

MINUTES OF MEETING OF MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY  
MEMBERS/DWELLERS HELD AT THE CHANNON JUNE  
13TH 1993

This meeting was called by Simon Clough and Brian Slapp, on behalf of PANCOM, to elicit a representative Multiple Occupancy Members'/dwellers' response to Lismore City Council's Discussion Paper on Multiple Occupancies.

The meeting commenced at 3.00pm at The Channon Hall with 34 attendees present, representing 17 different Multiple Occupancies, and was facilitated by Simon Clough.

Item 1:

Councillor Dianna Roberts offered a brief background to the Council's Discussion Paper.

Item 2:

Peter Hamilton offered ~~for~~ a paper for consideration which made recommendations for possible responses to each of the issues raised in the Council's Discussion Paper. Ten of the issues were then discussed with the following responses agreed upon by the meeting.

- 1 a) SUBDIVISION:  
(detail Peter's proposal)  
The meeting agreed with this response.
- 2 b) MINIMAL AREA:  
(detail PH'S proposal)  
The meeting agreed to accept this response.
- 3 c) AGRICULTURAL LAND:  
(detail PH's proposal)  
The meeting agreed.
- 4 d) NON RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT:  
(detail PH's proposal)  
The meeting agreed.
- 5 e) SITING OF DWELLINGS:  
(detail of PH's proposal)  
It was pointed out that the SEPP does indicate a preference for clustered development and that with



this correction, and the deletion of the inference that dispersed development could be seen as "de facto subdivision", the meeting agreed with the response.

6 f) PUBLIC ACCESS:

(detail of PH's proposal)

PH's proposal was accepted again with the recommendation that traditional farmers

- (a) — not be singled out for special mention; that the case for lower road usage patterns by Multiple Occupancies be strongly put; that flood-free access be opposed; and  
(c) — that right-of-way access be approved where the owner agrees. (h)

17 g) RATING:

The meeting proposed that Multiple Occupancies should support a review of the equitability of rating.

11 h) VISUAL IMPACT:

The meeting supported the suggestion that the general motherhood statement should prevail and that it would be discriminatory to impose such regulations on MOs alone.

18 i) SECTION 94:

(detail of PH's proposal)

and

- 18.1 (a) ↑ The meeting supported PH's proposal to point out that unreasonably high section 94 levies would be in breach of the SEPP' aim to provide low cost housing.  
18.2 (b) ↓ Once again it was agreed that the proposal point out the lower road usage patterns by MOs, that MOs are also low-impact developments and that levies arrived at on the basis of distances from Lismore would be inequitable.  
18.3 (c) ↓  
18.4 in kind!

14 j) SPECULATION:

(detail of PH's proposal)


The meeting agreed, with the recommendation to include the fact that the difficulty in selling shares due to the need to procure community agreement to the sale and the buyer, as well as the chance of recouping little more than outgoings, meant that speculation in the current circumstances was greatly discouraged. Here is



- At this point the meeting decided that proposed responses to the issues not so far covered would be dealt with by a group of volunteers from the meeting at a further meeting later in the coming week. Those volunteers were:

Simon Clough, Peter Hamilton, Brian Slapp, Philip Falk, Dianna Roberts and Jonathan ?

When finalised an outline of the complete list of responses would be mailed to all communities for consideration in preparing their own individual responses.



- Simon Clough undertook to write a philosophical background to Multiple Occupancies for inclusion in the submission.

- The hat was passed around and \$72 was raised to help cover expenses already incurred in preparing and mailing information and hall hire. It was suggested that each community should consider a contribution of \$20 to meet on-going costs for the final PANCOM submission

- THE MEETING CLOSED AT 5.30 PM