS) to Landscape Conservation (TPS).

My understanding of the current situation is that –

- (a) Our property is currently zoned Environmental Living under the Huon Valley Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (HCCIPS) with several key overlays applicable.
- (b) The proposal is for our property to be rezoned to Landscape Conservation when it transitions to the Tasmanian Planning Scheme (TPS) with similar overlays.
- (c) The transition is necessary because there is no such Environmental Living zone under the Tasmanian Planning Scheme so the next best equivalent is proposed.

My submission is that Rural Living under the Tasmanian Planning Scheme (TPS) may be more appropriate for our rural property rather than the proposed Landscape Conservation.

We are not planning experts, but some examples of why Rural Living under the TPS may be considered more appropriate than the proposed Landscape Conservation are as follows –

1. The current Environmental Living zoning has specified days/times for non-residential use with the same matching wording in Rural Living (TPS) whereas nothing at all is specified or mentioned in relation to "Landscape Conservation". We would not want for example a business operating nearby seven days a week. Saturday afternoon and all-day Sunday should be days of rest. Rural Living (TPS) specifically provides the protection we seek whereas Landscape Conservation only touches on it.
2. The current Environment Living zoning is more consistent with Rural Living (TPS) in relation to exterior building surface colours giving owners greater choice whereas "Landscape Conservation" is unnecessarily prescriptive (requiring exterior colours to be "greys, greens and browns"). Our property can hardly be seen from road/river and any renovation/extension should be able to be done in colours as per our building designer, not colours prescribed by local government.

3. The proposed Landscape Conservation zone specifies that an addition or alteration to an existing building is allowed provided the existing building height is maintained. There appears to be no such proviso under Environmental Living and no such proviso under Rural Living (TPS). In case we want to build upwards at a later date we feel that Rural Living better suits our needs whereas Landscape Conservation we would be limited to the existing single-storey building height.
4. Visitor accommodation under both Environmental Living and Rural Living (TPS) is a Permitted Use whereas it is Discretionary under Landscape Conservation. Also, under both zonings (EL/RL) the floor area cannot be any more than 160m² and 200m² respectively whereas the proposed Landscape Conservation zoning allows for massive floor areas of up to 300m². That is hardly consistent with Landscape Conservation values when a smaller footprint for visitor accommodation would suffice.
5. Zone purpose statement for Landscape Conversation is very short and concise and does not appear to contemplate the wider range of uses under Environmental Living zone whereas Rural Living (TPS) does allow for those uses. Specifically, no mention is made in Landscape Conservation about use of the land for agricultural use whereas Rural Living allows for agricultural use. What if we want to plant out an orchard of assorted fruit/nut trees? Landscape Conservation does not contemplate this.
6. Landscape Conservation does not appear to contemplate the grazing of sheep or other livestock in the zone purpose statement. This is essential and more environmentally friendly for bush fire prevention than petrol/diesel mowing and slashing. We do not want to be like Victoria where grazing has been restricted/outlawed resulting in a much greater bush fire risk. Rural Living appears to specifically allow for compatible agricultural use: sheep grazing.

In summary, whilst there are safeguards in place regardless of the zoning that we end up with in that it would still be necessary to lodge and have approved a Development Application for any proposal, my question is why impose a Landscape Conservation zoning upon us when Rural Living could easily be adopted and seems more consistent with current property use?

Whilst we do have some degree of confidence in the council planning process, we do tend to see on an increasing number of occasions that ratepayers' concerns are often dismissed on grounds "*this is not a planning issue*" and of course once a development application has been approved more-or-less anything seems to happen, hence our concern and this submission.

"Flashpackers" for example looks like a laundry facility and an increasing number of residents are commenting on the unsightly nature of same. As you leave Huonville heading south along the "Huon Trail" visitors to the region are greeted with the Council Tip on the left side of the Highway and Flashpackers on the right. Some days, you cannot tell which is which.

We are not planning experts, and we rely on the council for that, but when we see what has been approved and allowed to be built in the Huon Valley, we frequently question whether what has been proposed for us is in our best interests. This rezoning of our property to Landscape Conservation when Rural Living could be equally applicable is one of them.

This is our official submission to the Huon Valley Council in relation to the proposal to switch the zoning from Environmental Living to Landscape Conservation. In summary, my gut feeling is that Rural Living might possibly be a better, more appropriate, zoning for our property given the reasons set out above.

On the other hand, we watched the HVC television broadcast whereby the council officer presenting advised us to be careful about what we wished for just in case any switch to a different zoning might open-up opportunities for our neighbours to engage in undesirable activities that we then cannot do anything about (eg. dog/cat boarding kennel).

Unfortunately, we cannot afford to get our own independent planning advice (and ERA had a conflict of interest anyway) so we are likely to accept the decision of the Huon Valley planning officers after they have had a chance to weigh up all representations from our little corridor along the Esperance Coast Road.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'S. Eedy', written over a diagonal line that extends from the 'Yours faithfully' text.

Stephen Eedy

Mobile 0409 566 482