

**Attachment 5:
Draft Rural Land Strategy (Re-exhibition February 2019)
Community Conversations (Council Auditorium, Murwillumbah) – Survey responses to proposed deletions,
Actions 82, 83, 84, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, and 93**

	Action 82	Action 83	Action 84	Action 87	Action 88	Action 89	Action 91	Action 92	Action 93
Response	Proposed making detached dual occupancy dwelling permissible with consent on allotments of at least 40 hectares	Proposed making secondary dwelling permissible with consent on allotments of at least 10 hectares	Proposed removing the requirement to demonstrate that the property is remote or isolated when seeking approval to build a rural workers' dwelling	That small detached dual occupancies not larger than the size requirements for secondary dwellings be exempt from development contributions	That small detached dual occupancies not larger than the size requirements for secondary dwellings be exempt from development contributions	That a supply and demand analysis be completed as a first step in determining the need for further subdivision of rural land	That assessment criteria be developed to assist applicants and Council in deciding on the merits of rezonings seeking to obtain a dwelling entitlement	That a review be undertaken to determine the implications of allowing subdivision of properties split by major infrastructure	That investigations be undertaken into the ability of existing legal multiple occupancies to be converted into another form of title
Strongly Disagree	33	32	25	24	10	16	24	25	18
Agree	1	0	1	2	2	2	2	0	2
Neutral	0	2	0	3	7	5	1	2	2
Disagree	3	0	1	0	2	5	4	4	3
Strongly Agree	0	0	2	1	9	2	0	0	2
No Comment	0	1	3	2	3	2	1	2	3

Sample responses included:

- Breaking up of the agricultural land - all the people living on the property would not be making any living off the property.
- Dual occupancy should be allowed on 40 + hectare. Secondary dwelling should be allowed on 10 hectare and above.
- We should be allowed to subdivide if it does not upset the neighbours and does not put large demands on the Council.
- Removing this item will not allow future generations of farmers to live on the property and work it without having to live with their parents. It would also provide drought proof income.
The RLS was a result of extensive public contributions. Will remove/damage credibility of rest of process. Real, valid reasons by detached dual occupancy dwellings are appropriate given agricultural properties are not economic units in their own right.