

James Hay
Director of Parisienne Basket Shoes Pty Ltd

PO box 100
Glen Iris 3146

Dear sir/ madam,

I refer to 6-12 Mannish Rd Wattle Glen. In 1957/ 1958 my family purchased Residentially zoned land opposite a railway station for the purposes of subdivision. The land has all services and is in fact surrounded by housing in a gazetted suburb. The land now has been backzoned to rural conservation by the Brumby/ Bracks government. The Urban Growth Boundary actually goes around the property. Around 90% of the financial value of the land has been lost without compensation. Residentially zoned neighbours are considered to be inside Melbourne whilst the land is considered to be outside Melbourne. In 2001 an independent panel under the orders of Minister Thwaites found that the lands residential zoning be reinstated. In 2002 the Nillumbik shire council recommended that the zoning be reinstated. In a council survey in 2001 the population of wattle glen voted for the land to be reinstated to residential zoning.

Given that all levels of government are looking at publically owned land to be sold and alienated, If the above land was government land would it to be considered? Is this then discrimination and a restraint of trade?

According to legislation, No new titles can be created in the government labelled Green wedge. If subdivision occurs on what was government land now alienated land new titles are then created. Is this discrimination and a restraint of trade to private land owners?

Given that up to 30 to 40% of major political parties funding comes from developers. Given that various members of this family has been approached by ranking members of the ALP to commit to funding in exchange for favorable treatment. -(willing to give testimony)
Given that the government and major political parties are contractually obligated to the discriminatory growth corridors, Is the funding of political parties as result of public planning policy or is the public planning policy a result of the need for political funding?

Given that there is a limit to infrastructure. Given that Infrastructure was promised to land owners and or designated to land owners. This infrastucture is now being redirected to favoured developers, creating either an overcrowding or a shortfall. Is this theft of infrastructure compensatable or to be replaced?

There is a quantifiable loss of public land creating a shortfall of useable public land. Are the private landowners to provide public amenity and open space with the associated expenses for the public benefit?

yes i do wish to make personal representations to the committee.

james hay