ER EDUNCIL S CA Servey Completed by SURVEY Eddie

$ \cup$

SEPP 15 REVIEW MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY (MO) OF RURAL LANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENT SURVEY

00034

1.	Has Council used SEPP 15 to approve MO development applications within its rural zones?	Yes No	<u>미</u>
٠	If No, go to Question 2		٠,
(0)	Dience complete the following Common of Davidson A. C.		

a) Please complete the following Summary of Development Applications approved by Council using SEPP 15 Provision:

YEAR	Number of DAs approved	Total Dwellings	Number of DAs Notified to DOP
1988	٦ . ٦	43	6
1989	5	17.	5
1990	3	. 6	. 3
1991	3	9	٠ ك ٠
1992	5	42_	- 3
1993	2	6	. 3
TOTAL	25	118	22

(b)	What is the average size in hectares of MO developments approved by Co last five years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one box only)	uncil over the
	· 0 - 10 ha 🔲 11-40 ha 🗍 41-80 ha 🗹 81-210 ha 🗍 211-360 ha 🗍	>360 ha 🗆
(c)	Please list the main themes present in approved MO developments using SEPI	P 15
· ·	Share-farming Horticulture Permi-culture Permi-culture Rural-residential Rainforest living/preservation Tourist-oriented Weekend/Holiday Homes Other (Please Specify)	व - व व व व व व व



			ا.
ż	Has Council used SEPP 15 to refuse MO development applications Yes within its rural zones? No	(c) Please list the main themes present in these approved MO developments using its l provisions.	LEF
	If No, go to Question 3	Share-farming	
		Horticulture	
(a)	How many MO applications have been refused by Council over the	Rural-residential	
	last five years using SEPP 15?	Rainforest living/preservation	
(b)	What were the main reasons for refusal of MO development applications using SEPP 15.	Tourist-oriented	
	Extent of prime ag. land; dwellings on prime ag. land;	Weekend/Holiday Homes	
		Other (Please Specify)	
	dispersed settlement; insufficient information re		
	water, effluent disposed, risk and hazard; impacts of	4. Has Council used its LEP provisions to refuse MO development Yes applications within its rural zones?	
	adjoining devely; inadequale site plans	If No, go to "Instructions" below.	
(c)	Is it usual practice for Council to notify DOP of these refusals? Yes No	(a) How many MO applications have been <u>refused</u> by Council over the last five years using its LEP?	٠.
		(b) What were the main reasons for <u>refusal</u> of MO development applications using its LEP.	
3.	Does Council have MO provisions within any of its LEP(s) which Yes Control the development of MOs in rural zones?	Adverce impad on adjoining land user, lack of	
	If No, please go to Question 4	buffer (separation), lack of information.	
(a)	Please complete the following Summary of Development Applications approved by Council using its LEP provisions:	Also various 290(1) issues deficiencies	· • •

	YEAR Number of DAs approved Total Dwellings		
	1988	Please attach a copy of your LEP provisions with your completed questionnaire.	
	1989	Instructions	
	1990	IC man have a server at NY of the	
	1991	If you have answered No to all questions above, you need go no further. Please fill in details at the end and return the questionnaire. Thank you for your assistance.	the
	1992	The following questions relate to all MO development in rural areas regardless of whet they were approved under SEPP 15 or Council's LEP.	her
•	TOTAL	5. How many MO development applications are currently before Council which are subject	t to:
<i>a</i> .s			
(p)	What is the average size in hectares of MO developments approved by Council over the last five years using its LEP provisions? (Please tick one box only)	SEPP 15?	
	y world to be provided to tome one out only)	Council's LEP provisions?	
	0-10 ha 🗆 11-40 ha 🗀 41-80 ha 🗀 81-210 ha 🗀 211-360 ha 🗀 > 360 ha 🗀		

2

Purdon Associates 1993 SEPP 15 REVIEW © Purdon Associates 1993

SEPP 15 REVIEW

6.	Over the last 12 months, has the number of MO applications: (please tick one)		10.	What is the predominant dwelling type constructe (please tick one)	d on MO de	velopme	ents in	your L	JGA?
•	declined? ☐ remained constant? ☑ increased? ☐ OR were no applications received? ☐	•		* Individual single family dwelling units dispersed Individual single family dwelling units clustered	throughout si	ite on			
7.	Since 1988, Has the rural population in your LGA: (please tick one)	. 1		of site Clusters of expanded dwellings with shared facility Individual expanded dwelling with shared facility	lities ies	•			
	declined? remained constant? increased?			Other (please specify) combination of	* 90001	٤.		□	•
	If the rural population increased:		11.	Does SEPP 15 conflict with Council's rural instruments?	planning po	olicy	Yes No	a	
	(a) can a significant portion of this increase be attributed Yes to MO developments? No	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(a)	If Yes, In what way?				y)	
	(b) If the rural population increased, have MOs been more Yes			Other forms of irral develop.					
٠	successful than other forms of rural settlement in creating No population increase?	"		are more constrained in term	ms . of . !	locat	ر ببخر		
	(other folms of rural settlement have	<u>}</u>		somiced required atc			• • • •		
· 8.	In Council's opinion, is the minimum allotment size of 10 hectares No an appropriate minimum standard?		12.	Using the following 5-point scale, please indicate SEPP 15 Objectives are being met by MOs in your	how successful LGA.	ully eac	h of th	e follo	wing
(a)	If No, what should the minimum lot size be?	, . 			Not Successful	•		Succe	Very essful
	Please explain your reasons.	····· '		Encourage community based rural settlement; Encourage environmentally sensitive rural	. 1	2	3	0	5
	***************************************			settlement;	1	2 .	③	4	5
•	***************************************			Enable collective living; Enable sharing of facilities and resources;	1	2	3	• •	5
9.	Are the descine and the control of t			Enable pooling of resources;	ì	2	3 3	4	5
7.	Are the density standards established by SEPP 15 appropriate? Yes No			Facilitate clustered style rural development; Avoid demand for Council/Government	1	2	3	4	·5
(a)	If No, what should the standard be? bensities should be holved with higher densities (up to present SEPP standards) only possible if development is clustered and land	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		services; ★ Avoid subdivision of rural land;	1 1	2	3	4	5 (5)
	possible if development is clustered and land capability adequate.	 2	* Av (a)	Increase in rural population: Swer given on basis that MOs soldered to be de-facto fragmen If the objectives are not being adequately mer, why	are hot	2	3	4	5
(b)	Please explain your reasons. Density should be based on enviorage and of land, compatibility with adjoining pot land use and some degree of relativity to existing residential dwelling densities of MOS in	attens	(ω)	See attached opinion regar	dlag. ob	jech:			(iii)
				10 11 1 1					
	<u> </u>			·					

ğ		ì.
ž	الم ا	1

13.,	Has the policy resulted in previously illegal rural d being legalised in your LGA?	wellings		Yes No	ϫ		
- •	If No, please explain why? Partially, some 'illegal' MOS	. have	യക്ക	vanit	L. u	 h	1
	sought regularisation due t	و ج جمع	ې اد	من بخر	leol	cir.	
	concerning collection of so	it lonie	'S: :	·		•••	l
	***************************************	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			· · · · ·	· . :	
14.	Using the following 5-point scale, please indicate to each SEPP 15 objective in the assessment of MC	the relative in developmen	nportan t applic	ce giver ations?	by Co	uncil	
		Not				Very	
		Important		•	Impo	•	
	Encourage community based rural settlement; Encourage environmentally sensitive rural	1	2	3	(5	:
	settlement;	1	2	3	4	. 5	į
	Enable collective living;	. 1	2	(3)	4 :	. 5	ŀ
	Enable sharing of facilities and resources; Enable pooling of resources;	i	2	\mathfrak{G}	4	5	
	Facilitate clustered style rural development;	. 1	2	(3)	4	5	1
	Avoid demand for Council/Government	1,	2	3	(5 .	
	services;	1	2 .	3	④	5	
	Avoid subdivision of rural land;	1 .	2	3	4	(5)	
	Increase in rural population;	, l	(3)	3	4	5	
15.	Have any MO applications received by Council bee documentation:	n accompanie	ed by a	iny of th	ie follov	wing _	•
	Proposed ownership/occupancy structures			Yes	□ No	P	
	Community plans			Yes			
	Land Management plans			Yes	□ No	<u></u>	
	Other (please specify)	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• •	Yes	□ No		
(a)	In general, have the developments occurred in accoplans/documents?	rdance with t	hese	Yes No Not k	⊡ □ ⁄nown	© ⁄	
		•	•				

	•	•
16.	In general, does Council feel that they can enforce such plans/documents?	Yes □ No □
(a)	If No, Please explain why	
	Inadednate resonnce?	
17.	Which of the following should be a requirement of application?	•
	Proposed ownership/occupancy structures	Yes 🗹 No 🗆
• •	Community plans	Yes 🗹 No 🛘
	Land management plans Other (please specify) Statement of Environ'	Yes 🖳 No 🗆
	Other (please specify) statement of Environ (Effects addressing SEPP clauses a sach	Yes A No .
(a)	Please explain your reasons.	
:	Provides Council and community a bother	opportunity
	to proporty assess DAs and provides sor	na certainty
18.	Compared with other rural residential/living development application Council resources is taken up in the determination of each MO develop (please tick one only)	s, what level of oment application?
	More than average ☐ Average ☐ Less than average ☐	
19.	In your opinion, what are the three main advantages of MO developmen to 3 only with 1 being the biggest advantage).	ts? (please rank 1
	Alternative lifestyle opportunities	١
	Lower cost rural living	
	Good environmental management (e.g. decreased land degradation)	•••••••
	Improved land management practises (e.g. decreased weed	************
	infestations)	
	Introduction of new forms of agricultural activity	3
	Continued use of land for agriculture	,
	Innovative house styles	3
	Increased bushfire fighting facilities	2.0.=
	Other (please specify) Increases in population socio-	c(w 1
	The state of the s	
		•

,20.	In your opinion, what are the three main disadvantages of MO developments? (please rank 1 to 3 only - with 1 being the biggest disadvantage).	24	4. In Council's opinion is the prohibition on subdivision of MO Yes & developments necessary to maintain the philosophy behind the No SEPP 157. Subdivisor of an MO is a fundamental
	Increased demand for Council services	. (2	contradicted to the present of t
	Social disruption		"multide" occupancy of land Retaining one lot
•	Increased traffic on rural roads	·	1915 TOURS CONCEPT OF COMMUNAL OWNERSHIP and
	Interference with traditional agricultural activities		focuses the social and anvironmental abjection and
•	Lower property values		focuses the social and anviron mental objections and aspirations of the occupants and also provides a
	Non-payment of rates		low cost mechanism to provide affordable housing
	Adverse environmental impact (e.g. increased land degradation)	•	
	Increased bushfire hazard		
	Poor land management practises (e.g. increased weed infestations)		
	Increased conflict between different land uses	. 24	5. Could the community living objectives for MO's be achieved by other forms of and
	Adverse effect on water quality	٤.	 Could the community living objectives for MO's be achieved by other forms of rural residential development such as:
٠.	Poor solid waste disposal practices		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Other (please specify)		Standard Subdivision Yes Cl. No. 177
21.	What is the general community attitude towards MO developments?	1	Strata Title Yes □ No ☑ Community Title Yes □ No ☑
	0		152 U WO E
	Opposed □ Neutral □ Mixed ☑ Supportive □	(a	a) Please explain your reason(s). Subdivision creates an appointming for
(a)	If opposed, what are the nature and reasons for this opposition?	, ,	"individual ownership" of part of the land not with- standing other shaled tacilities may exist This is contradictory to the concept of all property being vester
	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••		in the group - a key principle of Moserty being vester
			2.004 c 122 filesoft c 2.
		•	
22.	Have any MO developments received opposition at the time of Yes public notification?	(b	What implications would such subdivision have locally?
	N/A		Dramatic increase in unplamed royal settlement
(a)	If Yes, what were the main reasons for this opposition?		because MO provisions do not contain location or
	lack of into mation in DA, lack of applicants knowledge of subject land impact on roads adverse effect an water supplies, impact on adjoining properties, conflicts with agricultural uses		amount of MO development.
(b)	Where the development has been completed, were the concerns Yes		6. Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of Yes
	realised?		existing MO developments?
	(raidy)		no uz
23.	In general, what is the attitude of adjacent landowners to MO developments? Opposed Neutral Mixed Supportive		7. Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO: Yes developments to enable their subdivision under community title No.
			legislation? Note: Only if the land complied with councils Rural.
			Residential Policy
		_	1011 Ca
	•		



O t	 ١
_ ∩ [- 1
₾.	 - 1
ا∵⊆	*
DL (_

28.	Is Council aware of instances where MO applications have been submitted with the intended use being for conventional rural residential purposes rather than communal/community living?	 !	32.	Is Council satisfied that, in comparison with other rural residential developments, MO developments adequately contribute towards the cost of funding services and infrastructure?
(a)	If Yes, What is the main reason applicants have chosen MO over other forms of Land Tenure? (please select one reason only)		(a).	If No, please explain why. Rates reflect land value vather than domaind for
	Development cost Fewer legal land management requirements Avoidance of zoning requirements Avoidance of minimum lot sizes in planning instruments Other (please specify)		33.	services. A large MO may pay voter little move than a farm with only one family
29.	In Council's opinion, does cluster housing offer advantages for Yes environmentally sensitive land management over those offered by No Council in Council's opinion, does cluster housing offer advantages for Yes environmentally sensitive land management over those offered by No Council in Council is opinion, does cluster housing offer advantages for Yes environmentally sensitive land management over those offered by No Council is opinion.		(a)	on MO developments? No W N/A If No, please explain why Rodes needs to include additional
(a)	If Yes, what are the main advantages? (please rank 1 to 3 only).	1		charge par occupied site on an MO ie a
	Limits road construction 3.			special rate is needed
	Minimises vegetation clearance Eases servicing Increases fire protection	i		•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
	Other (please specify)	!	34.	How many rural residential Community Title subdivisions are located in your LGA?
30.	Using the following code, please indicate how frequently each of the following community facilities are constructed as part of existing MO developments? ($l = never$, $2 = sometimes$, $3 = often$, $4 = always$)	1	35.	How many applications for rural residential Community Title subdivisions in your LGA has Council received in the last 12 months?
	Community shop Play equipment		36.	Would Council prefer to: (please select one only)
	Schools Community hall Artists workshops/gallery Farm buildings Stables Other (please specify)	•		Introduce a replacement provision in Council's LEP? Revoke SEPP 15 Retain SEPP 15 in its present form? Retain SEPP 15 in an amended form? Other? (please specify)
31.	Do you have a Section 94 Plan which enables you to levy Yes Contributions on MO developments?		(a)	If you would prefer to amend SEPP 15, what changes would improve its operation? Rework objectives to make practical in intent and
(a)	If Yes, What level of Section 94 contributions, if any have been			application. Remark densities to be based on particula
	applied to MO sites? (please indicate in 8 per dwelling unit) variable Most of levy is for rural road \$3,000 - \$6,000 up-grading with charges increasing for more isolated			local gout area and land capabilities (Refer Councils draft DCP for MO, -attached)
	147 -441 -447	•		



37.	Do you have any other comments regarding the effectiveness of SEPP 15 for the management of community-based developments on rural lands?
	Mase refer to information Council has supplied
	to Chris Murray (Discussion paper; and
•	various reports)
٠	
Than clarif	k you for your co-operation. In the event that we require further information or ication of your responses, please supply a contact name and phone number
Conta	act Details
Name	Malcoln Scoth
Positi	on Davelopment Control Planner
Coun	cil: Lismore Coty Council
Phone	s: 066 250 500

Work Copy Coural Review

V.R.D.	
ا ۵۰	ш

SEPP 15 REVIEW MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY (MO) OF RURAL LANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENT SURVEY

00034

1.	Has Council used SEPP 15 to within its rural zones?	approve MO development application	ons	Yes No	छ
	If No, go to Question 2		•	110	٠.

Please complete the following Summary of Development Applications approved by Council using SEPP 15 Provision:

YEAR	Number of DAs approved	Total Dwellings	Number of DAs Notified to DOP
1988		43	٠. ل
1989 .	5	12.	5
1990	3	. 6	. 3
1991	3 .	9	. 2
1992	5	42	3
1993	2	6	3
TOTAL	25	118	2.2

(ъ)	What is the average size in hectares of MO developments approved by Coulast five years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one box only)	ncil over
	0 - 10 ha 🗆 11-40 ha 🗀 41-80 ha 🗹 81-210 ha 🗀 211-360 ha 🗆	> 360 ha [
(c)	Please list the main themes present in approved MO developments using SEPP	15
- -	Share-farming Horticulture Permi-culture Permi-culture Rural-residential Rainforest living/preservation Tourist-oriented Weekend/Holiday Homes Other (Please Specify)	व्या त्र व्यव्य



		incil used SEPP 1 s rural zones?	15 to <u>re</u>	fuse MO	development a	applications	Yes No	
	If No, go	to Question 3			•		•	
)		ny MO applicatio years using SEPP		been <u>re</u>	fused by Counc	il over the	· .	2
)	What we	re the main reaso	ns for p	efusal of	MO developme	nt applications	using S	SEPP 15.
		ti of prime						
		used settl						•
	•			,		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
		r, effluend	•			,	-	ick of
	aq10;	ning deve	ᆟ	بوبين	لافأنظف	site plains	:	
	Is it usus	al practice for Co	uncil .to	notify D	OP of these refi	usals?	Yes No	□ □
	control t	ouncil have MO pute development o	f MOs			EP(s) which	Yes No	□ ⊌
)	Please c	lease go to Questi omplete the follow LEP provisions:		mmary o	f Development	Applications ag	proved	by Council
	YEAR	Number of DAs ap	proved	Total Dw	ellings	•		
	1988							
	1989							
	1990					:		
	1991		:					
1	1992							
;	1993							
	TOTAL	<u> </u>						
)		the average size years using its L					y Coun	cil over the
	0-10 ha	☐ 11-40 ha ☐	41-8	0 ha 🗆	81-210 ha 🗆	211-360 ha 🗆] >:	360 ha 🗆
(b)	last five	years using its L	EP prov	visions? (Please tick one	box only)	_	_

(c)	Please list the main themes present in these approved MO develops provisions.	ments usi	ng its	LEP
.•	Share-farming Horticulture Permi-culture Rural-residential Rainforest living/preservation		00000	
	Tourist-oriented Weekend/Holiday Homes Other (Please Specify)	•		•
4.	Has Council used its LEP provisions to refuse MO development applications within its rural zones?	Yes No	<u> </u>	
	If No, go to "Instructions" below.			•
(a)	How many MO applications have been <u>refused</u> by Council over the last five years using its LEP?	·		
(ь)	What were the main reasons for refusal of MO development application	as using it	s LEP	
	Adverce impad on adjoining land usec,	lack	<u>ا</u> ن.	
	buffer (separation) lack of information			
	Also various saou) issues deficiencies			
٠	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
	Please attach a copy of your LEP provisions with your completed qu	uestionņa	ire.	
Instru	ections			
If you details	t have answered No to all questions above, you need go no furthers at the end and return the questionnaire. Thank you for your assist	. Please ance.	fill in	ı the
The f	ollowing questions relate to all MO development in rural areas reguers approved under SEPP 15 or Council's LEP.	gardless (of whe	ther
5.	How many MO development applications are currently before Council v	which are	subjec	it to:
	SEPP 15? Council's LEP provisions?		<u>i</u>	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•

6.	Over the last 12 months, has the number of MO applications: (please tick one)	 What is the predominant dwelling type constructed o (please tick one) 	n MO developments in your LGA?
	declined? ☐ remained constant? ☑ increased? ☐ OR were no applications received? ☐	 ★ Individual single family dwelling units dispersed thr ★ Individual single family dwelling units clustered on of site 	one portion
7.	Since 1988, Has the rural population in your LGA: (please tick one) declined? remained constant? increased?	Clusters of expanded dwellings with shared facilities Individual expanded dwelling with shared facilities Other (please specify) Combination of	<u> </u>
	If the rural population increased:	11. Does SEPP 15 conflict with Council's rural pla instruments?	unning policy Yes 🗹 No 🗆
	(a) can a significant portion of this increase be attributed to MO developments? (b) If the rural population increased, have MOs been more Yes	(a) If Yes, In what way? Other forms of jural developme	
•	successful than other forms of rural settlement in creating No [] population increase? (other tolms of rural settlement have been constrained eg zoning) Yes	are more constrained in terms	w.i
8.	In Council's opinion, is the minimum allotment size of 10 hectares No an appropriate minimum standard?	 Using the following 5-point scale, please indicate how SEPP 15 Objectives are being met by MOs in your LG 	successfully each of the following A.
(a)	If No, what should the minimum lot size be?		Not Very Successful Successful
	Please explain your reasons.	Encourage community based rural settlement; Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement; Enable collective living; Enable sharing of facilities and resources;	1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
9.	Are the density standards established by SEPP 15 appropriate? Yes No	Enable pooling of resources; Facilitate clustered style rural development; Avoid demand for Council/Government	1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
(a)	If No, what should the standard be? lensities should he holived with higher donsities (up to present SEPP standards) only possible if development is clustered and land capability adequate.	services; * Avoid subdivision of rural land; Increase in rural population; * Answer given on basis that 110s are considered to be de-tacto fragmenta (a) If the objectives are not being adequately mer, why is the	1 ② 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 ⑤ e んって 2 3 ④ 5 かっこ. nis the case?
(b)	Please explain your reasons. Density should be baced on environ'l capacity of land, compatibility with adjoining patterns of land use and some degree of relativity to existing residential dwelling dansities of MOs in LEA	See attached opinion regards no consus collector districts to dedining population	ng objective 2(c)(iii)

	(please tick one)		•		
	 ★ Individual single family dwelling units dispersed ★ Individual single family dwelling units clustered 	d throughout site i on one portion			
	of site Clusters of expanded dwellings with shared facilitation of the companies of the co	ties	•	(a)	•
11.	Does SEPP 15 conflict with Council's rural instruments?	planning policy	Yes No	e /	
(a)	If Yes, In what way? Other follows of jural develop	ylovni knem	ابع ا	rovsi	પ્રવુ.
	are more constrained in terms	ms of loce	ر بیمبد) e e e e e	> Ç 9
12.	Using the following 5-point scale, please indicate SEPP 15 Objectives are being met by MOs in your	how successfully e	ach of the	ne follo	wing
		Not Successful	•	Succe	Very ssful
	Encourage community based rural settlement; Encourage environmentally sensitive rural	i 2	3	0	~ <u>`</u> 5
	settlement; Enable collective living;	1 2 1 2	. ③	4	5
	Enable sharing of facilities and resources; Enable pooling of resources; Facilitate clustered style rural development;	1 2 1 2 1 2	3 3	. 4	5 5 5
	Avoid demand for Council/Government services; * Avoid subdivision of rural land; Increase in rural population; Super given on basis, that MOs	1 2 . 1 2	3 3 3	4 4	5
(a)	If the objectives are not being adequately met, why	is this the case?	ء ميدا	•	ا زندام
	see attached opinion roga-				 (;ii)
	dedining population				<i>.</i>



13.	Has the policy resulted in previously illegal rural d being legalised in your LGA?	wellings		Yes No	: @ _	
•	If No, please explain why? Partially, some 'illegal' MOS	. have	abba	.vanit	ly w	 . t e
	sought regularisation due to	ةغ. لخ <i>غ</i>	sł. C	مر مخ	.Poli	جبير
	concerning collection of so	it lovi	د د د			
						:
14.	Using the following 5-point scale, please indicate to each SEPP 15 objective in the assessment of MC	he relative ii developmer	mportano it applica	ce given ations?	by Cor	ıncil
		Not			,	Very
	,	Importan	t	•	Impo	•
	Encourage community based rural settlement; Encourage environmentally sensitive rural	1	2	3	4 : .	5
	settlement;	1	2	3	4	5
	Enable collective living;	. 1	2	③	4	5
	Enable sharing of facilities and resources;	1	2	(3)	4	5
	Enable pooling of resources;	. 1	2	(3)	4	- 5
	Facilitate clustered style rural development; Avoid demand for Council/Government	1	2	3	(5 .
	services;	1	2	3	④	5
	Avoid subdivision of rural land;	1 .	2	3	4	(3)
	Increase in rural population;	1	②	3	4	5
15.	Have any MO applications received by Council bee documentation:	n accompani	ed by a	лу of th	e follow	ving
	Proposed ownership/occupancy structures			Yes	□ No	19
	Community plans				□ No	_
	Land Management plans			Yes	□ No	Œ/
	Other (please specify)			Yes l	⊃ No	
(a)	In general, have the developments occurred in accorplans/documents?	rdance with (these	.Yes No Not K	Onown	Q⁄

16.	In general, does Council feel that they can enforce such Yes D plans/documents?
a)	If No, Please explain why
	Inadequate resources
17.	Which of the following should be a requirement of application?
,	Proposed ownership/occupancy structures Community plans Land management plans Other (please specify) Statement of Environ Effects addressing SEPP clauses a square of Environ Effects addressing SEPP clauses a square of Environ Effects addressing SEPP clauses a square of Environ Other (please specify)
a)	Please explain your reasons.
	Provides Council and community a bother opportunity
	for future occupiers. DAs and provides come containty
8.	Compared with other rural residential/living development applications, what level of Council resources is taken up in the determination of each MO development application? (please tick one only)
	More than average ☐ Average ☐ Less than average ☐
9.	In your opinion, what are the three main advantages of MO developments? (please rank 1 to 3 only with 1 being the biggest advantage).
	Alternative lifestyle opportunities Lower cost rural living Good environmental management (e.g. decreased land degradation) Improved land management practises (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 Other (please specify) Intended in population socio-econ and cultural diversity of legion
	<u> </u>

.20.	In your opinion, what are the three main disadvantages of MO developments? (please rank 1 to 3 only - with 1 being the biggest disadvantage).	24.	In Council's opinion is to developments necessary to SEPP 157 . Soled
	Increased demand for Council services	. (a)	Please explain why Cower
	Social disruption	. (4)	" multiple " occupa
	Increased traffic on rural roads		roinforces the co
	Interference with traditional agricultural activities	• •	focuses the soci
•	Lower property values	,	assinations of a
	Non-payment of rates		low cost mechan
	Adverse environmental impact (e.g. increased land degradation)		
	Increased bushfire hazard		
	Poor land management practises (e.g. increased weed infestations)		
	Increased conflict between different land uses	. 25.	Could the community living
	Adverse effect on water quality		residential development such
•	Poor solid waste disposal practices		
	Other (please specify)		Standard Subdivision Strata Title
21.	What is the general community attitude towards MO developments?		Community Title
	Opposed □ Neutral □ Mixed ☑ Supportive □	(a)	Please explain your reason(s)
(a)	If opposed, what are the nature and reasons for this opposition?	(4)	"individual oune
			contradictory to
22			
22.	Have any MO developments received opposition at the time of Yes public notification?	(b)	What implications would suc
	No N/A		Dramatic Increase
(a)	If Yes, what were the main reasons for this opposition?		pocause MO pr
	lack of information in DA, lack of applicants knowledge		of the throme.
	of subject land impact on roads adverse effect on water supplies, impact on adjoining proporties, conflicts with agricultural uses		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
(b)	Where the development has been completed, were the concerns Yes	26.	Has Council received repe
.,,	realised?	20.	existing MO developments?
23.	In general, what is the attitude of adjacent landowners to MO developments?	27.	Would Council be receptive
	Opposed □ Neutral □ Mixed ☑ Supportive □		developments to enable the legislation? Note: Only if the residential

•	developments necessary to maintain the philosophy behind the SEPP 15? Subdivisor of an MO is a	Yes @ No D Rudamental
)	Please explain why contradiction to the very community ple occupancy of land. Retaining roinforces the concept of communation	one lot nousbacked
-	focuses the social and anvivonmental easyvations of the occupants and also plan cost mechanism to provide afforda	bjectives and volvides a ble housing
•	Could the community living objectives for MO's be achieved by o residential development such as:	ther forms of rural
	Standard Subdivision	Yes 🗆 No 🗗
	Strata Title	Yes 🛭 No 🗹
	Community Title	Yes 🗆 No 😉
	Please explain your reason(s). Subdivition creates an operativities of the land standing other shared facilities may existent adultion to the concept of all prope in the group — a key principle of Mos.	al not with-
	What implications would such subdivision have locally?	
	Dramatic increase in unplanned roval e	ettlement
	because MO provisions do not contain.	
	amount of MO dayelopmand.	
	Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of existing MO developments?	Yes □ No □
	Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO developments to enable their subdivision under community title legislation?	Yes ☑ No ☐
	Note: Only if the land complied with council Residential Policy	ls Rural



-6	• •			
28.	Is Council aware of instances where MO applications have been submitted with the intended use being for conventional rural No residential purposes rather than communal/community living?	.	* 32.	Is Council satisfied that, in comparison with other rural residential Yes developments, MO developments adequately contribute towards the cost of funding services and infrastructure?
(a)	If Yes, What is the main reason applicants have chosen MO over other forms of	f Lond .	(a).	If No, please explain why.
٠:	Tenure? (please select one reason only)	Land		Rates reflect land value rather than domand for
	Development cost		,	
	Fewer legal land management requirements			services. A large MO may pay rates little more
	Avoidance of zoning requirements	l		than a farm with only one family
	Avoidance of minimum lot sizes in planning instruments Other (please specify)			•
	Ottler (prease specify)		33.	Is Council satisfied with the current arrangements for levying rates Yes
29.	In Council's opinion, does cluster housing offer advantages for Yes			on MO developments?
	environmentally sensitive land management over those offered by			. N/A 🗆
	dispersed housing?		(a)	If No, please explain why Rodes needs to Include addutional
(a)	If Yes, what are the main advantages? (please rank 1 to 3 only).	1		charge per occupied site on an MO ie a
		١ -		
•	Limits road construction 3 Avoids land slip		•	special rate is needed
	Notice that the second			
	Eases servicing	····		
	Increases fire protection	••••		
	Other (please specify)	•••	34.	How many rural residential Community Title subdivisions are
30.	Using the following code, please indicate how for the state of the sta			located in your LGA?
	Using the following code, please indicate how frequently each of the following comm facilities are constructed as part of existing MO developments? $(I = I)$	nunity	35.	How many applications for rural residential Community Title
	2 = sometimes, $3 = often$, $4 = always$)	never,		subdivisions in your LGA has Council received in the last 12
				months?
	Community shop	•••	36.	Would Council profes to Alexander and I to
	Play equipment 3	•••	50.	Would Council prefer to: (please select one only)
	Schools Z Community hall 3 Artists workshops/gallery 2			Introduce a replacement provision in Council's LEP?
	Community hall	•••		Revoke SEPP 15
		'		Retain SEPP 15 in its present form?
	Farm buildings 3 Stables 2	•••		Retain SEPP 15 in an amended form?
	Other (please specify)	•••		Other? (please specify)
31.	Do you have a Castle Of Di		(a)	If you would prefer to amend SEPP 15, what changes would improve its operation?
51.	Do you have a Section 94 Plan which enables you to levy Yes Contributions on MO developments?	•	()	A
	No 🗆			Rework objectives to make practical in intent and
(a)	If Yes, What level of Section 94 contributions, if any have been applied to MO sites? (please indicate in \$ per dwelling unit) variable			application. Remork densities to be based on particular
	Most of levy is for rural road \$3,000 - \$6,0			local gout area and land capabilities. (Refer Council
	up-grading with charge increasing for more isolate			draft DCP for MOs - attached)
	locations 3	€ 6 4	_	avait be to s - emeching

10

7.	management of community-based developments on rural lands?
	Peace refer to information Council has supply
	to Chris Murray (Discussion paper; and
	various reports)
•	
Than Harif	sk you for your co-operation. In the event that we require further, information of fication of your responses, please supply a contact name and phone number
	act Details
Name	: Malcolne Scott
Positi	ion: Development Control Planner
Coun	cil Lismore City Council
	e: 066 250 500



SEPP 15 REVIEW MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY (MO) OF RURAL LANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENT SURVEY

00034

1.	Has Council used SEPP 15 to approve MO development applications within its rural zones?	Yes No	1
	If No, go to Question 2		·

(a) Please complete the following Summary of Development Applications approved by Council using SEPP 15 Provision:

YEAR	Number of DAs approved	Total Dwellings	Number of DAs Notified to DOP
1988	7	43	6
1989	5	12	5
1990	3	6	3
1991	3	9	· Z
1992	5	42.	3
1993	2	6	3
TOTAL	25	118	22

(b)	What is the a last five years	verage size in using SEPP 1	hectares of M 5? (Please tick	O development	s approved by Co	ouncil over th
	·0 - 10 ha □	11-40 ha 🗆	41-80 ha 🗹	81-210 ha 🗆	211-360 ha 🗆	>360 ha
(c)	Please list the	main themes p	present in appro	ved MO develo	pments using SEF	PP 15
2		Rainfor Tourist Weeker	ulture fulture residential rest living/prese -oriented nd/Holiday Hon	•	• • • •	व् । । व् व् व् ।
						Palm

()

2.	Has Council used SEPP 15 to within its rural zones?	refuse MO development applications	Yes □ No ☑
	If No, go to Question 3		``
(a)	How many MO applications ha last five years using SEPP 15?	ve been <u>refused</u> by Council over the	<u>2.</u>
(b)	What were the main reasons for	refusal of MO development application	s using SEPP 15.
	Extent of prime ag	. land; dwellings on f	vime ag lan
	dispersed settleme	ent; insufficient inform	nation re
	water effluent dis	posed, risk and hazard;	impacts of
	_	; inadequate site plan	
	•		
(c)	is it usual practice for Council i	to notify DOP of these refusals?	Yes ☑ No □
3.	Does Council have MO provis control the development of MO	ions within any of its LEP(s) which s in rural zones?	Yes □ No ☑
	If No, please go to Question 4		
(a)	Please complete the following Susing its LEP provisions:	Summary of Development Applications a	pproved by Council
	doing its Bex provisions.	1	
	YEAR Number of DAs approved	Total Dwellings	
	1988		
	1989		
	1990		
	1991		
	1992		
	1993		
	TOTAL		
(b) ·	What is the average size in he last five years using its LEP pro	ctares of MO developments approved to considerate to the constant of the const	by Council over the
	0-10 ha 🗆 11-40 ha 🗀 41-	80 ha 🗆 81-210 ha 🗀 211-360 ha [⊃ >360 ha □

	(c)	Please list the main provisions.	themes present in these approved MO dev	elopments us	ing its LEI
	,		Share-farming		
			Horticulture		
			Permi-culture		
		•	Rural-residential		
			Rainforest living/preservation		. 🗅
			Tourist-oriented	٠	
			Weekend/Holiday Homes		
			Other (Please Specify)	•	
3	4.	Has Council used it applications within its	ts LEP provisions to <u>refuse</u> MO developmes rural zones?	ent Yes	
		If No, go to "Instruct	tions" below.		
	(a)	How many MO appl last five years using it	ications have been <u>refused</u> by Council over its LEP?	the	
,	(b)	What were the main	reasons for refusal of MO development applic	cations using i	ts LEP.
•		Adverce imp	ad on adjoining land us	es, lack	· Yo
,			ration), lack of informati		
	•		s 590(1) issues deficienci		
1		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
		Please attach a copy	of your LEP provisions with your complet	ed questionna	aire.
•	Insti	<u>uctions</u>			
	If yo	ou have answered No ils at the end and return	to all questions above, you need go no fur rn the questionnaire. Thank you for your a	rther. Please assistance.	e fill in the
	The they	following questions re were approved under	elate to all MO development in rural area SEPP 15 or Council's LEP.	s regardless	of whether
	5.	How many MO deve	lopment applications are currently before Cou	ncil which are	subject to:
		SEPP 15?		7	i
		Council's LE	P provisions?	••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	- p10.10101101	••	•••••
[]					

υ.	Over the last 12 months, has the number of MO applications: (please tick	k one)
	declined? ☐ remained constant? ☐ increased? ☐	
	OR were no applications received?	
7.	Since 1988, Has the rural population in your LGA: (please tick one)	
	declined? □ remained constant? □ increased? □	
•	If the rural population increased:	
	(a) can a significant portion of this increase be attributed to MO developments?	Yes D
	(b) If the rural population increased, have MOs been more successful than other forms of rural settlement in creating population increase?	Yes D
	(other forms of rural settlement have been constrained eg zoning)	Yes 🖳
8.	In Council's opinion, is the minimum allotment size of 10 hectares an appropriate minimum standard?	No 🗆
(a)	If No, what should the minimum lot size be?	
	Please explain your reasons.	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
9.	Are the density standards established by SEPP 15 appropriate?	Yes No
(a)	If No, what should the standard be? Densities should be holy higher densities (up to present SEPP standard possible if development is clustered and la capability adequate.	
(b)	Please explain your reasons. Density should be based capacity of land, compatibility with adjoint of land use and some degree of relativity existing residential dwelling densities of	on environ'l ning patterns 1. to Light
	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

	O	<u> </u>	١
֓֡֡֡֡֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓	Δ		,
, רו	团	1 1 11	
ਨ /	5		
	☶	I/	

(please tick one)	ucted on MO de	velopme	nts in your	LGA?
Individual single family dwelling units cluster of site Clusters of expanded dwellings with shared individual expanded dwelling with shared factors.	red on one portional facilities	on ·		
Does SEPP 15 conflict with Council's ruinstruments?	ral planning po	olicy	Yes ☑ No ☐	•
are more constrained in t	ums of	امدمه	انبرا	<u>.</u>
Using the following 5-point scale, please indic	ate how successiour LGA. Not	fully each	h of the foll	owing Very essful
If the objectives are not being adequately met, in See attached opinion received and consultations of the consultations and consultations collected districts	rendation. The called in the c	se? ojech	-	5 5 5 5 5 5
	Individual single family dwelling units disper Individual single family dwelling units cluster of site Clusters of expanded dwellings with shared in Individual expanded dwelling with shared factory (please specify) Combination Does SEPP 15 conflict with Council's ruinstruments? If Yes, In what way? Other folions of rural development: And more constrained in the sample of the following 5-point scale, please indice SEPP 15 Objectives are being met by MOs in y Encourage community based rural settlement; Enable collective living; Enable sharing of facilities and resources; Enable pooling of resources; Facilitate clustered style rural development; Avoid demand for Council/Government services; Avoid subdivision of rural land; Increase in rural population; Increase in rural population; Increase in rural population; If the objectives are not being adequately met, we see attached opinion really considered to be a factory fragment.	Individual single family dwelling units dispersed throughout s Individual single family dwelling units clustered on one portion of site Clusters of expanded dwellings with shared facilities Individual expanded dwellings with shared facilities Other (please specify) Combination of ** above Does SEPP 15 conflict with Council's rural planning prinstruments? If Yes, In what way? Other follows of rural development in any of construction of the series of serviced and the following 5-point scale, please indicate how successful successful the following 5-point scale, please indicate how successful the	Individual single family dwelling units dispersed throughout site Individual single family dwelling units clustered on one portion of site Clusters of expanded dwellings with shared facilities Individual expanded dwellings with shared facilities Other (please specify) Combination of ** above Does SEPP 15 conflict with Council's rural planning policy instruments? If Yes, In what way? Other folms of rural development involving the following 5-point scale, please indicate how successfully each SEPP 15 Objectives are being met by MOs in your LGA. Not Successful Encourage community based rural settlement; Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement; Enable collective living; Enable sharing of facilities and resources; Enable pooling of resources; Facilitate clustered style rural development; Avoid demand for Council/Government services; Avoid subdivision of rural land; Increase in rural population; Avoid demand for Council/Government If the objectives are not being adequately met, why is this the case? See attached opinion regarding objects.	Individual single family dwelling units dispersed throughout site Individual single family dwelling units clustered on one portion of site Clusters of expanded dwellings with shared facilities Individual expanded dwellings with shared facilities Other (please specify) Combination of * above Does SEPP 15 conflict with Council's rural planning policy resinstruments? If Yes, In what way? Other folias of rural development involving house are more constrained in felias of location, Serviced required of the following 5-point scale, please indicate how successfully each of the foll SEPP 15 Objectives are being met by MOs in your LGA. Not Successful Encourage community based rural settlement; Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement; Enable collective living; Enable sharing of facilities and resources; Enable pooling of resources; Facilitate clustered style rural development; Avoid demand for Council/Government services; * Avoid subdivision of rural land; Increase in rural population; * Hos are hot 2 3 4 Increase in rural population; * Hos are hot 2 3 4 Increase in rural population; * Hos are hot 2 3 4 Increase in rural population; * Avoid subdivision of rural land; Increase in rural population;

•						
13.	Has the policy resulted in previously illegal rural debeing legalised in your LGA?	wellings		Yes No		
	If No, please explain why?			•		.•1
	Partially, some 'illegal' 1705	have	appa	rant	ly ye	: te
	sought régularisation due to	و ج جمع	4 0	ou na	'boj,	cių
	concerning collection of 29			• • • • •	•	
		• • • • • • •				• • •
	·				. 	<i>.</i>
14.	Using the following 5-point scale, please indicate to each SEPP 15 objective in the assessment of MO	he relative in developmen	nportano t applic	ce given ations?	by Cot	ıncil
		Not			7	Very
		Important	•	•	Impo	•
	Encourage community based rural settlement; Encourage environmentally sensitive rural	. 1	2	.3	4	5
	settlement;	. • 1	. 2 .	:, 3	4)	5
	Enable collective living; Enable sharing of facilities and resources;	. 1	2	\mathfrak{Q}	4	5
	Enable pooling of resources;	1 ·	2 2		. 4 . 1	5 5
	Facilitate clustered style rural development; Avoid demand for Council/Government	1	2	3	4	5
•	services;	1	2 .	3	4	5
	Avoid subdivision of rural land;	1	2	3	4	(3)
	Increase in rural population;	1	(2)	3	4 .	5
15.	Have any MO applications received by Council bee documentation:	n accompanie	ed by a	my of th	e follov	ving
	Proposed ownership/occupancy structures			Yes	□ No	9
	Community plans			Yes	=	
	Land Management plans Other (please specify)			Yes Yes		
(a)	In general, have the developments occurred in accordance to the second s	rdance with t	hese	Yes		
	plans/documents?			No	_ 🗆	
				Not K	Cnown	W

is	ջ <u></u>	
C)	- 	- [
	ול, וב	- [
	ا لنا ۵	

	16.	In general, does Council feel that they can enforce such Yes plans/documents?]
	(a)	If No, Please explain why	
	-	Inadequate resources	
	,		
	17.	Which of the following should be a requirement of application?	
)		Proposed ownership/occupancy structures Community plans Land management plans Other (please specify) Statement of Environ Effects addressing SEPP clauses a sqo(1) ETA A	No [
	(a)	Please explain your reasons.	
		to property assess DAs and provides some confor future occupiers	tonih tainh
	18.	Compared with other rural residential/living development applications, what I Council resources is taken up in the determination of each MO development appl (please tick one only)	level of lication?
		More than average ☐ Average ☐ Less than average ☐	
	19.	In your opinion, what are the three main advantages of MO developments? (please to 3 only with 1 being the biggest advantage).	? rank 1
		Alternative lifestyle opportunities Lower cost rural living Good environmental management (e.g. decreased land degradation) Improved land management practises (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 Other (please specify) Intendes in population socio-econ and cultural diversity of region.	

20.	In your opinion, what are the three main disadvantages of MO developments 1 to 3 only - with 1 being the biggest disadvantage).	s? (please rank
7	Increased demand for Council services	
,	Social disruption	
	Increased traffic on rural roads	ζ.
	Interference with traditional agricultural activities	• • • • • • • • • • • •
•	Lower property values	*******
	Non-payment of rates	*********
	Adverse environmental impact (e.g. increased land degradation)	
	Increased bushfire hazard	· · · · · · <u>·</u> · · · · · ·
	Poor land management practises (e.g. increased weed infestations)	3
	Increased conflict between different land uses	**********
	Adverse effect on water quality	
	Poor solid waste disposal practices	••••
	Other (please specify)	******
21.	What is the general community attitude towards MO developments?	
-	Opposed □ Neutral □ Mixed ☑ Supportive □	
(a)	If opposed, what are the nature and reasons for this opposition?	
	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • •
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
		• • • • • • • •
22.	Have any MO developments received opposition at the time of public notification? No. N/	` 🗆
(a)	If Yes, what were the main reasons for this opposition?	
	lack of information in DA, lack of applicants to of subject land, impact on roads, adverge examples, impact on adjoining proporties, with agricultural uses	mowledge effect on conflicts
(b)	Where the development has been completed, were the concerns Ye realised?	/
	;· 140	(raidy)
23.	In general, what is the attitude of adjacent landowners to MO developments?	
	Opposed □ Neutral □ Mixed □ Supportive □	Strage .
	· ·	
© _{Pur}	rdon Associates 1993 SEPP 15 REVIEW	8



24.	In Council's opinion is the prohibition on subdivision of MO developments necessary to maintain the philosophy behind the SEPP 15? Subdivisor of an MO is a	Yes D No D Rudamental
(a)	Please explain why contradiction to the very community ple occupancy of land. Retaining reinforces the concept of communal own focuses the social and anvironmental apprations of the occupants and also plan cost mechanism to provide affordation	meet of one lot
25.	Could the community living objectives for MO's be achieved by or residential development such as:	her forms of rural
	Standard Subdivision Strata Title Community Title	Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes Yes
(a)	Please explain your reason(s). Subdivison creates on operindividual ownership of part of the landing other shared facilities may existent adoutong to the concept of all proper in the group - a key principle of Mos.	ortunity for of not with- this is thy being vest
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
(p)	What implications would such subdivision have locally? Dramatic increase in unplanned rural contains because MO provisions do not contain amount of MO development.	
	•••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
26.	Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of existing MO developments?	Yes □ No □
27.	Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO: developments to enable their subdivision under community title legislation? Note: Only if the land complied with Council Residential Policy	Yes D No D

Mary Mary	PURID	J.
الناص		٠. "

(a)	If Yes, What level of Section 94 contributions, if any have been applied to MO sites? (please indicate in \$ per dwelling unit) variable. Most of levy is for rural road \$3,000 up-grading with charges increasing for more locations.	- \$6,000 isolated
31.	Do you have a Section 94 Plan which enables you to levy yes contributions on MO developments? No	
	Community shop Play equipment Schools Community hall Artists workshops/gallery Farm buildings Stables Other (please specify)	ک ع ع
30.	Other (please specify)	ng community $I = never,$
(a)	If Yes, what are the main advantages? (please rank 1 to 3 only). Limits road construction Avoids land slip Minimises vegetation clearance Eases servicing Increases fire protection	3
29.	In Council's opinion, does cluster housing offer advantages for environmentally sensitive land management over those offered by dispersed housing?	•
ŧ.	Development cost Fewer legal land management requirements Avoidance of zoning requirements Avoidance of minimum lot sizes in planning instruments Other (please specify)	
(a)	If Yes, What is the main reason applicants have chosen MO over other for Tenure? (please select one reason only)	orms of Land
28.	Is Council aware of instances where MO applications have been submitted with the intended use being for conventional rural residential purposes rather than communal/community living?	



32.	Is Council satisfied that, in comparison with other rural residential Yes developments, MO developments adequately contribute towards the cost of funding services and infrastructure?	
(a).	If No, please explain why. Rates reflect land value rather than domaind for	
	services. A large MO many pay votes little more than a farm with only one family	
33.	Is Council satisfied with the current arrangements for levying rates on MO developments? No W N/A	
(a)	If No, please explain why Rodes needs to include additional	
	charge per occupied site on an MO ie a	
	special rate is needed	
	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	
34.	How many rural residential Community Title subdivisions are located in your LGA?	
35.	How many applications for rural residential Community Title subdivisions in your LGA has Council received in the last 12 months?	
36.	Would Council prefer to: (please select one only)	
A.	Introduce a replacement provision in Council's LEP? Revoke SEPP 15 Retain SEPP 15 in its present form? Retain SEPP 15 in an amended form? Other? (please specify)	
(a)	If you would prefer to amend SEPP 15, what changes would improve its operation?	
	Rework objectives to make practical in intent and	
	application. Remork densities to be based on particula	7
	local gout area and band capabilities. (Refer Councils draft DCP for MOs - attached)	

	anagement of community-based developments on rural lands?	of Seer 15 for the
	Mease refer to information Council	has Supphe
	to Chris Murray (Discussion paper;	•
	various reports)	
	•••••••	
- ,		
	you for your co-operation. In the event that we require fution of your responses, please supply a contact name and phone	
Contact	<u>Details</u>	
Name: .	Malcolne Scott	
Position:	Davelopment Control Planner	
Council:	Lismore City Council	
Phone: .	066 250 500	



P. Hemister Planendan



SEPP 15 REVIEW MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY (MO) OF RURAL LANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENT SURVEY

00034

1988 1989 1990 1991 1992 1993 TOTAL What is the average size in hectares of MO developments approved by Coulast five years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one box only)	Please o	•		_
Sing SEPP 15 Provision: YEAR				•
YEAR Number of DAs approved Total Dwellings Number of DAs Notified to Do 1988 1989 1990 1991 1992 1993 TOTAL What is the average size in hectares of MO developments approved by Coulast five years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one box only) 0 - 10 ha 11-40 ha 41-80 ha 81-210 ha 211-360 ha Please list the main themes present in approved MO developments using SEPP Share-farming	- 0		mmary of Develo	opment Applications approved
1988 1989 1990 1991 1992 1993 TOTAL What is the average size in hectares of MO developments approved by Coulast five years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one box only) 0 - 10 ha 11-40 ha 41-80 ha 81-210 ha 211-360 ha Please list the main themes present in approved MO developments using SEPP Share-farming				
1989 1990 1991 1992 1993 TOTAL What is the average size in hectares of MO developments approved by Coulast five years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one box only) 0 - 10 ha 11-40 ha 41-80 ha 81-210 ha 211-360 ha Please list the main themes present in approved MO developments using SEPP Share-farming	YEAR	Number of DAs approved	Total Dwellings	Number of DAs Notified to DOF
1990 1991 1992 1993 TOTAL What is the average size in hectares of MO developments approved by Coulast five years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one box only) 0 - 10 ha 11-40 ha 41-80 ha 81-210 ha 211-360 ha Please list the main themes present in approved MO developments using SEPP Share-farming	1988			
1991 1992 1993 TOTAL What is the average size in hectares of MO developments approved by Courast five years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one box only) 0 - 10 ha 11-40 ha 41-80 ha 81-210 ha 211-360 ha Please list the main themes present in approved MO developments using SEPP Share-farming	1989	·		· ·
1992 TOTAL What is the average size in hectares of MO developments approved by Coulast five years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one box only) 0 - 10 ha 11-40 ha 41-80 ha 81-210 ha 211-360 ha Please list the main themes present in approved MO developments using SEPP Share-farming	1990			
TOTAL What is the average size in hectares of MO developments approved by Courast five years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one box only) O - 10 ha 11-40 ha 41-80 ha 81-210 ha 211-360 ha Please list the main themes present in approved MO developments using SEPP Share-farming	1991	·		
What is the average size in hectares of MO developments approved by Couast five years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one box only) 0 - 10 ha 11-40 ha 41-80 ha 81-210 ha 211-360 ha Please list the main themes present in approved MO developments using SEPP Share-farming	1992		,	
What is the average size in hectares of MO developments approved by Couast five years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one box only) O - 10 ha 11-40 ha 41-80 ha 81-210 ha 211-360 ha Please list the main themes present in approved MO developments using SEPP Share-farming	1993			
ast five years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one box only) O - 10 ha 11-40 ha 41-80 ha 81-210 ha 211-360 ha Please list the main themes present in approved MO developments using SEPP Share-farming	TOTAL	,		
ast five years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one box only) O - 10 ha 11-40 ha 41-80 ha 81-210 ha 211-360 ha Please list the main themes present in approved MO developments using SEPP Share-farming	1			
ast five years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one box only) O - 10 ha 11-40 ha 41-80 ha 81-210 ha 211-360 ha Please list the main themes present in approved MO developments using SEPP Share-farming	What is	s the average size in hect	ares of MO dev	elopments approved by Counc
Please list the main themes present in <u>approved</u> MO developments using SEPP Share-farming				
Share-farming .) - 10 1	na 🗀 11-40 ha 🗆 41-	80 ha 🗆 81-2	10 ha □ 211-360 ha □ >
-	Please 1	list the main themes presen	nt in <u>approved</u> M	O developments using SEPP 1
-		Share-farmi	กg	
			_	•
Permi-culture		Permi-cultu	ге	
		Rainforest I Tourist-orie	iving/preservatio	n

Weekend/Holiday Homes

Other (Please Specify)

2.	Has Council within its rura		efuse MO development applications	Yes No	
	If No, go to	Question 3			
(a)	•	10 applications have using SEPP 15?	e been <u>refused</u> by Council over the		••••••
(b)	What were th	e main reasons for g	refusal of MO development applicatio	ns using S	SEPP 15.
(c)	Is it usual pra	actice for Council to	notify DOP of these refusals?	Yes No	
3.		l have MO provision in the have MO provision in the had been been been been been been been bee	ons within any of its LEP(s) which in rural zones?	Yes No	
	If No, please	go to Question 4	•		
(a)	Please complusing its LEF		nmary of Development Applications	approved	by Council
	YEAR Num	ber of DAs approved	Total Dwellings		
	1988				
	1989				
	1990			:	
	1991			•	
	1992				
	1993			•	
	TOTAL				
(b)			tares of MO developments approved visions? (Please tick one box only)	by Coun	cil over the
	0-10 ha 🗆	11-40 ha □ 41-8	30 ha □ 81-210 ha □ 211-360 ha	ι□ >3	360 ha 🗆



(c)	Please list the main provisions.	themes present in these approved MO development	nts using its LEP
		Share-farming Horticulture Permi-culture Rural-residential Rainforest living/preservation Tourist-oriented Weekend/Holiday Homes Other (Please Specify)	
4.	Has Council used it applications within its		Yes No
(a)	How many MO appl last five years using i	ications have been <u>refused</u> by Council over the its LEP?	
(b)	What were the main	reasons for refusal of MO development applications	using its LEP.
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	Please attach a copy	of your LEP provisions with your completed que	stionnaire.
Instra	<u>ıctions</u>		
If you detail	u have answered No s at the end and retu	to all questions above, you need go no further. rn the questionnaire. Thank you for your assistan	Please fill in the
		elate to all MO development in rural areas rega SEPP 15 or Council's LEP.	rdless of whether
5.	How many MO deve	elopment applications are currently before Council wl	nich are subject to:
	SEPP 15? Council's LE	P provisions?	

6.	Over the last 12 months, has the number of MO applications: (please tic	k one)
	declined? ☐ remained constant? ☐ increased? ☐	
	OR were no applications received?	
7.	Since 1988, Has the rural population in your LGA: (please tick one)	
	declined? □ remained constant? □ increased? □	•
	If the rural population increased:	,
-	(a) can a significant portion of this increase be attributed to MO developments?	Yes □ No □
	(b) If the rural population increased, have MOs been more successful than other forms of rural settlement in creating population increase?	Yes □ No □
8.	In Council's opinion, is the minimum allotment size of 10 hectares an appropriate minimum standard?	Yes □ No □
(a)	If No, what should the minimum lot size be?	
	Please explain your reasons.	••••••••
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
0		
9.	Are the density standards established by SEPP 15 appropriate?	Yes □ No □
(a)	If No, what should the standard be?	
(b)	Please explain your reasons.	

SEPP 15 REVIEW

[©] Purdon Associates 1993

8	
۱۾	
P	_ [

10.	What is the predominant dwelling type constructed (please tick one)	d on MO de	velopm	ents in	your Lo	GA?
	Individual single family dwelling units dispersed Individual single family dwelling units clustered	•				•
	of site		٠,			
	Clusters of expanded dwellings with shared facility Individual expanded dwelling with shared facilities					
	Other (please specify)	es			. D	
11.	Does SEPP 15 conflict with Council's rural instruments?	planning p	olicy	Yes No		
(a)	If Yes, In what way?				y)	٠
		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		• • • •		
	•••••••••••			• • • • •		
12.	Using the following 5-point scale, please indicate SEPP 15 Objectives are being met by MOs in your	how success LGA.	fully ea	ch of the	he follo	wing
	•	Not			,	Verv
		Not Successfu	nl		Succe	Very ssful
	Encourage community based rural settlement; Encourage environmentally sensitive rural	=	ıl 2	3		-
	Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement;	Successfu		3 3	Succe	ssful 5
	Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement; Enable collective living;	Successfu 1	2 2 2	·. 3	Succe 4 4 4 4	5 5 5
	Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement; Enable collective living; Enable sharing of facilities and resources;	Successfu 1	2 2 2 2	·. 3 3 3	4 4 4 4 4	5 5 5 5 5
	Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement; Enable collective living; Enable sharing of facilities and resources; Enable pooling of resources;	Successfu 1	2 2 2 2 2 2	· 3 3 3	4 4 4 4 4	5 5 5 5 5 5
	Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement; Enable collective living; Enable sharing of facilities and resources; Enable pooling of resources; Facilitate clustered style rural development;	Successfu 1	2 2 2 2	·. 3 3 3	4 4 4 4 4	5 5 5 5 5
	Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement; Enable collective living; Enable sharing of facilities and resources; Enable pooling of resources;	Successfu 1	2 2 2 2 2 2	· 3 3 3	4 4 4 4 4	5 5 5 5 5 5
	Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement; Enable collective living; Enable sharing of facilities and resources; Enable pooling of resources; Facilitate clustered style rural development; Avoid demand for Council/Government	Successfu 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 2 2 2 2 2 2	3 3 3 3	4 4 4 4 4	5 5 5 5 5 5
	Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement; Enable collective living; Enable sharing of facilities and resources; Enable pooling of resources; Facilitate clustered style rural development; Avoid demand for Council/Government services;	Successfu 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 2 2 2 2 2 2	3 3 3 3 3	4 4 4 4 4 4	5 5 5 5 5 5 5
(a)	Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement; Enable collective living; Enable sharing of facilities and resources; Enable pooling of resources; Facilitate clustered style rural development; Avoid demand for Council/Government services; Avoid subdivision of rural land; Increase in rural population; If the objectives are not being adequately met, why	Successful 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 is this the ca	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	3 3 3 3 3	4 4 4 4 4 4 4	5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
(a)	Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement; Enable collective living; Enable sharing of facilities and resources; Enable pooling of resources; Facilitate clustered style rural development; Avoid demand for Council/Government services; Avoid subdivision of rural land; Increase in rural population; If the objectives are not being adequately met, why	Successful 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 is this the call.	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	3 3 3 3 3 3	Succe 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
(a)	Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement; Enable collective living; Enable sharing of facilities and resources; Enable pooling of resources; Facilitate clustered style rural development; Avoid demand for Council/Government services; Avoid subdivision of rural land; Increase in rural population; If the objectives are not being adequately met, why	Successful 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 is this the call.	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	3 3 3 3 3 3	Succe 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5

13.	Has the policy resulted in previously illegal rural dbeing legalised in your LGA?	wellings		Yes No	□ [⋄] /	
	If No, please explain why?			,		1
		• • • • • • • •			. 	
	······································	• • • • • • •			· · · · · ·	
				• • • • •		
					<i></i> .	
14.	Using the following 5-point scale, please indicate to each SEPP 15 objective in the assessment of MC		~	-	by Cou	ncil ./
		Not			V	/егу
		Important			Impor	tant
	Encourage community based rural settlement; Encourage environmentally sensitive rural	1	2	3	4 .	5
	settlement;	1	2	3	4	5
	Enable collective living;	.1	2	3	4	
	Enable sharing of facilities and resources;	1	2	3	4	5
	Enable pooling of resources;	1	2	3	. 4	5
	Facilitate clustered style rural development;	1	2	3	. 4	5
	Avoid demand for Council/Government	-				Ī
	services;	1	2	. 3	4	5
	Avoid subdivision of rural land;	1	2	3	.4	5
	Increase in rural population;	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Have any MO applications received by Council be documentation:	en accompanio	ed by	any of t	he follov	ving
	Proposed ownership/occupancy structures			Yes	□ No	
	Community plans			Yes	□ No	
	Land Management plans			Yes	□ No	\Box
	Other (please specify)			Yes	□ No	
(a)	In general, have the developments occurred in acc	ordance with	hese	Yes		
	plans/documents?			No		
				Not	Known	
					•	
	don Associates 1993 SEPP 15 REVIEV	···				

~

16.	In general, does Council feel that they can enforce such plans/documents?	Yes □ No □
(a)	If No, Please explain why	
		<i>.</i>
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
17.	Which of the following should be a requirement of application?	
	Proposed ownership/occupancy structures Community plans Land management plans Other (please specify)	Yes □ No □ Yes □ No □ Yes □ No □ Yes □ No □
(a)	Please explain your reasons.	
18.	Compared with other rural residential/living development applicatio Council resources is taken up in the determination of each MO develo (please tick one only)	ns, what level of pment application?
	More than average ☐ Average ☐ Less than average ☐) .
19.	In your opinion, what are the three main advantages of MO developme to 3 only with I being the biggest advantage).	nts? (please rank 1
	Alternative lifestyle opportunities Lower cost rural living	
	Good environmental management (e.g. decreased land degradation)	**********
	Improved land management practises (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	**********
	Other (please specify)	`





20.	In your opinion, what are the three main disadvantages of MO developmed 1 to 3 only - with 1 being the biggest disadvantage).	ents? (please rank
	Increased demand for Council services		
	Social disruption		
	Increased traffic on rural roads		••••••
	Interference with traditional agricultural activities	•••	
	Lower property values		
	Non-payment of rates		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	Adverse environmental impact (e.g. increased land degradation)		********
	Increased bushfire hazard		*******
	Poor land management practises (e.g. increased weed infestations)	•••	• • • • • • • •
	Increased conflict between different land uses	•••	• • • • • • • •
		•••	
	Adverse effect on water quality	•••	•••••
	Poor solid waste disposal practices	•••	• • • • • • •
	Other (please specify)	•••	•••••
21.	What is the general community attitude towards MO developments?		
	Opposed □ Neutral □ Mixed □ Supportive □]	
(a)	If opposed, what are the nature and reasons for this opposition?		
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • •	
22.	Have any MO developments received opposition at the time of public notification?	Yes No N/A	
(a)	If Yes, what were the main reasons for this opposition?		
	······································		
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••:	
(b)	Where the development has been completed, were the concerns realised?	Yes No	
23.	In general, what is the attitude of adjacent landowners to MO development	ts?	
	Opposed □ Neutral □ Mixed □ Supportive □]	



Strata Title Yes No	24.	In Council's opinion is the prohibition on subdivision of MO developments necessary to maintain the philosophy behind the SEPP 15?	Yes No		
25. Could the community living objectives for MO's be achieved by other forms of ruresidential development such as: Standard Subdivision	(a)	Please explain why			
25. Could the community living objectives for MO's be achieved by other forms of ruresidential development such as: Standard Subdivision Strata Title Community Title Yes No (a) Please explain your reason(s). (b) What implications would such subdivision have locally? 26. Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of existing MO developments? No 27. Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO developments to enable their subdivision under community title No		•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	• • • •	· · · · · ·	
25. Could the community living objectives for MO's be achieved by other forms of ruresidential development such as: Standard Subdivision		•••••			
25. Could the community living objectives for MO's be achieved by other forms of ruresidential development such as: Standard Subdivision		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			•
residential development such as: Standard Subdivision		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		• • • • • •	•
Strata Title Community Title Yes No Yes No No (a) Please explain your reason(s). (b) What implications would such subdivision have locally? 26. Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of existing MO developments? Yes No No Yes No Yes No Yes Modelopments? Yes No The subdivision of existing MO developments? Yes No N	25. -	Could the community living objectives for MO's be achieved by otheresidential development such as:	er for	ms of rura	j
Community Title Yes No (a) Please explain your reason(s). (b) What implications would such subdivision have locally? 26. Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of existing MO developments? 27. Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO developments to enable their subdivision under community title No					J
(b) What implications would such subdivision have locally? 26. Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of Yes existing MO developments? No 27. Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO Yes developments to enable their subdivision under community title					_
(b) What implications would such subdivision have locally? 26. Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of existing MO developments? 27. Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO yes developments to enable their subdivision under community title	(a)	Please explain your reason(s).		er:	
26. Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of Yes existing MO developments? No Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO Yes developments to enable their subdivision under community title		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•	•
(b) What implications would such subdivision have locally? 26. Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of Yes existing MO developments? No 27. Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO Yes developments to enable their subdivision under community title		***************************************			
26. Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of existing MO developments? 27. Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO developments to enable their subdivision under community title No		•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••			•
26. Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of Yes □ existing MO developments? No □ 27. Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO Yes □ developments to enable their subdivision under community title No □		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			•
26. Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of Yes □ existing MO developments? No □ 27. Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO Yes □ developments to enable their subdivision under community title No □	(b)	What implications would such subdivision have locally?			
26. Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of Yes causting MO developments? No developments to enable their subdivision under community title		•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••			
26. Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of Yes existing MO developments? No Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO Yes developments to enable their subdivision under community title		•••••••••••••			
26. Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of Yes □ existing MO developments? No □ 27. Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO Yes □ developments to enable their subdivision under community title		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
existing MO developments? No Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO developments to enable their subdivision under community title No		••••••••••••			
developments to enable their subdivision under community title No	26.				
	27.	developments to enable their subdivision under community title		<u> </u>	

	PURDOO!
- " /	

28.	Is Council aware of instances where MO applications have been submitted with the intended use being for conventional rural residential purposes rather than communal/community living?	Yes No	
(a)	If Yes, What is the main reason applicants have chosen MO over oth Tenure? (please select one reason only)	ner forr	ms of Land
	Development cost Fewer legal land management requirements Avoidance of zoning requirements Avoidance of minimum lot sizes in planning instruments Other (please specify)		
29.	In Council's opinion, does cluster housing offer advantages for environmentally sensitive land management over those offered by dispersed housing?	Yes No	
(a)	If Yes, what are the main advantages? (please rank 1 to 3 only).		
	Limits road construction	.:	
	· Avoids land slip		
	Minimises vegetation clearance		•••
	Eases servicing	••	
	Increases fire protection		
	Other (please specify)	••	•••••
30.	Using the following code, please indicate how frequently each of the form facilities are constructed as part of existing MO development $2 = sometimes$, $3 = often$, $4 = always$)	_	
	Community shop	••	*********
	Play equipment	••	
	Schools	••	
	Community hall		
	Artists workshops/gallery		
	Farm buildings	·	
	Stables .		
	Other (please specify)		
31.	Do you have a Section 94 Plan which enables you to levy contributions on MO developments?	Yes No	
(a) ·	If Yes, What level of Section 94 contributions, if any have been applied to MO sites? (please indicate in \$ per dwelling unit)		•••••



Ż	
ЭŘ	
ፈ	

32.	developments, MO developments adequately contribute towards the cost of funding services and infrastructure?	Yes No		
(a).	If No, please explain why.			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			•
	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••			
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
33.	Is Council satisfied with the current arrangements for levying rates on MO developments?	Yes No		
-		N/A		
(a)	If No, please explain why	· · · · ·		•
•				
	•••••••••••••		• • • • •	•
34.	How many rural residential Community Title subdivisions are located in your LGA?	••	••••••	
35.	How many applications for rural residential Community Title subdivisions in your LGA has Council received in the last 12 months?			
36. ··	Would Council prefer to: (please select one only)			. •
	Introduce a replacement provision in Council's LEP? Revoke SEPP 15 Retain SEPP 15 in its present form? Retain SEPP 15 in an amended form? Other? (please specify)			
(a)	If you would prefer to amend SEPP 15, what changes would improve its	operati	on?	
	•••••••••••••••••			
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		• • • • •	٠





37.	ma																											ne	SS	O	10	S	EP.	Ρ,	, 13)	tor	t	he
	•			•				•	•		•					•			•														· •	•					:
																	-																						
	•			•		•		•	•							•	• •	• •	•				•			•		•								•			٠
					•																																		
	•			•		•		•	•		•					•	•.•		•		•		•		•	•		•	• •		•		• •	•		•	• •		•
-						-																																	
Thanl clarifi	k yo icati	ou on	fo of	r y	yo ou:	ur r 1	es	:0- po	op ns	er es	at , Į	io: ple	n. eas	se	Ir su	ı ıp _j	tho ply	e e	eve Co	ent ont	th act	iat t n	: v an	ve ne	r aı	eq nd	ui p	re ho	fi ne	ur n	the	er nt	in er	ıfo	rn	12	tio	a (or
Conta	ct I	<u>)et</u>	ail:	<u>\$</u>	•																																		
Name																																							
	: .			•																																			
Positio									•		. •																												
Counc	on:	· •						•	•	• •	•		• •														···.			•			•		•				
	on:	· •						•	•	• •	•		• •														···.			•			•		•				



SEPP 15 REVIEW MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY (MO) OF RURAL LANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENT SURVEY

_	to Question 2			
	omplete the following Si PP 15 Provision:	immary of Develo	opment Applications <u>appro</u>	<u>ved</u> by Co
YEAR	Number of DAs approved	Total Dwellings	Number of DAs Notified to	DOP
1988				
1989				
1990				
1991				
1992				
1993				
TOTAL				
last five 0 - 10 h	years using SEPP 15? (Please tick one bo	•	>360 h

N O	\
Ä	
\mathbb{F}	

2.		ncil used SEPP 15 to <u>re</u> rural zones?	efuse MO developmo	ent applications	Yes No	
i	If No, go	to Question 3				
(a)		ny MO applications have years using SEPP 15?	e been refused by C	council over the	•••	
(b)	What we	re the main reasons for g	efusal of MO develo	opment applications	using S	EPP 15.
					• • • • • •	
(c)	Is it usua	al practice for Council to	notify DOP of these	e refusals?	Yes No	
3. (a)	if No, pi	ouncil have MO provision the development of MOs dease go to Question 4 complete the following SulLEP provisions:	in rural zones?	.,	Yes No pproved	□ □ by Council
	YEAR	Number of DAs approved	Total Dwellings			
	1988					
	1989					
	1990			-[
	1991					
	1992					
	1993					
	TOTAL			·		•
(b)		the average size in hear years using its LEP pro		one box only)		



(c)	Please list the main provisions.	themes present in these approved MO develop	oments using its I	LEP
i		Share-farming Horticulture Permi-culture Rural-residential Rainforest living/preservation Tourist-oriented Weekend/Holiday Homes Other (Please Specify)		
4.	Has Council used is applications within it	its LEP provisions to refuse MO development ts rural zones?	Yes □ No □	
	If No, go to "Instruc	ctions" below.		
(a) .	How many MO app last five years using	lications have been <u>refused</u> by Council over the its LEP?		•
(b)	What were the main	reasons for refusal of MO development application	ons using its LEP.	
				٠ : ٠
,	~		• • • • • • • • • •	
	Please attach a cop	y of your LEP provisions with your completed	questionnaire.	
Instru	<u>ictions</u>			
		to all questions above, you need go no furth urn the questionnaire. Thank you for your ass		the
		relate to all MO development in rural areas in SEPP 15 or Council's LEP.	regardless of whe	ther
5.	How many MO dev	elopment applications are currently before Counc	il which are subjec	t to:
	SEPP 15? Council's LE	EP provisions?	·············	•



6.	Over the last 12 months, has the number of MO applications: (please tick	one)		
i	declined? ☐ remained constant? ☐ increased? ☐			
	OR were no applications received?			
7.	Since 1988, Has the rural population in your LGA: (please tick one)			
	declined? □ remained constant? □ increased? □			
	If the rural population increased:			
	(a) can a significant portion of this increase be attributed to MO developments?	Yes No		
	(b) If the rural population increased, have MOs been more successful than other forms of rural settlement in creating population increase?	Yes No		
8.	In Council's opinion, is the minimum allotment size of 10 hectares an appropriate minimum standard?	Yes No		. •
(a) ·	If No, what should the minimum lot size be?			
	Please explain your reasons.	• •		
			•	
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			•
9.	Are the density standards established by SEPP 15 appropriate?	Yes		
9. (a)	Are the density standards established by SEPP 15 appropriate? If No, what should the standard be?	No		
		No 		
	If No, what should the standard be?	No 		
(a)	If No, what should the standard be?	No 		•
(a)	If No, what should the standard be?	No		

10.	What is the predominant dwelling type constructed (please tick one)	on MO de	velopme	ents in y	your LG	A?
i	Individual single family dwelling units dispersed the					
	Individual single family dwelling units clustered of of site		on			
	Clusters of expanded dwellings with shared facilities Individual expanded dwelling with shared facilities Other (please specify)					
11.	Does SEPP 15 conflict with Council's rural prints instruments?	planning p	olicy	Yes No		
(a)	If Yes, In what way?					
		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
	· ·					• •
12.	Using the following 5-point scale, please indicate h SEPP 15 Objectives are being met by MOs in your I		fully ea	ich of tl	ne follov	ving
		Not Successfu	ıl		Succes	Very ssful
	Encourage community based rural settlement;	1	2	3	4	5
	Encourage environmentally sensitive rural settlement;	1	2	3	4	5
	Enable collective living;	1	2	3	4	5
	Enable sharing of facilities and resources;	1	2	3	4	5
	Enable pooling of resources;	1	2	3	4	5
	Facilitate clustered style rural development;	1	2	3	4	5
	Avoid demand for Council/Government					
	services;	1	2	3	4	5
	Avoid subdivision of rural land;	1	2	3	4	5
	Increase in rural population;	1	2	3	4	5
(a)	If the objectives are not being adequately met, why	is this the c	ase?			
						• • •

N O	\
æ	,
\mathbb{Z}	

13.	Has the policy resulted in previously illegal rural dwe being legalised in your LGA?	ellings		Yes No		
i	If No, please explain why?					
14.	Using the following 5-point scale, please indicate the to each SEPP 15 objective in the assessment of MO				by Cour	ncil
		Not			V	ery
		Important			Import	tant
	Encourage community based rural settlement; Encourage environmentally sensitive rural	1	2	3	4	5
	settlement;	1	2	3	4	5 .
	Enable collective living;	1	2	3	4	5
•	Enable sharing of facilities and resources;	1	2	3	4	5
	Enable pooling of resources;	1	2	3	4	5
	Facilitate clustered style rural development;	1	2	3	4	5
	Avoid demand for Council/Government					
	services;	1	2	3	4	5
	Avoid subdivision of rural land;	1	2	3	4	5
	Increase in rural population;	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Have any MO applications received by Council been documentation:	n accompani	ied by	any of	the follow	ving
	Proposed ownership/occupancy structures			Yes	□ No	
	Community plans			Yes	□ No	
	Land Management plans			Yes	□ No	
	Other (please specify)			Yes	□ No	
(a)	In general, have the developments occurred in acco	rdance with	these	Yes		
	plans/documents?			No	∐	
				Not	Known	

Z O	
Ä	1
<u>P</u>	

16.	In general, does Council feel that they can enforce such plans/documents?	Yes No	
(a)	If No, Please explain why		
17.	Which of the following should be a requirement of application?		
	Proposed ownership/occupancy structures	Yes	□ No □
	Community plans	Yes	□ No □
	Land management plans	Yes	□ No □
	Other (please specify)	Yes	
(a)	Please explain your reasons.		
	· 		
	·		
18.	Compared with other rural residential/living development application Council resources is taken up in the determination of each MO develo (please tick one only)		
	More than average ☐ Average ☐ Less than average ☐] ′	
19.	In your opinion, what are the three main advantages of MO developme to 3 only with 1 being the biggest advantage).	nts? <i>(p</i>	olease rank 1
	Alternative lifestyle opportunities		
	Lower cost rural living		
	Good environmental management (e.g. decreased land degradation)		
	Improved land management practises (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		
	Other (please specify)		



20.	In your opinion, what are the three main disadvantages of MO developm 1 to 3 only - with 1 being the biggest disadvantage).	ents? (pi	ease rank
i	Increased demand for Council services		
	Social disruption		
	Increased traffic on rural roads	••••	
	Interference with traditional agricultural activities		
	Lower property values		• • • • • • •
	Non-payment of rates	••••	
	Adverse environmental impact (e.g. increased land degradation)		
	Increased bushfire hazard	••••	
	Poor land management practises (e.g. increased weed infestations)	• • • •	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	Increased conflict between different land uses	••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	Adverse effect on water quality	• • • •	• • • • • • •
	Poor solid waste disposal practices	• • • •	
	Other (please specify)		
21.	What is the general community attitude towards MO developments?		
	Opposed □ Neutral □ Mixed □ Supportive [
(a)	If opposed, what are the nature and reasons for this opposition?		
•		 .	
22.	Have any MO developments received opposition at the time of public notification?	Yes No N/A	
(a)	If Yes, what were the main reasons for this opposition?		
(b)	Where the development has been completed, were the concerns realised?	Yes No	
23.	In general, what is the attitude of adjacent landowners to MO development	ents?	
	Opposed Neutral Mixed Supportive		

N	\
2	
2	

24.	In Council's opinion is the prohibition on subdivision of MO developments necessary to maintain the philosophy behind the SEPP 15?	Yes No		
i (a)	Please explain why			
				• •
25.	Could the community living objectives for MO's be achieved by other residential development such as:	er for	ms of i	ural
	Standard Subdivision		□ No	
	Strata Title Community Title	Yes Yes		
(a)	Please explain your reason(s).			
(b)	What implications would such subdivision have locally?			
			• • • • • • • •	
26.	Has Council received repeated requests for the subdivision of existing MO developments?	Yes No		
27.	Would Council be receptive to the concept of rezoning existing MO developments to enable their subdivision under community title legislation?	Yes No		

Z		
Š.)
出		
$\frac{1}{2}$		

28. <i>i</i>		Yes (No (<u> </u>
(a)	If Yes, What is the main reason applicants have chosen MO over othe Tenure? (please select one reason only)	r forms	of Land
	Development cost Fewer legal land management requirements Avoidance of zoning requirements Avoidance of minimum lot sizes in planning instruments Other (please specify)	<u>;</u> (0 0 0 0
29.	In Council's opinion, does cluster housing offer advantages for environmentally sensitive land management over those offered by dispersed housing?		
(a)	If Yes, what are the main advantages? (please rank 1 to 3 only).		
	Limits road construction Avoids land slip Minimises vegetation clearance	••••	
	Eases servicing		
	Increases fire protection	••••	
3	Other (please specify)	••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
30.	Using the following code, please indicate how frequently each of the fol facilities are constructed as part of existing MO developments $2 = sometimes$, $3 = often$, $4 = always$)	lowing o	community = never
	Community shop		
	Play equipment		
	Schools	•••	
	Community hall	•••	
	Artists workshops/gallery		
	Farm buildings	• • •	
	Stables		
	Other (please specify)		
31.	Do you have a Section 94 Plan which enables you to levy contributions on MO developments?	Yes No	
(a)	If Yes, What level of Section 94 contributions, if any have been applied to MO sites? (please indicate in \$ per dwelling unit)	••	•••••

S	
띮	
\mathbb{Z}	

32.	Is Council satisfied that, in comparison with other rural residential developments, MO developments adequately contribute towards the cost of funding services and infrastructure?	Yes No	
(a).	If No, please explain why.		
33.	Is Council satisfied with the current arrangements for levying rates on MO developments?	Yes No N/A	
(a)	If No, please explain why		
34.,	How many rural residential Community Title subdivisions are located in your LGA?		
35.	How many applications for rural residential Community Title subdivisions in your LGA has Council received in the last 12 months?		-
36.	Would Council prefer to: (please select one only)		
	Introduce a replacement provision in Council's LEP? Revoke SEPP 15 Retain SEPP 15 in its present form? Retain SEPP 15 in an amended form? Other? (please specify)		
(a)	If you would prefer to amend SEPP 15, what changes would improve it	s opera	tion?
			• • • • • • •



37.	Do mar																																		.es	S	0	Γ	پ ا	EF	'P		13)	Ю	r	u	ic
i		•		٠	•	•	•	•			•	•		•			•	•	•					•	•					•	•	•	•				٠	•			•	•		•			•	
		•		•	•		•					•			•		•			•			•	•					•					•				•			•	•		•	•			•
		٠			٠	•	•	•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•						•		•		•				•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•	•
																																																٠,٠
		•	•		•	•	٠		•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	• •		٠	•	•	•	•	•		•	٠	٠	٠	•	•		•	•	•		•	•	٠	٠	•	•		•
			Thank you for your co-operation. In the event that we require further information of clarification of your responses, please supply a contact name and phone number																																													
																																										fo	rn	na	ıti	or	ì	or
	icati	on	0	f y																																						fo	rn	ma	iti	or	1	or
clarif	ication	on <u>)et</u>	oi ai	f <u>:</u> <u>ls</u>	yo	uı	. 1	res	sp	01	ns	es	,	pl	lea	as	е	Si	ıp	p.	ly	a	C	or	nta	ac	t i	na	ın	ıe	a	n	d	pl	ho	ne	e n	ıu:	ml	be	r		٠					•
clarif Conta	ication	on <u>)et</u>	oi <u>ai</u>	f <u>y</u> ls	уо́ 	u 1		res	sp		ns	es 	,	pl	lea	as	e	sı	п р	·p	ly	а	С.	or	nta	ac	t 1	na		ie	a	n(di.	pl	ho	ne		1U:	m)	be	:r 			•	•	•		
Conta Name	ication act December 2.	on <u>)et</u> 	0 ai	f :	yo.	ui					ns	es		pl	lea		e							or			t :				a			pl						be	er			•				