

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 19 December 2022 11:04 PM
To: LLS Policy Mailbox
Subject: submission for native veg statutory review

*For the last 25 year we have been fighting against property right erosion. We have written many, many submissions explaining why the vegetation regulations are unworkable and need to have more landowner input, but we are always ignored, "for the supposed greater good." Just because land is over 18 degrees, does not mean it should be categorized as vulnerable protected land, there should be other factors involved. Not all steep land is vulnerable to erosion.

*Strategic planning means the government has a desired outcome and needs private landowners to implement them.

*Often public consultation can be skewed to achieve a predetermined outcome. Sometimes independent expert advisory panels are chosen for their predisposition. LLS are a good example of this, they are a government agency who are loyal to the government in power, they are not there for us, nor do they have unbiased judgement or a working knowledge to make recommendations on all private land managements.

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

*We don't agree with set asides, why should we have to lock up part of our property to have access to something we already own.

*The legislation is extremely difficult to understand. It is written in technical jargon and so much of it. Trying to sift through and find what is and isn't allowable is really hard. The maps are too hard to load and negotiate and we don't have enough internet for a reliable connection.

*A lot of city people are buying properties in the country and are neglecting them. There is no weed management, or even bushfire prevention, they allow fuel loads to build up which contribute to hotter wildfires. There should be strong regulations on property management, not a lock it up and leave it approach like National Parks do.

*The governments idea of protecting koala feed trees is unrealistic, keeping trees such as camphor laurels which is a weed and will invade native bush land, just because someone saw a koala up one once does not make sense. Camphor's have taken over hundreds of acres on the coast and are becoming more prevalent inland, and by not allowing us to keep the undergrowth down so that koalas and other native animals have a safe and easy pathway between timber stands is endangering them further.

*The native veg act protects the riparian zone from clearing, which again causes problems, leaving weed invasions and tree growth on the creek banks. In floods the weeds wash down the river and spread as well as causing water diversion. The trees cause water diversion as well as erosion, when the trees fall down it takes out chunks of the bank which causes massive erosion, it also causes damage when they float down the river. Take note of the last flood, in our area they took out bridges and big chunks of road. The landslides were often under tree lines on the side of hills, taking out roads and houses.

*The terms of reference for submissions and the surveys that are available on 'have your say' are limiting, they are leading questions which doesn't allow for any opinion other than the one that the government is looking for, which is such a shame,

*The best productive consultation you could do is with the landowners who are affected by the land category changes. Together we could make an acceptable, workable, equitable, practical and environmentally sustainable

policy. Public consultation on private land issues is fraught with problems, as the public have no financial interest, no working knowledge of our land or what we want to achieve. The public is easily swayed by vocal groups who have the ear of the media and are very good at instilling fear.

Hopefully this review will take our submission into account.

Regards

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

please remove our names and number from this submission.