

**SEPP 15 REVIEW:
MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY
OF RURAL LANDS**

**VOLUME 2: MO RESIDENT
SURVEY DATA**

**Report to
NSW DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING**

Prepared by

PURDON ASSOCIATES PTY LIMITED
Unit 3/9 McKay Street, Turner, ACT 2601
Phone: (06) 257 1511 Fax: (06) 248 8347

CHRISTOPHER M. MURRAY AND ASSOCS. P/L
16 Bailey Place, Yarralumla, ACT 2600
Phone: (06) 282 5321 Fax: (06) 282 1567

JUNE 1994

INTRODUCTION

This volume contains the analysis of the MO resident survey undertaken as part of the review. Responses to the survey have been aggregated to protect the confidentiality of individuals. All surveys will be retained by the Department on completion of the review and will be disposed of to protect this confidentiality. A copy of the survey is contained within **Attachment D**, Volume 1.

This volume is arranged with tabulation of responses followed by summary of responses to open ended questions. This information was used to prepared the discussion of the existing situation (**Chapter 2**) and issues (**Chapter 3**). A detailed discussion of these responses are contained in **Attachment D of Volume 1**.



ATTACHMENT 1

TABULATION OF
QUESTIONS

TABLE : YEAR IN WHICH COMMUNITY WAS ESTABLISHED - DOP MO

(Q1)		BEFORE 1976	1976 TO 1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	3	3	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	0
	(%)	27.3	27.3	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	2	3	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	1
	(%)	18.2	27.3	0.0	9.1	9.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	2	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0
	(%)	14.3	28.6	0.0	14.3	14.3	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	5	5	0	4	3	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	26	2
	(%)	19.2	19.2	0.0	15.4	11.5	7.7	3.8	3.8	0.0	3.8	0.0	3.8	3.8	7.7	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	11	13	1	6	6	2	5	3	2	1	0	1	3	2	56	3
	(%)	19.6	23.2	1.8	10.7	10.7	3.6	8.9	5.4	3.6	1.8	0.0	1.8	5.4	3.6	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : WHETHER APPROVAL HAS BEEN GRANTED TO THE COMMUNITY UNDER SEPP 15 - DOP MO

(Q2)		YES	NO	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	10	1	11	0
	(%)	90.9	9.1	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	9	3	12	0
	(%)	75.0	25.0	100.0	
KYOGLÉ	(NO.)	4	2	6	1
	(%)	66.7	33.3	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	22	5	27	1
	(%)	81.5	18.5	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	1	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	46	11	57	2
	(%)	80.7	19.3	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : YEAR IN WHICH APPROVAL WAS GRANTED UNDER SEPP 15 - DOP MO

(Q3)		1976 TO 1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	4	0	0	10	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	10.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	1	3	9	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	0.0	22.2	11.1	11.1	33.3	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
	(%)	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	3	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	8	0	0	1	1	1	20	2
	(%)	15.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	3	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	14	1	3	6	2	4	44	2
	(%)	6.8	2.3	4.5	2.3	2.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	31.8	2.3	6.8	13.6	4.5	9.1	100.0	

FILTER: APPROVAL HAS BEEN GRANTED FOR THE COMMUNITY UNDER SEPP 15
SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY OF RESIDENTS (EXCLUDING VISITORS) IN THE COMMUNITY - DOP MO

(Q4)		LESS THAN 1 YEAR	1-5 YEARS	6-10 YEARS	MORE THAN 10 YEARS	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	0	3	7	0	10	1
	(%)	0.0	30.0	70.0	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	0	3	3	5	11	1
	(%)	0.0	27.3	27.3	45.5	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	1	2	4	7	0
	(%)	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	0	8	11	6	25	3
	(%)	0.0	32.0	44.0	24.0	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	0	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	0	16	23	15	54	5
	(%)	0.0	29.6	42.6	27.8	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : APPROXIMATE OVERALL AREA OF THE MO - DOP MO

(Q5)		50 HEC- TARES OR LESS	51-100 HEC- TARES	101-200 HEC- TARES	201-300 HEC- TARES	MORE THAN 300 HEC- TARES	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	6	2	1	2	0	11	0
	(%)	54.5	18.2	9.1	18.2	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	7	4	0	0	1	12	0
	(%)	58.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	2	2	1	0	6	1
	(%)	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	0.0	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	6	10	7	1	3	27	1
	(%)	22.2	37.0	25.9	3.7	11.1	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	20	18	11	4	4	57	2
	(%)	35.1	31.6	19.3	7.0	7.0	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : APPROXIMATE OVERALL AREA OF THE MO - DOP MO

(Q5A)		10 HEC- TARES OR LESS	11-50 HEC- TARES	51-100 HEC- TARES	101-200 HEC- TARES	201-300 HEC- TARES	MORE THAN 300 HEC- TARES	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	0	6	2	1	2	0	11	0
	(%)	0.0	54.5	18.2	9.1	18.2	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	0	7	4	0	0	1	12	0
	(%)	0.0	58.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	1	2	2	1	0	6	1
	(%)	0.0	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	0.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	0	6	10	7	1	3	27	1
	(%)	0.0	22.2	37.0	25.9	3.7	11.1	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	0	20	18	11	4	4	57	2
	(%)	0.0	35.1	31.6	19.3	7.0	7.0	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : WHETHER THERE ARE DISTINCT SEPARATE COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE NO - DOP NO

(Q6)		YES	NO	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	2	9	11	0
	(%)	18.2	81.8	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	1	11	12	0
	(%)	8.3	91.7	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	7	7	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	2	24	26	2
	(%)	7.7	92.3	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	1	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	5	52	57	2
	(%)	8.8	91.2	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF DISTINCT SEPARATE COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE MO - DOP MO

(Q7)		2 COMM- UNITIES	3 COMM- UNITIES	8 COMM- UNITIES	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	2	0	0	2	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	0	0	1	1	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	1	1	0	2	0
	(%)	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	3	1	1	5	0
	(%)	60.0	20.0	20.0	100.0	

FILTER: THERE ARE DISTINCT SEPARATE COMMUNITIES ON THE MO
SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE

(Q8)

NOTE : MULTIPLE RESPONSE POSSIBLE. OTHER RESPONSES WERE NOMINATED BY FEWER THAN 2 RESPONDENTS.
SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. LIVING IN THE COMMUNITY ON A PERMANENT BASIS - DOP MO

(Q9)		LESS THAN 6 PEOPLE	6-10 PEOPLE	11-15 PEOPLE	16-20 PEOPLE	21-30 PEOPLE	31-50 PEOPLE	51-100 PEOPLE	MORE THAN 100 PEOPLE	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	0	10	1
	(%)	20.0	10.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	10.0	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	0	4	2	2	4	0	0	0	12	0
	(%)	0.0	33.3	16.7	16.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	7	0
	(%)	14.3	0.0	28.6	14.3	14.3	14.3	14.3	0.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	0	8	6	1	2	6	1	3	27	1
	(%)	0.0	29.6	22.2	3.7	7.4	22.2	3.7	11.1	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	3	14	12	5	8	9	3	3	57	2
	(%)	5.3	24.6	21.1	8.8	14.0	15.8	5.3	5.3	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF PEOPLE IN VARIOUS AGE GROUPS LIVING IN THE COMMUNITY ON A PERMANENT BASIS, BELLINGEN - DOP MO

(Q\Q10)		NONE/ NOT STATED	LESS THAN 6 PEOPLE	6-10 PEOPLE	11-15 PEOPLE	16-20 PEOPLE	21-30 PEOPLE	31-50 PEOPLE	51-100 PEOPLE	MORE THAN 100 PEOPLE	TOTAL
0-4 YEARS	(NO.)	2	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	18.2	72.7	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-18 YEARS	(NO.)	2	3	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	11
	(%)	18.2	27.3	36.4	9.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
19-55 YEARS	(NO.)	0	3	4	1	0	3	0	0	0	11
	(%)	0.0	27.3	36.4	9.1	0.0	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
55+ YEARS	(NO.)	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	63.6	36.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF PEOPLE IN VARIOUS AGE GROUPS LIVING IN THE COMMUNITY ON A PERMANENT BASIS, BYRON - DOP MO

(Q\Q10)	NONE/ NOT STATED	LESS THAN 6 PEOPLE	6-10 PEOPLE	11-15 PEOPLE	16-20 PEOPLE	21-30 PEOPLE	31-50 PEOPLE	51-100 PEOPLE	MORE THAN 100 PEOPLE	TOTAL
0-4 YEARS	(NO.) 4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%) 33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-18 YEARS	(NO.) 1	6	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	12
	(%) 8.3	50.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
19-55 YEARS	(NO.) 1	0	5	5	0	1	0	0	0	12
	(%) 8.3	0.0	41.7	41.7	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
55+ YEARS	(NO.) 11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%) 91.7	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF PEOPLE IN VARIOUS AGE GROUPS LIVING IN THE COMMUNITY ON A PERMANENT BASIS, KYOGLE - DOP MO

(Q\Q10)	NONE/ NOT STATED	LESS THAN 6 PEOPLE	6-10 PEOPLE	11-15 PEOPLE	16-20 PEOPLE	21-30 PEOPLE	31-50 PEOPLE	51-100 PEOPLE	MORE THAN 100 PEOPLE	TOTAL
0-4 YEARS	(NO.) 2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%) 28.6	42.9	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-18 YEARS	(NO.) 0	2	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	7
	(%) 0.0	28.6	28.6	28.6	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
19-55 YEARS	(NO.) 0	2	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	7
	(%) 0.0	28.6	28.6	14.3	0.0	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
55+ YEARS	(NO.) 6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%) 85.7	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF PEOPLE IN VARIOUS AGE GROUPS LIVING IN THE COMMUNITY ON A PERMANENT BASIS, LISMORE - DOP MO

(Q\Q10)		NONE/ NOT STATED	LESS THAN 6 PEOPLE	6-10 PEOPLE	11-15 PEOPLE	16-20 PEOPLE	21-30 PEOPLE	31-50 PEOPLE	51-100 PEOPLE	MORE THAN 100 PEOPLE	TOTAL
0-4 YEARS	(NO.)	9	16	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	28
	(%)	32.1	57.1	7.1	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-18 YEARS	(NO.)	2	15	4	4	0	1	1	1	0	28
	(%)	7.1	53.6	14.3	14.3	0.0	3.6	3.6	3.6	0.0	100.0
19-55 YEARS	(NO.)	0	3	13	1	2	3	3	1	2	28
	(%)	0.0	10.7	46.4	3.6	7.1	10.7	10.7	3.6	7.1	100.0
55+ YEARS	(NO.)	14	10	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	28
	(%)	50.0	35.7	7.1	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF PEOPLE IN VARIOUS AGE GROUPS LIVING IN THE COMMUNITY ON A PERMANENT BASIS, SHOALHAVEN - DOP MO

(Q\Q10)		NONE/ NOT STATED	LESS THAN 6 PEOPLE	6-10 PEOPLE	11-15 PEOPLE	16-20 PEOPLE	21-30 PEOPLE	31-50 PEOPLE	51-100 PEOPLE	MORE THAN 100 PEOPLE	TOTAL
0-4 YEARS	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-18 YEARS	(NO.)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
19-55 YEARS	(NO.)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
55+ YEARS	(NO.)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF PEOPLE IN VARIOUS AGE GROUPS LIVING IN THE COMMUNITY ON A PERMANENT BASIS, TOTAL - DOP MO

(Q\Q10)		NONE/ NOT STATED	LESS THAN 6 PEOPLE	6-10 PEOPLE	11-15 PEOPLE	16-20 PEOPLE	21-30 PEOPLE	31-50 PEOPLE	51-100 PEOPLE	MORE THAN 100 PEOPLE	TOTAL
0-4 YEARS	(NO.)	18	35	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	59
	(%)	30.5	59.3	6.8	1.7	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-18 YEARS	(NO.)	5	27	12	9	0	3	2	1	0	59
	(%)	8.5	45.8	20.3	15.3	0.0	5.1	3.4	1.7	0.0	100.0
19-55 YEARS	(NO.)	1	9	24	8	2	8	4	1	2	59
	(%)	1.7	15.3	40.7	13.6	3.4	13.6	6.8	1.7	3.4	100.0
55+ YEARS	(NO.)	38	17	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	59
	(%)	64.4	28.8	3.4	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : TOTAL NO. OF PEOPLE IN VARIOUS AGE GROUPS IN ALL MOs - DOP MO

(Q10.WKS) (Q10)	PERSONS				TOTAL
	AGED 0-4	AGED 5-18	AGED 19-55	AGED 55+	
BELLINGEN	(NO.) 22 (%) 9.7	72 31.9	126 55.8	6 2.7	226 100.0
BYRON	(NO.) 15 (%) 6.4	91 38.6	129 54.7	1 .4	236 100.0
KYOGLE	(NO.) 24 (%) 12.1	63 31.7	111 55.8	1 .5	199 100.0
LISMORE	(NO.) 90 (%) 8.3	268 24.9	667 61.9	53 4.9	1078 100.0
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.) 0 (%) .0	4 44.4	4 44.4	1 11.1	9 100.0
TOTAL	(NO.) 151 (%) 8.6	498 28.5	1037 59.3	62 3.5	1748 100.0

NOTE : % BASED ON TOTAL NO. OF PERSONS IN ALL MOs
SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : TOTAL & AVERAGE NO. OF PERSONS AGED 0-4 YEARS IN ALL MOs - DOP MO

(Q10A)		TOTAL & AVERAGE	NO. OF RESPON- DENTS
BELLINGEN	(AMT)	22.0	11
	(AVE)	2.0	
BYRON	(AMT)	15.0	12
	(AVE)	1.3	
KYOGLE	(AMT)	24.0	7
	(AVE)	3.4	
LISHORE	(AMT)	90.0	28
	(AVE)	3.2	
SHOALHAVEN	(AMT)	0.0	1
	(AVE)	0.0	
TOTAL	(AMT)	151.0	59
	(AVE)	2.6	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : TOTAL & AVERAGE NO. OF PERSONS AGED 5-18 YEARS IN ALL MOS - DOP MO

(Q10B)		TOTAL & AVERAGE	NO. OF RESPON- DENTS
BELLINGEN	(AMT)	72.0	11
	(AVE)	6.5	
BYRON	(AMT)	91.0	12
	(AVE)	7.6	
KYOGLE	(AMT)	63.0	7
	(AVE)	9.0	
LISMORE	(AMT)	268.0	28
	(AVE)	9.6	
SHOALHAVEN	(AMT)	4.0	1
	(AVE)	4.0	
TOTAL	(AMT)	498.0	59
	(AVE)	8.4	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : TOTAL & AVERAGE NO. OF PERSONS AGED 19-55 YEARS IN ALL MOs - DOP MO

(Q10C)		TOTAL & AVERAGE	NO. OF RESPON- DENTS
BELLINGEN	(AMT)	126.0	11
	(AVE)	11.5	
BYRON	(AMT)	129.0	12
	(AVE)	10.8	
KYOGLE	(AMT)	111.0	7
	(AVE)	15.9	
LISMORE	(AMT)	667.0	28
	(AVE)	23.8	
SHOALHAVEN	(AMT)	4.0	1
	(AVE)	4.0	
TOTAL	(AMT)	1037.0	59
	(AVE)	17.6	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : TOTAL & AVERAGE NO. OF PERSONS AGED 55+ YEARS IN ALL MOs - DOP MO

(Q10D)		TOTAL & AVERAGE	NO. OF RESPON- DENTS
BELLINGEN	(AMT)	6.0	11
	(AVE)	0.5	
BYRON	(AMT)	1.0	12
	(AVE)	0.1	
KYOGLE	(AMT)	1.0	7
	(AVE)	0.1	
LISMORE	(AMT)	53.0	28
	(AVE)	1.9	
SHOALHAVEN	(AMT)	1.0	1
	(AVE)	1.0	
TOTAL	(AMT)	62.0	59
	(AVE)	1.1	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF SEPARATE HOUSEHOLDS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY - DOP MO

(Q11)		1 HOUSE- HOLD	2 HOUSE- HOLDS	3 HOUSE- HOLDS	4 HOUSE- HOLDS	5 HOUSE- HOLDS	6 HOUSE- HOLDS	7 HOUSE- HOLDS	8 HOUSE- HOLDS	9 HOUSE- HOLDS	10 HOUSE- HOLDS	11-15 HOUSE- HOLDS	16-20 HOUSE- HOLDS	21-50 HOUSE- HOLDS	MORE THAN 50 HOUSE- HOLDS	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	11	0
	(%)	9.1	0.0	9.1	18.2	0.0	9.1	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	18.2	18.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	0
BYRON	(NO.)	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	12	0
	(%)	8.3	0.0	8.3	16.7	0.0	8.3	8.3	16.7	8.3	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	7	0
	(%)	0.0	14.3	14.3	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	100.0	1
LISMORE	(NO.)	0	0	2	3	1	3	0	2	0	2	3	3	6	2	27	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	7.4	11.1	3.7	11.1	0.0	7.4	0.0	7.4	11.1	11.1	22.2	7.4	100.0	0
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0
TOTAL	(NO.)	2	1	5	7	3	6	1	6	2	5	6	5	7	2	58	1
	(%)	3.4	1.7	8.6	12.1	5.2	10.3	1.7	10.3	3.4	8.6	10.3	8.6	12.1	3.4	100.0	1

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : PERCENTAGE OF SEPARATE HOUSEHOLDS EARNING LESS THAN \$20000 PER YEAR - DOP MO

(Q12)		NONE/ NOT STATED	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-99%	100%	TOTAL
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	1	2	0	1	4	3	11
	(%)	9.1	18.2	0.0	9.1	36.4	27.3	100.0
BYRON	(NO.)	0	1	2	3	3	3	12
	(%)	0.0	8.3	16.7	25.0	25.0	25.0	100.0
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	0	1	2	0	3	7
	(%)	14.3	0.0	14.3	28.6	0.0	42.9	100.0
LISHORE	(NO.)	0	1	3	4	11	9	28
	(%)	0.0	3.6	10.7	14.3	39.3	32.1	100.0
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TOTAL	(NO.)	3	4	6	10	18	18	59
	(%)	5.1	6.8	10.2	16.9	30.5	30.5	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : PERCENTAGE OF RESIDENTS BETWEEN 18-60 YEARS OF AGE WHO ARE ENGAGED PREDOMINANTLY IN DAILY ACTIVITIES ON THE MO - DOP MO

(Q13)		NONE/ NOT STATED	1-25%	26-49%	50%	51-75%	76-99%	100%	TOTAL
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	1	2	1	3	2	2	0	11
	(%)	9.1	18.2	9.1	27.3	18.2	18.2	0.0	100.0
BYRON	(NO.)	0	2	3	3	2	2	0	12
	(%)	0.0	16.7	25.0	25.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	100.0
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	0	0	2	2	2	0	7
	(%)	14.3	0.0	0.0	28.6	28.6	28.6	0.0	100.0
LISHORE	(NO.)	2	3	3	7	3	8	2	28
	(%)	7.1	10.7	10.7	25.0	10.7	28.6	7.1	100.0
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TOTAL	(NO.)	5	7	7	15	9	14	2	59
	(%)	8.5	11.9	11.9	25.4	15.3	23.7	3.4	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : PERCENTAGE OF RESIDENTS BETWEEN 18-60 YEARS OF AGE WHO ARE ENGAGED PREDOMINANTLY IN ACTIVITIES WHICH TAKE THEM OFF THE MO - DOP MO

(Q14)		NONE/ NOT STATED	1-25%	26-49%	50%	51-75%	76-99%	100%	TOTAL
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	0	4	2	3	2	0	0	11
	(%)	0.0	36.4	18.2	27.3	18.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
BYRON	(NO.)	0	4	2	3	2	1	0	12
	(%)	0.0	33.3	16.7	25.0	16.7	8.3	0.0	100.0
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	7
	(%)	0.0	42.9	28.6	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
LISMORE	(NO.)	4	10	2	6	3	1	2	28
	(%)	14.3	35.7	7.1	21.4	10.7	3.6	7.1	100.0
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
TOTAL	(NO.)	4	21	8	14	7	2	3	59
	(%)	6.8	35.6	13.6	23.7	11.9	3.4	5.1	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : MODES OF TRANSPORT USED BY PEOPLE LEAVING THE MO - DOP MO

(Q15)		PRIVATE TRANS- PORT	COMMUN- ITY TRANS- PORT	SHARED PRIVATE TRANS- PORT	PUBLIC TRANS- PORT	SCHOOL BUS	HITCH- HIKING	WALKING	NO. OF RESPON- DENTS	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	11	0	6	2	1	2	1	11	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	54.5	18.2	9.1	18.2	9.1	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	12	1	3	2	0	0	0	12	0
	(%)	100.0	8.3	25.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	7	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	26	1	15	9	1	2	0	27	1
	(%)	96.3	3.7	55.6	33.3	3.7	7.4	0.0	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	57	2	25	14	2	4	1	58	1
	(%)	98.3	3.4	43.1	24.1	3.4	6.9	1.7	100.0	

NOTE : MULTIPLE RESPONSE POSSIBLE

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : MAIN MODE OF TRANSPORT USED BY PEOPLE LEAVING THE MO - DOP MO

(Q16)		PRIVATE TRANS- PORT	COMMUN- ITY TRANS- PORT	SHARED PRIVATE TRANS- PORT	PUBLIC TRANS- PORT	SCHOOL BUS	HITCH- HIKING	WALKING	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	8	0	3	0	0	0	0	11	0
	(%)	72.7	0.0	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
KYOGLÉ	(NO.)	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	0
	(%)	85.7	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	25	0	2	0	0	0	0	27	1
	(%)	92.6	0.0	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	52	0	6	0	0	0	0	58	1
	(%)	89.7	0.0	10.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : SETTLEMENT TYPE - DOP MO

(Q17)		CLUST- ERED SETTLE- MENT	DISPER- SED SETTLE- MENT	BOTH	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	1	10	0	11	0
	(%)	9.1	90.9	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	3	9	0	12	0
	(%)	25.0	75.0	0.0	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	6	0	7	0
	(%)	14.3	85.7	0.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	3	22	3	28	0
	(%)	10.7	78.6	10.7	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	8	48	3	59	0
	(%)	13.6	81.4	5.1	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF VARIOUS TYPES OF DWELLING WITHIN THE COMMUNITY, BELLINGEN - DOP MO

(Q\Q18)		NONE/ NOT STATED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11-20	21-50	MORE THAN 50	TOTAL
SINGLE DWELLING	(NO.)	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	11
	(%)	0.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	18.2	9.1	9.1	9.1	9.1	0.0	9.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
COMMUNAL HOUSE	(NO.)	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	63.6	36.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SHED	(NO.)	6	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	54.5	27.3	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TENT	(NO.)	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	90.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
COVERED CARAVAN	(NO.)	4	4	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	36.4	36.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
EXPANDED DWELLING	(NO.)	6	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	54.5	18.2	18.2	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
UNCOVERED CARAVAN	(NO.)	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
ILLEGAL DWELLING	(NO.)	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
UNDER CONSTRUCTION	(NO.)	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TEMPORARY DWELLING	(NO.)	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	90.9	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF VARIOUS TYPES OF DWELLING WITHIN THE COMMUNITY, BYRON - DOP MO

(Q\Q18)		NONE/ NOT STATED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11-20	21-50	MORE THAN 50	TOTAL
SINGLE DWELLING	(NO.)	1	0	0	3	4	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	8.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	33.3	0.0	8.3	8.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
COMMUNAL HOUSE	(NO.)	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SHED	(NO.)	7	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	58.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TENT	(NO.)	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	91.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
COVERED CARAVAN	(NO.)	8	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	66.7	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
EXPANDED DWELLING	(NO.)	9	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	75.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
UNCOVERED CARAVAN	(NO.)	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
ILLEGAL DWELLING	(NO.)	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
UNDER CONSTRUCTION	(NO.)	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TEMPORARY DWELLING	(NO.)	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF VARIOUS TYPES OF DWELLING WITHIN THE COMMUNITY, KYOGLE - DOP MO

(Q\Q18)		NONE/ NOT STATED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11-20	21-50	MORE THAN 50	TOTAL
SINGLE DWELLING	(NO.)	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	7
	(%)	14.3	0.0	0.0	28.6	14.3	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
COMMUNAL HOUSE	(NO.)	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	85.7	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SHED	(NO.)	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	28.6	14.3	14.3	28.6	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TENT	(NO.)	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
COVERED CARAVAN	(NO.)	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	71.4	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
EXPANDED DWELLING	(NO.)	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	85.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
UNCOVERED CARAVAN	(NO.)	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	85.7	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
ILLEGAL DWELLING	(NO.)	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
UNDER CONSTRUCTION	(NO.)	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	85.7	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TEMPORARY DWELLING	(NO.)	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF VARIOUS TYPES OF DWELLING WITHIN THE COMMUNITY, LISMORE - DOP MO

(Q\Q18)		NONE/ NOT STATED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11-20	21-50	MORE THAN 50	TOTAL
SINGLE DWELLING	(NO.)	3	1	3	2	3	3	1	1	1	0	0	7	1	2	28
	(%)	10.7	3.6	10.7	7.1	10.7	10.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	25.0	3.6	7.1	100.0
COMMUNAL HOUSE	(NO.)	22	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
	(%)	78.6	14.3	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SHED	(NO.)	10	5	2	2	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	28
	(%)	35.7	17.9	7.1	7.1	17.9	0.0	0.0	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	3.6	100.0
TENT	(NO.)	22	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
	(%)	78.6	21.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
COVERED CARAVAN	(NO.)	12	5	7	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	28
	(%)	42.9	17.9	25.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
EXPANDED DWELLING	(NO.)	19	2	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	28
	(%)	67.9	7.1	7.1	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
UNCOVERED CARAVAN	(NO.)	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
	(%)	96.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
ILLEGAL DWELLING	(NO.)	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
	(%)	96.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
UNDER CONSTRUCTION	(NO.)	26	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
	(%)	92.9	0.0	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TEMPORARY DWELLING	(NO.)	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
	(%)	96.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF VARIOUS TYPES OF DWELLING WITHIN THE COMMUNITY, SHOALHAVEN - DOP MO

(Q\Q18)		NONE/ NOT STATED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11-20	21-50	MORE THAN 50	TOTAL
SINGLE DWELLING	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
COMMUNAL HOUSE	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SHED	(NO.)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TENT	(NO.)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
COVERED CARAVAN	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
EXPANDED DWELLING	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
UNCOVERED CARAVAN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
ILLEGAL DWELLING	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
UNDER CONSTRUCTION	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TEMPORARY DWELLING	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF VARIOUS TYPES OF DWELLING WITHIN THE COMMUNITY, TOTAL - DOP MO

(Q\Q18)		NONE/ NOT STATED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11-20	21-50	MORE THAN 50	TOTAL
SINGLE DWELLING	(NO.)	5	1	4	9	10	6	4	3	2	2	1	9	1	2	59
	(%)	8.5	1.7	6.8	15.3	16.9	10.2	6.8	5.1	3.4	3.4	1.7	15.3	1.7	3.4	100.0
COMMUNAL HOUSE	(NO.)	46	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
	(%)	78.0	18.6	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SHED	(NO.)	25	10	4	7	8	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	59
	(%)	42.4	16.9	6.8	11.9	13.6	0.0	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	1.7	100.0
TENT	(NO.)	50	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
	(%)	84.7	13.6	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
COVERED CARAVAN	(NO.)	30	12	7	4	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	59
	(%)	50.8	20.3	11.9	6.8	1.7	3.4	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
EXPANDED DWELLING	(NO.)	41	5	4	0	2	2	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	59
	(%)	69.5	8.5	6.8	0.0	3.4	3.4	0.0	5.1	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
UNCOVERED CARAVAN	(NO.)	56	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
	(%)	94.9	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
ILLEGAL DWELLING	(NO.)	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
	(%)	98.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
UNDER CONSTRUCTION	(NO.)	56	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
	(%)	94.9	0.0	1.7	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TEMPORARY DWELLING	(NO.)	57	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
	(%)	96.6	0.0	1.7	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : TOTAL NO. OF VARIOUS DWELLING TYPES WITHIN THE COMMUNITY

(Q18A.WKS) (Q18A)		SINGLE DWELL- ING	COMMUN- AL HOUSE	SHED	TENT	COVERED CARAVAN	EXPAN- DED DWELL- ING	UNCOV- ERED CARAVAN	ILLEGAL DWELL- ING	UNDER CONST- RUCTION	TEMP- ORARY DWELL- ING	TOTAL
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	63	4	12	1	20	11	0	0	0	2	113
	(%)	55.8	3.5	10.6	.9	17.7	9.7	.0	.0	.0	1.8	100.0
BYRON	(NO.)	56	2	14	4	8	9	0	0	0	0	93
	(%)	60.2	2.2	15.1	4.3	8.6	9.7	.0	.0	.0	.0	100.0
KYOGLE	(NO.)	31	1	13	0	5	7	1	0	3	0	61
	(%)	50.8	1.6	21.3	.0	8.2	11.5	1.6	.0	4.9	.0	100.0
LISMORE	(NO.)	360	9	127	6	51	53	5	7	5	4	627
	(%)	57.4	1.4	20.3	1.0	8.1	8.5	.8	1.1	.8	.6	100.0
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	6	0	3	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	14
	(%)	42.9	.0	21.4	7.1	.0	.0	28.6	.0	.0	.0	100.0
TOTAL	(NO.)	516	16	169	12	84	80	10	7	8	6	908
	(%)	56.8	1.8	18.6	1.3	9.3	8.8	1.1	.8	.9	.7	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : COMMUNITY FACILITIES MO HAS - DOP MO

(Q19)		NONE	COMMUN- ITY CENTRE	COMMUN- ITY KIT- CHEN/ EATERY	UTIL- ITIES	ARTIST WORK- SHOPS/ GALLERY	HEALTH/ MEDICAL	BUSH- FIRE/ FLOOD FACIL- ITIES	COMMUN- ITY HOUSE	COMMUN- ITY LAUNDRY	CHILD CARE FACIL- ITIES	COMMUN- ITY HALL	WORK- SHOP/ FARM BUILD- INGS	RELIG- IOUS FACIL- ITIES	EDUC- ATION FACIL- ITIES	RECREA- TION FACIL- ITIES	TRACT- ORS/ FARM MACHIN- ERY
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	1	3	3	10	3	1	10	3	5	1	1	9	1	1	6	1
	(%)	9.1	27.3	27.3	90.9	27.3	9.1	90.9	27.3	45.5	9.1	9.1	81.8	9.1	9.1	54.5	9.1
BYRON	(NO.)	1	3	3	10	2	0	7	3	4	1	3	6	3	2	3	0
	(%)	8.3	25.0	25.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	58.3	25.0	33.3	8.3	25.0	50.0	25.0	16.7	25.0	0.0
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	2	1	7	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	6	0	1	4	1
	(%)	0.0	28.6	14.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	28.6	0.0	28.6	0.0	85.7	0.0	14.3	57.1	14.3
LISHORE	(NO.)	0	10	4	28	7	2	22	8	9	2	6	14	4	2	15	1
	(%)	0.0	35.7	14.3	100.0	25.0	7.1	78.6	28.6	32.1	7.1	21.4	50.0	14.3	7.1	53.6	3.6
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	(NO.)	2	19	11	56	12	3	42	16	18	6	10	36	8	6	28	3
	(%)	3.4	32.2	18.6	94.9	20.3	5.1	71.2	27.1	30.5	10.2	16.9	61.0	13.6	10.2	47.5	5.1

TABLE : (CONTINUED)

(Q19)		OTHER	NO. OF RESPON- DENTS	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	2	11	0
	(X)	18.2	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	2	12	0
	(X)	16.7	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	7	0
	(X)	14.3	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	0	28	0
	(X)	0.0	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	0
	(X)	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	5	59	0
	(X)	8.5	100.0	

NOTE : MULTIPLE RESPONSE POSSIBLE. OTHER RESPONSES WERE NOMINATED BY FEWER THAN 2 RESPONDENTS
 SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : WHETHER ANY COMMUNITY FACILITIES ARE/HAVE BEEN USED ON AN ONGOING BASIS BY PEOPLE WHO ARE/WERE NOT RESIDENTS OF THE MO - DOP MO

(Q20)		YES	NO	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	4	6	10	1
	(%)	40.0	60.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	4	8	12	0
	(%)	33.3	66.7	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	3	4	7	0
	(%)	42.9	57.1	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	16	11	27	1
	(%)	59.3	40.7	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	1	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	27	30	57	2
	(%)	47.4	52.6	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : APPROXIMATE SITE AREA ASSOCIATED WITH VARIOUS LAND USES WITHIN THE MO, BELLINGEN - DOP MO

(Q\Q22)		0%	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6-10%	11-15%	16-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-75%	76-100%	TOTAL
RESIDENTIAL	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.4	27.3	0.0	9.1	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
AGRICULTURE	(NO.)	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	11
	(%)	9.1	9.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	9.1	18.2	0.0	27.3	9.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
ENVIRONMENT PRESERVATN	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	3	11
	(%)	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	18.2	9.1	9.1	27.3	100.0
ACTIVE OPEN SPACE	(NO.)	5	0	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	45.5	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	9.1	36.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
COMMUNITY FACILITIES	(NO.)	5	1	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	45.5	9.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	27.3	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
PASSIVE COMMUNITY LAND	(NO.)	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	11
	(%)	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	18.2	0.0	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	100.0
OTHER	(NO.)	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	90.9	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : APPROXIMATE SITE AREA ASSOCIATED WITH VARIOUS LAND USES WITHIN THE MO, BYRON - DOP MO

(Q\Q22)		0%	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6-10%	11-15%	16-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-75%	76-100%	TOTAL
RESIDENTIAL	(NO.)	0	0	2	0	1	0	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	8.3	0.0	50.0	16.7	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
AGRICULTURE	(NO.)	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	16.7	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	25.0	8.3	8.3	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
ENVIRONMENT PRESERVATN	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	3	12
	(%)	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	50.0	25.0	100.0
ACTIVE OPEN SPACE	(NO.)	5	3	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	41.7	25.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	8.3	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
COMMUNITY FACILITIES	(NO.)	8	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	66.7	8.3	8.3	0.0	8.3	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
PASSIVE COMMUNITY LAND	(NO.)	7	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	58.3	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
OTHER	(NO.)	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : APPROXIMATE SITE AREA ASSOCIATED WITH VARIOUS LAND USES WITHIN THE MO, KYOGLE - DOP MO

(Q\Q22)		0%	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6-10%	11-15%	16-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-75%	76-100%	TOTAL
RESIDENTIAL	(NO.)	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7
	(%)	14.3	14.3	28.6	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	100.0
AGRICULTURE	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	28.6	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
ENVIRONMENT PRESERVATN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	7
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	57.1	14.3	100.0
ACTIVE OPEN SPACE	(NO.)	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	57.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
COMMUNITY FACILITIES	(NO.)	2	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	28.6	42.9	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
PASSIVE COMMUNITY LAND	(NO.)	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	7
	(%)	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
OTHER	(NO.)	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : APPROXIMATE SITE AREA ASSOCIATED WITH VARIOUS LAND USES WITHIN THE MO, LISMORE - DOP MO

(Q\Q22)		0%	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6-10%	11-15%	16-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-75%	76-100%	TOTAL
RESIDENTIAL	(NO.)	0	2	0	0	0	5	7	2	2	6	1	1	2	0	28
	(%)	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.9	25.0	7.1	7.1	21.4	3.6	3.6	7.1	0.0	100.0
AGRICULTURE	(NO.)	6	4	0	0	0	7	6	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	28
	(%)	21.4	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	21.4	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	10.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
ENVIRONMENT PRESERVATN	(NO.)	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	5	4	6	28
	(%)	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	3.6	14.3	17.9	17.9	14.3	21.4	100.0
ACTIVE OPEN SPACE	(NO.)	18	3	1	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
	(%)	64.3	10.7	3.6	3.6	0.0	14.3	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
COMMUNITY FACILITIES	(NO.)	10	5	5	3	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	28
	(%)	35.7	17.9	17.9	10.7	3.6	7.1	3.6	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
PASSIVE COMMUNITY LAND	(NO.)	9	1	0	2	0	1	3	3	1	1	5	0	1	1	28
	(%)	32.1	3.6	0.0	7.1	0.0	3.6	10.7	10.7	3.6	3.6	17.9	0.0	3.6	3.6	100.0
OTHER	(NO.)	25	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	28
	(%)	89.3	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : APPROXIMATE SITE AREA ASSOCIATED WITH VARIOUS LAND USES WITHIN THE MO, SHOALHAVEN - DOP MO

(Q\Q22)		0%	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6-10%	11-15%	16-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-75%	76-100%	TOTAL
RESIDENTIAL	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
AGRICULTURE	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
ENVIRONMENT PRESERVATN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
ACTIVE OPEN SPACE	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
COMMUNITY FACILITIES	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
PASSIVE COMMUNITY LAND	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
OTHER	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : APPROXIMATE SITE AREA ASSOCIATED WITH VARIOUS LAND USES WITHIN THE MO, TOTAL - DOP MO

(Q\Q22)		0%	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6-10%	11-15%	16-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-75%	76-100%	TOTAL
RESIDENTIAL	(NO.)	1	3	4	1	1	10	17	4	4	9	1	1	3	0	59
	(%)	1.7	5.1	6.8	1.7	1.7	16.9	28.8	6.8	6.8	15.3	1.7	1.7	5.1	0.0	100.0
AGRICULTURE	(NO.)	10	5	0	2	1	9	12	4	6	6	0	4	0	0	59
	(%)	16.9	8.5	0.0	3.4	1.7	15.3	20.3	6.8	10.2	10.2	0.0	6.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
ENVIRONMENT PRESERVATN	(NO.)	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	7	8	7	16	13	59
	(%)	6.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	3.4	11.9	13.6	11.9	27.1	22.0	100.0
ACTIVE OPEN SPACE	(NO.)	33	6	3	1	1	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
	(%)	55.9	10.2	5.1	1.7	1.7	13.6	11.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
COMMUNITY FACILITIES	(NO.)	26	10	8	3	2	7	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	59
	(%)	44.1	16.9	13.6	5.1	3.4	11.9	3.4	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
PASSIVE COMMUNITY LAND	(NO.)	21	2	0	3	0	6	8	4	5	1	6	0	1	2	59
	(%)	35.6	3.4	0.0	5.1	0.0	10.2	13.6	6.8	8.5	1.7	10.2	0.0	1.7	3.4	100.0
OTHER	(NO.)	55	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	59
	(%)	93.2	0.0	1.7	1.7	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : OWNERSHIP STRUCTURES OF THE COMMUNITY - DOP MO

(Q23)		TENANTS IN COMMON	JOINT TENANTS	TITLE HELD BY TRUSTEE	CO-OP- ERATIVE	PART- NER- SHIP	PROP- RIET- ARY COMP- ANY	OTHER	NO. OF RESPON- DENTS	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	4	2	2	2	1	2	1	11	0
	(%)	36.4	18.2	18.2	18.2	9.1	18.2	9.1	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	6	0	0	0	0	5	1	12	0
	(%)	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	41.7	8.3	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	3	0	1	0	0	3	0	7	0
	(%)	42.9	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	42.9	0.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	12	0	3	6	1	8	1	28	0
	(%)	42.9	0.0	10.7	21.4	3.6	28.6	3.6	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	25	2	6	8	2	19	3	59	0
	(%)	42.4	3.4	10.2	13.6	3.4	32.2	5.1	100.0	

NOTE : MULTIPLE RESPONSE POSSIBLE. OTHER RESPONSES WERE NOMINATED BY FEWER THAN 2 RESPONDENTS.
SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : ARRANGEMENT UNDER WHICH INDIVIDUAL DWELLINGS ARE OWNED & OCCUPIED - DOP MO

(Q24)		ALL OWNED BY COMMUN- ITY	INDIV. DWELLS. OWNED BY OCC- UPIER	LEASE BEING NEGOT- IATED	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	1	10	0	11	0
	(%)	9.1	90.9	0.0	100.0	0
BYRON	(NO.)	1	11	0	12	0
	(%)	8.3	91.7	0.0	100.0	0
KYOGLE	(NO.)	2	5	0	7	0
	(%)	28.6	71.4	0.0	100.0	0
LISHORE	(NO.)	3	24	1	28	0
	(%)	10.7	85.7	3.6	100.0	0
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0
TOTAL	(NO.)	7	51	1	59	0
	(%)	11.9	86.4	1.7	100.0	0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF SHAREHOLDERS/MEMBERS IN MO - DOP MO

(Q25)		LESS THAN 6	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-30	31-50	51-100	MORE THAN 100	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	3	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	11	0
	(%)	27.3	27.3	9.1	0.0	36.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	3	5	2	0	2	0	0	0	12	0
	(%)	25.0	41.7	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	7	0
	(%)	14.3	28.6	14.3	14.3	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	4	5	5	4	2	6	0	2	28	0
	(%)	14.3	17.9	17.9	14.3	7.1	21.4	0.0	7.1	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	11	15	10	5	9	7	0	2	59	0
	(%)	18.6	25.4	16.9	8.5	15.3	11.9	0.0	3.4	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF SHAREHOLDERS/MEMBERS NOT CURRENTLY LIVING ON THE MO - DOP MO

(Q26)		LESS THAN 6	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-30	31-50	51-100	MORE THAN 100	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	2
	(%)	77.8	11.1	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2
	(%)	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
KYOGLÉ	(NO.)	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	2
	(%)	60.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	13	4	3	0	4	0	0	1	25	3
	(%)	52.0	16.0	12.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	31	9	4	1	4	0	0	1	50	9
	(%)	62.0	18.0	8.0	2.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF SHAREHOLDERS/MEMBERS NOT CURRENTLY LIVING ON THE MO - DOP MO

(Q26A)		NONE	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-30	31-50	51-100	MORE THAN 100	TOTAL
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	2	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	18.2	63.6	9.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
BYRON	(NO.)	2	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	16.7	66.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
KYOGLE	(NO.)	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	28.6	42.9	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
LISHORE	(NO.)	3	13	4	3	0	4	0	0	1	28
	(%)	10.7	46.4	14.3	10.7	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	3.6	100.0
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TOTAL	(NO.)	9	31	9	4	1	4	0	0	1	59
	(%)	15.3	52.5	15.3	6.8	1.7	6.8	0.0	0.0	1.7	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF PEOPLE CURRENTLY LIVING IN THE COMMUNITY WHO ARE NOT SHAREHOLDERS - DOP MO

(Q27)		LESS THAN 6	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-30	31-50	51-100	MORE THAN 100	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1
	(%)	90.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	1
	(%)	81.8	9.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1
	(%)	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	14	0	4	0	5	0	1	0	24	4
	(%)	58.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	20.8	0.0	4.2	0.0	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	38	3	4	1	5	0	1	0	52	7
	(%)	73.1	5.8	7.7	1.9	9.6	0.0	1.9	0.0	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : NO. OF PEOPLE CURRENTLY LIVING IN THE COMMUNITY WHO ARE NOT SHAREHOLDERS - DOP MO

(Q27A)		NONE	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-30	31-50	51-100	MORE THAN 100	TOTAL
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	1	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	9.1	81.8	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
BYRON	(NO.)	1	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	8.3	75.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	14.3	71.4	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
LISMORE	(NO.)	4	14	0	4	0	5	0	1	0	28
	(%)	14.3	50.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	17.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	100.0
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TOTAL	(NO.)	7	38	3	4	1	5	0	1	0	59
	(%)	11.9	64.4	5.1	6.8	1.7	8.5	0.0	1.7	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : AVAILABILITY OF SHARES IN THE MO - DOP MO

(Q28)		NOT AVAIL- ABLE	AVAIL- ABLE TO THE PUBLIC	CONDIT- IONALLY AVAIL- ABLE	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	7	0	4	11	0
	(%)	63.6	0.0	36.4	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	5	0	7	12	0
	(%)	41.7	0.0	58.3	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	1	5	7	0
	(%)	14.3	14.3	71.4	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	4	5	19	28	0
	(%)	14.3	17.9	67.9	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	0	1	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	18	6	35	59	0
	(%)	30.5	10.2	59.3	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : CURRENT COST OF SHARES OR EQUIVALENT - DOP MO

(Q29A)		\$5000 OR LESS	\$5001 TO \$10000	\$10001 TO \$15000	\$15001 TO \$20000	\$20001 TO \$25000	\$25001 TO \$30000	\$30001 TO \$40000	\$40001 OR MORE	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	4	0
	(%)	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	5	2
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	5	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	5	1	4	3	4	3	1	1	22	2
	(%)	22.7	4.5	18.2	13.6	18.2	13.6	4.5	4.5	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	6	1	6	5	5	7	4	2	36	5
	(%)	16.7	2.8	16.7	13.9	13.9	19.4	11.1	5.6	100.0	

FILTER: SHARES ARE CURRENTLY AVAILABLE

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : TOTAL & AVERAGE CURRENT COST OF SHARES - DOP MO

(Q29A-1)		TOTAL & AVERAGE (\$'000)	NO. OF RESPON- DENTS
<hr/>			
BELLINGEN	(AMT)	158.5	11
	(AVE)	14.4	
BYRON	(AMT)	302.0	12
	(AVE)	25.2	
KYOGLA	(AMT)	113.4	7
	(AVE)	16.2	
LISHORE	(AMT)	402.1	28
	(AVE)	14.4	
SHOALHAVEN	(AMT)	25.0	1
	(AVE)	25.0	
TOTAL	(AMT)	1001.0	59
	(AVE)	17.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : ORIGINAL COST OF SHARES OR EQUIVALENT - DOP MO

(Q29B)		\$5000 OR LESS	\$5001 TO \$10000	\$10001 TO \$15000	\$15001 TO \$20000	\$20001 TO \$25000	\$25001 TO \$30000	\$30001 TO \$40000	\$40001 OR MORE	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
	(%)	60.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	2	2	1	3	1	0	0	2	11	1
	(%)	18.2	18.2	9.1	27.3	9.1	0.0	0.0	18.2	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0
	(%)	42.9	57.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	11	11	4	1	0	0	0	1	28	0
	(%)	39.3	39.3	14.3	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	19	19	6	4	1	0	0	3	52	7
	(%)	36.5	36.5	11.5	7.7	1.9	0.0	0.0	5.8	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : PERCENTAGE OF ORIGINAL SHAREHOLDERS WHO STILL RESIDE ON THE MO - DOP MO

(Q30)		0%	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-75%	75-100%	TOTAL
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	2	2	2	1	0	3	0	1	11
	(%)	18.2	18.2	18.2	9.1	0.0	27.3	0.0	9.1	100.0
BYRON	(NO.)	0	0	1	3	0	1	4	3	12
	(%)	0.0	0.0	8.3	25.0	0.0	8.3	33.3	25.0	100.0
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	0	7
	(%)	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	28.6	42.9	0.0	100.0
LISMORE	(NO.)	1	4	2	4	5	5	6	1	28
	(%)	3.6	14.3	7.1	14.3	17.9	17.9	21.4	3.6	100.0
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TOTAL	(NO.)	3	6	7	8	6	11	13	5	59
	(%)	5.1	10.2	11.9	13.6	10.2	18.6	22.0	8.5	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : MAIN SOURCE OF FINANCE FOR DWELLINGS ON THE MO - DOP MO

(Q31)		BANK/ COMMER- CIAL LOAN	COMMUN- ITY CAPITAL	INDIV- IDUAL PRIVATE LOAN	PRIVATE CAPITAL	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	0	1	2	8	11	0
	(X)	0.0	9.1	18.2	72.7	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	1	1	1	9	12	0
	(X)	8.3	8.3	8.3	75.0	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	0	0	7	7	0
	(X)	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	2	0	4	22	28	0
	(X)	7.1	0.0	14.3	78.6	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	1	0
	(X)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	4	2	7	46	59	0
	(X)	6.8	3.4	11.9	78.0	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : WHETHER THE RESIDENTS HAVE EXPERIENCED ANY DIFFICULTY OBTAINING FINANCE FOR DWELLING CONSTRUCTION FROM A LENDING INSTITUTION - DOP MO

(Q32)		YES	NO	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	7	2	9	2
	(%)	77.8	22.2	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	10	2	12	0
	(%)	83.3	16.7	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	3	3	6	1
	(%)	50.0	50.0	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	23	4	27	1
	(%)	85.2	14.8	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	1	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	44	11	55	4
	(%)	80.0	20.0	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : % OF ADJOINING LAND OWNERS WITH WHOM THE COMMUNITY HAS VARIOUS DEGREES OF CONTACT, BELLINGEN - DOP MO

(Q\Q37)		0%	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-99%	100%	TOTAL
NO CONTACT	(NO.)	9	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	81.8	0.0	9.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
FRIENDLY CONTACT	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	5	10
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	100.0
NEUTRAL CONTACT	(NO.)	7	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	63.6	0.0	9.1	9.1	9.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
UNFRIENDLY CONTACT	(NO.)	9	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	81.8	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : % OF ADJOINING LAND OWNERS WITH WHOM THE COMMUNITY HAS VARIOUS DEGREES OF CONTACT, BYRON - DOP MO

(Q\Q37)		0%	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-99%	100%	TOTAL
NO CONTACT	(NO.)	8	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	66.7	0.0	0.0	8.3	16.7	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
FRIENDLY CONTACT	(NO.)	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	3	0	1	10
	(%)	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	30.0	0.0	10.0	100.0
NEUTRAL CONTACT	(NO.)	3	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12
	(%)	25.0	0.0	50.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	100.0
UNFRIENDLY CONTACT	(NO.)	8	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : % OF ADJOINING LAND OWNERS WITH WHOM THE COMMUNITY HAS VARIOUS DEGREES OF CONTACT, KYOGLE - DOP NO

(Q\Q37)		0%	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-99%	100%	TOTAL
NO CONTACT	(NO.)	4	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	57.1	0.0	28.6	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
FRIENDLY CONTACT	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	6
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	100.0
NEUTRAL CONTACT	(NO.)	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	(%)	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
UNFRIENDLY CONTACT	(NO.)	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : % OF ADJOINING LAND OWNERS WITH WHOM THE COMMUNITY HAS VARIOUS DEGREES OF CONTACT, LISMORE - DOP MO

(Q\Q37)		0%	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-99%	100%	TOTAL
NO CONTACT	(NO.)	14	0	7	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
	(%)	50.0	0.0	25.0	10.7	7.1	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
FRIENDLY CONTACT	(NO.)	4	0	0	1	0	3	1	5	6	0	0	5	25
	(%)	16.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	12.0	4.0	20.0	24.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	100.0
NEUTRAL CONTACT	(NO.)	13	1	4	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	28
	(%)	46.4	3.6	14.3	7.1	7.1	10.7	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	100.0
UNFRIENDLY CONTACT	(NO.)	25	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
	(%)	89.3	0.0	3.6	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : % OF ADJOINING LAND OWNERS WITH WHOM THE COMMUNITY HAS VARIOUS DEGREES OF CONTACT, SHOALHAVEN - DOP MO

(Q\Q37)		0%	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-99%	100%	TOTAL
NO CONTACT	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
FRIENDLY CONTACT	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
NEUTRAL CONTACT	(NO.)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
UNFRIENDLY CONTACT	(NO.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : % OF ADJOINING LAND OWNERS WITH WHOM THE COMMUNITY HAS VARIOUS DEGREES OF CONTACT, TOTAL - DOP MO

(Q\Q37)		0X	1-10X	11-20X	21-30X	31-40X	41-50X	51-60X	61-70X	71-80X	81-90X	91-99X	100X	TOTAL
NO CONTACT	(NO.)	36	0	10	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
	(X)	61.0	0.0	16.9	10.2	6.8	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
FRIENDLY CONTACT	(NO.)	5	0	0	2	2	5	2	8	11	3	0	14	52
	(X)	9.6	0.0	0.0	3.8	3.8	9.6	3.8	15.4	21.2	5.8	0.0	26.9	100.0
NEUTRAL CONTACT	(NO.)	27	1	14	5	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	58
	(X)	46.6	1.7	24.1	8.6	5.2	6.9	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	100.0
UNFRIENDLY CONTACT	(NO.)	50	0	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
	(X)	84.7	0.0	11.9	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : WHETHER THE COMMUNITY HAS EVER BEEN THE SUBJECT OF COMMUNITY OPPOSITION OR MISCONCEPTIONS - DOP MO

(Q39)		YES	NO	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	3	8	11	0
	(%)	27.3	72.7	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	4	8	12	0
	(%)	33.3	66.7	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	5	5	2
	(%)	0.0	100.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	8	20	28	0
	(%)	28.6	71.4	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	1	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	15	42	57	2
	(%)	26.3	73.7	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : THREE MAIN ADVANTAGES OF MO DEVELOPMENT - DOP MO

(Q41A)		COMM- UNAL LIFE- STYLE	ALTERN- ATIVE LIFE- STYLE OPPORT.	LOWER COST RURAL LIVING	ENVIR- ONMEN- TAL MANAGE- MENT	IMPROV- ED LAND MANAGE- MENT	NEW FORMS OF AGRI- CULTURE	USE LAND FOR AGRI- CULTURE	INNOV- ATIVE HOUSE STYLES	INCRD. BUSH- FIRE FIGHTING FACILS.	DEVT COST	FEWER LEGAL REQU- IRE- MENTS	FEWER ZONING REQU- IRE- MENTS	USE OF ALTER- NATIVE TECH- NOLOGY	MERGING OF SOCIAL GROUPS	CHANGES IN LAND VALUE	ENVIR- ONMEN- TAL IMPACT
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	2	6	11	6	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1
	(%)	18.2	54.5	100.0	54.5	9.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	9.1	9.1	0.0	9.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	9.1
BYRON	(NO.)	2	9	7	5	1	0	1	2	1	3	0	0	3	0	1	0
	(%)	16.7	75.0	58.3	41.7	8.3	0.0	8.3	16.7	8.3	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	8.3	0.0
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	5	6	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	71.4	85.7	71.4	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3
LISHORE	(NO.)	1	16	22	14	2	4	0	6	3	5	1	0	4	2	0	1
	(%)	3.6	57.1	78.6	50.0	7.1	14.3	0.0	21.4	10.7	17.9	3.6	0.0	14.3	7.1	0.0	3.6
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	(NO.)	5	36	47	31	5	5	1	8	5	10	2	2	8	2	1	3
	(%)	8.5	61.0	79.7	52.5	8.5	8.5	1.7	13.6	8.5	16.9	3.4	3.4	13.6	3.4	1.7	5.1

TABLE : (CONTINUED)

(Q41A)		OTHER	NO. OF RESPON- DENTS	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	1	11	0
	(%)	9.1	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	1	12	0
	(%)	8.3	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	7	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	3	28	0
	(%)	10.7	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	1	0
	(%)	100.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	6	59	0
	(%)	10.2	100.0	

NOTE : MULTIPLE RESPONSE (3 RESPONSES PER RESPONDENT). OTHER RESPONSES WERE NOMINATED BY FEWER THAN 2 RESPONDENTS.
SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : FIRST MENTIONED ADVANTAGE OF MO DEVELOPMENT - DOP MO

(Q41C)		COMM- UNAL LIFE- STYLE	ALTERN- ATIVE LIFE- STYLE OPPORT.	LOWER COST RURAL LIVING	ENVIR- ONMEN- TAL MANAGE- MENT	IMPROV- ED LAND MANAGE- MENT	NEW FORMS OF AGRI- CULTURE	USE LAND FOR AGRI- CULTURE	INNOV- ATIVE HOUSE STYLES	INCRD. BUSH- FIRE FIGHTING FACILS.	DEVT COST	FEWER LEGAL REQU- IRE- MENTS	FEWER ZONING REQU- IRE- MENTS	USE OF ALTER- NATIVE TECH- NOLOGY	MERGING OF SOCIAL GROUPS	CHANGES IN LAND VALUE	ENVIR- ONMEN- TAL IMPACT
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(%)	18.2	36.4	36.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
BYRON	(NO.)	1	4	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(%)	8.3	33.3	33.3	8.3	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(%)	0.0	28.6	42.9	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LISHORE	(NO.)	1	8	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(%)	3.6	28.6	53.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	(NO.)	4	18	27	3	1	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(%)	6.8	30.5	45.8	5.1	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	6.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE : (CONTINUED)

(Q41C)		OTHER	TOTAL	NOT STATED
--------	--	-------	-------	---------------

BELLINGEN	(NO.)	0	11	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	0	12	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	7	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	0	28	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	0	59	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : THREE MAIN DISADVANTAGES OF MO DEVELOPMENT - DOP MO

(Q41B)		NONE/ NOT STATED	COMM- UNAL LIFE- STYLE	DEVT COST	FEWER LEGAL REQU- IRE- MENTS	INAB- ILITY TO OBTAIN FINANCE	LOW RE-SALE VALUE	CHANGES IN LAND VALUE	ENVIR- ONMEN- TAL IMPACT	POOR LAND MANAGE- MENT PRACTICE	INCRD. BUSH- FIRE RISK	PERSON- ALITY DIFFER- ENCES	PROBLEM OF DISPUTE RESOL- UTION	NO TITLE TO LAND	SOCIAL DISCRI- MINAT- ION	INTERN- AL POLIT- ICS	ISOL- ATION
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	1	1	2	0	6	7	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	1	0
	(%)	9.1	9.1	18.2	0.0	54.5	63.6	9.1	9.1	9.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	9.1	18.2	9.1	0.0
BYRON	(NO.)	0	0	1	0	12	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	100.0	58.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	0	1	0	4	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2
	(%)	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	57.1	42.9	28.6	14.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	28.6
LISHORE	(NO.)	0	1	0	5	26	15	1	1	3	1	0	2	2	3	0	0
	(%)	0.0	3.6	0.0	17.9	92.9	53.6	3.6	3.6	10.7	3.6	0.0	7.1	7.1	10.7	0.0	0.0
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	(NO.)	1	2	4	5	49	32	4	4	4	4	2	2	3	8	2	2
	(%)	1.7	3.4	6.8	8.5	83.1	54.2	6.8	6.8	6.8	6.8	3.4	3.4	5.1	13.6	3.4	3.4

TABLE : (CONTINUED)

(Q41B)		PREJU- DICE FROM GOVT BODIES	NO SUIT- ABLE OWNER- SHIP	POVERTY TRAP	OTHER	NO. OF RESPON- DENTS
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	2	11
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	100.0
BYRON	(NO.)	0	0	0	3	12
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	100.0
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	1	0	3	7
	(%)	14.3	14.3	0.0	42.9	100.0
LISMORE	(NO.)	1	1	2	11	28
	(%)	3.6	3.6	7.1	39.3	100.0
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TOTAL	(NO.)	2	2	2	19	59
	(%)	3.4	3.4	3.4	32.2	100.0

NOTE : MULTIPLE RESPONSE (3 RESPONSES PER RESPONDENT). OTHER RESPONSES WERE NOMINATED BY FEWER THAN 2 RESPONDENTS.
 SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : FIRST MENTIONED DISADVANTAGE OF MO DEVELOPMENT - DOP MO

(Q41D)		NONE/ NOT STATED	COMM- UNAL LIFE- STYLE	DEVT COST	FEWER LEGAL REQU- IRE- MENTS	INAB- ILITY TO OBTAIN FINANCE	LOW RE-SALE VALUE	CHANGES IN LAND VALUE	ENVIR- ONMEN- TAL IMPACT	POOR LAND MANAGE- MENT PRACTICE	INCRD. BUSH- FIRE RISK	PERSON- ALITY DIFFER- ENCES	PROBLEM OF DISPUTE RESOL- UTION	NO TITLE TO LAND	SOCIAL DISCRI- MINAT- ION	INTERN- AL POLIT- ICS	ISOL- ATION
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	1	1	0	0	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	(%)	9.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	36.4	27.3	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0
BYRON	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
KYOGLÉ	(NO.)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	(%)	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6
LISHORE	(NO.)	0	0	0	3	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.7	53.6	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	(NO.)	1	1	1	3	28	10	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	2
	(%)	1.7	1.7	1.7	5.1	47.5	16.9	0.0	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	1.7	1.7	3.4

TABLE : (CONTINUED)

(Q41D)		PREJU- DICE FROM GOVT BODIES	NO SUIT- ABLE OWNER- SHIP	POVERTY TRAP	OTHER	NO. OF RESPON- DENTS
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	11
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
BYRON	(NO.)	0	0	0	1	12
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	100.0
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	0	0	1	7
	(%)	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	100.0
LISMORE	(NO.)	1	0	0	2	28
	(%)	3.6	0.0	0.0	7.1	100.0
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TOTAL	(NO.)	2	0	0	4	59
	(%)	3.4	0.0	0.0	6.8	100.0

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : RELEVANCE OF SEPP 15 OBJECTIVE TO ENCOURAGE COMMUNITY BASED RURAL SETTLEMENT - DOP NO

(Q42A)		1 NOT RELE- VANT	2	3	4	5 VERY RELE- VANT	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	1	1	1	3	5	11	0
	(X)	9.1	9.1	9.1	27.3	45.5	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	0	1	1	3	6	11	1
	(X)	0.0	9.1	9.1	27.3	54.5	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	1	1	2	3	7	0
	(X)	0.0	14.3	14.3	28.6	42.9	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	5	1	9	4	9	28	0
	(X)	17.9	3.6	32.1	14.3	32.1	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	(X)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	6	4	12	12	24	58	1
	(X)	10.3	6.9	20.7	20.7	41.4	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : RELEVANCE OF SEPP 15 OBJECTIVE TO ENCOURAGE ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE RURAL SETTLEMENT - DOP MO

(Q42B)		1 NOT RELE- VANT	2	3	4	5 VERY RELE- VANT	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	0	1	0	3	7	11	0
	(%)	0.0	9.1	0.0	27.3	63.6	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	0	0	3	1	7	11	1
	(%)	0.0	0.0	27.3	9.1	63.6	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	0	1	1	5	7	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	71.4	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	1	1	1	2	23	28	0
	(%)	3.6	3.6	3.6	7.1	82.1	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	1	2	5	7	43	58	1
	(%)	1.7	3.4	8.6	12.1	74.1	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : RELEVANCE OF SEPP 15 OBJECTIVE TO ENABLE COLLECTIVE LIVING - DOP MO

(Q42C)		1 NOT RELE- VANT	2	3	4	5 VERY RELE- VANT	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	3	2	2	1	3	11	0
	(%)	27.3	18.2	18.2	9.1	27.3	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	1	2	4	3	1	11	1
	(%)	9.1	18.2	36.4	27.3	9.1	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	2	1	2	1	7	0
	(%)	14.3	28.6	14.3	28.6	14.3	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	8	5	8	2	5	28	0
	(%)	28.6	17.9	28.6	7.1	17.9	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	13	11	15	8	11	58	1
	(%)	22.4	19.0	25.9	13.8	19.0	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : RELEVANCE OF SEPP 15 OBJECTIVE TO ENABLE SHARING OF FACILITIES & RESOURCES - DOP MO

(Q42D)		1 NOT RELE- VANT	2	3	4	5 VERY RELE- VANT	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	0	0	3	2	6	11	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	27.3	18.2	54.5	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	0	1	2	4	4	11	1
	(%)	0.0	9.1	18.2	36.4	36.4	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	0	2	1	3	7	0
	(%)	14.3	0.0	28.6	14.3	42.9	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	2	1	8	5	12	28	0
	(%)	7.1	3.6	28.6	17.9	42.9	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	3	2	16	12	25	58	1
	(%)	5.2	3.4	27.6	20.7	43.1	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : RELEVANCE OF SEPP 15 OBJECTIVE TO ENABLE POOLING OF RESOURCES - DOP MO

(Q42E)		1 NOT RELE- VANT	2	3	4	5 VERY RELE- VANT	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	1	0	3	3	4	11	0
	(%)	9.1	0.0	27.3	27.3	36.4	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	0	2	3	2	4	11	1
	(%)	0.0	18.2	27.3	18.2	36.4	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	0	0	2	4	7	0
	(%)	14.3	0.0	0.0	28.6	57.1	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	3	2	8	5	10	28	0
	(%)	10.7	7.1	28.6	17.9	35.7	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	5	4	15	12	22	58	1
	(%)	8.6	6.9	25.9	20.7	37.9	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : RELEVANCE OF SEPP 15 OBJECTIVE TO FACILITATE CLUSTERED STYLE RURAL DEVELOPMENT - DOP MO

(Q42F)		1 NOT RELE- VANT	2	3	4	5 VERY RELE- VANT	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	8	0	1	1	1	11	0
	(%)	72.7	0.0	9.1	9.1	9.1	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	4	3	1	2	1	11	1
	(%)	36.4	27.3	9.1	18.2	9.1	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	3	1	3	0	0	7	0
	(%)	42.9	14.3	42.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	13	4	5	2	4	28	0
	(%)	46.4	14.3	17.9	7.1	14.3	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	28	9	10	5	6	58	1
	(%)	48.3	15.5	17.2	8.6	10.3	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : RELEVANCE OF SEPP 15 OBJECTIVE TO AVOID DEMAND FOR COUNCIL/GOVERNMENT SERVICES - DOP MO

(Q42G)		1 NOT RELE- VANT	2	3	4	5 VERY RELE- VANT	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	2	2	5	1	1	11	0
	(%)	18.2	18.2	45.5	9.1	9.1	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	1	1	4	2	3	11	1
	(%)	9.1	9.1	36.4	18.2	27.3	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	2	1	1	2	1	7	0
	(%)	28.6	14.3	14.3	28.6	14.3	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	5	4	4	6	9	28	0
	(%)	17.9	14.3	14.3	21.4	32.1	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	10	9	14	11	14	58	1
	(%)	17.2	15.5	24.1	19.0	24.1	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : RELEVANCE OF SEPP 15 OBJECTIVE TO AVOID SUBDIVISION OF RURAL LAND - DOP MO

(Q42H)		1 NOT RELE- VANT	2	3	4	5 VERY RELE- VANT	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	2	2	1	1	5	11	0
	(X)	18.2	18.2	9.1	9.1	45.5	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	1	0	1	5	4	11	1
	(X)	9.1	0.0	9.1	45.5	36.4	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	0	0	4	2	7	0
	(X)	14.3	0.0	0.0	57.1	28.6	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	12	0	3	6	7	28	0
	(X)	42.9	0.0	10.7	21.4	25.0	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	(X)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	16	2	5	16	19	58	1
	(X)	27.6	3.4	8.6	27.6	32.8	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : RELEVANCE OF SEPP 15 OBJECTIVE TO AVOID DECLINE IN SERVICES DUE TO DECLINE IN RURAL POPULATION - DOP MO

(Q421)		1 NOT RELE- VANT	2	3	4	5 VERY RELE- VANT	TOTAL	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	4	1	4	0	2	11	0
	(%)	36.4	9.1	36.4	0.0	18.2	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	2	2	2	2	2	10	2
	(%)	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	0	0	2	1	4	7	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	28.6	14.3	57.1	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	8	2	2	7	9	28	0
	(%)	28.6	7.1	7.1	25.0	32.1	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	14	6	10	10	17	57	2
	(%)	24.6	10.5	17.5	17.5	29.8	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : WHETHER RESPONDENT FEELS THAT THE BUILDING HEIGHT RESTRICTION OF 8M ABOVE NATURAL GROUND LEVEL IS APPROPRIATE - DOP MO

(Q44)		YES	NO	TOTAL	DON'T KNOW/ NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	8	3	11	0
	(%)	72.7	27.3	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	11	1	12	0
	(%)	91.7	8.3	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	5	2	7	0
	(%)	71.4	28.6	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	18	10	28	0
	(%)	64.3	35.7	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	1	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	43	16	59	0
	(%)	72.9	27.1	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : WHETHER RESPONDENT FEELS THAT THE BUILDING HEIGHT RESTRICTION OF 8M ABOVE NATURAL GROUND LEVEL IS APPROPRIATE - DOP MO

(Q44)		YES	NO	TOTAL	DON'T KNOW/ NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	8	3	11	0
	(%)	72.7	27.3	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	11	1	12	0
	(%)	91.7	8.3	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	5	2	7	0
	(%)	71.4	28.6	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	18	10	28	0
	(%)	64.3	35.7	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	1	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	43	16	59	0
	(%)	72.9	27.1	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : WHETHER RESPONDENT FEELS THAT THE SEPP 15 RESTRICTION ON THE AMOUNT OF PRIME CROP & PASTURE LAND TO A MAXIMUM OF 25% IS APPROPRIATE - DOP MO

(Q46)		YES	NO	TOTAL	DON'T KNOW/ NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	4	7	11	0
	(%)	36.4	63.6	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	2	10	12	0
	(%)	16.7	83.3	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	2	5	7	0
	(%)	28.6	71.4	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	13	14	27	1
	(%)	48.1	51.9	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	1	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	22	36	58	1
	(%)	37.9	62.1	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : WHETHER RESPONDENT FEELS THAT THERE IS A PLACE FOR TOURIST ACCOMMODATION ON MO DEVELOPMENTS - DOP MO

(Q48)		YES	NO	TOTAL	DON'T KNOW/ NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	8	1	9	2
	(%)	88.9	11.1	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	9	3	12	0
	(%)	75.0	25.0	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	7	0	7	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	23	5	28	0
	(%)	82.1	17.9	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	1	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	48	9	57	2
	(%)	84.2	15.8	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : WHETHER RESPONDENT FEELS THAT THE POLICY THAT AT LEAST 20% OF THE LAND HAS SLOPES OF LESS THAN 18 DEGREES IS APPROPRIATE - DOP MO

(Q50)		YES	NO	TOTAL	DON'T KNOW/ NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	5	5	10	1
	(X)	50.0	50.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	7	5	12	0
	(X)	58.3	41.7	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	4	3	7	0
	(X)	57.1	42.9	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	21	7	28	0
	(X)	75.0	25.0	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	1	0
	(X)	100.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	38	20	58	1
	(X)	65.5	34.5	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : WHETHER RESPONDENT FEELS THAT A MINIMUM ALLOTMENT SIZE OF 10 HECTARES IS APPROPRIATE FOR MO DEVELOPMENTS - DOP MO

(Q53)		YES	NO	TOTAL	DON'T KNOW/ NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	7	4	11	0
	(%)	63.6	36.4	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	9	3	12	0
	(%)	75.0	25.0	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	4	3	7	0
	(%)	57.1	42.9	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	16	9	25	3
	(%)	64.0	36.0	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	1	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	36	20	56	3
	(%)	64.3	35.7	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : WHETHER RESPONDENT FEELS THAT THE DENSITY PROVISIONS AS PROVIDED BY CLAUSE 9 OF THE POLICY ARE APPROPRIATE - DOP MO

(Q54)		YES	NO	TOTAL	DON'T KNOW/ NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	4	6	10	1
	(%)	40.0	60.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	8	4	12	0
	(%)	66.7	33.3	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	4	3	7	0
	(%)	57.1	42.9	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	17	10	27	1
	(%)	63.0	37.0	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	1	1	0
	(%)	0.0	100.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	33	24	57	2
	(%)	57.9	42.1	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : WHETHER RESPONDENT FEELS THAT THE PROHIBITION OF SUBDIVISION OF MOs IS NECESSARY TO ENSURE THAT THE COMMUNITY LIVING OBJECTIVES WILL BE ACHIEVED - DOP MO

(Q56)		YES	NO	TOTAL	DON'T KNOW/ NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	6	4	10	1
	(%)	60.0	40.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	10	1	11	1
	(%)	90.9	9.1	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	5	2	7	0
	(%)	71.4	28.6	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	13	14	27	1
	(%)	48.1	51.9	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	1	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	35	21	56	3
	(%)	62.5	37.5	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : WHETHER RESPONDENT FEELS THAT THE COMMUNITY LIVING OBJECTIVES FOR MOS COULD BE ACHIEVED BY OTHER MEANS - DOP MO

(Q58)		YES	NO	TOTAL	DON'T KNOW/ NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	9	1	10	1
	(X)	90.0	10.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	8	3	11	1
	(X)	72.7	27.3	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	3	4	7	0
	(X)	42.9	57.1	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	20	7	27	1
	(X)	74.1	25.9	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	1	0
	(X)	100.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	41	15	56	3
	(X)	73.2	26.8	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : WHETHER RESPONDENT FEELS THAT THE REQUIREMENT FOR PUBLIC EXHIBITION OF CERTAIN MO DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS IS APPROPRIATE - DOP MO

(Q60)		YES	NO	TOTAL	DON'T KNOW/ NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	11	0	11	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	11	1	12	0
	(%)	91.7	8.3	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	6	1	7	0
	(%)	85.7	14.3	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	23	4	27	1
	(%)	85.2	14.8	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	0	1	0
	(%)	100.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	52	6	58	1
	(%)	89.7	10.3	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : STUDIES/PLANS UNDERTAKEN/SUBMITTED AS PART OF THE DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION TO SATISFY THE REQUIREMENTS OF CLAUSE 8 OF THE POLICY - DOP MO

(Q62)		CONSUL- TATION	COMMUN- ITY PLANS	LAND MANAGE- MENT PLANS	ENVIR- ONMEN- TAL STUDY	CONST- ITUT- ION	OTHER	NO. OF RESPON- DENTS	NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	10	11	7	3	3	0	11	0
	(%)	90.9	100.0	63.6	27.3	27.3	0.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	5	10	9	8	9	0	11	1
	(%)	45.5	90.9	81.8	72.7	81.8	0.0	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	3	5	5	4	3	0	6	1
	(%)	50.0	83.3	83.3	66.7	50.0	0.0	100.0	
LISMORE	(NO.)	16	23	20	12	17	4	26	2
	(%)	61.5	88.5	76.9	46.2	65.4	15.4	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0
	(%)	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	35	50	41	28	33	4	55	4
	(%)	63.6	90.9	74.5	50.9	60.0	7.3	100.0	

NOTE : MULTIPLE RESPONSE POSSIBLE. OTHER RESPONSES WERE NOMINATED BY FEWER THAN 2 RESPONDENTS
 SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : STATUS NOW GIVEN TO VARIOUS DOCUMENTS, BELLINGEN - DOP MO

(Q\Q63)		MAND- ATORY RULES	COMM- UNITY GUIDE- LINES	OTHER	TOTAL	NOT APPLIC- ABLE/ NOT STATED
<hr/>						
COMMUNITY PLAN	(NO.)	3	7	0	10	1
	(X)	30.0	70.0	0.0	100.0	
LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN	(NO.)	3	4	0	7	4
	(X)	42.9	57.1	0.0	100.0	
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY	(NO.)	1	2	0	3	8
	(X)	33.3	66.7	0.0	100.0	
CONSTITUTION	(NO.)	6	0	0	6	5
	(X)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
OTHER	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	11
	(X)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : STATUS NOW GIVEN TO VARIOUS DOCUMENTS, BYRON - DOP MO

(Q\Q63)		MAND- ATORY RULES	COMM- UNITY GUIDE- LINES	OTHER	TOTAL	NOT APPLIC- ABLE/ NOT STATED
COMMUNITY PLAN	(NO.)	3	8	0	11	1
	(%)	27.3	72.7	0.0	100.0	
LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN	(NO.)	1	9	0	10	2
	(%)	10.0	90.0	0.0	100.0	
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY	(NO.)	2	7	0	9	3
	(%)	22.2	77.8	0.0	100.0	
CONSTITUTION	(NO.)	8	2	0	10	2
	(%)	80.0	20.0	0.0	100.0	
OTHER	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	12
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : STATUS NOW GIVEN TO VARIOUS DOCUMENTS, KYOGLE - DOP MO

(Q\Q63)		MAND- ATORY RULES	COMM- UNITY GUIDE- LINES	OTHER	TOTAL	NOT APPLIC- ABLE/ NOT STATED
COMMUNITY PLAN	(NO.)	0	5	0	5	2
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	
LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN	(NO.)	0	5	0	5	2
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY	(NO.)	0	4	0	4	3
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	
CONSTITUTION	(NO.)	0	3	0	3	4
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	
OTHER	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	7
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : STATUS NOW GIVEN TO VARIOUS DOCUMENTS, LISMORE - DOP MO

(Q\Q63)		MAND- ATORY RULES	COMM- UNITY GUIDE- LINES	OTHER	TOTAL	NOT APPLIC- ABLE/ NOT STATED
COMMUNITY PLAN	(NO.)	2	20	0	22	6
	(%)	9.1	90.9	0.0	100.0	
LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN	(NO.)	6	12	0	18	10
	(%)	33.3	66.7	0.0	100.0	
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY	(NO.)	4	7	0	11	17
	(%)	36.4	63.6	0.0	100.0	
CONSTITUTION	(NO.)	10	8	0	18	10
	(%)	55.6	44.4	0.0	100.0	
OTHER	(NO.)	0	5	0	5	23
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : STATUS NOW GIVEN TO VARIOUS DOCUMENTS, SHOALHAVEN - DOP MO

(Q\Q63)		MAND- ATORY RULES	COMM- UNITY GUIDE- LINES	OTHER	TOTAL	NOT APPLIC- ABLE/ NOT STATED
COMMUNITY PLAN	(NO.)	0	1	0	1	0
	(X)	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	
LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN	(NO.)	0	1	0	1	0
	(X)	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	1
	(X)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
CONSTITUTION	(NO.)	1	0	0	1	0
	(X)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
OTHER	(NO.)	0	1	0	1	0
	(X)	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : STATUS NOW GIVEN TO VARIOUS DOCUMENTS, TOTAL - DOP MO

(Q\Q63)		MAND- ATORY RULES	COMM- UNITY GUIDE- LINES	OTHER	TOTAL	NOT APPLIC- ABLE/ NOT STATED
<hr/>						
COMMUNITY PLAN	(NO.)	8	41	0	49	10
	(%)	16.3	83.7	0.0	100.0	
LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN	(NO.)	10	31	0	41	18
	(%)	24.4	75.6	0.0	100.0	
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY	(NO.)	7	20	0	27	32
	(%)	25.9	74.1	0.0	100.0	
CONSTITUTION	(NO.)	25	13	0	38	21
	(%)	65.8	34.2	0.0	100.0	
OTHER	(NO.)	0	6	0	6	53
	(%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : ISSUES REQUIRED BY COUNCIL TO BE RESOLVED/ADDRESSED BY THE MO PRIOR TO APPROVAL - DOP MO

(Q64)		ROAD & FLOOD FREE ACCESS	IMPACT ON WATER QUALITY	WATER SUPPLY	MASS MOVE- MENT/ LAND SLIP	LAND CAPAB- ILITY	BUSH- FIRE HAZARD	FAUNA & FLORA IMPACT	WASTE DIS- POSAL	ADJOIN- ING LAND USES	VISUAL IMPACT	DEVEL- OPMENT APPLIC- ATION	NUMBER OF DWELL- INGS	OTHER	NO. OF RESPON- DENTS	NONE/ NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	9	5	5	3	2	8	4	9	4	7	2	0	1	11	0
	(%)	81.8	45.5	45.5	27.3	18.2	72.7	36.4	81.8	36.4	63.6	18.2	0.0	9.1	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	6	5	6	5	9	9	5	8	4	6	0	1	2	11	1
	(%)	54.5	45.5	54.5	45.5	81.8	81.8	45.5	72.7	36.4	54.5	0.0	9.1	18.2	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	5	3	2	4	4	4	3	4	0	3	0	0	0	6	1
	(%)	83.3	50.0	33.3	66.7	66.7	66.7	50.0	66.7	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	22	13	19	19	16	25	10	20	9	16	1	1	3	27	1
	(%)	81.5	48.1	70.4	70.4	59.3	92.6	37.0	74.1	33.3	59.3	3.7	3.7	11.1	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
	(%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	43	27	33	32	32	47	23	42	17	33	3	2	6	56	3
	(%)	76.8	48.2	58.9	57.1	57.1	83.9	41.1	75.0	30.4	58.9	5.4	3.6	10.7	100.0	

NOTE : MULTIPLE RESPONSE POSSIBLE. OTHER RESPONSES WERE NOMINATED BY FEWER THAN 2 RESPONDENTS

SOURCE: PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

TABLE : ISSUES THAT HAVE BECOME A CONCERN TO THE COMMUNITY SINCE APPROVAL - DOP MO

(Q65)		ROAD & FLOOD FREE ACCESS	IMPACT ON WATER QUALITY	WATER SUPPLY	MASS MOVE- MENT/ LAND SLIP	LAND CAPAB- ILITY	BUSH- FIRE HAZARD	FAUNA & FLORA IMPACT	ADJOIN- ING LAND USES	VISUAL IMPACT	FINAN- CING THE DEVEL- OPMENT	ILLEGAL DWELL- INGS	OTHER	NO. OF RESPON- DENTS	NONE/ NOT STATED
BELLINGEN	(NO.)	3	3	2	1	1	3	2	2	2	1	0	2	5	6
	(%)	60.0	60.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	100.0	
BYRON	(NO.)	2	2	2	0	0	5	2	4	0	4	0	1	9	3
	(%)	22.2	22.2	22.2	0.0	0.0	55.6	22.2	44.4	0.0	44.4	0.0	11.1	100.0	
KYOGLE	(NO.)	1	2	2	3	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	5	2
	(%)	20.0	40.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
LISHORE	(NO.)	8	2	5	6	1	9	5	3	3	7	3	4	18	10
	(%)	44.4	11.1	27.8	33.3	5.6	50.0	27.8	16.7	16.7	38.9	16.7	22.2	100.0	
SHOALHAVEN	(NO.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	(%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
TOTAL	(NO.)	14	9	11	10	2	19	10	9	5	14	3	8	38	21
	(%)	36.8	23.7	28.9	26.3	5.3	50.0	26.3	23.7	13.2	36.8	7.9	21.1	100.0	

NOTE : MULTIPLE RESPONSE POSSIBLE. OTHER RESPONSES WERE NOMINATED BY FEWER THAN 2 RESPONDENTS.
SOURCE: . PURDON ASSOCIATES SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, MARCH 1994

ATTACHMENT 2

**RESPONSES TO
OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS**

**RESULTS OF MO RESIDENT SURVEY
OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS**

This Section contains a compilation of all comments made in respect of each open ended question in the MO Resident Survey (refer **Volume 1 - Attachment D**). This analysis is broken down by Local Government Area.

Q. 17

In this Question D = Dispersed Development, C = Clustered Development and B = Both forms of Development.

BELLINGEN

- ☐ D Topography of land does not allow concentrated settlement.
- ☐ D Privacy, heavily timbered and steep nature of majority of land.
- ☐ C To protect the major part of the land, to share infrastructure, to have a more communal lifestyle.
- ☐ D This most suits needs of people on community.
- ☐ D To allow each family group some privacy (space) to compensate for the intensity of communal living.
- ☐ D Most suited to permaculture style agriculture; lowers the environmental impact on the land; reduces the visual and sound impact; and accommodates individuals preferences.
- ☐ D Noise.
- ☐ D Privacy, land use - suitable home sites - enabling shareholders to pursue individual lifestyle within the community.
- ☐ D Because there is enough land to allow for the privacy of each house site. An original aim was that all house sites blend into surrounding environment eg. by vegetative site screens.
- ☐ D Privacy and the topography.
- ☐ D Privacy.

BYRON

- ☐ C 80% of land is flood prone, we were only allowed to settle on the hill, also hill is close to services.
- ☐ D Personal preference.
- ☐ C Maintain environmental integrity of property.
- ☐ C Following advice from local town planner that they would only approve cluster dwellings.
- ☐ D To satisfy wishes to live in a rural setting departing from the suburban subdivision concept.
- ☐ D The geographical nature of the property and individual preference.
- ☐ D Privacy and creativity.
- ☐ D Privacy.
- ☐ D Topography of land: prefer individual space while maintaining community areas, meeting, infrastructure etc.
- ☐ D Maintain privacy without alienating excessive agricultural land.
- ☐ D It just happened that way.
- ☐ D individual privacy terrain of land.

KYOGLE

- ☐ D That was the way it was set up and presented and those who came brought-in and stayed (or later left) liked it that way in preference to a cluster or community housing.
- ☐ D Privacy, geographical sites.
- ☐ C Predominantly because of availability to good house sites
- ☐ D Privacy and maintenance of property
- ☐ D It suited the lay of the land; and we didn't move from the city to the bush to live on top of one another. We wanted to share environmentally sensitive management of the allotment, a rural lifestyle, work, resources, information and support - not kitchens and bathrooms, a community not a commune. Has facilitated caring for larger areas of the allotment.
- ☐ D wish for privacy some people are close together because of availability of good building sites made this necessary
- ☐ D Privacy and available space on land

LISMORE.

- ☐ D Privacy and serenity
- ☐ D Mainly for peace and space. If we were cluttered together their would be more friction between community members as well as their animals (eg chickens and dogs) definitely more peaceful being dispersed.
- ☐ D Family privacy work communally
- ☐ B Reflect the topographical restraints and councils requirement to cluster
- ☐ D Physical nature of land suggests this
- ☐ D prefer private residential with family households
- ☐ D Privacy and good building sites
- ☐ D More privacy.
- ☐ B Social evolution shared access roads shared water resources sub group responsible for local issues.
- ☐ D Topography and privacy
- ☐ D Each shareholder has their own 2 acres on which they have built their own house and looked after their own gardens.
- ☐ D The disadvantages of a clustered development were experienced prior to the formal establishment of our community and the development of the draft constitution in December, 1985, whereby interested members were primarily interested in individual 2.24 ha management zones governed by Proprietary Lease agreements. The topography of the also supported a dispersed development in favour of a cluster.
- ☐ D The slope of the land determines where the roads go and that determines where houses are built, clusters don't work well on sloping land.
- ☐ D Privacy, space.
- ☐ D Environmentally sensitive. Lifestyle and privacy. Suitable site availability.
- ☐ D Maximise privacy.
- ☐ D Preference for privacy.

- ☐ B The lay of the land. Ease difficulty of access.
- ☐ D Privacy, views.
- ☐ D Geographical and individual privacy.
- ☐ C A sense of community; reduce infrastructure costs; reduce impact on the environment.
- ☐ D People want their own houses and their own areas of influence as well as privacy.
- ☐ D To have a private and quiet environment has less impact on the flora and fauna.
- ☐ D Stupidity we would do it clustered now if we could start again - with more community and wildlife areas.
- ☐ D Convenience and land form.
- ☐ C Village style development dictated largely by existing contours and tracks. Also clustered to enhance day to day contact and develop a sense of extended family.
- ☐ C Topography and most desirable residential part of property.

SHOALHAVEN.

- ☐ D Allows privacy (sound, visual, personal), minimise personality differences, and availability of suitable house sites.

LATE

- ☐ D Topography, privacy, environmental consideration.
- ☐ C Suits the topography > Easier provision of roads and water and power (to one cluster). Desire to maintain substantial areas free from human intrusion.
- ☐ B Mainly access and privacy
- ☐ C We have a high degree of sharing, eating together 6 nights a week. A cluster of about 10-12 adults living around a community house suits our way of living together.
- ☐ B Settlements follow a transport spine through the property which relates to the useable land, due to the topography of the property ie a ridge road with occasional spurs.
- ☐ D Privacy and choice.
- ☐ C Lower visual impact and minimal land disturbance. Also for mutual support and assistance.
- ☐ B Depends on the needs.
- ☐ D Difficult terrain led to dispersal of sites, combined with privacy concerns. Some clustering of sites around accessible low gradient areas.
- ☐ B Our homes are built close together to satisfy hamlet type development as required under MO Title. To share costs such as road, electricity and telephone.

Q. 21.

BELLINGEN.

- ☐ Dorne Paddock (contains community kitchen) for Dreaming Camp (two weeks per year) and formally for other workshops. Community house for occasional workshops.

- Paddock for Darkwood Derby - fundraiser for Orana School.
- Guests staying for a short period of time use all of the above.
- Utilities, workshop, bushfire tanker and equipment used by non-residents and neighbours eg tractor, pumps.
- Archery field used by local archery club.

BYRON.

- Friends come to visit stay in community house.
- they are used by visiting friends.
- Artists workshop gallery used by artists. Bushfire facilities shared with surrounding communities as with recreational and educational facilities.
- The communal access is used by visitors as residents, as is the communal swimming hole

KYOGLE.

- Community house rented and for courses TAFE, permaculture business course, yoga etc.
- Friends and neighbours come to play volleyball each Saturday.
- The pottery kiln was built and is used by a small group, one of which does not live here any more

LISMORE.

- One of our neighbours regularly borrows one of our pumps - we also let this family access and use our big dam ie recreation as well as the right to pump water from it.
- Visitors of shareholders and friends of tenants.
- Road use.
- Workshops seminars.
- Our community caters for people outside we also have a youth club that occasionally caters for youth outside MO.
- Tractor shared with neighbouring MO.
- Playground area used as BBQ. Dam used as swimming pool.
- Rented community facilities.
- Visitors may also use these facilities.
- Workshop continuously used for mechanical repairs by neighbours and friends.
- Roads used by neighbouring farms. Firefighting equipment available to two local units. Mains water connected to neighbours for firefighting.
- Weekly meditation meetings attended by people from surrounding areas and occasional retreats.
- Visitors, friends of residents and shareholders who are not resident on the MO also use community facilities.
- Visitors use various facilities on an on-going basis, road wear and tear etc.
- We are the only place within 10-15 miles for: general store; CES enterprise creation; and community service work.
- Facilities used by friends and invited guests.

SHOALHAVEN.

- Occasional visitors use a communal facility (converted dairy - 1 bedroom, kitchen, lounge room). Facilities used frequently by members who are currently non-resident.

LATE

- Volleyball Court for locals. Firefighting backpacks, telephone, electricity, tractor-slasher/blade.
- The community Learning Centre on the property is used by the wider community.

Q. 33.

BELLINGEN.

- No title to act as collateral suitable for conservative financial institutions- no housing loans available.
- Unable to raise, use property for collateral for loan or mortgage on MO.
- As there are no individual titles, borrowing is nearly impossible, especially for low income/unemployed members.
- Banks and lending institutions are unwilling to loan monies without land title as a security and company policy restricts shareholders taking out loans over any part of the property as this may jeopardise the security of other shareholders.
- Because land title was not in the member's name - unable to obtain a loan from banking institution.
- Difficulty in obtaining a mortgage via a lending institution due to the legal structure of the MO code.
- No mortgages available for MO purchases.

BYRON.

- Without title, loans are generally unavailable.
- Other than expensive personal loans for small amounts, finance not available.
- Yes, because no shareholders are eligible for bank loans because they have no deeds.
- General unwillingness by lending institutions to lend capital for MO development.
- Banks etc. unwilling to lend on grounds that it is difficult to recoup funds when a share is used as collateral.
- No person can borrow on land assets without separate collateral - Its impossible to borrow anywhere with such.
- No real legal title to mortgage.
- No one has tried to get finance but we understand that it would be extremely difficult.
- Bank not interested in lending without title over whole property as security.
- You can't get a bank loan as a tennant in common on an MO.
- No equity of shares (tenants in common no mortgage facility)

KYOGLE.

- Under tenants in common a mortgage requires 12 signatures.
- Have never tried because finance not available for people on MOs.
- Not available from financial institutions.
- Mortgage and personal loan unavailable because we don't have separate title to house sites. Lending institutions don't recognise MO ownership.
- Home building loans are not available due to what banks see as lack of individual title, so only personal loans up to 10,000 at higher rates

LISMORE.

- Loans not available for MO residents so no-ones tried.
- Banks etc are very reluctant to lend against an MO share as collateral.
- Tenants in common = bank hassles. Too much mortgage difficulty with all to sign rules.
- Institutions reluctant or refuse to recognise separate legal rights over portions of land (shares).
- Banks/credit unions are reluctant or refuse to lend money to applicants living on MO
- Govt subsidies and bank loans are not available unless title to the land is available or specific lease to the land is available. Co-op can't obtain title or lease.
- Possibly not for dwelling construction but for appliances etc. Credit Unions generally more helpful. Often people aren't financially eligible for loans.
- Practically impossible to get a loan on a non subdivided MO (legal right).
- Original building materials etc were affordable on v. low incomes and finance wasn't sought. However often now loans are sought to purchase already built houses!.
- Can only obtain unsecured personal loans as opposed to mortgage.
- Banks won't lend mortgage's to non-freehold house and land ownership.
- The majority of lending institutions approached will not give housing finance for individual sites on multiple occupancies. Similarly, insurance agents avoid giving public liability coverage to multiple occupancies unless individual residents also acquire coverage.
- Lending institutions won't lend because they can't repossess the land that the dwelling is built on, all they could take is the building materials.
- None have applied, believing that it was not available.
- No mortgage available without mortgaging entire community.
- Not available.
- No one has ever applied.
- F.W.O.S. grants unavailable. Home loans unavailable.
- Company constitution does not allow use of shares as security.
- Because title not in name of individuals.
- Lending institutions such as banks, building societies and credit unions will not lend for construction of MOs as they cannot mortgage the land. People may perhaps get small unsecured loans from these institutions.
- No lending institutions will loan to people with no title to own piece of land.
- Finance unavailable for assets not owned by borrower (institutions have not been approached because success was considered unlikely due to above).
- Bank refused loan - no security offered.

SHOALHAVEN.

- Home loans not granted because individual loan applicant does not own the land to date members have raised finance by way of loans and mortgages through families (3 cases, one pending).

LATE

- The property has two mortgages over it and all shareholders are liable for the loans, a most unsatisfactory situation.
- No one has tried to get a loan.

- Mainstream lending institutions will not give mortgages on shares on MOs. The only alternative lending institution (Ethical Credit Union) willing to do so has ceased to operate.
- They don't lend to single parents. MO shares are not classified as an asset for finance through banks. Refused first home owners grant.
- no. Never tried because banks won't lend for house on communally owned land.
- No financial institutions in Lismore would loan to individuals on a MO in August 1993.
- Banks are not lending money without secure title.

Q. 34.

BELLINGEN.

- ☐ Consensus decision making by members with an appointed treasurer and secretary.
- ☐ Under co-operative rules, board of directors, most decisions by consensus of members.
- ☐ Meetings when necessary.
- ☐ I am the principal (currently). All ownership is now within my family.
- ☐ A democratic system of management is used with Directors, secretary and treasurer elected by the members annually.
- ☐ Directors are responsible for the various areas of community energy (eg. landuse, maintenance, etc.).
- ☐ Four person executive body for minor decisions and general meeting of shareholders and their partners.
- ☐ We have 15 company directors who manage the running of the MO - including treasurer and secretary.
- ☐ Registered Rural Co-operative with a Board of nine directors (responsible for different areas eg. road, housing).
- ☐ No formal structure - a rotating secretarial position.
- ☐ Set of rules and guidelines for all to abide by. Quarterly meetings.

BYRON.

- ☐ Run by community meetings with delegated jobs for individuals.
- ☐ The holding company has two directors and treasurer. Small decisions affected by these three, larger ones by all shareholders. All positions voted for.
- ☐ Participatory and communal.
- ☐ We have a company secretary and a community coordinator.
- ☐ Company ie Board of Directors. All residents and shareholders are directors.
- ☐ A Land Co Pty Ltd - 2 directors, 1 secretary, 1 treasurer giving AGM meeting - you may call a meeting as share holder at anytime, as each person has one share, one vote per share. 16 shares all told.
- ☐ Company with directors, secretary and treasurer.
- ☐ Secretary, treasurer, meetings called as needed, funds contributed monthly for rates and expenses to bank account.
- ☐ None.

- A management committee, two votes per share - committee comprises all adult residents - we have T in common agreement and an agreement on customs.
- Decisions made in accordance with deed of Agreement.

□ AGMs, secretary changes each year. Other meetings had when necessary
KYOGLE.

- Five directors whose power is minimal, one secretary whose power is minimal.
- A small group assumes the day to day management.
- Do not have a formal management structure because MO has only 3 members.
- Informal.
- All shareholders are directors and each house site attracts equal say. Sectary/treasurer position filled by volunteers and swapped each year or two. Early on all business discussed at monthly meetings - nowadays day to day business runs smoothly and meeting required less frequently.
- Board of directors, company secretary, finance director, all bound by decisions of meetings of all company shareholders.
- ad-hoc

LISMORE.

- One officer the secretary handles business office rotates among members changing annually.
- We have a constitution and yearly meetings with elected chairpersons secretary treasurer - any shareholder can call a meeting.
- 4 people soon 5, have different skills (ie. carpentry mechanic agriculture leadlight and crafts solicitor aeroplane (ultra-light) manufacturer). We combine skills for good of the farm and its members. No profit among shareholders.
- Community members abide by an agreed to Deed of Management that includes rulings we feel important for living on this land.
- Executive committee of 5 dealing with issues arising. Notification of other shareholders through mail phone and calling occasional meetings.
- Mainly unstructured - deal with issues as they arise and call occasional meetings to confirm activities.
- Board of directors secretary treasury of 7 selected members.
- Company law 1 secretary 1 treasurer 5 directors with 3 signatories on all documents.
- A Company constitution (Memorandum and Articles of Association), and Proprietary Leases with By-laws for occupation of the land owned by the Company were drafted by solicitors from Walters and Co. Solicitors of Lismore in December 1985, then amended and adopted by the Company in June 1992. A Residential Management Policy has also been established by resident members.
- Co-op meetings shared management.
- Board of Directors elected at an AGM carrying out administrative duties.
- NA.
- Board of Directors (up to 10) to run day to day administration.

- Board of Directors elected each August to run the company and pay our dues.
- Company structure. Board of directors and executive - chairperson, secretary, treasurer.
- 2/3 majority rule.
- Monthly management committee. Monthly meetings.
- Board of Directors (5), office bearers (3).
- Day to day consensus and occasional meetings.
- Private company with annually elected board of members.
- All shareholders are directors, we have a treasurer, secretary and chairperson.
- Internal constitution, consensus process with all members within context of authority structure of larger religious organisations.
- Co-operative elects a Board of 7 directors each year of which one is the treasurer and one the secretary. The Board calls meetings eg. AGM and pays the bills but has very little power to act on their own initiative.
- Co-op has a Board of Directors which are made up of the members directors show no management skills.
- A Body Corporate. The Council refers to a monthly residents meeting for comment/decisions and delegated to committees.
- Consensus.
- Collective structure - no hierarchy or leadership decisions made by consensus at monthly meetings, AGM and special. Individuals volunteer for regular tasks.
- Task management.

SHOALHAVEN.

- All 13 members are equal shareholders in the Company. Treasurer and secretary elected annually. Two monthly meetings of shareholders make decisions usually by consensus. Occasionally voting rules apply.

LATE

- There are four full shares within the structure each attracting equal rights. Three are held individually and the fourth jointly between husband and wife.
- Unit Trust administered by Corporate Trustee of which each unit-holder is a member. Directors of Corporate Trustee elected each year from members (5 directors) who carry out the day to day administration of Trust business.
- Board of Directors - 7 officers, 5 directors, a secretary and a treasurer.
- Community Advancement Co-op all members are directors. We meet every week to decide farm and community issues.
- All shareholders are company directors and management is 75% vote of all those voting.
- Managed by owner of Freehold Title with discussion on areas community planned and worked.
- One chairperson, seven directors on the Board. All decisions by consensus.
- Registered co-operative. Four meetings/year, and as necessary for new members, rule changes and other big issues.
- All three families own and maintain their own home and surrounding acre. Each family has chosen their own agricultural area and works it individually.

Q. 35.

BELLINGEN.

- ☐ Consensus decision making by members with an appointed treasurer and secretary.
- ☐ Proposals are brought to meetings and voted on, most decisions except membership require simple majority.
- ☐ Consensus, right of veto.
- ☐ By family decision.
- ☐ Decisions are made by all members at regular weekly meetings, generally by consensus. However certain areas of decision making can be made by direct approach to each member (outside of a meeting) using a proposal form. Selected non-contentious issues only require 75% approval.
- ☐ Consensus for sale of share, changing the constitution and winding up the company. 75% majority of shareholders for other major decisions. Executive body for minor day to day decisions.
- ☐ Discussion.
- ☐ Consensus is aimed for but failing that a 75% vote is required after a quorum is fulfilled.
- ☐ Regular board of management (currently every 2nd month) and to which all members may attend. AGM in December. Comply with Cooperation Act.
- ☐ By effective communication and honesty in group discussion.
- ☐ At meetings by majority decision.

BYRON.

- ☐ By monthly meetings of shareholders.
- ☐ By formal vote.
- ☐ Consensus.
- ☐ Monthly meeting decide small issues by majority or major issues by 80% approval.
- ☐ Democratically - by vote of the Board of Directors.
- ☐ By vote with 3/4 majority.
- ☐ Majority rules - after discussion with share holders of such votes are taken for each decision.
- ☐ Majority vote of 75%.
- ☐ Community meetings approx once a month - decisions by consensus or if not 80% of vote (no vote has needed to be taken yet).
- ☐ By consensus.
- ☐ Consensus.
- ☐ Preferable 100% vote on important matters but 70% at last

KYOGLE.

- ☐ Major decisions made at a democratic monthly meeting.
- ☐ Run by small core group who consult all other shareholders on important decisions.
- ☐ By informal seeing and talking to each other on a weekly basis.
- ☐ Consensus.
- ☐ At quarterly meetings of directors decisions are reached by consensus. If important issues arise between meetings, a meeting is called.
- ☐ Majority vote at shareholders meetings.
- ☐ Informal discussion with consensus decisions

LISMORE.

- By consensus at meetings (infrequent) 2/3 vote can carry a management decision but only 100% agreement can bring about any changes to the constitution to which no changes have been made.
- Everyone looks after their own household and area of skills. Farm dinners replace meetings and we all have the same objectives and plans as discussed in 1982. Implementation is running smoothly.
- Usually by discussion and consent. An agreement within our deed of management allows for a vote of 70% majority to carry in major issues.
- By executive and shareholder canvassing by mail phone meeting. Votes are counted per share (cf shareholder) so 1 shareholder with 3 shares gets 3 votes out of 16 (16 dwelling shares).
- Through a meeting of available shareholders; notification of others via mail/phone. Votes are counted per share eg 1 shareholder with 3 shares gets 3 votes out of 16 share system (14 dwellings 2 land management shares).
- Personal attendance at meetings and vote of paid up shareholders. Directors meetings.
- Items are posted on an agenda which closes one week before advertised meeting date. Items on agenda by Directors or members. Majority vote decides most decisions eg workdays accounts meeting days fire equipment levy fees tree planting etc.
- Meetings - consensus process where possible.
- We have monthly tribal meetings where general business is discussed and monthly board meetings which ratify or modify decisions and are final responsibility for corporate issues.
- Discussion.
- Monthly meetings.
- Decisions are made through majority consent at duly convened meetings of the Company, or as otherwise specified in the Company's constitution.
- Monthly board meetings and special general meetings for big issues.
- Majority vote. 75% majority to change the constitution.
- Group meetings. General consensus.
- Voting system.
- By meetings of members, under rules of co-operative.
- Consensus.
- Most by resolution of the Board.
- By consensus at monthly meetings and workdays.
- Formal meetings called - consensus process.
- They are supposed to be made through co-op meetings which have agendas sent to all members. Personal attendance is usually necessary as postal votes are not often sent or counted at meetings.
- By community vote at meetings.
- By committees and Council, as decided at a monthly residents meeting or AGM and by Peace Tribunal in case of disputes.
- By consultation and discussion.
- Consensus decision making through community meetings. Where every individual is encouraged to share their view. Sometimes with difficult issues this process can be protracted/time consuming.

- ☐ Consensus.

SHOALHAVEN.

- ☐ Major decisions eg approval of membership applications require 100% of members agreement. Ordinary decisions - made at members meetings, held every 2nd month, quorum of 5/13. decisions by consensus or simple majority. Minor decisions - eg. maintenance (routine) by residents.

LATE

- By vote.
- Directors are empowered to make administrative decisions without reference to other unit-holders. Important decisions are referred to a meeting of unit holders and residents who vote as necessary. Most decisions are by majority vote, however changes to legal documents etc requires 100% vote in favour, a selection of new unit-holders requires 92% vote in favour. Anybody is free to raise issues for discussion or to call a vote. Directors and residents meetings held monthly.
- Monthly meetings are held and majority vote is usual. But a full discussion, each person having a say is tried, before need for vote.
- Decisions are made on the basis of consensus. This can require spending more time over decisions but we believe better decisions are made. Consensus is on the basis of does anyone object to a decision, rather than by agreement.
- Attempts at consensus are persistent & usually achieved - if conflict arises and this is not reached, meditation is the next step followed by a vote as last resort 75%.
- Meetings around table as problems arise.
- Consensus
- Monthly meetings on 2/3 majority.
- Consensus decisions (ie discussion seeking consensus) then revert on second reading to 80% majority voting.
- A meeting is organised, minutes are kept and issues discussed. We are currently formulating our MO rules and conditions.

Q. 36.

BELLINGEN.

- ☐ Weekly contributions by members.
- ☐ Annual levy on residents.
- ☐ Weekly levy of \$10/person living on land.
- ☐ From a common fund.
- ☐ A weekly levy of \$25 is applied to all members.
- ☐ Weekly levy on residents.
- ☐ Partners in proportion to original contribution.
- ☐ Annual levy paid in monthly instalments, sale of hay.
- ☐ Annual levy.
- ☐ Equal sharing of expenses.
- ☐ Annual levy.

BYRON.

- ☐ Annual levy on residents.
- ☐ Annual levy.
- ☐ Non owner residents pay rent, shareholder pay weekly contribution.
- ☐ Annual levy on residents.
- ☐ Annual levy on shareholders.
- ☐ Ad-hoc contributions eg. the treasurer in conjunction with directors see fit.
- ☐ Council rates - % each share holder contributes. Internal roads - each share holder maintains his/her own. Each year company members make a contribution to Land Company - re accounts.
- ☐ Majority vote of 75%.
- ☐ An original deposit by each share into community funds.
- ☐ Levy on shareholders.
- ☐ Ad hoc contributions.
- ☐ Common bank account

KYOGLE.

- ☐ An annual service fee per month covers some of what needs doing. Members are reluctant to increase it to improve their quality of life.
- ☐ Annual levy on shareholders (resident and non-resident).
- ☐ By private capital ad-hoc
- ☒ Annual levy on residents
- ☒ Monthly levies
- ☒ We pay an internal annual service fee that is updated yearly
- ☒ ad hoc contributions

LISMORE.

- ☐ \$25 monthly levy on all adult residents.
- ☐ We have our own internal yearly rates which rise or drop depending on the needs of the community.
- ☐ Share cost according to logic and fairness
- ☒ Equal contributions made when monies are required. Dues are collected each year to cover rates.
- ☐ Annual levy \$440.
- ☐ Annual rate of \$40.
- ☐ Annual levy.
- ☐ Each AGM decides on a weekly levy fee which must not be 3 months in arrears or an interest rate is charged.
- ☐ Weekly subscriptions.
- ☐ We have a cash levy of \$175 and a compulsory levy of one week a year.
- ☐ Ad hoc contributions.
- ☐ Annual levy.
- ☐ An annual General Management levy of \$250/site is due in February and covers Council rates, insurance, pastures protection, tax, Company equipment, and other general expenses. A monthly Road Management levy of \$20/site is collected solely for the development and maintenance of the internal community road.
- ☐ Annual levy on all shareholders.
- ☐ Annual levy \$300.
- ☐ Monthly levy.

- ☐ Annual levy.
- ☐ Annual levy on residents.
- ☐ Annual levy on residents. Metering and pricing of water. Ad hoc contributions (e.g. non-shareholders resident levies).
- ☐ \$400 annual levy.
- ☐ Weekly levy on residents.
- ☐ Regular levy contributions.
- ☐ Annual levy.
- ☐ Annual levy.
- ☐ From annual levy part of which can be worked off.
- ☐ Ad-hoc contributions and cattle agistment.
- ☐ Weekly contributions to kitty plus donations for membership and housing cover all community expenses.
- ☐ Share account on receipt.

SHOALHAVEN.

- ☐ Quarterly levy on members (\$175 for residents, \$150 for non-members). Ad-hoc contributions - for special projects.

LATE.

- ☐ Ad-hoc contributions on an equal basis.
- ☐ Annual levy on unit-holders. Additional levy on all residents, payable if community work days are not attended.
- ☐ \$45.00/month/family (per house site).
- ☐ There is a weekly levy of \$25/adult for current costs. \$5/week for capital costs. Food that we don't grow is brought out of a kitty. A person can live here only paying common expenses ie \$30/week. Ad-hoc and quite large contributions have also been made.
- ☐ Weekly levy on shareholders and residents.
- ☐ Ad-hoc contributions ie money and work.
- ☐ Annual levy of \$600 per share. Also income from agistment.
- ☐ Annual levy.
- ☐ Annual levy on shareholders to meet rates and running expenses and periodic ad-hoc sub-group contributions to projects.
- ☐ We keep an agistment account and this money goes towards rates, road maintenance, fencing etc. Costs exceeding these are contributed to evenly, by each family.

Q. 38.

BELLINGEN.

- ☐ Conflicts about gravel extraction, logging, etc.
- ☐ Land use by neighbours and personality conflict.

BYRON.

- ☐ They don't like MOs.
- ☐ Diametrically opposed developer.
- ☐ He doesn't believe MO is an appropriate lifestyle for Australians.
- ☐ They are shareholders and don't pay there rates and expenses and don't live there.

LISMORE.

- Local community sees the DA as introducing a rural slum. There may be hidden agendas on their part as well. Very strong reaction against DA - 60 written submissions 200 petitioners.
- The individuals nature. He is like this with everyone in the district.
- Shit stirrer - overlooks community easement through property - he brought in after us knowing of easement.
- Old conservative farmer disapproves of religious beliefs and is an alcoholic.
- Mental instability

LATE.

- All relationships friendly, however, some concern that only a single rate applicable to the property.
- Water easement, herbicide spraying - vehicle and aerial.
- Redneck who hates hippies.

Q. 40.

BELLINGEN.

- Council wanted to designate it as an early intervention and convalescent hospital. Neighbours opposed the concept and won.
- Objection to MO approval - fear of possible social disruption.
- Objection to establishing MO - overruled by Council.

BYRON.

- An MO application is pending on a neighbours property, some neighbours are concerned about a big community possibility.
- Council prejudice against MO - opposition to environmentalists
 - One neighbour said he thought 11 houses was too many on 100 acres
 - One complaint to DA by person who has since become a shareholder !!.
- Objections at time of DA lodgement

KYOGLE.

- Some difficulty in relating with outside community because lack of formal decision making process and lack of partnership agreement

LISMORE.

- Local community sees the DA as introducing a rural slum. There may be hidden agendas on their part as well. Very strong reaction against DA - 60 written submissions 200 petitioners.
- 7 written objections to MO/DA over development alleged 20 petitioners.
- DA opposition most residents on the road - extra traffic and road easement. Noise due to spite.
- Ignorance, prejudice and unrealistic fears of original settlers on neighbouring properties, although nothing major.
- Before they knew us opposed DA for MO status - afraid of religious beliefs and afraid we would become a huge community and afraid of lifestyle and afraid of conflict.
- We were taken to court in 1983 by a collective of neighbours on our DA and won in the Land and Environment Court.
- A disgruntled, mentally unstable individual developed a mind set against community members and MOs generally.

- ☐ Access denied. Stereotypical prejudices against alternative lifestyles.
- ☐ There have been wild stories in the past about things done here - like selling. There have also been perceptions that our community poses a fire hazard - in reality we have clear plans and procedures.

SHOALHAVEN.

- ☐ There was one letter of opposition to DA by a (non-resident) neighbouring land holder. Generally very good relations and support from local community.

LATE.

- ☐ Neighbours objected to MO granting, fearing drugged out feral hippies would overrun the land.

Q. 43.

BELLINGEN.

- ☐ The possibility of individual titles to enable borrowing from lending institutions.
- ☐ Lack of an individual title eg. strata title denying capital raising and subsequently many poor quality houses, keeping real prices low and housing of low standard.
- ☐ An individual share (home and land) cannot be used as collateral for loan/finance.
- ☐ Adequate return for sale of shares, adequate road maintenance and upgrading, recognition by financial institution for mortgage purposes.

BYRON.

- ☐ Disagreements between groups of shareholders, finance of house etc., difficulty of selling shares, lack of some title to own house.
- ☐ Low cost living and housing. Committing land to natural bushland. Regeneration.
- ☐ Relaxation of buildings codes and resultant council harassment.
- ☐ Allow low income earners to own their own home.
- ☐ The local councils have elected to tax as heavily as possible, and the attitude seems to be to vilify the residents.
- ☐ Borrowing against your assets.
- ☐ The overall philosophy of a new way of living together in a low impact way at a time in the world where new answers to social/cultural questions are desperately needed.
- ☐ None

KYOGLE.

- ☐ The socio-economic reasons why people buy into MOs or communities.
- ☐ Synergistic group process, clean air, clean water, health, low crime rate, environmental protection, cultural development and community networks.
- ☐ Councils can currently impose consent conditions that ignore the fact that MO is low cost development for low income people.
- ☐ Lower cost rural living should maybe be stressed more.
- ☐ Prevention of developers exploiting land by subdivision

LISMORE.

- I own my own house but not the land it is attached to and do not have the ability to obtain an equitable price if I wished to sell nor loans if I wished to relocate.
- The individual loses rights eg proof of home ownership and owner builders licence difficult to eject violent persons (child abusers junkies etc) in court system due to being persons place of residence.
- More support for alternative power systems (ie solar not grid).
- Allows members to share responsibility for quality of life. Children have more respect for other people and their eco system. Better health for all.
- Lack of Council interest in supervising development.
- The avoidance of speculation and/or profiteering when establishing a multiple occupancy or through resale of individual shares.
- Secure title for individual shares.
- To enable housing in spacious and natural surroundings.
- Poor resale values. Inability to sell. Inability to finance MO projects.
- Economically penalised by government and non-government bureaucracies. Telecom, banks, N.R.E., R.A.P.A.S., Police harassment.
- Encouraging community based eco-tourism projects. Joint purchasing power. Lower initial development costs. Low cost of living.
- Quality of life, ordinance 70 and hygienic living standards not enforced.
- Affordable housing. Provide a safe environment to deal with social issues and problems on an individual and family level.
- The objectives restrict MO developments by not enabling people to borrow to finance housing on MOs. People must rely on private capital or family loans. It takes MO residents out of the mainstream of the society and for some keeps them there.
- As no Title is given your movements are controlled, to sell your house etc.
- MOs and Community Title have no cat/no dog Policy ie. the objective for the land to act as a Wildlife Regeneration Area, otherwise its impact is unacceptable.
- Providing a model for community living - less exploitative of natural resources, living close to nature with like-minded people.

SHOALHAVEN.

- Contribution to diversity of lifestyles in rural community.

LATE.

- Land tenure and security. Ability to obtain finance to further develop within the MO, (or) for outside business interests.
- Preservation of the visual landscape of rural areas, whilst allowing for human settlement. MO development is generally not intrusive visually and allows for buildings to blend in with landscape.
- To avoid isolation in country areas and lack of access to cultural and higher educational facilities ie art gallery major exhibits, concerts, universities and colleges.
- MO developments having ownership structures by shareholders and resident equality - especially at the outset. To discourage individual or corporate developers capitalising on MO development.
- Encourage young people to see possibility of a sensible lifestyle without large debts.

Q. 45.

BELLINGEN.

- ☐ Depending on size and position of land, I see no reason to limit height. Each applicant should be judged on own merit.
- ☐ We are not advocating multi storey structures that don not harmonise with surroundings. It restricts the building of creative, innovative structures, and towers for bush fire spotting and star gazing.
- ☐ Up to individual needs which would be overseen by local government.

BYRON.

- ☐ No big deal though, because if people are encouraged to build with the landscape and flora and regeneration is encouraged taller buildings can be ok.
- ☐ According to individual cases

KYOGLE.

- ☐ Each structure needs to be looked at on its own merits. MOs are often on steep land and housing can be most suited split level construction which may result in a height over 8 metre.
- ☐ What is the reason for this? Safety? We have to stick to the building code and build structurally sound buildings anyway

LISMORE.

- ☐ Every case should be taken on its own merits.
- ☐ Any restriction fails to allow for individual and collective negotiation with each other and council.
- ☐ Any restriction fails to allow for individual taste and negotiation with shareholders and council.
- ☐ For dwellings. But exceptions need to be made for buildings such as schools halls and industry.
- ☐ 10 metres. This isn't suburbia, it's rural residential in a bush setting, if I can't see my neighbours and they can't see me - who cares, as long as the building inspector says its safe, and within the building code.
- ☐ It should be variable and subject to environmentally sensitive planning. As a separate DA is applied for the limit should be appropriate to the nature of the overall development and be approved by the community itself.
- ☐ eg. pole houses on steep land, elevated house in flood prone areas. Need flexibility.
- ☐ Relative to skyline.
- ☐ On steep hillside this may be irrelevant eg. 4 storey stepped house may fit in quite adequately, whereas on the flat it would jut out.
- ☐ Restrictions should apply on a case by case basis if needed.
- ☐ Depends on topography.

LATE.

- ☐ To allow for innovative building design but not high rise development.
- ☐ Should be determined in relation to all factors such as slopes and protection of agricultural land.
- ☐ It should be same as for other developments.

Q. 47.

BELLINGEN.

- ☐ 100% to accommodate farming communities and farm families.
- ☐ Any restrictions on limitations prevents MO who wish to be involved in extensive agriculture, the two are not mutually exclusive.
- ☐ No limit.
- ☒ Depending on size of community and purpose more land could be required for communal working.
- ☒ Increasing the percentage of prime crop and pasture land for MOs puts the production of food back into the hands of the people and takes it out of the hands of the monopolies.
- ☐ It increases the amount of quality land available for sustainable agriculture eg. Bio-Dynamics.
- ☐ It depends on the agricultural objectives of the applicants.

BYRON.

- ☐ If MO can demonstrate intention to carry out farming they should be allowed to carry out communal farm vs one family high stressed farm.
- ☐ Should be based on individual consideration.
- ☐ No limit because the best use good land is low density living combined with permaculture.
- ☐ 50%.
- ☐ MO development is as capable of using prime agricultural land as any private farmer. One should not distinguish between the two.
- ☐ It would be a case by case situation. If people have appropriate land for alternative (clean) crops that should be encouraged.
- ☐ No limit as long as subdivision is precluded.
- ☐ It very much depends on the individual case.
- ☐ Varies with individual developments

KYOGLE

- ☐ Because farmers who can sometimes be on large tracts of 100% prime land often and do misuse and abuse it ie. run-off from rivers and erosion or rise in salt water table etc.
- ☐ No limit subject to permaculture, Jarlenbar permaculture- village an appropriate development.
- ☐ Usage of land percentage should be decided on a case by case basis on application for MO development.
- ☐ Each applicant needs to be looked at on its merits. Prime crop and pasture land should not be utilised for housing and MO provides a pool of labour that can benefit from and make use of all prime agricultural land.
- ☐ Many MOs want to use their land for agriculture. There shouldn't be a limit, MOs tend to use land in an environmentally friendly way.

LISMORE

- ☐ No restriction. MO development can lead to intensive agriculture/permaculture systems for the future but hard on marginal lands now.
- ☐ Permaculture and other environmentally sensitive systems of agriculture and forest regeneration should be encourage 100%.
- ☐ Open - subject to appropriate DA - to allow MO primary production.

- If there was a genuine commitment from a horticultural based community to utilise the land for horticultural purposes no restrictions should exist.
- Any restriction fails to allow for individual and collective negotiation with each other and council.
- Any restriction fails to allow for individual taste and negotiation with shareholders and council.
- Up to 100% is appropriate.
- The ecologically sustainable level eg what impact will cropping have on water resources during the dry? Will native vegetation be removed? Does the community agree?.
- All unoccupied or common land should be managed to avoid fire risk.
- If the multiple occupancy is established as an agricultural co-operative or extended family venture, there may be a need for more than 25% of the land to be prime crop or agricultural land in order for it to be sustainable, especially where that agricultural activity is the sole income source of the community.
- Some MO may require access to prime agricultural land with no limit on acreage.
- Could provide a profitable income. As there is a separate DA the limit should be appropriate to the whole development. Why limit agricultural potential if some MOs wish to be primarily (possibly up to 50% of use) agricultural.
- 50% .
- MO's if designed as clustered housing can efficiently use prime ag land so I would suggest 75% .
- While the land should not be prime crop or pasture land, there are cases where a community farming ventures are desirable - so the Policy should be flexible, retain the low cost benefits, but regulate conditions of land management to 50% if the DA reflects a Farm Management Plan, Wildlife Protection Clauses and stricter condition of settlement.
- Depends on the size of the land and the number of residents and house sites.
- No limit if MO plans to be engaged in agriculture or reforestation uses.

LATE

- No specific limits should be set. One of the reasons why most MOs cannot internally support themselves is that many are located in poor quality agricultural lands.
- All rural areas should be available to MOs. Most MOs are forced onto marginal land and yet Rural Subdivisions get prime agricultural land. Generally MOs manage their land in amore sustainable manner than Rural Subdivisions.
- MOs should be able to apply to waive requirements. The Mo will need to prove that they will be carrying out bona-fide agricultural activities on the land.
- 50%? Some MOs use their agricultural land for sustainable agriculture or communal farming. Some MO's as our is are a farm and the residents wish to live on a farm rather than just in the bush. .
- Increase to 50%.
- Each MO needs to consider land usage according to the zoning of that particular land - be it environmental protection or rural-residential.

Q. 49.

BELLINGEN

- ☐ It seems there could be an argument for allowing low key farm type accommodation as an income source.
- ☐ Eco-tourism should be allowed, if not encouraged as a source of income and enlightenment of general community.
- ☐ I believe it ought to be a matter of personal choice, but within clear guidelines.
- ☐ Would be a positive way to enable intentional communities to provide jobs for some members.
- ☐ Within strict guidelines, sustainable tourism which respects the sensitivity of the environment and remains very low key should be acceptable eg. bed and breakfast, farm experience holidays.
- ☐ MOs exist in areas where eco tourism may be appropriate at some time.
- ☐ Means for ongoing income earning in eco-tourism and possibilities for employment to service this industry.
- ☐ To assist with obtaining community based revenue through rental - for philanthropic reasons.
- ☐ Advantages of eco-tourism, most forms of eco-tourism are income earning and often the only income source in rural areas.

BYRON

- ☐ Cabins or guest house enable residents to earn income and be less reliant on unemployment also can reduce isolation in some cases.
- ☐ Integrative tourism can earn \$'s from home; facilitate a sharing of alternative and ecological values.
- ☐ Low density tourism could provide much needed rural employment and enable city dwellers to enjoy the countryside.
- ☐ There must be equal choice with other zoning to have tourist income, we need opportunity to make money.
- ☐ Employment is often a problem for MO occupants who live far from town - this kind of landuse should not be limited to freeholders.
- ☐ For low income families to buy an area of rural land to develop as a home for their family is no 1.
- ☐ Many people who reside on MOs have been very interesting ideas about the kind of possibilities. There are untapped resources in the minds and hearts of many people.
- ☐ Opportunity for farm stay/tourist cabins/environmental walks etc.
- ☐ Holiday cabins to provide income for MOs

KYOGLE

- ☐ If the MO wants to operate and build a sort of guest house and advertise it to tourists, why not let them?.
- ☐ MO development has a right access to tourist \$. MO development is often in areas of low employment, a tourist attraction in themselves.
- ☐ It gives communities a chance if they choose to make income. Tourists could learn something by staying on an MO.
- ☐ Low impact environmentally friendly developments only.
- ☐ If a MO wants to develop low key tourist accommodation it should be allowed to in the same way that it is available to other rural landholders.

- MOs need income. The tourist industry could bring both money to the MOs and educate the public about environmental matters and alternative lifestyles.
- Provided it is totally environmentally sensitive

LISMORE

- Small scale soft tourism is appropriate. Could bring in funds and provide options for those wanting to experience MO lifestyles first hand. Provide also working models of alternative technologies and ecological sustainability.
- I think tourists ought to be given the chance to experience MO lifestyle.
- Small retreat type tourism can provide needy community income for community projects. This should be encouraged on a small scale ie farm employment.
- Low key tourist facilities could enhance public awareness of natural environments and financially support MOs.
- Any restriction fails to allow for individual and collective negotiation with each other and council.
- Any restriction fails to allow for individual taste and negotiation with shareholders and council.
- Low budget tourist accommodation would be of great benefit to the area.
- Most communities run on type of levy fee. Approved minor tourist capacity could provide a better standard of living for MO residents.
- Very low key - eco tour educational allows personal choice of income making.
- With eco-tourism being the catchword I feel the policy needs to accommodate the potential for communities to generate income through tourism.
- If sought by the community why the discrimination?.
- Willing Workers On Organic Farms and other low budget eco-tourists have the potential to assist residents with the development of resources on their multiple occupancies while experiencing alternative lifestyles.
- We are a residential development, more concerned with housing ourselves.
- Environment sensitivity and unnatural demand on resources.
- Shareholders only.
- There should be no restriction of bona-fide tourist ventures on behalf of MO members if approved by consensus vote. (Eco)tourist development construction within appropriate environmental guidelines should be subject to the same restrictions as on any other property. Could be a source of income for MOs and contribute to the development of community facilities.
- Visitor accommodation for income. Influencing the general population by increasing peoples awareness of options.
- Educate publicly. Employment generation.
- For alternative lifestyle and agricultural education.
- Eco-tourism.
- People living on MOs could possibly generate some income by offering backpackers or home-stay accommodation in either alternative lifestyle or rural bush settings. There is a large problem with unemployment in rural areas.
- Home-stays can give income to MO members. MO living has a chance to develop Eco-Tourism to advantage of members.

- ☐ In many cases eco-tourism is the key mean of MOs becoming economically sustainable.
- ☐ Provide income for MO dwellers by providing access to tourists to World Heritage rainforest by offer accommodation and facilities.
- ☐ Appropriate for visitors exploring alternative lifestyles and adjacent National Parks to have access to community accommodation facilities.
- ☐ Eco-tourism and guest house accommodation.

SHOALHAVEN

- ☐ Commercial tourism should be restricted (unless a special case can be argued) but short term visitors should be permitted. Some members not wishing to occupy the land at this time may use it for weekends or holidays. This MO would not want tourist accommodation but will temporarily accommodate visitors.

LATE

- ☐ This should be assessed on merit basis.
- ☐ Eco-tourism could be a valuable source of employment/income for MOs. Low key tourist development is often permitted in rural areas; the same right should be available for MOs.
- ☐ Small scale sustainable developments ie dry composting toilets, water harvesting - tanks, swales, dams in situ. Eco-tourist based showing food production systems, low cost artistic housing etc.
- ☐ There should be provision for low impact eco-tourism facilities.
- ☐ Each case should be judged on merits. As for example some aboriginal communities have achieved this. MOs should have same right as other blocks of land. Maybe tourist development should not be approved until MO has established itself.
- ☐ Yes. Retreats and healing facilities. Growing and regeneration (human and wildlife, flora and fauna). Seminars on experiences.
- ☐ Our Lismore Rocks location lends itself beautifully to low key small scale tourist activity.
- ☐ Yes. Important for providing income for eco-tourism in boom.
- ☐ Yes. If there is a limitation of land usage for prime crop and pasture land and residents within MOs are trying to earn some money - then tourist accommodation could be another possibility.

Q. 51.

BELLINGEN

- ☐ Steepness of land should not preclude MOs as long as development is on suitably flat land where environmental damage can be minimised.
- ☐ Can only be assessed in each individual case.
- ☐ Under certain conditions it should be acceptable - otherwise the land available for MOs is too limited. If you can't have MOs on steep land or any good land, where can you have them?.
- ☐ The application should be looked at in each case as landuse and MO requirements do vary.
- ☐ Depends on land care and environmental preservation objectives of each MO.

BYRON

- ☐ Each case needs to be judged on its merits.
- ☐ Building can be on eg. 2% of land - the rest to be ecologically managed - bull-shit? depends on layout of MO itself
- It's hard to find a place in the mountains that hasn't.
- ☐ As long as enough is available there should be no prescribed limit. Each case should be evaluated on its own merits.
- ☐ Individual cases

KYOGLE

- ☐ In some instances yes; others no. Decision should be made by council after inspection of said land after receipt of MO application.
- ☐ Steep land is often very degraded rural land. If a MO can show that it can provide safe housing areas, roads and effluent disposal whilst rehabilitating or protecting steep land that should be allowed.
- ☐ Because it should be based on density of population

LISMORE

- ☐ Community living is applicable to any slope if environmentally sensitive.
- ☐ Any restriction fails to allow for individual and collective negotiation with each other and council.
- ☐ Any restriction fails to allow for individual taste and negotiation with shareholders and council.
- ☐ Based on ecological and geological considerations relevant to the specific locality. What use is flat land if you cant get to it?.
- ☐ Depends on the overall size of the property. There should be no limit, providing there is enough relatively level land for residential, agricultural and other purposes of the organisation.
- ☐ Depends on individual geography.
- ☐ As long as our impact is intelligently planned, impact can be low - depends on usage. What about terraces of Nepal!!!!.
- ☐ Limitations should be based on merits of each case.

LATE

- ☐ No, MOs should have options on prime agricultural land - if 80% of land is steep and marginal, agriculture is difficult and environmental impact is increased.
- ☐ No. Properly planned habitation and horticulture can be sensibly carried out on slopes greater than 18 degrees.
- ☐ No. All land unless prime agricultural land should be able to be used as MO development.

Q. 53.

BELLINGEN

- ☐ The density should be variable according to local topography.
- ☐ Five hectares, but depends on individual case - location, lay of land, etc.
- ☐ Depends on individual development.
- ☐ Different MOs have different needs.

BYRON

- Smaller MOs should be allowed, we effectively only use 10 Ha of ours with 10 shares due to flood restriction.
- Small acreages ie. 10 acres would be capable of sustaining 3 households and would keep costs down if councils can be prevented from taxing too much.
- There is no reason why a successful MO more in the structure of community title could not work on smaller areas

KYOGLE

- Appropriateness of house site and water access could be smaller under ideal geographic conditions eg Bill Mollison permaculture on 5 acres.
- More flexible depending on gradient of land.
- A small MO should be able to be established on parcels of land of less than 10 ha which would assist in consolidating rural development on areas of land that were subdivided under the councils concessional lots policy

LISMORE

- 10 ha could have a 3-4 share MO - small MOs have less disputes.
- Any limits like this obviate individual and collective freedom to negotiate.
- The average medium density under SEPP 15 is about 3 ha/dwelling - on small lots this can be restrictive. 1ha/dwelling is permitted on subdivision (even up to 4 dwellings/ha). MO can be responsible at these densities too!.
- Depends on lot sites in surrounding area; MO could consolidate Village Titles also.
- Unlimited.
- 10 ha. Is too small for other than a clustered development of 3 families/individual units.
- 25 ha. To provide ability for community projects with minimum impact.
- No reason not to have urban sites. Consider each case on its own merits - possibly a person/dwelling ratio to allotment size.
- 40 ha commonsense in rural areas.
- 2 hectares. Look at 15 year old example of co-housing in Denmark: very successful no equivalent on small (even 1ha) blocks.
- We now favour clustering +/- 1 acre lots, to 33% residential lots 33% nature reserve and 33% other purposes (community, crops, commerce etc.).
- 10 ha per shareholder to minimise crowding and consequent environmental impacts.

SHOALHAVEN

- 40 ha, to minimise environmental impact.

LATE

- Any size - as long as sustainable for future and environment. Large tracts of land developed along land trust systems of agriculture.

Q. 55.

BELLINGEN

- The available density is too great for some areas.
- Depends on individual development.
- Depending on use of property (ie. amount of land for agriculture). I believe it could be one dwelling per two hectares.

- Most larger communities have not provided for their own children, some of who will need their own homes in the future. If unemployment levels remain high better that their parents care for them than to additionally burden the taxpayer.
- MOs consciously minimise environmental damage should be able to at least double their density.
- The climate and carrying capacity of the land should determine population density. to limit house size to accommodate only four people per dwelling limits the size of each household to less than the Australian average.
- Many families have more than two children.
- Once again the individual needs of applicants for MO should be looked at.

BYRON

- Density also relates to how spread out houses are eg. ours is densely populated in 20% of land. More shares/Ha could be ok with larger MOs.
- Should be based on site considerations.
- We feel the density should be double to create a more viable community size.
- Again case by case, piece of land by piece, there should be flexibility possible

KYOGLE

- Dependent on local conditions and appropriate plan for development.
- More flexible depending on land geography and type of development proposed.
- Current formula provides for too dense occupation of inappropriate land re steepness of land

LISMORE

- Density levels allowed seem very large. We are only small and enjoy good co-operation and flexibility in that way.
- Any limits like this obviate individual and collective freedom to negotiate.
- The average medium density under SEPP 15 is about 3 ha/dwelling - on small lots this can be restrictive. 1ha/dwelling is permitted on subdivision (even up to 4 dwellings/ha). MO can be responsible at these densities too!.
- Not for more densely settled areas not all MOs need be perm/agriculture based.
- Unlimited. Rural land has to be managed.
- Densities of greater than 30 family/individual units present management problems where majority participation and consensus are required.
- Assess for each development - matter of choice within MOs.
- Low density is too expensive, too wasteful often. We favour medium density but linked to special conditions, such as no dogs/cats, no ag poisons, etc.
- 25 acres (10 ha) per share.
- Density should be determine according to merits of each case.

SHOALHAVEN

- Density provisions should be more flexible reflecting land capability and environmental impact.

LATE

- Whatever proves to be viable in terms of water availability and production of food plus type of land - flat lands > density, steep lands < density.
- More flexibility to allow some neighbouring properties to have an input in this. Many prefer densities to be lower and more in keeping with rural environment.

Q. 57.

BELLINGEN

- If any form of subdivision/strata/community title is allowed someone sooner or later will attempt to disrupt the community.
- To discourage speculative investment.
- There needs to be a safeguard against abuse by developers, speculators, etc.
- I believe subdivision should be an option. Ideologies can change. Right of ownership for inheritance should be considered.
- Removes any chance of dispute and ensures maintenance of objectives into the future.
- Subdividing the MO would destroy the internal structure of the community.
- The community as an ethical entity would be lost as it loses control of who buys into the land, how the land is managed, how people relate to the land and to other people.
- Our company constitution regulates the objectives of this MO.
- Impediment to capital input and raising housing standard.
- However the entity or community needs to remain together.
- Community living objectives can still be achieved under community title subdivision.

BYRON

- If sites are made separate subdivisions - it becomes a suburb. If larger Mo short of cash they should be able to sell part of land like any farmer subject to zoning regulations.
- Our aim was for low cost, responsible rural living. Subdivision possibilities opens up a Pandora's Box of developers exploitation.
- MO should not be another developers tool. The concept of MO must maintain shared common, hopefully protected land not private property under another guise.
- This prohibition excludes property speculators and safeguards the ideals of the community.
- The residential aspect of Mo is community living, subdivision would negate this aspect.
- Sharing land, roads, water, electricity (alternative) and orchards gives us a common interest. Without this common interest people would tend to drift apart.
- On Kohinoor, we back in the seventies we able to free hold our allotments and the local government got a stand still in 80's - leaving a lot in the lurch.
- Yes until perhaps a maturation of the community allows a flexibility to decide to do something different as long as the essential components (sustainability, shares facilities, environmental sensitivity) are adhered to.

- Subdivision would weaken bonds between shareholders.
- Keeping rural land intact with common thread of development

KYOGLE

- People who now live on MOs have plenty of scope already to ensure community living objectives are reached if they are serious about it, so lifting prohibition subdivision will open doors for exploitation of the sites even more.
- No, community title achieves community living objectives.
- As the majority of the community living objectives are decided by members of the community they should have the choice as to whether a subdivision is appropriate or not
- Subdivision would: inevitable increase the cost of the land and housing; open the way for the real estate industry to illegally sell off rural land, and is contrary to the spirit and aims of MO in sharing land and resources etc. as a lifestyle. In our case shareholders have a say in agreeing to a new member - no one has been refused but this process promotes a willingness to get along with other community members.
- The concept of subdivided land is contradictory to that of shared land, and communally shared resources.
- Subdivision allows for capitalisation of holdings which break up communities and allows for more conflicting participants

LISMORE

- Many MO residents have expressed a desire to have their land management areas around their dwellings more clearly defined - they would prefer clear cut boundaries.
- MO when done well is unique and an important living development (cooperative new style). That leads to rural efficiency that is environmentally tuned. Australia could learn heaps from the MO experiment. Mos done well are brilliant we should encourage and preserve them.
- Subdivision allows for exploitation/profitteering of the land. The share aspect of land ownership would be nullified.
- Stage 1 can be community purchase and development of services on the property. Stage 2 can be subdivision of some kind of enabling legal rights to obtain finance over a share.
- Subdivision is a useful stage - after community approaches to but and develop the land. This makes low cost development feasible for a group and renders legal status to lot owners for on-going developments - as in getting a loan on mortgage/lieu over the lot.
- Prohibitions of MO subdivisions is the cause of many disputes over use of land which could be solved by community title.
- There is no community ethic so that sub-division of some sort may as well be allowed. Most of the violence on MOs is a result of people who think that MO means do what you like. Eliminate this misconception.
- Rising land costs real estate access reduces sharing advantages.
- The point is to rediscover skills in sharing scarce resources; land; energy; the planet. Subdivision and return to private boundaries would destroy this process which planet management for sustainability requires.

- The decision to subdivide land from a community should rest with the community and local government. Ecological considerations need to apply.
- Do MO's have objectives?.
- Some multiple occupancies could convert to Community Title, where applicable, and still ensure that their community living objectives were achievable, however, that would entail a great deal of expense with development application, surveyors, increased living costs (i.e. rates, roads), etc., and therefore defeat the original aim/objective of SEPP 15 at low cost, shared resources.
- Subdivision won't change anything, we will still have to deal with our neighbours and there will always be work which has to be done, so we have to co-operate in order to survive; secure title for our homes is what we need.
- Subdivision would not create the conditions without MO i.e. private land and lack of commitment to exist as a community.
- Common interest in the land physically and financially.
- Better land management of larger areas - maintain the integrity and spirit of the initial aims of MO development.
- Subdivision is contrary to communal values and group management of the environment. It may place social and physical (e.g. fences) barriers between people. Subdivision reduces the importance in finding communal solutions to problems.
- Subdivision goes against philosophy of MOs.
- Almost every MO operates as a defacto subdivision internally thus formal prohibition irrelevant except for creating difficulty.
- It will increase the cost of land and housing, prevent land speculation, it has less environmental impact. It is contrary to the spirit and aims of MO is sharing land and resources.
- Otherwise may as well just subdivide - MO will not be any different at all.
- Community Title would appear to cover much of the same ground as MO development. This would enable the bulk of MO to be communally owned but individual house sites would be privately owned and dams, roads, fences etc. could be financed by members as a whole and houses would be individually financed as is done now. But finance would be available through banks.
- I don't think that communities have living objectives that they live to. As Community Title would clear up most of the problems.
- We are living proof of this, once a MO now a Strata subdivision with a vibrant sense of community. The real issues are costs, creating community through empowered residents meetings, by-laws and special DA conditions - all possible under sub-division.
- Community title would be more appropriate.
- Subdivision gets back to individual title and encourages further privatisation. A major goal from our point of view is the encouragement of living collectively, taking care of the land as a group and being accountable to one's peers.
- Prohibition not necessary, subdivision should be an option.

SHOALHAVEN

- ☐ Subdivision leads to fragmentation in land management and would undermine the MO objectives of environmental protection and co-operative practices.

LATE

- ☐ No. The integrity of community living can be maintained by the use of Community Title legislation and this can afford shareholders some form of independency to raise finance.
- ☐ Yes. Subdivision raises the cost of land and individual services. It means that small parcels of land can be treated as isolated units and developed without reference to each other. Aesthetically, environmentally, economically and socially this is not good practice. MO development encourages interaction between people and consideration of ones neighbours. Subdivision would allow land speculators and developers to destroy the concept of "community".
- ☐ Yes. Subdivision automatically ties into the artificially inflated price of land/property and encourages people to buy onto MOs for speculation.
- ☐ Yes. The opportunity to subdivide could be very divisive in a community causing factions. Ability to subdivide would mean that MO shares would become very expensive meaning that only people with large sums of capital could undertake MO development. This would defeat a major objective of SEPP 15 that is the provision of low cost housing.
- ☐ Yes. Essential to prevent developers eroding MO principals and lifestyles. It would create a loop hole that would destroy the whole concept and cause intense conflict in rural communities.
- ☐ No. There should be a way for families to extend in a favourable way.
- ☐ No. Subdivision of a small part of our 600 acres would provide all the finance we need.
- ☐ Yes. Subdivision will remove price difference in MOs. Management of land by a group generally more conservative (and therefore less environmentally damaging). Co-operation in management is a goal in itself.
- ☐ No. On the contrary, subdivision of MOs is the next step to help current residents in MOs; to secure land tenure; to solve problems which arise due to socio-economic status and changes in social relationships.

Q. 59.

BELLINGEN

- ☐ Some people could find this form an advantage - providing it is not forced on any existing MO founded with other philosophy its ok.
- ☐ I know there a MO on a strata-type concept.
- ☐ Community is a decision to live co-operatively. to do so people do not need restrictions of non-subdivision. It is a matter of choice.
- ☐ Some MOs may and it is probably an advantage to offer more possibilities. We have not been disadvantaged by existing structures, but nothing really fitted our objectives.
- ☐ Community Title etc. would increase the red tape and cost of setting up the MO and of building, and no longer provide a wide range of communal living opportunities or the possibility of low cost dwellings.

- The community would lose its cohesion and because just a rural suburb - no unity, no ethics, no internal management, and no environmental protection.
- Company constitution could regulate objectives.
- Strata Title subdivision would allow for capital raising and subsequent improvements and still cover issues such as land held in common title.
- New creative forms of title.

BYRON

- Although I don't know enough about Community Title to make any comments - normal subdivisions encourage fences, streets and alienation found in most towns and cities.
- With the exception of standard subdivision all aims can be met as long as the community (MO) has control over what happens within the community.
- Anything is possible but less likely.
- Because any other structure encourages division within the community.
- Yes they would be - but we believe MO best encapsulates the concept of community living.
- The facilities for division of land mentioned in Q. 58 are directly opposed to the concept of land share.
- It is necessary these times to have a true title to ones assets for financial borrowing. We pay rates but get nil for such in our shire.
- Community title would be a very viable alternative, giving more autonomy while still maintaining community principles. Our MO would definitely be interested in Community title.
- Community titles or Strata could achieve the same results but these would significantly increase costs.
- Present structures are too limiting ie. difficulties getting loans, difficulties reselling.
- Community Title or Strata Title yes, because common land is still retained and a common thread of development

KYOGLE

- There are communities already that are strata title and or standard subdivision. the big difference being they are more saleable - but not necessarily better spots to live.
- Community title provides philosophical base, internal decision making process and conflict resolution process provides for group management, allows economic development of community, where as MO policy SEPP 15 inhibits development.
- By having individual title to your share individuals may then procure finance from banks and lending institutions. Shares then have security of tenure, are easier to buy and sell and are much more attractive.
- The concept subdivided land is contradictory to that of shared land. Private subdivisions are likely to erode other aspects of communally shared resources and community living.
- The concept of subdivided land is contradictory to that of shared land, and communally shared resources.
- Separate title reduces commitment people have to the community. When you buy into a MO you are aware that it is not a capital investment

LISMORE

- I think clearly defined boundaries would dispense with the inevitable disagreement over land use and thus allow community members to work together more harmoniously.
- Share certificates that could be accepted by lending institutions as regards house and surrounds. But definitely keep it simple let communities look after themselves they do not need expensive council levies and services.
- I do not know how this would effect MO objectives. The communities approval of incoming shareholders is important to maintain integrity of community
- Stage 1 can be community purchase and development of services on the property. Stage 2 can be subdivision of some kind of enabling legal rights to obtain finance over a share.
- Subdivision is a useful stage - after community approaches to but and develop the land. This makes low cost development feasible for a group and renders legal status to lot owners for on-going developments - as in getting a loan on mortgage/lieu over the lot.
- Would bring us in line with the community of home owners ie title to land and house.
- People living in urban areas make their own communities by getting together with people they like. So do we. When were forced to deal on a constant basis with people we don't like then violence occurs.
- MO is specifically different style of development.
- These arrangements work in urban areas so why discriminate unless ecological reasons necessitate?.
- On large MO's community spirit is virtually non-existent due to such a wide range of ideas. Freehold ownership would not necessarily change the situation but shareholders could relocate if they were unsatisfied with their purchase.
- As Above (Q57).
- We are already doing those things anyway, you have to in order to make it work; cluster works better on flat land. What we need now is to own the land under our houses. Strata title would probably suit our frame of mind better.
- Yes, if the land as a whole remains under one title - providing the basis for a shared lifestyle.
- So individuals could mortgage their share in the community to finance housing or resale.
- Inhibited manoeuvrability (financial) and physical mobility by shareholders under SEPP 15. Difficulties encountered i.e. inheritance, inability to borrow money at home loan rates, difficulty selling encumbered titles.
- Communalism and individualisation is in conflict. Separate titles may erode community spirit and social activity.
- In regard to land there is no feeling for individual apportionment or title but with regard to dwellings there is some feeling for individual title (inexpensively obtained).
- Community Title at least could work - what makes it a MO is the spirit of community - again can refer to co-housing experience in Denmark.

- All existing obligation of MO members could be included in Community Title management statement without causing poverty by blocking access to finance.
- The concept of subdivided land is contradictory to that of shared land. Private subdivisions are likely to erode other aspects of communally shared resources and community living.
- MO dwellers would not be separate and isolated from mainstream community and they would still be allowed to pursue alternative objectives.
- I don't think that communities have living objectives that they live to. As Community Title would clear up most of the problems.
- Yes, and those who say no have fears about subdivision as they let council in, cost a lot, and have no community. But we disprove all that by combining the low cost sharing community MO ideals with the legal and planning benefits of strata.
- Increases equity for shareholders - security for investment.
- No more appropriate titles have been developed - MO title is the only one which attempts to allow for communal living. We have no experience with other titles.
- Community living does not depend on type of land tenure.

SHOALHAVEN

- A new form of Community Title could perhaps achieve similar objectives.

LATE

- Yes. Community Title subdivision allows for community living with the benefit of freehold title. This allows shareholders to have a tangible asset and also enjoy the benefits of community living.
- Yes but not subdivision. The essential aspect of MOs is shared responsibility of the land and for each other. This may be achieved by Community Title. When a person buys into a community it is often understood that certain so called "rights" are foregone, because that person desires a lifestyle that helps reduce barriers between people. This includes the knowledge that resale value may not be as high (although this may change as the benefits of community living become apparent in years to come) and what restrictions may be placed on who you sell to.
- No. Privately owned land is contrary to shared land. MOs should be provided for those who want to share land and live by communal principles also as a low cost method of housing for those who are on gov't housing list.
- No. Not on our community as it is based on a high degree of sharing. We have a minimum six month trial period (though most people take twelve months) before people can apply for membership. The legal right to move in and out of the community at will, would destroy the community living objectives.
- No. Encourages people to buy for cheap land instead of because they are interested in community. These people often have no desire for harmony and co-operation and would be better on their own title not a MO.
- Better a title that allows a MO member to borrow to enable growth and good management of the land and provides a secure title not effected by negative stands taken by other MO members.
- Yes. Easier to borrow money from recognised banking organisations.

- ☐ Yes. Always depends on the people who live together and share resources.
- ☐ No. Sharing land is a goal in itself.
- ☐ Yes. Definitely need title to their land to avoid conflict with fellow occupants.

Q. 61.

BELLINGEN

- ☐ What's there to hide?

KYOGL

- ☐ No more so than other developments pertaining to certain area - why should they be otherwise.
- ☐ We have had to inform our neighbours about buildings they can not see, can not hear and have nothing to do with.

LISMORE

- ☐ MOs are counter cultural (usually) and conservative initial rural response is bad but always seems to gradually warm to the MOs as the MO progresses to their dream and neighbours respect for their communal achievements.
- ☐ The public is often ignorant and prejudiced and lobby groups can cause delays in DAs viz DA for J1661 was submitted in 3/3/93 and is still before Council many thousands of dollars and hours later.
- ☐ The public has often showed a penchant for getting emotionally involved in DAs for MOs. The public can be manipulative and manipulated by lobby groups. Many informed assumptions; opinions; prejudices and ignorant attitudes are revealed in public submissions to council.
- ☐ No more MOs should be allowed before the present MOs come up to the standards as other developments.
- ☐ Qualification: public exhibition at times provides opportunity for objections for those opposed to MOs on principle, rather than genuine concerns from immediate neighbours. All DAs whether MO or not should be up for public scrutiny.

Q. 66 (a).

BELLINGEN

- ☐ Roads are continually requiring maintenance.
- ☒ Local Council has failed to maintain Darkwood Road adequately with the road contributions provided.
- ☐ Cost of maintenance of internal roads/bridges etc.

BYRON

- ☐ An adjoining cane farm encourages weed infestation and clogging of the creeks through over use of chemical fertiliser(k) MOs are not eligible for bank loans.
- ☐ In our high rainfall area we are being forced to put in roads which are unnecessary and seriously increase erosion thus impacting on water quality in the streams. Minimal roads is recommended.

KYOGL

- ☐ Very poor maintenance of access road by council

LISMORE

- ☐ Roads are not well maintained by council rutted condition causes severe maintenance of vehicle problems and levy money paid just disappear no improvements for the money.
- ☐ Drainage batters.
- ☐ General road maintenance on-going process on property.
- ☐ Internal roads not maintained.
- ☐ The plans adopted by Council for the internal road were unrealistic and above the collective resources of the Company and its members. Council recently modified its requirements for consent.
- ☐ Funding for widening and sealing Symond Road was a problem until 1987 when an arrangement was made.
- ☐ Funds have just become available to upgrade.
- ☐ No Council maintained road to property - forced to sign agreement accepting this - demolition orders/DA approval hinging on this.
- ☐ Cost of meeting approval conditions re access roads.
- ☐ We are cut off by flood an average once/year for one day.

LATE

- ☐ Very high rainfall area with low level culvert which can be flooded for weeks at a time. We have constructed a high level footbridge.
- ☐ Current repaired bridge floods easily and often preventing work attendance.

Q. 66 (b).

BELLINGEN

- ☐ Clearing of fire trails has caused erosion and therefore effects water quality.
- Our MO has kept our cattle away from the river to maintain water purity for downstream uses. We are concerned about those landowners who allow their cattle into the river to foul the water.
- ☐ Cowshit in creek water (which feeds tanks) chemical runoff from adjoining farms.

BYRON

- ☐ In our high rainfall area we are being forced to put in roads which are unnecessary and seriously increase erosion thus impacting on water quality in the streams. Minimal roads are recommended.
- ☐ Concern over water quality in creeks due to septic and chemical agriculture upstream

KYOGLE

- ☐ The local council quarry silts part of our dams. They also do oil changes there which can sink into the groundwater.
- ☐ When septic tanks, pit toilets have been installed water testing showed no problem with septic tank

LISMORE

- MO concerned with water quality. Maintains minimum contaminates.
- ☐ Concern over impact of rural land users on spring and creek flows during the critical dry - ecological impact.
- ☐ We have restored soil eroded, poisoned creeks into pure waterways.

LATE

- ☐ Because part of our property is proposed for a large dam there is to be no effluent into catchment.

Q. 66 (c).

BELLINGEN

- ☐ Our MO is concerned that Coffs Harbor Council will attempt to take water from the Bellingen River, Destroy the river system and reduce our supply.
- ☐ Need to provide alternatives to creek for emergency (drought).

BYRON

- ☐ Vastly increased use in catchment dries up creek sources for more often.
- ☐ A continuing upgrading and increasing of water facilities

KYOGL

- ☐ We have had to enlarge our water supplies.
- ☐ Concern with easement rights from adjoining land owners. Resolved by mutual agreement with neighbour

LISMORE

- ☐ MO constantly increasing water storage - minimum permanent water.
- ☐ Relates to problems faced by catchment during prolonged dry - fire fighting reserves.
- ☐ Internal disputes over shared resources, access etc. between some members (Sites 1,2,3 and 5). No mutual agreement in writing has yet been submitted to the Company as requested by those involved.
- ☐ We rely on a spring, the supply decreases in dry times, we had an unsuccessful bore dug.
- ☐ More planning required.
- ☒ Permission given upstream for removal of water from creek for horticulture, reducing flow for power generation and recreational use. Low flow rate in summer is still a concern.

LATE

- ☐ Quality of water in creek during dry periods is questionable.
- ☐ Little storage available, low creek contents and few waterways (permanent).

Q. 66 (d).

BELLINGEN

- ☐ Not an actual problem - constant awareness not to expose slopes eg. strict tree-felling rules.

KYOGL

- ☐ A couple of land slips have appeared which we are in the process of stabilising.
- ☐ Has happened a few times due to earth moving (dams, house sites)

LISMORE

- ☐ Soil Conservation advised on possibilities and gave advice on how to deal with.
- ☐ Caused by landuse practices on a neighbours property. One site relocated to avoid possible future slip.

- ☐ Landslip on internal roads.
- ☐ Our steep land was degraded by conventional farming methods, we are dealing with this with re-forestation.
- ☐ We arrested landslip of previous owner overgrazed land by re-forestation.

Q. 66 (e).

BELLINGEN

- ☐ The land is being managed on organic/bio-dynamic/permaculture principle - thereby improving soil fertility and carrying capacity.
- ☐ Gradual restoration (a) removal of lantana, noxious weeds (b) establish gardens, plant trees. See ourselves as caretakers of the land.

BYRON

- ☐ Reduced though unnecessary roads forced on us by council

LISMORE

- ☐ MO manages farm use with minimum environmental impact.
- ☐ DA to guide management plan. MOs tend to become traps for the unemployed if there is no agreed management plan.

Q. 66 (f).

BELLINGEN

- ☐ Increase in general awareness has made us look at measures for hazard reduction.
- ☐ This MO donated land to the local Bush Fire Brigade to shed fire fighting vehicles and has recently consulted the local brigade chief on ways to upgrade our fire protection and fighting capabilities.
- ☐ On-going review and upgrading of strategies.

BYRON

- ☐ When we purchased it was dairy farm - no trees - now many trees and fire hazard is different.
- ☐ Lack of real knowledge of best way to reduce fire impact.
- ☐ Council's over zealous requirements of bush safety clearing.
- ☐ The environmentally responsible habit of burning off threatens regrowth annually.
- ☐ Is low in this area but there is a push for extra fire trails and hazard reduction.
- ☐ More fire breaks clearing etc

KYOGLE

- ☐ There is a problem here, but due to some fascist greenies and apathy our roads after Jan 94 heatwave remain much too narrow despite a serious fire on a MO 2 kms south of here, so a fire here sooner or later is a certainty.
- ☐ We are clearing more than originally but are arguing about environmental impact. Burning off is difficult as we have many rare species (koalas, platypus, echidna).
- ☐ Communication with previous bushfire captain. Has been resolved

LISMORE

- Needs to maintain fire breaks and keep lawn areas mowed and finish fire trailer with equipment partially supplied already.
- Forest regrowth - more fire equipment needed in region. Farm equipment brought and on-going process.
- No hazard reduction plan.
- Fire fighting equipment required by Council has been purchased and distributed among resident members.
- There always has been a Bushfire hazard but where as we used to have low key fire fighting - ourselves (and NPWS) recently large scale bushfire fighting is occurring.
- Tractor and machinery to be purchased for ground fuel reduction/maintenance.
- Conflict between our policy of forest regeneration on marginal land and some neighbouring properties uncontrolled and use of fires to create rough feed for cattle.
- Hippies won't clear rubbish and weeds.
- More planning required.

LATE

- Difficulty in maintaining firebreaks and enforcing regulations relating to vegetation on private sites.

Q. 66 (g).

BELLINGEN

- Concern about feral animals - cats and foxes resulting from clearing and human presence, infestation of noxious weeds - privet, parramatta grass, lantana.
- The MO became a wildlife refuge - no dogs or cats permitted on the property and no fishing in the river. We are currently moving privet from the property and planting native species for windbreaks, wood lots and recreational areas.
- Caretaker attitude, strict guidelines for domestic animals.

BYRON

- Weed control without use of toxic chemicals.
- The creeks are poisoned by cattle and cane farming chemicals.
- Dogs and cats are a major worry as rural populations increase.
- Improved markedly many more wallabies and birds due to increase in food supply and habitat

LISMORE

- Wonderful increase.
- Improved flora and fauna since start of MO.
- So much has been lost greater protection on all rural lands.
- No maintenance of common lands.
- Domestic animals on land has created dissension between some community members.
- Dogs and cats are incompatible with the MO and DA conditions for all. MPs should regulate this "Earth Care" aspect.

Q. 66 (h).

BELLINGEN

- Non-combustible waste is regularly taken to Bellingen Tip. Septic pit and dry compost toilets are used.
- Not a problem - though distant from shire facilities.

KYOGLE

- When septic tanks, pit toilets have been installed water testing showed no problem with septic tank

LISMORE

- We manage our own disposal attempting to minimise waste input in our own MO.
- Non-acceptable sewerage systems.
- Together with Lismore City Council we are testing Composting Toilets successfully.

Q. 66 (i).

BELLINGEN

- Concern of chemicals used in agriculture.

BYRON

- Sugar cane farms - pollution by burning cane and pesticides.
- Chemicals and top soil loss from cane farming and grazing.
- Concern over Pacific Powerline extensions. Need for koala sanctuary. Concern over neighbour land uses ie. macadamia/banana growing and associated chemicals spray drift

LISMORE

- Problems exist with neighbours pursuing development with downstream effects eg pig farms and chemical sprays.
- Aerial spraying of herbicide was a contentious issue - has abated at present time.
- We have some 25,000 trees now and act a wildlife haven for surrounding farms.

LATE

- Aboriginal sacred site adjoins and covers part of our land.

Q. 66 (j).

BELLINGEN

- Houses are kept out of site of each other and positioned so as to retain the rural vista.
- Great value invested in gardens, presentation.

LISMORE

- We manage our own visual impact.
- Building colours not environmentally suitable.
- We still have a problem with reflecting roofs, visual pollution etc. Lismore City Council does not enforce its own regulations!

Q. 66 (k).

BELLINGEN

- No collateral recognised by banks - this financial tools lacking prevents many people from joining an MO.

BYRON

- Inability of banks etc. to lend money on MO structure, inflexible, thick headed, uncaring.
- Local government has massively increased s. 94 contributions which has doubled the price of shares. Also banks are unwilling to lend money.
- No lessee can borrow against their share to do home maintenance legitimise the land to accept our DA.
- No one has the money to pay this huge levy and legalise the MO (road levy needs looking at from a user point of view)

KYOGLE

- Members cannot receive housing loans, mortgage home, or get finance to buy shares.
- This has been a concern to some residents who have been unable to take out loans for housing and were refused the first home owners grant

LISMORE

- Tenants in common = basic hassles. We are now financially ok but early days it was hard.
- Money is always a problem esp during this recession. However we manage to keep ourselves in the black!.
- Difficult to borrow capital unwise to overcapitalise.
- Many members do not honour their financial obligations, therefore their lifestyles are subsidised by other contributing members, whereby the community has difficulties in developing resources and complying with council consent conditions.
- Loans impossible through regular financiers due to shared title deed.
- Developers abandoned project at verge of liquidating.
- We self financed this \$1,000,000 project.

LATE

- Hard to get money locally.

Q. 66 (l).

BELLINGEN

- Dispute over road reserve relocation.
- Cost of mainstream services eg Telecom in a rural setting.

LISMORE

- We were granted 30 home sites and have approved 33 with 13 more shareholders wanting sites. No application has been made by the co-op for these sites and 9 illegal dwellings most rented and some very substandard dwellings.
- Noise - stand alone power systems reverberate -soundproof rooms needed and nearly finished.
- Inherited weed problem from previous grazing and banana cropping. Weeds are on an interim natural process on land that has been abused.

- Some members have not paid their mandatory road levy; have not built to council specification and have not submitted plans for developments to council. Building inspector has seen and documented 9 or 10 substandard buildings.
- As Council has not enforced building codes on MO some members have built substandard dwellings which are illegal.
- Large MOs should be required to justify an employment or enterprise strategy so as to prevent rural slums. It took us 10 years to overcome this problem.

SHOALHAVEN

- Pets - as a result of one member being burgled and wanting a sheep dog.

Q. 67.

BELLINGEN

- So far it has proved as effective as the group preparing the draft policy hoped.
- I believe that SEPP 15 is a good policy that shows the right direction. Sadly local councils are mostly interested in more rate and fee revenue and they make MOs another good thing that is not affordable for the people it has been designed .
- If my memory serves me right, our council developed its own concept and did not adhere directly to SEPP 15.
- This community operated very successfully for 11 years before it became a legal MO. Since then we have not been disadvantaged by SEPP 15 and have operated very much as before. Perhaps a little more clarity and a little less paranoia.
- SEPP 15 protect rural land from being subdivided for profit return into a soulless rural suburb of bitumen and tv antennae.
- Whilst successful in providing relatively low cost land it seems to result in a lot of low quality temporary accommodation and a high turnover of residents - which perpetuates this situation (catch 22).
- Apparently D.O.H. is introducing Community Management Co-ops, any move to permit low cost housing must be supported and many styles are needed eg the cluster, expended on your diagram.

BYRON

- The continuing increase in the price of rural land has taken it beyond the reach of those people the legislation was designed to help. Hence the need for density increase.
- Must guard against local councils taking vindictive actions against MOs and applicants.
- SEPP 15 is generally a good instrument for this community. However most of the people here are low income and the policy does not protect us from being rated out of existence by unsympathetic councils.
- It would be interesting if for once and for all the government bodies would make up their minds to allot us with the said title - either strata or Community subdivision, so we would know what we are up against.
- If it makes it cheaper for people to buy land and build then it should be implemented or amended as needed to make sure this occurs

KYOGLE

- I have not seen or heard of SEPP 15. Could I please have a copy or advise me as to where I can get one. Perhaps I should have access to one prior to filling out this series of questions.
- Community and Strata title is a much fairer position (than SEPP 15) as it gives its members much more security and allows for finance. MOs must have the right to change over to these alternative ways of living on community based properties. (see attach A).
- Generally no, but this presumes that Council interprets SEPP 15 in the spiriting which it was written. This is often not the case and is based on prejudice. It would be useful if supplementary guidelines were available for people wishing to set up Mo. SEPP 15 is not effective in stopping speculator based MO development. We recognise this aspect is very difficult to regulate but it is critical in order for MO to retain its integrity.
- There should be restrictions on developers being able to sell shares in land prior to consent by govt authorities as a MO. Density equation doesn't take into account the landscape of property.

LISMORE

- Some sort of dispute resolution ombudsman would be a big plus for MO residents. It is very expensive to enforce the agreed constitution and disputes are often left unresolved due to reluctance of residents to resort to legal action.
- 2/3 Mo residents to be on title is too tough. Sometimes casual farm workers can stay for up to six months this should be legal. Cottage industry including retreat tourism (small scale) should be encouraged. Good permaculture reforestation farm tools and equipment cost money that is hard and dangerous to borrow. We need to create environmentally friendly income for MO ie MO employment.
- Yes introduce a clause that can deal with the issues of obtaining finance for development/housing for individuals/collective.
- Yes introduce a clause that can deal with ownership rights in such a way that banks/financial institutions can treat MO occupants as equal applicants for finance with other proprietors of land.
- I think that the SEPP 15 should include the provision for community title the problems seem to be that co-op companies etc do not meet the needs of the individual house owner and cause great conflict and stress both to individuals or groups living on MO who are also subject to equity. Court and legal action by individuals against the co-op company and the problems of directors and shareholders who do not want to comply with the Local Govt Act.
- Very little real policy.
- It is hard to judge the effectiveness of SEPP 15. However in our case we have managed most situations ourselves. We feel we are responsible and concerned to ensure this type of development continues in an appropriate manner.
- Stricter environmental controls need to be implemented: effect on spring creek during dry; waste water disposal and proximity to water courses; land slipping/erosion. N.B. this affects all rural land users not just MOs.

- I think it is important to not over plan potential MOs people and communities evolve naturally. It would be a shame if MOs were knocked back because they couldn't afford consultants engineers designers and architects road levies excessive council fees and levies before they even set foot on the land eg its always exciting to be cut off a few days in a flood!
- There is a need for a government appointed body/person to specifically deal with internal disputes and/or act as an arbitrator for multiple occupancies, as with Community Title developments, especially in relation to compliance with internal management agreements, i.e. enforcing contribution requirements, related to financial contribution, residential status, community labour projects, etc. Legal advice and/or arbitration are currently costly and/or drastic measures to take against other community members, especially considering the potential negative impacts that they may impose on limited resources and relationships between members in the future, and the abuses that can occur.
- SEPP 15 was an attempt to put a handle on something that was already happening, it made us legitimate. 12 years down the track, most of us are still here, we've built houses and developed our shares. Now we would like to have separate title to our own blocks of land.
- We are a dispersed development and SEPP 15 seems to cover the management of our development adequately. One thing - people cannot borrow to build. Another - people cannot transfer loans to buy and existing home on the MO - this limits buyers to cash buyers.
- SEPP 15 is outdated. A perfunctory, 1970's solution to low cost, affordable housing in a rural setting. Too restrictive for the needs of a diverse, evolving segment of the population, especially considering mortgages and future land titles.
- Prefer to see maintenance of SEPP 15 as a State Planning Policy, rather than individual Council regulations. Possibly too restrictive.
- Scrap SEPP 15 in favour of Community Title or at least provide for individual title to home sites.
- On going consultation with MOs whenever new policies are being formulated. Should consider legal management structures more appropriate for alternative living.
- The problem for MOs is in the structure they have to take. Companies and co-operatives are directed at business enterprises not residential living. Community title is a structure that can cater for rural land sharing for residential purposes. Our co-operative structure caters to members not to house owners and a member who has an \$850 share and who has never resided on the land has equal say with another who has either brought or built a house and who lives on the property. (see further notes, Nmbngee).
- Our structure has a member who has no site and does not live on the property with a share value of \$850 having the same rights as a member with a house and living on the property. This system has not worked. Community Title of some form would be more equitable for members who live and build on the property.
- Small sized privately formed MO's are more appropriate than entrepreneurial development.

- MOs under SEPP 15, Community Title and similar developments "out bush" require more government regulations to ensure they act as wildlife/flora reserves, have an enterprise strategy, interface regularly with local government, and yet ensure low cost, self help development standards. (see attached material Billen Cliffs).
- Very successful given trepidation of Dept and prolong process in passing of the legislation. Fears of rip-offs by real estate agents have not been realised. Many new communities have been established. Many people have been housed in low income bracket, with improved quality of life for many. No particular clause has been onerous for MOs. Court cases have been due to council's interpretation rather than to the legislation itself.
- Precludes subdivision of land.

SHOALHAVEN

- SEPP 15 has been useful for our group in enabling us to establish a shared settlement on now disused farmland and to pursue our lifestyle and environmental objectives. We feel this is a valuable form of land use - environmentally and socially - and could not have been achieved without the opportunity provided by SEPP 15.

LATE

- I would prefer all community members to have an input into this question.
- Policy is in the main very effective. Could be improved by: more effective implementation by Councils eg examination of MO constitutions to ensure that development is not speculative; a handbook for prospective MO members and developers needs, to be prepared so that there is a lot more quality information available; and Council should consider appointing a MO Advisory Panel to assist Council in approving MO DAs.
- An unprincipalled individual has been abusing MO development by using Tenants in Common Title and selling shares in such land. The land has been mortgaged by him, unbeknown to shareholders. Perhaps Council should request better proof of joint ownership and constitution before approving DAs. MOs are wonderful and it is a shame for a few poorly done MOs to spoil it for the rest.
- Only security of tenure.

The following responses were comments on late questionnaires which would have otherwise been coded.

Q. 2

- Yes approval granted under SEPP 15 with conditions, Road contribution \$30,000 finalised in November 1994.

Q. 6

- No distinct separate community only due to geographic location.

Q. 7

- Along 2 ridges.

Q. 8

- Communal rural lifestyle, forest regeneration/preservation, permaculture, spiritual, environmentally sensitive lifestyle and safe environment for children.

Q. 14

- Community requires 2 days work on farm each week.

Q. 15

- There is no public transport, school bus used.
- Private (individual) transport and hitchhiking.
- Local hitching

Q. 18

- Six single dwellings, one communal house and one visitor accommodation.
- Fourteen dwellings, three sheds, five covered caravan/caravan & shed, three dwellings under construction and four self contained cabins.

Q. 19

- Utilities, bushfire/flood facilities and farm machinery.

Q. 21

- Cost of maintaining roads, infrastructure main disadvantage, inability to obtain finance 2nd biggest disadvantage.

Q. 22

- 5% of site area for horse paddocks.

Q. 23

- One freehold. Tenants awaiting legality.

Q. 24

- Individual dwellings owned by owner-occupiers and rented.

Q. 30

- 40% of original shareholders no longer reside on the MO but still maintain their share.

Q. 31

- Private capital and unemployment benefits/pensions.
- Private capital and First Home Owners Grant.
- Credit Union loan

Q. 41

- Inability to obtain finance (1). No RAPAS funding for home power systems (3). Discrimination by local council and public utilities (2).
- Inability to obtain finance (1), low resale value (2) and lack of financial security (3).
- Isolation/access (3).

- Low re-sale value (1). Inability to obtain finance (2). Public discrimination often led by the media (3).
- Trying to get widespread agreement and action to do anything.
- No land title for individual families.

Q. 62

- To satisfy the conditions of clause 8 we are presently in the process of preparing an application.

Q. 63

- Council requirement.

Q. 64

- For approval a road levy of \$2,150/house site ie \$30,000 total.
- Impact on water quality, water supply, mass movement/land slip, bushfire hazard, waste disposal, visual impact and identification of aboriginal sites.