



1449

17 November 2021

Iain More
Town Planner
City of Launceston
Via email: Iain.More@launceston.tas.gov.au

Dear Iain

Review of Representations 23, 25, 34 & 44 Regarding Proposed Agriculture or Rural Zoning in City of Launceston's Local Provisions Schedules of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme

I have undertaken a review of four representations against proposed Agriculture zoning that were made in response to the public exhibition period for the proposed City of Launceston (CoL) Local Provisions Schedule of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme. The representations considered were:

- Representation 23 – 3420 Blessington Rd, Blessington
- Representation 25 – 135 Rostella Rd, Dilston
- Representation 34 – 2147 East Tamar Hwy, Mount Direction
- Representation 44 – 298 Patersonia Rd, Nunamara

The key points made in each representation have been considered and I have also reviewed the characteristics of the land associated with each representation against the Decision Rules developed by AK Consultants (now RMCG). These Decision Rules were utilised to delineate the Agriculture and Rural zones from the existing Rural Resource zone in the CoL municipal area from the *Agricultural Land Mapping in the City of Launceston 2019* report, by AK Consultants (now RMCG). The representation key points and zoning recommendations are provided below in Table A1-1.

If you would like to discuss any of the representations further, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. J. Tempest'.

Michael Tempest
SENIOR CONSULTANT

REFERENCES

AK Consultants (now RMCG) (2019). Agricultural Land Mapping in the City of Launceston.

City of Launceston (2021). Local Provisions Schedule – Tasmanian Planning Scheme.

Department of Justice. (2017) Agricultural Land Mapping Project - Background Report, Tasmanian Government.

APPENDIX 1: REPRESENTATION SUMMARY

Table A1-1 identifies the key points made in each reviewed representation and the zoning recommendations based on the information provided in the Representation and the zoning Decision Rules.

Table A1-1: Representation Summary and Recommendations

REPRESENTATION	REPRESENTATION MAIN POINTS	RMCG COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION
<p>23 – 3420 Blessington Rd, Blessington. Proposed for the Agriculture Zone</p>	<p>Proposing Rural Zone, a supporting Agricultural Assessment and Planning Report was provided with the representation</p> <p>Ag Assessment Key Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Class 4 land – severe limitations of soil wetness, depth and climatic limitations. ▪ Mapped as potentially constrained 2a – has capital value of >\$50,000/ha. ▪ Rural Zone would provide for a greater range of uses under the TPS. ▪ Land is surrounded by private timber reserves (PTRs) and roadways. ▪ Limitations of land make it unviable for commercial cropping activities. ▪ Estimated gross margin from grazing is \$2,100, which would not constitute a feasible use for the property. ▪ 2.6ha forestry operation would be severely restricted. Capital value of the property would outweigh the potential for amalgamating with adjacent forestry enterprise. ▪ Proponents are involved with the Ben Lomond Alpine Resort and are looking at potential developments on this 	<p>We agree with the Agricultural Assessment. This land is limited due to size, Land Capability limitations and surrounding land use. It is highly unlikely that this title would be economically attractive to be included with the adjacent forestry enterprise.</p> <p>However, when considering the title against the Decision Rules the following rules are relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum of three titles (where feasible) to make a zone • Plantation or native vegetation can be zoned either Ag or Rural • individual or small clusters of mapped potentially constrained titles to be zoned Ag if surrounding adjacent land use has commercial scale characteristics or is mapped as Unconstrained in the ALMP. <p>In this instance all surrounding land was mapped as unconstrained by the ALMP. To avoid spot zoning this title, surrounding land would need to be considered for its appropriateness for the Rural Zone. Surrounding land is under a PTR, with plantation forest as the land use, which can be suited in the Rural or Agriculture Zone. However, in this instance, the adjacent plantations have been established over pasture, with areas mapped as Class 4 land. This means there is potential that the adjacent land could be converted back to</p>

REPRESENTATION	REPRESENTATION MAIN POINTS	RMCG COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION
	<p>site to improve the ski offering. This includes a potential; café, ski gear rental/sale, transport to ski village. They are also exploring mountain bike opportunities in the Ben Lomond National Park. It is considered that these developments will have a positive impact on the local community.</p> <p>Planning Report Key Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If zoned Agriculture a future development would need to conform with Cl.21.3.1.P3. Under the Rural Zone a development would need to meet CL.20.3.1. Hence the Rural Zone is more appropriate. ▪ Land is classed as Rural Land Use under Section D of the RLUS, this allows for a great use than just agriculture. 	<p>pasture in the future and so it should be retained in the Agriculture zone. It is noted that grazing at a commercial scale occurs in the Blessington area.</p> <p>The Planning Report suggests that if this land was zoned Agriculture, then any future tourism development would need to comply with Cl.21.3.1.P3, however this performance criteria is specifically for assessing proposed uses on 'Prime Agricultural Land'. 'Prime Agricultural Land' is defined by the PAL Policy as Land Capability Class land 1, 2 & 3. The accompanying Agricultural Assessment has assessed the land as Class 4 land, which is not 'Prime Agricultural Land'. Because of this the most likely clause that a potential future development would need to comply with is Cl.21.3.1.P1, P2, or P4.</p> <p>Regardless of the zoning, in our opinion, the main limitation a development on the subject title would need to demonstrate is that it will not confine or restrain the existing or potential adjacent primary industry land use. Due to the small size of the block appropriate separation distances between a sensitive use and adjacent existing and potential primary industry use will be difficult to achieve.</p> <p>Bases on these factors, this title should be retained in the Agriculture Zone.</p>

REPRESENTATION	REPRESENTATION MAIN POINTS	RMCG COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION
<p>Rep 25 – 135 Rostella Rd, Dilston. Proposed for the Agriculture Zone.</p>	<p>Proposing Rural Zone, a supporting Agricultural Assessment and Planning Report was provided with the representation</p> <p>Ag Assessment Key Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Title is 115ha in area and is developed for agricultural use – pasture-based cattle breeding and finishing. ▪ A Land Capability assessment determined there is 81.4ha of Class 4 land and 33.4ha of Class 6 land. The key limitation for the Class 4 land is wind erosion risk, while for the Class 6 area it is waterlogging issues. ▪ Residential development to the east has the potential to create current and future conflict issues between agricultural operations and residential neighbours, especially when out of hours activities may occur for livestock health and well-being requirements. ▪ 15 dwellings adjacent to the land, all zoned Rural Living. Setback distance ranges from 40m to 150m. ▪ Rural living properties along the boundary are fully developed and so there is little likelihood of the density increasing, therefore the level of risk of conflict or interference will not increase. ▪ Normal pasture activities are expected to have minimal impact on adjacent properties. ▪ Land is not within an Irrigation District. ▪ Cannot support a profitable agricultural enterprise. The property is considered a lifestyle property. Estimated gross margin based on the land’s carrying capacity is \$108,000. 	<p>It is agreed that this title is isolated from other nearby agricultural land by the Tamar Estuary, wetlands to the north and the Rural Living Zone to the east.</p> <p>However, it is also noted that a productive agricultural enterprise occurs on this title with an estimated gross margin of approximately \$108,000. The Gross Margin of an enterprise is a commonly used indicator of its relative ‘profitability’ and is calculated as the margin between the Gross Income and the Variable costs of that enterprise.</p> <p>As such, the Gross Margin represents the funds available to meet the Overhead Costs of the business, the interest and capital requirements, and provide a return for the business owner. Variable costs are generally around 33% of Gross Income. This assumes that the gross income of the enterprise would be approximately \$160,000. In our opinion, this represents a hobby scale activity. Land with hobby scale characteristics could be appropriately zoned Rural or Agriculture depending on the capacity to be farmed on conjunction or contribute to commercial scale operations.</p> <p>Although the title is not directly adjacent to other land with commercial scale characteristics, it is large enough to be considered for farming in conjunction with additional land further away (for example land at higher altitude).</p> <p>Also, the potential for intensification or diversification to be able to generate a higher Gross Margin needs to be considered.</p>

REPRESENTATION	REPRESENTATION MAIN POINTS	RMCG COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Isolated from other Agricultural land by the Tamar Estuary on three sides and residential development on the other side. ▪ Agricultural land not significant from a regional perspective. ▪ Review of constraints flow chart Property assessed as potentially constrained 3, rather than ALMP mapping that mapped it as 'Unconstrained'. 	<p>It is stated that there is no potential for irrigation water. However, the land falls within the Tamar Irrigation Scheme area that is currently under development.</p> <p>Therefore, irrigation water may become available in the future, that would enable enterprise diversification and/or intensification.</p> <p>There is also some potential for a dam to be constructed in the northern part of the property, which could potentially be pump filled from Coulsons Creek below the confluence with Symmons Creek. As this pumping site would be within the tidal zone (which extends at least as far upstream as the Tamar Highway), the extraction of water does not require a Water Licence under the Water Management Act 1999.</p> <p>The Agricultural Report assesses the potential of conflict as medium to low with adjacent residential developments.</p> <p>The relevant decision rule is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum of three titles (where feasible) to make a zone. <p>The rationale behind this rule states: To avoid spot zoning of individual titles it was determined that a minimum of 3 titles should be investigated (depending on size and scale of titles) for a zone. For planning purposes, a consistent zoning pattern is preferable to fragmented zoning patterns.</p> <p>In our opinion the size and scale of the land and agricultural enterprise and potential are suitable to retain this land in the Agriculture zone even though it is isolated from other land it</p>

REPRESENTATION	REPRESENTATION MAIN POINTS	RMCG COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION
		<p>could be farmed in conjunction with. There is insufficient justification to consider an alternate zone.</p>
<p>34 – 2147 East Tamar Hwy, Mountain Direction. Proposed for the Agriculture Zone.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The land is mainly rocky and covered in native bush. ▪ More suited to Rural or Rural Living. 	<p>Agree. This title is limited for agricultural use. It is predominantly mapped as Land Capability Class 6, with an area of Class 7.</p> <p>The land was mapped as unconstrained by the ALMP so was not further assessed as part of the mapping project for CoL as it was out of the scope of the project.</p> <p>When considered against the Decision Rules, the following are relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consistency of land use patterns ▪ Minimum of three titles (where feasible) to make a zone ▪ Plantation or native vegetation can be zoned either Ag or Rural <p>The land has connectivity with land proposed to be zoned Rural to the south east.</p> <p>In our opinion this title should be zoned Rural. There may also be scope to consider adjacent titles currently proposed for the Agriculture Zone as Rural as well; CT 144205/2, CT 131672/1, CT 144205/3, CT 86593/1 & CT 169223/1.</p>

REPRESENTATION	REPRESENTATION MAIN POINTS	RMCG COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION
<p>44 – 298 Patersonia Rd, Nunamara. Proposed for the Agriculture Zone.</p>	<p>90% of the land is under a Conservation Covenant and is covered in native vegetation. The balance is 5.5 acres and contains a dwelling and two paddocks. This is not suitable for agriculture for commercial purposes.</p>	<p>Agree. This title is limited for agricultural use.</p> <p>The land was mapped as unconstrained by the ALMP so was not further assessed as part of the mapping project for CoL as it was out of the scope of the project.</p> <p>When considering against the Decision Rules, the following are relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consistency of land use patterns ▪ Minimum of three titles (where feasible) to make a zone ▪ Plantation or native vegetation can be zoned either Ag or Rural <p>Because surrounding land is also proposed to be zoned Agriculture, it is not feasible to spot zone this title 'Rural', based on the Decision Rurals, so it should remain in the Agriculture zone. However, when considering the characteristics of surrounding titles along Patersonia Rd, especially to the south and west, there may be potential to include more titles into the Rural zone, resulting in a connection with other titles located in this particular Rural zone.</p>

This report has been prepared by:

RM Consulting Group Pty Ltd trading RMCG

Level, 102-104 Cameron Street, Launceston Tasmania 7250

rmcg.com.au — ABN 73 613 135 247

Offices in Victoria, Tasmania, ACT and NSW



Key contact

Michael Tempest

0467 452 155 — michael@rmcg.com.au

Document review and authorisation

Project Number: #1449

Doc Version	Final/Draft	Date	Author	Project Director review	BST QA review	Release approved by	Issued to
1.0	Final	17/11/21	M. Tempest	A. Ketelaar	S.Roberts	A. Ketelaar	I. More