

SUBMISSION

I provide my submission on rejection of the changes proposed in the Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 (“the Bill”).

This constant change in legislation severely impacts on the ability of farm managers to plan and implement effective long-term property and business management decisions. Ecological processes work in much longer timeframes and can be severely compromised when mismatching regulations are enforced. Farmers have long called for certainty with the vegetation management regulatory framework. I am totally opposed to continued uncertainty and attacks on the viability of myself, the long-term sustainability of my business as well as attacks on fellow farmers.

The impacts of the proposed changes to the Vegetation Management Act include;

- The purpose for High Value Agriculture and Irrigated High Value Agriculture will be removed.
- Extends Category B areas (remnant vegetation) and Category C (regrowth vegetation) to freehold land, and indigenous freehold land. Additional 862 000ha High Value Regrowth and water course buffers to all reef catchment, Burnett Mary, Fitzroy, Eastern Cape York.
- Thinning will require Development Application to be lodged for approval.
- The purpose for High Value Agriculture and Irrigated High Value Agriculture will be removed.

Describe the impacts the changes will make to stall agriculture, discourage investment, and increase costs and time to manage vegetation.

It is unfortunate again that we as Queenslanders and a Rural Industry Body are opposing the State Governments Vegetation Management Act. This further erodes our Confidence in all areas – not only day to day Land Management decisions for Queenslanders but for future Food Production, Enterprises, Personal, Financial, Family, Livestock, Employment, and Community. The compounding result of the “People Effect” not being realistic about Timeframes of Biological Progress is far more detrimental as it is trying to “stop our Landscape at a point of time”. Our Country has only been occupied for a small 200 years, but the evidence of continual evolution is convincing.

- **With these continuous changes to the Vegetation Management Act, the area of reliance between Queensland residents is becoming untenable. There are very few Offices with Staff in all areas, therefore limiting the collaboration between all identities. Having to wait for visiting Staff, is not sustainable and erodes abilities to make decisions at the appropriate times.**
- **Then to work over Maps, which are meant to be the common tool, that show signs of imprecise information is very frustrating and further erodes decision making confidence. It would be beneficial if Maps were precise on Lots & Plan Numbers Codes, and / or Landscape Types. To have a Code from your neighbour’s property impacting on your own property because the Trees of interest are in the neighbouring property does not reflect the Biological process on your own property.**
- **“The Bill” does not seem to recap Scientific process which represents the Biological process, and take into account the Local knowledge that is documented in the different Landscapes. There seems to be focus on Punishing for an outcome, not striving for**

Cooperation in a process for a sustainable future for all.

- “The Bill” uses ‘ SLATS’ figures on “how much is cleared” as an evidence, not Where, What types, What for, Which industry, or “How much is growing” under each description, to result in a balanced Management Act for all Queensland Residents and Enterprises.

Signed:	<i>U J S Coxon</i>
Address:	
Date:	22 March 2018