

Submission
No 45

**INQUIRY INTO GREATER SYDNEY PARKLANDS TRUST
BILL 2021**

Organisation: Saving Sydney Trees

Date Received: 11 January 2022

**Submission
No 45**

**INQUIRY INTO GREATER SYDNEY PARKLANDS TRUST
BILL 2021**

Organisation: Saving Sydney Trees

Date Received: 11 January 2022

GREATER SYDNEY PARKLANDS TRUST BILL 2021

10/1/22

SUBMISSION TO COMMITTEE:-

Saving Sydneys Trees (SST) welcomes this opportunity to express its great disappointment in this Bill as it is presented to the Committee.

We are happy for this document to be open to Public view.

We are an Association with a Database of over 12 thousand and Public following of around 10 thousand and more on issues of peaked interest.

This Suggested Bill raises many concerns for us and our Followers.

We point out most strongly in this submission, that while the Then Minister Stokes indicated a desire to expand Parklands in the Greater Sydney Area, NO such demarcation or acquisition of spaces exists. It is in Fact, Aspirational at best, and cannot be considered in any way as a reality when reviewing this Proposed Bill. We also raise huge concern that any such acquisition must not be viewed as an "OFFSET" to any Encroachment or Diminishment of existing Public Amenity provided by the EXISTING Trusts.

We further urge that these Parklands be exempted from such Encroachment and Demishment by ANY "Critical Infrastructure Projects" as they present a "IRREPLACEABLE CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE" in themselves. This increased and appreciated value is heightened by COVID; CLIMATE and SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.

We point out that in 2017 Jason Byrne of the Griffith University in Queensland produced a Paper in Mental Health Week that drew a \$12 BILLION Annual (and self-adjusting) Deficit to the Budget connection. This was directly linked to the Loss of Tree Canopy, Vegetation and Green Spaces (Development process at that stage and now, the driving agent).

He made particular mention that this did not include Respiratory, Particulate and Other Linked Health Detrimental \$\$ COSTS.

Since then, much research has been produced indicating the same. YET, these REAL detrimental and \$\$Costs, are not implemented in the Cost Benefit Analysis Process and as such a continuance of the detrimental impacts of removal and non-appropriate assessment of Trees, Vegetation and Green Spaces etc. continues.

** - We call for this to be Properly addressed and ended.

The COVID and Science backed prediction of such Impacts as the "Norm" for the future, when added to CLIMATE Impacts, puts enormous emphasis on the need to Maintain and INCREASE such Assets.

The Commercialism of these Assets is strongly rejected by our followers and is seen as a "user pay or do not gain access" Development promotion.

There is indeed deep concern.

Free and open space with population increases; Housing design that disallows Tree growth and has diminished back yard access inbuilt, requires more opening of space NOT strict controls on what already exists.

The Public looks for areas of open Space; Canopy; Green Spaces and open access to it.

They need Protection for Wildlife and the Parklands that support them and at the same time enhance our lives.

This Agency as presented does none of this.

In Fact, the powers afforded the "Agent" and the lack of Assurance against Encroachment by Development and Leases within this Proposal, ALLOWS (if the Governing Agent sees fit), for Fees of entry and use of Amenity by a Leaser or Other arrangement.

A Family picnic could find a Permit needed and fines imposed...

This is NOT in the Public Interests nor meet with expected Governance over these Precious Public Parklands.

* We question the Legality of an Act of Parliament in regards to Lachlan Swamp and Centennial Park and Moore Parklands Trusts arrangements.

The effective "Dissolving" of Non Encroachment Obligations and Historic Guardianship.

We make note that while a particular Trust may have had issues the Public may have disagreed with, that Public had rights of Objection. To which the Trust was responsible. The Public could then appeal for Governance to the Minister.

However, as proposed, IF That Minister or he/she are the Agency, A Democratic Procedural Problem has been created and should be abolished.

We see this Document as in need of Abandonment and a New Democratic Public Formed and Publicly Agreed Format (In consultation with Conservation Stake holders and the Public be entered into)

While there are some problems with Some Trust Operations and Care in Management, these are largely due to a lack of Adequate Funding.

SST See that these Critical Public Infrastructures warrant renewed input of Public Funds in keeping with the Health Facility they provide. Self-Funding is in no way seen as an appropriate response.

* This NEW suggested Agency gives itself ALL rights;

Makes no reference to Protections of Wildlife, Canopy, History or Development encroachments.

Rather, it talks of Public Participation and meeting places with very controlling rules on what that will look like. e.g. a group of 10 require a "Permit" which will have a self designated \$ amount applied ..."At the discretion of the "Trust" or ""Authority""(We can only assume that is Infrastructure NSW or Other)?;

This leaves Birthday Party or even a single Family, School Fundraisers and FREE social access by the public under these conditions, rightly questionable.

Many People indicate on our social page responses: mistrust, lessening of Free Accessibility,

Commercialism over Free access to Green spaces and trees as well as shoreline and amenity,

Depletion of Wildlife and Horticultural and Historic Significance

..

We see no assurances in what has been presented that our Parklands will not be turned into Barangaroo Precincts and EQ's with ALLIANCE Stadiums and the like. They have already seen what is happening: Windsor; CSELR impacts on Centennial and Moore Park lands and their Green Spaces used as CAR PARKS. As well as to Our Historic Parramatta Parklands and Amenities ...and they voice Great Disapproval.

* We Suggest that this appointment of a NEW AGENCY TRUST be allocated responsibility to Homebush. We make note that the appointment of the members involved in this "Trust" have excellent credentials for Business and might well make excellent choices, for its better public use of that area.

* Rather than dismantle the Horticultural ; Historical and General Public Interests of the existing Trusts, enhance these trusts and amalgamate the "Brains Trust" for all with the Public Voice and Interests to benefit. That way the Public have the assurance of existing TRUST OBLIGATIONS TO PRESERVE AND PROTECT IN PERPETUITY and strengthen these objectives for the Public.

We hope you will review the proposal and amend accordingly to ensure the Public Free Access and Protection ; ABANDON or reformat this Newly Proposed Agency with the Public Voice Foremost in the Assured Best Practice in Horticultural and Species Care and Free and Open Access, Enjoyment and Use.

Most Sincerely
M Hogg
(on behalf of)
Saving Sydneys Trees

E: savingsydneystrees@gmail.com

FB: savingsydneystrees

T: sydneytrees