

From: [Lauren Hewitt](#)
To: [State Development Infrastructure and Industry Committee](#)
Subject: Submission: Arthur & Vanessa Bambling
Date: Friday, 3 August 2012 4:07:27 PM

The Research Director

State Development

Infrastructure and Industry Committee

Parliament House

George Street

Brisbane QLD 4000

Friday, July 27, 2012

RE: Inquiry into the future and continued relevance of Government land tenure across Queensland

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Parliamentary Inquiry into 'the Future and Continued Relevance of Government Land Tenure across Queensland.'

As a primary producer, my future business is predicated on secure tenure and regulation.

Below, I have detailed my concerns and issues associated with my tenure and attempted to provide some suggested methods through which these could be addressed.

My Enterprise

- **I hold the following tenure type/s**
 - Grazing Homestead Perpetual Lease
 - Freehold Land
- **My primary production includes**
 - Cattle

My Tenure Issues

- **I believe that the following conditions or actions by Government have affected my ability to**

manage this land effectively

- Limits on diversification
- Increasing regulation and loss of rights on freehold land
- Other

· This issue/s have affected my enterprise because:

Purpose of Lease, Grazing Homestead Perpetual Lease is defined by the Land Act as being the primary purpose is for Grazing. Govt policy through the vegetation management Act has greatly impeded our business in that it doesn't support the leases primary purpose being for grazing. For Example. We recently put in an application for Thinning via Stem Injection of Remnant forest which has undergone woodland thickening stemming from historical management. After much assessment this application was granted but the conditions on which it has to be implemented do not support the GHPL definition. EG. The retention rate required didn't support Grazing management or even Forestry best practice but totally focused on the Green outcome. The VMO who was handling this case had very little understanding of the practical on ground vegetation management and knowledge of land. He actually stated to the applicant that this application is not about "Grass for Grazing", which totally contradicts the purpose of the GHPL

· My suggested solutions to rectify this issue/s are:

The tenure needs to be respected. The sole purpose of this lease is for Grazing and that other Acts that apply to this lease must support the purpose of this lease. The other solution is that the government support lease holders in converting to Free Hold Tenure by means of a reasonable payment over a period of time of the unimproved value. Noting the already mounting financial pressures and declining terms of trade that most landholders are currently experiencing it is recommended that this payment for freehold be over at least 30 years. The purpose of free holding is to allow the sustainable natural resource manager to be able to use his hands on knowledge and historical knowledge of this land to best practice manage it. However consideration should be given to the land holders who received no compensation for the locking up of vegetation. For eg in our case. Our lost income was conservatively \$60 000 annually plus CPI for the rest of our lives, in return for a one off adjustment package of \$100 000. As full compensation for our loss the Lease tenure should be converted to Freehold.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on this significant inquiry.

Best regards,

My Contact Details

· Full Name

Arthur & Vanessa Bambling

· E-mail

[REDACTED]

· Address

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]