

# **ATTACHMENT**

**DRAFT CENTRAL HIGHLANDS LOCAL PROVISIONS SCHEDULE**

**PUBLIC EXHIBITION**

**SUBMISSIONS ASSESSMENT TABLE**

**DRAFT CENTRAL HIGHLANDS LOCAL PROVISIONS SCHEDULE**

**PUBLIC EXHIBITION**

**SUBMISSIONS ASSESSMENT TABLE**

**3 November 2021**

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
1.	Tree Alliance Private Forests Tasmania Penny Wells, CEO	Advises that Private Forests Tasmania's comments will be submitted as part of the Department of State Growth's submission	Noted.
2.	TasRail Jennifer Jarvis Manager Group Property & Compliance	Notes several aspects of the Draft LPS, including the inclusion of the Road & Rail Assets Code. No objections.	Noted.
3.	Tony Donaghy 460 Dry Poles Road Ellendale, 7140	<p>460 Dry Poles Road, Ellendale. PID 3389090</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that property is proposed to be rezoned to Agriculture. 7.269 ha and not part of a larger farm. States that it is 'too small to be viable farm'.</li> <li>• Used as a 'rural dwelling' and 'should be zoned either Rural Living or Rural.</li> <li>• Aerial images provided.</li> </ul> <p>449 Dry Poles Road, Ellendale. PID 1661759</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Block across road owned by Mr Donaghy's parents.</li> <li>• Even smaller than 460 Dry Poles Rd and proposed to be Agriculture also.</li> <li>• Same concerns.</li> </ul> <p>Considers the propose zoning to be an error.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>These lots are on the edge of the broader boundary between Rural and Agriculture Zoned areas.</p> <p>Small lots in such locations and clearly incapable of accommodating a commercial farming enterprise and used, or intended to be used, for rural living purposes, should be in the Rural Zone.</p>
4.	Reliance Forest Fibre Darryn Crook, Technical Manager	<p>Reliance Forest Fibre manages large areas of plantation forestry.</p> <p>Concerned that their land holdings are split between Rural and Agriculture Zones, and notes that plantation forestry is 'no permit required' in the Rural Zone.</p> <p>Notes that if is desirable from a forest management perspective to have all plantation properties in the Rural zone to avoid conflict where areas are not covered by a Private Timber Reserve.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Areas dominated by forestry and other non-agricultural use, whether PTRs exist or not, should be zoned Rural.</p>

Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
5.	Stuart & Karen Philp	<p>Owners of Lot 1 Lyell Highway, Bronte Park, PID 3054354, CT 241850/1</p> <p>124.9 ha property, 116.1 ha of which is covered by a Conservation Covenant.</p> <p>Proposed to be zoned Rural.</p> <p>Requests that it be zoned Landscape Conservation Zone.</p> <p>Note that this property is also part of the Conservation Landholders of Tasmania (CLT) submission.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Council’s policy on this issue is that all covenanted land would be proposed to be zoned Rural in the Draft LPS, and that Council would consider alternate zoning if the owners submitted a request to change.</p> <p>This policy was adopted in light of the fact that Council was anecdotally aware that many landowners specifically do not want their land rezoned as a consequence of entering into such a covenant, whilst others do.</p> <p>If rezoning was an automatic consequence of entering into a conservation covenant, many such covenants would not have been created, leading to reduced environmental outcomes generally.</p>
6.	Conservation Landholders Tasmania John Thompson obo the Board of Trustees, CLT Trust.	<p>Conservation Landholders Tasmania (CLT) describes themselves as ‘an educational trust’.</p> <p>CLT has identified 13 Conservation Covenant areas in Central Highlands that it believes should be zoned Landscape Conservation Zone, instead of the proposed Rural Zone in the Draft LPS, ‘subject to landowner agreement’.</p> <p>These are listed in table provided in the submission.</p>	<p>It appears that CLT have contacted the owners of the Conservation Covenant areas and requested them to consider supporting the idea that the zoning of the land be changed from Rural to Landscape Conservation Zone.</p> <p>Seven of the landowners have separately made submissions making this request. These are submissions No. 5, 8, 14, 15, 19, 25 and 33. All except No. 8 requested that the entirety of their titles change to Landscape Conservation with No.8 requesting that just the covenanted area change.</p> <p>As detailed above in relation to submission No. 5, Council has indicated it would be receptive to changing the zone of covenanted areas if requested by the landowners. Therefore, it is recommended that this submission by CLT be supported insofar as the proposed zoning changes are supported by the landowners concerned.</p>

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
7.	TasWater Jason Taylor Development Assessment Manager	<p><b>A.</b> Requests that several water reservoir tank facilities be zoned Utilities. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ouse Reservoir Tank</li> <li>• Bronte Park (Various Tanks).</li> </ul> <p><b>B.</b> Requests that Attenuation Area buffers around Sewerage Treatment Plants not be mapped and that the system rely on the distances specified in the code. In support of this, the submission noted that several mapped Attenuation Areas do not match that specified in the code, and that TasWater is planning upgrade works on various facilities which would alter other appropriate attenuation distances.</p>	<p><b>A.</b> Agree.                      Key infrastructure such as township water reservoir tanks should be zoned Utilities.</p> <p><b>B.</b> Disagree.                      The policy for the depiction of Attenuation Areas on the LPS overlay maps is determined by the State Government.                      The downside of relying on the written description for buffer areas is that they can be missed – by members of the public, Council planners, consultant planners, people involved in conveyancing, etc. If they are mapping into an overlay, such mistakes are much less likely.                      The overarching policy embedded within the state planning system is that codes should be applied by mapped overlay wherever possible. The depiction of bushfire prone areas is one notable example of this that Councillors will be familiar with.                      This is a matter for statewide consistency, and not for individual councils to determine, and it is recommended that Council not support this suggestion.</p>

Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
8.	Daniel Lee	<p><b>A.</b> Owner of Lot 1 Marked Tree Road, Hamilton, PID 3264618, CT 166564/1 41.9 ha property, 39.3 ha of which is covered by a Conservation Covenant. Proposed to be zoned Rural. Requests that the covenanted area be zoned Landscape Conservation Zone, but that the 2.5 ha portion of non-covenanted land be retained as Rural Zone. If split zoning is not possible, then the preference is to retain the Rural Zone for the entire property. This property is also part of the Conservation Landholders of Tasmania (CLT) submission.</p> <p><b>B.</b> The submitter also notes that two adjoining forested properties are proposed to be zoned Agriculture, yet they contain substantial areas of significant environmental values – the same values that led the government agreeing to the conservation covenant on Lot 1 Marked Tree Road. The submitter requests that this neighbouring land be zoned Rural so that the Priority Vegetation Overlay of the Natural Values Code can apply to provide a level of protection. Aerial mapping provided.</p>	<p><b>A.</b> Agree. Council’s policy on this issue is that all covenanted land would be proposed to be zoned Rural in the Draft LPS, and that Council would consider alternate zoning if the owners submitted a request to change. This policy was adopted in light of the fact that Council was anecdotally aware that many landowners specifically do not want their land rezoned as a consequence of entering into such a covenant, whilst others do. If rezoning was an automatic consequence of entering into a conservation covenant, many such covenants would not have been created, leading to reduced environmental outcomes generally. Agree to the covenanted portion only being changed to Landscape Conservation and the remainder being Rural Zone.</p> <p><b>B.</b> Agree. This accords with Council’s view that the Agriculture Zone has been applied far too widely within Central Highlands, covering land that is clearly not agricultural land of any significance. Significant areas of land that are dominated by rural lifestyle blocks, forestry and/or nature conservation have been inappropriately mapped as ‘land potentially suitable for the Agriculture Zone’. The titles identified in the submission are a case in point. Agree that the two neighbouring titles (RF 171934/1 and FR 108593/1) be zoned Rural.</p>
9.	Department of Justice Consumer, Building & Occupational Services Peter Graham, Executive Director	<p>Notes that the Bushfire Prone Areas mapping will be introduced into the Central Highlands via the Tasmanian Planning Scheme, (once the Local Provisions Schedule is finalised by the TPC). Requests that Council consider introducing it into the current scheme, the Central Highlands Interim Planning Scheme 2015.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Bushfire Prone Areas mapping could only be introduced into the current planning scheme via a planning scheme amendment process. This would take months – possible as long, or longer, than to complete the Local Provisions Schedule process.</p>

Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
10.	<p>Department of Police, Fire &amp; Emergency Management State Emergency Services Andrew Lea, Director.</p>	<p>Notes that there is no Flood Prone Areas overlay in the Draft LPS, and further notes that Council advised that this is because there is no reliable spatial data.</p> <p><b>A.</b> Advises that a state-wide project is underway to produce flood prone area mapping for areas that do not yet have it and asks Council to consider incorporating the mapping into the appropriate overlay in the planning scheme in the future.</p> <p><b>B.</b> Notes that, despite there being no overlay in the LPS, the Flood Prone Areas code applies anyway, via the ordinance. The submission advises that the Department of Justice / State Emergency Service is working on a guidance document for Councils to help them determine when a development application should trigger consideration under the Flood Prone Areas code.</p> <p>The submission further notes a range of information that Council officers can utilise whilst awaiting the above.</p>	<p><b>A.</b> Agree in principle, noting that this is not a matter for Council to determine as part of the current Draft LPS process. Flood prone areas mapping, if available, should be incorporated into the appropriate overlay in the planning scheme.</p> <p><b>B.</b> Noted, and welcomed. Under C12.2.3 of the State Planning Provisions, planning authorities may ask for a flood hazard report. In the absence of a mapped overlay of flood prone areas, there is no specific trigger for Council to ask for such a report. A guidance document would be of great assistance to Council planning officers whilst awaiting the introduction of a mapped overlay.</p>
11.	<p>Michael Stevens &amp; Fiona McOwan 370 Strickland Rd Strickland 7140</p>	<p>Owners of property at 370 Strickland Rd, Strickland. PID 7710494, CT 160316/1. 70 acres.</p> <p>Rural lifestyle block with hobby-farm level agriculture. No intention to use for commercial agriculture.</p> <p>Concerned about the restrictions on use of proposed Agriculture Zone and has requested the Rural Zone apply.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Whilst this patch is cleared, the property is part of a broader landscape dominated by forest.</p> <p>It is a relatively small lot close to the edge of the broader boundary between Rural Zone and Agriculture Zone.</p> <p>This accords with Council's view that the Agriculture Zone has been applied far too widely within Central Highlands, covering land that is clearly not agricultural land of any significance. Significant areas of land that are dominated by rural lifestyle blocks, forestry and/or nature conservation have been inappropriately mapped as 'land potentially suitable for the Agriculture Zone'. This is a case in point.</p>

Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
12.	<p>Humbie Pastoral Paul Ellis &amp; Shauna Ellis St Patricks Plains 6011 Highland Lakes Rd Steppes 7030</p>	<p>Owners of St Patricks Plains, PID 5000165. 2,143 ha property. Class 6 agricultural land. 900m above sea level. Fit for dry sheep grazing only. Runs 1 sheep to 3 to 5 acres. Severe winters (average maximum temperatures do not exceed 10 degrees C. Widespread inundation in winter, with rocky land elsewhere. 434 ha of FCF covenanted land.  Maps and BOM data provided.  The submitters strongly question the application of the Agriculture Zone to this area, as it is poor farmland. The future, they say, is in tourism, recreation and, potentially, renewable energy. Not farming.  The Rural Zone is much more suitable to this land.</p>	<p>Agree.  High altitude central plateau land such as this is clearly some of the poorest and most marginal land in Tasmania. It is several orders of magnitude poorer than some of the hinterland on the northwest coast that has been allocated the Rural Zone. A core outcome of the entire state-wide single planning scheme project is consistency. In the interest of this alone, this land should be Rural Zone.  Recommend that this land, and the other areas of proposed Agricultural Zone in this landscape, be changed to Rural.  In regard to the proposed windfarm, alluded to in the submission, it is noted that as the Local Planning Authority, Council must not pre-judge a possible development application upon which it may need to statutorily sit in judgment.</p>



No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
13.	<p>Greg Pullen 365 Barren Plains Road Miena 7030</p>	<p>Resident of the Central Highlands. Concerned that too much land is proposed to be zoned Agriculture instead of Rural. Agriculture Zone up the boundaries of settlements will make future expansion all but impossible. The Agriculture Zone also removes consideration of natural values, as the Priority Vegetation overlay cannot apply in this zone. This will lead to ill-considered developments. Cites the proposed wind farm at St Patricks Plains as an example – on land proposed to be Agriculture Zone yet contains many significant natural values. Concerned the inability of councils to ‘tidy up ... historical anomalies’ in the planning scheme through this process will be at a substantial cost to ratepayers through the need for multiple minor planning scheme amendments in the future.</p>	<p>Agree. This accords with Council’s view that the Agriculture Zone has been applied far too widely within Central Highlands, covering land that is clearly not agricultural land of any significance. Significant areas of land that are dominated by rural lifestyle blocks, forestry and/or nature conservation have been inappropriately mapped as ‘land potentially suitable for the Agriculture Zone’ The submission is correct in that the Priority Vegetation overlay cannot apply in the Agriculture Zone. This is reasonable in the case of genuine productive agricultural land, as such land was invariably cleared and farmed many years ago and therefore contains little or no natural values. Many large areas of proposed Agricultural Zone in the Central Highlands, conversely, are inherently poor from an agricultural perspective and there have not been subject to wholesale clearance over the course of the last 200 years and retain very substantial levels of significant natural values. This is indicative of the poor ‘fit’ of the Agriculture Zone to such land. Recommend that the extent of the proposed Agriculture Zone be substantially reviewed using the ‘decision tree’ document that the Southern councils jointly developed. In regard to the proposed windfarm, it is noted that as the Local Planning Authority, Council must not pre-judge a possible development application upon which it may need to statutorily sit in judgment.</p>

Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
14.	ECO-NOMY P/L Dean Brampton, Director. 32 Bronte Estate Road, Bronte Park 7140	Owner of 'Bronte Park 2', Lyell Highway, Bronte Park, PID 2304227, CT 243948/1 15.09 ha property, 14.08 ha of which is covered by a Conservation Covenant. Proposed to be zoned Rural. Requests that it be zoned Landscape Conservation Zone. Note that this property is also part of the Conservation Landholders of Tasmania (CLT) submission.	Agree. Council's policy on this issue is that all covenanted land would be proposed to be zoned Rural in the Draft LPS, and that Council would consider alternate zoning if the owners submitted a request to change. This policy was adopted in light of the fact that Council was anecdotally aware that many landowners specifically do not what their land rezoned as a consequence of entering into such a covenant, whilst others do. If rezoning was an automatic consequence of entering into a conservation covenant, many such covenants would not have been created, leading to reduced environmental outcomes generally.
15.	PC Jacques & MJ Jacques	Owner of property off Dennistoun Road, Bothwell, PID 1843865, CT 126437/1 Property containing a Conservation Covenant. Proposed to be zoned Rural. Requests that it be zoned Landscape Conservation Zone. Note that this property is also part of the Conservation Landholders of Tasmania (CLT) submission.	Agree. Council's policy on this issue is that all covenanted land would be proposed to be zoned Rural in the Draft LPS, and that Council would consider alternate zoning if the owners submitted a request to change. This policy was adopted in light of the fact that Council was anecdotally aware that many landowners specifically do not what their land rezoned as a consequence of entering into such a covenant, whilst others do. If rezoning was an automatic consequence of entering into a conservation covenant, many such covenants would not have been created, leading to reduced environmental outcomes generally.

Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
16.	<p>Tas Fire Service Tom O'Connor Senior Planning &amp; Assessment Officer</p>	<p>TFS is broadly supportive of the Draft LPS.</p> <p>The TFS points out that, since the Bushfire Prone Areas Code was reviewed in 2017, it no longer applies to Visitor Accommodation use. It is therefore suggested that clause P1.2(b) in the proposed Lake Meadowbank Specific Area Plan be amended to remove specific reference to the Code and simply refer to 'bushfire protection':</p> <p><i>(b) the extent of clearing is the minimum necessary to meet the requirements of the Bushfire Prone Areas Code for bushfire protection.</i></p> <p>TFS consider that this change will enable proposed Visitor Accommodation Use to be subject to bushfire risk mitigation considerations.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Whilst this change seems counter-intuitive, the recommendation is based on the practical experience of TFS working with the Code.</p> <p>It is somewhat inexplicable that the 2017 revision of the Code removed Visitor Accommodation from its operation, as fire emergencies are even more threatening to people unfamiliar with an area.</p> <p>The proposed change is supported.</p>
17.	<p>Venesser Oakes 168 Risbys Road Ellendale 7140</p>	<p>Owner of 168 Risbys Road, Ellendale. PID 7147419.</p> <p>12.17 ha 'steeply sloped property, with approximately 50% natural bush' and with electrical infrastructure running through it. Too small and steep to be successfully used for anything more than a small-scale hobby farm.</p> <p>Concerned that the land is proposed to be Agriculture Zone. The Rural Zone is more appropriate.</p> <p>Expressed dissatisfaction with the formatting and layout, and general usability of the various documents on display as part of the Draft LPS public exhibition.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>This property is approximately 50% cleared and is relatively steep. It is part of a cluster of Rural Zoned similar-sized lots to the north and west, whilst it abuts a much larger Agriculture Zone property to the east.</p> <p>It is a relatively small lot on the edge of the broader boundary between Rural Zone and Agriculture Zone.</p> <p>The submission accords with Council's view that the Agriculture Zone has been applied far too widely within Central Highlands, covering land that is clearly not agricultural land of any significance. Significant areas of land that are dominated by rural lifestyle blocks, forestry and/or nature conservation have been inappropriately mapped as 'land potentially suitable for the Agriculture Zone'. This is a case in point.</p> <p>Recommend change to the Rural Zone.</p>

Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
18.	TasNetworks ?	<p><b>A.</b> Requests the Derwent Bridge substation and nine communication sites be zoned Utilities.</p> <p><b>B.</b> Requests that no land with Electricity Transmission Corridors over it be zoned Landscape Conservation.</p> <p><b>C.</b> Requests Priority Vegetation Overlay be removed from infrastructure 18 sites where the vegetation has already been substantially modified.</p> <p><b>D.</b> Notes several problems with the State Planning Provisions that could cause safety issues - - mainly exemptions. It is suggested that there be exceptions to these exemptions in the Electricity Transmission Corridors overlay – similarly to the exceptions associated with the Local Historic Heritage Code.</p>	<p><b>A.</b> Agree. Substantial infrastructure sites such as these should be zoned utilities.</p> <p><b>B.</b> Agree. The Landscape Conservation Zone is incompatible with Electricity Transmission Corridors. Whilst there is no Landscape Conservation Zone in the draft LPS, this may change with a number of owners of conservation n covenanted land requesting this zoning. The existence of an Electricity Transmission Corridor would need to be checked in these cases.</p> <p><b>C.</b> Agree. The Priority Vegetation Overlay on substantially modified infrastructure sites is unnecessary and problematic.</p> <p><b>D.</b> Noted. As this matter relates to the State Planning Provisions, it is not within Council’s current role to form a view on this matter.</p>
19.	Malcolm Grant 41 MacDonald St Erskineville NSW 2043	<p>Owner of Lot 3 Marked Tree Road, Hamilton, PID 3268969, CT 166563/3 40.1 ha property, 27.43 ha of which is covered by a Conservation Covenant. Proposed to be zoned Rural. Requests that it be zoned Landscape Conservation Zone. Note that this property is also part of the Conservation Landholders of Tasmania (CLT) submission.</p>	<p>Agree. Council’s policy on this issue is that all covenanted land would be proposed to be zoned Rural in the Draft LPS, and that Council would consider alternate zoning if the owners submitted a request to change. This policy was adopted in light of the fact that Council was anecdotally aware that many landowners specifically do not what their land rezoned as a consequence of entering into such a covenant, whilst others do. If rezoning was an automatic consequence of entering into a conservation covenant, many such covenants would not have been created, leading to reduced environmental outcomes generally.</p>

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
20.	Jim Allwright	<p><b>A.</b> Concerned about the large extent of proposed Agriculture Zone, covering land that is unsuitable to agriculture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural lifestyle areas around Ellendale and Westerway.</li> <li>• High-altitude seasonal grazing land, better suited to other (non-agricultural) pursuits.</li> </ul> <p>The Agriculture Zone will reduce landowners' ability to further use and development of these areas in the future. Applying the Agricultural Zones to marginal areas such as these is at odds with the zoning of much better agricultural potential land in the northwest as Rural, and one of the stated key aims of this entire planning reform project to achieve state-wide consistency.</p> <p><b>B.</b> Concerned that the Planning Commission has directed that Council's modified Lake Meadowbank Specific Area Plan be removed from the Draft LPS. The lake, with all its users and values, including Aboriginal heritage, needs contemporary planning arrangements.</p> <p><b>C.</b> Concerned that Council's attempts to remove minor split-zonings has not been permitted, so far, by the Commission, despite State guidance to the effect that split zoning is to be avoided if at all possible.</p> <p><b>D.</b> Concerned that this planning reform process has not allowed the removal of minor redundant anomalies, such as the removal of the Attenuation Area around the now non-existence sewerage treatment ponds at Great Lake Hotel.</p>	<p><b>A.</b> Agree.</p> <p>This accords with Council's view that the Agriculture Zone has been applied far too widely within Central Highlands, covering land that is clearly not agricultural land of any significance. Large areas of land that are dominated by rural lifestyle blocks, forestry and/or nature conservation have been inappropriately mapped as 'land potentially suitable for the Agriculture Zone'.</p> <p>Recommend that areas with these characteristics be changed to the Rural Zone, in accordance with the 'decision tree' document adopted by the Southern councils.</p> <p><b>B.</b> Agree.</p> <p>The amendments to the Lake Meadowbank Specific Area Plan would enable it to function more efficiently, better fit with the SPP format and protect significant Aboriginal Heritage values.</p> <p>Recommend that Council continue to argue for its inclusion at the Commission hearings.</p> <p><b>C.</b> Agree.</p> <p>The split zone titles that Council wishes to adjust so that they are entirely one zone constitute minor changes and ought to be possible.</p> <p><b>D.</b> Agree.</p> <p>Council has not been able to undertake a general 'scheme renovation' for twenty years. In the late 2000s, Council was about to embark on a new planning scheme when the Regional Planning Reform process began, and Council chose to join that process. Midway through the process it was announced by the State that the interim schemes being created had to be 'like-for-like', and hence scheme renovation was not permitted. The current Statewide planning reform process has also been designed to be a 'like-for-like' transition and, hence, general scheme renovation is similarly not allowed.</p> <p>The outcome of all of this is that schemes have become full of redundant or out-of-date components, and it will take a great deal of local government and state government resources to fix these matters through a long series of planning scheme amendments.</p>

Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
21.	Eco-Nomy P/L Dean Brampton	<p>Proposes the creation of a Scenic Road Corridor (possibly a Scenic Protection Area) under the Scenic Protection Code of the State Planning Provisions.</p> <p>The area would extend 20km along the Lyell Highway, extending to the furthest skyline or 2 km if the skyline is very distant. Detailed maps and extensive landscape values analysis are provided in the submission.</p>	<p>Not agree.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal may have merit, the introduction of such a significant planning mechanism cannot be undertaken in this process at this stage.</p> <p>There has been no formal consultation with the community generally or the impacted landowners in particular regarding this specific proposal.</p> <p>A proposed change of this magnitude should only be considered through a specific planning scheme amendment process.</p>
22.	S&K Superannuation Fund Stuart & Karen Philp	<p>Proposes the creation of a Scenic Road Corridor (possibly a Scenic Protection Area) under the Scenic Protection Code of the State Planning Provisions.</p> <p>The area would extend 20km along the Lyell Highway, extending to the furthest skyline or 2 km if the skyline is very distant. Detailed maps and extensive landscape values analysis are provided in the submission.</p> <p>The submission is identical to No. 21.</p>	<p>Not agree.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal may have merit, the introduction of such a significant planning mechanism cannot be undertaken in this process at this stage.</p> <p>There has been no formal consultation with the community generally or the impacted landowners in particular regarding this specific proposal.</p> <p>A proposed change of this magnitude should only be considered through a specific planning scheme amendment process.</p>
23.	PDA Surveyors Justine Brooks Senior Planning Consultant.	<p>Pertains to an approved subdivision on the northern edge of Bothwell, for Clyde River Holdings Pty Ltd. PID 3240245, CT 164767/1.</p> <p>The subdivision for 16 residential lots and the amalgamation of a number of adjacent large rural titles was approved prior to the advent of the Central Highlands Interim Planning Scheme 2015. The small lots have not yet been created but the approval has “substantial commencement” and therefore remains alive.</p> <p>The submission states that the land was zoned Village prior to the 2015 interim scheme and that this zoning was changed to Rural Resource by that scheme. It is now proposed to be Agriculture under the draft LPS.</p> <p>It is requested that the land subject to the 16 approved small lots be changed back to Village, to appropriately suit the future development and use of this land.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p><b>(Subject to checking history)</b></p>

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
24.	<p>Alexandra Brock &amp; Garry Daud. 571 Thousand Acre Lane Hamilton 7140</p>	<p>Owners of 571 Thousand Acre Lane, Hamilton. Proposed to be zoned Rural. (The submitters are content with that zoning.) Concerned about the rezoning of neighbouring land to Agriculture. Their land and the neighbouring properties form a cluster of rural lifestyle lots that retain substantial areas of remnant native bush, embedded within a broader pastoral farming landscape that is predominantly cleared. The native bush has priority vegetation values, both on the submitters land and on the neighbouring rural lifestyle blocks. These values are not protected on the neighbouring land, due to the Agriculture Zoning. It is requested that these neighbouring titles be zoned Rural. The submitters also express broader concerns over the proposed far-ranging application of the Agriculture Zone in Central Highlands, where they consider there will be many other cases where high-value native vegetation areas are so zoned, and therefore omitted from the Priority Vegetation Overlay.</p>	<p>Agree. Subject to landowner consent. The submission accords with Council’s view that the Agriculture Zone has been applied far too widely within Central Highlands, covering land that is clearly not agricultural land of any significance. Large areas of land that are dominated by rural lifestyle blocks, forestry and/or nature conservation have been inappropriately mapped as ‘land potentially suitable for the Agriculture Zone’. This is a case in point. Recommend that Council contact the owners of the neighbouring rural-lifestyle blocks to ascertain their views. Where agreed, support change to the Rural Zone.</p>
25.	<p>Peter &amp; Michelle Cassar Smith.</p>	<p>Owners of Lot 3 Marked Tree Road, Hamilton, PID 3264626, CT 166564/3. (Note: a different Lot 3 to Submission No.19) 138.9 ha property containing a Conservation Covenant. Proposed to be zoned Rural. Requests that it be zoned Landscape Conservation Zone. Advises that they are selling the property and that they have notified the purchasers of this issue and that the purchasers agree with the Landscape Conservation Zone. Note that this property is also part of the Conservation Landholders of Tasmania (CLT) submission.</p>	<p>Agree. Council’s policy on this issue is that all covenanted land would be proposed to be zoned Rural in the Draft LPS, and that Council would consider alternate zoning if the owners submitted a request to change. This policy was adopted in light of the fact that Council was anecdotally aware that many landowners specifically do not want their land rezoned as a consequence of entering into such a covenant, whilst others do. If rezoning was an automatic consequence of entering into a conservation covenant, many such covenants would not have been created, leading to reduced environmental outcomes generally.</p>

Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
26.	Department of State Growth James Verrier Director, Transport Systems and Planning Policy	Generally, in agreement with the draft LPS. Several aspects of the State Planning Provisions are noted and endorsed. <b>A.</b> Requests amending the zoning of a new road lot to Utilities. CT 46/6704, Highland Lakes Road near Ripple Creek. <b>B.</b> Notes that some mining leases are proposed to be zoned Agriculture and suggests that the Rural Zone might be more appropriate.	<b>A.</b> Agree. The road casements of major roads such as Highland Lakes Road should be Utilities.  <b>B.</b> Not agree. Council liaised with Mineral Resources Tasmania regarding all mining leases. Where a lease is for a relatively minor operation within a larger agricultural title, it was agreed not to spot-zone to Rural.
27.	Tasmanian Land Conservancy James Hatton, CEO	<b>A.</b> Requests all land owned by the Tasmanian Land Conservancy to be zoned Landscape Conservation Zone. In Central Highlands this is multiple properties covering 20,000 ha. Protected by conservation covenants. Much of this land is currently proposed to be Rural. Some is proposed to be a mix of Environmental Management, Agriculture and Rural. Nevertheless, all TLC land is requested to be Landscape Conservation. <b>B.</b> Request Council to implement a process of continually revising, updating and re-evaluating natural assets overlay mapping. <b>C.</b> Requests that the Priority Vegetation Overlay apply to all zones. <b>D.</b> Request that the Natural Assets Code be reviewed – principally to remove exemptions. <b>E.</b> Suggest that all covenanted land be zoned landscape Conservation.	<b>A.</b> Agree. Council’s policy on this issue is that all covenanted land would be proposed to be zoned Rural in the Draft LPS, and that Council would consider alternate zoning if the owners submitted a request to change. This policy was adopted in light of the fact that Council was anecdotally aware that many landowners specifically do not want their land rezoned as a consequence of entering into such a covenant, whilst others do. <b>B.</b> Not relevant to the current statutory process. It is noted that such work is best carried out at the regional or state level. <b>C.</b> Not within Council’s purview. This pertains to the State Planning Provisions. The State has directed that these are specifically outside the scope of the current process. <b>D.</b> Not within Council’s purview. This pertains to the State Planning Provisions. The State has directed that these are specifically outside the scope of the current process. <b>E.</b> Not agree. If rezoning was an automatic consequence of entering into a conservation covenant, many such covenants would not have been created, leading to reduced environmental outcomes generally.



No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
28.	<p>Greg &amp; Jane McGann                      Hatlor Pty Ltd                      389 Arthurs Lake Road                      Arthurs Lake 7030</p>	<p>Owners of a home on 70 acres at Arthurs Lake.</p> <p><b>A.</b> Concerned about the proposed rezoning from Rural Resource to Agriculture, and the ‘unintended negative impacts’ that could result.</p> <p><b>B.</b> Questions why the Scenic Protection Code has not been used, given the area’s natural beauty.</p> <p><b>C.</b> Questions why the changes are being proposed and what has initiated this action.</p>	<p><b>A.</b> The submitters appear to hold the same concerns that Council has in regard to the proposed inappropriate rezoning of large areas of land to Agriculture. Council’s view is that the Agriculture Zone has been applied far too widely within Central Highlands, covering land that is clearly not agricultural land of any significance. Large areas of land that are dominated by rural lifestyle blocks, forestry and/or nature conservation have been inappropriately mapped as ‘land potentially suitable for the Agriculture Zone’.</p> <p><b>B.</b> Council has not sought to introduce a Scenic Landscape Area into the scheme via this Tasmanian Planning Scheme establishment process. Whilst this may have merit, the introduction of such a significant planning mechanism cannot be undertaken in this process at this stage. There has been no formal consultation with the community generally or potentially impacted landowners. A proposed change of this magnitude should only be considered through a specific planning scheme amendment process, and be based on a professional study by a suitably qualified person to define the area(s).</p> <p><b>C.</b> The Supporting Report details this State Government-initiated project. This can be provide to the submitters.</p>
29.	<p>Dominica Sophia Tannock</p>	<p>Melbourne resident who has recently purchased a property in the Central Highlands lakes area.</p> <p><b>A.</b> Concerned about the rezoning of this area from Rural Resource to Agriculture. Specifically, the potential impact on landscape.</p> <p><b>B.</b> Proposes the use of the Scenic Protection Code</p>	<p><b>A.</b> Council’s established view is that the Agriculture Zone has been applied far too widely within Central Highlands, covering land that is clearly not agricultural land of any significance. Council view therefore accords with the general concerns of the submitter.</p> <p><b>B.</b> Not agree.</p> <p>Whilst the creation of scenic protection areas may have merit, the introduction of such a significant planning mechanism cannot be undertaken in this process at this stage.</p> <p>There has been no formal consultation with the community generally or impacted landowners in particular. A proposed change of this magnitude should only be considered through a specific planning scheme amendment process, and be based on a professional study by a suitably qualified person to define the area(s).</p>

Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
30.	<p>GHD David Cundall, Senior Planner obo Geoffery Herbert</p>	<p>3 Adelaide Street, Bothwell. CT 245881/1. Land zoned Low Density Residential and proposed to transition to the new Low Density Residential zone. Existing approval for subdivision of 8 lots, ranging in size from 1547m2 to 2446m2. Notes that this land is adjacent to five existing village-sized lots (around 900m2) and proposes that 3 Adelaide Street should also be Village Zone. Requests Council to commit to a structure planning process for Bothwell to consider the most appropriate zoning for the various parts of the town into the future.</p>	<p>Agree. Many rural towns around the State have been subject to structure planning projects over the last ten years. It would appear to be many decades since Bothwell has had the benefit of such a process. Structure plans often recommend rezonings, and they are then used to support planning scheme amendments. Recommended that Council pursue a structure plan for Bothwell once the LPS work is completed, potentially with financial support from the State Government.</p>
31.	<p>Ian Fitzgerald 8 Johnsons Road Miena 7030</p>	<p>Concerned for the preservation of the natural landscapes around The Steppes, St Patricks Plains, Thousand Islands Wilderness Area and the Great Lake and associated water bodies. Specifically, concern is expressed about the possible impacts of the mooted windfarm at St Patricks Plains / Steppes.</p>	<p>The submitter is not specific in suggesting how the Draft LPS could be modified to address these concerns. The creation of Scenic Protection Areas under the SPP's Scenic Protection Code would potentially address them. Whilst the creation of Scenic Protection Areas may have merit, the introduction of such a significant planning mechanism cannot be undertaken in this process at this stage. There has been no formal consultation with the community generally or impacted landowners in particular. A proposed change of this magnitude should only be considered through a specific planning scheme amendment process and be based on a professional study by a suitably qualified person to define the area(s). In regard to the proposed windfarm, it is noted that as the Local Planning Authority, Council must not pre-judge a possible development application upon which it may need to statutorily sit in judgment.</p>

Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
32.	Mary Louise Ashton Jones Ashton Ouse 7140	Concerned for the preservation of the natural landscapes around Central Highlands. Request that the Scenic Protection Code be utilised in the LPS.	Not agree. Whilst the creation of Scenic Protection Areas may have merit, the introduction of such a significant planning mechanism cannot be undertaken in this process at this stage. There has been no formal consultation with the community generally or impacted landowners in particular. A proposed change of this magnitude should only be considered through a specific planning scheme amendment process and be based on a professional study by a suitably qualified person to define the area(s).
33.	Natalie Fowell	Owner of Lot 2 Marked Tree Road, Hamilton, PID 3264597, CT 166564/2. 41.64 ha property containing a 38.19 ha Conservation Covenant. Proposed to be zoned Rural. Requests that it be zoned Landscape Conservation Zone. Note that this property is also part of the Conservation Landholders of Tasmania (CLT) submission.	Agree. Council's policy on this issue is that all covenanted land would be proposed to be zoned Rural in the Draft LPS, and that Council would consider alternate zoning if the owners submitted a request to change. This policy was adopted in light of the fact that Council was anecdotally aware that many landowners specifically do not want their land rezoned as a consequence of entering into such a covenant, whilst others do. If rezoning was an automatic consequence of entering into a conservation covenant, many such covenants would not have been created, leading to reduced environmental outcomes generally.
34.	Victoria Onslow & William Phipps Onslow Bridge House Ouse 7140	Concerned for the preservation of the natural landscapes around Central Highlands. Request that the Scenic Protection Code be utilised in the LPS. Cites the need to protect the area's world class trout fishing, tourism and recreation industries. Particularly mentions the Steppes area.	Not agree. Whilst the creation of Scenic Protection Areas may have merit, the introduction of such a significant planning mechanism cannot be undertaken in this process at this stage. There has been no formal consultation with the community generally or impacted landowners in particular. A proposed change of this magnitude should only be considered through a specific planning scheme amendment process and be based on a professional study by a suitably qualified person to define the area(s).

Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
35.	David Ridley 3 Monk Street Shannon 7030	<p>Concerned for the preservation of the natural landscapes around Central Highlands.</p> <p>Requests that the Scenic Protection Area be created in the LPS covering those parts of the Central Plateau visible from Highland Lakes Road and Waddamana Road.</p> <p>Provides a very detail report “Central Highlands Scenic Protection Area (SPA, Tasmania”. This includes maps, photographs and a detailed and thorough analysis of landscape values.</p> <p>The submitter points out that the existing Rural Resource Zone contains some provisions pertaining to landscape protection whilst the new Rural and Agriculture Zones do not.</p>	<p>Not agree.</p> <p>Whilst the creation of Scenic Protection Areas may have merit, the introduction of such a significant planning mechanism cannot be undertaken in this process at this stage.</p> <p>There has been no formal consultation with the community generally or impacted landowners in particular. A proposed change of this magnitude should only be considered through a specific planning scheme amendment process and be based on a professional study by a suitably qualified person to define the area(s).</p> <p>The point that the transition from the existing Rural Resource Zone to the new Rural and Agriculture Zones will result in the removal of clauses pertaining to landscape impact is well made, and should be relevant to Council’s future consideration of this matter generally.</p>
36.	Irene Inc Jacqui Blowfield, Senior Planner obo the No Turbine Action Group Inc (Central Highlands).	<p>Concerned that the mooted windfarm will significantly impact on the significant natural values of the areas around Liawenee, Todds Corner and St Patricks Plains.</p> <p>Supporting the submission is a biodiversity values assessment and a statement on the impact on Wedge-tailed eagles.</p> <p>Of particular focus is the proposed zoning of these areas to Agriculture and the subsequent omission of the Priority Vegetation Overlay of the Natural Assets Code. These areas have important natural values that ought to be protected in the new scheme.</p> <p>Suggests that the Landscape Conservation Zone is the most appropriate zone.</p>	<p>Not agree.</p> <p>Recommended that the Rural Zone, and therefore the Priority Vegetation Overlay of the Natural Assets Code, apply to these areas.</p> <p>In regard to the proposed windfarm, it is noted that as the Local Planning Authority, Council must not pre-judge a possible development application upon which it may need to statutorily sit in judgment.</p>

Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
37.	Red Seal Urban & Regional Planning Trent Henderson, Principal Planner obo Jonathon Dorkings	<p>Jonathon Dorkings is owner of 204 Meadowbank Road, Meadowbank, PID 7516181, CT 35385/2.</p> <p>The subject land is a small 3079m<sup>2</sup> rural lifestyle block, part of a cluster with seven similar -sized lots.</p> <p>Concern centres on the proposed Agriculture Zone.</p> <p>Request that the zone be Rural Living Zone to match the use and development of this land.</p> <p>The request is supported by a detailed planning report and an agricultural capability assessment by a qualified consultant – Geo-Environmental Solutions (GES).</p> <p>The GES report concludes the land is Class 6 agricultural land, i.e.: poor, with no capacity for cropping.</p> <p>Concludes that the subject land and the seven similar-sized adjacent lots should be Rural Living Zone.</p>	<p>Agree that the Agriculture Zone inappropriate for this land and the seven similar adjacent titles.</p> <p>Recommend Rural Zone, however, not Rural Living Zone.</p> <p>Although small clusters of Rural Living Zone or Low Density Residential Zone are not uncommon, with many such small clusters around the Highland lakes.</p>
38.	John Toohey 1 Mowbray Court Lenah Valley 7008	<p>A regular visitor to the Central Highlands.</p> <p>Concerned that the intrinsic values, scenic values, aboriginal heritage, unique character and landscape values of the Highlands is maintained and protected.</p> <p>Suggests these tables in the LPS should not be left blank:</p> <p><b>A.</b> Table C6.1 Local Heritage Places</p> <p><b>B.</b> Table C6.3 Local Historic Landscape Precincts</p> <p><b>C.</b> Table C6.4 Places or Precincts of Archaeological Potential</p> <p><b>D.</b> Table C6.5 Significant Trees</p> <p><b>E.</b> Table C8.1 Scenic Protected Areas</p> <p><b>F.</b> Table C8.2 Scenic Road Corridors</p>	<p><b>A.</b> Disagree.</p> <p>As Councillors will be aware, Council's preference is to include the existing Local Heritage Places list in the new LPS – but with spatial extents modified to match the revised equivalent listings on the Tasmanian Heritage Register. To transfer them without doing this would result in thousands of hectares of farmland unnecessarily listed for non-existent heritage values. This was apparently not possible, so the decision was made to remove the local list. It is noted that all places remain on the Tasmanian Heritage Register, and so remain protected.</p> <p><b>B. C. D. E &amp; F</b> Disagree.</p> <p>These various precincts, places and areas are not in the current planning scheme and there has been no work done to identify any and/or liaise with community and potentially impacted landowners. Council is not in a position to propose the introduction of these mechanisms as part of this current process.</p>

Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
39.	Jacob Smith PO Box 136, Ouse, 7140	<p>Owner of the former Principal’s Cottage of Ouse School at 7011 Lyell Highway.</p> <p>States that this land is not zoned Village despite being part of the village of Ouse, next to the school.</p> <p>Under the Draft LPS it is proposed to be zoned Agriculture and is currently Rural Resource Zone.</p> <p>Notes that Council’s Supporting Report states that there is insufficient need for more Village Zone land in Ouse pursuant to the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy. However, the submitter argues that this strategy is out-of-date, being developed eleven years ago prior to the recent population boom in Tasmania which has led to a general shortage of housing supply.</p> <p>The land is unsuitable for an agricultural enterprise, being relatively small, adjacent to the school and unirrigated.</p> <p>Allowing the land to be subdivided would, in contrast, likely strengthen the school through increased student numbers.</p> <p>Request change to Village Zone.</p>	<p>Agree that the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy is badly out of date.</p> <p>However, a structure plan or similar settlement analysis would need to be undertaken at Ouse to support a rezoning to Village.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the Agriculture Zone is considered inappropriate for the reasons raised by the submitter.</p> <p>Smaller titles such as this that are, in practice, part of villages but not zoned as such should be zoned Rural, as a ‘holding zone’. This would allow easier consideration of town expansion in the future and to create a buffer around the townships.</p>

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
40.	<p>Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water &amp; Environment. Tim Baker, Secretary</p>	<p><b>1.</b> Does not support the zoning of the western half of the Interlaken Canal as Utilities Zone. Requests that it be Environmental Management Zone. States that the EMZ zones is necessary to protect the RAMSAR wetland <i>“from further encroachment and/or hydrological impact by the canal and associated works, now and in the future”</i>.</p> <p><b>2.</b> Requests that a Public Reserve, PID 5475283, on the Lyell Highway be changed from Rural Zone. (Not stated which zone is requested).</p> <p><b>3.</b> Request unallocated Crown Land at Brady’s Lagoon (PID 2541169) be changed from Agriculture Zone to Environmental Management Zone, as it contains threatened native vegetation.</p> <p><b>4.</b> Notes that all references to the National parks and Reserves Land Regulations 2009 should be updated to the national Parks and reserves management regulations 2019.</p>	<p><b>1.</b> Not agree: Council has zoned the eastern half of the canal as Utilities Zone. This section is on an adjacent title outside the RAMSAR area. In the Supporting Report, Council indicated its preference for the entire canal to be zoned Utilities, reflecting the reality on the ground and providing greater certainty that this key component of the Clyde irrigation district can continue operating properly into the future.</p> <p><b>2.</b> Agree. Public Reserves are generally appropriately zoned Environmental Management Zone.</p> <p><b>3.</b> Agree. Change to the Environmental Management Zone.</p> <p><b>4.</b> Noted. A matter for the State Government to address within the State Planning Provisions.</p>
41.	<p>Susanne and Dean Klower</p> <p>Received at 8:58pm, 22 October 2021. After the advertised deadline of close of business 22 October 2021. The Planning Commission have advised it is up to Council to decide if late submissions will be accepted.</p>	<p>Owns land at 735 Arthurs Lake Road, Arthurs Lake. Concerned with the proposed extent of rezoning to the Agriculture Zoning in the area, and that this will lead to loss of important values. Cites the proposed wind farm at St Patricks Plains as an example – on land proposed to be Agriculture Zone yet contains many significant natural values.</p>	<p>Agree. This accords with Council’s view that the Agriculture Zone has been applied far too widely within Central Highlands, covering land that is clearly not agricultural land of any significance. Significant areas of land that are dominated by rural lifestyle blocks, forestry and/or nature conservation have been inappropriately mapped as ‘land potentially suitable for the Agriculture Zone’. Recommend that the extent of the proposed Agriculture Zone be substantially reviewed using the ‘decision tree’ document that the Southern councils jointly developed. In regard to the proposed windfarm, it is noted that as the Local Planning Authority, Council must not pre-judge a possible development application upon which it may need to statutorily sit in judgment.</p>

Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
42.	<p>T.L Wood 57 Fitzroy Crescent, Dynnyrne, 7005</p> <p>Received at 5:27pm, 22 October 2021. After the advertised deadline of close of business 22 October 2021.</p> <p>The Planning Commission have advised it is up to Council to decide if late submissions will be accepted.</p>	<p>Concerned with the proposed extent of rezoning to the Agriculture Zoning in the area, and that this will lead to loss of important values.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>This accords with Council’s view that the Agriculture Zone has been applied far too widely within Central Highlands, covering land that is clearly not agricultural land of any significance. Significant areas of land that are dominated by rural lifestyle blocks, forestry and/or nature conservation have been inappropriately mapped as ‘land potentially suitable for the Agriculture Zone’.</p> <p>Recommend that the extent of the proposed Agriculture Zone be substantially reviewed using the ‘decision tree’ document that the Southern councils jointly developed.</p>
43.	<p>Odile Foster 33 Thiessen Crescent, Miena</p> <p>Received on 23 October 2021. After the advertised deadline of close of business 22 October 2021.</p> <p>The Planning Commission have advised it is up to Council to decide if late submissions will be accepted.</p>	<p>Owner of shack at Miena</p> <p>Concerned with the proposed extent of rezoning to the Agriculture Zoning in the area, and that this will lead to loss of important values.</p> <p>Cites the proposed wind farm at St Patricks Plains as an example – on land proposed to be Agriculture Zone yet contains many significant natural values.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>This accords with Council’s view that the Agriculture Zone has been applied far too widely within Central Highlands, covering land that is clearly not agricultural land of any significance. Significant areas of land that are dominated by rural lifestyle blocks, forestry and/or nature conservation have been inappropriately mapped as ‘land potentially suitable for the Agriculture Zone’.</p> <p>Recommend that the extent of the proposed Agriculture Zone be substantially reviewed using the ‘decision tree’ document that the Southern councils jointly developed.</p> <p>In regard to the proposed windfarm, it is noted that as the Local Planning Authority, Council must not pre-judge a possible development application upon which it may need to statutorily sit in judgment.</p>



Central Highlands Draft LPS - Submissions Assessment Table – 3 November 2021

No.	From	Key Issues Raised	Assessment and Recommendation to Council
44.	<p>William John Gunn 7 Robertson Road, Miena Received on 25 October 2021. After the advertised deadline of close of business 22 October 2021. The Planning Commission have advised it is up to Council to decide if late submissions will be accepted.</p>	<p>Owner of house at Miena. Concerned with proposed changes to the planning scheme “as it appears to be mainly to allow the development of many more wind towers”. Concerned of the impact on the natural landscape ‘over the whole community’.</p>	<p>Agree, generally. It is assumed the changes to the planning scheme referred to are the rezoning of large areas of Highland Lakes land to Agriculture, rather than Rural, especially at St Patricks Plains. This underlying sentiment accords with Council’s general view that the Agriculture Zone has been applied far too widely within Central Highlands, covering land that is clearly not agricultural land of any significance. Significant areas of land that are dominated by rural lifestyle blocks, forestry and/or nature conservation have been inappropriately mapped as ‘land potentially suitable for the Agriculture Zone’. This includes St Patricks Plains. In regard to the proposed windfarm, it is noted that as the Local Planning Authority, Council must not pre-judge a possible development application upon which it may need to statutorily sit in judgment.</p>
45.	Sue Chandler	Unclear	To be discussed.