

**From:** [Dianne Vavryn](#)  
**To:** [Agriculture Resources and Environment Committee](#); [Callide Electorate Office](#)  
**Subject:** Submissions to the Minerals and Energy Bill 2014  
**Date:** Tuesday, 8 July 2014 6:31:32 AM

---

I object to clauses 234 and 242. It is inappropriate to restrict matters that the Land Court can consider and give these powers, such as to consider the 'public interest', to the Minister. Decreasing judicial oversight, increasing ministerial powers and shutting out community participation has worrying implications for corruption.

I object to Clause 245. Limiting community notification and formal objection rights to the Land Court to "site specific" environmental authorities will, in conjunction with the above clauses, remove all existing public rights to lodge formal objections to the Land Court in up to 90% of mining projects in Queensland.

I object to Clauses 419 and 420. These clauses remove existing community notification rights and rights to object to mining lease applications. Changing land tenure to allow for mining rather than another land use could impact on a broad section of the public. Therefore the narrow definition of an 'affected person' proposed, which would exclude neighbours or community groups or people in the water catchment, is absurd. Land use decision making processes for other industries provide for community submission and appeal rights, so there is no good reason why mining tenure should be exempt from this basic standard.

I object to Clause 429. Removal of restricted land status when the miner is granted exclusive surface rights to access land removes one of the few rights of vulnerable landholders. No-one should have the land surrounding their house destroyed by an open-cut mine yet this would be possible under this clause.

Dianne Vavryn

  
QLD 4702