

Our property is a [REDACTED] acre battle-axe block our family has owned for 40+ years.

It has recently been assessed as “mostly non-certified – avoided land” by the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment in its Draft Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan.

We object to the assessment for the following reasons:

- Half of the land was cleared before our family purchased the property, and much of this cleared area has been used for growing fruit and vegetables.
- The Department did not perform an on-site inspection. We did respond to the request by the Department. ***We agreed to an on-site inspection; but we were then told an on-site inspection was not required.*** The assessment of our property was made on the basis of an aerial inspection ONLY.
- We have not been provided any information in regard to what is being protected on our land.
 - Why has most of our property been identified as “mostly non-certified – avoided land”?
 - Why is it that the green zone shown on the map is almost exclusively on our property?
 - What is being protected in this small ~ 2 or 3 acre area that does not need to be protected on our neighbours’ properties?
 - If the small green zone which is almost entirely on our property is so special, why did it not require an on-site inspection?
- The “avoided” land is not in a flood zone.
- The septic system for the property is located well within the avoided area
- The property including the avoided area has been used for a variety of functions including chicken sheds, storage sheds, grazing of sheep and cows, vegetable gardens, fruit trees and grape vines. It would be of little value for conservation
- Most of the trees within the “avoided” area are regrowth
- It is understood that a very small part of the land would be reserved as part of a riparian corridor. One corner of our property ends at the creek. ***According to the NSW guidelines for riparian corridors, the width on our side of the creek that is to be protected should be no more than 10 to 30m from the creek*** (depending on the watercourse type). We accept that this strip is an area that would be protected. The width of this strip would be consistent with the width protected on adjoining properties.
 - It should be noted that the creek in question that touches one corner of our property is affected by lantana. We have tried to keep our small section clear of the lantana, although this is not the case with the neighbouring properties which the creek runs through.
- Our small section of land is insignificant and isolated, it is unlikely that this would be able to sustain anything – particularly once it is surrounded by development.
- The re-classification “mostly non-certified – avoided land” will greatly affect the value and use of our property.
- The green zone on the map provided appears arbitrary, trivial from a conservation perspective, and therefore grossly unfair.

We require the Department to provide details as to why such a small and specific section of land has been singled out for biodiversity, when other similar properties and surrounding properties have not.

This small 2 or 3 acre area is surrounded by land that is zoned "urban capable". Is our property being singled out to provide parklands or green zone for the urban development that is planned for the area? If our property is intended to provide parkland for the surrounding urban development, we will be seeking compensation for the decrease in value of our property compared to the value it would have had if it was zoned "urban capable" like all the neighbouring properties.

We are in the process of obtaining an ecologist's report and reserve the right to submit an updated submission when it is available.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]