SUBMISSION TO THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING

LAUNCESTON CITY COUNCIL

PRESENTED BY:-

IAN ABERNETHY, DIRECTOR DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

INTRODUCTION

From the outset Launceston City Council states that it is fully supportive of the concept of Affordable Housing, in its many guises.

Affordable Housing to Launceston City Council means best use of land, existing infrastructure and good design.

Affordable does not mean bad, cheap housing. Affordable can result in quality developments that set benchmarks in medium density housing. That should be an objective of all Affordable Housing programmes across the Country.

Launceston City Council is not a Housing Authority. Under Tasmanian legislation it is a Planning Authority – and as a result can influence outcomes in the realm of Affordable Housing.

The question must be asked – when did the concept of Affordable Housing start? Was it when the various Housing Authorities changed their policy of not investing in mass Community housing – resulting in a shortfall in low cost housing.

Is this an example of cost shifting between levels of Government as the higher authorities try to involve the lower levels in the concept of Affordable Housing?

WAYS COUNCILS CAN INFLUENCE THE COST OF HOUSING

- Promoting concept to developers and investors
- Knowledge of land that is development ready
- Shared cost of infrastructure
- Some subsidy for fees and charges
- Some rate subsidy

Some of the above beg the question why should the general ratepayers subsidise one sector of the housing market?

DEMAND AND SUPPLY FOR HOUSING IN LAUNCESTON

In reviewing the Launceston City Council Planning Scheme there has been extensive work undertaken in regard to the supply, demand and turnover of residential land. The City has been broken up into discrete precincts and data

collected in regard to lots created, lots taken up, new dwellings built and new units built.

As general finding the City was oversupplied with zoned residential land. This is a general statement and when one factors in available infrastructure and specific locations then there is a different picture across the City. In some suburbs / precincts there is a distinct lack of serviced land. In other a gross oversupply – in some cases almost an infinite supply when one considers demand.

The shortage of land generally occurs in the suburbs one could class as less affordable – East Launceston, Norwood and West Launceston.

ZONED LAND AND SUPPLY

An accepted measure of "good planning" is the available supply of any particular land type (by zoning). An accepted benchmark is a ten year supply. This is based around the demand / supply described above.

It is also assessed around sales of property within the City. Undertaking the same review of the Planning Scheme Launceston City Council collected data based around property sales across the City. From this data one can see the most desirable suburbs in the City. One can also track gentrification of suburbs – certain areas becoming more popular for a variety of reasons.

INFRASTRUCTURE

As a City we have not kept up with the supply of available infrastructure for new subdivisions. This has come about as a result of decades of very low demand and there being no need to invest in new infrastructure.

A key to keeping costs of housing low is to make the best use of existing infrastructure - thus taking the pressure off new development to invest in basic services.

Launceston City Council does not operate a system of headworks charges for new developments. Thus new developers can capitalise on the past investments in services of both Councils and private developers.

This should assist with the concept of Affordable Housing. Headworks charges are however a subject that is under review within Council as a way of distributing the costs of infrastructure more equally within the community.

NEW MARKETS

It is very easy to do land use and zoning assessments purely on demand and supply data. This however does not take into account of new markets, such as influx of sea changers / tree changers / those wanting a life outside of major cities. Launceston has experienced significant new markets in recent

years. This again has placed pressure on the rental market and the availability of property for purchase.

RECENT TRENDS IN HOUSING

Data collected for the Planning Scheme review shows a shift in household size from around 2.8 in 1990 to 2.3 in 2006. This has created a greater demand for housing – albeit not the three bedroom house on quarter of an acre. With reduction in house size comes a new market – the smaller house on a smaller lot. In the years 1992, 1993, 2003 and 2006 the number of units built in the City exceeded the number of single dwellings built.

A snapshot of the residential property market over the period 1990 to 2006 is:-

- Average number of lots created per year 92
- Average lots developed per year 150
- Average single dwellings built per year 128
- Average units built per year 73
- Average housing transfers pre year 1358

RENTAL PRESSURES

From the data on sales we can see a huge increase in sales of property in the period of 2002 to 2004. This related to both established house and vacant land. The market was not ready for this shift and as a result the supply of vacant land declined dramatically – resulting in the first real pressure on rental prices.

CHANGING MARKETS

In regard to gentrification we could look at Mayfield. This is a suburb that has traditionally been regarded as a low socio-economic area. A suburb built around Housing Commission property. Demand and supply data would suggest that over the last 17 years there has been little take up of housing in that area. As a result, the suburb has been characterised by low rents, suiting low income families.

Over the last few years the suburb has changed for a number of reasons:-

- Lack of investment by the Housing Dept in mass Community housing
- Influx of "mainland" investors who saw areas like Mayfield as "easy pickings" – buying multiple properties in one "raid".
- The influence of the University and AMC creating a demand for student accommodation

The reasoning goes like this – why should I (as an investor) accept $140 per week from a low income family when I can get $80 a week times three from students?

RATING STRATEGIES

Launceston City Council adopts a policy of equity within land use types in regard to rating. Council has not considered the concept of some rating differential for Affordable Housing. It is highly unlikely that Council would support this strategy, given the pressure on ratepayers to sustain existing infrastructures and deal with high priority issues across the City.

BUILDING REUSE

Launceston City Council supports the concept of the reuse of existing buildings. Some buildings lend themselves to reuse for residential purposes. Council has a good track record of supporting developments that result in the use of non-residential buildings for residential purposes.

This is a strategy Council would like to explore further in regard to Affordable Housing. Council is firmly of the belief that good quality, affordable developments can result from the conversion of existing non-residential building to residential use.

INNER CITY LIVING

Whilst it is easy to envelope oneself in the rhetoric of the statements above it is a fact that Launceston has a good track record of attracting developments of a residential nature into the City centre (another new market?).

Unfortunately for the concept of Affordable Housing the market that this trend has created is very much at the higher end income. As a result we have seen the price of inner city residential units in certain circumstances hit the $1m mark – hardly affordable for the majority of the population.

Council would like to explore with landowners / developers the concept of Affordable Housing in the inner city. To this end Council policy in regard to provision of car parking on site within the inner city has been completely relaxed to zero.

RESIDENTIAL STRATEGIES

In developing a residential strategy (in draft format) Council has adopted the following principles:-

- Matching demand and supply – exceeding demand to allow housing choice
- Encouraging choice in types of housing supply
- Adopting the principle of sustainable housing
- Making best use of infrastructure
- Ensuring good community outcomes – urban fabric, recreation opportunities, transport options, etc
- Choice and diversity of types, style and location
- Responding to new markets

- Looking for higher densities – particularly in the inner city
- Coordinated land release to make best use of infrastructure
- Better use of Outline Development Plans to give certainty to future developments and reduce cost of services
- Planning around activity centres – mix of land uses – reduce car dependence – public surveillance
- Clear list of criteria for assessment of suitability for residential uses.

PROMOTING THE CONCEPT

As stated at the beginning Launceston City Council is a supporter of the concept of Affordable Housing. To this end the following matters are considered by Council to support the Affordable Housing:-

- Knowledge of a range of sites that could be suitable for Affordable Housing
- Constantly talking to developers about the idea of Affordable Housing
- Making links between possible investors and landowners
- Making minor changes to Planning Scheme to clear the way for Affordable Housing – an example being opening up the zonings across the City to encourage housing
- Regular discussions with State Affordable Housing agency around possible sites and investors.

A BAD RECENT EXAMPLE

If the Select Committee had been in Launceston last week you could have read in the local press how our Council refused planning permission for three applications for Affordable Housing within the City. Does this mean we don't support Affordable Housing? No. It means we believe in the concept that Affordable Housing does not have to mean poor quality development.

As a Planning Authority we were faced with three applications from a developer who had tendered (to the State Government) for the development of a certain number of sites based around a fairly tight brief – two house on each site. When asked to review the level of development on two adjoining blocks the developer was trapped between meeting the basic requirements of the Planning Scheme (and good design) and meeting the terms of the State Government contracts.

With better consultation between State and Council before the tenders were called these bad examples could have been avoided – and costs to the developer reduced – adding to the concept of Affordable Housing.

A RETURN ON INVESTMENT

Anecdotally, a possible investor in Affordable Housing shared this story with me. Under the current strategy being promoted by the State Government the return on investment being offered in regard to Affordable Housing was 3.1%.

The cost of finance for the suggested project is 8.5%. His summation – why bother?

Residential Strategy

Introduction

Residential development is one of the most fundamental aspects of planning schemes. Any planning scheme must provide sufficient residential land for residents of the Municipality, in areas that can adequately provide the optimum expectations and aspirations of the population.

A review of the historical residential land take up and future demographic projections must form the basis for Council's strategic approach to economic and sustainable land use planning.

Whilst Council may not in the past deliberately acted to influence the housing market, it must now take some leadership in the future management of this market segment.

Objectives for housing

In Planning for housing, Council should seek to co-ordinate the future planning of housing and release of land to achieve the following objectives:

Matching demand and supply: providing the opportunity for the market to supply the required number of houses. Match demand with supply

Sustainable development: Locate in a way that maximise the opportunities for sustainable development – transport and the need for cars, access to services, encouragement for sustainable housing layout and design

Infrastructure efficiency: maximise the efficiency of existing infrastructure systems and reduce costs to the community

Ensuring good community outcomes: opportunities for integration into the existing urban fabric - providing recreational opportunities and access to community services and transport options

Choice and diversity of types, style and locations: a variety of housing developments and locations should be available to meet the community needs

Future Urban Form

There are a number of important demographic and social trends that suggest future patterns of urban development maybe different into the future.

The 3 key drivers include:

Environmental sustainability:

- the desire to prevent loss of quality farmland

- pressure of climate change and use of fossil fuels

Economic considerations:

- infrastructure efficiency, connections per hectare
- encouragement of more compact development
- transport costs increasing; commuting is more expensive and less desirable.

Social considerations:

- ageing population
- increasing single persons – changes in demographics
- changing demand for housing – smaller houses, closer to services, higher density

Demographics

Attachment 1 contains a report "Demographic Analysis and Projections for Launceston Local Government Area. This report includes the following:

- *At June 2004 Launceston's population numbered around 64,057. This was a little below the peak of 65,370 which was recorded in 1991, and after which the population began a steady decline until 2001. Growth resumed in 2002 at around 1.3 per cent between 2002 and 2003 and 1.1 percent between 2003 and 2004. This rate of growth is slightly greater than that for Total Tasmania over the same period.*
- *As elsewhere, Launceston's population is ageing structurally, but its age structure is slightly younger than that of Total Tasmania, seemingly due to the presence of the University which is the likely cause of a small gain of interstate migrants aged 15-19 years. At the same time Launceston has a slightly greater proportion aged 65+ years, and a slightly smaller proportion aged 0-14, than does Total Tasmania.*
- *Launceston's growth since 2002 occurred too late to be built into the most recently available set of projections at LGA (and SLA) level; accordingly the latter are likely to underestimate Launceston's population size and structure in the short to medium term.*
- *The growth in Launceston's population between 2001 and 2004 was shared by all Part B suburbs, but most unevenly, headed by Launceston (Parts A and B combined) at almost 20 per cent and Youngtown at 16 per cent. Overall Part C grew significantly less than Part B (3.6 and 0.4 per cent respectively).*
- *Launceston's median age did not change appreciably over the 2001-2004 period, indicating that the age structure of migrants was sufficiently young. This is reinforced by the age structure of Launceston's interstate migrants around 2001, which showed disproportionate gains at 15-19 years and disproportionate losses at ages 20-24 and 25-29. There was minor growth at the older ages, especially among women.*
- *A significant degree of disparity exits with respect to median age across the Launceston suburbs, with the oldest and youngest areas (Norwood and Rocherlea) ranging from 40.6 to 20.5 years. Relatedly, some suburbs and CDs have disproportions of elderly or young in relation to their population shares. Kings Meadows has the highest ratio of elderly to population share, while*

Newnham - as might be expected - has the highest ratio of 15-24 years olds to population share. Part B suburbs are on average a little younger than Part C.

- *Between 2001 and 2004 all suburbs and Census Collection Districts (CDs) gained population at ages 55-64 but this was primarily the result of the baby boomers moving into this age band, rather than migration. Launceston and Youngtown gained a disproportion of younger people (0-14, 15-24 and 25-44 years), indicating some degree of internal migration, while most Part C CDs lost people aged 0-14 and 25-44 years.*
- *Household size also differs somewhat across the suburbs and CDs, from 2.8 in Rocherlea (seemingly a correlate of the youthful age of the area) to 2.0 in Launceston (Parts A and B combined). Part B suburbs have an average household size of 2.3 and Part C CDs, 2.8, challenging the argument that median age is a useful predictor household size at sub population level.*
- *A number of factors make the projection of the future population size and structure of Launceston problematic. Among these are that Tasmania's recent net migration gains have slowed considerably and indicate an imminent shift to a loss, and that the age-specificity of migration differs quite markedly in Launceston. Where Tasmania typically loses young people aged 15-39, even during periods of significant net gain, Launceston gains people aged 15-19 years and loses them at 20-29 years. As elsewhere Launceston's natural increase (the difference between births and deaths) is declining, in 2004 being half that of a decade earlier. At the same time, birth rates have recently increased slightly, although it is unlikely that they will rise to or above replacement level (2.1).*
- *Drawing on these patterns and trends, and taking account to the assumptions developed by the Australian Bureau of Statistics for their most recent set of state- and national-level projections, three sets of projection assumptions were developed. The high variant assumes a TFR rising from its present 1.84 to 1.97 from 2019, annual net migration (ANM) of 100, and life expectancy continuing to improve at a constant rate. The medium variant assumes the TFR falling to 1.77 by 2019 and then remaining constant, with ANM at zero, and the low variant assumes the TFR falling to 1.56 by 2019 and then remaining constant, and ANM at -100. Both the medium and low variants assume the same life expectancy as the high variant.*
- *The assumptions generate a population size in 2024 of 72,903 (high variant), 68,878 (medium variant) and 64,986 (low variant). The projected proportions aged 65+ are greater under the low and medium variants (21.7 and 20.6 per cent respectively in 2024) than under the high variant (19.4 per cent) primarily due to the loss of people of reproductive age under the former assumptions.*
- *As always, users of population projections should be cautioned that projections merely illustrate the trajectory of a population under the conditions assumed. They provide a guide for monitoring, planning, and possible intervention, rather than actual forecasts of future population. The small numbers and volatility of migration involved in developing the migration assumptions for Launceston are particularly problematic.*

For the purpose of this planning scheme review the medium population projections were accepted.

Year	Population	Annual growth rate %	Average Annual Increase
2004	64 057	0.36	231
2009	65 212	0.40	261
2014	66 516	0.38	256
2019	67 797	0.32	216
2024	68 878	0.24	168

Higher density and inner city living

Launceston has experienced a shift in demand for residential development over the last decade. Whilst many people still wish to build a house in a new subdivision there are a significant proportion of people who look for alternatives. Alternatives include smaller houses in unit developments, renovation of inner area properties, flats and apartments. A desire for access to services, reduced travel distance, proximity to the CBD, reduced maintenance responsibilities and lifestyle benefits are some of the drivers of this trend. The ageing population and their changing needs are also significant.

Many alternatives are in developments that are higher than the normal density or are in more central locations that are more 'mixed use' in character. Such developments are often noisier, have more activity and lower levels of privacy. Unless carefully considered, this trend can lead to increased neighbour disputes or disagreements as to the expected entitlement to residential amenity.

Whilst it is recognised, that many areas of the city are currently mixed use, encouraging this and seeking to develop further mixed use areas comes with a responsibility to control nuisance.

Commercial and non-residential uses that operate in inner city areas have a responsibility to contain their emissions, including noise, within their site. However, this is often not the case and the introduction of residential development causes nuisance complaints with regards to the continued non-residential operations.

This situation may progressively worsen, with growing numbers of unit developments in inner areas, if careful consideration is not given to potential issues. Accordingly, it is necessary for the Planning Scheme to encourage design responses appropriate for the site and for individual buildings to ensure residential amenity. Issues such as building materials, i.e. double-glazing, insulation, increased privacy screening, clearly defined private and common spaces can assist.

Mixing residential uses with traditional fringe uses, such as industry, is a balancing act of competing interests.

Longer term land use planning may want to influence the location of certain types of use in these areas (any remaining industry) to meet new or emerging objectives.

The Planning Scheme should recognise the importance of consideration of nuisance in consideration of new unit developments, redevelopment of existing buildings in inner areas apartments or residential components in mixed-use developments.

The planning scheme should seek to require explicit consideration of noise, privacy and amenity issues for new dwellings. Double-glazing and insulation is particularly important in this context.

Future higher density and subdivisions

Unit developments over the last few decades in Launceston have produced a variety of outcomes with regards to streetscape, impact on the surrounding development and the general amenity for future residents. Whilst the 1996 planning scheme includes Development provisions to be complied with, it is often found that even when a proposal complies with the compliance measures it is still not an attractive and liveable development proposal. Any new planning scheme must include direction towards "Best practise design outcomes"

Future subdivision designs must promote mixture and choice. Subdivisions should not only be surveyor driven cutting up of land, but attention should be focussed on the future community that will live in this subdivision. The promotion of choice and diversity will provide for the opportunity to stay within the same suburbs through various stages in life – cradle to grave. Access to community and other services within walking distance and not car dependant must be incorporated.

Future subdivision must concentrate on the development outcomes where the focus is on connectivity, open space, sustainable infrastructure provision and urban design outcomes. Traditional urban sprawl is linked to poor community outcomes, traffic congestion, reliance on motor vehicles and expensive infrastructure provision. Future development should aim to improve transport networks with a focus on pedestrians, providing a range of mixed uses throughout the area, promotion of conservation of agricultural land, natural habitats, improving housing diversity and affordability, increased density of developed (in stead of low density sprawl on the periphery) and efficient infrastructure networks.

Vital to future smart growth is an increased housing density and the option of a range of housing types to meet the desires of a diverse community. It has however been found that in neighbourhoods with single dwellings of substantial value, there is a reluctance to allow higher density multiple dwellings/unit developments. The fear is often that these housing types will devalue the surrounding housing stock and that it will be occupied by "second class citizens".

The Policy Papers underpinning the 1996 planning scheme contained the following key principles that should be carried forward and be emphasised in the review:

Provide for compact commercial centres which are accessible to public and private transport; are integrated with respect to vehicle access, parking and pedestrian movement;
Encourage a compact city form which minimises encroachment into rural areas, minimises new extensions of infrastructure, encourages cost efficient

provisions of public transport and minimises travel times between places of employment and residence;
Encourage closer association of community facilities with commercial nodes

The locations of the last large subdivisions within the city were on the outskirts of the city:

- Alanvale
- Richings
- Mt Pleasant
- St Leonards

Whilst there is still a demand for the traditional subdivision layout in suburban areas, all natural trends point to a cultural change to smaller lots, closer to centres of activities and with access to public transport. These are factors that will influence the development pattern of Launceston in future years. Dependence on the car will be seen as a thing to be avoided.

Some car dependant subdivisions do exist. These are a result of lifestyle choices and will be discussed under the heading of rural residential living elsewhere in this document. Even though the market demands this lifestyle choice, this option should always be measured against the sustainability of the option.

Need for a co-ordinated release of land

The need for a co-ordinated approach to the release of land is important since there is more land available than what the market demands – this is nothing new but has been a trend in the Tamar Valley for decades. The market may demand variety in choices and priorities, but what is the market's capacity to pay for its demands and what % of the development costs is subsidised by the general rate revenue and what % is really contributed by the developer?

Urban expansion in Launceston has occurred to some degree in a piecemeal way. Landowners have developed land in stages, independently of surrounding land and without the necessity to integrate development into the wider city.

Issues include:

- Car dependant residential areas - where residents are not able to reasonably walk to a school or shop,
- Poorly planned road layouts
- Little or no integration of community services,
- Lack of integration of public transport
- Poor integration of recreational opportunities,
- Lack of opportunity for different housing types
- Poorly integrated and planned infrastructure.
- Inability to overcome or plan for land in multiple ownerships

Large scale future development must require an Outline Development Plan. This is essentially a blue print for how an urban area should develop and is a mechanism to ensure that future urban developments avoid the problems listed above and maximise the opportunities to provide desirable and liveable residential areas.

Requiring all new development or urban expansion over a certain size to demonstrate resolution of these issues through an outline development plan process would significantly increase the quality of residential development in Launceston.

Infrastructure considerations are the key inputs into outline development plans. These include:

- Identifying the key road, public transport cycling and pedestrian connections into an area
- Determining the location and capacities of hydraulic services
- Determining the potential for flooding, or overland stormwater flows
- Calculating development contribution

Outline Development Plan

An Outline Development Plan consists of a **plan**, at a scale of no less than 1:2500 and **guidelines**, in an appropriate report format or provided on the plan, addressing the following details:

1) the boundary of the ODP being clearly demarcated;
2) the objectives of the development and future of the ODP area;
3) proposed major land uses or zones
4) the natural features of the area to be retained;
5) the location and provision of public open spaces
6) the proposed transportation infrastructure, including .....
7) an indicative lot pattern and the location, orientation and design of major buildings or designation of building envelopes (where appropriate);
8) the proposed servicing infrastructure, including details relating to:

    - sewerage;
    - storm water drainage, which shall generally be designed in accordance with the principles of water sensitive design;
    - water supply;

9) other key infrastructure services;
10) other key aspects, including:

    - provision of Design Guidelines or special development control provisions;
    - designated Tree Preservation Areas;
    - any heritage places

11) Preliminary Management Plans, including details as to the timing for the development and implementation of such management plans.

Background and History

- Existing Ownership (including a copy of the Certificate of Title);
- An assessment of Aboriginal Heritage;
- Existing and previous land uses;
- Existing transportation networks, including roads and public transport;
- Existing infrastructure and social services provided in the area;

Natural and Environmental Features

- Map showing existing landforms, topography and landscape features;
- Details or map showing existing significant wetlands and hydrology;
- A detailed flora and fauna study;
- A map illustrating the soil types within the area;
- A map or report identifying and detailing any areas containing conservation, wildlife corridors or heritage values;

Planning Context

- Relationship/compliance with State Policies
- Relationship/compliance with Strategies of Council
- Relationship with adjacent or nearby Outline Development Plans;
- Details including:
  - A recent aerial photograph of the site, accompanied with a transparent overlay of the ODP plan layout;
  - A site analysis plan demonstrating the opportunities for and the constraints to development of the ODP area;
  - An indication as to how the ODP is to be integrated into the surrounding area;
  - Details relating to the approximate timeframe and staging of subdivision and development, including estimates of lot yield, dwellings, population and employment opportunities;
  - Transport and Traffic Report, providing details of traffic volumes, the proposed Road Hierarchy and possible public transport routes;
  - Details relating to the proposed earthworks required for the subdivision and development of the area on existing and proposed contour plans, the impacts and control of dust, land clearing and water and ground pollution during and after construction;

Sustainable Development

Demonstration as to how the proposed ODP addresses the principles of sustainable development, with respect to:

- Provision of social infrastructure;
- Sustainable long term economic growth opportunities;
- Integration with the natural and cultural environment;
- Energy efficient design principles;

Justification for lots sizes, with reference to

- Access to public transport;
- Access to services (Community & Commercial)
- Road system that encourages alternative modes of transport

Sequencing of land release is required to utilise gaps/capacity in infrastructure in an economically sustainable manner. It is suggested that a 20 year supply is identified to be released in 10 year timeslots. The opportunity for Council control is greater within short time frames as this is more likely to direct demand and sequence residential development. Sustainable future urban growth requires the following:

- an urban growth boundary determined by current infrastructure capacity and the economical/sustainable future expansion (including the capacity of the population to afford maintenance over the lifetime of the infrastructure)
- an urban expansion overlay for controlled land release.

Why is management/influence by Council required?

1. Council is the infrastructure/asset manager for most of the major infrastructure provided to its ratepayers and visitors. As such Council must manage these assets in an economically viable manner; and seek to determine the following:

   (a) demand for infrastructure in the future;
   (b) cost of infrastructure supply;
   (c) cost of future maintenance of infrastructure; and
   (d) the capability of ratepayers to fund future supply and maintenance.

   It is therefore clear that infrastructure planning and its economic provision and maintenance can only occur within an environment where there is a strategic land use vision for the future. This is not only with regards to residential land use; but land use in its broadest sense.

2. Oversupply of land can seriously impair economic returns for developers:

   (a) the location where the market demands development is not always where the capacity in the infrastructure is;

   (b) a balance needs to be struck between infrastructure capacity, the cost of infrastructure supply and maintenance and market demand – including the capacity of the market to subsidize demand;

   (c) should developers insist on developing outside of the infrastructure capacity, Council must quantify the developer contribution to extending infrastructure as well as the additional future maintenance cost it will incur as a result of the unplanned infrastructure extension.

3. Undersupply of land can increase the cost of housing out of reach of the average family; and can inhibit population growth within the municipality when potential residents are forced to reside in neighbouring municipalities.

4. Unplanned expansion of residential development has an impact on the provision of community, emergency and commercial services. Impacts can include the viability and accessibility of these services.

Historic overview

Attachment 2 Residential Lot creation and Take up 1990 – 2006 shows a historic overview of residential development within the municipality over the last 16 years.

The data has been collected and displayed within designated Precincts. Maps showing these precincts and the lots vacant at 01/01/07 (eg no Building Approval issued) are enclosed in Attachment 3. These precinct boundaries had been selected to be as close as possible to the Census boundaries for the last 3 census collections (the boundaries did differ slightly between collections) and where possible roads were selected as boundaries between adjacent precincts. It is envisaged that the Planning Scheme will provide for specific precinct development standards and future character outcomes.

A snapshot of the residential market over the last 17 years 1990 – 2006 shows the following:

Average lost created:	92 lots per year
Average lots taken up by residential development:	150 lots per year
Average single dwellings built per year:	128
Average units built per year:	73
Average transfers per year:	1358

Unit development over the last 17 years only accounts for 36% of the total residential dwellings constructed. Only in 1992, 1993, 2003 and 2006 did the construction of units exceed the number of single dwellings constructed.

The early 1990's seemed to be the boom period for residential construction. The level of construction reached it lowest point in 2000 with a sharp upwards curve in 2003 with a limited plateau towards 2006 still falling short of the high levels of 1992 – 1994.

The highest levels of property transfers during the 17 period 1990 – 2006 were in East and West Launceston.

When the lots taken up over the period are considered, the following is significant:

Urban lot take up resulted in 85% of residential development at a rate of approx 138/year.

Rural residential lot take up resulted in 4.6% of residential development at a rate of approx 7/year.

Whilst **Lilydale** is neither urban nor rural development it was not calculated as part of the urban or rural residential development due to the uniqueness of the village with regards to its development potential and constraints. Lot take up in Lilydale contributed only 0.4% of the total take up rate. Council can seek to influence (attract) demand for development in Lilydale by allocating land for

development. This would strengthen the community and make shops, the hotel, medical services and community services more viable. Such a strategy may require an upgrade of Council's infrastructure to determine the relationship between the positive community benefits and public investment.

Rural lot take was 10% of the overall residential development at a rate of approx 15/year. The 1996 planning scheme made a deliberate effort to curb rural land fragmentation and residential development unrelated to rural enterprise that can have an impact of the level of public infrastructure required to be provided and maintained or have a detrimental impact on agricultural, forestry and mining activities. This strategy is in line with sustainable rural land development and mirrors the Protection of Agricultural Land State Policy.

Invermay

When the 1996 planning scheme was prepared and approved, it was considered that the Invermay area was free from flood inundation due to the protection of the levee system. Council adopted the *Invermay Flood Levee Policy* during July 2006. This confirmed that it could not be accepted that the levees will hold up against a 1: 100 year flood event. Approx 30% of the Invermay suburb is below high tide by up to 1.5m.

The various levels of government have pledged financial resources to mitigate the flood risk. This is a longer term project and there can be no expectation that the flood risk will be resolved in the near future. It should be acknowledge that the flood risk can NEVER be totally negated.

For this reason the planning scheme must limit future residential growth within the suburb and discourage capital investment within the flood risk area. Council and the community need to have a long term socially and economically sustainable land use strategy for the Invermay area. In preparing this there is a need to consider and evaluate the flood protection paradox and how serious Council is regarding managing the risk.

The huge amount of capital investment in both the public infrastructure and private development needs to be weighed against the risk and real cost of loss of life and community taking into account the likelihood of a major flood event.

What is currently available?

Zoning	Vacant lots #	Vacant land in ha
Urban residential	1	3.2
Closed residential	13	36.32
Low Density Residential	7	31.14
Reserved Residential	7	21.06
Future Urban	12	140.97
Rural Residential	54	193.83
TOTAL	**94**	**426.52**

Maps of this land are included in Attachment 3

This table only shows land parcels larger than 1ha that were vacant at 01/01/07. Only these parcels were used as part of the housing requirement

calculations. Future Urban DOES NOT imply future residential development. These vacant parcels were therefore not taken into consideration as part of the vacant land.

What does this translate to in terms of possible single dwellings and unit developments? Certain assumptions need to be made with regards to density of development, number of dwellings and population per dwelling.

The current planning scheme has the following minimum lot sizes:

Urban Residential: 350m²
Closed Residential: 500m²
Low Density Residential: 1500m²

This provides a large range of development density. When taking into account that all these zones provide the option for multiple dwellings - where the density of the development is usually determined by the footprint of the units (coverage of lot) and the required provisions for on site car parking and private open space, the range of development density is not a given.

The following assumptions are made with regards to development density when calculating the future need for serviced residential land:

Single dwellings @ 12/ha
Unit development @ 24/ha

Future demand

In assessing future demand certain benchmarks have to be recognised and accepted. Over time these may change and any plan has to be flexible enough to adopt to those changes.

The model below is based on the median predictions of Dr Natalie Jackson described earlier in this paper.

It is predicted household size will continue to reduce and thus effect the demand for housing. At this stage there is no published data to contradict the 2.3 persons per household quoted by Jackson.

I Chosen methodology

a. Calculate the total numbers of population growth by 2024
   2004 to 2024
   64057 to 68 878 population
   Total population growth: 4821 people over 20 years

b. Calculate the projected household size = **2.3 per household**

c. Divide the additional people by the household size
   4821 additional people / 2.3 per household = **2096 additional households**

d. Calculate the average numbers of households built per year as a long term average.
1990 – 2006 = 17 years of data collection
Average households built = 128 single dwellings average per year
+ 73 units average per year
Average households built = 201 per year

e. Average the population projection figure and the historical building rates.
Required to built **2096** households over **20** years for projected population growth to 2024: **2096/20 = 105 per year**
Historic average **= 201 per year**
Average $\frac{105 + 201}{2}$ = 153 per year

f. Determine the number of dwelling units (single dwellings and multiple dwellings) required in the serviced urban area and unserviced rural residential.

Historic:
85% = urban dwelling units (36% = units; 64% = single dwellings)
4.6% = rural res
0.4% = Lilydale
10% = rural
15% = non urban
153 households per year:
Urban: 85% = 130 households
36% or **47 units per year @ 24/ha requires 2 ha per year for unit development**
64% or **83 single dwellings per year @ 12/ha requires 7ha per year for single dwellings**
Rural = 15% = 23 households
4.6% = Rural Residential or 7 dwellings per year
10% = Rural or 15 dwellings per year

g. Determine the timeframe of supply release – eg 5/10 or 15 years.
Urban development requires 9 ha per year

90 ha from 2004 – 2014
180 ha from 2004 – 2024 (or 90ha from 2015 – 2024)

II. Limitations

The above methodology has the following limitations:

a. does not factor in elements such as the housing booms – unexpected economic circumstances of growth or decline – factors such as the pulp mill
b. does not factor in Council's own activities such as economic and social policy that may influence demand in some areas

c. does not factor in decisions by council as to how it sees the City growing and its desires to provide for growth
d. does not factor in the surrounding context and the actions of other council areas and their desired to limit or provide for housing growth.
e. new trends in household size/product and mixed migration.

The principle is for Council to co-ordinate the releasee of land to achieve sustainable development, viability for development and to ensure the economic provision and use of infrastructure – rather than restrict supply. The aim should be to provide a thriving housing market catering for variety in demand. If you plan for decline – the city will die. Therefore it is important to contain future urban expansion within an urban boundary. This boundary will be determined by the cost effective provision and future maintenance of infrastructure.

Attachment 4 Residential Development Planning (A Strategy to Identify Priority Areas) is the result of a study undertaken to identify those areas within the urban boundary of the city that are undeveloped and to prioritise the areas after considering a variety of factors, including the availability of infrastructure, transport links and the unique limitations of the land. It is considered that the priority list, as a result of this study, should form the basis for a future urban land release/residential development strategy.

The scope of the study was to:

- identify sites that are underdeveloped and within Launceston Urban Boundary
- Identify a list of criteria that is considered to be important in any well functioning, fully developed area
- Develop a scoring system and weighting factors for each identified criteria to assist in determining the priority for those subject sites
- Prepare a priority list of the subject sites that are the most appropriate area for future development
- Determine the next steps to allow for proper planning of the priority subject sites – to include identification in the strategic land use plan; and for future preparation of Outline Development Plans and servicing strategy for incorporation in the review of the planning scheme.

32 Sites were selected. These are vacant sites within the urban boundary of the City.

18 Criteria were identified, based on parameters that are considered to be important in any well functioning, fully developed urban area. The criteria included:

1) Proximity to reticulated water supply
2) Ability of the water quantity /pressure at the subject site to meet desirable standards
3) Ability of sewer mains from the subject site to flow via gravity to Council's system

4) Capacity of Council's Waste Water Treatment Plant to accept effluent if the subject site is fully developed
5) Ability of stormwater drainage to discharge into public watercourse or Council's existing system if the subject site is fully developed
6) The subject site's risk to flooding by inland water
7) The subject site's landslip zoning as per Mineral Resources Tasmania latest information
8) Location of the subject land within an important view shed or on a major access route into the city
9) Conservation values of the subject land in accordance with TASVEG 2004
10) Distance from CBD
11) Proximity to arterial road network
12) Slope of building envelope
13) Currant zoning and /or Special overlay
14) Level of interest from owner/developer
15) Level assistance required from Council to make things happen – eg negotiate with number of owners to develop ODP
16) Proximity to neighbourhood services
17) Infill development or not
18) Conflicts with adjacent land use

Each criterion was assigned a weighting factor and then the subject sites were scored against the criteria and a final ranking calculated. The weighting and scoring was a team effort and subject to a peer review of senior staff in Infrastructure Directorate and Planning Department.

The final outcome of the process was a ranking of subject sites in priority. These priorities included Planning scheme development ranking and Outline Development Plan Priority ranking.

The top 8 development sites are the following:

why not St devonds?

Site No	Location	Suburb	ODP Ranking	Planning Scheme priority ranking	Land area in hectare
13	Seymour/Lambert Street	Ravenswood	2	1	2.4
30	Treherne Street	Mayfield	4	2	1.8
5	Bertha Street#	Prospect	1	3	18.7
12	Chapple Street	Ravenswood	5	4	0.95
16	Vermont Road	Mowbray	6	5	2.6
19	Alanvale Road	Alanvale	3	6	9.5
11	Faulkner Road	Ravenswood	8	7	2.6
32	Reservoir Road##	Rocherlea	7	8	75.7
TOTAL					114.25

Site 5, Bertha Street – Hume & Kerrison Site (Rezoning and subdivision currently under assessment)

Site 32, Reservoir Road, Rocherlea = 75.7ha (This site is currently under investigation as a large scale residential development; where the major focus is on building a community as well as being part of the government's Affordable Housing strategy).

In an ideal world, the above top 8 sites should be the first sites to be developed for future urban residential use. Future subdivision must be in accordance with an approved ODP. Linkages with community services, open space and public transport are essential. Each ODP must also contain future development criteria with regards to housing density, urban design and streetscape. The new planning scheme must include a process for assessment of an ODP that also include 3rd party appeal rights.

Need for flexibility and responsiveness

Whilst Council can plan and develop a strategy it must recognise that it cannot control all factors including market trends and desires and the willingness of land owners to enter the development market. It must therefore be flexible to amend its approach to accommodate future changing circumstances; eg. if a suitably located commercial/industrial land use is to relocate and the land is available for infill residential development.

The approach suggested, allocates an initial quantity of land – this land represents the most desirable land from a planning assessment.

Should this land not development and there is an identified demand for alternative locations or types/ styles of houses these alternatives should be able to be considered. Reasons for the identified land not developing could include the following:

- Unwilling owners
- Market trends
- Relative desirability of locations
- Changing economic or social circumstances
- Patterns of economic investments
- Changes in demographic forecasts i.e. migration rates
- Commercial/industrial uses relocate and leave land available for infill residential development.

Any new residential development out of sequence with the above 8 subject sites and before 2015 must be subject to an ODP and address the requirements described above.

Generally land over 1ha should be required to develop in accordance with an ODP approved by Council.

Rural

Why do we have limited rural res development?

Protection of Agricultural land (PAL)

Over recent decades significant amounts of productive agricultural land in Tasmania has been permanently lost to agriculture and converted to other land uses particularly lifestyle properties and less productive hobby farms. Should this trend continue it is feared that the value of agriculture to the Tasmanian economy will be eroded. In order to address these issues the State Government through the Resource Planning and Development Commission developed a State Policy for the Protection of Agricultural Land. The purpose of the policy is to foster sustainable agriculture and ensure the continued productivity of the states agricultural resources.

All Planning schemes must comply with State Policies. Attachment 5 contains a copy of the State Policy on the Protection of Agricultural Land.

The PAL policy is based on a land capability system grading the ability of land to produce agricultural goods without impairing the long-term, sustainable productive potential of the land. The system is based on 7 grades with grades 1 to 3 being classified as "prime".

Launceston has very little prime land and much of the productive agriculture takes place on Classes 4 and 5. Land capability does not extend to the assessment of land for its suitability for specialist agricultural enterprises, such as viticulture. It also does not assess suitability for forestry.

The key tasks for Council in implementing the policy are to identify those areas of land within Launceston that are currently utilised for, or have the potential for, productive agricultural use and to ensure that this capacity does not become eroded over time through inappropriate developments. The balance areas that are not suitable for agriculture or that have lost their agricultural capacity **may** be subject to less restriction or exempted from consideration under the policy.

This split between productive agricultural areas and non-productive or converted areas will form the basis of the new '**Rural Living'** and "**Rural Resource'** zone boundary.

The Launceston Planning Scheme must implement the State Policy for the Protection of Agricultural Land. This requires Council to ensure the impacts of agricultural productivity are considered in approval of new land use and development. Council must apply the following principles:

- **That productive agricultural land should not be converted to non-agricultural uses**. Conversion occurs through both directly building on land and changing it to a non-agricultural use or subdivision of land into title that in not viable for future agricultural use. Residential development that is not integral to an agricultural enterprise is generally considered conversion.

- **Avoiding land use conflicts and fettering of agriculture**: To ensure that new land use or development does not compromise the ability of farmers to farm without complaint or interference from neighbouring non-

agricultural land uses. Conflict is most often caused by residential uses in farming districts. Issues include generally include smell and noise, uncontrolled domestic animals, fence maintenance

There are a number of areas in Launceston that are attractive for "lifestyle" properties and hobby farms. Areas such as between the Tamar Estuary and Lilydale and areas to the south and east of Launceston are attractive because of easy access to the city, views and generally small manageable lots sizes. Historically there is a steady demand for new houses.

Approval of new houses in rural areas is a perennial problem for Council. This occurs because there is a general presumption in the community that people have a 'right' to build a house on a separate title in rural areas. In reality this has not been the case for some time and conflict often occurs.

Council's current approach depends on overcoming 2 key tests:

1. A house can only be built on a vacant Rural title providing the title was created prior to the commencement of the current scheme in 1997; and

2. Meeting some basic minimum standards including:

    - Access to a Council-maintained road or a road maintained by a highway authority
    - Evidence of satisfactory effluent disposal by an approved system
    - Evidence the land to be developed is not high quality agricultural land
    - The house site must not be located in a quarry buffer area.

The purpose of these tests was to put a finite limit on the number of houses that could be constructed in Rural Areas. At the time of scheme adoption approximately 1400 Titles complied with age and frontage criteria representing about 40 years supply. These tests have generally been a well-accepted tool that achieves Council objectives in a transparent way that does not further disadvantage landowners and should be continued in a new planning scheme.

Council has sought to limit houses on rural land for the following main reasons:

1. To preserve agricultural capacity and prevent break up of productive farms and conversion to 'hobby' farms - thus prevent fettering of productive farms (implementation of the PAL policy objectives)
2. To protect mineral resource deposits and investment in quarry operations.
3. To limit demand for extension of costly services in rural areas, such as sealed roads, water supplies, garbage collections and other social services
4. To encourage a more sustainable development pattern that is less reliant on car based transport.

As part of a holistic housing strategy Council should make provision for 'rural residential' type development. This differs from ad hoc houses in rural areas

in that it occurs in a planned way where individual properties can be created and provided with the necessary services and all relevant matters can be considered. Launceston has a number of successful rural residential areas including Relbia and the Windermere/ Swan Bay areas. Rural residential development provides choice for people who want to live in a countryside setting without a significant land holding and without the problems of conflict with productive agriculture.

Houses in rural areas should only be approved when some basic minimum criteria can be met:

a) Compliance with the requirements of the PAL policy and agricultural impact assessment.
b) Frontage to a Council maintained road or a State road
c) Demonstrated ability to dispose of effluent
d) Satisfactorily addressing relevant safety, bushfire, aesthetic and amenity considerations
e) Not located within an identified buffer area for mining operations or other protected land use

The current prohibition on building houses on lots created after 1998 should be maintained.

Rural living
The Rural residential developments within the municipality are situated in the south at Relbia and along the East Tamar in Dilston, Windermere and Swan Bay areas.

Development during the 17 years between 1990 until 2006, in these areas was the following:

Precinct	Lots created	Lots taken up/dwellings erected	Vacant lots
Windermere/Dilston	41	47	61
Relbia	37	73	14
TOTAL	**78**	**120**	**75**

Over 17 years the average take up rate was 7 lots/dwellings per year. That leaves just over a 10 year supply when taken into account the existing vacant lots.

In an attempt to provide options in choice for residential development – rural residential living must also be provided for. Whilst accepting that there is a market demand, the overriding emphasis should be a policy of restraint.

Future Rural Residential must be part of a holistic strategy recognising the Council must protect its most productive agricultural areas. Co-ordinated and planned residential areas must only be provided in this context. In conjunction with policies to limit non-agricultural related residential development, Rural Residential areas must protect rural areas from unfettered development via

implementation of the State Policy on the Protection of Agricultural Land. It is considered a better planning strategy to focus rural residential development into planned areas where issues of fettering and agricultural capacity can be appropriately managed. This is preferred to an approach where rural residential/rural living is spread across the municipality.

Future Rural residential/rural living expansion should give preference to existing settlements where there is already infrastructure available such as water reticulation, power, telephone services, public transport, garbage removal, public transport and shops; or locations where these services can be most efficiently provided. Locations should be avoided if it will create unnecessary demands for services that will eventually be subsidised by state and local government rate payers.

Council should avoid allocating large areas of land for Rural residential/rural living purposes. This can fuel land speculation and create pressures for the provisions of services and facilities that are difficult to provide economically.

The approach should be a land release strategy that gives preference to the most suitable locations.

Rural Residential/rural living model

To determine the most suitable locations for future Rural residential/rural living land release strategy, the following methodology was followed:

- Identifying series of factors that make land a sustainable choice for Future Rural Residential Development.
- Group the factors in "Positive attributes" and "Fatal flaws".
- Land containing "Fatal flaws" was removed from consideration.
- Remaining land was scored based on number of "Positive attributes".
- Results were mapped.

Fatal flaws

- Tasveg Forest priority
- Land zoned for other uses
- Class 4 & 5 landslip
- Watercatchment Areas
- Buffer Areas
- Landcapability – Rural/PAL policy
- Sewer catchment
- Flood risk
- Landslide hazard – MRT map
- Non freehold land
- Slope > 17 degrees
- No road frontage

Positive attributes

- Within 500m of reticulated water
- Sealed road frontage
- Gravel road frontage

- On current garbage collection route
- Not in Scenic Protection LPS 1996
- Not containing Tasveg native forest

Preference Priority

= Desirable preference present

= Undesirable preference present

Order	Road Frontage	Water Reticulation 500m buffer	Scenic Protection	Native Forest
1	Yes	Yes	No	N0
2	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
3	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6	Yes	No	No	No
7	Yes	No	No	Yes
8	Yes	No	Yes	No
9	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
10	No	Yes	No	No
11	No	Yes	Yes	No
12	No	Yes	No	Yes
13	No	No	No	No
14	No	No	No	Yes

Attachment 7 contains a map showing the result of the above matrix. The top areas for future Rural Residential/rural living is an expansion of the existing areas around Windermere/Swan Bay and Lilydale.

It must be noted that where a property was not currently within 500m of Council's reticulated water system, it was automatically pushed to below the top 5 positions. Should Council allow a willing owner to extend the current mains to elevate their land to a higher position on the priority list, Council must also calculate the future additional maintenance of this extended infrastructure. These costs must be absorbed by the developer and not be for future urban ratepayers to subsidise. Should this be the case, the modelling can be re-run to determine where such a property ends up on the priority list.

Conclusion

This report contains a historic overview of residential development in Launceston over a 17 year period 1990 – 2006. It also suggests a defendable methodology to determine priority areas for future development – sustainable development where major infrastructure capacity already exists. This report also acknowledge that whilst this methodology is acceptable, this is not an ideal world and matters such as market demand, desirable location and owner's willingness to enter the development market requires Council to be

flexible in their assessment of future development applications. Economic and environmental sustainability must be a priority and in rural areas the conflict with legitimate rural land uses must be taken into account, and avoided.

It is important that the status of the regional provision for housing is taken into account. Anecdotal evidence is that Launceston municipal area has a serious lack on residential options available at present. This pushes the price up and not only makes owning a house in Launceston out of reach of a segment of the market, but it also pushed potential residents out to our neighbouring municipalities. The last census figures showed that our neighbouring municipalities recorded a larger residential growth that Launceston.

It is therefore imperative for a viable Council to always have land in reserve for future needs. The implication of regional development for Launceston includes the following:

- Traffic issues over the municipal boundary;
- Service provisions in the region – infrastructure, community services, education, emergency and retail.

Who pays to provide these and who uses these?

Implementation

Existing Planning Scheme zones

Launceston Planning Scheme, 1996 provides for the following Residential zones.

- Urban Residential. This is the inner city residential development where the density is the highest. The minimum lot size is 350m².
- Closed Residential. This is the city's principle residential area where single dwellings are interspersed multiple dwellings. The minimum lot size is 500m².
- Low Density Residential. This is land on prominent vistas were visual intrusion and environmental factors are of primary concern. The minimum lot size is 1500m².
- Reserved Residential. This zoning was introduced to the 1996 planning scheme in an attempt to manage the future orderly development of residential land. The Intent of this zone includes: *To enable essential planning to be carried out before subdivision, including the location and type of roads, housing, recreation areas and the provision of essential services.* While this intent was admirable, this was not applied in all cases.
- Rural Residential. This zoning provides for residential development in a semi-rural environment where all lots are able to be connected to reticulated water and are serviced by Council maintained rural roads. The planning scheme provides for a variety of minimum lots sizes within the Rural Residential zoning, depending on the specific site constraints of the area. Minimum lots sizes vary from 0.8ha at Doctors Rise to 30ha in Swan Bay.
- Future Urban. This zoning was introduced in the 1996 planning scheme as another mechanism to manage urban development. This land was designated for development beyond the first 10 years of the life time of the planning scheme. This land was **not** specifically earmarked for future residential development and was "back zoned" to reduce the amount of undeveloped residential zoned land that had development constraints.

The planning scheme also contains a number of Particular Use Zones that provides for or includes residential development options. These are Caretakers dwellings, Multiple dwellings or Care facilities and aged care facilities.

Other zones within the Planning Scheme that provides for Residential development are:

- Central Business Distinct Zone: provides for Multiple dwelling and Caretakers dwelling.
- Business Zone – provides for Multiple Dwelling, Caretakers dwelling and Single dwelling.
- District Business Zone – provides for Multiple dwelling and Caretakers dwelling.
- Local Business Zone - provides for Multiple Dwelling, Caretakers dwelling and Single dwelling.
- Commercial Zone – provides for multiple dwelling and Single dwelling within the Central Activities district.
- Industrial and Light Industrial Zone provides for Caretakers dwelling.
- Village Zone – provides for single dwelling, Caretakers dwelling, Care facility, Multiple dwelling and Retirement Village.
- Rural Zone – provides for Single dwelling and Caretakers Dwelling.
- Recreation and Leisure Zone – provides for Caretakers Dwelling.
- Public Recreation Zone - provides for Caretakers Dwelling.
- Tourism Zone – provides for Caretakers dwelling and Single and Multiple dwellings (only within the Central Activities District).
- Community Services Zone – provides for Caretakers dwelling, Care facility and single dwelling.

Schedule 2 to the Planning Scheme includes various definitions pertaining to dwellings. Whilst the planning scheme provides for a variety of type and location/zone for residential accommodation, the **Simplifying Planning Scheme format** provides for limited Zones and definitions.

The next step is to identify how these specific activities and developments can be categorised into the **Simplified Planning Scheme format**.

Residential zones set out in the **Simplified Planning Scheme format** are:

- **Residential** – *To provide for residential use or development that accommodates a range of dwelling types and densities where full infrastructure services are available, including access to educational, recreational, transport and community services.*
- **Low Density Residential** – *To provide for residential development on larger lots (with or without infrastructure services) where there are constraints to development at higher densities.*
- **Rural Living** – *To provide for residential development on large lots in a non-urban setting where it can be expected that infrastructure services may be limited and residential amenity will be influenced by the rural character of the area.*
- **Mixed Use Zone** – *To provide for a range of residential, commercial, industrial and other uses that complement the function of a township,*

settlement or a locality where a mix of uses has established and it is desirable for a mix to be maintained.

New planning scheme implementation

The current planning scheme provides for different character areas, land uses, the necessary protection and development direction in the city via multiple zones. The **Simplified Planning Scheme format** only provides for limited zones and definitions. To manage future development outcomes, precincts will require an additional layer of control.

Any new planning scheme must include the following with regards to future residential development:

1) Urban boundary – determined by the capacity of existing infrastructure capacity;
2) Urban expansion overlay for controlled land release/urban expansion;
3) Best practise design guidelines for future subdivision and residential development;
4) Outline Development Plan guidelines;
5) A process to adopt an ODP including 3rd party appeal rights;
6) A process to determine, collect and use developer contributions.

ATTACHMENTS

1) Natalie Jackson: Demographic Analysis and Projections for Launceston Local Government Area.
2) Residential Lot creation and Take up 1990 – 2006
3) Maps showing precincts and vacant land > 1ha
4) Residential Development Planning (A Strategy to Identify Priority Areas)
5) State Policy on the Protection of Agricultural Land
6) Map showing Rural Residential priority areas
7) Simplified Planning Scheme format

PROPERTY SALES IN LAUNCESTON MUNICIPAL AREA: 1990 - 2006

1 Rocherlea Industrial

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	1	0.13
1991	1	0.13
1992	1	0.11
1993	1	0.10
1994	2	0.18
1995	0	0.00
1996	0	0.00
1997	1	0.08
1998	4	0.13
1999	1	0.07
2000	2	0.17
2001	1	0.07
2002	5	0.32
2003	1	0.11
2004	8	0.3
2005	5	0.2
2006	5	0.3
Total	**40**	**0.14**

2 Alanvale

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	37	4.92
1991	45	5.78
1992	50	5.27
1993	62	6.08
1994	52	4.81
1995	58	5.77
1996	59	5.84
1997	71	5.79
1998	66	5.15
1999	58	4.22
2000	68	5.63
2001	71	4.93
2002	69	4.36
2003	40	4.46
2004	168	6.1
2005	166	6.8
2006	144	6.3
Total	**1284**	**5.42**

5 Mowbray West

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	16	2.13
1991	16	2.05
1992	18	1.90
1993	19	1.86
1994	13	1.20
1995	22	2.19
1996	20	1.98
1997	15	1.22
1998	29	2.26
1999	26	1.89
2000	19	1.57
2001	24	1.67
2002	29	1.83
2003	16	1.78
2004	62	2.3
2005	50	2.0
2006	45	2.0
Total	**439**	**1.87**

6 Mowbray East

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	14	1.86
1991	6	0.77
1992	7	0.74
1993	14	1.37
1994	21	1.94
1995	9	0.90
1996	10	0.99
1997	19	1.55
1998	21	1.64
1999	21	1.53
2000	15	1.24
2001	23	1.60
2002	16	1.01
2003	16	1.78
2004	39	1.4
2005	37	1.5
2006	40	1.8
Total	**328**	**1.4**

9 Invermay East

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	45	5.98
1991	47	6.03
1992	50	5.27
1993	46	4.51
1994	46	4.25
1995	34	3.38
1996	37	3.66
1997	60	4.89
1998	54	4.22
1999	49	3.56
2000	38	3.15
2001	47	3.27
2002	67	4.23
2003	44	4.91
2004	139	5.1
2005	108	4.4
2006	110	4.8
Total	**1021**	**4.45**

10 Inveresk Rail yards

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	0	0.00
1991	0	0.00
1992	0	0.00
1993	0	0.00
1994	0	0.00
1995	0	0.00
1996	0	0.00
1997	0	0.00
1998	1	0.08
1999	0	0.00
2000	0	0.00
2001	0	0.00
2002	0	0.00
2003	0	0.00
2004	1	0
2005	0	0
2006	0	0
Total	**2**	**0.00**

13 St Leonards

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	17	2.26
1991	13	1.67
1992	22	2.32
1993	31	3.04
1994	20	1.85
1995	18	1.79
1996	29	2.87
1997	36	2.93
1998	30	2.34
1999	22	1.60
2000	26	2.15
2001	31	2.15
2002	39	2.46
2003	14	1.56
2004	68	2.5
2005	51	2.1
2006	63	2.8
Total	**530**	**2.26**

14 Trevallyn

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	23	3.06
1991	33	4.24
1992	18	1.90
1993	35	3.43
1994	35	3.23
1995	33	3.28
1996	32	3.17
1997	42	3.42
1998	51	3.98
1999	50	3.63
2000	37	3.07
2001	40	2.78
2002	37	2.34
2003	23	2.56
2004	73	2.7
2005	66	2.7
2006	68	3.0
Total	**696**	**3.09**

17 Central Area

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	10	0.33
1991	11	1.41
1992	20	2.11
1993	8	0.79
1994	14	1.29
1995	12	1.19
1996	14	1.39
1997	23	1.87
1998	20	1.56
1999	25	1.82
2000	37	3.07
2001	23	1.60
2002	28	1.77
2003	28	3.12
2004	74	2.7
2005	46	1.9
2006	44	1.9
Total	**437**	**1.75**

18 Central periphery

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	6	0.80
1991	7	0.90
1992	9	0.95
1993	18	1.77
1994	15	1.39
1995	14	1.39
1996	13	1.29
1997	15	1.22
1998	9	0.70
1999	17	1.24
2000	31	5.57
2001	28	1.95
2002	11	0.69
2003	26	2.90
2004	25	0.9
2005	27	1.1
2006	25	1.1
Total	**296**	**1.52**

21 East Launceston

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	86	11.44
1991	85	10.91
1992	118	12.45
1993	100	9.81
1994	132	12.20
1995	123	12.24
1996	113	11.19
1997	145	11.82
1998	170	13.27
1999	173	12.57
2000	154	12.76
2001	186	12.93
2002	206	13.01
2003	101	11.26
2004	319	11.62
2005	331	13.5
2006	278	12.21
Total	**2820**	**12.07**

22 West Launceston

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	90	11.97
1991	94	12.07
1992	157	16.56.
1993	153	15.01
1994	124	11.46
1995	153	15.22
1996	149	14.75
1997	163	13.28
1998	189	14.75
1999	214	15.55
2000	147	12.18
2001	212	14.73
2002	212	13.39
2003	96	10.70
2004	292	10.63
2005	304	12.39
2006	296	13.01
Total	**3045**	**13.39**

25 Kings Meadows

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	50	6.65
1991	49	6.29
1992	78	8.23
1993	66	6.48
1994	55	5.08
1995	62	6.17
1996	66	6.53
1997	89	7.25
1998	84	6.56
1999	96	6.98
2000	71	5.88
2001	84	5.84
2002	103	6.51
2003	51	5.69
2004	153	5.57
2005	141	5.74
2006	115	6.76
Total	**1004**	**6.37**

26 West Youngtown

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	7	0.93
1991	10	1.28
1992	2	0.21
1993	10	0.98
1994	8	0.74
1995	12	1.19
1996	8	0.79
1997	8	0.65
1998	10	0.78
1999	16	1.16
2000	8	0.66
2001	13	0.90
2002	22	1.39
2003	9	1.00
2004	34	1.24
2005	11	0.45
2006	25	1.10
Total	**213**	**0.91**

29 Windermere/Dilston

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	20	2.66
1991	11	1.41
1992	5	0.53
1993	12	1.18
1994	13	1.20
1995	10	1.00
1996	8	0.79
1997	11	0.90
1998	13	1.01
1999	16	1.16
2000	28	2.32
2001	15	1.04
2002	10	0.63
2003	7	0.78
2004	40	1.46
2005	18	0.73
2006	38	1.67
Total	**275**	**1.20**

30 Lilydale

Table 1: Property Sales 1990-2006

Year	*Number properties sales*	*% Sales in Launceston*
1990	6	0.80
1991	2	0.26
1992	8	0.84
1993	2	0.20
1994	11	1.02
1995	8	0.80
1996	2	0.20
1997	5	0.41
1998	7	0.55
1999	6	0.44
2000	7	0.58
2001	7	0.49
2002	7	0.44
2003	1	0.11
2004	13	0.47
2005	12	0.49
2006	17	0.75
Total	**121**	**0.52**

RESIDENTIAL LOT CREATION AND TAKE UP 1990 - 2006

Alanvale

YEAR	LOTS CREATED	LOTS TAKEN UP	NEW DWELLINGS	NEW UNITS (Lots utilised)
1990	1	23	21	7 (2)
1991	0	20	14	16 (6)
1992	4	33	26	17 (7)
1993	21	39	24	34 (15)
1994	0	21	21	0
1995	0	12	12	0
1996	0	7	7	0
1997	0	12	11	2 (1)
1998	0	14	13	2 (1)
1999	0	15	13	4 (2)
2000	1	9	8	2 (1)
2001	1	11	11	0
2002	20	14	13	2 (1)
2003	65	12	11	3 (1)
2004	42	9	6	5 (3)
2005	3	34	29	11 (5)
2006	26	52	45	46 (7)
TOTAL	**184**	**337**	**285**	**151 (52)**

Vacant Residential land as at 01/01/07 (parcels > 1ha)

Zoning	Vacant lots	Vacant land in ha
Urban Residential		
Closed Residential	4	13.18
Low Density Residential		
Reserved Residential	1	2.91
Future Urban		
Rural Residential		
TOTAL	**5**	**16.09**

Mayfield

YEAR	LOTS CREATED	LOTS TAKEN UP	NEW DWELLINGS	NEW UNITS (lots utilised)
1990	34	7	2	16 (5)
1991	0	3	1	6 (2)
1992	6	8	0	16 (8)
1993	0	4	2	5 (2)
1994	0	3	2	3 (1)
1995	0	2	1	2 (1)
1996	0	1	1	0
1997	0	3	3	0
1998	0	4	3	1 (1)
1999	1	1	1	0
2000	0	0	0	0
2001	0	0	0	0
2002	0	2	1	3 (1)
2003	0	5	4	2 (1)
2004	0	1	1	0
2005	0	2	2	0
2006	0	3	2	2 (1)
TOTAL	**41**	**49**	**26**	**56 (23)**

Vacant Residential land as at 01/01/07 (parcels > 1ha)

Zoning	Vacant lots	Vacant land in ha
Urban Residential		
Closed Residential		
Low Density Residential		
Reserved Residential		
Future Urban		
Rural Residential		
TOTAL	**0**	**0**

Mowbray East

YEAR	LOTS CREATED	LOTS TAKEN UP	NEW DWELLINGS	NEW UNITS (lots utilised)
1990	0	1	0	7(1)
1991	1	6	1	13(5)
1992	0	2	0	4(2)
1993	0	2	0	6(2)
1994	0	2	0	4(2)
1995	3	1	1	0
1996	0	1	1	0
1997	0	1	0	2(1)
1998	0	1	0	2(1)
1999	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0
2001	0	0	0	0
2002	0	1	1	0
2003	0	2	0	37 (2)#
2004	2	3	2	2 (1)
2005	0	2	1	1 (1)
2006	0	2	1	2 (1)
TOTAL	**6**	**27**	**8**	**80 (19)**

One application was for 35 villas on 1 lot – only one was constructed. The rest of the complex was constructed in 2006/2007.

Vacant Residential land as at 01/01/07 (parcels > 1ha)

Zoning	Vacant lots	Vacant land in ha
Urban Residential		
Closed Residential		
Low Density Residential		
Reserved Residential		
Future Urban		
Rural Residential		
TOTAL	**0**	**0**

Invermay

YEAR	LOTS CREATED	LOTS TAKEN UP	NEW DWELLINGS	NEW UNITS (lots utilised)
1990	2	1	0	2 (1)
1991	0	2	2	0
1992	0	0	0	0
1993	0	0	0	0
1994	0	2	0	4(2)
1995	0	1	0	1(1)
1996	0	1	0	2(1)
1997	0	1	1	0
1998	0	2	2	0
1999	0	1	1	0
2000	0	0	0	0
2001	0	2	1	5 (1)
2002	0	1	1	0
2003	0	1	1	0
2004	1	0	0	0
2005	0	2	1	6 (1)
2006	0	2	2	0
TOTAL	**2**	**19**	**12**	**20 (7)**

Vacant Residential land as at 01/01/07 (parcels > 1ha)

Zoning	Vacant lots	Vacant land in ha
Urban Residential		
Closed Residential		
Low Density Residential		
Reserved Residential		
Future Urban		
Rural Residential		
TOTAL	**0**	**0**

Inveresk Railyards – limited residential

YEAR	LOTS CREATED	LOTS TAKEN UP	NEW DWELLINGS	NEW UNITS (Lots utilised)
1990	0	0	0	0
1991	0	0	0	0
1992	0	0	0	0
1993	0	0	0	0
1994	0	0	0	0
1995	0	0	0	0
1996	0	0	0	0
1997	0	0	0	0
1998	0	0	0	0
1999	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0
2001	0	0	0	0
2002	2	0	0	0
2003	1	0	0	0
2004	0	0	0	0
2005	1	0	0	0
2006	0	1	1#	1
TOTAL	**4**	**1**	**1**	**1**

Northern Youth Shelter

Vacant Residential land as at 01/01/07* (parcels > 1ha)

Zoning	Vacant lots	Vacant land in ha
Urban Residential		
Closed Residential		
Low Density Residential		
Reserved Residential		
Future Urban		
Rural Residential		
TOTAL	**0**	**0**

* The current PU 11 Zoning provides for residential development

Waverley – also includes non residential land

YEAR	LOTS CREATED	LOTS TAKEN UP	NEW DWELLINGS	NEW UNITS (Lots utilised)
1990	0	0	0	0
1991	0	0	0	0
1992	0	2	1	1 (1)
1993	0	1	0	2 (1)
1994	0	1	1	0
1995	2	1	1	0
1996	7	2	1	1 (1)
1997	0	0	0	0
1998	0	0	0	0
1999	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0
2001	0	0	0	0
2002	0	1	1	0
2003	0	0	0	0
2004	4*	3	3	0
2005	0	1	1	0
2006	0	1	1	0
TOTAL	**13**	**13**	**10**	**4 (3)**

* Non residential subdivision

Vacant Residential land as at 01/01/07 (parcels > 1ha)

Zoning	Vacant lots	Vacant land in ha
Urban Residential		
Closed Residential		
Low Density Residential		
Reserved Residential		
Future Urban		
Rural Residential		
TOTAL	**0**	**0**

Trevallyn

YEAR	LOTS CREATED	LOTS TAKEN UP	NEW DWELLINS	NEW UNITS (Lots utilised)
1990	0	2	2	1 (0)
1991	1	3	3	0
1992	2	2	2	0
1993	2	4	3	2(1)
1994	0	4	3	2(1)
1995	1	0	0	0
1996	0	1	1	0
1997	0	0	0	0
1998	0	1	1	0
1999	0	2	2	0
2000	0	0	0	0
2001	0	1	1	0
2002	1	2	2	0
2003	1	1	1	0
2004	2	3	3	0
2005	3	2	2	0
2006	0	3	2	8 (1)
TOTAL	**13**	**31**	**28**	**13 (3)**

Vacant Residential land as at 01/01/07 (parcels > 1ha)

Zoning	Vacant lots	Vacant land in ha
Urban Residential		
Closed Residential		
Low Density Residential		
Reserved Residential		
Future Urban		
Rural Residential		
TOTAL	**0**	**0**

Central Periphery - only part residential

YEAR	LOTS CREATED	LOTS TAKEN UP	NEW DWELLINGS	NEW UNITS (Lots utilised)
1990	0	0	0	0
1991	0	0	0	0
1992	0	0	0	0
1993	0	1	1	0
1994	0	0	0	0
1995	0	1	0	5 (1)
1996	1	1	1	0
1997	0	0	0	0
1998	1	0	0	0
1999	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0
2001	0	0	0	0
2002	0	1	1	0
2003	0	0	0	0
2004	0	2	2	0
2005	0	0	0	0
2006	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	**2**	**6**	**5**	**5 (1)**

Vacant Residential land as at 01/01/07 (parcels > 1ha)

Zoning	Vacant lots	Vacant land in ha
Urban Residential		
Closed Residential		
Low Density Residential		
Reserved Residential		
Future Urban		
Rural Residential		
TOTAL	**0**	**0**

South Launceston

YEAR	LOTS CREATED	LOTS TAKEN UP	NEW DWELLINGS	New units (Lots utilised)
1990	0	2	1	6 (1)
1991	0	1	0	2 (1)
1992	2	6	3	12 (3)
1993	0	6	2	14 (4)
1994	0	9	3	9 (6)
1995	21	3	1	3 (2)
1996	3	3	2	1 (1)
1997	0	2	1	2 (1)
1998	1	4	4	0
1999	1	3	3	0
2000	1	1	1 (10 bedroom community facility)	0
2001	4	0	0	0
2002	1	2	2	0
2003	10	7	3	22 (4)
2004	2	4	3	2 (1)
2005	23	6	6	0
2006	6	6	6	0
TOTAL	**85**	**65**	**41**	**73 (24)**

Vacant Residential land as at 01/01/07 (parcels > 1ha)

Zoning	Vacant lots	Vacant land in ha
Urban Residential		
Closed Residential		
Low Density Residential	1	2.94
Reserved Residential		
Future Urban		
Rural Residential		
TOTAL	**1**	**2.94**

West Launceston

YEAR	LOTS CREATED	LOTS TAKEN UP	NEW DWELLINGS	NEW UNITS (Lots utilised)
1990	5	28	26	7 (2)
1991	2	39	30	20 (9)
1992	8	53	42	28 (11)
1993	4	53	41	25 (12)
1994	1	60	48	22 (12)
1995	10	32	31	4 (1)
1996	2	21	19	5 (2)
1997	18	10	10	0
1998	0	24	22	2 (2)
1999	3	24	23	2 (1)
2000	33	7	7	0
2001	17	14	13	1 (1)
2002	7	21	20	1(1)
2003	29	14	11	7 (3)
2004	40	10	9	2 (1)
2005	4	16	15	1 (1)
2006	8	21	20	1 (1)
TOTAL	**189**	**447**	**387**	**128 (60)**

Vacant Residential land as at 01/01/07 (parcels > 1ha)

Zoning	Vacant lots	Vacant land in ha
Urban Residential		
Closed Residential	2	4.58
Low Density Residential	1	5.04
Reserved Residential		
Future Urban	3	18.04
Rural Residential		
TOTAL	**5**	**27.66**

Norwood

YEAR	LOTS CREATED	LOTS TAKEN UP	NEW DWELLINGS	NEW UNITS (Lots utilised)
1990	1	15	14	2(1)
1991	1	21	18	8 (3)
1992	1	22	18	8 (4)
1993	10	25	20	10 (5)
1994	1	16	16	0
1995	0	7	7	0
1996	1	7	5	4 (2)
1997	0	8	8	0
1998	2	8	8	0
1999	0	9	7	5 (2)
2000	0	5	4	4 (1)
2001	1	6	6	0
2002	0	9	9	0
2003	0	10	10	0
2004	0	1	1	0
2005	2	0	0	0
2006	2	0	0	0
TOTAL	**22**	**169**	**151**	**41 (18)**

Vacant Residential land as at 01/01/07 (parcels > 1ha)

Zoning	Vacant lots	Vacant land in ha
Urban Residential		
Closed Residential		
Low Density Residential		
Reserved Residential		
Future Urban		
Rural Residential		
TOTAL	**0**	**0**

West Youngtown

YEAR	LOTS CREATED	LOTS TAKEN UP	NEW DWELLINGS	NEW UNITS (Lots utilised)
1990	0	0	0	1(0)
1991	0	3	2	4 (1)
1992	1	2	1	2(1)
1993	0	0	0	0
1994	0	0	0	0
1995	0	0	0	0
1996	0	1	1	0
1997	25	0	0	0
1998	0	2	2	0
1999	0	3	3	0
2000	0	0	0	0
2001	0	5	4	30 (1) Glenara
2002	15	2	2	0
2003	0	6	5	18 (1) Glenara
2004	0	3	2	5 (1)
2005	32	3	2	6 (1)
2006	7	3	2	2 (1)
TOTAL	**80**	**33**	**26**	**68 (7)**

Vacant Residential land as at 01/01/07 (parcels > 1ha)

Zoning	Vacant lots	Vacant land in ha
Urban Residential		
Closed Residential		
Low Density Residential		
Reserved Residential	1	1.67
Future Urban	1	14.63
Rural Residential		
TOTAL	**2**	**16.30**

Relbia

YEAR	LOTS CREATED	LOTS TAKEN UP	NEW DWELLINGS	NEW UNITS (Lots utilised)
1990	4	0	0	0
1991	17	0	0	0
1992	0	4	4	0
1993	1	6	6	0
1994	2	8	8	0
1995	0	2	2	0
1996	2	10	10	0
1997	2	3	3	0
1998	0	6	6	0
1999	0	8	8	0
2000	1	0	0	0
2001	1	9	9	0
2002	0	7	7	0
2003	3	3	3	0
2004	1	2	2	0
2005	2	3	3	0
2006	1	2	2	0
TOTAL	**37**	**73**	**73**	**0**

Vacant Residential land as at 01/01/07 (parcels > 1ha)

Zoning	Vacant lots	Vacant land in ha
Urban Residential		
Closed Residential		
Low Density Residential		
Reserved Residential		
Future Urban		
Rural Residential	12	42.46
TOTAL	**12**	**42.46**

Lilydale

YEAR	LOTS CREATED	LOTS TAKEN UP	NEW DWELLINGS	NEW UNITS (Lots utilised)
1990	0	0	0	0
1991	4	0	0	0
1992	1	3	3	0
1993	0	0	0	0
1994	0	1	1	0
1995	0	0	0	0
1996	2	1	1	0
1997	0	1	1	0
1998	0	0	0	0
1999	0	1	1	0
2000	1	0	0	0
2001	0	0	0	0
2002	0	0	0	0
2003	7	1	1	0
2004	12	0	0	0
2005	0	1	1	0
2006	2	1	0	4 (1)
TOTAL	**29**	**10**	**9**	**4 (1)**

Vacant Residential land as at 01/01/07 (parcels > 1ha)

Zoning	Vacant lots	Vacant land in ha
Urban Residential		
Closed Residential	1	1.46
Low Density Residential	4	12.25
Reserved Residential		
Future Urban		
Rural Residential		
TOTAL	**5**	**13.71**

TOTAL LAUNCESTON MUNICIPAL AREA

YEAR	LOTS CREATED	LOTS TAKEN UP	NEW DWELLINGS	NEW UNITS	(Lots utilised)
1990	65	156	135	114	21
1991	31	186	147	92	39
1992	56	223	157	165	66
1993	80	250	174	202	76
1994	11	235	185	103	50
1995	56	127	110	51	17
1996	19	122	111	22	11
1997	55	88	80	15	8
1998	36	118	108	19	10
1999	61	134	121	27	13
2000	57	70	67	9	3
2001	83	111	108	36	3
2002	183	136	131	10	5
2003	292	168	149	159	19
2004	211	138	128	22	10
2005	127	146	126	51	20
2006	141	166	136	144	30
TOTAL	**1564**	**2574**	**2173**	**1241**	**401**

Vacant Residential land as at 01/01/07

Zoning	Vacant lots	Vacant land in ha
Urban Residential	1	3.2
Closed Residential	13	36.32
Low Density Residential	7	31.14
Reserved Residential	7	21.06
Future Urban	12	140.97
Rural Residential	54	193.83
TOTAL	**94**	**426.52**