

POST/EMAIL SUBMISSION DETAILS	
Date Received	03/03/2017
Name	[REDACTED]
Organisation	
Email	[REDACTED]
Postcode	3401
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	Farming
Previous engagement in review?	Info session 2015
	Workshop 2015/16
	Targetted consultation
	SRG
	Written submission to CP?
Other? Describe	Heard about it and then sought information
Will changes improve function of regs?	
Reasons	The guidelines and proposed changes are written in a way that is difficult to understand and is convoluted. This leads me to believe interpretation could vary with individuals
Implementation issue with proposed changes?	Yes
Reasons	It refers to "sensitive" vegetation. What is that? What may be a fairly rare tree in one place could be in abundance in others. Who decides? The proposed changes appear to ignore agriculture and the advances made by farmers to improve their soil health, environment etc. They seem to be slanted towards people who think biodiversity is nice but want someone else to provide it and farmers are an easy target.
Guidelines – guidance or clarification needed?	Yes
Details	The whole concept of offsets. Ridiculous to have to replace one tree with hundreds. Also the positioning of offsets does not take into consideration the major feral and native pest animal problems that already exist.
Terms to include in guidelines glossary?	Yes
Details	Biodiversity Utility...does this also mean private developments such as windfarms and pipelines?
Subscribe to e-newsletter?	Yes. Please send information updates to my email address
Other comments	It really disturbs me when I see "stakeholder groups". Who are these? Carefully selected people with an agenda maybe? This sort of exercise doesn't engage the average farmer. To read

	<p>the review is convoluted and does not use language that is easily understood. Why not use simple dot points ie...fence clearing will still be allowed, permission will be needed to remove more than x number of indigenous trees etc. That does happen at the end but even then the language is convoluted.</p> <p>The review seems to be more concerned with providing trees for habitat that actually doing any good for the environment. No farmer wants to cause degradation to his land because it is his income. The proposed changes appear to ignore agriculture and the advances made by farmers to improve their soil health, environment etc. Maybe have a look at some councils that have allowed clearing for housing development, hobby farms etc. This is mentioned in 2.1.2 but it seems regulations targetting this type of development are being imposed across all sectors even though they are totally different.</p>
<b>Written submission provided?</b>	No