

From: [Sunshine](#)
To: [Agriculture Resources and Environment Committee](#)
Subject: Land Protection Legislation
Date: Thursday, 6 September 2012 1:52:34 PM

We wish to comment on the proposed Land Protection Legislation (Flying-Fox Control) Amendment Bill 2012

We are of the opinion that

Section **96B** (1)(b) *A regulation or conservation plan under the Nature Conservation Act 1992* should not be over-ruled by this amendment. Such plans were instigated for species protection.

96C Control of Flying-foxes This section relies on the definition of *reasonable*. How is this clause to be interpreted, in other words what would constitute a *reasonable* belief.

(2) (a) and (c) A landowner should not have the automatic right to destroy a flying-fox, or a flying-fox roost.

(4) The Minister should not have the automatic right to direct a local government to take action under subsection (2) The local government would have valid reasons for not taking action.

Part 3 Amendment of Nature Conservation Act 1992

Clause 6 Omission of Section s88 (Restrictions relating to flying-foxes and flying fox roosts) This section must be retained for the protection of the flying fox, a valuable pollinator of many plant species.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Jill Chamberlain
President
Wildlife Preservation Society of Queensland - Sunshine Coast & Hinterland Inc
PO Box 275 Caloundra Qld 4551
Phone/Fax 0754 442 707
[email:Sunshine@wildlife.org.au](mailto:Sunshine@wildlife.org.au)