

Tasmanian Planning Commission
Level 3, 144 Macquarie Street
HOBART
tpc@planning.tas.gov.au

To: Nick Health

RE: Representation 430 and Direction 52 - Consent Forms

Dear Nick,

I refer to Direction 52 and my earlier correspondence dated 5 September 2025.

I note that representation 430 to the Kingborough Draft LPS was submitted in the interests of natural justice, knowing that a significant portion of the Kingborough community was unaware of the proposed zoning change to the Landscape Conservation Zone. Known impacts of the Zone can include: the inability to obtain property finance and insurance on competitive terms, significant land valuation impacts and, in some cases, significant restrictions on future allowable uses and development when compared to historical arrangements and broad community expectations.

During Commission Hearings on 2 September 2025, I tendered a list of 46 property owners who had responded to a simple social media post over two weeks. All respondees were previously unaware of the Kingborough Draft LPS exhibition. Most of the responses came from a small number of neighborhoods where one or two people had door-knocked. One person indicated that the majority of people in their street were unaware of the proposal. All this indicated that there was a very high number of property owners within Kingborough who were unaware of the rezoning proposal, and had not been in a position to make a representation.

In light of this, I requested that the Commission give these people the opportunity to be heard and to be able to speak to their property on this important issue. The Commission responded and indicated that signed consent forms would be necessary, so that members of the community could become 'Witnesses' to my representation. Details of future hearing(s) were yet to be determined.

Following this, the Kingborough Community organised a fundraiser, a mailout and a door-knock to distribute a flyer to around 700 properties not covered by the Elcock mailout. This was organised by individuals involved with the Landscape Conservation Zone town hall meetings, as reported by the Mercury, and involved people within the 1600 member Facebook Group that broadly oppose the application of the Zone in Kingborough. The flyer contained a witness consent form that was to be returned direct to the TPC, with a copy to the email address: [REDACTED], run by volunteers from the Kingborough Community.

I am informed that the "return to sender" rate on the Elcock mailout was 14%. The community fundraiser mailout did not include a "return to sender" address, however it could be reasonably assumed that the rate of unopened or unreceived mail would have been significantly higher. This is because the properties targeted in the community fundraiser mailout are commonly in more outlying locations where vacant land is proportionally higher. Mailout addresses were based on the physical locations of properties, as no other mailing information was available.

When considering that the "return to sender" metrics from the Elcock's mailout would be significantly understate the true level of unopened or unreceived mail (likely by a factor of two), I would estimate that only about 50% or less of the mailout to the 700 properties was actually read by landowners.

Despite this, I am told that 245 signed consent forms have been received to date, which is an exceptionally high response rate. If it would be of use to the Commission, a document summarising the names and addresses of the respondees can be provided by the end of the week. A USB drive with copies of consent forms can also be provided.

I am informed that rudimentary checking of data has been undertaken. In some cases, consent forms were only sent to the Kingborough Community email address ([REDACTED]) and not to the Commission. In these cases, the property owner was advised and a copy was onforwarded to the Commission.

The Commission should therefore already be in receipt of all 245 consent forms that the Kingborough Community email address has received. Kingborough Community member volunteers who have been managing the email account indicate that they would welcome the opportunity to cross-check records with the Commission, should that be helpful to the Commission.

The Commission likely has more consent forms in its records, in cases where property owners sent consent forms only to the TPC email address.

Thank you once again for your commitment to this issue and to hearing from the public and property owners. I will await the Commission's advice on future Hearings.

Many thanks

 Josh Graeme-Evans

15 October 2025