

From: [Natalie Hoskins](#)
To: [Health and Community Services Committee](#)
Subject: Submission Amendments to the NCA
Date: Friday, 13 September 2013 10:43:50 AM

Health and Community Services Committee

Submission on the Nature Conservation and Other legislation Amendment Bill (No.2) 2013

To the Committee

I am strongly opposed to the Amendment of the Nature *Conservation Act 1992* (NCQ) which, amongst other things, seeks to:

- broaden the object of the NCA to achieve recreational and commercial outcomes in the management of protected areas; and
- provide access to and use of protected areas.

Protected areas are protected for a reason – **to conserve nature** – they are not protected for commercial outcomes and access. Queensland has so much land that has been the subject of historic clearing and degradation for the purpose of ‘commercial outcomes’ (ie agriculture) and which now sit idle and wasted growing weeds. Why can’t this land be designated for ‘commercial outcomes’ and leave the protected areas only to do what they do best – **conserve nature!**

I am a frequent visitor to National Parks and have never felt that I can’t enjoy these parks because they have access restrictions or lack of commercial facilities. We appreciate these protected areas for what they are and what they provide – **the conservation of nature.**

Further the Bill intends to amend tenure classes to combine national park, national park (scientific) and national park (recovery) into one tenure. The objectives and management requirements of the existing tenures are unique and provide for specific conservation outcomes. I feel the amalgamation of these tenures, despite the proposed revision of management principles, will result in the loss of conservation outcomes, particularly for threatened species and communities that require specific management.

Natalie Hoskins
Tallebudgera QLD 4228