

## **DRAFT BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK – SUBMISSIONS SUMMARY**

The Draft Biodiversity Framework was exhibited from 30 April 2021 to 8 June 2021, which is a period of twenty-eight (28) business days. The Draft Biodiversity Framework was hosted on Council's website via a Have Your Say page. The exhibition of the Draft Biodiversity Framework was advertised in print and on-line media. Council staff attended four (4) public drop-in sessions, held at Taree Central Shopping Centre at Taree, Stocklands at Forster, Gloucester Library at Gloucester and Tea Gardens Library at Tea Gardens. Interested people and organisations were encouraged to lodge a submission, either by way of one of two on-line options or a formal written submission.

Council received sixteen (16) surveys and ninety-eight (98) online surveys comprising:

- seven (7) formal submissions from six (6) contributors,
- nine (9) email submissions from ten (10) contributors,
- forty (40) full online surveys from thirty-eight (38) contributors, and
- fifty-eight (58) quick online submissions from fifty-eight (58) contributors

In total, one hundred and eighty-two (182) comments were received across a range of themes.

A summary of comments in submissions / surveys is provided in the table below. The response that outlines what action has been taken (if any) in response to each comment is also provided. These comments are grouped into themes for ease of consideration.

In the table below, the abbreviation F refers to formal submission, the abbreviation O refers to online submissions and the abbreviation E refers to emailed submissions.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>Objection in relation to farming (2)</b>						
O 332	-	-	2422	[REDACTED]	<p>A Biodiversity Plan prior to the Draft Rural Strategy has disadvantaged rural land holders. Landowners are concerned that E2 &amp; E3 zoning has already been decided prior to consultation with primary producers. The survey excludes meaningful input from farmers. The survey appears to be weighted in favour of environmentalists who do not always appreciate the important role of food producers. Better outcomes would be achieved through working more collaboratively with all stakeholders, including farmers. This will ensure the sustainability of the environment and food production.</p>	<p>Commentary is provided in Activity 1.2 to make it explicit that the Framework will not direct or change the zoning of certain lands or direct the application of E2 or E3 lands. Such rezonings require a formal planning proposal process under the NSW Government's planning framework. It is not the intent of this Framework or any consultation undertaken to prejudice one group or stakeholder over any other across the MidCoast region. The Framework does seek to recognise "right to farm" principles and work with farmers. Key elements of the Framework seek to maintain the conditions that would assist the productivity and economic sustainability of farmers. Council has had a long history of these partnerships. Council staff are keen to work with farmers to explore these issues during the implementation of the Framework. The Framework is not expected to impinge upon or reduce the ability of farmers. Engagement and projects with farmers will always be on an opt-in / voluntary basis.</p>

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
O 81	-	Bulahdelah	2423	-	<p>It is biased against farmers and owners of forested land. Maintaining a productive farming landscape and timber production on private and public land. Farming is an important part of the Community. Farmers are expected to bear most of the cost of the Councils biodiversity aspirations. Make it clear that farmers will not have to relinquish their right to farm and bear the cost of the Council's biodiversity aspirations. Buy the land if you want to control it. Make provision to feed the growing population without having to import food. Maintaining a productive farming landscape and timber production on private and public land. Biodiversity conservation usually means removing the right to farm from farmers and hence reducing food production. If the community wants to restrict the property rights of farmers, they should pay a commercial rate. Farmers have the right to earn a living just as much as the city dwellers. Plus, the city dwellers probably also need to eat and like to build with wood.</p>	<p>Commentary is provided in Activity 1.2 to make it explicit that the Framework will not diminish a farmers' right to farm nor bear the cost of the aspirations set out in the Framework.</p> <p>It is not the intent of this Framework or any Framework to prejudice one group or stakeholder over any other across the MidCoast region. Key elements of the Framework seek to maintain the conditions that would assist the productivity and economic sustainability of farmers. Council has had a long history of these partnerships. Council staff are keen to work with farmers to explore these issues during the implementation of the Framework. The Framework is not expected to impinge upon or reduce the ability of farmers. Engagement and projects with farmers will always be on an opt-in / voluntary basis.</p>
<b>Objection based on keeping status quo (1)</b>						
E9	█ █	-	Diamond Beach	█	<p>I do not support this new strategy; leave it as it is. Self-management works very well.</p>	<p>The Framework will enhance the current management of biodiversity without burdening landholders with restrictions or impediments. The Framework is a roadmap and guiding document. Actions arising from the Framework will be reported to Council and the community through a consultation and engagement process.</p>

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>Notes on the source of likely opposition to the Framework (1)</b>						
O 298	-	-	2430	[REDACTED]	Most of any community opposition to biodiversity management by Council are from community people who are unaware of the importance of it. Council needs a very strong biodiversity framework.	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted.
<b>Positive comments (18)</b>						
F3	[REDACTED]	-	-	[REDACTED]	Applauds the underlying principles of the Framework.	NA
F5	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Forster	[REDACTED]	Applauds Council's development of the Biodiversity Framework	NA
F6	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Tinonee	[REDACTED]	Glad that Council is taking steps to ensure our area can support a wide range of flora and fauna.	NA
F7	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Glenthorne	[REDACTED]	There should not be opposition to the adoption of the Framework. The current council should consider the finalisation of the Framework.	NA
O 333	-	-	2423	-	Overall, the Framework looks good.	NA
O 329	-	Diamond Beach	2430	[REDACTED]	Very supportive of the Framework. Thank the authors for their insight and forward-thinking.	NA
O 329	-	Diamond Beach	2430	[REDACTED]	I support Council's efforts to become a protector of our local environment and encourage further efforts act as advocates for the legal rights of our environment.	NA
O 329	-	Diamond Beach	2430	[REDACTED]	Overall, the MidCoast Biodiversity Framework 2020-2030 plan is to be applauded as a significant initiative.	NA

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
O 328	-	-	2443	[REDACTED]	I applaud the initiative to look after biodiversity. Without biodiversity we will not survive. It is important in any land planning that areas of high biodiversity are protected and not cleared for development.	NA
O 321	-	-	2430	[REDACTED]	It seems to be a good overview of the work that needs to be undertaken to protect biodiversity in the region.	NA
O 288	-	Bulga Forest	2429	[REDACTED]	Quite happy with it.	NA
O 271	-	Tinonee	2430	[REDACTED]	I think it is comprehensive. I like the idea of Council being responsible for strategy and planning, for leading the way, but also working to give residents the idea of stewardship.	NA
O 218	-	Forster	2428	-	I am glad Council is developing the Framework. I hope it guides decisions and is not just a box ticking exercise.	NA
O 34	-	Brimbin	2446	[REDACTED]	It is an impressive document and the personnel involved deserve full marks.	NA
E4	[REDACTED]	-	Wingham	[REDACTED]	Overall, the Framework looks good	NA
E5	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	-	Coomba Bay	[REDACTED]	The Framework has many positive suggestions to tackle the gigantic job of managing the regions' vast natural areas.	NA
E6	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	-	Green Point	[REDACTED]	Would like to commend Council and staff on taking the time to develop a Biodiversity Framework for our region.	NA
E7	Gloucester Environment Group c/- Tibor Kovats	-	Gloucester	[REDACTED]	Welcomes the establishment of the Framework. The overall purpose and structure of the Framework is comprehensive.	NA

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>Funding (5)</b>						
F1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Glenthorne	[REDACTED]	The Framework should be given funds in the 2021-22 budget.	No changes are proposed; allocation of environmental rate and other Council budgets would consider the Framework. This is discussed in s6.1.
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Significant investment is needed in ecosystem restoration to address the multiple threats of altered fire regimes, altered hydrological regimes, feral predators and transformer weeds.	No changes are proposed; the Framework is a roadmap for biodiversity conservation and fits in with Council's Integrated Planning and Reporting Framework. Actions will be delivered by Council as resources are sourced or are available. Council will review the delivery of the Framework at four-yearly intervals in line with the DPOP review.
O 329	-	Diamond Beach	2430	[REDACTED]	Council should increase funding to improve the policing of compliance with biodiversity regulations and fines for breaches of same. The preservation of existing vegetation, including the preservation of wildlife corridors and of young and mature trees, continues to be a significant approach in reducing habitat loss and related threats to our wildlife biodiversity.	No changes are proposed. Council's regulatory framework and processes is set out in s4.5.
O 329	-	Diamond Beach	2430	[REDACTED]	Further ongoing financial investment and additional commitment of council resources and support for the plan will be needed to offset the current erosion of local biodiversity due to overpopulation and climate change.	No changes are proposed; actions will be delivered by Council as resources are sourced or are available.
E7	Gloucester Environment Group c/- Tibor Kovats	-	Gloucester	[REDACTED]	Council should allocate a sum of funds towards implementation of the Framework at the time that the Framework is adopted. This would demonstrate Council's commitment to the implementation of the Framework.	No changes are proposed; actions will be delivered by Council as resources are sourced or are available.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>The urgency and seriousness of the situation (9)</b>						
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	<p>Nature and humanity are at a critical stage. We are amid a global biodiversity crisis. Globally, there has been an average of 68% decline in populations of birds, mammals, amphibians, reptiles and fish as human conversion of natural ecosystems and consumption of natural resources has massively increased over the last 50 years. We now face risks that whole ecosystems will collapse. In Australia, the outlook for biodiversity is poor, with increasing pressure on ecosystems and declining trends. Although local landscapes in the MidCoast region retain scenic beauty, here too, nature is under pressure. The Framework does not reflect the urgency of the situation. The biodiversity actions are inadequate to achieve the stated intention to "<i>conserve and restore the biodiversity, environment and natural assets of the MidCoast Region</i>".</p>	<p>No changes are proposed; the Framework at s2.4 recognises international agency and National and State government advice on the state of biodiversity decline. The Framework presents a reasoned, valid and appropriate recognition and roadmap for Council over the next ten years, in the context of wider action by other agencies and the community.</p>

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Nature is essential for human existence and a good quality of life. It provides the air, freshwater and soils on which we depend. It regulates the climate and provides many services including crop pollination and reducing the impacts of natural hazards. The actions taken over the next decade will determine the future of global biodiversity, ecosystems and human well-being. Biodiversity loss and ecosystem collapse have the potential to interact with other global risks (including climate change and pollution). The United Nations has launched the Decade for Ecosystem Restoration (2021 to 2030). The seriousness of the risk demands a change in the way that we operate. Biodiversity conservation and restoration should be the centre of everything that we do as individuals, as local communities, and as governments. The roadmap acknowledges that local government has an important role in biodiversity conservation, however, the roadmap and the actions that it outlines suggest that Council has not understood the seriousness of our situation.	<a href="#">The Framework has been amended to reflect the United Nations declaration of the Decade for Ecosystem Restoration.</a>
F6	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Tinonee	[REDACTED]	Concerned with the length of time it will take to set required environmental standards and whether there will be adequate protection.	No changes are proposed; the Framework sets the roadmap for Council to act with reasonable and appropriate biodiversity protection and management in combination with the efforts of other stakeholders.
O 325	-	Wallabi Point	2430	[REDACTED]	The Framework is very positive but could be more intensive. For example, lawn maintenance impacts biodiversity	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
O 304	-	-	2428	-	Great concepts though perhaps the Framework does not embrace the breadth of human impacts on our biodiversity (eg. potential / sometimes negative impacts of tourism). In relation to " <i>human impacts</i> ", " <i>recreational</i> " use of our waterways by " <i>water sports enthusiasts</i> " has not been considered (eg. foreshore erosion, destruction of seagrass beds and noise pollution in residential areas.)	No changes are proposed; the Framework recognises the broad threats to biodiversity and the natural environment, including habitat degradation and human impacts / disturbance. The impacts of some aspects of recreational boating fall within these broad drivers of biodiversity impact.
O 276	-	Gloucester 2422	-	[REDACTED]	In the introductory statements, there should be a commitment from Council to not only protect but enhance the ecosystems that will support the region's biodiversity into the future. The Introduction needs strengthening.	No changes are proposed; the Framework incorporates commentary and commitment to not only protecting but restoring and enhancing biodiversity and the natural environment.
O 154	-	-	2430	[REDACTED]	The underlying principles and goals are great, but the framework needs to go further and not be just rhetoric.	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted. In implementing the Framework, Council will achieve on-ground and measurable positive outcomes for the community.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
E2	[REDACTED]	Bungwahl	-	[REDACTED]	As we have human rights, we should give the environment rights. The submission noted that it costs \$46 trillion dollars to humanly reproduce the environmental activities that we could obtain for free from the environment. Anthropogenic environmental change has been profound, affecting the biosphere, extinctions, climate change, deforestation, acid rain, desertification and pollution. There is a need to recognise the connection and close relationships between all other species. We need to collaborate and co-exist with all creatures to ensure the future and enrich our wellbeing and that of all other living species. The current economic system is fractured and will need a rethink. Decisions need to be made for the future and not for quick cash and keep all living things at the top of our priorities because we are all connected.	No changes are proposed; the context of the changes requested are mostly of a very high-level and beyond the scope of Council's area of influence.
E5	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	-	Coomba Bay	[REDACTED]	The timeframes in the Implementation Plan are vague and lack definition.	No changes are proposed; the timeframes reflect priorities and are flexible to respond to funding opportunities as they arise.
<b>Inadequate change to current practice (1)</b>						
O 287	-		2428	-	It doesn't really scream out that things are going to be done that you are not already doing. There should be a refocussing of priorities based on the results of the feedback.	The Framework has been drafted with substantial community consultation. The Framework has been further amended with the commentary received from the community and other stakeholders during the exhibition.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>Whole of Council integration (1)</b>						
O 305	-	Hawks Nest	2324	[REDACTED]	There appears to be a lot of "motherhood" type aspirational statements. It is unlikely that the various disparate parts of Council will ever agree to many of the competing objectives of the Framework	No changes are proposed; the Framework is a whole-of-Council plan, prepared and delivered across the organisation working together to achieve outcomes for the community.
<b>Community consultation (3)</b>						
O 181	-	[REDACTED]	-	[REDACTED]	Council consistently acts with little to no community consultation. Given I was not aware of previous consultation, it would be fair to say I don't feel council have openly engaged with the community for feedback and input.	Council consulted extensively during the preparation and exhibition of the Framework. Council will further consult widely during the delivery of the Framework and will incorporate feedback adaptively in the review of the program. The Framework was prepared based on feedback from preliminary consultation and consultation during the exhibition of the draft Framework.
O 62	-	Taree	2430	-	Due to all the weather and environmental dramas we've been enduring, it is likely that not everyone has had their say. But I can see Council is putting in a good effort.	Council consulted extensively during the preparation and exhibition of the Framework. Council is open to progressive feedback and commentary and the Framework will be progressively reviewed and updated.
O 298	-	-	2430	[REDACTED]	The ranking system in this on-line survey is not ideal. Everything is important.	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted.
<b>Framework versus Strategy (1)</b>						
E6	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	-	Green Point	[REDACTED]	There is nothing to explain why a Framework format is better than a Strategy or Plan format. There is some insight given in s1.3 Purpose, but this is inadequate	No changes are proposed; the Framework model has been selected because it is more a guide for the next steps rather than a more prescriptive strategy.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>Biodiversity problems and issues (1)</b>						
E6	[REDACTED]	-	Green Point	[REDACTED]	The Framework does not clearly identify the problems / issues that it is trying to solve. These problems and issues should be framed within a national, regional and local context. By identifying the problems that biodiversity faces, then objectives, targets and actions can be developed to overcome them. For example, the problem of clearing of native vegetation on rural land can be linked to two of the Frameworks goals (Goal 1 and 2).	No changes are proposed; biodiversity issues affecting the MidCoast region are listed in s2.4 and 2.5.
<b>Targets, Strategies and Objectives (7)</b>						
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Target 1; it is not clear what this point means. Does improving diversity of species and ecosystems mean increasing species richness (which can be done by introducing exotic species)? Or does it mean that the status, integrity and population trends of local native species is increased? Improvements must be meaningful.	The wording in Target 1 of s3.2 has been amended to enhance clarity and understanding.
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Target 2; this is a utilitarian approach that does not recognise the intrinsic value of biodiversity. The integrity of ecological processes should be restored wherever we can. The term improve is so vague as to be unmeasurable. Perhaps it could be worded that " <i>ecological integrity is being demonstrably and significantly improved</i> ".	The wording in Target 2 of s3.2 has been amended to enhance clarity and understanding.
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Target 3; this should specify " <i>local native</i> " biodiversity (not just any diversity).	This clarification has been made to the Framework.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
O 313	-	Coomba Bay	2428	-	The Framework should have more specific targets and projects to prevent habitat loss and the resulting wildlife death as well as measurable goals.	No changes are proposed; the Framework is the over-arching roadmap for biodiversity management for Council. Specific goals and targets will be developed under individual activities and projects delivered under the Framework.
O 304	-	-	2428	-	The strategies are too vague/general to be informative	No changes are proposed; the Framework provides the roadmap for Council biodiversity conservation and management and specific details would be worked-up and scoped through the implementation of the actions set out in the Framework.

E6		-	Green Point		<p>Goals are an aim or a purpose. Objectives should be something that the Framework is planning to do or achieve to meet the goals. Objectives should translate goals into measurable components. Targets should be measurable and linked to achieving an objective. Actions are the process of doing something; typically to achieve a target or objective. There are issues related to vision, goals, objectives and actions and there is no way of easily identifying what the vision, goals and objectives of the Framework are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The vision in the Framework is from the DPOP but it should be from the Community Strategic Plan ("<i>we value ... our environment</i>").</li> <li>• The present vision (Objective 7) is not the same as that of the adopted DPOP, which simply states: "<i>we protect, maintain and restore our natural environment.</i>"</li> <li>• A new section called "<i>Building a Vision, Goals and Objectives</i>" is required, in s1, building on the work in s3.1 – 3.4.</li> <li>• A second new section called "<i>Vision, Goals and Objectives</i>" is required, building on the s3.5 and objectives and targets.</li> <li>• There are no specific and measurable targets linked to achieving an objective.</li> <li>• The biodiversity actions cannot be easily transferred into the DPOP.</li> <li>• The Framework does not identify any limitations for its delivery and how these can be overcome. Identifying limitations will help in managing community expectations.</li> <li>• The Framework does not identify the resourcing required for its implementation (funding and staffing).</li> </ul>	<p>Layout changes have been made to s3 of the Framework.</p>
----	---	---	-------------	---	---	--

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
E6	[REDACTED]	-	Green Point	[REDACTED]	The Framework does not identify objectives. Each theme should have clearly identified specific objectives which are relevant to Frameworks, Goals and Vision. Specific biodiversity actions that are time-bound and linked to targeted, achievable and measurable outcomes will then be needed to meet the specific objectives within each theme. This will allow the Framework to be SMART. The actions identified in the themes do not link back to Framework goals. From a community perspective, there is no way of gauging whether the biodiversity actions achieve the goals and visions or deliver meaningful outcomes.	<a href="#">Layout changes have been made to s3 of the Framework.</a>
<b>Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting (8)</b>						
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Monitoring, evaluation and reporting; given the lack of detail including specific targets and timelines it is not clear how progress in implementing the biodiversity actions will be measured.	No changes are proposed; in delivering on each action, Council will prepare a monitoring, evaluation and review framework for each action. Progress on the delivery of actions will be tracked (ie. completed, commenced but not completed, not commenced). The Framework is an overarching road-map of Council's involvement in biodiversity conservation and management.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
F4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Harrington	[REDACTED]	The Framework provides a wealth of useful information and important aspirations however there is little accountability built into the Framework. Section 6.2 Success Factors states, "It is also important that each biodiversity action identified in this Framework considers and adopts their own success factors and which are reflected upon as part of activity evaluation and review". People not "biodiversity actions" need to be given responsibility for developing, measuring and reporting on success factors for the actions listed in the Framework.	s6.2 has been amended to reflect this.
F4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Harrington	[REDACTED]	Section 6.3 Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting states that "A set of indicators will be developed as part of Action 6.6: terrestrial landscape health reports." However, this appears to be the only place where these Action 6.6 reports are mentioned. Theme 6: Land Use Planning and Development has actions from 6.1 to 6.5 – there is no 6.6 meaning that these reports are likely to drop off the agenda particularly as Part 2, which contains the Themes and Actions has been constructed to be used as a standalone document with its own page numbering.	This has been amended to read: <i>A set of indicators will be developed as part of Activity 4.5: sub-catchment terrestrial landscape health reports.</i>
F6	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Tinonee	[REDACTED]	The Framework should be setting the standards for the environment in which we live. It does seek to do this.	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted. The Framework seeks to identify responsible principles and standards.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
O 321	-	-	2430	[REDACTED]	It should be a living breathing document with regular updates to address biodiversity issues as they arise.	The proposed implementation of the Framework is described in s6.1. The Framework will be adaptively delivered, and the community will be consistently engaged and consulted. The Framework has been amended to reflect that there would be a formal review of the progress of the Framework every four years.
E6	[REDACTED]	-	Green Point	[REDACTED]	Monitoring, evaluation and reporting is inadequate. There are no specific and measurable targets that are derived from objectives. This means that monitoring is likely to be done in isolation from the Framework. How can you report on Biodiversity Framework Objectives if there are no Objectives in the Framework?	Several changes have been made to s3 of the Framework. A detailed MER plan will be prepared during the implementation of the Framework and targets and objectives will be derived and adopted for the first 4-year interim review.
E6	[REDACTED]	-	Green Point	[REDACTED]	The reporting process is inadequate. There is no way to adequately address through the adopted process whether the Framework is being met or resourced, or whether there have been positive or negative biodiversity outcomes as a result of the Framework.	A detailed MER plan will be prepared during the implementation of the Framework and targets and objectives will be derived and adopted for the first 4-year interim review.
E6	[REDACTED]	-	Green Point	[REDACTED]	The Framework does not adequately identify any current plans and strategies that Council has in relation to biodiversity and how they fit into the Framework	No changes are proposed; existing biodiversity actions are communicated in the Council's State of the Environment reports and Annual reports.
<b>Existing actions (19)</b>						
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Action 1.2.1 is strongly endorsed.	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Action 1.3.1 is strongly endorsed; although it lacks detail and is more like a general goal than a measurable action.	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted. It is a goal and an action and will underpin Council's ongoing commitment to working with the community and stakeholders for biodiversity conservation and management.
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Action 1.4.1; unsupervised volunteers can do work that is detrimental to the goals of habitat restoration. More support and oversight of volunteer environmental works is needed to ensure that the work is aligned with biodiversity goals for each site. Perhaps more paid staff or contractors are needed to work alongside volunteers.	<a href="#">Additional clarification has been made to Action 1.4.1 to ensure that volunteer activities are appropriately supervised and guided.</a>
E5	[REDACTED]	-	Coomba Bay	[REDACTED]	The reliance on volunteers to undertake work in reserves is misguided. Without proper supervision and clearly defined roles and boundaries, members of the community can undertake inappropriate work under the guise of " <i>tidying the area for the community</i> ".	<a href="#">Additional clarification has been made to Action 1.4.1 to ensure that volunteer activities are appropriately supervised and guided.</a>
E7	Gloucester Environment Group c/- Tibor Kovats	-	Gloucester	[REDACTED]	Organised community action through volunteers is a powerful resource for implementation of the Framework and presents an efficient means for carrying out some of the Frameworks' actions.	<a href="#">Gloucester Environment Group has been added to Activity 1.3.</a>
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Action 2.4.1; why only one IPA?	<a href="#">Action 2.4.1 has been amended to reflect that additional IPA's could be delivered, where there is support and acceptance by Government and local Aboriginal people.</a>

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Action 3.1.1; the level of weed infestation in the region is critical. There is a need for council to use its regulatory powers to enforce the law for weeds on private lands. This could be along the lines of the Backyard Bushcare project, where the first contact with landholders is to educate and offer support and then when there is non-compliance to use regulatory powers. Resources are required.	No changes are proposed; Council does use its regulatory powers for the control of very high priority weeds via a triaging process. Backyard Bushcare is proposed to be extended under the Framework.
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Action 3.2.1; there is a need for plans not only to be prepared but also implemented. Significant additional resources will need to be dedicated to this.	No changes are proposed; it is envisaged that the preparation of the MidCoast Pest Animal Strategy will identify the implementation schedule and attribute resources for such.
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Action 3.7.1 is strongly endorsed. Tourism and recreation should not harm biodiversity values. There is a need to reduce the amount of 4WDing on the ability of other beach users to enjoy the environment and to protect the biodiversity of our coast including beach-nesting birds. There should be an additional action to develop a management plan for driving on beaches.	<a href="#">Activity 3.7 has been amended to reflect that some forms of tourism and recreation have biodiversity impacts and that these activities need to be closely monitored and managed.</a>
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Action 4.3; vegetation mapping should include condition assessment.	<a href="#">Action 4.3.1 has been updated to reflect that condition assessment is undertaken in conjunction with vegetation mapping.</a>

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Action 4.4; consideration of important biodiversity and ecosystem service value lands should be included in the LEP zoning and council plans so that future developments are appropriate. For example, steep lands with highly erodible soils that are adjacent to waterways should have development / zoning restrictions placed on them to prevent waterway pollution from inappropriate developments.	No changes are proposed; once the mapping is compiled, Council should determine the means with which lands of biodiversity and ecosystem services values are managed, in consultation with the community.
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Action 6.1.1; there should be a mechanism for the identification and protection of information about important biodiversity and ecosystem service lands in Land Use Planning controls and strategies.	No changes are proposed; this is provided for in Action 6.1.1 presently.
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Action 6.3.1 is strongly endorsed. It is a legal requirement and not optional.	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted.
E7	Gloucester Environment Group c/- Tibor Kovats	-	Gloucester	[REDACTED]	Action 1.2.1 should be a short-term rather than medium-term action	<a href="#">This timing has been amended.</a>
E7	Gloucester Environment Group c/- Tibor Kovats	-	Gloucester	[REDACTED]	Action 1.4.2 should be a short-term rather than medium-term action	<a href="#">This timing has been amended.</a>
E7	Gloucester Environment Group c/- Tibor Kovats	-	Gloucester	[REDACTED]	Action 2.3.5 should be a short-term rather than medium-term action	<a href="#">This timing has been amended.</a>
E7	Gloucester Environment Group c/- Tibor Kovats	-	Gloucester	[REDACTED]	Action 3.2.2 should be a short-term rather than medium-term action	<a href="#">This timing has been amended.</a>

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
E7	Gloucester Environment Group c/- Tibor Kovats	-	Gloucester	[REDACTED]	Action 4.5.2, as it relates to the preparation of a terrestrial landscape health report should be a short-term rather than medium-term action for the sub-catchments that surround The Bucketts.	No changes are proposed; timing and priorities for the delivery of terrestrial landscape health reports has not yet been determined.
E7	Gloucester Environment Group c/- Tibor Kovats	-	Gloucester	[REDACTED]	A Conservation Action Plan should be prepared for The Bucketts and surrounding lands.	Action 5.1.2 has been amended to provide for a Conservation Action Plan for The Bucketts locality.
<b>Additional actions (4)</b>						
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	An additional action is needed under weed management. All projects that involve earthworks including should include management of weeds in the disturbed site for a minimum of three years. At present Council and the road work team is a major cause of weed introduction and creating the site conditions for the establishment of weeds. It is not acceptable to create such disturbance, facilitate the establishment of weeds and then simply walk away.	Activity 3.1 has been amended to identify that Council activities that disturb soils are a weed management risk and should be subject to improved management processes.
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	There should be an additional action to coordinate on-ground weed control programs with other significant landholders including National Parks, Roads Authority, Crown Lands, etc.	Council maintains effective partnerships with a range of authorities, including the development of Memorandums of Understanding. Theme 1 has been amended to better reflect the importance and effectiveness of these partnerships, now and in the future.
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	An action is required that Council develop and implement controls to ensure that all future developments have ecologically sensitive interfaces with natural areas.	Activity 6.1 has been updated to reflect that future developments have ecologically sensitive interfaces with natural areas.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
O 333	-	-	2423	-	The Framework does not elaborate on actions relating to soils and invertebrates are not mentioned much. Both are important for biodiversity.	No changes are proposed; the Framework recognises the values of soil and micro-organisms.
<b>Biodiversity data (4)</b>						
F3	[REDACTED]	-	-	[REDACTED]	The lack of comprehensive biodiversity knowledge and data in our area is a major oversight and needs rectification. With the increasing pressures clearing for housing developments, there is a real risk that important flora and fauna will be lost or endangered before it is fully recognised.	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted. The paucity of applied biodiversity knowledge is reflected in Theme 4 of the Framework.
F6	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Tinonee	[REDACTED]	[Pg. 22] re: the need for biodiversity knowledge to underpin effective management – this is essential before any major work is done which is likely to upset the balance of biodiversity in the area.	No changes are proposed; this comment supports the actions identified in 4.1.1 and 4.1.2.
F7	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Glenthorne	[REDACTED]	Two (2) books (identified) and the research of Geoff Williams in the Harrington area have relevant information on the biodiversity of the MidCoast.	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted.
F4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Harrington	[REDACTED]	2.3 Special Biodiversity Features is a valuable overview of our unique environment. In this context it is also worth mentioning that the Manning is the only snow-fed river draining to Australia's east coast.	The positive feedback and information is noted.
<b>Professional expertise of staff (1)</b>						
F1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Glenthorne	[REDACTED]	Staff should use their professional expertise in devising the Framework. Human wellbeing depends on biodiversity.	No changes are proposed; the Framework has been compiled by Council staff, with input from a range of stakeholders.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>Status of threatened species (1)</b>						
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	[pg. 2] Threatened species have legal protection which is not the same as actual protection.	The Framework has been amended to reflect this.
<b>Readability and accuracy (11)</b>						
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	There are typographical and formatting errors.	The Framework has been enhanced through a detailed review of readability, typography and formatting.
F4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Harrington	[REDACTED]	This document contains a lot of jargon and a glossary of acronyms should be included to assist readers to decipher sentences such as "Certified CMPs must be integrated with Council DPOP and IP&R Framework."	The text of the document has been amended to improve readability and address grammatical and typographical errors. Acronyms have been avoided or better explained.
F4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Harrington	[REDACTED]	3.6 Biodiversity Disaster Response and Resilience includes the statement, " <i>In this way, biodiversity is better able to cope with any disasters and recovery would be faster and more effective.</i> " Biodiversity refers to the number and variety of species of plant and animal life within a region. Biodiverse ecosystems may be more resilient, but biodiversity is not something which " <i>copest</i> ".	This text has been amended to address the language error and improve readability.
F4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Harrington	[REDACTED]	A review to ensure that jargon is being used appropriately would improve accessibility of this important document for non-technical readers.  Overall, the document needs editorial review to correct grammatical errors and ensure that all sentences are complete.	The text has been amended to improve readability and address grammatical and typographical errors.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
F4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Harrington	[REDACTED]	3.7 Nature-based recreation includes: <i>"One of the key goals of this plan is to support Thriving Communities with Direction 17 providing for Enhances access to recreational facilities and connect open spaces."</i>	This text has been amended to improve readability and address grammatical and typographical errors.
F4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Harrington	[REDACTED]	Readers of this document are unable to comment on the flow charts on pages 32 & 33 as they are on landscape pages which have been captured in portrait format.	Staff will ensure that these flow-charts are readable for the final adopted version.
F4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Harrington	[REDACTED]	It is vital that all pages are readable on the electronic document. All the photos are blurry but the maps on pages 22, 23 & 24 are so blurry as to be unreadable. The option of a print version without the photos would be useful	Staff will ensure that maps in the final adopted document are readable.
F6	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Tinonee	[REDACTED]	The terms "short term", "medium term" and "long term" should be explained (eg. how long).	No changes are proposed; the Framework identifies the specific timeframes envisaged for short-, medium- and long-term actions on pg. 52.
F4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Harrington	[REDACTED]	The Manning Coastcare Group Inc works to control invasive weeds in littoral rainforests from Crowdy Head to Black Head. We work closely with Council and are pleased to be recognised in the Framework: <i>"Tops to MidCoast Landcare, Manning Coastcare"</i> However, as an incorporated association our full name, Manning Coastcare Group Inc, needs to be used. Similarly, the regional group of which we are part is MidCoast 2 Tops Landcare Connection Inc and needs to be referred to as such.	The changes to organisation titles have been made.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
F4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Harrington	[REDACTED]	Theme 2.3 Private Land Conservation includes Action 2.3.2 " <i>Build on and enhance the existing partnership between Council and MidCoast to Lakes Landcare to continually improve the delivery and growth of the Land for Wildlife program</i> ". Is there a MidCoast to Lakes Landcare?	<a href="#">This relates to MidCoast 2 Tops Landcare Connection Inc and the required correction has been made.</a>
E4	[REDACTED]	-	Wingham	[REDACTED]	The Framework incorrectly references the organisations: Mid Coast 2 Tops Landcare Inc, Manning Landcare, Karuah & Great Lakes Landcare Inc and Manning Coastcare Group Inc.	<a href="#">The required corrections have been made.</a>
<b>Protection of native bushland (5)</b>						
F1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Glenthorne	[REDACTED]	The Framework should be a vehicle for the introduction of bushland protection. There is ongoing vandalism of trees and an attitude of dislike towards bushland. This attitude is outdated.	No changes are proposed; the Framework addresses bushland protection in several subject areas and actions, including Actions 3.3.1 – 3.3.4
O 298	-	-	2430	[REDACTED]	More protection of heathlands, riparian areas and less bare earth clearing from developers, eg Tuncurry opposite the council depot and Folly Foot Farm.	<a href="#">Activity 6.5 has been amended to reflect that retention of trees on development sites is valuable and should be considered in development layout and design.</a>
O 62	-	Taree	2430	-	Development should be away from the coastal and waterway edges to allow nature to survive and to prevent pollution.	No changes are proposed; development is regulated by Council under the NSW planning framework, which has procedures for the protection and management of coasts, waterways and riparian areas. The Framework recognises the value of such areas for biodiversity and identifies the importance of their protection.
E5	[REDACTED]	-	Coomba Bay	[REDACTED]	The Framework should prioritise habitat protection above all else in all land use planning and assessment processes.	No changes are proposed; appropriate principles are established for habitat protection, with the context of Council's scope of influence.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
E7	Gloucester Environment Group c/- Tibor Kovats	-	Gloucester		Some development and land management practices will contribute to further loss of habitat, particularly in natural closed or open woodlands. Even if trees remain, the loss of undergrowth caused by grazing or mowing and clearing of debris on large urban lots is causing a decline in avian diversity. Without native understorey and grasses and fallen woody debris, invertebrate diversity is lost, with flow on effects to birds, reptiles and mammals. Over the last 20-years, there has been a decline (and in some cases, absence) in several local native bird species. Droughts, fires, use of insecticides and predation by foxes and cats have also contributed. Council should show strong leadership through education, incentives and regulation to prevent land clearing unless justified by an appropriate investigation and balanced by appropriate offsets.	No changes are proposed; the Greening Strategy proposed in the Framework is expected to assist in the enhancement of green-spaces in urban and peri-urban areas. Clearing of native vegetation and agricultural practices in rural lands is regulated by the NSW Government.
<b>Greenspace and street trees (4)</b>						
O 59	-	-	2428		It is heading in the right direction. We need to create a greener and more attractive urban environment and priorities multiple recreation opportunities.	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted. The Framework recognises the value of greening urban areas and encouraging nature-based recreation.
O 59	-	-	2428		There should be less loss of existing green space and there should be better weed management and more rehabilitation of eroded areas. There has been a large loss in green space in the region in the last 2 years, including the loss of habitat and corridors for wildlife.	No changes are proposed; Action 6.5.1 relates to the implementation of a Greening Strategy. This is the vehicle for delivering enhanced greenspaces. A draft Greening Strategy has been exhibited by Council.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
O 59	-	-	2428	[REDACTED]	There should be more native street trees in the suburban areas to green the region. This creates more areas for birds and small mammals like gliders.	No changes are proposed; Action 6.5.1 relates to the implementation of a Greening Strategy. This is the vehicle for delivering enhanced street trees and greenspaces. A draft Greening Strategy has been exhibited by Council.
O 79	-	-	2428	[REDACTED]	There is no mention of urban street trees. There is a need to plant trees in existing reserves and parks to support more wildlife.	No changes are proposed; Action 6.5.1 relates to the implementation of a Greening Strategy. This is the vehicle for delivering more trees on streets and in parks. A draft Greening Strategy has been exhibited by Council.
<b>Tree Preservation Policies (4)</b>						
F3	[REDACTED]	-	-	[REDACTED]	The Framework needs to address a Council wide Tree Preservation Policy or Order. Tree preservation, including protection of wildlife corridors, mature trees and trees that will grow to be old and mature are essential as habitat loss continues to be a major threat to wildlife. Our region is under huge pressure to expand housing development including medium density housing. Such progress needs to be assiduously managed to ensure that habitat connectivity is not further endangered.	No changes are proposed; Council has recently exhibited a Draft Greening Strategy and a Draft Vegetation Management Policy, which includes tree protection tools.
F4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Harrington	[REDACTED]	There is no mention of how the Vegetation Management Policy fits into the Framework. As a policy affecting residential land, it should have a place in Theme 6 Land use planning and development.	<a href="#">Activity 6.5 has been amended to include details of the Vegetation Management Policy.</a>

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
O 329	-	Diamond Beach	2430	[REDACTED]	Concerned that a more assertive Tree Preservation Policy or Order is required. Both developers and private land holders seem able to remove trees and other vegetation with impunity. This seems to occur both by stealth (removal of trees in advance of development and/or other applications/ permissions), and by blatant action before during and after development.	No changes are proposed; Council has exhibited a Vegetation Management Policy.
O 154	-	-	2430	[REDACTED]	We have been waiting over three years for a return of a tree preservation policy, meanwhile trees are being removed from private land at a rapid rate with the ensuring loss of vital habitat including old growth tree hollows and wildlife corridors.	No changes are proposed; Council has recently exhibited a Draft Greening Strategy and a Draft Vegetation Management Policy, which incorporates tree protection processes.
<b>Greening Strategy and Housing Strategy (1)</b>						
O 315	-	-	2324	[REDACTED]	The Greening Strategy and the Housing Strategy are completely at odds. How can urban areas remain "green" with mature trees when the housing rezoning will allow lots to be as small as 350 or 450 sq. metres?	No changes are proposed; in line with the NSW Governments focus on improving urban trees and green spaces, these strategies will direct that the planning on an individual site will be responsive to landform and natural assets and values. Existing trees will be better incorporated into development layouts and landscaping will be delivered for enhanced liveability.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>Additions to conservation land (1)</b>						
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	[pg. 28] The concept of CAR (comprehensive, adequate and representative) is well established but the concept of adequacy has changed. The existing reserve system (public plus private) in the MidCoast region is far from being adequate. It is now thought by many ecologists that we should be aiming to conserve at least 50% of the landscape. There is a need to significantly increase the area dedicated to conservation in the region. This should be done in a way that increases the connectivity of native vegetation and the integrity of ecological processes.	The public conservation reserves scheme in NSW is managed by the state government, under the Minister for the Environment. Council can and does play a supportive role, where there are benefits to the wider community, and this is recognised in the Framework. This is recognised by the inclusion of Action 2.2.4, where the Council will collaborate with the NSW Government. Action 2.2.1 is added to facilitate additions of land to Reserves, where there are clear benefits and it addresses Council's priorities and processes.
<b>Acquisition and preservation of open space (1)</b>						
F3	[REDACTED]	-	-	[REDACTED]	Acquisition and preservation of green spaces are critical Council investments.	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted.
<b>Council's community profile / environmental credentials (2)</b>						
F3	[REDACTED]	-	-	[REDACTED]	Council's public profile is not visible enough for essential ecological messages to be heard. This needs to be rectified with a variety of strategies	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted. Council has consulted extensively through the development of the Framework and will continue to engage and consult as the Framework is implemented.
O 154	-	-	2430	[REDACTED]	Council needs higher public visibility for biodiversity.	No changes are proposed; this comment is noted. The Framework is expected to elevate the extent with which Council interacts and engages with the community positively in relation to biodiversity.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>Community environmental projects (1)</b>						
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Council could provide financial or in-kind support to community initiated small environmental projects such as clean-up projects.	No changes are proposed; Council provides significant funding for on-ground work in natural areas and will continue to identify and fund such work.
<b>Land for Wildlife (2)</b>						
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Action 2.3.1; the Land for Wildlife Program in its current formation is very underpowered. There is a need to encourage more private landholders to be involved in this scheme and to provide practical, ecologically informed outreach services to landholders many of whom do not have enough knowledge and skills to undertake conservation land management without support.	<a href="#">Action 2.3.1 provides for a review and improvement of the Land for Wildlife Scheme. The information provided in Activity 2.3 has been updated.</a>
F2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Coomba Park	[REDACTED]	Perhaps Council could provide some rate relief for participating landholders as an incentive to participate in Land for Wildlife.	No changes are proposed; rate relief is provided for some of the permanent private conservation lands via the NSW Government's biodiversity framework. As the Land for Wildlife scheme is non-binding, it is considered inappropriate that it would be associated with rate relief.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>Bushcare and Landcare (1)</b>						
E4	[REDACTED]	-	Wingham	[REDACTED]	[pg. 63] This section may be confusing as it only references the Council-managed environmental volunteer groups and omits mention of the many Landcare and Coastcare groups in the LGA supported by Mid Coast 2 Tops Landcare Connection Inc. The section should be re-named or reference should be provided to the many Landcare and Coastcare Groups that are managed by MC2T. The Framework should better acknowledge the decades of work done by local Landcare and Coastcare Groups to help protect the biodiversity and natural environment.	Reference is provided to the many Landcare and Coastcare Groups that are managed by MC2T across the MidCoast and the section has been enhanced to reflect the work of volunteers associated with non-Council organisations.
<b>Backyard Bushcare program (2)</b>						
F3	[REDACTED]	-	-	k [REDACTED]	The Backyard Bushcare program is useful to encourage wildlife friendly gardens. However, the program is limited to Pacific Palms and needs expansion to cover the whole of the council region as the whole of the MidCoast is a uniquely rich biodiversity area. The program needs to include education, awareness raising and assistance to help landowners and residents to provide more habitat rich gardens.	No changes are proposed; the extension of the Backyard Bushcare program is programmed within the Framework.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
O 329	-	Diamond Beach	2430		The 'Backyard Bushcare Program' is a useful initiative like several other Council initiatives (e.g., Gardens for Wildlife in Knox Council, Victoria) to encourage wildlife friendly gardens. However, at this point this program is limited to the Pacific Palms area. The program needs to be expanded to cover the whole of the MidCoast as a uniquely rich biodiversity area. The program would also need to include education, awareness raising and assistance to help landowners and residents to provide more habitat rich gardens	No changes are proposed; the extension of the Backyard Bushcare program is programmed within the Framework.
<b>Engagement with Aboriginal people (2)</b>						
O 304	-	-	2428	-	The knowledge and understandings of our local Aboriginal people need to be more seriously included. The Framework needs to better represent and involve the traditional owners and custodians of this Country in future/projected planning.	No changes are proposed; Activity 4.7 in the Framework relates to Aboriginal cultural and community knowledge. Council recognises and respects the immense knowledge of the First Nations people and respects their enduring connection to Country.
O 108	-	-	2428	-	There is a need to move with nature. Therefore, there is a need for more aboriginal input and for Council to listen to and act on what aboriginal people need and want. This would assist close the gap and incorporate activities such as an Aboriginal run museum at the back of Wallis Lake.	No changes are proposed; Activity 4.7 in the Framework relates to Aboriginal cultural and community knowledge. Council recognises and respects the immense knowledge of the First Nations people and respects their enduring connection to Country.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>Partnerships (4)</b>						
O 329	-	Diamond Beach	2430	[REDACTED]	Council should continue to facilitate partnerships with stakeholders including private landholders and developers, and State and Federal governments to achieve not only a sustainable action plan, but a plan that helps recover much of the biodiversity lost since European Settlement. The managers of Nature Reserves, National Parks and Forestry areas need to be working together to harmonise efforts	No changes are proposed; the Framework sets out the importance of partnerships in Theme 1.
O 271	-	Tinonee	2430	[REDACTED]	I like the idea that Council is managing public land but also working with private landholders, as that's where a lot of our wild places and waterways are. We need to look upstream, up-country.	No changes are proposed; the Framework at Theme 1 recognises the value of Council and landholder working partnerships. Landholder support is also provided by Council through the catchment and coastal management planning frameworks.
O 271	-	Tinonee	2430	[REDACTED]	Supporting local groups who have special interest in wildlife (shorebirds, turtles, koalas) is where I think a lot of effective action can be taken.	No changes are proposed; Council working in partnership with landholders, agencies and interest groups is discussed in Theme 1. Supporting local interest groups is a high priority focus for Council and will deliver significant benefits and outcomes under the umbrella of the Framework.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
O 68	-	Boomerang Beach	2428	[REDACTED]	It should recognise and be done in conjunction with National Parks, otherwise it will fail. National Parks areas are critical to our environment and to sustaining, for example, koalas. But either NPWS or Council are delinquent in weed control (see around Elizabeth Beach) and in re-establishing koalas on Booti Booti (including control of feral dogs).	No changes are proposed; Council has an effective working partnership with the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service, including a substantial record of achievement in collaboration in weed and pest control programs. Council has an operational plan to deliver strategic weed controls through the bushland reserves of Pacific Palms. To our knowledge, there is a residual population of koalas on Booti Booti Hill, which occurs within the National Park. The Framework adopts the koala as a priority species.
<b>Engaging with farmers (3)</b>						
O 333	-	-	2423	-	There should be more in relation to engaging farmers (not just in the context of conservation agreements).	<a href="#">Activity 1.2 has been amended and upgraded to better reflect the value of voluntary landholder engagement on farms.</a>
O 154	-	-	2430	[REDACTED]	There should be greater Council involvement with landholders in wildlife protection (eg. extending and expanding wildlife in your backyard programs).	No changes are proposed; the Backyard Bushcare program is planned to be extended as resources permit.
O 154	-	-	2430	[REDACTED]	Council should be assisting landholders with native bush regeneration.	<a href="#">Activity 1.2 has been amended to reflect that Council will seek to engage with landholders to assist promote native bushland regeneration in priority or targeted areas and programs.</a>
<b>Tighter controls on development (9)</b>						
F1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Glenthorne	[REDACTED]	The Framework needs to have influence on planning decisions. Eg. a proposed industrial rezoning at Glenthorne will disturb koala habitat.	No changes are proposed; the Framework provides an overview of Council biodiversity management and is not intended as a regulatory tool.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
O 330	-	Hawks Nest	2324	[REDACTED]	How is the framework going to be positioned in relation to other council strategies, especially those relating to development? It seems development has priority. This should not be the case. The push for development is at the expense of the environment. This is not why most people moved to this area in the first place. Tighter controls on development in significant biodiversity areas is needed.	No changes are proposed. Development is regulated by Council under the NSW Government's planning framework. The Framework provides a roadmap for integrated and coordinated biodiversity conservation and management, together with the community and other stakeholders. Land Use Planning and Development and the influence of the Framework are set out in Theme 6. The way this Framework sits within the wider reporting framework of Council is explained in s6.1.
O 329	-	Diamond Beach	2430	[REDACTED]	Residential development and general population increase in the MidCoast region seem inevitable and without limitation. By incorporating a biodiversity plan within that ongoing urban development may provide some offset to the otherwise inevitable demise of "The Bush".	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted.
O 323	[REDACTED]	Limeburners Creek	2324	[REDACTED]	We as individuals, Council and Government departments (all) have a responsibility to protect wildlife and habitat from further clearance from developments, mining, extractive industries, housing complexes.	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted. Development is regulated through the NSW Government's planning framework.
O 315	-	-	2324	[REDACTED]	The Framework will mean nothing if urban development continues along the current trajectory. More dwellings mean more people, more cars, more dogs and cats. So, less vegetation and less wildlife.	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted. Development is regulated by Council under the NSW planning framework, which has procedures for the protection and management of important native vegetation. The Framework recognises the value of such areas for biodiversity and identifies the importance of their protection.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
O 298	-	-	2430	[REDACTED]	Biodiversity is the ecological life support. Council should have in place essential biodiversity protection from urban development All of the existing vegetation should not be cleared on development sites as is happening now (eg. Folly Foot Farm and The Grange, Forster).	<a href="#">Activity 6.5 has been amended to reflect that retention of trees on development sites is valuable and should be considered in development layout and design.</a>
O 218	-	Forster	2428	-	Building development should not be permitted in low lying land, flood affected land or natural bushland.	No changes are proposed; development is regulated by Council under the NSW planning framework, which has procedures for the protection and management of low-lying land, flood-labile land and native vegetation. The Framework recognises the value of such areas for biodiversity and identifies the importance of their protection.
O 59	-	-	2428	[REDACTED]	There is concern about the spread of new urban areas into creek and wetlands.	No changes are proposed; development of new urban areas is regulated by the NSW planning framework, which has procedures for the protection and management of wetlands, waterways and riparian areas. The Framework recognises the value of these areas for biodiversity and identifies the importance of their protection.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
E2		Bungwahl	-		<p>Detailed submission on the severity of the environmental impacts of the approved development at Folly Foot Farm, Forster. The development seemingly has been constructed by non-local workers (Queensland), which have lower environmental standards. The major concern with respect to the development is that it occupies an area of wetland, that is a filter system to the lake and serves to protect the quality of lake waters and important fish spawning grounds. The development involved the destruction of every tree, plant, grasses, animals and other organisms on the land. People come to this region not to live in a built environment but to enjoy the biodiversity of the area. The site of this development instead of having a positive environmental impact has now left the lake open to run-off from new housing and fertilisers. The submission states that the area had many years of protection but is now being threatened by over development and ecosystem destruction, resulting in increased risk of pollution of our waterways, fish and oyster stocks. Expressed a feeling of despair at these decisions.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed. Development is regulated by Council under the NSW Government's planning framework. The Framework provides a roadmap for integrated and coordinated biodiversity conservation and management, together with the community and other stakeholders. Land Use Planning and Development and the influence of the Framework are set out in Theme 6.</p>

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>State-significant development (2)</b>						
O 323	[REDACTED]	Limeburners Creek	2324	[REDACTED]	Detailed submission on the need for Council to support the community in relation to objections of some Part 3A developments. The submission specifically identifies proposed quarries at Deep Creek, Karuah South (North?) and Maytoms Lane. It suggests that many natural areas of The Bucketts Way towns/villages, Tea Gardens, Hawks Nest and other areas are being destroyed for housing developments or mining/quarry companies. It calls for Council to object to any further mines and quarries in the MidCoast area as well any proposed dam at Limeburners Creek / Clarence Town or Upper Chichester. Mines / quarries or housing developments clear native vegetation, kill wildlife, pollute swamps, creeks, rivers, oceans and they contribute to climate change and cause human health impacts. The submission raises concerns about the lack state and council revenue and funding from mines and quarries.	No changes are proposed; the Framework does not address the issue of site-specific developments, whether state-significant of local. State-significant developments are regulated by the NSW Government through the state planning framework. Local Government is not responsible for state-significant development assessment but undertakes merit-based assessment through the NSW Government consultation framework.
E3	[REDACTED]	Limeburners Creek	2324	[REDACTED]	The Framework does not mention mining and quarrying impacts. Council has missed the opportunity to report accurately on the damage these industries does to the environment, including the pollution of water systems, killing of wildlife and the destruction of swamps and soaks.	No changes are proposed; the Framework does not address the issue of site-specific developments, whether state-significant of local. State-significant developments are regulated by the NSW Government through the state planning framework. Most quarrying and mining activities are regulated by the NSW Government.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>Development offsets (1)</b>						
O 330	-	Hawks Nest	2324	[REDACTED]	Offsets for developments in wildlife corridors and other significant areas should not be allowed. This does little to preserve areas of significance.	No changes are proposed; the biodiversity offsets scheme forms part of the NSW Government planning framework. Action 6.2.2 proposes to develop a local biodiversity offsets policy to complement the NSW scheme and optimise biodiversity offset delivery.
<b>Regulation and enforcement (2)</b>						
E5	[REDACTED]	-	Coomba Bay	[REDACTED]	There is a major ongoing issue with lack of enforcement. There is already many plans and laws protecting the natural environment, but unfortunately, many people deliberately ignore these laws and clear native vegetation on public land. There is a need for consistent enforcement of illegal clearing as well as clearly defined boundaries as to what is permitted and by whom. There needs to be a dedicated vegetation enforcement officer.	No changes proposed; biodiversity compliance responsibilities are documented in the Framework in s4.5.
E7	Gloucester Environment Group c/- Tibor Kovats	-	Gloucester	[REDACTED]	It is a concern that Council does not have a compliance policy. The adoption of such is a high priority considering the need for a balance between both incentive and regulation in biodiversity conservation.	No changes proposed; biodiversity compliance responsibilities are documented in the Framework in s4.5.
<b>Roadkill mitigation measures (1)</b>						
F3	[REDACTED]	-	-	[REDACTED]	High wildlife roadside conservation areas also need to incorporate reduced speed limits, traffic calming strategies and wildlife crossing bridges and tunnels	<a href="#">Activity 3.4 has been amended to reflect that Council will consider avoidance or protection measures at these priority sites.</a>

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>Feral animal control (2)</b>						
F3	[REDACTED]	-	-	[REDACTED]	Feral animal control is essential. Council could be more assertive by supplying advice and traps to private landowners in addition to community education.	No changes are proposed. In Activity 3.2 and Action 3.2.1, the development of a Pest Animal Strategy will frame the education and support program of Council for private landowners.
O 154	-	-	2430	[REDACTED]	There should be more resourcing for feral animal controls.	No changes are proposed; Activity 3.2 discusses pest animal management programs and Action 3.2.1 schedules the preparation of a Pest Animal Strategy for the MidCoast. Council undertakes feral pest animal controls for wild dogs, foxes and wild deer, with program partners in priority areas.
<b>Weed mapping (1)</b>						
F4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Harrington	[REDACTED]	The priority given to vegetation mapping is encouraging however weed mapping would also be beneficial. It could be included as an action in 3.1 Strategic Weed Program.	No changes are proposed; the vegetation community mapping program of Council incorporates weed mapping components. Further, bushland reserve plans of management will include and respond to weed mapping.
<b>Domestic dogs and cats (2)</b>						
E1	[REDACTED]	-	-	[REDACTED]	Very concerned about weak cat laws. Nothing has been done about domestic dogs and cats that kill wildlife. Something needs to be done about it. Curfews would be a start.	<a href="#">Action 3.2.2 provides for the development of protocols that manage the impacts of domestic dogs and cats on native wildlife.</a> <a href="#">Activity 3.2 has been amended to reflect the importance of best practice controls and policies on free-ranging domestic dogs and cats in order to protect native wildlife.</a>

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
O 325	-	Wallabi Point	2430	[REDACTED]	Dogs on beaches and in bushland destroys biodiversity.	No changes are proposed; Action 3.2.2 discusses the process to enhance the management of domestic dogs so that the biodiversity impacts of these essential companions are minimised and managed.
<b>Focus on wildlife and threatened species (1)</b>						
O 305	-	Hawks Nest	2324	[REDACTED]	Insufficient focus on wildlife and threatened species. Too much focus on agricultural productivity and development of built environments.	No changes are proposed; the Framework is a roadmap for the future. There is a substantial focus on wildlife and threatened species, including within Actions in Theme 5, including Activity 5.1 & 5.3.
<b>Threatened species: koala, grey-crowned babbler and grey-headed flying-fox (7)</b>						
F6	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Tinonee	[REDACTED]	A major concern should be the protection of koalas. The Framework, Greening Strategy and Vegetation Management Policy should enable the protection of koalas.	No changes are proposed; the Framework adopts the koala as a local priority species and sets out actions to manage this species.
F6	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Tinonee	[REDACTED]	[Pg.16] re: Significant Roadside Protection, Council should look at all areas where there is core koala and give these areas protection.	No changes are proposed; the Framework adopts the koala as a local priority threatened species.
E7	Gloucester Environment Group c/- Tibor Kovats	-	Gloucester	[REDACTED]	Gloucester Bucketts and surrounding lands should be added to the priority areas for the koala.	<a href="#">s2.3 has been amended to reflect this.</a>
F6	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Tinonee	[REDACTED]	[Pg. 36] re: "Council has responsibilities in relation to development assessment which can have a significant influence on the condition, function and health of biodiversity". Council should use its responsibilities wisely and ensure we have an area to be proud of in an ever-changing environment, which has been heavily impacted.	No changes are proposed; the Framework reflects the specialness of the MidCoast region and identifies the framework for Council's contribution to the management of the biodiversity values and assets.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
O 323	[REDACTED]	Limeburners Creek	2324	[REDACTED]	Tried unsuccessfully to log with Council a koala in Forest Glen Road, Limeburners Creek on the October 2020 long weekend.	No changes are proposed; Council has an on-line koala sightings report form available through Council's website. It is available at: <a href="https://www.midcoast.nsw.gov.au/Part-of-your-every-day/Council-Projects/MidCoast-Koala-Mapping">https://www.midcoast.nsw.gov.au/Part-of-your-every-day/Council-Projects/MidCoast-Koala-Mapping</a>
E7	Gloucester Environment Group c/- Tibor Kovats	-	Gloucester	[REDACTED]	Council should engage with the Gloucester Environment Group and the Gloucester community on the actions needed to conserve the local grey-crowned babbler.	Activity 5.3 has been amended to reflect this.
O 333	-	-	2423	-	Flying foxes should be considered a priority considering their importance for seed dispersal and pollination.	Grey-headed flying-foxes have been added at pg.32 as a priority threatened species. A draft camp management plan has already been prepared for local camps.
<b>Mosquitos and wetlands (1)</b>						
O 333	-	-	2423	-	Will the development of former wetlands create a mosquito problem? If so, this is not good for health or for insecticides in the environment.	No changes are proposed; there are a range of factors considered when restoring, re-constructing or creating wetlands, including limiting the potential for mosquito breeding.
<b>Nature-based tourism and recreation (1)</b>						
F6	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Tinonee	[REDACTED]	The natural environment should be a drawcard for many tourists.	No changes are proposed; tourism based on accessing natural areas and values is very important for the regional economy. This is noted in the Framework.
<b>Polluting businesses and waste (4)</b>						
F3	[REDACTED]	-	-	[REDACTED]	Lost and abandoned fishing tackle as well as plastic litter continues to take a major toll on our marine birds and animals. Strong and continuous community education is required to encourage safer practices and fishing tackle usage.	No changes are proposed; Council has a program of working with the agencies to provide receptacles for fishing tackle waste and we deliver combined fishing tackle waste education campaigns through our Waste Education Officer.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
O 154	-	-	2430	[REDACTED]	There should be programs highlighting responsible fishing and fishing tackle use. Discarded fishing tackle is a major cause of wildlife injury and death.	No changes are proposed; fishing rules and regulations are managed by the NSW Department of Primary Industries. Council has a program of working with this agency to provide receptacles for fishing tackle waste and we deliver combined fishing tackle waste education campaigns through our Waste Education Officer.
O 62	-	Taree	2430	-	There is a need to restrict polluting businesses like takeaway food waste and convert to using more environmentally friendly 'waste' products to reduce destructive impacts on nature.	No changes are proposed. Development controls are implemented through the NSW planning framework. Waste education, management and advocacy is undertaken by Council through the Waste team, with the NSW Government. Council is endeavouring to enhance waste outcomes, including waste avoidance, re-use and recycling.
O 290	-	Harrington	2427	[REDACTED]	Consideration for assisting households to reduce landfill through initiatives such as allowing disposal of kitchen scraps in green bins or providing home compost bins. Subsidies for use of cloth nappies and reusable feminine hygiene products	No changes are proposed; these measures are waste management and avoidance measures that are outside the scope of the Framework. Council's Waste Team delivers the Council Waste Management Strategy and works with the NSW Government to avoid, re-use or recycle waste.
<b>Walking and cycling trails (3)</b>						
O 79	-	-	2428	[REDACTED]	There is a need for more walk and bike ways.	<a href="#">Activity 3.7</a> has been amended to reflect support for the identification and delivery of bike and walking trails in natural areas to encourage the communities' positive interaction with nature.
O 59	-	-	2428	[REDACTED]	There is no mention of improved access to coast areas for people to walk or ride a bike.	<a href="#">Actions 3.7.1</a> and <a href="#">3.7.2</a> of the Framework relate to nature-based recreation. <a href="#">Activity 3.7</a> has been amended in the Framework to discuss improving access to natural areas and the coast.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
E3		Limeburners Creek	2324		Council does not promote the natural values and assets of our region, including koalas and creek and river walks in National Parks and State Forests. The Bucketts Way is a NSW Tourist Drive category 2.	No changes proposed; Council's Destinations team promotes the natural values of the region and has prepared and is implementing a Destination Management Plan.
<b>Bushfire (1)</b>						
O 70	-	Smiths Lake	2428		Good luck with this; there will be many conflicting views. The concern is getting the balance right between wildfire management and conservation of the bush.	No changes are proposed; the comment is noted.
<b>Climate change (2)</b>						
O 277	-	Hawks Nest 2324			The Framework should discuss and respond to climate change	No changes are proposed; in July 2021, Council adopted a Climate Change Policy and Action Plan.
O 79	-	-	2428		Neutral carbon emissions by 2030.	No changes are proposed; in July 2021, Council adopted a Climate Change Policy and Action Plan, which includes a net zero emissions target for Council activities.
<b>Sustainability (1)</b>						
O 62	-	Taree	2430	-	There should be more focus on human population control, education, green/clean tech and wildlife consideration.	No changes are proposed; population control and the adoption of green and clean technologies in industry and business are outside the scope of the Framework. The Framework discusses biodiversity education in Activity 1.1, Actions 1.1.1 & 1.1.2.
<b>Community involvement in the cultivation of food (1)</b>						
O 86	-	-	2429	-	There should be community involvement in the hand cultivation of food.	No changes are proposed; this is an excellent community initiative but is outside the scope of the Framework.
<b>Green business (1)</b>						
O 62	-	Taree	2430	-	There should be investment in green business.	No changes are proposed; this is noted.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>Erosion at Forster Keys and Pipers Creek (1)</b>						
F5	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Forster	[REDACTED]	<p>Detailed submission calling for the prevention of erosion to foreshore areas of Pipers Creek in Forster Keys (particularly the foreshore reserves). Raises issues with regards to the absence of a 4-knot zone in a 1km section between Supply Avenue and Elouera. Here, erosion is very apparent and increasing with increased use of that waterway by boats and jet-skis, including tubing and wakeboarding. The submission provides a history of studies, recommendations and actions, including foreshore stabilisation work. Notes that foreshore stabilisation to be completed by Council has not been delivered. Several environmental and human pressures have exacerbated the problem of foreshore erosion. This includes increasing wakeboarding and jet-ski use during the summer tourist season, Recognises the value of tourism to the area but is concerned with a tourism increase on powered water sports. Seeks council's support through measures which aim at foreshore stabilisation and measures to counter the wave / wake motion of recreational water sports of greater than 4-knots (together with other authorities). Recommends that Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commits funds to the conservation / protection of all foreshore reserves at Pipers Creek / Forster Keys,</li> <li>• Prohibits wakeboarding in Pipers Creek,</li> <li>• Increases patrols in Pipers Creek during the holiday seasons.</li> </ul>	<p>No changes are proposed; the erosion of the foreshore at Pipers Creek / Forster Keys is noted as a significant local environmental issue. The application of "no-wash" or speed limited zones in waterways (such as 4-knot zones) is the responsibility of, and applied by, Transport for NSW. Council can make representations to considerations of on-water speed limits on behalf of the community but does not have responsibility or authority to apply speed limit changes. The Framework reflects on the importance of considering biodiversity in the development of coast and catchment management plans. Coast and catchment plans do investigate estuarine and coastal management issues, such as erosion and on-water activities via a statutory process under the coastal management act. Action 5.4.1 links biodiversity outcomes to the development of coast and catchment plans.</p> <p>The detailed submission, in its entirety, has been provided to the Wallis and Smiths Coast and Estuary Management Committee for their detailed consideration and response.</p>

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
<b>Specific Sites: Glenthorne, Seal Rocks, Hawks Nest, Forster Main Beach and Mammy Johnsons Reserve (9)</b>						
F6	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Tinonee	[REDACTED]	Land at Glenthorne Employment Zone should be given protection. There must be other places which can be developed without causing impact to the biodiversity of an area. The entrance to Taree should be preserved to enhance its natural environment.	No changes are proposed; the Framework is not intended to make comment to individual rezonings, rather it is to provide a framework for high-level strategic and applied biodiversity management.
E2	[REDACTED]	Bungwahl	-	[REDACTED]	The decisions made at Seal Rocks has shown no consideration for biodiversity or the impact of tourism on the environment and its ecosystems or the biodiversity of the coastline, animals, trees, plants and the community. The gravel road was a deterrent to over-population but was sealed against the wishes of the community. The lack of an underpinning framework to cater for summer and seasonal visitors increases the destruction of the environment. The provision of adequate infrastructure for the tourists and visitors would cause substantial destruction of this pure and pristine coastal village. There is a concern for older community members when sightseers, tourists and visitors block all entry and exit options. The number of tourists and visitors needs to be restricted. This may require thinking outside the box and fit the community into the environment and its living parts and not strip away the life of the area.	No changes are proposed; the character of Seal Rocks is established through planning provisions and recreation and infrastructure planning.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
E8	[REDACTED]	-	Hawks Nest	[REDACTED]	Hawks Nest should be kept low-scale and bushy in character and koala trees should be protected	No changes are proposed; the character of Hawks Nest is established through planning provisions and statements. The Framework adopts an action that calls up a Greening Strategy and Vegetation Management Policy, which would assist tree protection in urban contexts, such as Hawks Nest.
E8	[REDACTED]	-	Hawks Nest	[REDACTED]	Detailed submission in respect of development application DA283/2019, being for residential development at Yamba Street, Hawks Nest.	No changes are proposed; the Framework is not address issues of site-specific developments.
O 59	-	-	2428	[REDACTED]	Forster Main Beach is a visual disgrace. Council should look to what other councils are doing. Port Macquarie, Coffs Harbour, Randwick all have attractive and people friendly environments for coastal recreation.	No changes are proposed; the Framework encourages greening and beautification of natural areas and natural area interfaces but does not seek to focus on individual sites. A Masterplan has been developed for the Forster Main Beach precinct and works are taking place to deliver the Masterplan. More information is available here: <a href="https://www.midcoast.nsw.gov.au/Part-of-your-every-day/Council-Projects/Forster-Main-Beach">https://www.midcoast.nsw.gov.au/Part-of-your-every-day/Council-Projects/Forster-Main-Beach</a>
O 323	[REDACTED]	Limeburners Creek	2324	[REDACTED]	Detailed submission on Council not maintaining the Mammy Johnsons River Reserve at Stroud Road, not mowing the front part of the Reserve and removing the ride-on lawn mower from the site without notice. This was in the plan that Council adopted and approved in 2014.	No changes are proposed; the issue of Council involvement in the maintenance of a Reserve is outside the scope of the Framework. This is considered and managed by Council's Community Spaces team.

Ref No.	Name	Address	Suburb	E-mail	Comment	Response
E3	[REDACTED]	Limeburners Creek	2324	[REDACTED]	Request that Council staff assist in the preparation of a grant application under the Crown Reserves Improvement Funds for the Mammy Johnsons River Reserve. The grant application should focus on native plants, fencing, signposts of Aboriginal names of plant species and uses and European names of plant species. This is as per the aims and objectives of the reserve plan, which was unfairly revoked by Council in 2014. The enhancement of the Reserve could provide a useful stop for tourists using The Bucketts Way.	No changes are proposed; the issue of Council involvement in the maintenance of a Reserve is outside the scope of the Framework. This is considered and managed by Council's Community Spaces team.
O 86	-	-	2429	-	The Bight cemetery has been overlooked.	No changes are proposed; the management of The Bight Cemetery is outside the scope of the Framework. Council has adopted a repair program for The Bight Cemetery. Details are available here: <a href="https://www.midcoast.nsw.gov.au/Part-of-your-every-day/Council-Projects/The-Bight-Cemetery-Wingham-repair-program">https://www.midcoast.nsw.gov.au/Part-of-your-every-day/Council-Projects/The-Bight-Cemetery-Wingham-repair-program</a>
O 325	-	Wallabi Point	2430	[REDACTED]	The sewerage treatment works at Old Bar has destroyed a wetland and is located behind dune littoral rainforest that is full of natural biodiversity.	No changes are proposed; the wastewater treatment plant at Old Bar was constructed many years ago and provides an essential service for the local community. It is maintained and routinely upgraded to meet contemporary best practice standards for effluent treatment and disposal. The perimeter lands are managed for foxes.