

| POST/EMAIL SUBMISSION DETAILS | | |
|--|--|-----|
| Date Received | 07/03/2017 | |
| Name | [REDACTED] | |
| Organisation | Beacon Ecological | |
| Email | [REDACTED] | |
| Postcode | 3228 | |
| 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 | Yes |
| | Workshop 2015/16 | Yes |
| | Targetted consultation | Yes |
| | SRG | |
| | Written submission to CP? | |
| | Other? Describe | |
| Will changes improve function of regs? | | |
| Reasons | To be honest, there doesn't seem to be huge changes from what I can see. Great to see losses of large trees being accounted for. | |
| Implementation issue with proposed changes? | Yes | |
| Reasons | Under the current system, if scattered trees overlap then the overlap area is counted twice. It would be great if these areas were merged. | |
| Guidelines – guidance or clarification needed? | Yes | |
| Details | <p>Is there a minimum size for scattered trees? In the previous guidelines tree species needed to be over 3 meters. The proposed changes detail large and smaller trees but no minimum size limit for smaller trees. Also the new scattered tree assessment requirements increase the skill level required. Should some qualification be required for all pathways? An arborist level at a minimum for basic pathways?</p> <p>Page 7 of the Summary of the proposed amendments to the Victoria Planning provisions details that avoid and minimisation of impacts to native vegetation is required for all application pathways. Also Table 4 of the proposed Native Vegetation clearing Assessment Guidelines details that all applications must include an avoid and minimization statement. However the document also states that basic applications do not need one. Avoid and minimise should be considered for ALL applications. In some basic pathway application it may be very easy to avoid vegetation loss.</p> | |
| Terms to include in guidelines glossary? | No Unsure | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Details | |
| Subscribe to e-newsletter? | Yes. Please send information updates to my email address |
| Other comments | <p>I feel that the policy should move back to a Net Gain approach. If the government is as serious about protecting and enhancing native vegetation as they make out then we should be trying improve the environment not just aim for no net loss.</p> <p>While stated as being beyond the scope of work s for this review, the exemptions listed under Clause 52.48 need to be reviewed as these allow large amounts of native vegetation to be cleared without requiring a permit.</p> |
| Written submission provided? | No |