

**SUBMISSION
TO
THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL SELECT COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC LAND DEVELOPMENT**

The Secretary
Legislative Council Select Committee on Public Land Development
Parliament of Victoria
Spring Street
Melbourne VIC 3002

Mr Richard Willis

Dear Sir,

PREAMBLE.

This Land Owners Rights Association Inc (LORA) submission concerns:

- **“The sale or alienation of public land for development and the relationship to the Victorian Government’s Melbourne 2030 policy and Green Wedges”** and seeks to enquire **why the Government has legalised such harmful planning practice.**

Whereas the objectives of planning in Victoria under the Planning and Environment Act 1987 are *“to provide for the fair, orderly, economic and sustainable use and development of land”* we would like to know **why the Victorian Government’s Melbourne 2030 Policy and Green Wedges legislation does not accord landowners of this state any of these opportunities? What is right and proper about this legislation which imposes such restrictions that we are unable to carry out any fair, economic or sustainable development at all?**

Why are we victimised and penalised by this discriminating legislation that requires us to maintain our properties according to bureaucratic direction at our expense, not for ourselves, but for the benefit of the wider community?

Why do we no longer have freehold tenure? Why have our property rights been retrospectively removed by the State and yet we are still held responsible for the financial obligations of our property?

Why are we now in servitude to the State? And thus slaves of the State? For a supposedly democratic Government why has the Government taken our freehold rights without compensation of any kind and imposed upon us severe land owning restrictions?

Why has the Government passed legislation which is both immoral and illegal and being an action more befitting a third world totalitarian dictatorship?

THE RELATIONSHIP

It is our belief there is a direct relationship between the Government's Melbourne 2030 Policy, Green Wedge legislation and sale of and development of public and Crown land.

This relationship is due to the hidden objective of the legislation, which is to crowd as many people as possible into the Melbourne metropolis and turn the surrounding semi-rural area into an indigenous wilderness.

In order to achieve these extreme and irrational objectives it has become necessary for the Government to place a wall around Melbourne, (UGB) and to use every piece of available ground for development in the case of the 2030 Strategy and to render unproductive and unattended as much ground as possible in the Green Wedges. The logic of this planning defies understanding but that is the overall effect of the legislation.

Thus in essence the Melbourne 2030 and Green Wedge legislation planning is land rationing so we ask **why has the Government decided to ration the availability of land when surely the Government knew rationing of any kind brings graft and corruption and results in inflated prices?**

Did the Government not have any idea of the detrimental effect of its legislation before it was passed by Parliament? If it did why did the Government bring the legislation before Parliament?

Just why has the Government decided to put a wall around Melbourne?

Why did the Government give the pathetic reason of stopping the urban sprawl when it knew the population of Melbourne was increasing so rapidly and the narrow development corridors would compound development distance problems?

What evidence can the Government present that the widening of the metropolitan area in its traditional form would be more costly and detrimental to Melbourne than enclosing it within a restraining wall?

Thus the desperate desire of the Government for land to develop inside the Urban Growth Boundary has grown so much that lands previously set aside for other Government purposes are being sold off and developed without one iota of concern that taxpayers have already paid for those lands for those other purposes.

And for what purpose is the Government using this money?

Was the revenue anticipated and was it included in the budget? If so, under what heading? Are the funds going into General Revenue or to a specific need?

Why is the Government obsessed with this extreme and defective 2030 Strategy planning fad which clearly has no logical or rational reason for drawing a line on a map and having one side of the line crammed with people and having the other side turned into a wilderness using the cost of extending infrastructure as the reason for the containment?

With the Melbourne infrastructure already collapsing from the overcrowding stress and failing to cope with the excessive number of people putting an increasing pressure on the infrastructure services **what cost projections were done in anticipation of this contingency?**

What comparison costing was made with the projected costs of letting Melbourne develop under free market conditions?

SPURIOUS REASON.

What is the evidence that proves the Green Wedges are needed because they are the lungs of the city?

Where is the evidence that compares the pollution levels of a metropolis with greenery within its area with that of a metropolis with greenery outside its boundary?

Whilst the Melbourne 2030 Policy is one of constriction using the UGB as a retaining wall to keep people in and prevent any development extending into the surrounding Green Wedges why was the Chinese Retirement Village in Donvale given permission to build in the Green Wedge when other people in the same location were denied?

Why is the Melbourne 2030 Strategy forcing more and more people into high energy consuming high-rise units that create excessive and unnecessary global warming?

Why has the Government allowed cooling greenery to be substituted by concrete inside the choking UGB when satellite evidence for this global warming is irrefutable?

Was the Government not aware that its policy of metropolitan congestion would lessen everybody's elbowroom and lead to rising personal irritations?

If the Government was not aware, why wasn't it?

Did it not take into account the psychological effect of increased congestion?

Or the effect of removing parkland, of cramming three or four units onto a block of land where one house existed beforehand and or;

- the overall effect of removing the vegetation on suburban blocks, which has been a feature of Melbourne, which makes it so liveable?**

- or with the removal of vegetation the loss of bird and insect life? If not, why not?**

What research did the Government conduct and make public about the probable increase in personal stress levels with more people living closer in a more confined space?

And why is the Government compounding the problem of congestion by having taxpayer paid for Crown land developed for even more people inside the UGB?

Why isn't the Government providing more open space where it is critically needed to combat pollution instead of compounding the existing congestion by alienating what little public land is left for purposes other than development?

Why isn't the Government using the nearest adjacent useless farmland for housing the increasing population?

Why has it not rezoned nearby Rural Conservation land to residential when clearly the so-called Rural Conservation land is not worth conserving because its original vegetation was removed over 100 years ago?

Does the Government have an obligation to the developers who have purchased the available housing land in the extended time and cost consuming development corridors?

Or would it be because there are more votes in crowded areas than in places where people enjoy the countless benefits of owning a home on a quarter acre block of land?

As selling and alienating public land is a corruption of the purpose for which the public land was originally created and paid for by the taxpayer, why has the Government engaged in this practice when it has never publicly declared its intention to do so?

As the Government has no mandate to usurp the paid for intention of the public space **why has the Government done so when a planning scheme can be changed at Government whim?**

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Land Owners Rights Association would like to urge the Select Committee to consider the following recommendations to the Parliamentary enquiry-

1. Remove the Urban Growth Boundary and the "growth corridors" and let people freely choose where they wish to live according to a free housing market.
2. Compensate landowners whose land is subject to any minimum lot size above 1000 sq. ft. or whose land is subject to any Government or Council regulation, which dictates control over fauna and flora except for vermin and noxious weeds at the same rate as the Commonwealth Bond interest rate.
3. Engage in a Land Capability study to assist determine the best use "*...for the fair, orderly, economic and sustainable use and development of land*" which is the objective of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.
4. Invest in adequate infrastructure to service all areas.
5. Dispose of Government departments such as the Port Philip Catchment Authority, the Growth Area Authority and other regulatory bodies, which influence Housing development.
6. Ensure Councils do not charge a General rate over their municipality, which has urban and non-urban zonings
7. Maintain the farm rate on viable farms where ever sustainable farming prevails.

Thank you for this opportunity to present this submission on behalf of the members of LORA.

I would like to speak to the submission at the public hearing.

Daryl Cox,

President,

Land Owners Rights Association Inc.

10/113 Country Club Drive,

Safety Beach, Vic., 3936

Tel. 03 5987 3497 Email-dwjcox@bigpond.net.au

26th September 2007.