To whom it may concern,

Please accept the below feedback in reference to the revised biodiversity policy.

- The policy provides further discretionary power to an already over zealous council with wishy washy language such as 'potential habitat'. Many residents are already reporting council abuse of power requesting report after report (costing thousands of dollars to the landowner) effectively locking up the land with red tape, whilst depleting the landholders bank balance. The new policy allows the Kingborough Council environmental planners even more discretion and the costs to land owners are increased exponentially.

- The scheme was brought in without community consultation and council have unsuccessfully tried to rush through the planning scheme amendments requesting to dispense with the usual public exhibition process. This raises suspicion to their motives

- The scheme is not required by the State Government. It is a voluntary scheme that Council has chosen to implement. Kingborough Council is well known for being one of the most difficult councils to deal with when it comes to development - this is demonstrated in their widespread and misguided application of proposed landscape conservation zoning. The biodiversity policy revision is yet another example of Kingborough council imposing harmful procedures on Kingborough residents in terms of the financial impacts and red tape requirements to build a home.

- In the middle of a cost of living, housing affordability and homelessness crisis, it's inappropriate for a Council (whose purpose is to represent and support its community) to penalise people trying to build a home on land that's been acquired for the purpose of building a home! Not only does council make this process more arduous and costly, Council is benefiting financially.

- KC's proposed landscape conservation zoning (where the primary purpose is conservation and protection of landscape values) coupled with this policy that aims to protect biodiversity, will find some landowners unable to build/live on their land at all. Surely this is a complete overreach when a council has the power to render a person's land unusable and unsellable.

Regards, Angela Hanly