

From: Ian Heywood [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 24 August 2012 9:41 PM
To: EHPP Landscapes & Ecosystems Section Mailbox
Subject: Comments re Proposed Changes

My submission regarding the regulations relevant to the Native Vegetation Act is principally concerned with the question of who should pay for the implementation of these regulations.

There was a time when the Government required those who drew blocks of land to clear them. That having been done, society now requires clearing to stop and native vegetation be allowed to regenerate. I accept that society through those elected to Parliament has a mandate to make decisions about land use. What is not reasonable is when society has the say and the landowner pays the cost.

The central issue for me is the way we deal with Invasive Native Species (INS). An INS such as White Cypress Pine, if only partially cleared, will rapidly reinvade an area. It is much the same as leaving several breeding age feral pigs behind when trying to deal with the problems they create. If some remain, they rapidly reinvade. By leaving 20 stems of Cypress per hectare it will rapidly reinvade.

Land which has been purchased relatively free of Cypress has a production value for agriculture and a capital value based on its production value. If Cypress or any other INS is allowed to invade that land because of the regulations preventing its eradication from the area then two things happen:

1. The INS will compete with other native species for sunlight and water. This creates bare ground, water runoff and erosion and so reduced productive capacity for either grazing or cropping.
2. The land which is then less productive has a decreased capital value.

The landholder is expected to comply with the regulations which reduce his/her income and the capital value of the land. When the community at large expects land use to follow their prescriptions then the community, not the land owner, should accept responsibility for all associated costs. Just as an urban resident is entitled to just compensation when their land is resumed, so too should a rural resident/farmer be entitled to just compensation when their land is effectually partially resumed due to an enforced reduction in productivity.

I have no desire to clear my country of all pine trees, but I don't have the capacity to have to continually thin the INS, It is too time consuming and expensive. What is important from my perspective is for INS which require some protection to be limited to appropriate but small areas so the landholder can manage them with minimal cost and loss of production.

Yours faithfully,

Ian Heywood

[REDACTED] Manilla, 2346.