

Goals 2050 forced city living

They have goals they are striving to reach. For example, their goal is to have 85% of the world's population living in a city by 2050 with a population density equal to living in a sardine can. Think about that. 85% of the people on the planet will be packed like a sardine in a city. So you say to yourself, I'm not moving; I don't care what they say; I hate cities. They can't force me to go where I don't want to be. Yes, they can and they are by gradually manipulating circumstances which will coerce you into the city. And here's how they are subtly, at times almost imperceptibly eliminating your options, one by one.

One of the biggest factors and easiest ways to manipulate people is to crash the economy which eventually forces people to be at the mercy of the government. Oliver Twist said, "Please sir, more porridge". Crashing economies worldwide has thrown millions of people into the poor house, who now find themselves rummaging through garbage cans for a crust of bread. Just look at [Greece](#) to see what is on the horizon for America et al. The *moneychangers* who have the power to [print money out of thin air](#), utilizing their bought and paid for useful idiots can and will do whatever they please.

Here is just a sample of some of the tactics they employ:

- Telling you that you can no longer do what you want on any

of your property that lies within 300 feet of the border of a creek or stream that runs near your property,

.Or the occasional puddle that forms after it rains is now classified as a wetland and you must now comply with all the wetland requirements,

.Or the EPA will ban most wood stoves

.Or they will force you to have your septic system checked every 6 months to make sure it is up to the standard and the standard will be changed so that every six months your septic system will no longer meet the standard and that will cost you thousands to correct,

.Or they will ban septic systems

.Or you live in the desert and they will begin to use the "nuisance abatement team" NAT (with you being the nuisance) to cite you with all kinds of "code" violations like:

- .Or having a broom on your front porch,
- .Or your bushes are too high,
- .Or you have a motor home on your property,
- .Or you have two cars in your driveway and only one belongs to the person whose name is on the deed to the property, the other is your son's car who just happens to live with you,
- .Or they will simply tell you to get off your property. They'll tell you that you can own it, but not live on it,
- .Or the county you live in will decide to no longer pave most of the roads in your county and eventually they'll be just ruddy dirt roads which will devalue your property (who wants to buy a property inaccessible to them?),
- .Or they will create arbitrary Urban Growth Boundaries which will prevent you from developing

or selling off or using any of your land the way you desire,

.Or they will add HOT lanes so it makes it much costlier to travel on a road if you don't have the required number of passengers in your vehicle,

.Or they will use traffic calming techniques to make your commute miserable and longer so you'll say, I think I'll move closer to work,

. Or they'll ticket you for washing your car in your own driveway,

.Or they'll claim that highways were racist and unjust because White people left the cities and went to live in the suburbs so they will begin to force people back into the cities using restrictive zoning ordinances, punitive code violation fines including liens, and seizure to rob people of the peaceful enjoyment of their property.

Their goal is to eliminate people living in suburbia (except for them) and to create an urban hell for all. And they'll even [ban cars](#) to prevent your escape...



TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

Managing growth of the county/local government decides which sections of the county it will deny the right to develop – “sending zone.” This includes a private land owner’s right to construct any structure on his property. Under the same program the county encourages the [construction](#) of houses on ALL available land in the “receiving zone.” In Shelby county the “core and transition” areas will likely be the “receiving zone.” If a property owner or developer purchases a TDR certificate from the private [property owner in](#) the designated

no build zone (sending) he is granted by government the right to build houses on property that was previously deemed to be too small to build a house on (example 50X100 ft lot or smaller). The first set of pictures from Portland show a house that, due to government created land shortage, was sold for an inflated value of \$171,000.00. The house was demolished and in its place 5 houses were built. A prime example of what is meant by “redevelopment.” “Transfer of Development Rights” is described on page 127 of Part Three – Implementation of the Shelby INSERT YOUR COUNTY HERE County proposed Comprehensive Plan The government created land shortage in Portland is to the point that 15 foot wide houses have been constructed. (The picture above shows 4 of the 5 houses for this redevelopment project.)

[Transfer of Development Rights](#)

[READ MORE HERE](#)



[“Infill “...it’s what on the](#)

zoning menu for your town too.

Friends of Neighborhood Zoning
writes:

“You moved into your home and never thought that someone could demolish the home next door and put two in it’s place. Look across the street. Three houses could be six. Don’t think only old run down homes are being demolished.”

The home below, a PRISTINE
\$265,000.00 home – is now gone.



FIVE homes will soon be in its place.



This is a ~~city country~~ worldwide problem. It ~~can~~ will happen to you, it's only a matter of time. You better find out what types of

zoning rules are in your town. They *aren't* going to ask your permission before they knock down the nice house next door and replace it with 5 houses that sit 5 feet from your bedroom window.

Or maybe they'll wedge a house in between your house and your neighbor' house.



They'll change minimum lot size requirements right under your nose. And you won't be happy. Nope. I guarantee, you're not going to like what's on the zoning

menu.

People all over Portland noticed something odd was happening. Nice homes were being torn down to be replaced by 2 or 4, **fifteen foot wide**, two story tall homes. What they were seeing is called “infill development”. “Infill development” is the establishment of a new land use on a site that may be undeveloped, underutilized or otherwise marginally acceptable for development but is located within an established, stable development where public facilities such as roads, water sewer and general services are available.”

<http://www.keepourrights.org/dccpfl yer.htm>

They soon learned that a code change in 1991 *eliminated the minimum lot size* in their neighborhood. A lot could be “segregated” or cut in two if originally platted that way. Infill development is coming to your neighborhood too. Look at your “comprehensive plan” or your “land use ” plan to find out the zoning rules for your area. Search for the term “infill”. It will be there.

[Take a look at this document](#) to get an idea of the “infill” terminology and how those who push this “cram us into a sardine can” ideology think.

[READ MORE HERE](#)

Tuesday July 26th David Hunnicuttt Oregonians in Action

July 26th David Hunnicutt

<http://www.oia.org/>

Oregonians in Action has been in the fight for property rights for many years. Why does a farmer need to make \$80000.00 a year for two years before he can build a house on his farm? The answer is the communist centralized land use planning that has been penalizing hard work for decades in Oregon. Who do these people that enact these "rules" think they are? I have a feeling things are going to be changing for Oregonians real soon. The critical mass necessary

for real change is building and the winds of change are beginning to blow...

Infill? Urban growth boundaries? What are they? Listen in to find out. Beware. You're not in Kansas anymore.

"In some areas, lands currently planned for resource uses have little direct value to their owners for those uses."

Now there's an understatement!

These numbers don't include all of the land owned by the federal, state, and local governments in Oregon. In fact, over 55% of all land

in Oregon is owned by government,

not private parties.

What does all this mean? It means that Oregon has a lot of land that

LCDC calls “farmland” or “forest land” that really isn’t, and that we

are under no risk of running out of land for food or timber production.

Since the definitions of “agricultural land” and “forest land” were first

adopted in Goals 3 and 4, they have proven controversial. As former

DLCD Director Richard Whitman (currently the Governor’s Natural

Resources Policy Director) noted in 2009:

“Two of the primary reasons for establishing Oregon’s land use system were the desire to preserve working farms and forest operations and to limit inefficient sprawl. Recent research indicates that Oregon’s program has been relatively successful in achieving both of these goals relative to other states.

Nevertheless, there is continuing sentiment in some parts of the state that our land use policies do not adequately recognize

differing conditions in different regions, either in terms of what

lands are needed for farming or for forestry, or in terms of growth pressures. Some counties also report that their mapping of farm and forest lands is not accurate.

READ MORE HERE
<http://oia.org/images/lookingforward/vol19-issue1online.pdf>

