



**Proposed Amendments  
to the  
Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy 2010-2035**

**9 August 2013**

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The Steering Committee of the Southern Tasmania Regional Planning Project has determined to proceed with a 'house keeping review' of the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy, (the Regional Strategy).

## **2.0 BACKGROUND**

It is nearly two years since the declaration of the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy on 27 October 2011. During this period, the Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority (STCA) and the twelve Southern Councils have undertaken substantial work on preparing the new planning schemes, intended to be the primary implementation mechanism for the Regional Land Use Strategy. The STCA has also commissioned and completed the Southern Tasmania Industrial Land Study. In addition, the interpretation of the Regional Strategy has also been tested through a number of amendments to existing planning schemes.

As a result of these events, a number of specific issues have arisen with the Regional Strategy that need to be addressed through a series of amendments. These involve:

- (a) Including a clarifying statement to the effect that the Regional Strategy addresses 'regional issues' only, and that local strategy also plays a role in formulating new planning schemes.
- (b) Incorporating amendments to include the outcomes of the Southern Tasmania Industrial Land Study, as foreshadowed in the current version of the Regional Strategy. Note that the Industrial Land Study was subject to a separate public consultation process in late 2012 with a view to including the short-to-medium term recommended new industrial zonings within the new interim planning schemes.
- (c) Including amendments necessary to resolve some of the difficulties arising from the 2012 Solicitor General's advice on the limitations of the interim planning scheme mechanism.

- (d) Providing for local Council policy to play a substantial role in the way each planning scheme recognises and protects biodiversity values.
- (e) Removing the mandatory requirement for Council planning schemes to regulate the use and development of land to recognise and protect geodiversity.
- (f) Clarifying the appropriate circumstances for the limited spatial application of the Rural Living Zone and the Environmental Living Zone where the land has not previously been zoned for such purposes.
- (g) Modifying the Strategy were necessary to accommodate amendments to current planning schemes that have been approved since the declaration of the Regional Land Use Strategy. This includes a number of amendments to the Urban Growth Boundary for Greater Hobart.
- (h) Undertaking a number of minor amendments to the Urban Growth Boundary for Greater Hobart, the need for which has been identified following refinement of the spatial extent of urban zones by the metropolitan Councils during the drafting of their new planning scheme maps, coupled with the desire to depict the Urban Growth Boundary to a higher degree of accuracy within the Strategy document.
- (i) Undertaking a range of other small amendments to the Regional Strategy, the need for which has become apparent following the drafting of the planning schemes to their current stage.

It should be noted that this amendment process does not constitute a major review of the Regional Strategy. This process is therefore not able to include major changes such as substantial expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary, or major increases in the amount of Rural Living land.

It is recognised that a more substantive review of the Regional Strategy does need to commence soon so that new fundamental information (such as the 2011 census statistics) can be incorporated into the base data and any subsequent major shift in policy and strategy provided for.

### 3.0 THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS

The consultation period will run from Saturday 10 August to Friday 23 August 2013, during which time interested members of the public are invited to consider the proposed amendments and provide comments.

- The proposed amendments to the text of the Regional Strategy are provided in the table in Section 5, below, along with an outline of the rationale for each change.
- The proposed amendments to the map depicting the Urban Growth Boundary for Greater Hobart (Map 10 on page 94 of the current Strategy document) are indicated in the accompanying map files. One of these is a PDF image file whilst the other is a file that opens in Google Earth.

As indicated above, this is not a major review and suggestions for additional amendments - other than those set out below - will likely not be able to be progressed under this process.

Following the consultation period, the Councils – through the Southern Tasmania Regional Planning Project - will take into consideration the comments received and subsequently prepare a draft amended strategy document for submission to the Minister for Planning. If deemed acceptable, the amended Regional Strategy will replace the current Regional Strategy.

The current Regional Strategy document is available from the STCA website.

Note: This consultation process is not a statutory process, as the relevant legislation does not set out any formal process for amending a Regional Land Use Strategy. Both the twelve Southern Councils and the Minister for Planning, however, consider that it is right and proper that the public should be provided with the opportunity to comment on the proposed amendments.

#### 4.0 LODGEMENT OF SUBMISSIONS

Submissions must be received by close of business **Friday 23 August**, and can be made by the following means:

Post to: The Project Manager  
Southern Tasmania Regional Planning Project  
GPO Box 503E  
HOBART TAS 7001

Email to: [planners@stca.tas.gov.au](mailto:planners@stca.tas.gov.au)

Enquiries should be directed to the Regional Project Manager, Damian Mackey: Ph: (03) 6270 2242 or email:  
[dmackey@stca.tas.gov.au](mailto:dmackey@stca.tas.gov.au)

The names of submitters will be kept confidential.

## 5.0 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE REGIONAL LAND USE STRATEGY

The amendments are set out in the table below.

Each amendment is based on the original text from the current strategy document. Proposed new text is shown underlined, whilst proposed deletions are shown ~~struck through~~.

### Amendment 1

Section 2.1

Include the following additional statement after the second paragraph of Section 2.1 as follows:

It is important to recognise that this strategy addresses matters of regional importance only. Local and/or sub-regional planning strategies prepared at the local government level, consistent with this strategy (and the objectives of the RMPS and relevant State Policies), are necessary in order to take into account local issues and circumstances that need to be expressed in individual planning schemes.

Where there is an inconsistency between local strategic planning and this regional strategy, the latter should prevail.

*Rationale:*

*Due to some confusion expressed over the past 18 months, it is important to clearly articulate that the Regional Land Use Strategy addresses planning matters that have regional significance only. It was always intended that the Strategy should sit within a context of a hierarchy of policy and strategies formed under the RMPS (as depicted in Figure 3 of the Strategy document), including local level strategic planning work.*

*The logic for all changes from current planning schemes to new interim planning schemes does not reside solely at the regional planning level. Local strategic planning (consistent with the Regional Strategy) is often both appropriate and necessary.*

## Amendment 2

### Section 5.5

Amend policy BNV 1.1 as follows:

Manage and protect native vegetation at the earliest possible stage of the land use planning process (~~rezoning~~). Where possible, ensure zones that provide for intensive use or development are not applied to areas that retain biodiversity values that are to be recognised and protected by Planning Schemes.

Amend policy BNV 1.2 as follows:

~~Implement a planning assessment approach that follows the, 'avoid, minimise, mitigate, offset', hierarchy of actions.~~

Recognise and protect biodiversity values deemed significant at the local level and ensure that planning schemes:

- (a) specify the spatial area in which biodiversity values are to be recognised and protected (either by textural description or map overlay); and
- (b) implement an 'avoid, minimise, mitigate' hierarchy of actions with respect to development that may impact on recognised and protected biodiversity values.

Replace policy BNV 1.3 with the following:

Provide for the use of biodiversity offsets if, at the local level, it is considered appropriate to compensate for the loss of biodiversity values where that loss is unable to be avoided, minimised or mitigated.

Biodiversity offsets:

- (a) are to be used only as a 'last resort';
- (b) should provide for a net conservation benefit and security of the offset in perpetuity;
- (c) are to be based upon 'like for like' wherever possible;

Amend policy BNV 1.4 as follows:

Manage clearance of native vegetation arising from use and development in a manner that is generally consistent across the region, but allowing local variation to accommodate variances in local values. ~~across the region and with the Policy for Maintaining~~

~~the Permanent Native Forest Estate and the Forest Practices System.~~

Amend policy BNV 2.1 as follows

Avoid the clearance of threatened vegetation communities except:

- ~~(a) in circumstances where there are significant long term where the long term social and economic benefit arising from the use and development facilitated by the clearance outweigh the environmental benefit of retention;~~
- ~~(b) where the use and development requiring the clearance will result in a net conservation benefit; and~~
- ~~(c) where the clearance will not significantly detract from the conservation of that native vegetation community. or those conservation values in the vicinity of the vegetation to be removed~~

*Rationale:*

*The bulk of biodiversity conservation in Tasmania is primarily undertaken through State and Federal Government policies, as encompassed within various State and Federal acts and regulations. These do not set forth any particular requirements for Local Government planning schemes. There is therefore a substantial role for local policy, developed by Local Government to reflect local values.*

*A purpose of the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy is to act as a mechanism through which the twelve Councils might agree on common policies and strategies to address various issues within the proposed new planning schemes. This has enabled many local level policies to be correlated and elevated to become regionally agreed policies. However, due to variances in the extent and depth of knowledge on specific biodiversity values, predominant land use pressures, landscape scales and dominant local community values, a 'one size fits all' approach to the recognition and protection of biodiversity values within planning schemes is not possible across the region.*

*In the absence of a clear State policy position on this matter, it is therefore appropriate that local Council policy play a role in determining how biodiversity values are recognised and protected within the various planning schemes.*

*The policy statements relating to biodiversity conservation have therefore been amended to provide for an overall regional approach while allowing for local variation dependent upon:*

- (a) the extent and depth of knowledge (in particularly spatial accuracy) on specific biodiversity values in the municipal area;*
- (b) the predominant land use pressures (i.e. urban v rural); and*
- (c) the willingness of each Council to take on the resource intensive responsibility of providing for an offset mechanism, coupled with an individual Council's assessment of the costs and benefits of such a mechanism within their local area.*

*In regards to (b) it is particularly noted that the conservation of biodiversity values on large rural lots is still primarily managed under*

*the State's Forest Practices System or other state level approval processes (i.e. Assessment Committee for Dam Construction). The streamlining objectives of the current planning reform agenda dictate that the new planning schemes should not duplicate or create un-necessarily complex approval mechanisms.*

*Ultimately it is within the urban context that there is greater need for the management of biodiversity values, which is unsurprising as:*

- The majority of development activity requiring a permit under planning schemes is likely to be in urban areas;*
- Recent growth within Greater Hobart has moved into the fringe bushland areas, and this growth has potentially coincided with the increased value that these local communities place on biodiversity conservation; and*
- Fringe and remnant bushland areas of Greater Hobart contain a high proportion of significant biodiversity values, included threatened vegetation communities.*

*The proposed amendments to policy BNV 1.3 are intended to provide the ability for a Council to make a judgement on whether or not to require offsets in exchange for the loss of biodiversity values. This essentially requires a judgment to be made that takes into account a range of factors including; local values, the extent of overlap of biodiversity values on land zoned for intensive development and the costs to the council and its community against the perceived benefits.*

*The amendments to BNV 1.4 clarifies the role Councils play in determining local policy on behalf of their local community.*

*The proposed amendments to policy BNV 2.1 are to provide greater clarity on the instances where clearance of a threatened vegetation community may be acceptable.*

### Amendment 3

Section 5.5

Delete policy BNV 6:

~~BNV 6 — Protect areas of high geodiversity significance.~~

~~BNV 6.1 — Include within Planning Schemes requirements relating to protection of registered sites under the Tasmanian Geoconservation Database.~~

~~BNV 6.2 — Identify Karst Catchment areas in planning schemes and protect karst features and values through the management of use and development.~~

Additionally: Amend the heading to Section 5 by deleting the words ‘and Geodiversity’, and delete the last paragraph on page 22 pertaining to geodiversity.

*Rationale:*

*It is considered appropriate to reconsider the use of Council planning schemes to provide for the statutory recognition and protection of geodiversity sites currently listed on the State’s geo-conservation database, which includes many sites on private land.*

*The primary reason is that there is no clear State policy position that use and development of private land must be restricted to protect geodiversity values.*

*A secondary reason is legal in nature. The listing of private land on the State database has not provided landowners with the opportunity to contest the listing of their land, and they have therefore not been afforded due process or opportunity for natural justice. This would be necessary if the database were to transform from its current non-statutory status to a statutory list.*

*Given the above, it is considered premature for the Regional Strategy and the new planning schemes to address the issue of the recognition and protection of geodiversity values.*

*The omission of geodiversity from this first iteration of the Regional Strategy will not substantially effect its compliance with the objectives of Tasmania’s Resource Management and Planning System as many sites are on public land and are protected by State regulation. Furthermore, of those sites on private land many are located in areas where intensive use and development would not be allowed under the zoning.*

*However the next major review of the Strategy should reconsider this issue, in light of any new State direction on this matter.*

#### Amendment 4

Section 8.4

Amend policy MRH 1.3 as follows:

Allow clearance of vegetation in areas adjacent to dwellings existing at the time that planning schemes based on this Strategy come into effect, in order to implement bushfire management plans, ~~subject to the requirements of the Threatened Species Protection Act 1995, Nature Conservation Act 2002 and Forest Practices Act 1985.~~ Where such vegetation is subject to a biodiversity code, the extent of clearing allowable is to be the minimum necessary to provide adequate bushfire hazard protection.

*Rationale:*

*Protection of existing dwellings from bushfire hazard is considered a higher priority than retention of biodiversity values, (unlike the consideration of proposed new dwellings, where both planning issues should be given equal weight). This amendment clarifies that bushfire hazard reduction around existing houses will not be impeded by considerations of threatened vegetation or threatened species, subject to its restriction to the minimum necessary to provide adequate bushfire protection.*

#### Amendment 5

Section 12

Amend 12.1 Overview and 12.5 Regional Polices to incorporate acknowledgement of electricity generation and major transmission assets and ensure that these are to be maintained and developed to ensure continued electricity supply for the State.

*Rationale:*

*Electricity generating assets and major electricity transmission infrastructure are not currently acknowledged within the Strategy. These are clearly of great important to the region and the State and should be acknowledged.*

## Amendment 6

Section 13 Amend Map 4 to show integrated transit corridor extending to Claremont Activity Centre.

*Rationale:*

*Map 4 should reflect the extent of the integrated transit corridor as defined by the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources, (DIER). At present the corridor is shown as terminating at what appears to be the intersection of Main Road and Claremont Link Road, which is not consistent with that defined by DIER.*

*The Tasmanian Urban Passenger Transport Framework, DIER, January 2007 shows the corridor terminating at Claremont, not before it. (Refer to Figure 1 – “Hobart Passenger Transport Case Study Map”, p. 37).*

## Amendment 7

Section 13 Amend 13.1 Overview as follows:

Amend the first dot point at top of page 50 as follows:

- Maximising the efficiency of freight and public transport corridors and assets including maintaining and improving existing key public transport corridors to facilitate reliable, frequent public transport services;

*Rationale:*

*The change has been proposed by the Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources to strengthen the reference to maintaining and improving public transport corridors.*

## Amendment 8

Section 13

Amend 13.1 Overview as follows:

Amend the third dot point on page 50 as follows:

- *Recognising and protecting major infrastructure corridors and assets through planning schemes including retaining and protecting the rail corridor to preserve potential for the future development of mass transit options;*

*Rationale:*

*The change has been proposed by the Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources to include specific reference to retaining and protecting the rail corridor, once rail freight ceases between Hobart and Brighton in order to support future development of mass transit options, e.g. light rail, bus rapid transit.*

## Amendment 9

Section 13

Amend 13.1 Overview as follows:

Insert a new dot point on page 50 as follows:

- *Recognise and preserve the Derwent River as a passenger transport corridor, including identifying passenger boarding locations and maintaining road and river access to these locations;*

*Rationale:*

*The change has been proposed by the Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources to include specific reference to protecting the Derwent River as a future passenger transport corridor, including potential passenger boarding locations and ensuring these locations are accessible by road access. This dot point is supported by LUTI 1.10 which includes specific reference to ferry infrastructure points, but provides more overarching strategic guidance to protection of a future function.*

## Amendment 10

Section 13

Amend 13.1 Overview as follows:

Delete dot point 5 on of page 50 as follows:

- ~~Examine alternative forms of public transport (such as light rail and ferries);~~

### *Rationale:*

*Dot point 5 should be deleted as it has been superseded by amending dot point 3 (refer above) to include specific reference to retaining and protecting the rail corridor and by creating a new dot point to protect the Derwent River for passenger transport options, e.g. ferries. Both light rail and ferries have been examined previously as passenger transport options and there is a need to be more explicit in protecting the assets and locations to support future use.*

## Amendment 11

Section 13

Amend 13.1 Overview as follows:

Amend dot point 7 on of page 50 as follows:

- Increasing residential densities and mixed use around designated Integrated transit corridors where appropriate; and

### *Rationale:*

*The change has been proposed by the Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources to include additional reference to mixed use. This ensures that the strategy is consistent with LUTI 1.2, which refers to mixed use. Research shows that a mixture of land uses creates more sustainable travel behaviour with higher levels of public transport use, walking and cycling. It also creates a more liveable urban environment, with people able to shop and work locally. Higher residential densities and mixed use should only occur in locations where it is appropriate.*

**Amendment 12**

(The originally mooted Amendment 12 is not proposed to proceed.)

**Amendment 13**

Section 13.5

Amend LUTI 1.5 as follows:

Locate major trip generating activities in close proximity to existing public transport routes and existing higher order activity centres.

*Rationale:*

*The change has been proposed by the Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources to ensure major trip generating activities such as schools, hospitals and shopping centres will be located in close proximity to existing public transport corridors to ensure they are accessible by a variety of modes.*

#### Amendment 14

Section 15

Add new policy SEO1.3 as follows:

Recognise the regional economic importance of Southwood through specific planning provisions within the planning scheme that allow for its expansion and use by timber, mineral or other primary industries benefitting from its strategic location.

Include additional discussion under Section 15.1 to support this inclusion.

*Rationale:*

*Section 15 is intended to protect and provide for appropriate use and development in locations within Southern Tasmania that have strategic economic potential.*

*Southwood is a locationally significant site offering strategic value to the primary production sector (in particular timber production), as confirmed by previous strategic planning assessment. In addition, the use of the land at Southwood for timber related production is also recognised in the Southern Region Economic Development Plan.*

*Given the unique location and its strategic importance, the processes for attracting the right businesses to the area should be supported by the Regional Strategy and the new planning scheme provisions.*

#### Amendment 15

(The originally mooted Amendment 15 is not proposed to proceed.)

## Amendment 16

Section 16.5

Amend policy PR 1.2 as follows:

Avoid potential for further fettering caused by residential development ~~areas~~ by setting an acceptable solution minimum buffer distance of 200 metres ~~from the boundary of the Significant Agriculture Zone, within which planning schemes~~ are to manage potential for land use conflicts.

*Rationale:*

*Amending the reference to the desirable separation distance from significant agricultural land to residential development, from 'minimum' to 'acceptable solution', enables the inclusion of a performance criteria under planning schemes, that will provide for the relaxation of the standard buffer distance where site conditions and other circumstances warrant such relaxation. This is considered important given that the 200 metres buffer distance is based upon a precautionary approach taking into account all the potential circumstances surrounding significant agricultural land that may occur throughout the region.*

## Amendment 17

Section 17

Replace policy IA 1.3 as follows:

Provide for a 30-year supply of industrial land, protecting such land from use and development that would preclude its future conversion to industrial land use - in accordance with the recommendations within the Southern Tasmania Industrial Land Strategy 2013

Amend policy IA 1.4 as follows:

Provide a 15-year supply of industrial land, zoned for industrial purposes within the new planning schemes - in accordance with the recommendations within the Southern Tasmania Industrial Land ~~Study~~ Strategy 2013.

*Rationale:*

*To incorporate the outcomes of the Southern Tasmania Industrial Land Study within the Regional Land Use Strategy.*

## Amendment 18

### Section 18

Amend Table 1: Activity Centre Network as follows:

- (a) Amend name of 'Local Strip' to 'Local Centre'.
- (b) Amend description of Commercial activity under 'Local ~~Strip~~ Centre' as follows:  
Offer at least one grocery/convenience store and a range of small specialty shops (i.e. newsagents, pharmacy, gift store) and a convenience store or small scale eating establishments.
- (c) Amend description of Access under 'Local ~~Strip~~ Centre' as follows:  
~~Ideally, near public transport corridor when occurring or bus services.~~ Should be highly accessible by cycling or walking from surrounding area to enhance local access. In an urban context should be serviced by public transport.

#### *Rationale:*

*The proposed changes to the title and description of a local strip is to provide for a better fit in both urban and rural circumstances.*

## Amendment 19

### Section 18.6

Include additional policy AC 1.11 as follows:

Ensure the Cambridge Park Specialist Activity Centre is consolidated by restricting commercial land to all that land bound by Tasman Highway and Kennedy Drive, and provide for a wide range of allowable uses, including, but not limited to, service industry, campus-style office complexes and bulky goods retailing.

Include additional policy AC 1.12 as follows:

Provide for 10 – 15 years growth of existing activity centres through appropriate zoning within planning schemes.

#### *Rationale:*

*AC 1.11: Cambridge Park is referred to as a specialist activity centre within Table 1 of the Regional Strategy. There has, however, been confusion as to the extent of the activity centre in light of surrounding industrial activity. The inclusion of the additional policy statement provides greater clarity as to what land is included in the Cambridge Park Activity Centre and therefore zoned an appropriate business/commercial zone. The boundaries of this activity centre described in AC 1.11 align with the Southern Tasmania Industrial Land Study.*

*AC 1.12: It is important to ensure new planning schemes provide sufficient room for growth in the short-to-medium term for existing activity centres. Planning authorities should ensure sufficient business and/or commercial zoned land is provided within the new planning schemes.*

## Amendment 20

### Section 19.5.2

Amend paragraph under 19.5.2 as follows:

- |                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| High Growth     | 20% to 30% increase in no. of <u>potential</u> dwellings*.  |
| Moderate Growth | 10% to 20% increase in no. of <u>potential</u> dwelling*.   |
| Low Growth      | less than 10% increase in no. of <u>potential</u> dwellings*.   |
| Very Low Growth | no new <u>potential</u> dwellings except single dwelling on existing subdivided lots <u>or where there is existing low density subdivision potential</u> subject to demonstrating that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• there will be no off-site impacts from on-site waste water disposal.</li><li>• adequate provision of potable water either through reticulation or tank water</li><li>• addressing hazard and natural values constraints</li></ul> |

\*assuming one dwelling per lot.

#### *Rationale:*

*The inclusion of the word 'potential' clarifies that the growth management strategies are intended to allow subdivision (and therefore potentially additional residential land dependent upon the capacity of existing zoned land in that settlement).*

*In regards to the very low growth scenario the amendments are to clarify that there will be some new dwellings on existing vacant lots and some limited subdivision potential arising, primarily because of the intended zoning of these settlements to low density residential.*

**Amendment 21**

## Section 19.7

Amend policy SRD 1.3 as follows:

Support the consolidation of existing settlements by restricting the application of rural living and environmental living zones to existing rural living and environmental living communities.. Land not currently zoned for such use may only be zoned for such use where one or more of the following applies:

- (a) Recognition of existing rural living or environmental living communities, regardless of current zoning. Where not currently explicitly zoned for such use, existing communities may be rezoned to rural living or environmental living provided:
  - (i) the area of the community is substantive in size; and
  - (ii) only limited subdivision potential is created by it's rezoning.
- (b) Replacing land currently zoned for rural living purposes but undeveloped and better suited for alternative purposes (such as intensive agricultural) with other land better suited for rural living purposes, in accordance with the following:
  - (i) the total area rezoned for rural living use does not exceed that which is back-zoned to other use;
  - (ii) the land rezoned to rural living use is adjacent to an existing rural living community;
  - (iii) the land rezoned to rural living use should not otherwise be zoned Significant Agriculture Zone;
  - (iv) the land rezoned to rural living use is not adjacent to the Urban Growth Boundary for Greater Hobart or identified for future urban growth; and
  - (v) the management of risks and values on the land rezoned to rural living use is consistent with the policies in this Strategy.
- (c) Rezoning areas that provide for the infill and consolidation of existing rural living communities, in accordance with the following:
  - (i) the land must share substantial common boundaries with an established Rural Living zoned area and must be lesser in area;
  - (ii) development and use of the land for rural living purposes would not increase the potential for land use conflict between residential use and any nearby resource development uses, (such as agriculture and quarrying);
  - (iii) such areas will be integrated with the established area by connections for pedestrian and vehicular

movement. If any new roads are possible, a structure plan will be required to show how the new area will integrate with the established Rural Living zoned area;

- (iv) the land rezoned to rural living use should not otherwise be zoned Significant Agriculture;
- (v) the land rezoned to rural living use is not adjacent to the Urban Growth Boundary for Greater Hobart or identified for future urban growth; and
- (vi) the management of risks and values on the land rezoned to rural living use is consistent with the policies in this Strategy.

*Rationale:*

*It has become apparent through the preparation of interim planning schemes that there is greater variation in interpretation of policy SRD 1.3 than what was envisaged.*

*The amendment is to clarify the original intent of this policy statement (reflected in the Zoning Framework contained in the Implementation Report). In particular it was intended that this policy:*

- (a) provide for the application of the Rural Living/Environmental Living Zone to existing areas, even if they may not be currently zoned that way. It is considered inappropriate that appropriately located clusters of land parcels that are already subdivided and predominantly developed at rural living densities be treated as rural land;*
- (b) recognise that whilst the overall footprint of the land utilised for lower density residential use is generally not to expand in the short term (i.e. until the Strategy is subject to a full review), the rezoning of land to Rural Living is acceptable where such rezoning constitutes logical infill, (i.e. the land in question has little connectivity to rural/agricultural land and is substantially surrounded by an existing lower density residential zone) and it does not increase the potential for land use conflict with adjoining agricultural and other rural resource uses.*

*To ensure proper integration with existing communities it is considered appropriate that structure plans be required as part of any consideration for rezoning of areas of land that potentially should have vehicular and pedestrian links with adjacent residential land. The need for a structure plan is proposed to be triggered if the subdivision of the subject land would potentially involve the need for a new public road or walkway.*

## Amendment 22

Section 19.7 Include a new policy after SRD 2.3 as follows :

Recognise that the Urban Growth Boundary includes vacant land suitable for land release as greenfield development through residential rezoning as well as land suitable for other urban purposes including commercial, industrial, public parks, sporting and recreational facilities, hospitals, schools, major infrastructure, etc .

*Rationale:*

*It has become apparent since the declaration of the Regional Land Use Strategy that there is confusion over the inclusion of some land which is clearly not suitable for residential purposes in the future: for example schools, industrial land precincts, the Rokeby Policy Academy, the airport and open space areas such as the Domain. These are all part of 'urban Greater Hobart'.*

*While it is indicated on the legend for Map 10 that the Urban Growth Boundary does include 'other urban land', for the purposes of providing clarity it is considered appropriate to recognise that the Urban Growth Boundary encompasses both residential land and non-residential urban uses.*

## Amendment 23

Section 19.7 Correct error in figure in SRD 2.6:

Amend infill growth target for Kingborough: 5% of the infill target of 13,250 dwellings is 662 dwellings, not 1325.

*Rationale:*

*This correction is required due to a mathematical error.*

## Amendment 24

Section 19.7

Amend policy SRD 2.7 as follows:

Aim for ~~Ensure that~~ the residential zone in planning schemes ~~to encompass more than a 10~~ to encompass more than a 10 to 15 year supply of greenfield residential land when calculated at a whole of settlement basis for Greater Hobart.

*Rationale:*

*Since the declaration of the Regional Land Use Strategy, there has been significant tracts of land within the Urban Growth Boundary rezoned to residential purposes (through amendments to existing planning schemes).*

*These approved rezonings will be translated across to the new planning schemes.*

*The potential result is that in aggregate the extent of the General Residential Zone in new planning schemes, may in fact be inconsistent with policy SRD 2.7 as currently worded.*

*It is considered inappropriate that approved rezonings are effectively reversed in order to ensure that the new planning schemes meet their statutory obligation (pursuant to Section 30E of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993), because of an arbitrarily strict limitation of the total supply limit of zoned residential land.*

*The adjustment of this policy to provide for a 10 to 15 year supply of suitable zoned greenfield land within the Urban Growth Boundary will not compromise the attainment of any other policy in the Strategy and will better facilitate the timely and smooth transition of land into available residential lots through subdivision.*

## Amendment 25

Map 10

Amend Map 10 as follows:

- Incorporate land outside of the Urban Growth Boundary that has been rezoned to an urban zone through amendments to existing planning schemes approved since the beginning of 2011.
- Incorporate industrial land within Greater Hobart identified in the Southern Tasmania Industrial Land Study, including the land at Hobart Airport.
- Depict the Black Snake Rural Village area in Granton as existing residential land.
- Amend the UGB line to correct minor errors and to provide for accuracy to the cadastral level.
- Amend the Densification Area by terminating it at 800m past Glenorchy Activity Centre, including by deleting the section between Berriedale and Windermere and including a densification area around Claremont activity centre in accordance with proposed Inner Residential Zone, which has been based on 800m walking distance from activity centres. (*Statement needs simplification*)
- Delete the note within the text box and replace with the following note:

**Please note:**

*A large-scale map providing for a more accurate spatial definition of the Urban Growth Boundary is provided in Appendix 1 - Map N<sup>o</sup>. [insert number].*

**Rationale:**

*These amendments arise from a variety of circumstances.*

*In regards to the first instance, there was a period between the finalization of the Strategy and its declaration where amendments to existing planning schemes were being considered without reference to the Regional Land Use Strategy. This has resulted in some residentially zoned land within Greater Hobart now being outside the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) - for example near Pawleena Road at Sorell). As it would be inappropriate to back-zone such land, given the previous statutory approval processes, it is necessary that the UGB be modified to provide for the translation of the existing zoning into new planning schemes.*

*Secondly, the Southern Tasmania Industrial Land Study is now completed and has identified future industrial land that should be rezoned in the short-to-medium term. It is appropriate that this land now be included in the UGB.*

*Thirdly, it is necessary to ensure that the existing zoned land at Granton does not require back-zoning in the new planning scheme.*

*It is also appropriate to undertake a range of minor adjustments to the UGB, the need for which has become apparent, as the greater Hobart councils have refined their planning scheme zone mapping. The outer edge of the urban zones should not extend beyond the UGB.*

*Another set of minor adjustments are necessary to resolve the current issues surrounding the interpretation of the Urban Growth Boundary to the property boundary level. The Urban Growth Boundary is currently depicted in the Regional Strategy document on Map 10, which is of insufficient scale to clearly show how the UGB relates to property boundaries. This has become a significant issue for Planning Authorities, the Tasmanian Planning Commission, the community and developers, particularly in regard to planning scheme amendments (rezonings). Greater precision is required to provide certainty and clarity.*

*Whilst Map 10 is the only map within the declared Regional Strategy depicting the UGB, it was however mapped more accurately within a working map (that has been made publicly available in a Google-earth version). This took into account the best available data on capacity of infrastructure, existing recognised values, potentially hazard and mapping of existing residentially zoned land (at that time - early 2011). Some additional minor proposed changes are also now proposed as a result of better information.*

*Map 10 is also proposed to be amended to exclude those settlements that fall outside the UGB, but happen to be within the area covered by the map. These are currently shown on the map, and this has proven to be a source of confusion. The table on page 85 of the Strategy - "Growth Management Strategies for Settlements" - sets out which settlements are defined on Map 10 and which are not, and the intention is to remove from the map all those settlements not relevant to it.*

*It is intended that the amended Regional Strategy will include an additional large-scale print of the Urban Growth Boundary map as an appendix and formally part of the document.*

#### Amendment 26

Glossary Amend glossary to include definitions of housing density terminology, currently contained at Table 5 of Background Report No. 14: Providing for Housing Needs.

*Rationale:*

*The housing density terms of described in Table 5 of Background Report No. 14 are used in various locations throughout the Strategy (i.e. Policy SRD 1.3). It is considered more appropriate that the definitions of these terms are included in the Strategy itself, to provide absolute clarity, for the interpretation and application of the relevant policies.*

#### Amendment 27

Glossary Amend glossary to include the following note:  
Where this Strategy has referred to specific types of uses (i.e. resource development or resource processing) the definition of these uses are to be taken from the Planning Scheme Template for Tasmania (Planning Directive No. 1).

*Rationale:*

*This amendment is to clarify the intended definition of specific uses referred to in the Regional Land Use Strategy.*

## Amendment 28

### Typographical corrections

Correct the document to remove typographical errors, as follows:

- Inside front cover, first paragraph:
  - The reference to the Implementation Report cites 'June 2011'. This will need updating to the new date for the Implementation Report.
- Table of Contents:
  - Section 19 is titled "Providing for Housing Needs".
  - Change to "Settlement and Residential Development".
- Section 2 Context, page 7, top RHS paragraph:
  - Reference to "Figure 2, over page ..."
  - Change to "Figure 3, over page ..."
- Section 13 Land Use and Transport Integration
  - Page 50, delete second dot point. It is a repeat of first dot point.
- Section 16 Productive Resources, page 63
  - PR 2.3. change 'particularly' to 'particular'
- Section 18 Activity Centres, pages 74, 75, 76
  - Heading refers to 'Activity Centres Hierarchy'
  - Change to 'Activity Centres Network'
- Section 18 Activity Centres, page 77
  - AC 1.2 refers to 'General Business, Business and Local Business Zones'
  - Change to 'Central Business, General Business and Local Business Zones'
- Section 19 Settlement and Residential Development, page 85
  - Text in table - top row, second column – additional word 'broader' needs to be deleted.
- Section 19 Settlement and Residential Development, page 86
  - The table should be 'Table 4', not 'Table 3'.

#### 4.0 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

In light of the proposed amendments to the Regional Land Use Strategy and other interpretation issues that have arisen, it is considered necessary to also amend supporting documentation.

The proposed amendments to the supporting documentation are outlined below.

##### **Background Report No. 12: Industrial Activity.**

Delete the report in its entirety and replace with the Stage One and Stage Two reports of the Southern Tasmania Industrial Land Study.

##### **The Process Forward: Implementing the Regional Land Use Strategy**

Amend the Zone Mapping Guidelines as follows:

General Business Zone	<p>Amend zone mapping guidelines as follows</p> <p><i><u>Only Apply to land that aligns with the Major Centre, Rural Service Centre and the higher-order Minor or Neighbourhood Centres defined <del>definitions</del> under the Activity Centre Network.</u></i></p>
Rural Resource Zone	<p>Amend zone mapping guidelines as follows:</p> <p>Apply to land that is, or has possible long term potential to be, utilised for productive resources.</p> <p>Includes State Forests <u>and</u> Private Timber Reserves <del>and Protected Areas on Private Land.</del></p> <p><u>May include sections of Protected Areas on Private Land.</u></p> <p>Not to apply to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <del>regionally significant areas</del> of significant agricultural land (refer Significant Agriculture Zone);</li> <li>b. <del>land which is part of a title area that contains more than 75% of significant agricultural land;</del></li> <li>c. <del>land which is part of a title area that contains more than 50% of significant agricultural land and no mapped physical features(s) exist approximating the boundary between the significant agricultural land and the other rural land; or</del></li> <li>b.d. land with significant environmental value (refer Environmental Management Zone).</li> </ol>

Significant  
Agriculture Zone

Amend zone mapping guidelines as follows:

Apply to areas of land identified (and within 50 metres) as regionally significant agricultural land (SAL) in the Regional Land Use Strategy, taking into account the following: (using GIS mapping prepared by ARM Consultants Pty Ltd). Notwithstanding this, the following land identified as SAL should still be zoned Rural Resource if:

- a. It is less than 25% of title area and no mapped physical feature(s) exists approximating the boundary of the significant land; or
- b. It is less than 4 ha and is not within 100 metres of another area of SAL that together would comprise more than 4 ha
- a. Preference to align zone boundaries with title boundaries where reasonably possible, taking into account the factors below.
- b. Whether the land is in an existing or proposed Irrigation District or is capable of being included in an Irrigation District.
- c. Agricultural land capability mapping (the ARM mapping).
  - (i) The size of the patch.
  - (ii) The separation distance of the patch from other patches / districts.
  - (iii) Whether the intervening land is agricultural land or other land (such as bush-covered hills).
- d. The size of the title under consideration.
- e. The proportion of the title mapped as significant agricultural land.
- f. The size of titles in the surrounding area.
- g. Proximity of sensitive uses, particularly clusters of sensitive use such as Village, Low Density Residential or General Residential zoned land. Ideally, there should be separation / attenuation distance of 200 m from such uses.
- h. Whether the land is used or is capable of being used for re-use wastewater irrigation.