> -----Original Message-----
> From: Cleverley R. & S. [mailto:cleverrs@iinet.net.au]
> Sent: Sunday, 21 April 2002 7:42 PM
> To: sustsinsbility@dpc.wa.gov.au
> Subject: Submissions re Strategy for Sustainability
>
>
> FOR ATTENTION Dr PETER NEWMAN
>
> FOR A DEFINITION OF SUSTAINABILITY PLEASE USE THE ONE IDENTIFIED BY
> THE U.N. COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENT, 1987:-
>
> "....which meets the needs of the present without
> compromising the ability
> of future generations to meet their own needs"
>
>
> I wish to make a number of suggestions and will rank them in their
> order of difficulty
> of achievement - with the easier ones first.
>
>
> SUGGESTION ONE
>
> In "Coastal & Lakelands Planning Strategy" WAPC, Feb 1999, criteria
> were established
> for classifying areas of "high scenic quality" in Quindalup and Spearwood
> Dune landscapes
> between Mandurah and Bunbury (p 112).
> Provision is made for protecting the aesthetic values of such highly
> scenic areas (p108)
> where it is stated:-
> "Development or changes in land use should result in
> inevident alterations
> to the landscape. This is not to say that changes cannot
> occur, but rather
> that the development or change of use should be of similar
> form, scale
> and pattern to the existing landscape."
>
> I WISH TO PROPOSE THAT:-
> "SHOULD" BE CHANGED TO "MUST" IN THE ABOVE VISUAL QUALITY
> OBJECTIVE;
>
> THAT SIMILAR OBJECTIVES BE PREPARED FOR OTHER
> GEOMORPHOLOGIC
> REGIONS OF THE STATE:
>
> THAT THESE PROVISIONS BE GIVEN STATUTORY FORCE BY BEING
> ENSHRINED
> IN STATE GOVERNMENT LEGISLATION AS SOON AS POSSIBLE,
> (CERTAINLY
> WITHIN THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT'S TERM IN OFFICE).
>
> My reasons for making these proposals are:-
> 1. Why should these provisions apply to land-holders in the
> "Lakelands" area but not
> for instance, to Mr Plunkett's proposed development at
> Moore River?
>
> 2. This Planning Strategy is operating in the "Lakelands"
> area without any need for
> Government compensation to land-holders so, in applying it
> to other areas, presumably
> there would similarly be no need for compensation.
>
> 3. Although my suggestion would be limited in its impact to
> especially scenic areas, it has

> the potential to protect many places which are of important
> "sanctuaries from the city" for
> WA holiday-makers and which also need to be conserved as
> potential destinations for
> eco-tourists for instance again, Moore River estuary.
>
>
> SUGGESTION TWO
>
> I propose that an important step towards sustainability in
> the rate of land clearing
> would be for land-holders (including the Government and its
> Agencies) to be required to pay
> the "real costs" of the environmental degradation that they cause.
> I suggest that this "real cost" be defined as "the
> expenditure in financial terms necessary
> to rehabilitate that land into its original condition before that
> clearing took place"
> After this "real cost" has been assessed the Developer would
> be required to pay this
> rehabilitation tax into a fund dedicated to environmental
> conservation.
>
> My reasons for making these proposals are:-
> 1. This tax would not take away from anyone their right(?) to
> develop their land
> but it would reduce "cavalier clearing" which bears no
> relationship to the
> damage that results.
>
> 2. Already degraded land would be much more attractive for
> more intensive agriculture
> or for urban development.
>
> 3. Most importantly IT WOULD BE POPULAR WITH THE ELECTORATE!!!
>
>
> SUGGESTION THREE
>
> In the long term I think that sustainability depends upon
> education of the public
> at large regarding all the many facets of this concept.
> Therefore I propose the establishment
> of a permanent "OFFICE OF SUSTAINABILITY" whose primary purpose
> would be to
> implement and oversee the inclusion of sustainability into the
> curriculum from primary
> school, through high/senior high school and on into adult education.
>
>
>
> THANKING YOU IN ANTICIPATION OF YOUR CONSIDERATION OF THESE SUGGESTIONS.