

EH & BM Davis

SA

17 June 2003

Dear Sir;

I read with interest, your by-laws regarding Native Vegetation and Biodiversity Regulations. One who's been in the Tatiara for many years, I could not miss the opportunity to raise my concerns on matters I feel as completely lost. As a land contractor in my early days, I have seen many things done to the place in the way of soil damage. AMP came into our district the 'Tatiara', turning our scrub into productive land, which was good for many years, as I will explain. By heavy ploughing it turned our scrub under the ground and formed a damp course 'which got rid of our non-wetting sands, but after many years and hold damp course rotted away and we again had the problem of non wetting sand.

There was lots of discussion that the land should not of been cleared but well that's an gone. By the way, we have over come over non wetting sand problem by the way of clay to replace our damp coarse, this has lifted our productivity and biodiversity to a great high, its lifted our light soil to strong soils growing grain. We now have good pastures, no non-wetting sand problems and no drift problems.

You're wondering why I go to all the trouble to explain this to you? I have lived in the Tatiara all my life, I could see the district falling apart all because of by-laws on vegetation.

I discussed the matter with Council and suggested we form a local committee, made up of people of the district that knew the area and respect vegetation. As it was when an application was made some one, two or three people would turn up with book in one hand and full of defense in the other; not good enough! We now have a committee of 8 locals. We do get a little say, but some of your by-laws are very grey! All theory and no practical. The only way a farmer can keep his farm tidy is to break the law, that's not good enough! Fallen trees, limbs laying around, limbs spreading out from the bottom of the trees starving the tree of moisture, white ants, silver grass around trees and to top it off stock congregate around the tree tramping the roots and the tree dies, all is lost because of your by-laws. No, I don't want to knock down every tree in the district but lets be reasonable.

The cost on loss to the farmer is very high, either in pride or on loss when the property is sold. There's a point to be discussed on the tree called the stringy bark, a mongrel if ever there was a tree, but it can be controlled if trimmed and treated correctly as some of these trees span some 40m TR. I call it a master tree but with so many limbs hanging off it the life is short because it's starved of moisture and white ants take over, this I can prove.

Sucker trees that grow from a root left after development are never any good and spoil the beauty of the master tree mentioned earlier. These sucker trees have no root system and they blow over after a while, we should be allowed to clean them up, as this is a disgrace to the property. Another thing that hits me hard, a guy put in for a permit to knock down a few old trees of low amenity value, you agreed, but the fellow must give an area in return such as a

strong hill and not only that, he has got to fence the area given plus plant 100 or 200 trees, and at his expense, no way! If you want the land you foot the bill.

I'll admit there are some people that thrust more of what they can put in their pockets than others. We call the railway line the divider, South the land works for the people, North the people work for the land, but still we work under the same by-laws, its time things changed; give the land owner a go. I'm sorry if you think I am out spoken on this matter, my education is low but my vision is high.

If you want to discuss these matters any further, come down, I'll be available. My telephone number is 08-8752 1227 or mobile 0428 854 915.

Yours faithfully

Edward H. Davis