

11.1.9.

Sub# 40.



**From:** Selene Conn [Redacted]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 18 December 2012 4:47 PM  
**To:** Health and Community Services Committee  
**Subject:** Amendments to Nature Conservation Act 1992

**RECEIVED**  
19 DEC 2012  
HEALTH AND COMMUNITY  
SERVICES COMMITTEE

Hi there,

I would like to load my opposition to the amendments proposed on the Nature Conservation Act 1992 in regards to the leasing of National Parks land for 'eco tourism facilities'.

As an avid national park visitor and a vegetation management specialist, I believe that this proposition has not been adequately investigated, researched and discussed with appropriate stakeholders and government agencies, and as such is inherently flawed.

Construction of any description creates land disturbance, which creates prime opportunities for weeds to colonise, invade and spread. This is not supposition but regularly repeated fact and almost unavoidable. I pose the question, who would be responsible for the increased level of weed control and vegetation management if a development was to go ahead? Would the government agree to front the costs of this, or would this be passed on to the consumer who would be utilising the facilities?

If the later is the case, I believe the costs of visiting such a facility (with costs already increased due to remoteness and access issues) would likely become to high for regular Australians, and many 'eco-tourists' to pay. Would the government then subsidise these facilities so that the operators could lower the cost tot he consumer?

I would also hate to see that access would become an issue with the concept of parcels of national park, essential becoming private land. Would these areas still be accessible to the public who are not intending to use the facilities? If not, then I believe that you would not be able to call this land parcel 'national park' as this would then be contradictory to the purpose.

I also think that for any kind of public and stakeholder buy in, the term 'eco-tourism facility' should be more clearly defined and clear limits to the extent (size, type, nature, footprint, power usage and 'green-ness') of development allowable. It would not be agreeable for a development to encompass, say half of a national park!

I hope that these concerns are addressed by future revisions, before this bill is passed, as I believe that these amendments in their current form will have the opposite effect to those desired.

Kind regards  
Selene Conn