## Dear Madam/Sir

I had been informed that Council was in the process of considering amendments to the Biodiversity Offset Policy.

It is not clear to me from the web site that this is the case, but I did look at the document which I understand to be recent proposals for amendment and I have some suggestions which I think would strengthen the policy if it is possible to have input to that process, as below.

I offer the following suggestions re the Biodiversity Offset Policy

1.1 The policy statement itself is confusing to me. Would it be best to end the sentence at 'exhausted'? The policy continuing as proposed, with the words 'and the impacts will not substantially distract from the conservation status of biodiversity value(s)' leaves unclear what is the status – and what policy covers – impacts that **do** substantially detract from the conservation status of biodiversity value(s).

Also, it is surely biodiversity not biodiversity values that the policy seeks to protect as the title of the policy makes clear, and the policy statement itself should be consistent with that.

4.1 It may be clear from the acts and planning schemes referenced here that the policy applies to Council developments on Council owned or managed land, but it would be desirable to make that explicit with a view to Council initiated developments being able to be cited as exemplars of good practice in the preservation of biodiversity.

5.1.1 'priority biodiversity values in Table..'Needs a reference to a particular table.

5.3.2 makes no sense to me. What does 'its' refer to?

5.4. I think this places the Council in a policing rather than an educational role and is likely to lead to sub-optimal outcomes for biodiversity and loss of support for the policy in the community, with consequent unregulated vegetation clearing. As an alternative I suggest

5.4 Council will work with proponents of each offset proposal on a case by

case basis in accordance with this policy, the Regional Offset Guidelines and the RMPS Offset Principles to assist proponents complete their proposal in a way that best protects the biodiversity of, preferably, the property concerned, or failing this the municipality, while Council retains the discretion to reject a proposal which cannot demonstrate that the development will deliver no net loss of the biodiversity of the municipality.

Thanks

Michael

Michael Rowan PhD Emeritus Professor University of South Australia

+61 408 743333 Personal email <u>michaelrowantasmania@gmail.com</u>



Wendy's fire bunker GoFundMe

Web Kingborough Council https://michaelrowanforkingborough.com Philosophy, Science and the Environment http://persuademe.com.au Education in Tasmania http://educationambassadors.org.au