

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 19 December 2022 8:57 PM
To: LLS Policy Mailbox
Subject: submission on Native vegetation provisions review

I am 89 years old and have been fighting the erosion of our property rights for well over 2 decades. I looked up what freehold land meant, 'freehold land allows the land owner to have unrestricted ownership of the land and right to deal with the land, subject to complying with applicable laws in the state'. This is where our problems began...each government that has been elected, changes the rules on our land, designing new red tape to placify a vocal minority and making it harder and harder to make a living off the land. Firstly it was bringing in unworkable Native veg plans that were mostly scrapped, then splitting the water rights from the land rights, now stripping the vegetation from land rights, and demoting us from landowners to landholders.

My property was pretty clean when I bought it, so I let the regrowth grow, planning to selectively log it at a later date, but now I am not allowed that option. I don't agree with set asides, why should I have to lock up part of my property to have access to something I already own. And I disagree totally with locking up part of my place so someone else can do some clearing.

The words strategic planning just means the government plans something and we have to implement it and it will not be in our best interest. It will either cost us money or we will lose money. It will always disadvantage us.

LLS should not be advisors as well as regulators of land management.

A lot of city people are buying properties in the country and are neglecting them. They do no weed management, nor bush fire prevention, they allow fuel loads to build up and are shocked when we have uncontrolled fires. Which is what the government is encouraging. The government, view protecting koala feed trees to be an answer to koala population decline, this comes with its own set of issues, why should we be made to keep trees such as camphor laurels, which is a weed and invades native bush, just because someone saw a koala up one once. And not allowing us to keep the undergrowth down so that koalas have a safe and easy pathway between stands.

The native veg act protects the riparian zone from clearing, which again causes problems, weed invasions and tree growth on the creek bank. In floods the weeds wash down the river and spread as well and causing water diversion. The trees cause water diversion as well as erosion, when the trees fall over it takes out chunks of the bank which causes massive erosion, as seen in the last flood, as well as causing damage as they float down and get stuck under bridges and narrow river areas. Which again is what the government appears to want.

I find the legislation extremely difficult to understand as there is no logic behind it. It is wrong that the maps and most information is via the internet, as many of us have no internet service and rely on others for information. The maps are hard to access and difficult to negotiate. Is this deliberate?

Public consultation is not always fair. As we have seen too often, the consultation is skewed to achieve a predetermined outcome. The independent expert advisory panels usually have a predetermined agenda as well. LLS are a good example of this, they are a government agency who are biased to the government, they are not there for us, nor do they have unbiased judgement or a working knowledge to make recommendations on all private land managements.

The encroachment on our property rights has been a gradual process, each law and act that comes in, takes just a little bit more of our rights and erodes our ownership, we have almost lost everything now with the category 2 vulnerable regulated land, which drastically limits the range of allowable activities.

Calling for public submissions to decide what we can and can't do on our freehold land is wrong. You are asking for people who have no vested interest, no financial risk, no knowledge of our land and they are often too emotive and enthused on getting their desired outcome at all cost.

The best and most productive consultation you could do is with the landowners, together we could make an acceptable, workable, equitable and environmentally sustainable policy, practical people making practical policies.

I hope commonsense prevails.

Regards

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

Please remove name and number before publication.