
From: rob kelman [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, 23 November 2019 12:11 PM
To: DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions
Subject: Rezoning

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Red Category

Hi,
I'm not sure what sort of agenda you have here for rezoning some of our iconic conservation reserves on Kangaroo Island, but let me blunt- I smell a rat!

May I remind you that we in South Australia have very few public places of natural resources. These places are supposed to be a last refuge for threatened plant and animal communities and left in perpetuity for the greater good of biodiversity and public access.

These rezoning proposals just chip away at the very nature of that perpetuity. As you can tell I'm vehemently opposed to the 'white anting' of our conservation reserves and national parks.

Private development belongs on PRIVATE land not public land set aside for biodiversity. And a Government eager for a cash grab in the form of developing for eco-tourism is Government on borrowed time.

I am submitting this feedback and I sincerely hope that it is read and clearly understood. NO REZONING! Biodiversity in perpetuity.

Regards
Rob Kelman

Sent from my iPhone

Hi,

And thank you for your computer generated, generic and vacuous response to my email about my concerns for your proposed rezoning of conservation reserves and national parks.

I'd just like to address your reasons behind this proposal in detail by teasing apart your explanation and ask a few questions if I may?

Below is your text:

“Additionally, this zoning has not kept pace with the boundaries of the parks and reserves. Over the years, this has created complexity and inconsistency in application and assessment of development applications”

Q1: Why does the zoning need to 'keep pace' with the boundaries of the parks and reserves? Surely these boundaries are set in stone? And if they aren't, they should be. After all it's a conservation park or reserve set aside in perpetuity. At least, I thought that was the original plan????

Q2: 'Over the years it has created complexity'.....what does that mean in context to a conservation park or reserve? The only complexity I can see is that it's bogged down in zoning legalities and is a hindrance to development. In other words it's totally necessary to halt inappropriate white anting and development of our conservation parks and reserves.

This rezoning proposal spits in the face of early conservationists like J.B. Cleland and James Dixon who saw the need to set large tracks of intact native vegetation aside for reasons of biodiversity and sustainability into the future. These proposals just undermine the will of those very people who cared for our environment.

Q3: Why does a conservation park or reserve need a consistent and easy assessment of development applications? That's a rhetorical question because I know the answer to that. At the very least, you've been honest with this sentence "inconsistency in application and assessment of development applications".

I don't think I need to spell this out to you but I will nonetheless. Conservation parks and reserves especially National parks should NEVER be developed. The word 'CONSERVATION' means to CONSERVE. If I wanted to go to a 'development park', I'd go to the city. Enough said.

This is plain and simple 'white anting' of legalities and paperwork to give developers an easier run at developing eco-tourism in our conservation reserves. Just look at the backlash from the Flinders Chase development application. The community on Kangaroo island is totally opposed to this and is completely outraged. This is causing much anxiety and disillusion about the future of our sacred spaces.

Your rezoning is just a smack in the face for all those people who respect country and have fought hard to keep our conservation parks and reserves intact. This is nothing more than a bad idea by a bad government intent on a money grab.

To quote Paul Keating -

“a Liberal Government is a bunch of vested interests in suits looking for good policy”. Never a truer word spoken.

Even if you don't like our native vegetation, or the species that inhabit it, you should think about what our generation will leave behind. I fear that these places of rich and fascinating biodiversity will not be there if they are constantly eroded away purely for the short term gain of a select few and a greedy government.

This will never be over unless you desist. And I promise you one thing, I and many many others will fight tooth and nail to stop these re-zoning proposals. We have much to lose so our efforts will be immense and enduring.

One last thing. Please don't respond with a generic computer generated reply. It's insulting. I at least, had the courtesy to write to you.

Kind regards
Rob Kelman.