

Submission to Native Vegetation Regulation 2012

By Trevor Wilson, [REDACTED] Dyraba, NSW, 2470 (email [REDACTED])

Like most landholders that there are major problems with the Native Vegetation Act 2003. Unlike most landholders I believe that many of the 'problems' with the Act can be adequately addressed through the Native Vegetation Regulations, however I will not attempt to address all these with my submission but rather only those that affect me personally.

There are two distinct aspects to my submission – **Understandability and Technical Detail.**

Understandability.

To be implemented by landholders these Regulations have to be understood by landholders. In their current form they do not meet this test. (I accept that they are in a similar format to previously but we shouldn't keep repeating something that is wrong). Examples are:-

1. Clause 25 The term 'minimum extent necessary' is used but who is to determine this? My 'minimum extent necessary' may vary widely from other people's definition.
2. Clause 26 (2) This doesn't exclude 'small holdings' yet there is a separate clause for 'small holdings' which has different distances. I would suggest that for consistency across jurisdictions that you use the same terminology as in the Standard LEP.
3. Clause 26 (7) The whole definition of Regions is very confusing where the Northern Rivers Catchment management area is mentioned in two Regions. There must be a simpler way. You have indicated to me (DOC 12/26679) that this is the same as the 2005 Regulations but the whole idea of a review is to correct issues and this is an issue which should be corrected.
4. Clause 33 & 34 There is no definition of what is 'Feral' and what is 'Invasive'.
5. Clause 26 By giving a list of some infrastructure it does not make it clear (in fact I would suggest it is prohibited by omission) that distances around other infrastructure 'is to the minimum extent necessary' as you have indicated to me (DOC12/26679).
6. Clause 50 There is no indication of what this land is or where you find out – a very serious omission.

Technical Detail

1. Clause 27 This clause is too restrictive. Many landholders own more than one parcel of land but manage them as one unit. In my case the best and most abundant construction timber is located on one property but is required on a second property (in the same ownership and management with cattle regularly moving between) yet I cannot use it on the second property. The current wording of this clause gives a negative environmental and economic cost to me.

2. Clause 36 This needs developing into an 'action clause' rather than as a process to 'making of orders'.

3. Clause 51 (d) There is no provision for normal 'farm management' fencing which may cross protected riparian land. Again you indicated to me (DOC 12/26679) that this was the same as before and I again say that the idea of a review is to correct issues and this is an issue.

Regards

Trevor Wilson