From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 23 August 2012 3:57 PM
To: EHPP Landscapes & Ecosystems Section Mailbox
Cc: [redacted]
Subject:

Review of the native vegetation Act.

Native.vegetation@environment.nsw.gov.au

John Riggall

[redacted]

[redacted]

NSW 2463

This all encompassing legislation has failed to reach a fair balance between protecting the environment and community benefit, indeed community benefit is not a consideration with the Catchment Management Authority (CMA).

In [redacted] on a hundred and thirty acre block zoned rural, the [redacted] Council have approved a Development application for a Child Care Centre. And requested a rezoning application for 25 one acre blocks. The land has been quarried for sand and gravel over twenty years ago with very little activity since then.

The proposal put to Council was to do forty eight one acre housing site development in conjunction with two adjoining land owners (zoned rural residential) and Including a child care centre.

The benefit to the community is as follows.

(1) In –fill of an existing settlement area.

(2) Orderly settlement of development land, without either increase or decrease to possible allotment yield.

(3) Location of rural residential allotments on flood-free land, each with flood free access to the "major town" of MacLean.

(4) Efficient use of serviceable degraded and unproductive land.

(5) Rehabilitation of degraded and heavily-cratered land.

(6) Protection of the locality's biodiversity values.

(7) Conservation and enhancement of a locally significant biodiversity corridor as a single land parcel.

(8) Local employment in a childcare centre.

I do not want to bore you for the merit of this development other than to say that the [redacted] Councillors voted unanimously for the development.

Under the separate development application for a child care centre by law the CMA, must inspect and approve the application.

A Mr [redacted] compliance officer from [redacted] came onsite and advised the owner of how the department system worked. During his site visit he advised us that he had been employed in this capacity since 1993 and had not had one approval in that time and further stated that only five approvals had come out of his office since 1993.

I rang the manager of CMA [redacted] who advised that he had 3.2 fulltime compliance officers. **To put it simply do the sums 3.2 X 9yrs X ?$ =5 projects approved**. This is not intended as a slur on the staff rather a computer system run by faceless men that has swung the system too far to the left without any consideration for the community benefit.

In this case the worst part of this so called protection of the environment is 100% wrong , land owners are entitled to legally clear their land for a home plus a fire break, a machinery shed plus a fire break, stock yards, access tracks and 6metre wide fencing to manage his stock. Call it a childcare centre, or a development and you are faced with a new set of rules and regulations with at best blurred guide lines hidden from the applicant inside a department computer

In conclusion the likely outcome if amendment to the act does not cater for community benefit, in this case just an opportunity of a small loss of jobs, a small loss to correct a degraded quarrying site;

rather than a hobby farm including a farm house, sheds,fire trails and stockyards and fencing to paddocks. with the environment coming off second best.

Where is the natural justice, where is an independent umpire like the land And environment court who can adjudicate in these matters.

Yours respectfully

John Riggall.

[redacted]

Attached is a layout of the proposal, (attachment removed for privacy reasons)