



Response to Crown Lands Legislation White Paper

Summary of Issues and
Government Response

October 2015

Title: Response to Crown Lands Legislation White Paper: Summary of Issues and Government Response - October 2015.

Author: NSW Government

© State of New South Wales through Department of Industry, Skills and Regional Development, 2015

This publication is copyright. You may download, display, print and reproduce this material in an unaltered form only (retaining this notice) for your personal use or for non-commercial use within your organisation. To copy, adapt, publish, distribute or commercialise any of this publication you will need to seek permission from NSW Department of Industry, Skills and Regional Development.

Published by NSW Department of Industry, Skills and Regional Development

www.industry.nsw.gov.au

First published October 2015

ISBN 978 1 74256 694 8

Disclaimer

Information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing (July 2015).

However, because of advances in knowledge, users are reminded of the need to ensure that information on which they rely is up to date and to check the currency of the information with the appropriate officer of NSW Department of Industry, or the user's independent advisors.

JTN 13584

Contents

Background	2
The submission review process	2
Overview of submissions	3
Details of submissions and Government response	5
Comments on the White Paper	5
New legislation	5
Improved management arrangements for Crown reserves	6
Other streamlining measures	11
Better provisions for tenures and rents	13
Greater flexibility for Western Lands leases	15
Stronger provisions for law enforcement	16
Comments on the Review Report	16
State and local land	16
Travelling Stock Reserves	18
New business model for Department of Primary Industries - Lands	19
Proposals relating to Crown roads	19
Additional issues raised that were not explored in the White Paper or the Review Report	20
What's next?	23
Legislation	23
Local Land Pilot Program	23
State Land Stocktake	23
Travelling Stock Reserve review	23
Reserves Governance Project	23
More information	24
Appendix 1: List of respondents	25

Background

The Crown land estate covers 42 percent of New South Wales and contributes to the social, environmental and economic structure of the State. There has not been major review of Crown land for more than 25 years. The Crown Land Management Review ('Review') took a timely and objective look at how to improve the management of existing assets and plan for our future.

NSW Trade & Investment (now NSW Department of Industry) invited comments on the proposed changes to the Crown Lands legislation through a White Paper released in early 2014. At the same time, the Crown Lands Management Review Report ('Review Report') was made available online.

Community and industry expectations have changed over time and the release of the Government's White Paper provided an opportunity for the people of New South Wales to have their say about what's important to help build the future management of the Crown land estate.

The White Paper included recommendations to:

- » create simpler legislation to support Crown land management in the 21st century
- » help grow the NSW economy through the more effective management of Crown land
- » continue the key objective of managing Crown land for the benefit of the people of NSW
- » reduce red tape for the community and stakeholders
- » streamline and speed up administration
- » cement the role of local communities in the management of Crown land.

Information about the White Paper appeared in the *NSW Government Gazette*, *The Land*, *the Sydney Morning Herald* and *the Daily Telegraph*. The White Paper was available at www.crownland.nsw.gov.au.

Letters were sent to key stakeholders including peak bodies, Local Councils, Local Aboriginal Land Councils, reserve trusts and commons trusts.

The Review team received 626 submissions by email, post and online.

The submission review process

The NSW Department of Industry Review team reviewed all submissions received. This report summarises the main themes arising from the submissions.

The analysis of the submissions will continue to inform improvements to the management of Crown land estate and the development of new Crown lands legislation.

The Review team thanks those who have invested in the process and contributed to the future management of the Crown land estate through their responses to issues raised in the White Paper and the Review Report.

Appendix 1 identifies the individuals or bodies who made submissions. This list excludes individuals or bodies who asked not to be identified.

Overview of submissions

A total of 626 submissions were received from a wide range of respondents (*see Figure 1*).

Figure 1: Submissions by group



● Community Member	37.9%	● State Government Agency	1.8%
● Local Council	13.9%	● Regional Organisation	1.9%
● Local Organisation	9.1%	● National Organisation	1.6%
● Environmental Group	6.6%	● Corporation	1.3%
● State Organisation	5.4%	● Local Councillor	1.3%
● Commoner	5.1%	● School of Arts	1.1%
● Community Reserve Trust	4.5%	● Reserve Manager	1.1%
● Tenure Holder	4.0%	● DPI Staff	0.6%
● Local Aboriginal Land Council	2.4%	○ Member of State Parliament	0.5%

The submissions included:

- » 84 submissions from Local Councils
- » 55 submissions containing similar comments about environmental issues
- » 49 submissions supporting the current legislative arrangements for St Albans and Woomargama Commons
- » 43 form letters from members of the Waterfront Action Group
- » 14 submissions from Local Aboriginal Land Councils
- » 12 submissions calling for the retention of community trust management for Gresford Park
- » 5 submissions from Regional Organisations of Councils

In broad terms the suggestions raised by different groups were as follows:

Group	Suggestions
Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Support for management under the Local Government Act, including reduced reporting requirements » Support for streamlining owner's consent process » Support for councils being able to close roads in their local government area » Concerns about the potential implications of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » management of Crown reserves under the Local Government Act » transfer of local land » transfer of Crown roads
Environmental groups Community members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Support for the proposal to replace Reserve Trusts and Reserve Managers with one Crown Land Manager and to move from a three tier to a two tier management structure for Crown reserves. » Strong support for increased enforcement and compliance provisions » Support for the removal of red tape » Support for real community consultation and engagement processes » Support for continued community involvement in reserve management » Confusion about the interaction between the various government review processes » Concern about removal of specific protections for environmental and social values of Crown land (including land assessment) » Concern about a perceived bias towards economic values » Concern about transferring management and ownership of Crown land to councils » Concern about the sale of Crown land » Concern about any potential to reduce public consultation, approval and reporting requirements
Tenure holders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Support for consistent lease terms » Support for increased flexibility for Western Lands tenures » Support for greater opportunities for perpetual Western Lands lessees to buy their leaseholds, but concern that purchase prices will be too high » Concern about the potential of charging market rent for community and not-for-profit organisations » A desire for more certainty, reduced delays, consistent terms
Reserve trusts, Commons and Schools of Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Support for the proposal to replace Reserve Trusts and Reserve Managers with one Crown Land Manager and to move from a three tier to a two tier management structure for Crown reserves. » Strong support for retaining management of local assets (including Crown reserves, commons and Schools of Arts) by local groups » Concerns about transferring management and ownership of Crown land to councils
Aboriginal groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » A desire to ensure that the reforms will not result in less Crown land available for claims under the Aboriginal Land Rights Act » A desire for full involvement in the reform processes

Details of submissions and Government response

The following sections give a brief overview of how the submissions addressed the proposals contained in the White Paper and the Review Report. They also include the Government's response to the comments that were made.

Comments on the White Paper

New legislation

The majority of submissions supported the idea of new consolidated legislation and repealing the existing Acts. Submissions from Commons Trusts, Schools of Arts and some Councils sought to retain the *Commons Management Act 1989* and the *Trustees of Schools of Arts Enabling Act 1902*.

Reasons for retaining the status quo for Commons and Schools of Arts included:

- » The current system functions efficiently and involves communities
- » The current system has played a major role in preserving the heritage of NSW
- » Help from local volunteers may not be forthcoming if managed by Councils
- » Councils would be unlikely to maintain them as well as under existing arrangements

Government response and next steps:

It is proposed that Commons will become Crown reserves, with the dual reserve purpose of commons and community use. This will preserve the historic nature of commons, and allow use by commoners and the broader community. Under the new legislation, existing commons trusts will be granted licences over 'their' commons.

It is proposed that where a Schools of Arts is on public land, that land will be reserved. The current trustees will form the Crown Land Manager board.

It is proposed that where a School of Arts is on private land, the trustees will remain the legal owners of the land and will be able to deal with the land subject to the terms of any trust deed and the *Trustee Act 1925*.

Relevant provisions will be included in the new legislation.

Very few comments were received in relation to the proposed repeal of the *Western Lands Act 1901* and only one in relation to the proposed repeal of the *Wentworth Irrigation Act 1890* and the *Hay Irrigation Act 1902*.

A large number of submissions contained comments to the effect that the proposed changes fail to recognise the environmental significance of Crown land, or to protect environmental, heritage and social values. The majority of comments on these issues came from community members and from local and environmental groups. A number of councils, the Law Society of NSW and some corporations also made similar comments.

The submissions contained a wide range of comments on the proposed objects of the new Act. There was overwhelming support for the objects to include the protection of environmental, cultural heritage and social values, and concerns that the draft objects in the White Paper seemed to focus on the economic values of Crown land. A number of submissions suggested that the objects should make stronger statements about the protection of Aboriginal interests.

Government response and next steps:

The proposed objects of the Act will explicitly recognise the need to integrate environmental, social, cultural heritage and economic considerations in decision-making about Crown land. The environmental significance of Crown land will be recognised in a number of provisions, including provisions for plans of management.

All land identified by the State land stocktake as having State significance will be retained by the State for the people of NSW. By definition, State land will have certain values, including in many cases environmental values.

The proposed objects of the Act will provide for Aboriginal use and co-management of Crown reserves. Under the legislation it will be possible for Aboriginal groups such as Aboriginal Land Councils to be appointed as Crown Land Managers.

The State land stocktake is under way in consultation with Government agencies. The stocktake will test the draft criteria for State land proposed by the Crown Land Management Review.

Submissions raised support for and concerns about the aims of removing red tape and reducing transaction costs. The concerns were largely around removal of red tape potentially resulting in the removal of protections for Crown land.

Government response and next steps:

There are very real issues of multiple layers of rules and administrative processes that currently make it difficult to manage the Crown land estate effectively and efficiently. The removal of red tape does not diminish protection of the value of the Crown land estate, given the approval mechanisms available in other legislation.

By cutting red tape, Government and Crown Land Managers will be able to more efficiently and effectively focus on preserving and managing the multiple values of Crown land.

The new legislation will remove red tape wherever practical.

Improved management arrangements for Crown reserves

The proposals for improved reserve management attracted a lot of comment from all groups of respondents. Overall more submissions supported than opposed the proposals, but this was not evenly spread across all groups.

Local Councils managing reserves under the Local Government Act

Local Councils broadly support being able to manage reserves under the Local Government Act 1993 ('LGA'). Local Councils do have concerns about the potential for increasing the cost of management, noting this particularly in relation to plans of management.

Several Local Council submissions stated support for complete autonomy to manage under the LGA including, for example, the ability to use the provisions for leasing and licensing available under the LGA, and not to have to seek approval from the Minister responsible for the Crown Lands Act.

Non-Council respondents expressed a strong philosophical belief that the Government should manage the Crown land estate and that oversight of Local Councils by State government was preferred. There was a general wariness of Local Councils, including concerns that Local Councils:

- » could impose higher rents for the use of reserves to cover potential increased resourcing requirements
- » could seek to change the classification of reserves from community to operational land in order to sell it
- » could be open to pressure from developers and other groups
- » may not have the same level of interest in small community reserves that those communities have
- » could reduce the level of community involvement under the LGA which will reduce community volunteering
- » may not be effective in protecting community land under the processes in the LGA

Government response and next steps:

Local Councils already manage a great deal of Crown land effectively for a variety of purposes. For example, most Local Councils manage local parks, sporting and recreation areas located on Crown reserves, including some high profile and iconic areas such as beaches, foreshore, riverside precincts and nature reserves.

The Government is driving a program to improve the sustainability, capacity and integrity of local government. This will increase the ability of councils to manage Crown land. Communities will be in a position to influence decisions about how Crown land is managed through the processes under the LGA.

Land of primarily local value can be made available to Councils as 'community land'. This will mean that councils are restricted in how they deal with it under the LGA requirements around community land.

It is proposed that land that councils can demonstrate is used for operational or local utility purposes, such as reserves used for depots or waste sites can be transferred as operational land.

Where land has State significance, councils will not be able to sell it and the Minister will retain a degree of oversight of it. This land will retain its reserve purpose and councils will need to manage it having regards to that purpose. The Crown land stocktake will explore the process of applying the State criteria to identify State significant land.

The proposed new management structure

There was overwhelming support in the submissions for the proposal to replace Reserve Trusts and Reserve Managers with one Crown Land Manager. A few submissions expressed concerns that this could lead to fewer 'checks and balances'.

Crown Land Managers

The majority of submissions supported the concept that legislation should provide for local community representation and participation in reserve management and governance.

There were also a number of submissions from individuals and community organisations that assumed that Local Councils would be taking over the management of all reserves currently managed by community trusts. This misconception raised a high level of concern about the potential to reduce the role of community members in the future management of community trust reserves.

A large number of community trusts and local groups expressed a strong desire to retain community management of 'their' reserves and identified benefits of the current system, including community involvement and a focus on environmental protection. It is clear that these trusts and groups have a high degree of commitment to their reserves.

Some Local Councils expressed a preference for community members to be involved in an advisory rather than a management capacity. Other Councils noted that they currently rely on volunteers to administer a number of reserves, and would not have the capacity to undertake the management and maintenance work that is currently done by volunteers.

Government response and next steps:

It is proposed that the legislation will provide for existing community trusts to become new corporate Crown Land Managers and community trust board members to continue as board members: the legislation will not transfer control of reserves to Councils.

Councils may ultimately take control of some land which is identified as having local rather than State significance where Local Councils believe that this will benefit their constituents. Where this happens, Local Councils will be able to establish community advisory groups to ensure continuing community involvement in the management of the reserves.

Where land is retained by the State, Department of Primary Industries - Lands will continue to work with community Crown Land Managers as it currently does with community reserve trusts and it is anticipated that significant community management of Crown land will continue.

Improved governance standards

There was general support for higher governance standards for reserve trusts. Other submissions noted:

- » caution about adopting a 'one size fits all' approach to governance standards, as there is a diversity of reserves
- » concern that community involvement in reserve management would reduce if governance requirements are too rigorous
- » that training would be required to raise governance standards
- » that effective support from Department of Primary Industries - Lands needs to continue
- » that support from Department of Primary Industries - Lands has reduced in recent times

Funding

Submissions from community trusts, community members and councils unanimously supported the retention of the Public Reserves Management Fund ('PRMF'). There were no objections to including provisions to retain the PRMF in the new consolidated legislation.

Government response and next steps:

It is proposed to retain provisions for the PRMF to continue as a vehicle to provide funding for Crown reserves with State significance.

Approval requirements

Half the submissions received on this issue came from Councils, with all supporting the opportunity to reduce the need for Ministerial approvals. Non-council respondents emphasised the importance of the State Government retaining an appropriate level of control over reserves.

Government response and next steps:

Crown Land Managers who are not Local Councils will continue to require Minister's approval for certain dealings with Crown reserves. There will be two categories of Crown Land Manager, with different approval requirements which will be detailed in the legislation.

Local Councils will not be required to seek the Crown Land Minister's approval for dealings on reserves because they will be subject to the requirements for managing land contained in the LGA. This will involve obtaining the Minister for Local Government's approval in certain circumstances.

Reporting requirements

Local Council submissions universally supported the removal or reduction of reporting requirements, noting that the requirements in the LGA are comprehensive and familiar.

A number of submissions from community members and community and environmental groups expressed concerns that reduced reporting would result in less transparency.

Government response and next steps:

Crown Land Managers who are not Local Councils will be required to review their operations on Crown reserves annually and submit a report to Department of Primary Industries - Lands. These reports will be publicly available.

In order not to duplicate requirements under the LGA, the only reporting obligation in the Crown Lands legislation for Local Councils managing Crown reserves will be to provide information if requested by the Minister. Councils will still be required to comply with their reporting requirements under the LGA.

Plans of Management

Submissions from environmental groups suggested that Plans of Management should be mandatory for all reserves, which is not the case under the current Crown lands legislation.

Submissions from Local Councils raised a number of suggestions, including the potential for more generic plans to be prepared.

Government response and next steps:

It is proposed that Plans of Management will be required for many reserves, particularly reserves that provide a number of facilities and are used by different community sectors.

Plans of Management may not always be appropriate for smaller reserves and it may be better to develop other plans, such as strategic plans.

Harmonising the management of submerged land

The submissions received on this issue all supported greater consistency between leases, licences and policies on land managed by Department of Primary Industries - Lands and Roads and Maritime Services.

Reserves used for specific purposes

A number of submissions included comments about specific categories of Crown reserves, in particular showgrounds, caravan parks and racecourses.

Comments on showgrounds were received from local organisations, show societies and community members. The comments highlighted the role that showgrounds play in providing a focal point for local communities. None of these respondents wanted the management of showgrounds to be transferred to Local Councils, citing reasons including potential cost increases, support for and satisfaction with the existing management arrangements and concerns that Local Councils may not have the necessary expertise or interest.

A small number of comments were received from a range of groups in relation to caravan parks. Most respondents were opposed to caravan parks being transferred to Local Councils, citing reasons including the potential for increased fees and that Local Councils may not continue to invest in caravan parks. Several examples were given of camping fees rising where Local Councils have taken over management of parks.

Comments on the future management of racecourses were received from racing clubs and organisations. Local clubs want to retain their current management of reserves that include racecourses. Concern was raised that if management was transferred to other bodies that might seek to diversify the use of racecourses it could create conflict and possibly workplace health and safety risks.

One suggestion was for Racing NSW to become the Crown Land Manager of all reserves used only for thoroughbred racing and training, with local racing clubs responsible for the on-ground management of these racecourses. Alternatively, Racing NSW could be given outright ownership of all racecourses.

Government response and next steps:

It is proposed that the legislation will provide for existing community trusts to become new corporate Crown Land Managers and for community trust board members to continue as board members.

Where Local Councils manage showgrounds, caravan parks and racecourses Local Councils will be able to establish community advisory groups to ensure continuing community involvement on the management of this land.

In all other cases, Department of Primary Industries - Lands will continue to work with Crown Land Managers for showgrounds, caravan parks and racecourses in much the same way as it currently does with reserve trusts.

The Department will explore the role of peak bodies in managing Crown land. The proposals for caravan parks will be carefully considered and the proposals for Racing NSW in relation to racecourses are under consideration.

Other streamlining measures

The White Paper invited comments on a number of streamlining measures. Responses generally focused on the proposals to abolish land assessment, streamline landowner's consent and improve notification requirements.

Land Assessment

A large number of submissions related to the removal of land assessment requirements in the Crown Lands Act, and this issue provoked strong feelings. The majority of submissions were concerned that assessment of the capabilities and values of individual parcels of land is not provided by the strategic planning framework and were of the view that this meant that assessment should be retained.

Government response and next steps:

The existing provisions in the *Crown Lands Act 1989* are not practical to implement. The Minister has the ability to waive the requirement for land assessment to be carried out and generally uses this power. The provisions are not aligned with the planning processes.

To ensure that land use considerations are aligned with a strategic process and to encourage a 'whole of government' approach to Crown land, it is proposed that land use is governed by a combination of the planning framework and the reserve purpose.

Landowner's consent

Comments from Local Councils supported simplifying landowner's consent arrangements with the majority wanting Councils to be able to give consent for reserves under their management. These Councils submitted that the current requirements and resulting delays are frustrating.

One suggestion was that any Reserve Manager should be able to give consent to developments or activities that are consistent with the reserve purpose and/or a Plan of Management. Other respondents were concerned that streamlining requirements could lessen the State's level of control over developments proposed on Crown land.

The White Paper invited submissions on what might be considered 'low impact' developments and activities for which landowner's consent was unnecessary. A wide range of developments and activities were suggested, for example: park infrastructure

and installing playgrounds, general maintenance and improvements not exceeding a certain value, telecommunications infrastructure, underground utility installations, conservation management and carbon sequestration activities, marinas and other boating infrastructure, fossicking, and ATM machines on university campuses. Another suggestion was to set a cost cap rather than identifying specific developments and activities.

Government response and next steps:

The range of activities proposed in the submissions will inform the list of low impact activities to be included in the streamlined and simplified landowner's consent provisions. This will allow greater flexibility and reduce red tape.

Notification requirements

The White Paper proposed improving the notification provisions to provide more effective community engagement. A large number of comments were received, from which it was evident that community consultation is very important to community members, environmental groups, Aboriginal groups, Local Councils and many other stakeholders.

Submissions highlighted the fact that notification in its current form is not active communication, and that the community must be fully engaged to ensure effective public consultation. Suggestions included developing a communications charter.

Several Councils stated that the consultation requirements in the LGA result in effective consultation, particularly in relation to processes for reclassifying community land as operational land. Some non-Council respondents took the opposite view. A number of Councils suggested that they could assist with notification (for example by including details of proposed dealings on their websites) and should be consulted as to what forms of notification work best in their local government areas.

Specific proposals for ways to provide notification of proposed dealings with Crown land included relying on a mix of traditional methods (for example newspapers or individual written notification) and newer methods such as popular websites, social media and online portals. It was suggested that newsfeeds would be preferable to expecting people to regularly check relevant websites or portals. Newsfeeds could also ensure that non-local users of Crown land such as fossickers could be advised of proposals that might affect their use of land.

Several submissions noted that not everyone has good access to the internet and that a 'one size fits all' system might not be appropriate for all communities, particularly smaller ones. Some submissions noted that consultation periods need to give adequate time for the community to comment.

Government response and next steps:

The Government agrees that community consultation must be meaningful, and proposes to develop a community engagement strategy for dealings with Crown land as part of the comprehensive response to the Review.

The strategy will be a requirement under the new legislation and will focus on meaningful community consultation, including community meetings where appropriate. The strategy will recognise the need for a mix of traditional communication methods (such as newspapers) and contemporary methods (for example social media). As has been suggested in submissions, the strategy will draw on Local Councils' experience of the best means for community engagement in their local government area.

Streamlining arrangements between Department of Primary Industries - Lands and Local Councils

The submissions included suggestions for improving and/or streamlining arrangements and communication between Department of Primary Industries - Lands and Councils. Some submissions suggested that this is something that should really be addressed across the whole of government.

Many of the submissions recommended an integrated IT and property resources platform to improve the flow of information and data between Local Councils and Department of Primary Industries - Lands. Such a platform could perform multiple functions, including providing spatial data to Local Councils, allowing Local Councils to lodge applications for approval from Department of Primary Industries - Lands and to check on their progress, and providing information to Local Councils and the community about the status and ownership of Crown land and/or all land managed by Local Councils.

Better provisions for tenures and rents

Market rent with rebates and waivers where appropriate

A market based approach to rent had significant support from across a variety of respondents. A number of submissions emphasised the inability of community groups and not-for-profit organisations to pay a market rental. For these groups, the need to have a robust and transparent system of rebates and waivers was important.

A number of Local Council submissions suggested that Local Councils should set, or at least be consulted about, the rebates and waivers for tenures in their local government areas. Some Local Councils expressed concern that they would be charged rent for the Crown reserves they manage.

Government response and next steps:

It is proposed that rebates, waivers and concessions will continue be available for community groups and not-for-profit organisations. Department of Primary Industries - Lands will develop a publicly available policy in this regards, to ensure that there is transparency and consistency in the application of rebates, waivers and concessions across the State.

Local Councils and Crown Land Managers will not be charged rent for reserves they manage.

Consistent provisions for tenures

Consistent provisions for tenures were generally supported. Some submissions suggested that the Minister responsible for administering the Crown lands legislation should not have to approve minor amendments to tenancy agreements.

Government response and next steps:

It is proposed that new legislation will not require Ministerial approval for minor changes to tenancy agreements. This will reduce red tape and speed up minor transactions.

Use of Crown Land without permission

Concerns were raised in some submissions that providing a power for the Minister to authorise the use of Crown Land by issuing a licence where land is being used without permission could retrospectively affect the ability to make Aboriginal land claims under the Aboriginal Land Rights Act.

Apart from these concerns, the proposal was generally supported.

Rent arrears

The overwhelming majority of submissions supported a requirement that any outstanding arrears to be paid prior to the transfer of a lease, with only two submissions comfortable with arrears being transferred to the new tenure holder.

Government response and next steps:

It is proposed that new legislation will require outstanding arrears to be paid prior to the transfer of a lease.

Sale of Crown Land to Lessees

A number of submissions expressed concern that there would be a general freehold purchase right for all lessees of Crown Land, which was largely opposed. There were a number of submissions that raised issues with the cost to lessees of purchasing the freehold in their land.

A few submissions raised environmental concerns regarding the sale of Crown Land to lessees.

Government response and next steps:

It is proposed that new legislation will provide that, outside of the Western Division, only lessees who currently have rights to purchase the freehold of their leases without going through a public tender process will continue to have those rights.

Permissive occupancies

Only a few submissions commented on the proposal to convert all existing permissive occupancies to licences. These submissions were generally supportive of the proposal, with no outright objections.

Carbon sequestration and forestry rights

There was a mixed reaction to the proposal to include broad provisions in the new legislation to facilitate all forms of carbon sequestration activities on Crown Land.

The majority of submissions generally supported the proposal. The most significant issue raised was that not all of the Crown land estate is appropriate for carbon sequestration activities.

Greater flexibility for Western Lands leases

Over 100 submissions included comments on the proposals for changes to Western Lands leases. These submissions came from a wide range of groups including 16 Western Lands lessees, a number of Councils, environmental groups and community members.

Freehold conversion

The vast majority of Western Lands lessees who made submissions believe that the leasehold system disadvantages them economically. In particular, lessees living near the River Murray maintain that the lack of development in Wentworth Shire by comparison with Mildura is due to the leasehold regime in NSW. Wentworth Shire Council proposes allowing conversion of all leases within 20 km of towns in its local government area.

Almost all the Western Lands lessees who made submissions want to be able to convert their perpetual grazing leases, and for conversion to be on no less favourable terms than the conversion of perpetual leases elsewhere in the State (3% of capital value).

NSW Farmers Association submitted that the majority of grazing leaseholders were happy to continue with the existing perpetual leasehold system provided that there was more flexibility to carry out other activities on their land.

Submissions from environmental groups and members of the community expressed concerns about freehold conversion and the likelihood that this would result in environmental damage to fragile rangelands.

Other submissions maintained that the current leasehold regime does not protect environmental values and that Crown Lands is not a good environmental custodian, with one submission noting that only three de-stocking notices have been issued in the past ten years. There were differing views as to whether leasehold conditions are more effective than statewide regulation such as the *Native Vegetation Act 2003*.

Several submissions expressed concerns about the adequacy of the ecological sustainability test and whether it considers all relevant factors. Most respondents who commented on this test want it reviewed and strengthened. One submission suggested using the Rangeland Condition Assessment Program as well as considering land capability.

Government response and next steps:

It is proposed that lessees of certain perpetual leases in the Western Division will be able to apply to purchase their leasehold land, including in an urban area, for residential, commercial and industrial leases and for primary production leases of land that has soil capability to sustain cultivation. This will balance environmental considerations with the provision of economic opportunities to Western Lands leaseholders.

Access

Access issues, including maintaining access for fishing and fossicking, were mentioned in relation to the freehold conversion of Western Lands leases.

Government response and next steps:

Prior to the conversion of Western Lands leases existing third party rights will be identified and protected where appropriate.

Flexibility measures

The White Paper sought suggestions for activities that could be undertaken on Western Lands leases without requiring approval from Department of Primary Industries - Lands. A wide range of activities was suggested, including: tourism, conservation activities and agreements, fossicking, Aboriginal community use, commercial yabby harvesting, motorcycle and 4WD events, mobile telecommunications infrastructure, and filming.

Government response and next steps:

The range of activities proposed in the submissions will inform the list of activities that will not require approval. This will provide greater flexibility and reduce red tape.

Stronger provisions for law enforcement

There was general support for the detailed proposals for the new legislation to include stronger compliance and enforcement provisions. Some submissions raised questions about the capacity of Department of Primary Industries - Lands to undertake enforcement action, the allocation of responsibility for enforcement activities between Department of Primary Industries - Lands, Councils and other Reserve Managers and the need for training in the new legislation.

There was some support for increased auditing (particularly of Crown roads), aligning the provisions in the new legislation with those in the local government legislation, and for compliance sharing with other agencies.

Comments on the Review Report

The Review Report was not released for public consultation but a number of submissions to the White Paper also commented on matters in the Review Report. The main themes of these comments are shown below.

State and local land

State and local land concept

Submissions were divided about the concept of Crown land being classified into State and local land. Those in favour of the concept liked the fact that local interests will have control of local land. Those against were concerned that it is an exercise by the Government to cost-shift to Local Councils, or for the Government to reap large financial gains through selling off of land to private interests. There was also a strong theme of the level of trust in Local Councils.

Government response and next steps:

The classification of State and local land is not about selling land or cost-shifting. It is about strategically looking at Crown land so that its management better aligns with the current and future needs of Government and the community as a whole. This is consistent with the land assessment provisions of the current CLA but will be more practical and strategic.

Where land is predominantly of local interest, transferring it to Local Councils will allow decisions about that land to be made by local communities rather than by the State Government. There will be no forced transfers of land to Local Councils.

Since colonial times the NSW economy has developed through the release and sale of Crown land. This approach continues to be relevant, and where Crown land does not have State or local values it may make sense to dispose of it. The legislation will allow current processes to continue, but will not force or require land disposals.

Process of classifying local and State land

Many submissions made comment on this issue, including that the draft criteria did not provide sufficient consideration of environmental and conservation values. The criteria for identifying land in CBDs and coastal areas as State significant were seen as raising problems when they were applied on a broad scale. Some submissions identified that Aboriginal interests in land were not receiving adequate consideration in the criteria.

Councils were of the view that their input and local decision-making is essential in finalising the criteria for classifying State and local land.

Government response and next steps:

The submissions will be considered in the development of the criteria for State and local land.

The draft local land criteria have been tested and further refined as a result of the Local Land Pilot. It is proposed that the criteria be used as a decision-making tool to guide councils in determining the benefits to local community from councils owning or managing the land. Determining the best manager for the land will be site specific and on a case by case basis. The draft State criteria will be tested and refined by the State land stocktake.

Aboriginal interests will be consulted prior to implementation of the criteria, and the Government intends to work in partnership with both Aboriginal interests and Local Councils in the implementation of the criteria.

Local Council control

Submissions were divided on this issue. There were some submissions from Local Councils who want full control of all Crown land in their LGA, including the right to sell any land transferred to them. A larger group of submissions doubted the capacity and commitment of Local Councils to manage Crown lands in the interests of their communities.

Financial implications for councils

The financial implications for Local Councils were of major concern to respondents, and in particular to Local Councils. The following aspects were highlighted:

- » Cost-shifting - concern that the Government will retain Crown land of high monetary value, while Local Councils will be offered the low-value or high-maintenance local lands
- » Income stream – concern that the classification of some Crown reserves as State land will cut Local Councils off from income streams or assets in which they have invested
- » Cost of transfer – concern that Local Councils will be charged a fee or have to pay transaction costs for Crown lands transferred to them
- » Cost of management – concern that Local Councils will be given land that they have no financial capacity to manage
- » Compliance – concern about Local Councils' ability to deal with Aboriginal land claims and native title

Government response and next steps:

Where Local Councils already manage Crown reserves that have local significance there may be an additional expense resulting from the legislative requirement under the LGA for plans of management over community land . The Government is investigating options, including phase in periods for plans of management, to address this. There will be no forced transfer of reserves to Local Councils. As such, Local Councils will be able to properly consider resourcing issues before accepting local land and will not be required to take on land with significant liabilities.

It is proposed to retain provisions for the PRMF to continue as a vehicle to provide funding for Crown reserves with State significance. .

Agency management

The vast majority of submissions supported the proposition that Government agencies should manage those parcels of the Crown Lands estate which meet their agency needs.

Many submissions supported the transfer of Crown land with conservation or environmental values to Government agency management.

Travelling Stock Reserves

The submissions on the recommendation that Local Land Services ('LLS') review all Travelling Stock Reserves ('TSRs') to determine their future use and management highlighted that TSRs are of interest and importance to a wide range of users, interest groups and the public.

A number of submissions identified that environmental, cultural and social values and the connectivity of TSRs are significant attributes that should be considered as part of the review. This was in addition to their use by farmers to move and graze stock, particularly during times of drought and other emergencies.

In acknowledging the cultural importance of TSRs to Aboriginal people, a number of submissions expressed the view that the assessment criteria and review process be developed in partnership with the NSW Aboriginal community and Aboriginal Land Councils.

A number of submissions noted that TSRs in the Western Division, in particular those on Western Lands leases, are different to those in the Central and Eastern parts of the State, acknowledging that in this region TSRs are managed on a day to day basis by lessees.

In considering the future management of TSRs, many submissions advocated that the linear, connected nature of TSRs be maintained and that they should not be broken up and sold off. The management of weeds and pests on TSRs, and bushfire risks were raised in a number of submissions as concerns that need addressing in the future management of TSRs.

Government response and next steps:

The submissions will be considered as part of developing the review of TSRs by LLS.

The review of TSRs will be undertaken by LLS. The aim of the review is to work out who is best placed to manage TSRs. The majority of work is expected to occur over 2015-2016.

New business model for Department of Primary Industries - Lands

A number of submissions were received relating to transitioning Department of Primary Industries - Lands to a public trading enterprise ('PTE'). The majority of submissions were not in favour of this, based on the assumption that a PTE model would be more corporate and primarily focussed on profit and loss, and designed to deliver only a financial return on the portfolio of Crown land in NSW.

Some respondents believed that less consideration would be given to other objectives such as long-term conservation and enjoyment of the NSW environment through recreation and other social pursuits. Concerns were raised by Aboriginal stakeholders that a PTE model may reduce the amount of claimable land.

Key performance indicators were identified as being essential to ensure that any future PTE has the right focus. It was also noted that the PTE model would also need the right business tools to support its operation.

There was a mixed response to the recommendation to investigate the use of market value to determine opportunity costs on Crown land. Some submissions expressed concerns that economic values would overshadow social and environmental values in decision making, leading to a more commercially focused organisation. This view was consistent with comments on the PTE.

Government response and next steps:

The submissions will be considered in any further development of a PTE model and in the development of business systems and Key Performance Indicators supporting Department of Primary Industries - Lands as an organisation.

It will be important that the business of managing the Crown land estate is accountable and transparent to the people of NSW. The Government has commenced reform of Department of Primary Industries - Lands to ensure the business processes, reporting and land management activities are all accountable and transparent.

Proposals relating to Crown roads

A number of submissions raised issues in relation to Crown roads, which was a topic in the Review Report. The key points were:

- » that Local Councils were opposed to forced transfers of roads to them, as they saw this as a cost and liability shifting exercise;
- » that Local Councils strongly supported being given the power to close the roads for which they are the roads authority; and
- » concerns about the backlog of Crown road closures.

Government response and next steps:

Improvements to deliver effective and efficient management of Crown roads, including transfer of Crown roads to Local Councils and reducing the backlog of road closure applications, will continue to be considered.

It is proposed that Councils will be given the power to close roads for which they are the roads authority. This will enable Department of Primary Industries - Lands to focus on the backlog of road closure applications.

Additional issues raised that were not explored in the White Paper or the Review Report**Disposal of Crown land**

Opposition to the disposal of Crown land was a strong theme in submissions from community members.

These submissions can be summarised as follows:

- » opposition to any sale of Crown land – this group was largely of the view that the basic approach should be to retain Crown land in public ownership in perpetuity
- » opposition to the current processes for the sale of Crown land – this group raised issues about the level of community consultation preceding disposals and the criteria for deciding what land should be disposed of
- » submissions from Aboriginal Land Councils - which put forward the view that all land that is surplus to the Crown land estate should be transferred to Aboriginal Land Councils

Government response and next steps:

The Review is not about the broadscale disposal of Crown land.

Since colonial times the NSW economy has developed through the release and sale of Crown land and this still continues today. The Review is about strategically looking at the Crown land estate so that it better aligns with the current and future needs of Government and the community as a whole. The legislation will not compel or require the disposal of land.

Opposition to coal seam gas

A number of submissions from a range of stakeholders (Local Councils, environmental groups, community groups and individuals) raised concerns about coal seam gas exploration and mining on Crown land.

Register of Crown land

There were a large number of requests for a publicly accessible register or database of Crown land.

Government response and next steps:

It is proposed a publicly accessible register of Crown land will be developed.

Department of Primary Industries - Lands Resourcing

There was a strong theme that Local Councils value personal relationships with Department of Primary Industries - Lands staff. There was a general perception about staff reductions impacting on the level of service provided.

Government response and next steps:

The changes being proposed will lead to a reduced administrative burden on Department of Primary Industries - Lands staff, who will be able to focus their attention on managing priority areas in the Crown land estate.

A reduction in Department of Primary Industries - Lands staff is not proposed as part of the (Crown Land Management) Review.

General Aboriginal issues

A number of Aboriginal groups, organisations with Aboriginal interests and environmental groups stressed the importance of recognising Aboriginal heritage and Aboriginal interests in Crown land, and involving Aboriginal people in the decision making process for Crown land.

Local Councils expressed concerns about owning and managing Crown land that is affected by native title or subject to claims under the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983*.

Government response and next steps:

Local Councils currently manage land affected by native title and land claims and this will continue in the usual course. The proposed legislation will specifically address native title by providing for a scheme of native title accreditation so that there is an understanding of the requirements of the native title legislation. Land that is the subject of undetermined land claims under the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983* will not be transferred to Local Councils.

The first group comprised 14 submissions from Aboriginal Land Councils and a number of submissions from organisations with Aboriginal interests. This group advocated that the reforms to Crown land management must not jeopardise land claims and should facilitate transfer of land to Aboriginal Land Councils.

The second group largely comprised Local Councils and individuals or organisations that had been affected by land claims. This group generally advocated for changes to the Aboriginal Land Rights Act to limit the ability for land to be successfully claimed and the impact of land claims on the use of Crown land.

Both groups expressed concerns with the existing backlog of undetermined land claims.

Government response and next steps:

Changes to the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983* and the land claims regime are outside the scope of the Review. The Aboriginal Land Rights Act and the Native Title legislation will not be amended by the new Crown land legislation. The Government will work closely with both Aboriginal Land Councils and Local Councils in implementing the recommendations of the Review, including by exploring opportunities afforded by the new Aboriginal land agreement provisions in the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983*.

Comments about Review and White Paper processes

There were a considerable number of submissions that supported the aims of the Review and the proposals in the White Paper.

There was a level of disappointment with the Review process and consultation on the Review Report. Some respondents considered that the Review had a pre-determined outcome and was undertaken by people who did not properly understand the purpose of the Crown land estate. There was a concern that the Review and White Paper were driven by economic and revenue enhancement and did not properly consider the environmental, social and cultural values of Crown land.

Some submissions raised concerns that the review of Crown land was being undertaken without the Government having released its findings or coming to a position on other legislative reviews, mostly the LGA review and the review of the planning framework.

A number of submissions raised concerns that the Review and White Paper only looked at Crown land and did not explore options for reform for all public land, with national parks frequently mentioned.

Government response and next steps:

Governments regularly review legislation and looks for ways to reduce red tape and increase transparency. The outcomes of these processes are synchronised in the preparation of legislation to the extent possible. The review of Crown land will proceed in order to progress a number of significant reforms that will deliver broadscale benefit the public.

The Government considered that a targeted review of the Crown land estate and Crown land management was required, particularly as the last major review occurred more than 25 years ago.

The Government will continue to explore options for consistency and good governance across all public land.

What's next?

Pilot programs and reviews are in the preliminary stages and will continue in 2015. These programs aim to test, define and review the current state of Crown land. There will be further engagement with key stakeholders as the legislation is developed and the Government considers financial implications.

Legislation

The new Crown lands legislation is being developed and is likely to be implemented in stages thereafter.

Local Land Pilot Program

The Government has given in principle support to the Review Report recommendation that ownership or management of land identified as having primarily local significance should be transferred to the relevant Local Council. This principle has been tested as part of a pilot program. The Local Land Pilot was conducted to help define and test the state and local land criteria and to develop an implementation plan for the transfer of local land, where feasible and appropriate.

The pilot has been conducted with four disparate councils (a council of a regional centre, a small inland council, a coastal council and an urban council) in order to identify different types of land management issues faced by Local Councils across NSW. From consultation with Local Government NSW and NSW Government stakeholder agencies, Warringah Council, Tamworth Regional Council, Corowa Shire Council and Tweed Shire Council were selected to participate in the Local Land Pilot.

The pilot program was completed in July 2015 and a report has been delivered to Government for consideration.

State Land Stocktake

A stocktake of the Crown land estate is currently underway. The aim of the stocktake is to refine State criteria to identify State significant land. This process will inform the identification of land for retention along with management options for land.

Travelling Stock Reserve review

Following on from the recommendation of the Crown Lands Management Review that Local Land Services (LLS) develop assessment criteria to review all Travelling Stock Reserves (TSRs) and determine their future ownership and management, LLS intends to develop criteria for a Capability Analysis in consultation with relevant agencies in the first quarter of 2016 and to begin an assessment of ownership and management options in the second half of 2016.

As an interim measure LLS is developing a Planning Framework to guide the development of Regional Plans for each of the 11 LLS regions. LLS expects to put the Planning Framework on public exhibition and to begin extensive consultation with stakeholders in September 2015.

Reserves Governance Project

The Reserves Governance project is identifying ways to improve the governance and oversight of reserve managers, for example in terms of appointment, support and compliance and ensuring the right manager is in place with effective governance and oversight. The policy development work is expected to occur during 2015-2016 with implementation to follow thereafter.

More information

For more information on the Crown Lands Management Review please contact us:

T: 1300 886 235

E: CL.Enquiry@crownland.nsw.gov.au

Appendix 1: List of respondents

Notes

Some respondents made more than one submission

The total of 626 submissions includes 22 submissions where the respondents indicated that they wanted their identities withheld

Submission respondent
Absolute Strata Management
Julie Adams
Megan Adams and Clinton Ryan
Agricultural Societies Council of NSW Ltd
Albury City Council
Phillip Altman
Jairan Amigh
Alaine Anderson
ANTaR NSW Inc.
Arts NSW
Ashfield Council
Association for Berowra Creek Inc.
Association of Mechanics' Institutes and School of Arts NSW
Association of Mining and Exploration Companies
Shane Auld
Australian Institute of Architects
Australian Institute of Landscape Architects, Local Government Landscape Design Forum
Australian Mobile Telecommunications Association
Australian Narrowcast Radio Association
Australian Plant Society - Nowra Group
Australian Property Institute and Spatial Industries Business Association Australia
Kathryn Baird
Ballina Environment Society Inc.
Ballina Shire Council
Bankstown City Council
Paul Barker
Steven Barnett
Bill Barnfield
Bathurst Agricultural, Horticultural & Pastoral Association Inc.
Bathurst Community Climate Action Network
Bathurst Regional Council
Lindsay Beck, Brendan and Jenny Coates, Craig and Sue Williams, Ron Harris, S and Paul Coates

Submission respondent
Bega Valley Shire Council
Belrose Rural Community Association
Bendick Murrell Recreation Reserve Trust
Peter Bernard
Berrigan Shire Council
Better Planning Network Inc.
Timothy Bidder
Binnaway Jockey Club
Birdlife Southern NSW
John Black
Blayney Shire Council
John Blore
Blue Mountains Bird Observers and Blue Mountains Bushcare Network
Blue Mountains City Council
Blue Mountains Conservation Society Inc.
Boating Industry Association of NSW
Bogal Local Aboriginal Land Council
Boorowa Council
Borah Creek Public Hall Trust
Matt Bortolotto
Bourke Shire Council
Leanne Boyce
Peter Boyce
Ronald and Robyn Boys
Linda Bracken
Barry and Judith Brading
Roger Braham
Jenny Brand
Max Breckenridge
Brewarrina Shire Council
Broken Hill City Council
Bronte and Tamarama Advancement Society
Emma Brooks Maher
Alja Brown
Anthony Burns
Burrendong Arboretum Trust
Burwood Council

Submission respondent
Bush Heritage Australia
Bushwalkers NSW
Jeff Cameron
Campbell Partnership
Campbelltown City Council
Campervan & Motorhome Club of Australia
Canal Reserve Action Group Inc.
Caravan and Camping Industry Association NSW
Carrathool Shire Council
Doreen Carter
Lynn Carter
Castle Hill & Hills District Agricultural Society Inc.
Castlecrag Conservation Society
Castlecrag Progress Association Inc.
Castlereagh Macquarie County Council
David Caswell
Central Darling Shire Council
Central NSW Councils (Centroc)
Central West Environment Council Inc.
Central Western Group of Shows Inc.
Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, ANU
Cessnock City Council
Jim Chambers
Norma Chapman
Charles Sturt University
Robyn Christie
Peter Chubb
City of Canada Bay
City of Sydney
Clarence Environment Centre
Clarence Valley Conservation Coalition Inc.
Clarence Valley Council
Mike Clear
Cobar Shire Council
Coffs Harbour City Council
Paul Cohrs
Alan Cole
Colong Foundation for Wilderness

Submission respondent
Community Environment Network
John Connell
Peter Connell
Aidan Conrecode
Coolah Common Trust
Coolamon Shire Council
Coonabarabran Local Aboriginal Land Council
Cootamundra Shire Council
Colin and Laurel Cope
Corindi Beach Reserves Trust
Corindi Community Group Inc.
Fran Corner
Corowa Common Trust
Corowa Shire Council
Correct Planning and Consultation for Mayfield Group
Country Women's Association of NSW, Castle Hill Branch
County of Finch Action Group
Ian Cranwell
Cronulla School of Arts Inc.
Brittany Crouch
Rodney Crouch
Crown Castle International Australia Pty Ltd
Crown Land is Our Land
Cudal Common Trust
Cumberland Bird Observers Club
Curl Curl Lagoon Friends Inc.
Dimitra Damianos
Savas Damianos
Daroo Orange Urban Landcare Group
Neville Davey
Gael Davies OAM
Carlos de Rocha
Bronwyn Delaney
NSW Department of Family & Community Services
David Dickson
Susan Dillon

Submission respondent
Andrew Docking
Dogs NSW
Ian Donald
John and Sharalyn Drayton
Drill Resources Pty Ltd
Ian Drinkwater
Catherine du Peloux Menage
Dubbo Show Society Inc.
Duffys Forest Residents Association
Ken Dumbleton
Dunedoo Showground Trust
Dungog Shire Council
Blake Dyer
Bronwen Dyson
J Ebeyer
EcoNetwork Port Stephens Inc.
Jennifer Edwards
Marg Edwards
S R Edwards
David Egan
Max and Hazel Elsley
Emmaville Common Trust
Environment Liaison Office
Environmental Defenders Office NSW
Environmentally Concerned Citizens of Orange
Eurobodalla Shire Council
Sam Evans
Elizabeth Eyre
Fairfield City Council
Fairhaven Services
Shelley Farriss
Laura Fernando
Wesley Fernando
Ferry Artists Gallery
Fiona Firth
Malcom Fisher
Fisheries NSW
Terry Fogarty

Submission respondent
Robert and Joyce Forbes
Forbes Shire Council
Brian Forbigg
Forster Local Aboriginal Land Council
Myra Fox
Noelene Franklin
Andrew Fraser M.P.
Friends of Berowra Valley Inc.
Friends of Burrendong Arboretum Inc.
Friends of Durras
Friends of Grasslands
Friends of King Edward Park
Friends of Narrabeen Lagoon Catchment
Les Gael
Garigal Landcare
P and J Garske
Glenda Gartrell
Helen and Mike Gayford
Nicholas and Louanne Gebert
Shan Gilchrist
Patricia Gillard
AE and CG Gillogly
Gillogly Holdings Pty Ltd
Girl Guides NSW & ACT
Gloucester Shire Council
Suzie Gold
Goobarragandra Valley Reserves Trust
Gosford City Council
Grafton Local Aboriginal Land Council
Grafton Showground & Recreation Reserve Trust
Grand Junction Pty Ltd
Granville Historical Society Inc.
Grassy Head Reserve Trust
Great Lakes Council
Greater Hume Shire Council
Greater Taree City Council
Greater Western Sydney Heritage Action Group
James Green

Submission respondent
Ruth and James Green
Sylvia Green
Jane Gregory
Gresford Bowls Sport & Recreation Club
Gresford Cricket Club
Gresford District Agricultural Society Inc.
Gresford District Bushman's Carnival Association Inc.
Gresford Park Trust
Griffith City Council
Jillian Grove
Kathryn Grusovin
Gugin Gudduba Local Aboriginal Land Council
Gundaroo Common Trust
Gundaroo Park Trust
Gundurimba Flood Refuge Reserve Trust
David Hall - Johnston
Jennifer Hamilton-McKenzie and Scott Lochhead
Ross Hampton
Harden Shire Council
Hal Harris
Krissy Harris
L Harrison
Martin Harrison
Matilda and Bruce Hartwell
Fred Haskins
Hastings Birdwatchers Inc.
Hawkesbury Race Club Ltd
G Hayes
John Hayes
Rosemary Hayes
Susan and David Hearn
Emma Hill
Hill End and Tambaroora Common Trust
Ian Hitchcock
Margaret Hogg
Kelly Hojer
John Hood
David Horkan

Submission respondent
Hornsby Conservation Society Inc.
Hornsby Shire Council
Horseshoe Cove Association Inc.
Janice Hosking
Kate Hughes
Peter Hughes
Matthew Hundleby
Graham Hunt
Phil Hunt
Hunter & North West Racing Association
Hunter Environment Lobby Inc.
Illawarra Birders Inc.
Illawarra Turf Club Ltd
Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal
Peter Inman
Susan Inman
Sara Jaclin
Pamela and Barry Jago
Susan Jalaluddin
Peter and Yvonne Janssen
Marion Jarratt
Peter Jarratt
Jemena Ltd
Kaye Jenkins
Imelda Jennings
Jerilderie Shire Council
Noela Jones
Noel Jupp OAM
Karuah Local Aboriginal Land Council
Margareta Keal
Leonie Kemp
Kempsey Shire Council
Kendall Community Centre Reserve Trust
Jennifer Kenna
Andrew Kennard
Kensington & West Kingsford Precinct
Kiama Municipal Council
Terence and Tanya Killalea

Submission respondent
Kingsford South Precinct
Kurri Kurri & District Pre-School Kindergarten Inc.
Virginia Kurtze
Kyogle Council
La Perouse Precinct Committee
Lake Macquarie City Council
Lake Tabourie Holiday Van Owners
Peter Lance
Lane Cove Bushland & Conservation Society Inc.
Lane Cove Municipal Council
Scott Lawrence
Maralyn Lawson
Paul Layt
Philip Le Geyt
Raichel Le Goff
Leeton Shire Council
Leeton Show Society
Leichhardt Municipal Council
Lightning Ridge Miners' Association Ltd
Hilary Linstead
Lithgow City Council
Liverpool City Council
Liverpool Plains Shire Council
Local Government NSW
Local Land Services
Peter Lubrano
Mark Luchetti
Des and Joyce Lush
John Lyons
Alasdair MacDonald
Alexander MacDonald
Scot MacDonald M.L.C.
R Mackenzie
Mackunbar Pty Ltd
Karin Mainwaring
M Mandeno
Mangrove Mountain Flora Reserve, Mangrove Creek Recreation Reserve and Mangrove Mountain Recreation Reserve

Submission respondent
Marine Rescue NSW
Annie Marlow
Maroubra Central Precinct Committee
Noel Matis
Denis Matthews
Barry May
Robert McBride
Graham McDonald
Margaret McDonald
Jocelyn McGirr
Carmel McIntyre
D McKee
S McKee
David McKew
David McKibbin
Marg Mclean
Stewart McNeice
Paul Meacham
Paul Meecham
C K Mendel
Peter Mitchell and Ross Brown
Rose and Harry Moll
Glenn Moore
Moree Plains Shire Council
Daniel Morgan
Mosman Municipal Council
Mosman Parks & Bushland Association Inc.
Moverly Precinct Committee
Mudgee District Environment Group
Mulgoa Valley Landcare Group
Kaylee Mulloy
Mullumbimby Agricultural Society Inc
Sharyn Munro
Lynette Murphy
G.A. (Bill) Murray
Murringo Community Association Inc
Muswellbrook Shire Council
Alice Nagy

Submission respondent
Antonia Nagy
Nambucca Shire Council
Namoi Councils
Narooma School of Arts & War Memorial Hall
Narrabri Shire Council
Narromine Local Aboriginal Land Council
Narromine Shire Council
National Parks Association Armidale Branch
National Parks Association of NSW
National Trust of Australia (NSW), Hunter Regional Committee
Natural Allies
Natural Areas Ltd
Nature Conservation Council of NSW
Nature Conservation Trust of NSW
Newcastle City Council
Newtown School of Arts
Michelle Nitschki
North Coast National A and I Society Inc.
North East Forest Alliance
North Sydney Council
NSW & ACT Prospectors and Fossickers Association Inc.
NSW Aboriginal Land Council
NSW Advisory Council on Recreational Fishing
NSW Apiarists Association Inc.
NSW Bird Atlassers Inc.
NSW Council of Freshwater Anglers Inc.
NSW Crown Holiday Parks Trust
NSW Farmers Association
NSW Minerals Council
NSW Ministry of Health
NTSCORP Limited
Oberon Show Society Inc.
Barry O'Connell
Anita O'Connor and Anny O'Connor
Carol O'Donnell
NSW Office of Local Government

Submission respondent
Sandy O'Flanagan
Deidre Olofsson
Clare O'Loughlin
Diane O'Mara
O'Neil Australia Pty Ltd
Joan Opbroek and Ian Elton
Optus
Orange City Council
Orange Field Naturalist & Conservation Society
Steven Osbourne
Kim Ostinga
Margaret Ostinga
Outdoor Recreation Industry Council of NSW Inc.
Don Owers
Pambula Wetlands And Heritage Reserve Trust
Parkes Pastoral, Agricultural and Horticultural Association Inc.
Parkes Shire Council
Parkes Showground Trust
Parramatta City Council
Jason Pascoe
Pastoralists' Association of West Darling
Paterson River Pony Club
Ron and Cynthia Patton
Peel Native Flora & Fauna Reserve Trust
Penrith City Council
Jacob Philpott
Emma Pocock and Ruth Faraday
Port Macquarie-Hastings Council
Port Stephens Council
Bob Puffett
PUSH HQ
Queanbeyan City Council
Racing NSW
Racing NSW Country
Randwick City Council
Stan Rees
B M G Remond

Submission respondent
Ian Richardson
T.R. Richardson
Marion Riordan
Rookwood Cemetery
Laughlin Ross
Darryl Rowley
Andrew Roydhouse
Mario Ruiz
Michael Rumbold
Kate Russell
Maureen Ryan and Amelio Sarchese
Rydal A, H & P Society (Rydal Show Society)
Rydal Showground Trust
Ryde - Hunter's Hill Flora and Fauna Preservation Society
Ryde City Council
Ryde Community Alliance
Samaritans Foundation
Save Little Manly Beach
Save the La Perouse Market Gardens
Lynne Saville
Neville Schrader OAM
David Scott
Scouts Australia NSW Branch
Geraldine Searles
Ann Sharp
James Shaw
Tom Sherlock
Shoalhaven City Council
David Shoebridge M.L.C.
Gordon Shrubbs
David Siebert
Dorothy Simmons
Tony Simpson
Susan Sims
Singleton Archery Society Inc.
Darvan Sinnetamby
Mark Skipper

Submission respondent
Mathew and Vivian Slack-Smith
Bev Smiles
Lindy Smith
Snowy River Shire Council
Patricia Sofios
South East Regional Organisation of Councils (SEROCC)
Robin Spies
Dennis Spooner
St Albans Common Trust
St Albans School of Arts
John Staker
Denis Starrs
Strathfield Municipal Council
Angelina Stratigos
Lyndal Sullivan
Wayne Sullivan
Surf Life Saving NSW
Sutherland Shire Council
Swan Lake Environment Protection Association Inc.
Sydney Coastal Councils Group Inc.
Sydney Water
Mark and Jennifer Tailby
Agnes Tait
Taree Literary Institute
Kevin Taylor
Martin and Marion Tebbutt
Telstra Corporation Limited
Tenants' Union of NSW Co-Op Ltd
Tharawal Local Aboriginal Land Council
The Haberfield Association Inc.
The Hills Shire Council
The Law Society of New South Wales
The Macdonald Valley Association Inc.
The Myall Koala & Environment Group Inc.
The Paddington Society Inc.
Peter Thompson
Elizabeth Thwaites

Submission respondent
Tilligerry Habitat Association
David Tolmie
Tomaree Ratepayers and Residents Association
Total Environment Centre
Terry and Valda Tout
Trangie Local Aboriginal Land Council
Transport for NSW
Ursula Tunks
Tweed Byron Local Aboriginal Land Council
Tweed District Residents & Ratepayers Association
Tweed Shire Council
Tyalgum District Community Association Inc.
U3A
Uki Public Hall and Recreation Reserve Trust
Ulladulla Local Aboriginal Land Council
Upper Lachlan Shire Council
Uralla District Show Society
Urana Shire Council
Valley Team Penning
Dianne Van Sommers
Garry and Louise Vickers
Vodafone Hutchison Australia Pty Ltd
Wagga Wagga City Council
Wagonga Local Aboriginal Land Council
Walcha Council
Walgett Shire Council
Philip Walker
Glenn Wall
Annabel Walsh
Wanaruah Local Aboriginal Land Council
P Wang
Vivien Ward
Warren Shire Council
Warrumbungle Shire Council
Kim Warwick
Suzanne and Robert Wason
Waterfront Action Group

Submission respondent
Wattle Flat Heritage Lands Trust
Wentworth Park Sporting Complex Trust
Wentworth Shire Council
West Wyalong Local Aboriginal Land Council (Aimee Davis, Andrew Carter, Braydn Davis, Colin Luck, Jasmine Boneham, Julie Hampton, Leeanne Hampton, Linton Howarth, Louise Davis, Marlene Collins, Max Lake, Michael Hampton, Mikayla Atkinson, Richard Hampton)
Western Division Councils of NSW
Western Lands Advisory Council
Western Sydney Community Forum
Western Sydney Conservation Alliance
Mark Whatley
Bob Wheeldon
Helen Wheeler
Beth White
Sue White
Wendy White
Ross Whitelaw
Wild Dog Destruction Board
Michael Wilkinson
P Williams
Willoughby City Council
Willoughby Environmental Protection Association
Adrian Wills
Wingecarribee Shire Council
David and Elizabeth Winterbottom
Wollondilly Shire Council
Wollongong City Council
Womboota Common Trust
Woollahra Municipal Council
Woomargama Common Trust
Woonona-Bulli School of Arts
Jamie Wright
Peter Bathurst Wyburd
Wyong Shire Council

Submission respondent
Yengo Produce
Yless4U Pty Limited
Michael York
Val Young
Young Dressage Association Incorporated
D Yule

