

131 410

ment

Adjournment

21 November 1985

ASSEMBLY

117

I am informed there are two alternative ways of overcoming the problem. The Minister should request that his department review the whole issue should not just update that report.

Mr McDONALD (Whittlesea)—The matter I raise with the minister for Local Government is a serious matter concerning a constituent. In November 1979 Mr Glen Thompson of Whittlesea purchased land in Kyneton on a terms contract. A planning permit was current and building permits were available.

Late in 1980 a Mr Buchanan and a Mr Brian Murphy proposed a development of a time-share holiday resort on the area adjacent to my constituent's land. Subsequently, Woodleigh Heights Resort Development Pty Ltd was formed to develop Woodleigh Heights time-share resort and that company entered into a contract to purchase my constituent's land.

Some time after that the company defaulted in the contract to purchase the land, and my constituent was informed by the company that, of the rescinded this contract, it would remove his access to water and render the land valueless.

Kyneton Water Board confirmed the ability of Woodleigh Heights Resort Development Pty Ltd to carry out that threat, although the board would not make available a copy of the agreement. The Kyneton council also informed my constituent that building permits would not be available without the availability of water to the block.

The council refused to supply a copy of the water agreement between the board and the developers. My constituent, by then had initiated Supreme Court action against Woodleigh Heights Resort Development Pty Ltd and his solicitor threatened the council with a writ unless the water agreement was made available. The council reluctantly agreed to hand over the agreement.

The Supreme Court action was settled by negotiation and the court order was: first, that the company purchase part of the land; secondly, that the company pay out some of the mortgages, and, thirdly, that the company do all in its power to transfer the water agreement to the body corporate.

This order should have had the effect of making water available to the blocks and removing any encumbrances to the sale of my constituent's land. The auction for the sale of the land was arranged for 23 November, which is next Saturday.

The day following the erection of the signs to advertise the auction, the estate agent was notified by a Mr Parkinson, the shire secretary, that the signs had to be removed immediately. When asked the reason why, he was informed that they were an embarrassment to the Woodleigh Heights time-sharing resort, even though Woodleigh Heights still had signs advertising the resort adjacent to the auction signs and there was no council permission for those signs.

The estate agent was informed by letter from the water board that no water was available for the blocks. The agent was also notified by council that building permits would not be available. This means my constituent had no option but to cancel the planned auction.

This is the worst example of collusion between a water board, a council and a private developer to deprive a citizen of his democratic rights. I have provided the House with a short account of what has taken place over a two-year period. A full report has been forwarded to the Minister for Water Resources to investigate the role played by the Kyneton Water Board in this sordid affair. A report was also forwarded to the Minister for Local Government and the Minister for Police and Emergency Services because police were involved in incidents over this two-year period.

I ask the Minister for Local Government to do everything possible to investigate what has taken place and to do whatever is necessary to ensure that my constituent receives justice and is able to sell the land fairly quickly.

across the State. It was initiated in Melbourne and it has been extended to regional places such as Ballarat, Geelong and Bendigo and further parts of country Victoria are currently under consideration. The honourable member should realize the Government did not have the resources at the outset to be able to apply this immediately right across the State, but there is a commitment to further extend it as resources permit. Rather than the elucidation that he went on with, I would suggest that his electors need to be careful they are not being duped by Digby.

The honourable member for Prahran raised the issue of the Prahran Housing Commission estate and the issue of rent collection offices being provided within that estate. Regrettably the Minister for Housing was unable to be present during the debate on the motion for the adjournment of the sitting, but I am sure he will deal with this matter expeditiously through the resources available within his Ministry.

Mr SIMMONDS (Minister for Local Government)—The honourable member for Whittlesea raised a question in respect to a time sharing arrangement for land associated with the Woodleigh Heights estate and the question of access to water via the Kyneton Water Board and the problems associated with the Kyneton council refusing to supply details of the water agreement.

There has been a Supreme Court action which has enabled the honourable member's constituent to have some satisfaction in respect to that matter. On the information which he has provided to the House it appears that over a two-year period there has been a need to inquire into the aspects that have affected his constituent. I shall ensure that that aspect which is associated with the Kyneton council is fully investigated. I have no doubt the Minister for Water Supply will similarly investigate those aspects and that the Minister for Police and Emergency Services may examine any aspects which could be dealt with on any evidence of conspiracy in respect to the matters raised.

The honourable member for Broadmeadows raised the question of the restructuring of local government and the role of the Goulburn group. I am concerned that the Municipal Association of Victoria has been associated with newsletters which have been distributed to that group. I have a copy of one such newsletter which is dated 23 September this year and addressed to Russell Vernon of the Goulburn group from Chris Gardiner. It describes Leo Hawkins who is the consultant to the Municipal Association of Victoria. The newsletter states:

Leo Hawkins, who as you know is consultant to the MAV in the amalgamation matter, came in today to discuss developments. The meeting was at his request, and he said he was authorised to brief me on the MAV's current plans and negotiating position with the State Government.

He then spells out a number of matters in which he was involved with respect to negotiations with the Minister for Local Government. In direct reference to the Goulburn group in a later section of the same newsletter, under the heading of "The Goulburn Group" the newsletter states:

Leo said the MAV supported the activities of the Goulburn group as the group was seen as a body that could say and do things which the association could not.

That aspect of the relationship between the Goulburn group and the Municipal Association of Victoria is one which most people would view with some concern. The Government negotiated with them in respect of the important matter of getting a greater degree of responsibility in local government by giving local government greater powers and more responsibility to ensure that local government thrives in the State. Such undercover operation is not conducive to the process of restructuring of local government in a manner which is beneficial to both the community and local government.

I believe that the development of relationships—

Mr Crozier interjected.

Mr SIMMONDS—The honourable member for Portland ought to go back to his home ground and he will find out that municipalities in his district are fully engaged in the