

From: [REDACTED]
To: [ym inquiry](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Reinstatement Bill-submission
Date: Monday, 25 April 2016 8:34:28 PM

Submission No. 454

To the Committee of Inquiry.

Please note our grave concerns regarding the Reinstatement Bill (17th March 2016 Tabled by Jacki Trad)

1. It appears to be retrospective in its application. Retrospectivity is not acceptable, as it is punitive toward business owners who are making legitimate vegetation management decisions, based on known legislation.
2. The terminology used is flawed. Eg "remnant" vegetation is identified by height and density measured, rather than actual known and shared history of the site, which indicates the site is regrowth vegetation, which has flourished after initial treatment. The vegetation management meaning of remnant does not match the dictionary meaning of remnant, which is an absurd misuse of meaning and language.
3. I have lived with and husbanded the land since early in my life, at the same property. I am well qualified, if not best qualified of anyone to make judgements about my management of vegetation to enhance the property as a base for rural business. I believe I have every capacity to make judgements which reflect my care for and my commitment to environmental sustainability. The current bill before committee does not do justice to my knowledge or skills. At no point would I ever do anything which is detrimental to my land which I hope to hand on to the next generation, in an improved condition.
4. Rural businesses have a right to manage their assets in a way that allows them to produce clean and green food and fibre. The latest twist in vegetation management is detrimental to our business, our future and our mental health.

Allen and Barbara Clark

[REDACTED]
Roma 4455
[REDACTED]