

PE 31 Eric Martin.txt

From: Eric OS [laptop@emaa.com.au]  
Sent: Wednesday, 6 September 2006 7:17 AM  
To: Committees  
Subject: UNESCO BIOSPHERE RESERVE ISSUES PAPER

Further to our earlier submission we provide some comments on the issues paper and trust that these can be considered despite it being late.

I have made reference to the issues for comment by referencing the clause where they occur in the paper and provide some supplementary comments at the end.

1.30 A conference will raise awareness within the community of the nomination and related issues and therefore is supported.

2.17 The additional benefits would be greater world exposure of Canberra, increased tourism and flow on benefits. Hopefully, a long term integrated plan for Canberra would flow from the nomination as I do not believe that the ACT Plan and the National Capital Plan are always aligned. If there is a possibility of the nomination expanding beyond the ACT then the current planning laws are clearly inadequate to deliver an integrated outcome.

3.21 Cross border should only be considered if the areas to be included have a management structure in place that is consistent and compatible with what exists in Canberra. I believe this will apply only to natural areas.

3.45 I believe the naming for the Biosphere Reserve is not critical at this stage.

3.48 Raising the issue with Nara is only likely to complicate the process.

3.54 The time frame should be guided by what is best for the outcome and not by artificial dates.

4.14 Stakeholders should represent all interests and be diverse. It is essential that cultural aspects, particularly cultural landscapes, are represented in any stakeholder group.

4.14 Incorporated association is probably best.

It is essential that cultural landscape, Griffin's ideology for a Garden City are an integral part of the nomination as these aspects meet most of the criteria and are detailed in Clause 3.3. We can provide a more detailed response against these criteria if desired.

The core areas should be those already recognised by current statutes, such as national parks and heritage conservation areas as the cultural values of these places are already articulated and acknowledged. Buffer areas should link these core areas and include all of inner Canberra which is the core of the Garden City plan. The transitional areas will then be the remaining areas of Canberra.

The issue of Lake George in Clause 2.4 is not relevant as it is a separate and isolated item and has different values to what we believe the Canberra nomination will contain.

Eric J Martin