

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 24 August 2012 2:56 PM  
**To:** EHPP Landscapes & Ecosystems Section Mailbox  
**Subject:** Comment on Native Vegetation Regulation Review

Dear Sir/Madam

I have the following comments on the proposed changes to the Native Vegetation Regulation:

Habitat for Australia's native animals has been severely cleared, eroded, degraded and infested with feral animals. Even the koala is now a threatened species, largely as a result of loss of habitat, starvation (related to loss of habitat) and attack from dogs and others (where residential areas have been built adjoining koala habitat) .

The Australian Wildlife Conservancy, a very highly regarded private conservation foundation that conducts research and breeding programmes on native animals estimates that the number of native animals killed each day by feral animals is now in the millions. AWC bases the estimates on studies of the population density of feral animals, especially cats and foxes, and the number and types of prey remains in the stomachs of the feral animal when trapped and examined. Whilst feral animals are a problem in both cleared and uncleared areas, once vegetation is cleared there is thereafter no hope for the survival of fragile native animal populations on the cleared land.

Whilst I support efforts to reduce unnecessary red tape in any area of regulation, I am concerned that making some types of clearing easier with no or very limited review, will result in an overall reduction in native vegetation and hence in native animal habitat. For example, clearing small areas without proper review of what the small areas provide, can result in the removal of vital protection stands of trees, fodder, or transport corridors for native animals. Less oversight of what is being cleared will increase the likelihood that some areas will be cleared inappropriately, recklessly or illegally. The requirement to obtain a permit may be enough to put some irresponsible landowners off reckless or irresponsible clearing - the mere presence of a regulatory authority that they must deal with acts as a deterrent.

In addition, retaining areas of trees and vegetation in otherwise cultivated areas is now regarded as an important means of controlling erosion, flooding and soil degradation. Allowing farmers to cut these down without a PVP is regressive. They should be educated and encouraged to understand the value of retaining stands of vegetation and the resultant benefits to their farms.

Of course farmers, like everyone else, don't like regulation and red tape. However in this context where fragile important native flora and fauna communities are becoming extinct, it is the responsibility of government to take the steps, whether popular or not with people who have vested interests, to ensure greater protections are put in place rather than to facilitate a winding back of the existing protections because of 'red tape'. With scientific evidence backing calls for greater protection, government should be looking to tighten the approval process and constrain clearing even of small areas which can provide such vital survival corridors for wildlife.

For these reasons, I urge you to tighten the Regulation so that native vegetation clearing is only permitted in very special circumstances, or, at the least, to discontinue the proposed changes to the existing Regulation that make clearing easier.

Yours faithfully

Carolyn Learoyd

Phone:

Email:

---

The information contained in this e-mail message and any accompanying files is or may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, reliance, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail or any attached files is unauthorised. This e-mail is subject to copyright. No part of it should be reproduced, adapted or communicated without the written consent of the copyright owner. If you have received this e-mail in error please advise the sender immediately by return e-mail or telephone and delete all copies. [REDACTED] does not guarantee the accuracy or completeness of any information contained in this e-mail or attached files. Internet communications are not secure, therefore [REDACTED] does not accept legal responsibility for the contents of this message or attached files.

---