

**ONLINE SUBMISSION DETAILS**

<b>Date Received</b>	24/02/2017
<b>Organisation</b>	Individual
<b>Postcode</b>	
<b>How do you think we should improve the FFG Act?</b>	<p>This suggestion does not directly influence the FFG Act, but does influence Victorian Biodiversity.</p> <p>It would be of great benefit to Victorian bush if a planning permit was not needed to remove NATIVE species, but was needed to remove INDIGENOUS species. The simple change of words would greatly impact the need for applying for a permit when it comes to the control on invasive native species in Victoria.</p> <p>Two examples are Sweet Pittosporum, and Coastal Tea Tree.</p> <p>Sweet Pittosporum, <i>Pittosporum undulatum</i>, is a serious invasive species on the Mornington Peninsula. Given it's indigenous region is East Gippsland, the species is far from its own Territory. Being a species common across the state, and readily available in most native nurseries and hardware stores means it is commonly planted for barriers and shrubs in gardens. In bush-land though, the species actively reduces indigenous biodiversity, and thus habitat and food for specialized fauna. The tree can quickly establish a high population and smother the under-story, out competing other species for light and space. Having seen the environmental differences first hand of the species before and after control the need for a planning permit prior to its removal is a major setback.</p> <p>Coastal Tea Tree, <i>Leptospermum laevigatum</i>, is another species that is invasive outside of its natural range. Naturally from the peninsula, it is another plant that has been sold across the state. Given its successful seed rate, and dispersal through fine seeds that can be blown by the wind, these factors meant that this species easily took hold of the Otways. Tracking down the species through the indigenous bush is a challenge, and if not consistently managed, is another species that has potential to smother large areas.</p> <p>There are many examples where areas in Victoria are under threat from native species from other areas of Australia.</p> <p>It was noticed section 4.4 of the Consultation Paper said:</p> <p>"The Act, the native vegetation clearing regulations and the Wildlife Act play particularly important roles in regulating the impacts of activities on biodiversity (see Figure 2).</p> <p>Changes to these existing regulatory roles is outside the scope of this review, which focuses on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the Act. However, the review may inform future reforms to Victoria's biodiversity management legislative framework."</p> <p>And again later at page 56:</p> <p>"It is not proposed to remove the existing requirement for a permit to take threatened species on public</p>

---

land. This means approval would still be required under both the Act and native vegetation clearing regulations in some circumstances."

And while this is being taken into consideration that this matter does not directly influence the Act, I certainly hope it may "inform future reforms to Victoria's biodiversity management legislative framework."

Thank you for this opportunity,



---