

Submission re the Draft Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan 9 October 2010

My wife and I strongly object to the proposal to rezone our land to E2– *Environmental Conservation*. My wife will make a separate submission.

We live on roughly seven acres at [REDACTED] Wilton. We are a family of two, with two dogs. We have lived here for almost 20 years. We came here from the city because we enjoy the rural environment. In particular, we enjoy nature and are very environmentally conscious. We applaud the efforts to protect koalas and other species. Why then, would we object to the zoning of our land to E2?

- **It will unfairly burden us financially and will restrict our current enjoyment of our land**
 - Our property is our only asset. A change to E2 zoning will dramatically reduce its value should we decide to sell it. We have never sought to make a profit from our land (for example, by seeking to subdivide it). We have simply sought to do what any householder is entitled to do – retain the market value of the property given the conditions of use under which we bought it.
 - In addition to the reduction in land value, an E2 zoning will cause us considerable expense (for example, in preserving existing flora, weed eradication and so on).
 - It would also significantly restrict our use and enjoyment of our property now. For example, it will prevent us from erecting a granny flat or similar for our elderly mother. It would even prevent us from erecting a small art studio or similar.
- **A less restrictive zoning (eg E4) will achieve the same result as intended**
 - As we have said, we applaud efforts to protect koalas and other threatened species. However, we believe a less restrictive zoning (eg, E4) would achieve the same biodiversity protection and would be fairer to us, the people who have looked after this land and protected its value for the last 20 years.
 - The ability to develop our land (consistently with environmental protection principles) would preserve *some* of its market value, would preserve *some* of our existing rights and would achieve environmental protection including protection of koalas.

In short, the proposal to rezone our land to E2 is unjustified because it unreasonably imposes a financial burden in circumstances where the same result can be achieved by a fairer and less restrictive zoning.

We agree that biodiversity protection is important. However, the fact is that your government and previous ones have contributed to the predicament we are all now in. You have approved development in environmentally sensitive regions, including the approval of very significant urban development in this area through the Wilton Priority Growth Area. We as small individual family landowners should not have to pay for the conservation offset to suit further development. The government must bear that cost.

If you make this decision, it will be a matter of serious grievance for us and we will seek compensation through a public campaign.

Yours faithfully,

Joseph Moore.

[REDACTED]

Wilton
[REDACTED]