

I have found as a landowner, the biggest impact of native vegetation laws is it removes my freedom to make commercial decisions regarding my agricultural business activities.

Freehold land in the New England area is valuable if it has been developed to create a profitable farming enterprise. If as a young farmer with aspirations of owning a viable area of such land, I would either need approximately \$5.2 million or buy cheaper undeveloped freehold land which through hard work would make it more valuable as an asset to me and more productive as a farm. The native vegetation laws as they stand make this impossible, as I am only allowed to maintain undeveloped or re-grown vegetation in its current state. Therefore younger people wishing to start a career as farmers, which are few in number cannot get a start. The threat of massive fines for breaking native vegetation laws is a deterrent to purchasing undeveloped freehold land, also stifling economic growth in the agriculture sector and regional areas of NSW.

Regarding compensation: I don't think this is appropriate because the stolen rights to use the freehold property should be returned forthwith. If this is not possible then rent for the use of the land taken by government vegetation is payable. See if you can park your car in Sydney and not have to pay for the area your car takes up!

Government should pay full market value for any loss incurred by the imposition of the native vegetation regulations through the democratic process of consultation and review.

The native vegetation laws in NSW are far reaching and run roughshod over the civil liberties of its citizens. The Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water staff has more power than our police force has, to enter private property and make determinations as to the guilt of a landowner without any recourse.

If the reason for retaining native vegetation is to mitigate carbon emissions, why does it matter what type of vegetation is involved so long as there is vegetation? Has anyone studied how much carbon is emitted and absorbed from a hectare of bush land, farmland or city blocks? I have also noted in the NSW woody vegetation change 2006-2007 report that the largest change to vegetation by some 202,437 ha was due to fire scars, maybe this is the largest threat to carbon storage, not landowners changing the type of vegetation on their freehold property.

A Royal Commission into the introduction of The Native Vegetation Laws in New South Wales should be instigated to find out how the property rights of its citizens have been taken without full and fair compensation or consultation with affected parties, to enable the entire population of the nation to meet carbon emission targets signed up to by various levels of government.

A carbon pollution reduction scheme would only add another layer of bureaucracy to an already over governed system imposed on landowners. Emitters of carbon should pay a tax. The landowners should not have to pay enormous fines for breaking draconian vegetation laws, have property rights taken and receive no compensation.