

| POST/EMAIL SUBMISSION DETAILS               |   |
|---|---|
| Date Received                               | 02/03/2017  |
| Name  | [REDACTED]  |
| Organisation                                |   |
| Email                                       | [REDACTED]  |
| Postcode                                    | 3020  |
| Privacy Options                             | I am making this submission as an individual. I request my submission be published anonymously including only my postcode   |
| Privacy Statement Correct?                  | Yes   |
| Privacy Collection Notice Read?             | Yes   |
| Submission Type                             | Individual  |
| Previous engagement in review?              | Info session 2015   |
|   | Workshop 2015/16  |
|   | Targetted consultation  |
|   | SRG   |
|   | Written submission to CP?   |
|   | Other? Describe   |
| Will changes improve function of regs?      |   |
| Reasons                                     | No - see submission   |
| Implementation issue with proposed changes? | Yes   |
| Reasons                                     | <p>What's missing and what needs improvement</p> <p>The draft policy fails to acknowledge that government instrumentalities are among of the largest destroyers of native vegetation in Victoria. The policy continues to provide exemptions from the rules to these organisations.</p> <p>The review's commitment to "work with relevant stakeholders to develop cost effective approaches to record and report significant new permanent clearing..." is nothing more than lip service and the weak measure stating that "...environmental impacts resulting from exemptions on public land are minimised and counterbalanced, and the accountabilities for this reporting" does not offer any measure of sensible protection</p> <p>It continues to be the case that the government is offering no clear commitments around regulatory enforcement.</p> <p>Offsets remain at the core of the Government's native vegetation clearing approach. Off-sets are little more than a fig leaf to conceal destruction. They provide no guaranteed benefit to biodiversity and frequently little more than more than a replacement of what the commercial user (or government) want with what they do not.</p> <p>What's improved, needs to be kept and strengthened</p> <p>Endangered Habitats: More attention needs to be given to the assessment process for observed threatened species at particular sites.</p> <p>While the Avoid-Minimise-Offset hierarchy has some greater</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>emphasis on clarity of the meaning and application of the terms when being assessed. Nonetheless, a 'Basic' clearance pathway application (which currently make up over 90% of applications) still does not require any supporting evidence around avoidance and minimisation. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>Onsite assessments involving local knowledge and expert assessors will only be required for approximately 10% of applications. This is clearly insufficient.</p> <p>Offsets continue to under-value the importance of Large Old Trees, particularly in heavily cleared landscapes.</p> |
| <b>Guidelines – guidance or clarification needed?</b> | Yes   |
| <b>Details</b>  | See submission  |
| <b>Terms to include in guidelines glossary?</b>       |   |
| <b>Details</b>  |   |
| <b>Subscribe to e-newsletter?</b>                     | Yes. Please send information updates to my email address  |
| <b>Other comments</b>                                 | Will someone please bring VicRoads under control.   |
| <b>Written submission provided?</b>                   | No  |