

POST/EMAIL SUBMISSION DETAILS

Date Received	25/01/2017	
Name	██████████	
Organisation	Cardinia Shire Council	
Email	████████████████████	
Postcode	3809	
Privacy Options	Yes	
Privacy Statement Correct?	Yes	
Privacy Collection Notice Read?	I am making this submission on behalf of an organisation, and understand that it may be published and will include the name of the organisation unless otherwise requested	
Submission Type	Local Government	
Previous engagement in review?	Info session 2015	Yes
	Workshop 2015/16	
	Targetted consultation	Yes
	SRG	
	Written submission to CP?	Yes
	Other? Describe	
Will changes improve function of regs?		
Reasons	Please see our response	
Implementation issue with proposed changes?	Yes	
Reasons	Please see our response	
Guidelines – guidance or clarification needed?	Yes	
Details	Please see our response	
Terms to include in guidelines glossary?	Yes	
Details	Landscape significance	
Subscribe to e-newsletter?	Yes. Please send information updates to my email address	
Other comments	N/a	
Written submission provided?	Yes	

Our ref: INT17224

20 January 2017

Manager of Native Vegetation Review
Regulatory Strategy and Design
Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning
PO Box 500
East Melbourne Vic 8002

Dear Manager of Native Vegetation Review,

Re: Review of the native vegetation clearing regulations

Council welcomes the review of the Native Vegetation Clearing Regulations and is supportive of the recommendations in particular valuing large old trees, endangered vegetation types and the reintroduction of the avoidance and minimisation principals for some applications.

There are four key issues that Council considers require re-examination:

1. Council receives a large number of applications to remove between 1-5 small scattered trees. Officers requests the reintroduction of a separate offset option for scattered trees. Officers previously had much success with the revegetation table provided in the Port Phillip and Westernport Native Vegetation Plan. This table lead to applicants being easily able to calculate their own first party offset and offset onsite. Council officers support onsite offsets are they retain local biodiversity and are more cost effective for applicants.

Our residents are currently struggling to fill in the current first party offset kit. The first party offset kit needs be shortened and simplified so an average resident can calculate offsets and fill it in themselves, or DELWP needs to provide support to residents so they can fill it in.

If a simplified replanting ratio is not possible state-wide then DELWP should consider allowing individual Council's to develop their own alternative offset policies that support local biodiversity for areas covered by local Environment Significance, Vegetation Protection or Significant Landscape Overlays.

2. The current mapping of threatened species distribution and habitat is not useful or accurate at a site scale. It is unclear from the proposed changes how this will be rectified. Officers routinely visit sites deemed Low Risk with threatened species present e.g. the Southern Brown Bandicoot or orchids such as the Cobra Greenhood. Based on the Low Risk pathway 0.5 hectares of native vegetation can be removed without any concerns, this is enough to entirely remove a population of Cobra Greenhoods or break a critical movement corridor for the Southern Brown Bandicoots.

The current and proposed native vegetation regulations do not align or work with the *Commonwealth Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*, which leads to confusion for applications and inefficient processes. If this mismatch of requirements cannot be rectified within Clause 52.17 then the new and reviewed Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act will be a suitable place.

3. The proposed amendment allowing the consideration of the landscape values of the native vegetation is not clear. Council officers do not understand how landscape values will be identified. Council has multiple Environment Significance, Vegetation Protection or Significant Landscape Overlays. Officers request this level of detail is sufficient. Council does not have the resource to map individual sites or trees of landscape significance.

4. Council officers support the reintroduction of the avoidance and minimisation principals for Intermediate and Detailed pathways. However the avoidance and minimisation principals are basic universal requirement that should apply to all applications including basic applications. This will save applicants money in offsets and will best protect biodiversity for example a 0.5 hectare area of forest could easily be 100+ trees and avoidance and minimisation could save dozens of these trees.

Please feel free to contact [REDACTED] – Biodiversity Officer on [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] if you wish to discuss this response further.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

General Manager Assets and Services