

POST/EMAIL SUBMISSION DETAILS		
Date Received	25/01/2017	
Name	Natural Resource Link Pty Ltd	
Organisation		
Email	██████████	
Postcode	3352	
Privacy Options	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	
Privacy Statement Correct?	Yes	
Privacy Collection Notice Read?	Yes	
Submission Type	Consultancy	
Previous engagement in review?	Info session 2015	
	Workshop 2015/16	Yes
	Targetted consultation	Yes
	SRG	Yes
	Written submission to CP?	
	Other? Describe	
Will changes improve function of regs?		
Reasons	The cost of the changes needs to be sufficient to warrant the expense involved in the process. It seemed from a recent training day in Melbourne with DELWP was that the changes would involve a 1% impact. It seemed that the political agenda was a priority rather than biodiversity. The spending of the public purse must produce sufficient quantifiable results/objectives to validate the expenses involved. In regard to a 1% impact I can't see how that will increase biodiversity sufficiently enough to warrant the exercise.	
Implementation issue with proposed changes?	Yes	
Reasons	The definition of a large tree in the regulations is different from that access in a habitat hectare assessment. Consistency across these areas is required to ensure that the component is equally rated.	
Guidelines – guidance or clarification needed?	No	
Details		
Terms to include in guidelines glossary?	Yes	
Details	More clarification as to how to manually calculate native vegetation clearance for defendable space. Currently using information in the BAR is used to manually calculate partial and full removal. Would a large tree be added only to the full clearance area ? ?	
Subscribe to e-newsletter?		
Other comments	It is imperative that we start to pander less to the political agenda and more to the issues at hand. There are many other components that are easily measured that impact on the ecology/biodiversity of a site. These components can include logs, hollows in trees and leaf litter all of which are critical and not assessed in all applications. Habitat hectare assesses logs and litter but not hollows and not dbh of the trees involved. These are both critical indicators of age and quality of habitat (Biodiversity).	

<p>Written submission provided?</p>	<p>Hi please find the following feedback on the proposed native vegetation changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">_ Large trees is great and should have been added ages ago_ Great that you need to provide minimise on low risk pathways. <p>Have an issue with the large trees definition think it should align with the habitat hectare-Large trees where it is 80% of the dbh so there is consistency across the board.</p> <p>Would also like contact details with the department that is dealing with Clause 52.48-5 which is the exemption for native vegetation for the provision of defendable space there are many issues pertaining to this clause.</p>
--	---
