

**Submission**

**No 090**

# **CONSULTATION ON THE MODERN MANAGEMENT OF COMMONS**

**Name:** Jacob Philpott

**Date received:** 21/02/2017

---

Date: Tue, Feb 21, 2017 at 11:44 AM Date: Tue, Feb 21, 2017 at 11:58 AM  
Subject: Opposition to Repeal of Commons Management Act

Tuesday 21 February 2017

To whom it may concern

My name is Jacob Philpott and I reside at [deleted].

I am not a Commoner of the St Albans Common but I unreservedly support its continued existence under the Commons Management Act as detailed in the Submission of the Trustees to the Department of Industry – Lands in relation to the NSW Government’s updated proposal for Commons. I am aware that I will be identified in the summary of submissions list.

As a Non-Commoner I appreciate and benefit from the community, cultural, heritage and environmental values embodied in the continued existence of the St Albans Common Trust with a Roll of Commoners and an elected Board of Trustees.

Specifically, I reiterate my opposition to any proposal that would result in the repeal of the Commons Management Act and the designation of the St Albans Common as Crown Land under the Crown Land Management Act. To do so would eradicate the Common Roll and the function of the Commoner and, over time, the right to elect those Trustees who manage the St Albans Common Trust. I understand that this function will be transferred to Land Managers under Ministerial appointment which is unacceptable to me. The legislative proposals are in direct conflict with the excision of Commons from the Crown Lands Management Act, which only occurred in November 2016 to much acclaim from all parliamentary parties.

I emphasise my support for the suggestion of the Trustees of the St Albans Common Trust that the Commons Management Act be retained, with a limited application to “eligible” Commons as listed in a new Schedule. An “eligible Common” would be a functioning Common in good standing under the Commons Management Act whose management and operations are carried on in a manner consistent with purposes as specified. Relevant purposes would embrace those suggested by the Department of Industry- Lands i.e. a common, community use and protection of cultural, heritage and environmental values.

Sincerely,