

GIANT RALLY—STOP

On 1 June the state government announced their "Growth Centres" plan for southwest and northwest Sydney. (Full details are available on their website—see page 2 for details). A key element of the plan is the so-called "Lifestyle & Rural Living Zone", covering large areas south of Pitt Town Rd with restrictions which we believe will be similar to those proposed in the council's environmental overlay.

Both the Lifestyle & Rural Living Zone and the council's environmental overlay are attempts to take property rights without compensation, and must be resisted in the strongest possible way. Since the announcement, many action groups have been formed, and representatives of each group have met several times to discuss what can be done.

The first combined activity will be a massive rally—STOP—to let the politicians & bureaucrats know that it is time to stop taking our property rights. Media, politicians & bureaucrats will be there, so make sure you are too.

STOP TAKING OUR PROPERTY

DATE: SUNDAY 7 AUGUST 2005

TIME: 11:00 am

**PLACE: CONNIE LOWE RESERVE
ADELPHI ST, ROUSE HILL**

Draft Rural Plan—rescission motion lost

Councillors Griffiths and Williams are to be congratulated for their motion of rescission in regard to the draft rural plan. However it is very disturbing the way 7 councillors continue to vote against what they know are the interests of those residents and ratepayers who will be most affected by the plan. It is even more disturbing to hear one councillor, Cr Harty, justify his lack of support on the basis of "political reality". Simply voting according to "political reality" calls into question the need for councillors, and is not in keeping with their role as defined by the Local Government Act to "represent the interests of residents and ratepayers".

Because the rescission motion was lost, the draft plan will now go to DIPNR for issuance of a "section 65 certificate", which is required before the plan can be publicly exhibited. It now appears that this will not happen until October or November, at which time we will call a meeting of members to discuss what further action we can take.

In the meantime, we should all continue to make representations to DIPNR on the basis that both the Rural Land Study and the review process were flawed, and on the basis that the vote of the council does not reflect our concerns or our interests. We must also continue to monitor the activities of the council, ask questions at council meetings, and discuss the issue with as many councillors, politicians and bureaucrats as possible.

President's Column

You may have read reports that the Mayor took exception to my use of the word "communism" at a recent council meeting. I was speaking about the Environmental Management Plan, and chose not to withdraw the comment because I think it is a fair reflection of how we all feel. I've published the entire address in this newsletter for you to judge for yourself whether my comments were appropriate or not.

Events are continuing to highlight just how strongly those who have determined they should be controlling and managing our lives hold onto their beliefs. It is clear that this is much more than simply an issue of restoring the minimum lot size to 5 acres, but has much more to do with maintaining centralised power and control.

One of the fundamental issues we face is loss of private property rights. While the council and the government would like us to believe that private property rights amount to nothing more than what they define through zoning, the reality is that they are much more than this. They include the right to possess—exclusively control, enjoy, manage; the right to benefit—rent, improve, use as financial security; the right to exclude others; the right to dispose of in any way; and the right not to be deprived of by force or coercion.

Under the influence of flawed socialist ideology, many of these rights have been severely diminished over the last several decades, to the point where now landowners are little more than caretakers bound by a government-set management plan.

This is a dangerous situation for the future of our country. Depriving populations of secure property rights takes away hope and the motivation to maintain and plan for the future. Without exception, history proves that this path leads to social and economic disaster.

We must do everything we can to undo the damage before it is too late.

Alex Davidson, President

More information ...

The primary aim of **5 Acres Now** is to regain the right, withdrawn some 40 years ago, to subdivide large lots to 5 acres in the so-called "rural" area of the shire of Baulkham Hills. That's why we are called **5 Acres Now**. We believe this is a very reasonable goal

that will benefit the area by restoring a moderate level of growth without undue impact upon the environment or infrastructure. To find out more, visit our website: www.5acresnow.com.au, or contact us as detailed below.

President's address to the council—Environmental Management Plan

Councillors, the last time this came before the council it was deferred for further community consultation.

Now I attended that consultation meeting, and heard what the majority of those who will be most affected by this plan had to say. They were highly critical of the amount of detail in the plan, and the way it attempts to reduce our rights and freedoms. There's a very strong feeling in the community that we are already over-regulated, and what we have here is a shining example.

So now that our concerns have been listened to, what has changed?

Should we be thankful that only one additional goal has been added, to now bring the grand total to 141 goals, and 461 objectives?

I don't think so.

The whole concept of this Environmental Management Plan is an outrage and an insult. It presumes that left alone, we will all destroy the place. It presumes that we all share in a vision of the future that is about as close to communism as you can get without branding it as such.

Apart from that, it hasn't been put together properly.

As ratepayers, we expect our council to act on our behalf, in our interests. We expect work to be carried out without bias, and reviewed objectively.

Anyone looking at this Environmental Management Plan with an open mind will quickly find that it is completely one-sided – in those 461 objectives it contains every imaginable item on an environmentalists' wish-list, while blithely ignoring our rights to freedom and choice. It's not objective, nor is it rigorous.

In the limited time I was permitted to address the consultation meeting held on the 20th June, I managed to point

out a couple of examples of what I mean. One was the ridiculous claim that 100 million hectares of agricultural land has been lost due to the encroachment of cities over the last 15 years. At the meeting, I was assured that this figure was correct, and that a reference would be provided.

Not surprisingly, no reference has been found, and the claim has now disappeared from the plan.

But not the goals and objectives put forward in its name. They are all still there.

This is simply not good enough. If you are trying to argue that we need to have controls to make agricultural practices sustainable, and the first reason you put forward is that we've lost 100 million hectares of land due to city encroachment, then I come along and point out that we haven't lost anything of the sort, logic dictates that you have to review the need for the controls. This hasn't happened. All the goals and objectives that were argued for on the basis of this wild exaggeration are still there, ready to pop up and restrict our lives in unimaginable ways for years to come.

Now if I had more time, and somebody was paying me to do it, I could show how this example isn't an isolated one, but typical of the whole plan. Most of the argument used to support all these goals and objectives is flawed. It's mostly based on opinion and belief, not sound reason and fact.

But why should I, when I'm already paying for council officers to do this on my behalf?

As I have said before, what this plan needs is a thorough review by someone who isn't an environmental fundamentalist – someone who doesn't agree with all the mantra – so we end up with something that's comprehensible, something that doesn't have 141 goals and 461 objectives, and something that respects our rights and our freedoms.

5 Acres Now Committee Members

Please note that Lynn & Bob Lollback are currently on extended leave away from Sydney

President	Alex Davidson	9652 0285	Glenorie	alex@ccstar.net
Vice President	Lynn Lollback	9654 9469	Kenthurst	all4lollback@AOL.com
Secretary	Angela Muller	4573 6075	Maraylya	mail@homecafe.com.au
Treasurer	Carol Petith	9652 0015	Glenorie	carolpetith@bigpond.com
Committee member	Bob Lollback	9654 9469	Kenthurst	all4lollback@AOL.com
Committee member	Gaye Wheatley	9652-1871	Forest Glen	primepropertygaye@century21.com.au
Committee member	John Wheatley	9652-1871	Forest Glen	
Committee member	Don Pye	4573-6446	Kenthurst	donaldpye@bigpond.com
Committee member	Rob Laird	4572-8599	Cattai	robert0414@bigpond.com

DIPNR—contact details for Metropolitan Strategy issues:

Metropolitan Strategy, Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources

Mail: GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001. Tel: 1300 305 695

Website: www.metrostrategy.nsw.gov.au. Email: metrostrategy@dipnr.nsw.gov.au.