

From: [REDACTED]
To: [ym inquiry: Agriculture and Environment Committee](#)
Subject: [REDACTED] Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016
Date: Friday, 15 April 2016 4:40:27 PM
Importance: Low

To the Agriculture and Environment Committee.

I write as a landowner of a freehold property affected by the proposed new law.

I submit that the law should allow the managing the regrowth on the productive area of my property, as explained below, and obviously on all land similarly compromised by this legislation. To be clear, I propose that I should be allowed to clear regrowth on previously cleared land without restriction, when I want to. This is a balanced, fair and just request.

My property is 648 acres, of which about 100 acres is remnant forest which has not been cleared ever. I have no objection to retaining the remnant forest on my property, I do not wish to clear it, and it can remain as remnant forest forever as far as I am concerned. My submission does not relate to this remnant forest.

I would like to have the ability to maintain the balance, (548 acres) of grazing in the best condition for raising cattle, which means I must periodically clear the regrowth. The tree regrowth stifles the growth of grass, and grass is necessary for raising cattle. Unfortunately, regrowth control is expensive and cannot always be done when needed, and in the absence of regular injections of capital to control them, the trees grow, then another satellite picture is taken, and because of the increased regrowth tree cover the land is reclassified into another vegetation category.

This reclassification is not fair, as the trees grow on previously cleared land only because we cannot afford the control costs, then we are penalised because it is claimed the land falls into another vegetation category which has restrictions on the regrowth control. The regrowth control is highly dependent on the availability of resources (money or time). There is generally only enough of both to just get by. Therefore some time can elapse between regrowth control campaigns as the money or time may not be available, but I should not be forced to keep these regrowth trees which effectively reduce productive capacity of the land in growing grass, simply because I cannot afford regrowth control all the time.

I understand the need to preserve remnant vegetation but if the land has been cleared for grazing and then the trees have subsequently regrown I should be able to clear the regrowth, regardless of how tall the regrowth is.

It is not fair for the State to impose what amounts to creeping acquisition of trees over land which is not remnant forest.

.

Regards,

Peter G Wilson

[REDACTED]

Boonah Qld 4310

[REDACTED]