

Sarah Ng

From: Anthony Tavella on behalf of DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox
Sent: Friday, 9 October 2020 3:11 PM
To: DPE PS Biodiversity Mailbox
Subject: FW: Webform submission from: Draft Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan
Attachments: cpcp-comments-1.docx

From: noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au <noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Friday, 9 October 2020 2:42 PM
To: DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox <eplanning.exhibitions@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Webform submission from: Draft Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan

Submitted on Fri, 09/10/2020 - 14:40
Submitted by: Anonymous
Submitted values are:
Submission Type: I am making a personal submission
First Name: Peter and Ruth
Last Name: Chaffer
Name Withheld: No
Email: [REDACTED]
Suburb/Town & Postcode: WILTON 2571
Submission file:
[cpcp-comments-1.docx](#)

Submission: We have serious reservations as to the validity of the categorization of our land and vehemently object to the proposed rezoning to E2. Please see attached file for detailed comments.

URL: <https://pp.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/draftplans/exhibition/draft-cumberland-plain-conservation-plan>

**Comments to DPIE regarding the
CUMBERLAND PLAIN CONSERVATION PLAN**

These comments relate specifically to our property at [REDACTED] Wilton and, in terms of ecological values, to the adjoining properties although I make no claim to speak for the owners of those properties who, I understand, intend to make their own submissions.

- We believe there are errors in the categories the [REDACTED] property is mapped to. Specifically our property is labelled as “Shale Sandstone Transition Forest” when earlier, assumedly definitive, geological maps have defined it as Hawkesbury Sandstone.
- A recent (verbal) report by a departmental contractor has revealed no endangered species of flora on the property
- There have been zero sightings or other signs of koalas on the property in the 40 years we have owned and occupied it.
- Page 33 of Draft Sub-Plan B Koalas states "Most of the Southern Sydney koala population prefers feed trees such as grey gum and blueleaved stringybark that are found on nutrient-rich soils derived from Wianamatta shale". This definitely does not describe our property which is not on Wianamatta shale and, as far as we know, is devoid of blueleaved stringybark.
- Therefore there appears to be no basis for categorising the property as “Important Koala Habitat” as referenced in the Spatial Viewer. In any case this appears to be a term outside normal usage in other related documents.
- Recent changes to the definition of "Core Koala Habitat" by state cabinet make this categorisation even less valid.
- The property has not been "ground truthed" to definitively establish any of the categories asserted in the CPCP
- On the basis of the above we see no justification for rezoning our property at all and certainly not to the overly restrictive E2 category.

In addition to the above we believe the following points are relevant.

- It's uncertain if the property has been recognised by the Department as having dwellings and outbuildings and as being inhabited. Some layers of the Spatial Viewer acknowledge the existence of a cleared area and others do not.
- Given that development will not be avoided in 26% of the important koala habitat in the CPCP area (implication of page 20 Draft Sub-Plan B Koalas) and given the, at best, very marginal nature of our land for koala habitat, we believe we are being unfairly targeted, if this is part of the rationale for rezoning.
- Consequently we feel we are being sacrificed on the altar of development.
- The proposed rezoning to E2 places an unconscionable burden on the existing landholders who have been stewards of this land for up to 40 years. We feel we are being punished for substantially retaining the ecological values of our property.

- The proposed E2 zoning will significantly reduce existing property values and the pool of interested buyers whilst imposing the heavy burden of land maintenance.
- Given this, the land should, at the very least, be ground truthed and the owners consulted before any rezoning is seriously considered.
- We believe this (DPIE CPCP) process and its outcome violate the fundamental principle of fairness that should apply to the planning process. That is, that those adversely affected are consulted directly before any decisions are made. Also, that the veracity of any assumptions upon which the prospective planning decisions are based, are thoroughly checked on the ground before decisions are made.
- These comments are not about the right to make a substantial profit from ones property, that right does not exist! It is however about the right to maintain the value and use of ones' property and to not have them taken away by government fiat without adequate compensation.
- As much as we hate to side with John Barilaro we have to say that property rights loom large in this issue and we feel that they are being fundamentally trampled on.
- Any koala fences proposed for the area are an unjustified waste of money given the zero local habitation by koalas and the inconvenience to both landholders and existing wildlife within in the area.
- Any conservation zone will be in conflict with the requirements for bushfire prevention on inhabited property.
- The Hume Motorway acts as a very effective barrier to east west movement of koalas as does the Nepean River to the south and west.
- It is unclear, if and when rezoning occurs, what rights will transfer to future owners.