

Presentation to Future Nillumbik Committee 13 February 2018

This trail is I believe a terrible injustice to the affected landowners.

Imagine this is your land.

Private property for a recreation trail for use by a select few at the expense of private landowners. This land grab for a non essential purpose sets a Nillumbik precedent, today we take their land, tomorrow we can take yours.

We already have a new bike trail and footpaths to Hurstbridge along the road side. Unlike the proposed trail it has the advantage of passive surveillance.

The claim that this will be shared by horses, cyclists and pedestrians, is not believable. What insurance company would cover such a risk? I suggest that under OH&S rules one or the other will be forbidden. In the words of Mr Kerrigan from the Castle 'tell em their dreaming".

The consultation process, in effect, ignored the affected landowners, most of whom are not here tonight, as they are saying we have not been listened to so what is the point.

Those owning land from around the 1950's suffer the greatest loss, loss of peace, privacy, safety, and loss of ability to farm and earn an income, those that purchased in recent times don't have the same loss.

The huge sum of money this requires would be better spent on repairs to our roads which are in an appalling state. For example, my own street in Yarrambat that we residents paid for about 10 years ago is not what was proposed and paid for and it is in poor and unsafe condition.

Compensation will be minimised, I see in the business paper \$4 million for about 19.5ha land. That equates to aprox. \$205.000 per hectare Those that lose res 1 land will get the higher per hectare value but those with land subject to inundation will receive very little.

One owner has 8 hectares and this includes residential land. (Other R1 land exists as well) When this is deducted the compensation for the remaining rural conservation land is very limited.

Regarding the issue of maintenance, look only to the trail section from Diamond Creek to Area B where the ground is littered with fallen leaves twigs and branches and worse the giant widow makers over the proposed trail. This is adjacent to a residential 1 area and shows a lack of maintenance and exacerbates the bush fire risk to that area.

The professional approach by our new council with cost cutting, no rate rise this year and the restructure at council is a welcome change but I held this council to a higher standard than our previous council.

C101 & C81 caused outrage to those landowners affected, both Amendments were designed to restrict their private land use, **not** to take the land. That consultation process was undemocratic, so too was the consultation process for the trail.

Interesting that many of those same people appear to wholly support the acquisition of private land for a non-essential purpose.

The completion of the ring road is for the benefit of **not** just a select few but for a benefit for all Victoria. It is notable that this council are endorsing a route which would not imperil the green wedge. No consistency.

This is unjust and not fair to the landowners who are forced to relinquish their land for a non-essential purpose for the few.

Mary McDonald