

Suburban Advocate

The voice of residents of New South Wales suburbs and towns

March 22, 2003

Distribution 200,000 copies

FREE

Authorised by Elsa Hocking, 11 Cook Road, Oyster Bay NSW 2225 Phone 9528 6091 Printed by Westernprint, Kiama

OVERDEVELOPMENT IS PLANNING FAILURE. WHO IS RESPONSIBLE? WHY IS IT HAPPENING? WHO BENEFITS? WHO LOSES?

Ban donations by developers!

New party issues bold challenge

The policies of the Carr Government that force town-houses and apartments onto communities have produced enormous profits for developers, says new political party Save Our Suburbs (SOS).

other political parties and independents to support its call.

In a visionary break from the left/right political spectrum, SOS encourages community activists who are engaged in protecting neighbourhood character,

residents who are feeling the pressure from overdevelopment and loss of green space.

SOS proposes that significant increases in housing density should only occur where they can be accommodated by the existing infrastructure.

This includes the road system, water, public transport and public facilities such as libraries, hospitals, schools, nursing homes, police, parks, sports fields and open space.

And where infrastructure requires upgrading, developers should be required to pay for a reasonable



Some of these developers make huge donations to both of the major political parties.

SOS believes such donations are unacceptable to the broader community and wants all developer donations to all political parties to be banned. It calls on

environment and heritage values, to get involved in the political process. In short, SOS is a determined grassroots organisation working for the benefit of resident action groups.

This new force in politics is winning support from the many

amount of the additional cost.

But these important policy initiatives will never be implemented, SOS says, unless political donations by developers are outlawed.

See also the article on page 2: "Buying influence".

Government-promoted theft

"Zoning" is currently a very powerful planning tool available to councils. It allows them to specify that certain areas are "residential", "commercial" and so on, and to specify the intensity of use in those zones.

Landowners may apply to change zonings, but decisions of councils cannot be appealed. The effect is that residents buying into a zone designated for single dwellings can be reasonably confident that they will continue to have a single dwelling next door.

SEPP5, the State Environmental Planning Policy for aged and disabled housing, breaks that "rule", and this is why SEPP5 developments cause such bitter

community dissatisfaction. By promoting multi-unit development in single-residential areas, SEPP5 allows "theft" of amenity.

Units in *single-residential areas* get a price premium compared to units in *areas zoned for units* because of the outlook and character of the surrounding single-residential blocks. But the original single-residences lose value because their outlook has changed to units with multiple overlooking windows, lack of vegetation and increased traffic.

The original house owners receive no compensation. This is government-promoted theft!

Developers' Dreams become Residents' Nightmares

Over the past four years a tide of grey ugliness has swept over Sydney. Families have been forced to the city fringes to find the room needed for houses and gardens. Roads have become more overcrowded as developers build the slums of the future.

The parks and green spaces of Sydney are under threat. Developers make massive profits by building cheap, sub-standard flats and villas.

The quality of life in Sydney continues to deteriorate yet developers, pro-development bureaucrats and the state government constantly push for more and more development.

We cannot afford another four years of excuses. The March state election must be the turning point. Vote for Save Our Suburbs, a party that will fight against nightmares.

Vote to save our ADI site



What gets lost with overdevelopment - emus on the ADI site

Local people have fought for over a decade to protect western Sydney's conservation and open space jewel, the ADI Site at St Marys.

The ADI Site is the largest, most diverse and best remaining area of Western Sydney woodland, protected behind security fences for the last 60 years. It has no less than four rare woodland communities, including the nationally endangered Cumberland Plain Woodland, and many rare and endangered species. It is the last place in the Sydney basin where mobs of kangaroos and emus range freely.

This 1535 hectare former munitions site has been targeted for development for decades, and in 1994 the Federal Government entered a secret joint venture agreement with Lend Lease, Australia's largest developer, to do just this.

The developers' own consultant, Kinhill Engineering, recommended that in an ideal world the site should not be developed. This did not deter the developers and early in 2001 the Carr Government created a special Regional Plan to assist them, despite overwhelming community opposition to the plan.

The community has made it clear that it wants to save the lot as a new Regional Park and Nature Reserve. So far 'our' politicians have not listened. The people of Western Sydney deserve better. In this State election you have another chance to use your vote to help save this special piece of bushland and its wildlife.

Go to Page 5 to learn more.

Planning must benefit existing residents

Residents have fundamental rights that developers must be made to respect:

- the right to live in the environment of their choice and to enjoy its amenity,
- the right to retain the ecological character of the locality,
- the right to be properly informed in advance of proposed changes to local land use,
- the right to reject changes that are unacceptable to the locality's residents.

Proposed changes to land use should be widely publicised for the purpose of identifying objections and properly dealing with them, particularly where such changes could have adverse ecological impacts. Changes to permitted land use should be dependent on the prior approval of a majority of the residents likely to be affected. Residents adversely impacted by changes to permitted land use must be promptly and adequately compensated by developers.