

Your details

Mr

Title	
First name	Scott
Last name	Lenton
	Submission details
I am making this submission as	A member of the general public
Submission type	I am making a personal submission
Consent to make submission public	I give my consent for this submission to be made public
	Share your experience or tell your story
Your story	I am a town planner with 30 years local government experience in the Clarence Valley, NE NSW. My personal submission, while late, is based on my experience with bush fire prone land mapping in my professional role at Clarence Valley Council. Terms of Reference (optional)
	The Inquiry welcomes submissions that address the particular matters identified in its <u>Terms of Reference</u> .
1.2 Preparation and planning	Bush fire prone land mapping requirements need to be simplified.
	Current mapping guidelines require bush fire prone vegetation to be classified into one of 3 categories (the former guidelines only

had 2 categories). I believe there should only be one, especially following the events of the past Spring and based on other observations of bushfires over several years.

On bushfire weather days any vegetation will burn, particularly anything from unmanaged Grasslands and above in terms of vegetation classification. Splitting vegetation into different categories only complicates and slows down mapping of bush fire prone land by local Councils, especially when large geographical areas are involved, eg Clarence Valley LGA, and local Councils have other priorities with limited financial, staff and sometimes technical resources.

By assigning a single category of bush fire prone land it would simply flag land as being subject to the hazard with a buffer applied. When a person or company wants to develop the land then that is when a more thorough assessment of the bush fire potential and management requirements should be completed. At present we do extra categorisation in the mapping phase and require the detailed site assessment at development application (DA) stage anyway. Seems to be duplicating effort to some degree for no significant benefit.

I have made my thoughts on this known to some RFS staff involved in assessment of DAs and so hopefully this idea has been raised by others already.

I am more than happy to be contacted to discuss this further.

Supporting documents or images