

**Robert Hansen**

---

**From:** Friedrich Nath [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, 4 August 2012 6:28 PM  
**To:** Agriculture Resources and Environment Committee  
**Subject:** Submission: Reducing regulatory burden—agriculture and resources industries

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to make a submission to the proposal of “Reducing regulatory burden—agriculture and resources industries”.

I oppose the proposed changes for the following reasons:

The impact created by both agriculture and especially resources has in most cases irreversible effects on the environment: Resource and agriculture developments often involve clearing of native vegetation, affect the course and flow of waterways. This affects the biodiversity of the sites. Thus the most stringent assessment of those development proposals has to be adhered to ensure inappropriate development / impact does not go ahead.

Preparing for regulatory approval makes applicant assess the full impact of their proposals and encourages them to develop the right management strategies of the impact: As applicant of the resource and agriculture have to go through a strict assessment process for their proposals, they need to consider all impacts of their proposals and develop appropriate management strategies BEFORE the projects goes ahead to gain approval. This, I believe leads to better environmental management. Therefore the “regulatory burden” should not be watered down.

Proper environmental assessment and gives all stakeholders and the community a change to have their say: Resource and agricultural developments can have an impact on the environment and the health and lifestyle of the wider community. Therefore if these proposals are approved in a rush, developments with a negative effect on other stakeholders might go ahead without them having the chance to voice their objections.

Government can stop proposals before it is too late: If inappropriate developments are not assessed properly they might go ahead without the total impact being realised before facts are created on the grounds and when it is too late to reverse them.

Multi-tier assessment reduces likelihood of corruption: One stop assessments might reduce the costs, but if the power to approve proposals is with one authority that could lead to this authority being inappropriately approached to rush through the development. Without subsequent tiers checking it, corruption is much more likely to occur and less likely to surface.

High regulatory requirements discourage developments that are not worthwhile: The cost and time required to go gain environmental approval makes applicant think twice on whether to lodge or not. This encourages that only proposals are submitted where the gain justifies the environmental impact.

Queensland’s environment is very precious and unique in Australia and the world. As a keen bushwalker I enjoy and appreciate the wild parts of QLD very much. It helps me cope with the stress of my working life and gives me great pleasure and joy by simply being there. It is what gives me a balanced lifestyle and is the reason why I love QLD. Seeing QLD’s bush eaten up bit by bit is very disturbing to me.

17/08/2012

While I believe regulation should be efficient enough not to encourage illegal facts being created on the ground, it also has to be stringent enough to safeguard QLD from too much environmental destruction and stop developments in places where they should not happen. As the speed of development in QLD is already very high the current level of protection and regulation should be maintained and certainly not reduced.

Regards,

Friedrich Nath

████████████████████

██████████

██████████

17/08/2012