



PAN-COMMUNITY
COUNCIL
P.O. BOX 102,
NIMBIN 2480

7.2.94

MASTER
copy

Attention: Leigh Knight.

Regional Manager,
Mr. Trevor Prior,
Department of Planning,
P.O. Box 6, Grafton, NSW, 2460

Dear Trevor Prior,

Re: REVIEW OF SEPP-15:
MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY SURVEY FORM
(Second Draft)

We enclose herewith our comments on the Second Draft Survey Form (marked "Attachment 'E'") for your consideration.

We see the reworked Survey Form as being a big improvement on the first draft!

Notwithstanding our comment herewith, we wish it to be noted that the comments and recommendations made in our letter of 19.1.94 still stand.

We believe there are a range of topics which have not been included in the Survey and that some of these testify to the success of the Policy.

The Survey for example, does not deal with the circumstances surrounding the formation of the community, the process of property selection, visions, communal bonding, development of community communication skills, conflict resolution and decision making to name but a few of the issues that our experience suggests are fundamental in the process of establishing a successful community within the Policy.

That the Policy has stood the test of time so well, is a credit to the drafters of the Policy.

We would appreciate receiving a copy of your final draft of this Survey Form as soon as this is available.

Thanking you in anticipation.

We await your communication.

Yours sincerely,

.....
Peter Hamilton
for the Pan-Com M.O. Review Collective

**COMMENTS ON THE 2nd DRAFT
MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY SURVEY FORM**

PREAMBLE

- (A) *The form is too long. Consideration should be given to reducing it by about one third.*
- (B) *As this is a survey of the community and not an individual, the term "Your community" should be used in lieu of "You" or "your MO" throughout the Survey Form.*
- (C) *Question numbers should related to a topic. Sub questions should be numbers (a), (b) etc. See eg. 39-40, 41-42, 45-46, 47-48, 49-51 etc.*

SURVEY QUESTION

If the reason for any of the following comments/suggestions is not self evident or clear, please make contact for explanation.

1. *In what year was your MO (a) established, (b) approved?*
COMMENT: Some MO's approved prior to SEPP-15.
2. *Should be 6 - 10 years. Is a "visitor" a "resident"?*
3. *Use "area" in lieu of "size".*
4. *The term "hamlet" is not widely used and not all will be familiar with this term. If it is the intention to gauge the extent of MO's that have a "clustered" form of development, then a question such as "Do you have "hamlets" or separate clusters of dwellings within your MO"?*
6. *Use "Spiritual" in lieu of "Religious". What does "Weekend/Holiday Homes" mean?*

Add eg. "Low environmental impact lifestyle" and "A simple way of living".
7. *Use "normally" in lieu of "currently".*
9. *Define "families". Discriminatory use of this term can offend! What about "singles" or a group of single people sharing one dwelling?*
12. *May be read as assuming that anyone who wishes/desires to become a shareholder has only to ask. This is very far from the case! Consider, "Is the community currently seeking new members? If so, how many?*

13. (A) Use "proportion" in lieu of "percentage as this is how it will be calculated.
14. How should a person who works 3 days per week off the property answer this question? See (A) in 13.
16. See (A) in 13.
17. The terms "clustered" and "dispersed" mean different things to different people. To obtain some common impression, it is recommended that a copy of your brochure "MO on Rural Land: How it works" be included with the Survey Form. If this brochure is out of print, we suggest it be reprinted for use in this survey.
18. Many are likely to be unaware of what an "expended house" means. The brochure referred to in Q17 may address this.
19. Use "How many" in lieu of "Which". Consider "covered caravan" in lieu of "Caravan & shed".
22. Give examples of "active" and "passive" space. Include "Orchards", "reforestation", "Roads and road reserves". If these are adopted then "Agriculture" should read "Agriculture (other than orchards)". Use "percentage" in lieu of "approximate". You could then indicate that the total should equal 100%.
23. Use "Which of the following ownership structures has your community adopted?" This enables those with a tiered system to answer the question!
26. This question should be in two parts (a) and (b), each self contained with space to answer each separately.
27. Confusing. What information is being sought? Consider "What percentage of the original settlers still reside on the property?".
28. Delete all and in lieu ask "How was the purchase of the land financed?"

If it is desired to know how eg. houses and infrastructure works are financed, then separate questions need to be asked. (If categories are proposed in this regard, then consideration should be given to including "sweat equity" and "self help owner building" and the like.)

29. Use (a) "How many members have, at any time, sought home building finance from a lending institution (eg a bank)?"
(If none, go to next question).
(b) "How many of these were successful?"

(Note: Many have not tried because they know finance is not available to MO residents!)

34. Use "major adjoining" neighbours as five or more neighbours are not uncommon. Four columns are required for each option. See also comment to Q44-45 in our Critique (Attachment "A") of 19.1.94.
36. The words in brackets are redundant. See our comments to questions 34, 35, 36 and 46 in critique of the first draft.

- 36A. How can this be answered on behalf of the community? Responses to this question will vary from person to person.

Consider "What are the advantages and disadvantages that your community generally, would hold in respect to the following issues and attributes?" Edit the options. (We are assuming that rows and columns will be provided).

37. The numbered scale should commence with zero.
- 48A. Consider a new question "Was your community approved under SEPP-15? If not, what?, or, "under what legislation was your community approved? (a) Gazetted, (b) Circular 44, (c) SEPP-15.
49. As these plans etc are required under s.90 and the Policy, what is the purpose of this question? Is this question endeavouring to ascertain if councils are doing their job!
50. It is our opinion that it would be ultra vires of council to require such information as a condition of consent. Suggest this question be deleted.
51. Confused. Delete.
52. Does "required" mean by the council or the community?
55. Consider explaining the basis and justification for the particular formula that has been adopted in SEPP-15 and ask for comment on this.
57. Whose "philosophy" is being referred to, an individual, the community or the Department? The prohibition on subdivision was based on the Departmental philosophy of the day, that fragmentation of rural land was undesirable!
- 59-60. Not applicable. How is one to make this assessment if one has had no experience of the options given? At the best, any answer would be speculative.
64. Additional Question.
Does membership in your community entitle individual members to have the exclusive right to a portion of the land in excess of 5000 square meters?

End

DRAFT MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY RESIDENT SURVEY:

A CRITIQUE

SURVEY QUESTION

1. "appropriate" presumably means "approximate"!!

2. These are inappropriate categories.

The use of the term "rural residential" is misleading in view of this term being defined to have a specific meaning in various planning instruments. It is a poor choice of words. Why not use for example "communal lifestyle"!

The inference that somehow MO is a de facto "rural residential" development in planning terms, is entirely out of place and confusing to the public. The use of this term is not justified in this Survey notwithstanding its use in the consultant's brief.

3. Isn't this question simply a total of the data sought in Q4 and if so why can't it be obtained by summing the data in Q4?

The terms "currently" and "permanently" can conflict. People "currently" living on a property may not necessarily live there on a "permanent" basis, and vice versa.

4. What useful conclusions or evaluation can be drawn by knowing the differences between these ages?

This level of breakdown would appear to be meaningless and pointless in this survey, notwithstanding that it might have been used in other surveys.

5. What does "separate family/household units" mean? What relationship does this term have with an "expanded house" if any?

6. The question should make clear that "dwelling" do not include any separate "units" in an "expanded dwelling", if this is the intention.

7. What constitutes "dispersed" or "clustered" will vary with the individual. Given this what meaningful conclusions can be deduced from the responses to this question?

8. We find the classification given in this question to be inappropriate. Notwithstanding the data sought in Q6, why are "dwelling houses" not recognised as valid structures on an MO? Why not just leave as, "Houses"?

9. These are poor options. Such options trivialise the MO experience. A relevant question would be one that related to the "move-in-stage". Appropriate periods are more of the order, <5, 5-10, 10-15, lifetime.

10. As the term "employed" is likely to be taken to indicate "paid employment", to imply that those children on an MO could or should, be working (on a full time employment basis) at age 15, is a discriminatory assumption.

To suggest that people are employed on a full time basis in "parent/child raising" is a fanciful idea.

How can one be "employed full time" on "unpaid housework"?

What is the basis for assuming there is a goal of "self sufficiency"?

11. As one individual may qualify equally for two or more of these categories, care will need to be taken as to the conclusions drawn from these results.

12. Is this before or after tax? ie gross or nett income?

13. Averaging this data will reduce it to a meaningless statistic. There seems to be no appreciation of the distinction between "resident members" and "visitors" or the concept that for many the lifestyle is a lifelong commitment! Why then stop at 10 years?

14. The question implies that there may be communities without any shared community facilities. If this should be the case the question should then be asked of the council, how did they come to get DA approval in the first place?

15. This is a very narrow selection of options. The options could to advantage include eg. community or shared kitchens, laundries, community workshop, garage, fire truck or fire fighting equipment, communal roads, orchards and the like.

16. The question does not make clear whether the facilities have on some occasion been used by others, or if such facilities are used on an ongoing basis. If the question was phrased "Have any of these facilities been used by other than the MO residents?", the answer could be quite different.

17. As there is no question 6.1, presumably reference is intended to Q15, and if so, is it reasonable to expect questionees to respond to this?

What does "community open space" mean? Is it to include "active recreational" areas such as sports fields, and "passive recreational" areas such as forests and natural swimming holes?

18-19. For whose benefit is this question? Is there evidence that an MO developer has been refused development because of this provision? No such case is known. Bob Smith (Dept of Ag.) has stated that he sees a case that perhaps MO's have a place in providing a long term stable labour force to work prime agricultural land. This we suggest is a realistic potential, at least in theory.

Using terms like SEPP-15 without any description is jargon to the lay person. How then are they to know what "prime crop and pasture land" means?

Wank Copy
"A"

The process for determining what constitutes "prime crop and pasture land" is spelt out in the Policy. It will be appreciated on close reading that the use of Class I, II and III Ag. land is NOT necessarily the only way to determine "prime crop and pasture" land. The present policy has well served the objective to protect prime ag. land while enabling MO dwellings, provided they are not on "prime crop and pasture land".

20. It is unlikely that a public company will ever be an attractive form of MO ownership. This is a poor set of options. Why not simply leave to "specify"?

Options (a) and (c) are likely to BOTH apply in some cases.

Why not include frequently used forms like "cooperative" and "tenants in common"?

21. What is this question directed to finding out? What is the difference between option (b) and (c)? Should not the word "individual" be deleted from the question to make sense of the options?

- 22-23-24. In Q22 is it implied that an MO may be "managed" by a NON COMMUNITY organisation? If so what such organisation is being alluded to? What does "managed" mean in this question?

If the question is intended to ask "What is the management structure of your community?", why not say so in such words?

25. These options trivialise the decision making processes on communities.

- 27-28. Why not include other realistic options?

(See for example Attachments "B", "C" and "D").

- 30-31. What does "consultation" mean in this context? What do "plans and study" mean in the context of "maintained for the MO"? Is oral documentation acceptable?

32. SEPP-15 and s.90 require details of community and land management plans. Is it to be inferred that there are some who are exempt from supplying such data?

A perusal of the MO DA's held by the DOP should provide the answer to this question. Is it to be assumed that no such examination of these DA's has taken place?

The question indicates an ignorance of the quality of many DA's, some of which are now prepared by professional consultants.

33. A preparatory question ought to test if indeed houses are individually "owned". It is an assumption to presume otherwise!

What percentage of dwellings have changed hands would be a more interesting and useful question. A variation would be "How many times has a dwelling changed hands?"

How might this question be answered where two shareholders share a house and one moves out? Has the "ownership" changed for the purpose of this question?

34. In asking "Were any of the issues a problem?" leaves hanging what time in the past is being referred to. For example, flood free access may have been a problem at one time, but is not a problem after building a bridge.

To imply that all the given options are a "problem" with a negative connotation, is a loaded situation. Is it implied that other forms of development "do not find these to be a problem"? Are such options not also of "concern", in farm development, rural residential development, or for that matter, an urban development?

"If any of the following issues have been a problem, are they still a problem?" would simplify this question.

- 35-36. If the options given were identified as of "concern" at the DA stage, why would they not remain a "concern", following DA approval?

As this question uses the past tense viz. "created concern", great care needs to be taken not to permit any extrapolation that these issues are necessarily of concern at the present time.

In drawing any conclusions from this question care is also needed to ensure that comparative data is available for non MO development.

Consideration of "land capability" is an important theme but how is a questioner to know what definition is being used by the questioner?

37. The question is poorly worded as it may be read as to imply that each and every sub aim of the Policy must be met. This of course is not the case, as meeting just one aim is sufficient to qualify for consideration.

The preamble to the question should explicitly convey that the Policy does not require all aims to be met.

The terms "Not successful" and "Very successful" could better be replaced with "Not relevant" and "Very relevant".

We are adamant that the wording of this question should leave no possible room for ambiguity that the several aims, should be read as cojoined.

38. Presumably this should read "What changes to current MO objectives ..." to make sense.

39. This is probably the best question in the survey form. It is a good model for other questions!

Why however, are the options (I), (J) and (K) included in the MO Survey, and NOT included in the same question asked in the council Survey Form (Q19)?

Will this difference not methodically compromise any chance of matching or mixing the findings in the two surveys?

40. Does "increased demand" mean that which flows from any new development (as all developments have some increased demand on the council), or does it mean the "increase" over and above that by a new

farm development, or a new rural residential estate? The question should be clear and unambiguous, or otherwise deleted from the survey.

"Limitations" is surely not the appropriate word in this context. Does it mean "disadvantages"? Contrast this with "advantages" in the previous question!

What for example is the connection between "limitations" and "non payment of rates"? How is "non payment of rates" a planning issue under SEPP-15?

Why are the options (m) and (n) in this question not provided in the council Survey?

44-45. Normally there will be four adjoining land owners, and there can be up to eight "neighbours" depending on the grid pattern, as one corner peg may be common to three neighbours. How can this be adequately addressed in one choice? Theoretically all four options could apply!

46. What constitutes "opposition" and over what period of time is the "opposition" to prevail to qualify in this question?

48-49. We can see no good reason for the inclusion of this question.

The spirit of "community" as a living situation, is clearly based on a shared lifestyle, and this principle is firmly and clearly enunciated in the Policy.

In addition, the drafters of the Policy were anxious to avoid any loop-hole, in which the Policy might be used by developers to create de facto subdivisions.

Residential planning legislation is almost exclusively aimed at providing private ownership of land occupied by a nuclear family.

So great is value placed on personal land ownership it seems, that it now attempts to pervade the SEPP-15 Policy. This Policy is we suggest, one which in part, aims to provide a "housing diversity" and an opportunity for a different lifestyle in the context of our multi cultural fabric.

Rural residential development using standard subdivision, strata title or community title, provides perfectly valid options for those who want private title in a clustered form of development.

To those who have bought into an MO and now claim that they should be allowed to subdivide, we would contend that they bought into the MO knowing full well that subdivision was not permissible.

We sympathise with those who have difficulty in not being able to obtain finance for housing because the lending institutions require a mortgage document over an exclusive parcel of land.

The problem is not with the planning policy, but the policy of the financial institutions. Governments have so far failed to successfully address this issue and as a result MO residents may be

considered as being "financially disadvantaged" in choosing this form of property, housing and lifestyle.

As we have said, this issue is not a planning matter but a financial management matter, and as such should be deleted from this survey.

50-51-52. The question is a non sequitur.

For those who seek a communal lifestyle, using standard subdivision, strata or community title, should submit a DA for same and an application for rezoning. This option is available now!

In the light of this, what possible justification is there to erode the SEPP-15 Policy that has successfully stood the test of time?

This is not an either-or situation. Let communities who want to operate under the SEPP Policy consolidate and flourish, and let those who want to use standard subdivision, strata or community title, argue their own case for settlement of rural land.

The evidence suggests that part of the push to consider permitting subdivision on MO's came from Real Estate interests apparently in the expectation that there would be more sales passing through their books and hence more profit.

This is not a justifiable ground for modifying a good planning policy.

In addition, such a move has the potential to "open the flood gates" to rampant de facto subdivision.

Such a potential force could have a profound effect on other regional policies attempting to put in place appropriate planning strategies for the sustainable development of rural land.

Such policy discussion includes the "Alternative Forms of Rural Residential Development" and "Cost of Rural Housing" consultancy briefs currently being funded by the DOP.

There is no apparent reason for this question in the survey. It should be deleted from the survey.

53. To answer this question effectively would require the questionee to have a good working knowledge of SEPP-15. Is this a reasonable expectation?

Is this question not like asking an urban dweller about the effectiveness of the LEP or the Local Government Act?

FINAL REQUEST (unnumbered)

No statement has been made in the preamble to the Survey, on the question of confidentiality or otherwise, in regard to the answers given in this Survey. This should be provided.

It would appear that there is no provision in the brief for individual follow-up on the Survey. If this is the case, what purpose is served in asking for the information?

That there may be members of the public who would like to obtain access to this data, on a case by case basis, for example for advertising or for an ulterior reason, should be considered.

On the grounds of confidentiality, privacy and limited, if any, relevance in needing to record community identity, this provision should be dropped.

To provide effective confidentiality in this regard, this should include the absence of any coded or numbered survey forms, which could permit tracing identity, even under FOI provisions.

A compromise might be considered acceptable in coding for the council area.

OTHER POSSIBLE QUESTIONS

The question could be asked "What other questions would you like to have seen included in this Survey?"

Comment: This could produce a series of questions which are experienced by community members as important and relevant issues in their daily activities.

In particular this may highlight other positive contributions that MO communities are making to the wider society, eg. not having to join the queue for a Housing Commission home!

For other questions that might be considered for inclusion see:

1. SOE "Checklist of Themes and Indicators relevant to MO", (Attachment "B").
2. Selection of questions and issues for consideration as raised by Pan-Com members (Attachment "C").
3. Selected bibliography of literature pertaining to other MO Surveys and issues (Attachment "D").

SUMMARY

The proposed survey questions have been closely examined, questions asked and constructive suggestions made with reasons, for their retention, amendment or deletion.

CONCLUSIONS

There are from our point of view, considerable shortcomings in the draft Survey.

All questions should be designed so that they can be evaluated in relationship to the statistics applicable to other rural development and the urban counterpart.

The wording of each question (or bracket of questions) should indicate the purpose in asking the question.

Why is acknowledgement not given to questions adopted from other surveys?

Why is copyright claimed on the survey form?

A draft should be trialled as a pilot on a sample of communities:-

- a. to assess its effectiveness,
- b. to determine a likely response rate,
- c. to determine the variation in replies given by different members of the same community, and the like.

In the Council Survey what weight will be given, if any, to returns from councils which have many MO's in contrast to those with a few?

What percentage of Survey returns is viewed to be adequate to claim some reliability that the conclusions drawn are representative?

THE USE OF "OTHER" AND "SPECIFY"

The use of "other" and "specify" as an open ended question, can be very useful and effective. It can however, result in considerable problems in collation of the data. Is it intended to produce new sub categories from this data? Will the report be primarily confined to the quantifiable data contained in the categories provided?

End

Attention: Graham Irvine

To be collected.

SEPP 15 REVIEW

MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY (MO) OF RURAL LANDS
RESIDENT SURVEY

MASTER
Final Draft

✓ Eddie
✓ Pub
✓ Di

(1) =

- ✓ 1. In what year was your community established?
- ✓ 2. Has an approval been granted for your community under SEPP 15?
- ✓ 3. If yes, in what year?
- ✓ 4. What is the average length of stay of residents (excluding visitors) on your community?
less than 1 year
1 - 5 years
6 - 10 years
more than 10 years
- ✓ 5. What is the approx. overall area of your MO? ha.
- ✗ 6. Do you have separate hamlets or distinct separate communities within your MO?
- ✓ 7. If yes, how many?
- ✓ 8. Does your community cater for any of the following:

Communal rural lifestyle
Share-farming
Horticulture
Permaculture
Forest regeneration/preservation
Tourist oriented activities
Weekend/Holiday Retreat
Spiritual
Dispersed Residential
Environmentally sensitive lifestyle

Other (Please Specify)

- ✓ 9. How many people normally live within your community on a permanent basis?
- ✓ 10. What are the approximate ages of current residents. (Please specify number in each age group)
0 - 4
5 - 18
18 - 55
> 55

Graham, If you should have any comments re this form
would you please ring Simon direct on 886217

Thanks
P

- ✓ 11. How many separate households are there within your community?
- X 12. Indicate the number, if any, of shareholders/members not currently living in the community
- X 13. How many people are there currently living in your community who are not shareholders?
- ✓ 14. What proportion/percentage of residents between 18 - 60 years of age are engaged in daily activities predominantly on the MO?
- ✓ 15. What proportion/percentage of residents between 18 - 60 years of age are engaged in daily activities which take them off the MO? (e.g. full or part time employment, education, volunteer or community work).
- ✓ 16. Of those people leaving the MO, what percentage would travel using:
- | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| Private (individual) transport | |
| Shared private | |
| Community transport | |
| Public transport | |
| Other | |
- ✓ 17. What proportion/percentage of people living in your community would be classified as low income earners (say, less than \$20,000 per year)?
- ✓ 18. Has your community chosen:
- | | |
|----------------------|-------|
| Clustered settlement | |
| Dispersed settlement | |
| Both | |
- For what reasons?.....
-
- ✓ 19. How many of the following dwelling types are there within your community? (specify number of each)
- | | |
|---|-------|
| Expanded dwelling (see attached Figure 1) | |
| Single dwelling | |
| Communal House | |
| Covered Caravan/Caravan & shed | |
| Shed | |
| Tent | |
| Other (Please specify) | |
- ✓ 20. Does your community incorporate any community facilities?

If yes, indicate which of the following:

Community house	Community Centre
Community laundry	Community kitchen/eatery
Child Care facilities	Utilities (Dams, pumps,
Community Hall	power, roads)
Workshop/Farm buildings	Artists Workshops/
Religious facilities	gallery
Health/Medical	Education facilities
Bushfire/Flood facilities	Recreation facilities

Other

- ✓ 21. Are any of these facilities used on an ongoing basis by more than just the residents of the community or have they been in the past?

If yes, please give details:

.....

.....

.....

- ✓ 22. Estimate the approximate site area associated with each land use within your community. (Please estimate percentage/proportion of site used)

Residential
Agriculture (incl.
horticulture)
Environment Preservation/
Protection/retention
Active Open Space
facilities (play
areas, playing fields)
Community facilities
(as listed in Q.20)
Passive Community land
(arborctum, creek bank
reserve, gardens)

Other (Please Specify)

- ✓ 23. Which of the following ownership structures has your community adopted?

Tenants in Common
Co-operative
Joint Tenants
Partnership
Title held by Trustee
Owned by private company

Other (Please Specify)

- ✓ 24. Under what arrangement are individual dwellings owned and occupied?

All owned by Community
 Individual dwellings owned by owner-occupiers

Other (Please Specify)

- ✓ 25. Are shares (or equivalent) currently:

(a) not available Yes/No
 (b) available to the public Yes/No
 (i.e. on a first come basis)
 (c) conditionally available, (e.g. subject to house available for purchase; or an approved building site; or on approval of other resident members; or the like Yes/No

- ✓ 26. What:

(a) Are current cost of shares (if any) or equivalent?
 (b) Were original cost of shares (i.e. to the first residents)?

- ✓ 27. What proportion/percentage of original shareholders still reside on the property?

- ✓ 28. How have dwellings in your community been financed?

Bank/Commercial loan
 Individual private loan
 Community Capital
 Private Capital
 Other

- ✓ 29. Have you experienced any difficulty obtaining finance for dwelling construction from a lending institution?

- ✓ 30. If yes, please give details

- ✓ 31. Please describe the management structure, if any, operating within your community.

32. How are decisions made within your community? (Please explain)

.....

✓ 33. How does your community meet common expenses such as council rates, internal road maintenance and fencing costs? (e.g. annual levy on residents, ad-hoc contributions).

.....

✓ 34. In general, what are the relationships like between your community and major adjoining land owners? (Place a cross on the relevant line for each neighbour.)

	ADJOINING LANDOWNERS										(TOTAL)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
No Contact											
Friendly											
Neutral											
Unfriendly											

✓ 35. If unfriendly, can you give any reason for this?

.....

36. Has your community ever been the subject of community opposition or misconceptions (e.g. objection to DA, complaints to residents or council)?

Yes/No

If yes, briefly provide any details and known reasons for this:

.....

37. What are the advantages and disadvantages that your community generally would hold with respect to the following issues and attributes? (Please indicate on the following Advantage/Disadvantage scale for each relevant attribute.)

DISADVANTAGE ADVANTAGE
-5 -3 -1 0 +1 +3 +5

Communal lifestyle
Alternative lifestyle opportunities
Lower cost rural living
Good environmental management (e.g.
decreased land degradation)
Improved land management practices (e.g.
decreased weed infestations)
Introduction of new forms of
agricultural activity
Continued use of land for agriculture
Innovative house styles
Increased bushfire fighting facilities
Development cost
Fewer legal land management requirements
Fewer zoning requirements
Access to council services
Merging of social groups (farmers and MO
residents)
Inability to obtain finance
Low re-sale value
Use of alternative technology (power,
waste disposal)
Changes in land value
Environmental impact
Other

- ✓ 38. SEPP 15, which relates to Multiple Occupancy developments, contains a set of Policy Objectives which may apply to your local government area and/or circumstance. Using the following 5-point scale, please indicate how relevant each of the following SEPP 15 Objectives are for your community.

	Not Relevant			Very Relevant	
	0	1	2	3	4
Encourage community based rural settlement	0	1	2	3	4
Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement	0	1	2	3	4
Enable collective living	0	1	2	3	4
Enable sharing of facilities and resources	0	1	2	3	4
Enable pooling of resources	0	1	2	3	4
Facilitate clustered style rural development	0	1	2	3	4
Avoid demand for Council/Government services	0	1	2	3	4
Avoid subdivision of rural land	0	1	2	3	4
Avoid decline in services due to decline in rural population	0	1	2	3	4

39. What changes, if any, to current MO Objectives in SEPP 15 would you regard as desirable to adequately reflect the nature of MO developments?
-
-

- ✓ 40. The Policy currently restricts the height of buildings to 8m. above natural ground level. Do you feel this restriction is appropriate? Yes/No

- ✓ 41. If no, what should it be and why?
-
-

- ✓ 42. SEPP 15 currently restricts the amount of prime crop and pasture land (as defined in the Policy) to a maximum of 25%. Do you feel this standard is appropriate? Yes/No

- ✓ 43. What alteration to this limit, if any, do you feel would benefit future MO applicants?
-
-
-

- ✓ 44. The Policy currently restricts tourist accommodation on MO developments (unless otherwise permitted in the zone). Do you feel there is a place for such development within MO? Yes/No

- ✓ 45. If yes, please give details.
-
-

- ✓ 46. The Policy currently requires that at least 20% of the land has slopes of less than 18 degrees. Do you feel this is an appropriate standard? Yes/No

- ✓ 47. If no, what do you feel it should be and why?
-
-

- ✓ 48. Which of the following (if any) were undertaken and submitted as part of your development application to satisfy the requirements of clause 8 of the Policy?

Consultation (with community, private or government organisations)	Yes/No
Preparation of Community plans	Yes/No
Preparation of Land Management plans	Yes/No
Environmental study	Yes/No
Constitution	Yes/No

Other (please specify)

- ✓ 49. If Yes to Q.50, what status is now given to these documents? (Please specify the status of each if more than one applies.) Are they now considered as:

	Mandatory rules	Community Guidelines	Other	Please Discuss
Community Plan			
			
Land Management Plan			
			
Environmental Study			
			
Constitution			
			
Other
.....			

- ✓ 50. Prior to approval of your development application were any of the following issues required (by Council) to be resolved/addressed for your MO in order to satisfy the requirements of clause 8 of the Policy?

Road and Flood Free Access	Yes/No
Impact on Water Quality	Yes/No
Water Supply	Yes/No
Mass Movement/Land Slip	Yes/No
Land Capability	Yes/No
Bushfire Hazard	Yes/No
Fauna & Flora Impact	Yes/No
Waste Disposal	Yes/No
Adjoining Land Uses	Yes/No
Visual Impact	Yes/No

Other (please specify)

51. Since approval, have any of the following issues become a concern to your community, or has council or any State Government agency advised that any are a concern?

State Auth.
(if applicable)

Road and Flood Free Access	Yes/No
Impact on Water Quality	Yes/No
Water Supply	Yes/No
Mass Movement/Land Slip	Yes/No
Land Capability	Yes/No
Bushfire Hazard	Yes/No
Fauna & Flora Impact	Yes/No
Waste Disposal	Yes/No
Adjoining Land Uses	Yes/No
Visual Impact	Yes/No
Financing the Development	Yes/No
Other (please specify)	Yes/No

52. If Yes to any of the above, please state why and advise if a problem still exists:

- (a) Road and Flood Free Access
- (b) Impact on Water Quality
- (c) Water Supply
- (d) Mass Movement/Land Slip
- (e) Land Capability
- (f) Bushfire Hazard
- (g) Fauna & Flora Impact
- (h) Waste Disposal
- (i) Adjoining Land Uses

- (j) Visual Impact
- (k) Financing the Development
- (l) Other (please specify)
- ✓ 53. The Policy currently allows for a minimum allotment size of 10 hectares for MO developments. In your opinion, is this minimum allotment size of 10 hectares appropriate?
- ✓ 54. If No, what should the minimum lot size be and why?
- ✓ 55. Do you feel the density provisions as provided by clause 9 of the Policy are appropriate?
- ✓ 56. If No, what should the provisions be and why?
- ✓ 57. In your opinion is the prohibition on subdivision of MO necessary to ensure the community living objectives of MO will be achieved? Yes/No
- ✓ 58. Please explain your answer
- ✓ 59. Do you feel the community living objectives for MO's could be achieved by other means (e.g. Community Title Subdivision, Strata Title Subdivision, Standard Subdivision) Yes/No
- ✓ 60. Please explain your reason(s):

✓ 61. Do you feel that the requirement for public exhibition of certain MO development applications is appropriate? Yes/No

✓ 62. If no, please explain why:

✓ 63. Do you have any other comments regarding the effectiveness of SEPP 15 for the management of community-based developments on rural lands?

Thank you for your co-operation. In the event that we require further information or clarification of your responses, please supply a contact name (if desired) and phone number.

Contact Details

Community:

Contact Name: (optional)

Phone:

End.

SA

✓ We are aware that many of the terms used in
the questions ^(e.g. 9.3.7) depend upon the definitions used.
Par Com recommends that you determine or choose
the definitions that you would use in your
part situation.

Comments/obj for Newsletter re completion
Survey Form.

11. ~~"Humble" obj 2 re-survey~~

13. ~~Babone~~

General

○ Response is for the community as a whole not from
point of view of any one individual

○ phone inquiries Pan Com - NNC - Pundans.

39 Charges to objectives: None.

40 While the policy ^{using PEPP-1}
Councils have discretion to slightly modify
this stated limit of 8m. We ^{are} not aware
that this limit has ever been an issue
a constraint for any mo. If it has
been a constraint in your mo please
advise of the details for consideration.

42 ~~Please not aware~~ ^{if you mo has been mentioned}
that the restriction to their
by their ^{not being aware of} ^{the restriction to their} ^{of PEPP-1} ^{or I. Land on your}
property would you please advise of
the details.

44 Pan Com view is that:

In the case of dis to a number of other Council areas)
low key tourist facilities as a permissible dev in
zoned rural ~~area~~ ^{area} subject to Council approval.

Pan Com's view is that tourist acc for mo should
be permitted where this is permissible generally
in the rural area.

46. Has the restriction that a level $\geq 7^\circ$ of the land to slopes $< 18^\circ$ been a problem or your man? If so please advise us of the details.

53. PC considers the min lot size of 10 has is app. If this has been a problem or your man? If this has been a problem in your past situation - please ^{contact} ~~advise~~ us.

55. PC members generally have not encountered the density prov as a problem. If this has been a prob for your place ~~advise~~ ^{advise} of the details.

57. PCs opposed to their subdiv being permitted on MOs because

a) it would ~~entirely~~ ^{entirely} the way for the real estate industry to ~~subvert~~ ^{subvert} the policy illegally open up rural land.

b) it would be contrary to the spirit & aim & purpose of the Policy - namely to share land resources etc as a lifestyle.

57. In addition for those who want private title there are good options available in the usual CT, strata title & standard subdiv.

59. No. The concept of individual ~~of~~ ^{of} land is contradictory to "shared land".

Private subdiv is likely to ~~erode~~ ^{erode} other ^{aspects of} community shared gardening of resources and ~~have~~ ^{communal} ~~shared~~ ^{shared} living.

The comment ~~in~~ ^{from} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~document~~ ^{document} 57 above re other options

Community not personal.
Phone

Red Whalley Wapthor Sep
in Bellinger. Red Whalley
at Tynes party.

Southall phone - different teeth no.

pooling of money, ^{and} construction of communal shed,
dorms, roads, quickly purchased.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL

built for light,

etc. opportunities for celebrating, birth, death, marriage,
Christmas etc.

low

safety & security of the home environment, particularly re food
as provides a peer group for growing children

6. EDUCATION

education - share learning skills from others.

has potential to
provide a high QOL over a lifetime time span.

healthy lifestyle

7. HEALTH
alternative to city lifestyle. Imp. as polluted
& socially vulnerable by comparison.
eg street muggings, noise etc cost,
dehumanising, isolation etc

1. LAND

Land (shared) purchased, not otherwise possible

5. ECONOMIC Much cheaper cost of living than in urban
counterpart.

8. OTHER

Pan Coon Newsletter we filling
out Survey Form

o Items sent of social work
carried out -

- free labour on projects
- " " off - -

Craft Market and

Tea House / Trust

Vol. Committee new Primary
Preschool School

local functions / reunions
dances
reforestation

➤ **To quit a non-Windows application**

- Choose the application's exit or quit command.
 - Or, if you are using MS-DOS Prompt, type exit at the command prompt.

The application closes, and you return to Windows.

Note When you quit a non-Windows application that is running in a full screen, you usually return to the Windows desktop just as you left it. However, you can change a setting in the application's program information file (PIF) so that you return to what's called an *inactive window*.

The inactive window captures information from the application that was displayed as you quit the application. Sometimes that type of information stays on the screen too briefly to be read, making the inactive window a convenient feature. For information about creating and modifying a PIF, see Chapter 8, "PIF Editor."

Working with Documents:

This section explains some basic tasks, such as opening, editing, and saving files, that are common to many Windows applications. For information about organizing your applications and documents, see Chapter 3, "Program Manager," and Chapter 4, "File Manager."

Note The procedures in this section apply to the applications supplied with Windows. Other applications might work differently.

Opening Files

Choosing the Open command from an application's File menu opens a dialog box that is often the same regardless of which application you are using. This dialog box is designed to save you time because you can select the drive, directory, file, and file type from the ones displayed in the list boxes.

➤ **To open a file**

1. From the application's File menu, choose Open.

The Open dialog box appears.

MO. Summary 2/2/94

Note for Review of DOP Final Report on Policy Review

The story of MO has not yet been told.
The of how come MO has been so successful. Has not yet been told.
eg. no bankruptcies (not one) of failure rate of small businesses.

The success of MO is not just the quantifiable aspects of achievements. But also the qualitative aspects of his lifestyle & old man.

This form of dev. is here, & here to stay. 1/2 of total settlement.

It has its own internal dynamics & change.

It is humble rather than pretentious.

It does not seek fame, nor is it long-lived.

It does not claim to contain answers to all the world's ills & troubles (nationally & globally).

The emphasis is more on the internal personal self reliance / awareness / attention / fulfillment.

The power of achievement while walking gently on the earth.

There is immense satisfaction (& the conscious & unconscious levels) in successfully being able to achieve deep personal satisfaction. This is only possible in the context of "community".

(2)

Others may (if they so choose) be helped by our achievements.

This experiment can no longer be seen as a 'young bid'.

In the longer time span, however, time will tell. (eg 3 generations).

I believe that meaningful evaluation of the MD Policy can only be made at the end of the second generation & the commencement of the 3rd.

Only at this point it will be possible to look the subject the lifestyle meet an individual, over the whole of their lifespan.

The indications are that, for many at least, it will be rich, rewarding & satisfying.

This difference will be even more marked when comparing with Urban quality of life.

If the Lifestyle comes to provide a social & physical environment where an individual's life needs are satisfied at the deepest level of awareness - & this prevails in the long term, then from a planning point of view the Policy will come to be seen as one of the most far sighted & influential policies of this age.

It is my view that when pop. increase in growth exceeds the meaningful wholistic carrying capacity of the land, as a sustainable

(3)
manner, then all planning policies will come to naught. They will come to be seen as meaningless & pointless.

It may come to be experienced & appreciated that this lifestyle, with its high QOL over the lifespan of the indiv, may come with it a zero pop. growth rate.

From a planning point of view

If such an achievement is brought about as a conscious planning policy, the instigation of such a policy may come to be seen by history as playing a not unimportant part of a movement into a sustainable global community.

In reviewing the efficacy of the Policy from time to time, guidelines are needed on which to base the evaluation.

Part of such a specification should incl. evaluation of the alternatives, viz the QOL comparison.

The present situation is a decreasing QOL in an increasing population. It is to achieve the reverse must be found - if we are not to perish from this planet.

This is the challenge for the planning process.

From this perspective there are many questions that this survey has not even begun to ask.

An encouraging glimmer of acknowledgment of exists in the EPPs inclusion in the 500 guidelines in putting JCH on the agenda.

I welcome this move & am not surprised to see that attention is now to be given to seeking out indicators to "measure" or record this aspect of planning policy.

The app. quantity of human occupation on the earth's land & the prevailing quality of life on the earth, are the two fundamentals of focus for planning.

Anything less than this is simply dealing with an inevitable & recurrent "series" of crises situation (as we move from one crisis to the next)

The evidence suggest that there is a one interdependent.

Disclaimer

The philosophical comment made above are of course; my personal views & are not claimed to be those of the Council

The notion of infinite growth being seen as a desirable & practical goal is like seeing a cancerous growth as being a healthy and inevitable state of being.

CONTENTS OF THE POLICY

- Clause 1** gives the name of the policy.
- Clause 2** states the aims and objectives of the policy.
- Clause 3** defines specific local government areas to which the policy applies. These are listed in Schedule 1. Clause 8(1) limits the applicability of the policy within those areas to rural and non-urban zones. Schedule 2 details lands in rural areas to which the policy does not apply, such as national parks, State forests and scenic protection areas.
- Clause 4** deletes multiple occupancy provisions in local environmental planning instruments existing at the date this policy came into effect. This avoids confusion between SEPP No. 15 and any local environmental planning instrument which contained multiple occupancy provisions prior to this policy.
- Clause 5** defines the terms used in the policy. Note the definition of 'dwelling' allows the concept of expanded dwelling-houses. These are intended to meet the needs of people, not necessarily related, who wish to live as a single household, but in two or more separate structures with shared facilities. This concept is more specifically stated in clause 5(2).
- Clause 6** states the relationship of this policy to other planning instruments. SEPP No. 15 prevails in the event of an inconsistency between it and any other instrument. The date of the making of another instrument does not affect the interpretation of this clause.
- Clause 7** subclause (1) provides that multiple occupancy is a development requiring the council's consent for three or more dwellings on any rural or non-urban land to which this policy applies. However, before a council may consent to a multiple occupancy development, it must ensure that certain conditions are met. These conditions are clearly stated in clause 7(1)(a) to (h).
- Subclause (2) states that this policy allows a development application to be made even though it may be prohibited under another planning instrument, including any local environmental plan. It is an elaboration of clause 4.
- Subclause (3) refers to the condition in 7(1)(b) that land which is the subject of a multiple occupancy development application must be at least ten hectares in area. Subclause (3) recognises that in most local environmental planning instruments the minimum area for subdivision is more than ten hectares. It ensures that a subdivision that would otherwise be illegal under a planning instrument cannot be carried out through the use of this policy.

- Clause 8** lists the matters that a council must consider before determining an application for multiple occupancy.
- Subclause (1) applies to all applications which will result in three or more dwellings.
- Subclause (2) lists additional matters that must be considered where an application will result in four or more dwellings. It prevents a council giving its consent to a multiple occupancy development application proposing four or more dwellings unless the site plan accompanying the application contains the additional information clearly stated in clause 8(2)(a) to (f).
- Clause 9** determines the density of multiple occupancy development which may be permitted on an allotment.
- Subclause (1) gives the formulae for calculating the maximum number of dwellings permissible, including any existing dwellings, based on the area of the allotment. To determine the maximum number of dwellings permissible, substitute the area of the subject land for the letter 'A' in the appropriate formula in column 2 of the table. The answer is easily calculated.
- Clause 9 also provides the maximum permissible density for a given area of land. When it has considered the matters listed in clause 8, a council may determine that a lesser density is more appropriate for a particular development application.
- The formulae are designed so that the density of development decreases as the area of the subject land increases.
- On more than 360 hectares, the maximum number of dwellings permissible is 80 regardless of how much larger than 360 hectares the land area is.
- Subclause (2) states that if the number of permissible dwellings results in a fraction of one-half or greater, it shall be deemed to constitute one whole dwelling. If the fraction is less than one-half, it shall not be deemed to constitute a dwelling and the fraction is ignored.
- Subclause (3) requires that density is also limited by an assessment of the accommodation needs for a population maximum at an average of four persons per permissible dwelling. This provides a way to judge an application which includes expanded dwellings.
- Clause 10** prohibits subdivision of land as part of a multiple occupancy development under this policy. Subclause (2) permits minor subdivisions for particular purposes such as widening a public road, creating a public reserve or consolidating allotments.

Clause 11 provides for multiple occupancy development for four or more dwellings to be advertised for public comment. This clause recognises the fact that the environmental impact of larger multiple occupancy developments is likely to be greater and should therefore be subject to public scrutiny. Public comment can then be taken into consideration by a council in reaching its decision.

Clause 12 enables the Department of Planning to monitor and review the policy. It is considered necessary that councils forward a copy of development applications and notice of determination of these applications to the department so the department can assess how well the demand for multiple occupancy is met by this policy.

Clause 13 suspends provisions of section 37 of the *Strata Titles Act 1973*; and any agreement, covenant or instrument which would otherwise prevent multiple occupancy from being carried out in accordance with (i) this policy; and (ii) the consent of the relevant council made under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* in accordance with this policy.

SCHEDULE 1 lists the local government areas to which the policy applies.

SCHEDULE 2 lists land that is rural or non-urban, but is excluded from the policy.

SCHEDULE 3 removes existing multiple occupancy clauses from local environmental plans.

PLEASE NOTE:

Schedules 1 and 3 of the policy have subsequently been amended in line with the following:

- (i) Severn Local Environmental Plan 1991 gazetted on 27th December, 1991 - introduced provisions for multiple occupancy (MO) in Severn local government area (LGA). Severn was deleted from Schedules 1 and 3;
- (ii) Byron Local Environmental Plan 1992 (Amendment No. 15) gazetted on 1st May, 1992 - introduced MO provisions in Byron LGA. Byron was deleted from Schedule 1.

THE POLICY (Gazetted 22 January 1988;
as amended on 23 November 1990.)

Citation

1. This Policy may be cited as State Environmental Planning Policy No. 15 - Multiple Occupancy of Rural Land.

Aims, objectives etc.

2. The aims, objectives, policies and strategies of this Policy are -
 - (a) to encourage a community based and environmentally sensitive approach to rural settlement;
 - (b) to enable -
 - (i) people to collectively own a single allotment of land and use it as their principal place of residence;
 - (ii) the erection of multiple dwellings on the allotment and the sharing of facilities and resources to collectively manage the allotment; and
 - (iii) the pooling of resources, particularly where low incomes are involved, to economically develop a wide range of communal rural living opportunities, including the construction of low cost buildings; and
 - (c) to facilitate development, preferably in a clustered style -
 - (i) in a manner which both protects the environment and does not create a demand for the unreasonable or uneconomic provision of public amenities or public services by the State or Commonwealth Governments, a council or other public authorities;
 - (ii) in a manner which does not involve subdivision, strata title or any other form of separate land title, and in a manner which does not involve separate legal rights to parts of the land through other means such as agreements, dealings, company shares, trusts or time-sharing arrangements; and
 - (iii) to create opportunities for an increase in the rural population in areas which are suffering or are likely to suffer from a decline in services due to rural population loss.

Land to which this Policy applies

3. (1) Except as provided by subclause (2), this Policy applies to land within the cities, municipalities and shires specified in Schedule 1.
- (2) This Policy does not apply to land specified in Schedule 2.

the carrying out of that development pursuant to any other environmental planning instrument.

- (3) Nothing in subclause (1)(b) shall be construed as authorising the subdivision of land for the purpose of carrying out development pursuant to this Policy.

Amendment of certain environmental planning instruments

4. (1) Each environmental planning instrument specified in Column 1 of Schedule 3 is amended by omitting the clause or matter specified opposite that instrument in Column 2 of that Schedule.
-

Matters for council to consider

8. (1) A council shall not consent to an application made in pursuance of clause 7 unless it has taken into consideration such of the following matters as are of relevance to the development the subject of that application:

- (a) the means proposed for establishing land ownership, dwelling occupancy rights, environmental and community management will ensure the aims and objectives of this Policy are met;
- (b) the area or areas proposed for erection of buildings, including any proposals for the clustering of buildings;
- (c) the area or areas proposed for community use (other than areas for residential accommodation and home improvement areas);
- (d) the need for any proposed development for community use that is ancillary to the use of the land;
- (e) the availability and standard of public road access to the land;
- (f) the availability of a water supply to the land for domestic, agricultural and fire fighting purposes and, where a proposed water supply is from a river, creek, dam or other waterway, the effect upon other users of that water supply;
- (g) if required by the applicant, the availability of electricity and telephone services;
- (h) the availability of community facilities and services to meet the needs of the occupants of the land;
- (i) whether adequate provision has been made for waste disposal from the land;
- (j) the impact on the vegetation cover of the land and any measures proposed for environmental protection, site rehabilitation or reafforestation;
- (k) whether the land is subject to bushfires, flooding, soil erosion or slip and, if so, the adequacy of any measures proposed to protect occupants, buildings, internal access roads, service installations and land adjoining the development from any such hazard;
- (l) the visual impact of the proposed development on the landscape;
- (m) the effect of the proposed development on the present and potential use, including agricultural use, of the land and of lands in the vicinity;
- (n) whether resources of coal, sand, gravel, petroleum or other mineral or extractive deposits will be sterilised by the proposed development;
- (o) the effect of the proposed development on the quality of the water resources in the vicinity;

- (p) any land claims by local Aboriginals and the presence of any Aboriginal relics and sites;
- (q) whether the land has been identified by the council as being required for future urban or rural residential expansion;
- (r) whether the development would benefit an existing village centre suffering from a declining population base or a decreasing use of the services provided in that centre.

(2) The council shall not consent to an application made in pursuance of clause 7 for the carrying out of development on land for the purposes of four or more dwellings unless the site plan accompanying the application identifies -

- (a) vegetated areas requiring environmental protection or areas where rehabilitation or reafforestation will be carried out;
- (b) any part of the land which is subject to a risk of flooding, bushfire, landslip or erosion or any other physical constraint to development of the land in accordance with this Policy;
- (c) any part of the land that is prime crop and pasture land;
- (d) any areas of the land to be used for development other than for dwellings;
- (e) the source and capacity of any water supply, electricity, telephone and waste disposal systems for the dwellings; and
- (f) the proposed access from a public road to the area or areas in which the dwellings are to be situated.

Density of development

9. (1) Subject to subclause (2), a council shall not consent to an application made in pursuance of clause 7 for the carrying out of development on land unless the number of proposed dwellings on the land, together with any existing dwellings on the land, does not exceed the number calculated in accordance with the formula specified in Column 2 of the Table to this clause opposite the area of the land specified in Column 1 of that Table.

(2) If the number calculated in accordance with the formula as referred to in subclause (1) includes a fraction, the number shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number in the case of a fraction of one-half or more or rounded down to the nearest whole number in the case of a fraction of less than one-half.

TABLE

Column 1

Column 2

SCHEDULE 1

(Cl. 3)

Armidale
 Ballina
 Barraba
 Bathurst
 Bega Valley
 Bellingen
 Bingara
 Blayney
 Bombala
 Byron
 Casino
 City of Greater Cessnock
 City of Greater Lithgow
 City of Maitland
 City of Shoalhaven
 Coffs Harbour
 Cooma-Monaro
 Copmanhurst
 Cowra
 Dumaresq
 Dungog
 Eurobodalla
 Evans
 Glen Innes
 Gloucester
 Goulburn
 Grafton
 Great Lakes
 Greater Taree
 Guyra
 Inverell
 Kempsey

Kyogle
 Lake Macquarie
 Lismore
 Maclean
 Manilla
 Merriwa
 Mudgee
 Mulwaree
 Murrumbidgee
 Muswellbrook
 Nundle
 Nymboida
 Oberon
 Orange
 Parry
 Port Stephens
 Quirindi
 Richmond River
 Rylstone
 Scone
 Severn
 Singleton
 Tallaganda
 Tamworth
 Tenterfield
 Tweed
 Ulmarra
 Uralla
 Walcha
 Yallaro

SCHEDULE 2

(Cl. 3)

Land which is a national park, historic site, nature reserve, Aboriginal area, State recreation area, protected archaeological area or game reserve within the meaning of the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974*.

Land which is a reserve within the meaning of Part IIIB of the *Crown Lands Consolidation Act 1913* or which is vacant land within the meaning of that Act.

Land which is subject to the *Western Lands Act 1901*.

Land which is a State forest, flora reserve or timber reserve within the meaning of the *Forestry Act 1916*.

Land which, under an environmental planning instrument, is within an area or zone (within the meaning of that instrument) identified in that instrument by the description -

- (a) Coastal lands acquisition;
- (b) Coastal lands protection;
- (c) Conservation;
- (d) Escarpment;
- (e) Environment protection;
- (f) Environmental protection;
- (g) Open space;
- (h) Rural environmental protection;
- (i) Scenic;
- (j) Scenic protection;
- (k) Water catchment;
- (l) Proposed national park,

or identified in that instrument by a word or words cognate with any word or words used in paragraph (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k) or (l) or by a description including a word or words so used and any other word or words.

Land to which Eurobodalla Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987 applies.

SCHEDULE 3

(Cl. 4)

COLUMN 1	COLUMN 2
Environmental Planning Instrument	Clause or Matter
Interim Development Order No. 40 - Lismore	15, 16(3) and Schedule 6
Interim Development Order No. 2 - Shire of Bibbenluke	23
Interim Development Order No. 1 - Shire of Evans	28, 29, 30 and Schedule 5
Interim Development Order No. 1 - Shire of Severn	13A
Interim Development Order No. 1 - Shire of Terania	13A and 13B(3)
Interim Development Order No. 1 - Shire of Ulmarra	13A
Interim Development Order No. 1 - Shire of Woodburn	13B
Interim Development Order No. 1 - Shire of Byron	11B and Schedule 8
Gloucester Local Environmental Plan No. 4	18
Great Lakes Local Environmental Plan No. 28	12
Nymboida Local Environmental Plan 1986	12 and 15
Orange Local Environmental Plan No. 11	29
Tweed Local Environmental Plan 1987	34.

1-2-94

Leigh Knight re non appearance of advertisement
to register for survey

Ad's placed by HO who couldn't do it in time due
to public holiday!

Will be run in NS tomorrow Wed 2 & Sat 5
& Byron Echo this week. (not in Echo)

She spoke with Grinton yesterday. Their target is to
have the survey out on 18th & will be a
Councils (one day each) between 28 Feb & 4 March

Copy of ad. has been FAXed to Darrin.

DOP has done 1st type (Theor has made changes) & second
type today.

Asked her to incl "Joint Thrusts" in option. She agreed.

7/1/94

Dop Leigh

Latest survey draft being FAXed out
today (see over).

Would like response by Mon 7 R.

Mailout will go to

○ Such Council lists as they can get

○ Registrants to add.

○ They may ask messg. & Per Com
for any additions etc.

red

✓ Not red

FAX of Survey.

✓ Rob. 895301 10 pages

✓ Slapp 224225

✓ Senora 886193 ✓

Di (NMC) 891492

✓ Peter Com. Act. ✓

✓ Irving 224167 ✓

Hark. ✓