TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary ........................................................................... 3

1.0 Introduction ............................................................................... 5
  1.1 Study Objectives ................................................................. 5
  1.2 Background ........................................................................... 6
  1.3 Major Findings from the 1994 Housing Strategy ......................... 6
  1.4 Terminology ......................................................................... 9
  1.5 The Study Area .................................................................... 9

2.0 Demographic and Housing Data ..................................................... 10
  2.1 Population Age .................................................................... 10
  2.2 Family Type ........................................................................ 11
  2.3 Dwelling Type ....................................................................... 12
  2.4 Number of Persons per dwelling (Density) ............................... 15

3.0 Low Density – Detached Housing .................................................. 17
  3.1 Inner Fringe Area .................................................................. 17
  3.2 Outer Fringe Area .................................................................. 17
  3.3 Villages ................................................................................ 19
    3.3.1 Eglinton ....................................................................... 20
    3.3.2 Raglan .......................................................................... 21
    3.3.3 Perthville ...................................................................... 21
  3.4 Inner City .............................................................................. 22
  3.5 Summary ............................................................................... 23

4.0 Medium Density ........................................................................... 24
  4.1 Residential Potential of the Central Bocks ................................. 25
  4.2 Further Development of the Central Blocks ............................... 33
  4.3 Population Estimates ............................................................ 34
  4.4 Ability of Central Land Stocks to meet future Medium Density Needs ........................................................................ 36
  4.5 Infiltration of Commercial type premises in the CBD and Fringe .... 37
    4.5.1 Existing Commercial Premises and Professional Chambers ... 38
    4.5.2 Housing lost to Commercial Premises and Professional Chambers ........................................................................ 38
    4.5.3 Methods of addressing this loss in Housing Stock ................ 39
5.0 Low-Medium Density: Dual Occupancy ........................................ 41

5.1 Types of Dual Occupancy Developments .............................. 42
5.2 Existing Dual Occupancy developments in Bathurst .............. 42
  5.2.1 Dual Occupancies ............................................. 43
  5.2.2 Granny Flats .................................................. 44
5.3 Future Provision of Dual Occupancy developments in Bathurst ... 46
  5.3.1 Inner Fringe Area .............................................. 46
  5.3.2 Inner City Area ............................................... 46
  5.3.3 Villages ....................................................... 46
  5.3.4 Outer Fringe Area ............................................ 46

6.0 Residential Satisfaction Surveys ........................................ 50

6.1 Demographics of Respondents .......................................... 50
6.2 Units ............................................................... 51
6.3 Suburbs ............................................................ 55

7.0 Urban Expansion Areas ............................................... 58

7.1 Increase Lot Yields .................................................. 58
7.2 New Urban Expansion Areas ......................................... 59
  7.2.1 2000-2050 Fifty Year Plan for the City of Bathurst .......... 59
  7.2.2 City of Bathurst Structure Plan 1994 .......................... 59
  7.2.3 Current Intentions for Residential Expansion ............... 59
  7.2.4 Calculations for Urban Land Release ......................... 62
  7.2.5 New City/New Villages ...................................... 66
  7.2.6 Summary ...................................................... 66

8.0 Major Findings ..................................................... 67

9.0 Recommendations ................................................... 70

10.0 Bibliography ......................................................... 71

Appendices
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Bathurst Housing Strategy 2001 has been conducted as a review to the Housing Strategy of 1994 and looks at future provision of various housing within Bathurst and whether current land stocks can match expected demand. This involves statistical analysis of population cohorts, occupancy rates in various sections of Bathurst, dwelling approval rates, vacant land stocks and future designated residential land. Council has now introduced to this study a perceptions survey which aimed to assess how the controls outlined in the Residential Housing Development Control Plan (DCP) are working in practice. These surveys were aimed at those living in residential units in the inner city and around dual occupancy developments in the outer fringe. Recommendations from both the statistical analysis and the perceptions survey are included as changes to the Residential Housing DCP.

The following provides a summary of each of the land area categories assessed under this strategy. Note that rural residential lands have not been assessed as they are to be dealt with in the upcoming rural strategy for Bathurst.

**Outer Fringe Areas**

The outer fringe areas of Bathurst as well as the villages, show the greatest interest and ultimate potential for future low density development. Despite this, to sustain the current ratio of detached dwellings to medium density dwellings and considering future residential land stocks, residential densities in the outer fringe areas should be increased. This can be done by lessening controls on dual occupancy developments in the outer fringe, which is one of the recommendations of the Strategy. Dual Occupancies in the outer fringe were given much negative publicity when Government initiatives encouraged their introduction to suburb areas of cities such as Bathurst. Now, it seems due to good design and limited introduction, dual occupancies in the outer fringe have received little attention since their establishment in the suburbs and as such have contributed to the variety of housing choice in the newer areas of Bathurst.

**Inner Fringe Areas**

The inner fringe of Bathurst is the area with the highest proportion of detached dwellings. This is due to the inner fringe being well established with predominantly residential land and the fact that some 50 years ago, this land would have been considered the Windradiyne of today. The inner fringe represents a unique area where dual occupancies are not restricted in numbers or proximity to one another and units are prohibited. Therefore, further dual occupancy and granny flat development is encouraged in the inner fringe to ensure vacant land stocks are efficiently used and Bathurst’s current residential land will last for a longer time period. Despite this, as most of this area is already well established, approvals for second dwellings in these areas may be the more likely end result.
**Inner City**

The inner city of Bathurst contains the greatest mix of residential uses with all types of dwellings permissible with consent in Precinct 1, as established in the Residential Housing Development Control Plan. The inner city area of Bathurst contains about 21% of all the detached housing in Bathurst which, due to the area’s age, is mostly older style. The older style lots in the inner city position the house at the front of the lot with large tracts of vacant residential land at the rear which has the potential for development. A number of factors limit the development potential of this land such as land prices, demand and the high initial capital input for large scale residential projects. Despite this, some 8.16 hectares of vacant land has been identified with the potential for this type of development. Further development of these centre blocks is encouraged as it not only locates residences close to services and shops, but also makes efficient use of existing infrastructure such as roads, water and sewer services. If all of these centre lots were developed for medium density purposes, this would still leave a shortfall of unit housing being only 14% of the total housing stock (it is currently 20%). This reinforces the idea above that other medium density (that is, dual occupancies) should be provided in the outer fringe. It is also known that commercial type premises infiltrate into the residential areas of the inner city to take advantage of lower lease fees while remaining close to the CBD. To address this problem, it is recommended that Council encourage the use of ‘shop top’ housing which, as it sounds, is housing above shops in the CBD, where land is zoned commercial.

**Villages**

The three main villages of Eglinton, Raglan and Perthville contain mostly detached dwellings, despite dual occupancies being permitted at a non-restricted rate. Since 1994, dual occupancies have begun to emerge in these villages as prior to this time, all housing was detached. Once fully developed, these villages could support some 4635 persons which is 1.5 times the present population. With water and sewer being connected to Perthville in late 1994, this area has grown substantially. It is expected that low density housing will dominate in the villages with the occasional dual occupancy/granny flat constructed. The next village worthy of economical expansion is Eglinton with residents expressing an interest in potential rezonings to residential.

Overall, this Housing Strategy has shown the recommendations of the 1994 Strategy to be working in practice. These recommendations included limited dual occupancies in the outer fringe and encouragement of a wider variety of housing choice as households change over time. Households are proving to change over time with occupancy rates decreasing across both Bathurst and the remainder of the state, which ultimately changes household needs. Statistical analysis has shown that current vacant land stocks will last for about another 28 years and perceptions analysis of the surveys has enabled changes to be recommended for the Residential Housing DCP and ultimately the Bathurst Local Environmental Plan 1997. This Strategy combines both of these analyses to produce educated recommendations with concrete repercussions.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared as a review to the 1994 Bathurst Housing Strategy. Bathurst’s current population is approximately 30,307 (as estimated by the Australian Bureau of Statistics at 30 June 2000). Bathurst is consistently amongst the fastest growing inland centres in NSW. Appropriate strategies for the provision of housing to meet such increments must be developed to ensure the city’s future housing demands are met.

Bathurst is located approximately 200 kilometres west of Sydney. It formed part of the Growth Centres concept in the 1970s/1980s and has enjoyed an annual growth rate of around 1-2 per cent for the past decade. Indications are that this growth will continue or perhaps increase during the next decade.

Bathurst, at present, offers housing types ranging from low to medium density. The different densities are presented in the following categories:

1. Low Density – detached housing
2. Low to Medium Density – dual occupancy development
3. Medium Density – residential unit developments
4. Rural Residential Development

This study seeks to re-assess the demand and provision for housing since the 1991 census and the 1994 Housing Strategy in three of the above categories. This study does not address rural residential development as this type of accommodation will be considered in the future Rural Strategy for the City of Bathurst.

1.1 Study Objectives

The objectives of the study are to:

1. Assess the demand for the various densities of residential development and their most appropriate location within the city boundary over the next 20 years;
2. Examine the appropriate nature of the varying forms of dual occupancy developments, particularly in fringe areas;
3. Examine the central portions of older areas within the city for suitable residential development;
4. Assess the suitability of the existing residential zones under the Bathurst Local Environmental Plan 1997 and their ability to meet future housing needs of Bathurst;
5. Examine the appropriateness of existing standards within the Residential Housing DCP;
6. Prepare recommendations in respect of future residential zones in Bathurst for subsequent reviews of the Bathurst Local Environmental Plan;
7. Prepare recommendations in respect of revision of the Residential Housing Development Control Plan for various housing components.
1.2 Background

Bathurst was proclaimed a town in 1815 and is the oldest inland settlement in NSW. The older part of town (inner city area) was originally subdivided in 1833 into rectangular sections of 200 metres by 200 metres, based on a grid pattern. Individual dwellings were built on lots in these street blocks measuring about 20 metres by 100 metres in depth. A number of these older dimension lots remain, with many being subdivided and subsequently developed for unit developments. Due to the predominance of this lot shape and permissibility of this size for unit development, Bathurst has seen much duplication of unit development styles with the access down one side and all units feeding off this access on the other side.

1.3 Major Findings from the 1994 Housing Strategy

The following provides a summary of the major findings of the previous Housing Strategy, with respect to low density, medium density, low to medium density, urban expansion areas and provisions of existing planning instruments.

Low Density

✦ The provision of detached dwellings in the future will largely be concentrated in the outer fringe areas and the villages. Other areas of Bathurst will most likely only experience a marginal increase in the number of detached dwellings as substantial tracts of undeveloped residentially zoned land are not available.

✦ If the existing undeveloped land stocks in the outer fringe areas and in the villages identified in chapter 3 of that Strategy are developed solely for detached dwellings, these land stocks can be expected to:

1. accommodate an additional population of 19,200 persons,
2. cater for demand for the next 20 years if existing demand remains constant, and
3. produce 4,888 additional lots in the outer fringe areas and 578 lots in the villages,

based on current lot yields.

Medium Density

✦ 10.58 hectares of vacant land has been identified within the central blocks of Bathurst. It is considered that some 9.34 hectares of this land is suitable for residential development in the short to medium term.

✦ The development of the vacant land stocks will largely follow the existing ad hoc pattern because of ownership problems. It will be very difficult, if not impossible, for Council to actively intervene to promote the comprehensive development of the vacant land.
Based on an occupancy rate of 2.7 persons per medium density dwelling and the existing density limitation of 88 persons per site hectare as outlined in Councils Residential Flat Code, it is estimated that the vacant land will support:

1. approximately 315 medium density dwellings, and
2. a population of about 850 persons.

If all existing vacant land stocks in the outer fringe areas and the villages are developed for low density purposes and the central blocks as medium density, medium density housing will only make up 15% of the total future housing stock. This is a reduction of 5% in comparison to the existing situation.

Medium density developments must be permitted in areas outside of central Bathurst in order to make up the shortfall outlined in the point above.

**Low to Medium Density**

The general community’s opposition to dual occupancies appears to be unfounded based on existing evidence.

In the last 7 years (prior to 1994), only 101 development approvals have been granted for dual occupancy developments as compared to 1298 building approvals for detached houses over the same time period.

The distribution of dual occupancy developments throughout the city is dependent upon the availability of vacant land. Thus they have tended to be fairly evenly distributed throughout the different areas of the city.

A reasonably high number of granny flats have been approved in the outer fringe areas and the villages, which points to a demand for this type of development in these areas. To satisfy this demand, restrictions which prohibit their development in the outer fringe areas should be lifted and, in particular, granny flats should be separately defined under the various planning instruments. *This was done in the Bathurst LEP 1997.*

The majority of second dwellings have occurred in the inner city area, largely due to the areas age and the allowable size of the allotments.

The shortfall of medium density dwellings which will not be able to be provided in the inner city area is estimated at 1000. The reintroduction of dual occupancy developments in the outer fringe areas of the city provides the opportunity to make up this deficit.

The reintroduction of dual occupancy developments at a ratio of one for every nine detached dwellings will ensure that the abovementioned deficit is dealt with.
Urban Expansion Areas

✦ An increase in the lot yield in the outer fringe areas to 10 lots per hectare will ensure that existing land stocks satisfy demand for the next 28 years. This is nearly a decade longer than will be achieved at the current lot yield.

✦ A maximum lot size of about 675 square metres will achieve a lot yield of 10 lots per hectare. However, market forces rather than Council intervention are likely to influence lot size.

✦ Extensions of the Windradyne and Macquarie Plains areas appear to be the obvious choice for expansion once existing land stocks are exhausted. The land identified could satisfy demand for an additional 18 to 24 years (ie to the year 2030 or 2040).

✦ A new city concept or new villages could provide an alternative to the linear expansion of the city in a westerly and easterly direction.

✦ The village of Eglinton could be expanded in the longer term to cater for a total population of nearly 4,000 persons.

✦ The Bathurst Local Environmental Plan 1987 contains five different residential zones. The only substantial difference between the zones is the residential density that they permit. Residential densities throughout the city could be controlled under a Development Control Plan. Thus the major review of the Bathurst Local Environmental Plan need only include one residential zone. *This was done in the Bathurst LEP 1997.

✦ The existing minimum standards for detached dwellings and dual occupancy developments are considered appropriate.

✦ A uniform minimum lot size of 670m$^2$ for residential flat buildings should be adopted. *A minimum lot size of 690m$^2$ for residential flat buildings/units was adopted in the Residential Housing DCP 1997.

✦ Existing residential Development Control Plans and Codes require review and updating. Where possible, the provisions of these documents should be consolidated into one document.

✦ The provisions of SEPP No.20 have adequately controlled residential flat development.

✦ The provisions of SEPP No.25, as it affects the outer fringe areas, will be minimal based on a limited reintroduction of dual occupancy developments in these areas at a provision of 1:9.
1.4 Terminology

For the purposes of this study, the following terminology is adopted:

Detached dwelling/house – means a single dwelling on a single allotment of land.

Development Control Plan (DCP) – a performance based statutory document drafted by a Local Government Area which provides standards, design guidelines and practical solutions to various aspects of development.

 Dwelling – means a room or suite of rooms occupied or used or constructed or adapted so as to be capable of being occupied or used as a separate dwelling.

Dual occupancy – means development that results in two dwellings (whether attached or detached) on a single allotment of land (or which would have that result were it not for the fact that the allotment is to be subdivided as part of the development), but does not include development for the purpose of a granny flat.

Granny Flat – means a dwelling connected (and subordinate) to another larger dwelling on the same allotment of land whether physically attached to the other dwelling or not.

Lot area/area of an allotment – means the area within the boundaries of the lot.

Residential Units – means three or more dwellings (whether attached or detached) on a single allotment of land, (or which would be on a single allotment of land were it not for the fact that the allotment is to be subdivided as part of the proposed development).

1.5 Study Area

The study area will encompass all that land presently zoned residential within the Bathurst Local Government Area and the rural hinterland in so far as an examination of residential expansion is concerned.
2.0 DEMOGRAPHIC & HOUSING DATA

This section of the Strategy provides a brief overview of the demographics of Bathurst with a particular emphasis on housing. The information was derived from the 1996 Census carried out by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). More detailed demographic analysis is available in the report, Bathurst Demographic Profile 1999.

2.1 Population Age

The population of Bathurst compared to NSW is shown below in Table 2.1.1. The age groups in which Bathurst have a proportionately higher number are in the 5-9 years, 10-14 years, 15-19 years and 20-24 years which represent a range from children to adolescents. The most marked differences are shown in the 15-19 age group where Bathurst has a 3.0% higher proportion of this age group compared to NSW, and in the 20-24 age group where Bathurst's proportion is 2.4% higher. Although Bathurst's population is aging, NSW has a greater proportion of people in the 65+ age cohort with 2.1% more. These differences might be explained by the plentiful number of primary, secondary and tertiary education institutions located in Bathurst attracting greater numbers of younger people to the city.

Table 2.1.1 BATHURST/NSW AGE PROFILE COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Bathurst 1996</th>
<th>Proportion of Pop.</th>
<th>NSW 1996</th>
<th>Proportion of Pop.</th>
<th>Bathurst/NSW</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0-4)</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>427690</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5-9)</td>
<td>2203</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>430329</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10-14)</td>
<td>2438</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>427573</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15-19)</td>
<td>2913</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>412714</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20-24)</td>
<td>2818</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>435711</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25-29)</td>
<td>2109</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>448132</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30-34)</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>470357</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35-39)</td>
<td>2201</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>476608</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40-44)</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>439371</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45-49)</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>418872</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50-54)</td>
<td>1449</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>333071</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(55-59)</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>274242</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60-64)</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>237973</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65+)</td>
<td>3110</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>762902</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29105</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5995545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ERM Mitchell McCotter, 1999, Bathurst Community Needs Assessment, 2.2
2.1 *Major Points to Note*

- Bathurst has a greater proportion of younger people compared to NSW.
- NSW has a greater proportion of older people than Bathurst, especially in the 65 and over age cohort.

2.2 *Family Type*

Family makeup in Bathurst is similar to that of NSW. Figure 2.2.1 below shows proportions of family types in Bathurst compared to NSW.

*Figure 2.2.1 Family Type*

*Other = Other Family, Unrelated individual living in family household, and Group household member.*

*Source: ABS, CDATA96.*

The proportion of couple families with children in Bathurst has fallen below the state proportion by about 5 per cent. The proportion of couples with children has fallen since 1991 when Bathurst recorded over half of its families (54.8%) as couples with children, while NSW has remained relatively the same. Bathurst has higher proportions of its population as single parent families, lone persons and other* families compared to the NSW proportions. These statistics are very similar to those recorded in 1991.
Regarding family and tenure type, the proportion of homes rented by single parent families (52.3%) outnumbers both the proportions of owned homes and homes being purchased (totalling 44.8%). This scenario was the same for Bathurst in 1991. In comparison, a greater proportion of couple families with and without children own their own home (76.9%) compared to those who rent (20.2%). This proportion has risen since 1991 with more couple families owning their own homes in Bathurst. This may be an indication of both the stable state of the economy and the steady demand for individuals to own their own home.

Two person households occupy the largest proportion of separate houses in Bathurst with 31%, followed by 4 person households with 18.5%. The former households would encompass couples with no children, couples with all children left home and two people in share accommodation. Four person households would also include those in share accommodation and couples with 2 dependent children. Most semi-detached, row or terrace houses and townhouses are occupied by lone persons (40%). Similarly, most units, flats and apartments are occupied by lone persons (60%). This dominant housing choice by lone persons may be due to the sense of security gained by living in a medium density environment and the obvious fact that a lone person requires less living area than other family types.

2.2 Major Points to Note

- Proportions of couple families with children has fallen in Bathurst since 1991 by about 5 per cent.
- More single parent families rent homes rather than own or purchase.
- More couple families both with and without children own their own homes.
- Separate houses in Bathurst are mostly occupied by 2-person or 4-person households.
- Most units, flats & apartments are occupied by lone persons.

2.3 Dwelling Type

Some 76% of all dwellings in Bathurst are detached houses and 84.7% of the population live in this dwelling type. Of all dwellings, 20.6% consist of semi-detached units and flats, which is comparatively high when contrasted with other regional centres in the area such as Orange, where semi-detached dwellings make up 14% and Mudgee, 7.9%. These proportions have not changed significantly since 1991. The mix of dwelling types in Bathurst can be seen in Figure 2.3.1 below.

![Figure 2.3.1 Structure of Dwellings](image-url)
The regional centre which best aligns with Bathurst's mix of dwelling types is Armidale which has 76% of its dwellings detached houses and 20.5% of its dwellings semi-detached flats. This similarity may be due to the demand for medium density and other housing types generated by the Universities in these centres and other tertiary students living in these cities. Albury has an even greater proportion of semi-detached houses with 25.8% of all dwellings semi-detached. This figure for Albury has not changed significantly since the 1991 ABS figures. It is interesting to note that the higher proportions of semi-detached housing in these centres is closely aligned with that of a suburban fringe city area such as Fairfield or Campbelltown.

Of all detached houses in Bathurst, 68.8% are either fully owned or being purchased. This figure has steadily fallen since 1991 when it was recorded at 74%. In comparison, 60.5% of all semi-detached units and flats are rented which has also fallen since 1991 when the proportion was 72%. This effectively means that less people own their own detached houses (more are being built for the rental market) and less people are renting their units (and possibly residing in them). Possibly this also indicates that a greater number of people (possibly retirees) are purchasing residential units as their main abode and effectively moving from the suburbs into the inner city.

Detached dwellings are the predominant housing preference for couple families both with and without children as 91% of Bathurst's families reside in this type of dwelling. Comparatively, only 7% of families (one family households) live in semi-detached units and flats. The other 2% is made up of 'other' abodes such as caravans and houses attached to shops. A greater proportion of lone person and group households live in semi-detached units and flats with 40% and 43% respectively living in these dwelling types. Of all the existing semi-detached units and flats in Bathurst, lone person households occupy most of these (58%).

Of the existing dwellings in Bathurst, Figure 2.3.2 below shows the proportions of dwelling types in regions of Bathurst. The following suburbs are used to form each Bathurst region.

- **Outer Fringe** - Macquarie Plains, Windradyne/Llanarth, Robin Hill, Greenhills (Wentworth Estate)

- **Inner Fringe** - Hospital and West Bathurst areas, South Bathurst, Gormans Hill area, Mount Panorama and the older residential area of Kelso

- **Inner City** - Central Bathurst

- **Villages** - Raglan, Eglinton and Perthville.
As seen above, detached dwellings remain the most common existing dwelling type in all areas of Bathurst, with Central Bathurst (inner city) having a closer distribution of dwellings between detached houses and units. This close resemblance is to be expected as under current planning controls, residential units are only permissible with consent in Precinct 1 which encompasses, on the majority, the centre of Bathurst. The dominance of detached houses increases as one moves toward the outer Bathurst regions such as the villages.

In contrast to Figure 2.3.2, Figure 2.3.3 looks at the whole of Bathurst and proportions of separate and semi-detached units across each of the regions.
As expected, the inner city area possesses the largest proportion of units and semi-
detached dwellings, followed by the inner and outer fringes. The inner fringe is
the area with the highest proportion of detached dwellings, followed by the outer
fringe and inner city. The villages showed the lowest proportions of both housing
types; this could be due to these areas not yet being fully developed. Since 1991,
these proportions have remained fairly similar with the only noticeable changes
being a decrease in the proportion of units and flats in the inner fringe and an
increase in the units and flats in the inner city. This also may be due to the ABS
area cohorts for some inner city collections districts\textsuperscript{*} increasing in size. *Collection
Districts are the smallest geographical area defined in the Australian Standard Geographical
Classification. In urban areas (such as Bathurst), there is an average of 225 dwellings per collection
district. (McLennan, 1996,143).

2.3 Major Points to Note

- Compared to other Central West cities, Bathurst has a high proportion of semi-
detached units & flats (20.6%).
- Numbers of detached houses either fully owned or being purchased in Bathurst
  has fallen by around 5% since 1991.
- Numbers of semi-detached units and flats being rented in Bathurst has also
  fallen by a larger 11% since 1991.
- Detached dwellings remain the dominant housing preference with 91% of
  Bathurst's families residing in this type of dwelling.
- Central Bathurst (inner city region) has the closest alignment of separate houses
  and units with 50.3% & 43.5% respectively.
- Predominance of detached houses increases as one moves toward the outer
  Bathurst areas.

2.4 Number of Persons per Dwelling (density)

At the drafting of the previous strategy, residential density figures were contained in
various residential codes for suburbs/sections of Bathurst such as Kilacloran and
Windradyne/Llanartha. With gazettel of the Bathurst Local Environmental Plan in
1997, two residential Development Control Plans (DCPs) were also adopted; these
were for Residential Subdivision and Residential Housing. The density controls from
the previous DCPs were transferred to the Residential Housing DCP, remaining
essentially the same for all of Bathurst's residential areas. Direct comparisons can now
be made for the occupancy rates (persons per dwelling) from the last strategy.
Density and hence occupancy figures have generally decreased between the 1991 and
1996 census. Table 2.4.1 below shows these previous figures from the 1991 census.

Table 2.4.1 Residential Occupancy Rates 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Averages</th>
<th>Council Codes</th>
<th>Bathurst</th>
<th>Central Precinct</th>
<th>New Release</th>
<th>NSW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average 1 denotes the average for all dwellings regardless of dwelling type (semi/detached)
*Average 2 denotes the average for detached houses only.
Table 2.4.2 below shows the occupancy rates for the same areas based on 1996 census figures.

**Table 2.4.2 Residential Occupancy Rates 1996**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Averages</th>
<th>Council Codes</th>
<th>Bathurst</th>
<th>Central Precinct</th>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>New Release</th>
<th>NSW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average occupancy rates in the central precinct have fallen considerably over the past 5 years, with detached houses in this central area showing the sharpest decline in persons per dwelling. The above general declines in average occupancy have followed state averages with these figures falling as well. The only occupancy rates which have increased over this period were the general Bathurst average total occupancy (from 2.7 to 2.86) and the average total new release precinct (from 2.9 to 3.1), which may indicate larger families moving from the inner city to the outer fringe and village areas.
3.0 **LOW DENSITY – DETACHED HOUSING**

3.1 **Inner Fringe Area**

The inner fringe comprises a largely older and established residential region with small tracts of other mixed land uses, such as industrial, business and recreation. Similar to the 1991 census, the inner fringe area holds the greatest proportion of detached dwellings among the four main regions of Bathurst. This is largely because it is already well established and also because this area some 50 years ago would have been considered the Windradyne of today, providing housing lots close to the CBD, but still considered at a distance from the busier city streets where a family lifestyle was considered ideal. Although some medium density forms of housing (dual occupancies and granny flats) are permissible in this area, residential units are not permissible.

Since the 1991 census, four more collection districts have been included in the inner fringe area, further expanding the number and mix of houses in this region. The proportion of detached dwellings within this area has remained fairly similar (at around 42 per cent) and the proportion of semi-detached units and flats have decreased (from approximately 32 per cent in 1991 to 21 per cent in 1996). This indicates that the collection districts included in the inner fringe were comprised mostly of detached dwellings. The inner fringe, despite this dominance of low-density, seems the most likely to see a shift toward dual occupancies as the development potential of larger lots in close proximity to the CBD is realised.

The 1994 Strategy recommended that the Mount Panorama area was not suitable for low density urban expansion due to policy adoptions by Council regarding no future rezonings for residential inside the 50dBA noise contour as well as the importance of the Mount Panorama racing circuit to the city of Bathurst. These intentions are reinforced with the revision of this strategy.

3.2 **Outer Fringe Area**

The outer fringe, as in 1991, does not contain as large a proportion of detached dwellings as the inner fringe, mainly due to this area not yet being fully developed. Figures 3.2.1a and 3.2.1b show the undeveloped outer fringe land with residential development potential in 1994 compared to 1999 (refer also to the Residential Subdivision Development Control Plans). The outlined areas in these maps show land which has been, or is soon to be, developed for residential purposes since 1994. Table 3.2.2 shows the residential potential of these areas in terms of lot numbers and population.
Table 3.2.2  Undeveloped Land – Residential Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windradyne/ Llanarth</td>
<td>267.29</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>2364/</td>
<td>8274/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie Plains</td>
<td>340.75</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>2524/</td>
<td>8835/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2556</td>
<td>7668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>608.04</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>4888/</td>
<td>17,109/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4561</td>
<td>13,683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above table, a lot yield of 7.5 lots per hectare has been used as the current lot yield average in new release areas. An occupancy rate of 3.0 has been used for the same reasons as for the 1994 Strategy, being:

- the average occupancy of both detached and total dwellings in new release areas is 3.1, as shown in Table 2.4.2, and
- the average occupancy is expected to decline as a suburb ages, note the average occupancy for detached dwellings in Bathurst is 2.7.

Figure 3.2.3 displays the number of building approvals for new dwellings in the last 17 years in Bathurst. With a stable growth rate for Bathurst over the next few years, an estimation can be made that on average 163 new dwellings will be approved each year (this figure is the average for the last 3 years). It is worthwhile noting that the same figure estimated for 1994 was 233 new dwellings approved each year. This was not achieved in the years following 1993, with approval numbers for 1994 to 1996 being 214 (which was an 18 month period) in 1994, 124 in 1995 and 137 in 1996. An assumption also made from the 1994 strategy was that as the number of dwelling approvals had steadily increased from 1990 to 1993, this trend would continue. As seen from the numbers above, this increase was not sustained in the years following 1993 with a sharp decline in building approvals in 1995/96. It seems that new dwelling approvals follow a cyclical pattern of booms and busts, similar to a trade cycle. Other factors may influence the rate of confidence in the building industry such as the CPI index (inflation rate), interest rates and Government initiatives such as the boom experienced in the building industry prior to 30 June 2000 as a result of pending introduction of the GST.
When compared to the rest of NSW, Bathurst follows a similar pattern of increased and decreased building approvals over time, indicating that factors influencing confidence in the new housing market have a similar effect state-wide. The overall average over the past 20 years for new dwelling approvals is about 164 per year. Our last figure indicated that we are above this average, however recent numbers of applications in 2001 indicate that this average figure will not be reached and a downturn will result for this financial year.

3.3 Villages

Three residential villages are located in the Bathurst area; those being Eglinton, Raglan and Perthville. The main form of housing in these villages is detached dwellings. In 1994 it was noted that Eglinton and Raglan contained only detached dwellings, however since this time about five (5) dual occupancies/granny flats have been approved in these village areas. The minimum lot size of 900 square metres in the villages has been maintained since 1994 and a small rise in approvals for medium density housing is beginning to show (as indicated above). Of the dwelling types in the three villages, 1.4 per cent are semi-detached/dual occupancies. According to all of Bathurst, 0.5 per cent of semi-detached/dual occupancies are in the villages. This number has risen from zero in 1994, indicating a small shift in the preferred housing types in outer areas, with a major preference remaining for detached dwellings.

All of the villages have the potential for further growth in low density housing, as seen below.
3.3.1 Eglinton

At present, Residential Subdivision Development Control Plan Map No. 3, Eglinton (previously the Eglinton Development Control Plan), shows a village of some 630 residential lots once fully developed. With 538 of these lots already formed, 92 are yet to be created. The number of lots already formed in 1994 was 474. Therefore, 64 new lots have been created in Eglinton over the last five years. This new lot creation can be mostly attributed to the rezoning of land along Hamilton Street which created an additional 61 residential lots (some not yet formed). As an aside, Council has recently resolved to investigate interest levels in rezoning additional lands surrounding Eglinton to residential.

From personal observation, at present only 19 of the existing registered residential lots are currently vacant. The total remaining residential potential of Eglinton is thus 111 lots (92 lots plus 19 lots).

The future population of Eglinton can be projected based on the following assumptions:

- the existing occupancy rate of 3.2 persons per dwelling is adopted; and
- each of the remaining lots will majoratively contain a detached house with a slight proportion of new houses being dual occupancies.

From the above assumptions, Eglinton’s population will increase by about 416 persons to a total of some 2076 persons. The existing population of Eglinton is estimated at 1660 persons, based on the existing occupancy rate of 3.2 persons per dwelling with 519 existing dwellings in this village. The same assumption in 1994 was that Eglinton’s population would increase by some 655 persons to a total of 2245 persons. This was with an estimated occupancy rate of 3.7 persons per dwelling. It has been shown that this estimate is too high for an average figure with occupancy rates falling over the last 6 years. This new occupancy rate reflects a more accurate population estimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGLINTON</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCP Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential (Lots)</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Lots</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots not yet created</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots created but vacant</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Potential</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lots)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Population</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Population</td>
<td>2245</td>
<td>2076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2 Raglan

The Raglan Development Control Plan shows a village of some 533 residential lots once fully developed. At present, 378 residential lots have been created, leaving 155 lots unformed. In 1994 the number of lots created was 325, indicating that over the past 5 years, 53 new lots have been created in Raglan (ie, just over 10 new lots per year). From personal observation, 20 formed lots in Raglan are currently vacant. Thus it can be assumed that 358 dwellings exist in Raglan. The total remaining residential potential of Raglan is therefore 175 lots (20 lots plus 155 lots).

The future population of Raglan is projected using those same assumptions as outlined for Eglinton. On this basis, it can be expected that Raglan’s population will increase by about 551 persons, to a total of some 1512 persons (note: the existing population of Raglan is taken from a collection district covering the majority of the Raglan area).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAGLAN</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCP Development Potential (Lots)</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Lots</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots not yet created</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots created but vacant</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Potential (lots)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Population</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Population</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.3 Perthville

At the time of the last Strategy, a draft Development Control Plan for Perthville had been prepared, showing a village of some 283 lots once fully developed. Since then, Residential Subdivision Development Control Plan Map No. 5 - Perthville, has been adopted which shows a village of 287 lots once fully developed. At present, Perthville has some 147 lots already created with 27 of these vacant. Therefore, it can be assumed that 120 houses currently exist in Perthville.

At the 1994 Strategy, water and sewer services were soon to be extended to Perthville which would expand the existing boundaries of the village to ensure maximum utilisation of these services. A system capacity of 1050 persons was adopted by the Department of Public Works in the design of both the water and sewerage systems. Water and sewer were connected to Perthville in late 1994 and since this time the area has grown substantially. The 1996 population of Perthville was approximately 388 (from the appropriate Collection District). Thus, the population of Perthville can be expected to grow by another 2.7 times its present size to cater for the intended population. Since the last strategy, Perthville has grown by the addition of another 23 dwellings and approximately 86 persons. Therefore, on average, Perthville’s population has increased by 17 persons per year. If this growth were to remain constant, ceteris paribus, Perthville will reach its water and sewer capacity by the year 2034.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERTHVILLE</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCP Development Potential (Lots)</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Lots</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots not yet created</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots created but vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Potential (lots)</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Population</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Population</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Inner City

The inner city area of Bathurst contains about 21 per cent of the detached housing in Bathurst. This proportion has decreased slightly from 25% in 1994. As in 1994, the housing stock is predominantly older due to its location in the older grid pattern section of Bathurst. With the dominance of detached housing in the inner city declining and the proportion of semi-detached housing, units and flats increasing, this region is seeing a move toward a more consolidated, compact city. As in 1994, subdivisions of existing lots are reducing average lot sizes in the city as dual occupancies and units are built on remaining land parcels. Infill development also contributes to the consolidation of the inner city.

Large lots of residentially zoned land still exist in the inner city. It is unlikely that this land will be used for low-density residential development in the future for a number of reasons:

- land prices are progressively increasing in the inner city area and therefore the provision of low density housing would not be the most feasible economic option;
- current planning controls over the inner city permit all types of housing, including residential units; and
- community acceptance of higher density living is greater in the inner city.

Therefore, as the market has determined and as the above pressures influence housing preference in the inner city, any additional supply of low density housing may not serve a vast need.

An examination of the types of residential development likely to occur in the inner city will be undertaken in a later chapter.
3.5 Summary

Low density housing remains the dominant housing preference for the people of Bathurst. This housing preference will be seen mainly in the villages and outer fringe areas. The inner fringe area is comprised of the largest proportion of detached houses when considering all of Bathurst, mainly due to its age and proximity to the city centre. The outer fringe area, due to its more recent development, does not have as many detached dwellings as the inner fringe, however this will change as the area develops. A total population for the outer fringe areas of Windradyne/Llanarth and Macquarie Plains is estimated at 13,683 persons when fully developed. For this estimated population to eventuate, a number of factors such as the interest rate, CPI index and general state of the economy are relevant. It is interesting to note that the previous estimated building approvals of 233 new dwellings each year for the years following 1994 did not eventuate over this time period. With an estimation based on the average building approvals of the past 3 years, the time frame for the existing land stocks in these outer areas is expected to last another 27 years (ie. to the year 2026). This will enable Bathurst to increase its population to approximately 44,000. The 1994 Housing Strategy estimated a population of 45,000 persons by the year 2023. This estimation was even less than the 1974 Structure Plan which predicted a target population of 50,000. The issue then, as before, is whether the estimated lot yields currently used are appropriate. Are the outer fringe areas developing at too low a density?
4.0 **MEDIUM DENSITY**

For the purpose of definition, Bathurst relies on limitations of persons per hectare for medium and high density housing. Medium density housing, as defined in the Bathurst LEP 1997 is ‘residential units designed to be occupied by no more than 100 persons per site hectare’. Council has adopted the following limitations on medium density development for residential units:

For lots up to 4000m², no more than 88 persons per site hectare.  
For lots over 4000m², no more than 93.5 persons per site hectare.

High density housing is often encouraged as it provides greater choice for home seekers while using land and infrastructure more efficiently (Woodhead, 1994). For Bathurst, high density is defined in the LEP as ‘residential development in the form of residential units where the residential density is greater than 110 persons per hectare’. The majority of Bathurst’s high density housing developments have been undertaken by the Department of Housing and Charles Sturt University (previously Mitchell College of Advanced Education) and are located in the suburbs of Windradyne, Kelso and Mitchell. As high density housing is generally not proposed, nor is it in high demand in Bathurst, it is not considered necessary to include high density housing as part of this study. The planning controls for higher density housing in the Residential Housing DCP remain relevant and therefore do not require revision.

Medium density housing has largely been provided in the central areas of Bathurst to fit with intended urban consolidation measures and satisfy demand for dwellings close to the city centre. Currently, all forms of dwellings are permissible in Precinct 1 as defined under the Residential Housing DCP (Figure 4.1 shows the extent of the boundaries for the inner city component of Precinct 1), including residential units, dual occupancies and granny flats. This chapter will look at existing housing stocks and implications surrounding change which has occurred since the 1994 Housing Strategy, and the change in vacant land potential.

Since the 1994 Strategy, some of the inner city blocks have developed with mostly medium density developments being constructed. Despite this, portions of the inner city blocks remain available for residential development. In 1994, medium density housing made up 20% of the existing housing stock in Bathurst. In 1999, medium density housing makes up 21% of housing stock. This does not represent an extensive increase and Bathurst could still benefit from increased provision of medium density housing in the following ways:

- offering a wider choice of housing types to suit the different lifestyles of the community;
- providing a source of rental accommodation;
- allowing for more efficient use of existing facilities;
- providing a mechanism to slow down urban sprawl and revitalise the urban centre; and
- providing accommodation closer to services and employment
- to address the decline in housing occupancy rates.
Figure 4.1 Precinct 1
Combined with this is the notion that larger percentages of older people prefer to live in medium density style housing, as do single person households and couples with no children. With these demographic types increasing in numbers, so may the demand for this type of housing.

4.1 Residential Potential of the Central Blocks

This section deals with the remaining residential potential of the central blocks of Bathurst. The same sections as for the last strategy will be reviewed to determine how quickly Bathurst’s central area has grown in the last six years. Figure 4.1.1 shows the locations of the sections to be reviewed, and Appendix 1 shows each of these sections in diagrams.

Section 7

In 1994 approximately 7600 square metres of vacant land had been identified as suitable for medium density development. One of three vacant portions of land identified from the 1994 Strategy has been developed since this time, constituting about 1720m² of land. This portion has been successfully developed with colonial-style units being built on the smallest of the original three vacant lots. Remaining vacant land in this section is approximately 6406 square metres. Additional vacant land identified in this block was previously considered not suitable for development due to the number of significant trees on the land. This is still apparent, combined with the utilisation of this battleaxe lot by the Senior Citizens Centre and associated parking area.

Section 16

Approximately 6407m² of vacant land is available in this section. This has decreased in area by 2393m² since the 1994 as a unit development has been built over a portion of the vacant land. Access to the remaining vacant area remains an issue and demolition of an existing dwelling may be the only option for appropriate access. For such access to be created via demolition of a house, the Heritage Planning provisions from the Bathurst LEP and Council policies regarding Structural and Historical Assessments as well as infill forms would need to be satisfied and completed.

Section 17

The vacant land in this section is an odd shape, mainly made up of large backyards totaling approximately 2289 square metres in area. A small section of this land has been subdivided and developed since 1994 as a single dwelling. No figures on the size of this portion were given in the 1994 Housing Strategy. The remaining vacant land has no direct access to any street frontage and a comprehensive development of this vacant land would prove difficult with the multiple ownerships over the land parcels. This issue does not render the development prohibitive, but is rather a deterrent to potential developers.
Section 18

About 2584m² of vacant land has been identified as suitable for development in this section. This amount of land has not changed significantly since 1994. Development approval has been given for this vacant land to be utilised in a Motel development. This approval has until late 2004 to be developed. Much of this section has been utilised by medium density developments, with possibly this section having the greatest coverage of units in the city. This area is an ideal unit location as the land is quite flat and is very close to the CBD.

Section 25

In 1994 this section possessed a very large vacant area in its central portion. It was thought that this area would best be developed by a unified approach and including the entirety of the vacant land. However, smaller parts of this central area have been developed since this time by way of one strata unit development off Stewart Street and one smaller development off Durham Street. Consolidation and re-subdivision of some of these lots may not eventuate, so as suggested in the previous strategy, dual occupancy developments for the smaller lots fronting Peel Street may be a more viable option. The remaining vacant area in this section is approximately 3502 square metres, which compares to 7700m² in 1994.

Section 26

This section has seen limited development since the last strategy. In fact, vacant land identified has increased in area since the last strategy with 4593 square metres available for development (an increase of 1393 square metres). The additional land was identified at the rear of existing properties on Stewart Street, which may or may not want to build second dwellings and/or subdivide. The other parcel which has been previously identified forms part of the curtilage of Miss Traill’s House which also may or may not be appropriate to develop, depending on the conservation values of the remaining land. A recommendation from this will be seen in a future study to be undertaken regarding contributory buildings and curtilages in the conservation area.

Section 28

Under the previous planning instrument, a DCP covered this inner city section. Following the introduction of the Residential DCPs which cover design and layout issues in a more general format, this DCP was abandoned; however the general intentions for this section were not. Some of the vacant land identified previously has been developed, with the remaining vacant parcels appropriate for dual occupancy and generally low to medium density style developments. The vacant land identified in this section is approximately 1355 square metres, which compares to 2300m² in 1994.
Section 29

Vacant land in this section in 1994 totalled 5200m². Two of the smaller vacant land parcels identified in 1994 have now been developed as one dual occupancy and one single house. The larger parcel remaining is yet to be developed, as shown on the section map. The larger parcel is approximately 5034 square metres and has access from Lambert Street. Some discussions have been held and applications lodged with Council regarding the lot which provides access to the proposed larger lot. If a house were to be approved on this lot, possible stagnation of potential unit developments on this site could result, with a disjointed vacant area. The rear of the lot closest to Piper Street could alternatively be developed as a dual occupancy with access from Piper Street, or subdivided and a new house erected.

Section 30

In 1994 a small area of approximately 1000m² was identified. This area has not been developed in this time and remains vacant. It may be best developed with a dual occupancy or further unit development, which is predominant in this section.

Section 31

Approximately 3400 square metres of vacant land was identified in 1994 as vacant land. Since this time this land has been developed as a strata unit development and this section has now reached its full development potential at this time.

Section 32

The parcel of land identified from the 1994 Strategy has since been developed into residential units, which is an appropriate development for this section. As only half of this section is zoned residential, the residential potential of this section has been fulfilled.

Section 33

Interest has been shown in this large vacant residential area. In 1994, 8700 square metres of land was identified as vacant and suitable for medium density housing. Today, 7595 square metres of vacant land exists as applications for dual occupancies have been approved and constructed for the front Lambert Street portions near the vacant land. Applications for further dual occupancies and residential units are expected to be submitted for the rear of these lots. It was suggested that the demolition of the existing fibro house on Lot 17, DP 809078 may be feasible combined with a unified proposal to develop the majority of the vacant area. An application to relocate this house was approved, which facilitates the development of the majority of this area which is intended to occur in the near future.
Section 34

Approximately 8200m² of land was identified in 1994 as vacant in this section. The smaller parcel, with direct road access on two frontages (and about 1400m²) and singular ownership was developed in a relatively short time with units in 1998. The larger parcel of approximately 7240 square metres does not have direct access to a public road except through existing driveways. With this access issue unresolved, other development options may have to be explored. A large component of this middle section is occupied by a nursery which seems to be well settled in its chosen location. The existence of large trees on these lots may also restrict the design of residential developments in this area. Therefore, redevelopment of this section for residential development is unlikely in the short to medium term as previously assumed.

Section 37

In June 1994 following the writing of the previous Strategy, the vacant parcel identified was developed as residential units and one dual occupancy. It can therefore be assumed that this section has reached its full potential for housing development at this point in time.

Section 42

The same area remains vacant in this section with an area of 5100m² as was the case in 1994. Access is obtainable from Peel Street and cluster style housing would be appropriate. This area has a low to medium slope and drainage would be effectively directed to Peel Street. With views able to be maximised over the city, this area would be best developed by a high quality apartment style development.

Section 45

The vacant area in this section has remained similar since the last Strategy and is approximately 4462m² in area. Although physically able to be developed, it may not be advisable due to the number of significant trees located in this area. This land is also in the vicinity of a heritage item and part of the vacant area may contribute to the curtilage of this item. Council has had an application lodged for subdivision of this land. This application was refused, nonetheless it is likely that another application will be lodged at some point.
Sections 27, 65 and 66

No significant tracts of vacant land were identified in these sections. Although many lots in these sections have the potential for dual occupancy type developments, this is unlikely due to:

- the higher socio-economic appearance of the area. The area consists of very large houses centrally located on large lots. Consequently the owners of the properties will be less likely to subdivide.
- The large number of very significant trees found in these sections will hinder the erection of new dwellings.

Section 68

The small parcel identified in the previous strategy (1000m²) has been developed as a two lot subdivision and dwellings placed on both lots. The two lots at the rear of these lots seem to have been developed at the same time in a similar manner to the front two dwellings. The previous strategy predicted that this style of development may occur on this rear lot. Therefore section 68 has reached its full residential potential at this stage.

Section 72

This section houses the Bathurst Olympic Pool and waterslide. A residential block approximately 1500 square metres in area has been identified as vacant and able to be developed. It has direct access to Stanley Street and could be developed as a single dwelling or dual occupancy style development. Currently in the ownership of Bathurst City Council, perhaps its only downfall is its proximity to the waterslide and pool.

Section 78

This section has seen much interest and development since the inception of the last Strategy. The presence of larger lots in single ownership has facilitated unit, dual occupancy and conventional subdivision developments over the last six years. Some land is still available for development in this section in three lots; one approximately 1346m², one approximately 1776m², and the middle one approx. 699m². All of these lots have access from Rankin Street and judging from the natural slope, drainage would be easily directed to the gutter in this street. The largest of these lots has seen much interest by way of applications for various developments including conventional subdivision and dual occupancy. These consents have now lapsed on this land and its future development is now in question again. The parcel of approx. 699 square metres is currently the access for a large land parcel. This access is large enough to accommodate another dwelling (dual occupancy) or be subdivided from the existing parcel. There do exist significant trees on this parcel, whose inherent value should be determined prior to removal, if this is necessary.
Section 80

The same area of land (approximately 4400m²) has been identified in this section as being vacant as for the last strategy. This land capable of development is located in the centre of the section and has no distinct access to a public road. This access issue combined with the relatively steep slope of the land and the higher socio-economic status of this area are all limiting factors to the medium density development of this land. These lots contain larger style houses and it is thought that residents would be less likely to subdivide their land.

Section 81

Approximately 4000m² of vacant land was identified in this section in the last strategy. Small portions of this land has been developed since this time, leaving approximately 2491 square metres of vacant land. This land would be easily developed in the two existing parcels, one as a dual occupancy off Park Street and the other possibly a unit development off Seymour Street. The Seymour Street parcel may be best utilised by the demolition of an older cottage on site (pending demolition approval) to unify the new development.

Section 82

A large central portion of this section is still available for development, as indicated in the previous strategy. Another parcel shown which has access from Rocket Street has approval for a unit development, however as work has not yet commenced, the lot is still shown as vacant. A small cottage at the front of this lot was also approved for demolition on this lot, which has slightly increased the area on this site available for development to 2023m². The total area available for development in this section is 6523m². The development of the larger middle area of vacant land would be dependent on a number of factors including access, multiple ownership and drainage issues.

Section 83

This section has seen some development for medium density in the past six years. Two unit developments have been completed on battleaxe lots identified as vacant in the last strategy, with two areas remaining vacant. One of these areas is owned by the Central Tablelands Rural Lands Protection Board and currently houses buildings which relate to this business. Demolition would need to occur on this site for a residential development to be carried out. This site is approximately 1037m², which is appropriate for dual occupancy or a medium density development. The other area currently vacant is at the rear of existing properties in Rocket Street and covers approximately 867 square metres. This area would be best developed as a dual occupancy. The total vacant land identified in this section is 1904 square metres.
Section 122

Approximately 3077 square metres of land has been identified in section 122. Access is obtainable from both Brilliant and Browning Streets. The access from Browning Street is shown on Council’s register as public road. Therefore, the use of this road to access a private unit development may have ownership implications. Thus, the access from Brilliant Street may be a more viable option. This access currently serves student accommodation in this section and is owned by Charles Sturt University, so possibly the University may want to use this land to expand its accommodation in the future.

Sections without development potential

The following sections were found to have only limited development potential in 1994: 14, 15, 19, 19a, 20, 20a, 36, 39, 40, 44, 46, 69, 76, 77, 79, 84, 85, 89, 89a, 119, 123 and 155. Added to this in 2000 are sections 31, 32, 37 and 68 which have been substantially developed. Most sections mentioned have experienced some kind of low to medium density development over the past six years with the least amount of interest shown in sections 18, 26, 30, 42, 45, 72, 80, and 82. This may be due to their location, market forces and proximity to services and the flood plain.

Flood prone areas may become viable residential/commercial areas once the flood levees are constructed. The following sections are currently being reviewed for their rezoning/development potential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Area</th>
<th>Section Number</th>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near Sewer Treatment Works</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1(b) Market Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22a</td>
<td>6(a) Local Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21a</td>
<td>6(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20a</td>
<td>2(a) Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2(a) &amp; 4(a) Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havannah Street area</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2(a) &amp; 6(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2(a) &amp; 6(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>6(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>6(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>6(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>6(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations from a study currently being completed on residential land following levee construction will determine the potential of these areas.

Summary

To recap on the vacant land statistics mentioned in the sections above, the following table summarises vacant land figures for 1994 and 2000, showing resulting decreases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Number</th>
<th>Land Vacant 1994 (sq. metres)</th>
<th>Land Vacant 2000 (sq. metres)</th>
<th>% Increase or decrease of original (1994) vacant land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7600</td>
<td>5880</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8800</td>
<td>6407</td>
<td>-27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>2289</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>2584</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7700</td>
<td>3502</td>
<td>-55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>4593</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>-41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td>5034</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>8700</td>
<td>7595</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>8200</td>
<td>7240</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4462</td>
<td>4462</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,65,66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>8200</td>
<td>3821</td>
<td>-53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2491</td>
<td>-38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>5900</td>
<td>6523</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>5900</td>
<td>3077</td>
<td>-48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>111,050</td>
<td>83,046</td>
<td>-25% (average %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall some 8.16 hectares of vacant land has been identified. Therefore, over the past 6 years, some 2.42 hectares (or 4033 square metres per year) of vacant land has been developed for low to medium density residential use in the CBD sections. This may seem like a small figure, however other factors affecting the development of land would have played a part, such as the cyclical nature of interest in development and the difficulties of developing inner section land parcels. This part of the plan has made suggestions regarding maximum potential development which could be carried out. This section, however, does not intend to promote these suggestions regarding development potential as the ideal, as in some cases land ownership, access restrictions, engineering and overall density and design issues may prevent comprehensive development of the land. It is considered that parcels of single ownership will remain to be developed in isolation of adjoining vacant parcels, which is a current trend. Previously it was suggested that DCPs be drafted for certain sections. This exercise was never carried out and from experience, is not needed as the remaining sections have experienced steady development over the past six years. A more appropriate study to be done over the next few years (as mentioned previously) is to be concerned with the CBD sections and their heritage significance according to inherent value and contribution to the streetscape. This study would further clarify which lands have development potential and which should be left vacant as they contribute to the significance of an item or the streetscape.

**Recommendation:** That initiation of the Bathurst Conservation Area Management Strategy be pursued to ensure both Council and potential developers have a clear understanding of the central areas intended for conservation and those which are not.

### 4.2 Further Development of the Central Blocks

As was the intention in 1994, the further development of the central blocks in Bathurst is a viable and encouraged option for the following reasons:

1) The Open Space Study has indicated that additional open space in central Bathurst is not required,
2) Large portions of the backyards are not being used and are being left unmaintained,
3) The vacant land identified above should be developed for residential purposes to ensure that medium density forms of housing can be provided as Bathurst grows. Although the land identified is not considered to be enough in terms of supporting future demand (see section 4.4), it will meet a significant proportion of the need close to the city centre, and
4) The further development of the inner city blocks will offer additional accommodation with the general benefits associated with inner city living and make better use of existing utilities.
4.3 Population Estimates

The future population of the centre blocks is estimated below. It should be noted that these estimates are based on all the vacant land being developed. Despite this, further investigations may indicate that not all of the land may have development potential due to engineering (such as water and drainage) problems and other site specific problems.

A total area of 8.16 hectares was identified as vacant in section 4.1 above. Of all the central sections identified it is considered that a total of 3.5 hectares will not be developed in the short to medium term due to problems such as those mentioned above. Therefore, all estimates excepting estimate 1 will use 4.66 hectares as the total vacant land figure. The density rates used in the estimates are those as outlined in Council’s Residential Housing DCP.

Estimate 1

Total area of vacant land is 8.16 hectares.
Assume density of 88 persons per site hectare.
Estimated population = 718 persons
Estimated 1994 population = 930 persons.

Estimate 2

Total area of vacant land is 4.66 hectares.
Assume density of 88 persons per site hectare.
Estimated population = 410 persons
Estimated 1994 population = 820 persons.

Estimate 3

(i) Total area of vacant land zoned 2(a) Residential and located inside Precinct 1 is 4.3 hectares.
Assume density of 88 person per site hectare.
Estimated population = 378 persons
Estimated 1994 population = 540 persons.

(ii) Total area of vacant land zoned 2(a) Residential and located in Precinct 2 is 4462 square metres.
Assume dual occupancies on all lots at 550m2 per lot.
Assume each dual occupancy contains 1x2 bedroom and 1x3 bedroom dwellings at an overall occupancy of 5.5 persons.
Total lots = 8
Estimated population = 44 persons
Estimated 1994 population = 310 persons (based on total 2(a) residential vacant land being 3.125 hectares).

TOTAL ESTIMATED POPULATION = 422 persons.
TOTAL 1994 ESTIMATED POPULATION = 850 persons.
Estimate 4

(i) Total area of lots currently zoned 2(a) Residential in Precinct 1 with an area greater than 4000m² is 4.59 hectares.
Assume density of 93.5 persons per site hectare.
Estimated population = 429 persons
Estimated 1994 population = 300 persons.

(ii) Total area of lots currently zoned 2(a) Residential in Precinct 1 with an area less than 4000m² is 3.14 hectares.
Assume density of 88 persons per site hectare.
Estimated Population = 276 persons
Estimated 1994 population = 260 persons.

(iii) Estimated population for that area currently zoned 2(a) is 44 persons (as per Est.-3(ii) above).

TOTAL ESTIMATED POPULATION = 749 persons
TOTAL ESTIMATED 1994 POPULATION = 870 persons.

Estimate 5

Total area of vacant land is 4.66 hectares.
Assume single dwellings on all lots at 550m² per lot and an occupancy rate of 2.29 persons per dwelling (refer to Table 2.4.2 for occupancy rates for detached dwellings in Central Bathurst).
Total lots = 84
ESTIMATED POPULATION = 192 persons
ESTIMATED 1994 POPULATION = 600 persons.

Estimates 1 to 4 indicate that Bathurst's central population can increase by between 400 to 700 persons through medium density development, depending on densities chosen. The population of this area as at the 1996 Census was 6384 persons. This number has declined since 1991 when the figure was 7316 persons. This may be due to the number of family residents moving to the outer suburbs of Bathurst and the average number of people in households replacing these families declining. Consequently, the future population of the central Bathurst area once fully developed is estimated at between 6584 and 7084 persons, an increase of about 11 per cent on the existing population. Note that the estimates above are based on the current provisions in Council’s Residential Housing DCP 1997 and existing precinct boundaries and zoning restrictions. Additional site specific limitations such as significant mature tree locations have not been taken into account in these calculations. Therefore, these population estimates are based on maximum predictions.

Estimate 5 was undertaken to show the difference in population projection should low density housing proceed in the area instead of medium density housing.
4.4 Ability of Central Land Stocks to meet future medium density needs

Some 8.16 hectares of vacant land has been identified in central Bathurst as suitable for future residential development. The question which now needs to be reviewed is whether or not this land is sufficient to meet Bathurst’s needs for future medium density housing.

The market, as always, will generally control housing stocks. Presently, Bathurst’s housing stock is made up of about 76% detached dwellings and 20.6% units (refer to section 2.3). It is reasonable to assume that the market will maintain these proportions of dwelling types as Bathurst’s population steadily increases and the demand for unit development style housing remains high. Similar dwelling type ratios are seen in other larger regional centres with Universities such as Armidale, Albury and Wagga Wagga. As mentioned previously, the market may demand greater numbers of medium density housing in the future as the population ages and reductions in household size become more the norm.

The following calculation has been made to show that the existing land stocks in central Bathurst may not be sufficient to support the existing ratio of detached houses to units/flats, i.e. low density living to medium density living. The calculation is made on the basis that all land in the outer fringe areas and villages of Bathurst is developed for low density purposes, as outlined in Chapter 3, and that all the land identified in central Bathurst is developed for medium density purposes.

- Existing population of Bathurst is approximately 30,000.
- Increase in population in fringe areas and the villages from low density housing is estimated at about 15,697. The increase in population of central Bathurst from medium density housing is estimated at about 550 persons.
- Bathurst currently supports 10,458 dwellings, i.e. 2228 units/flats and 8230 detached dwellings (refer section 2.3).
- The occupancy rate for units in central Bathurst is 1.98. The occupancy rate for detached dwellings in Bathurst is 2.7. These figures compare to 1991 figures of 2.7 and 3.5 respectively. Occupancy rates have therefore fallen over the past 6 years.

The fringe areas and villages of Bathurst can be expected to generate a further 5,814 detached dwellings (i.e. 15,697 divided by 2.7). The central area of Bathurst can be expected to generate a further 278 medium density dwellings (i.e. 550 divided by 1.98). Once all the existing land stocks have been developed, Bathurst can expect to have a total housing stock comprising 86% detached dwellings and only 14% units/flats. This medium density proportion is well below the existing ratio and also slightly below the 1994 expected ratios of 85% and 15% (refer to part 2 of Appendix 2).

Additional medium density housing could be provided in central Bathurst through:

- an increase in residential density; or
- redevelopment of existing premises through dual occupancies.
An increase in residential density is not considered desirable unless matched by an appropriate standard of design. Problems such as ownership of the land will make the comprehensive development of vacant parcels of land very difficult thereby limiting design capabilities. In addition, vehicular access and accommodation may also limit the ability to increase residential densities. Whilst ever car ownership remains high, car access and parking on site will remain an issue and a development requirement.

Many existing lots in central Bathurst have the potential for redevelopment as dual occupancies. Outside the vacant land identified in 4.1, it is considered that any increase in housing stock will be marginal in relation to the overall potential of the 4.66 hectares of vacant land. That is, it is considered that much of the 4.66 hectares may never in fact be able to be developed or may be wasted through developments of part of parcels of vacant land due to ownership problems. Any increase in housing stock due to dual occupancy developments will thus probably only match the lost potential of some of the vacant land examined above.

It is therefore reiterated from the recommendations of the previous strategy, that medium density housing will have to be able to be provided in other areas of Bathurst in order to meet the future demand which currently exists.

4.5 Infiltration of Commercial type premises in the CBD & fringe

Housing stock in the inner city is being developed for purposes other than housing. This also requires examination to determine areas of Bathurst currently residential but perceived as able to convert to prosperous areas for business. This occurrence may change previous residential neighbourhoods and lead to a ‘squeezing out’ effect for existing residences. This effect may then lead to a residential area becoming a predominantly commercial area, which may not meet the initial intended objectives of the zone. In introducing this topic, it should be noted that there is a difference between defined professional chambers and commercial premises under the Bathurst LEP 1997, as listed below:

Professional Chambers: means a room or a number of rooms forming part of, attached to, or within the curtilage of, a dwelling-house and used or intended for use by not more than 3 professionally qualified practitioners who practise their profession there and who, if more than one, practise in partnership, and employ not more than 3 employees in connection with that practice.

Commercial Premises: means a building or place used as an office or for other business or commercial purposes but, in the zoning control table, does not include a building or place elsewhere specifically defined in the Bathurst Local Environmental Plan 1997.
4.5.1 Existing Commercial Premises and Professional Chambers

Commercial premises and professional chambers have located to the CBD fringe for a number of reasons, as listed below:

- cost-efficient rent for commercial use
- ability to purchase property, therefore no commercial rent
- high traffic volumes (and potential clientelle) along major highways/through roads
- ease of on-street and on-site parking
- quiet work environment

Although this list is not exhaustive, these reasons provide advantages that some businesses reap when decentralising. Locations of these businesses can be seen in Figure 4.5.1.

4.5.2 Housing lost to Commercial Premises & Professional Chambers

The areas of Bathurst which have had commercial premises infiltrate into residential are mostly those which front either highways or roads which experience large traffic volumes. Precincts such as Stewart Street and Durham Street (which constitute the Great Western Highway), George Street and Lambert Street all have commercial premises which have located to residential areas to take advantage of large traffic volumes. From 1998 to June 2000, Council has approved fourteen (14) change of use applications from residential to commercial premises and six (6) change of use applications from residential to professional chambers. Not all of these are located in the 2(a) zone, but do reflect overall housing stock potential loss. Refer to Figure 4.5.1 which shows the locations of these in Bathurst.

Of the commercial premises identified, it can be seen that they tend to locate in the busier CBD streets and along the highway. No distinct pattern can be construed from their locations, but rather the perceived volume of traffic along that route and general appropriate location. Note also that one commercial premises and one professional chambers were not able to be shown on this map; their locations are to the south and west of the identified map area.

With a loss to the central and fringe housing stock of approximately 10 houses per year, the following estimates can be derived. These estimates will be based on detached dwelling figures as commercial type premises of the kind abovementioned are usually located in detached houses rather than units. In section 4.4, 5814 detached dwellings were predicted to be approved in the fringe and outer areas. With a loss of 10, this brings the total back to 5804 detached dwelling stock. When considered proportionately, this does not change the ratio substantially from the 86% detached dwelling and 14% unit figures. Therefore, as there is not a substantial change, encouragement methods to address this and other housing stock loss can be investigated, as seen below.
4.5.3 Methods of Addressing this loss in Housing Stock

A number of alternatives could be encouraged/devised to address any loss in housing stock. The advantages/disadvantages of these alternatives are listed below:

(a) Encourage ‘shop top’ housing.

‘Shop Top’ housing is used by Councils to encourage residents to live in city centres and potentially make commercial areas more ‘alive’ after work hours. Pittwater Shire Council encourages this type of housing and defines shop top housing in its LEP (1993) as:

‘a dwelling, group building or residential flat building in a business zone attached to and integrated with premises used for a non-residential purpose that is permitted in the relevant business zone’.

Some existing Bathurst commercial buildings already have residences in the second storey usually above the work area. Although initially intended to house shop owners/workers at low-cost, this housing style provides perceived natural surveillance of the street, more lighting in the built up areas after hours and greater pedestrian movements in the city centre out of work hours which may all combine to provide a safer city centre. Disadvantages to shop top housing would mostly be experienced by the occupant with greater traffic noise and less privacy. Such housing may be converted to commercial space at any time if needed and this is not considered a disadvantage. The inclusion of a ‘shop top’ housing definition in the Bathurst LEP may therefore be of benefit as this existing situation can be specifically defined.

(b) Consider the use of Mixed Zones

Mixed zones are used in some cities to encourage a range of housing and commercial premises to co-exist in certain precincts. South Sydney Council has four mixed zones in which the proportion of residences is controlled to certain degrees depending on the intended level of commercial development for the area. It is considered that Bathurst is not big enough to justify the creation of a mixed zone, considering the limited number of professional chambers and commercial premises applications Council receives in residential areas. The general business zone also permits dwellings with consent, so this is not a commercial-only restrictive zone. Bathurst’s Retail Strategy also seeks to retain core retail activities within the existing CBD to ensure it retains its own viability. It is therefore not recommended that Council adopt mixed zones in the Bathurst area.

(c) Approvals for Professional Chambers

It has been seen that approvals in the past for Professional Chambers have ended up as quasi-commercial-type developments with no intention of the applicant ever residing in the premises. It is suggested that the Professional Chambers definition has limited use and most developments could be classed as either Commercial Premises or Home Occupations.
Home Occupations as defined in the Bathurst LEP 1997 are ‘an occupation carried out in a dwelling where the occupation does not involve:

a) the registration of the building under the *Factories Shops and Industries Act 1962*, or
b) the employment of persons other than the residents of the dwelling, or
c) interference in any way with the amenity of adjoining properties or the locality in which the dwelling is situated, or
d) the display of goods, whether in a window or otherwise, or
e) the display of a sign, other than a non-illuminated sign not exceeding 50 centimetres in width or 25 centimetres in height indicating the name and occupation of the residents, or
f) the sale of items (whether goods or materials) or the exposure or offer for sale of items, by retail at the dwelling.

Therefore, if developments did not fit in the above criteria or classify as exempt from the need for consent under the Exempt Development DCP, it would be classified as commercial and assessed accordingly.

Another option may be to retain the Professional Chambers definition with the deletion of the component requiring the chambers to form part of a dwelling house. There is currently no way of checking whether Professional Chambers are inhabited after approval is issued, which effectively renders the definition inaccurate. By deleting only the requirement for the building to be a part-dwelling, this may address this issue of inaccuracy while still limiting the potential impact on surrounding residential properties as employment numbers are still limited. This may be a more effective way of dealing with these types of developments.

**Recommendation:**

a. That Council include ‘shop top housing’ as a definition in its next review of the Bathurst LEP 1997 and the Residential Housing DCP and encourage such land use in the CBD area.

b. That Council delete the reference to a dwelling house in the professional chambers definition of the Bathurst LEP 1997, but retain the remainder of the definition so that it reads as being a building in which professionals practice their small-scale business.
5.0 **LOW - MEDIUM DENSITY: DUAL OCCUPANCY**

For the purposes of this study, a low to medium density category is adopted and refers to dual occupancy developments. Dual occupancy is defined in chapter 1 and refers to “development that results in two dwellings (whether attached or detached) on a single allotment of land (or which would be on a single allotment were it not for the fact that the allotment is to be subdivided as part of the development), but does not include development for the purpose of a granny flat (Bathurst Local Environmental Plan, 1997).

In the early 1990’s, planning initiatives and emphasised the advantages of the promotion of differing housing types to cater for a changing residential demand. Urban consolidation was the main drive behind these initiatives, with the main ones comprising:

- **SEPP 5 – Housing for Aged or Disabled Persons,** which encourages special housing for these persons in all residential areas;

- **SEPP 20 – Minimum Standards for Residential Flat Development** which provided design guidelines for residential flat buildings prior to 1997 (repealed);

- **SEPP 25 – Residential Allotment Sizes and Dual Occupancy Subdivision,** which encouraged smaller blocks of land for new housing and enabled subdivision of dual occupancies (repealed 26 September 1997);

- **SEPP 28 – Town Houses and Villa Houses,** which created additional opportunities for medium density housing (repealed 19 May 1995);

- **SEPP 32 – Urban Consolidation (Redevelopment of Urban Land),** which allows large, underused urban sites to be made available quickly and efficiently for medium density development; and

- **The City West Urban Strategy** which aimed to redevelop former industrial sites and government land on the fringe of the Sydney Central Business District to house up to 30,000 people over the next 20 years. (Dept. Planning, 1992).

Although some of these policies worked to diminish the autonomy of Local Councils, they have reinforced the Government’s objective of encouraging as far as possible, the consolidation of urban lands to maximise efficient use of residential land. Urban consolidation remains an effective argument and one that applies locally to Bathurst as demand for housing types change with an aging population and a decrease in average household size.

It is considered that residential densities in the fringe areas and/or villages of Bathurst must be increased to ensure that the composition of housing stock at least remains the same in the future. As mentioned in the previous Housing Strategy, the promotion of higher densities in these areas will also help to address the potential problems associated with urban sprawl and ensure greater longevity of existing land stocks. It is suggested that dual occupancies could offer a solution for the increase in densities in the fringe areas whilst also offering a greater variety of housing types.
The Department of Planning (1991) has listed the following benefits of dual occupancy developments:

1) Benefits to individual owners:
   - ability to develop part of their land, or their house;
   - ability to subdivide and sell part of their land, or their house;
   - chance to provide accommodation for relatives; and
   - option of creating an investment by renting out a dwelling.

2) Benefits to the community:
   - greater choice of housing, either to rent or own;
   - greater variety of housing, including homes to suit small households;
   - more homes becoming available in established areas, close to jobs and facilities; and
   - fuller use of services in areas where population is declining.

Dual occupancy developments also offer general benefits associated with urban consolidation such as minimising the impact of housing on the environment, e.g. decrease dependency on cars and retention of bush/agricultural land on the urban fringe.

5.1 Types of Dual Occupancy Developments

Dual occupancies have been constructed in a variety of forms. Those commonly found in Bathurst are listed below:

1) Attached dual occupancy – refers to two dwellings attached by a common wall, frequently known as duplex units/flats.

2) Detached dual occupancy – refers to two dwellings located separately on a block of land. This type of development often occurs where a dwelling is constructed behind an existing dwelling, but may include the construction of two new separate dwellings on a vacant block of land.

3) Granny Flat – refers to the construction of an attached or detached one bedroom unit to a dwelling house, which has a maximum floor area of 60m².

5.2 Existing Dual Occupancy Developments in Bathurst

In 1994, the number of dual occupancy and granny flat developments that had been approved over the seven years preceding was 109 (8%), which compared to approval numbers of new dwellings of 1298 (92%). Since the 1994 strategy, a total of 125 dual occupancies and granny flats (15%) have been approved to date, which constitutes a six year period. This compares to approval numbers for new dwellings of 828 over the last six years. Therefore, although the total number of new dwelling approvals has fallen, the proportion of these being dual occupancies has increased from 8% to 15% over a shorter amount of time. This further emphasises the shift towards a preference for medium density housing as a household choice in Bathurst.
An analysis of consents granted has been undertaken in an attempt to determine in which areas the different types of dual occupancies are most popular. This will be compared to the findings of the previous study to determine change in housing choice.

5.2.1 Dual Occupancies

In the past six years, 131 dual occupancies have been approved by Bathurst City Council, which compares to 67 dual occupancy developments approved over the 7 years preceding 1994. Figure 5.2.1a shows this increase over time.

![Dual Occupancy & Granny Flat Approvals](image)

Note the substantial increase in dual occupancy approvals from 1992 onwards, where a sharp increase in such approvals is seen, especially for the 1995 period. It is prudent to mention here that this increase is partly due to a statewide initiative adopted in 1991 to encourage urban consolidation and medium density developments. It was thought that left to market forces, urban sprawl would become a major problem as people’s preferences remained with the quarter acre block and an increasing cost of infrastructure to service fringe areas resulted. The intention was to encourage more people to live in the urban centres, further enhancing their vibrancy and allowing for a cost effective method of servicing a greater proportion of the population. At the same time, a wider choice of housing would be made available to the population as the traditional detached dwellings in the suburbs would be complemented by smaller urban dwellings in the cities.

Figure 5.2.1b shows where the approvals for dual occupancies have been given.
Note that most approval numbers have remained similar over the past 14 years. An interesting shift can be seen for the increase in approvals in the inner city and outer fringe. Possibly these areas have proved more popular in the dual occupancy market in recent times. The inner city region has also overtaken the inner fringe as the most popular region of Bathurst to build dual occupancies. Possibly, in the inner city area, larger tracts of vacant land for unit development are not as readily available and those remaining are more difficult to develop. Hence, dual occupancies have been developed on the smaller, easier areas of vacant land.

5.2.2 Granny Flats

Over the past seven years, 31 granny flats have been approved by Bathurst City Council. This compares to 40 approvals for granny flats in the seven years preceding 1994 (refer to Figure 5.2.1a). This decrease is also seen in Figure 5.2.2a where approval numbers for granny flats in the outer fringe have dramatically decreased. The inner city is now the region attracting the highest number of dual occupancy and granny flat applications.
Figure 5.2.2a Granny Flat Approvals: Years preceding 1994 and 2000

Like dual occupancies, granny flat approvals experienced an upturn following the introduction of SEPP 25 in 1992. Since this time, approval numbers for granny flats have decreased considerably going from a high of 8 in 1994 to zero in 1999. Changes to the local planning instruments over this time may highlight some reasons for such a decline such as one change whereby prior to 1994, granny flats were not separately defined.

After SEPP 25 was introduced in 1992, Bathurst received many applications for dual occupancies and granny flats in the outer fringe areas. As dual occupancies were not initially separately defined, all of these applications were advertised (as they came under the residential flat building definition) and most were controversial with adjoining neighbours in the outer fringe areas. It was for this reason and to act as a temporary measure, that Amendment No. 42 of the Bathurst LEP 1987 was gazetted on 17 September 1993, prohibiting dual occupancies (including granny flats) from approval in the outer fringe areas. Following the adoption of the Housing Strategy, Amendment No. 55 (gazetted on 6 October 1995) separately defined dual occupancy and granny flats and gave granny flats a maximum area of 60 square metres. Despite this maximum area, granny flats were and still are permitted in all areas of Bathurst including the villages. Therefore, the only maximum control for granny flats introduced was floor area.

The reasoning behind the fall in granny flat approvals in recent years may be that a 60 square metre maximum floor area is too small. Therefore, with changing preferences what might have once been approved as a granny flat is now assessed as a dual occupancy. Following on from this is the fact that some pre-1994 granny flat applications are actually dual occupancies under the current standards.
5.3 Future Provision of Dual Occupancy Developments in Bathurst

This section looks at the most appropriate locations for dual occupancies and granny flats in Bathurst. This is based on previous trends and an assessment of the population and land potential if residential densities are increased.

5.3.1 Inner Fringe Area

The inner fringe area is very appropriate for further dual occupancy and granny flat developments. With residential units prohibited in this area, dual occupancies are the next highest density form of housing permissible. Also, limited large tracts of vacant land means a second dwelling is the only form of development available in this area. The previous section highlighted that dual occupancies are still popular in this region, however granny flats have recently decreased in favour. Again, this may be due to the 60 square metre floor area limit, such that other forms of dual occupancies are actually being used as granny flats.

5.3.2 Inner City Area

The inner city has come back in favour as a desirable place to settle in dual occupancy style housing. This may also be due to the above comments regarding limited large vacant lands and subsequent smaller scale development options. This is promising for urban consolidation objectives, which aim to promote the centralisation of persons living in the urban centres. This may also reflect an ageing population which prefers living close to services, as well as an increasing University base which generally prefers lower cost central living.

5.3.3 Villages

The villages are still experiencing some growth in dual occupancy approvals, however not as marked as pre-1994. Dual occupancies were permissible in the villages under the previous LEP with this control maintained in the current instrument. It seems that demand for dual occupancies in the villages is slow and that the villages are promoted as a very low density residential area well separated from the urban fringe. It is possibly due to these reasons that the type of person attracted to living in dual occupancy developments is also not attracted to these other characteristics.

5.3.4 Outer Fringe Area

Many Bathurstians were initially opposed to the idea of dual occupancies being built in the outer fringe areas. Main concerns raised were with the following:

- increase in traffic
- effect on surrounding property values
- adverse effect on the amenity of the area
- the effect of restrictive covenants on previously single dwelling areas, and
- excess demand placed on services.
All of these issues were addressed in the last Housing Strategy, which looked at their relevance in the Bathurst area and methods of addressing potential adverse outcomes. All of these issues were thought to have minimal effect on surrounding properties in terms of traffic increases, decreases in property values and other adverse effects. If built to an appropriate local housing standard to neither dwarf or be subservient to surrounding properties, the outcome is a good result. It should also be recognised that over time outer areas are perceived as closer to the inner areas as the city grows and subsequently, a wider variety of housing is then needed to provide greater housing choice for the city’s people.

The number of consents for dual occupancies in the outer fringe areas (Precinct 3) issued from 1993 to 2000 can be seen in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Dual Occupancies Approved (Precinct 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Applications to date as at 1 May 2001.

In comparing the above figures to Figure 3.2.3 which states the number of approvals for new dwellings each year, the closest the proportions get to achieving the 1:9 standard (as adopted by the 1994 Strategy) is 1:20 for the year 1998. Therefore, despite the existence of this maximum standard, market forces have shown that in reality approvals are not coming close to this figure. The need for this maximum rule it seems, may not be necessary.

As predicted in the last Housing Strategy, if all the vacant land in the inner city were developed for medium density purposes there would remain a shortfall of about 1014 medium density dwellings which would not be able to be provided should the outer area be developed solely for the purpose of low density housing (see Appendix 2, part 4). Some of this shortfall may be picked up in the inner fringe area, however as current trends have shown, dual occupancies and granny flats have recently fallen in popularity in this region. From this, it seems viable to provide increased densities in the outer fringe areas which will help maintain the current unit proportion of housing at 20 per cent, or at the very least not prevent the proportion from being achievable.

The current standard for the maximum number of dual occupancies in outer fringe areas, as set in the last strategy, is 1 dual occupancy for every 9 new dwellings. This standard when translated to practical terms, meant that dual occupancies in the outer fringe areas were to be located at least 75 metres from any other dual occupancies. This standard was initially created in 1995 as amendment 55 in the previous planning instrument and later transferred to the Residential Housing Development Control Plan, which has been in place since 1997.
As suggested above, market forces rather than Council intervention is more likely to determine lot sizes in the outer fringe areas and ultimately, lot yield. Therefore, the ability to provide lots for those 985 medium density dwellings which are not provided in the inner city may be more difficult with current demand showing a preference for larger lot sizes in the outer fringe. Despite this, the encouragement of dual occupancy developments in the outer fringe areas would attempt to address this supply problem. The encouragement of dual occupancies in the outer fringe areas could be done in two ways:

- unlimited encouragement with applications treated on their merits; or
- limited encouragement at a level which will meet the shortfall outlined above.

As previously suggested, the first option is not recommended as it could lead to an influx of clustered applications in the new release areas. This would lead possibly to whole sections of streets being dominated by medium density style housing which should not be encouraged based on past community concern and impacts on established residential amenity. Developer activity may also be directed to the outer fringe, which should also be discouraged as increased medium density activity should not be directed away from the inner city. Rather, the outer fringe should be provided as an alternative to inner city medium density style living.

To accommodate the shortfall of 1014 medium density dwellings which cannot be provided in other areas of Bathurst, 507 additional lots would need to be created in the outer areas. Appendix 2 outlines two possible scenarios to make up this shortfall through the limited encouragement of dual occupancy developments in the outer fringe areas (refer to parts 5 & 6 of Appendix 2). The first scenario maintains the existing lot yield of 7.5 lots per hectare with the 507 dual occupancy lots to be obtained by reducing the number of detached dwellings by an equivalent amount. The second scenario increases the lot yield so as to accommodate the required dual occupancy lots without reducing the number of detached housing lots. In the first case the ratio of dual occupancy lots to detached dwellings is 1:8. In the second case it can be reduced to 1:9.

It is considered that the ratio of 1:8 or less is appropriate for dual occupancy provision in the outer areas of Bathurst. This is based on a statistical judgement as shown in Appendix 2 and in Chapter 7.0 as well as the results of the Residential Satisfaction survey for suburbs as shown in Chapter 6.3. The current standard is 1:9, so with a slight increase in dual occupancy provision in the outer areas, this will allow for future land stocks to remain in good supply for a longer time frame and will maximise land use efficiency. Resulting from this is a recommendation which puts the 1:8 or less dual occupancy provision in a more user-friendly manner.
**Recommendation:** That part 2.3.2 of the Residential Housing DCP be modified to reflect the following:

Dual occupancies are to be located with a distance of at least 20 metres between another dual occupancy, be this a residential dwelling lot, road, footpath, accessway or entrance to an open space area.

**Explanation:** This modification to the previous standard allows a greater number of dual occupancies to be approved in the outer fringe areas while still not able to be constructed next door to one another. This will limit the proliferation of dual occupancies in small street sections where a change of street character could possibly result. It would in some cases allow a greater ratio of dual occupancies beyond the 1:8 ratio mentioned above. However, given recent past experience, market forces are unlikely to support a major influx of developments.
6.0  RESIDENTIAL SATISFACTION SURVEYS

A new addition to this Housing Strategy is two surveys to determine how Council’s current housing design standards are working in practise. These surveys were aimed at residents living in residential units and people living in houses surrounding dual occupancies in the outer fringe areas. The surveys also targeted the units and dual occupancies approved following the implementation of the last Bathurst Local Environmental Plan in 1997 to ensure Council was examining its latest development controls. The surveys were sent out in early May 2001 and residents were given one month to complete the surveys. Both of these surveys can be seen in Appendix 3.

6.1  Demographics of Respondents

A total of 31 surveys were sent to houses surrounding dual occupancies in the outer fringe areas. These surveys were sent to all residents living in a dwelling located closeby to a dual occupancy which was approved after December 1997. A total of 45 surveys were sent to occupants of residential units constructed after December 1997. The following graph shows the response rate for both surveys.

![Figure 6.1.1a Survey Response Rate](image)

Note: Total Unit Surveys received 25
Total Suburbs Surveys received 21.

A greater proportion of people responded to the suburbs survey than did those sent the units survey.

Regarding gender and ages of respondents, the following graphs display the breakdown of these from the survey respondents.
A relatively close proportion between males and females is seen from the Units survey respondents, while the Suburbs survey will reflect mostly female perspectives. It is interesting to note that about 76% of the suburbs survey respondents also noted that either 3 or 4 or more persons normally resided in their dwelling. This indicates that possibly the mother of the suburb household is the most likely to complete the survey. Conversely, of the units surveys, it is either a male or female who responds to the survey from a household of either 1 or 2 people. These figures also correspond with the higher occupancy rates of dwellings in the outer suburbs and lower occupancy rates of units in the inner city as mentioned in Chapter 2. This indicates that our sample of respondents, although small, is reflective of the wider Bathurst population.

The following points summarise the major points to note on the demographics of the respondents:

- The majority of unit survey respondents were from single households (40%), closely followed by couple households (32%). No couple with children households responded to the unit survey.
- Most suburbs survey respondents had lived at their current address for 1-3 years (57%), while most unit survey respondents (84%) had lived in their unit for 0-12 months. This unit response was expected as only units approved after December 1997 were targeted. This was done to ensure Council’s current Planning standards were being assessed.
- About half of the unit respondents owned their unit (48%) and half rented their unit (52%).
- Most of the unit respondents lived in single storey residential units (88%).
- All of the unit respondents lived in either 2 or 3 bedroom units (48% and 52% respectively). Most of the suburbs surveys reported houses with 4 or more bedrooms (76%).

6.2 Units

The Residential Housing Development Control Plan (DCP) sets a range of performance standards for which housing developments should comply with and
look to for guidance. This survey looked at components of this DCP and how they are working in practice. Questions raised in the unit survey focussed on private open space, sunlight exposure, perceived crime, streetscape aesthetics, crowding, privacy, parking and access and drainage.

Question number 6(a) asked whether the amount of private open space for their unit was not enough, the right amount, or plenty. About 60% of respondents nominated ‘about the right amount’ as their answer and about 28% of respondents noted that their amount of open space was not enough. Of those who said they did not have enough open space, their reasons were that their lot was very small anyway and some were happy with a limited amount of outside area as they did not want the responsibility of maintenance. Overall, responses for this question were positive.

The amount of sunlight units receive in winter is an important aspect of building design especially in the cold winter climate of Bathurst. 72% of respondents noted that their unit receives about the right amount of sunlight in winter and 24% of respondents said they had not enough sunlight in winter. Of those who said they didn’t have enough, some noted that there was no sun in their backyard and others noted that landscaping and trees obstructed sunlight. Possibly this is where the argument for deciduous trees which lose their leaves in winter is appropriate.

Perceived crime has long been a concern among designers of medium density housing. Social aspects of design are becoming an important aspect of planning. The Department of Urban Affairs and Planning in 2001 released guidelines for assessing development applications with crime prevention in mind. Just over half of the respondents (56%) said that they had either noticed or experienced criminal activity near their home. Of these responses, the most common forms of crime noted were break & enter or break & enter and stealing (79%), followed by vandalism (21%). Some respondents made it clear that they had only heard of these incidents and were not directly involved which lessens the accuracy of information received, however it does give an indication of crime activity awareness in the community. When cross-examining perceived crime with age, it seems that there is no correlation between the age of a person and their perception of heightened crime in their area. This idea was reinforced with the findings of the Bathurst Community Survey 2001 where crime was considered an area of minor concern over all age groups. Most of the 45-59 age category mentioned that they had noticed crime in their area, while most of the 60+ age category mentioned that they had not noticed crime in their area. Regarding gender, there was no correlation between whether a respondent was male or female and their perception of crime. Both genders were even when considering this question, which indicates that honest answers were being given and the question was generally understood by respondents.

Crowding is another design aspect of medium density housing which requires good planning. Just over half (56%) noted that at present the area in which they live is just right in terms of crowding/spaciousness. Limited further comments were given in respect of this question. Question 12 asked about perceived privacy which follows on from the issue of crowding. Most respondents (84%) noted that their level of privacy was adequate. Of those who answered no to this question, solutions regarding thicker walls between units, an increased distance from neighbours and bigger site areas for units were offered.
One indicator of whether residents are happy overall with their living conditions is to ask whether they intend to move from their current abode. Question 13(a) asked this question which returned 44% saying yes that they wanted to move and 52% saying they did not intend to move. Of those who wanted to move, reasons included upgrading to a larger house were the most common responses, followed by reasons of moving to another town or city.

Respondents were overall very satisfied with their own carparking arrangements on site with all responding that they had either 1 or 2 parking spaces provided on site for their dwelling. Visitors parking was considered more of a problem on site with 24% of respondents saying there were no visitors parking spaces provided for their units. Of those who answered yes to provision of visitor parking on site, 56% indicated that there was not enough visitors parking provided. Overall, this means that about 80% of respondents were dissatisfied with visitors parking on the site. Visitors parking is therefore one area which needs attention in the Residential Housing DCP.

Following on from parking is access. Most unit developments in Bathurst utilise a common centre driveway from which rear units achieve access to the street. Just over half of the respondents (56%) indicated that people have trouble turning their car around on site. The most common reasons for this were that there is not enough room to turn the car around and that everyone parks their cars in the driveway. Both of these reasons can be attributed to design on site – possibly cars find it difficult to access garages provided. From these responses, the main concern seems to be manoeuvring area rather than access widths at the boundary.

Drainage of unit developments has become an issue of late with Bathurst City Council recently adopting the practice that no more pump-out stormwater drainage systems are allowed. This decision was made following feedback indicating that such systems were not working well in practice. This has put the onus back on the developer to think of such things as appropriate drainage for units at the initial design stage. Only a small number of people (16%) indicated that water flows onto their land from another block after rain. Others indicated that water gets trapped in their backyard area after rain. Of those who noted some kind of drainage problem, only a couple of these are properties where a pump-out stormwater drainage system is present.

Overall, responses to the unit questionnaire were mostly positive with areas needing attention including access, visitor parking, safe design of unit developments and drainage design. Recommendations regarding these areas are as follows:

**Access**

(i) That Council adopt Austroads Design Motor Vehicle turning circles as the benchmark for manoeuvring area on residential unit plans.

(ii) That parking spaces provided on site are not to form part of the vehicle manoeuvring area.
**Explanation:** Previously Council relied on a DCP standard which simply stated that adequate manoeuvring area be provided for all unit developments. The latest Austroads Design templates for manoeuvring vehicles were updated in 1995 and now cater for larger vehicles 5.0 metres long with power steering. This covers most cars as smaller vehicles without power steering would be able to manoeuvre in a similar space to larger vehicles with power steering.

**Visitor Parking**

(iii) That Visitor Parking for unit developments be provided as follows:

1 space per 2 residential units (regardless of the number of bedrooms in each units).

(iv) That Visitor parking on residential unit sites be linemarked and either marked on the pavement or signposted as visitor parking.

**Explanation:** The current standard for visitor parking for residential units is 1 space per 5 units (for 2 bedroom units) and 1 space per 2 units (for 3 bedroom units). By removing the inclusion of segregated bedroom numbers from this standard, provision of visitor parking will increase on individual sites. This should satisfy the concerns of the 80% of respondents who noted that visitor parking was either non-existent or not sufficient on unit sites.

**Crime Prevention**

(v) That principles for minimising crime risk be incorporated into the design guidelines in the Residential Housing Development Control Plan.

(vi) That a standard checklist be devised which requires applicants of medium density housing to ensure their proposal comply with all the design guidelines outlined in the Residential Housing DCP (including the new guidelines for minimising crime risk).

(vii) That the requirement for applicants to complete this checklist be placed as a standard in the Residential Housing DCP.

**Explanation:** As more than half of the respondents noted some kind of criminal activity in their local area, measures should be taken to ensure safety of residents and belongings is considered at the design stage. Following on from this idea, a standard checklist given to applicants of all types of housing is to be completed and submitted at the same time as the development application. This idea was initially thought appropriate when considering the crime design guidelines, but was expanded to include all of the existing design guidelines as well. Overall, the intention of ensuring applicants consider crime prevention at the design stage is then a real outcome. Until the applicant completes and submits this form, the DA has not yet been made.

The principles to be incorporated into the design guidelines will be taken directly from DUAP’s publication ‘Crime Prevention and the Assessment of Development Applications’ which was an initiative taken from the NSW Police Service’s Safer by Design team.
Drainage

(viii) All new drainage lines in the city are to be gravity fed to a legal point of discharge. No pump-put stormwater drainage systems are permitted.

(ix) Developments with more than 50% impervious site area are to submit detailed engineering design plans of the proposed stormwater drainage layout, including locations of grade inlet pits, size of pipes and modelling results for certain storm events.

Explanation: In about 1999, Bathurst's last pump-out stormwater drainage system was approved for installation by Council. Following this, Council adopted the practice that no more pump-out systems would be allowed. The reasons for this was that these systems do not always work and back-up generators are not usually installed for situations where power failure may occur.

Ponding of water in low lying areas and in neighbouring properties is something of which Council has also made a standard development condition. Checking compliance with this condition has traditionally been an educated guess, considering topography, drainage capacities, storm events and amount of impervious area. By introducing a cut-off point of 50 % of site impervious area, this ensures that anything over this point requires detailed engineering design plans of the proposed stormwater drainage. This then ensures that larger unit developments with increased potential for ponding and other drainage problems are assessed for this likeliness at the design stage, rather than following construction at occupation stage.

6.3 Suburbs

The suburbs survey as previously mentioned, was sent to houses surrounding dual occupancies in the outer fringe area of Bathurst, in particular, Windradyne and Kelso. The introduction of dual occupancy approvals in these outer areas, when initiated, caused much debate over their appropriate location in these areas. Issues of increased traffic, devaluation of land and other social problems were identified as having the potential to escalate. Therefore, questions were aimed at these and other areas of concern to determine if dual occupancies, once introduced, had actually produced the adverse impacts envisaged by neighbouring residents. Questions asked therefore concentrated on subjects such as reasons for moving to the area, bedroom numbers in houses, property devaluation, traffic, car parking and street aesthetics.

Most respondents of the suburbs survey had lived in their house for 1-3 years (57%), which was followed by 9-20 years (19%) and 0-12 months (14%). Most popular reasons for moving to the area were that it was a nice area of town (47%), followed by the fact that their land or house was affordable (19%). Other reasons which were noted for moving to the area were close to schools/services/shops and the fact that it was a 'quiet area'. Following on from this question, respondents were asked if these reasons for moving to the area had changed after a while. Most (81%) said that none of their reasons had changed since moving in. Of those who said yes, concerns raised included adjoining owner pet nuisances and new developments increasing in their area with subsequent increases in traffic and rubbish in streets. None mentioned neighbouring dual occupancies as a cause of concern.
Most dwellings surveyed had 4 or more bedrooms (76%), with 4 or more people usually living in the house (52%). Although not questioned, it can be assumed that most of these households are families with children when comparing to ABS statistics for Bathurst’s outer fringe collection districts.

Only one respondent noted that the value of their home had dropped since moving to or building in the area. The reason for this was because of the increased amount of estates opening up in the area. This reasoning seems to come from supply and demand factors; with greater supply comes less demand and potentially lower house prices. Despite this, once again dual occupancies were not mentioned.

Question 7 which asked about traffic concerns reported some negative reactions. When asked ‘Is there a lot of traffic in your street?’, 71% responded no, with the remaining 29% including various reasons why this was the case. Of those who answered yes, the most common response was people driving through, followed by private dwellings and their cars. When living on a through or collector road, additional destination traffic will be noticed unless one lives in a quiet cul-de-sac. Others mentioned some vehicles which travel at too fast a pace for the street with speed humps mentioned as a possible deterrent. Past practice has found that using such devices to slow vehicles in neighbourhood streets actually provides annoyance for those living along that road as noise of vehicles slowing and accelerating to traverse these humps becoming a problem in itself. Another respondent noted that delivery trucks were contributing to the traffic in their street which most likely serviced the neighbourhood shopping centre in their area of town. Such vehicles would only use collector roads and should not ‘rat-run’ in the residential streets. ‘Rat-running’ is a term used when cars look to shorter routes through towns and use residential streets to reach certain destinations. Such streets are not intended for use by large numbers of vehicles and as such may be treated by drivers as through roads. This does not happen as often in regional centres and is more common in larger cities where large queues and traffic lights cause major delays. It is not considered that rat-running poses a major problem in Bathurst.

When asked if many cars park in the street near their home, only 19% of respondents noted yes as their answer. Reasons for this response included cars being parked by visitors to houses nearby (75%) and ‘no idea why they park in the street’. One respondent noted that parking in the street causes traffic flow problems at times; probably as this may be a narrow street and cars have to wait to pass when a vehicle is parked in the street.

Street aesthetics is usually not a cause for concern in low density suburb areas of cities as owners generally strive to ensure their home maintains a similar standard to its neighbours. Just over half of the respondents (52%) chose their street as looking ‘very well kept – couldn’t be better’. Of those who mentioned the next favourable response which was ‘well kept sometimes’, reasons included the fact that the residential area is still developing so some homes are not yet completed and others did not explain their choice. Overall, responses were very positive for this question which indicates that persons living in Bathurst’s suburbs are quite ‘house proud’ and enjoy living in a well-maintained street. Once again, no mention was made of dual occupancy developments.
Overall, it seems that once the suburbs develop and people move in, the general standard of the area is maintained even when dual occupancy developments are constructed next door. Most suburb dual occupancies in Bathurst are difficult to notice due to their exterior mimicking that of a detached house which fits with the surrounding dwellings. Dual occupancies have not, it seems, downgraded people’s quality of life in the suburbs and in some cases may have contributed to the overall standard of living with a greater variety of homes provided in outer areas. This reinforces the recommendation in Chapter 5 that dual occupancies be provided in precinct 3 with a distance of at least 20 metres between them. Therefore, dual occupancies would not be able to be constructed next door to one another and other perceived social problems would be minimised.

The results of this survey justify Council’s previous decision to no longer place dual occupancy applications on public exhibition.
7.0 **URBAN EXPANSION AREAS**

In previous chapters it has been estimated that the existing land stocks in the outer fringe areas of Bathurst can last at least 28 years based on current building rates. For the purposes of this strategy, 28 years is considered to be an appropriate planning horizon. However, it is prudent for Council to consider what will happen after this time, especially if Bathurst’s growth rate increases and land stocks are consumed at a faster rate.

Two options for expansion are available:

a) Increase lot yields now so that the longevity of existing land stocks is increased, or
b) Identify new areas for urban expansion.

7.1 **Increase Lot Yields**

As discussed in Chapter 3 market forces rather than Council intervention is likely to determine future lot sizes in the outer fringe areas. An increase in lot yields may address this issue and curb the urban sprawl problem apparent in Bathurst’s development climate.

Under the previous planning instrument (the Bathurst LEP 1987), the minimum lot size in the outer fringe areas was 550 square metres which is the same at present. Of the subdivisions proposed in these areas, lot sizes are averaging twice this size, reflecting current market preference. Current lot yield in these outer areas is about 7.5 lots per hectare. Increasing the lot yield to 10 lots per hectare may address this problem and curb effects of urban sprawl. To bring this into effect, a maximum lot size of 712 square metres per lot would have to be imposed (refer to Part 9 of Appendix 2).

Part 8 of Appendix 2 outlines the possible lot yields and population projections for the existing land stocks if:

(a) lot yield is increased to 10 lots per hectare; and
(b) the ratio of dual occupancy developments to detached dwellings is 1:8.

The result of this combination of dual occupancy and increased lot yield is quite substantial, with potential population being increased to 19,371 persons. If building rates remain at a constant level, existing land stocks can be expected to last some 37 years which is a good 9 years longer than at the current lot yield.

Current demand suggests that a decrease in lot size in the outer areas will not be favourable or accepted. The previous strategy suggested that no action be taken in this regard and that the situation be monitored to determine if lot yields decrease any further and whether dual occupancy lots proposed are being acquired additional to detached housing lots. Lot yields have in fact slightly increased from between 7 and 7.5 lots per hectare in 1994 to 7.5 lots per hectare in 1999, which although minimal, is a forward step. As previously mentioned, the lot yield required to provide for medium density in the outer areas without reducing the number of detached dwelling lots is 8
lots per hectare. With an increasing lot yield currently at 7.5 lots per ha, attaining this figure may not be too distant.

7.2 New Urban Expansion Areas

Appendix 2 examines existing residential areas and their longevity considering current occupancy rates. This section examines opportunities for the new residential areas once existing areas are developed.

Other studies have recommended various sections of Bathurst to extend residential boundaries. The following provides a summary of previous documents and their recommended residential expansion.

7.2.1 2000-2050 50 Year Plan for the City of Bathurst

This is a strategic document which looks at all Council services and their future provision, working on a population of approximately 80,000 by the year 2050. A number of objective statements are listed, outlining Councils intentions in areas such as Leadership, Infrastructure (Water, Sewerage, Waste, Stormwater, Drainage, Roads, Carparks, Footways, Cycleways, Aerodrome, Tourism, Promotion, Saleyards), Economic Development & Lifestyle (Planning, Recreation & Leisure, Cultural Services & Community well-being). Although quite generic, this document lists acceptable rates of service Council intends to provide to the people of Bathurst.

7.2.2 City of Bathurst Structure Plan 1994

The Structure Plan brought together all land uses in Bathurst and gave them current and strategic directions. Future residential areas were directed initially toward the eastern side of existing residential land in Kelso up to the 708 metre contour. This land was considered relatively easy to expand the residential boundaries while retaining the rural vistas and achieving appropriate water pressure considering height limitation. This land as well as the Windradyne/Llanarath areas were to be developed first, followed by the Mount Stewart area, west of Windradyne (see overleaf for Structure Plan).

Other future residential areas were designated, including a steep area of land immediately south of Dees Close, the currently developing Ashworth Estate off Ashworth Drive, Kelso, and the land immediately west of the service trades centre on the Mitchell Highway. The rural land on the northern side of the intersection of Eleven Mile Drive and Sofala Road was also shown as future residential on the Structure Plan.

7.2.3 Current Intentions for Residential Expansion

From the above information it seems that the areas intended for future residential expansion have not changed considerably since the 1994 Structure Plan was adopted. The same east-west residential expansion is supported with expansion of some villages another viable option. The table below summarises the priorities for new urban expansion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Development Potential (no. lots)</th>
<th>Reasons for listing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1              | Area west of Windradyne (Mount Stewart) | 108.8 289.4 + 398.2 | 2987 lots                      | - Close to existing services  
|                |          |           |                                  | - Drainage to Sawpit Creek relatively easy  
|                |          |           |                                  | - Lower ground levels means cheaper water and sewer augmentation (less pumping stations & reservoirs)  
|                |          |           |                                  | - Able to connect into existing road network |
| 2*             | Area east of Kelso (up to 708 metre contour) | 179.8 | 1349 lots                      | - Close to existing infrastructure/roads  
|                |          |           |                                  | - Already fragmented rural lands  
|                |          |           |                                  | - Development up to 708 metre contour should not adversely affect rural vistas  
|                |          |           |                                  | - As this land is higher than the above, it was listed second. |
| 2*             | Area surrounding Eglinton village | Not known | Not known | - Council resolved in April 2000 to write to the Eglinton landholders & ask their opinions about rezoning land to residential. Response has generally been favourable.  
|                |          |           |                                  | - Relative ease in extending services to Eglinton  
|                |          |           |                                  | - Previous Council study recommended expansion west of Eglinton |
| 3*             | Area east of Harvey Norman, Kelso | 31.4 | 236 lots                      | - Land comprises extension of currently developing Ashworth Estate.  
|                |          |           |                                  | - Development up to 708 metre contour should not affect rural vistas  
|                |          |           |                                  | - Appropriate access from Highway through Ashworth Drive. |
|   | Area on northern side of intersection of Eleven Mile Drive and Sofala Road | 41.9 | 314 lots | - Development would be balanced with equal lengths of residential on both sides of the entrance to Bathurst from Peel/Sofala  
- Development could be easily serviced with relatively small extensions to water & sewer  
- Access to collector roads is easily attained  
- Slope of land limits cropping ability  
- Rezoning application for this area was not pursued in 1994 as timing was premature and was to be examined when the Macquarie Plains area was closer to nearing full development. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|4* | Land south and east of existing Dees Close, Gormans Hill | 15.6 | 117 lots | - Land is of Class 4 capability (ie. limited cultivation & grazing capability)  
- Ease of extension to service mains  
- Placed at a lesser priority due to unresolved proximity to Regional Saleyards issue |
|4* | Land west of Corporation Avenue | 24.9 | 187 lots | - Part of this land has been identified as having potential for rural residential. An LES has been completed and this rezoning may go ahead. This is why this land has been given lesser priority. |

Note: *Those numbers with a star are of equal priority with another option of the same number).

The above table summarises and supports Council’s previous intentions with regard to future residential land and current land use proposals. From an engineering perspective, Option 1 including the land west of currently zoned residential land in Windradyne/Llanarth is the most cost effective to develop once other residential lands are developed. This is due to its proximity to the sewer treatment works and elevation to enable fall to the treatment works.
7.2.4 Calculations for Urban Land Release

Once existing land stocks are developed as identified in Chapter 3, the above mentioned land may become available for residential development. The above options are listed below with longevity calculations included.

1) West of Windradyne

Approximately 398.2 hectares of land has been identified west of the Windradyne area (see Figure 7.2.4a). The table below outlines 3 scenarios of population projections:

Scenario 1: Assumptions

- lot yield of 7.5 lots per hectare
- lots used for single detached dwellings only
- occupancy rate of 3.1 persons per detached dwelling
- rate of development = 200 lots per year

Scenario 2

- lot yield of 7.5 lots per hectare
- ratio of dual occupancy developments to detached dwellings = 1:8
- occupancy rate of 3.1 persons per detached dwelling and 2.8 persons per dual occupancy unit
- rate of development = 200 lots per year

Scenario 3

- lot yield of 8 lots per hectare
- ratio of dual occupancy developments to detached dwellings = 1:8
- occupancy rate of 3.1 persons per detached dwelling and 208 persons per dual occupancy unit
- rate of development = 200 lots per year

Table 7.2.4A Urban Expansion West of Windradyne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Lot Yield</th>
<th>No of Detached Dwellings</th>
<th>No of Dual Occupancy Units</th>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
<th>Development Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>398.2 x 7.5 = 2987</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2987 x 3.1 = 9260</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>398.2 x 7.5 = 2987</td>
<td>2655</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2655 x 3.1) + (664 x 2.8) = 10,090</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>398.2 x 8 = 3186</td>
<td>2832</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2832 x 3.1) + (708 x 2.8) = 10,761</td>
<td>16 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) East of Kelso

Approximately 179.8 hectares of land has been identified east of the Macquarie Plains area in Kelso, up to the 708 metre contour (see Figure 7.2.4b). This area has urban potential insofar as servicing the area is concerned. Protection and retention of higher grounds, including open space should be considered with any development proposals for this land as well as appropriate buffers to screen new developments from adjoining rural enterprises. Table 7.2.4B below shows population projections and other information based on the abovementioned scenarios.

Table 7.2.4B Urban Expansion East of Kelso

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Lot Yield</th>
<th>No of Detached Dwellings</th>
<th>No of Dual Occupancy Units</th>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
<th>Development Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>179.8 x</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>1348 x 3.1 = 4179</td>
<td>6.7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>179.8 x</td>
<td>1348 - 150 = 1198</td>
<td>150 x 2 = 300</td>
<td>(1198 x 3.1) + (300 x 2.8) = 4554</td>
<td>6.7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>179.8 x</td>
<td>1438 - 160 = 1278</td>
<td>160 x 2 = 320</td>
<td>(1278 x 3.1) + (320 x 2.8) = 4858</td>
<td>7.1 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Area surrounding Eglinton village

The 1994 Strategy looked at an area west of Eglinton approximately 65 hectares. Since this time, Council has resolved to conduct public consultation into the possibility of rezoning part of the land surrounding the Eglinton village. Feedback on this consultation has mostly been positive and Council is now preparing a further report on the feasibility of rezoning 157.4 hectares of rural land to residential and 124.4 hectares of rural land to rural residential (see Figure 72.4c). Table 7.2.4C below shows development periods for the residential proposal if it proceeds.

Table 7.2.4C Urban Expansion surrounding Eglinton village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Lot Yield</th>
<th>No of Detached Dwellings</th>
<th>No of Dual Occupancy Units</th>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
<th>Development Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>157.4 x</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>1180 x 3.1 = 3660</td>
<td>5.9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>157.4 x</td>
<td>1180 - 131 = 1049</td>
<td>131 x 2 = 262</td>
<td>(1049 x 3.1) + (262 x 2.8) = 3985</td>
<td>5.9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>157.4 x</td>
<td>1259 - 140 = 1119</td>
<td>140 x 2 = 280</td>
<td>(1119 x 3.1) + (280 x 2.8) = 4253</td>
<td>6.2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) **Area east of Harvey Norman, Kelso**

Approximately 31.4 hectares has been identified east of the existing Harvey Norman development, Ashworth Estate (see Figure 7.2.4d). This land is available for development up to the 708 metre contour due to adequate water pressure issues. The development of this land represents a logical extension of existing residential land in the vicinity of Ashworth Estate. Table 7.2.4D below shows development potential on this land.

**Table 7.2.4D  East of Harvey Norman, Kelso**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Lot Yield</th>
<th>No of Detached Dwellings</th>
<th>No of Dual Occupancy Units</th>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
<th>Development Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.4 x 7.5 = 236</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>$236 \times 3.1 = 732$</td>
<td>1.2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.4 x 7.5 = 236</td>
<td>236 - 26 = 210</td>
<td>26 x 2 = 52</td>
<td>$(210 \times 3.1) + (52 \times 2.8) = 796$</td>
<td>1.2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31.4 x 8 = 251</td>
<td>251 - 28 = 223</td>
<td>28 x 2 = 56</td>
<td>$(223 \times 3.1) + (56 \times 2.8) = 848$</td>
<td>1.3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) **Area on northern side of intersection of Sofala Road and Eleven Mile Drive**

About 41.9 hectares of land has been identified as capable of residential development in this area (see Figure 7.2.4e). Currently zoned 1(a) General Rural, this land has limited cropping ability due to its slope and may be suitable for future residential development. Table 7.2.4E below further explains the development potential.

**Table 7.2.4E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Lot Yield</th>
<th>No of Detached Dwellings</th>
<th>No of Dual Occupancy Units</th>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
<th>Development Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.9 x 7.5 = 314</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>$314 \times 3.1 = 974$</td>
<td>1.6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41.9 x 7.5 = 314</td>
<td>314 - 35 = 279</td>
<td>35 x 2 = 70</td>
<td>$(279 \times 3.1) + (70 \times 2.8) = 1061$</td>
<td>1.6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41.9 x 8 = 335</td>
<td>335 - 37 = 298</td>
<td>37 x 2 = 74</td>
<td>$(298 \times 3.1) + (74 \times 2.8) = 1131$</td>
<td>1.7 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) Area south of Dees Close, Gormans Hill

About 15.6 hectares south of the existing Dees Close area has been identified as having the potential for residential rezoning (see Figure 7.2.4f). This area, currently zoned 1(b) Market Garden, is not particularly suitable for cropping due to slope. This land cannot be considered for rezoning until final decisions are made with respect to the nearby Saleyards. Table 7.2.4F below shows greater detail.

Table 7.2.4F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Lot Yield</th>
<th>No of Detached Dwellings</th>
<th>No of Dual Occupancy Units</th>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
<th>Development Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.6 x 7.5 = 117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>117 x 3.1 = 363</td>
<td>0.6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.6 x 7.5 = 117</td>
<td>117 - 13 = 104</td>
<td>13 x 2 = 26</td>
<td>(104 x 3.1) + (26 x 2.8) = 395</td>
<td>0.6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.6 x 8 = 125</td>
<td>125 - 14 = 111</td>
<td>14 x 2 = 28</td>
<td>(111 x 3.1) + (28 x 2.8) = 422</td>
<td>.6 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Land West of Corporation Avenue

24.9 hectares of land has been identified in this area also north of the McDiarmid Street rural residential area (see Figure 7.2.4g). Table 7.2.4G below further explains the potential development.

Table 7.2.4G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Lot Yield</th>
<th>No of Detached Dwellings</th>
<th>No of Dual Occupancy Units</th>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
<th>Development Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.9 x 7.5 = 187</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>187 x 3.1 = 580</td>
<td>0.9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.9 x 7.5 = 187</td>
<td>187 - 21 = 166</td>
<td>21 x 2 = 42</td>
<td>(166 x 3.1) + (42 x 2.8) = 632</td>
<td>0.9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.9 x 8 = 199</td>
<td>199 - 22 = 177</td>
<td>22 x 2 = 44</td>
<td>(177 x 3.1) + (44 x 2.8) = 672</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above calculations indicate that an additional 849.2 hectares of land could be rezoned for residential purposes, accommodating a further 21,513 persons in the Bathurst area. At current overall rates of development, these subdivisions would occur approximately 28 years after the existing residential land is fully developed, so these possibilities are quite long term. Further studies would be required to determine the feasibility of rezoning such land parcels considering other factors such
as demand, costs of water and sewer extensions and rate of development in years to come.

7.2.5 New City/New Villages

The 1994 Strategy looked at whether urban expansion would be feasible through the creation of a new city or urban area or new villages. The expansion of Bathurst in this means as concluded previously, would require detailed feasibility studies to be done to ensure that the designation of a new city/village would be cost effective and otherwise appropriate compared to the current east/west expansion of Bathurst.

7.2.6 Summary

The 1994 Strategy recommended that Council monitor lot yield to determine if it is decreasing and if so, to consider placing maximum lot size prescriptive standards on the outer suburbs. Although sales evidence suggests that smaller lots are not popular in these regions, lot yield has slightly increased over Bathurst, suggesting that subdivisions in other areas of Bathurst may have increased in density. At this time, therefore, the 1994 recommendation remains appropriate which was that Council continue to monitor lot yields.

The priority list shown in Table 7.2.3a, detailing new urban development areas and their yield aligns with recommendations from previous documents such as the Structure Plan. Some 849.2 hectares of new urban land is identified in this list and if all were developed consecutively, this land would last another 28 years (approximately). If proposed for development in the future, each of the above suggestions would require further investigations regarding the appropriateness of such new urban development. The new city or villages suggestion is a long way off and would ultimately be decided once all other viable land stocks are consumed.

Recent public consultation with the surrounding Eglinton landholders has shown that interest in rezoning to residential in this area is strong, although the Eglinton community itself (through earlier consultation processes) does not favour expansion. Such an expansion of Eglinton's residential boundaries will require a greater amount of consultation in the future if it proceeds, however such interest at the outset from adjoining landholders suggests that this proposal may not be far off. Due to this recent interest in Eglinton and Council's initial support of this potential rezoning, it is suggested that Eglinton be the next area designated for future rezoning studies, despite its lower ranking above.

The potential future expansion of Raglan is dependent mostly on water provision and maximum return on monies expended. At present, funds have been allocated to the resizing of the Raglan reservoir which, due to the amount allocated, would only be enough to improve water pressure for the current population. As Raglan has not yet reached its full development potential, this is considered a quick-fix solution and is not likely to proceed at this stage as it does not provide for any future growth of Raglan. Council is further studying this issue of water provision at Raglan and amounts of funding required to service predicted populations.
8.0 MAJOR FINDINGS

8.1 Chapter 2: Demographic & Housing Data

- Bathurst has a greater proportion of younger people compared to NSW.
- NSW has a greater proportion of older people than Bathurst, especially in the 65 and over age cohort.
- Proportions of couple families with children has fallen in Bathurst since 1991 by about 5 per cent.
- More single parent families rent homes rather than own or purchase.
- More couple families both with and without children own their own homes.
- Separate houses in Bathurst are mostly occupied by 2-person or 4-person households.
- Most units, flats & apartments are occupied by lone persons.
- Compared to other Central West cities, Bathurst has a high proportion of semi-detached units & flats (20.6%).
- Numbers of detached houses either fully owned or being purchased in Bathurst has fallen by around 5% since 1991.
- Numbers of semi-detached units and flats being rented in Bathurst has also fallen by a larger 11% since 1991.
- Detached dwellings remain the dominant housing preference with 91% of Bathurst’s families residing in this type of dwelling.
- Central Bathurst has the closest alignment of separate houses and units with 50.3% & 43.5% respectively.
- Predominance of detached houses increases as one moves toward the outer Bathurst areas.
- Average occupancy rates in the central precinct have fallen considerably over the past 5 years, with detached houses in this central area showing the sharpest decline in persons per dwelling.
- Occupancy rates have fallen in accordance with NSW state averages.

8.2 Chapter 3: Low Density – Detached Housing

- The inner fringe area holds the greatest proportion of detached dwellings among the four main regions of Bathurst.
The inner fringe seems most likely to see a shift toward dual occupancies as the
development potential of larger lots in close proximity to the CBD is realised.

New dwelling approvals follow a cyclical pattern of highs and lows over the
years, similar to a trade cycle.

Residential building approvals for Sydney and the remainder of NSW have
followed a similar pattern of highs and lows, indicating that similar factors
influence the building industry statewide.

All of the villages have the potential for further growth in predominantly low
density housing.

All of the villages could grow to accommodate a total of approximately 4635
persons.

Eglinton is likely to be the first village to have its residential boundaries
examined in detail. Surrounding land owners in this area have expressed an
interest in this future proposal.

Existing land stocks in the outer areas are predicted to last another 27 years (that
is, to 2026). This will enable Bathurst to increase its population to
approximately 44,000.

8.3 Chapter 4: Medium Density

Medium density housing makes up about 21% of Bathurst's total housing stock.
This is a comparatively high proportion for a Central West city.

With the population increasing in households comprising older people, single
person households and couples with no children, demand for medium density
housing may increase.

Some 8.16 hectares of vacant land has been identified in the centre of the inner
city blocks as having the potential for development.

Some 2.42 hectares (or 4033 square metres per year) of vacant land has been
developed for low to medium density use in the CBD since 1994.

Medium density housing will have to be able to be provided in outer areas of
Bathurst in order to meet the future demand.

Professional Chambers are not being used for their approved purpose, which is,
the building forming part of a dwelling. Professional Chambers are being used
as quasi-commercial premises in practice when considering definitions.

To balance the residential premises lost in the CBD to commercial and professional
chambers, the encouragement of 'shop top housing' should be pursued.
8.4 Chapter 5: Low-Medium Density: Dual Occupancy

- Dual Occupancy and granny flat approvals over the past seven years has represented 15% of the total numbers of new dwellings. This has increased from 8% in 1994.

- The inner city is the most popular area for dual occupancies to be constructed.

- Demand for dual occupancies in the villages is slow.

- The 1:9 standard for dual occupancy provision in the outer fringe is not being achieved. The closest proportion to this is 1:20 for the year 1998. Market forces have ultimately determined the supply of such housing.

8.5 Chapter 6: Residential Satisfaction Surveys

- Respondents for both surveys were representative of the wider Bathurst community in terms of demographics.

- The issues identified in the previous Housing Strategy as to why dual occupancies should not move into the outer suburbs were not revealed as a problem from the residential satisfaction survey results. Dual occupancies were not mentioned as the cause of any social and other problems identified.

- Generally, residential unit aspects of the Residential Housing DCP assessed were quite positive with issues regarding access, visitor parking, crime prevention and drainage requiring attention.

8.6 Chapter 7: Urban Expansion Areas

- A decrease in lot size in the outer areas will not be favourable or marketable.

- Areas intended for future residential expansion have not changed considerably since the 1994 Structure Plan.

- Expansion of land to the west of Windradyne and Llanarth is the most cost effective from an Engineering perspective once other nearby residential lands are developed.

- Some 849.2 hectares of new urban land is identified for development potential in all the new urban areas of Bathurst and if all were developed consecutively, this land would last another 28 years.

- The concept of a new city or urban area is a long way off and feasibility studies regarding this would not be commenced until existing residential stocks were exhausted.
9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations of the 2001 Housing Strategy worthy of consideration by Council include:

9.1 That initiation of the Bathurst Conservation Area Management Strategy be pursued to ensure both Council and potential developers have a clear understanding of the central areas intended for conservation and those which are not.

9.2 That Council include 'shop top housing' as a definition in its next review of the Residential Housing DCP and Bathurst LEP 1997 and encourage its use in the CBD area.

9.3 That Council delete the reference to a dwelling house in the professional chambers definition of the Bathurst LEP 1997, but retain the remainder of the definition so that it reads as being a building in which professionals practice their small-scale business.

9.4 That part 2.3.2 of the Residential Housing DCP be modified to reflect the following:

Dual occupancy developments in Precinct 3 are to be located with a distance of at least 20 metres from another dual occupancy, be this a residential dwelling lot, road, footpath, accessway or entrance to an open space area.

9.5 That Council adopt Austroads Design Motor Vehicle turning circles as the benchmark for manoeuvring area on residential unit plans.

9.6 That parking spaces provided on site are not to form part of the vehicle manoeuvring area.

9.7 That principles for minimising crime risk be incorporated into the design guidelines in the Residential Housing Development Control Plan.

9.8 That a standard checklist be devised which requires applicants of medium density housing to ensure their proposal complies with all the design guidelines outlined in the Residential Housing DCP.

9.9 That the requirement for applicants of medium density developments to complete this checklist be placed as a standard in the Res Housing DCP.

9.10 All new drainage lines in the city are to be gravity fed to a legal point of discharge. No pump-put stormwater drainage systems are permitted.

9.11 Developments with more than 50% impervious site area are to submit detailed engineering design plans of the proposed stormwater drainage layout, including locations of grade inlet pits, size of pipes and modelling results for certain storm events.
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APPENDIX 1:

SECTIONS OF CENTRAL BLOCKS
Section 16

LEGEND.

Vacant land suitable for development.

Land developed since 1994 strategy.

Vacant land not suitable for development.

Printed: 31/7/2001

Scale 1:1,146
Section 18

LEGEND:
- Vacant land suitable for development.
- Land developed since 1994 strategy.
- Vacant land not suitable for development.

Printed: 31/7/2001
Scale 1:1,167
LEGEND.

- Vacant land suitable for development.
- Land developed since 1994 strategy.
- Vacant land not suitable for development.

Printed: 31/7/2001
Scale 1:1,176
Vacant land suitable for development.
Land developed since 1994 strategy.
Vacant land not suitable for development.
Section 29

Vacant land suitable for development.
Land developed since 1994 strategy.
Vacant land not suitable for development.
Section 30

LEGEND:
- Vacant land suitable for development.
- Land developed since 1994 strategy.
- Vacant land not suitable for development.

Printed: 31/7/2001
Scale 1:1,514
Section 32

LEGEND

Vacant land suitable for development.
Land developed since 1994 strategy.
Vacant land not suitable for development.

Printed: 31/7/2001
Scale 1:1,340
Section 33

Vacant land suitable for development.
Land developed since 1994 strategy.
Vacant land not suitable for development.
Section 34

LEGEND.

Vacant land suitable for development.
Land developed since 1994 strategy.
Vacant land not suitable for development.
Section 37

LEGEND:
- Vacant land suitable for development.
- Land developed since 1994 strategy.
- Vacant land not suitable for development.

Printed: 31/7/2001
Scale 1:1,357
Section 42

LEGEND:

- Vacant land suitable for development.
- Land developed since 1994 strategy.
- Vacant land not suitable for development.

Printed: 31/7/2001  
Scale: 1:1,078
Section 45

LEGEND:
- Vacant land suitable for development.
- Land developed since 1994 strategy.
- Vacant land not suitable for development.

Printed: 31/7/2001
Section 72

Vacant land suitable for development.
Land developed since 1994 strategy.
Vacant land not suitable for development.

Printed: 31/7/2001
Scale 1:1,340
Vacant land suitable for development.
Land developed since 1994 strategy.
Vacant land not suitable for development.
Section 80

LEGEND:

Vacant land suitable for development.

Land developed since 1994 strategy.

Vacant land not suitable for development.

Printed: 31/7/2001

Scale 1:1,091
Section 82

LEGEND.

- Vacant land suitable for development.
- Land developed since 1994 strategy.
- Vacant land not suitable for development.
Section 83

LEGEND.

- Vacant land suitable for development.
- Land developed since 1994 strategy.
- Vacant land not suitable for development.
Vacant land suitable for development.

Land developed since 1994 strategy.

Vacant land not suitable for development.
Housing Stock and Population Projections for Existing Vacant Land Stocks

1. Existing Housing Stock in Bathurst (1996 Census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detached Dwellings</th>
<th>8230</th>
<th>79%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Dwellings</td>
<td>2228</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10,458</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Future Housing Stock

Assumptions:

- all vacant land in the outer fringe and villages (as identified in Chapter 3) is developed as single detached houses
- All vacant land in the inner city area (as identified in Chapter 4) is developed for medium density purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Detached Dwellings</th>
<th>Medium Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing areas (all)</td>
<td>8230</td>
<td>2228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Fringe</td>
<td>4560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raglan</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eglinton</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perthville</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner City</td>
<td></td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>(84%) 13,242</td>
<td>(16%) 2506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, if the existing land stocks are developed in the above manner, the composition of housing stock will change so as to incorporate 5% less medium density housing.

This conclusion was the same as in 1994 Strategy.


Assumptions:

- as outlined under (2) above.
- occupancy rate for detached houses in the outer fringe areas = 3.1 persons
- occupancy rate for detached houses in the villages = 3.3 persons
- occupancy rate for medium density housing in the inner city = 2.86 persons
Outer Fringe (4560 x 3.1) = 14,136
Villages (452 x 3.3) = 1,492
Inner City (278 x 2.86) = 795

TOTAL 16,423

Note: the population density achieved in the Outer Fringe is between 23 and 24 persons per site hectare (ie. 14136 ÷ 608ha).

4. Number of Addition Medium Density Dwellings required to maintain the existing ratio of houses to units as outlined in (1) above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Houses</th>
<th>13,242</th>
<th>79%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16,762</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the 3520 units incorporates 2228 (existing) and 278 (inner city potential) plus 1014 (additional requirement).

5. Detached Housing Lots lost to support these units in the outer fringe areas

Assumption: the 1014 additional medium density dwellings to be provided as dual occupancy developments, that is, 2 dwellings per lot.

Lot yield of vacant land in outer fringe 4561
Lots required for dual occupancy developments 507
Remaining lots 4054

Projected population for the outer fringe areas is made on the assumption that the occupancy rate for each dual occupancy dwelling is the same as medium density dwellings in the inner city (ie. 1.98).

Detached Dwellings (4054 x 3.1) = 12,568
Dual Occupancies (1014 x 1.98) = 2,008

TOTAL 14,576

Consequently, the population of the vacant land in the outer fringe areas (as identified in Chapter 3) can be increased from 13,683 to 14,576 by allowing the required medium density housing in these areas. The population density is also increased to approximately 24 persons per site hectare.

6. Additional lots required to support these units in the outer fringe area without reducing the number of detached dwelling lots.

Assumption:
the 1014 additional medium density dwellings will be provided as
dual occupancy developments, that is, 2 dwellings per lot.

Lot yield of vacant land in outer fringe 4560
Additional lots required for dual occupancies 507
Total lots required 5067

Lot yield required to achieve this is as follows:

\[
\frac{\text{Total Lots Required}}{\text{Total Vacant Land}} = \frac{5067}{608\text{ha}} = 8 \text{ lots per ha}
\]

Note: the existing lot yield in the outer fringe area of Bathurst is about 7.5
lots per ha. (ie. \(4560 \div 608\)).

The projected population for the outer fringe areas is again made on the
basis that the occupancy rate for each dual occupancy dwelling is the
same as medium density dwellings in the inner city (ie. 1.98).

Detached Dwellings \((4560 \times 3.1)\) = 14,136
Dual Occupancies \((1014 \times 1.98)\) = 2,008
TOTAL 16,144

Consequently, the population of vacant land in the outer fringe areas (as
identified in Chapter 3) can be increased from 13,683 to 16,144 by allowing
the required medium density in these areas and increasing the lot yield to
accommodate them. The resultant population density is between 26 and
27 persons per site ha. (ie. \(16144 \div 608\)).

7. Ratio of Detached Dwellings to Dual Occupancy Developments in the
Outer Fringe

(a) if lot yields are not increased as outlined under (5) above:

507 dual occupancy lots to 4054 detached dwelling lots, OR
1 dual occupancy lot to 8 detached dwelling lots.

(b) if lot yields are not increased as outlined under (6) above:

507 dual occupancy lots to 4560 detached dwelling lots, OR
1 dual occupancy lot to 9 detached dwelling lots.

8. Projected Population for vacant land in the outer fringe if living densities
are further increased

Assumptions:

- increase lot yield to 10 lots per hectare
- ratio of detached dwellings to 1 dual occupancy as per 7a above.
Lot yield (608ha x 10) = 6080
Potential no. of dual occupancy lots = 608 (6080/10)
Potential no. of detached dwelling lots = 5472 (6080-608)

Projected Population:

Detached Dwellings (5472 x 3.1) = 16,963
Dual Occupancy (1216 x 1.98) = 2,408

TOTAL = 19,371

9. Maximum lot size necessary to achieve a lot yield of 10 lots per hectare

Assumptions:

- average lot size at the present time is 950 square metres

Present land consumption per hectare:

(a) Residential Requirement = 7.5 lots x 950 = 7125m² (34)
(b) Road/Open Space etc. Requirement = 10,000 – 7,125 = 2,875m² (4)

Maximum lot size required to achieve a lot yield of 10 lots per hectare is approximately 712m² (ie. 7,125 ÷ 10).

10. Development period for existing land stocks in the outer fringe

Assumptions:

- the vacant land stocks will be developed at the current rate of 163 dwellings per year (see chapter 3)
- the rate of construction of a dual occupancy development is equivalent to one single detached dwelling

(a) to cater for a population of 14,136 as outlined under (3) above, the existing land stocks can be expected to last some 28 years (4560 ÷ 163).

(b) to cater for a population of 14,576 as outlined under (5) above, the existing land stocks can be expected to last some 28 years ([4054 + 507] ÷ 163).

(c) to cater for a population of 16,144 as outlined under (6) above, the existing land stocks can be expected to last some 31 years (4560 = 507 ÷ 163)

(d) to cater for a population of 19,371, as outlined under (8) above, the existing land stocks can be expected to last some 37 years (5472 = 608 ÷ 163).
11. Summary of Development Potential of vacant land stocks in the outer fringe areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios for Development</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
<th>Development Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant land developed for detached dwellings only (under (3) above)</td>
<td>14,136</td>
<td>28 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached dwellings and dual occupancies with no increase in lot yield (under (5) above)</td>
<td>14,576</td>
<td>28 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached dwellings and dual occupancies with an increase in lot yield (under (6) above)</td>
<td>16,144</td>
<td>31 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached dwellings and dual occupancies at ratio of 8:1 and lot yield of 10 lots per hectare (under (8) above)</td>
<td>19,371</td>
<td>37 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Summary of Population Projections for Bathurst based on the four scenarios for Development of outer fringe areas as outlined above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Population of Bathurst</th>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
<th>Scenario 3</th>
<th>Scenario 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29,683</td>
<td>29,683</td>
<td>29,683</td>
<td>29,683</td>
<td>29,683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vacant Land Stocks

| Outer Fringe | 14,136 | 14,576 | 16,144 | 19,371 |
| Villages     | 1492   | 1492   | 1492   | 1492   |
| Inner City   | 795    | 795    | 795    | 795    |
| TOTAL        | 46,106 | 46,546 | 48,114 | 51,341 |
APPENDIX 3:

RESIDENTIAL SATISFACTION SURVEYS
TO THE OWNER/OCCUPANT

Your household has been chosen to be part of a residential satisfaction survey conducted by Bathurst City Council. Council would like to know your opinions about living in housing in the outer suburbs. Your input will help to better inform Council of how its planning controls are working in practice. This survey should take about 5 minutes to complete. Please note that this survey will remain completely confidential and at no time are you required to write your name on this form.

PLEASE TICK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

1. How long have you lived at your current address?
   a. 0-12 months □
   b. 1-3 years □
   c. 4-8 years □
   d. 9-20 years □
   e. 20 years and over □

2. Which of the following most influenced your decision to move to this area or build in this area? (Please rank your choices in order of importance, Number 1 being the most important).
   a. Nice area of town □
   b. Affordable block of land or house □
   c. Quiet area □
   d. Increasing land values in the area □
   e. Good distance from the neighbours □
   f. Close to schools/services/shops □
   g. Other ____________________________

3. (a) Have any of the above reasons in Question 2 changed since you moved to the area?
   Yes □
   No □ - Go to question 4

   (b) If yes, in what way?

   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
4. How many bedrooms are in your house?

1  □
2  □
3  □
4 or more □

5. How many people usually live in your house?

1  □
2  □
3  □
4 or more □

6. (a) Have you noticed a drop in the value of your home since moving or building in your area?

Yes □  No □  - Go to question 7

(b) If yes, why do you think this has happened?

________________________________________________________________________

7. (a) Is there a lot of traffic in your street?

Yes □  No □  - Go to question 8

(b) If yes, what do you think is the main contributor to this traffic (e.g. private dwellings, people driving through)

________________________________________________________________________

8. (a) Do many cars park in the street near your home?

Yes □  No □  - Go to question 9

(b) If yes, why is this so? (e.g. no room to park their cars on their own properties, lots of visitors, no garage/carport on their properties)

________________________________________________________________________
9. (a) Do you intend to move from your current house?

Yes ☐  No ☐ - Go to question 10

(b) If yes, why?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

10. (a) Which of the following best describes the look of your street? (Think of what your street near your home looks like when you drive through)

a. Very well kept – couldn’t be better ☐  
b. Well kept sometimes ☐
c. O.K. ☐
d. A bit untidy ☐
e. Very untidy ☐

(b) Please explain your choice

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

11. What is your gender?

☐ Male  ☐ Female
12. Which of the following best describes your age?

a. Under 19 years  □
b. 20-29 years  □
c. 30-44 years  □
d. 45-59 years  □
e. 60 and over □

Thank you for taking part in this questionnaire. Your answers will help Council to develop planning schemes which aim to create a pleasant suburban lifestyle in Bathurst. You can drop this form in to either the Bathurst City Council offices in Russell Street or the City Library in Keppel Street, or mail to the following address:

The General Manager
Bathurst City Council
Private Mail Bag 17
BATHURST NSW 2795
TO THE OCCUPANT/OWNER

Bathurst City Council is conducting a survey regarding opinions about living in residential units in the centre of town. Council wants to know your ideas about living in this style of housing (whether you own the unit or not) and in what ways it can be improved. The survey should take about 8 minutes to complete. This survey will remain completely confidential and at no time are you asked to include your name on this form.

PLEASE TICK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

1. Which of the following best describes the dwelling in which you live?
   - Unit style housing (i.e. 3 or more dwellings on one allotment of land whether attached or not)
   - Dual Occupancy (i.e. 2 dwellings on one allotment of land)
   - Semi-detached house (i.e. 2 dwellings attached by a common wall)

2. Is your dwelling:
   - single storey
   - two-storey
   - three-storey or more

3. How many bedrooms are there in your unit?
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4 or more

4. How many people usually live in your unit?
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4 or more

5. (a) Do you own your unit or rent it?
   - Own the unit
   - Rent the unit
6. (a) Which of the following responses best describes how much private outside area you have? (e.g. where you can relax/hang your clothes/park the otto bin)?

☐ Not Enough  ☐ About the right amount  ☐ Plenty

(b) What made you choose this answer?


7. (a) Which of the following best describes how much sunlight your house gets in winter:

☐ Too much  ☐ About the right amount  ☐ Not enough

(b) Please explain your choice


8. (a) Have you noticed or experienced any criminal activity near your dwelling? e.g. break & enter, stealing, vandalism, graffiti, etc.

☐ Yes  ☐ No – Go to Question 9

(b) If Yes, which of the following have you noticed/heard of? (You may choose more than one).

a. Break & Enter  ☐
b. Stealing  ☐
c. Vandalism  ☐
d. Graffiti  ☐
e. Assault  ☐
f. Other ______________________  ☐

9. How far is your dwelling located from the street (in metres, approximately)?
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10. If you answered 8 metres or less to Question 9, which of the following best describes the look of your units from the street? (You may tick more than one)

a. Our units are similar in size to the neighbouring buildings
b. Our units are much bigger than the neighbouring buildings
c. Our units are much smaller than the neighbouring buildings
d. Our units look more modern than the neighbouring buildings
e. Our units look out of place compared to neighbouring buildings
f. You cannot see our units very well compared to next door
g. Other ____________________________

11. (a) Which of the following best describes the area in which you live at present? (Think of how close/far away you are from your neighbours)

a. Very crowded
b. Slightly crowded
c. Just right
d. Slightly spacious
e. Very spacious

(b) Comments_________________________________________


12. (a) Does your unit have an adequate level of privacy?

☐ Yes - Go to Question 13  ☐ No

(b) If No, in what way/s would you like it to be more private?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
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13. (a) Do you intend to move from your unit/flat?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  – Go to Question 14

(b) If Yes, what are your reasons for moving?

a. Unit/Flat too small  ☐
b. Unit/Flat too big  ☐
c. Want a yard  ☐
d. Don’t like the area anymore  ☐
e. Want somewhere more private  ☐
f. Moving to another town/city  ☐
g. Other __________________

14. Which of the following describes your household

a. Single  ☐
b. Couple  ☐
c. Couple with children  ☐
d. Single parent with children  ☐
e. Group household (e.g. singles sharing unit)  ☐

15. (a) How many parking spaces are provided on site for your dwelling?

a. 1  ☐
b. 2  ☐
c. None  ☐

(b) Comments____________________________________________________

16. (a) Are there any parking spaces for visitors provided at your units?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  – Go to Question 17

(b) If Yes, is there enough?

______________________________________________________________
17. (a) How do you access your property by vehicle?

☐ Own driveway       ☐ Shared/Common driveway      ☐ No access

(b) Comments__________________________________________________________

18. (a) If your units have a shared/common driveway, does anybody have any trouble turning their car around on the site?

☐ Yes            ☐ No – Go to Question 19

(b) If yes, which of the following describes why they have trouble?

a. There is just not enough room to turn the car around ☐
b. The units are too close together ☐
c. Everyone parks their cars in the driveway ☐
d. There is too much area for plants and not enough for cars ☐
e. Other _________________________________________________________ ☐

19. What is your main mode of daily transport?

a. Car ☐
b. Motorbike ☐
c. Bus ☐
d. Walk ☐
e. Pushbike ☐
f. Other ___________________________ ☐

20. (a) Have you ever noticed any of the following at your units? (If no, do not tick any).

a. Water flowing onto your land from another block after rain ☐
b. Water forming ponds in the areas meant for plants ☐
c. Water flowing from your site onto other blocks after rain ☐
d. Water getting trapped in your backyard area ☐

(b) Comments__________________________________________________________
21. What is your gender?

☐ Male ☐ Female

22. Which of the following best describes your age?

a. Under 19 years ☐
b. 20-29 years ☐
c. 30-44 years ☐
d. 45-59 years ☐
e. 60 years and over ☐

23. What is your current address?

________________________________________________________

24. How long have you lived at your current address?

a. 0-12 months ☐
b. 1-3 years ☐
c. 4-8 years ☐
d. 9-20 years ☐
e. 21 years and over ☐

Thank you for taking part in this questionnaire. Your answers will help Council to develop planning schemes which aim to design units in a way that meets the needs and desires of Bathurst’s people. You can drop this form in to either the Bathurst City Council Offices in Russell Street, or the City Library in Keppel Street, or mail to the following address:

The General Manager
Bathurst City Council
PMB 17
BATHURST NSW 2795